AMERICAN

FEAR

THE
UNDERGRADUATE
JOURNAL
OF AMERICAN
STUDIES

AMERICAN

FEAR

THE UNDERGRADUATE JOURNAL OF AMERICAN STUDIES

CO-EDITOR'S NOTE

Helen Alexandra Hayes
Co-Editor in Chief

Dear Readers,

The Undergraduate Journal of American Studies aims to actively engage the University of Toronto community—including but not limited to students of the Centre for the Study of the United States—in meaningful and thought-provoking discourse pertaining to our southern neighbours. This volume of the Undergraduate Journal of American Studies represents an original scholarly exploration of both historical and contemporary issues facing the United States. For that reason I enthusiastically welcome the arrival of this volume and I am excited for its release.

My goal for this volume of the Undergraduate Journal of American Studies was to contrast the pointed perspectives of University of Toronto undergraduate students with the vast political, social, and cultural landscape of the United States in order to further this unique platform for undergraduate academic research and writing. On behalf of all editors of this publication, we express our gratitude for the strong contributions of the talented undergraduate authors whose work is featured herein.

This year has been one of unparalleled social awareness, yet one that has also been ridden with unparalleled fear. This collection of essays is designed to analyze the causes and effects of American fear in particular, and to offer informed opinions on a series of timely issues. Its articles weigh rational and irrational fears to reveal the multifaceted nature of American fear. The volume's four sections: "Fear for American Security," "Fear for American Life," "Fear for Religious Sanctity," and "Fear and Disaster: Coping Methods," each highlight different forms of fear, and their historical and current implications.

I hope that this edition of the Undergraduate Journal of American Studies will challenge you with novel arguments relating to the theme of American Fear. I urge our readers to follow the example of our contributors in carefully unpacking the complex meaning of fear and reflecting deeply on the perspectives offered within this volume.

Helen Alexandra Hayes
Co-Editor in Chief

CO-EDITOR'S NOTE

Zach Wallace
Co-Editor in Chief

We've been shown our entire lives that the best way to learn about the path of humanity is through textbooks. But textbooks are a medium for, what are in fact, subjective retellings, existing behind a veil of adjective-barren language that lends itself to the objective air of textbook learning. Some of us realize later than others that the overwhelming majority of historical accounts that we devote our studies to are absent of an objective lens, because it doesn't exist. A reader should understand that any paper or account or article carries along with it the burden of context.

In the past year, the world has been binge-watching the Donald Trump show as it unfolds in the United States. Time has continued, as it does, to evoke a variety of ever-changing responses crippled by the conditions of where and when they were made. Just as a newspaper article from a Texan discussing Trump's political agenda will vary from an essay from a student of the University of Toronto, any perspective regarding the present state of U.S. relations changes seemingly month-to-month. The transition from disbelief to fear and eventually back to a more farcical disbelief has been within our personal realm of tangence but will inevitably be lacking in perspective outside our temporal reach as privileged Canadian students.

When looking upon the history of fear in America, its easy to simply read and absorb as if it were another history book, however it's the subtext that rings louder for those that are willing to dive deeper. Fear can be unwarranted or obviously forged out of malice in hindsight but our human condition leaves us all equally impaired and susceptible to the impressions of our environment. Mistakes are made but it's detrimental to read for anger and not an understanding. This collection of essays is designed to not accept, but analyze definitions we are given; to not reject, but to comprehend issues for what we think they were, and to leech out what we believe to be important. This edition will dive into different fears that have swept through the United States, and weigh the rational with the irrational and learn and impart our conclusions upon you, the reader. Our goal was to curate an outsiders view on the American political tornado, a University of Toronto undergraduate lens that, in turn, acts as a tool for self-awareness. Its only through recognizing our own fears that we can accurately interpret the world we have created for ourselves. A reminder that we are bound by our mutual humanity.

Zach Wallace
Co-Editor in Chief

MESSAGE FROM THE DIRECTOR

Robert Vipond
Director
Centre for the Study of the United States
and American Studies program

It is my real pleasure to welcome you, readers, to the twelfth volume of the *Undergraduate Journal of American Studies* at the University of Toronto. As usual, the articles in this volume cover a wide variety of topics and articulate a wide variety of perspectives. What unites them is the overarching theme of "fear" – physical and psychological, internal and external, current and historical. It is a wonderfully evocative and timely theme that crosses disciplinary boundaries. It is, as a result, a terrific showcase for the way we do American Studies at the University of Toronto.

I want, especially, to thank and congratulate both the individual contributors and the editorial team who assembled the various contributions into a coherent whole. Writing well is not easy, but it is both important and deeply satisfying. To paraphrase Alexis de Tocqueville's famous comment about the freedom of the press in America, authors (like these undergraduate students) have an amazing ability to put the same thought in a thousand minds at the same time. Such is the power of ideas. And such is the promise of an academic journal that serves as a vehicle for such smart, talented, idea-laden undergraduates as these.

The Centre for the Study of the United States (CSUS) at the Munk School of Global Affairs, University of Toronto is our country's preeminent place for making sense of our southern neighbour. It is a place where scholars in fields as diverse as political science, economics, cinema studies, women and gender studies, history, English, geography, art history, and many others come together through a shared intellectual interest in the United States. We host dozens of public lectures and intellectually stimulating events each year. We mount a complete undergraduate program in American Studies. We act as a touchstone for graduate students whose focus is the United States. And, as you will see, we help bring to fruition an undergraduate student journal in American Studies which advertises the breadth and depth of our students' interests.

Congratulations all.

Robert Vipond
Director
Centre for the Study of the United States and
American Studies program

TABLE
OF
CONTENTS

THE "OTHER" SIDE: THE CONTOURS OF TRUMP'S MEXICO BORDER WALL

By Aisha Assan-Lebbe

President Donald Trump released Executive Order 13767, titled "Border Security and Immigration Enforcement Improvements" on January 25, 2017. In the language of the order, enhancing "territorial integrity" and ensuring the "safety of America" are among its chief objectives.[1] Secondly, it dictates a host of prison sentences, ranging from two to five years, for persons with histories of convictions or deportations.[2] Lastly, it extends penalties to visa holders who overstay. The order states that the "wall shall mean a contiguous, physical wall or other similarly secure, contiguous and impassable physical barrier."[3] This paper advocates moral and humanist reasons against Trump's decision to construct a wall along America's southern border and argues that the wall functions as an extension of imperialist objectives of expansion and enforced dependency. I begin with an outline of the colonial legacy of dispossession that characterizes the founding of America. Next, I examine the nativist and ethno-nationalist basis supporting the construction of a wall. Finally, I argue the case that Trump's decision to build a wall is as inhumane as it is deadly, emphasizing the dehumanizing aspects of a militarized barricade wall.

A BORDERLAND PRODUCED BY WARS AND CONQUEST

Trump's proposed order ignores the violence of colonial conquest. Colonists subsumed the land that comprises modern-day America. Borders are largely "the inheritance of a colonial past" according to Zuniga.[4] The creation of America entailed the dispossession, death, and destruction of indigenous peoples and their lands. Thomas Hobbes aptly called American expansionism an "insatiable appetite, or Bulimia, of enlarging Dominion"[5] states, "the United States, for its part, constitutes a special case in the history of the production of borders…they invented a new way of creating borders, filling empty spaces (defined as such so as to justify expansion)."[6] Since the border was seen as the point of contact between civilization and barbarism,[7] the violence of colonialism and a collective American identity are inextricably connected. A wall explicitly espouses this violent history and affirms its role in the making of the present-day borders.

Maps of Mexico produced in the 1840s show that the country reached into the Pacific Northwest. The 11th U.S. president, James K. Polk (1795–1849), wanted the land that comprised Mexico and declared war in 1846 following Mexico's refusal to sell its land.

Mexico and the conquistadors faced a stunning defeat and ceded to the U.S. half of its territory with the signing of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo and the Gadsden Purchase. In exchange for 15 million dollars, Mexico surrendered the territory that became the states of Texas, California, Nevada, Utah, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Kansas and Wyoming, and expanded the territory that would become Arizona and Colorado and parts of Texas. Carroll (2017) summarized the attitude that justified this expansion:

> "The expansionary war was borne out of the Manifest Destiny, the ideology that America was destined to expand its territory throughout North American territory owned by Native Americans, referred to as 'savage tribes' in the language of the treaties, and several thousand former Mexican citizens. Ninety percent of these citizens decided to become US citizens while the rest located to the Mexican side of the new border."[8]

Following this definition, the construction of a wall is an act of U.S. expansionism.

The stereotypes and racist tropes that Border Patrol employs when it differentiates between illegal and legal migrants are based off a hegemonic notion of American identity. Trump has flagrantly associated Mexican migrants with violent crime. Trump evokes the language of expansionist fantasies in declaring that "bad hombres" living within America endanger the country. He insists on building a wall through appealing to its historic contention. This phenomenon is accounted for by Zuniga (1992) who suggests that borders are "unfinished business, pending tasks or vestiges from the past."[9] Demarcations of borders thus serve as reminders of past violence and looming threats of future invasion.

ETHNO-NATIONALIST HYSTERIA

The border wall emphasizes the contradictory nature of the borderland, permitting and increasing economic trade and the movement of goods, while forbidding the movement of peoples. A wall would concede to such nativist fears and resentment of non-whites. Right-wing nationalists, who fret about the threat of invasion by outsiders, express concerns over the changing ethnic composition of America. Zuniga

elaborates this, stating "Collective identities are essentially unique combinations of temporal (historical) dimensions and of spatial (territorial) dimensions."[10] The process of nation building is imbued with hegemony. To be American, one must espouse frontier violence.

A wall is an extension of the frontier. Donald Trump projects an image of the rugged individualism of the frontier — a modern frontiersman. The border wall is his rallying cry to an allegedly misunderstood, forgotten majority. He is confrontational and approaches the topic of the wall with vengence; indeed, he is a redeeming figure who seeks rough justice. Trump intends to humiliate and denigrate Mexico, a less prosperous country when he demands that Mexico pay for the wall. Furthermore, the construction of a wall could foster a cynical and violently self-interested America. Legitimized through discourses of objectivity and security, a wall articulates an atavistic impulse to separate and cordon non-white migrants. Therefore, discourses of security and fear of crime are used to legitimate truly racist fears of difference.

Heyman (1999) notes that nationalism and border action are causally linked. The fear of demographic change is a driving force of the far-right movement. Trump's wall is a direct response to this fantasy appealing to nativist and white supremacist sentiment. Zuniga (1998) describes a process of fortification whereby internal borders are erased, and external borders are supported. Internally, this manifests itself in the ethnic solidarity over class lines. The desire to build a wall is driven by the resentment of immigrants. The fear of non-whites works as a unifying force.

Andreas notes that descriptions of Mexican migrants use of natural disaster and war metaphors, such as "invasion" and "flood." Mexican migrants pose an existential threat to a unified white majority akin to that of natural disasters. The discourse used to describe the influx of migrants equates to biblical plagues and natural disasters, which results in an approach towards migrants akin to containing diseases. A wall would represent a projection of a collective fear of the "other". It promotes resentment towards and stigmatization of Mexicans. In addition to fostering anti-immigrant sentiment and xenophobia, it constitutes an extremely palpable form of "othering."[11] This fascination with territoriality, the way people use space to communicate ownership, predates Trump and, as a product of America's history, is embedded in the American psyche.

A WALL OF THE MIND

As previously illustrated, Trump's plan for enhanced border security entails the creation of a wall that separates 'us' vs 'them' categories. Here I argue that such a wall would denote a metaphysical separation of the 'other'. "The construction of reality, depends on borders because content, form, and discourse in the physical, social, and political worlds require distinct delimitations, differentiations, differences — all of which are formulated by, through, over and under different kinds of borders and boundings" according to Ackleson.[12] Under this understanding of the delineations of space borders function as crucial to notions of othering. A border demarcates these 'us' vs 'them' distinctions, and conveys tangible ideas of space ownership and dominance.

The current border encourages certain performances of race and ethnicity by different actors (e.g. Mexican migrants, border patrol, and the U.S. government). Such a wall would therefore have an affective materiality; it would encourage and influence actor behaviours and performances, and would be intensified if the government implements increasingly austere measures. Moreover, borders are social constructions. They serve the dual purpose of denying the corporeal existence of migrants while vigorously asserting national sovereignty. In addition to infringing upon Mexican migrants' freedom of movement, a wall would facilitate the policing of the Mexican community. Trump admits that he intends to expand the prison sentences of migrants, giving rise to prison landscapes dedicated to detaining and holding migrants. Today, the military furthers colonial era objectives into the post-colonial context. The intent to build a barricade exemplifies the cruelty of the immigration-enforcement complex.

The commonplace perception that Mexican migrants pose a threat to American society is shaped more by fear than empirical evidence. Similarly, the perceptions of American novelists and poets, albeit sympathetic towards Mexicans, remain incomplete and are severed from the lived reality of Mexicans.[13] Paz notes that while they "have often been brilliant, they have also been fragmentary … they reveal less of the Mexican reality than of the authors' personalities. In general, Americans have not looked for Mexico in Mexico; they have looked for their obsessions, enthusiasms, phobias, hopes, interests — and these are what they have found." Americans, both within and outside of the Government, project their biases upon Mexicans instead of seeing the objective truth. Ultimately, these biases affect their attitudes and, by extension, behaviours towards Mexicans, which, in turn, help shape Mexican-Americans

behaviours to create a self-fulfilling prophecy. Furthermore, Limerick (2000) connects American psychological projection to the frontier; she details a "much more realistic usage of *la frontera*," which directs attention to the cultural complexities and personal experiences along the U.S.-Mexico borderlands[14] is Limerick's belief that there exists a discord between the "idea of the frontier" and the lived reality on the ground. She argues that the borderlands continued to exist "only in the imagination … and that the Mexican border was a social fiction that neither nature nor people in search of opportunity observed."[15] Ultimately, what appears to be a social construction of an "illegal" other begets legal, political and material ramifications upon migrants.

(IL)LEGALITY

The borderlands are purposefully deadly.[16] People go missing and are killed. The story of the Weltton 26, for example, tells of a group of migrants who were disoriented in the physical landscape of the U.S.-Mexico borderlands.[17] In contrast to the absence of border deaths along America's border with Canada, border deaths are a common occurrence along their border with Mexico. Washington (2016) suggests that a wall is as much a weapon as it is a barricade.

The borderlands constitute as a legally ambiguous and retributive space. While constitutional protections do apply, they are frequently ignored by border operations, thus casting aside migrants' civil liberties.[18] Court proceedings, deportation hearings, interdiction and detention subsume migrants in the legal system with a growing imprisoned Mexican migrant population. Technologies, security contractors, and military style images dehumanize these migrants. A wall would only serve to uphold imperial interests.

AMERICAN ENCROACHMENT INTO MEXICO

The grip the United States has on Mexico is emblematized in a famous quote by the late Mexican dictator, Porfirio Diaz, lamenting Mexico's close proximity to the U.S.: "Poor Mexico, so far from God, so close to the United States." He recognized that American expansionism produced mass poverty in Mexico. A wall would serve as a physical reminder of the suffocating grip of U.S. trade policies. Dunn (1996) states that "the image of the U.S.-Mexico border

region that emerges … is that of a vulnerable zone in urgent need of numerous, serious security measures — to repel an "invasion of "illegal aliens", to win the War on Drugs, and even to counter the threat of terrorism."[19] Indeed, these alarmist portrayals render the border space exceptional, giving the military far-reaching powers on American and Mexican soil. The construction of a wall allows the military to expand indefinitely into every aspect of Mexicans' lives, granting Border Patrol more freedom to act with impunity.

Common critiques of Trump's proposed wall cite economic and practical reasons against the construction of a wall. Seldom note the disastrous effects of neoliberal trade policies, "decades of political recklessness," climate change, and U.S.-backed coups on Mexico.[20] Many of these are documented characteristics of the present-day American empire, thereby demonstrating the reach of empire lives of Mexicans. Indeed, America has created a dependence on its economy and military and it is inhumane that a barricade then be created. In his seminal work, Frederick Jackson Turner (1896) proclaimed, "the dominant fact of [American] life has been expansion."[21] One can therefore interpret the proposed wall and its accompanied militarization as the natural, almost evolutionary progression of America. Mexico is thus resisting the flow of empire. The construction of a wall would cleave through communities in Mexico that are scattered throughout the borderlands, further separating families.[22]

Trump's decision to construct a wall along the U.S.-Mexico border is worthy of condemnation. In demanding the construction of a wall, the same forces that create and impose a dependence on American empire are then ensnaring Mexican migrants who search a better life, thus illustrating the atrocity of such a project. Trump's wall blurs the line between fantasy and reality, fomenting a racist fear of ethnic difference that is both on the rise in and rooted in the history of America.

ENDNOTES

1 "Executive Order: Border Security and Immigration Enforcement Improvements." The White House. The United States Government, 23 Feb. 2017.

2 Kelly, A., & Sprunt, B. (2016, November 09). Here Is What Donald Trump Wants To Do In His First 100 Days. Retrieved March 28, 2017.

3 "Executive Order: Border Security and Immigration Enforcement Improvements." The White House. The United States Government, 23 Feb. 2017.

4 Zuniga, V. (1998). Nations and Borders: Romantic Nationalism and the Project of Modernity. In Spener, D., & Staudt, K. A. (1998). The U.S.-Mexico border: Transcending divisions, contesting identities. pp. 35–55. Boulder, Colo:

Lynne Rienner Publishers, 37.

5   Hobbes T. (2012). Leviathan: The English and Latin texts (Vol. 2). N. Malcolm (Ed.). (The Clarendon Edition of the Works of Thomas Hobbes). (Vol. 4) Oxford: Oxford University Press. Oxford Scholarly Editions Online (2013), 518.

6   Zuniga, V. (1998). Nations and Borders: Romantic Nationalism and the Project of Modernity. In Spener, D., & Staudt, K. A. (1998). The U.S.-Mexico border: Transcending divisions, contesting identities. pp. 35–55. Boulder, Colo: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 37.

7   Turner, F. J. (1896). The significance of the frontier in American history. Ann Arbor: University Microfilms.

8   Carroll, R. (2017, February 2). 'So far from God, so close to the US': Mexico's troubled past with its neighbour. The Guardian. Retrieved March 28, 2017, 42.

9   Carroll, R. (2017, February 2). 'So far from God, so close to the US': Mexico's troubled past with its neighbour. The Guardian. Retrieved March 28, 2017, 42.

10 Zuniga, V. (1998). Nations and Borders: Romantic Nationalism and the Project of Modernity. In Spener, D., & Staudt, K. A. (1998). The U.S.-Mexico border: Transcending divisions, contesting identities. pp. 35–55. Boulder, Colo: Lynne Rienner Publishers.

11 Zuniga, V. (1998). Nations and Borders: Romantic Nationalism and the Project of Modernity. In Spener, D., & Staudt, K. A. (1998). The U.S.-Mexico border: Transcending divisions, contesting identities. pp. 35–55. Boulder, Colo: Lynne Rienner Publishers.

12 Zuniga, V. (1998). Nations and Borders: Romantic Nationalism and the Project of Modernity. In Spener, D., & Staudt, K. A. (1998). The U.S.-Mexico border: Transcending divisions, contesting identities. pp. 35–55. Boulder, Colo: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 158.

13 Paz, O. (2005). The labyrinth of solitude: the other Mexico ; return to the labyrinth of solitude ; Mexico and the United States ; the philanthropic ogre. London: Penguin.

14 Limerick, P. N. (2000). Something in the soil: Legacies and reckonings in the New West. New York: W.W. Norton, 88.

15 Limerick, P. N. (2000). Something in the soil: Legacies and reckonings in the New West. New York: W.W. Norton, 89.

16 Rubio-Goldsmith, R., McCormick, M., Martinez, D., & Magdalena Duarte, I. (2016, July 20). A Humanitarian Crisis at the Border: New Estimates of Deaths Among Unauthorized Immigrants. Retrieved March 28, 2017.

17 Acosta, A. (2012). Hinging on Exclusion and Exception: Bare Life, the US/Mexico Border, and Los que nunca llegarán. Social Text 30(4 113): 103–123.

18 Know Your Rights: The Government's 100-Mile "Border" Zone - Map. Retrieved March 28, 2017, 3.

19 Know Your Rights: The Government's 100-Mile "Border" Zone - Map. Retrieved March 28, 2017, 3.

20 Washington, J. (2016, June 22). These Haunting Photos Show the Deadly Absurdity of the US-Mexico Border Wall. Retrieved March 28, 2017.

21 Washington, J. (2016, June 22). These Haunting Photos Show the Deadly Absurdity of the US-Mexico Border Wall. Retrieved March 28, 2017.

22 Washington, J. (2016, June 22). These Haunting Photos Show the Deadly Absurdity of the US-Mexico Border Wall. Retrieved March 28, 2017.

AMERICA THE SAVIOUR: HOW THE RHETORIC OF MASCULINIST PROTECTION JUSTIFIED THE WARS IN VIETNAM AND AFGHANISTAN

By Caroline Nguyen

The Vietnam War (1955–1975) and War in Afghanistan (2001–2014) are two monumental events in contemporary history that, while occurring in two separate eras under different circumstances, share several similarities. While neither country presented a clear, direct threat to the United States, American troops nonetheless invaded. Both of these conflicts continued long after initially conceived, and as such saw high financial, societal and human costs felt by American, Vietnamese, and Afghan civilians. The decision to escalate or launch attacks in Vietnam and Afghanistan fell upon two presidents, Lyndon Baines Johnson and George Walker Bush, respectively, two Texan "cowboys" whose presidencies would later be defined by these events.

Because these wars were, and remain, controversial, it is essential to examine and compare how these two presidents justified American involvement in these foreign states to the American people despite the benefits for the United States being questionable. Upon further investigation, it is evident that both the Johnson and Bush administration depicted their respective wars not as a straightforward battle for American security, but as an American duty to protect weaker subjects on the international stage from forces of evil. This case comparison rests on two theories. The first of which is securitization theory, which argues that security issues are not objective but rather "securitized", meaning that they are socially constructed by powerful actors, such as state leaders. These individuals attempt to undergo the securitization process, which is when they attempt to persuade their audience through discourse that there is an imminent threat requiring immediate action. The second theory, the theory of masculinist protection, posits that when states and actors securitize conflict-related issues, they perpetuate patriarchal power dynamics by adopting the role of masculine protector, who provides protection for the weak in exchange for their submission and obedience.

These theories are applicable when analyzing various speeches, press statements and documents from Presidents Johnson and Bush during the early stages of the Vietnam and Afghanistan Wars. Although there are minor differences, both men pushed the narrative that the South Vietnamese state and Afghan women were vulnerable to exploitation from evil enemies that only the United States could stop. This masculinist protectionist rhetoric has broad implications on American foreign policy, for it rationalizes American imperialism through the exportation of U.S.-friendly democracies

and encourages American solipsism or egocentricity. Therefore, the rhetoric used by Presidents Lyndon B. Johnson and George W. Bush when justifying the Vietnam and Afghanistan Wars demonstrates how patriarchal power dynamics manifest and inform American imperialism in its foreign policy.

CONSTRUCTING SECURITY: THE THEORIES OF SECURITIZATION AND MASCULINIST PROTECTION

In order to fully appreciate how the Vietnam and Afghanistan Wars were framed by their respective Presidents, it is necessary to first discuss the theory of securitization and its feminist expansion, and the logic of masculinist protection.

According to securitization theory, a "security issue" is when there is "an existential threat to a designated referent object… [therefore justifying] the use of extraordinary measures to handle them."[1] A referent object is any object, person, or idea of prescribed value that requires protection. Securitization theory is a rejection of conventional notions of "security": rationalist explanations for war rely on the assumption that these existential threats to safety and self-interests are objective. This is faulty, however, because it fails to explain why some issues are treated as security needs even though they do not pose immediate harm, nor why some pressing issues, such as global warming, receive little urgent action. In reality, security is not objective at all; the existential threat must undergo "securitization", which is the "intersubjective establishment of an existential threat with a saliency sufficient to have substantial political effects."[2] "Securitizing actors" are individuals in authority who carry out the securitization process. They aim to persuade their audience, using discourse and rhetoric, that a particular issue presents an existential threat to a valued referent object, and thus requires extraordinary action to be subdued.[3] Securitization often utilizes the specific rhetorical themes of survival and urgent action, stressing that "if the problem is not handled now it will be too late, and we will not exist to remedy our failure."[4] Should this discourse succeed, the audience permits emergency action that will combat the threat to take place, actions that would normally break the norms and laws of the society. Whether or not the issue at hand actually presents a physical security threat is irrelevant; the basis of securitization rests in the ability of the actors to persuade their

audience to "[legitimize] the breaking of rules" for the purpose of protection.[5] If this can be done, no matter the objective nature of the issue, securitization is successful.

An extension of securitization theory is the logic of masculinist protection, which requires a conceptualization of the roles of the protector, the protected, and the predator.[6] The protector, or the "good man", is analogous to a strong, patriarchal husband. He is the leader of his family and "readily risks himself in the face of threats from the outside in order to protect the subordinate members of his household."[7] The protected, or the woman, acts like the husband's wife. She is dependent on her protector because he has "a near monopoly on the means of destruction."[8] In return for this protection, she must be submissive to her protector, and not question his judgment.[9] The predator is what threatens the safety of the protected; he is a "bad" man, a "selfish aggressor who wishes to invade the lord's property and sexually conquer his women."[10] In summary, the protector, a good man, shields the protected, his wife or daughter, from the exploitation of the predator, or bad man, and in return the protector rules his household.

Young states that the power dynamics of the patriarchal household parallels the relationship between state governments and subjects whom they seek to control. The security state is responsible for protecting itself and its citizens from external and/or internal aggression, and in exchange citizens must abide by the law and the authority of leaders, even when they exercise arbitrary power in the name of security.[11] Oftentimes, when governments securitize issues, "state officials adopt the stance of masculine protector, telling us to entrust our lives to them, not to question their decisions about what will keep us safe."[12] They will attempt to persuade their subjects that they are threatened by a predatory enemy, and that only the state can save them so long as they accept state rule. This perpetuates power dynamics between the state, civilians and enemies that harken to the patriarchal power relationship that which masculinist protection is based upon. In conjunction, securitization theory and masculinist protection theory attempt to illustrate that "security", and in this case "war", are social constructions that rely on manipulating people's perceptions of reality to become both fearful and hateful of a supposed enemy, regardless of the objective nature of the situation. Through an analysis of the securitizing language used by Presidents Johnson and Bush in regards to the Vietnam and Afghanistan Wars, it is clear that they assumed the role of masculine protector, seeking to shield weak, feminized subjects from a predatory threat.

THE PROTECTED, THE PREDATOR AND THE PROTECTOR: MASCULINIST PROTECTION IN WAR RHETORIC

While the subjects may be different, a comparison of the two cases demonstrates that despite some variances in context, the general rhetoric in justifying these wars largely remains the same: there are innocent, dependent people who face exploitation and evil and it is up to America to save them. Firstly, Johnson and Bush sought to feminize the country of Vietnam and Afghan women respectively to characterize them as weak and vulnerable. For instance, on April 7, 1965, President Johnson gave an address to the nation explaining his commitment to Vietnam's welfare by stating, "To abandon this small and brave nation to its enemies, and to the terror that must follow, is an unforgivable wrong."[13] Here, the referent object is the South Vietnamese state itself and not necessarily the people of Vietnam, although that is certainly implied when he speaks. While he acknowledges that South Vietnam is brave for fighting against communism, he nonetheless depicts the country as "small", vulnerable to "terror", and dependent on the United States to save it. Johnson asserts that South Vietnam is incapable of protecting itself, similarly to how women are dependent on good men in masculinist protection theory.

In comparison, President Bush and First Lady Laura Bush made concerted efforts to painfully and vividly detail the plight of Afghan women under Taliban Rule, rather than the country of Afghanistan. For instance, First Lady Bush, on behalf of her husband, delivered the presidential radio address on November 17, 2001, the first address ever given by a first lady.[14] Focused on the subject of Afghan women, she claimed that "the brutal oppression of women is a central goal of the terrorists. Long before the current war began, the Taliban and its terrorist allies were making the lives of children and women in Afghanistan miserable."[15] While the maltreatment of women during this period was atrocious, it is nonetheless interesting that the Bush administration chose to highlight this issue since the status of Afghan women was not an obvious American self-interest. Instead, the speech was a strong emotional appeal to its listeners' humanity and empathy for suffering women rather than a logical presentation of how the Afghan War was crucial for American safety. The fact that this was the first American presidential radio address delivered by a first lady illustrates the abnormal level of urgency felt by the Bush administration to securitize and act on

behalf of Afghan women. Although she was not the President, the First Lady's decision to deliver this speech herself is an appeal to authority: she, as a woman, can speak on behalf of Afghan women whose voices are being silenced. Although women are not typically seen as political actors, Laura Bush's presence indicates the non-partisan and emotional nature of this crisis. The appeal to human compassion is stronger in this case in comparison to Johnson's rationalization of the Vietnam War, because while Johnson maintained his focus on the South Vietnamese state and its stability, the radio address demonstrates the Bush administration's reliance on emotional empathy and outrage over the treatment of Afghan women. Nonetheless, the feminization of the referent objects, South Vietnam and Afghan women, is consistent in both cases.

In order to save a referent object, however, a threat must be presented. The communists in Vietnam and the Taliban in Afghanistan filled this role, and both presidents attempt to portray their enemy as malicious. For example, Johnson framed communists as predators occurred in a speech on September 29, 1967, during which he lamented that Vietnam "is the arena where Communist expansionism is most aggressively at work… where it is killing and kidnaping; where it is ruthlessly attempting to bend free people to its will."[16] His choice of vocabulary when describing communism conjure strong mental images of a predator. By using words such as "conspiracy", "aggressively", "killing", "kidnaping", and "ruthlessly", Johnson makes strong emotional appeals to fear of the "Other," implying that a communist takeover of Vietnam would result in the moral degradation and exploitation of innocent people. In comparison, President and First Lady Bush employ the language of civilization and barbarism when describing their enemy, the Taliban. For instance, in First Lady Bush's radio address, the words "brutal" and "brutality" appear five times, and "terrorist" appears nine times.[17] One month later at the signing of the Afghan Women and Children Relief Act into law, President Bush proclaimed that "[The Taliban] not only violate basic human rights, they are barbaric in their indefensible meaning of justice… Their attitude is wrong for any culture. Their attitude is wrong for any religion."[18]

The biggest difference between the rhetoric of Johnson and Bush is the degree to which they frame their enemies as evil. In the Vietnam War scenario, while communists are framed as immoral and a threat, their danger lies in their ideology, not necessarily in the people themselves. There is no proof that Johnson ever claimed that

communists cannot be saved or converted to democracy and capitalism. Therefore, it is not necessarily *communist people* who are a threat, rather it is *communism as an ideology* that can corrupt the human. But while such individuals remain communist, they are dehumanized and vilified. Contrastingly, the rhetoric surrounding the Taliban is reminiscent of the language used in Samuel Huntington's "The Clash of Civilizations?" Huntington proclaims that people from opposing civilizations do not share important aspects of identity such as religion, language and "views of the relative importance of rights and responsibilities, liberty and authority, equality and hierarchy."[19] Bush heightens the clash between the United States and the Taliban to such a level that which the Taliban threatens *all other civilizations*, regardless of culture and religion, as if to say that the entire world should be opposed to the Taliban. As best dictated by President Bush himself, "either you are with us, or you are with the terrorists."[20]

It is unclear whether this heightened degree of conflict can be applied to the Vietnam War. "The Clash of Civilizations?" was written with the purpose of predicting the post-Cold War world order, yet parallels still arise between the piece and the Vietnam War.[21] In essence, the war was a battle between two different "civilizations", a capitalist and democratic one against a communist one. Johnson's descriptions of communism as described above certainly imply that he believed the opposing ideology to be inferior and destructive. But unlike the Bush administration, there is little evidence to suggest that Johnson associated communism with barbarism or "un-civilization" as explicitly and publicly as Bush. Nonetheless, both Johnson and Bush intended to frame their enemy as a dangerous and morally corrupt force that must be eliminated.

The final aspect of this masculinist protectionist relationship is thus the "protector" role, and it is very clear from both cases that America is portrayed by Johnson and Bush as the good man who saves the weak from danger. In that same April 1965 speech, President Johnson proclaimed, "we are there because we have a promise to keep… we have helped to build, and we have helped to defend [South Vietnam] … And I intend to keep that promise."[22] This statement illustrates the rhetoric of the masculine protector who is "expected to provide for others."[23] His 1967 speech follows the same pattern, for he references a number of individuals who support American intervention in Vietnam to stop communism, including President Dwight Eisenhower, President John F. Kennedy, President Park Chung-hee of Korea, the Minister of Foreign Affairs

of Thailand, Thanat Khoman, and Prime Minister Keith Holyoake of New Zealand.[24] This portion of the speech is a direct appeal to authority to illustrate that America's decision to defend Vietnam is just and supported by other leaders and strong men. It perpetuates the notion that ultimately, "the sovereign decides what actions or opinions constitute a danger to peace and properly suppresses them."[25] What is notable, however, is that Johnson does not include a quotation from any Vietnamese leaders. Although this may have been unintentional, it nonetheless demonstrates the shift of power and authority not to the Vietnamese people who have the most at stake, but to other statesmen who act as masculine protectors or support America as a masculine protector. Thus, Johnson paints the United States as the masculine protector of Vietnam, responsible for its safety and wellbeing.

Similar rhetoric was used in the case of the Afghanistan War, especially in regards to how the United States liberated Afghan women. During his 2002 State of the Union Address, he began by listing the accomplishments of the country since 9/11 and the launch of Operation Enduring Freedom. Bush claims that the United States has "comforted the victims… captured, arrested, and rid the world of thousands of terrorists… saved a people from starvation, and freed a country from brutal oppression."[26] He later on states, "The last time we met in this chamber, the mothers and daughters of Afghanistan were captives in their own homes… Today women are free."[27] Bush takes credit for the "liberation" of Afghan women, claiming that without American intervention, Afghanistan would still be under terrorist rule and that the women would still be oppressed. Bush re-packages the War in Afghanistan as a humanitarian effort to free the Afghan people, pushing this type of narrative much harder than Johnson. Whether or not Bush's claims are true, this speech and the morphing of the War as an altruistic endeavor signifies Bush's further attempts to legitimize the Afghan War. Because the United States acted as a masculine protector and "freed" Afghan women, the war was supposedly justified. This is a dangerous claim to make; not only does it encourage Afghan citizens to show gratitude to their saviours and to "submit to [the United States'] rule and decisions without questioning", but it also erases the contributions, achievements and experiences of Afghan women in their own fight for freedom.[28] While Bush acknowledges the presence of Afghanistan's first Minister of Women's Affairs, Doctor Sima Samar, in the audience, he does not recount her achievements

nor those of any other Afghan women.[29] Like her counterparts, Doctor Samar is framed to Bush's audience as a subject and beneficiary of American assistance, not an autonomous actor.

Ultimately, the two cases demonstrate that America has sought to play the role of masculine protector in Vietnam and Afghanistan in order to save others abroad from an encroaching evil threat. In their effort to securitize and justify the Vietnam and Afghanistan Wars, Presidents Johnson and Bush used masculinist protectionist language to paint their enemies as immoral and themselves as liberators and good men. Although perhaps unintentional, this type of rhetoric perpetuates patriarchal power dynamics in which the United States, acting as a "good man", has power over both its subjects whom it supposedly protects and its enemies who were framed as fundamentally different from American values and culture.

AMERICAN IMPERIALISM
THROUGH DEMOCRATIC PEACE

Although it is clear that Presidents Johnson and Bush used the rhetoric of masculinist protection in their respective wars, it is not as explicit as to why this came about, or why either president felt the need to "save" people on the other side of the world. However, upon further consideration, it becomes apparent that these "humanitarian" efforts were one means to the end goal of achieving democracy in Vietnam and Afghanistan, and the export of democracy and American values are strong self-interests for American security.

President Johnson's rhetoric surrounding the War in Vietnam has unambiguously and consistently revolved around the establishment of democracy and liberty in Vietnam. Best encompassed by his 1966 State of the Union, President Johnson lists the pursuit of democracy across the world as one of his foreign policy priorities, stating, "We fight for the principle of self-determination — that the people of South Vietnam should be able to choose their own course, choose it in free elections without violence, without terror, and without fear... This is all we want for South Vietnam."[30] Similar statements about the pursuit of worldwide democracy are made in each of his State of the Union addresses from 1964 to 1969, demonstrating his clear commitment to the preservation of Vietnamese democracy.31 Although he may fully subscribe to this belief, this sentiment does not reveal the full picture; in 1965, Johnson also claimed, "we

must fight if we are to live in a world where every country can shape its own destiny. And only in such a world will our own freedom be finally secure."[32] Although he does not say this explicitly, he subscribes to the idea of Democratic Peace Theory, which posits that democracies do not war with each other "because they share common norms of live-and-let-live and domestic institutions that constrain the recourse to war."[33] Thus, Johnson seeks to persuade his audience that American security rests in the United States' ability to keep South Vietnam's democracy upright. The notion that America's survival is dependent on Vietnam's democratic stability is one that which Johnson repeatedly emphasizes, and this relationship is made quite clear throughout his tenure in office.

The relationship between Afghan women's rights and American safety is less clear, however, for it involves an extra level of rationalization. At a meeting between American and Afghan women leaders in 2004, President Bush proclaimed that "the advance of women's rights and the advance of liberty are ultimately inseparable."[34] This statement implies that the pursuit of women's rights and democracy are interconnected, and that it is necessary to have women's rights in order to operate a functioning, true democracy. The pursuit of world democracy was in fact one of the most pressing issues for the Bush administration. This is evident in the country's 2002 National Security Strategy, of which the introduction of the report states, "[the United States] will actively work to bring the hope of democracy, development, free markets, and free trade to every corner of the world. The events of September 11, 2001, taught us that weak states, like Afghanistan, can pose as great a danger to our national interests as strong states."[35] Like Johnson, Bush is also an advocate of Democratic Peace Theory, but the intensity of the rhetoric used in the National Security Strategy implies a much stronger commitment to exporting democracy. Whereas Johnson was attempting to *save* the failing South Vietnamese democracy, Bush was attempting to *create* a democracy where one was absent, in Afghanistan.

Furthermore, it is interesting to note that the report only highlights "respect for women" once, without discussing what concrete measures this entails.[36] This is a strong divergence from the official discourse that surrounded the plight of Afghan women, which as previously discussed, described at length the both various forms of mistreatment they faced, and how America and its allies would liberate these women. The vagueness and lack of explanation regarding "respect for women" in the National Security Strategy implies

that this is secondary to other more pressing issues, such as promoting democracy. Women's rights, therefore, are seen not as the end goal, but rather as a means to achieving a democratic state, which ultimately serves American self-interests.[37] Thus, while the degrees of rationalization and commitment to global democracy varied between Johnson and Bush, both nonetheless prescribed to the idea that it was necessary to establish democracy in Vietnam and Afghanistan in order to ultimately maintain American safety, leading both presidents to securitize these issues.

MASCULINIST PROTECTION AS THE FOUNDATION OF AMERICAN SOLIPSISM

So long as America acts as a masculine protector over weaker, inferior subjects, this patriarchal power dynamic also American solipsism and ignorance about other nations and societies. Solipsism is defined as the belief that "someone believes that he is the world", and particularly in the context of American solipsism, the belief that "the world is populated by frustrated or potential Americans."[38] This is rooted in the idea that the United States has a personal, and supposedly selfless, responsibility to secure freedom across the world. For instance, as Johnson stated in his 1966 State of the Union Address, "We seek neither territory nor bases, economic domination or military alliance in Vietnam."[39] Bush makes similar claims about American responsibility. In his 2001 ultimatum to terrorists, he said, "The advance of human freedom — the great achievement of our time, and the great hope of every time — now depends on us."[40]

These assertions of responsibility, which parallel those of the selfless and wise masculine protector, imply not only that their wars are just, but that they are necessary and welcomed by Vietnam and the Afghan women who were feminized.[41] As a result, masculine protectors, who are the "absolute authority who makes, interprets and enforces the laws… for the sake of peace and security of subjects", find no need to consult with those they protect for determining the best course of action, thus falling into solipsist thinking.[42] In the case of America, solipsism "[imposes] the imperial American self… it serves as a justification of ignorance."[43] By claiming the right to intervene in international conflicts on the basis of morality, Johnson and Bush as masculine protectors embodied solipsist thinking, believing that military action and the establishment of democracy would

be enough to "save" Vietnam and Afghanistan. They demonstrate that masculinist protection demands solipsism, and because America plays the role of masculine protector when it seeks to impose its presence abroad, America is simultaneously also a solipsistic nation. In summary, the rhetoric from these two wars masks the underlying intention of securing democracies abroad and therefore, American safety. It is this goal coupled with masculinist protection that perpetuates American solipsism in its foreign policy.

CONCLUSION

The justifications used by Presidents Johnson and Bush to legitimize the Vietnam and Afghanistan Wars can be analyzed through the lens of masculinist protection, both in terms of how the parties involved in each conflict were portrayed and in regards to how the patriarchal power dynamics between these parties encourages American imperialism and solipsism in international affairs. By examining various speeches, statements and documents released by each administration, it is clear that both presidents intentionally framed their wars as America's moral duty to save those under attack, particularly South Vietnamese and Afghan women. The enemies that they faced, communists and the Taliban, opposed American values and society. The ultimate intention was to shape Vietnam and Afghanistan in America's image by pursuing democracy in each country, a goal that was not only fed by but also illustrates the strong tendency of American foreign policy to embrace masculinist protection and solipsism. While this paper focused on only two American presidencies and two specific conflicts, the theories and implications presented are easily recognizable: so long as the rhetoric of war, the language of "us versus them", and the desire to "civilize" or "liberate" other people remain, authority figures will continue to feminize the weak and dehumanize the Other in order to frame themselves and their allies as superior and righteous. Until masculinist protection and solipsism disappear in the discourse surrounding conflict, war will continue to demonstrate how social constructions surrounding security and the enemy can turn into a violent and patriarchal affair.

ENDNOTES

1 Barry Buzan, Ole Wæver, and Jaap de Wilde, Security: A New Framework for Analysis (Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publications, 1998), p. 21.

2 Ibid., p. 25.

3 Ibid., p. 26.

4 Ibid., p. 26

5 Ibid., p. 25.

6 Judith Hicks Stiehm, "The Protected, the Protector, the Defender," Women's Studies International Forum 5, nos. 3-4 (January 1982): p. 367.

7 Iris Marion Young, "The Logic of Masculinist Protection: Reflections on the Current Security State,"

Signs 29, no. 1 (Fall 2003): p. 4.

8 Steihm, "The Protected, the Protector, the Defender," p. 368.

9 Young, "The Logic of Masculinist Protection," p. 5.

10 Ibid., p. 4.

11 Ibid., p. 8.

12 Ibid., p.9

13 Lyndon B. Johnson, "Address at John Hopkins University: Peace Without Conquest" (speech, Washington, DC, April 7, 1965), The American Presidency Project, http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=26877

14 Brittney Bain, "Mrs. Bush Discusses 15th Anniversary of Radio Address on Afghan Women," George W. Bush Presidential Center, November 17, 2016, http://www.bushcenter.org/publications/articles/2016/11/mrs-bush-discusses-15th-anniversary-of-radio-address.html

15 Laura Bush, "The Weekly Address Delivered by the First Lady" (speech, Washington, DC, November 17, 2001), The American Presidency Project, http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=24992

16 Lyndon B. Johnson, "Speech on Vietnam," (speech, San Antonio, TX, September 29, 1967), The Miller Center, http://millercenter.org/president/lbjohnson/speeches/speech-3526

17 Laura Bush, "The Weekly Address."

18 George W. Bush, "President Signs Afghan Women and Children Relief Act," The White House, December 12, 2001, https://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/news/releases/2001/12/20011212-9.html

19 Samuel P. Huntington, "The Clash of Civilizations," Foreign Affairs 72, no. 3 (Summer 1993): p. 25.

20 George W. Bush, "Address to a Joint Session of Congress and the American People," (speech, Washington, DC, September 20, 2001), The White House, https://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/news/releases/2001/09/20010920-8.html

21 Ibid., p. 22.

22 Johnson, "Address at John Hopkins."

23 Stiehm, "The Protected, the Protector, the Defender," p. 372.

24 Johnson, "Speech on Vietnam."

25   Young, "The Logic of Masculinist Protections," p. 8.

26   George W. Bush, "President Delivers State of the Union Address," (speech, Washington, DC, January 29, 2002), The White House, https://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/news/releases/2002/01/20020129-11.html

27   Ibid.

28   Young, "The Logic of Masculinist Protection," p. 14.

29   George W. Bush, "President Delivers State of the Union Address."

30   Lyndon B. Johnson, "State of the Union (January 12, 1966)" (speech, Washington, DC, January 12, 1966), The Miller Center, http://millercenter.org/president/speeches/speech-4035.

31   Lyndon B. Johnson, "Annual Message to the Congress on the State of the Union — January 8, 1964" (speech, Washington, DC, January 8, 1964), The American Presidency Project, http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=26787

32   Johnson, "Address at John Hopkins."

33   Sebastian Rosato. "The Flawed Logic of Democratic Peace Theory," The American Political Science Review 97, no. 4 (November 2003), p. 585.

34   "Bush Calls Women's Rights and Liberty 'Inseparable'," IIP Digital, U.S. Secretary of State, last modified March 12, 2004, http://iipdigital.usembassy.gov/st/english/texttrans/2004/03/20040312190840eaifas0.5034601.html#ixzz4VxdETHLA

35   "The National Security Strategy of the United States of America: September 2002". Executive Branch, September 2002, Washington, DC. https://www.state.gov/documents/organization/63562.pdf, p.ii-iii.

36   Ibid., p. 3.

37   Michaele L. Ferguson, "'W' Stands for Women: Feminism and Security Rhetoric in the Post-9/11 Bush Administration," Politics & Gender 1, no. 1 (March 2005): p. 30.

38   Loren Baritz, Backfire (New York City, NY: William Morrow and Company, 1985), p. 32.

39   Johnson, "State of the Union (January 12, 1966)."

40   Bush, "Address to a Joint Session."

41   Young, "The Logic of Masculinist Protection," p. 7.

42   Ibid., p.7.

43   Baritz, Backfire, p. 32.

NATIONALISM: AN IMMINENT THREAT TO GLOBAL STABILITY

By Luke Jeagal

While in consequence 'great power conflicts' and 'nuclear weapons' cause devastating destruction, the growing relevance of ultra-'nationalism' and isolationism in international relations, especially its prevalence in US politics, poses the greatest threat to global stability in the near future. While all three are omnipresent threats to global stability, the ultra-nationalist influence is the most imminent threat — prone to sparking a major conflict. In the realist cycle of anarchy, great power conflicts are followed by periods of sustained peace. Mutually Assured Destruction (MAD) helps deter conflicts between nuclear capable-great powers. Examining the influence of ultra-nationalist politics in the USA, the liberal world order is clearly vulnerable to being upended through isolationist economic policies and the national proliferation of nuclear weapons. Mostly focusing on the lenses of Liberal cooperation and Constructivist conventions, this essay will demonstrate how the rise of ultra-nationalism in the USA, seeking to put 'America First' by "renegotiating deals"[1] so the US can "win bigly,"[2] threatens the stability of the international system. This paper will define the policies of ultra-nationalism as alluded to by Pappas' anti-liberal institutions, anti-immigration and security as priority (Pappas 2016). It will outline why great power conflicts are deterred by nuclear weapons and how nuclear weapons existentially do not pose an imminent threat. The argument will focus on the imminent threat posed to global stability by ultra-nationalist policies of military and nuclear proliferation, its disengagement from liberal institutions and its increased likelihood in escalating conflicts.

ISOLATION: THE NATIONALIST RESPONSE TO GLOBALIZATION

The recent trend of ultra-nationalism is a co-adaptation — a response to globalization and an emerging connectedness between isolated cultures. As Taylor describes, this Global System emerged in a "moment of birth for [the] contemporary world" (Gunitsky W17). Nationalism is a useful tool required to sustain territorial integrity, economic and political interests, and preserve a national identity based on a political community surrounding the patria. Unfortunately, the political community of ultra-nationalism deviates from "something hard to define," to solely defining its opposition, especially immigration and liberal international institutions. By pushing national

identity beyond unity nations are pit against each other, increasing conflict between states, and often resulting in the trampling of basic civil liberties. Gellner and Anderson define modern nationalism as an imagined, invented social tool for mobilization, reinforced by mass media and public perception (Gunitsky W16). There is also a primordial aspect to nationalism, a mentally of "Us vs Them". This is best projected when Bush (jr.) laid out in his speech to congress, and by proxy to the world, after the 9/11 attacks, "you are either with us or against us".[3] The threat of ultra-nationalism is posed not by primordial instincts but rather by the mechanics that feed into those instincts, a modern tool of propaganda to antagonize and vilify others.

Pappas outlines three elements of ultra-nationalism — antidemocrats, nativists and populists — as current challenges to stable democracy. Together the elements focus on security issues, are hostile to liberal institutions like the EU and vehemently oppose immigration, fearing imported change. Nativists especially embrace a protectionist approach for "the interests of native-born or established inhabitants against those of immigrants." Fostering such regressive ideas can be detrimental to the state's culture (Pappas 2016). The minimalist definition of culture given by Geertz describes "a shared knowledge or system of symbols that create meaning within a social group" (Gunitsky W16). Ultra-nationalist culture increases not only the risk of conflicts with other cultural identities but challenges the stability of democracies. It is important not to undermine the significance of ideas and cultures. History has shown hegemony can be either be made or broken by ideology. The collapse of the USSR can be attributed to a cultural revolution, specifically glasnost and perestroika, Gorbachev's policies. The US in contrast established Hegemony, *Pax Americana*, through a political culture upholding liberal institutions, increasing cooperation between great powers. Hence, if war is an invention as Mead suggests, and the continuation of politics by other means as per Clausewitz, then ultra-nationalist politics is more prone to sparking a major conflict and threatening global stability (Mead 1940)(Gunitsky W19).

THE NATIONALIST DRIVE FOR NUCLEAR SUPREMACY

The rise of ultra-nationalism poses a more imminent threat to global security than nuclear weapons and may even induce nuclear proliferation and consequent nuclear conflict amongst great powers. The

global trend vis-à-vis nuclear weapons for constructivists is disarmament, preventing further proliferation and acquisition. Nuclear weapons pose an existential threat and strategically transformed warfare through deterrence either by denial or punishment. Especially from a realist standpoint, it renders war pointless due to MAD and victory impossible according to optimists, and upholds peace through fear according to pessimists (Gunitsky W19). Paradoxically, the nuclear option does not deter attacks from Non-Nuclear States. Sununu categorizes this taboo under the logic of appropriateness (Gunitsky W19). Yet this logic allows terrorist non-state militants to attack nuclear states. Mueller therefore sees the stability that nuclear weapons bring by making great power conflicts obsolete (Mueller 1989). This outlines the main purpose of nuclear second-strike capability: insurance against Great Power Conflicts. However, while MAD awaits any second-strike capable nuclear states from engaging in conflict with one another, this does not deter non-nuclear states from waging conflicts. In fact, exclusive nuclear possession amongst great powers seems to feed the desire of countries not protected by nuclear umbrellas to acquire nuclear capabilities. This is most apparent in North Korea. Its regime was so intent on acquiring nuclear weapons to defend against the threat posed by the USA that even in 1997, at the peak of the great famine that claimed the lives of 2.5 million citizens, North Korea's annual military budget was $6 billion USD.[4] In this aspect, one could claim that nuclear weapons are the most imminent threat to global stability. After all, both Iran and North Korea never quelled their nuclear ambitions despite countless negotiations. Even when multi-lateral agreements were reached to deescalate their nuclear programs in exchange for lifting sanctions or obtaining aid, both states have been documented returning to previous proliferation efforts afterwards.

Waltz offers an alternative to the seeming instability brought on by nuclear weapons. Because power needs to be balanced, a nuclear Iran keeps Israel, currently the only nuclear state in the Middle East, in check. In this aspect, nuclear weapons or nuclear breakout capability instills greater regional security by balancing power. If states are to be believed as rational actors, then fears of impulsive first strikes are unfounded (Waltz 2012). Iran and North Korea would in theory prioritize self-security because of the taboo and likelihood of reciprocal strike. As Mueller also points out, nuclear weapons come with a certain burden, causing leaders to behave cautiously (Mueller 1989). Schelling agrees that history has cultivated "a tradition of non-use" (Schelling 2005). Due to its

unprecedented scale of destructive capacity, even while in theory its use in conflict zones such as the Busan Perimeter in the Korean War was speculated, in practice they were never used. The POTUS, Eisenhower at the time, expressed a willingness to deploy, but was deterred by his British allies. Even among states under the same nuclear umbrella, there is significant importance emphasized in convention. The foreign policy of the USA has since been non-proliferation efforts to restrain the production and deployment of weapons by other states. Even if, as Schlosser describes, an accident was to occur involving a nuclear weapon, the fallout would be deemed a natural disaster rather than a deliberate attempt and an act of war (Schlosser 2013). Therefore, under current conventions, nuclear weapons by themselves do not pose a substantial threat on global stability. Rather, they are used for political influence.

RECOGNIZING THE REAL THREAT OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS AND GREAT POWER CONFLICTS

In contrast, Perry believes the threat of nuclear weapons on global stability is undermined (Harris&Bender 2017). At first glance, current events also seem to lean towards that view as well. The USA's decision to deploy the Terminal High Altitude Area Defense system in South Korea to defend against the growing threat of a nuclear North Korea elicited a strong response from Beijing. State sponsored news even warned a possible "arms race in the region".[5] China has always feared a US first-strike and has been attempting to modernize its small stockpile. Therefore, it is no surprise that when then-presidential candidate Trump suggested giving South Korea and Japan nuclear weapons, the Obama administration made it explicitly clear that it was "contrary to a policy… long pursued" and would destabilize the region.[6] The current view of nuclear weapons is very different from Perry's Cuban Missile Crisis. Various conventions have been ratified under International Law in regards to disarmament. Currently, the New Start Treaty limits both USA's and Russia's number of deployed warheads, and it enforces data exchanges and inspections of each other's nuclear forces, ensuring bipolar stability. A 2013 Pentagon study even showed USA could maintain a strong and credible deterrent with only 1,000 warheads, 550 fewer than prescribed under the New Start.[7] Instead, nationalist views of strength and power are more likely to cause a Great Power

Conflict involving nuclear weapons than solely the weapons' existence. President Trump recently tweeted: "The United States must greatly strengthen and expand its nuclear capability until such time as the world comes to its senses regarding nukes".[8] He has made clear he equates national strength with nuclear capabilities. Of course, the underlying assumption is putting 'America First' when it comes to nuclear proliferation. This ultra-nationalist rhetoric is destabilizing. It is illogical to further pursue nuclear proliferation when the USA already holds the most advanced arsenal. Further modernization of its capacities will only force Russia and China to attempt to match those improvements, turning the cogs for a nuclear arms race especially when Russia sees parity with the USA as essential to its national security.[8] This gives the green light for other states to further their nuclear development, overturning current conventions. The tweet also places the onus on other states to act first. This is the core issue of the isolationist, ultra-nationalist point-of-view which warrants no initiative for action, a problem magnified when applied to the Hegemon, often seen as the trend-setter.

THE POST-GREAT POWER CONFLICT, LIBERAL ORDER

After the great power conflict of the last century, the Liberal Manifesto heralded a new world order under US Hegemony. Fukuyama characterized this post-conflict "homogenization of all human societies" as driven by cooperation in technology and wealth (Betts 2010). Engaging in economic openness, joint management, institutions, and constitutionalism, it meant to prevent a relapse of American isolation as experienced in the WWI and WWII great power conflicts. The consequent implications are relevant beyond the West to this day with Japan's Pacifist Constitution, preventing the sovereign state from retaining a military of its own. If Post-Cold War Institutions like Bretton Woods, International Monetary Fund and the European Union uphold global stability under US Unipolarity, then ultra-nationalism is the very threat to these institutions (Ikenberry 1996). In the current state of world affairs, not only is the Trans Pacific Partnership ailing, threatening to be the end of all FTAs, the rise of far-right nationalist parties in Europe may also condemn the EU to its demise. In addition to Brexit, the French far-right party, le Front National, led by Le Pen, has vowed to exit the EU as well if they obtain power. This threat is very real since she is the

leading contender for the second round of the presidential election. In a recent poll, most French believe le Front National is a "danger to democracy".[9] In Germany, Merkel's Christian Democrats may lose their governing coalition with growing criticism that Germany has taken in too many refugees tearing apart the fabric of their culture and society. Nationalists have put the EU on life support.

Nationalism preys on asymmetric insight and Huntington foresees an inevitable "clash of civilizations" between the US and Islam, threatening global stability. This is because Muslim states do not hold the same core values of the West, notably: representative government, separation of church and state, and unalienable protection of individual civil rights and liberties (Betts 2010). Like Fukuyama, Huntington recognized the impact of globalization but instead viewed it as a source of conflict. To his credit, the rise of nationalism has been attributed as a response to globalization. Trump recently re-enacted the "Muslim [travel] ban", now restricting entry to nationals from six (seven initially) Muslim-majority states.[10] In contrast, Mearsheimer attributes this clash to an impulsive will to power and prove dominance over others, giving power to nationalism and causing conflicts in international relations. As a realist, he argues the cycle of conflict can only continue since international life is a tragic and brutal competition to seek hegemony (Betts 2010). He views Fukuyama's belief in universality of Western culture as false, immoral and dangerous. In this sense, democratization empowers nativism, promoting universalism at home and multiculturalism abroad because "the security of the world requires the acceptance of global multiculturality" (Betts 2010).

WHEN THE NATIONALIST HEGEMON ABUSES POWER

Bannon, Chief Strategist to POTUS, recently likened the issues surrounding immigration with the French novel, *The Camp of the Saints* where WASPs literary wage war against a "Muslim invasion".[11] This may be a reversal from the "end of history" that Fukuyama once envisioned with a decline in globalization and a retreat to an isolationist, ultra-nationalist "America First" and "[insert country] Second" attitude. Meinecke would categorize this cavalier brashness as an active, self-determining political maneuver (Smith 1991). Trump has already cautioned the possibility for the US to "take Iraq's oil"[12], deal with bad hombres in Mexico[13], build "[walls]" and

make "others pay".[14] An ultra-nationalist Hegemon has an unprecedented opportunity to take advantage of the established global order. Nationalism focuses heavily on security. While the US already owns the most funded military, the best nuclear capability and the most number of aircraft carriers, Trump is adamant on increasing the military budget. This is clearly excessive but these policies are not driven by necessity but rather, a sense of Nationalist pride at being Hegemon.[15] By further insinuating military escalations, Trump's ultra-nationalist rhetoric certainly threatens global stability. It alienates liberal institutions and takes advantage of other states to enact protectionist policies. This also reviles supporters and allies, leaving the Hegemon vulnerable to challenge. In response to this instability, both Russia and North Korea have been eager to push boundaries. North Korea tested four missiles in the wake of this ultra-nationalist veering.[16] Power Transition moments have never been peaceful. By shying away from globalization and liberal institutions such as free trade agreements, the EU and established conventions like the Nuclear Non-Proliferation treaty, ultra-nationalism is the most imminent threat to US Unipolarity and subsequently global stability.

Great power conflicts, nuclear weapons and ultra-nationalism are all potent, plausible threats to global stability. Among them, ultra-nationalism poses the most imminent danger to destabilizing the current power dynamics in international relations. To continue a period of stability, isolation as a response to globalization is not a viable solution. While some like Mearsheimer may suggest the absence of global power brings greater stability, there is a clear difference between theory and practice. While the abstract claims seem rational, the behaviour of states in the absence of a balanced order display otherwise. This assumption of stability under US Hegemony may be a post-hoc fallacy. Or perhaps it is an overstatement to declare the importance of the Liberal Manifesto as a necessity to global stability. However, the current consensus in the West remains that the rise of ultra-nationalism is not to be undermined. Even the Brexit, a blow to the European Experiment, has met great resistance. The House of Lords recently rejected PM May's Brexit Bill 366 to 268.[17] As this attempt to persuade has made clear, ultra-nationalist politics is an immediate threat to global stability and may very well spark a great power conflict of nuclear magnitudes.

ENDNOTES

1   Evans, Pete. "NAFTA talks to begin within 30 days, White House says as Trump pulls U.S. out of TPP." CBCnews, CBC/Radio Canada, 23 Jan. 2017, www.cbc.ca/news/business/donald-trump-trade-nafta-1.3947989. Accessed 28 Aug. 2017.

2   Who, and What Why. "Who, What, Why: Did Donald Trump use the word 'bigly'?" BBC News, BBC, 27 Sept. 2016, www.bbc.com/news/magazine-37483869. Accessed 28 Aug. 2017.

3   Rampton, Roberta, et al. "Trump idea of Japan, South Korea with nuclear weapons is destabilizing: White House." Reuters, Thomson Reuters, 30 Mar. 2016, www.reuters.com/article/us-usa-election-nuclear-whitehouse-idUSKCN0WW2B9

4   Lee, Joshua Stanton and Sung-Yoon. "Opinion | Pyongyang's Hunger Games." The New York Times, The New York Times, 7 Mar. 2014, www.nytimes.com/2014/03/08/opinion/pyongyangs-hunger-games.html. Accessed 28 Aug. 2017.

5   "China Warns of Arms Race After U.S. Deploys Missile Defense in South Korea." The New York Times, The New York Times, 7 Mar. 2017, www.nytimes.com/2017/03/07/world/asia/thaad-missile-defense-us-south-korea-china.html. Accessed 28 Aug. 2017.

6   Rampton, Roberta, et al. "Trump idea of Japan, South Korea with nuclear weapons is destabilizing: White House." Reuters, Thomson Reuters, 30 Mar. 2016, www.reuters.com/article/us-usa-election-nuclear-whitehouse-idUSKCN0WW2B9

7   Board, The Editorial. "Why Mess With a Nuclear Treaty, Mr. Trump?" The New York Times, The New York Times, 6 Mar. 2017, www.nytimes.com/2017/03/06/opinion/why-mess-with-a-nuclear-treaty-mr-trump.html. Accessed 28 Aug. 2017.

8   Board, The Editorial. "Why Mess With a Nuclear Treaty, Mr. Trump?" The New York Times, The New York Times, 6 Mar. 2017, www.nytimes.com/2017/03/06/opinion/why-mess-with-a-nuclear-treaty-mr-trump.html. Accessed 28 Aug. 2017.

9   Saeed, Saim. "Majority of French believe National Front is a danger to democracy: poll." POLITICO, POLITICO, 7 Mar. 2017, www.politico.eu/article/majority-of-french-believe-national-front-is-a-danger-to-democracy-poll/. Accessed 28 Aug. 2017.

10 SMITH, FARHANA KHERA and JOHNATHAN. "Don't Be Fooled, Trump's New Muslim Ban Is Still Illegal." The New York Times, The New York Times, 6 Mar. 2017, www.nytimes.com/2017/03/06/opinion/dont-be-fooled-trumps-new-muslim-ban-is-still-illegal.html. Accessed 28 Aug. 2017.

11 Blumenthal, Paul, and JM Rieger. "The Huffington Post." The Huffington Post, TheHuffingtonPost.com, 6 Mar. 2017, www.huffingtonpost.co m/entry/steve-bannon-camp-of-the-saints-immigration_us_58b75206e4b0284854b3dc03. Accessed 28 Aug. 2017.

12 Link, Taylor. "Salon." Salon, 24 Jan. 2017, www.salon.com/2017/01/24/iraq-is-worried-that-donald-trump-says-he-wants-to-re-invade-to-take-their-oil/. Accessed 28 Aug. 2017.

13 Agren, David. "The Guardian." The Guardian, Guardian News and Media, 1 Feb. 2017, www.theguardian.com/us-news/2017/feb/02/bad-hombres-reports-claim-trump-threatened-to-send-troops-to-mexico. Accessed 28 Aug. 2017.

14 Thiessen, Marc A. "Yes, Trump can make Mexico pay for the border wall. Here's how." The Washington Post, WP Company, 17 Jan. 2017, www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/yes-trump-can-make-mexico-pay-for-the-border-wall-heres-how/2017/01/17/7edf7872-dcbf-11e6-ad42-f3375f271c9c_story.html?utm_term=.24aa9ee6f4bc. Accessed 28 Aug. 2017.

15 Talmadge, Caitlin. "Trump's Military Budget Minus a Plan." The New York Times, The New York Times, 6 Mar. 2017, www.nytimes.com/2017/03/06/opinion/trumps-military-budget-minus-a-plan.html?ref=opinion. Accessed 28 Aug. 2017.

16 Visser, Nick, and Eline Gordts. "North Korea Fires 4 Missiles Into Sea." The Huffington Post, TheHuffingtonPost.com, 6 Mar. 2017, www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/north-korea-fires-projectile_us_58bca14ce4b05cf0f4014fd1?huvm8pxq9k4jthuxr&. Accessed 28 Aug. 2017.

17 Kroet, Cynthia, and Charlie Cooper. "UK government loses House of Lords vote on Brexit Bill." POLITICO, POLITICO, 8 Mar. 2017, www.politico.eu/article/uk-government-loses-house-of-lords-vote-on-brexit-bill/.

JOHNSON RESPONDS TO "THAT BITCH OF A WAR"

By Maxim Basu

At the Geneva Conference of 1954, France, USSR, the US, and other Great Powers attempted to end the ongoing French-instigated hostilities in French Indochina, a region comprised of Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia. The hostilities were long and troublesome, taking the lives of 75,000 French forces and over 170,000 civilians.[1] By signing the Geneva Accords, France withdrew its troops from the region marking an end to the French phase of the Indochina Wars of 1946–54. At the Conference, the Great Powers partitioned the former Vietnam territory of French Indochina into two regions: South Vietnam, a non-communist state that would be led by Ngo Dinh Diem and North Vietnam, a communist regime that Ho Chi Minh would lead. The hopes had been that partition would ensure a more peaceful political environment in the region.

However, after the partition, military confrontations, political instability, and starvation plagued both nations. By March 1964, the National Liberation Front (NLF), a South Vietnamese revolutionary organization, controlled over forty percent of the territory in South Vietnam.[2] By autumn, the political situation had become so dire that senior US state officials increasingly warned the White House of the "near anarchy" in the region; they posited that without US military support, South Vietnam's regime would only last six more months.[3] A year later, the Vietnam War began between North Vietnam and South Vietnam. The domestic conflict soon attracted the attention of the two remaining Great Powers, USSR and China, who increased their support for their ideological counterparts. They provided military aid to North Vietnam while the US actively advised South Vietnam on military matters. On the whole, the military conflict became multidimensional and it gained incredible momentum.

The summer of 1965 marked the Americanization of the war, a time period which witnessed an increased presence of US troops and military personnel in the region who began to actively combat North Vietnam, instead of simply advising local forces on military matters as they did prior in the region.[4] Two key events helped to bring about the Americanization of the war. In August 1964, at the Gulf of Tonkin, unconfirmed reports posited that North Vietnamese forces attacked the *Maddox* US navy boat. Although Johnson stated that, "For all I know, our Navy was shooting at whales out there," he and other US officials presented the incident as an aggressive provocation on behalf of the enemy that the US required to respond to.[5] Subsequently, in August, Congress passed the Southeast Asia

Resolution, granting Johnson permission to "take all necessary steps, including the use of armed force" to defend US interests in the region.[6] Indeed, the Resolution provided the "legal justification" for escalating the war effort. Additionally, in February 1965, North Vietnamese forces attacked Camp Holloway, a US military base near Pleiku. The event became a "watershed" moment in the war's history because after it, US policy-makers set out to initiate aggressive bombing campaigns in North Vietnam. US officials presented the incident as yet another example of provocation on behalf of the enemy that the US required to respond to.[7]

Aside from the two incidents, other factors also contributed to escalating the political atmosphere favourable to war in the US. Indeed, some of Johnson's closest state advisors actively urged him to escalate tensions in the Vietnam region. The July 1965 state report by Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara argued for the need to "expand our forces" in the Vietnam region, an act that Johnson ultimately carried out.[8] Previously, the National Security Advisor McGeorge Bundy also urged Johnson to introduce more US military personnel into the region.[9] Evidently, support for the war effort increasingly gained popularity among US officials. McNamara's report posited that North Vietnam would not consider negotiations because it desired a "complete take-over" of South Vietnam.[10] From his perspective, it appeared that there existed no potential for diplomatic negotiations with North Vietnam that would be able to potentially diffuse the ongoing tensions in the region. By deploying an additional 175,000 troops and becoming more invested in the war, McNamara concluded that the US would have a "good chance" of achieving a "good outcome within a reasonable time period."[11] The report put forth an optimistic vision to Johnson by suggesting that the war was winnable. By December 7, 1965, McNamara concluded that Johnson decided to "send a substantial number of additional forces to VN if we are to avoid being defeated there."[12] In retrospect, McNamara's report contributed to informing Johnson of the political situation in the region which in turn, partly influenced Johnson's decision-making to escalate the war. All in all, although in 1965, Johnson promised "not . . . to send American boys . . . to do what Asian boys should do for themselves," a year later, he deployed over 385,000 US troops. By 1969, over 540,000 personnel were in the region.[13] The war would end in 1975, taking the lives of over 50,000 US troops and over one million civilians.[14] To this day, the war continues to affect contemporary political dialogue in the US.

Aside from political pressure from state advisors, other, more complex geopolitical and personal factors influenced Johnson's decision to 'choose war' and deploy US troops into the region. In this paper, I will ask: What accounts for the Americanization of the War in Vietnam during the summer of 1965? Why did Johnson 'choose war'? I will argue that to a large extent, the desire to contain communism in the Vietnam region and the fear of losing national credibility due to being defeated by a non-Industrial power influenced Johnson's decision-making. More importantly though, Johnson 'chose war' because the conflict threatened his Presidential reputation and his domestic goal of creating a 'Great Society' in the US; in the end, he also benefitted from weak opposition among his critics who did not fiercely challenge his decision-making. The geopolitical and personal factors often functioned together to influence Johnson's decision-making; for instance, national humiliation threatened to undermine Johnson's Presidential reputation. Indeed, Bundy stated that such humiliation had the potential to "threaten their careers."[15] However, for the purposes of this essay, I will speak of the geopolitical and personal factors separately for clarity. I will initially comment on the historiographical debate surrounding the inevitability of the Americanization of the war. Subsequently, I will present the international political and personal factors that contributed to Johnson's decision for 'choosing war.' I incorporated McNamara's 1965 state report into the introduction of this paper to demonstrate that support for the escalation of the war existed among Johnson's advisors, who contributed to fostering a social environment favorable for war. In the pages that follow, I will analyze Johnson's 'Peace without Conquest' speech which was delivered on April 7, 1965, to demonstrate his commitment to upholding US credibility internationally.

Historians have debated and interpreted the inevitability of the Americanization of the war in different ways. In the 1970s, the historian Richard Betts argued that the war was largely inevitable; indeed, he posited that Johnson and his administration "did not possess real choice" for going to war.[16] From his perspective, Johnson's choice had been primarily a response to political factors in the Vietnam region beyond his control. Conversely, other scholars disagree with his conclusions. In the 1990s, the historian Fredrik Logevall argued that the decision to escalate military tensions in the region was not "inevitable."[17] From his point of view, complex domestic and international factors affected Johnson's decision-making. Johnson possessed decision-making power and had the potential to not escalate tensions in the region.

Historians have continually reinterpreted the Americanization of the war over time and it is important to acknowledge their differing points of view to gain a multidimensional understanding of the events. I largely agree with Logevall's point of view because I do not believe that historical events are inevitable.

Most obviously, the desire to contain communism in the Vietnam region largely contributed to Johnson 'choosing war.' At the time, Johnson feared that "all of Southeast Asia would pass under Communist control . . . inevitably" had the US not increased its presence in the region.[18] From his perspective, the US had an obligation to oppose the "domino effect" of nations in Southeast Asia becoming communist states.[19] Indeed, Johnson was a product of his time period. Since the end of World War Two, US foreign policy regarded the containment of communism to be a high priority. Political leaders based US foreign policy decisions on preventing the spread of the ideology. For instance, the 1947 'Truman Doctrine' provided political, military, and economic assistance to European nations under perceived communist threat.[20] Due to such policy-making endeavors, a 'Cold War Consensus' emerged among many US officials; policy-makers increasingly agreed that the US had an obligation to cooperate with other non-communist nations in order to contain communism in the world, which at times required US-led interventions in the affairs of other nations.[21] The 1951 report of the National Opinion Research Center reinforced the 'Cold War Consensus' idea by pointing out that that many US officials regarded communism to be a "real threat" to the "security [and] free way of life" of Americans."[22] Newspapers reinforced notions of the 'Cold War Consensus' as well. For instance, in the 1960s, *The New York Times* actively spoke of the "Red" permeation of the Vietnam region while *The Washington Post* expressed similar sentiments.[23] With such dominant anti-communist state and public opinions existing in society, it is not surprising that Johnson also desired to contain communism.

For Johnson, the successful containment of the ideology promised to uphold the credibility of US capitalism in the world. Johnson concluded that failure to contain communism would lead to "our ruin."[24] Indeed, he regarded President Harry Truman's 1949 'loss of China' to communism to be especially embarrassing. At the time, the Communist Party overtook mainland China from the US-backed Chinese nationalists, an event that resulted in national humiliation.[25] Johnson decided not to let South Vietnam fall to communism the way China did. He exclaimed, "the loss of

China was chicken shit compared to Vietnam . . . they'll have Vietnam right up my ass."[26] Learning from Truman's example, Johnson wanted to uphold his nation's social status internationally. The US ideological Cold War framework centered around the containment of communism, coupled with prior failures of US officials to prevent nations embracing the ideology, influenced Johnson's decision-making in major ways.

Aside from strict ideological considerations, Johnson 'chose war' in order to avoid the potential humiliation of losing US credibility on the international stage that would result from being defeated by a non-Industrial power. US national credibility was founded on ideas of national greatness and superiority, characteristics which the historian Michael Hunt argued were key to forming US foreign policy.[27] Losing North Vietnam would undermine the validity of US's political image on the world stage that the nation actively promoted. Indeed, Bundy argued that a North Vietnamese victory in the region would cause the US to lose "national prestige."[28] From Johnson's perspective and from the points of view of many internationally, the US was military and culturally superior to North Vietnam. Johnson considered North Vietnam to be a "ragged-ass . . . fourth-rate country" in comparison to the US.[29] Losing the military conflict would result in national humiliation. Johnson posited that the US "might as well pull out of Berlin" had North Vietnam won.[30] The failure to assert power and might in the Vietnam region had the potential of undermining US endeavors in other parts of the world. In Johnson's eyes, a loss in the region would signify to the world that the US was a nation that was military weak and ineffective as a global superpower.

Johnson's April 7, 1965 speech, 'Peace without Conquest,' underscored the importance of upholding US credibility on the international stage. The speech was broadcasted across the nation and the world from John Hopkins University in Baltimore. In it, Johnson argued that the US had an obligation to stand by its allies, which in this case was South Vietnam. He posited that since 1954, the US had always "offered support" to the government of South Vietnam and moreover, the US had given its "word" to continue to do so. To withdraw now would "shake the confidence of all" in US credibility, which would inevitably lead to national humiliation.[31] Johnson understood that US defeat threatened to undermine the confidence of the international community in US ideological principles. It was imperative that the US maintained its image of a strong Industrial unshakable Great Power.

In the speech, Johnson presented US support to be a noble selfless act that would help South Vietnam shape its own destiny. "We want nothing for ourselves," he concluded.[32] It is likely that Johnson genuinely desired to help the populace achieve self-determination. After all, at the time, he offered to fund an "electrification project" worth a billion dollars along the Mekong River to help provide the people in the region with basic necessities.[33] Johnson posited that the project would enable the US to "enrich the hopes and existence of more than a hundred million people."[34] Despite Johnson's assertions, Logevall points out that the US had a history of subverting all major self-determination efforts of South Vietnamese people "whenever" possible.[35] For instance, the US played a prominent role in thwarting the 1964 Minh junta, a coup in South Vietnam. At the time, the Interdepartmental Working Group's state report concluded that the US government would continue to "oppose any independent South Vietnamese move to negotiate" with rebels.[36] Indeed, it seemed that US foreign policy was more concerned with the image the US portrayed to the world than with attaining self-determination for the people of South Vietnam, as Johnson asserted in his speech.

Aside from broad international considerations, personal and domestic factors also affected Johnson's decision-making. The desire to preserve his Presidential reputation and pride contributed to his choice for war as well; mainly, Johnson did not want to be remembered as a weak political leader in the history books. Indeed, he viewed the ongoing military conflict to be a test of his own manliness and machismo. He wanted to be remembered as mighty and powerful in the international arena. To him, fighting against North Vietnam was somewhat similar to fighting a bully who threatens you and your family's safety and security. Johnson argued that "if you let a bully come in your front yard, he'll be on your porch the next day and the day after that he'll rape your wife in your own bed."[37] The war had been personalized by Johnson and he wanted to come out of the war triumphantly. He feared that the potential domestic debates regarding the loss of South Vietnam would "shatter [his] Presidency."[38] To him, the war determined whether he would go down in history as a "coward" or a hero and he preferred the latter.[39] Powerful conceptions of gender and masculinity played a vital role in Johnson's perception of the war effort which informed his decision-making.

Furthermore, Johnson 'chose war' because it threatened to thwart his domestic goal of creating a 'Great Society,' a nation in which poverty rates were reduced and racial tensions were diffused.[40]

The 'Great Society' had been the cornerstone of Johnson's political ambitions in the US. In 1964 at the University of Michigan, Johnson stated that the 'Great Society' would "end racial injustice" and focus on better education for all Americans.[41] Indeed, he largely based his presidency on attempting to make the US a more equitable and tolerant nation to live in. To him, "that bitch of a war" threatened to destroy the "woman I really loved . . . the Great Society."[42] Johnson personalized his political ambitions in romantic terms. One Congressional debate, in the context of a loss to North Vietnam, had the potential of killing off his domestic policies. "I would lose everything . . . all my hopes, all my dreams," he stated.[43] The military tensions in the Vietnam region shook Johnson to his very core, affecting him emotionally. The desire to save face and advance his domestic agenda contributed to his decision to escalate military tensions in the hopes of coming out of the conflict triumphantly.

Lastly, in addition to Johnson's actions, it is important to examine the ways in which other US officials and political actors responded to Johnson's decision-making. It is evident that the failure of anti-war critics both in the US and in other nations to forcefully oppose Johnson's decision contributed to the subsequent Americanization of the war. On the international stage, the leaders of Western nations largely failed to forcefully resist Johnson's efforts. For instance, in 1964, "now is not the best time for us to confront the Americans" became a popular slogan of British state officials.[44] Indeed, British foreign policy-makers largely decided to isolate themselves from US involvement in the Vietnam region instead of actively condemning it. Domestically, US leaders also failed to challenge Johnson's decision-making, largely because Johnson created a "conformist atmosphere" around him that did not encourage dissent.[45] Many individuals that surrounded Johnson largely went along with his plans for the Vietnam region, and those who opposed some aspects of the plans did not forcefully speak out against them. Even Undersecretary George Ball, who appeared to be one of the biggest critics of the war effort, stated that he would accept the outcome of the decision-making regarding the war effort.[46] Logevall argued that Ball's fervour against the war effort was "outweighed" by his desire to be included in the debates surrounding the war.[47] Aside from particular individuals, Congress also did not significantly oppose Johnson's efforts. At the time, Paul Kattenburg, a member of the State Department, critiqued Congress' relatively passive position: "if Congress does not fulfill the role of loyal opposition in foreign policy, that role does not

seem to get fulfilled at all.''[48] The lack of opposition to Johnson adds another dimension to the nature of the decision-making process. External players largely failed to voice their political positions, and Johnson capitalized on their weaknesses.

All in all, during the summer of 1965, Johnson 'chose war' due to both geopolitical and personal factors; the desire to contain communism and the desire to uphold US political credibility contributed to his decision. However, more importantly, he 'chose war' because his Presidential reputation and his domestic goal of creating a 'Great Society' stood on the line; the fact that he did not face stark opposition from his critics also worked to his benefit. On the international stage, Johnson wanted to portray the US as a strong Great Power that held a firm hand in foreign affairs. Anti-communism was a key ideological tenant that Johnson had to uphold in order to maintain his nation's credibility in the eyes of others who looked to the US for political guidance. Indeed, Johnson simply could not afford to 'lose Vietnam' in the same embarrassing way that Truman 'lost China.' He was determined to come out of the war triumphantly. Domestically, Johnson wanted to do a lot of good with his vision of a 'Great Society;' however, the war seemed to undermine his immediate goals. That being said, Johnson did successfully initiate some aspects of his domestic agenda, such as the Medicare program and the Civil Rights Act of 1968, which banned racial discrimination on matters regarding housing and property sales.[49] Ultimately, Johnson did not manage to end the conflict in the Vietnam region. In 1968, amid anti-war demonstrations, he chose not to run for re-election and he died in 1973. The Vietnam War continued for decades and opposition to it rapidly increased in the US and around the world. Until very recently, the war had been 'America's longest war' and one of the most troubling for countless Americans and Vietnamese people whose lives had been shattered by it.

ENDNOTES

1 William Keylor, A World of Nations, the International Order since 1945, Second Edition (New York: Oxford University Press, 2009), 302.

2 Ibid.

3 Gerard DeGroot, A Noble Cause? America and the Vietnam War (Harlow: Pearson Education Ltd., 1988), 126.

4 Mitchell Hall, The Vietnam War (Harlow: Pearson Education Ltd., 2007), 51.

5 Ibid.

6   Ibid., 52.

7   Ibid., 53.

8   Robert McNamara, "Former Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara Concludes That He Erred, 1995," in Major Problems in American Foreign Relations, Volume II: Since 1914, Edited by Dennis Merrill and Thomas Paterson (Boston: Wadsworth Cengage Learning, 2010), 420-1.

9   Kerr, The Vietnam War, 55.

10 McNamara, "Former Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara Concludes That He Erred, 1995," 420-1.

11 Ibid.

12 Robert McNamara, "Position Paper, December 7, 1965," in Vietnam and America, a Documented History, Edited by Marvin Gettleman and others (New York: Grove Press Inc., 1985), 287.

13 Keylor, A World of Nations, 306.

14 DeGroot, A Noble Cause? America and the Vietnam War, 340.

15 Fredrik Logevall, Choosing War, The Lost Chance for Peace and the Escalation of War in Vietnam (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999), 389.

16 Ibid., xvi.

17 Ibid.

18 DeGroot, A Noble Cause? America and the Vietnam War, 139.

19 Ibid.

20 John Merriman, A History of Modern Europe, From the French Revolution to the Present, Third Edition (New York: W. W. Norton and Company Ltd., 2010), 1119.

21 Eugene Wittkopf and James McCormick, "The Cord War Consensus: Did it Exist?" in Polity, 22, 4 (1990): 628.

22 Ibid.

23 Logevall, Choosing War, 32.

24 DeGroot, A Noble Cause? America and the Vietnam War, 125.

25 Keylor, A World of Nations, 310.

26 DeGroot, A Noble Cause? America and the Vietnam War, 40.

27 Logevall, Choosing War, 384.

28 Kerr, The Vietnam War, 55.

29 Gordon Kerr, A Short History of the Vietnam War 48.

30 George Herring, America's Longest War: The United States and Vietnam, 1950-1975 (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1986), 41.

31 Lyndon Johnson, "Peace without Conquest" (April 1965) in The Vietnam War, an International History in Documents, ed. Mark Lawrence (New York: Oxford University Press, 2014), 86.

32 Ibid.

33 Dror Yuravlivker, "'Peace without Conquest': Lyndon Johnson's Speech of April 7, 1965," Presidential Studies Quarterly, 36, 3 (2006): 458.

34 DeGroot, A Noble Cause? America and the Vietnam War, 136.

35 Logevall, Choosing War, 387-8.

36 Ibid.

37   Ibid., 93.

38   Herring, America's Longest War, 41.

39   DeGroot, A Noble Cause? America and the Vietnam War, 129.

Ibid., 125.

40   Keylor, A World of Nations, 102.

41   Lyndon Johnson, "The Great Society," May 22, 1964. University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan, https://www.c-span.org/video/?153610-1/great-society-speech (accessed November 6, 2016).

42   Herring, America's Longest War, 33.

43   DeGroot, A Noble Cause? America and the Vietnam War, 135.

44   Logevall, Choosing War, 401.

45   Ibid., 394.

46   Ibid.

47   Ibid., 402.

48   Ibid.

49   Keylor, *A World of Nations*, 102.

THE LOGIC OF TERRORISM: IDENTIFYING A COHERENT STRATEGY

By Sameen Zehra

Historical sociologists trace the roots of terrorism as a form of political persuasion from the French Revolutionary state, highlighting that the employment of the tool by non-state groups places it firmly within the progression of modernism[1]. Although it has existed for centuries, public interest and complex post-modern analysis on the issue grew exponentially following September 11, 2001.[2] The topic continues to inform national debates in times of socio-political restructuring and occupies the bulk of major headlines on primetime news. Despite the plethora of information available, the phenomenon of so-called post-9/11, 'new terrorism' has yet to be framed as a coherent strategy within these respective settings. The act is often deemed an aberrant form of violent activity that is irrational, unmethodical and unnatural. In the wake of the 9/11 attacks, American historian, Bruce Cummings, stated, "…in its utter recklessness and indifference to consequences, its craven anonymity, and its lack of any discernible 'program' save for inchoate revenge, this was an apolitical act. [It] had no rational military purpose [because it] lacked the essential relationship between violent means and political ends"[3]. Within this framework, the aspect of a suicide attack, which is key to most terrorism campaigns, seems especially counter-intuitive, raising the puzzle of: *how can you win if you kill yourself? What success can be gained from depleting one's own human capital and potential sympathizers?*

These questions, which deconstruct the process and objectives driving these organizations, are critical in order to form effective counter-terrorism and de-radicalization policies at the local, national and international levels, and move beyond the blanket statements pushed in popular western discourse. The international community cannot expect to make terrorism unprofitable and scarce without knowing the incentive structure of its practitioners.[4] Therefore, this paper will aim to show that there is a calculated and systematic approach to the way in which terrorist organizations employ violence to accomplish their goals. It will be argued that "winning" is closely tied to an agenda based on a) shifting the terrorists' bargaining position and overall dynamics of the conflict in the group's favour, as well as b) increasing levels of support and social control. After briefly outlining the level of analysis and definitions being used, this essay will review the relevant scholarly literature in two sections. First, the psychological impact made through efforts of attrition and spoiling will be discussed to understand how terrorists seek to shift the dynamics of political conflicts in their favour. Then,

outcomes such as provocation, outbidding and intimidation will be outlined to highlight the aims pursued by these groups to shape public support and compliance.

LEVEL OF ANALYSIS AND DEFINITIONS:

Despite being one of the most significant words in today's political vocabulary with billion dollar budgets dedicated to countering it, terrorism is rarely clearly defined as a concept.[5] This paper will grapple with terrorism more broadly, while also touching on the strategic uses of suicidal tactics that fall under that umbrella. Intergovernmental definitions tend to identify three elements of the subject: terror, opprobrium (illegal, criminal) and coercion.[6] This analysis will expand the definition to include that there is a specific set of political goals that are being sought. They could include, but are not limited to: regime change, territorial change, policy change, social control, and status quo maintenance.[7] The nature of the violence is also symbolic in character and goes beyond the norms of violent political agitation accepted by a particular society.[8] Suicide attack as a weapon of terror, is usually chosen by weaker parties against materially stronger foes when fighting methods of lesser cost seem unlikely to succeed. Choice is often voluntary, but typically under conditions of group pressure and charismatic leadership.[9]

The evidence that will be provided in the following sections will center on the perspective of the organization, rather than the individual attacker. The latter may be more varied in its motivations to participate in missions, whereas the goals driving terrorist organizations as a whole are usually political, and determine how the campaigns will be launched.[10] Scholars have also pointed that little tangible benefit can be determined for suicide bombers who expect to be rewarded only in the afterlife. Maximized "expected utility" can be more clearly evaluated for the leaders of groups, who almost never consider killing themselves.[11]

I — CREATING FAVOURABLE CONFLICT DYNAMICS AND NEGOTIATING ARENAS

Terrorism is a particular form of psychological warfare that is best understood as coercive diplomacy or bargaining, where the terrorist

group seeks to threaten the material and elusive aspects of life that the enemy holds dear to achieve desired political ends.[12] This coercive bargaining often takes the form of attrition and spoiling to elicit voluntary compliance from the mere "capacity to hurt". However, to be successful, it must be backed with credible information to the audiences whose behaviour they hope to influence.[13] The targeted governments are central to this, as they can grant concessions over policy or territory that the terrorists are seeking. Since 'talk is cheap' and it is harder for weaker actors to make credible threats, terrorists who wish to influence the behavior of an adversary must resort to costly signaling to prove the degree of commitment to their cause.[14] Within contemporary terrorism studies, the theory of coercive bargaining articulated by Thomas Schelling ultimately forms the basis for one of the primary analytical frameworks for terrorist strategy.[15]

Although the lengths terrorist organizations go to seem nihilist on the surface, their actions are aimed at increasing the costs inflicted on the enemy, and eroding their resolve to continue a particular policy.[16] The organization wants to put the target's vital interest into question by triggering doubts around whether it is worth paying the price to maintain the status quo.[17] When examining suicide terrorism, Robert Pape highlights that the 1983 Hezbollah attack against the U.S. in Beirut was a clear example of the strategy to inflict costs on the enemy until it withdraws its occupying forces. In his memoirs, former U.S. President Ronald Reagan directly explained that the "the price [they] had to pay in Beirut was so great, the tragedy at the barracks was so enormous.... [They] had to pull out.... [They] couldn't stay there and run the risk of another suicide attack on the Marines."[18] The Greeks, Jews and Arabs used similar strategies in the final years of the British Empire. In his 1996 declaration of jihad, Osama Bin Laden also argued that the U.S. lacked resolve to fight a long attritional war against Al Qaida.[19] The success of an attrition strategy generally depends on the state's level of interest in the issue, constraints on its ability to retaliate, and cost tolerance.[20]

At the same time, there are certain contexts of 'new wars' in the 21st century that are characterized by a shared self-perpetuating interest to maintain conflict, in order to reproduce political identity and further economic interests.[21] The reasons for prolonging conflict may also be linked to unaddressed grievances or maintaining certain power structures that have been produced. In order to preserve such an environment, terrorist organizations resort to acting as spoilers when a peace settlement is near. Peace agreements alarm terrorists

because they give leverage to moderates, who are more willing to concede and compromise to end violence. The terrorist group therefore plays on the mistrust between the moderates and the enemy to undermine all efforts to bring the war to an end. This was the case when Iranian-U.S. tensions seemed to be easing when moderate Prime Minister, Mehdi Bazargan, met with the U.S. national security adviser, Zbigniew Brzezinski, and Iranian radicals responded with the 1979 kidnapping. Arab-Israeli peace negotiations, as well as talks between Protestants and Catholics in Northern Ireland were hampered in similar ways.[22] Scholars find that spoiling is most likely when the objective is territorial change and when the enemy perceives the moderates as having the capacity to end violence.[23]

II — GARNERING PUBLIC BACKING AND CONTROL

Success in the eyes of strategic terrorists is also linked broadly to appealing to its second target audience, the domestic audience, through provoking destructive foreign action, undermining domestic competition and employing intimidation when necessary. This is crucial to recruitment, obtaining resources and appearing as a robust and influential political actor. In order to radicalize and mobilize a population whose interests the terrorists claim to represent, terrorists often attempt to incite governments to take harsh and indiscriminate counter measures.[24] The aim is to inflict enough socio-economic damage on a population, which may already be inclined to the terrorists' agenda, and leave them feeling that the government is unconcerned with their welfare. With an increased sense of victimization and decrease in economic opportunity, the aim is that there will be greater readiness to behave according to organizational doctrines and policies.[25] Even if it does not get drawn into excessive force, the government may have to rely on special police and judicial measures which will impinge on everyday life and inconvenience the ordinary citizen (ex. curfews, house searches, internment without trial, state-sponsored death squads, etc.). The enemy ultimately ends up responding in a way that undermines its own authority, and potentially radicalizes moderates.[26]

Examples of successful enemy overreactions include the Irish Catholic 1916 "Rising" that led to harsh British countermeasures that significantly strengthened the republican cause.[27] Extremist militant groups in Palestine also gained support after Israeli crackdowns

in the West Bank and Gaza Strip.[28] Provocation is often used in pursuit of regime or territorial change, and general resistance against a foreign power.[29] Successful use of this tactic depends on the government's inclination to respond with middling levels of brutality, that neither destroys the domestic population nor is incapable of indiscriminate punishment.[30]

Another means of mobilizing the domestic audience is to engage in outbidding through violence, to convince the public of the organization's greater resolve to fight the enemy than the rival group.[31] The objective is to show that the group is willing to suffer costs rather than sell out, as well as take a hard line on bargaining. The case of Hamas vs. Fatah shows how two groups vied for the support of the Palestinian citizens, who are unsure of whom to back.[32] Commitment to the cause can also be shown through extensive suicide bombing, as bombers are "expendable assets whose losses generate more assets by expanding public support."[33] Outbidding provides a potential explanation for terrorist attacks that continue even when they seem unable to produce any real results.[34] Extremist groups also attempt to outbid their own government through damaging the psychological bond that exists between the population and regime. Scholars describe this as disorientation, where terrorists escalate violence to the point where it seems authorities cannot prevent the spread of chaos, while increasing the appeal of their alternative political program.[35]

Finally, intimidation can be an extremely effective tool for raising the cost for supporting enemy forces, or to generate passive support where "collaborators" are punished for dissent against terrorist ideology.[36] This strategy is most often used when the group is competing for social control with the government. It works by demonstrating that the terrorists have the power to punish whoever disobeys them, and that the government is powerless to stop them. Organizations have targeted state agents such as mayors, police, and prosecutors to show that they can harm their opponents and their supporters.[37] Columbia and Peru have experienced judicial intimidation where judges were frequently offered the "choice between silver and lead", and according to Colonel Roger Trinquier, the Algerian National Liberation Front (FLN) also controlled the population through similar terror.[38]

There are many reasons for the reluctance to engage with the phenomenon of so-called "new terrorism" as a strategy. The common assumption is that it is deeply irrational and apocalyptic, with no broader mission of success in material terms.[39] The goal of this piece was to argue that the lengths terrorist organizations go to achieve chaos,

is inherently entwined with sustaining their broader political program through shifting their bargaining position in the conflict and increasing general support for their cause. The paper proceeded by exploring various psychological tools that are used to achieve these ends, including, campaigns of attrition, spoiling, overreaction/provocation, outbidding and intimidation. Several motivations usually drive terrorist organizations; however, they tend to be linked to a military strategy devoted to advancing a deeply political agenda of social control and change.

ENDNOTES

1 Neville Bolt, David Betz, and Jaz Azari. 2008. "Propaganda of the Deed: Understanding the Phenomenon". Royal United Services Institute Whitehall.

2 Peter Neumann and M. L. R. Smith. 2005. "Strategic Terrorism: The Framework and Its Fallacies." Journal of Strategic Studies, no. 28 (August): 4.

3 Ibid., 572

4 Max Abrahms. 2008. "What Terrorists Really Want: Terrorist Motives and Counterterrorism Strategy." International Security 32 (4). http://muse.jhu.edu. myaccess.library.utoronto.ca/article/237009/pdf.

5 Alex Schmid. 2004. "Terrorism - The Definitional Problem." Publication Western Reserve Journal of International Law 36 (2). http://myaccess.library.utoronto. ca/login?url=http://search.proquest.com/ docview/211184999?accountid=14771.

6 Ibid., 405

7 Andrew H. Kydd and Barbara F. Walter. 2006. "The Strategies of Terrorism." International Security 31 (1). http://www.mitpressjournals.org.myaccess.library. utoronto.ca/doi/pdf/10.1162/isec.2006.31.1.49.

8 Peter Neumann and M. L. R. Smith. 2005. "Strategic Terrorism: The Framework and Its Fallacies." Journal of Strategic Studies, no. 28 (August): 4.

9 Scott Atran. 2003. "Genesis of Suicide Terrorism." Science 299 (5612).

10 Andrew H. Kydd and Barbara F. Walter. 2006. "The Strategies of Terrorism." International Security 31 (1). http://www.mitpressjournals.org.myaccess.library. utoronto.ca/doi/pdf/10.1162/isec.2006.31.1.49. , p52

11 Scott Atran. 2003. "Genesis of Suicide Terrorism." Science 299 (5612).

12 Peter Neumann and M. L. R. Smith. 2005. "Strategic Terrorism: The Framework and Its Fallacies." Journal of Strategic Studies, no. 28 (August): 4. p576

13 Tom Dannenbaum. 2011. "Bombs, Ballots, and Coercion: The Madrid Bombings, Electoral Politics, and Terrorist Strategy." Security Studies 20.

14 Andrew H. Kydd and Barbara F. Walter. 2006. "The Strategies of Terrorism." International Security 31 (1). http://www.mitpressjournals.org.myaccess.library. utoronto.ca/doi/pdf/10.1162/isec.2006.31.1.49. , p58

15 Tom Dannenbaum. 2011. "Bombs, Ballots, and Coercion: The Madrid Bombings, Electoral Politics, and Terrorist Strategy." Security Studies 20. p310

16 Andrew H. Kydd and Barbara F. Walter. 2006. "The Strategies of Terrorism." International Security 31 (1). http://www.mitpressjournals.org.myaccess.library.

utoronto.ca/doi/pdf/10.1162/isec.2006.31.1.49. ,p60

17 Peter Neumann and M. L. R. Smith. 2005. "Strategic Terrorism: The Framework and Its Fallacies." Journal of Strategic Studies, no. 28 (August): 4. p576

18 Robert A. Pape. 2003. "The Strategic Logic of Suicide Terrorism." The American Political Science Review 97 (3). http://www.jstor.org/stable/3117613.

19 Andrew H. Kydd and Barbara F. Walter. 2006. "The Strategies of Terrorism." International Security 31 (1). http://www.mitpressjournals.org.myaccess.library. utoronto.ca/doi/pdf/10.1162/isec.2006.31.1.49. ,p60

20 Ibid., 62

21 Mary Kaldor. 2013. "In Defence of New Wars." Stability: International Journal of Security and Development 2 (1). DOI:http://doi.org/10.5334/sta.at.

22 Andrew H. Kydd and Barbara F. Walter. 2006. "The Strategies of Terrorism." International Security 31 (1). http://www.mitpressjournals.org.myaccess.library. utoronto.ca/doi/pdf/10.1162/isec.2006.31.1.49. ,p73

23 Ibid., 74

24 Ethan Bueno de Mesquita and Eric S. Dickson. 2007. "The Propaganda of the Deed: Terrorism, Counterterrorism, and Mobilization." American Journal of Political Science 51 (2).

25 Scott Atran. 2003. "Genesis of Suicide Terrorism." Science 299 (5612).

26 Peter Neumann and M. L. R. Smith. 2005. "Strategic Terrorism: The Framework and Its Fallacies." Journal of Strategic Studies, no. 28 (August): 4. p580

27 Ethan Bueno de Mesquita and Eric S. Dickson. 2007. "The Propaganda of the Deed: Terrorism, Counterterrorism, and Mobilization." American Journal of Political Science 51 (2) p362

28 Ibid., p373

29 Andrew H. Kydd and Barbara F. Walter. 2006. "The Strategies of Terrorism." International Security 31 (1). http://www.mitpressjournals.org.myaccess.library. utoronto.ca/doi/pdf/10.1162/isec.2006.31.1.49.

30 Ibid., 70

31 Ibid., 51

32 Ibid., 71

33 Scott Atran. 2003. "Genesis of Suicide Terrorism." Science 299 (5612).

34 Andrew H. Kydd and Barbara F. Walter. 2006. "The Strategies of Terrorism." International Security 31 (1). http://www.mitpressjournals.org.myaccess.library. utoronto.ca/doi/pdf/10.1162/isec.2006.31.1.49.

35 Peter Neumann and M. L. R. Smith. 2005. "Strategic Terrorism: The Framework and Its Fallacies." Journal of Strategic Studies, no. 28 (August): 4. P577

36 Christopher Paul. 2010. "As a Fish Swims in the Sea: Relationships Between Factors Contributing to Support for Terrorist or Insurgent Groups." Studies in Conflict and Terrorism 33.

37 Andrew H. Kydd and Barbara F. Walter. 2006. "The Strategies of Terrorism." International Security 31 (1). p66

38 Christopher Paul. 2010. "As a Fish Swims in the Sea: Relationships Between Factors Contributing to Support for Terrorist or Insurgent Groups." Studies in Conflict and Terrorism 33.

39 Peter Neumann and M. L. R. Smith. 2005. "Strategic Terrorism: The Framework and Its Fallacies." Journal of Strategic Studies, no. 28 (August): 4.

ETHOS AND ALCOHOL: THE INFLUENCE OF PROTESTANTISM ON PROHIBITION IN THE UNITED STATES AND CANADA

By Samantha Odrowaz-Sekeley

National Prohibition began in the United States of America in January of 1920, and continued until 1933 when it was overturned by the 21st Amendment.[1] North of the border, National Prohibition in Canada had ended in the year before it began in America. And yet the Prohibition movement had not been extinguished, but rather it was decided on the provincial level.[2] This essay explores the influence of Christianity on prohibition laws between 1920 and 1933 in both Canada and the United States of America, and examines the contrasting histories of Prohibition through an analysis of how the Christian communities influenced their respective alcohol policies, and how these respective histories affected the development of Prohibition. I posit that the histories of these respective Christian communities in these two countries helped shape the different manifestations of Prohibition policies. First, the origins and rise of Temperance are explained, establishing that the Temperance movement was developed by and for those who followed the Protestant ethos. Next, I discuss how the years immediately prior to the time period in question influenced the nature of Prohibition in each country, considering the predominantly Protestant population in the United States was able to implement Prohibition at the national level. This is compared to Canada, where Prohibition policies were determined by provinces. This paper then uses the findings from each analysis to conclude that Prohibition was a Protestant movement. Finally, this paper considers the consequences of this societal disparity for American-Canadian relations during the Prohibition era through an examination of the mutual reception of the two countries.

In the study of religious influences on Prohibition, it is important to consider the Temperance movement, which grew out of the Second Great Awakening at the start of 19th century.[3] This movement saw a revival of Calvinist ideas and a revival of large public interest in religion. As a result, the religiosity of Protestant America intensified, now including more women who felt an obligation to serve their communities by providing a religious education for children.[4] The Temperance movement arose from the Second Great Awakening, which preached that "society's ills could be cured in a world without drink."[5] The determination of this new movement is shown in the establishment of the Temperance Society of America in 1826.[6] Such an attitude did not disappear from American social life throughout the 19th century, but the intensity and size of the

Temperance movement were catalyzed in the early 20th century, reaching its most powerful during the Prohibition years because of drastic changes in American life.

It is necessary to understand that Temperance was a Protestant movement. Not only was it born out of the Second Great Awakening, but it remained a Protestant cause up until and throughout the Prohibition years. As historian James Timberlake articulates, "most of the Protestant churches aligned themselves solidly behind the prohibition movement" save Protestants of German descent and Episcopalians.[7] Furthermore, the movement did not generate a Catholic basis of support.[8] Approximately 80% of over 500 Prohibition leaders were Protestant.[9] Therefore one cannot brand Temperance as a Christian movement, but rather it must be viewed as a Protestant American movement.

When examining the Prohibition years, it is necessary to observe what social factors contributed to the continuation of National Prohibition. The Progressive Era and Prohibition were in part reactionary to each other. The youth culture of the Jazz Age, characterized by its divergence from Victorian ideals of sex and properness, intensified the feeling of Temperance adherents to fix society.[10] "Temperance," writes Joseph R. Gusfield, "has been an ethical position on life style commitment."[11] They branded the Progressive movement as sinful, and saw it as their duty to remedy these flawed cultural developments through the indoctrination of the population with Temperance ethics.[12]

Another factor was that atheism was a growing ideology. It was now a large enough movement that there existed a push for evolution should be taught in schools.[13] This tension reached its apex in 1925 with the famous Scopes Trial, where former Secretary of State William Jennings Bryan defended the literal interpretation of the biblical creation story, insisting that evolution should therefore not be taught in schools. Although Bryan won the trial, this case illustrates the tensions between Christianity and atheism in the 1920s, and how the Christian community felt threatened by their country's divergence from tradition.[14]

Additionally, the late 19th and early 20th centuries saw a large wave of immigration into the United States. The increasing presence immigrants, many of whom were neither white nor Protestant, was a source of the Protestant community's revived adherence to Temperance. Furthermore, many of these immigrants did not share the puritanical view of alcohol. As a result, saloons, a common

socializing spot for immigrants, were characterized as the hotbed of sin. The establishment of the Anti-Saloon League in 1893 demonstrates the insecurity Temperance adherents felt over the changes in American society, and how they created xenophobic narratives through their anti-alcohol rhetoric.[15]

In summation, many Americans in the early 20th century felt that the *status quo*, especially the position of the United States as a Protestant nation, was threatened by these new socio-political developments, and their politics became more extreme in their attempt to counter these changes. "[Not] alone of that return to physical sanity…will follow the downfall of the drink habit," asserted Frances E. Willard of the Women's Christian Temperance Union in 1883, "But the reign of a religion of the body, which for the first time in history shall correlate with Christ's wholesome, practical, yet blessedly spiritual religion of the Soul."[16]

The social group behind the rapid growth of Temperance was Protestants of rural origin.[17] In the late 19th and early 20th century, there was an influx of immigrants from rural areas into urban areas.[18] This meant that the values common to rural areas were now brought into the city life, which expanded the scope and audience of Temperance. Indeed, Temperance was most popular among the middle-class population of large cities and the countryside.[19] This statistic is an important factor to consider when examining the 1920s because not only were modernism and Christian fundamentalism both intensifying, but they dominated similar circles. Both emerged and flourished in middle-class America, which suggests a reason for the deepening divide in American culture in the early 20th century. Not only did these conflicting ideologies exist in the same country, but they occupied the same socioeconomic bracket, and thus the rivalry manifested itself at the quotidian level, as shown in the aforesaid examples.

Temperance adherents saw themselves as liberating people from a sinful life.[20] They understood alcohol consumption to be a social problem as opposed to an individual one, and thus they could only remedy society by banning alcohol through the law. This agenda violated the concept of individual freedom, and as such, it required a significant amount of public support for the government to impose "its statist will on free individuals" in the 1920s.[21] The number of Protestants who felt that their religion was threatened by new social and cultural developments was extensive enough that they became receptive to the Temperance movement; then, they exercised their sway as the largest religious demographic in the United States to elect politicians that supported Prohibition.

Because of the largesse and intensity of Temperance adherents, the Federal Government was able to implement National Prohibition in 1920. Americans nationwide were forbidden by law to sell, purchase, or import any beverage with an alcohol content greater than 0.5 percent; however they were still allowed to drink it.[22] This was incompatible with the Temperance ethos that preached that only in a dry society could common morality exist.[23] As such, the United States Government enforced the Volstead Act, which illegalized the consumption of alcohol.[24]

Prohibition in Canada took a different course. No liquor laws, except about revenue existed in Canada until 1864, when Dunkin Law was passed. This law allowed for counties to forbid the sale of alcohol if there was a majority vote ruled in favour of such a policy. A similar system of policy-making was granted in the Canadian Temperance Act of 1878, which allowed alcohol policies to be determined by popular vote in cities and municipal regions, which led to smaller communities being able to choose the status of liquor. Prince Edward Island went completely dry[25] in 1901, and Nova Scotia was nearly dry in this same period, finally becoming completely dry in 1916.[26] The Ontario Government disliked this decentralization, but the communities themselves did not oppose Prohibition. In this time period, the presence of hotels licensed to serve liquor dramatically decreased, and the government contained retail liquor sales large towns and urban areas.[27] Yet the Ontario Government hesitated to introduce any provincial Prohibition policies. A similar trend occurred in New Brunswick; the provincial government organized a national plebiscite on the issue of Prohibition in 1898, and the popular vote ruled in favour of Prohibition with 278,380 votes over the 264, 693 who opposed Prohibition.[28] Nonetheless, the federal government did not consider the result to be decisive enough to justify a nationwide ban on alcohol.[29] Thus the decision regarding Prohibition remained at a more local level.

National Prohibition was finally instated through the War Measures Act in 1918 during World War I, but this decree had little effect as all had already adopted a provincial ban on the consumption and sale of liquor, except for Quebec. When the War Measures Act expired in December of 1919 with the end of the First World War, provinces were now allowed to determine their respective alcohol policies.[30] In the years following the end of National Prohibition, we can see that, like in the United States, Prohibition was popular among Protestants, which supports the claim that Prohibition was a

Protestant movement because we can see the correlation between a large Protestant population and support for Prohibition.

Ontario and the Maritime provinces had the largest Protestant populations. Moreover, these provinces had the highest population of American immigrants, many of whom descended from the Loyalists of the American Revolution who relocated to Canada during the War of Independence.[31] Their immigration was therefore motivated by a political, not religious, disagreement; as such, they maintained their conservative Protestant views that made them sympathetic to Temperance.[32] Prohibition endured the longest in these provinces: Prince Edward Island was the first to ban alcohol in 1901, with the ban lasting until 1948; Prohibition lasted in Nova Scotia from 1916 to 1930, and in Ontario from 1916 to 1927. New Brunswick did not ban alcohol as early as the aforementioned provinces, but its Prohibition lasted from 1917 until 1927, and the only provinces that continued their Prohibition policies later than New Brunswick were the two other Maritime provinces.[33]

Quebec had the staunchest opposition to Prohibition in Canada, which furthers the argument that Temperance was a cause that appealed to a Protestant, not simply a Christian, worldview. The largest opposition towards Prohibition in the 1898 Plebiscite was from Quebec.[34] Prior to National Prohibition, Quebec had banned only liquors as opposed to all alcohols.[35] Following the expiration of the War Measures Act, the government of Quebec issued a ban on the sale of alcohol, however, this initiative lasted only a few months, ending in the same year it began.[36] This parallels the Temperance movement in the United States, where the movement did generate a significant Catholic following.[37] Quebec, the only Canadian province where Catholics, not Protestants, were the religious majority, and its attitude towards Prohibition laws demonstrate that Temperance was a predominantly Protestant cause.

What did this disparity mean for Canadian-American relations during the thirteen years of National Prohibition in the United States? Foremost, the lack of uniformity in Prohibition policies meant that Canadians could more easily access alcohol, even if they lived in a province where Prohibition endured into the latter half of the 1920s, because in Quebec, and later other provinces, Canadians could legally purchase and consume alcohol. Out of this, the American-Canadian border became a site of alcohol smuggling.[38] Canadian exportation of liquor increased from $707,099 worth of liquor in 1920 to $3,178,908 in 1923. At the

end of 1925, when only the Maritime provinces and Ontario retained their Prohibition laws, the number had increased to $11,610,169, and at the end of the decade, when Prince Edward Island and Nova Scotia were the only two dry provinces remaining, it had reached $11,610,169.[39]

Stephen Moore posits that the interactions contributed something more. He hypothesizes that the American influx into Canada in search of alcohol resulted in an increase of interactions between Canadian and American cultures, and altered the Canadian perception of the United States. The growth of the American presence in Canada in this period was key to the history of American-Canadian history because it helped define the relationship between Canada and the United States as one of common interaction. Moreover, Canadians viewed their government, and, by extension, themselves, in contrast to the American counterparts. The aforementioned American presence did engender a mild dislike of American culture; however this sentiment did not dampen the growing amicability between the two nationalities, as the act of crossing the border became much more common in these years.[40] After Prohibition, Canadians compared their dry years to the American ones, and came to view themselves as better at implementing reform without falling into extremes.[41] This perception shows that the Prohibition years played a significant role in forming the Canadian national identity, and the method of implementing Prohibition, whether it happened on the local or national level, influenced each country's perception of their neighbour.

This essay traced the origins and implementation of Prohibition in Canada and the United States of America with a focus on how religion shaped these movements. While one cannot accurately say that Protestantism was the only factor that incited Prohibition policies in either country, it is clear the Temperance movement, firmly Protestant in nature, is tied to the success of Prohibition. This is supported by the fact that Prohibition's success in both nations was due to support from their Protestant populations, as opposed to any other denomination of Christianity or other religions. Furthermore, the development of Prohibition manifested itself differently in these countries because of the recent sociopolitical developments within each of these nations. The history of Prohibition in both Canada and the United States is the product of Protestant support in the context of their respective sociopolitical situations.

ENDNOTES

1 John Frendreis and Raymond Tatalovich, "'A Hundred Miles Dry': Religion and the Persistence of Prohibition in the U.S. States," State Politics & Policy Quarterly 10, no. 3 (2010): 303.

2 Sean Dennis Cashman, Prohibition: The Lie of the Land (New York City, NY: The Free Press, 1981), 260-261.

3 Frendreis and Tatalovich, "A Hundred Miles," 304.

4 Mark C. Carnes and John A. Garraty, American Destiny (London: Pearson, 2012), 274-276.

5 Stephen T. Moore, "Defining the "Undefended": Canadians, Americans, and the Multiple Meanings of Border during Prohibition," American Review of Canadian Studies 34 (1) (2004): 7.

6 Frendreis and Tatolovich, "A Hundred Miles," 304.

7 James H. Timberlake, Prohibition and the Progressive Movement (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1963), 21.

8 Timberlake, Prohibition, 7.

9 Frendreis and Tatalovich, "A Hundred Miles," 305.

10 Paula S. Fass, "Sex and Youth in the Jazz Age," Major Problems in American History vol. 2, eds. Elizabeth Cobbs and Edward J. Blum.

11 Joseph R. Gusfield, Symbolic Crusade: Status Politics and the American Temperance Movement (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1986), 30.

12 Paul L. Murphy, "Societal Morality and Individual Freedom" in Law, Alcohol, and Order: Perspectives on National Prohibition, ed. David E. Kyvig (Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1985), 67-69.

13 Edward J. Larson, "Fundamentalists Battle Modernism in the Roaring Twenties" Major Problems in American History vol. 2, eds. Elizabeth Cobbs and Edward J. Blum.

14 Elizabeth Cobbs and Edward J. Blum, eds. Major Problems in American History Volume II: Since 1865 (Boston, MA: Cengage Learning, 2017), 188.

15 Frendreis and Tatalovich, "A Hundred Miles," 306.

16 Frances E. Willard, Women and Temperance, Major Problems in American History Volume II: Since 1865 edited by Elizabeth Cobbs and Edward J. Blum. (Boston, MA: Cengage Learning, 2017), 127.

17 Frendreis and Tatalovich, "A Hundred Miles," 304.

18 Carnes and Garraty, American Destiny, 644-645.

19 James Timberlake, Prohibition, 29-30.

20 Murphy, "Morality," 67.

21 Murphy, "Morality," 72

22 Moore, "Defining the 'Undefended'," 2.

23 Murphy, "Morality," 69.

24 Murphy, "Morality," 69.

25 Cashman, Prohibition, 259.

26 Matthew J. Bellamy, "The Canadian Brewing Industry's Response to Prohibition, 1874-1920," Brewery History, 132 (Fall, 2009): 2.

27 Cashman, Prohibition, 259. Cashman notes that Canada did not have saloons like the United States, but uses licensed hotels as a comparative measure of the extent of Prohibition laws.

28 Cashman, Prohibition, 260.

29 Cashman, Prohibition, 260.

30 Cashman, Prohibition, 259-260.

31 Moore, "Defining the 'Undefended'," 11.

32 Moore, "Defining the 'Undefended'," 11.

33 Bellamy, "Response," 2. To compare these long tenures to the other provinces, here are the dates for Prohibition in other provinces, in order of the year they instated the ban on alcohol: Alberta (1916-1924), Manitoba (1916-1923), Saskatchewan (1917-1925), and British Columbia (1917 to 1921), and Quebec (1919).

34 Bellamy, "Response," 11.

35 Cashman, Prohibition, 260.

36 Bellamy, "Response," 2.

37 Frendreis and Tatalovich, "A Hundred Miles," 304-306. See pages 2 and 3 of this paper, where the popularity of Temperance among Catholics and Protestants is explored.

38 Moore, "Defining the 'Undefended'," 4.

39 Moore, "Defining the 'Undefended'," 12.

40 Moore, "Defining the 'Undefended'," 4.

41 Moore, "Defining the 'Undefended'," 11.

THE SCOPES TRIAL: A TEST OF FAITH

By Angus Lee

While the Scopes Trial in May 1925 was a very straightforward case in the legal sense, its sensation did not arise from the trial's legalities. The Butler law was explicitly violated by John Scopes, with the defense intending to lose the trial. Instead, the dialogue of the trial was focused more heavily upon the surrounding context that lead up to this event. The main point of contention shifted from a legal standpoint to a nationally debated topic of religion versus science, with one of the prosecutors, William Jennings Bryan, alluding to it as the "issue between the believer and the unbeliever."[1] Through the smaller scope of evolution as the basis for this debate, the Scopes Trial revealed the attitude of the fundamentalists and their fear towards science and its consequences on faith, as well as the efforts of the modernists to integrate science into religion for co-existence.

This article argues that the Scopes Trial's national sensation came from the exemplification of a larger, pre-existing division within a conflicted society relating to scientific progress and religious fear. The religious defenders were opposing and fearing a larger social movement towards the loss of faith. They also saw a declining civility within America with younger generations' acceptance of science threatening the stability of religious faith. In contrast, the defense attempted to persuade that science championed progressive thought. Rather than incompatible, science served as a platform to allow for a higher and stronger understanding of religion by addressing its inconsistent interpretations with facts that were excluded from regular religious studies.

One of the primary undertones of the prosecution's stance towards science was its perception of theories and facts, such as evolution eroding and affecting the faithfulness of younger generations. The fundamentalists used faith and their connection to God in order to substantiate a position that rejected evolution and, by extension, scientific knowledge. Attorney general Tom Stewart claimed that "it is a battle of between religion and science, and in the name of God, I stand with religion because I want to know beyond this world that there may be an eternal happiness for me and for all," which compounded a strong attachment and reason for sticking to religion.[2] Furthermore, Stewart supported his faith by stating it is a backbone of America's fundamental civility, believing that science would cause a conflict that "challenges even permitting anyone to believe… until finally that precious book and its glorious teachings upon which this civilization has been built will be taken from us."[3] By framing

science as a detriment towards society, Stewart attempted to broadly generalize America as a country that is constructed from religion and faith. Not only did this stance visibly show the strong, conservative roots of religion, but it also revealed a greater disconnect between science and religion in their potential to co-exist from the fundamentalists' perspective.

Conversely, while the prosecution's motive was to discredit science and invalidate its correlation to religion, the defense's claim characterized science as a progressive form of education that did not interfere with the teachings of religion, but instead simply provided a means of learning about the world. During defense attorney Clarence Darrow's questioning of Scope's student Harry Shelton, the cross examination revealed that there was not necessarily a tie between scientific knowledge and theological decline as the prosecution feared. Darrow asked "[y]ou didn't leave church when [Scopes] told you all forms of life began with a single cell?" in which Shelton had stated he had not.[4] In addition, when Darrow asked one other student, Howard Morgan, if being taught evolution "ha[d] not hurt you any, has it?", Morgan had likewise stated that he had not been.[5] Morgan's mother said that "the morals of her boy had been unimpaired by the course in Hunter's *Civic Biology*" and that "[s]he wanted him to learn more about evolution and everything else. He was as keen a Bible student as he was a student of biology."[6] This attitude gives some insight upon the younger generation's and even some of the older, parental figures' views towards evolution and how they were capable of having the two co-exist, thus disputing the prosecution's claim. Another member of the defense, Dudley Field Malone, attempted to appeal to the fundamentalists by alleviating their fears while trying to push for an agenda that integrated science:

> Any teacher who teaches the boys or the girls today an incredible theory — we need not worry about these children of this generation paying much attention to it. The children of this generation are pretty wise. The least that this generation can do, your Honor, is to give the next generation all the facts, all the available data, all the theories, all the information that learning, that study, that observation has produced — give it to the children in the hope of heaven that they will make a better world of this than we have been able to make it… For God's sake let the children have their minds kept open — close no

> doors to their knowledge… Make the distinction
> between theology and science. Let them have both. Let
> them both be taught.[7]

Although the prosecution had alluded to science as a force that attacked the very structure of America, Malone attempted to argue for it as a means of consolidating religious civility, saying that younger generations required knowledge to not repeat the past mistakes. Chiefly, he referred to World War One that had occurred seven years earlier and asserts science as a cause for its destructive force due to technological weapons that had escalated warfare. Implicitly, he faulted human character for wielding such powerful technology. In doing so, he also condemned the lack of civility inherent in the older generations, so that science could not be sole reason for a war that reached such levels of human degradation, claiming that "[c]ivilization is not so proud of the work of the adults" and that "[it] need not be so proud of what the grown-ups have done."[8] Malone's criticism and capability to concede on his own front, while chastising the supposed moral high ground of religion that the prosecution had taken likewise reflects the fear fundamentalists felt opposed to the modernist's insistence on progression. Such a stance weakened the platform of civility for the prosecution and demonstrated a lack of solid logic for rejecting scientific knowledge. Despite the distress towards science in supposedly corrupting faith, the trial revealed a core flaw in the religious argument: its interpretations were subject to the individual's beliefs and not to a general consensus, meaning faith could be broadly understood.

Judge Raulston claimed that in relation towards Christianity, "there are two things in this world that are indestructible, that man cannot destroy or no force in the world can destroy. One is truth… another thing indestructible… is the word of God, that he has given to man, that man may use it as a waybill to the other world."[9] The closing remarks of the trial highlighted the fundamentalist's problem of religious integration with science. Due to the fundamentalist's belief that the Bible was to have subjective interpretation and meaning to the individual, it could be said that no one possessed the right or the authority to prescribe a correct interpretation of the text, thus facts that science attempted to use to interpret the Bible could not be accepted. When questioned on the Bible's literal interpretations, Bryan thought that "everything in the Bible should be accepted as it is given there; some of the Bible is given illustratively."[10] Furthermore,

he believed that the Bible was the authority above scientific facts in validity, saying that "even if they put God back [in evolution], it does not make it harmonious with the Bible."[11] In demonstrating such a blind attachment to the Bible as a stronger interpretative unity, the fundamentalists had shown that their defense and rejection of evolution was founded upon a bias and ignorance, bolstered by the lack of comprehensive consensus on the Bible's content.

This gap in knowledge was revealed more strongly in court when Darrow interrogated Bryan, asking him if he didn't "care how old the earth is, how old man is, and how long the animals have been here? You have never made any investigation to find out?"[12] Bryan's justification in not attempting to learn factual information about the events in the Bible was that he "[had] been so well satisfied with the Christian religion, that [he] [has] never spent no time trying to find arguments against it."[13] The fundamentalist approach was to simply accept the Bible in what it had said, and interpret it to the capacity that faith lead an individual to do so. When contrasted with scientific attempts to explain the phenomena within the Bible, this core attachment to individuality and faith would inherently contradict the scientific facts' purpose of prescribing a certain method of interpretation into the texts.

Furthermore, Bryan's insistence on dodging Darrow's direct questions that could potentially be disputed scientifically reveals either that there was a theological aspect of faith that was not necessarily supported by the realm of scientific interpretation. Moreover, this attempt to stick to traditional, religious roots was part of a greater fear that science would deconstruct faith and destroy it. The stance taken by both Judge Raulston and Bryan, in siding heavily with religion, implicitly demonstrates their belief in the incompatibility of science in tandem with faith. Yet in doing so, they contradicted the attitudes that were taken up by adults and students such as Howard Morgan, who saw a possibility for science to co-exist and perhaps even heighten faith. Thus, it could be determined that the fear of declining civility from fewer people adhering to their religion was simply a deeply rooted conservative belief, and that this trial had exposed the lack of proof to validate such a claim.

The trial's outcomes were also widely criticized and the debate between science and religion was analyzed as a result of the magnitude this case had reached. Articles and editorials popularly compared humans and monkeys in their evolutionary relationship, and even characterized the South as a monkey in its own right for

backwards thinking from the rest of human civilization. The Chicago Defender had described the South as a region that if "[a]nything which conflicts with the South's idea of her own importance, anything which tends to break down her doctrine of white superiority, she fights. If truths are introduced and these truths do not conform to what southern grandfathers believed, then it must be suppressed."[14] The paper further went to criticize that Tennessee was devolving back into monkeys, and saying that "[i]t is too bad that the monkeys cannot speak and show the South just how ridiculous she is becoming in her efforts to convince the world that she is "superior."[15] This was an effort to display that in its steadfast attachment to conservative roots and fear of challenges to their beliefs, the South was rejecting prospects of moving forward and progressing.

Another form of criticism came from H. L. Mencken, who displayed his shock from hearing evolution being denounced by Bryan alongside "every other stranger in the courtroom."[16] However, in contrast to his reaction and the strangers', who were just non-southerners, he saw that "the native fundamentalists, it quickly appeared, saw nothing absurd in [Bryan's] words."[17] It is interesting to note that on a national level, only those who lived in the South seemed to agree with Bryan's words, showing that there may have been a divide in ideas between the North and the South, with the former accepting science and its possible relation to religion, while the South remained stagnant in its conservative nature. Certainly, the North could be argued as more accepting due to the stronger industrialization and heavier use of technology within their cities, yet the sharp contrast shown in Mencken's writing conveys two separate groups of people within America: those who allowed science and religion to co-exist, and those who didn't.

Political cartoons were also created in response to the ideas addressed within the Scopes Trial. Both sides' points were depicted in different cartoons, with one criticizing state legislature in the South as a prohibitive force, asserting that higher forms of education were not welcome as they contradicted the ignorant values of what the uneducated people knew.[18] Another cartoon portrayed Lady Liberty as a representative figure of the South, showing that she (the South) represented religious goodness, fertility, opportunity, and a good life, which was reflective of the belief that America was founded upon the civility of faith.[19] Bryan's representative stance was also attacked, with the cartoon showing him as a figure of bigotry that resonated strongly with the South's unwillingness to accept ideas and

progressive thought. Cartoons offered a strong response to the trial on different sides across the nation, demonstrating just how deeply controversial this topic was between modernists and traditionalists.

The strong, conservative stance of the South combined with outsider knowledge of science created a clash of ideas that visibly brought out a sharp disparity in faith within America. Despite the trial not having much legal ground, it gained recognition as the trial set the stage for a more powerful underlying debate between two seemingly incompatible ideas. Yet through intensive arguments and attempts to deconstruct faith to a factual level, the fundamentalists revealed a severe flaw in their justification of these two ideas being inharmonious. The ambiguous and vague means in which interpretation and faith were held demonstrated an inconsistent and illogical reasoning for rejecting scientific fact. Moreover, it could be seen that there was evidence in progressive thought within the South, contradicting the fear that traditionalists held towards declining civility. Ultimately, the Scopes Trial gained national recognition from its capacity to challenge the fundamentalist beliefs and fears, and reject it through deconstruction and recognizing its contradictory nature.

ENDNOTES

1   William Jennings Bryan, William Jennings Bryan's First Speech (16 July 1925), in The Scopes Trial: A Brief History with Documents, Ed. Jeffrey P. Moran (Boston: Bedford Books, 2002), 125.

2   Tom Stewart, Attorney General Stewart Answers Malone (29 July 1925), in The Scopes Trial, 132.

3   Stewart, Ibid, 146.

4   Clarence Darrow, Harry Shelton, Introduction, in The Scopes Trial, 60.

5   Clarence Darrow, Howard Morgan, Examination of Howard Morgan, One of Scope's Students (14 July 1925), in The Scopes Trial, 104.

6   Howard Morgan's Mother, *Trial Shows Wisdom of Youth* (October 1925), in *The Scopes Trial,* 106.

7   Dudley Field Malone, *Dudley Field Malone Replies to Bryan* (16 July 1925), in *The Scopes Trial,* 129-130.

8   Dudley Field Malone, Ibid, 130.

9   John T. Raulston, Farewell Remarks (21 July 1925), in The Scopes Trial, 168.

10   William Jennings Bryan, Darrow Questions William Jennings Bryan on the Stand (20 July 1925), in The Scopes Trial, 144.

11   William Jennings Bryan, William Jennings Bryan's First Speech, 123.

12   Clarence Darrow, William Jennings Bryan, Did the Flood Wipe out Civilization? (20 July 1925), in The Scopes Trial, 153.

13   William Jennings Bryan, Ibid, 152.

14   The Chicago Defender, If Monkeys Could Speak (23 May 1925), in The Scopes Trial, 181.

15   The Chicago Defender, Ibid, 181.

16   H. L. Mencken, Battle Now Over; Genesis Triumphant and Ready for New Jousts (18 July 1925), in The Scopes Trial, 170.

17   H. L. Mencken, Ibid, 170.

18   Cargill, Education in the Higher Branches (1925), in The Scopes Trial, 175.

19   Baltimore Sun, Waiting (17 July 1925), in The Scopes Trial, 178.

FLOOD MUSIC: FROM BLUES TO HIP HOP AFRICAN-AMERICAN CREATIVE RESPONSE TO DISASTER

By Tomas Lammers

Creative response as a coping and defense mechanism to systems and institutions of oppression has been a part of African-American culture for centuries. This artistic relief has most often come in the form of song and music; however, the events and circumstances that trigger these responses are far too persistent and frequent. Though major social change such as the abolition of slavery and the civil rights movements have signified significant progress, it is no secret that there are still pervasive racial issues that trouble the United States. Some of the more controversial racial issues have gained media attention, but the underlying, deep-rooted, systemic issues that affect black Americans most are often ignored. Disaster — which for all intents and purposes of this paper will refer to a calamitous climatic event that is exacerbated or catalyzed by anthropocene activities — can act as a lens through which one can find cracks in the structures of power, and in turn, incur social change. Perhaps no disaster unveiled more bureaucratic incompetency and systemic marginalization than Hurricane Katrina. The incompetency of the government was unveiled through the inadequate preparation and response by the federal government that resulted in the inundation of most of the city of New Orleans — leaving an overwhelmingly disproportionate amount of socioeconomically disadvantaged citizens, a majority of who were black, in a semi-apocalyptic state for days without food and water.[1] Apocalypse, etymologically speaking, is derived from the Latin origin, which means to *unveil.*[2] Throughout the history of America, disasters have unveiled many weaknesses in American fortitude. But calling out those in charge is no easy task, especially for the poor and marginalized. Thus, African-Americans are recurrently forced to find new outlets and media to protest and demand change. This is clearly reflected in the outpouring of both underground New Orleans artists and mainstream hip-hop that emerged in the aftermath of Katrina.[3] African-American creative response to disaster furthers this unveiling, as it allows a person or group to reach inward to investigate new depths while simultaneously allowing them to reach beyond imposed boundaries.[4] This assertion is reinforced by the outpouring of blues music that transcribed the African-American experience of the Great Mississippi Flood of 1927, which displaced 700,000 people, 300,000 of whom were black.[5] The 1927 flood disaster narrative will be used as proxy through which blues epistemology can be analyzed, and in turn, conflated with African-American experience in the aftermath of Katrina.

Thus, this paper will employ the epistemology of African-American music, namely the blues and hip-hop, as a 'looking glass' in order to illustrate the influence of African-American creative response and its role in enabling a collective voice that reveals truth, demands change, and one that ultimately led to action in the aftermath of Katrina.

This paper will employ a wide array of both primary and secondary sources in the form of both traditional literature and song lyrics that arose from the historical events in question. Firstly, Clyde Woods' book *Development Arrested: The Blues and Plantation Power in the Mississippi Delta* (1998), argues that the genres of blues and spirituals are not simply mechanistic responses to oppression, but are, rather, conscious codification of African and African-American knowledge systems, soundscapes, spirituality, and social research traditions.[6] Additionally, Woods argues that the various subgenres of blues and spirituals — namely, jazz, gospel, rock and roll, rhythm and blues, funk, and hip-hop — all draw on these cultural pillars for their insights.[7] In other words, these aural traditions are simultaneously generated by the past, while seeking to serve a dynamic and evolving collective consciousness. Moreover, it was the mix of collective consciousness and personal sentiment that allowed it to be shaped by the past while able to grow and evolve in the present.[8] Thus, blues and spirituals became a form of structure and rule in a chaotic and seemingly lawless environment. This state of chaos was perhaps never more rampant for black Americans than during the aftermath and subsequent diaspora of black Americans due to the Great Flood and Katrina. This paper will also draw on several songs of blues and hip-hop that were written in response to, or in spite of, these two historical events.

"When the Levee Breaks" by Memphis Minnie and Kansas Joe McCoy was written in response to Minnie's experience of the 1927 floods and was first recorded in 1929.[9] "When the Levee Breaks" is essentially a first hand account of the fleeing and fear that Mississippians experienced after the levee broke. Though the circumstances that led to, and stemmed from, the respective disasters are complex and naturally very different, there is a mutual element of sadness stemming from disenfranchisement that is evident in the outpouring of blues and hip-hop that arose from both the 1927 Mississippi floods and Katrina, respectively. Rapper/hip-hop artist Mos Def's song "Katrina Klap" (later renamed "Dollar Day") was written, recorded, and performed within two weeks of Katrina's destruction of the gulf coast.[10] Mos Def's criticism of the incompetency and failure of the Bush Administration in its execution of both

preparation and relief efforts in New Orleans simultaneously protests what has been done organizationally while demanding change, as he encourages sympathizers to not only "talk about it," but to "be about it."[11] Each of these creative responses effectively encapsulate the collective historical experience of being black in America, while also establishing the personal sentiment and emotion that contextualizes each narrative in its own way. Both these similarities and dissimilarities will be investigated in order to better understand African-American response to disaster.

Understanding blues epistemology — the longstanding African-American tradition of explaining reality and change — is vital to understanding hip-hop and how it evolved as a means of protest and dissent against those structures of power that have oppressed, and continue to oppress, black people in America. As blues legend Willie Dixon once stated, "had it not been for the blues, the black man wouldn't have been able to survive through all the humiliations and all the various things going on in America […] he had nothing to fight with but the blues […] the blues is the facts of life."[12] While the exact origin of the blues is not explicitly clear, its call-and-response format and the use of blue notes can be traced back to African origins.[13] The call-and-response format gave way to spirituals, work songs, field hollers, shouts, chants, and rhymed simple narrative ballads; consequently, blues is a manifestation of these elements.[14] As a result, the blues genre is inherently dynamic as the genre also takes its shape from the idiosyncrasies of each individual performance, and each predominant blues artists spreads these peculiarities to both fellow artists and its audience.[15] The initial popularization of the blues can be attributed to Mamie Smith's 1920 recording of "Crazy Blues," which sold a million copies in less than a year and had a major influence on jazz, which furthered its popularity.[16] The influence this had on African-American life is unbounded, as Smith's recording brought blues into the mainstream, opened the door for other artists, and most importantly, gave a voice to the voiceless. Additionally, blues has historically been the means through which black Americans cope with the violence, racism, displacement, and environmental vulnerability that have consistently been a part of African-American life.[17] Disaster, the Great Migration, and cultural and racial oppression are examples of the push-and-pull factors that have forced African-Americans to migrate and resettle, often marking black migrants as a "*refugee* whose foreignness marks the limits of majoritarian identity and hospitality."[18] (The term "refugee' and its connotations in the context of

American disaster will be further discussed in relation to media attention during Katrina later). The United States federal government's vacillation towards displaced migrants is reflected in both 1927 and Katrina. Though, arguably, in the case of Katrina, the Bush Administration's ambivalence toward the displaced residents of New Orleans more so resembled abandonment and a complete lack of accountability in regards to the measures taken to adequately prepare, and respond, to Hurricane Katrina.

The notion of displacement and diaspora as being catalysts and anchorages of African-American suffering is echoed by the emergence of hip-hop and the circumstances that led to it in the 1970s. The South Bronx (along with Brooklyn's Brownsville, Bushwick, and Bedford-Stuyvesant neighborhoods, and Manhattan's Harlem and Lower East Side) saw extraordinary rates of fire during the 1970s. Seven different census tracts in The Bronx lost more than 97% of their buildings to fire and abandonment between 1970 and 1980; 44 tracts (out of 289 in the borough) lost more than 50%.[19] Hip-hop and elements of hip-hop culture began in these neighborhoods and evolved throughout the 1970s. In early-1970s, New York City hip-hop found its start in the form of 'block party music' played by African-American, Puerto Rican, and Jamaican party hosts.[20] In its infancy, hip-hop was a combination of rap (or at the time, semi-autobiographical chant) and an instrumental track that was usually sampled from a preexisting reggae, rock, or blues recording.[21] Though hip-hop was initially a means of entertainment, some artists used hip-hop to channel internalized anger rather than rebel against society in the form of gang violence, which was also rampant in New York City in the 1970s.[22] By the onset of the 1980s, hip-hop was increasingly commercially popular and rapidly went from a marginalized genre to one in the mainstream.[23] As Edgar Pieterse argues, "it is opportune to turn to the role of popular music, particularly hip-hop, in challenging the predominant urban condition of increasing marginalization of poor black youth through offering an alternative sense of place, a means of interpreting the world and 'a capacity to aspire.'"[24] Once again, African-American creative response gave a new generation a voice at a time when they were seemingly voiceless. The forms in which this can be achieved continues to to evolve through the popular arts.

Woods' assertion that the blues and spirituals are not simply an aesthetic movement, but, rather, a complex epistemology is important to understanding contemporary African-American creative

response, especially in the form of hip-hop. That is, blues is a mode of knowing and interpreting the world with the driving forces being "autonomy of thought and action in the midst of constant surveillance and violence."[25] This characteristic of blues — trying to make sense of a world in a state of constant chaos and violence — is perhaps the most evident blues element that has manifested in hip-hop. Hip-hop is also derived from African origins. According to Dawn M. Norfleet, rap arose from "African derived oral traditions of storytelling, 'boasting' (self-aggrandizement), 'toasting' (long narrative poems that sometimes bestow praises) and 'playing the dozens' (competitive and recreational exchange of verbal insults)."[26] Hip-hop's emergence as a cultural form that attempts to negotiate the experiences of marginalization, unequal opportunity, and oppression has become a vessel through which African Americans have contributed to the history of creative output in response to disaster.[27] This sentiment is especially apparent in the 'Katrina hip-hop' that emerged in response to inundation of New Orleans and in spite of the organizational failures that preceded and followed it. As Kish describes, 'Katrina hip-hop' is a veritable subgenre "born on waves of backlash against the unnecessary suffering and institutional failure that transformed the natural disaster of Katrina into a national one."[28]

In his article "American Urbicide" (2006), Andrew Herscher asserts Katrina's effects were "but the last and most visible traces of a chronic disaster, an urbicide fabricated not by military action but by policy and ideology. Black and often poor communities bore a disproportionate share of the environmental and economic risks of natural disaster as underwritten by discriminatory housing practices, job opportunity, and rescue efforts.[29] In other words, the destruction that wreaked havoc on New Orleans was not due solely to natural occurrences; rather, it was the result of a myriad political decisions and social policies that manifested into the unnecessary suffering and diaspora of its citizens.

The inadequate response to Katrina by local, state, and federal governmental and organizational bodies left a significant scar on the American psyche and the idea of American fortitude as a means of overcoming any situation. The immediate effects of Katrina were catastrophic. The myriad factors — infrastructure divestment, socioeconomic and racial segregation, and a complete lack of urgency and competency in evacuation and response measures — resulted in the unnecessary suffering and displacement of hundreds of thousands of Americans. More than 800,000 Gulf

residents were displaced, approximately 1,500 died, and tens of thousands were left stranded in New Orleans without food, water, or possibility of escaping without rescue.[30] The storm caused over fifty breaches in New Orleans' hurricane surge protection and resulted in the inundation of over 80% of the city and some of its surrounding parishes[31] A majority of these breaches were failures of levees protecting the city from surrounding water. According to a study by the United States Army Corps of Engineers ("USACE"), approximately two-thirds of the deaths in New Orleans and affected surrounding areas were due to levee and floodwall failure.[32]

Additionally, a study led by the National Science Foundation concluded that local officials in New Orleans had contributed to the disaster by forcing the Corps to build less effective protection for the city than the Corps had wanted to build in an effort to save money. The study also found that "dysfunctional interaction" between local officials led to the long stretches of levees and flood walls, which cataclysmically failed in the face of the storm.[33] An alternative plan to put gates at the mouths of the canals that could be closed as a storm approached was proposed; however, the levee board members and other city officials pushed for the more inexpensive, less protective long canals and flood walls.[34] Further studies found that African-American residents experienced 76% of the deeply flooded areas despite being just 67% of the city's population.[35] This is because racial and ethnic minorities have been found to be more likely to live in disadvantaged and more environmentally hazardous neighborhoods.[36]

There has also been criticism of the preparation and evacuation efforts on a municipal level. In the months following the disaster, The House of Representatives employed a Select Bipartisan Committee to investigate the preparation for and response to Hurricane Katrina. The report, titled "A Failure of Initiative" concluded that former New Orleans Mayor, Ray Nagin, was responsible for delaying a mandatory evacuation notice until 19 hours before the storm hit the Gulf, as he was concerned about the cost and logistics of forcing an evacuation.[37] As a result, there was a complete organizational failure to facilitate the disabled, elderly, and those who lacked the transportation to evacuate the city in time.

While the political and bureaucratic incompetency prior to Katrina was responsible for the inundation of New Orleans, there was also a pervasive failure in response to the disaster that left its most vulnerable citizens stranded and resulted in hundreds of

avoidable fatalities. According to a study by the Southeast Louisiana Data Center, nearly half of all victims were over the age of 74.[38] In the immediate aftermath, there was extensive criticism of local, state, and federal governments for mismanagement and a lack of leadership that resulted in increased suffering and fatalities. The hip-hop community was quick to respond, and during an on-air concert fundraiser for flood victims, rapper Kanye West bluntly stated, "George Bush doesn't care about black people," a sentiment that — though undoubtedly an oversimplification — resonated with many in the African-American community on a national scale.[39] According to the report by the Select Bipartisan Committee, "[i]t has become increasingly clear that local, state, and federal government agencies failed to meet the needs of the residents of Louisiana, Mississippi, and Alabama."[40] While the report was quick to place blame on state and local leadership, it asserted, "[i]t does not appear the President received adequate advice and counsel from a senior disaster professional."[41] Moreover, in the aftermath of the storm, Bush said, "I don't think anybody anticipated the breach of the levees."[42] Video obtained by the Associated Press, however, shows that Bush was aptly warned that the storm could, and probably would, breach flood barriers. The said video also showed that Bush was warned of the government's incompetency — or lack of will — in adequately responding to the disaster.[43]

As news and images of the disaster spread throughout the country, sadness, anger, and disbelief spread too. Public outcry was widespread — nowhere more so than within the African-American community. Moreover, news networks added insult to injury as many showed images suggesting black victims were looters, whereas white victims were simply looking for food in a fight for survival. This immediately created controversy and further angered the black community, which had been devastated.[44] Additionally, the term 'refugee' was applied to the stranded victims of Katrina, a majority of whom were U.S. citizens. Calling Katrina victims refugees, Charles Taylor argues, is an instance of a more pervasive pattern of "misrecognition" in which black disaster victims are routinely and repeatedly characterized as standing outside the law, the moral order, and the nation.[45] The use of the term refugee furthered the collective outcry of the black community as it implied the 'statelessness' of the victims and had an undertone of xenophobic racism and disenfranchisement that was reflected in the actions taken by the state and federal governments.[46]

Mos Def's "Katrina Klap" is a representation of the suffering and frustration that stemmed from the pervasive institutional failure to protect and respond to its citizens. The song emphasizes the devaluation of black people by the federal government, suggesting "You better off on crack, Dead or in jail, or with a gun in Iraq."[47] Mos Def is just one of the myriad artists who responded to the event in artistic and literal protest, both locally and nationally. Underground New Orleans artists such as 540 Boys and Mia X were part of the aforementioned 'Katrina hip-hop' subgenre, an integral part of the 'conscious codification' described by Woods. Conversely, mainstream artists such as Jay-Z and Lil Wayne provided a discourse that interrupted the status-quo; in turn, this assisted in sparking a national outcry for intervention from the federal government.[48] While many local artists' responses targeted the President George W. Bush's administration and state institutions as 'gold diggers,' mainstream, or more nationally recognized artists, used language that drew attention to the ways in which racial discrimination in the United States is often experienced through structural economic inequities. In this regard, "Katrina Klap" embodies the latter.[49] After Mos Def criticizes President Bush for being "bout that cash," Mos Def then facetiously equates being black with being poor, saying, "if you poor you black."[50] Thus, in 'Katrina hip-hop,' one is exposed to the "plurality of speaking positions, grappling with identification, empowerment, and objectification in response to a collective trauma that was both local and constitutive of what Mos Def identifies as 'the storm called […] America.'"[51] In "Katrina Klap," Mos Def further ascertains that the inadequate rescue efforts were racially selective and stemmed from the Bush Administration's political agenda. Namely, he emphasizes the misappropriation of federal resources concerning the military intervention in Iraq and Afghanistan, while American citizens at home were left abandoned in the wake of Katrina:

> *You better off on crack*
> *Dead or in jail, or with a gun in Iraq*
> *And it's as simple as that*
> *No opinion my man it's mathematical fact*
> *Listen, a million poor since 2004*
> *And they got -illions and killions to waste on the war*
> *And make you question what the taxes is for*
> *Or the cost to reinforce, the broke levee wall*
> *Tell the boss, he shouldn't be the boss anymore*

Mos Def thus employed Katrina as "a synecdoche for the pervasive systems of racial oppression structuring American life."[52]

Though the circumstances and factors that led to the Mississippi Floods and Katrina are naturally very different, the feelings of disenfranchisement due to racial discrimination are evident in virtually all African-American creative responses to these disasters. More specifically, government incompetency, racial oppression, a sense of disenfranchisement, and widespread displacement are common elements that are evident in both the 1927 floods and Katrina. For instance, in Memphis Minnie and Kansas Joe McCoy's "When the Levee Breaks," Minnie laments "I ain't got nobody to tell my troubles to […] And all these people have no place to stay […] I ain't got nobody, keep the water away."[53] Though the lyrical language is obviously discernable from hip-hop, these sentiments could appropriately be applied to, and are evident in, the Katrina hip-hop that arose in the aftermath of Katrina. As Fred Hay contends, the blues embody a fully developed philosophy and worldview, and these deceptively simple songs are in fact layered with subtle and complex meanings."[54] By analyzing the blues and hip-hop in the context of these disasters, it becomes evident that the racial inequities that the 1927 floods emphasized and unveiled were mirrored in the preparation and response to Katrina. Thus, African-American creative response to disaster is the one of the sole reliable means by which African-Americans have been able to decry the pervasive discriminatory practices that have manifested into seemingly racially selective response to disaster by all three levels of government. That is, both the blues and hip-hop emerged from regional identities and are the "conscious codification of African and African American knowledge systems, soundscapes, spirituality, and social research traditions."[55]

This paper has employed the epistemology of African-American music — namely, the blues and hip-hop — as a lens to illustrate the influence of African-American creative response and its role in enabling a collective consciousness and voice that reveals truth, decries injustice, and is a catalyst for change. Understanding blues epistemology — the longstanding African-American tradition of explaining reality and change — is vital to understanding hip-hop and how it evolved as a means to protest and dissent against those structures of power that have oppressed and continue to oppress African Americans. Furthermore, the emergence of hip-hop as a vessel to enable a marginalized group or individual to reach inward and explore new depths — while simultaneously allowing

them to project a combination of a collective consciousness and personal sentiment — allows one to reach beyond enforced boundaries, and in turn, to disrupt the status-quo. Katrina did not unveil the city's vulnerability to Mother Nature. Instead, it exposed the inadequacy and weaknesses of the governmental structures that are in place to both protect, and respond to, its citizens in the face of disaster. As Mos Def asserted, Katrina revealed "the storm called […] America." The subgenre of Katrina hip-hop that emerged in the aftermath of the storm seemed to interrupt the political discourse that was suggesting Katrina was just another unavoidable 'natural' disaster. In turn, Katrina hip-hop helped expose and draw attention to the structures of power through which people might pry open spaces for social change.

ENDNOTES

1 Herscher, A. (2006). American Urbicide. Journal of Architectural Education, 60(1), 18.

2 Kirwan, M. (2012). "A Candle in Sunshine": Desire and Apocalypse in Blake and Hölderlin. *Contagion: Journal of Violence, Mimesis, and Culture* 19(1), 178.

3 Kish, Z. (2009). "My FEMA People": Hip-Hop as Disaster Recovery in the Katrina Diaspora. American Quarterly 61(3), 671.

4 Woods, C. (1998). Development arrested: *The blues and plantation power in the Mississippi* Delta. London: Verso, 74.

5 Morrison, S. J. (1994). Downhome tragedy: The blues and the mississippi river flood of 1927. Southern Folklore, 51(3), 266.

6 Morrison, S. J. (1994). Downhome tragedy: The blues and the mississippi river flood of 1927. Southern Folklore, 51(3), 83.

7 Woods, C. (1998). Development arrested: The blues and plantation power in the Mississippi Delta. London: Verso, 83.

8 Barlow, W. (1989). *Looking up at down: The emergence of blues culture*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 40.

9 Garon, P., & Garon, B. (1992). Woman with guitar: Memphis Minnie's blues. New York: Da Capo Press. 40.

10 Kish, Z. (2009). "My FEMA People": Hip-Hop as Disaster Recovery in the Katrina Diaspora. American Quarterly 61(3), 671.

11 Mos Def (2006). Katrina Klap (Dollar Day). *True Magic,* Geffen.

12 Woods, C. (1998). Development arrested: The blues and plantation power in the Mississippi Delta. London: Verso, 25.

13 Garofalo, Reebee (1997). Rockin' Out: Popular Music in the USA. Allyn & Bacon, 40.

14 BBC News. (2014). Origins of the blues. British Broadcasting Corporation: Music.

15 Southern, Eileen (1997). *The Music of Black Americans*. W. W. Norton & Company Inc, 333.

16 Schuller, Gunther (1986). *Early jazz: its roots and musical development*. Oxford University Press, USA, 226.

17 Kish, Z. (2009). "My FEMA People": Hip-Hop as Disaster Recovery in the Katrina Diaspora. American Quarterly 61(3), 672.

18 Kish, Z. (2009). "My FEMA People": Hip-Hop as Disaster Recovery in the Katrina Diaspora. American Quarterly 61(3), 672.

19 Purdy, M. (1994). Left to Die, the South Bronx Rises From Decades of Decay.

20 Motley, C. M., & Henderson, G. R. (2008). The global hip-hop diaspora: Understanding the culture. Journal of Business Research, 61(3), 245.

21 Motley, C. M., & Henderson, G. R. (2008). The global hip-hop diaspora: Understanding the culture. Journal of Business Research, 61(3), 245.

22 Lipsitz, G. (1994). *Dangerous crossroads: popular music, postmodernism, and the poetics of place*. London: Verso; 1994.

23 Cheeseman T. (1998*). Polyglot politics: hip hop in Germany*. Debate: Review of Contemporary German Affairs. 8: 193.

24 Pieterse, E. (2010). Hip-hop cultures and political agency in Brazil and South Africa. Social Dynamics, 36(2), 432.

25 Woods, C. (1998). Development arrested: The blues and plantation power in the Mississippi Delta. London: Verso, 29.

26 Norfleet, D. M. (2006) "Hip-Hop and Rap." African American Music: An Introduction. Eds. Mellonee Burnim & Portia Maultsby. New York Routledge, 353.

27 Rose, T. (1994). *Black noise: Rap music and Black culture in contemporary American society.* Hanover, NH: Wesleyan*, 21.

28 Kish, Z. (2009). "My FEMA People": Hip-Hop as Disaster Recovery in the Katrina Diaspora. American Quarterly 61(3), 671.

29 Rivera, J. Miller, D.S. (2007) "Continually Neglected: Situating Natural Disasters in the African American Experience," Journal of Black Studies 37:4, 210.

30 Brookings Institution. (2006). "Katrina Index Monthly Summary of Findings". Brookings Institution.

31 Plyer, A. (2015). "Facts for Features: Katrina Impact". The Data Center.

32 Anderson C., Battjes J., et al. (2007). "The New Orleans Hurricane Protection System: What Went Wrong and Why". *American Society of Civil Engineers,* 33.

33 Robertson, C., & Schwartz, J. (2015). Decade After Katrina, Pointing Finger More Firmly at Army Corps.

34 Robertson, C., & Schwartz, J. (2015). Decade After Katrina, Pointing Finger More Firmly at Army Corps.

35 Campanella, R. (2007). An ethnic geography of New Orleans. *The Journal of American History*, 94(3), 714.

36 Crowder, K., & Downey, L. (2010). Inter-neighborhood migration, race, and environmental hazards: Modeling micro-level processes of environmental inequality. American Journal of Sociology, 115(4).

37 Select Bipartisan Committee. (2006) "A Failure of Initiative: Final Report of the Select Bipartisan Committee to Investigate the Preparation for and Response to Hurricane Katrina." U.S. Government Publishing Office, 2.

38 Plyer, A. (2015). "Facts for Features: Katrina Impact". The Data Center.

39 de Moraes, L. (2005). "Kanye West's Torrent of Criticism, Live on NBC."

40 de Moraes, L. (2005). "Kanye West's Torrent of Criticism, Live on NBC."

41 Select Bipartisan Committee. (2006) "A Failure of Initiative: Final Report of the Select Bipartisan Committee to Investigate the Preparation for and Response to Hurricane Katrina." U.S. Government Publishing Office, 2.

42 BBC News. (2006). "Video shows Bush Katrina warning". British Broadcasting Corporation.

43 The Associated Press. (2006). "Video Shows Bush Was Warned Before Katrina" The New York Times.

44 Masquelier, A. (2006), Why Katrina's Victims Aren't Refugees: Musings on a "Dirty" Word. American Anthropologist, 108: 740.

45 Taylor, C., Gutmann, A., & Taylor, C. (1994). *Multiculturalism: Examining the politics of recognition*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 25.

46 Kish, Z. (2009). "My FEMA People": Hip-Hop as Disaster Recovery in the Katrina Diaspora. American Quarterly 61(3), 672.

47 Mos Def (2006). Katrina Klap (Dollar Day). True Magic, Geffen.

48 Kish, Z. (2009). "My FEMA People": Hip-Hop as Disaster Recovery in the Katrina Diaspora. American Quarterly 61(3), 671.

49 Kish, Z. (2009). "My FEMA People": Hip-Hop as Disaster Recovery in the Katrina Diaspora. American Quarterly 61(3), 672.

50 Mos Def (2006). Katrina Klap (Dollar Day). True Magic, Geffen.

51 Kish, Z. (2009). "My FEMA People": Hip-Hop as Disaster Recovery in the Katrina Diaspora. American Quarterly 61(3), 673.

52 Kish, Z. (2009). "My FEMA People": Hip-Hop as Disaster Recovery in the Katrina Diaspora. American Quarterly 61(3), 681.

53 Minnie, M. & McCoy, J. (1929). "When the Levee Breaks" On: That Will be Alright. Song (Recording). New York. Columbia Records.

54 Hay, F. (2005). *Goin' Back to Sweet Memphis: Conversations with the Blues.* University of Georgia Press. xxxi.

55 Woods, C. (1998). Development arrested: The blues and plantation power in the Mississippi Delta. London: Verso, 59-60.

KATRINA CANAL BREACHES CONSOLIDATED LITIGATION: A DISASTER NARRATIVE OF HUMAN ACCOUNTABILITY CAUSING TORT LIABILITY

By Helen Hayes

At the time of the Great Mississippi Flood of 1927, Governor Gifford Pinchot declared, in reference to the flawed river control policies of the Army Corps of Engineers, "this isn't a natural disaster. It's a man-made disaster."[1] Nearly eighty years later, the Army Corps of Engineers were named once again as one of the underlying causes of a particularly excruciating and devastating 'natural' disaster of historical proportions — Hurricane Katrina. In 2005, Hurricane Katrina destroyed the city of New Orleans, claiming the lives of 1,464 individuals and causing property damage amounting to over twenty-two billion dollars.[2] Between August 2005 and November 2009, an understanding of the flooding of New Orleans evolved through the "characterization of three distinguishable phases — reactive, organizational, and legal."[3] Not surprisingly, tort litigation emerged as one of the responses to the causation of Hurricane Katrina and included lawsuits that contended that the Federal Government of the United States was liable for damages.[4] In fact, "Katrina generated more research and more litigation than any single catastrophe in the history of the federal judiciary."[5]

This evolution of thought and newfound legal power paved the way for the "production of knowledge claims" that spawned numerous court claims, most notably, the *Katrina Canal Breaches Consolidated Litigation*.[6] The idea that one might recover in court for damages caused by a 'natural disaster' revealed to Hurricane Katrina victims that the disaster they faced was not solely a catastrophic natural experience, but rather that the harm and losses they incurred came at least in part as a result of human wrong, thereby creating legal liability for those who committed tortious actions or omissions. Attributing human involvement in disaster causation was not unprecedented, as evidenced by Governor Pinchot's claim, yet having the freedom to pursue disaster litigation under the pretense of human involvement and negligence was precedent setting. Through the analysis of the *Katrina Canal Breaches Consolidated Litigation*, this paper will expose the implications of Judge Stanwood Duval Jr.'s progressive decision regarding human negligence in Hurricane Katrina, and will consider how the litigation represents disaster subjects and the nature of the catastrophe itself. In doing so, it will demonstrate that the *Katrina Canal Breaches Consolidated Litigation* is the essential example of a tortious disaster narrative. This discussion will furthermore claim that tort liability in natural disasters is necessary in order to address human accountability, and thusly significant for both the

prevention of and response to future disasters. In order to do so, I will define tort litigation, summarize the facts of the *Katrina Canal Breaches Consolidated Litigation*, and present the analysis.

DEFINING TORT LITIGATION AND NEGLIGENT ACTS IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

A tort is a "wrongful act other than a breach of contract for which relief may be obtained in the form of damages or an injunction."[7] In the United States of America, in order to sue in tort there must be a "failure to behave with the level of care that someone of ordinary prudence would exercise under the same circumstances."[8] "The behavior usually consists of actions, but can also consist of omissions when there is some duty to act."[9] With respect to natural disaster, there is a presumption that there exists a mutual obligation among citizens, the government, and federal agencies, to assume an appropriate amount of responsibility amidst the disaster, or otherwise possibly be subject to tort litigation. Furthermore, under tort law, negligence is defined as "conduct that falls below the standard of care established by law for the protection of others against the unreasonable risk of harm."[10] In order to bring a tort claim to court, the plaintiff must determine whether or not an individual, or group of individuals, owed them a duty of care, breached that duty, caused their injury, or, resultant of their breach, ensued damages.[11] Until the enactment of the Federal Tort Claims Act of 1949 (FTCA), the Federal Government of the United States was "immune from any and all liability," meaning that it could not be involved in tort litigation of any kind.[12] By enacting the FTCA, the United States Congress waived this immunity.[13]

The way in which the American legal system has responded to tort litigation has evolved in order to support the demand for compensation for massive harms faced by disaster victims. Liability and accountability is, for victims, socially desirable. "Accountability is not simply taking the blame when something goes wrong," rather it is about delivering on a commitment and taking initiative for that commitment.[14] Although the defendants of the tortious lawsuits concerning Hurricane Katrina were not the sole causers of the disaster — there obviously were natural and ecological catalysts as well — the tort system is a necessary and important part of disaster aftermath and recovery. It serves as a system in which to call

individuals to attention who fail to take initiative for a commitment they may have owed to the plaintiff.

In the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina, the stream of complaints resulting from damages due to levee breaches were consolidated "for purposes of pretrial discovery and motion practice."[15] As such, *Katrina Canal Breaches Consolidated Litigation* became the umbrella for all cases which concerned damages caused by flooding as a result of breaches or overtopping.[16] These cases revolved around a common question: "what caused the levees to fail?"[17] The common factor among all of the claims was that the recourse sought involved a determination as to whether the failing of a specific levee or levees was caused by negligent design, construction or maintenance.[18] In order for a plaintiff to have a legitimate and viable tortious claim he or she must have asserted that there was an undue human influence that affected the outcome of their situation.

FACTS AND SUMMARY: KATRINA CANAL BREACHES CONSOLIDATED LITIGATION

The *Katrina Canal Breaches Consolidated Litigation* is a civil action suit that was filed in November 2009 in the United States District Court of the Eastern District of Louisiana by six plaintiffs: Norman Robinson, Kent Lattimore, Lattimore & Associates, Tanya Smith, Anthony Franz, Jr. and Lucille Franz. The plaintiffs contended that "as the result of certain defalcations of the United States Army Corps of Engineers ("Army Corps of Engineers") [and] with respect to the maintenance and operation of the Mississippi River Gulf Outlet ("MRGO")," that they were eligible, under tort law, for compensation from the Government of the United States.[19] The claim of the plaintiffs further asserted that the Army Corps of Engineers was negligent, and even possibly malicious, insofar as putting the city of New Orleans and its hundreds of thousands of inhabitants at serious risk.[20]

The Army Corps of Engineers argued that the "shear force of Hurricane Katrina and its resultant storm surge was the sole cause of the flooding of New Orleans."[21] Their defense also rested on the claim that "neither the surge nor the waves nor the Reach 2 Levee itself was at all affected by the operation and maintenance of the Mississippi River Gulf Outlet."[22] Essentially, the Army Corps of Engineers were claiming no responsibility for their involvement in Hurricane Katrina despite evidence produced by expert witnesses

contending the opposite. Being a costal city, the Army Corps of Engineers touted that New Orleans is subject to the effects of ocean rise and geology — naturally occurring phenomenological issues that inevitably and unavoidably affect the safety of those who live in close proximity to the gulf.[23]

In the final stage of the tortious judicial process, Judge Stanwood Duval Jr. recounted the Construction of the Mississippi River Gulf Outlet, its effects on the environment and conversely, the effect of the environment on it, the theories of causation of both the plaintiffs and defendant, and the conclusions of law.[24] In order to substantiate his findings, Judge Duval Jr. relied heavily on the precedent case *Graci v. United States (1971)* in which the plaintiffs alleged that the affects of Hurricane Betsy in 1965 were propagated through "negligence on the part of the United States of America in design, construction, and operation of the Mississippi River Gulf Outlet."[25] The similarity of the subject matter of these two cases allowed Judge Duval Jr. to find that "the Corps could be held liable for damages arising out of activities surrounding a navigational channel notwithstanding the fact that those actions caused the failure of certain levees."[26] Judge Duval Jr. ordered for judgment to be "entered in favor of certain plaintiffs and against the United States of America."[27] Although unable to "recover damages for mental anguish," five out of the six plaintiffs were entitled to monetary compensation in an amount ranging between $100,000 and $317,000.[28] Following Judge Duval Jr.'s decision, the Army Corps of Engineers petitioned the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.[29] Nearly three years later, the appellate court ruled to "reverse each judgment for the plaintiffs [and] affirm each judgment for the government of the United States of America."[30]

Regardless of this appeal, of importance are the ideas for which *Katrina Canal Breaches Consolidated Litigation* and Judge Duval Jr.'s initial decision stood. Judge Duval Jr.'s conclusion found that Hurricane Katrina was a human-made disaster in which individuals lost their lives as a result of the negligent behavior and inaction of the Army Corps of Engineers. To have a legal assertion that Hurricane Katrina was accelerated by human inaction and irresponsibility is a remarkable statement. This decision set a significant precedent, "indicating that the responsibility for this natural disaster [was] similar to industrial disaster and other human-made disaster and that governments and corporations should bear that responsibility and be required to help and compensate victims in a similar way."[31]

KATRINA CANAL BREACHES CONSOLIDATED
LITIGATION: IMPLICATIONS OF THE DECISION

Judge Duval Jr.'s groundbreaking decision that found the Army
Corps of Engineers negligent in tort gave tangible evidence that
the Federal Government of the United States had grossly wronged
New Orleanians. Louisiana Senator Mary Landrieu publically
stated after the Duval decision that "finding that the Corps of
Engineers was negligent in its operation and maintenance of a
federal navigable waterway [had] serious implications for all of
coastal Louisiana, and the entire country."[32] This decision was
groundbreaking insofar as it pointed out how human inaction and
negligence before and during disaster can have a serious effect on
it adding to the disruption of not only an immediate community,
but also an entire nation. This has a far-reaching impact on the
way in which 'natural' disaster is understood. Prior to the Duval
decision, 'natural' disasters in the United States were chiefly
viewed as unexpected and unpredictable accidents that fell outside
the scope of human control or involvement. Disaster did not have
accountability, or obligation, or responsibility. Following the Duval
decision, however, the perception of natural disaster shifted drasti-
cally to consider the chain of human choice, irresponsible inac-
tion, and negative influence that can directly affect disastrous nat-
ural occurrences. The *Katrina Canal Breaches Consolidated Litigation*
acknowledged the role that humans can play in 'natural' disaster
and acted as an educating tool.

Indeed, there were numerous tortious claims following
Hurricane Katrina, however, a majority were small-scale claims.[33]
The *Katrina Canal Breaches Consolidates Litigation*, unlike other lawsuits,
was not chiefly concerned with recovering negligible compensation
from the defending party, but rather was focused on revealing the
insufficiencies of disaster preparation, the irresponsibility of the
Federal Government of the United States, and most importantly, the
way in which the human hand can be directly involved in 'natural'
destruction. Justice Duval Jr.'s decision furthermore revealed the ways
in which tort law acts as an accountability and liability standard for
human offences that contribute to the onslaught of natural disaster.

The *Katrina Canal Breaches Consolidated Litigation* was a highly
contentious case for numerous reasons, but perhaps most notably for
the use of the Federal Tort Claims Act on government immunity.
The FTCA grants the United States Government immunity for

matters wherein there are natural causes, even if a plaintiff can prove that there is undue human influence.[34] Yet, in Judge Duval Jr.'s decision, he did not apply this immunity.[35] Instead, he exercised his power of judicial review, asserting that "immunity did not apply to a manmade shipping channel…nor did it protect government from its responsibilities as a steward of its projects."[36] This counter to the FTCA was obviously not favorable to the Army Corps of Engineers, or to the Government of the United States, yet Judge Duval Jr. clearly believed that amending the FTCA would rectify an injustice faced by the victims of Hurricane Katrina. The FTCA's original mandate allows the government to abuse its power and limits the extent to which individuals can sue the government in tort. Judge Duval Jr. paved the way for government accountability and general fairness in the tort liability system. With his decision, he effectively condemned not just the Army Corps of Engineers in Hurricane Katrina, but also the FTCA itself for establishing a theoretical power to seek ameliorative compensation from the Government of the United States in tort — one that was not realistically practicable in disaster claims. By way of Judge Duval Jr.'s judgment within the *Katrina Canal Breaches Consolidated Litigation,* an alternative power for individuals to bring action against their government was established at common law, thusly granting the public a certain standard of human security.

Disaster litigation, and specifically the decision in the *Katrina Canal Breaches Consolidated Litigation,* illustrates the shortcomings of the American notion of self-reliance and illuminates how its meaning changes during a period of disaster. Litigating in tort inherently indicates a shift away from individual self-reliance and a move closer to the collective responsibility of the government to protect human security. Those affected by the devastating ruination caused by natural disaster have often been left to 'fend for themselves' — individually responsible for seeking refuge from their homes, medical help, and the basic necessities needed to survive. The principle of self-reliance in the 'natural' disaster context thusly has a negative connotation — one in which the state defines itself as not responsible and thereby forces victims to be self-reliant. Self-reliance, however, is an inherently American ideology. It is a belief rooted in the individualism and self-actualization wherein the American Dream lies, and is thereby essential to American patriotism. The conflicting notions of self-reliance, wherein one understanding is positive and the other negative, are representative of an ideological divide. How is it that the necessary foundation of self-reliance in American culture

becomes an inherent injustice when disaster strikes? What does this say about the foundation of American philosophy and the ideals that it propagates? Perhaps the idea of American self-reliance hinders an individual facing natural disaster. Rather, when a 'natural' disaster is influenced or caused by human intervention or inaction, all Americans, although ideologically self-reliant, should be able to be dependant on his or her state and the federal government. If that dependence fails them, they should have, in accordance with Judge Duval Jr.'s decision, the right to litigate for compensatory damages.

Despite such a groundbreaking decision, the *Katrina Canal Breaches Consolidated Litigation* was overturned in the appellate court.[37] Declaring Judge Duval Jr.'s decision void had serious social, legal, and environmental impacts for society. Firstly, it undermined legal stability and precedent, a fundamental part of the rule of law. It is true that some legal decisions have to be appealed in order to achieve beneficial objectives, but in what ways was it beneficial to let the Army Corps of Engineers 'off the hook?' Obviously this was a 'win' for the Government of the United States — the appeal set them free of both the charges they faced and the obligation to compensate the plaintiffs for their losses. In the grand scheme of things, however, this was a relatively small 'win' compared to the catastrophic losses that accompanied it. The appellate court, in appealing the Duval decision, effectively denounced human involvement in Hurricane Katrina completely. By doing so, Katrina flood victims were left in a precarious state wherein the disaster was, under law, declared human-influenced in one case, and naturally caused in the other. This clearly represents the ideological divide that exists in defining 'natural' disaster generally, as well as in disaster narratives.

CIVIL ACTION LAWSUITS AS DISASTER NARRATIVES

Civil action lawsuits take place in the aftermath of a disaster. Although they recount disaster to its fullest extent, they are not 'live-action' narratives. They instead are legal accounts of a past event, and in that way, fall more so into a category of historic non-fiction, than a time slice present-day reenactment, or a futuristic speculative work. Civil action lawsuits, such as the *Katrina Canal Breaches Consolidated Litigation*, are unique disaster narratives insofar as the individuals directly involved in the disaster are the authors of their own story. The 'characters' of the narrative have the power to cast *themselves* as

victims, and not be cast in that same role by the media or the government. Therefore, in the disaster lawsuit genre, the victims themselves construct victimhood. This gives 'victims' a sense of agency wherein they are not seen as helpless sufferers, but rather as having a position of power. This is important because it signifies a role reversal — victims are not vulnerable, rather the unaffected 'causers of disaster' are instead. The onus is now placed on the defendants to escape their situation, not the other way around. Additionally, the disaster lawsuit genre is one in which the judge plays a significant role. He or she is the definitive power, the decider of who ultimately wins or loses. Unlike traditional disaster narratives, the outcome of the disaster narrative is not already decided. Therefore, for what the civil action lawsuit lacks in excitement, it makes up for in suspense.

Furthermore, the civil action lawsuit as a narrative demands truth. Unlike traditional disaster narratives such as novels or films, the disaster lawsuit genre, by way of legal convention, presents unbiased information. Two opposing parties recount the disaster in question, offering the reader a unique experience with disaster — one in which all sides of the story are recounted equally. In this way, disaster is not fashioned; it is blatantly depicted in its raw, unedited form. It is not an account of disaster that is perfect; rather it is one that is ridden with conflicting opinions that make its comprehension challenging to the audience.

For the plaintiffs of the *Katrina Canal Breaches Consolidated Litigation* the original decision of Judge Duval Jr. was one of a rebirth of accountability on the part of the American Federal Government. The appeal of this case, however, dismantled the narrative, brutally subverting the expectations of the plaintiffs, and insisting that a different story be told. Overturning the original progressive Duval decision radically rewrote many of the conventions that were at the heart of the original *Katrina Canal Breaches Consolidated Litigation narrative*, and likewise the conventions of natural disaster.

SPECULATIVE WORK: THE PRECEDENT OF TORTIOUS DISASTER CLAIMS

Tort liability in natural disasters is necessary in order to address human accountability, and thusly significant for both the prevention of and response to future disasters. It is obviously desirable for people to take preventive measures before a disaster occurs that can

either reduce the frequency of disasters happening, or the severity of the harm that follows when disasters do occur. Justice Stanwood Duval Jr.'s decision in the *Katrina Canal Breach Consolidated Litigation* paved the way for this type of preparedness to occur. By targeting human behavior he demanded the accountability that is required for government action, and general disaster prevention. The government, in taking responsibility for disasters, can likewise influence federal agencies and private parties to also take accountability for disaster prevention. In certain ways, the Duval decision acted as a threat to not only the Federal Government, but also to its agencies, allowing victims of negligence to sue if precautions had not been taken and harm had subsequently occurred. Tortious disaster claims regarding natural disaster are somewhat straightforward. The disaster occurs, damage influenced by human behavior affects the plaintiffs, and the plaintiffs sue in court.

When looking towards the future, however, and especially considering climate change, tortious disaster claims become more difficult to define. Climate change is a different kind of disaster. It is dated to the moment when the impact of humanity on the earth became measurable and irrevocable. "Many of climate change's costs are harms to property produced at least partially as a result of human actions," and this type of harm is the central concern of tort law.[38] This brings into question whether or not the costs of climate change, for which there are many, should be left to victims, or should be transferred to those who have contributed to creating the harm.[39] Also troubling, however, is how exactly to differentiate victims from those who have caused climate harm. Perhaps this could be more effectively categorized through a system outlining the severity of environmental destruction. That is to say, large corporations such as those involved in the fossil fuel sector, can be held more accountable than private individuals, and thusly be subject to higher scrutiny, and potentially tortious liability. While a tort framework might be appropriate in terms of climate change accountability, it could easily face significant institutional, practical, and legal obstacles.[40] "Courts generally focus on the particular plaintiffs and defendants in front of them; however, in this instance, the major issues of causation, … the variety of remedies, and present and future harms all suggest a more comprehensive approach to climate change that might be better taken by a legislature or agency."[41] Therefore, although a tort approach to climate change could be desirable, perhaps stricter political lobbying and government legislation could mitigate the harms just as effectively.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

Tort litigation represents disaster victims as powerful, justice seeking warriors, unafraid to exercise their right to due process. In this way, tort litigation is a unique, and absolutely essential disaster narrative. It extends the traditional scope of disaster narrative to include representations of many points of view, including first party, and is also unprecedented in its ability to demand accountability. No longer do disaster narratives have to focus on the plight of the victim — in tortious claims the victim can also be the hero, the individual who sheds light on injustice and the subsequent need for accountability amidst natural disaster. The *Katrina Canal Breaches Consolidated Litigation* is the essential example of a tortious disaster narrative.

ENDNOTES

1 John P. Manard, "Katrina's Tort Litigation: An Imperfect Storm," 1.

2 Daniel A. Farber, "Tort Law in the Era of Climate Change, Katrina, and 9/11: Exploring Liability for Extraordinary Risks," 1075.

3 Wesley Shrum, "What Caused the Flood? Controversy and Closure in the Hurricane Katrina Disaster," 1.

4 John P. Manard, 31.

5 Wesley Shrum, 6.

6 Ibid., 1.

7 Merriam-Webster Dictionary, "Tort," 1.

8 Legal Information Institute, "Negligence," 1.

9 Ibid, 1.

10 Tarak Anada, "The Perfect Storm, an Imperfect Response, and a Sovereign Shield: Can Hurricane Katrina Victims Bring Negligence Claims Against the Government?" 303.

11 Ibid., 303.

12 Ibid., 306.

13 Ibid., 306.

14 Peter Bregman, "The Right Way to Hold People Accountable," 1.

15 "05-CV-4182 Katrina Canal Breaches Litigation," 1.

16 Ibid., 1.

17 Wesley Shrum, 6.

18 Ibid., 1.

19 United States District Court Eastern District of Louisiana, Katrina Canal Breaches Consolidated Litigation, 1.

20 Edward P. Richards, "The Hurricane Katrina Levee Breach Litigation: Getting the First Geoengineering Liability Case Right," 268.

21 United States District Court Eastern District of Louisiana, Katrina Canal Breaches Consolidated Litigation, 58.

22 Ibid., 59.

23 Ibid., 268.

24 Ibid., 1-156.

25 United States District Court for the Eastern District of Louisiana, Graci v. United States, 1.

26 United States District Court Eastern District of Louisiana, Katrina Canal Breaches Consolidated Litigation, 2.

27 Ibid., 155.

28 Ibid., 152, 155.

29 United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, Appeal in Re: Katrina Canal Breaches Consolidated Litigation, 1.

30 Ibid., 3.

31 Christopher Hobson, Paul Bacon, and Robin Cameron, Human Security and Natural Disasters, 100.

32 "Katrina Lawsuit Raises Broader Questions About Levee Safety," 1.

33 Wesley Shrum, 6.

34 Gary Rivlin, Katrina: After the Flood. New York, Simon & Schuster, 358.

35 Ibid., 358.

36 Ibid., 358.

37 United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, Appeal in Re: Katrina Canal Breaches Consolidated Litigation, 1.

38 David A. Grossman, "Warming Up to a Not-so-Radical Idea: Tort Based Climate Change Litigation," 3.

39 Ibid., 3.

40 Ibid., 6.

41 Ibid., 6.