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Wilson Nash

The doors to the emergency room suddenly fly open, and a mother with a young child frantically enter. The mother is in a state of desperate panic as her child coughs and wheezes from an unexpected asthma attack. The condition is treatable with the proper medical attention, but in this case, the child is one of 48 million Americans who does not have health insurance. Crippled by insufficient government support and consigned to last minute patient care, these Americans live in the constant uncertainty of an illness or accident. These Americans experience higher rates of infant mortality and shorter life expectancies. They are more likely to be overweight or obese, and they generally have poorer job and school performance. The plight of those who live without health insurance in the most affluent nation in history is a public tragedy, but early in the 1990s, there was an opportunity to change this reality. With the election of President Clinton in 1992 and the work of the Task Force on National Health Care Reform, America was poised to take on the most massive public policy project since the creation of Social Security. Under the guidance and direction of the Clinton administration, health care reform became a national priority. However, because of inconsistent leadership, a well organized opposition, and political circumstances, the dream of universal health care was reduced to an abandoned opportunity.

In diagnosing the failure of health care reform, it is necessary to begin at the top with President Clinton. Fresh off the campaign trail and assuming the presidency after his gubernatorial tenure in Arkansas, Clinton pledged to make health care reform a major priority early in the first term. In his announcement speech from the steps of the Arkansas State House, Clinton promised to take on insurance companies and health care providers in order to provide meaningful cost control, improved quality of service, and expanded preventive coverage. He guaranteed the American people “that in the first year of a Clinton Administration, we will present a plan to Congress and the American people to provide affordable, quality health care for all Americans” (Clinton 1991). Believing that everyone was entitled to health care coverage, Clinton promised to expand the current policy to a single-payer, universal system. His plan was to provide every American the opportunity to basic medical care regardless of ability to pay or previous insurance history. However, a number of factors impeded this process in its early stages.

The first obstacle was the fact that Clinton had not been elected with an electoral majority. In his race against President Bush in 1992, Clinton received 43 percent of the popular vote, which was far
short of the mandate required to aggressively push his first-term agenda. Although health care was an important campaign issue and most Americans favored some form of expanded coverage, health care reform was immediately hindered by Clinton’s failure to garner majority support (Bok 1998). Additionally, Clinton’s initial procedural decisions with regard to how health care reform was to be accomplished presented significant problems. Immediately after taking office, Clinton created the Task Force on National Health Care Reform, which was to assume primary responsibility for drafting the incredibly complex proposal as a complete legislative package. Traditional public policy models for issues as complex as health care reform, however, typically require incremental changes to existing policy (Hacker 2001). Rejecting this model from the very beginning, Clinton possessed what Fred Greenstein, professor of politics at Princeton’s Woodrow Wilson Research Program in Leadership Studies, calls the “have it all approach” (1993-1994). Clinton wanted the health care package (generated by the Task Force) without having to barter with interest groups or dissect the proposal into more manageable pieces. The issue of the interest groups will be addressed later, but it is important to note at this juncture that Clinton rejected the opportunity to engage in transactional leadership. Leadership theorist James McGregor Burns suggests that transactional leadership “occurs when one person takes the initiative in making contact with others for the purpose of an exchange of valued things” (1995). In this case, Clinton’s decision not to negotiate the proposal outside the Task Force damaged the health care reform package because it limited the legislative options available to the President. Using his “all or nothing” approach, Clinton gambled that public support would ensure passage of the bill. However, in doing so, his vision of universal health care faced incredible challenges before the process even began.

It is also worth mentioning that at this point, Clinton possessed several personal qualities that made effective leadership on this issue more difficult. The first among them was his speaking style. When we think of President Clinton’s ability to verbally communicate, we usually remember majestic, eloquent oratory. We recall that Clinton had the ability to connect personally with his audience and articulate broad visions for the future of the country. However, this rhetorical ability was not particularly well developed early in the first term of his presidency. As Greenstein again explains:

As articulate as Clinton is, his record for communicating his aims to the public has been poor. He finds it all too easy to deluge the public with details, and it appears to be difficult for him to transcend policy mechanics and convey the broad principles and values behind the programs (1993-1994).

Clinton’s energy and enthusiasm for public policy was certainly evident, but on the issue of health care, Clinton was not able to communicate effectively the philosophy associated with reform. While ability to communicate is not specifically included in the litany of leadership traits provided by Shelly Kirkpatrick and Edwin Locke, co-authors of The Essence of Leadership, (1995), it is certainly an important element in effectively garnering public support for a massive political undertaking.

Additionally, Clinton’s lack of personal discipline produced an unfocused early administration. Fred Greenstein further suggests, “Another of Clinton’s traits is a predilection to take on large numbers of personal responsibilities, so much so that it is difficult for his administration to move on more than one track at a time” (1993-1994). Early in the first term, the Clinton administration was faced with an incredible array of duties and circumstances including the budget battle, the conflict in Somalia, and the Whitewater Scandal. All these issues converged while Clinton was attempting to get traction on health care reform. Clinton’s lack of discipline also created problems because there was a limited amount of political capital available to be used on each of these issues. The result was a diminished amount of attention and resources dedicated to health care reform, which again limited the likelihood that a massive overhaul would occur.

The next factor influencing the outcome of health care reform is the issue of the opposition. As mentioned before, Clinton made the decision early on that whatever proposal the Task Force decided upon, he would not barter or compromise with the recommendation. As a result, interest groups were very skeptical of the process before the proposal was even generated. Moreover, the minutes and proceedings of the Task Force were kept secret in order to grant political cover for the participants (Bok 1998, Starr 1995), the rationale being that all ideas needed to be on the table in order to produce the most effective piece of legislation. The downside to this strategy, however, was that an uninformed opposition emerged that had a vested interest in defeating the legislation because of the lack of
information and the perceived threat to immediate interests. This opposition included insurance companies, advocacy organizations such as AARP, and business interests in particular (Akard 2005). The Task Force failed to solicit interest groups for their perspective in the creation of this bill, which subsequently produced a highly disaffected, well-funded opposition to health care reform prepared to use a variety of tools to defeat the measure.

According to Derek Bok, former professor and President of Harvard University, “Interest groups spent large sums communicating with the public, but most of these efforts seemed designed less to inform than to arouse latent fears and anxieties” (1998). An example of this strategy was the infamous “Harry and Louise” television campaign, which portrayed a middle-aged couple baffled by the new health care changes and fearful that they would not be adequately covered. Bok asserts that the creation of the legislation “tended to shut out voices that might have helped create a more visible plan—voices of knowledgeable persons in the administration who feared to criticize the work of the First Lady, voices of critics, voices of interest groups and politicians who might have exposed the political vulnerabilities of the eventual plan” (1998). Clinton’s decision to exclude interest group influence in this draft process resulted in the commitment of these groups to the defeat of health care reform.

The other issue of protocol that solidified interest group opposition was the nomination of Hillary Clinton to chair the Task Force. Just one week after President Clinton’s inauguration in January, the First Lady was appointed to lead the effort to produce the health care proposal spanning over a thousand pages. However, even before her appointment, Hillary Clinton was cast as a controversial political figure. During the campaign, she famously said of her role as the wife of a career politician, “I suppose I could have stayed home and baked cookies and had teas.” Offending female homemakers and making Americans generally uncomfortable with her assertiveness, Hillary Clinton assumed the responsibility with a reputational burden (Burden and Mughan 1999). Despite her tactful testimony in September of 1993 on Capitol Hill, Mrs. Clinton did not enjoy favorable approval, which can be added to the confluence of events that undermined the reform effort.

John Gardner, professor at the Stanford University Business School and former Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, identifies the difficulties associated with these events as a manifestation of leadership in large-scale organized systems. He suggests, “We have come to recognize that the sheer size of an organization can create grave problems for the leader interested in vitality, creativity, and renewal. The first thing that strikes one as characteristic of contemporary leadership is the necessity for the leader to work with and through extremely complex organizations and institutions” (1995). In this case, the massive overhaul, the interest group opposition, and the bureaucracy needed to make the program work were all combined within an institutional framework that seems to validate Gardner’s proposition. Essentially, the institutional resistance associated with this proposal was enough to prevent the dream of universal health care from ultimately materializing.

Not surprisingly, throughout this process, health care reform also faced the typical challenges associated with partisan legislation. Paul Starr, who served on the health policy team at the White House, illustrates this point: “By putting his personal signature on health care reform, Clinton gave the Republicans an incentive to defeat it and humiliate him rather than compromise” (1995). Because Clinton had campaigned heavily on the issue of health care reform and the proposal was officially introduced during the midterm campaign season, Republicans were not willing (or likely) to cooperate with the Democrats. Additionally, Jacob Hacker proposes that “President Clinton and Democratic leaders have been almost universally condemned for their failure to reach out to the Republicans and moderate Democrats at the beginning of the health care reform debate” (2001). As a result, health care emerged with significant political opposition both from interest groups and from the Republican Party.

The final element that is worth our discussion is the issue of political circumstance. Numerous factors can be identified that led to the defeat of health care reform. But perhaps the most important political event that coincided with health care reform was the budget battle. Paul Starr contends, “During the presidential transition and his initial year in office, Clinton concentrated on the economy and the budget. The battle for the budget dragged into the summer of 1993 and threatened his presidency; he had little choice but to focus on winning it” (1995). In addition to the budget, America was distracted overseas with the conflict in Somalia and the death of nineteen U.S. Special Forces in Mogadishu. The quasi-recession that occurred during this era further complicated the issue of the budget. In March of 2003, Hillary Clinton’s father had a stroke, which also stalled negotiations of the
proposal. Around this same time, the Whitewater Scandal—the real estate development controversy implicating the Clintons—forcefully emerged to divert public attention (Starr 1995). Overall, the political climate in Washington was less than conducive for a massive political initiative to receive anything more than cursory attention. Simply, the agenda was too cluttered, the public was too preoccupied, there was too little support from vital interest groups, and the campaign season was just underway. These events synthesized in such a way to make health care reform a remote possibility.

Paul Hersey and Kenneth Blanchard, architects of the Situational Leadership Theory, describe this situational model as “an attempt to demonstrate the appropriate relationship between the leader’s behavior and a particular aspect of the situation- the readiness of the followers” (1995). The willingness of followers to follow the direction and initiative of the leader is crucial in moving the group towards a goal. In this case, the followers—the American people, the Congress, and interest groups—were simply not ready to be sold on the merits of Clinton’s program. While the public was sympathetic to the reality that something needed to be done about rising health care costs and the growing number of uninsured Americans, the situation was just not conducive to the methods and tactics used by Clinton and his administration. Hersey and Blanchard conclude, “Situational leadership describes a way of adapting behaviors to features of the situation and followers” (1995). Clinton’s behavior with regard to health care reform simply did not match the situational readiness of the American people or the institutional realities of Congress, and as a result, the program was abandoned.

Ultimately, the first question that comes to mind is “What could have been done differently?” What could Clinton or his administration have done another way to make health care reform a reality? While it is fundamentally impossible to identify one decision or one circumstance that would have completely changed the outcome, it seems like there are some general lessons that can be extracted from this experience. The first is that complex legislation that affects large sectors of organized interests cannot be muscled through without bipartisan support or without some form of negotiation. In today’s Congress, interest groups are simply too integrated and too organized in the public policy process to be shoved aside by an ambitious political agenda. Moreover, the organized interest groups tend to be connected to their constituencies in such a way that they can significantly undermine public support even for popular programs. The next lesson is that comprehensive reform requires focused attention. As discussed earlier, Clinton and his administration had innumerable other responsibilities during this timeframe, and the inability to concentrate on a single, massive political undertaking substantially decreased the likelihood of its success. As a result, I would argue that if it were possible to go back to 1993 and start again on health care reform, the process should be more inclusive with regards to exterior political influences, and the agenda should be more focused in order to sustain public attention.

In conclusion, the failure of Clinton’s health care plan was primarily the confluence of three intersecting factors: inconsistent leadership from the President, well organized opposition, and the political situation. While critics will argue that health care reform was doomed from the start due to the institutional resistance of Congress or Washington’s political climate, I believe differently. I believe that America had a historic opportunity to change millions of lives. I believe that we had the chance to endow the future with the hope and promise of health care for every citizen. Who knows what the future holds for the millions of Americans that are uninsured? Who knows what gifts and talents are lost or neglected because we missed the chance to provide universal coverage to every American? We may never know the full impact of health care reform’s failure, but at the end of the day, the mother and her asthmatic child are still waiting in the emergency room.
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Georgia O’Keeffe: Artist, Barrier Breaker, American Icon: A Portrait of Indirect Leadership

Rachel Stinson

The fiery crimson rocks stand jagged against the turquoise sky streaked with wisps of nature’s floating cotton, while an arid landscape speckled with adobe structures and rugged asphalt roads leading to infinity immediately capture the human eye. Tumble weeds mounted with thorns crisscross the red desert land as rattlesnakes slither across the scarcely traveled footpaths in the brush. The sun’s mercy is nonexistent for all creatures who dare to traverse the land illuminated by the vividly golden rays. Humidity is rare, and sweat from the brave rambling creatures is even rarer. Though it may appear harsh at first, Northern New Mexico is a piece of Earth’s splendor that captures the soul and infiltrates itself into one’s dreams and memories after departure.

This landscape, first loved and still principally inhabited by the Navajo people, is now commonly associated with the life and work of one of America’s most influential artists. In 1929, Georgia O’Keeffe was first introduced to the land of red rocks. She was 42 at this meeting that inspired countless paintings henceforth, but her name was already solidified in American culture through her earlier groundbreaking work. Over the span of her career, Georgia O’Keeffe painted varying aspects of America from city skylines to the desert; she captured the nation at its best during the series of decades in the 1900s that drastically shaped the country’s spirit. In fact, O’Keeffe once commented, “One can not be an American by going about saying that one is an American. It is necessary to feel America, like America, love America, and then work” (“Georgia Quotes”). O’Keeffe not only influenced a nation through her work, but her life also served as a sledgehammer to break the firmly sealed glass ceiling for women in the art world. Her husband of twenty-one years and art great himself, Alfred Stieglitz, once remarked that O’Keeffe “became ‘a religion’ for legions of women who had recently acquired the right to vote” (Hogrefe 3).

Through all of her acclaim and the changing tone of the artistic world, O’Keeffe remained true to herself and her passion. Her style was unique, and through her uniqueness, she established a revolutionary technique that many people tried to emulate. The manner in which she created such phenomenal work has inspired countless generations of artists and artistic appreciators. She is often hailed as a leader in the art world and in American culture, but she did not directly affect the lives of the scores of her followers. Therefore, her multi-layered work must be categorized as indirect leadership.

The life of an indirect leader, and particularly an artistic indirect leader, should be studied from his or her roots. These roots are instrumental in the solidification of the expansive life that has affected generations of people who have ventured to its base to learn

Rachel Stinson

“Society today places much emphasis on the charismatic leader. However, I discovered through my final project for Dr. LaMonte’s Leadership Studies 200 class that Georgia O’Keeffe’s indirect style of leadership is the most powerful kind; it is the style that moves mountains and breaks barriers. By simply living life to its fullest extent with a recognition of her exceptional personal gifts, Georgia O’Keeffe forever changed the social climate of the art world and society itself. Her legacy continues to teach today—and that’s a powerful form of leadership.”

Rachel is a junior English major from Auburn, Alabama and participates in the Leadership Studies and Service Learning programs. She serves as features editor on The Hilltop News, student coordinator for the ‘Southern Political Action and Civic Engagement group, and house manager for Chi Omega Fraternity. She is also an intern for Church Relations at the Center for Ministry. Rachel holds membership in Alpha Lambda Delta, Phi Eta Sigma, Omicron Delta Kappa, and Sigma Tau Delta.
and to grow from it for years. Georgia O’Keeffe’s roots are deep and many in number, but each has proven to be instrumental in the production of the great indirect leader whom Americans appreciate today. From family members and art teachers to early encounters with the Western landscape, Georgia O’Keeffe’s art and life were intensely groomed before she began. Furthermore, the work that she produced throughout the course of her life has enriched, challenged, and motivated countless people. From her beginning with each brushstroke, Georgia O’Keeffe became a portrait of indirect leadership.

Georgia Totto O’Keeffe inhaled her first breath on November 15, 1887 in Sun Prairie, Wisconsin, and by age twelve, she had already proclaimed to a friend, “I am going to be artist,” (Messinger 8). Clearly, she began her pursuits early, which, according to Howard Gardner in his book *Leading Minds*, is a specific trait of indirect leaders. Gardner states:

the indirect…leaders I studied seem from an early age to have stood apart from their contemporaries. They have felt that they were special and, at least in some cases, capable of feats beyond those achieved by normal individuals (33). Not only did her instinct instruct her in her quests, but her mother, grandmother, and father all played key roles in her formative years.

Georgia O’Keeffe’s mother Ida understood the value of education. With this guiding principle, Ida made certain that her seven children were consistently pursuing educational avenues. Ida encouraged all of her daughters to excel in the artistic field, which was common for women of the period. Apart from tradition, artistic ability was a practical necessity for women living on the frontier who “were expected to decorate their own houses and furnishings with colorful splashes of paint and floral patters” (Hogrefe 17). Her mother did notice in O’Keeffe’s later childhood that her daughter truly had a gift, but surely did not “believe that Georgia could make her living as a painter” (Berry 23). The profession was simply not in line for women of the times. However, Ida found ways to separate herself from the conventions of the time period. One such progressive way appeared through the literary club that she formed with participation from neighboring farm wives. Her classics reading club was called “King’s Daughters.” In fact, O’Keeffe later speculated that her mother “would have been successful in business had she been born under different circumstances” (Hogrefe 13), and Ida even considered a medical profession before she married Georgia’s father (Philp 17). Often noted for her stern and demanding Victorian-esque behavior with Georgia, Ida’s encouragement to excel in schoolwork, regardless of the family’s income, was indispensable to Georgia’s career and life (Philp 37).

On February 28, 1884, Ida Totto married Frank O’Keeffe. Unfortunately for their children, who later recalled the tension, their marriage was not a pleasant one. In particular, arguments over religion constantly clouded the household, as the O’Keeffes were devout Catholics and the Tottos were Episcopalian (Philp 17).

Despite their differences, Frank was, in fact, a “jolly and fun-loving” individual, as related by Georgia’s younger sister Catherine (Philp 19). However, he may have embodied the “fun-loving” lifestyle a bit too much. He was an alcoholic rambler who often abandoned the family for extended periods of time and squandered the family’s fortune (Hogrefe 42). Interestingly, though, Georgia was his favorite child, and she was given a variety of special treatments. To escape her mother’s demanding eye, Frank would often take Georgia on a wagon ride into town to buy her candy and ice cream cones. He even built a private bedroom, a tower on the top of the farmhouse, for Georgia, who was the second oldest child and oldest female (Gherman 15). Georgia later commented, “I had a sense of power,” due to her private quarters. This scenario “seems to have reinforced her self-image” (Hogrefe 14). Georgia O’Keeffe placed her father on a godly pedestal and refused to admit that he had any shortcomings, one of which was the molestation that he forced upon his favorite daughter (Hogrefe 15). Despite these flaws, the love that Frank provided for Georgia was instrumental in the formation of her craft (Hogrefe 12).

Frank’s mother Mary Catherine, “Kate,” O’Keeffe also contributed to Georgia’s solid foundation and epitomized the term “devout Catholic.” Not only was Kate steadfast in her religion, but she was equally as steadfast in her self-confidence. “In the log books of Dane County, the name Mary Catherine O’Keeffe appears as one of the few women to have loaned money in her own name—unquestionably, an influence on Georgia’s later independence” (Hogrefe 12). Observing her grandmother’s leadership as a female within the Sun Prairie community did, in fact, empower a young Georgia in her ever increasing artistic pursuits.
When Georgia was twelve, she moved to the Sacred Heart Academy boarding school, which was operated by nuns and located in Madison. Georgia identified this year as “the one year that I ever learned anything” (Eldredge 18). The individual with the most influence upon Georgia during that year of school was Sister Angelique. When Georgia completed her first artistic assignment for the Sister, Georgia’s product was dense with heavy black lines. Quite displeased with the “messy picture,” Sister Angelique taught Georgia how to make sizeable, sweeping lines across the canvas, which influenced Georgia’s entire style of art for the rest of her life (Gherman 18-19). Interestingly, another monumental moment occurred under Sister Angelique’s instruction. During an end-of-the-school-year art display in the classroom, Georgia noticed that Sister Angelique had heavily written “G.O’Keeffe” on each drawing. Georgia was so horrified that she could see her name clearer than she could see her drawing that she decided to leave all of her paintings, for the remainder of her life, unsigned. In her book, Georgia O’Keeffe: The ‘Wideness and Wonder’ of Her World, Beverly Gherman commented, “Her paintings would have to identify themselves” (19).

Georgia completed her high school education at the all-girls boarding school, Chatham Episcopal Institute, where she won numerous awards for her early work. Chatham is located in Virginia, which was where the O’Keeffe family had moved due to her father’s hypochondriac fit over the nation’s outbreak of tuberculosis (Hogrefe 24). Georgia was accepted into the prestigious Art Institute of Chicago. With the encouragement of her mother and art teacher, Sister Angelique, at Chatham, Georgia moved to Chicago to attend the school. Before she departed for the Institute, O’Keeffe made her famous proclamation while at Chatham, “I’m going to live a different life than the rest of you girls. I am going to give everything up for my art” (Hogrefe 31). While she attended the Art Institute, she lived with Ida’s sister and brother (Barry 26).

Ida’s sister Ollie provided an exemplary model for Georgia during her stay in Chicago. Jeffrey Hogrefe, in his book O’Keeffe: The Life of an American Legend commented on the significant impact of this event: “Close contact with her stern aunt focused her wild energy, so that the year she spent in Chicago crystallized a part of her that would later make her a successful artist” (30). Georgia’s Aunt Ollie also led by example. Ollie was the only female proofreader for one of the city’s largest newspapers, the Milwaukee Sentinel (Gherman 37), which gave Georgia remarkable footsteps to follow on her own path towards breaking the glass ceiling. While studying at the Art Institute, Georgia also excelled tremendously in her classes. After five months of classes, Georgia had already progressed from a beginning level to an intermediate level of class work; by the five month marker, she ranked first in her highly competitive class (Barry 26).

The following year, Georgia enrolled in the Art Students League in New York City. The year she spent at the League provided an inspirational and influential teacher, William Chase, who taught her favorite class of still life work. Through her time with Chase, O’Keeffe was introduced to the art of painting a flower, which would later become a central figure in her work (Hogrefe 34). Also under his leadership, O’Keeffe began a metamorphosis. Throughout her life, O’Keeffe had been told that she must copy what she saw, since she was not expected to become an original artist; women of the time were art teachers (Barry 23). Georgia even won many awards for her remarkable early copying skills and was awarded the top still-life prize in Chase’s class that year (Barry 30). In addition to that prize, she was also a class monitor, which indicated her status as a top student (Gherman 46). While in Chase’s class, O’Keeffe began to question what she was creating. Being an intuitive person, a daughter of a farmer, guided by an inner rhythm based on the rotation of the planet, she felt false merely imitating Chase’s style. She felt her work was not from the heart. She wanted it to express the ‘wideness and wonder of the world we live in’ (Hogrefe 35).

However, Chase encouraged Georgia’s individual artistic pursuits. He commented, “Great work comes from the heart. When only from the head, it is uninteresting” (Hogrefe 35). In addition to her revelation regarding independent expression, Georgia also “came to believe that colors could create a picture by interacting not only to define a subject but to evoke a universe of sensation” (Hogrefe 34). This belief would shape the product that affected a nation.

Even though the good experiences outweighed the bad that year, O’Keeffe met disappointment. She was often pursed to model for fellow students’ art work, but actually refused one male student’s sitting invitation during her early days in New York. In fury over his rejection, he commented to Georgia, “It
doesn’t matter what you do. I’m going to become a great painter and you’re just going to end up teaching art in some girls’ school” (Hogrefe 32). Sadly, his comment did not stand alone. Georgia met with much disapproval over her enrollment in the League. During this time period, Georgia realized the truth of what Germaine Greer wrote in The Obstacle Race, “To be truly excellent in art was to be de-sexed, to be a woman only in name, to inhabit a special realm that no other women could enter, to be separated from all other women” (Hogrefe 33).

While O’Keeffe was studying at the League, Frank O’Keeffe lost the family fortune. Due to the consequent lack of substantial funding for her education, Georgia was forced to return home. Her mother had since separated, though not legally, from her father and moved from Williamsburg, Virginia to Charlottesville with the younger children (Eldredge 19). Fortunately for O’Keeffe, her mother’s home was steps away from the entrance to the University of Virginia where her sisters were taking art classes from Alon Bement. Lured by her sisters, Georgia enrolled in the classes taught by Bement as well (Eldredge 20). This class catapulted O’Keeffe into the artist we know today. The revolutionary method of creating art that Bement taught in his classes is referred to as the Dow Method. The Dow Method was unique in that it relied on the creation of original artwork. O’Keeffe biographer Jeffery Hogrefe described this method:

Instead of copying the works of others, the Dow Method...advocated that students produce original artwork from the beginning of their instruction. Unlike other programs Georgia had taken, the Dow Method actually discouraged students from copying the works of other artists...The course of study was based on an Oriental model of beauty in which less was more (44-45).

One text even states that when Georgia learned the Dow Method of creating art, “The scales fell from her eyes, and suddenly she could see” (Hogrefe 44).

Following this summer with her teacher turned close friend, O’Keeffe traveled to the edge of American civilization in Amarillo, Texas to teach high school art for two years in the public school system. Bement offered O’Keeffe a teaching fellowship at the University of Virginia, which she accepted on the condition that she first complete an internship. Her two years in Amarillo proved to be an exhilarating and challenging time period that sewed the western landscape into O’Keeffe’s heart forever (Eldredge 20).

When her internship was complete, O’Keeffe returned to Charlottesville to teach with Bement for two summer terms. After this time teaching and saving funds, O’Keeffe traveled back to New York and enrolled in a class at the Columbia University Teachers College taught by her inspiration, Arthur Wesley Dow. While a student at Columbia, O’Keeffe made a friend in Anita Pollitzer. Through Pollitzer’s energetic instruction, O’Keeffe joined the National Woman’s Party, which at the time was vigorously working toward the goal of women’s suffrage. O’Keeffe remained a member of the party throughout her lifetime (Eldredge 20).

After her instruction at Columbia, O’Keeffe took a teaching assignment in Columbia, South Carolina for one year. During this time, she incorporated Dow’s teachings into her life and her art. She “discarded old mannerisms and materials, and began a new series of abstractions drawn in charcoal, personal works that she shared with...Pollitzer” (Eldredge 21). According to her museum’s website, these charcoal drawings are “now recognized as being among the most innovative in all of American art of the period” (“Biography”). One set of drawings of the familiar Texas landscape that O’Keeffe sent to Pollitzer was so brilliant that Pollitzer immediately showed them to Alfred Stieglitz who, in addition to being a photographer, also operated the trendy gallery 291 (“Biography”). This renowned gallery debuted the art work of Pablo Picasso, Henry Matisse, and Paul Cézanne to America under Stieglitz’s leadership (Hogrefe 36).

Stieglitz was instantly absorbed by the passion that seeped through each carefully placed line and curve in O’Keeffe’s drawings. After viewing the paintings he famously remarked, “Finally, a Woman on Paper!” (Hogrefe 51). From this moment onward, Stieglitz’s life and work became intertwined with O’Keeffe’s. The two later married in 1924 (Hogrefe 117). Stieglitz operated three galleries which showcased the many layers of O’Keeffe: 291, which debuted O’Keeffe’s first show (1905-1917); The Intimate Gallery, which displayed intimate photographs of O’Keeffe that Stieglitz captured (1925-1929); and An American Place, which revealed the “real” O’Keeffe through her series of New Mexican
Through these layers, Georgia’s indirect leadership is clear. Her first showcase depicted the male versus female attitude that was prevalent in society. Flocking critics eagerly pointed out O’Keeffe’s use of bright colors, namely pink and yellow, during this time period when most paintings being produced were darker and more masculine. In jest, O’Keeffe responded to the color remarks by creating “The Shanty” in which she used “low-toned, dismal colored painting.” Interestingly, this dark painting sold quickly to a prestigious gallery in Washington (Hogrefe 108). Critics used such gender-influenced remarks as, “What men have always wanted to know, and women to hide, this girl sets forth,” and “Essence of womanhood impregnates color and mass” (Hogrefe 108) to describe her work. Additionally, one critic labeled O’Keeffe’s exhibit “the shrine to St. Georgia holding on to the Victorian belief that women are more spiritual than men, and again separating her work from the mainstream as that of a female oddity” (Hogrefe 109). In a letter to a friend, O’Keeffe responded to the masses of comments with one poignant line, “They make me seem like some strange unearthly sort of creature—floating in the air—breathing in clouds for nourishment—when the truth is that I like beef steak—and I like it rare at that” (Hogrefe 116).

Her early work of the New York skyline, still-life objects, and the Stieglitz family home and surroundings on Lake George, was often categorized in the Precisionist movement and based in abstractionism (Messinger 48). O’Keeffe took ordinary landscapes and twisted and sculpted their real-life appearances into that which would appear in a spiritual dream. O’Keeffe reflects this statement in one of her famous comments about her pieces highlighting New York, “One cannot paint New York as it is, but rather as it is felt.”

Author and O’Keeffe biographer Lisa Mintz Messinger’s states, “As a painter she was able to adjust the subject to fit her artistic concept by eliminating, reworking, or adding any element she deemed necessary” (Messinger 45). The majority of her craft was placed in the modernist category, but no one was ever really able to place any label on O’Keeffe’s work. The manner in which she dramatically played with light and the topography of the land within her work inspired people and left many speechless (Messinger 145). Later in her life, O’Keeffe’s work was highly influenced by her extensive travels across the globe. Messinger comments, “These experiences generally informed the choice of forms, colors, and aerial perspectives used in her...series of nature-derived abstractions (Messinger 160).

In an account of one of O’Keeffe’s paintings, Lisa Mintz Messinger vividly conveys O’Keeffe’s dramatic ability:

In both of these paintings, the viewer is brought dramatically close to the cliffs that occupy almost the entire piece. Only her inclusion of the narrowest bit of ground and sky suggests that this site is part of a much larger environment. In the shallow space of this painting, the landscape elements recede in three distinct layers: in the foreground are the bare slopes dotted with green juniper bushes and...trees; in the mid-ground, the rounded and crevassed red hills; and finally, in the background the recession stops at the imposing wall of rock. Intense sunlight bathes the composition with a warm glow that seems almost to dissolve the upper yellow stripes of the cliffs (Messinger 144).

Georgia O’Keeffe fiercely guarded her privacy throughout her lifetime, always wishing that critics would focus on her work, not her. At times her manner was icy, coarse, and even nasty to outsiders, but O’Keeffe remained true to her craft (Berry 104). She always worked alone and definitely proved her independence by permanently moving to her beloved New Mexico after Stieglitz’s death in 1946 (Berry 92). In fact, Michael Berry notes in his book, “If she shied from contact with other humans, O’Keeffe formed a rather unlikely attachment to a pair of Chinese chow pups. These fluffy, lion like dogs possessed...vicious tempers. O’Keeffe enjoyed their ferocity and their exotic appearance” (Berry 93). Many commentators who noted this intense attachment thought that O’Keeffe saw herself in the ferocious dogs. Since O’Keeffe was such a private person and independent in the execution of her work (Hogrefe ix), she aligns with another aspect of Howard Gardner’s definition of indirect leadership. He notes in his book, “For the individual who leads indirectly through his work in a domain, most time is spent working alone or in small groups” (Gardner 37).
After her death in 1986 at the age of 98 (Eldredge 42), her legacy, which was already flourishing before that time, became even more apparent. Jan Garden Castro closes her book about O’Keeffe with the following statement about O’Keeffe’s legacy:

O’Keeffe’s art should become known for a style that comments on and ranges between the various traditional genres. O’Keeffe’s spaces, smooth surfaces, forms, and colors create rich, yet elusive, object worlds of their own. Her visual language, with its highly developed points of reference, must be further analyzed rather than taken for granted. O’Keeffe has distilled meanings from nature and herself on her quest for beauty in a profane world (Castro 178).

Currently, The Georgia O’Keeffe museum, located in Santa Fe, New Mexico, is the only museum in America dedicated solely to the art of a female. When her museum opened in 1997, more than 15,000 people toured it within the first weekend. In 2001, Christie’s New York auctioned one of O’Keeffe’s paintings for $6.2 million dollars, which was a record price for the work of any woman artist sold at auction (Philp 7). Biographies are still being published about the female art great. Clearly, O’Keeffe’s legacy has been safely established, another element establishing her indirect leadership.

An intense examination of the influences and work that formed the artist known world-wide today reveals that Georgia O’Keeffe’s life and work clearly define her as an indirect leader. Her work was for her own soul, yet her legacy broke barriers and continues to dare others to reach higher intellectual realms while depicting a moving and truly American landscape.

Bibliography

Joseph Conrad's Heart of Darkness: A Unique Study of Leadership, Ethics, and Organizational Behavior in Classic Literature

Kelli Hansen

Heart of Darkness, Joseph Conrad's most well-known and enigmatic work, tells the journey of Charlie Marlow as he travels up the Congo River in Africa. As the story unfolds, Marlow learns about personal ethics and morals by comparing himself to Kurtz, an ivory trader, who exercises power over the inhabitants of the region through charismatic and coercive leadership. Fascinated by Kurtz's power, Marlow is exposed to corruption and despair at the cost of human life (Hartwick 1). The story explores themes of personal identity and leadership that can be related to issues of modern imperialism, the ethics of business and government practices, and self-interested behavior that is frequently demonstrated in society.

Marlow examines morality and leadership through his study of Kurtz and the mystery that lies in defining this mysterious character. This classic piece of literature provides timeless examples of leadership behaviors and organizational challenges.

Several events throughout the story suggest the corruption of Kurtz's company. As Marlow travels up the Congo River, he encounters widespread chaos and cruelty in the Belgian trading company stations. The natives of the region who work for the company are often dealt with forcefully. Marlow speaks of this force used by Kurtz and his men, stating:

Mind, none of us would feel exactly like this. What saves us is efficiency—the devotion to efficiency. They were conquerors, and for that you want only brute force—nothing to boast of, when you have it, since your strength is just an accident arising from the weakness of others. They grabbed what they could get for the sake of what was to be got. It was just robbery with violence, aggravated murder on a great scale, and men going at it blind—as is very proper for those who tackle a darkness (Conrad 69).

Culture is an important explaining factor that can also be used to analyze Kurtz's corruption and unethical behavior. Exploitation, inhumane acts, and thievery were the values and norms of the cutthroat environment in which Kurtz conducted business.

As the story unravels, Marlow identifies Kurtz's leadership qualities as those of a charismatic leader. Literature on leadership defines this charismatic trait as "a special quality that enables one to mobilize and sustain activity within an organization through specific personal actions combined with perceived personal characteristics" (Wren 108). Charismatic leadership is observable, definable, and has clear behavioral characteristics. These three major behavior characteristics include: envisioning, energizing, and enabling (109).

Conrad's novel deals with the charismatic leadership of Kurtz who is temporarily freed from the constraints of society but is eventually...
forced to confront his behavior (Hartwick 2). Throughout *Heart of Darkness*, Kurtz has a vision—one of great power and might as he tears through villages, murders innocent people, steals what is not his to take, and yet achieves what he set out to do. Ultimately, by envisioning, energizing, and enabling, Kurtz exercises unethical practices as a means to an end. Unlike many other charismatic leaders, Kurtz’s charisma helps him to organize the world in a manner that contradicts generally accepted social models. He has created an inspiring legacy which Marlow reveres. Kurtz has achieved the ultimate; he has ensured his own immortality.

As the journey continues, Marlow begins to identify with Kurtz and finds himself trapped in a web of deceit to preserve Kurtz’s reputation. Marlow begins to idolize Kurtz, as he realizes that “the man filled his life, occupied his thoughts, swayed his emotions” (Conrad 129). He becomes aware that he is being “seduced into something like admiration—like envy” (129). Marlow goes on to say, “He won’t be forgotten. Whatever he was, he was not common. He had the power to charm or frighten rudimentary souls into an aggravated witchdance in his honor” (129). Marlow conceives of a character so grand that as the story comes to an end, even Kurtz cannot satisfy Marlow’s idea of perfection. Still, Marlow is overwhelmed by Kurtz and his commanding verbal communication; he exclaims that “he [Kurtz] is eloquence itself. ‘A voice! A voice!’” (Ridley). This voice speaks to Marlow about himself and all human beings. It speaks of the threatening darkness, how it can triumph in this world, and the effects of such an event. Kurtz’s voice conveys this to Marlow through exploitation and stealing.

*Heart of Darkness* can be used as a guide to study contemporary cases of leadership, such as the 1974 corporate ethics case of United Brands Company. The multinational food company’s chairman and CEO, Eli M. Black, authorized a $2.5 million dollar bribe to a Honduran official in order to reduce the Honduran export tax on bananas (Hartwick 22). The money was financed through foreign subsidiaries of the company and was not accurately identified on records. According to the review conducted by the Securities and Exchange Committee, “the company violated the reporting provisions of federal securities law by failing to disclose the payoff in its financial statements” (Hartwick 24). On February 3, 1975, shortly after steering United Brands through this disastrous scandal, Eli M. Black jumped to his death from the 44th floor of his Manhattan office (Hartwick 19).

Mr. Black’s death raises questions about ethics in a business environment, as well as personal ethics and morals. The tragedy of Eli Black begs the question, “Can a sensitive man, a man with high moral standards, survive in an uncompromising financial world that demands steadily increasing earnings?” (Hartwick 19). Business leaders must meet the high expectations of their shareholders and the financial community. Dr. Jerome Motto, professor of psychiatry at the University of California School of Medicine in San Francisco states, “It’s tough for the Eli Blacks of this world. If they slip, they can’t accept it” (Hartwick 19). How does one know when the pressures are too great? Soon after his death, Mr. Black’s son, Leon, attended school at Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration. When asked if he was reconsidering his career path, Leon commented, “I think I’ll go into business, but I hope I never lose the perspective that living is the most important thing” (Hartwick 20). This seems to indicate that Eli Black’s son realized that his father allowed the societal pressures of greed to prevail over his company’s ethical standards and his own personal morality.

Similarly, in *Heart of Darkness*, Kurtz thrived on labor exploitation and Belgian imperialism and found himself in a cloud of darkness from which he could not escape. Instead, he was compelled to adjust and thrive in the atmosphere. Eli Black, a moral and ethical man according to society’s accepted principles, made an imprudent decision. Mr. Black was conscious of his decision, as well as his obligation to his company and shareholders; however, this awareness caused him to take his own life. Kurtz, on the other hand, lived his life consciously choosing not to address his unethical practices, yet on his deathbed he seemed to experience regret as he cried out, “The horror! The horror!” (Conrad 157).

Both Black and Kurtz also deeply impacted the environment in which they conducted business. In his business dealings, Eli Black “preferred to use social contributions to influence relations with the foreign countries where United Brands operated” (Hartwick 24). During his time with United Brands, Mr. Black supervised several projects including the building of a medical center in Guatemala and the distribution of 300,000 doses of the polio vaccine to people in Costa Rica. United Brands also donated the use of planes and ships and gave medical aid and food to victims of Hurricane Fifi in Honduras (Hartwick 24). Kurtz, however, treated the people in the villages in which he conducted business quite
differently. With no regard for human life, Kurtz blazed through the jungle, wreaking havoc on anything that stood in his path, and acted on the assumption that everything belonged to him.

Both Black and Kurtz made decisions that profoundly affected the inhabitants of the vulnerable villages in which they ran their businesses. However, one must question under what pretenses each leader communicated and took action. Kurtz’s actions were blatant and obviously disregarded interests apart from his own, while Mr. Black acted more deceptively and made it appear that he intended to aid the Honduran villagers. Therefore, Black helped these people under false pretenses. In the end, it seems that both Black and Kurtz exploited local inhabitants and conducted business under self-interested motives. The primary difference between these situations is merely that Kurtz made this exploitation apparent and did not engage in deception. Consequently, one must question whether either leader remained true to his personal convictions.

To avoid betraying his personal convictions, Mr. Black could have explored other alternatives before choosing to violate regulations. The most logical, as well as ethical, alternative would have been to pay the taxes in full. Because of violations such as Black’s, policies should be enacted where companies would be obligated to disclose foreign payments they have made in exchange for special treatment. If a company receives substantial benefits as the result of a bribe or payoff, investors should have the right to know the surrounding circumstances (Hartwick 24). Also, in the case of United Brands, the company should have reviewed their own ethical policies and procedures in order to strengthen the company’s relations both internally and externally. It is important that any company make certain that each employee complies with corporate ethics standards. When employees—from factory workers to company executives—do not align their business practices with the standards of the company, dysfunction occurs, and this prohibits efficiency and effectiveness.

The Foreign Corrupt Practices Act, created in 1977 as a United States federal law, requires that any company that has publicly traded stock must maintain accurate and fair records of the company’s transactions; this clearly relates to the contemporary case of Eli Black. The act requires any publicly traded company to have a sufficient system of internal financial controls. The FCPA applies to all companies in the United States, as well as those companies associated with the U.S. It was put into place by Congress to end the bribery of foreign officials and to restore people’s confidence in the integrity of American business (“FCPA”). The practice of ethical business called into question by the case of Eli Black and United Brands helped contribute to the conception of the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act. In the 1970s, over 400 U.S. companies admitted to questionable or illegal activity, resulting in over $300 million in bribes and payments to foreign government officials, politicians, and political parties (“FCPA”).

Obviously, this unsettling trend indicates that many business leaders are willing to breach ethical standards for the sake of increasing profits, and Eli Black is a fitting example of this. Often, business executives like Black are able to capitalize on their powerful positions to take advantage of those with less clout. This theme of domination and subordination also plays a major role in Heart of Darkness. In many instances, factors of inequality and differences in status and power come into play throughout the novel. Kurtz often takes advantage of permanent inequality. Various criteria such as “race, sex, class, nationality, or religion” define individuals as unequal (Wren 224). Permanent inequality provides no hope or intention of ending the relationship of inequality (Wren 224). Kurtz has no innate desire to help others; instead, he takes advantage of the powerless to attain personal ends.

In particular, Kurtz preys on the workers’ hopes of escaping their economic plight. Because of this, their tasks take on new significance. At one point in Conrad’s novel, Marlow gives his initial impressions of Central Stations soon after arriving: “The word ‘ivory’ rang in the air, was whispered, was sighed. You would think they were praying to it. A taint of imbecile rapacity blew through it all, like a whiff from some corpse” (Conrad 89). This quote demonstrates that for the men working in the company, the word ‘ivory’ has taken on new meaning. Ivory has come to represent economic freedom, social advancement, and an escape from reality. The word itself has become both an object of worship and a symbol of death. As the white workers search for ivory, elephants and African natives often die. This reveals the dangers of imperialism and government control. The entire enterprise of exploiting African resources and people appears immoral and oppressive.

According to leadership theorists Jones and George, “a key component of effective leadership is found in the power the leader has to affect other people’s behavior and get them to act in certain ways”
and this connects to Kurtz’s ability to have his followers comply with his demands in *Heart of Darkness*. The following passage from the novel explores Kurtz’s talent for speaking boldly and garnering loyalty, as Marlow compares himself to Kurtz. Marlow comments:

I was within a hair’s-breadth of the last opportunity for pronouncement, and I found with humiliation that probably I would have nothing to say. This is the reason why I affirm that Kurtz was a remarkable man. He had something to say. He said it. He had summed up—he had judged. He was a remarkable man” (Conrad 148).

At this point in the story, Marlow is recovering from his near-fatal illness and has come to realize that he really has nothing to say and that his own words are ambiguous and inestimable. However, Marlow reveres Kurtz’s remarkable ability to avoid ambiguity and thus create something definite. As his journey comes to a close, Marlow is fully aware of Kurtz’s corrupt ideals and tactics; however, a sense of loyalty remains embedded in Marlow. Though Marlow understands the severity of Kurtz’s actions, he continues to place his trust in Kurtz. In the end, while Kurtz may not have complied with the ethics and moral standards that society had instilled, he still received loyalty from his followers and was able to efficiently achieve his ends.

This multifaceted piece of literature, in its combination of commanding symbolism, detailed character study, and keen psychological analysis, is a landmark of modern literature. *Heart of Darkness* offers material for critical study for the business executive and leadership scholar alike. The story certainly offers insight into man’s innate selfishness, but it also provides an example of how leadership motivated by self-interested desires can be especially destructive. If these leadership qualities were executed in a more positive manner, effectiveness and efficiency would prevail, yielding satisfying results. This provides hope that a better understanding of ethics and personal morals in leadership will contribute to a more altruistic, ethical society.
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Religion as a Bridge Rather Than a Wedge

Maria Presley

Historically and currently, religious differences have been used to both wage and justify conflict. Not until relatively recently, however, has religion been explored as a practical conflict resolution technique. In 1994, the Center for Strategic and International Studies composed a book entitled Religion, the Missing Dimension of Statecraft, in which the study of religion was first suggested to be a necessary component of conflict resolution theory and practice. Since this book’s conception, an increased number of conflict resolution theorists have sought to integrate the study of religion and conflict in the international sphere, calling for a more religious-based approach to conflict resolution. This has brought about an acknowledgement of the successful use of religion in historical and contemporary conflicts, as well as fashioned a framework upon which to construct future applications of religious understanding in conflict situations. Most recently in 2006, former United States Secretary of State Madeleine Albright published her book advocating for an increased understanding of religion in U.S. foreign policy (Albright 73-74). But even with the recent scholarship on religion and conflict and the acknowledgement of the benefit religion has played in conflict resolution abroad, the U.S. continues to overlook religious-based approaches to conflict resolution. U.S. foreign policy is wary to use a religious-based approach to conflict resolution because of the fear of violating the principle of separation of church and state, the influence of the Christian right and the Neoconservatives, and the misunderstanding of the role of religion in conflict. Because of this, U.S. foreign policy has oftentimes failed in situations where religion could be used as a catalyst for change.

Traditional Methods of Conflict Resolution

In order to appreciate religious-based conflict resolution and its required application to U.S. foreign policy, one must first understand traditional methods of conflict resolution and the failure of these methods to properly address contemporary conflicts. In the 1970s and 1980s, approaches to conflict resolution focused on interstate war and conflicts over resources or interests, rather than civil and ethnic wars (Rothman 239-90). By the end of the Cold War, however, many conflict resolution theorists and practitioners were left questioning the effectiveness of these traditional methods due to the fact that a peaceful “New World Order” had not emerged as expected (290). During this time, identity-based wars, or wars commonly referred to as civil and ethnic conflicts, gained the attention of many conflict resolution theorists.

After the study of identity-based wars increased in the late 1980s, conflict resolution theorists concluded that the traditional methods of negotiation used in interstate war did not solve the problems raised by the newly understood conflicts. For example, interest-based bargaining, or bargaining based on discussions involving parties’
interests, was commonly applied in interstate conflicts under the supposition that the involved parties had no interest in continuing the war. In identity-based conflicts, however, interest-based bargaining is not as relevant because the parties’ interests come secondary to other motives that drive their use of violence (290).

According to the research of conflict resolution theorist Roy Licklider, out of 63 identity-based conflicts during 1945-1993, only nine ended through a negotiated settlement (290). Additionally, 67 percent of the conflicts ended in negotiated settlements during these years never really ended at all, but instead resulted in later violence (290). Due to Licklider’s evidence and other similar findings, many conflict resolution theorists began to believe that traditional methods of conflict resolution were ineffective in dealing with identity-based conflicts because of their primary focus on the symptoms rather than the causes of conflict (290).

During the 1990s, conflict resolution theorists and practitioners began to explore identity-based conflicts more in depth. Much of their findings found religion to be central to many cultures’ identities. According to conflict resolution theorist Mohammed Abu-Nimer, “religious values and norms are central aspects of the cultural identity of many people involved in conflict dynamics” (686). Because religion is oftentimes an essential part of identity, it can lead to both the escalation and decline of conflict (686).

Although some conflict resolution theory began to explore the role of religion in the resolution of conflict, Western approaches continued to exclude such consideration. For the West, conflict resolution is still understood within secular and intellectual frameworks (Funk). Separate from justice, peace is equated with an absence of war or organized violence, while justice is seen as an absence of gross human rights violations (Funk). For the West, reason is essential to conflict resolution techniques, and passion is seen as unbeneﬁcial to conﬂict resolution practice (Funk). These ideas are at odds with the integration of religion and conﬂict resolution because passion, combined with reason, is a central part of the identity of many religious people and groups in the international community, and thus, an essential part of solving religious-based conﬂicts (Funk). For much of the international community engaged in religious-based and religiously justified conﬂicts, passion cannot be separated from their understanding of both religion and conﬂict resolution. Therefore, the West’s understanding of conﬂict resolution has differed from that of non-Western states over the issue of identity-based conﬂicts. Because many practitioners in the West still relate to conﬂict resolution in its traditional forms, religious-based conﬂict resolution techniques are largely overlooked (Funk).

Religious-Based Conflict Resolution Methods

Although many religious-based conﬂict resolution methods are still in development, much of the academic community agrees that governments, religious people and groups, and nonaffiliated and religious-based NGOs should be involved in religious-based conﬂict resolution (Mbon 8-16). For this technique to work, each group must take responsibility for the different roles they are able to perform and collaborate with each other as much as is constitutionally possible.

Conflict resolution theorists agree that relationship building should be a central part of religious-based conflict resolution. Oftentimes, this relationship building is understood to mean dialogue, but the relationship building that religious-based conflict resolution calls for is different from the Western concept of dialogue. Usually, dialogue is synonymous with attempts to “win over” or convert members of other religions (12). This form of dialogue, however, defeats the purpose of the conversation and makes the different religious groups suspicious of one another (12). On the other hand, the term “relationship building” means constant and genuine communication among religious groups (12). According to conflict resolution theorist Marc Gopin, “[D]ialogue is only the most basic stage of relationship building. Relationship building involves a very broad range of people to people contacts, and the full range of emotional life. This is the ultimate goal of conflict resolution and healing” (Intervening 9). For this tactic to be effective, religious groups must actively seek to engage in communication with religions from across the world, and the government must do all that is constitutionally possible to encourage all religions to take part in this activity. Additionally, government policies should promote relationship building and the proper use of dialogue to engage in conversation with all religious groups, no matter how violent or separatist they may be (Between Eden 208). This could not only help resolve active religious-based conflicts, but it could also aid in conflict prevention, assuming that the government supported such policies on a continual basis.
Also important in relationship building is the opportunity it presents to stress the ethical content of religion. All religions place some type of an emphasis on kindness, truthfulness, justness, honesty, humility, discipline, altruism, selflessness, tolerance, and love (Mbon 13). Additionally, most religions have traditions of nonviolence or pacifism, and all religions place a great amount of sanctity on what they consider to be life (Between Eden 21). If no reliance on these principles existed, then one would question whether it is a religion at all, and instead merely a destructive device used only to gain and manipulate its followers. According to conflict resolution theorist R. Scott Appleby:

Deep formation in the peaceable heart of a religious tradition is fundamental to the religious militancy that can serve conflict transformation, whether through participation in humanitarian intervention, peacekeeping, rights advocacy, community organizing, election monitoring, conflict mediation, or dialogue with aggrieved members of rival ethnic or religious communities (286).

If relationship building leads religions to stress the ethical content of their belief systems, then each is less likely to wage or justify war in the name of religion and more likely to aid in the transformation of societal woes.

Better world-wide religious education is also a vital part of religious-based conflict resolution. According to conflict resolution theorist, Friday Mbon:

Governmental policies should encourage the teaching of the major religious traditions of the world at all levels of the educational system. At the elementary school level, pupils should be exposed to the comparative, non-dogmatic study of religions to help them appreciate the common elements as well as the differences among the religions (10).

Additionally, a comparative study of the world’s religions can contribute to a people’s understanding of the political philosophies being used in the different countries around the world (10). According to Mbon,

This is possible because there is a relationship [...] between the study of religions and political education. For instance, since religious ideas and values often color political decisions and ideologies (especially in Islam), a study of the religions of a given society can aid the people of that society to understand (and perhaps appreciate and tolerate) the religious foundation of certain political views being held within that society (10-11).

By examining the differences and similarities between religions, religion is seen in its real terms. Oftentimes, relationship building alone focuses too much of its attention on the similarities within religions. This can be beneficial in the search for similar religious standards of non-violence existing in established religions, but the differences between religions should not be ignored or religious-based conflict resolution risks overlooking the roots of the conflict (11). Instead, differences should be closely examined in order for religious-based conflict resolution to work properly.

Also part of religious-based conflict resolution is its reliance on the largely global recognition of human rights (Intervening 10). In much of the world, constructive conflict resolution techniques urging peace and justice have been the ideals of most religious traditions (11). Although extremist, militant religious beliefs exist, an emphasis on peace is usually found in most religious traditions. Religious-based conflict resolution, therefore, must build upon this emphasis and frame the ideas and values of human rights in deeply religious terms (11). According to Gopin, “It is vital that this then become the basis for how gestures are made, agreements are framed, and even how education is pursued in these cultures” (11).

Religious-based conflict resolution should also use symbols and rituals to resolve conflict. Because reality is interpreted through ritual and symbol in many cultures throughout the world, these tools can be used to communicate in terms that speak to deeply held beliefs (11). Governments, religious groups, and NGOs should maximize the presence of ritual and symbols by sharing with cultures how this has been done in the past as well as attempting to elicit the practice of these rituals and symbols from the parties involved in a conflict (11).

In order for religious-based conflict resolution to be effective in the long run, it must attempt to develop a better relationship between the religious and the secular (Mbon 15). In practical terms, this means that religious groups must be committed to working towards conflict resolution with others who chose not to believe in the sacred. According to Appleby, “religious authorities must agree to collaborate, as necessary, with trainers, educators, and facilitators who come from outside the religious
community” (285). This also means that the traditional emphasis on “evangelizing” and “converting” that is present within some religions must be separated from the practice of conflict resolution.

In conclusion, religious-based conflict resolution can only work if it is fully integrated into a society’s complete range of activities, from its educational system to its relationships with the secular community. In order for religious-based conflict resolution to be effective in resolving conflicts, there must be increased collaboration among NGOs, religious groups, and governments who are committed to these techniques.

U.S. Foreign Policy and the Separation of Church and State

So far, this essay has focused on religious-based conflict resolution techniques as well as the history from which these methods have evolved. If one decides that these practices are effective in addressing many of the types of conflicts that are waged today, then the American citizen must ask why the United States continues to view conflict resolution in its traditional forms, refusing to incorporate religious-based conflict resolution as part of its foreign policy.

U.S. foreign policy does not use a religious-based approach to conflict resolution because of its policymakers’ understanding of the separation of church and state. According to the Bill of Rights’ First Amendment written in 1791, “Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.” For the American citizen and policymaker, the interpretation of this law deeply affects how matters of religion and politics are currently viewed. According to Robert Fowler, Allen Hertzke, Laurea Olson, and Kevin Den Dulk in *Religion and Politics in America*, “This ideal of church-state separation and religious freedom is deeply ingrained in American culture today. It is also one of the central contributions of the United States to the world” (10).

This legacy of the First Amendment creates a distinction between the “public” and “private” realms of life for many Americans (*Between Eden*). This distinction influences the way Americans understand and practice religion, leading them to assume that religion is primarily a private matter (1). Many Americans’ interpretation of the First Amendment dictates that religions remain outside of the public sphere. Although the last decade has seen a convergence between the public and private distinction through the influence of the Christian right in politics, this trend has not been great enough to dismantle the separation of church and state set by the First Amendment and the interpretations that stem from this law.

Modern interpretations of the First Amendment require that the U.S. government refrain not only from favoring any religion but also from engaging in or directly cooperating with U.S. religious bodies in domestic and foreign policy issues (1). Although constitutional lawyers still debate proper interpretations of the Constitution, the government tends to adopt a minimalist attitude towards religion’s role in foreign policy (1). In *The Mighty and The Almighty*, former Secretary of State Madeleine Albright argues that U.S. foreign policymakers currently believe that it is best to “keep religion out” of foreign policy decisions “because it does complicate things” (73).

When policymakers attempt to totally divorce religion from foreign policy, religious-based conflict resolution cannot be practiced. This is true because an understanding of religion and a willingness to engage in conflict resolution using religious symbols and traditions must exist in the top levels of government in order for this type of resolution to function. If U.S. foreign policy attempts to limit religion’s role in the public sphere, then religious-based conflict resolution is deemed irrelevant.

Furthermore, when U.S. foreign policymakers refuse to engage in religious-based conflict resolution based upon interpretations of the First Amendment, then many international actors are confused by a United States that picks and chooses which wars it uses religious terminology to defend. For example, the current U.S. administration categorizes the war in Iraq as a war of good versus evil. This does little to help the international community interested in religious-based conflict resolution techniques understand why the United States can enter into war with religious references in mind but cannot attempt to end war by using religion as an aid. In America these references to good and evil are often understood by academics as a selective reliance on the religious traditions in America in order to foster national unity. In *Civil Religion in America*, Robert Bellah explains: [America] borrowed selectively from the religious tradition in such a way that the average American saw no conflict between the two. In this way, the civil religion was able to build up
without any bitter struggle with the church powerful symbols of national solidarity and to mobilize deep levels of personal motivation for the attainment of national goals” (13). A large international community whose identity is not based on the same buffet-style references to religion, however, cannot understand America’s civil religion. Instead, much of the international community interested in the possibilities of religious-based conflict resolution views the separation of church and state as contradictory to current U.S. foreign policy.

The Influence of the Christian Right and the Neoconservatives

The influence of the Christian right and the strong Neoconservative presence in the upper levels of government make religious-based conflict resolution particularly difficult. Both Christian right and Neoconservative groups affect U.S. foreign policy in important ways, either by supporting particular legislation or by their visible presence in the top realms of government. Because of these influences, the U.S. enters into international relations with particular goals in mind, and dialogue is conceived differently than it would be in the relationship building aspect of religious-based conflict resolution.

The rhetoric of the Christian right heard in the words of activists like Jerry Falwell, Pat Robertson, and President George W. Bush often prevents the occurrence of proper relationship building. For example, after the terrorist attacks of September 11, President Bush addressed the nation, saying, “Every nation, in every region, now has a decision to make. Either you are with us, or you are with the terrorists” (The White House). Since then, President Bush has phrased the war on terror as a war of good versus evil, a war of us versus them. Almost as detrimental to relationship building, Christian right leader Jerry Falwell has said, “I think the Muslim faith teaches hate” (Belief Net). In 1992, the former leader of the Christian Coalition, Pat Robertson, released a controversial book entitled The New World Order, claiming, “those who believe in the Judeo Christian values are better qualified to govern America than Hindus and Muslims” (Robertson 218).

Statements by such prominent leaders of the Christian right community influence the opinions of their followers as well as policy decisions. If leaders in the Christian right call other religions evil and view their beliefs as inherently good, then communication between and within disagreeing religious factions cannot occur. The harsh language used by leaders of the Christian right has the ability to prevent dialogue, and since an important aspect of religious-based conflict resolution includes the proper practice and understanding of dialogue, this impedes any attempts at religious-based conflict resolution.

Additionally, a large majority of the Christian right is influenced by theology that stresses the “end times,” emphasizing biblical language filled with images of warfare and the coming destruction of the earth (Larson, Wilcox 158-159). For many supporters of the Christian right, these images translate into the belief that humans have a minimalist role to play in attempting to make the world a more peaceful place. Instead of seeking to bring peace on earth, much of the Christian right sees peace as a possibility only for the afterlife. This reliance on premillennialist theology and its influence on policy make any approach to conflict resolution, including religious-based conflict resolution, very difficult.

Both the 2001 passage and the 2005 renewal of the USA Patriot Act also limit relationship building between the U.S. and those countries that are designated as “terrorist states.” According to the Patriot Act, no U.S. citizen can provide support, material, or advice to those associated with terrorist organizations or states (USA Patriot Act). Although the Patriot Act does not legally criminalize actors when they merely talk with terrorist -designated organizations, the U.S. as a matter of policy refuses to engage in any forms of communication with these groups (Hodes). For example, the United States does not currently enter into direct dialogue with North Korea because the U.S. government has deemed it to be a terrorist state. Although the law states that the U.S. may talk with North Korea as long as it does not provide it with support, material, or advice, current U.S. policy largely prevents any direct communication at all. This policy interferes with the methods of religious-based conflict resolution because it prevents communication with all parties of a conflict when one of the groups in the conflict is determined to be a terrorist organization.

Although both conservatives and liberals passed the USA Patriot Act by an overwhelming majority in 2001, the influence of the Christian right was instrumental in its renewal in 2005. Before the Act was renewed, Christian right groups voiced strong support for the Act. People For the American Way, The Christian Coalition, and The Conservative Voice released statements calling for its renewal (Combs,
Ibbetson, People For the American Way). Associations of mainline religious groups such as The American Academy of Religion, however, called for the Act’s repeal (American Academy of Religion). The strong support of Christian right supporter and former Attorney General John Ashcroft also contributed to the Act’s renewal. Although Ashcroft had retired from his position by the time the Act was renewed in 2005, he had been a strong advocate for the Act in 2001 and continued to push for its renewal even out of office (King). The strong commitment of the Christian right combined with the lingering effects of Ashcroft’s support of the USA Patriot Act led to the renewal of the Act in 2005, and thus contributed to a policy that does not engage in relationship building as the term is defined in religious-based conflict resolution.

A general lack of conflict resolution departments within Christian right organizations prevents any knowledge of religious-based conflict resolution from reaching the levels of government in which the Christian right has influence. When compared to the mainline denominations, Christian right groups place little to no emphasis on conflict resolution theory. Currently, only religions and ecumenical religious groups that traditionally fall outside of the influence of the Christian right have social programs advocating conflict resolution (Religion 11-21). These groups are the Mennonite Central Committee, the World Conference on Religion and Peace, the Society of Engaged Buddhists, the World Council of Churches, and Catholic Relief Services (Appleby 6). Although recent trends have shown that some Catholics views are aligned with the Christian Right, Catholic Relief Services tends to be more liberal than the Church itself. Currently, there are no conflict resolution programs advocating the academic study of conflict resolution theory within the full influence of the major Christian right groups. Because of this, the Christian right does not currently have the ability to understand the vital link between conflict resolution and foreign policy. Furthermore, the Christian right does not appear to understand the subdivision of religious-based conflict resolution theory within the study of conflict resolution.

Even more pervasive than the influence of the Christian right in U.S. foreign policy is the role that many Neoconservative policymakers have in establishing governmental approaches to conflict resolution. Top Neoconservatives like Paul Wolfowitz, Elliott Abrams, Jeane Kirkpatrick, Max Boot, William Kristol, Robert Kagan, Peter Rodman, and Norman Podhoretz influence foreign policy directly through their administrative posts or through jobs in powerful think-tanks like the American Enterprise Institute (AEI) and the Project for the New American Century (PNAC). Additionally, Condoleezza Rice, Dick Cheney, and former Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld have supported Neoconservative policies and are often championed as heroes by numerous Neoconservatives.

According to Hugh B. Urban in the Journal of Religion and Society, Neo-conservatism is characterized by three features:

First, a belief deriving from religious conviction that the human condition is defined as a choice between good and evil and that the true measure of political character is found in the willingness by the former to confront the latter; second, an assertion that the fundamental determinant of the relationship between states rests on military power and the willingness to use it; and third, a focus on the Middle East and global Islam as the principal theater for American overseas power (6).

Based on Urban’s definition of the term, it is easy to see how the Neoconservative agenda is not at all compatible with religious-based conflict resolution techniques. Since Neoconservatives rely on a willingness to use military power in times of political stress, two factors of religious-based conflict resolution, relationship building and the emphasis on nonviolent traditions, are largely ignored. The recent war in Iraq serves as a helpful example in understanding the Neoconservatives’ willingness to pursue military engagement. The Neoconservatives’ role in the invasion of Iraq is heavily documented, and Wolfowitz’s support for preemptive war through the creation of the Bush Doctrine stresses the need for the U.S. to keep its “strength beyond challenge” (The National Security Strategy of the United States of America). Policies advocating preemptive war and the necessity of putting military might on display do little to contribute to conflict resolution.

Additionally, Neoconservatives’ strong alignment with the defense of Israel leads much of the international community to believe that relationship building and conflict resolution is of little importance to the current U.S. administration. Since relations in the Middle East take center stage in many international relations discussions, U.S. foreign policy towards Israel, Palestine, and Lebanon
matters a great deal to those interested in seeing a peaceful resolution in these areas. Such strong support for Israel makes many in the international community believe that the U.S. is not open to dialogue on the issue, and this prevents religious-based conflict resolution from occurring.

In conclusion, the influence of Neoconservatives prevents religious-based conflict resolution from advancing in U.S. foreign policy because of the nonnegotiable alignment with Israel and the willingness to enter into preemptive war. Additionally, the Christian right’s “good versus evil” rhetoric, its lack of religious-based conflict resolution departments, and its influence in passing the USA Patriot Act prevents religious-based conflict resolution from taking effect.

**The Misunderstanding of Religion in Conflict**

Not only does the interpretation of the separation of church and state and the influence of the Christian right and the Neoconservatives prevent religious-based conflict resolution, but the general misunderstanding of religion’s presence in conflict also creates obstacles for U.S. foreign policy to overcome. First of all, it is of primary importance for U.S. foreign policymakers to define conflicts in their real terms. Although parties in a disagreement often use religion as a means and justification for engaging in conflict, not all conflicts are motivated by religious reasons. Some conflicts are primarily over resources, and the role of religion is of little importance in waging violence. It is important for policymakers to recognize the role of religion in conflict and to base conflict resolution strategies on a proper examination of the motivating factors behind the use of violence. It is also important that policymakers recognize if religion is one of the primary factors to be addressed in a peace settlement or if religion is being manipulated by leaders to motivate their adherents to engage in conflict.

In the past, the U.S. has done a poor job of recognizing the use of religion in conflict. For example, the North-South war in Sudan was often referred to in the U.S. as a religious conflict, pitting Northern Muslims against Southern Christians and traditional African animist believers. Those living in the South protested to the imposition of Shari law by the national government in Khartoum. Khartoum outlawed any non-Muslim from holding the presidential office and treated Muslim-dominated areas of Sudan more favorably. Although religion was one aspect of the conflict, it was not however the only dynamic involved. Economic, political, and ethnic factors played key roles in the 21 years of conflict as well. One of the predominant factors of the 2005 Comprehensive Peace Agreement was determining whether or not the North or the South would receive the revenues from Southern oil production financed by Northern funds. For Sudan, the North-South war was caused by many economic and political factors that were separate from religion. When U.S. newspapers addressed the war, however, it was often referred to as a war between Muslims and Christians. The evangelical community rallied behind the war under these terms, supporting the Southern Christians against the oppressive Muslim regime. U.S. newspapers were a reflection of overall U.S. foreign policy during the end of the war in 2005, often referring to the war strictly as a war over religion. This serves as a good example of the necessity of understanding religion’s role in conflict. If U.S. foreign policy had recognized that many of the demands of the South and the North had little to do with religion, perhaps more productive dialogue would have occurred in a more timely fashion.

As mentioned earlier, U.S. foreign policy often overlooks the importance of symbols and traditions in conflict resolution. In *Between Eden and Armageddon*, Marc Gopin describes an example of the use and abuse of religion in the Hindu religion. In the past, Hindu radicals in India have manipulated sacred mythic tales of their gods, creating dramas of defeat against foreigners, and specifically Muslims. This has created a large rift between the different religious groups in and outside of India. The stories that the Hindu radicals have created are circulated throughout the country, so many moderate Hindus are influenced by these writings, causing an increase in discrimination against Muslims (*Between Eden* 14-15).

U.S. foreign policy’s approach to the situation in India, which many middle class and academic Hindus embraced, was to fight for the strengthening of civil society by encouraging civil rights for all, free press, and honest courts. However, religious organizations in India have recently joined together and pushed for the creation of extensions to their own religious myths. These alterations are not blatant changes in Hindu doctrine, but rather continuations of their religious myths that are acknowledged to be fictional. The extensions to the Hindu texts are nonviolent accounts of gods and heroes that encourage peace and reconciliation. With the help of the Indian parliament, the religious groups have
circulated the stories in the regions where violence is strongest, leading to a dramatic de-escalation of conflict (Between Eden 14-15).

The situation in India is just one of many examples to stress the importance of U.S. foreign policy solutions speaking to the average person’s mythic sense of the true and the untrue. If policymakers better understood how fomenters of violence appeal to otherwise decent people, U.S. foreign policy might stand a chance of moving society towards peaceful resolutions to conflict.

The U.S. also lacks proper understanding of the role of religion in conflict because the government currently has no advisors trained in religion. Without knowledge of the similarities and differences within religious traditions, one cannot understand the potential that religion has in bringing peaceful resolution to violence. Since there are no religious advisors in the top realms of government, U.S. foreign policy does not operate with an academic understanding of the role of religion in foreign affairs.

In conclusion, U.S. foreign policy does not take into consideration the role of religion in conflict because it does not include an understanding of the importance of religious symbols and traditions, and it often fails to define the conflict in its real terms. Such failures can be attributed to the lack of religious advisors to U.S. foreign policymakers.

**Recommendations**

If religious-based conflict resolution is to be beneficial for U.S. foreign policy, the U.S. government must do a better job of encouraging conflict resolution techniques. In addition to the religious-based conflict resolution methods previously mentioned, the U.S. must include religious advisors in its top levels of government, better intelligence about religion’s political dimension and politics’ religious dimension, and push for structured education about world religions. Additionally, the government must begin to support more faith-based and secular conflict resolution programs through its Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives and attempt to institutionalize conflict resolution techniques at the grassroots level. For this to be most effective, the government must have better communication with NGOs and religious groups and financially support the strengthening of secular and religious nonviolent community leaders. Additionally, the government must reassess its current political strategies and the messages that they send to the international community. In order to foster better relations abroad, the government should increase its support for organizations like the Peace Corps in hopes of creating a better understanding of divergent political and religious philosophies across nations.

**Obstacles to Overcome**

There are several obstacles in addition to the three addressed in this paper that the U.S. must overcome in order to successfully initiate religious-based conflict resolution approaches. First of all, conservative U.S. religious traditions have typically emphasized mission work and converting in their relations in the international arena. Religious-based conflict resolution plays down such emphases and attempts to build relationships revolving around peaceful transformations of societies rather than religious missionary zeal. Many of the identity-based conflicts that U.S. foreign policy would have to address are in Africa; therefore, religious-based conflict resolution would be especially difficult on a continent that has seen brutal colonialism cloaked in the veil of religious missions.

Second, relationship building is difficult when the parties of a conflict believe that the other is fundamentally wrong. Many look at relationship building as one of the last elements that happens in conflict resolution rather than as a process to be engaged in from the onset of the conflict. It can be extremely difficult to convince some factions to negotiate with others, and oftentimes seemingly impossible to make parties listen to one another. This can be particularly difficult when both groups share the same religion but disagree about how it should be interpreted. According to former President Jimmy Carter, it is easier for people of completely different faiths to accept their differences and not argue about them than it is for people who disagree only on interpretation (Albright 78).

Philip Jenkins’s “The Next Christianity” argues Carter’s point, saying that as a more evangelical form of Christianity spreads throughout the developing world, modernized Western Christianity is clashing with Southern Christian traditions stressing mysticism and communal orthodoxy. Jenkins asserts that “the competing ideologies are explicitly religious” with “vast religious conflicts already in progress” and “demographic trends [that] suggest that these feuds will only worsen”. Jenkins is correct
to acknowledge the separate Christian ideologies of the West and the South and the potential conflicts that their differences may cause.

Religious-based conflict resolution theorists also acknowledge the difficulties of relationship building among such groups but believe that differing factions can find common ground within their religious traditions. According to these theorists, the mere fact that religious beliefs exist among both groups when previously this commonality was not present can be referenced as hope for the possibility of religion’s role in conflict resolution. Since the competing ideologies share similar religious traditions, symbols, and myths, religion can be referenced as a foundation for relationship building. Former President Bill Clinton refers to the possibility of creating peace within dissenting religious interpretations when he says,

If you’re dealing with people who profess faith, they must believe there is a Creator; if they believe that, they should agree that God created everyone. This takes them from the specific to the universal. Once they acknowledge their common humanity, it becomes harder to kill each other; then compromise becomes easier because they’ve admitted that they are dealing with people like themselves, not some kind of Satan or subhuman species (Albright 78).

Such ideas do not completely disagree with Jenkins’s thesis but rather focus on Jenkins’s own argument advocating for increased understanding of religion in U.S. policy. Jenkins goes on to conclude, “All this means that our political leaders and diplomats should pay at least as much attention to religions and sectarian frontiers as they ever have to the location of oil fields”.

Also posing a problem to an increased focus on religious-based conflict resolution is the format that such a tactic would take in the present U.S. administration. Since the influence of the Neoconservative agenda is so prevalent in current foreign policy, the U.S. must be careful to ensure that strict methods of religious-based conflict resolution are followed. If carried out, the ethical dimension of the various religious traditions would be stressed not just because it is required by policy, but because it is pragmatic to do so. Foreign policy should be practical at all times, and religious-based conflict resolution should not be followed because of its ethical emphasis on peace, but because of the realistic benefits its methods have in bringing an end to many forms of identity-based conflicts.

Additionally, although the influence of Neoconservatives in foreign policy does pose a problem to religious-based conflict resolution methods, many Neoconservatives themselves have called for an increased understanding of religion in the public sphere. In 1995, William Kristol said

Conservatives and the Republican Party must embrace the religious if they are to survive. Religious people always create problems since their ardor tends to outrun the limits of politics in a constitutional democracy. But if the Republican Party is to survive, it must work on accommodating these people” (Urban 6).

If Neoconservative leaders acknowledge that religious accommodation is essential to the survival of their party, there is hope that they could eventually determine that religious approaches to conflict resolution are essential in U.S. foreign policy.

Finally, and perhaps most importantly, the Constitutional separation of church and state should not be sacrificed for religious-based conflict resolution. It is important that religious groups remain separate entities from the government and equally important that the government does not favor one religious group over another. However, if the U.S. government supported the funding of both religious and secular conflict resolution groups, the Establishment Clause would not be violated because the purpose of this action is not meant to endorse or disapprove of religion. The 1983 Supreme Court decision in Lynch v. Donnelly and its reinterpretation of the Lemon Test reinforces this argument. This case can be referenced when distinguishing whether or not it is “endorsement [that] sends a message to nonadherents that they are outsiders, not full members of the political community, and an accompanying message to adherents that they are insiders, favored members of the political community” (Lynch v. Donnelly). Religious-based conflict resolution stresses the need for increased support for all conflict resolution organizations. If the study of conflict resolution leads many theorists to believe that religious approaches to conflict resolution are appropriate, the government will not be interfering with freedom of religion.

Additionally, religious-based conflict resolution pushes for a better understanding of religion in the top realms of government just as U.S. foreign policy pushes for economic advisors to advise
governmental leaders. In *The Mighty and the Almighty*, Former Secretary of State Madeleine Albright says,

> Our diplomats are very well trained and they are very capable. But, they have not really focused on religion per se as a subject of study. A Secretary of State has economic advisors and arms control advisors and environmental advisors. And so, I would advocate having religious advisors that are complementing all the other advisors (78).

Instituting increased intelligence in the U.S. government is not a violation of the separation of church and state, just as increased funding to secular and religious conflict resolution organizations is not against the Establishment Clause.

**Conclusion**

It has become increasingly evident that religion is a salient feature of many identity-based conflicts. Moreover, conflict resolution theorists have come to understand that while religion may be used to galvanize oppositional parties, sanctify violence, fuel and frame conflict, and make peace untenable, successful conflict resolution depends upon engaging and challenging these religious aspects and players in the conflict.

However, there is little consensus among conflict resolution theorists regarding the means by which the government can play a part in entering into religious-based dialogue and supporting conflict resolution organizations rooted in faith-based traditions. For some, the potential to fan the flames of religious protest and the dangerous possibility of encouraging religious leaders and communities to hold even more tightly to their religious are too dangerous a possibility to permit the use of religion in conflict resolution. However, many others admit that though the process will be difficult, the prominence of religion in many divisive conflicts necessitates engaging this new technique.

If the study of religion and conflict resolution theory is many ways intertwined, there is hope that religion will produce new possibilities for peace and resolution in conflicts that have been incorrectly analyzed for decades. At its best, religion has the possibility of emphasizing the central values that are necessary for people of different cultures and beliefs to live in some degree of peace. U.S. foreign policy should benefit from these shared values and secure a more peaceful future for the world. Religion should be recognized as a bridge and not just a wedge in resolving conflict, and the U.S. should harness the immense potential of religious-based conflict resolution.
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Muhammad Ali: A Leader in Many Regards

Asif Khan

Throughout history, scholars have sought to find what constitutes effective or exceptional leadership. The answers that they have found have been rather ambiguous and varied. According to Thomas Wren, “[leadership] is one of the most observed and least understood phenomena on earth” (Wren ix). Ultimately, analysts of leadership have agreed that the task of identifying general qualities that are necessary for adequate leadership is quite difficult, but the task of identifying successful leadership when presented with a particular case is not. Muhammad “The Greatest” Ali can be considered one of the most influential leaders of the United States in this past century. His leadership extends far beyond the realm of boxing, as he became one of the most significant figures in the Civil Rights Movement. However, his leadership is not only a symbol of the past; Ali’s leadership has only continued to blossom with time. In many regards, he embodies charismatic, servant, and indirect leadership.

In the 1950’s, twelve-year old Cassius Clay lived in Louisville, Kentucky and rode bicycles with his friend to the Colombia Auditorium, “which was hosting an annual black bazaar called the Louisville Home Show” (Hauser 18). Upon leaving the bazaar, this young boy found that his bicycle had been stolen. While searching for someone to report the incident to, Cassius Clay heard there was a police officer in the basement of the auditorium instructing children how to box. So Clay proceeded downstairs to file a police report (Hauser 18). Upon being questioned by the police officer, this young child said that he would “whup” the individual who had stolen his bicycle. In response to Clay’s statement, the police officer told the child “that he had better learn to box first” (“Greatest in S. Shields” 3). Cassius Marcellus Clay, as he was known at that time in his life, took these words to heart and began his career in amateur boxing under the tutelage of a black trainer, Fred Stoner, and the same white police officer he met in the basement that day, Joe Martin (Hauser 19).

Muhammad Ali was born with the name Cassius Marcellus Clay, Jr., on January 17, 1942 in Louisville, Kentucky. His mother, Odessa Clay, was a devout Baptist and taught her children her religious values. Muhammad Ali once said, “She taught us what she thought was right. She taught us to love people and treat everybody with kindness. She taught us it was wrong to be prejudiced or hate” (Hauser 14). Odessa Clay also made her children attend church every Sunday. It may have been this deeply religious heritage that later played a role in Ali’s accomplishments in the Civil Rights Movement (Hauser 180). Growing up as a minority in a society of segregation, Muhammad Ali saw a need for reform. Looking back at his youth, Ali said, “I don’t know what it
was, but I always felt like I was born to do something for my people. Eight years old, ten years old; I'd walk out of my house at two in the morning, and look up at the sky for an angel or a revelation or God to tell me what to do. I never got an answer….Then my bike got stolen and I started boxing, and it was like God telling me that boxing was my responsibility” (Hauser 18). His religious convictions would become one of the most significant aspects in his life that contributed to his leadership. They altered his view of the seemingly insignificant incident of the stolen bicycle into something that changed his life and how he viewed the world around him.

Cassius Clay, later known as Muhammad Ali when he openly announced his conversion to Islam, entered into the realm of boxing at one of the most opportune times for this sport. In the 1960s, the United States continued to grow concerned with many issues such as the Vietnam War and the Civil Rights Movement. The preoccupation with these types of conflicts began to draw attention away from sports such as boxing as the United States found itself in a state of segregation and turmoil. During this tumultuous time, Ali revolutionized the manner in which this sport was viewed and became the savior of boxing.

As for the more technical aspects of the sport, Muhammad Ali revolutionized the mechanics of boxing and broke the existing paradigms that dominated its athletes. Preceding Muhammad Ali’s appearance in the sport, all boxers adhered to an orthodox style of fighting which consisted of “carrying [one’s] hands high to defend the face.” The conventional method of evading punches was to “bob and weave out of danger” (African, par. 4). Muhammad Ali entered into the ring with his hands at his sides in an unconventionally low position. His style of movement relied on leaning back rather than bobbing and weaving; as a result, he came under heavy criticism from the boxing community (Hauser 100). In contrast to traditional boxing styles, Ali was “taught to move with the grace of a dancer” which he relied on to ensure his success; this set a precedent for a new breed of boxing style (Contemporary 1). His unique style made for an entertaining fight, but many experts remained skeptical of his skill (Hauser 41). The controversial and critical atmosphere surrounding Ali helped him amass great attention. As spectators and critics watched Ali accumulate a record of sixty-one wins and only five losses, the criticism disappeared. His performance in the ring became a marvel that many new boxers have attempted to emulate. Contributing greatly to the sport, Muhammad Ali has made it acceptable for athletes to introduce their own creativity and personality into boxing.

Muhammad Ali also made significant changes in his time through his ability to raise public interest in the sport of boxing. In the 1950s, boxers were represented by their trainers; as a result, the most any boxer would say was, “I’m looking forward to the fight, and I’ll do my best” (Hauser 39). In 1961, Cassius Clay told Gilbert Rogin of Sports Illustrated, “Boxing is a dying sport because everybody’s so quiet” (Contemporary 2). In order to break this mold and raise public interest, Ali would read “childlike poetry spouting self descriptive phrases” and make claims such as “I am the Greatest” (African 1). Ali would even predict the round in which he would beat his opponent (Hauser 51). An example of one of these predictions is shown in the following statement made regarding his fight with Doug Jones:

This boy likes to mix
So he must fall in six…
I’m changing the pick I made before
Instead of six, Doug goes down in four (Hauser 52).

Crowds would gather solely to see whether his predictions were correct. Interestingly, “seven of his eight previous fights had ended in the predicted round,” which created a growing crowd (Hauser 51). By evoking the emotions of masses of people, Ali was able to generate a renewed interest in boxing, which had suffered a decline in popularity prior to his appearance. In the end, Muhammad Ali became more than a boxer; he became an entertainer—which was exactly what boxing needed.

As Muhammad Ali’s boxing career continued, his fame grew to monumental proportions as he developed his role as an entertainer. He did not care whether people loved or hated him because either emotion elicited a response that added to his fame. In fact, his only concern was that people respected him for his beliefs and abilities. Ali certainly earned this respect on February 25, 1964, when he defeated Sonny Liston to become the heavyweight champion of the world (African 2). On this day, Muhammad Ali ascended to a much higher level of fame than he had previously held, and his role as the heavyweight champion shocked the world.
Every heavyweight boxer in the world prior to Muhammad Ali had conformed to the demands of society in order to portray the image of a good role model for children and the public. However, Muhammad Ali was not like any boxer before him, so it is no surprise that he refused to follow in their footsteps (Hauser 83). In a press conference following his victory, Ali asserted his independent attitude. At this conference, a reporter asked, “Are you a card-carrying member of the Black Muslims?” (Hauser 81). This question had deep social implications since the Black Muslims were considered a radical interest group that advocated a strong disdain for segregation (Hauser 81). In response to the question, Ali replied, “Card carrying; what does that mean? I believe in Allah and in peace. I don’t try to move into white neighborhoods. I don’t want to marry a white woman. I was baptized when I was twelve, but I didn’t know what I was doing. I’m not a Christian anymore. I know where I’m going and I know the truth, and I don’t have to be what you want me to be. I’m free to be who I want to be” (Hauser 82).

This statement marked the first time “[a] black sports star had ever issued such a ringing declaration of independence” (Marqusee 1). Such rhetoric showed his willingness to speak his mind and adhere to his beliefs. He later elaborated on this controversial statement in a second press conference in which he talked of how he never participated in marches for integration or publicly tried to impose integration; he expressed that his affiliation with the Muslim sect simply represented his desire to have peace among men (Hauser 82-83). His final statement sent the message that he would not conform to what society had previously wanted the heavyweight champion of the world to be (Hauser 84). Muhammad Ali held to his firm beliefs because he had a vision and felt as though he could not conform to societal pressures.

Muhammad Ali had converted to Islam three years prior to the press conference in 1964, where he made his association with the Black Muslims public (Hauser 97). Initially, however, he kept his conversion secret because he feared that he would not have been allowed to fight for the heavyweight title since society looked so unfavorably upon this religious organization. The Black Muslims, also known as the Nation of Islam, were known for their desire to separate from the Caucasian society in America; in fact, the Nation of Islam preached of the white race as the “devil” and advocated a sense of division among all men (Hauser 92). Although Muhammad Ali was a member of the Black Muslims, his involvement was rather complicated. Ali’s reasons for joining the Nation of Islam centered on its empowerment of African Americans; he said:

Elijah Muhammad [leader of the Nation of Islam] was trying to lift us up and get our people out of the gutter, so they weren’t looking like prostitutes and pimps. He taught us good eating habits, and was against alcohol and drugs. I think he was wrong when he talked about white devils, but part of what he did was make people feel it was good to be black (Hauser 97).

As Muhammad Ali stated in his infamous press conference, he was an advocate of peace; however, in a prejudiced American society, he found a place of acceptance in the Black Muslims. It was through this organization that Cassius Marcellus Clay became Muhammad Ali. This organization also helped him to express pride in his race, but he later disaffiliated from the group when he realized that the Nation of Islam did not represent his best interests or his views. In the end, it was his pride in his race that led to the declaration, “I don’t have to be who you want me to be. I’m free to be who I want to be” (Hauser 82). With this statement, Muhammad Ali empowered others with his vision of equality and thus became a leader in the Civil Rights Movement. Ironically, he had no intention of leading integration, but was only speaking his mind.

Muhammad Ali’s views regarding the Vietnam War also revolved around his personal expression. “I ain’t got no quarrel with those Vietcong... and no Vietcong ever called me nigger” are the infamous words declared by Muhammad Ali upon being questioned about the Vietnam War (Hauser 145). In 1967, Muhammad Ali refused induction into the United States Army during the draft, and his protest against the war was not viewed positively in such a patriotic society. In spite of this, Ali held strongly to his religious beliefs and believed that his participation in the war would go against the Qur’an [Koran], which he cited as his reason for refusal (Contemporary Black Biography 3). Approximately an hour after hearing the news, the “New York State Athletic Commission suspended his boxing license and withdrew recognition of him as champion” (Hauser 172). With the Commission’s decision, Muhammad Ali risked incarceration and his future as a professional boxer. Howard Cossell, a renowned sports commentator of this era, declared his disdain for the situation when he retrospectively said, “There’d been no grand jury impanelment, no arraignment. Due process had not begun, yet they took away his
livelhood because he failed the test of political and social conformity, and it took him seven years to get his title back” (Hauser 173). Ali was sentenced to five years in prison, although this conviction was later overturned. Still, he spent the following three years with his boxing license suspended (Contemporary Black Biography 3). However, Ali’s commitment to boxing, his religion, and his country never wavered during his exile from professional boxing.

From 1967 to 1970, Muhammad Ali endured some of his most difficult challenges, but his persistence in the pursuit of boxing stood firm. Ali was faced with the serious possibility of never regaining his boxing license but would not accept this harsh reality without a fight. He refused to accept another career path because he would not allow his situation to dictate the course of his life. Therefore, he accepted an offer from Murray Woroner, an executive advertising executive, to partake in a “fictitious tournament” called “The Superfight” in which he would fight a previously undefeated heavyweight boxer named Rocky Marciano (Hauser 196). This film grossed an extravagant amount of money because many people still wanted to see Ali fight, and it was the only means for Ali to continue his passion. Unfortunately, Ali had to pursue other endeavors in order to support his wife and himself.

Although Ali had been stripped of his boxing license, he stayed in the public eye in other various ways. He began lecturing at colleges, where he would speak about his thoughts on pressing issues of the time. His speeches usually discussed issues that revolved around race. These college audiences were predominantly white, but Ali was able to raise much enthusiasm from the crowd because of his charisma. Although Ali believed in equality, he did not promote integration because he was unsure if it was feasible. Ultimately, he spoke of the division that he saw and made people aware of society’s inequality and unfairness. In fact, he actually mentioned segregation as an option because he thought that it might have been the only possible solution (Hauser 188). Regardless, as a public speaker Ali empowered African Americans and advocated the notion of equality of all men.

Eventually, Ali’s role in “Superfight” introduced him to a short career on Broadway. A critic named Bert Sugar professed, “Each time we reconsider Ali, we realize there’s more to him and more value than we realized before” (Hauser 198). In many ways, it seems that Ali’s fame only grew during his exile from boxing, which ultimately created more followers and fans.

Still, Muhammad Ali’s decision to refuse induction into the army during the Vietnam War resulted in much controversy. Jeremiah Shabazz, a member of the Nation of Islam, said, “Because he refused, thousands more were inspired to oppose military service and stay at home” (Hauser 177). This, nevertheless, was not Muhammad Ali’s intention. He merely wanted to adhere to his beliefs, and people consequently found his actions inspiring. Although many people condemned Ali for his unpatriotic stance, others viewed him as a hero (Hauser 171). Ali wanted America to recognize its foundations, which were based on freedom of religion. On the other hand, at times Ali also expressed his disdain for the government. One such example was when Ali said, “The government had a system where the rich man’s son went to college, and the poor man’s son went to war. Then after the rich man’s son got out of college, he did other things to keep him out of the Army until he was old enough not to get drafted” (Hauser 172). Comments like this made it possible for African Americans and poor whites alike to see leadership in Ali’s position. Those who questioned his bravery could see that his reasons for refusing military service were genuine. He was offered a deal where he could be employed in a field where he would not see combat, but he refused to participate in any aspect of the war. He continued to say that he did not fear going to jail because he felt as though his cause was worth the price of imprisonment. As a result of his resolute stand, Ali ascended to a position of leadership.

After a hard fought litigation, Muhammad Ali’s boxing license was reinstated on October of 1970. By this time, it had been six years since Muhammad Ali’s first fight, and he was no longer one of the younger fighters in the sport. However, Muhammad Ali became determined to become the heavyweight champion of the world once again (Hauser 207). He received much criticism because many people felt as though he could no longer compete with his opponents. In fact, Rocky Marciano told him to get out of boxing because he was simply torturing himself. In response, Ali’s wife said, “He won it in the ring, and he’ll lose it in the ring. That’s the only way he’ll give up his crown” (Hauser 207). Since Ali had lost his license in all fifty states, he had to start from the beginning once again. Still, the sincerity Ali had exhibited in the previous three years won him the support of more people than ever before. People sympathized with him because he had lost everything; he had become something they had never seen him as before—an underdog. According to Thomas Hauser, Ali’s biographer, “He became a symbol to
those who had never been interested in boxing before” (209). On March 8, 1971, Ali challenged Joe Frazier for the Heavyweight Championship, but Frazier knocked him out in the final round. This event came to be known as “The Fight of the Century” (African 2). Despite this defeat, Ali was still resolute in regaining his title, so he challenged George Foreman for the Heavyweight Championship on October 30, 1974 in a fight named “The Rumble in the Jungle” (African 2). Muhammad Ali came out victorious in this fight, and he was once again the champion. In the face of adversity, Muhammad Ali remained persistent through his determination and ultimately shocked the world while inspiring countless people in the process.

Muhammad Ali is regarded as one of the greatest boxers in history because of his accomplishments in the ring. In 1960, Muhammad Ali received the gold medal for the 175 pound weight class at the Olympic Games in Rome, Italy. In his professional career, he has been named “the greatest heavyweight champion of all time” by Ring Magazine in 1983 (African 1). And in 1978, Muhammad Ali became the first fighter to win the world championship three times (African 1). As these many accomplishments demonstrate, Muhammad Ali amazed audiences with his performance as a boxer. Although Muhammad Ali worked diligently in the United States fulfilling his role as the heavyweight champion of the world, he also made time for charitable contributions. In the summer of 1977, he traveled to South Shields, an impoverished area north of England, to help the locals raise money for a boxing club that was inspired by his life (“Greatest in South Shields” 3). This act of charity is a great illustration of Muhammad Ali’s character and his leadership outside of boxing.

Muhammad Ali has since been diagnosed with Parkinsonism, which is also known as Parkinson’s syndrome. This syndrome is a “neurological problem with several key features such as tremors, slowness of movement, rigidity in muscles including those in speech, and difficulty maintaining balance” (Hauser 489). Muhammad Ali actually began to see signs of the disease in 1980, but his doctors misdiagnosed him as having a thyroid condition (Contemporary 3). A doctor’s examination prior to one of his fights in 1980 revealed a “hole in the membrane of his brain,” but Don King, the fight promoter, withheld this report. Because of this, Ali was able to continue his boxing career despite the disease until he was forced to retire in 1981 after his deteriorating condition became visible (Contemporary 3). The cause of his condition has not been determined; doctors have disagreed as to whether his condition was degenerative or caused by boxing. One expert, Dr. Stanley Fahn, has argued that Ali’s Pugilistic Parkinsonism was “brought on by repetitive trauma to the head” (3). As a result, people have asked Ali if he regrets his decision to box. His inherent charisma and his leadership are apparent as he responds; “If I wasn’t a boxer, I wouldn’t be famous. If I wasn’t famous, I wouldn’t be able to do what I’m doing now” (5). In the end, Muhammad Ali fought through Parkinsonism in the ring for as long as he could and continues to do so in his retirement.

Muhammad Ali has shown leadership in the realm of boxing, as well as the Civil Rights Movement, especially during his professional boxing career, and his leadership role has continued with even more esteem since his retirement. Since retiring, Ali has said, “All of my publicity was just the start of my life. Now my life is really starting. Fighting injustice, fighting racism, fighting crime, fighting illiteracy, using this face the world knows so well, and going out and fighting for truth and different causes” (Hauser 514). Ali is a devoted humanitarian and has “contributed to countless, diverse charities and causes” (Contemporary 1). After his boxing career, Ali created a charitable organization, the Muhammad Ali Center, and has made many appearances at fundraisers. Along these same lines, he has also undertaken missionary work and continues to do so. His leadership is reflected in these humanitarian endeavors that comprise his daily routine. Additionally, Ali’s leadership role developed as he entered politics near the end of his career. In 1980, he associated himself with the Democratic Party and has undertaken many related responsibilities (Contemporary 4). He is still politically active as the current United Nations “Messenger of Peace” (“Greatest in South Shields” 4).

Upon reflection of Muhammad Ali’s life, the prevalence of leadership is apparent. He embodies the ideals of charismatic leadership through his personality and public speaking ability; he was and continues to be envisioning, enabling, and energizing. The Civil Rights Movement was heavily influenced by his words and actions as he refused to conform to what society wanted him to be as the Heavyweight Champion of the World. His refusal to be inducted into the army was also influential in the Civil Rights Movement. He even became the savior of boxing by fulfilling the role of an entertainer when the sport needed one desperately. His servant leadership can be seen through his charitable work
in his willingness to serve others; he also led by example when speaking out, which was an inspiration to
many. His indirect leadership can be seen through the consequences of his actions because he so often
created followers when he had not planned to do so.

Muhammad Ali can be seen as a genuine role model for society because he lived a good life according
to his own principles and served his fellow man. Ali used his fame in the realm of boxing to advocate
his political views and ultimately preached a higher gospel. He came into boxing at a time of corruption
and served as an example of what he felt society should strive to be by speaking his mind and inspiring
others. In the end, Muhammad Ali was courageous enough to stand alone when others would not dare
to do so.
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Postponed, Deferred, Delayed: The Struggles of a Life of Poverty

Ginny Coats

In my very first class on my first day of college, I walked into a room not knowing what to expect. Quite simply, the course’s title, Literature and the Social Experience, had caught my eye when I made my class preference list during the summer. Literature combined with a variety of social issues sounded like it would be an interesting premise; plus, I had never given too much thought to gender, race, and class in the atmosphere of an English class. Our first lesson gave us an insight as to what the class was really going to be about. We sat nervously at our desks, arranged in a circle, each of us looking at a strange object in the center of the room and attempting to guess the purpose of this bizarre centerpiece. One student thought the object was a bird feeder, while another argued that it closely resembled an incense holder from a church. Despite our wide variety of guesses, none of us actually guessed the object’s true identity: a small, worn piston from an older car. Although none of guessed correctly, the point of the exercise was still clear. This activity, as well as the class, was about perspective and learning to think about the world and literature from points of view different from our own.

We also learned about an essential element of the class that would be crucial in the development of our new perspectives: service learning. Our service experiences would provide the framework in which to view the course’s literature, allowing us to focus in on specific issues of gender, race, and class through firsthand experiences. I chose to volunteer at the First Light Women’s Shelter in downtown Birmingham with a group of girls from the class. Every Wednesday, some conversation I took part in or interaction I witnessed among the women altered my perspective. I found my experiences with two women, Ramona and Melissa, to be the most beneficial in expanding my narrow perspective. Many of our conversations, in addition to those I had with other women at the shelter, taught me about the core issues of the class. In connecting my experience with Ramona and Melissa to literature, I found Langston Hughes’s poem “Deferred” to be relevant. It brilliantly addresses the heartache of postponing and deferring every desire in one’s life amidst the day to day struggle of trying to stay afloat financially. This burden also bears profound similarities to the situation of a struggling woman named Caroline in David Shipler’s The Working Poor, an eye-opening piece of nonfiction the class studied.

While reading Hughes’s “Deferred,” I experienced an array of feelings: confusion, depression, exasperation, and guilt for my privileged life. Interestingly, these feelings mirror many of the emotions I experienced throughout my service activities. Hughes’s poem is an upsetting account of the inability of the poor to
achieve certain goals or attain seemingly basic possessions. Hughes uses multiple voices in the poem to convey the universality of this issue for many poor; while individual desires may be different, the sentiment is still often the same. One voice in the poem laments, “All I want to see is my furniture paid for,” while another simply dreams of the day when he can purchase two brand-new suits simultaneously (Hughes 132). The simplicity of these requests reflects the hopes and aspirations of many women at First Light. Though meager and easily achieved by some standards, the women’s goals are significant and challenging for them because of the numerous obstacles they face.

After visiting the shelter for several months, I encountered an outgoing new mother named Melissa who had recently arrived. She was equipped with a different perspective from me and the other BSC volunteers, and her goals and dreams reflected this difference. While reading “Deferred,” I found it difficult to comprehend people struggling for such small things. Similarly, in my service experience, it was strange for me to see women praying and working so hard to realize such different goals from my own. Melissa, a recovering drug addict, was struggling after giving birth to an unhealthy, premature baby. She told us she was hoping to acquire a “real” education to supplement her minimal mathematical knowledge of “adding and taking away” and lack of experience with most other subjects. She asked our group of volunteers if we would be willing to assist her. Throughout her life, she had postponed holding education as a priority. She had experienced the government removing her children from her care, a fight with drugs, and an absence of religion in her life. Melissa, however, is unlike the voices in “Deferred” in at least one sense because she seems to be taking a proactive stance now in achieving her dream. Unfortunately, I do not know if this is merely a short-lived hope that will be deferred once again. She has not actually begun her new education process but has taken a tangible step by approaching students with her concern.

On a broader scale at First Light, I witnessed different types of deferment other than those Melissa suffered. Many of the women there are forced to postpone their aspirations because of health concerns, inability to work, responsibilities of caring for family members, and financial constraints. These directly correlate to the voices of “Deferred.” Ramona, a First Light resident in her mid-thirties, has a checkered past filled with mental illness and time in jail. Ramona’s mother, who also lives at First Light, has also had health concerns to reckon with, along with the burden of caring for other family members’ abandoned children and a mentally ill brother. They have deferred their dreams of having a comfortable apartment and car for years because of all of these responsibilities. Other women have uttered phrases that could have come directly from Hughes’s pen. Some commonly heard postponed phrases I often heard were, “I’ll get my car next month,” or “After my friend gets me this job, I’ll get my house.” Deferring dreams becomes a part of life for those who are unable to transcend their circumstances. It is a necessity for the women at First Light to expect achievement of their dreams, even after years of disappointment.

The tone of “Deferred” is despondent and ironic, matching the tone of many of my First Light visits this semester. There is an assured, confident sound to some of the poem’s voices, as though they fully believe they will be reaching their goals shortly. As a reader I felt that most of their dreams will probably never be realized. One such hopeful character is the third voice in Hughes’s poem. This person is forever hoping to learn French but has had to defer the dream for a long period of time. Finally, the character gets a job that ends at five o’clock, so attending French class at night school is finally possible. I felt conflicted after reading the poem. Was I actually supposed to believe the speaker will become fluent in French and make straight A’s in school after a few months of having this dream job? Maybe an elderly mother gets sick, or the car breaks down. Maybe something defers the dream again, delaying its fulfillment for another time, another year.

Hughes does not spell out the outcome of each particular voice’s dream for the reader. I did try, nonetheless, to learn from the tone of the poem to garner insight into the author’s overall meaning. The final few lines of the poem are significant in creating the tone: “Montage of a dream deferred. Buddy, have you heard?” (Hughes 132). The question seems to be asking readers whether they have ever had a dream deferred or a goal postponed for uncontrollable reasons. After reflecting on my service activities, I ask myself these same questions. Both reading this poem and visiting First Light aroused feelings in me that caused me to realize the simplicity, privilege, and blessings that are so abundant in my life.

After noticing the connections between the homeless women at First Light and the fictional voices of “Deferred,” I reflected upon the experiences of the characters in David Shipler’s The Working Poor. This
book is a component of the class that recounts the lives of a diverse group of hard-working people in America who remain poor despite their best efforts to escape poverty. It clearly illustrates the setbacks and obstacles that the poor face in their quests for financial security, just as Hughes’s “Deferred” does. Shipler describes the lives of many poor who find their dreams pushed aside in the process of striving to make ends meet. Chapter two of the book, “Work Doesn’t Work” largely revolves around a woman who cannot afford basic necessities, despite the fact that she devotes her energies to various, demanding jobs with low wages. With respect to wealth, Shipler portrays America in the year 2000 as “a nation wallowed in luxury, burst with microchips, consumed with abandon, swaggered globally” (50). Then again, Shipler contends that not all Americans enjoy this carefree extravagance. One such woman, Caroline Payne, struggles unceasingly to attain her dream of “a good-paying job” (Shipler 50).

Caroline, like the hardworking characters in “Deferred” and the women of First Light, always finds her goals just out of reach. She is “punctual, rarely out sick, willing to do night shifts, and assiduous in her work habits,” yet she cannot achieve her elusive dream (Shipler 51). Shipler astutely calls the path of the working poor the “track that leads nowhere” (Shipler 51). Sooner or later, something always gets in the way. Caroline’s fourth child, Amber, causes such “family turbulence” that it interferes with the completion of Caroline’s duties at work. So, she quits: another dream deferred. When Caroline’s home life “got stressful,” “her life at work got perilous” (Shipler 57). Additionally, Caroline’s own health stands as another obstacle blocking the attainment of her goals. Even her Medicaid disappears after she begins working, forcing her to pay for medicine with money that she needs for other items (Shipler 64). For most people, various areas of life are not neatly compartmentalized: money, health, work, and family are all interwoven and dependent on one another. This fact can especially causes difficulties for many of the poor. Shipler writes, “In the house of the poor, however, the walls are thin and fragile, and troubles seep into one another” (76). These fragile walls allow for the daily conflicts of the poor to prevent the realization of small dreams and goals.

Similar to many of the people that Shipler depicts, the second speaker in “Deferred” loses sight of his dream of getting a nice stove amidst his dealing with concerns of “rooming and everything, then kids, cold-water flat and all that” (Hughes 131). He has to put his hopes of providing for his family and attaining the bare necessities on hold. In much the same way, First Light’s Melissa must first worry about her baby and combating her drug addiction before she can address her lack of education. And yet again, The Working Poor’s Caroline must confront her family and health problems before she can hope to maintain a steady, well-paying job. Neglecting self-fulfillment and personal ambitions is often a common thread for the poor, who make personal sacrifices daily to ensure that the rent will be paid, hot water will run, and food will be on the table. Minor accomplishments like taking up Bach or owning a television set, as some of the characters in “Deferred” hope for, may not be minor if we look through the lens of another’s perspective.

Tying together fictional literature with my real-life service experiences taught me about service, the problems of society, and how to apply this knowledge to better interpret text. I realized that authors are intentional with even the most detailed elements of their works in order to convey as much meaning as possible. In analyzing Hughes’s “Deferred,” I found startling similarities between the women I worked with first hand at First Light and the frustrated voices in Hughes’s work. It is shocking to me that poetry from a different era can resonate so much with my modern experiences. I believe this is because the plight of the poor has not evolved all that much, and because the basic human emotions present in the poem remain the same. The poor were then, and still are, as David Shipler suggests, “invisible in America.” No one notices as they defer their dreams to next month or next year, while many of the wealthy unknowingly live theirs out from day to day.
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A Chapter excerpt from the Thesis entitled
*A Study of Attitudes Towards Mixed versus Single-Sex University Education In Trinity College, Dublin: 1878–1906*

by Jeris Burns in partial fulfillment of the Masters of Philosophy Degree in Women’s Studies The Center for Continuous Study University of Dublin, Trinity College

“The floor which for generations has been trodden by man alone now gives to the high heel patter of the other sex; the walls decked with the noblest of Trinity’s sons now re-echo the thoughtless laughter of maidens.”

*– TCD: A College Miscellany, 1906*

**Historical Background**

Irish society during the mid to late 1800s experienced dramatic social and economic change. An emerging Irish middle class, eager to gain economic prowess, witnessed the beginning of a new era. Borrowing from the social reform values of England’s industrial revolution, the Irish middle class displayed a desire to exhibit social change. Women, in particular, embraced the opportunity to increase their overall standard of living. Until then, activities performed through the church were the only outlet which gave middle class women the excuse to organize voluntarily, to enter the public domain and engage in work which was considered socially useful. These philanthropic activities expanded women’s social roles, and gave rise to organizations that allowed women to influence the public sphere.

Several women’s issues were addressed during the latter half of the 19th century. Women’s groups organized to increase their rights and curtail the passing of legislation that inhibited their lives. One such group, the Ladies National Association (LNA) successfully aided in repealing the Contagious Diseases Act, laws which portrayed men as innocent in the spreading of diseases by prostitution, while women were portrayed as a necessary evil and imprisoned. By 1870, this group also managed to influence the passing of the Married Women’s Property Act, giving women autonomy over their possessions. Previously, English common law prohibited women from any civil rights regarding property or divorce. These campaigns gave women the chance to speak in public on previously unspeakable issues and “transformed women from passive objects of ideological prescription into active agents in a political campaign.” Another cause which women organized to promote was that of the higher educational rights of young women.
The development of women’s higher education was a high priority for women’s rights leaders throughout Ireland. During this time, the Irish system of higher education was highly unfavorable to women. Trinity College, the only institution within the University of Dublin, refused to allow women to matriculate within its gates. More specifically, many social and political leaders, including various educationalists, refused to engage in the belief that women and men should obtain a joint education at such a high level.

Anne Jellicoe, one of the era’s leading advocates for women’s education strongly believed that the long-term solution for women’s employment was education, and “if women were eligible to hold responsible positions in society, they should be educated to fill them successfully.” Economic reasons also drove women to seek more educational opportunities. After the Irish famine during the early 1850s, farmers could not afford to dower more than one daughter. Middle-class women found themselves penniless as a result of the death or recklessness of fathers or husbands. Programs of law, medicine, and divinity were all closed to women, leaving teaching as one of the only options.

Aware of the increasing disconnect between education and employment, in 1861 reformist Anne Jellicoe established the Queen’s Institute for the Training and Employment of Educated Women in Dublin, which provided classes for women in preparation for work as telegraph clerks, law writers, and sewing machinists. Another branch in Belfast, the Ladies’ Institute, was established in 1867. Soon other women’s institutions were established such as Victoria College, Belfast and Alexandra College in Dublin.

Educational opportunities continued to expand for women with the passing of the Intermediate Education (Ireland) Act in 1878 and the Royal University of Ireland Act in 1879. The Intermediate Act devised a system of public examinations which were open to both female and male pupils. Yet, to avoid competition, the girls only competed among themselves. The aforementioned Royal University Act established the non-denominational Royal University of Ireland which provided degree examinations, but not instruction. Women were able to receive degrees upon passing, but had to prepare for the exams elsewhere.

The opening of the RUI led several other Irish Universities to open their doors for women students. In 1882, Queen’s College, Belfast admitted women to honors classes and seven years later they were admitted to medical classes. Queen’s College, Cork followed suite in 1886, and Queen’s College, Galway acquiesced in 1888. Despite the advantages elsewhere, Dublin women had a difficult time obtaining higher education. In 1882, a group of educationalists formed the Central Association of Irish Schoolmistresses and charged themselves with the task of “acting as a medium of communication between schoolteachers and other ladies interested in education and watching over the interests of girls, especially with regard to intermediate education and the Royal university.” In addition, they also led the campaign to have women admitted into the University of Dublin. Their work, along with a later formed group, the Irish Association of Women Graduates, led to women’s eventual inclusion within a system of mixed education.

Much of the debate over the higher education of women in Ireland was played out within the walls of the University of Dublin at Trinity College. Not surprising however, since within Dublin during the late 19th century, a degree from Trinity was much more desirable than that conferred by the Royal University, a non-teaching institution which strictly offered degrees. Trinity College did offer examinations for women at the junior and senior level beginning in 1870, but no degree to coincide. Not only was it important for women that they attended Trinity, but it would later also prove beneficial for the college to accept this seemingly monumental adjustment as women proved themselves as more than able pupils. Kenneth Bailey wrote in his history of the college that “of the changes of the half-century, none has affected the life of the University more profoundly than the opening of its course and its degrees to women.” Yet, this decision was one which came with its share of contest and controversy.

Literature Review

The entirety of the research for this work was conducted at the University of Dublin, Trinity College Library, specifically the College Archives and the Department of Early Printed Books. This research includes a thorough investigation of previous work surrounding women and higher education in Dublin through books, magazines, and academic journals. Also since the late 1800s, several histories of Trinity
College were written, and each was consulted for their viewpoint on women’s education. From this, primary sources were utilized and observed. The Trinity student publications consulted began with the year 1878 and ended two years after the entrance of women into Trinity, 1906. The work draws from secondary and primary sources which have added considerable knowledge to the recent debate about women’s higher education in the late 19th and early 20th centuries.

This article includes a close observation of the three student publications: The Dublin University Review, The Dublin University Magazine, and TCD: A College Miscellany; in print at various times between 1878 and 1906. This primary research adds to existing knowledge the thoughts and feelings of the young men of Trinity regarding the women’s issue. Here, the study of women’s history is seen through the very patriarchal voices which strove to curtail its progress. The Trinity student publications reveal another outlet by which to interpret women’s history. These patriarchal opinions are placed into perspective alongside the coinciding opinions of the era pertaining to mixed education.

The Dublin University Magazine: A Literary and Philosophical Review

Written primarily for those interested in literary and philosophical matters, The Dublin University Magazine served as a starting block to discuss the female university question. Of the three Trinity College student publications written during the campaign for women’s admission, The Dublin University Magazine was the shortest lived. Begun in January 1878, its four volumes lasted only until December of 1879. During this short publication period, little in the magazine was written regarding mixed classes, but some commentary on female students in general was included.

The first volume and issue in January of 1878 set the tone for the magazine’s content by quoting Trinity Professor F.W. Newman, who in 1843, commented that the school needed “a more than juvenile vigor, such as can only be gained by either new elements or new organs, to expand proportionally to the free intellect which has been formed without them, and every day wins upon them. There is a stir in the universities, there has been a throwing off of shackles.”22 Taken from in a section entitled, “The Ideal University,” this quote, although it never mentioned women specifically as the “new element” needed, spoke of change and new beginnings. Unfortunately this idealistic language was short lived if it held any regard for women because the article continued by explaining that the “permanent element in the ideal university, and on all gatherings of trained and well-stored minds, depends to be school teachers of men.”23

In 1843, Trinity received no pressure to admit women, yet the sentiment expressed by Professor Newman is mimicked by the attitudes of Trinity’s older Board members who, during the 1880s, adamantly refused to accept women as scholars. The belief in a male-dominated system of higher education within Trinity was one built on years of complete patriarchal control.

Only once within The Dublin University Magazine did the writers address the ensuing campaign for women’s higher education with the comment, “The educational question in England now seem to be Women’s Degrees. Here we have not got beyond Intermediate Schools.”24 Whether this was a proud statement or one of regret for the situation, the writers remained aloof on the subject and made no further comments on this topic for the remainder of its publication.

This magazine only slightly brushed on issues prevalent to the matriculation of women into Trinity. From July of 1878 until the magazine’s demise in December of 1879, there was no further mention of women’s education or of women in general.25 The Dublin University Magazine does, however, serve as a starting point to examine what Trinity men were interested in writing. As the subject of mixed education within Trinity became more established, so did the topics that students were willing to discuss regarding the issue.

The Dublin University Review

Begun in 1885, the students of Trinity organized another publication entitled The Dublin University Review: A Monthly Magazine of Literature, Art, and University Intelligence. The Review was set to appear at the first of each month on a yearly basis.26 The first issue in February of 1885 outlined the magazine’s readership and gave further detail regarding the journal’s intentions: “We assume that Dublin University is, or in the nature of things ought to be, the true center of culture and educated opinion in Dublin. The Dublin University Review will be directed to the students of the University. A journal which would adequately reflect its social doings and notice all events of general interest in
student life.” The journal focused largely on broad issues such as nationalism, peasant propriety, Catholicism, and Protestantism in Ireland, but also included a section called College Notes, detailing school life. In addition, it included myriad public interest pieces including the topic of women’s higher education.

Of the three Trinity publications available during the last two decades of the 19th century, The Dublin University Review displayed the most progressive ideas regarding women’s issues. The students who organized the journal conveyed their pro-women stance in the first publication in 1885 where they declared,

“The friends of the women’s suffrage in Dublin are not idle. We see it announced two public meetings to promote the extension of the franchise to women ratepayers. We advise those eloquent gentlemen, who emphatically express their belief that women have neither the capacity nor the power to take part in public affairs, to attend, when perhaps they may find that business capacity is not confined to the male sex, and that eloquence and logical clearness are not denied to the female.”

Although this statement dealt with the franchise question and not with education, it is significant that these men were addressing a women’s issue in a positive light. Their tone is strongly in defense of women’s rights, something that is not expressed in either of the other publications.

The writers of The Dublin University Review wasted no time in commenting on the subject of women’s entrance to Trinity College. Their second issue in March of 1885 included an article entitled “Trinity College and Lady Students: A Plea for the Higher Education of Women.” This lengthy piece began by asking the questions, “Why not open all our educational institutions, especially Trinity College Dublin, to lady students?” and “What just cause of impediment exists why our professors and Fellows should confine their lectures to male students?”

The writers examined what they termed the “ole and well nigh” reasons used to keep women from obtaining a higher education in order to explain that public sentiment was far from universally accepting the higher education of women. The student’s belief in the ability of women at the university level was also shared by Trinity Professor Seeley who stated in the article, “if I were asked which sex did the most credit to the education they had been able to receive, I would not hit upon the male sex.”

Despite this initial optimism, the men shrunk from believing the women they found capable of learning at a university level could do so alongside them in class. They wrote, “We do not say that College lectures should be common to both sexes; but surely some arrangement could be devised by which the classes of students could be accommodated.” Mixed classes were, in their opinion, not the most efficient option, but their enthusiasm for women’s higher education was significant because it showed a level of support for the women’s movement not frequently seen among Irish males. The Trinity students involved in this publication wrote with such understanding of the Irish woman’s strife, something not as apparent in either of the other two publications.

The Dublin University Review remained in print from 1885 until 1887, and the aforementioned article in 1885 was the only mention of the women’s issue during its short life. The end of each edition included a section on college notes, but information on the women’s educational issue were never included. It is unclear why the journal ended publication in June of 1887. Loss of interest or lack of money could have contributed, but whatever the case, Trinity’s male students had no organ of written communication until eight years later with the formation of a new magazine, one that became a mainstay in college life.

**TCD: A College Miscellany**

A new college publication meant a new era for student writing at Trinity College. Begun in 1895, TCD: A College Miscellany served as Trinity’s official newspaper and was published every Saturday during the six weeks of lecture terms. Instead of focusing on one or two divisions within the college, “this paper was started with two objectives: the first being to provide the present and past members of the University with a body of news relating to the College, and a representative of the opinions of the generation which for the time occupy the stage; the second, for the purpose of training the students to use their pen in the expression of their thought.” In the newspaper’s first nine years, those before the admission of women into Trinity, the male students wrote in a style that was frank, satirical, and creative in their use of language and dialogue. Their words exemplify a generation of students who battled with the acceptance of women into the academic arena.
From 1895 until the admission of women in 1904, the writers and contributors of *TCD: A College Miscellany* varied in their opinions on the topic of women students within Trinity. Most frequently the attitude within the newspaper was strongly against women’s presence. In a letter from two Trinity College students of English Literature such pessimism was apparent. Their letter to the editor, published in 1895, declared, “Most men greatly object to have to pursue their studies in company with students of the opposite sex, as they find notwithstanding all the up-to-date theory on the subject, that it is impossible to devote themselves seriously to work in a mixed class.”31 Although it would seem that most students would sympathize with the anti-mixed educational opinion of these men as it was early in the campaign, the authors of this letter signed themselves “X & Y.” Keeping their identity a mystery suggested they did not want their names revealed to the student population. Where they afraid their opinions would not be popularly received? This action leads to the assumption that in Trinity during this time, there were some opinions among Trinity’s males for women’s inclusion at the University.

Another indication of a pro-woman stance involved the editors of *TCD: A College Miscellany* who attached a footnote to this particular letter of correspondence stating, “We confess that we cannot feel much sympathy with them on their objections to mixed classes; which have been found to work so well in other universities.”32 With a large student population, varying opinions are expected, yet the editors, those in charge of what enters the newspaper were the ones defending the system within the University. The editor’s voices might have been part of a larger student force on campus. Regardless, their reasoning indicates they were aware of the ongoing debate surrounding women’s higher education. Two years previously, the Central Association of Irish School Mistresses (CAISM) had published their *Answers of Cambridge Lecturers to Questions Relating to the Teaching of Mixed Classes of Men and Women* which discussed the opinions of educators abroad. It is likely that the editors of the *TCD: A College Miscellany* were referring to the opinions within this document when responding to the editorial. The collection of opinions was strongly in favor of a system of mixed education, and would have been available for the men to examine.

Another letter written ten years later described the same sentiment regarding the issue. In 1905, women had been admitted for only a year, yet the attitudes against their presence continued. The unsigned letter began by clearly stating, “A Mixed University is not ideal. None seriously think it is. The best mental education for men cannot be exactly best for women.”33 The author also argued that a co-educational setting mixed business with pleasure, something which caused a university to suffer, and was what he considered an “unwritten rule.” Everyone, in his opinion, knew this rule, and “all students, men and women, loyally support it. All, save perhaps a negligible minority, too small and too ashamed to declare itself.”34

This was certainly one of the stronger opinions published in the newspaper. Using words such as “none” and “all students,” this contributor made sweeping assumptions about his classmates. It is hard to believe these opinions were shared by all male students since the editors again prefaced this article stating, “We publish today a letter dealing with the subject of the education of women. Some of us are at times tempted to consider this chapter closed with the admittance of women to modern universities.”35 Ten years after the previous editorial, and a little over a year into women’s admission into Trinity, all the male students had not yet accepted the new system. The editor’s comments lead readers to believe that such a negative opinion was infrequent and unpopular, especially since neither of the editorials included the student’s names. However, the language used within the newspaper in the years leading up to women’s admission frequently displayed strong feelings against the possibility of women students.

### TCD: A College Miscellany

A new college publication meant a new era for student writing at Trinity College. Begun in 1895, *TCD: A College Miscellany* served as Trinity’s official newspaper and was published every Saturday during the six weeks of lecture terms. Instead of focusing on one or two divisions within the college, “this paper was started with two objectives: the first being to provide the present and past members of the University with a body of news relating to the College, and a representative of the opinions of the generation which for the time occupy the stage; the second, for the purpose of training the students to use their pen in the expression of their thought.”1 In the newspaper’s first nine years, those before the
admission of women into Trinity, the male students wrote in a style that was frank, satirical, and creative in their use of language and dialogue. Their words exemplify a generation of students who battled with the acceptance of women into the academic arena.

From 1895 until the admission of women in 1904, the writers and contributors of TCD: A College Miscellany varied in their opinions on the topic of women students within Trinity. Most frequently the attitude within the newspaper was strongly against women’s presence. In a letter from two Trinity College students of English Literature such pessimism was apparent. Their letter to the editor, published in 1895, declared, “Most men greatly object to have to pursue their studies in company with students of the opposite sex, as they find notwithstanding all the up-to-date theory on the subject, that it is impossible to devote themselves seriously to work in a mixed class.”

Although it would seem that most students would sympathize with the anti-mixed educational opinion of these men as it was early in the campaign, the authors of this letter signed themselves “X & Y.” Keeping their identity a mystery suggested they did not want their names revealed to the student population. Where they afraid their opinions would not be popularly received? This action leads to the assumption that in Trinity during this time, there were some opinions among Trinity’s males for women’s inclusion at the University.

Another indication of a pro-woman stance involved the editors of TCD: A College Miscellany who attached a footnote to this particular letter of correspondence stating, “We confess that we cannot feel much sympathy with them on their objections to mixed classes; which have been found to work so well in other universities.” With a large student population, varying opinions are expected, yet the editors, those in charge of what enters the newspaper were the ones defending the system within the University. The editor’s voices might have been part of a larger student force on campus. Regardless, their reasoning indicates they were aware of the ongoing debate surrounding women’s higher education. Two years previously, the Central Association of Irish School Mistresses (CAISM) had published their Answers of Cambridge Lecturers to Questions Relating to the Teaching of Mixed Classes of Men and Women which discussed the opinions of educators abroad. It is likely that the editors of the TCD: A College Miscellany were referring to the opinions within this document when responding to the editorial. The collection of opinions was strongly in favor of a system of mixed education, and would have been available for the men to examine.

Another letter written ten years later described the same sentiment regarding the issue. In 1905, women had been admitted for only a year, yet the attitudes against their presence continued. The unsigned letter began by clearly stating, “A Mixed University is not ideal. None seriously think it is. The best mental education for men cannot be exactly best for women.” The author also argued that a co-educational setting mixed business with pleasure, something which caused a university to suffer, and was what he considered an “unwritten rule.” Everyone, in his opinion, knew this rule, and “all students, men and women, loyal support it. All, save perhaps a negligible minority, too small and too ashamed to declare itself.”

This was certainly one of the stronger opinions published in the newspaper. Using words such as “none” and “all students,” this contributor made sweeping assumptions about his classmates. It is hard to believe these opinions were shared by all male students since the editors again prefaced this article stating, “We publish today a letter dealing with the subject of the education of women. Some of us are at times tempted to consider this chapter closed with the admittance of women to modern universities.” Ten years after the previous editorial, and a little over a year into women’s admission into Trinity, all the male students had not yet accepted the new system. The editor’s comments lead readers to believe that such a negative opinion was infrequent and unpopular, especially since neither of the editorials included the student’s names. However, the language used within the newspaper in the years leading up to women’s admission frequently displayed strong feelings against the possibility of women students.

Language of the TCD: A College Miscellany

Often when speaking on the subject of women in Trinity, the men not only wrote with disdain, but also used embellished language, most likely to make the issue seem more appealing to its readership. Satirical language was also frequently used to ridicule the women and mock the ensuing campaign for admission. Dale Spender, a contemporary feminist author, described this patriarchal writing style in her book, Man Made Language. She described similar patriarchal language, suggesting it “promotes male
imagery and a masculine view of the world at the expense of women.” Although an all male publication might inherently assume patriarchal tones, the male students writing for *TCD: A College Miscellany* used language in a blatant attempt to stain women’s academic existence, and discredit women’s rights.

Repeatedly within the newspaper, the students described the campaign of women’s admission by referencing warfare. In an article written in 1896, a contributor to the magazine wrote, “It is reported that the Board in their long and arduous struggle against the besieging forces of the female faction have just executed a very brilliant counter-attack…and we congratulate them on the success of so cleverly designed maneuver.” Although this was a satirical piece and the “brilliant counter-attack” mentioned involved removing even the washerwoman from Trinity College, making the University completely female free, this type of language was frequently offered.

In 1897, when Cambridge University was amidst the debate over allowing degrees to be conferred on women, the men of *TCD: A College Miscellany* took this opportunity to again belittle Irish women. They wrote:

> While we were all attentively engaged in watching the attack which the gentler sex was making on the University of Cambridge, we were unaware of the great danger which lay at our own doors. Already our enemies have gained a footing in our territory…Last week a company of some thirty or forty penetrated as far as the park! Trinity had better wake up…Cambridge is at present having a hot time of it; our time will come next."

Again in 1899 the men wrote, “Trinity was invaded this week by an eager throng of the gentler sex.” Although the men used this battle language, they mostly kept the “gentler” adjective when referring to women. When this was not used, they referenced women as “the new regime,” “the sterner sex,” or “intellectual Amazons.” Once women were admitted, the harsh language did not cease entirely. In response to the King’s Letter for women’s admission, one male student wrote, “The old world is with all its pomp and ceremony unconsciously signing its own death warrant. Under the mask of legal fiction women are being smuggled into the University.” A year later, in 1905, the men still wrote with the same hostile contempt for women by stating, “the Amazons are within our walls, and we must make our peace with them, or else wage war, eternal war.”

Why did college-aged men feel the need to write about women using such harsh language? Susan Brownmiller, feminist, and author of *Against Our Will: Men, Women, and Rape*, explained why men use either words or acts of violence. Brownmiller argued that a violence mentality “is built around the glorification of male strength.” It is possible the male students writing for *TCD: A College Miscellany* used such language to exert dominance over the potential women students, making their language simply a power tool for the control of women.

Jean Miller, director of the Stone Center for Developmental Studies at Wellesley College, described why people act a certain way to those who are different. One explanation is the formation of a domination group. This group, in her opinion, has the greatest influence in determining a culture’s overall outlook. Trinity’s male students writing for the newspaper were in a position of legitimate power over the intellectual minds of the other students. They controlled what their fellow students read in an attempt to influence their thoughts. With women as their subordinates, the men used the newspaper as an outlet for control over them. This being done in a public sphere ensured that others would become aware of such control.

A dominant group also finds it normal to treat others, their subordinates, destructively and to derogate them. By using this language, the men were constantly showing their outward resentment towards their subordinate, women. This expression mimicked their strength, derived simply from their gender and authority. This gave them confidence to exert their influence over the supposedly weaker female sex. The frequency of this war language to describe women suggests the male students were continually feeling threatened either by the women’s campaign or the simple presence of women on the campus. An invasion of their patriarchal space triggered a defense mechanism which immediately associated women as the enemy. Spender suggested “the cultivation of violence among young men finds its peak in the army.” Although the young men writing for the newspaper were not involved in a literal military situation at the time, their use of violent language placed women in a military setting.
dominated by men. This was a place where they, as females, had no control. If the men were not writing about the women as if they were engaged in battle, they were scoffing at the possibility of women’s admission.

Not only did the writers of *TCD: A College Miscellany* ridicule the potential female students, they also mocked the campaign itself, specifically Alice Oldham, an advocate for female education:

> There, as the white foam high upon the crest of the tempestuous billows of surging motherhood, lashing the shores of our Isle of Man, sits Miss Oldham. The meaning of this is that those ladies, who are anxious to receive such an education as this University now bestows upon the male sex, having for several years carried on fruitless negotiations with the College authorities, have appointed Miss Oldham as their prolocutrix to demand an entrance.17

The writers hardly mention members of the CAISM, but were obviously aware of the campaign underway, specifically the actions of Miss Oldham.

Their words regarding women in general were harsh and degrading. In fact, their language became so callous, the college administration interceded. In 1905, the writers of *TCD: A College Miscellany* published a short statement which read, “We have been requested by the Provost to publish no articles containing personal references toward lady students; such as articles being liable, inadvertently, or otherwise, to bring ridicule upon them.”18 Despite the strong opinions which warranted a ceasefire, within *TCD: A College Miscellany* male students often expressed opinions leading readers to believe that the struggle of women students’ acceptance was nearly complete.

The men of the *TCD: A College Miscellany* did, from time to time, provide their readers with positive thoughts when speaking on women students. For example, when women were admitted as students, the newspaper published a short poem which read,

> Fair lady candidate, fair lady candidate,  
> Welcome to Trinity, welcome you come,  
> We you congratulate,  
> More than congratulate;  
> Welcome to Trinity, make it your home.19

With regard to the subject of mixed classes within Trinity, entire articles were not devoted to the topic, but often within articles, writers would express some encouraging sentiment on the issue. These bits were normally quite small and never included much detail. One writer in favor of the system stated, “We decline to think that Irishmen and Irishwoman are less capable of working together satisfactorily than our friends on the other side of the channel.”20 Another article entitled *The Lady Graduate Question* also compared Trinity to another institution, St. Andrew’s University in Scotland. There the women were admitted and given residence by the college. The Trinity men wrote “The women students at St. Andrews are exceptionally fortunate. We, here, grudge women their educational rights, while other Universities, with certain among of chivalry, after giving them their rights are adding special privileges.”21

It was not often that women were referred to as anything but dangerous enemies regardless of the circumstances surrounding them within the first ten years of the magazine’s publication. Yet, it is obvious that throughout the 1890s and the first few years of the 20th century, some students refused to adhere to the belief that women were the enemy. Why did these students not follow suite, and why were their beliefs so dramatically different from their fellow students? It is perhaps purely personal and situational, leaving little room for assumptions, but their thoughts were certainly progressive. They were not trying to exhibit dominance or their masculine strength; instead, they were sympathetic to the female predicament. This suggested a break in the power struggle between the genders. Although the students at Trinity held dominating power as males, their authority as writers was only temporary. Miller writes that the eventual outcome of temporary inequality is ultimately an end to the period of disparity.22
the overall use of such expressions declined. The student’s authority weakened as women were offered a chance to contribute to the newspaper.

**Women Contributors to the *TCD: A College Miscellany***

Once women were admitted as students, the writers of the *TCD: A College Miscellany* begrudgingly, yet politely, allowed women to contribute to the publication. Specifically, they wanted to obtain, “a candid account of someone’s first impressions of College and its inhabitants.” Suddenly the men’s interest went from contempt to intrigue. The first contribution by a female student appeared in a 1904 November issue. Simply entitled *An Enquiry*, and signed “Anxious One,” this eloquent poem detailed her experience with a rowdy crew of Trinity males. She wrote:

The Lady Undergraduates are seriously perplexed,
By a very pressing problem their righteous souls are vexed.
Before they entered Trinity they’d been to Balls, ’tis true,
But the paper balls in T.C.D. are altogether new.
When from the aborigines a missile whistles by,
And hits a Lady Undergrad directly in the eye,
Must she with haughty air pretend to look another way?
Or cast around the other eye to see whom she can slay?
Now any kind contributor, who can our mentor be,
Will help us much to find our feet within Old Trinity.

Although slightly humorous, it is obvious that within their first few months as students, Trinity College’s new females were not entirely welcomed. Their presence disrupted the patriarchal stronghold within Trinity. In order to defend their honored place within the College, a male author by the name of Euripides responded to the paper pellets in a rebuttal poem published a week later by hauntingly writing, “The reason that the thing was sent was just to see what she was made of.”

Similar competitive language between males and females occurred often in the first few years after women were allowed to contribute to the newspaper. Women contributors to *TCD: A College Miscellany* became more frequent after the first years of their matriculation, and the satirical remarks subsided. The men were no longer able to dominate the women with language since they were now classmates. Whether or not the genders considered each other equals is uncertain, but from the aforementioned poem, it is doubtful.

**Conclusion**

Throughout the years 1878 to 1904, Trinity College publications played a large role as an avenue for student opinion and debate. Regardless of the actions by the Trinity Board or the CAISM, the male students of Trinity wrote with enthusiasm and support for both sides of the campaign. Although *The Dublin University Review* and *The Dublin University Magazine* contained little regarding women’s higher education, their commentary uncovered that the topic of women’s higher education was not unimportant to the men of that publication. By the onset of *TCD: A College Miscellany* it was apparent that the women’s issue became a large topic of debate among the male undergraduates.

Several contributing writers’ knowledge of the campaign is apparent through their comments and opinions within the newspaper regarding mixed lectures. They were abreast on the issues, yet many of the men were unwaveringly against immediate change. Threatened with the inclusion of the other gender into the College, their language was descriptive yet emphatic when their academic autonomy was in jeopardy. Issues of control and domination arose as the men used violent metaphorical war language as well as satirical jabs to describe encounters with females. Overall, their articles and editorials provided insight into the opinions of the younger generation in Dublin because this was their only outlet for commentary. Their opinions, although insightful, did not resonate with the larger community working either to halt women’s admission or advocate for it. The government soon decided to take the matter up in a series of commissions which uncovered the opinions of several community and civic leaders on the topic of mixed classes in both Ireland and Trinity College. However, there is no evidence to suggest that the opinions in all three college magazines directly influenced the government.
reports of 1901 and 1906, or Trinity’s eventual acceptance of women’s higher education. They do, however, provide a different perspective on the issue than is commonly consulted in contemporary research. Historians have yet to include the opinions of Trinity’s students into the larger issue of women’s higher education, especially with regard to the opinions of Trinity leaders. The evidence included suggests that there was a strong student voice at this time, and this voice adds to the discourse of women’s history. The students’ attitudes were a product of the ensuing campaign and the opinions resonating from public leaders, not only within Trinity, but in Dublin and abroad.

In the words of the historian E.H. Carr, “we can view the past, and achieve our understanding of the past, only through the eyes of the present.” The current views of the past are moving forward in defining a more accurate and holistic view of women’s history. This work attempts to add to the body of knowledge cultivated by previous Irish historians regarding women’s higher education within Dublin. The primary research focuses specifically on the opinions of Trinity’s male students through the print medium of The Dublin University Review, The Dublin University Magazine, and TCD: A College Miscellany. The opinions of these young men present a critical view on the state of women’s higher education toward the end of the 19th century and provide an examination of women’s history through the lens of student voices within an all-male institution. The opinions of the Trinity College male students unveil exactly how difficult of a struggle it was for young females to break through the patriarchal mold that their society clung to so tightly.
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