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Jeanne-Marie LePrince de Beaumont’s “Beauty and the Beast,” published in 1756, and Angela Carter’s 1979 retelling of the tale in “The Tiger’s Bride” both present an interplay between animalism and civility in the relations between a beautiful virgin, a beast, and the townsfolk. While “Beauty and the Beast” advances the largely clear-cut view that animalistic qualities and behavior are undesirable, and that cultured, refined traits are desirable, “The Tiger’s Bride” blurs the line between wildness and civility, questioning the comparative values and parameters of each form of conduct. Comparing the way each tale depicts the protagonist, the beast, and the predominant social values of each historical era reveals that societal expectations of relationships have shifted away from social performances of love—such as respectful conversations and marriage—and toward a greater concern for achieving authentic physical and emotional intimacy with another person.

Although both protagonists (“Beauty” in “Beauty and the Beast” and the unnamed narrator in “The Tiger’s Bride”) are brave and defiant adventure-seekers who resist coercion into undesirable relationships, Carter presents a more self-aware version of Beaumont’s heroine. While Beauty settles for a routine, socially approved courtship—eating elaborate dinners and exchanging thin, polite conversation with the beast—Carter’s narrator seeks a more adventurous and passionate relationship by pursuing more direct and physical forms of communication. She never speaks to The Beast, but the narrator nevertheless powerfully communicates her feelings nonverbally by dismissively turning her head away, aggressively glaring at him, and trustingly extending her open hand toward him. She recognizes that she “[does] not need to speak for The Beast to understand [her]” because the frank emotion in her gestures can communicate everything. Furthermore, while Beauty does not acknowledge her love for the Beast until his near-death, Carter’s narrator is closely aware of her feelings toward The Beast and actively pursues a relationship with him without needing the prompt of dire circumstances. Nor is she highly concerned with socially acceptable behavior—she decides for herself how she wishes to behave and then follows her inclinations without regret. For instance, she lets out an unladylike “raucous guffaw” at The Beast’s initial request, threatens to hang herself with her bed linen, and, most notably, presents herself naked to The Beast, despite not being betrothed or even in a formal relationship with him. Such behaviors would have been unacceptable and shunned by readers of Beaumont’s tale, but seem to be accepted and celebrated enough by modern readers that The Times ranked Carter as the tenth best British writer of the last 70 years.
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The stark contrasts found in the behavior of the protagonists and in the audience’s perceptions of socially accepted behavior reveal the evolution of relational expectations: that is, the pursuit and achievement of physical and emotional closeness is more important to modern audiences than propriety and primarily verbal courtship rituals. Through the protagonists’ different responses to their respective beasts, each woman constructs a personal hierarchy of animalistic and cultured traits which deliberately conforms to or opposes the socially valued traits of the respective historical era. Beauty’s constant complimenting of the Beast’s valuable qualifications . . . [of] virtue, sweetness of temper, and complaisance,” contrasted with her enduring “dread of the monster” he appears to be, implies that society at the publication of her story generally condoned civilized traits as desirable and eschewed animalistic or wild traits as undesirable. Even after constructing a clear moralistic example of the importance of not judging others based on appearance, Beaumont’s narrator nevertheless declares that the unknown prince, now appearing before Beauty transformed, is “worthy of all her attention” simply because he is the “loveliest prince that eye ever beheld”—his (the narrator is Beaumont himself) words suggesting that, in that era, the appearance of civility in some form was necessary to be perceived as desirable. The values held by society in “The Tiger’s Bride” are actually quite similar to those of “Beauty and the Beast” ; the townsfolk fear and disapprove of The Beast’s unorthodox life, as demonstrated by the hushed, superstitious stories of the horrors of beastliness that they tell each other. 21 In the earlier tale, despite Beauty’s growing love for the Beast and her increasing acceptance of his deformity, Beaumont’s protagonist conforms to her society’s blind endorsement of that which seems civilized and repeatedly denies the Beast her love because of his beastly appearance. 22 Beauty struggles with defying her culture’s bias against animalism because she is attempting to accept the Beast in spite of an aversion to his animalistic appearance. In contrast, the narrator of “The Tiger’s Bride” accepts The Beast, thus completely disavowing any social prejudices against wildness. She values The Beast’s animalistic physicality, feeling “so terrible [The Beast] must hide it” when in town, and she finds his restrained public civility to be “too perfect [and] uncanny . . . [like] a carnival figure.” 23 Hence, in defying her society’s values this narrator clearly demonstrates how acceptable romantic behavior has evolved from the performance of civil and proper courting etiquette to a celebration of more instinctive and authentic behavior that is based on an attraction generated by those same primitive traits which the performing of civil rituals seeks to disguise. In addition, the authors also reshape the nature of romantic desire over the past three centuries in their distinct depiction of the beasts’ appearance and conduct. Readers see a shift toward viewing personal desire and animalistic attraction as more important than virtue in a marriage. The Beast in “Beauty and the Beast” embodies clear divisions between animalism and civility: he is entirely animal in appearance and entirely gentlemanly in speech and behavior. Despite his appearance as an “ugly monster,” when the Beast eats with Beauty, he sits calmly and speaks learnedly and courteously with her, telling her that he “should be very uneasy if [she] were not happy.” 24 He is a contradiction between a perfectly virtuous personality and a socially unacceptable exterior. The tiger Beast, in contrast, represents a more tangled blend of wild and civilized characteristics in both his appearance and his comportment, and it is often difficult to separate where is a contradiction between a perfectly virtuous personality and a socially unacceptable exterior. The tiger Beast, in contrast, represents a more tangled blend of wild and civilized characteristics in both his appearance and his comportment, and it is often difficult to separate where the beastly traits end and the civilized traits begin. Although The Beast’s appearance in a tailcoat, silk sock, and tied-back hair fit the image of a high-society man, his “reek of purplish civet,” the fearful, half-believing stories the townsfolk tell about him, and the sense that he would “rather drop down on all fours . . . [than] remain upright” reveal his animalism. 25 Similarly, in terms of behavior, the tiger Beast juxtaposes human and animal characteristics, for he has a man’s “knack at cards” and he cries at the narrator’s rejections, but he also speaks with an incomprehensible “growling impediment” and he predatorily “pa[es] backward and forward” several times when upset with the narrator. 26 This Beast is neither perfectly virtuous and respectful in behavior nor accepted socially by the fearful townsfolk, but he is passionate and authentic, crying when she hurts him and honestly expressing his wishes. Thus, while the beast from “Beauty and the Beast” is portrayed as the epitome of a respected and restrained courtier—prohibited from marrying only by his frightening looks—the Beast from “The Tiger’s Bride” is a more imperfect suitor who wins the girl not because of his civilized behavior or appearance. This evolution of the Beast figure diminishes the importance of propriety and social approval in relationships, suggesting that virtue and respect are less important to a modern relationship than mutual openness and intimacy. And so, while the 18th century “Beauty and the Beast” centers on a polite Beauty learning to value the Beast’s proper courting etiquette over his distasteful animal appearance—thus acquiescing with the townsfolk’s opinion of propriety—“The Tiger’s Bride” portrays a modern bride who openly chooses romantic and physical attraction over propriety in relationships. That the narrator in “The Tiger’s Bride” is simultaneously more flawed and more accepting of The Beast’s flaws than her counterpart in “Beauty and the Beast” indicates an evolution, too, in what women are searching for in a relationship: rather than a man whom society deems perfect, she seeks a man whose flaws mesh well with her own. In her reworking of the classic tale, Carter suggests that modern society has moved away from valuing the social performance of love in support of more private, more physical, and more intimate expressions of that love.

Andanim stisem quiamen dignis venim nosaecta non cum mis es rem re labo. Nam quo temped minvector sapitem quaepto reprior temporpetio.
In Diderot’s and d’Alembert’s Encyclopédia, that tangible manifestation of the new age of Enlightenment, Edme-François Mallet writes that “[t]he authenticity of the Holy Books requires for Christians no other proofs beyond the judgment and decision of the Church, which... declared with an authority sufficient for the faithful and with well-justified motive, that these books had been inspired, had been written by the authors whose name they bear, and had not been either fraudulent with regard to their origins or interpolated or corrupted in the course of the centuries.” The Church, in other words, has not demanded of its followers a rational understanding of their environment. Rather, the Bible assumes a certain authority, legitimized in part by the very strangeness of the biblical text. There is so much mystery in the Bible that man will never understand; all he can do is have faith. For Mallet and other men who fashioned themselves as new and “enlightened,” this reliance on faith proved wholly deficient:

But that assertion is inadequate for unbelievers, and it is necessary to demonstrate by the standard rules of criticism that the Books that we call divine have not been either forged or modified, and that they are not the simple work of men...The greatest difficulty is that these books, cited at the slightest provocation, as is obvious, by the Christians and Jews as proof of received dogma...have never been known or preserved except among them and that they have too much of an interest not to sanctify them in order to justify either dogma which appalls reason, or a morality contrary to humanity?

Here we can discern a radical departure from previous modes of intellectualism. Mankind, Mallet implies, cannot possibly accept the biblical scripture as true as long as its spiritual authority is merely assumed. Rather, it must be proven in a logical and non-mystical manner that the scriptures are legitimate sources of instruction, and that the common man bears the responsibility of reasoning into this conclusion. The Enlightenment dictates that Man cannot acquiesce to an authority that lacks the consent of the people. The Encyclopedia thus marks a noble milestone in the history of mankind’s autonomy in its attempt to understand the world through reason. Yet, in Mallet’s entry lurk the strange, paranoid undertones of conspiracy theory. After all, as Mallet points out, the scriptures have always been under the control of those who declare their own divinity. No secular authority has ever declared the biblical text legitimate. How then can we be sure that the Bible is not the tool of a small group of religious elites who want to control mankind by suppressing its rationality? Such paranoia, it would seem, should not follow the Enlightenment, yet a certain tradition of French revolutionary scholarship has dedicated many pages to explaining the obsession.
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with plot in revolutionary rhetoric. This essay will explore the relationship between the Enlightenment and paranoia by focusing on two rhetoricians, Jean Paul Marat—a trained scientist who embodied the ideals of the new Enlightenment and became a martyr for the revolutionary cause—and the abbé Augustin Barruel, a counter-revolutionary proponent of the Jacobin/philosophe conspiracy theory of the Revolution. Both of these men left a body of work that is at once enlightened and paranoiac, texts that, in addition to describing the worldly and spiritual ideals of their authors, require Marat and Barruel to obscure over their political opposition.

To begin, I’ll show how Marat characterizes his opposition by examining his reaction to the night of August 4, 1789, when many of the Assembly’s nobles and clergymen renounced certain privileges that had defined the social order of the Old Regime. Writing in his Ami du Peuple, Marat first concedes that many privileges of the Ancien Régime had indeed been relinquished—in fact, he enumerates fourteen major privileges—but follows the concession with a caveat:

Let us indeed beware of outraging virtue; but let us not be dupes of any one. If beneficence dictated these sacrifices, it must be admitted that it has waited rather late to raise its voice. What! at the reflection of the flames of their burnt chateaux they have the magnanimity to renounce the privileges that had defined the social order of their burnt chateaux they have the magnanimity to renounce the privileges that had defined the social order at their side, only wishing to use the people’s naïveté to further their own goals. Second, Marat relishes in oversimplification. Notice how he groups an entire political body with the pronouns “they” and “them,” as if every member of the Assembly plotted against the people—“ourselves” and “us”—and at once establishes the binary opposition of us vs. them, a primitive understanding of the world as “us good,” “them bad.” Third, Marat refuses to acknowledge his opponents’ intellectual motivations. In three successive exclamatory phrases Marat attributes the men’s “virtue” to beholding “the reflection of the flames of their burnt chateaux,” “the sight of the tortures of plunders,” and “[h]earing the names of the proscribed and seeing the fate that awaits them”: in short, the assemblymen relinquish privilege because they are scared. Marat takes no pains to entertain the possibility that the men, inspired by the new ideas of universal manhood that the Assembly would enumerate shortly after August 4th in the Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen, wished to fashion a world logically consistent with the fashionable Enlightenment. In fact, Marat locates liberty as an ideal exclusive to the people; the evil assemblymen merely suppress it with “chains.”

Operating under such rigid division between friend and foe, it is difficult to discern exactly whom Marat considers the opposition is as he responds to political events with the same simplicity as shown above. For instance, in response to Louis XVI’s attempted flight to Austria with his family in the hope of seeking political sanctuary—the so-called Flight to Varennes—Marat places blame on “the traitors of the National Assembly and above all on the Committees of Investigation and of Reports” which “prepared from afar” the flight of the royal family.

The moment has arrived to make fall the heads of the ministers and their subalterns, of Motté, of all the scoundrels at headquarters and all the anti-patriotic battlefield commanders, of Bailly, of all the count-er-revolutionary municipal officers, of all traitors in the National Assembly. Begin by assuring yourselves of their persons, if there’s still time, and friends: Schemers have doubtless imposed upon you… I was denounced from your tribune for having called for a chief.” Marat had previously been on record calling for a centralized leader to organize the will of the people, and he refused to blame his political allies even in this moment of betrayal. Rather, it is outside...
forces, “schemers,” that have convinced his political allies to turn on Marat. Marat seems to realize that alone, he is nothing. Rather than stubbornly denounce the Jacobins as traitors and enemies of the people, Marat refers to them as family because he knows that their broad political vision is the same as his, and he realizes that power is greater when individuals group together. We can see in Marat’s political speech, then, a reluctance to realign, differentiate, and distinguish. I propose that this is the product of the thinker’s refusal to abandon the ideals of the Enlightenment. If a man supports the new public sphere, he is a friend or brother; if not, he is a traitor undermining the will of the people.

The main point here is to show how “unenlightened”—that is, how unscientific, unreasonable, illogical, uncritical, shallow—Marat’s political speech reads. The question is, does Marat realize how unrefined his analysis is? One could give him the benefit of the doubt and argue that Marat in fact deliberately ignores reality when he characterizes everyone in the Assembly as manipulative hypocrites merely saving face on that transformative August night, or when he groups together every non-noble as “the people,” as though the entirety of the French bourgeoisie populace could possibly share a singular political vision. Assuming Marat’s framework is deliberate, he himself becomes the great manipulator, the astute rhetorician who understands how to reach an audience still untrained in participating in the art of politics that the nascent bourgeois public sphere had foisted upon them. Marat would thus stand as a transcendent figure of revolutionary France who understands what truly enlightened, scientific inquiry looks like, but he nonetheless chooses to convey his analysis in pre-Enlightenment terms.7 He makes a simple argument for clarity’s sake, yet knows he is unfair in his characterization. If one accepts this interpretation, Jean Paul Marat, the scientist becomes Marat, the rhetorician.8

Alternatively, we could take Marat at his word. Perhaps the pamphleteer’s simple framework is sincere and he truly believes in the power of the non-nobility to band together as a coherent political force, united against the evil of the throne-sympathizing nobility. This interpretation requires us to think of Marat as a noble ignoramus, a man so earnest that he becomes blinded by the unrealistic framework of his political worldview. The ignoramus then becomes part of “the people” he has manipulated as it becomes obvious that he too has not had enough practice with political analysis to make an enlightened argument. Thus, Marat is either master of the Enlightenment or slave to it.

Yet the question remains: Is the language of paranoia merely a rhetorical tool to further political ends, or is it a necessary consequence of the nascent age of Enlightenment? At stake in how we understand the role of paranoia is whether we view the revolution as the product of the High Enlightenment or of the material realities facing the people. The Marxist interpreter views Marat in the most sympathetic light possible, by, counterintuitively, refusing to give him the benefit of the doubt. After all, the social interpretation demands that Marat appear noble, ignorant, and/or unable to control the thorough method enlightened reason demands because otherwise Marat loses his position as the great martyr; he would become the people’s manipulator. The Marxist must believe that Marat legitimately feared that the political class threatened the material wellbeing of the people. Thus E. Belfort Bax can defend Marat’s claim to the title of “The People’s Friend,” which characterizes him as a noble precursor to the imminent bourgeois revolution: “The ideals of Marat’s life, Justice and Social Equality…will assuredly realize themselves sooner or later under the forms of that true economic freedom through collective ownership in the material bases of social life.”9 Marat’s focus on the material certainly invites the Marxist idealization of him. The socialist interpretation forces paranoia to exist as a consequence of the Enlightenment: Marat has absorbed the ideals of the Enlightenment (“justice,” “social equality,” “liberty”), and nowhere that he does not find those ideals—in other words, anywhere he finds the people’s physical wellbeing diminished or threatened—he must define an enemy because an enlightened worldview demands a rational explanation.10 Though the Marxist interpreters want to view Marat as the noble martyr, they must

---

7 A valid place to look for a pre-Enlightenment worldview is the Bible, which establishes the binary of good vs. evil.

8 Thus, Marat characterizes them in an oversimplified manner. As quoted in Louis R. Gottschalk, 10 Jean-Paul Marat: A Study in Radicalism (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1966)

9 A diary entry from March 19, 1793 supports a reading of a sincere Marat: “Having had greater confidence in the mock patriots of the Constituent Assembly than they deserved, I was surprised at their pettiness, their lack of virtue. Believing that I was far from God and reared in hatred, I cast about to find famous deputees, notable with Cluvalier, Mirabeau, and Barrave. Their stubborn silence on all my letters I provoked to me that though they needed light, they cared little to be enlightened. I adopted the course of publishing my ideas by means of the press. I founded the Ami du Peuple. I began it with a severe but honest tone, that of a man who wishes to tell the truth without breaking the conventions of society. I maintained that tone for two whole months. Disappointed in finding that it did not produce the entire effect that I had expected, and indignant that the boldness of the unfaithful representatives of the people and of the lying public officials was steadily increasing, I felt that it was necessary to renounce moderation and to substitute satire and irony for simple censure. The bitterness of the satire increased with the number of mismanagements, the iniquity of their projects and the public misfortunes. Strongly convinced of the absolute perversity of the supporters of the old regime and the enemies of liberty, I felt that nothing could be obtained from them except by force. I evoked by their attempts, by their ever recurrent plots, I realized that no end would be put to these except by exterminating the ones guilty of them. Outraged at seeing the representatives of the nation in league with its deadliest enemies and the laws serving only to tyrannize over the innocent who are protected, I revealed to the sovereign people that since they had nothing to expect from their representatives, it behooved them to mete out justice for themselves.” Here, Marat is cynical of the opposition and indignant that the absurdity of the public officials is either master of the Enlightenment or slave to it.

10 E. Belfort Bax, The People’s Friend, Conclusion

11 Opposed to a mystical or divine explanation, such as suggested by these Middle English verses from a poem responding to the Great Famine (1315-17) that hit France as well most of Europe: “For tho God seih [saw] that the world was so over gart [proud] / He sent a dethre [famine] on eorthe, and made hit ful smarte [painful].” James M. Deen, editor, Symonye and Courtesie, or On the Evill Tymes of Eduard II, ca. 1321, (Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute Publications), lines 391-2.
admit he has an “enlightened” persuasion. If Marat’s age did not think itself enlightened, Marat’s writing would not necessarily appear so paranoid—he would not be required to assign blame on his political enemies. Yet Marat, in his pursuit of an enlightened explanation of material reality, fails to provide a truly enlightened analysis. Good versus bad doesn’t suffice; in fact, it is almost idealistic.

Alternatively, the High Enlightenment interpretation of the revolution allows for the possibility that the major players of the revolution could harness the ideals and language of the Enlightenment. Marat can consequently use paranoia as a rhetorical strategy to further his political goals, as François Furet might claim. Furet locates Rousseau as the intellectual godfather of the Revolution. The revolutionaries borrowed Rousseau’s concept of the “general will”—the common interest and will of the sovereign whole—which helps explain how Marat is able to characterize any opposition to his political goals as evil; what else can a man be who challenges the will of the people?12 Lynn Hunt makes a similar argument when, in comparing the French revolutionaries to their Anglo-American counterparts, she stresses novelty and, in particular, the absence of authoritative or constitutional texts among the French revolutionaries: “The difference in France was the emphasis on rejecting all models from the national past. Imagine the difficulties of teaching history in republican schools.”13 The challenge for the revolutionaries was to understand their world as divorced from the realm of the Ancien Régime and wedded to the rules and terms of Enlightenment. Indeed Marat, in his constant state of paranoia, seemed intent on creating a teaching model for revolutionary rhetoricians that featured a complete recasting of political speech. The first lesson: define your enemies. The second: claim to speak for the people. One can see how the second lesson appropriates the language and ideals of the Enlightenment, and how the first forces Marat to simplify his message. An intellectual interpretation of the Revolution offers us the possibility of viewing Marat as a conscious manipulator of the people; and thinking of paranoia as a strategic weapon suggests an interpretation of the Revolution in which the individual had more control over his environment than in a Marxist interpretation, which sees material and social forces as compelling the players.

Yet such an interpretation does not always leave us with a cast of actors masterfully fanning out the stage according to their improvisational skills. Rather, it can leave us with an amateur troupe robotically reciting the lines of their overbearing playwright or director, called Plot (conspiracy).14 Defining revolution-ary periods in terms of conspiracy gives the impression that men like Marat would today be diagnosed as paranoid schizophrenics. As Rebecca Spang explains, “the revolution is shadowed by irrational impulses . . . Even the most careful historians often allow the vocabulary of mental illness or animality to evoke the mood of France in this period.”15 Such diagnostic (some would say clumsy) explanations relinquish the power of historians and place it into the hands of psychologists: Marat becomes a figure one wishes to shove into an MRI scanner rather than a man one might place it into the hands of psychologists: Marat becomes a figure one wishes to shove into an MRI scanner rather than a man one might place in a history textbook or in a collection of radical political writings. Spang illustrates how the predominant paradigms in French Revolutionary scholarship “leave […] us lurching from rational choice…to irrational fears.”16 The dilemma here is that two of the major interpretive traditions have brought us back to a Biblical dichotomy that Marat uses in his political writings. But rather than good versus evil, the polar positions are occupied by paranoia and ignorance (which, as mentioned, are different sides of the same coin in that they both rob the historical subject of his agency). Spang proposes the development of a new paradigm, a hybrid of sorts, that would combine the intellectual17 and Marxist historiographies of revolutionary France.18 Put another way, can one read the writings of an elite revolutionary political figure in a manner that honors his agency while at the same time acknowledges the social forces that shape his texts?

To do so requires me to kill the question I posed above, “Does Marat realize how unrefined his work is?” This question lends itself to a hardline answer—yes or no—that leads us down the rabbit hole of close-minded historiography. Rather, the question I should ask is, “Why would Marat make such an unrefined argument?” This question presupposes the author’s agency, yet forces the historian to unearth those social forces that put his argument into context. Such forces are beyond the scope of this paper, but one can see how reframing the question honors Timothy Tackett’s point in “Conspiracy Obsession in a Time of Revolution,” namely that it is implausible that such a great number of individuals suffering from a paranoid worldview because certain events—such as Louis XVI’s Flight to Varennes—can serve as legitimate stimuli for a “paranoid” style.19 Can Marat really be paranoid about the

14 An intellectual interpretation of the revolution defines political actors as “paranoid” because they for the first time in history have entered into the realm of democratic politics, which forces men to define their enemies according to their ideas of how the world should be. Thus, they become paranoid of the opposition, whom they characterize as having opposing ideals to their own political vision. So, scholars have described French revolutionaries as “paranoid,” in that they act on their own ideas of political threat, suggesting that their perception of the “enemy” is wholly unrealistic. Plot here is a synonym for conspiracy. (See “Famine Plot Persuasion” by Steve Kaplan for a glimpse into this tradition.)
16 Ibid, 136.
17 An “intellectual interpretation” is, in historian’s terms, used to describe traditions of interpretation that focus exclusively on rhetoric, intellectualism, ideas, etc. to describe the revolution. It is understood in opposition to a marxist/materialist interpretation in that it does not actively seek out materialist reasons for human action.
18 Ibid.
king and his minions when Louis XVI actually attempted to abandon the people? Is Marat’s reaction not justified in light of the evidence? The new framework forces the historian to think about both the ideals and language of the Enlightenment along with the social forces acting on Marat.20

With this new framework in mind, I now turn to the work of a man outside the crucible that was Paris in the 1790s in an attempt to phrase a similarly sound historical question whose answer integrates the Marxist and intellectual realm. I will also seek come to a satisfying conclusion concerning exactly how the rhetoric of paranoia relates to the Enlightenment. The Jesuit priest abbé Augustin Barruel would have proudly announced himself as a card-carrying member of the pre-Enlightenment crowd, an anti-philosophe clergyman whom Marat would denounce as a lover of the crown and enemy of the people. Writing from a safe vantage point in England where he sought refuge in 1792, Barruel earned his place in history with the publication of Memoirs Illustrating the History of Jacobinism, in which he argued that the Revolution was the product of a plot by the Jacobins and philosophes to topple the monarchy and transform French society according to its own enlightened image. Like Marat, Barruel’s project requires him to define his enemy in simplistic terms. This might happen partly because of the distance Barruel assumes from his opposition: writing in London, he would not have come in contact with a great number of Jacobins. Additionally, the sheer number of Jacobin revolutionaries renders a nuanced interpretation of their various political positions impossible—not all Jacobins had an identical view of what the enlightened French society of the future should look like. Though Barruel worries that the new republican leaders will threaten the wellbeing of the average Frenchman, he does not align himself with the people as Marat did. Instead, Barruel’s argument features another hallmark of the Enlightenment: scientific analysis. I will focus on the third volume of Barruel’s analysis, The Antisocial Conspiracy, in which the abbé develops the historical precedent and model for Jacobin Illuminism.

Certainly, albeit surprisingly, Barruel approaches Memoires from the vantage point of the skeptic; doubt, in a sense, is the enemy Barruel seeks to defeat in Memoires. In the “Preliminary Observations,” the author establishes the methods by which he will assume his work. Hard evidence is requisite. Early on, Barruel mentions two volumes of work that “contain irrefragable proofs of the most detestable conspiracy. They disclose the principles, the object, and the means of the Sect; the essential parts of their code, the diligent correspondence of the adepts, particularly that of their chief, and a statement of their progress and future hopes.”21 Barruel assumes that faced with the very text of Jacobin correspondence and thought his readers cannot but acknowledge that a conspiracy in fact exists. Barruel also rightly assumes that the more evidence he provides, the more convincing his argument becomes. The authenticity of the text is paramount. Barruel finds it a “remarkable advertisement” that the editor of one of his sources, Original Writings—compiled based on documents procured after a search at the castle of Sandersdorf, “a famous haunt of the Illuminées”—wrote in the frontispiece that “[t]hose who may harbor any doubt as to the authenticity of this collection, have only to apply to the office where the secret archives are kept at Munich, and where orders are left to show the originals.”22 Barruel instructs readers to “recollect this advertisement whenever they shall see the Original Writings cited” as a way to remind his audience that this is not all in their heads. By presenting the option for a reader to go on his own to Munich and read for himself the texts which Barruel quotes suggests the extent to which the abbé borrows from the new terms of the Enlightenment: only by seeing for oneself can one eliminate all doubt of the truth of an idea. Absent a medium to make exact replicas of certain Jacobin documents, Barruel must hope that readers will accept that his presentation of the evidence is not obscured. Clarity must arise from obscurity: “The baleful projects of the Sect and the laws for their execution are so strangely combined, that I thought it necessary to begin by making my reader perfectly acquainted with its code; that is to say, with the regular progression of its degrees, mysteries, and government.”23 The religious appreciation of the mysterious is absent in the abbé’s abstract, and though Memoires was propelled by the author’s emotional response to his environment, he does not appeal to his readers through affect. He demands that their rationality grapple with his evidence, and thus his task is to define, categorize, catalogue, and clarify. He fashions an Encyclopedia on Jacobinism, if you will.

Later in The Antisocial Conspiracy, Barruel criticizes another theorist of the Jacobin plot, a certain Mr. Robison. The grounds for his criticism prove instructive. Robison, Barruel alleges, uses the “easiest…most hazardous method” of argumentation: “He combines together in one paragraph what his memory may have compiled from many…In some passages he has even adopted as truth certain assertions which the correspondence of the Illuminées evidently demonstrate to have been invented by them against their adversaries…[and he falsely claims] that Illuminism drew its origins from Masonry,” despite the contrary reality that has already been established “beyond all doubt.”24 Robison, in short, fails to meet the minimum standards of reasonable analysis. This critique reads as a purely strategic move to provide the abbé more credibility, and the manipulative tone of the Robison critique underscores the extent to which Barruel appreciated the persuasive power of enlightened reasoning. Despite his conscious effort to present a valid and enlightened argument, throughout Memoires one can’t help but hear echoes of Marat’s good guy, bad guy formulation in Barruel’s

21 Here, I acknowledge that Spang proposes that historians will “have to re-pose” historical questions that will “find[…] ways of acknowledging both the discursivity of physical things and the physicality of discourse.” “Paradigms and Paranoia,” 147.
23 Ibid, vii
24 Ibid, vi
25 Ibid, x-xi
descriptions of the opposition. The abbé is very heavy-handed, in fact, in imposing his strict moral code on his analysis. For example, he opens his discussion of Spartacus-Wieshaupt, the “Founder of the Illuminees,” with: “There sometimes appear men formed with such unhappy dispositions, that we are led to consider them in no other view than as emancipations from the evil genius, bereft by the avenging God of the power of doing good.”25 Surely, Barruel sees the world in pre-Enlightenment terms; nonetheless, he does not proceed in a shallow manner. Indeed the fascination of Barruel’s work is the very craft required to birth such a creative (some would say delusional) argument that seems to convince, particularly when drawn out over a thousand pages. The irony of this masterwork is that Barruel, in his attempt to eliminate his audience’s doubt that there was a Jacobin conspiracy, assumes the position of the skeptic to prove his point—a role that only exists thanks to the pervasiveness of Enlightenment thought, the great enemy of his beloved throne and altar.

While Marat uses the ideals and language of the Enlightenment, Barruel uses its method, its form. Rather than ask if this self-styled opponent of the Enlightenment realizes how enlightened his argument actually is, I propose that we examine why Barruel appropriates the form of enlightened reasoning in his anti-Enlightenment conspiracy. This question forces the historian to look at Barruel’s environment—the people with whom he surrounded himself, the economic realities of his home and community, the effects of the Church and state on his worldview—after, of course, he examines the intellectual currents of Barruel’s language and style. Doing so would be going beyond the original purpose of this paper, but we can extrapolate a couple of important insights that this sound historical proposition suggests. For one, Barruel becomes more than an antiquated charlatan and relic of history. Scholars should not discount his version of the Revolution because it buckles under historical scrutiny, for what Barruel does more than anything is to create a theory that influenced the right-wing interpretation of the French Revolution and the broader political sphere in the years to come.26 As Amos Hofman explains it: [T]he concept of conspiracy itself, which Barruel’s work helped to define, became part of the vocabulary of modern politics.27...the idea of philosophique conspiracy, which Barruel made famous, created a representation of modern politics as a conflict between two irreconcilable positions. This, indeed, was to become an extremely influential view. The vision of politics as a clash between opposing opinions that cannot reach any compromise is the basis of the division between the Left and the Right in the modern era. The theory of conspiracy, precisely because of its simplicity, suggested a view of political change, which still influences modern society.27

To claim that Barruel suffered from paranoia or to say that he was ignorant of how enlightened his argument was, is to force the historian to discredit Barruel’s legacy. Only if we assume that the man had control over his work and intended for it to appear as it appears can we argue that he wanted to create a certain historiographical legacy. (Of course, we can argue that he created that legacy despite his intentions, but, again, the point here is to look at rhetoric as the product of a free agent, not a puppet.) In fact, one could then argue that Barruel consciously appropriated the form of Enlightenment reasoning because he knew that a pre-enlightened argument would never convince a post-Enlightenment intelligentsia. Despite its simple-mindedness, Barruel’s theory became widely popular in part because of how convincing it sounds. The other insight worth mentioning is that Barruel’s work helped establish the very idea of the “Enlightenment” that he so viciously attacked. In fact, as Darrin McMahon argues, the pre-Enlightenment crowd—as he puts it, the “enemies of the Enlightenment”—of the decades leading up to 1789 manufactured what we today call the Enlightenment: this crowd “shared a language, a set of common beliefs, and a vision...a nascent view of the world that involved a loose, though identifiable, set of mutual assumptions, a group of postulates, and a rhetorical style—what I term an ‘anti-philosophe discourse.’”28 So, although Barruel’s magnum opus is reactionary, it in a way precedes Marat’s revolutionary rhetoric, drawing on the recent tradition of “anti-philosophe discourse.”29 Because he popularized anti-philosophe discourse, Barruel deserves more credit as the first major theorizer of Hofman’s “vocabulary of modern politics.”

Yet the fact that conspiracy existed under the Ancien Régime challenges the notion that the Enlightenment created the paranoid rhetoric of the revolution. Even before the bourgeois public sphere existed, people exhibited paranoid tendencies. So, while the Frenchman had politics foisted upon him post-1789, the paranoid style was not a necessary consequence of that imposition and should not be used to distinguish revolutionary rhetoricians from other political rhetoricians. Rather, paranoia proved a useful tool for Marat. Perhaps more precisely, the Enlightenment followed paranoia: had the anti-philosophes not defined “the Enlightenment,” perhaps historians would not have the concept to work with in the first place. Furthermore, Barruel’s legitimization encouraged the development of a modern politics defined by pre-Enlightenment dichotomy. In this sense—considering the unscientific, unreasonable, illogical, uncritical, shallow and, in short, unenlightened nature of contemporary politi-
cal discourse—the anti-philosophe crowd can claim victory. Listening to the stunning lack of sophistication of today’s political discourse, it seems that Kant was seriously mistaken when he claimed that man is in a constant state of Enlightenment. Can we truly say, based on our political rhetoric, that we are more enlightened than the French revolutionaries?

It would seem, then, that out of fear, the basest of human emotions, a noble conception of human capacity was born. Thanks to the anti-philosophes, mankind became conscious of the fact that he now possessed the opportunity to understand his world according to his own faculty. The first men to fancy themselves enlightened cherished this fact, and the scholarship of the Revolution should honor the spirit of the early enlightened man by assuming he intended his rhetoric to appear as it today appears. In fact, so seductive was this new Enlightenment that its ideals and language permeate the simplistic rhetoric of revolutionaries like Jean Paul Marat, while its form defines base theories of conspiracy such as that of the abbé Augustin Barruel. By framing our inquiries in a way that insists on the agency of historical figures—and consequently honoring the spirit of the new enlightened age—we provide a new way to understand the role of the revolutionary political writer. He becomes more than a man suffering from paranoia or hopelessly subject to the influence of intellectual forces. A better framework honors both the historical writer’s design and the historian’s project of putting that design into context. To straddle the extreme Marxist and extreme intellectual interpretation of revolutionary France is to render a better version of history that casts a revolutionary hero and a counter-revolutionary theorist as competent visionaries, grappling with the intellectual and social currents of their time.
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Nearly one month after the astonishing resignation of Richard Nixon, President Gerald Ford issued a full and absolute pardon to the former president for his involvement in the Watergate scandal. Shifting the public’s attention from the Watergate cover-up to a new controversy, this presidential pardon would come to define, and undermine, the Ford presidency. The first news cycle framed the event with pity; The New York Times called the pardon an “act of mercy” and framed Nixon’s story as “an American tragedy” (Herbers). Despite the initial compassion, the Times proceeded to run five editorials in the next three days that criticized President Ford’s decision (Rozell 53). Echoing these editorials, both domestic and foreign newspapers widely criticized the pardon, commenting on its suspicious nature (Rozell 57-58; Gray). The media’s criticism captured the American people’s turbulent reaction to President Ford’s announcement of his pardon. Due to poor timing and the unexpectedness of the announcement, President Ford’s pardon of former President Nixon was an extremely controversial decision. Despite the fervent reaction to the pardon, the law demonstrates there was nothing illegal about President Ford’s decision. Although it was legal, a number of environmental factors suggest President Ford might have been subjected to undue influence during his decision-making process. Therefore, while President Ford’s choice to pardon Nixon was legally acceptable, several institutional factors suggest he arrived at this decision for the wrong reasons.

Before Gerald Ford became the 38th President of the United States, he was a member of the House of Representatives for 25 years (Greenstein 113). Beginning his political career in 1948, Congressman Ford’s likeability helped him to ascend through the House ranks and eventually became House Minority leader in the 1960s (Brinkle 31). After the resignation of Vice President Spiro Agnew in 1973, President Nixon nominated Congressman Ford to become his Vice President—a position Ford neither intended nor desired to hold (Becker; Greenstein 115). At the time of his nomination he had been planning on retiring after his successful tenure in the House (Greenstein 115). Despite these expectations, he was sworn in as Vice President just days after the resignation of Spiro Agnew. However, his tenure as vice president was so brief that the Ford family was never even afforded the chance to move into the Vice President’s residence due to the fallout from the Watergate scandal (Kunhardt Jr.).

On June 17, 1972, a security guard for the Democratic National Committee’s offices at the Watergate Hotel complex in Washington, discovered a break-in and arrested President Nixon’s “Plumbers”—a covert group of staff assigned to stop the Pentagon paper leaks (Kutler 31). Due to aggressive investigation by two Washington Post reporters who covered the initial story, the break-in was eventually traced to high levels of the White House, and a Senate Committee was formed to further investigate the matter. The investigation stalled after President Nixon refused to turn over audiotapes that recorded every conversation that occurred in the Oval Office (Kutler 7). After Supreme Court intervention in United States v. Nixon, Nixon was required to turn over his tapes because the Court held they were not protected by the President’s right of executive privilege. These tapes included damning audio evidence that illustrated how Nixon had ordered his officials to use the CIA against the FBI in order to
impede its investigation into Watergate matters (Kutler 199; Scott). The public release of these incriminating tapes destroyed all of Nixon’s Congressional support and it inevitably became clear that the House was going to hold impeachment trials against him. As a result, on August 9, 1974, Richard Nixon became the first person to resign from the Office of the Presidency of the United States. Just as Gerald Ford became the first Vice President to assume the office under the 25th Amendment, he became the first President who was not elected by the American people. As Professor of Political Science Fred Greenstein has succinctly summarized, Gerald Ford “had never represented a broader constituency than Michigan’s Fifth Congressional District” (Greenstein 113). By assuming the presidency in this novel manner, President Ford was not afforded the traditional transition time generally used to compile an administration. As a result of his quick transition time and lack of forewarning, President Ford assumed the office “as innocent as if he had committed” (Jeffrey 310). The announcement sparked immediate public disapproval, with the Times describing it as a “body blow to the President’s own credibility” and the Washington Post characterizing it as “nothing less than a continuation of a cover-up” (Cannon, Honorable Life 249). Mirroring the media’s reaction, a Gallup poll further reported a sixteen point drop in President Ford’s public approval rating following his announcement (Rozell 122). Though President Ford believed his decision would move the country past Watergate and the infamous Nixon legacy, the choice to issue a presidential pardon backfired and, as a result, caused the American people to distrust the federal government.

Despite the contentious political and ethical frames surrounding the pardon, the most pressing question posed was whether the pardon was legal. Though the pardon has historically been used in a diverse range of circumstances, never had a former President of the United States been on its receiving end. The executive pardon power comes from Article II, Section 2 of the United States Constitution: “He shall have Power to grant Reprieves and Pardons for Offenses against the United States, except in Cases of Impeachment” (U.S. Constitution, Article II). The impeachment clause refers to Article II, Section 2, Clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution that states the President of the United States shall have the power to grant pardons “except in Cases of Impeachment” (U.S. Constitution, Article II).

As Professor of Political Science Fred Greenstein has succinctly summarized, Gerald Ford “had never represented a broader constituency than Michigan’s Fifth Congressional District” (Greenstein 113). By assuming the presidency in this novel manner, President Ford was not afforded the traditional transition time generally used to compile an administration. As a result of his quick transition time and lack of forewarning, President Ford assumed the office “as innocent as if he had committed” (Jeffrey 310). The announcement sparked immediate public disapproval, with the Times describing it as a “body blow to the President’s own credibility” and the Washington Post characterizing it as “nothing less than a continuation of a cover-up” (Cannon, Honorable Life 249). Mirroring the media’s reaction, a Gallup poll further reported a sixteen point drop in President Ford’s public approval rating following his announcement (Rozell 122). Though President Ford believed his decision would move the country past Watergate and the infamous Nixon legacy, the choice to issue a presidential pardon backfired and, as a result, caused the American people to distrust the federal government.

Despite the contentious political and ethical frames surrounding the pardon, the most pressing question posed was whether the pardon was legal. Though the pardon has historically been used in a diverse range of circumstances, never had a former President of the United States been on its receiving end. The executive pardon power comes from Article II, Section 2 of the United States Constitution: “He shall have Power to grant Reprieves and Pardons for Offenses against the United States, except in Cases of Impeachment” (U.S. Constitution, Article II). The impeachment clause refers to Article II, Section 2, Clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution that states the President of the United States shall have the power to grant pardons “except in Cases of Impeachment” (U.S. Constitution, Article II).
never committed the offence" (Ex parte Garland [1866]). However, now presidential pardons carry "an imputation of guilt" and accepting a pardon is "an admission of guilt" (United States v. Burdick, [1915]). Interestingly, in response to the public’s vehement reaction, President Ford carried this exact quote in his wallet as a testament to former President Nixon’s guilt—an act he felt necessary because President Nixon did not expressly admit wrongdoing in his acceptance of the pardon (Shane; Becker). Applying the law to former President Nixon’s acceptance statement, though his acceptance is seen as an indirect confession of guilt, he was still immune from all charges, investigations, and sanctions that would arise from his involvement in the Watergate scandal. Most Supreme Court decisions have focused on the process of the presidential pardon rather than the limits of its uses; as a result, constitutional scholars characterize the president’s pardon power as “quite broad, almost plenary” (PfiFFner). In short, a presidential pardon must follow certain steps in order to be valid, but if these criteria are met, it can seemingly be applied in any instance that is not explicitly barred by the Constitution. According to this logic, President Ford was acting within the legal boundaries of the Constitution by pardoning the former President.

The legal objections to President Ford’s pardon followed different lines of reasoning to advance why the pardon was illegal, invalid, or otherwise unconstitutional. Two of the most salient objections concern the claim that former President Nixon had broken federal law. The pardon was issued and accepted while the Watergate Commission was still in the discovery phase and consequently all allegations were still under investigation. Though legally a presidential pardon ceases all ongoing investigation into the pardoned matter, these scholars argue President Ford’s pardon could not have been valid since the charges against former President Nixon were still unresolved (Crouch 130). These arguments invoke historical analysis of the Constitutional Convention to support their claims, with specific reference to Luther Martin’s motion to add “after conviction” to the impeachment clause of the pardon power (Firmage 1099). This line of reasoning overlooks the fact that Luther Martin’s motion was withdrawn after another delegate argued a pardon might be necessary before conviction if testimony of the accused’s accomplices was needed (“Madison Debates: August 27”). Proponents of this argument attempt to extrapolate from this insignificant motion a broad theory of the Framers’ intentions to claim that the pardon power was to be used before conviction only in a narrow set of circumstances (Firmage 1099). Beyond the fallacious reasoning this claim is founded upon, this view further overlooks an explicit Supreme Court decision that invalidates its claims (Rozell 127). Specifically in Ex parte Grossman, the Court claimed that “The Executive can reprieve or pardon all offenses after their commission, either before trial, during trial, or after trial” (Ex parte Grossman). The Court in Ex parte Grossman examined the evolution of Article II in the Convention using the same research method—a historical analysis of James Madison’s notes—that scholars against the Ford pardon employed (Ex parte Grossman). Ultimately, the Supreme Court held that the only time requirement for a pardon is that it must be issued after the relevant acts have been committed. This explicitly dismisses opponents of the Ford pardon who argue the pardon was improper because of its timing, since case law demonstrates a pardon does not discriminate based on the stage of the legal proceedings. Beyond a timing issue, other scholars argue the impeachment clause of Article II bars acts that are impeachable offenses (Rozell 124). These scholars misinterpret the Framers’ intentions that “in cases of impeachment” refers to acts “that were impeachable” (Rozell 124). This reasoning could not apply to President Nixon because, at the time of President Ford’s pardon, it was not exactly clear what acts President Nixon had committed since the federal investigation was ongoing. Therefore, in order for this reasoning to be valid, President Nixon would have to have been seen as guilty until proven innocent (Rozell 128).

Both sets of critics further complain about the broad, unchecked power of the presidential pardon. Limited legal analysis poses the dilemma that there is no checking or balancing of power for the president’s ability to issue pardons. Though these scholars are correct in the sense that the acceptance of a pardon cannot be reversed, they overlook the simple check in place for presidential pardons. Congress is endowed with the formal power to impeach the pardoning president for “other high crimes and misdemeanors” (Boudin 7; U.S. Constitution, Article II, Section 4). This clause checks a president’s pardon power, and it seems reasonable to conclude that if members of Congress felt President Ford had egregiously abused the pardon power, they could have begun impeachment proceedings against him. Despite this, no motions were ever made in Congress to impeach President Ford for his pardon.

Even if granting the pardon were unconstitutional for the sake of argument, former President Nixon likely would have been acquitted of his involvement in the Watergate scandal by the Sixth Amendment’s guarantee of a citizen’s “right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury” (“Bill of Rights”). Due to the high profile of the Watergate scandal, Nixon received extensive media coverage before federal charges were filed and investigation had begun. The sensationalistic attitude of the media coupled with the voluminous coverage of the Watergate hearings exacerbated the magnitude of the issue in the eyes of the public. Studies conducted during the time show the coverage likely created “intense public emotion to the prejudice of Mr. Nixon” (Kutner 245). Even the prosecutors of the Watergate Commission expressed concerns related to the Sixth Amendment during the course of their investigation. In a memo from Watergate Commission attorneys to Special Prosecutor Leon Jaworski, the prosecutors highlighted procedural concerns, noting there might be “considerable difficulty in achieving a fair trial because of massive pre-trial publicity” (United States of America—Department of Justice). Even if President Ford had not pardoned Nixon, it seems plausible that the influence of pretrial publicity might have barred the former president from attaining an “impartial jury,” and would therefore have made any subsequent trial on the Watergate charges unconstitutional (“Bill of Rights”).

As legal analysis demonstrates, President Ford was not precluded from pardoning former President Nixon across all aspects of the law—statutory, common, and legislative intent. Examining the legislative history of the Consti-
tutional Convention reveals there was nothing inherently illegal about President Ford’s de-
cision from the point of view of the Framers’ presumed intentions. Furthermore, President
Ford’s decision did not deviate sharply from the historical precedent of the office. In short,
the pardon of former President Richard Nixon complied with all the legal requirements of a
presidential pardon. Examining the decision solely from a legal perspective reveals Pres-
ident Ford made an acceptable decision to pardon former President Nixon.
However, despite the legality of President Ford’s pardon, the rapid transition into his
presidency brought several institutional factors that might have unduly influenced his ultimate
decision to issue the pardon. Before the discov-
ery of the smoking gun tape 3, President Ford
did not believe Nixon was involved in the Wa-
tergate scandal because he had been “repeat-
edly assured” President Nixon was not guilty
(“The Ford Memoirs”). President Ford’s im-
pressions were significantly shaped by Nixon’s
White House Chief of Staff Alexander Haig,
who approached Vice President Ford a week before Nixon resigned to discuss the possibility
of a resignation—an idea Ford found ludicrous
(“The Ford Memoirs”). Due to Vice President
Ford’s disbelief that President Nixon would
resign, he neither had the time nor inclination
to plan ahead and prepare his own adminis-
tration. As a result, with the rapid transition
period President Ford inherited essentially all
of former President Nixon’s staff, advisors, and
Cabinet—employees who all still held a strong
loyalty to the former President (Becker). It is
more than likely that the composition of Ford’s
early staff subjected him to undue influence in
the following weeks that may have pressured
him to pardon former President Nixon for the
wrong reasons. While it is unlikely these
influences were the sole reason President Ford
pardoned Nixon, the extent of their presence
makes it highly likely they affected his deci-
sion-making process. In fact, President Ford’s
own staff, who did not serve under Nixon,
was largely neglected in the decision-making
process.
Even before President Nixon’s resignation,
his staff pressured Ford about the possibility of
a presidential pardon. Then, during the Water-
gate scandal, Vice President Ford was con-
going to open the whole Bay of Pigs thing, and
involvement, but just say this is sort of a comedy of errors, bizarre, without getting into it, ‘the President believes that it
involves the decision-making process. In fact, President Ford’s
own staff, who did not serve under Nixon,
was largely neglected in the decision-making
process.
Even before President Nixon’s resignation,
his staff pressured Ford about the possibility of
a presidential pardon. Then, during the Water-
gate scandal, Vice President Ford was con-
stantly badgered by President Nixon’s staff to
defend all allegations against the White House
(Mieczkowski 12). Often minutes before Vice
President Ford was to speak publicly, Presi-
dent Nixon’s aides would hand him revised
speeches that included very strong defenses
against Watergate (Becker).
Furthermore, when President Nixon’s Chief
of Staff Alexander Haig approached Vice Pre-
ident Ford with the revelation of the smoking
gun tape, Haig outlined the various courses of
action that might result if the audio evidence
leaked to the media (“The Ford Memoirs”).
Haig ultimately proposed the idea of Vice Pres-
ident Ford pardoning President Nixon if he
choose to resign – a verbatim request to the Vice
President to engage in the quid pro quo deal
that has been speculated about since President
Ford’s announcement (“The Ford Memoirs”;
Cannon, “Character”). Though he finally
rejected the deal, Vice President Ford serious-
ly entertained the proposal for 24 hours as he
consulted both his family and closest advisors
(Cannon, “Character”).
While Vice President Ford declined the idea
of a pardon before President Nixon’s resign-
ation, after assuming the office of President
he began seriously deliberating the idea of a
pardon in order to move the country past the
Watergate scandal. This consideration was like-
ly influenced by the many Nixon staffers still
present in the White House. Immediately after
taking office, President Ford was placed in an
environment with over 480 of former President
Nixon’s staff – aides President Ford declined
to immediately dismiss (Kalman 355). The
arrival of President Ford’s new staff into the
White House resulted in conflict and compet-
ing incentives with the remaining aides of the
former president because the two factions were
ultimately loyal to different leaders (Kalman
355). This conflict became no more apparent
than in the debate on whether or not to pardon
former President Nixon. President Ford’s advi-
sors encouraged him to attend to more import-
ant matters and were hesitant to advocate for
a pardon due to the fear that it would damage
President Ford’s credibility with the American
people and jeopardize his legislative agenda
(Cannon, “Character”; Johnson).
However, these opinions conflicted with Nix-
on’s chosen staff—a set of White House aides
who remained fiercely loyal to the former pres-
ident. Ostensibly, these staffers now worked
for President Ford and were expected to sup-
port him and his policies. Despite these obliga-
tions, they continued to advocate for President
Nixon’s best interests rather than the nation’s
needs (Kalman 356; Becker). One of President
Ford’s closest advisors, James Cannon, high-
lights the frustration of working with the left-
over staff from the Nixon White House, noting
that the threat of former President Nixon being
subjected to criminal prosecution “was their
prime concern.” (Cannon, Honorable Life 221).
Testimony from the first weeks of the Ford
White House portrays President Ford constantly
shuffling between his own aides and former
President Nixon’s staff, trying to determine
which set of advice he should follow (Cannon,
Honorable Life 222). This confusion was further
compounded by Haig morally baiting Presi-
dent Ford into pardoning Nixon, telling him
that the impending legal proceedings were
imparting “grave physical and psychological
repercussions” on the former president (Kal-
man 357). The clash of staff incentives and
the bombardment of differing opinions in the Ford
White House is best summarized by a Ford
aide who recalled the following: “Ford had
listened to a full morning of conflicting advice
about Nixon: Haig urging a pardon, Hartmann
and terHorst suggesting caution; Buchen pro-
posing delays; Zeoli preaching mercy. It was
enough to muddle his mind” (Cannon, Honor-
able Life 222). These accounts portray a chaotic
and confusing environment, but examining the
early Ford White House from an institutional
perspective sheds further insight into Presi-
dent Ford’s ultimate decision to pardon former
President Nixon.
President Ford’s viable options were re-
strained by the rules that govern the pres-
idency. As previous legal analysts have

3 This refers to the White House Oval Office tape that explicitly captures President Nixon ordering his staff to instruct
the CIA to obstruct the FBI’s investigation of the Watergate matter, with Nixon’s aides saying “When you get in these people
when you...get these people in, say, ‘Look, the problem is that this will open the whole, the whole Bay of Pigs thing, and
the President just feels that ah, without getting into the details...’ don’t, don’t lie to them to the extent to say there is no
involvement, but just say this is sort of a comedy of errors, bizarre, without getting into it, ‘the President believes that it
is going to open the whole Bay of Pigs thing up again. And, ah because these people are plugging for, for keeps and that
they should call the FBI in and say that we wish for the country, don’t go any further into this case’, period.” (Bernstein; Scott)
demonstrated, there were very few legal rules that limited Presidential Ford, and the pardon power grants him considerable leniency. The Constitution articulates the essential rules for exercising the pardon power, detailing that the pardon must be issued by the President of the United States after he has properly taken the oath of office. As a result of the 25th Amendment, President Ford was sworn in after the resignation of former President Nixon and therefore properly assumed all the powers of the office. The Supreme Court further holds that in order for a presidential pardon to be valid, it must be clearly accepted by the pardoned citizen (United States v. Wilson). As previously noted, President Nixon formally accepted the pardon from his California home (Milne). Beyond these applicable legal rules, there are further institutional rules of the office that shaped President Ford’s viable options. Historical precedent of the office demonstrates that the scope of pardon power is broad; presidents have pardoned a diverse range of citizens since its inception. Beyond the more explicit institutional rules lies a more fundamental norm of the American Presidency: the demand for the President to act in the best interest of the nation. Accounts of President Ford’s decision-making process show that he complied with this norm. He revealed to an aide, for example, that his days at Yale taught him “no man should be above the law” yet “public policy demanded that [he] put Nixon ... behind us” (Kalman 358); and he pardoned the former President in order to free the nation of Watergate’s grip (Greenstein 117). The applicable institutional rules yielded two viable options for President Ford regarding the aftermath of the Watergate scandal: he could choose not to pardon former President Nixon in hope that the public sentiment would eventually subside or he could issue a pardon that would ideally allow him to begin focusing on his policy agenda and the ailing economy. Since no institutional rules precluded the pardoning of former President Nixon, during the decision-making process President Ford had to weigh the incentives of each option to decide which was best for his presidency – and ideally the country as a whole. Beyond the personal incentives that factored into the deliberation process, other political actors had an opportunity to influence the outcome as well. Testimonies from the early Ford White House suggest clashing incentives between various factions that can be categorized into three essential units, each with competing incentives regarding the decision to pardon former President Nixon: President Ford himself, President Ford’s advisors, and former President Nixon’s aides. President Ford’s incentives derived essentially from two main sources: the responsibilities to his presidency and his personal relationship with former President Nixon. Regarding the presidency, President Ford was largely motivated to act in ways that sustained or increased his public approval rating. Since the president is mostly incapacitated in regards to independently enacting policy, a president’s approval rating is essential for getting his policy agenda passed through Congress. Accounts detail how President Ford’s policy initiatives were ignored in Congress as the public continued to focus on the Watergate scandal. When he informed his most senior aides of his decision to pardon Nixon, President Ford framed the pardon as a way to “remove the former president from the national agenda” (Greenstein 117). While this motivation appears sincere at face value, it can also be examined from a more negative angle. One advisor viewed the pardon as a selfish and reckless act, suggesting that Ford used the pardon as a tool to “get on with the business of the Ford Presidency” (Kalman 359). This account implies President Ford did not engage in a thorough decision-making process, but rather issued the pardon in the hope that the country would move on to his agenda. Despite the various interpretations of President Ford’s motives, the irony of the outcome was that the decision to pardon former President Nixon backfired on the Ford presidency, resulting in a complete deterioration of public support that essentially defeated President Ford’s policy agenda. President Ford’s incentive to pardon Nixon was also guided by his private friendship with the former president. The selection of Gerald Ford for the Vice Presidency was an unexpected choice for the public as Congressman Ford was planning on retiring following a successful tenure in the House of Representatives (Greenstein 115). Despite the apparent randomness of the nomination, Ford and President Nixon were actually close friends during the Watergate crisis, and President Nixon repeatedly confided in Ford when all his other friends turned away (Woodward). Transcripts of the calls between the two reveal that, during the dark days of the Nixon presidency, Ford told President Nixon, “Anytime you want me to do anything, under any circumstances, you give me a call, Mr. President” (Fulsom 236). Remarking on his choice to pardon the former President, Ford himself even stated that he felt compassion for the Nixon family during the Watergate years: “I looked upon him as my personal friend … I had no hesitancy about granting the pardon, because I felt that we had this relationship” (Kalman 13; Shane). Though President Ford was partially motivated to issue a pardon by his own policy agenda, further evidence suggests there probably were personal incentives as well. This private friendship paints a more adverse, selfish portrait of President Ford’s pardon. Beyond the personal incentives of President Ford, the strong loyalty of former Nixon White House staffers likely influenced the decision-making process as well. Led by Chief of Staff Alexander Haig, these aides were largely motivated to preserve the legacy of the prior President (Becker; Cannon, Honorabale Life 221). Knowing the rules of a presidential pardon, these staffers understood that a formal pardon would cease the Watergate investigations and salvage the remaining dignity of their former president. Therefore it seems these individuals persuaded President Ford by explicitly telling him that a pardon was in his presidency’s best interest even while they were implicitly advancing a pardon because of their residual loyalty to the former president. Further accounts describe how these aides were so deeply loyal to their former boss that they embellished the truth by telling President Ford the impending charges were having a harmful physiological effect on Nixon (Kalman 357). President Ford was frustrated with the lack of progress of his policy agenda, and it seems likely that former Nixon aides manipulated this frustration by telling him a pardon would refocus the country’s attention on the weakening economy (Cannon Honorabale Life, 118; Greenstein 117). Unlike former Nixon aides, President Ford’s set of advisers was loyal to the Ford presidency and desired to arrive at decisions that best represented President Ford. These incentives imply a careful, calculating approach to the
decision of pardoning former President Nixon. On one hand, pardoning former President Nixon might allow the administration to focus on its policy initiatives. Several accounts corroborate the view that White House aides were frustrated because none of their legislation was given any attention in Congress due to its obsessive focus on the Watergate investigation (Cannon, Honorable Life 118). On the other hand, Ford staff might have been reticent to issue a pardon because they understood the emotional magnitude of the Watergate scandal in the eyes of the public. While these incentives do not indicatively lean one way, it seems that President Ford’s staff would advocate a more methodological and calculated approach to the issue of a presidential pardon. This approach to the problem contrasted sharply with former President Nixon’s aides’ hasty attempts to solve the problem by issuing an immediate pardon, and likely contributed to the tension in the early Ford White House.

Despite the even-handed, methodical approach of President Ford’s staff, it seems the decision-making process was most affected by Nixon’s former staffers and President Ford’s personal relationship with the former President. This claim is particularly startling because it suggests that President Ford reached his decision for wrong and selfish reasons. This conclusion is bolstered by three simple facts. First, few accounts recall interactions between President Ford’s advisors and President Ford concerning the possibility of a pardon—most of the literature details former Nixon staffers persuading President Ford. Furthermore, it is heavily documented that few of President Ford’s staff were aware of the pardon hours before its announcement (Werth 312-313). It would seem then that President Ford’s own staff played an insignificant role in the decision-making process. Second, the brevity of the decision-making process and the suddenness of the decision reflect a deliberation process more congruent with Nixon staffers than the Ford administration. Ten days before his announcement, President Ford stated in a press conference that it was far too soon to begin even contemplating the idea of a pardon (Woodward, The Milwaukee Journal). Despite this claim, President Ford hastily issued a pardon ten days after this statement without informing his own staff, Cabinet members, or the leaders of Capitol Hill (Greenstein 117). The rapid transition from publicly declaring a doctrine of patience to a firm decision to issue the pardon suggests the result was reached through hasty, inadequate reasoning. Third, changes in President Ford’s explanations for the pardon suggest he was not frank to begin with in explaining his rationale. In his initial statement President Ford explained he arrived at his decision by considering his own morals and the immediate future of the country (“President Gerald Ford’s Pardon of Richard Nixon”). However, in the later years of his life, President Ford’s story seemed to change. When recently asked about his most infamous act, President Ford cited the primary reason was his friendship with President Nixon and his obligation to the Nixon family (Woodward; Kalman 13). President Ford has openly stated these claims in multiple interviews: “I didn’t want to see my real friend have the stigma [of Watergate] and “I looked upon him as my personal friend … I had no hesitancy about granting the pardon, because I felt that we had this relationship” (Shane, Kalman 13). This reasoning contradicts his initial statements regarding the pardon and further reinforces the notion that the pardon was reached through a hasty decision-making process.

This evidence suggests President Ford’s final decision to issue a presidential pardon was guided by institutional incentives that were not in the best interest of the nation, but rather promoted by selfish actors such as Ford himself and Nixon’s former staffers who had their own interests in mind. Though President Ford’s decision falls on the right side of the law, it seems that the pressures of former President Nixon’s badgering staff combined with President Ford’s own incentives to satisfy his friendship with the former President and his anxiousness to begin his own policy agenda resulted in a decision that had not been subjected to rigorous, thorough debate. In short, while legally the pardon was issued for the right reasons, institutional factors suggest that the principal criteria used to reach the decision might not have been for the benefit of the nation.

Due to the emotional disposition of the public in the aftermath of the Watergate scandal, President Ford’s pardon of former President Nixon evoked political and emotional uproar. The public and media largely disagreed with the decision at the time it was announced and the move likely cost President Ford reelection. However, historians now offer a more positive appraisal of President Ford’s decision, praising his courage and patriotism. Nearly 40 years after President Ford’s pardon, most media and historical accounts reflect on the decision positively, noting that President Ford’s courage helped move the country past Watergate (Shane). Even a Special Watergate Prosecutor, whose investigation was impeded by the pardon, published an opinion-editorial piece in the Washington Post praising President Ford’s decision in hindsight (Ben-Veniste). What is perhaps most demonstrative of history’s take on President Ford’s decision is that a bipartisan panel awarded President Ford the 2001 Profile in Courage Award, citing that his decision “proved that ‘politics can be a noble profession’” (Shane; Clymer). Though it is possible Ford’s true motives may have been misguided, in public hindsight, his decision still ultimately reflects the courage he demonstrated as President of the United States.

Taylor Ballinger is a sophomore double-majoring in Psychology and English with a minor in Political Science. His primary research interests are centered at the fascinating intersection of law and social psychology, and include understanding perceptions of procedural fairness and theories of implicit racism under the tutelage of Professor Victor Quintanilla at the Indiana University Maurer School of Law. He intends to pursue a senior thesis examining the role of empathy and race in understanding the amount of process afforded to disputants. He plans to attend law school after his undergraduate tenure, and potentially pursue a joint Ph.D. in Social Psychology.
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The United States and European Union’s domestic protection of their agricultural industry through tariffs and subsidies has not only lost international economic growth, especially for developing nations, but has also slowed implementation of intellectual property rights that would greatly help developed nations with biotechnology and pharmaceuticals. The EU and US have a vested interest in protecting their local agricultural industries, which will likely struggle against international competition. Conversely, developed nations have held up more stringent applications of international intellectual property rights law, since they believe many of the monetary gains from corporations, such as pharmaceutical firms, are at the expense of their citizens’ health.

Although both developed and developing nations are focused on protecting their citizens, would these nations be better off as a whole by liberalizing agricultural policies and intellectual property rights as demanded in the World Trade Organization’s (WTO) recent round of trade negotiations, the Doha Development Agenda? This question is difficult to answer because of the scale of the economic changes that would occur. I will examine the reluctance to make these WTO changes through the framework of the Prisoner’s Dilemma, but first I will explain the power that local agricultural industries can exert on the United States and European Union’s political decision-making. I will also analyze other problems that domestic politics create in relation to foreign aid and international trade settlements.

The American agricultural industry receives large subsidies and direct payments that do not make fiscal sense for the economic health of America. In an increasingly globalized world, Americans could import cheaper corn from Argentina without large subsidies on domestically produced corn, or we could import Brazilian sugarcane if it were not for large tariffs. These protections preserve the viability of American farmers, but do these industries need taxpayer money to protect them? Are they truly worth this economic security, or would it be better to just import foreign agricultural products?

In a recent interview with journalist Ezra Klein, the United States Secretary of Agriculture Tom Vilsack discussed many issues regarding the protection of rural farmers with direct payments and subsidies. Mr. Klein asked Secretary Vilsack to justify subsidizing rural farmers if cheaper food could be imported from abroad. Although Vilsack stated that some subsidies do need to be phased out over time, he continually focused his answer on two points: jobs and values. Vilsack sees the necessity of protecting rural America since farmers often live with low incomes. These farmers’ lives are not sustainable without subsidies and tariffs on other nations. He makes an interesting point about the values of rural America concerning the military, stating, “small-town folks in rural America don’t feel appreciated. They feel they do a great service for America. They send their children to the military not just because it’s an opportunity, but because they have a value system from the farm” (Vilsack 2011). Klein’s reasoning is that rural America deserves these benefits due to their positive externality from their traditions that is good for society as a whole. Groups in favor of subsidies often employ these arguments. The United States agricultural industry has the power of millions of farmers who have grown economically dependent on these subsidies and safety nets, but the time of the United States’
competitive advantage has come and gone, and America should now allow more imports to increase global trade and economic progress for labor-advantaged nations.

The European Union’s agricultural system revolves around the long-standing and often-reformed Common Agricultural Policy (CAP). Like the United States, the EU enacts large subsidies and import levies to protect local agricultural products. These levies and import quotas restrict the amount of goods that can be imported, essentially stalling any ability for developing nations to gain a foothold in the rich markets of the European Union. In certain aspects, the EU’s CAP is better at addressing these concerns than other nations’ policies. Its “Everything But Arms” program gives preferential treatment to the world’s forty-nine least developed countries through duty-free and import quota-free trading of almost all products (Everything But Arms [EBA] – Who benefits? 2013). Still, the main proponents of many of the CAP subsidies and payments believe they are keeping the tradition and livelihood of farmers alive while protecting local industry. The CAP regulations have significant power in controlling how the EU operates and are central in halting Doha negotiations (Common Agricultural Policy After 2010). Nevertheless, there are opponents of this type of protections ranging from supporters of the Global Justice Movement to Neoliberal Globalization enthusiasts. These unlikely allies are unified in their attempt to alter those policies. The Neoliberal free-trade groups are willing to see protected industries decline if it means less government regulation and greater opportunity for other industries to thrive from their new access to developing markets. The Global Justice Movement supporters see that the Western world owns an exorbitant amount of world resources and they support measures that would promote redistribution of these resources back to lesser-developed countries, beginning with fixing unfair trading practices in the developing world’s most important industry, agriculture. However, adversaries of CAP guidelines have not been able to completely alter the preferential treatment and unfair trade competition allowed the local European Union agricultural industry (Tran 2011).

Domestic politics as well as big agricultural industries have played a role in stalling Doha negotiations. Since the financial crisis of 2008, domestic austerity movements have caused domestic politics to rise in prominence over foreign relations. America’s increasing isolationism became one of the most important issues for Americans during the elections. The focus was on domestic economic issues, with calls for buying American-made products growing in popularity. Likewise, in Europe austerity measures became powerful and made intra-European Union trading even more unpopular (Winecoff 2013). If domestic needs challenge even cooperation within the EU, then cooperation among more diverse nations involved in Doha cannot achieve the desired results. The world’s largest economy has even more complicated problems when it comes to domestic politics affecting international trade reform talks. The most in-depth and helpful analysis of these dilemmas is research by Helen Milner and Dustin Tingley about the effect of American legislators and domestic issues upon the politics of foreign aid and trade. Milner and Tingley examined politicians’ motivations and voting records on international trade bills. They concluded that voting on international trade and foreign aid differed along party lines. Overall, foreign aid support and helping trade cooperation both provide support for developing nations. These types of economic support for other nations would benefit the people of developing nations, yet the political parties of the United States do not agree on supporting both objectives. The Republicans’ disinterest in foreign aid support overrides neoliberal arguments to limit international trade cooperation. The Democratic view is muddied as well; even though they historically support foreign aid and foreign economic advancement, they also receive large contributions from labor organizations. According to the Stolper-Samuelson model in Milner and Tingley’s research, the lobbying by labor interest groups to protect their labor-intensive industries strongly influences Democratic politicians against significant international trade deals (Milner and Tingley 2010). The unaccommodating domestic politics of the EU and the US have created an environment where gaining national support for a Doha deal is unlikely.

Now I will move on to the international negotiations and their own concerns. In my opinion, the most beneficial and interesting way to examine these talks is through the use of game theory and the Prisoner’s Dilemma. Paul Krugman spearheads this issue with his ideas from “Is Free Trade Passé?” He dismisses the models previously used for focusing solely on comparative advantage. Even Bertil Ohlin of the Heckscher-Ohlin-Samuelson theory stressed that although comparative advantages should be used as a learning tool, they should not be exclusively used to analyze international trade (Krugman 1987). Technological change and strategic trade policy are also important. Many neoliberals advocate free trade, yet in certain circumstances it can be used effectively to support the national interest look down strategic trade policy upon. Krugman makes a significant point by stating, “as soon as the respectability of non-comparative-advantage models in international trade was established, international trade theorists began to ask whether the new view of the causes of trade implied new views about appropriate trade policy” (Krugman 1987). These new views manifested in the creation of situations in which trade policy can be changed for one side’s particular advantage. Game theory is an effective tool in showing this development. The main “game” used by Krugman is between the airplane-manufacturing giants Airbus and Boeing, but his firm model is applicable to national industries as well (Krugman 1987). In this example the game will be a hypothetical scenario played between European Union local wheat production and Algeria wheat exports. No actual data was used for this scenario. In this game we assume that if both sides produce, and thus create more competition, then they will both produce -$10 profit. If both sides do not produce, then they will both create $0 profit. Now, if one side produces and the other side does not produce, then the side producing will gain $50 profit and the side not producing gains $0 profit. This works both ways in which both sides are perfectly competitive. This results in both sides hoping the other side does not produce, leading to inefficient competition. Table 1.1 is provided to help visualize the scenario in a 2x2 matrix format.
Because it is advantageous to use game theory in trade policy, it is important to examine treaties through the Prisoner’s Dilemma. In this scenario I will examine the generic countries A and B. Table 2.1 shows the effect of home market protections on these countries. They have the option to either defect or cooperate. The gains are greatest for a country when they decide to defect and the other country cooperates, so the second country opens itself to trade, while the first country does not (Brander 1987).

In this specific Prisoner’s Dilemma the primary outcome is that both countries defect. This protects their domestic markets from only creating economic gains of 10. Nevertheless, if both sides had cooperated they would have been able to create a total economic output of 400, with 200 gains for each side. Mutual cooperation would be beneficial for both.

Table 2.1 Domestic Market Security Scenario

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Country A</th>
<th>Country B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cooperate</td>
<td>(200,200)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defect</td>
<td>(50,50)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The World Trade Organization attempts to fix this problem through trade treaties and negotiations such as the current Doha Development Agenda. The difficulty is that most agreements are just that, agreements. Enforcing these agreements is difficult because countries have the option to cheat or short-change on earlier arrangements. If a country successfully defects from an earlier assurance, the gain would be economically massive for that country and economically disastrous for another. Due to this, large tariff reductions have become overshadowed by increasing interference in other forms of trade agreements, such as subsidies, direct payments, and other unfair trading policies.

According to the Prisoner’s Dilemma, it seems impossible for a nation to rationally decide to cooperate. However, there is a solution to this predicament. Rodney Hughes’ research examines a situation similar to table 2.2’s new scenario. In this situation there is a Nash Equilibrium in which neither participant has incentive to reform individually, but certain trade reforms could terminate inefficiencies and allow the cooperation output of the two nations to increase. In our next scenario, the economic gains increase to 300 for each country under a cooperate-cooperate choice. The result now equals the maximum either country can receive by defecting after the other country cooperates. Under these conditions, countries A and B are now indifferent to the payoff from cooperate-cooperate and defect-defect since they will both receive the output of 300. This causes the country to logically choose to cooperate; defecting not only has the same output as cooperating, but it also causes the other country to eventually retaliate and defect. Then both countries would only have an output of 50 (Hughes, 14:16).

Because these Prisoner’s Dilemmas can lead to unfair agreements and negations of fair treaties, it is important to restate how these agreements affect the world economically. Many developing countries are primarily agrarian, and agricultural production can be the sole driver behind economic progress and growth. Decreased producer surplus in these nations leads to less local development and investment, resulting in little to no capital gain and low capabilities for growth. When addressing the WTO in 2003, the President of Burkina Faso, Blaise Comparoré, argued against the imbalanced subsidies of developed nations, stating:

"The massive subsidies awarded to cotton farmers in some WTO member States are among the most important and direct causes of the problems encountered on the international cotton market. These subsidies artificially inflate the offer and depress export prices. In 2001, cotton production in Benin, Burkina, Mali and Chad, accounted for 5 to 10 percent of gross domestic product and an average of about 30-40 percent of overall export revenues. (WTO News 2003)"

He then argued that although an impoverished country can receive tens of millions of dollars in foreign aid, it loses more than that in production losses. For example, Mali received...
$37 million in aid, yet lost $43 million in cotton export losses. Mali’s competitive advantage of about a half a dollar on a kilogram of cotton was lost due to wealthier countries’ subsidies in its local markets (WTO News 2003).

The most publicized example of an imbalanced trading practice is Brazil’s WTO case against the United States’ cotton industry. The United States had made commitments to reduce their support payments and guarantees for American cotton farmers during past WTO negotiations. These domestic protections lowered cotton prices and caused around $600 million in damages to Brazil’s economy in 2001, according to the Brazilian government. Brazil appealed to the WTO compliance panel and requested $1.5 billion in compensation for its damages. If the United States did not pay these reparations, Brazil threatened to implement trade retaliations, which would cause a loss of over $800 million in American goods. Negotiations immediately began to prevent this from happening, granting the United States time to take the steps proposed by Brazil (Schnetp 2010). The loss of a competitive advantage in Brazil and Mali demonstrates the cost of the strategic trading measures shown in the earlier 2x2 scenario.

Although there is robust debate on this subject, there is significant research indicating that most national subsidies and local industry protections hurt their home country more than help. The economic advantage of manipulating trade policy does not extend to all economic interventions. According to one study, the European Union’s Common Agricultural Policy may cost citizens £4 billion ($6.5 billion) in taxes to support the subsidies. CAP regulations and interventions may also result in an average of £800 ($1300) per year of food costs to European families (Hughes 2007).

American research reports similar findings. Hughes references an American report stating that the sugar protections in the United States cause great economic damage, and the removal of these subsidies would bring in over a billion dollars to the domestic economy. He even states that according to his research, “three jobs in confectionery manufacturing are lost for each job protected in sugar growing or sugar harvesting by the U.S. sugar program” (Hughes 2007). This micro situation’s argument effectively destroys the reasoning behind Tom Vilsack’s thoughts earlier in this paper. The loss of these jobs creates more jobs in related fields, such as confectionery manufacturing, due to the globalization and economic gains from trade.

Economic losses in single nations are staggering, but the losses incurred across the globe are astonishing. These numbers vary from report to report since they attempt to effectively estimate the global output boost. The Peterson Institute for International Economics puts the export increase for one agricultural deal at $65 billion and world GDP increase at $100 billion annually (Lynn 2009). It has already been stated that the United States and other developed nations have financial research to support these agricultural trade liberalizations; however, these estimated gains from a Doha agreement would go primarily to developing nations. If $65 billion more in export revenue is important to a nation as massive as the United States, then a similar upsurge in growth for a developing nation will be worth exponentially more.

Many of the goals for the Doha Development Agenda are based on facts and figures, while trying to avoid economic decisions based upon political motives. I have already stated that, unfortunately, political motives become very strong in these negotiations. Still, there are agencies focused on ranking development decisions for future global progress. One such organization, the Copenhagen Consensus, commissioned a study to rank desirable places for political and economic intervention. The successful implementation of the Doha Development Agenda’s proposals was ranked second only behind investing in a micronutrient supplement for the world’s starving children (Copenhagen Consensus 2008 Outcomes – The Experts 2008).

The lack of an agricultural agreement also hinders reform of the Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS). Many government agencies in the developing world believe that improved intellectual property rights protection will be detrimental to the public interest in health, food security and safety, technology transfer, and environmental issues. TRIPS was initially agreed upon during the WTO’s Uruguay Round, but countries are still following through on their commitments. Developing nations are worried about the enactment of several bilateral and regional agreements that go beyond what was agreed upon in TRIPS; commonly referred to as TRIPS-plus arrangements. Since many developed nations want to expand and further initial TRIPS agreements, the developing countries have used these negotiations as a powerful bargaining chip in their Doha agricultural talks (Vivas-Engui 2006).

TRIPS talks are based around developed nations and their local companies’ need to protect intellectual property rights if the technology is sent to another country. Because of issues concerning local laws and regulations, TRIPS helps to establish minimum standards for nations to follow in order to protect the rights of inventors and innovators. Conversely, many developing nations have reservations about agreeing to these terms because they might stall treatment of citizens during public health epidemics. If the price of a newly created drug is too expensive for a poor nation, these agreements could possibly prevent the nations from temporarily breaking these rules in order to get the drugs to their affected citizens. In addition to concerns about health, agricultural property rights may cause problems because patents on plant or animal inventions have unknown effects (World Trade Organization n.d.).

These TRIPS negotiations seem to follow the game theory used to analyze the agricultural talks. The developing nations are unwilling to cooperate in TRIPS talks if they believe that the developed nations will not respond to their grievances concerning reform in the agricultural discussions. Although researchers have been unable to study the results of expanding intellectual property rights extensively, the few existing reports suggest that developed nations will gain significantly. A specific report from the UK Intellectual Property Office concludes that developing nations could experience some economic gains from TRIPS-plus arrangements, but future research is needed to evaluate the extent of these gains. It goes on to state TRIPS-plus agreements hamper access to medicine in developing nations and might have negative effects on pharmaceutical innovation, which would benefit the developing world (Hassan, et al. 2009). The reports show that there are ethical issues to take into account for all globalization measures, especially those concerning trade and property rights. In this specific circumstance, the report shows that
economic gains can occur, especially for the nations prompting the adoption of the TRIPS-plus agenda.

If the agriculture parts of the Doha proposals were put in place, developed nations’ biotechnology and pharmaceuticals industries would thrive, successfully offsetting negative effects on the farming communities. This means that if they are able to successfully leverage for TRIPS reforms, the United States and the European Union have more reason to go through with agricultural reforms. It has been demonstrated that large economic growth will result from successfully agreeing to the agricultural trade reforms. It has been demonstrated that unfair trading practices damage not only international cooperation and relations, but can significantly hurt the country’s taxpayers due to subsidies. It has been demonstrated that the Prisoner’s Dilemma of the Doha negotiations can be resolved by demonstrating the draining economic costs of inefficient trade regulations. Yet, progress has still not been made in signing a plan that satisfies the ambitions of the initial Doha agenda that began twelve years ago. Considering all these issues with domestic politics, how can a resolution be reached?

Rodney Hughes gives a simple yet eloquent answer to this question: awareness (Hughes 2007). The developed world is dominated by democratic societies in which citizens communicate with the government through voting. Average citizens of these countries need to be aware of the high prices they pay for food, since cheaper food cannot compete with local subsidies. Citizens must be aware that they give their governments’ vast amounts of money in taxes that are then spent on inefficient and unethical subsidies and protections for agricultural industries. Voting citizens need to know that substantial economic growth can occur in their own nation and that their nation can use the money from subsidies to benefit underfunded parts of government. Finally, citizens need to be mindful of the economic conditions that developing nations face and understand that opening agricultural trade to these nations would not only create GDP growth, but also improve literacy rates, health of the citizens, and overall progress of these countries.

In early December 2013, there were significant news reports covering the first-ever multilateral trade agreement during the 9th Ministerial Conference in Bali. This agreement finalized a deal, despite difficulties arising from the political and domestic issues mentioned earlier in this paper. However, many of the major discussions points that came into focus during the initial talks in Doha leave Qatar out. These include intellectual property discussions and agricultural reform to stop discriminatory trading policies. This current agreement is just rhetoric, and does not have significant practical use. It seems to be a show of global cooperation, which brings hope for future settlements with real-world applicability. A journalist covering the Bali talks, Jean-Pierre Lehmann, believes that change needs to occur in the global trade negotiations, arguing that “mindsets, the culture of 21st century globalization, must change and implement radical reforms to adapt to the new realities and thereby seize the opportunities for a more equitable, inclusive, and sustainable globalization” (Lehmann 2013). It seems Bali prevented Doha’s dreams from being completely destroyed, but Doha’s goals were not close to being fulfilled by the approval of the Bali Package. The lack of agricultural and intellectual property measures in the agreement could set resolving trade inefficiencies back years or decades.

The importance of complex domestic political situations is vital to understanding why the objectives of the preliminary agricultural Doha talks have not been fulfilled. Agricultural subsidies in developed countries have caused these industries to survive artificially against more efficient competition for years. US and EU agricultural industries have successfully influenced international trade agreements.

The power of agriculture in these countries is complemented by partisanship and isolationist tendencies. Then, understanding strategic trade policy through game theory shows how current economic relationships have caused countries to defect from agreeing to trade talks. These game theory scenarios also demonstrate how a practical, real-world change of economic output in a (cooperation-cooperation) decision could logically cause nations to choose to cooperate. The game theory model attempts to loosen the deadlock for future negotiations. The importance of trade liberalization for the economic prosperity of developing nations cannot be overstated, and there is now an economic reasoning for these liberalizations.
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This paper focuses on musical responses to South African social movements. I examine the ways in which musicians in Johannesburg and Cape Town responded to the anti-apartheid and gender and sexuality movements through their productions and performances, and discourse about music. While arguing the usefulness of local- and regional-based approaches to studying music in social movements, I also address the transregional and transnational flow of music. I discuss the music that emerged from these two movements within a broader history of music used in social movements in South Africa.

With a goal of providing an online, interactive model for presenting research, this paper is tied to a multimedia presentation available online.1 As newer digital and online technologies—from digital books and academic journals to websites—continue to develop, scholars have made use of them to present their research and to engage students. Such media are particularly useful in the field of ethnomusicology, since they enable us to provide easier access to the sounds and images of musicians, performance contexts, and discourse about music. They also offer us new ways to connect with students who use such technologies in their everyday lives, and to engage them in cultural and musical studies. In this paper, I hope to provide a model of research, as one option for what future research in ethnomusicology can look like. I have created an online, interactive supplement to this paper. Throughout the paper, footnotes indicate how to proceed with online material, from maps to video clips, that I refer to in the text.

In the first section, I discuss the methods and theories of the social movements I employ as a theoretical framework for my research. I begin with a brief discussion of the importance of recognizing the regional particularities in South African society, followed by key definitions of the social movements, the historical methods for conducting research on social movements, and the theories about the relation between music and social movements. In the main body of the paper, I draw upon these theories and methods to describe and analyze the ways in which music emerged from the anti-apartheid and gender and sexuality movements in Johannesburg and Cape Town.

Theories and Methods

Regionalism in South African Studies. Musicologist Charles Garrett discusses a performance of and discourse about “Nuestro Himno,” a Spanish cover of “The Star-Spangled Banner.” He uses this to illustrate the difficulties in defining national music and culture. Viewing music as a site of cultural debate, Garrett analyzes an “episode” when President George W. Bush negatively responded to this cover of the United States’ national anthem. Garrett asks, “What is America? Who is American? And who has the right to decide? This striking episode intersects with many themes vital to the study of American music, including music and national identity, music and politics, and music and social protest.” In my reading of

---

1 The embedded link directs readers to the project titled “The Emergence of Music from South African Social Movements: An Example of Interactive Scholarly Research,” which is available on my Prezi page, https://prezi.com/wbyizz6cmimn/the-emergence-of-music-from-south-african-social-movements/.
various authors’ approaches to the study of music and culture in South Africa, I have asked these same questions. Several researchers, who have conducted studies on such topics as race or film in South Africa, have analyzed specific case studies in one location. These have led to generalized conclusions about views on race and popular culture.

In her book, *Focus: Music of South Africa*, Carol Muller says that her aim is not to “expand the conversation on regionalism,” but to provide an overview of regional research on South Africa and a bibliographic source for new South African scholars. According to Muller, historians and literary critics, rather than music scholars, were the first to view South Africa as a unified whole in their research. Ethnomusicologists, or music anthropologists, face challenges in regionally viewing the country’s music since the past generation of South Africans was legally unable to do so. When the South African Defense Force ceased to exist in the 1990s, South Africans “began to understand their deeper ties to the Southern African subcontinent” and therefore see “musical connections that transcend contemporary political borders between states.” She goes on to propose a mode of research for representing the musical past through technological innovations. She suggests that “we might visualize a map of the world created in HTML. The map would highlight a range of places in South Africa, tracing the travels of South African musicians and styles between towns and countrieside, in the Republic, neighboring countries in Southern Africa, through the continent, and out into the world at large.”

My research, like Muller’s, emphasizes that South Africa was and is a country that encompasses 136,136.215 square miles of land and is inhabited by millions of people with diverse cultural, religious, racial, and linguistic backgrounds. I use this approach to regionalism, scaling it down to fit the space and scope of this project. I narrow the time period to approximately fifty years of diverse music within two major South African cities. I concentrate on music that emerged from both the anti-apartheid movement and the gender and sexuality movement near Cape Town and Johannesburg.

### Defining ‘Social Movements’

Many scholars have conducted research on social movements and have developed varying definitions of their key theoretical concepts. To create a working definition of the concept of “social movements” that explains my criteria for researching particular social movements, I compared definitions of social movements from the following three works: *The Social Movements Reader: Cases and Concepts* by Goodwin and Jasper, *Voices of Protest: Social Movements in Post-Apartheid South Africa* by Ballard, Habib, and Valodia, and *Methods of Social Movements Research* by Christiansen.

Goodwin and Jasper define social movements as “conscious, concerted, and sustained efforts by ordinary people to change some aspect of their society by using extra-institutional means.” Common conceptions of social movements are founded on the idea of a ‘collective’ effort to work toward or against something. The idea of these movements as “conscious and concerted” is useful to my study of these particular South African movements because it specifies a motivational characteristic of the group, which emphasizes that it is not a happenstance occurrence. Stating that “ordinary people” are the subjects of social movements, Goodwin and Jasper also indicate that people who are motivated by their desire to change some aspect of their society are the driving force behind social movements. Goodwin and Jasper—as well as Christiansen—use the phrase, “extra-institutional means.” This is controversial in defining social movements because of the assumption that social movements must have financial means, and therefore established institutional relations, in order to function.

By contrast, scholars such as Ballard, Habib, and Valodia instead focus on institutionalized organizations and networks involved in social movements. They define social movements as “politically and/or socially directed collectives, often involving multiple organizations and networks, focused on changing one or more elements of the social, political, and economic system within which they are located.” Stating that movements are “politically and/or socially directed collectives” helps to highlight that social movements are not just formed, but are formed with a specific common goal. Goodwin and Jasper’s point that movements are based on conscious and concerted efforts further strengthens this idea. In my research I combine the idea that social movements “often involve multiple organizations and networks” with Goodwin and Jasper’s emphasis on people as the driving forces behind these movements by attending to individuals within the organizations and networks. Saying that people organize, with the goal of “focusing on changing one or more elements of the social, political, and economic systems within which they are located” reminds us of the individual agency within organizations and builds ties between multiple organization and networks to create or reinforce similar concerns.

Jonathan Christiansen defines social movements as “organized yet informal social entities that are engaged in extra-institutional conflict that is oriented towards a goal. These goals can be either aimed at a specific and narrow policy or be more broadly aimed at cultural change.” This definition frames social movements in relation to conflict among groups within a society. Christiansen describes the subjects of social movements as organized yet informal social entities. While social movements may begin as informal groups of people, they can develop into formal groups with websites, formal meeting locations, and promotional slogans.

After considering these definitions, I define social movements as conscious, concerted, and politically and/or socially directed efforts by people within a society to change one or more elements of the social, political, and economic system within which they are located through means of extra-institutional and/or formal or informal organizations or networks. For the
focus of my paper, I chose two topics in South African history that fit this working definition of a social movement: the anti-apartheid movement and the gender and sexuality movement.

**Historical Methods of Research on Social Movements.** Elizabeth Clemens and Martin Hughes introduce historical methods of research on social movements in their essay entitled “Recovering Past Protest.” They state that, “to a far greater extent than contemporary social movement research, historical research is shaped by the politics, practices, and events that selectively document protest.” Much has been documented in the case of music in South African social movements, particularly in relation to the social movements analyzed in this paper. For example, Grant Olwage edited a volume on the music that emerged in response to apartheid laws. Jeremy Marre released a documentary on anti-apartheid music, and Chris Walton and Stephanus Miller released a book on music in the gender and sexuality movement. Clemens and Hughes recommend that researchers avoid “looking for evidence of past protest with a checklist drawn from the primary material.” I have conducted this contextual research by reading three different histories of South Africa, which have helped me understand the historical contexts of social movements and music. Second, prominent individuals, important institutions, and research organizations involved in the social movement should become information resources for scholars. Each of these participants may shed light onto and provide different perspectives about the social movement. For instance, I conducted research on individuals or bands because they created songs, and on one institution, the South African Broadcasting Company, because of its prominent restraining role during apartheid, and because artists had to disguise their messages to avoid government censorship in this institution. Finally, Clemens and Hughes discuss the application of social movement research theories in relation to historical research. Although “one cannot interview the dead or expect them to return completed surveys … many of the standard questions … can be answered by using archival evidence.” I will rely on such evidence when I apply theories on music and social movements to my historical research on the anti-apartheid movement.

**Theories on Music and Social Movements.**

Eyerman and Jamison begin their book about music and social movements by defining social movements as “central moments in the reconstitution of culture.” They argue that the most common fault in research on music and social movements is the tendency of scholars to begin on a lofty, epistemological level, and then to descend straight to the concrete examples. “What tends to be ignored is all that falls between, specifically, the historical, or what can be called tradition…[or] inherited ways of interpreting reality and giving meaning to experience.” They argue that music often is forgotten in the study of social movements. As Eyerman and Jamison point out, one way music is used in social movements is to redefine and re-identify the community:

> In many of these social movements, the classical activity of political campaigning has been subordinated to a range of cultural or symbolic practices—from women wearing veils to the rediscovery of traditional forms of art, music, and religious ritual. Questions of meaning, belief, value, and identity have seemingly become more important than the political pursuit of power.8

Eyerman and Jamison propose a method for research on music and social movements that focuses on the stages between the epistemological level of the topic and the minute details of particular cases. Here, they think that analyzing the reasons for the emergence of music would prove more useful than previous approaches to this topic. During the same year that Eyerman and Jamison wrote their book on music and social movements, Mark Mattern wrote *Acting in Concert: Music, Community, and Political Action.* This book analyzes three different forms of political acting in concert. Acting in concert is “a metaphor for community-based political action through music.” Based on his analysis of three case studies from different periods and places, he explains that acting in concert can be analyzed in three different forms: confrontational, deliberate, and pragmatic. He defines the confrontational form of political action as when people in a community use music to confront, oppose, or protest.8 Using research composed by Marxist-influenced writers, Mattern lists protest music and the emphasis on confrontational relations, rather than community, as two different examples of confrontational music. When describing protest music, he says that “typically, the intent of protest musicians is to expose the exploitation and oppression exercised by dominant elites and members of dominant groups.” Deliberative music is the second form of acting in concert and is used when individual members of a community want to use their own music traditions to convey identity. The final form of acting in concert is pragmatic music which, according to Mattern, individuals use to bring people in different communities together over an issue of common concern. Mattern also states that “these three forms of acting in concert should not be viewed as mutually exclusive. In practice, it is possible and probable that they will overlap.”

**The Emergence of Music from the Anti-Apartheid Movement.**

Before delving into an analysis of music that emerged from the anti-apartheid movement

---

8 Click the “next” button twice to listen to “Die Struggle.” Slides 7 and 8.

9 Click the “next” button twice to listen to “Africa.” Slides 11 and 12.
in Johannesburg and Cape Town, I will briefly discuss how several scholars have interpreted apartheid. I will also offer a description of the historical context and the role of radio during the apartheid era and in the anti-apartheid movement. In his introduction to Composing Apartheid, Grant Olwage states that apartheid is a “horror, notorious the world over.”

He relies on the deconstructionist definition by Jacques Derrida:

By itself the word occupies the terrain like a concentration camp. System of partition, barbed wire, crowds of mapped out solitude…the glaring harshness of abstract essence (heid) seems to speculate in another regime of abstraction, that of confined separation. The word concentrates separation, raises it to another power and sets separation itself apart: ‘apartheid’, something like that.10

Carol Muller defines apartheid as a “legalized racial discrimination … established by a body of laws made by a minority of people of European and British descent in response to their fears of living in a country where the majority of the people were of Black African descent.” The Encyclopedia Britannica defines apartheid as a “policy that governed relations between South Africa’s white minority and sanctioned racial segregation and political and economic discrimination against nonwhites.”

During the era of Grand Apartheid, the South African government used a range of methods and media in an attempt to control black citizens, to disseminate policies, and to maintain its control over the country. One of these methods was an audio technology—the radio. The government went to great lengths to encourage the use of radio in rural areas, especially within black townships. The South African Broadcasting Company (SABC), “with loans from the government, installed high-quality, good-reception radio technology in the mid-1960s” throughout the country to control the airwaves and to propagate government messages in black townships. Within the SABC broadcasts were embedded messages that tried to reinforce the black, ‘tribal’ identity. The company’s goal was to “educate and enlighten its audiences, to maintain social control by not engaging with any political troublemakers, and to program according to Christian values and morals.” Because of the SABC dominance over radio broadcasting, black artists had to “contend with white control of the record industry and radio,” which demanded that all programs be “pre-recorded and edited. All music [had to] pass through the central committee of censors.” Such a system of censorship forced artists to look for alternative means to express their responses to the anti-apartheid movement in ways that the censors could not distinguish. Otherwise, they would not be played on the public radio.

**Cape Town Case Studies.**

Mac McKenzie and his band, the Genuines, claim that it was “South Africa’s only black rock band” during Grand Apartheid. This Cape Town punk rock band released their first hit, “Die Struggle,” a song with Afrikaans lyrics and a conscious and concerted message against apartheid laws, in 1986. Interspersed with clips of the band performing, the video shows scenes of confrontation between government institutions (particularly the military) and both black and white citizens coming together and “acting in concert” to convey their message against apartheid laws. One year later, a few members of the anti-apartheid movement sponsored their performance in Amsterdam. When they returned to South Africa, their music had spread across the country, and the government had banned their songs from the radio because of the lyrics’ political message and their open involvement in this formal organization against apartheid. In the video clip, Mac McKenzie describes the freedom that they had to speak about their feelings on apartheid and to perform with the ghoema, a drum that he learned to play because of his father’s work with the Cape Carnival Minstrels. “Now we could play our ghoema and we could sing about the politics and say ‘hey, fuck this politics … fuck this government.’” While Mac McKenzie and the Genuines expressed their opposition to the government openly through their lyrics, punk rock style, and involvement in the anti-apartheid movement, other artists in Cape Town expressed their resistance through more subtle means.

Unlike most of the other genres discussed here, scholars such as Carol Muller and Christopher Ballantine have extensively researched the post-World War II jazz scene that emerged in Cape Town. Muller emphasizes three main reasons for examining socio-historical studies of Cape Town prior to this time: first, that the culture of Cape Town, which was established by an intermingling of various religions, languages, music, and races, was influenced by multiple factors: narratives of slavery, colonial immigration, the travels of British and American entertainers-minstrels, classical musicians, vaudeville, and variety artists; the decimation of indigenous peoples through warfare and disease; an ongoing interaction between Islam, Christianity, and traditional beliefs; racial and nationalist power struggles; and the emergence of the South African language of Afrikaans.

The second reason Muller gives for understanding the broader context of Cape culture is that mixed race sexual relations created some of the first citizens, now known as “Cape Coloured.” Finally, she emphasizes the strong historical musical legacy; the predecessors of current Cape residents were highly skilled musicians who could “replicate … almost any musical repertoire.”

One artist who emerged from this Cape Town jazz scene during the anti-apartheid movement was Sathima Bea Benjamin. Her interest in the jazz community began when she was sixteen years old. She would sit outside of the skating rink, since laws forbade her to enter because of the color of her skin, and would listen to Sam Issacs and his band perform. Issacs would later become her entrance to the jazz community, although her move to Kew Town also assisted her. During the 1960s the government expanded implementations of a law where non-white citizens were required to carry passes that gave them the...
right to be outside of their designated ethnic area. In protest against this law, black citizens appeared at the Sharpeville police station, and police killed sixty-nine citizens. Since Cape Town jazz inherently integrated various races in one setting, and most non-white citizens did not have passes to verify their being outside of ethnic areas, performing became very dangerous. Benjamin decided to move to Switzerland for safety reasons.\textsuperscript{14} In 1983 she released the album \textit{African Songbird}, which contained the song “Africa.” The lyrics reflect her longing to return to Africa and the desire for an Africa where she could perform jazz as she had been performing it. “I’ve been gone much too long and I plan to say that I’m home, I’m home to stay … Now I’m home to stay, for many a day, Africa, let your music play.” Muller comments that the lyrics were “remarkably prophetic for its time.”\textsuperscript{14}

Benjamin participated in the anti-apartheid movement both through her conscious involvement in the integrated jazz scene of Cape Town and through her songs and lyrics. Although very different from Benjamin’s involvement in the anti-apartheid movement, McKenzie and the Genuines also participated in a confrontational form of acting in concert, through lyrics openly critical of the government, the use of punk rock style, and their association with the anti-apartheid movement.

\textit{Johannesburg Case Studies.}\textsuperscript{10} In Johannesburg, Grand Apartheid displaced Africans through word of mouth, for a number of years.\textsuperscript{15} It was formally popularized across the country through recordings by Nancy Jacobs and Sisters, Miriam Makeba, and many other artists. Government officials interpreted this song as a positive reflection on the forced movement to Meadowlands, but black citizens interpreted the lyrics quite differently and the song quickly turned into a form of resistance sung during the morning of February 9, 1955. Masked by lyrics in Zulu, Sesotho, and Tswana, this song was used by Africans fluent in these languages to voice their opinions about and to collectively mobilize against the government in the anti-apartheid movement. From 1979 until 1981, the band National Wake performed, recorded, and sold 700 copies of their single album. The band was composed of two brothers, Gary and Punkha Khoza, who formed the rhythm section; Ivan Kadley, who was the lead vocalist; and Steve Moni, who was the guitarist.\textsuperscript{16} This punk rock, multi-racial band was inspired to speak out against apartheid by the example of high school students in the June 1976 Soweto Uprising. Kadey stated in a 2012 interview that, “for me, music had always been a vehicle for expressing one’s rebellion.”\textsuperscript{16} Kadey wanted to record the songs they were performing in front of segregated, live audiences. However, National Wake ended up producing an album through a formal organization. Their song “International News” was played on a popular radio station, and they began performing across the city.\textsuperscript{17} The lyrics began, “they put a blanket over Soweto. They put a blanket nowhere to go” — works that referred to how, under apartheid laws, the media was not allowed to report on the boycotts and political unrest that occurred throughout South Africa.\textsuperscript{17} Like the Genuines in Cape Town, National Wake not only spoke outwardly against apartheid through their lyrics, but they also used punk rock music, which was considered rebellious, and performed as a racially mixed group for integrated audiences.

The band’s performances, however, also faced government resistance: “there were cops that would wait at the outskirts of the house and arrest guys before a gig.”\textsuperscript{16} The band members continued using their music as an outward sign of their involvement in the anti-apartheid movement, until they started “making it.” Then they “broke it” by agreeing to play at the Chelsea, a segregated venue. The stress of performing to a segregated audience, an audience that supported the very laws they were singing against, caused the band to quit their live performances. Years later, in 2013, Kadley confessed that performing at the Chelsea was a large reason why they broke up; they felt they were “selling out.”\textsuperscript{16} A documentary called \textit{Punk in Africa} was released in 2012, drawing attention to this subcultural punk group that spoke against apartheid and other political and social injustices across southern Africa.\textsuperscript{16}

Between The Genuines’ boldly open political involvement in the anti-apartheid movement and Sathima Bea Benjamin’s exile from South Africa and longing for freedom to perform her music at home, Cape Town artists found a way to voice and share their opinions about apartheid. In Johannesburg, Strike Vilakazi, by using multiple African languages, kept his lyrics from being censored, and the National Wake used their lyrics, music, and skin color to participate in the anti-apartheid movement. While the government was more actively controlling the public dissemination of music through official institutions and media during the anti-apartheid movement, South African artists in Cape Town and Johannesburg found alternative ways to publicly and creatively express their feelings during the gender and sexuality movement.

The Emergence of Music from the Gender and Sexuality Movement.\textsuperscript{14}

In 2006, South Africa became the fifth country in the world, and the first country in Africa, to legalize same sex marriage through the Civil Union Act.\textsuperscript{17} Prior to this legislation, the 1997 Bill of Rights made it illegal to discriminate based on “race, gender, sex, pregnancy, marital status, ethnic or social origin, colour, sexual orientation, age, disability, religion, conscience, belief, culture, language and birth.”\textsuperscript{18} Although South Africa was early in establishing Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender (LGBT) legal rights, public opinion did not necessarily reflect the legal judgment of the country. A recent survey conducted by the Pew Research Center confirmed the general lack of support for the gender and sexuality movement among South African citizens. Between March and May of 2013 the researchers at Pew Research Center asked citizens of various countries across the globe whether homosexuality should be accepted by society.\textsuperscript{19} Sixty-one percent of South African citizens responded “no,” while thirty-two percent responded “yes.”\textsuperscript{19} Although this survey, like any survey, cannot be considered a direct correlation to South African
popular opinion on the topic, it does show that the general view differs from the governmental policies on LGBT rights.

Ethnomusicologist Nicol Hammond also confirmed the lack of support the LGBT community receives in South Africa during her paper presentation at the 2013 Society for Ethnomusicology’s conference. Using examples from her research, Hammond spoke about how online communities have become platforms for LGBT communication out of fears associated with public perception and reaction.\(^{20}\) Even though the National Assembly passed the Civil Union Act in 2006, many supporters of the law, like former President Jacob Zuma, or other government figures, will try to dismantle it. In 2012, one reporter speaking about the 1997 Bill of Rights amendment stated that “it’s important to remember the achievement, because it is likely only a matter of time before Jacob Zuma and the African National Congress (ANC) attempt to dismantle gay rights in the country.”\(^{21}\)

Music is one of the ways supporters of the gender and sexuality movements voice their support, as seen in case studies from Cape Town and Johannesburg.

\textbf{Cape Town Case Studies.} Die Antwoord, a “zebra rap-rave krew” composed of Ninja, Yolandi Vi$$er, and DJ Hi-Tek, formed in Cape Town in 2008.\(^{22}\) Vi$$er and Ninja explained what zef style is in an interview with Wat kyk jy?:

> In South Africa they made up the name for a people who are a little bit common… it came from poor neighborhoods when people don’t have money but they look fancy. But it also used to be an insult… We changed it to something like cool.”\(^{23}\)

The free release of their first album in 2009 and the popularity of their music videos brought international acclaim to Die Antwoord. The band’s releases are now reviewed by managers across the world, including one in Los Angeles. In lieu of releasing their new album, Die Antwoord sent a single called “Fok Julle Naaiers” to the band’s manager in Los Angeles. The manager thought that the use of the word ‘faggot’ by DJ Hi-Tek would cause controversy and result in a loss of fan support in the United States. In response to this suggestion, Die Antwoord posted a home-recorded video on YouTube explaining why the word ‘faggot’ was not discriminatory, and then released the music video shortly after:

> I’d like to set the record straight here once and for all. Number one – DJ Hi Tek is gay. So there you go. Now you know. Number two – DJ Hi Tek says the word ‘faggot’ doesn’t hold any power over him. Hi Tek says ‘faggot’ all the time, because he’s like kinda taken that word and made it his bitch. Number three – just to be fuckin’ clear, Die Antwoord are not homophobic… And finally number four – it comes across to us that some people in America are heavy sensitive about the use of certain words. But the thing is, what you need to understand is, we’re not from America, we’re from South Africa, and South Africa people aren’t so pumped up about these words.”\(^{24}\)

Die Antwoord’s claim that they are not homophobic and their desire to transform the normally derogatory term of ‘faggot’ are ways this group has taken part in the gender and sexuality movement in Cape Town, and possibly across the world.

Freshlyground, another internationally acclaimed band, has been performing across southern Africa for the past eleven years. The group released its most recent album Take Me to the Dance in 2012, which was filled with a new, more electronic-sounding style of music that listeners were not as accustomed to hearing. Kyle-Rose Smith, violinist and singer for Freshlyground, spoke about why the members of the group decided to branch out musically by electrifying their sound.

> “I think we are in a position where we are secure enough not to have to play to people’s expectation of us but rather show them a different side to Freshlyground because we are all varied and diverse individuals.”\(^{25}\)

The band uses this informal network of fans to spread messages about the gender and sexuality movement.

The title track, “Take Me to the Dance,” relates in many ways to the gender and sexuality movement in South Africa. First through Xabiso, a boy cast to play an “androgyneous but strong… African super hero” throughout the music video. Influenced by superheroes Silver Surfer and Doctor Manhattan, Freshlyground and their video director, Sam Coleman, originally thought this role would be played by a girl, to create an alter-ego for lead singer Zolani Mahola while she sings “I am a woman not a child.”\(^{26}\) However, when Xabiso attended the casting call-outs, they instantly changed their minds and created the androgynous superhero. Though they did not explain their reasons for choosing to portray the boy this way, it is interesting that Xabiso is portrayed as androgyneous instead of a specific sex. Second, one of the group’s goals in producing the music video was to create a lively dance floor that represents people one would not run across in every day life. “Cape Carnival Minstrels, strippers, kids and their mamas, androgynous types, cross dressers, roller girls, zombie shake dancers, booty dancers and everything else in between all showed up” for the casting call, which made Coleman very excited. These were exactly the type of people he was looking for.\(^{27}\) Why Coleman wanted to portray these “unlikely characters” in Freshlyground’s music video for “Take Me to the Dance” is still a question. Because of the work of previous artists in the gender and sexuality movement, nudity is not uncommon in popular South African music videos today. The combination of all of these types of people in one location was a new addition to the movement, and was a socially directed effort to change public expectations for gender and sexuality roles.

In Cape Town, Die Antwoord participated in the gender and sexuality movement by posting a video stating their acceptance of homosexuality and trying to positively reclaim the word ‘faggot’ in their song “Fok Julle Naaiers.” Freshlyground supported the movement by using an “androgyneous…African superhero” and other “unlikely characters” in their music video for “Take Me to the Dance” to support the gender and sexuality movement.

\textbf{Johannesburg Case Studies.} Afropop singer Brenda Fassie was born in 1964 in a township near Cape Town named Langa. Her mother was a pianist who surrounded her with music from the time she was born. By age five she was earning money by singing for tourists, and by age sixteen she had moved to Johannesburg to pursue a musical career with the support of producer Koloi Lebona.\(^{28}\) She formed a group called Brenda and the Big Dudes, In 1983 their album, which included the hit single “Weekend Special,” earned her much renown across South Africa. With such wide support, Fassie said she did not feel the pressure to conform to typical societal norms. Many argue that because of this liberty gained through her secure, informal network of fans, Fassie became the
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in 2002. According to Nicol Hammond, Zoid
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Fassie as a groundbreaker for other artists.
views on homosexual preferences, also framed
to remain an artist, despite derogatory societal
another aspect of the movement: the LGBT
movement had made significant progress since
-9, 2004, her own passing. Mali, which included
the song “My Baby,” was not released until af-
ter she died. Though the gender and sexuality
movement had made significant progress since
the release of “Touch Somebody” in 1985, fans
and members began using Fassie to represent
another aspect of the movement: the LGBT
community. Public discourse about her ability
to remain an artist, despite derogatory societal
views on homosexuals preferences, also framed
Fassie as a groundbreaker for other artists.
Singer-songwriter Karen Zoid, another
female artist from Johannesburg, has also
challenged gender stereotypes in South Africa
when she released her first album, Poles Apart,
in 2002. According to Nicol Hammond, Zoid
confronted these gender stereotypes in three
ways. First, she chose to create rock music,
which has a history of use for resistance
against apartheid in South Africa. 27 Using a
genre typically identified with resistance and
opposition is one way that Zoid clarified she
was saying something different. Second, Zoid
used performance techniques intended to defy
gender stereotypes:
Zoid’s deliberate efforts to keep her
feminine body visible as she performs
rock masculinity (she has been known
to expose her breasts on stage, and, even
when cross-dressing, wears her long
blond hair in a feminine style and favours
skin-tight outfits, black sequins, and
playful jewellery) reveals the performa-
tive (and, hence, non-real) nature of this
masculinity. 27

During one of her first performances in
2002, she also gathered the attention of the
South African audience by smashing a guitar
onstage, a typically masculine act. Finally, as
Hammond points out, Zoid used a different
vocal timbre and register than most female
Afrikaner artists. 27 Similar to Dutch, only with
harder consonants, Afrikaans is “characterized
(confusingly) as ‘deep.’” Because of this com-
mon characterization of Afrikaans as sounding
masculine, females often deliberately sing in a
higher, more innocent sounding tone. “Zoid’s
more throaty, deeper, husky vocal delivery
is in deliberate opposition to this sound.” 27
An example of this lower tone, found in Zoid’s
song, “Ons Soek Rock en Roll,” is a consciously
placed male voice in falsetto on top of her low-
ered tone for the introduction. Over the years
Zoid has become an icon in the South African
musical scene.
To sum up, Brenda Fassie began her career
in Johannesburg by assertively approaching
topics of love in her lyrics. When news of her
bisexuality was spread across the country
through both institutional and extra-institu-
tional sites, her public appearance as a bisexual
artist encouraged fans to participate in the
gender and sexuality movement. As queen of
rock Karen Zoid remains active in Johannes-
burg’s gender and sexuality movement today,
continuing to challenge gender stereotypes
through her music.

Conclusion
Apartheid laws institutionalized censorship
policies on black South African radio stations,
forcing artists to decide whether they would
mask their participation in the anti-apartheid
movement to get airtime on government-run
stations, or bear the consequences of not being
played on the public radio and find alternative
means to disseminate their messages. In Cape
Town, The Genuineus decided to bear these
consequences by openly speaking against
apartheid in their music. Because she played
jazz music, Sathima Bea Benjamin also did
not receive airtime on government-sponsored
stations. In Johannesburg, Strike Vilakazi was
able to mask his anti-apartheid message by
incorporating various African languages into
his song “Meadowlands.” National Wake used
punk rock, lyrics, and their diverse band mem-
bership to speak against apartheid laws.
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