

The Hayes
History Journal
2018

The Hayes History Journal 2018

Editors: John Reynolds, Jacqueline Gibson, Ashley Green,
Sarah Knapp, and Andrew McCormack

Faculty Advisors:
Dr. Alison Williams Lewin and Dr. Melissa Chakars

The Hayes History Journal staff thanks
Victor Taylor for his long-standing support
of the Journal and student publishing at Saint
Joseph's University

The Hayes History Journal is a student publication of the Department of History, Saint Joseph's University, Philadelphia. The Journal welcomes submissions from students at Saint Joseph's University for its next issue. Please contact the Department of History for information regarding submissions or any editorial matters.

Contents

Section I - Women in History

Jacqueline Gibson

Eleanor of Aquitaine and Female Autonomy in Medieval Europe

Ashley Green

Catherine the Great and the Impact of her Reign

Lauren DiAngelo

The Rise, Expansion, and Flaws of the Women's Liberation Movement and the Sexual Revolution

Section II - Modernity

Chelsea Smith

The Bark Side of the Moon: Exploring the conflicting categorizations of the Space Race animals

James Elliott

The Soviet-Afghan War: The Blowback that was Afghanistan

Section III - The Supernatural in History

Meredith O'Reilly

Leonarde's Ghost: Why It Didn't Become a Case of Demonic Possession

John Reynolds

Revered or Burnt at the Stake

Gabriella Gutierrez

Classifying the Thirty Years War

Women in History

This section moves chronologically through history, telling stories of queens testing the limits of female authority and women working towards achieving equality in the twentieth century.

The common theme throughout each of these pieces is not only that they involve women throughout history, but what they show about women throughout history: strength, resilience, and a willingness to challenge the status quo.

Eleanor of Aquitaine and Female Autonomy in Medieval Europe

Jacqueline Gibson

In 1168, Eleanor of Aquitaine was stationed in her duchy of Aquitaine after experiencing something of a hiatus from the region. Eleanor's husband, Henry II of England, seems to have decided that it would be politically beneficial to station his wife in her ducal domains in order to subdue the lords of Aquitaine, who had rebelled frequently against the authority of the English crown. The fact that Henry put Eleanor there is not surprising, as medieval aristocrats frequently depended on strong, capable wives to aid them in matters of governance. What is somewhat surprising is the way she may have perceived her authority there and how this opportunity to govern her inherited domains allowed her to further develop her own sense of autonomy.

Interestingly, in 1173, Eleanor and Henry's sons staged a rebellion against their father. Scholars have debated Eleanor's role in helping her sons foment this rebellion against their father, as Henry imprisoned Eleanor in 1173 and she would remain his virtual captive until his death in 1189. In addition, the period of 1168 to 1173 has been the subject of much scholarly debate and has raised numerous questions, including why Eleanor was stationed in Aquitaine for so long, what role she played in stabilizing the region, and, importantly, the degree of autonomy she enjoyed while stationed there. Arguably, the relationship between these two events (Eleanor's governance of Aquitaine and the rebellion against Henry) present another question: Did Eleanor's growing sense of autonomy, which was arguably always present, but was potentially reinforced beginning in 1168, compel her to aid her sons in fomenting rebellion against their father and her husband in 1173?

It is necessary to understand how Eleanor's circumstances as a noble woman born in Aquitaine may have fostered in her a desire to rule autonomously and also to compare her upbringing and noble circumstances to those of her contemporaries. It is also vital to explore her relationship to her ducal domains, especially the experience she had of exercising essentially full authority over her domains between 1152 and 1154, the years between her being Queen of France and Queen of England. Arguably, one cannot explore the nature of Eleanor's autonomy between 1168 and 1173 without having explored her position from 1152 to 1154. It is also pertinent to analyze the turbulent political situation in Aquitaine as it relates to Henry II's governance, as this ultimately led Henry to station Eleanor in Aquitaine in 1168. Finally, it is crucial to analyze textual evidence from this time, namely chronicles, letters, and an important text from a Poitevin poet, in order to investigate Eleanor's level of involvement in the rebellion of 1173. First, however, it is important to begin with an analysis of the medieval system under which Eleanor lived and the opportunities that this system presented for aristocratic females to have power.

Eleanor's connection to her duchy was most likely always present. Her first documented connection to her duchy dates to contemporary records in July 1129, however, when she, accompanied by her parents and her younger brother, witnessed a charter which granted

privileges to the Abbey of Montierneuf in memory of her grandfather, who was buried there.¹ Each member of the family inscribed a cross by his or her name, while Eleanor's infant brother made a print with a finger which had been dipped in ink.² Eleanor would have been about seven years old when this charter was issued, thus showing her documented ties to her duchy at a very young age. Weir writes, "[S]he conceived a great love and loyalty for her ancestral domains: throughout her life Aquitaine would always be her first priority."³

Eleanor of Aquitaine was born into a society whose culture was relatively favorable to women. In fact, Aquitanian laws, which had been laid down in the years before the Church increased its influence in ducal domains, ensured that a woman's status in the duchy was higher than elsewhere in Europe.⁴ In Aquitaine, women could inherit property in their own right and even rule autonomously over lands they inherited while also taking part in public life; unlike women in northern France, women in Aquitaine were not kept secluded from men or broader society.⁵

D.D.R. Owen and Alison Weir argue that Eleanor in many ways continued the tradition of her strong-minded, female ancestors, who clearly benefited from the relatively accepting approach regarding female authority in the region of Aquitaine. Weir argues that Eleanor shared "many qualities with that company of ambitious, formidable, and strong-minded female ancestors."⁶ Owen argues that William III, Duke of Aquitaine "was rather under the thumb of his pious spouse Adela" while his son's wife, Emma, "showed as much zeal in taking revenge on his mistress as she commonly devoted to charitable works. (The latter included the foundation of the abbey of Bourgueil in Touraine.)"⁷ Moreover, Emma "played a vital part in the formative years of the future William the Great and during the first decade of his reign."⁸ Owen argues that these noble ladies in the Aquitaine dynasty show an impressive range of active abilities; they were not confined to ceremonies of the court, but acted on their own initiative in public as well as domestic matters, and commonly patronized the Church with gifts and foundations.⁹

While Eleanor likely benefited from this relatively favorable social structure and continued the tradition of her strong female ancestors, she most certainly benefited from a somewhat unusual circumstance: the fact that her father, Duke William, was committed to giving her some formal education. Unusually for the time, Duke William ensured that Eleanor could read in both her native language and in Latin.¹⁰

1 Alison Weir, *Eleanor of Aquitaine: A Life* (New York: Ballantine Books, 1999), 17.

2 Weir, *Eleanor of Aquitaine*, 17.

3 Weir, *Eleanor of Aquitaine*, 17.

4 Weir, *Eleanor of Aquitaine*, 16.

5 Weir, *Eleanor of Aquitaine*, 16.

6 Weir, *Eleanor of Aquitaine*, 17.

7 D. D. R. Owen, *Eleanor of Aquitaine: Queen and Legend* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1993), 6-7.

8 Owen, *Eleanor of Aquitaine*, 6-7.

9 Owen, *Eleanor of Aquitaine*, 6-7.

10 Weir, *Eleanor of Aquitaine*, 17.

Though it was not typical for a noble woman to be so highly educated, Eleanor's experience in this regard is not entirely unique. Many examples exist of noblewomen who, like Eleanor, had some formal education and therefore were valued by their husbands as smart and capable partners in ruling their domains. Adela of Blois, who famously ruled alongside her husband, Stephen-Henry, is one such example: "The sources indicate that Stephen-Henry, whose sons were too young to take significant decisions independently, willingly associated his younger, literate, and high-born wife in all aspects of comital lordship from the start of his tenure as count."¹ Scholars believe that Adela received formal instruction in Latin letters; Adela's mother came from a family that fostered a tradition of Latin literacy and several of Adela's siblings are known to have received at least some form of a literary education from household tutors or religious establishments.² Adela's education, coupled with her royal lineage, made her a more than suitable match for a noble man, a wife who could rule alongside her husband or alone in his absence. Indeed, Adela's own wealth and abilities, her noble status, which lent her authority, and her age relative to that of her husband and children, led to Adela's being acknowledged as co-count with her husband, even when he was living.³

Eleanor's noble standing and duchy definitely made her a suitable and desirable match for Henry Plantagenet. Eleanor was newly divorced in 1152 and recognized the importance of a hasty marriage. Ralph V. Turner delineates Eleanor's circumstances and therefore the importance of her marriage, and also the unique way in which she herself arranged her marriage to Henry Plantagenet: "As heir to the largest of the French duchies and as a former queen, Eleanor had few options in marriage partners, but she had to take the initiative in making a new marriage before being forced into wedding someone not of her own choosing. In an act almost unheard of in her time, Eleanor acted independently without consulting her kin or other counselors."⁴ While Eleanor saw the benefit of choosing her own husband and making sure he could defend her and her lands, for his part Henry was well aware of the political advantage that Eleanor could bring as his wife, and was thus equally determined to marry her.⁵

In order to understand the importance of Eleanor's reign in Aquitaine between 1168 and 1173, in terms of what it would have meant for her personally and for the Angevin domains politically, it is important to analyze the years between her divorce from Louis VII and her coronation as queen of England. As Ralph Turner writes, "During the brief period between Eleanor's return to Poitiers and her departure for England to become Henry II's queen, she wielded full authority as duchess of Aquitaine."⁶ Turner and Weir analyze Eleanor's sense of independence during this period of her life. Eleanor issued two documents at Poitiers in May

1 Kimberly A. LoPrete, "Adela of Blois: Familial Alliances and Female Lordship," in *Aristocratic Women in Medieval France*, ed. Theodore Evergates (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 1999), 20.

2 LoPrete, "Adela of Blois," 15.

3 LoPrete, "Adela of Blois," 25.

4 Ralph V. Turner, *Eleanor of Aquitaine: Queen of France, Queen of England* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009), 108.

5 Turner, *Eleanor of Aquitaine*, 108.

6 Turner, *Eleanor of Aquitaine*, 112.

1152, a mere week after marrying Henry, in which she confirmed grants that her great-grandfather, grandfather, and father had made to two important Poitevin religious houses, Montierneuf and Saint-Maixent; in each document she acted independently without seeking Henry's approval.¹ Indeed, in many acts during this time, Eleanor acted without her new husband witnessing or confirming the acts; in fact, Henry is mentioned in only one of the charters and then only for the purpose of dating the charter: "in the time of Henry ruler of the Poitevins and Angevins," since he was not yet officially the "duke of Aquitaine."² More evidence suggest Eleanor's independence shortly after her new marriage: the witnesses of her charters were only members of her own entourage, with no one representing Henry's household.³

In the charter issued on May 26, 1152, Eleanor highlighted her own kinship ties and ties to her ducal domains while also asserting her autonomy: "Since the memory of men slips away swiftly, lest any difficulty of controversy should arise over this among those to come, I Eleanor, by the grace of God duchess of Aquitainians and Normans, I signify to the future as well as the present..."⁴ Eleanor established her own authority in the present as well as in the future, enshrining herself as the authority while also connecting herself to her ancestors: "my father and grandfather similarly gave, granted and confirmed, I give, grant, and confirm and order to be held in perpetuity those things which have been acquired and those which will be acquired. I grant also and confirm all the protections which my ancestor, grandfather, and father gave to that monastery..."⁵

Weir analyzes Eleanor's sense of autonomy and her reassertion of her ties to the lords of Aquitaine, writing that upon receiving her annulment of her marriage with Louis, Eleanor notified her vassals of the annulment and summoned them to renew their loyalty to her as Duchess of Aquitaine, and, undoubtedly, to approve her choice of husband.⁶ Moreover, Weir argues that Eleanor asserted her autonomy by annulling all the acts and decrees Louis had made in Aquitaine, by issuing charters on her own and by renewing grants and privileges to several religious houses in her domains.⁷ Furthermore, the attention that she paid to the business of ruling suggests that she was enjoying her independence.⁸ Scholars argue that Eleanor's coronation as Queen of England put an end to this relatively brief period of Eleanor's absolute reign over her ducal domains. She did not regain this degree of authority until growing tensions between the lords of Aquitaine and King Henry II led to her being stationed in her duchy in

1 Turner, *Eleanor of Aquitaine*, 112.

2 Turner, *Eleanor of Aquitaine*, 113.

3 Turner, *Eleanor of Aquitaine*, 113.

4 Francois Villard ed., *Recueil des Documents relatifs a L'Abbaye de Montierneuf de Poitiers* (1076-1319), (Poitiers, 1973), pp.135-36. "A letter from Eleanor of Aquitaine (1152, May 26)."

5 Villard, 135-36.

6 Weir, *Eleanor of Aquitaine*, 89.

7 Weir, *Eleanor of Aquitaine*, 89.

8 Weir, *Eleanor of Aquitaine*, 89.

1168, thus creating an opportunity for Eleanor to once again execute significant authority over her ducal domains.

Eleanor's ducal lands were perceived as notoriously difficult to govern, especially by outsiders.¹ Weir analyzes the Aquitanian perception of Henry's rule: "Always fiercely independent and, in the opinion of many, ungovernable, they [the Aquitainians] had resented French interference in the duchy, but Henry represented a far more potent threat to their autonomy than his predecessor had done. They were deeply suspicious of his aspiration to be king of England, and feared that he would milk the duchy dry to achieve this, then use the vast resources at his disposal as a sovereign ruler to force his will upon them."²

John Gillingham argues that the notion of Aquitaine as a vast political wilderness where tenants rebelled against their lords and family infighting and feuds over territory were common is an incorrect interpretation that historians continue to propagate.³ He argues that the origins of these claims and beliefs come from politically motivated twelfth-century sources: "It is true that late twelfth-century English historians such as Gerald de Barri and Richard of Devizes wrote of Aquitaine as a region almost impossible to govern - but this was precisely in order to praise Richard for governing it well."⁴

While the modern views of Aquitaine may rely too much on contemporary propaganda praising the reigns of Richard I, the duchy of Aquitaine did nonetheless pose considerable problems for Henry II during his reign as King of England. Gillingham provides important information regarding the political geography of twelfth-century Aquitaine: "The facts of political geography alone are sufficient to suggest that there might have been many occasions when the duke of Aquitaine found himself at odds with the Taillefers and the Lusignans. Indeed feuds with these families had been part of the staple political diet of the early twelfth-century dukes."⁵ Ralph Turner argues that the prominent source of conflict between Henry and the Poitevin nobility related to cultural differences: "Although the Poitevin nobility were willing to acknowledge Henry Plantagenet's pre-eminence as their count-duke, they regarded his attempts to introduce an Anglo-Norman pattern of governing into their duchess's lands as unwarranted meddling. He put them on the defensive in trying to transform vague ties of lordship that had bound to Eleanor's predecessors into the enforceable obligations owed by his Norman and English nobles."⁶ Henry II was involved in suppressing rebellions in Aquitaine as early as the spring of 1154, when he was called to the duchy to suppress a minor rebellion.⁷

Henry faced a problem common to many monarchs whose kingdoms comprised various distant lands, but he strove valiantly to maintain his authority regardless. Weir writes, "Governing such far-flung territories presented many practical difficulties in an age of poor

1 Weir, *Eleanor of Aquitaine*, 91.

2 Weir, *Eleanor of Aquitaine*, 96.

3 John Gillingham, "Aquitaine, 1157-1172," in *Richard I* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999), 35.

4 Gillingham, "Aquitaine," 35.

5 Gillingham, "Aquitaine," 36.

6 Turner, *Eleanor of Aquitaine*, 177.

7 Weir, *Eleanor of Aquitaine*, 101.

communications, but with his tremendous energy Henry strove to overcome them, keeping in constant touch with the affairs of each domain by messenger, letter, and personal visits.”¹ Despite his efforts, which included constantly visiting the various domains and centralizing the administration of his territories, “Henry was almost constantly at war, either with France, or subduing rebellious vassals, or keeping his borders secure from attack.”² Indeed, Henry found his continental domains significantly more difficult to govern than his kingdom, especially Aquitaine, where his rule was never popular; the region was almost constantly in a state of revolt against him.³

Henry tried to appease the rebellious Aquitanian lords on numerous occasions, including in November 1165, when he summoned them to meet him and declared his intention of honoring them by holding his Christmas court at Poitiers, where he planned to present their future overlord; the Poitevins, however, were not impressed with his overtures and returned home to continue plotting against him.⁴ Early in the new year of 1166, Henry crushed a rebellion by William Taillefer, one of Eleanor’s uncles, in Aquitaine.⁵ Shortly after, on Easter, he marched against the Count of Auvergne, who was conspiring with King Louis against Henry.⁶

During the fall, following yet another campaign through Aquitaine to subdue its rebellious lords, Henry seems to have realized that having Eleanor present in the duchy, and having her reassert her authority as duchess, might help to minimize opposition to his lordship.⁷ Henry by his right of marriage was count of Poitou and duke of Aquitaine, and though he could exercise his wife’s hereditary rights by way of delegation, he could not lawfully transfer ducal rights without first receiving her consent.⁸ Likewise, Eleanor, as a married woman, could not act in matters concerning her ducal lands without her husband’s assent.⁹ While this was legally the case, Eleanor and the lords of Aquitaine recognized her right to her inheritance when she was fourteen years old, as the lords of Aquitaine swore fealty to Eleanor on her fourteenth birthday in 1136.¹⁰ Therefore, the lords of Aquitaine may have been much more inclined to listen to Eleanor, their long-acknowledged duchess, than Henry, whom they historically did not trust.

In 1168, Henry seems to have determined that Eleanor should be based in Poitiers for the foreseeable future.¹¹ After reports of more unrest in the South, Henry set off for Poitou to

-
- 1 Weir, *Eleanor of Aquitaine*, 124.
 - 2 Weir, *Eleanor of Aquitaine*, 124-125.
 - 3 Weir, *Eleanor of Aquitaine*, 124.
 - 4 Weir, *Eleanor of Aquitaine*, 168.
 - 5 Weir, *Eleanor of Aquitaine*, 169.
 - 6 Weir, *Eleanor of Aquitaine*, 169.
 - 7 Weir, *Eleanor of Aquitaine*, 170.
 - 8 Turner, *Eleanor of Aquitaine*, 175.
 - 9 Turner, *Eleanor of Aquitaine*, 175.
 - 10 Weir, *Eleanor of Aquitaine*, 13.
 - 11 Weir, *Eleanor of Aquitaine*, 170.

confront the rebels, most notably, the Lusignans.¹ Owen writes, “He captured their castle and devastated the surrounding territory; but most of the refractory lords remained at liberty.”² He took Eleanor with him, intending to leave her, along with Patrick, Earl of Salisbury to control her vassals.³ Marie Hivergneaux writes, “To calm and contain the Aquitainians, Henry gave them back their duchess.”⁴

Scholars and historians have explored a wide variety of reasons for Eleanor being stationed in Aquitaine between 1168 and 1173, from Henry’s recognition that he could not possibly control his wife’s unruly ducal domains on his own, to the declining marital relationship between Eleanor and Henry, and Henry’s desire to carry on an affair with the beautiful Rosamund de Clifford without his wife’s uncomfortable presence.

Weir argues that Eleanor remained in Aquitaine in the years after 1168 because she wanted to be separated from Henry, though she acknowledges that the cause for this separation has been extensively debated.⁵ Turner makes a similar argument: “It is not unlikely that the decision for Eleanor to return to Poitou was mutual, marking the couple’s agreement to an unofficial separation without undue rancor, whether for political or personal reasons.”⁶ Some have suggested that Eleanor was angered by Henry’s love for Rosamund de Clifford and thus desired to separate from him, yet the evidence suggests that Eleanor largely ignored his frequent infidelities almost from the time of their marriage, which is evidenced by the fact that she had tolerated the presence of his bastard son Geoffrey in her household.⁷ Moreover, the claim that Eleanor was hurt because Henry was in love with Rosamund, thus making it different from his previous affairs which had been of a purely physical nature, is also unfounded, as Henry had been emotionally involved with another woman, Rohese de Clare.⁸

While Weir surmises that the separation was not due to Eleanor’s jealousy of her husband’s extramarital affair with Rosamund de Clifford, she does suggest that Eleanor might have decided to separate from Henry due to her age, as she may have been undergoing menopause in roughly 1168.⁹ One other possible explanation that Weir provides is that both Eleanor and Henry recognized the dire circumstances in her duchy of Aquitaine: “Both Eleanor and Henry seem to have felt that, in view of the volatile nature of Aquitanian politics, she should be resident in the duchy with her heir to safeguard his inheritance, and they probably intended that in time he would become associated with her in the government of her lands and would ultimately relieve her of that responsibility.”¹⁰

1 Owen, *Eleanor of Aquitaine*, 57.

2 Owen, *Eleanor of Aquitaine*, 57.

3 Owen, *Eleanor of Aquitaine*, 57.

4 Marie Hivergneaux, “Queen Eleanor and Aquitaine, 1137-1189,” in *Eleanor of Aquitaine: Lord and Lady*, ed. Bonnie Wheeler and John Carmi Parsons (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), 67

5 Weir, *Eleanor of Aquitaine*, 173.

6 Turner, *Eleanor of Aquitaine*, 185.

7 Weir, *Eleanor of Aquitaine*, 173.

8 Weir, *Eleanor of Aquitaine*, 173.

9 Weir, *Eleanor of Aquitaine*, 173.

10 Weir, *Eleanor of Aquitaine*, 173-174.

Pointing to charter evidence, Hivergneaux writes that Eleanor's stationing in Aquitaine had everything to do with the unruly lords of Aquitaine: "The spite or jealousy of a deceived woman was never expressed in charters and would be impossible to prove in any case. Certainly it did not underlie Eleanor's reappearance at the head of Aquitanian administration late in 1167 or early in 1168. Rather, her reappearance underlines Henry II's inability to control all his domains through his own administration."¹ Weir argues that another potential reason for Eleanor's time in Aquitaine stemmed from her desire for relative autonomy from Henry: "She may... have decided that she preferred living in her native land with a relative degree of autonomy as its duchess than as Henry's wife and queen, relegated to a subordinate role. [I]t suited Henry, and was in everyone's interests, for her to do this."² Turner echoes this idea, writing, "Little considered as a factor in Eleanor's willingness to take up residence in Aquitaine was her own desire to wield power over her patrimony, a wish to assume her hereditary right as duchess."³

While Hivergneaux maintains that Eleanor was stationed in Aquitaine first and foremost because of her essential role in subduing the Aquitanians, Hivergneaux argues that Eleanor certainly enjoyed the increased autonomy: "There is reason to believe that Eleanor was seeking during this period to confirm herself definitively as the head of the duchy, and even to distance herself increasingly from Henry II's policies."⁴ This is evidenced by the Christmas courts she held in Aquitaine in 1168 and 1171 with her son but not her husband; the sources which indicate that in 1172, she hosted King Alphonso II of Aragon and King Sancho VI of Navarre.⁵ Thus Weir, Turner, and Hivergneaux acknowledge the growing sense of autonomy that Eleanor experienced between 1168 and 1173, but while Weir and Turner recognize this as a reason for her decision to stay in Aquitaine, in "Queen Eleanor and Aquitaine, 1137-1189," Hivergneaux by contrast sees Eleanor's growing sense of autonomy as a result of her experience of having been stationed in Aquitaine.

If the years between 1152 and 1154 saw Eleanor wielding "full authority as duchess of Aquitaine,"⁶ then the time period of 1168 to 1173 is important because it was, as Turner points out, "the longest period of her direct authority over her ancestral lands."⁷ Hivergneaux argues that the six years during which the queen-duchess administered Aquitaine "saw the most elaborate production of charters in either of her marriages"; during this time, Eleanor witnessed at least two surviving acts and issued fifteen surviving charters which required no confirmation.⁸ During these six years, Henry II issued no acts for Aquitaine, and Eleanor refers

1 Hivergneaux, "Queen Eleanor and Aquitaine," 66.

2 Weir, *Eleanor of Aquitaine*, 173.

3 Turner, *Eleanor of Aquitaine*, 185.

4 Hivergneaux, "Queen Eleanor and Aquitaine," 68.

5 Hivergneaux, "Queen Eleanor and Aquitaine," 68.

6 Turner, *Eleanor of Aquitaine*, 112.

7 Turner, *Eleanor of Aquitaine*, 176.

8 Hivergneaux, "Queen Eleanor and Aquitaine," 60.

to him as king in only two of hers.¹ Turner makes an important point about Eleanor's use of her own seal when issuing major administrative acts: "Eleanor, now formally in charge of her duchy, issued all major administrative acts—charters, writs, and letters—under her own seal, and an indicator of her public authority is her use of her seal to endorse or guarantee grants or agreements made by others."² Throughout this period, she also increasingly associated herself with the abbey at Fontevraud, which Henry had previously endowed significantly; while she may have been pursuing and strengthening Henry's policies, it is also possible that Eleanor desired to take up the abbey on her own and to attract the support of local barons who were ready and willing to turn against the king as count of Anjou.³

Historians believe that one of Eleanor's main focuses during her time in Aquitaine was to help position her son Richard as the future Duke of Aquitaine. Hivernaux explains that while Richard was enthroned as duke in 1170, he did not issue any acts alone until 1174.⁴ She explains that Eleanor associated Richard with herself in two-thirds of the acts she issued between 1168 and 1174⁵, most likely to prepare the Aquitanians for the eventual transfer of power from her hands to those of Richard. Hivernaux makes an important distinction regarding the relationship between the issuing of these charters "jointly" with Richard and the nature of her own power as queen-duchess: "It was not that she exercised power any the less in her own name in keeping with her rights, nor solely as the representative of husband or son. Thus her acts constrained her subjects by calling upon all the king's faithful followers and hers to respect her acts and the double authority that reigned over Aquitaine ('to the archbishops, bishops, abbots, counts... and all the king's faithful followers and hers throughout Aquitaine [archiepiscopis, episcopis, abbatibus, comitibus... et omnibus fidelibus regis et suis totius Aquitanie])."⁶

Turner makes a bold claim regarding the nature of Eleanor's autonomy during her time spent in her duchy: "Between 1168 and 1174, the queen-duchess possessed the greatest degree of autonomy that she would enjoy during Henry II's lifetime..."⁷ However great her gain in autonomy, however, Turner acknowledges that her authority was not unlimited, as Henry kept control over military matters.⁸ Hivernaux elaborates on the limitations of Eleanor's power in Aquitaine and highlights another important facet of power, namely money: "[I]t is clear that though Henry II rarely appeared on the spot to deal personally with Aquitanian affairs, he kept himself well informed on such matters to the extent that Eleanor did not exercise complete

1 Hivernaux, "Queen Eleanor and Aquitaine," 67.

2 Turner, *Eleanor of Aquitaine*, 186.

3 Hivernaux, "Queen Eleanor and Aquitaine," 68-69.

4 Hivernaux, "Queen Eleanor and Aquitaine," 67.

5 Hivernaux, "Queen Eleanor and Aquitaine," 67.

6 Hivernaux, "Queen Eleanor and Aquitaine," 67.

7 Turner, *Eleanor of Aquitaine*, 186.

8 Turner, *Eleanor of Aquitaine*, 186.

freedom over the direction of her policies. Nor, evidently, did she control two major avenues of power, money and military action.”¹

While it is likely that Eleanor sought to establish the political positions of her sons, especially Richard, during her reign in Aquitaine, Hivergneaux is quick to dismiss the idea that this was Eleanor’s sole intent and purpose. Indeed, one of the more noteworthy of Eleanor’s actions in Aquitaine, at least as it pertains to her perceived degree of autonomy and the way in which historians try to interpret it, occurred in 1172: “Eleanor modified the form of address in three acts: instead of the words ‘to the king’s faithful followers and hers [fidelibus regis et suis],’ there appears only ‘her faithful followers [fidelibus suis].”² Referring to this notable change in Eleanor’s form of address, Hivergneaux writes, “This seemingly affirmed for the future the duchess’s sovereign authority without reference to that of her husband.”³ Hivergneaux takes this to be evidence of Eleanor’s determination to assert her own authority and free herself to act as an autonomous person as head of the duchy and to govern with more freedom, “not only as young Richard’s representative and most especially not as her husband’s.”⁴

While Turner and Hivergneaux define Eleanor’s governance in Aquitaine as creating a growing sense of autonomy as well as focusing on her sons’ succession, Weir and Owen ascribe greater passivity to Eleanor’s role in Aquitanian politics and governance, as they focus more on her concern with her sons’ successions and less so on her desire to exercise her autonomy. Both Weir and Owen point to the sparsity of evidence that remains from this period of Eleanor’s life. Weir argues that the little extant evidence suggests that she was both an intelligent and capable ruler over her chaotic and rebellious people and that she continued to “follow a policy of conciliation.”⁵ Weir writes, “During this period she not only travelled extensively in Poitou and Aquitaine, but is also recorded as having visited Falaise, Chinon, and other places in Normandy and Anjou, usually as a response to the needs of her children. As her heir, Richard was frequently at her side, learning about his future fiefs and how to administer them, and becoming increasingly associated with his mother in the running of the duchy.”⁶ Owen writes, “Eleanor...appears to have remained in Poitiers, securing her own position and doubtless nurturing plans of her own, especially as regards the future of Richard, who may have been with her at the time.”⁷ He also maintains that historians are relatively limited in knowledge of Eleanor’s activities in 1169, though it is assumed that she spent much of her time at Poitiers, growing increasingly concerned with the eventual succession and the roles that her sons would assume in the future.⁸

1 Hivergneaux, “Queen Eleanor and Aquitaine,” 70.

2 Hivergneaux, “Queen Eleanor and Aquitaine,” 69.

3 Hivergneaux, “Queen Eleanor and Aquitaine,” 69.

4 Hivergneaux, “Queen Eleanor and Aquitaine,” 69.

5 Weir, *Eleanor of Aquitaine*, 178-179.

6 Weir, *Eleanor of Aquitaine*, 178-179.

7 Owen, *Eleanor of Aquitaine*, 59.

8 Owen, *Eleanor of Aquitaine*, 60.

More evidence of Eleanor's quest for freedom from Henry and the development of her autonomy comes from the way in which she structured her court at Poitiers. Eleanor was free to choose her own household officials without Henry's supervision, despite the fact that Henry had apparently intended to position his own loyal followers in her household in Poitou in 1168.¹ Turner writes, "The paucity of Anglo-Norman or Angevin names in Eleanor's entourage in Poitou testifies that she quickly won freedom to choose her own household officials without her husband's supervision."² Moreover, Eleanor turned to the families of longtime servants of the counts to create her own household at Poitou, as evidenced by the names of those Poitevin office holders who joined Eleanor's entourage shortly after her return to Aquitaine.³

Eleanor's return to her domains and the re-establishment of a ducal court helped heal the wounds caused by thirty years of rule by alien overlords.⁴ She did everything in her power to regain the loyalty of her vassals, including: going on campaigns through Poitou and Aquitaine; receiving homage of the local lords at Niort, Limoges, and Bayonne; dismissing some of Henry's unpopular administrative officers; encouraging exiled barons to return home and regain their lands; reviving old fairs and customs within the regional culture; and renewing the long-recognized privileges of towns and abbeys.⁵ As Eleanor sought to establish Richard as the future Duke of Aquitaine, she brought him along on this campaign of reconciliation in 1171, which, Jean Flori argues, was also "an affirmation of real power, aimed at undoing the effects of Henry II's confiscations and penalties."⁶

Scholars have debated Eleanor's role in aiding her sons in fomenting a rebellion against their father in roughly 1174. While exploring Eleanor's role in the rebellion is not the focus of this paper, it is nonetheless important to explore her relationship with her sons, especially her closeness to Richard. Owen argues that it even if Eleanor had the best intentions of not turning her sons against their father, it would have perhaps been difficult, given her "political acumen," to refraining from engaging in any level of criticism of him.⁷ Owen even goes as far to suggest that it was almost in her own best interest to criticize their father: "With her own relations with him perceptibly cooling, she may well, almost in self-defence, have ensured that their sympathies remained more firmly with her."⁸

Owen argues that by 1173, Eleanor was in a position that many noble women had found and would find themselves in; should she recognize her age and choose the calm and quiet the cloister offered, which was usually seen as a positive for both men and women who retired from political life, or remain politically active?⁹ Owen argues that Eleanor had no desire to choose

1 Turner, *Eleanor of Aquitaine*, 191.

2 Turner, *Eleanor of Aquitaine*, 191.

3 Turner, *Eleanor of Aquitaine*, 192.

4 Weir, *Eleanor of Aquitaine*, 172-173.

5 Weir, *Eleanor of Aquitaine*, 172-173.

6 Jean Flori, *Eleanor of Aquitaine: Queen and Rebel* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2007), 94.

7 Owen, *Eleanor of Aquitaine*, 65.

8 Owen, *Eleanor of Aquitaine*, 65.

9 Owen, *Eleanor of Aquitaine*, 68.

the cloister (which is likely true, since she chose to remain politically active) and suggests that Eleanor did involve herself in her sons' cause: "Although she maintained close links with Fontevrault (her first recorded personal donation to the abbey dates from about this time), she had no wish to douse her undiminished energies in the cloister. If her husband could dispense with her now, she felt that her sons (with the exception of young John, whom Henry kept with him) stood in particular need of her. Equally, she needed them; so she committed herself fully to their cause."¹

Eleanor's possible involvement in her sons' rebellion against their father, Henry II, is an entirely different topic. However, one could argue that Eleanor found during her time in Aquitaine a sense of autonomy that she might have lost in the roughly fourteen years she spent splitting her time between England and other domains within the kingdom. It was arguably sensible for Henry II to place Eleanor in Aquitaine in 1168; his ability to maintain control of the region probably depended on it. This necessity illustrates an important aspect of the nature of the relationship between Henry II and Eleanor, and between other important and powerful noble partners: Henry required Eleanor's help; she had a sort of power that he did not have and his very authority depended on her ability in this specific regard. While suggesting that we can only speculate how aware she was of her own significance, in the absence of any specific evidence, this fact was likely not lost on her.

¹ Owen, *Eleanor of Aquitaine*, 68.

Bibliography

- Flori, Jean. *Eleanor of Aquitaine: Queen and Rebel*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2007.
- Gillingham, John. "Aquitaine, 1157-1172." In *Richard I*, 24-20. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999.
- Hivernieux, Marie. "Queen Eleanor and Aquitaine, 1137-1189." In *Eleanor of Aquitaine: Lord and Lady*, edited by Bonnie Wheeler and John Carmi Parsons, 55-76. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003.
- LoPrete, Kimberly A. "Adela of Blois: Familial Alliances and Female Lordship." In *Aristocratic Women in Medieval France*, edited by Theodore Evergates, 7-43. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 1999.
- Owen, D.D.R. *Eleanor of Aquitaine: Queen and Legend*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1993.
- Turner, Ralph V. *Eleanor of Aquitaine: Queen of France, Queen of England*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009.
- Weir, Alison. *Eleanor of Aquitaine: A Life*. New York: Ballantine, 1999.
- Villard, Francois ed., *Recueil des Documents relatifs a L'Abbaye de Montierneuf de Poitiers (1076-1319)*, (Poitiers, 1973), pp.135-36. "A letter from Eleanor of Aquitaine (1152, May 26)." <https://epistolae.columbia.edu/letter/896.html>

Catherine the Great and the Impact of her Reign

Ashley Green

Catherine the Great is one of the most well-known empresses throughout the world. Even if people have no knowledge of Russian history, they know Catherine. She was not the only female ruler in Russia but certainly the most renowned. After coming to the throne via a coup d'état in 1762 that forced her husband, Peter III, out of power, Catherine set out to reform Russia's autocratic government. She was a product of the Enlightenment, a movement that centered primarily on reason, rational thinking, liberty, human rights, tolerance and constitutionalism. Catherine wrote The Great Instruction of 1762, in which she outlined Enlightenment ideas. She then created a commission devoted to using her Instruction to create laws and to reform Russia. She led several successful military campaigns, practiced religious tolerance, and opened several universities and academies. Catherine was educated and had several experienced advisers around her to guide her.

Catherine the Great's reign and its challenges to gender roles and stereotypes created more opportunities for women to flourish in spheres outside the home. She also made the media question the traditions established by male rulers concerning extramarital affairs when a female ruler continued those traditions. This paper will explore the life of Princess Yekaterina Vorontsova-Dashkova and her connections to Catherine, the assumptions about Catherine as a female ruler and finally, the attempt to erase her history after her death.

Life of Princess Dashkova

It is important to study and acknowledge Catherine's impact on women and gender roles because women are key to empowering other women. If women see a successful woman take control and run an entire empire, then one can hope those women will start to believe in themselves and their own capabilities too. One prominent female figure who exercised great power and benefitted from Catherine's influence was Princess Yekaterina Vorontsova-Dashkova. Dashkova was of noble birth and received a remarkable education; she also grew up during the Age of Enlightenment so she shared the same ideals as Catherine. Growing up, Dashkova was particularly interested in politics; when she greeted visitors, she questioned them respecting their countries, forms of government, and laws.¹ This interest would later help shape her career.

In 1762, Dashkova became part of the faction that helped bring Catherine to power. Dashkova claims to have had a significant role in the coup while Catherine's memoirs say the opposite. Regardless of that detail, their friendship grew from that point on. After the death of Dashkova's husband, she withdrew from public life to concentrate on raising her children. She was able to travel abroad where she became a prominent figure in the intellectual circles of eighteenth-century Europe.² She traveled to Paris where she met with many of the great minds of the Enlightenment, including Benjamin Franklin. He invited her to become the first woman to join the American Philosophical Society. Because of her education, travel abroad, and

1 Ekaterina Romanova Dashkova, *The Memoirs of Princess Dashkova* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1995), 35

2 A. Woronzoff-Dashkoff, "Disguise and Gender in Princess Dashkova's 'Memoirs'", *Canadian Slavonic Papers* 33, no. 1 (March 1991): 62-74.

writings she was a leading figure in the introduction of eighteenth-century Russian culture to the West and the transmission of Enlightenment to Russia.¹

When Dashkova finally returned from her travels, Catherine appointed her Director of the Academy of Sciences. The Russian Academy of Sciences, known in their time as the Imperial Academy of Arts and Sciences, is an academy dedicated to scientific research. Before Dashkova, a woman had never been head of an academy of natural sciences, a fact Dashkova was well aware of. Dashkova describes her feelings about this appointment, saying that "God himself, by creating me a woman, had exempted me from accepting the employment of a Director of an Academy of Sciences."² Moments like these defined her life. An unavoidable result of her eminence and exceptionality was a double identity, as she acted out certain well-defined male roles while remaining clearly aware of herself as a woman in a position of power.³

Dashkova mentions multiple times when she dressed as a man to be accepted into certain circles. The officer's uniform she donned underlies the acquisition of unprecedented power and the appropriation of a newfound social influence and personal mobility. Such mobility depended totally on being disguised as a male and was impossible without it.⁴ Both Catherine and Dashkova recognized that they had to wear male clothing to be taken seriously. Dashkova recounts another time where she was prevented from acting in the man's sphere because of her clothing. After a meeting with Grigory Orlov, she realized she could not continue her activities, because "to my great disappointment I learned from my maid that the tailor had not yet brought my suit of man's clothes."⁵ She realized that "in default of male clothes I could not even follow my natural impulse to go and meet the Empress."⁶ Dashkova acknowledged that the lack of male clothing, much less a true male identity, prevented her from participating in spheres that were open only to men.

Viewpoint of Catherine's Reign

During the eighteenth century life was changing dramatically. Literacy rates rose and so did the production of newspapers and books. As news of the empress consort's coup d'état spread, opinions circulated wildly. The multitude of rumors concerning Paul I not being Peter the III's legitimate son appeared consistently in foreign publications and even circulated right in Russia. An interesting side note is that at the same time that Catherine was being depicted as an adulteress, she was also playing the wronged but patient legitimate wife with a semi-legitimate rival in the form of Peter's widely acknowledged mistress.⁷ Even though Peter the III had his own extra-marital affair, the media (using this term to refer to publications during the 1700s-1800s) chose to focus on Catherine's. Her sexuality and relations were constantly critiqued.

1 Woronzoff-Dashkoff, "Disguise and Gender," 62.

2 Dashkova, *Memoirs*, 204.

3 Dashkova, *Memoirs*, 68.

4 Dashkova, *Memoirs*, 60.

5 Dashkova, *Memoirs*, 71.

6 Dashkova, *Memoirs*, 72.

7 Ruth Dawson, "Eighteenth Century Libertinism in a Time of Change Representations of Catherine the Great," *Women in German Yearbook* 18, (2002): 67-88.

After her rise to the throne and Peter the III's death, Catherine was officially unmarried and free to have relations like her former tsars, who often had multiple mistresses. Just like those before her, Catherine II not only took lovers but did so openly after she came to the throne.¹ Catherine began to act like a male ruler; in doing so, she not only challenged the stereotypes regarding how women should act, she also significantly unsettled gender roles.

It is also worthwhile to note the different responses to Catherine and earlier rulers of Russia. When publications criticized her military actions and reforms for the empire, her sexuality was almost always involved. Whether consensus surrounded her controversial military expeditions or not, the images satirizing such events frequently included sexuality as part of the visual code of the critique.² Foreign publications were free to publish this type of material but Russian publications were not. This paper examines ideas of gender and sexuality concerning only Catherine the Great and her reign and those regarding her male counterparts; however, it does present some basic knowledge about male rulers and their ability to take mistresses without much criticism. Obviously, there was criticism from conservatives and the Church regarding such male rulers, but for men, having mistresses displayed their masculinity and sexual prowess. Now that Catherine was an unmarried ruler, she followed the same tradition set by her male counterparts and engaged in relations with other men.

The French Revolution of 1789 threatened all autocratic regimes. Even though Catherine was an enlightened individual, she had no plans of relinquishing any of her power. Poland, following the lead of the United States, wrote a strong constitution in 1788. Catherine, fearing this idea could spread to Russia, led the Polish-Russian War of 1792. Russia, Prussia and Austria all attacked Poland and divided it in three; the nation of Poland was no more. Catherine's destruction of Poland strengthened the pro-constitutionalists and foreigners even more. She claimed to be an enlightened individual and yet had forcefully displayed her autocratic power by invading another country. The media went wild. Foreign published political cartoons of Catherine began to represent her in new and lewd fashion.³ While similarly lewd images of male rulers might have existed during this time, the numerous depictions of Catherine specifically commented on her sexuality and identity as a female ruler. Depictions of Catherine as a powerful woman tended to slide into those of her as a lascivious woman.⁴ The coded and uncoded semi-pornographic depictions of Catherine that began to appear in 1789 and continued for years after her death consistently invoke anxieties about a woman in power and the power of women, represented by sexuality and female sexual appetite.⁵

As a ruler, Catherine knew how to use people ways that would benefit her, manipulating them skillfully. Catherine was especially good at this; she had lovers whom she would then put into positions of power of her choosing. This helped ensure that those men were forever indebted to her. Ironically, Catherine was criticized for placing the men in positions of powers because

1 Dawson, "Libertinism," 73.

2 Dawson, "Libertinism," 73.

3 Dawson, "Libertinism," 76.

4 Dawson, "Libertinism," 77.

5 Dawson, "Libertinism," 77.

some believed that the men were actually manipulating her. According to the mentality of the 1700s, female rulers stood condemned by the presumed weakness of women and their propensity to fall under the domination of powerful lovers and advisers.¹

The most famous of these relationships involved Catherine and Grigory Potemkin. Potemkin was born in Russia to a noble family. He had first wooed Catherine when he assisted in her coup against Peter the III. At this time, Catherine already had a lover in Grigory Orlov but Potemkin continued to flirt with her. In 1762, he was given a foreign assignment and on his return, became one of Catherine's lovers. Throughout Potemkin's relationship with Catherine, he was given several positions in the military. A German novel, *Pansalvin*, written in 1794 describes the relationship between Catherine and her famous favorite, Potemkin. Catherine appeared as the character Miranda while Potemkin is the Prince of Darkness. The book depicts Catherine in a favorable light but ends with a sentence that focuses on her fault as a woman: "Miranda was a praiseworthy princess and in her land there was perhaps only one major weakness-that the Prince of Darkness was allowed to have too much power."² This last sentence provides a glimpse into how Germans perceived the relationship between Catherine and Potemkin. When a male ruler had a lover, no question ever arose concerning the power dynamics in the relationship. But when the ruler is female, most assumed that Catherine's gender overpowered her identity as a ruler and that she would naturally submit to her lover.³ Foreign publications present many different observations about the relationship between Catherine and Potemkin. Jean Charles Thibault de Laveaux, a secret agent of Louis XV living in the court of St. Petersburg, saw their relationship as troubled. Laveaux wrote that Potemkin was able to manipulate Catherine:

Since Potemkin had noticed that Catherine had the vanity to make the world believe that she governed alone, and without the help of ministers, he did not miss any opportunity to present these men as ambitious people to her, who, not content to partition among themselves the government of the Empire, wished to have all Europe see that they were the principal source of state affairs, and that the reign of Catherine derived all its sparkle from them.⁴

Laveaux saw Potemkin as being able to convince Catherine that she was still in control while he was actually the master the entire time. Laveaux's view of their relationship was not unique; others also believed that a female ruler was inherently flawed because of the presumed weakness of women and their propensity to fall under the domination of powerful lovers and

1 Brenda Meehan-Waters, "Catherine the Great and the Problem of Female Rule," *The Russian Review* 34, no. 3 (July 1975): 293.

2 Meehan-Waters, "Female Rule," 298.

3 Meehan-Waters, "Female Rule," 297.

4 [J. C. T. Laveaux], *Histoire secrète des amours et des principaux amans de Catherine lo, Imperatrice de Russie* (Paris, 1798), 143.

advisers.¹ Catherine's contemporaries saw her first as a woman and then as a ruler. Because of this, they imposed their assumptions of women onto Catherine, who was behaving like a male ruler. When Catherine demonstrated that she was able to manipulate people for her own benefits, much like her male counterparts, the public attacked her self-mastery, her coldness, and her propensity to use people.² They accused her of turning those around her into mere tools of her ambition.³ However, it is worthwhile to note that the ideas mentioned above surrounding Catherine and Potemkin were from foreign publications. The Russians generally did not have a problem with female rule, at least judging by their own publications. In fact, Russian literature celebrated specific female rulers. Anna, Elizabeth and Catherine were all praised in literature by certain authors who never remarked on their sexuality but rather praised them for being good rulers - not just good female rulers. Most Russian writers did not specifically wrestle with the idea of female rule; The Russian opinion of Catherine II and of female rule in general seems to differ from that of West European contemporaries of Catherine.⁴

There are many theories as to why the Russians were desensitized to female rule; One could say these Russians had a tendency to respect for power per se regardless of the person in whom it is manifested.⁵ Could it be because Russians thought of themselves as different from Westerners? Many tsars, especially Nicholas I, had emphasized that idea. While his reign came some thirty years after Catherine's, his idea that Russia was on a different historical path than other western countries attempted to show the public that autocracy was good for Russia, an idea that had been pushed for decades before him by other tsars. While it is impossible to speak for all Russians, the present research and other earlier research suggest Russians in general seemed to have a different connection with their ruler than their western counterparts. Rulers highlighted the belief in divine right, but the Russian people truly believed it and did not seem to care about the sex of the ruler.

Catherine the Great's Posthumous Reputation

Catherine's death at sixty-seven was unexpected. Catherine's relationship with her son Paul was strained and tumultuous. Catherine felt that Paul was not prepared to become tsar and instead wanted her grandson, Alexander, to become the next heir. However, she died before she was able to make this official. Many theories exist as to why the relationship between mother and son was not cordial or even loving; regardless, it was known that Paul I strongly disliked or even hated his mother and idolized his father, Peter III.

After her death, Paul became the tsar and immediately created a new law for line of succession. This law of primogeniture said that the first-born son becomes heir. This law differed from the succession law created by Peter the Great that said the ruling tsar or tsarina could pick his or her next heir. This new law also significantly decreased the chance that a woman would be

1 Brenda Meehan-Waters, "Catherine the Great and the Problem of Female Rule," *The Russian Review* 34, no. 3 (July 1975): 298.

2 Meehan-Waters, "Female Rule," 298.

3 Meehan-Waters, "Female Rule," 298.

4 Meehan-Waters, "Female Rule," 306.

5 Meehan-Waters, "Female Rule," 307.

able to rule Russia. Furthermore, Paul exiled all Catherine's advisers and brought back all those whom she had exiled during her reign. While Catherine's advisers were favorable to her and her ideas, they also had valuable knowledge about running an empire that could have been of use to Paul. But because the advisers were associated with his mother, he exiled them. The return of Catherine's enemies to the empire also proved problematic for many nobles. While Catherine had the power to exile anyone whose opinion she did not like, she also exiled people that she suspected of being enemies of the state. By bringing those people back, just to spite her, Paul created an opportunity for attacks by Russians on Russian soil. Paul did everything imaginable to reverse his mother's legacy, a course of action that led to his assassination only four years later. While Paul was trying to destroy Catherine's legacy, the nobles were reminiscing on the glory days during Catherine's reign. Russia had flourished under her and been brought into the larger world.

Catherine's allure lived on after her death. Even a chance encounter with Catherine was enough to inspire a lasting glow in those who outlived her.¹ However, the new tsars did not idolize her. Neither Alexander I nor Nicholas I saw any benefit in idolizing their grandmother; perhaps they believed that to praise her was to doubt themselves.² The publication of Catherine's memoirs was restricted. Why? Was it solely because Alexander and Nicholas did not want their grandmother's reign to overshadow theirs? Were they protecting her legacy by not allowing anyone to read her deepest and innermost thoughts in her memoirs? The answer is unknown. There were some that tried to preserve her legacy and give her the credit she deserved. The world was changing, especially with the reign of Nicholas I. He did not spend much time with his grandmother, Catherine, and saw her reforms as harmful to autocracy. Her successors saw her reign as personifying unnatural female rule, unethical territorial expansion, and an unnerving flirtation with juridical reform and intellectual speculation.³

Conclusion

Catherine's impact on history is significant despite those who tried to silence her. She demonstrated her power when she came to power in a coup that forced the abdication of her husband, Peter the III. Some of her power doubtless came from her upbringing during the Age of Enlightenment; because she had been exposed to its radical and reforming perspectives, she was not afraid to act as a male ruler. Catherine the Great's reign transformed gender roles and stereotypes in ways that allowed women like Dashkova to flourish in the public sphere. Catherine proceeded acted in ways similar to those of her male predecessors, especially in her sexual behavior, and a great deal of evidence suggests how profoundly uncomfortable with her actions. Catherine benefited the Russia Empire in many ways, but often using means that neither her confidantes nor those abroad expected.

1 Simon Dixon, "The Posthumous Reputation of Catherine II in Russia 1797-1837," *The Slavonic and East European Review* 77 no. 4 (October 1999): 653.

2 Dixon, "Posthumous Reputation," 654.

3 Dixon, "Posthumous Reputation," 678.

Bibliography

- Dashkova, Ekaterina Romanovna. *The Memoirs of Princess Dashkova*. Durham: Duke University, 1995.
- Dawson, Ruth. "Eighteenth Century Libertinism in a Time of Change Representations of Catherine the Great." *Women in German Yearbook* 18, (2002): 67-88.
- Dixon, Simon. "The Posthumous Reputation of Catherine II in Russia 1791-1837." *The Slavonic and East European Review* 77, no. 4 (October 1999): 646-679.
- Meehan-Waters, Brenda. "Catherine the Great and the Problem of Female Rule." *The Russian Review* 34, no. 3 (July 1975): 293-307.
- [J. C. T. Laveaux], *Histoire secrete des amours et des principaux amans de Catherine lo, Imperatrice de Russie* (Paris, 1798), p. 143.
- Woronzoff-Dashkoff, A. "Disguise and Gender in Princess Dashkova's "Memoirs"" *Canadian Slavonic Papers* 33, no. 1 (March 1991): 62-74.

THE RISE, EXPANSION, AND FLAWS OF THE WOMEN'S LIBERATION MOVEMENT AND THE SEXUAL REVOLUTION

Lauren DiAngelo

While some historians (like Kendra Van Cleave) argue that the Women's Liberation Movement and the Sexual Revolution in the United States began in the 1920s with more opportunities for women and a new wave of sexual freedom among young females, others, like Beth Bailey, argue that the creation of the first human birth control pill by Margaret Sanger marked the beginning of the Women's Liberation Movement and the Sexual Revolution. The work of Batrix Campbell, Robert Chrisman and others who have researched the modern Sexual Revolution in America, as well as primary sources, including articles from Phyllis Schlafly and Enriqueta Longeaux Vasquez, suggest that while both movements lack a clear beginning, they did blossom in the 1960s where changes in social norms provided an environment for attitudes toward women and about sex to also change, particularly among young adults. The counterculture of the 1960s led to many movements which demanded social change. Additionally, while the Women's Liberation Movement and the Sexual Revolution were important and progressive movements, neither was cohesive and both did, in fact, have numerous flaws and face opposition.

Most historians will agree that the 1920s was an era of change. Many Americans benefited from the economic prosperity of the twenties and, for this reason, were able to participate in the new social and cultural trends, such as changes in fashion. In the 1920s it became more acceptable for women to wear shorter skirts and dresses than they had in the decade prior. Some women also cut their hair into a short, bob style. These new fashion trends are often linked to flappers and connected to an image of sexuality. Despite popular perceptions, many women did not actually participate in these trends. People often considered women who followed flapper trends to be audacious and rebellious.¹ While short skirts and hair were typically associated with flappers, this style was also seen among women in college. For a number of students, this change in fashion came to represent women's progress and new ideas of femininity and feminism. According to fashion historian and academic librarian Kendra Van Cleave, "some Americans understood the less cumbersome styles now gaining in popularity to be symbolic of women's political, economic, and social progress. American women were increasingly active in the public sphere via higher education, employment, and political activism."² Nonetheless, most American women were not attending college or even working during the twenties; in 1920, only seven percent of American women aged 18 to 21 attended college. By 1930, this number increased to only ten percent, showing that although more opportunities for women existed, the majority of women were not benefiting from or taking

1 Laura Davidow Hirshbein, "The Flapper and the Fog: Representations of Gender and Age in the 1920s," *Journal of Family History* (Jan. 2001). AgeLine.

2 Kendra Van Cleave, "Fashioning the College Woman: Dress, Gender, and Sexuality at Smith College in the 1920s," *Journal of American Culture* (2009). MLA International Bibliography.

advantage of them.¹ Moreover, most women who did attend college in the 1920s were white, Protestant, and upper-middle class. This again shows that most women did not actually benefit from the changes of the 1920s.

Three decades later, in the year 1950, two women worked to promote research into birth control. Katharine McCormick was a women's rights advocate and heiress to the International Harvester fortune. Margaret Sanger had been a birth control activist since the early 1900s and even opened the first birth control clinic in the United States. McCormick contacted Sanger, and together they contacted Dr. Gregory Pincus, who created the first oral contraceptive, Enovid. After years of trial testing, the FDA approved Enovid in 1960. However, even after FDA approval, over a dozen states had laws limiting the sale, distribution, and even advertising of the birth control pill.² Even in states that did not have legal limitations, it was still difficult for women to obtain the pill. While it was challenging enough for married women to get it, it was nearly impossible for unmarried women because only a small minority of physicians would prescribe the pill to unmarried women. The pill generated a lot of controversy. According to historian Ruth Rosen, when the birth control pill became available to the public, society used it as a way to "divide the female population into 'good' and 'bad' women." "Good" women did not take the pill and "bad" women did. The greatest opposition to the birth control pill, however, came from religious authority; in 1968, Pope Paul VI reaffirmed the Catholic church's position against birth control.³

Although the success and lasting memory of the Women's Liberation Movement and the Sexual Revolution cannot be attributed solely to the creation of the pill, the 1960s was still the era where both movements blossomed. As a whole, the 1960s were filled with social change. Many Americans, especially in the younger generation, rejected the nation's conservative norms and embraced counterculture. The Civil Rights Movement, Chicano Movement, and Gay Rights Movement took off during the sixties as Americans called for social change throughout the country. As different groups challenged various social norms, it was only natural that women's roles and expectations of women were also challenged during the sixties. During the fifties, the ideal life for a number of Americans meant a suburban, family-centered life. Women were expected to be housewives, while men worked and were considered the bread winners. While some women did have jobs, their work was often limited to specific professions, such as teaching, nursing, or clerical work.⁴ *MLA International Bibliography*. As America entered the sixties, many Americans were beginning to drift away from the American Dream lifestyle of the previous decade. However, change did not occur instantaneously. In the year 1960, all Americans did not suddenly change their beliefs about sex and women's roles in society, though a number of people did.

1 Van Cleave, "Fashioning the College Woman."

2 Beth Bailey, "Prescribing the Pill: Politics, Culture, and the Sexual Revolution in America's Heartland," *Journal of Social History*, vol. 30, no. 4 (1 July 1997). JSTOR Journals.

3 Marjorie Kravand, "The Pill at Fifty: How the New York Times Covered the Birth Control Pill, 1960-2010," *American Journalism*, vol. 29, no. 4 (2012). Communication & Mass Media Complete.

4 "The Women's Rights Movement," ed. Carol Brennan et al., *American Social Reform Movements Reference Library*, 2: Almanac, UXL, Detroit, 2007. U.S. History in Context.

According to Beth Bailey, “the sexual revolution was not one movement. It was instead a set of movements, movements that were closely linked,” and the same holds true for the Women’s Liberation Movement.¹ Since there was not one single movement, there cannot be one single moment that began the movements. While the start of the Women’s Liberation Movement and the Sexual Revolution cannot be pinned down to an exact date, the movements gained momentum in the sixties due to the buildup of both private and public tensions. First, Americans were having sex before marriage, but few people wanted to acknowledge that fact publicly, which created tensions. According to the Kinsey Reports, a collection of studies on human sexual behavior, fifty percent of women surveyed in 1953 had had premarital sex, while over eighty percent of women surveyed disapproved of premarital sex on “moral grounds.”² The results of the Kinsey Reports shocked many people. The topic of sex had been considered taboo for many decades, and many people were in denial about how common premarital sex was becoming. Those strongly opposed to the Kinsey Reports’ findings challenged its accuracy and reliability. In addition to premarital sex, a growing number of young Americans began living together in the 1960s, a behavior that challenged the century-old idea that unmarried couples who lived together were living in sin. While it was possible for people to deny the increasing sexuality of the private sphere, it was much more difficult for people to deny the increasing sexuality of American culture in the public sphere. With magazines such as *Playboy* and *Cosmopolitan*, among other forms of entertainment and media, sex and womanhood became more visible in popular culture. The first issue of *Playboy* was published in 1953; by the mid-1960s Hugh Hefner was a multimillionaire, showing the popularity his magazine was able to acquire in a decade. Although *Playboy* and *Cosmopolitan* are strikingly different magazines, in the sixties they both explored the concept of sexual freedom and publicized the idea that both men and women could enjoy sex.³

Along with the interest in and desire for sexual freedom, women during the sixties who supported the Women’s Liberation Movement and the Sexual Revolution also wanted more opportunities and rights. In 1966, twenty-eight women who wanted “true equality for all women in America” founded the National Organization for Women.⁴ The National Organization for Women stressed the importance of eliminating sex discrimination at work, at school, and at home. The women in the National Organization for Women wanted more job opportunities, more education opportunities, and an equal sharing of responsibilities at home. Additionally, during the sixties, the National Organization for Women became deeply involved in the passage of the Equal Rights Amendment. The goal of the Equal Rights Amendment was to guarantee equal rights for all American citizens, regardless of gender. Despite the efforts of National Organization for Women’ and the work of many others, the Equal Rights Amendment was never

1 Beth Bailey, “Sexual Revolution(s),” in *A History of Our Time*, ed. William H. Chafe, Harvard Sitkoff, and Beth Bailey (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), 246–259.

2 Bailey, “Sexual Revolution(s).”

3 Bailey, “Sexual Revolution(s).”

4 The National Organization for Women, “Statement of Purpose,” in *A History of Our Time*, ed. Chafe, Sitkoff, and Bailey, 218–222.

ratified. The Equal Rights Amendment was controversial for its time, even among women. While not all in the National Organization for Women's wanted to endorse the Equal Rights Amendment, it ultimately rallied support and led to an increase in membership.¹

As mentioned previously, the Equal Rights Amendment was controversial, even among women. Phyllis Schlafly was one notable opponent of the Equal Rights Amendment. Schlafly, an American conservative activist, who organized the STOP ERA campaign. Schlafly opposed the Equal Rights Amendment because she feared that it would destroy the "special place" of women in the home, force them to fight in combat, and mandate unisex toilets. Schlafly was against the National Organization for Women and feminism in general. She believed that feminism was anti-family, anti-marriage, and anti-children. In her article entitled "What's Wrong with 'Equal Rights' for Women?" Schlafly states, "Women's libbers are trying to make wives and mothers unhappy with their career, make them feel that they are 'second-class citizens' and 'abject slaves.' Women's libbers are promoting free sex instead of the 'slavery' of marriage... They are promoting abortions instead of families."² Schlafly's ideas about gender roles were not uncommon. While a large number of women did want equal rights and sexual freedom, a large number of women did not. All American women did not necessarily support the Women's Liberation Movement and the Sexual Revolution. Many women were content with the gender roles in place and saw no need for change. This lack of consensus among women during the sixties was one main flaw of the Women's Liberation Movement and the Sexual Revolution.

Another flaw of the Women's Liberation Movement and the Sexual Revolution was the lack of unity among differing races and sexualities. While supporters of both movements wanted what they felt was best for women, this did not always include all women. According to journalist Beatrix Campbell, the movements "didn't easily accommodate difference," meaning that the Women's Liberation Movement and the Sexual Revolution in reality only benefited certain women, specifically white, heterosexual, college-educated women.³ For this reason, women of color often did not participate in the movements. In her article ¡Soy Chicana Primero!, Enriqueta Longeaux Vasquez explains why, as a Latino woman, she does not identify with the Women's Liberation Movement. Vasquez identified with the Chicano Movement which occurred contemporaneously with the Women's Liberation Movement and the Sexual Revolution. According to Vasquez, "It is not our business as Chicanas to identify with the white women's liberation movement."⁴ Like Vasquez, many other women of color felt as though they were, in a way, betraying their race by supporting the Women's Liberation Movement. African

1 Hutchinson, "Equal Rights Amendment," in *The Hutchinson Unabridged Encyclopedia with Atlas and Weather Guide* (Helicon, 2016).

2 Phyllis Schlafly, "What's Wrong with 'Equal Rights' for Women?" in *A History in Our Time*, ed. Chafe, Sitkoff, and Bailey, 230–237.

3 Beatrix Campbell, "A Feminist Sexual Politics: Now You See It, Now You Don't," in *Feminist Review*, no. 5, 1 (Jan. 1980). JSTOR Journals.

4 Enriqueta Longeaux Vasquez, "¡Soy Chicana Primero!" in *A History of Our Time*, ed. Chafe, Sitkoff, and Bailey, 226–229.

American and Latino women in particular often had more to gain from supporting race movements like the Civil Rights Movement and the Chicano Movement. In the sixties, white women already had more rights and privileges than women of color. Many women of color believed that if they rallied behind the Women's Movement, they would still be denied certain rights because they would be seen solely for their race. Vasquez best describes the feelings of many women of color when she states, "The Chicana must not choose white woman's liberation... To be Chicana PRIMERO (first), to stand by her people, will make her stronger for the struggles and endurance of her people."¹ Similar to women of color, a number of women from the LGBT community also did not participate in the Women's Liberation Movement and the Sexual Revolution. During the sixties most feminists were straight and, while they wanted equality and sexual freedom, their movement often did not include homosexuals.² Thus, many LGBT women felt more of a connection with the Gay Liberation Movement and decided to put their efforts there.

Another flaw, specifically for the Sexual Revolution, was that the movement sometimes benefited men more than it benefited women. The Sexual Revolution embraced the idea that sex can be separate from reproduction, an idea that appealed to many young men. According to Beatrix Campbell, "[the Sexual Revolution] was about the affirmation of young men's masculinity and promiscuity."³ Essentially, a lot of men supported the Sexual Revolution, not necessarily because they supported women's freedom, but because they wanted women to be more openly sexual and more willing to have premarital sex. Additionally, many men still saw women as sexual objects. While media, such as Playboy, did place sex and womanhood in the forefront of popular culture, women were still sexualized and seen as an object for men's pleasure. Overall, "what [the Sexual Revolution] did not do was defend women against the differential effects of permissiveness on men and women."⁴ Basically, the Sexual Revolution was intended to protect women while still allowing them to express themselves. In some instances, however, the movement provided men with an opportunity to exploit women.

In short, because the 1960s was an era of change, it allowed for the growth of the Women's Liberation Movement and the Sexual Revolution. While the 1920s was also an era of change, it cannot be seen as the start of the Women's Liberation Movement or the Sexual Revolution because the majority of women did not participate, and it did not produce long-lasting changes. Likewise, the creation of the birth control pill cannot be considered the start of either movement. When birth control was first introduced to the market it was unattainable for many women and did not change the way people thought of women and sex. Although neither the 1920s nor the creation of the pill can be considered the start of the Women's Liberation Movement and the Sexual Revolution, both were historically important and allowed for feminism to thrive in the 1960s. While feminism did flourish in the sixties, both movements

1 Vasquez, "¡Soy Chicana Primero!" 226–229.

2 Campbell, "A Feminist Sexual Politics."

3 Campbell, "A Feminist Sexual Politics."

4 Campbell, "A Feminist Sexual Politics."

were flawed. As best stated by Tom W. Smith, an expert in the study of social change, “the metaphor of a Sexual Revolution captured the imagination of a generation of Americans, but poorly describes and generally exaggerates the changes in the sexual mores of Americans.”¹ Many women did join together and ideas about sex did begin to change, but the movements did not completely transform America. Both movements were complex and neither functioned as a single, cohesive movement. Additionally, many women, specifically women of color and members of the LGBT community, were often excluded from the Women’s Liberation Movement and the Sexual Revolution, or chose to identify with other groups. Despite these flaws, the movements were a step in the right direction. According to scholar and activist Robert Chrisman, “unless men and women in the sexual movement launch a struggle for new equality in class, racism and sex relations, built upon love and humanity... the future of humanity is dim.”² Even today we have a long way to go to reach gender equality and full acceptance of sexual freedom. Ideally, Americans will eventually be able to come together in support of equality for those of all races, colors, classes, and sexualities, thus promoting full sexual freedom in the United States.

1 Tom W. Smith, “The Sexual Revolution?” *Public Opinion Quarterly*, vol. 54, no. 3, (1990). Business Source Complete.

2 Robert Chrisman, “A Critique of the Sexual Revolution,” in *The Black Scholar*, vol. 43, no. 3, (2013). JSTOR Journals.

Bibliography

- Bailey, Beth. "Prescribing the Pill: Politics, Culture, and the Sexual Revolution in America's Heartland." *Journal of Social History*, vol. 30, no. 4, (1 July 1997). JSTOR Journals.
- Bailey, Beth. "Sexual Revolution(s)." *A History of Our Time*, edited by William H. Chafe, Harvard Sitkoff, and Beth Bailey, 246-259. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Brennan, Carol, et al. "The Women's Rights Movement." *American Social Reform Movements Reference Library*, 2: Almanac, UXL, Detroit, 2007. U.S. History in Context.
- Campbell, Beatrix. "A Feminist Sexual Politics: Now You See It, Now You Don't." *Feminist Review*, no. 5, (1 Jan. 1980). JSTOR Journals.
- Chrisman, Robert. "A Critique of the Sexual Revolution." *The Black Scholar*, vol. 43, no. 3, (2013). JSTOR Journals.
- Hirshbein, Laura Davidow. "The Flapper and the Fog: Representations of Gender and Age in the 1920s." *Journal of Family History*, (Jan. 2001). AgeLine.
- Hutchinson. "Equal Rights Amendment." *The Hutchinson Unabridged Encyclopedia with Atlas and Weather Guide*. Helicon, 2016. Credo Reference.
- Kruvand, Marjorie. "The Pill at Fifty: How the New York Times Covered the Birth Control Pill, 1960-2010." *American Journalism*, vol. 29, no. 4, (2012). *Communication & Mass Media Complete*.
- The National Organization for Women. "Statement of Purpose." *A History of Our Time*, edited by William H. Chafe, Harvard Sitkoff, and Beth Bailey, 218-222. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Schlaflly, Phyllis. "What's Wrong with 'Equal Rights' for Women?" *A History in Our Time*, edited by William H. Chafe, Harvard Sitkoff, and Beth Bailey, 230-237. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Smith, Tom W. "The Sexual Revolution?" *Public Opinion Quarterly*, vol. 54, no. 3, (1990). *Business Source Complete*.
- Van Cleave, Kendra. "Fashioning the College Woman: Dress, Gender, and Sexuality at Smith College in the 1920s." *Journal of American Culture*, (2009). *MLA International Bibliography*.
- Vasquez, Enriqueta Longeaux. "¡Soy Chicana Primero!" *A History of Our Time*, edited by William H. Chafe, Harvard Sitkoff, and Beth Bailey, 226-229. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Modernity

We grouped the essays in Section II based on their focus on modern historical issues, namely twentieth century developments. Interestingly enough, each essay in this section focuses on developments that occurred during the Cold War era. In this section, we explore the largely unknown story of the animals that served as testing subjects for the Soviet Union and the United States respectively during the Space Race. We also analyze the United States' complicated policy concerning Afghanistan, which began through efforts to counter the Soviet Union's presence in Afghanistan.

The Bark Side of the Moon:

Exploring the conflicting categorizations of the Space Race Animals

Chelsea Smith

Only days before, hers was the bark heard around the world. Soon, it would be a bark forever silenced. She had already completed a full orbit of the earth, making her the first living creature to do so. The next few orbits would further cement her name in history, but also take a terrible physical toll on the Moscow stray. Her already floppy ears would droop. She would begin to pant as the heat in the cabin began to climb. This once animated creature would start to lose more and more energy, until she simply had none left. She would close her eyes, heart racing, breath laboring, and, for the second time that day, enter the heavens that no living creature had ever trod. Laika, the space dog, was dead, but her legacy would echo through the ages.

Animals as Test Subjects

The conclusion of the Second World War was a moment of relief and celebration for much of the world. Yet, from the ashes of this conflict a new war would take shape, one which would pit the liberal democratic United States against the communist Soviet Union and divide the world, and even the heavens, accordingly. Indeed, one of the most prominent battlegrounds of this conflict was outer space. This Space Race saw both sides competing to demonstrate their scientific and technological superiority by making it further and further into the final frontier. Unlike any conflict before it, the first soldiers commissioned in the battle for extraterrestrial domination were largely not humans but animals. This was a calculated decision which reveals much about the way in which humans categorize and value their non-human compatriots. The exceptionally high mortality rates of early space experimentation led to humans using those lower on the food chain in their stead. Therefore an extensive menagerie of non-human animals including mice, monkeys, dogs, rabbits, cats, turtles and chimpanzees were sacrificed in the name of science.¹ The series of V-2 rockets the United States tested in the late forties caused the death of two monkeys (Albert II and Albert IV) and a mouse.² The Soviets' R-1 series experiments deployed a total of nine dogs, of which four perished.³ Despite these tragic deaths, the Soviet Union pushed ahead and sent Laika into space in 1957. She would not return to Earth alive. The Thor-able rocket series, Jupiter Rocket, and Discoverer 3 Spy satellite projects together killed at least 21 mice.⁴ Other animal fatalities included squirrel monkeys (Gordo and

1 Lulu Morris, "Animals Lost In Space," National Geographic, October 04, 2017, accessed November 17, 2018, <https://www.nationalgeographic.com.au/space/animals-lost-in-space.aspx>.

2 Sarah Zielinski, "A Brief History of Animal Death in Space," Science News, September 08, 2014, accessed November 18, 2018, <https://www.sciencenews.org/blog/wild-things/brief-history-animal-death-space>.

3 Zielinski, "A Brief History of Animal Death in Space."

4 Zielinski, "A Brief History of Animal Death in Space."

Goliath); dogs (Bars, Lisichka, Pchelka, Muska); turtles; fish; and seven tadpoles, among others.¹ Of the wide array of species utilized in these experiments, dogs and monkeys made up the bulk of high-profile test subjects.

In the Soviet Union, the decision to use dogs as the primary test subjects was motivated both by a pre-existing wealth of research on dogs and by simple convenience.² The Nobel prize winning physiologist Ivan Pavlov was a native Russian and his work relied heavily on the study of dogs.³ Thus, the Soviets inherited a wealth of information about the anatomy of dogs and its correlation with that of humans, predisposing them to the continued use of canines in scientific experimentations. Additionally, stray dogs were running rampant in Moscow following the Second World War. With no owners to present any sense of sentimental attachment to these creatures, they made readily acquirable test subjects.

In the United States the situation was quite different. Following the First World War the American public had grown increasingly attached to the dog as a household pet and extended member of the family. Thus, the use of dogs as subjects of scientific experimentation was less than ideal from a public relations perspective. Instead, NASA largely used monkeys and chimps in its scientific experiments. Their anatomy was also highly similar to that of humans and the public on the whole was less sentimentally attached to them as a species, making them preferable to dogs and other companion species. That is not to say that the United States faced no backlash for using animals in its scientific experiments. In fact, public outcry against the use of animals in science was already an established practice in America by the start of the Cold War, in large part because of the work of Victorian-era anti-vivisectionists.

Vivisection, the “dissection of living animals for experimental purposes,” was practiced as early as the seventeenth century, but became increasingly widespread during the nineteenth.⁴ Its increased popularity among the scientific community aroused intense resistance. The American Anti-Vivisection Society (AAVS) and other like-minded organizations were established in order to forbid the practice of vivisection through legal means.⁵ They struggled to find success in these pursuits as veterinary vivisectionists asserted that the sacrifice of a few dogs was vital to the survival of the masses of canines the world over.⁶ A similar line of logic would be used to justify the use of animals in the experiments pertaining to space exploration decades later. The official NASA web page dedicated to the animals of the space race declares:

1 Zielinski, “A Brief History of Animal Death in Space.”

2 Amy Nelson, “The Cold War Celebrity and the Courageous Canine Scout: The Life and Times of Soviet Space Dogs,” in *Into the Cosmos: Space Exploration and Soviet Culture*, ed. James T. Andrews and Asif A. Siddiqi (University of Pittsburgh Press, 2011), 134, accessed November 21, 2018, JSTOR.

3 “The Nobel Prize in Physiology or Medicine 1904,” Nobelprize.org, accessed November 18, 2018, <https://www.nobelprize.org/prizes/medicine/1904/pavlov/biographical/>.

4 Paul Lagasse, *The Columbia Encyclopedia*, 8th ed. (Columbia University Press, 2018), s.v. “Vivisection,” accessed November 21, 2018, Credo Reference.

5 Susan B. Jones, “Pricing the Priceless Pet,” in *Valuing Animals: Veterinarians and Their Patients in Modern America* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2003).

6 Jones, “Pricing the Priceless Pet,” 126.

These animals performed a service to their respective countries that no human could or would have performed. They gave their lives and/or their service in the name of technological advancement, paving the way for humanity's many forays into space.¹

In other words, the unwilling sacrifice which these animals made was justifiable because of the magnitude of their contribution to human understanding of the cosmos. In both the Soviet Union and the United States, the rights of animals were less valuable than those of humans and the progress of humankind. Despite this dismissive attitude towards the life and dignity of these animals, many of the non-human cosmonauts were simultaneously regarded as national heroes, a type of propagandistic celebrity unique to them alone. Thus, a fascinating discrepancy in the categorization and valuing of these animals emerged which the United States, in particular, has struggled to reconcile.

Animals as Boundary Objects ²

Amy Nelson accounts for this apparent discrepancy by identifying the Space Race animals as boundary objects, "a concept that has been used to show how the same specimen, exhibit, or research subject means different things to different people."³ This allows the same animal to be categorized in several different ways by several different observers. Thus, the same Soviet stray might be seen as a type of 'biotechnology'⁴ by Russian scientists, a national hero by the Russian public, and a defenseless victim of human exploitation by Western observers all at once. Not surprisingly, the varying categorizations of these animals frequently divided along national lines. As Nelson observes, "Western criticism over the use of dogs as experimental subjects in space research played against the Soviets' promotion of the brave canine 'scout' and their adept manipulation of the dogs in the Cold War propaganda war."⁵ This super power rivalry fueled the formation of a unique iteration of 'celebrity' which applied exclusively to Cold War space explorers, both human and otherwise. The concept of celebrity animals was well established in the American conscious by the onset of the Cold War. Space celebrities such as Able, Baker, and Laika were preceded by Rin-Tin-Tin, Jumbo, Balto, and Lassie. The history of celebrity animals in America is quite extensive, but truly took off with the development of film following the First World War. Americans ate up heartfelt stories of canine heroism during the war with such enthusiasm that they made stars of man's best friend.⁶ Canine celebrities took off further with the expansion of the film industry which developed 'flea features,' to capitalize on the popularity of such stories.⁷

1 Tara Gray, NASA, August 2, 2004, accessed October 18, 2018, <https://history.nasa.gov/animals.html>.

2 Amy Nelson, "The Cold War Celebrity and the Courageous Canine Scout."

3 Nelson, "The Cold War Celebrity and the Courageous Canine Scout."

4 Nelson, "The Cold War Celebrity and the Courageous Canine Scout."

5 Nelson, "The Cold War Celebrity and the Courageous Canine Scout."

6 Jones, *Priceless Pet*, 117.

7 Jones, *Priceless Pet*, 117.

In this climate of increased interest in companion species, the dog, especially, came to loom large in the hearts and minds of the average American. Balto, the sled-dog who successfully led a perilous journey across Alaska to save the town of Nome, became a house-hold name and even had a statue erected in his honor in Central Park. His cinematic compatriots, including Rin-Tin-Tin and Lassie, also connected with the American public. Their acts of every-day heroism and unwavering loyalty to their humans made them high-grossing icons. As the public grew increasingly enamored with Lassie and Balto, they also became increasingly disposed towards the canine species as a whole.¹ A similar but intensified emotional response was directed towards the animals of the Space Race. Instead of simply embodying their breed or species, these animals took on the representative power of entire nations. As Damjanov and Crouch explain, “each of them attained the ‘representative power of celebrities’ as emblems of humanity’s achievements...”² Thus, the celebrity of the Space Race animals ascended to a level which surpassed that of all who came before them as they represented their host country in a battle for international dominance. Under international space law, human astronauts are granted the status of, ‘envoys of mankind,’ a title which Damjanov and Crouch assert unofficially applies to non-human cosmonauts as well.³ The fame of these groundbreaking Space Race animals certainly rivaled that of their human compatriots - so much so that Yuri Gagarin, once asked the press, “am I the first human in space, or the last dog?”⁴ Certainly, the names Laika, Able, and Baker loom just as large in the pages of history as Gagarin, Armstrong, and Ride, but, unlike their human counterparts, these animals unwittingly participated in the missions which made them famous. While few would deny that they were test subjects, national icons, and political pawns, it needs to be recognized that the Space Race animals were ultimately victims of human cruelty. While it is too late to right many of the wrongs committed against animals in the pursuit of space exploration, it is both possible and imperative to remember and reflect on their role in history.

Laika

The first animal to be sent to outer space was a Husky-Spitz mix taken off of the streets of Moscow.⁵ By the time of Laika’s flight in November 1957, the Soviets had already established a tradition of using dogs for scientific purposes. Laika was not the first of her kind; during the early 1950s a total of nine other canines would be used in Soviet space tests.⁶ Of

1 Jones, *Priceless Pet*, 118

2 Katarina Damjanov and David Crouch, “Global Media Cultures Among the Stars: Formations of Celebrity in Outer Space,” *International Journal of Cultural Studies* 21, no. 5 (September 2018):577, accessed November 18, 2018, EBSCOhost.

3 Damjanov and Crouch, “Global Media Cultures Among the Stars,” 555-556.

4 Alex Wellerstein, “Remembering Laika, Space Dog and Soviet Hero,” *The New Yorker*, November 03, 2017, accessed November 07, 2018, <https://www.newyorker.com/tech/annals-of-technology/remembering-laika-space-dog-and-soviet-hero>.

5 Alice George, “The Sad, Sad Story of Laika, the Space Dog, and Her One-Way Trip into Orbit,” *Smithsonian.com*, April 11, 2018, , accessed November 07, 2018, <https://www.smithsonianmag.com/smithsonian-institution/sad-story-laika-space-dog-and-her-one-way-trip-orbit-1-180968728/>.

6 Tara Gray, NASA, August 2, 2004, accessed October 18, 2018, <https://history.nasa.gov/animals.html>.

these nine, four would not survive.¹ Even with a fatality rate that would be considered quite high by today's standards, the Soviets moved forward with plans to send yet another canine sacrifice into space. The mission which would seal Laika's fate was hastily put together by scientists facing pressure from Premier Nikita Khrushchev who desired the next space flight to be in orbit on November 7th, 1957, in order to commemorate the anniversary of the Bolshevik Revolution.² Consequently, scientists had a scant four weeks to assemble Sputnik II, which did not leave enough time to conceive of a means of returning its canine occupant back to earth alive.³ Thus, when the Soviet scientists selected a dog for Sputnik II, they did so with the full knowledge that it would be a fatal mission. Several female dogs were put through a series of tests to determine which was most fit for space travel. These tests ranged from measures of obedience to physical examinations which saw the dogs placed in high-pressure chambers.⁴ Laika was declared the most fit after these trials and was subjected to medical procedures which planted devices in her body to measure her vital signs and bodily movements.⁵ These invasive procedures, Amy Nelson argues, reflected the categorization of Laika as a form of "biotechnology," as she was, "a living organism modified by humans to serve human ends."⁶ This made it all too easy for the Soviet scientists to send her into space without any plans to recover her alive, as she was categorized as nothing more than an expendable piece of equipment. However, as a "boundary object," several other categorizations of Laika persisted.

Despite their best efforts, several Soviets found themselves emotionally attached to Laika. This sentimental value would make moving forward with the mission an emotionally grueling process for these individuals. One handler, Vladimir Yazdovsky, claimed that he, "wanted to do something nice for the dog," and brought her home to play with his children before her flight.⁷ Another admitted to having an emotional episode when it came time to bid Laika farewell.⁸ This was not the first instance of Soviet scientists acknowledging sentimental feelings towards the dogs. In fact, a rumor made its way through the Soviet press prior to Laika's flight that another one of the dogs in her testing group had actually performed better and ought to have been the one to fly in Sputnik II. According to this story, the other dog, Albina, was spared by Soviet scientists who had grown emotionally attached to her and her new-born litter of puppies.⁹ These glimpses of sentimental valuing of canine biotechnology demonstrate the permeability of human categorizations regarding these creatures. In the case of the Soviet

1 Tara Gray, NASA, August 2, 2004, accessed October 18, 2018, <https://history.nasa.gov/animals.html>.

2 George, "The Sad, Sad Story of Laika, the Space Dog, and Her One-Way Trip into Orbit."

3 "Photo Gallery: Laika The Space Dog."

4 George, "The Sad, Sad Story of Laika, the Space Dog, and Her One-Way Trip into Orbit."

5 George, "The Sad, Sad Story of Laika, the Space Dog, and Her One-Way Trip into Orbit."

6 Nelson, "The Cold War Celebrity and the Courageous Canine Scout," 134.

7 George, "The Sad, Sad Story of Laika, the Space Dog, and Her One-Way Trip into Orbit."

8 "Photo Gallery: Laika The Space Dog."

9 George, "The Sad, Sad Story of Laika, the Space Dog, and Her One-Way Trip into Orbit."

scientists, they walked a thin line between regarding the dogs as laboratory subjects and acknowledging that they were living creatures. Amy Nelson suggests that this was reminiscent of Pavlov who struggled to balance “the tension between his stance as a neutral scientist investigating indifferent, natural material and his involved even sentimental attachment to experimental subjects.”¹ This discrepancy would become even more prominent after the dogs completed their missions, especially in the case of Laika.

Laika’s flight and death offer a unique case study as she was both the first living creature to reach outer space and the only one to be intentionally sent to her doom.² This combination further complicated the various categorizations imposed on her by humankind. To citizens and allies of the Soviet Union, she was a national hero whose service demonstrated the superiority of Russian space technology to the world and refuted any assumptions that the USSR was a backward nation. In order to shape this public perspective of Laika, the Soviets relied heavily on anthropomorphism. To this effect, Laika was presented to the world in a press conference prior to her flight, during which she infamously earned her moniker by barking into the microphone (Laika means ‘Barker’ in Russian). She even posed for an official portrait prior to her flight. In that photograph, released to the public while Sputnik II remained in orbit, her positioning is, “carefully calculated to convey a sense of the dog’s confidence and alertness.”³

Notably, Laika is wearing her space suit, which conjures a similar sense of professionalism and gravitas as is captured by military portraits.⁴ This is a deliberate choice in style which seeks to present Laika as a new breed of soldier whose mission is essential to the security of the nation. Implied in this conception of Laika as a soldier is her role as a national hero. This perception cannot be fully appreciated without the context of the Cold War, characterized by a genuine and pervasive fear of nuclear oblivion in both the USSR and United States. In this context, the domination of space concerned not merely national pride, but in a very real sense, national security. Thus, Laika’s sacrifice was framed as an action undertaken for the defense and prosperity of the Soviet Union giving her a legacy akin to other national heroes in the USSR. Like any great military hero, her likeness was reproduced throughout the Soviet Union on cigarettes, stamps, postcards, and all sorts of memorabilia.⁵

Her legacy remains strong in Russia to this day with a notable news station, RT, publishing an article on the 60th anniversary of her death. The article, entitled, “Sacrifice for humanity: 60 years since heroic death of pioneering Soviet space dog Laika,” heaps praise on the

1 Nelson, “The Cold War Celebrity and the Courageous Canine Scout,” 151.

2 Nelson, “The Cold War Celebrity and the Courageous Canine Scout,” 141.

3 Nelson, “The Cold War Celebrity and the Courageous Canine Scout,” 146-147.

4 “Photo Gallery: Laika The Space Dog.”

5 Jake Wallis Simons, “The Amazing True Story of Soviet Astronaut Dogs,” CNN, June 29, 2015, accessed December 11, 2018, <https://www.cnn.com/2014/09/10/world/europe/the-soviets-sent-stray-dogs-to-conquer-space/index.html>

dog who undertook “a doomed trip for the sake of future space travel.”¹ For the Soviets, Laika was a brave soldier who had sacrificed her life for the benefit of the union, an embodiment of Soviet technological and military superiority, and a national hero whose mission enhanced the security of the USSR.

On the opposite side of the iron curtain, Laika was both the adorable puppy dog who was brutally sacrificed in the name of science and the single greatest threat to liberal democracy at that moment. The American public, which was especially attached to dogs as a species, was concerned for the well-being of the poor Soviet puppy who had been sent so far from home. In fact, the criticism from the West was so strong that the Soviet government felt obliged to insist, “The Russians love dogs. This has been done not for the sake of cruelty but for the benefit of humanity.”² This hardly convinced concerned members of the American public, but there was little to be done about the matter once Laika was in orbit. As the *Boston Globe* reported, “while humane societies and dog lovers gasped, the little Russian laboratory dog took her place in history.”³ Despite the emotional response Laika provoked in America’s canine-loving population, the press and leading intellectuals struggled to determine how they ought to categorize the Soviet pup. An article in the *Times* took a comedic approach to reporting on Sputnik II, including cringe-inducing puns such as, “headlines yelped such barbaric new words as pupnik and pooch-nik, sputpup and woofnik,” and, “every dognik has its daynik,” which made light of the Soviet’s triumph and even the sacrifice of Laika, herself.⁴ On the other end of the spectrum, some offered a more ominous perspective on Laika. Renowned nuclear scientist Edward Teller bluntly stated in mid-November 1957, “[the Russians] will advance so fast in science and leave us so far behind that their way of doing things will be the way, and there will be nothing we can do about it.”⁵ For those who assumed Teller’s view of Laika’s flight, her mission was a devastating blow to the future of liberal democracy. Laika, for them, demonstrated the superiority of the Soviet space program over that of the United States. The ability of the Soviets to send a living being into the cosmos gave rise to very real fears regarding their capability to launch missiles aimed at the United States into orbit.⁶ Such a capability could allow the Soviets to wipe the United States, the beacon and champion of liberal democracy, from the face of the earth. For those who recognized what a successful Soviet mission into space would mean for the future of democracy, Laika was no innocent puppy, but the embodiment of the

1 “Sacrifice for Humanity: 60yrs since Heroic Death of Pioneering Soviet Space Dog Laika,” RT International, November 03, 2017, accessed November 10, 2018, <https://www.rt.com/news/408668-space-dog-laika-60th-anniversary/>.

2 “Which Comes First, Science or Ethics?” Citizens for Alternatives to Animal Research, accessed December 11, 2018, https://www.caareusa.org/science_or_ethics.

3 John Barbour, “Sputnik II Made Laika Most Famous Dog in History,” editorial, *The Boston Globe*, April 15, 1958, accessed December 13, 2018, ProQuest Historical Newspapers.

4 “Dog Story,” *Time* 70, no. 21 (November 18, 1957): 77, accessed November 10, 2018, EBSCOhost.

5 “Knowledge Is Power,” *Time* 70, no. 21 (November 18, 1957): accessed November 10, 2018, EBSCOhost.

6 Alex Wellerstein, “Remembering Laika, Space Dog and Soviet Hero.”

the single greatest threat to the free world since the defeat of fascism. Interestingly, Laika's categorization in the United States changed with the times. Once the Soviet Union collapsed, and the threat it had posed to the superiority of the United States was neutralized, the dominant discourse on Laika became one of martyrdom and pity. This shift suggests that perceptions of Laika during the Cold War had less to do with the dignity of the dog herself and much more to do with the nation and ideology she unwittingly personified. This emphasis on what the animals represented over their worth as living beings would continue for the duration of the Cold War.

Able and Baker

"Able/Baker perfect. No injuries or other difficulties," was the radio message sent by Navy frogmen on May 25th, 1959. In that moment, a seven-pound rhesus monkey and a one-pound squirrel monkey became national heroes. The press conference following their successful mission would further cement Able and Baker in the pages of history, and their likenesses would grace the cover of every prominent publication in the United States. The Chicago Daily Tribune lauded the monkeys and reported that the press conference was worse than any part of their space mission.¹ The Los Angeles Times dubbed them, "the world's most famous females,"² and the Washington Post declared them "VIMS" (very important monkeys).³ Life magazine dedicated a spread to their press conference in which it categorized Able and Baker as "space heroes."⁴

The celebrity of Able and Baker was due in large part to their branding as national heroes and the anthropomorphism which bolstered that categorization. Before the completion of their mission, Able and Baker were viewed largely as scientific test subjects. In fact, their names were simply the first two letters of the alphabet, making them equivalent to Monkey A and Monkey B. This was done intentionally to minimize any sentimental attachment to either subject.⁵ Additionally, scientists were so determined to use monkeys despite the risks to those animals that they navigated through significant red tape in order to use them for that purpose. One such challenge was the opposition to the use of monkeys in dangerous experimentation by the American public. The indignation of animal rights advocates following the death of Gordo the previous year was so strong that President Eisenhower mandated that all future flights involving live animals be personally approved by him to avoid such backlash.⁶ It was only after being presented with 4:1 odds that Able and Baker would return safely that he approved the mission.⁷ Another complication, was the cultural implications attached to certain breeds of monkey. In

1 Philip Dodd, "Find 2 Monkeys Little Affected by Space Fight: Press Conference," Chicago Daily Tribune(Chicago), May 31, 1959, accessed November 17, 2018, ProQuest Historical Newspapers.

2 "Able and Baker and Rockets in General," Los Angeles Times (Los Angeles), May 29, 1959, accessed November 17, 2018, EBSCOhost.

3 Morton Mintz, "Big Time for Able and Baker: Press Greets Space Monkeys Here; 'Conference' Arranged for Today," The Washington Post and Times Herald (Washington D.C.), May 30, 1959, accessed November 17, 2018, ProQuest Historical Newspapers.

4 Don A. Schanche, "Able and Baker, U.S. Heroes, Come Back from Space," Life 46 (June 8, 1959): EBSCOhost.

5 Schanche, "Able and Baker," 40.

6 Schanche, "Able and Baker," 39-40.

7 Schanche, "Able and Baker," 40.

India, the rhesus monkey was highly revered.¹ Because India remained, thus far, unaligned in the Cold War, preserving positive relations with that nation was of the utmost importance to the United States. Therefore, it was decided that the rhesus monkey utilized in this mission had to be one bred and born in the United States to avoid giving any offense. Thus, the selection of Able and Baker had come about through an extensive review of various scientific and political considerations. Yet, the rights of the actual animals involved was given little to no consideration which demonstrates their apparent lack of value as autonomous creatures. Interestingly, this value as individuals would skyrocket upon their return to earth.

The successful mission of Able and Baker was a moment of great pride for the United States' space program which, until this time, had lagged far behind that of the Soviet Union. Therefore the United States was eager to capitalize on the mission and the two tiny monkeys which came to embody it. Like the Soviet Union, the United States was guilty of anthropomorphizing its interstellar non-human animals. Almost as soon as they returned to earth, Able and Baker were whisked off to a press conference in Washington D.C. where they were subjected to an onslaught of photo ops. Adding further to this relative absurdity, Able and Baker were transported to said conference via military detail.² The amount of fanfare which Able and Baker received was nearly on par with that which the human astronauts who followed them would experience. The anthropomorphizing did not stop with the American government as even the press adopted this practice. The Washington Post proclaimed Able and Baker, "the nation's first space veterans," and, "heroine[s] of rocket flight."³ The Chicago Daily Tribune attributed certain characteristics to the monkeys that would rarely ever be applied to non-human animals. Able was described as, "pale and bewildered," while Baker was called, "more ladylike," and deemed, "a doll."⁴

The anthropomorphizing of Able and Baker was not an accident. The United States government and its space program were desperately in need of good press by 1959. Not only was the history-making flight of Laika still fresh in the world's mind, but Americans' support for their own program had declined due to the death of Gordo, a squirrel monkey, only a year prior. Gordo had returned to earth alive, but was lost at sea and presumed dead. His death caused a considerable deal of protest from organizations such as the ASPCA and the British Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals.⁵ Thus, trailing behind the Soviet Union and facing a maelstrom of controversy, the United States desperately needed the success of Able and Baker in order to justify the continued use of animals in space testing. Thus Able and Baker were

1 Schanche, "Able and Baker," 40.

2 Greenfieldboyce, "After 50 Years, Space Monkeys Not Forgotten."

3 Mintz, "Big Time for Able and Baker."

4 Dodd, "Find 2 Monkeys Little Affected by Space Fight."

5 "BBC ON THIS DAY | 13 | 1958: Monkey Lost after Space Flight," BBC News, December 13, 1958, accessed December 13, 2018, http://news.bbc.co.uk/onthisday/hi/dates/stories/december/13/newsid_3240000/3240133.stm

anthropomorphized in order to endow them with greater value than was typically possible for non-human animals to achieve, which in turn allowed them to enjoy greater celebrity status.

Their celebrity continued even after their deaths. Able was the first of the duo to pass away. Shortly after her return to earth, one of the electrodes which had been implanted in her skin was discovered to be infected. Doctors decided to remove it in a procedure which should have been quick, low-risk, and painless. Able, however, died on the operating table due to the impact of anesthesia.¹ Her death was covered by a spread in Life magazine which included graphic photographs of doctors performing all manner of maneuvers (including mouth-to-mouth) in a vain attempt to revive her.² When all efforts failed, it was decided that she be treated by a taxidermist for permanent display at the Smithsonian. Had she lived, Able would have shared a fate similar to that of Baker, who spent the rest of her life ‘answering’ fan-mail, appearing on television, and being observed at the U.S. Space and Rocket Center.³ Upon her death, Baker was entombed in Huntsville, Alabama, where a pillar commemorates the final resting place of “Miss Baker,” the first American monkey to travel to space and return alive. Her burial site is still frequented by tourists, many of whom have taken to placing bananas at the site as a token of respect.⁴ In both cases, the monkeys continued to serve human purposes after their deaths. As Jordan Bimm of York University elaborates,

Once Able’s value as a scientific instrument unexpectedly ended, humans found new uses for her... Stuffed and on display, Able continues to serve as an unwilling representative of the U.S. space program, silently vouching for the inherent value and moral imperative in pursuing space science.⁵

The same could be said for Baker, whose final resting place is no arbitrary location, but rather a fixture of the U.S Space and Rocket Center. Such a location testifies to the lack of independent value these monkeys held. Able and Baker were so devoid of autonomy that nearly any location which might serve as an appropriate final resting place for them was inherently tied to a laboratory or noteworthy site pertaining to space exploration. Thus, not only were their lives dominated by the desires of human beings, but their deaths also served human ends.

Pushinka

“Dear Mr. Chairman,” reads the letter dated June 21, 1961, “Mrs. Kennedy and I were particularly pleased to receive ‘Pushinka.’ Her flight from the Soviet Union to the United States

1 Monte Morin, “Space Monkeys: The Humanizing of Able and Baker,” Los Angeles Times, July 27, 2013, accessed November 11, 2018, <http://articles.latimes.com/2013/jul/27/science/la-sci-sn-space-monkeys-the-humanizing-of-abel-and-baker-20130726>.

2 “Able’s Dramatic Death and New U.S. Advances in March to Space,” Life 46 (June 15, 1959): accessed December 12, 2018, EBSCOhost.

3 Monte Morin, “Space Monkeys.”

4 Greenfieldboyce, “After 50 Years, Space Monkeys Not Forgotten.”

5 Morin, “Space Monkeys.”

was not as dramatic as the flight of her mother, nevertheless, it was a long voyage and she stood it well. We both appreciate your remembering these matters in your busy life.”¹ The source of this amicable exchange was an adorable mutt with a snow-colored coat and pointed ears aptly named Pushinka, which translates to ‘Fluffy’ in Russian. She came with her very own passport which lists her mother as Strelka, one of the two dogs who successfully traveled to and returned from space.²

The American press was surprisingly receptive to the Soviet transplant. A special to The New York Times announced her arrival on June 20th and affectionately described her as, “little Pushinka, the puppy,” and described in detail how she was introduced to another one of the Kennedy dogs, Charley, who, “has a big size advantage, but ... seemed hospitable.”³ Another article written about Pushinka describes how the White House was specifically modified to accommodate the tiny dog. The article, which describes how an additional fence needed to be installed to accommodate the dog’s tiny stature, proclaims that Pushinka, “now has her own iron curtain,” before lightheartedly relaying, “the ducks that cruised the White House pond have been moved to winter quarters, out of harm’s way, and Pushinka now has the run of the back yard.”⁴ Given the exceptionally high tensions of the Cold War, it is surprising that the American press was so willing to cover Pushinka’s romping with such light-heartedness at the same time that it was lambasting her home country. Even the American public grew to love Pushinka, despite her ancestry. When ‘Fluffy’ had a litter of puppies with another one of the Kennedy’s dogs, Charlie, nearly 5,000 Americans wrote letters to request one of the new dogs.⁵ Thus, it appears as though the perception of Pushinka as a part of the Kennedy family triumphed over any ill-will towards her nation of origin, at least as far as the American public was concerned.

The perception of Pushinka within the White House, however, was more complicated. The first children were the easiest to win over, but not without a minor bump in the road. When Caroline Kennedy was first presented with Pushinka, the pup growled at her, prompting the first daughter to give “Fluffy” a swift kick in its hindquarters by means of reprimand.⁶ When told of this incident, an amused President Kennedy reportedly replied, “That’s giving it to those damn

1 Dog Records: Pushinka, Jacqueline Bouvier Kennedy Onassis Personal Papers, John F. Kennedy Presidential Library and Museum, comp. Nancy Tuckerman, accessed December 13, 2018, <https://www.jfklibrary.org/asset-viewer/archives/JBKOPP/SF050/JBKOPP-SF050-014>.

2 “Archives,” John F. Kennedy Presidential Library and Museum, accessed November 19, 2018, <https://www.jfklibrary.org/asset-viewer/archives/JBKOPP/SF050/JBKOPP-SF050-014>.

3 “Kennedys Get Puppy as a Gift from Khrushchev,” The New York Times, June 21, 1961, accessed October 11, 2018, ProQuest Historical Newspapers.

4 “Pushinka Is Fenced In: Chicken Wire Protects Dog Khrushchev Gave Kennedys,” The New York Times, December 6, 1961, accessed October 11, 2018, ProQuest Historical Newspapers.

5 Gee, “Pushinka: A Cold War Puppy the Kennedys Loved.”

6 Oleg Yegorov, “Pushinka the Dog: How a Soviet Space Dog’s Puppy Wound up Living in the White House,” Russia Beyond, April 19, 2018, accessed November 19, 2018, <https://www.rbth.com/history/328099-pushinka-dog-space-dog-puppy-in-the-white-house>.

Russians.”¹ This light-hearted but loaded statement was emblematic of the Kennedy-Khrushchev relationship. While their messages became more personal after the exchange of Pushinka, historian Martin Sandler insists, “one-upmanship goes throughout the whole correspondence.”² Pushinka herself was a subtle demonstration of Soviet superiority, due to her famous parentage. Her mother, Strelka, was one of two dogs to be sent into space and returned alive for the first time in human history. Kennedy was immensely aware of developments of the Space Race and Strelka’s success would have been something of a sore spot for him. Thus, having her offspring romping around the White House retained some animosity that no level of cuteness could fully eradicate. Yet, Pushinka’s cute factor did go a long way to endearing the President towards her, and, to an extent, the man who gave her away. Khrushchev’s son, Sergei, believes that the improved relations between his father and President Kennedy had been the primary motivation for giving Pushinka. Sergei Khrushchev recalls his father’s desire for increased communication with Kennedy because of Pushinka as he “thought it would be pleasant for the family and good for politics.”³ By and large, this goal was achieved just before one of the most pivotal moments in the Cold War. Shortly after Pushinka’s arrival in the United States, the Cuban Missile Crisis had come to the fore. The personal correspondence between Kennedy and Khrushchev had established a relationship which would be pivotal in the negotiations which followed.⁴ Ultimately, Pushinka was far more than a cute playmate for the Kennedy children. She was a bridge between Khrushchev and Kennedy at a time when their personal relationship was all that prevented the world from collapsing into nuclear war.⁵

Conclusion

“The more time passes, the more I’m sorry about it. We shouldn’t have done it. We did not learn enough from the mission to justify the death of the dog.”⁶ - Soviet scientist Oleg Gazenko discussing Laika, 1998.

Theirs is a legacy written in the stars. The space race animals live on in museums, monuments, band names, children’s books, documentaries, editorials, and a multitude of other outlets. Yet, not a single one chose this fate. As concerned citizen Carole Warburg Rothschild wrote in a letter to the editor of *The New York Times*, “the courageous astronauts, who willingly undertake high risks, can at least choose to participate or not in these voyages.”⁷ Non-human animals, on the other hand, were incapable of providing consent and were used nonetheless in dangerous and often deadly experimentation. Their sacrifices shed light on the way in which humans perceive the value of other non-human animals. A common justification for the use of animals in space testing is the rationale that their sacrifice would make extraterrestrial travel

1 Gee, “Pushinka: A Cold War Puppy the Kennedys Loved.”

2 Gee, “Pushinka: A Cold War Puppy the Kennedys Loved.”

3 Gee, “Pushinka: A Cold War Puppy the Kennedys Loved.”

4 Gee, “Pushinka: A Cold War Puppy the Kennedys Loved.”

5 Gee, “Pushinka: A Cold War Puppy the Kennedys Loved.”

6 Wellerstein, “Remembering Laika, Space Dog and Soviet Hero.”

7 Carole Warburg Rothschild, “Monkey in Space,” editorial, *The New York Times*, August 9, 1969, accessed December 13, 2018, ProQuest Historical Newspapers.

safer for human beings. The same Life article which claimed, "Able's death was but a minor tragedy in the grand design of man's march into space," also asserted that, "animal experimentations are the necessary fore-runners of human space travel."¹ Indeed the same rationale was given by the Soviets who justified Laika's flight as a vital sacrifice, "for the benefit of humanity."² In both cases, the desire for human progress was considered to be of greater value than any infringement upon the autonomy of the animals in question. This was not only true for their time as test subjects, but for the entirety of their lives. Those who were lucky enough to survive were paraded in front of the press, studied for years after their return, and used as political leverage.

The Cold War is so named because the tensions between the United States and the USSR never reached the point of direct military conflict.³ However, it still produced myriad victims. Often, when scholars look at the proxy altercations brought on by this rivalry of superpowers they discuss Iran or Afghanistan, but they should also include outer space in that conversation. The Space Race was indeed a battleground of immense importance, and the bulk of its victims were the non-human animals whose sacrifices are too often glossed over. The entire menagerie of Space Race animals gave their lives to a war which had nothing to do with them. They were selected by humans, used in place of humans, and sacrificed for human ends. If even their legacy must serve mankind, it ought to do so as a warning, a warning as to just how dangerously inhumane humanity can be when it ignores the inherent dignity in our fellow animals.

1 "Able's Dramatic Death and New U.S. Advances in March to Space," Life 46 (June 15, 1959): accessed December 12, 2018, EBSCOhost.

2 "Which Comes First, Science or Ethics?" Citizens for Alternatives to Animal Research, accessed December 11, 2018, https://www.caareusa.org/science_or_ethics.

3 Harlan Cleveland, "The Cold War," National Archives and Records Administration, October 21, 2006, accessed December 14, 2018, <https://www.archives.gov/research/foreign-policy/cold-war/symposium/cleveland.html>

Bibliography

Primary Sources

"Able and Baker and Rockets in General." Los Angeles Times (Los Angeles), May 29, 1959.

Accessed November 17, 2018. EBSCOhost.

"Able's Dramatic Death and New U.S. Advances in March to Space." Life 46 (June 15, 1959): 20-31. Accessed December 12, 2018. EBSCOhost.

Barbour, John. "Sputnik II Made Laika Most Famous Dog in History." Editorial. The Boston Globe, April 15, 1958. Accessed December 13, 2018. ProQuest Historical Newspapers.

Cleveland, Harlan. "The Cold War." National Archives and Records Administration. October 21, 2006. Accessed December 14, 2018. <https://www.archives.gov/research/foreign-policy/cold-war/symposium/cleveland.html>.

Dodd, Philip. "Find 2 Monkeys Little Affected by Space Fight: Press Conference." Chicago Daily Tribune (Chicago), May 31, 1959. Accessed November 17, 2018. ProQuest Historical Newspapers.

Dog Records: Pushinka. Jacqueline Bouvier Kennedy Onassis Personal Papers, John F. Kennedy Presidential Library and Museum. Compiled by Nancy Tuckerman. Accessed December 13, 2018. <https://www.jfklibrary.org/asset-viewer/archives/GBKOPP/SF050/GBKOPP-SF050-014>.

"Dog Story." Time 70, no. 21 (November 18, 1957): 77. Accessed November 10, 2018. EBSCOhost.

Finney, John W. "One Space Monkey Dies During a Minor Operation: A Space Monkey Dies in Surgery." The New York Times (New York), June 03, 1959. Accessed November 17, 2018. ProQuest Historical Newspapers.

Ivanov, K., and Oliver Wainwright. 1960 space propaganda poster. Digital image. The Guardian. September 2, 2014. Accessed December 13, 2018. <https://www.theguardian.com/artanddesign/gallery/2014/sep/02/soviet-space-dogs>

"Kennedys Get Puppy as a Gift from Khrushchev." The New York Times, June 21, 1961. Accessed October 11, 2018. ProQuest Historical Newspapers

"Knowledge Is Power." Time 70, no. 21 (November 18, 1957): 23. Accessed November 10, 2018. EBSCOhost.

"Man Able to Go Where Baker Went: Monkey Flight Raises Hope for Human Trip." Los Angeles Times (Los Angeles), May 31, 1959. Accessed November 17, 2018. ProQuest Historical Newspapers.

Mintz, Morton. "Big Time for Able and Baker: Press Greets Space Monkeys Here; 'Conference' Arranged for Today." The Washington Post and Times Herald (Washington D.C.), May 30, 1959. Accessed November 17, 2018. ProQuest Historical Newspapers.

"Monkeys Through Space." Time 73, no. 23 (June 8, 1959): 66. <https://ezproxy.sju.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=aph&AN=54197258&site=ehost-live>.

"Pushinka Is Fenced In: Chicken Wire Protects Dog Khrushchev Gave Kennedys." The New York Times, December 6, 1961. Accessed October 11, 2018. ProQuest Historical Newspapers.

Rothschild, Carole Warburg. "Monkey in Space." The New York Times, August 9, 1969. Accessed October 11, 2018. ProQuest Historical Newspapers.

Schanche, Don A. "Able and Baker, U.S. Heroes, Come Back from Space." Life 46 (June 8, 1959): 38-40. EBSCOhost.

"SPCA Honors Space Monkeys." The Washington Post and Times Herald, June 30, 1959. Accessed November 17, 2018. ProQuest Historical Newspapers.

Topping, Seymour. "Animals Unhurt: Capsule Comes Down After 17 Circuits in 24-Hour Flight." The New York Times, August 21, 1960. Accessed October 11, 2018. ProQuest Historical Newspapers.

Warburg Rothschild, Carole. "Monkey in Space." Editorial. The New York Times, August 9, 1969. Accessed December 13, 2018. ProQuest Historical Newspapers.

Witkin, Richard. "Russian Expected As First In Orbit." The New York Times, August 21, 1960. Accessed October 11, 2018. ProQuest Historical Newspapers.

Secondary Sources

- "Animals as Cold Warriors: Missiles, Medicine, and Man's Best Friend - Laika." U.S. National Library of Medicine. April 17, 2012. Accessed November 10, 2018. <https://www.nlm.nih.gov/exhibition/animals/laika.html>.
- "Archives." John F. Kennedy Presidential Library and Museum. Accessed November 19, 2018. <https://www.jfklibrary.org/asset-viewer/archives/GBKOPP/SF050/GBKOPP-SF050-014>.
- BBC ON THIS DAY | 13 | 1958: Monkey Lost after Space Flight." BBC News. December 13, 1958. Accessed December 13, 2018. http://news.bbc.co.uk/onthistday/hi/dates/stories/december/13/newsid_3240000/3240133.stm
- Damjanov, Katarina, and David Crouch. "Global Media Cultures Among the Stars: Formations of Celebrity in Outer Space." *International Journal of Cultural Studies* 21, no. 5 (September 2018). Accessed November 18, 2018. EBSCOhost.
- Gee, Alison. "Pushinka: A Cold War Puppy the Kennedys Loved." BBC News. January 06, 2014. Accessed October 11, 2018. <https://www.bbc.com/news/magazine-24837199>.
- George, Alice. "The Sad, Sad Story of Laika, the Space Dog, and Her One-Way Trip into Orbit." *Smithsonian.com*. April 11, 2018. Accessed November 07, 2018. <https://www.smithsonianmag.com/smithsonian-institution/sad-story-laika-space-dog-and-her-one-way-trip-orbit-1-180968728/>.
- Gray, Tara. NASA. August 2, 2004. Accessed October 18, 2018. <https://history.nasa.gov/animals.html>.
- Greenfieldboyce, Nell. "After 50 Years, Space Monkeys Not Forgotten." NPR. May 28, 2009. Accessed December 12, 2018. <https://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=104578202>.
- "Introduction: Man and Beast in Nature." In *Animals and Science: A Guide to the Debates*, by Niall Shanks. ABC-CLIO, 2002. https://ezproxy.sju.edu/login?url=https://search.credoreference.com/content/entry/abcanscie/introduction_man_and_beast_in_nature/0?institutionId=473
- Jones, Susan B. "Pricing the Priceless Pet." In *Valuing Animals: Veterinarians and Their Patients in Modern America*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2003.
- McCallum-Smith, Susan. "Able and Baker: Not Invented Here." *Agni*, no. 76 (2012): 102-33. Accessed November 11, 2018. JSTOR.
- Morin, Monte. "Space Monkeys: The Humanizing of Able and Baker." *Los Angeles Times*. July 27, 2013. Accessed November 11, 2018. <http://articles.latimes.com/2013/jul/27/science/la-sci-sn-space-monkeys-the-humanizing-of-abel-and-baker-20130726>
- Morris, Lulu. "Animals Lost In Space." *National Geographic*. October 04, 2017. Accessed November 17, 2018. <https://www.nationalgeographic.com.au/space/animals-lost-in-space.aspx>.
- Nelson, Amy. "Cold War Celebrity and the Courageous Canine Scout: The Life and Times of Soviet Space Dogs." In *Into the Cosmos: Space Exploration and Soviet Culture*, edited by Andrews James T. and Siddiqi Asif A., 133-56. Pittsburgh, Pa.: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2011. doi:10.2307/j.ctt6wrcn2.10.
- Simons, Jake Wallis. "The Amazing True Story of Soviet Astronaut Dogs." CNN. June 29, 2015. Accessed December 11, 2018. <https://www.cnn.com/2014/09/10/world/europe/the-soviets-sent-stray-dogs-to-conquer-space/index.html>.

- Tate, Karl. "Cosmic Menagerie: A History of Animals in Space (Infographic)." Space.com. April 19, 2013. A8. <https://www.newyorker.com/tech/annals-of-technology/remembering-laika-space-dog-and-soviet-hero>.
- "Which Comes First, Science or Ethics?" Citizens for Alternatives to Animal Research. Accessed December 11, 2018. https://www.caareusa.org/science_or_ethics.
- "The Nobel Prize in Physiology or Medicine 1904." Nobelprize.org. Accessed November 18, 2018. <https://www.nobelprize.org/prizes/medicine/1904/pavlov/biographical/>.
- "Vivisection." In The Columbia Encyclopedia, by Paul Lagasse, and Columbia University. 8th ed. Columbia University Press, 2018. <https://ezproxy.sju.edu/login?url=https://search.credoreference.com/content/entry/columency/vivisection/0?institutionId=473>
- Wellerstein, Alex. "Remembering Laika, Space Dog and Soviet Hero." The New Yorker. November 03, 2017. Accessed November 07, 2018. <https://www.newyorker.com/tech/annals-of-technology/remembering-laika-space-dog-and-soviet-hero>.
- "Which Comes First, Science or Ethics?" Citizens for Alternatives to Animal Research. Accessed December 11, 2018. https://www.caareusa.org/science_or_ethics.
- Yegorov, Oleg. "Pushinka the Dog: How a Soviet Space Dog's Puppy Wound up Living in the White House." Russia Beyond. April 19, 2018. Accessed November 19, 2018. <https://www.rbth.com/history/328099-pushinka-dog-space-dog-puppy-in-the-white-house>.
- Zielinski, Sarah. "A Brief History of Animal Death in Space." Science News. September 08, 2014. Accessed November 18, 2018. <https://www.sciencenews.org/blog/wild-things/brief-history-animal-death-space>.

The Soviet-Afghan War: The Blowback that was Afghanistan

James Elliott

Introduction:

By the mid-1980's the Soviet Union found itself caught in an unwinnable war with Afghan insurgents. With the economy on the brink of collapse and the military taking high casualties, it appeared as though the Soviet Union's time in the country was limited. Still, the military pressed on believing there was a sure chance they could pull through with a victory. However, the anti-Soviet Afghan fighters, often referred to as the Mujahideen, were backed by two foreign intelligence agencies throughout the war: the United States' Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) and Pakistan's Inter-Services Intelligence (ISI). Together, these agencies helped form a coherent front against the Soviets by funding arms and supplies to the Mujahideen in an attempt to maintain a consistent fighting force. Although these two agencies agreed on expelling the Soviet forces from Afghanistan, their differing strategies often created tension between the United States and Pakistan.

The current analysis will comprise of information regarding the actions taken by both intelligence communities. While the goal of both agencies was to expel Soviet forces from Afghanistan, their hopes for the future of the country were polarized. The US later supported pro-nationalist movements (the concept of creating an Afghanistan for Afghans) in the country, while the Pakistanis were determined to provide the most supplies to fundamentalists (someone who believes in the strict interpretation of something) to lay the foundation for an Islamic alliance. Intelligence strategy meant everything to the Afghan war effort; without it, the anti-Soviet fighters would have had a far more difficult time trying to get rid of the Soviet Union.

Background:

The Soviet Union tried to formulate a way in which communism spread across the world, while simultaneously strengthening the already established Soviet allies. Additionally, the Soviet army never looked past an opportunity to inject influence onto a country with a growing sympathy for communist politics. This is what attracted the Soviets to Afghanistan by 1979. In 1978, Communist revolutionaries took control of the Afghan government, dethroning the monarchy which had been long established. The Soviet Union immediately offered support to the communist revolutionaries by constructing a new government, which attempted to bring the country closer by implementing new progressive legislation. This change, however, proved unpopular amongst the population. Soon the country was in an uproar of rebellion and civil war.

By the end of 1979, the new communist government of Afghanistan, also known as the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan, was destined to collapse. Officially on December 25, 1979, the USSR had conducted a surprise invasion of Afghanistan. According to CIA records, there were multiple reports of large Soviet military airlifts in and around Afghanistan during the time of this attack. In addition to the large amounts of troops and supplies in these airlifts, there was also a great deal of Soviet forces already in Afghanistan, which had infiltrated

weeks prior to the main invasion.¹

By December 28th, 1979, only three days after the main invasion, the Soviets took control of the capital city of Kabul and successfully liquidated the current communist government to install its own. The size of this invasion was massive, and the intelligence community in the United States was caught off guard. Along with intelligence agencies, the Carter administration was especially taken back by the sudden and swift invasion of Afghanistan.

After the Soviets replaced the former communist government with the Taraki regime, it continued to fund the government with nearly 250 million dollars worth of support.² Along with the extensive support, the Soviet Union also created a permanent occupation force to police the country and the new Communist Government. The country is located conveniently at the underbelly of the Soviet Union. Thus, the underlying thought process behind this decision was that the Soviet Union could take complete control of the country, and establish a number of military strongholds that would prove to be a strategic advantage to its enemies in the Middle East.

With the extreme efforts to tie the country closer together in order to assume complete control, a number of issues arose which the Soviets had to immediately deal with. In multiple records, the CIA and other intelligence agents use the term “tribalism,” or a fragmented form of government which involves the constant competition of multiple factions who continuously attempt to gain superiority over other groups.³ It is important to understand the foundational setup of the country. Afghanistan at this time was an extremely poor country and the majority of the landscape included mountains and desert. Inhabitants of the land were not exclusively Afghani, but had ties to the neighboring cultures. These geographic features, along with the extreme cultural differences, made it easy for most tribes to disaffiliate from one another. Some of these details may seem confusing, but they are essential in understanding the overall concept of the Soviet-Afghan War. The Soviet Union was originally convinced that it could conquer the entire country and simply demolish any opposition. Through tribalism, these hopes were eventually crushed. According to the CIA’s National Foreign Assessment, Afghanistan fell into “a state of insurgency,” which eventually became the Achilles heel of the Soviet Union and the backed government of Afghanistan. Insurgencies were highly dependent on the familiar terrain and the element of surprise to subdue the enemy through the use of guerrilla warfare to make their forces as fluid and untraceable as possible. Guerrilla warfare is best defined as an untraditional form of combat; consisting of paramilitary militias or armed civilians who conduct a series of small clashes involving ambushes and sabotage. More often than not the Mujahideen

1 Central Intelligence Agency “Predicting the Soviet Invasion of Afghanistan: The Intelligence Community’s Record.” Central Intelligence Agency Archive. June 28, 2008.

2 Central Intelligence Agency “Predicting the Soviet Invasion of Afghanistan: The Intelligence Community’s Record.” Central Intelligence Agency Archive. June 28, 2008.

3 Interview by Scotto, Ian.”Episode 326: CIA veteran of 32 years Jack Devine discusses intervention and Afghanistan.”Sofrep.com. February 14, 2018.

used this style of fighting as its main strategy while fighting with the Soviet military. These strategies also made it incredibly frustrating for a conventional force, such as the Soviet Union, to contain and foil the rampant insurgencies. However, these forces were not alone in their efforts. In fact, they were heavily supported by outside forces who tried to covertly supply the Mujahideen.

After the Carter administration, U.S. President Ronald Reagan became far more invested in the intelligence community and offered a great deal of funding to the CIA. With the funding, the U.S. was able to provide a great deal of effort to the Afghan cause. In the 98th meeting of Congress in 1984, supporting the Afghan people became an official policy of the U.S. Subsequently, the CIA was granted an abundance of money and supplies to the Mujahideen. However, this support was indirectly filtered through the ISI and the funds went to groups in which the ISI felt were most deserving of the weapons. The groups deemed worthy of the supplies were the most ruthless warlords in the country. The U.S. continued to supply excessive funding to these groups for many years, in hopes of steadily breaking down the Soviet war machine. Towards the end of the war, the agreements between the CIA and the ISI became unstable, as the U.S. realized the projected future of the country. The CIA, backed by the U.S. government, helped create and maintain the Mujahideen; in fact, the U.S. is now seen to have determined the subsequent political and economic state of the country.

Afghanistan: “A Place Where Empires go to Die”

The Soviet Union’s invasion of Afghanistan was the third instance in history that a foreign country attempted to conquer the entire region. Along with the other past aggressors who attempted to take control of Afghanistan, the Soviet Union was met with a significant amount of obstacles that eventually prevented them from taking total control of the country.¹ Over the course of five years, the Soviet forces found themselves “bogged down in a guerrilla war with increasing intensity.” According to a CIA report, during 1985, the Soviet Union lost a tremendous amount of land control due to the unreliable Communist Afghan military.² Furthermore, the Mujahideen fighters were heavily armed while the fighting commenced all around the country.³

By this point, the Soviets still claimed control over the country, but it is more appropriate to state they were completely surrounded by an enemy they could not always fight or find. The original goal to transform Afghanistan into a product of Soviet political influence had come to

1 Barfield, Thomas. *Afghanistan: A Cultural and Political History*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2012.

2 “Defense Intelligence Agency, Defense Intelligence Digest.” National Security Archive, September 29, 2011, 5-9. Doc# 5.

3 “Defense Intelligence Agency, Defense Intelligence Digest.” National Security Archive, September 29, 2011, 5-9. Doc# 3.

an abrupt stop.

There are a few factors which contribute to the advantages of the Mujahideen and why it transformed into the crippling tool against the Soviet Union's military and morale. First, the Mujahideen had no shortage of volunteers. When the Soviet Union invaded the country in late 1979, it managed to displace people numbering upwards of three million. A large percentage of these people fled to neighboring countries; among those being Pakistan. These refugee camps along the Afghan-Pakistani border were a perfect place to muster young vengeful fighters. The border between these two countries ran for 2,180 kilometers, or 1,354 miles, making it the second largest bordering region just behind the Soviet Union itself. This not only reveals how important this border was toward the security of the USSR, but in addition, the Mujahideen were able to use this extensive border with Pakistan as a means of constructing bases and supply lines.¹

Other advantages included familiarity of land, elements of surprise and the lack of centralization. This adds to the list of difficulties the Soviet Union had to suffer through in its attempt to effectively conquer Afghanistan.² A document unclassified by the CIA revealed a list of key judgements on the situation in Afghanistan. This document stated that Afghans "never had much a sense of national identity"; in fact, local interests came first for many as fighters would only serve amongst their own tribe.³ This caused a plethora of complications for the Soviet military. Along with this, there were varying ethnicities within the country. Afghanistan's geographic positioning is one of the major crossroads of the world, with the majority of the population being native to neighboring countries. Although a majority of the inhabitants are Pashtun, only approximately 40% of the population are considered the true Afghans. Just behind the Pashtuns are the Tajiks, who make up nearly 30% of the population.⁴ They are believed to have Iranian origins and are majority Sunni Muslims. The Tajiks, more often than not, settle along the northern border of Afghanistan while the Pashtun people reside toward the South.⁵ The rest of the population is split up between smaller ethnicities across the country. According to a NSA document released in 1980, "there are hundreds of tribes belonging to nearly a dozen

1 Sawe, Benjamin Elisha. "Ethnic Groups Of Afghanistan." WorldAtlas. September 14, 2016. Accessed May 10, 2018.

2 "Defense Intelligence Agency, Defense Intelligence Digest." National Security Archive, September 29, 2011, 5-9. Doc# 3.

3 "Defense Intelligence Agency, Defense Intelligence Digest." National Security Archive, September 29, 2011, 5-9. Doc# 5.

4 Sawe, Benjamin Elisha. "Ethnic Groups Of Afghanistan." WorldAtlas. September 14, 2016. Accessed May 10, 2018.

5 Sawe, Benjamin Elisha. "Ethnic Groups Of Afghanistan." WorldAtlas. September 14, 2016. Accessed May 10, 2018.

ethnic groups in Afghanistan and neighboring areas of Iran and Pakistan.”¹

Tribalism is a recurring theme throughout a number of intelligence documents; whether or not people were of the same ethnicity, they were expected to follow their tribe. In most cases, there was no central authority between tribes except a chief who had absolute authority. Relationships between the tribes also varied tremendously which, caused tension between those within the same ethnicity. In the case of the Soviet-Afghan War, some clusters of tribes did not work directly with one another. The lack of communication among the tribes was a large disadvantage; however, the rebels were still utterly unpredictable. Thus, there is a sense of fluidity in the Mujahideen. No matter how hard the military targeted a specific group, there were always other tribes willing to put forth resistance.

The same declassified CIA document also determined “the number of full- and part-time fighters at 150,000 ... and about 30,000 full-time Afghan insurgents at any given time.”² The Afghan resistance movement not only consisted of a large number of fighters and supporters, but the act of involvement was far more flexible than a conventional force. This pressed the Soviet Union to fight an enemy that it could not always identify, making ambushes far more prevalent and effective for the Mujahideen. Not only did this make combat easier for the fighters, but it improved the transportation of materials and supplies, knowing that a large number of the population was in support of the resistance. Along with the empires before it, the Soviet military eventually lost all of its grip of the country and, like each empire before it, it too, crumbled.

The Afghan Situation: US -Pakistani Relations

The Mujahideen was proven to be a formidable force against the Soviet Union. The success of the rebellion drew attention from outside powers, who were willing to provide support and aid to various groups established across the nation. Political influence and religious fundamentalism highly influenced how the foreign entities choose their preferred groups to offer support. The CIA believed it was imperative to get the U.S. involved. It has been mentioned in a number of sources and in an interview with Jack Devine, Head of CIA Operations in Afghanistan, that the U.S. needed to become involved, but only to a certain extent. It was vital that the U.S. limit the level of direct participation to an absolute minimum, considering the exceptional tensions that resulted from the Cold War in the 1980's. The 1980's have been widely considered one of the heights of the Cold War and tensions were exceptionally high between the USSR and the U.S.³

Thus, the goal was to become involved so much that the U.S. could control its

1 “Defense Intelligence Agency, Defense Intelligence Digest.” National Security Archive, September 29, 2011, 5-9. Doc # 2.

2 “Defense Intelligence Agency, Defense Intelligence Digest.” National Security Archive, September 29, 2011, 5-9. Doc # 5.

3 Interview by Scotto, Ian.”Episode 326: CIA veteran of 32 years Jack Devine discusses intervention and Afghanistan.”Sofrep.com. February 14, 2018.

contribution to the Afghan war effort while simultaneously maintaining plausible deniability. The government feared what agents called a blowback, or a poisonous fallout, borne by political winds, drifting back home from a faraway battlefield. Because getting involved in a conflict such as the Soviet-Afghan War could dramatically affect the well-being of the U.S., the government had to establish alliances and agreements with a number of different organizations and countries.¹

The most important ally the United States had in Southeast Asia during this time was Pakistan. In 1978, General Zia-ul-Haq declared himself the President of Pakistan. U.S. President Carter had been reluctant to consider Zia an ally in the Middle East. According to the U.S. intelligence, Carter had offered the dictator a large sum of money to support a fight in Afghanistan. Although President Zia accepted the support of the U.S., he replied with “peanuts” when he approved seemingly low offers of monetary support. The U.S. were not the only ones aware of the strategic importance of the country during this time. A number of other “high level visitors” came to the defense of Pakistan, including British Foreign Secretary Lord Carrington and the U.N. Secretary General. Pakistan understood that within a short time, Reagan would be elected as President of the U.S., and it was only a matter of waiting out Carter’s administration.²

By 1980, Reagan had offered Pakistan upwards of one billion dollars for annual Afghan support. This created a loose alliance between the U.S. and Pakistan. Pakistan was originally concerned that it would be next in line to be invaded by the Soviet military. This was the perfect situation; not only could the U.S. remain at a distance in its involvement in the Soviet-Afghan War, but the Pakistanis could fund who they wanted with the support and potentially defend themselves from invasion.

The U.S., under President Reagan and William Casey, head of the CIA, invested so much in the relationship with Zia, hoping to win over the support of the Muslim World. For the next decade, the U.S. had to commit a large sum of monetary support to jihad (sacrificing effort to work for God). Not only did this mark the beginning of the U.S. offering support to extremists, but it is also empowered Zia and his legitimacy.³ Zia became a figure for the West in the Middle East, which allowed him to act however he pleased. In turn, the ISI became imperative in this newly developed proxy war. The head of the ISI was Chief Lt. General Akhtar Abdur Rehman, who was considered the most important figure for the ISI involvement in Afghanistan. He was able to organize the entire operation by using the funding by the U.S., converting the

1 Johnson, Chalmers. “Blowback.” *The Nation*. June 29, 2015. Accessed May 10, 2018.

2 Datta, S. K. *Inside ISI: The Story and Involvement of the ISI in Afghan Jihad, Taliban, Al-Qaeda, 9/11, Osama Bin Laden, 26/11 and the Future of Al-Qaeda*. New Delhi: United Service Institution of India, 2015.

3 Datta, S. K. *Inside ISI: The Story and Involvement of the ISI in Afghan Jihad, Taliban, Al-Qaeda, 9/11, Osama Bin Laden, 26/11 and the Future of Al-Qaeda*. New Delhi: United Service Institution of India, 2015, 58.

money to arms and supplies, and transporting it through the Pakistani-Afghan border.¹ The weapons for the Mujahideen came from places such as Egypt and China, which were generally AK-47s or Kalashnikovs. Thus, during the war, it was easy to transfer captured Soviet supplies. According to Mohammad Yousef, the U.S. and China had worked with one another in order to make this arrangement take place.² The headquarters were established in the capital city of Islamabad.

The organization was considered a completely separate entity to the military, which directly answered to the President. This organization had been employed by a few hundred intelligence officers and nearly a thousand staff under the leadership of Lt. General Rehman.³ This was also one of the first times in history Pakistan was able to effectively use an intelligence agency for covert operations. With this foundation, they were able to carry out the largest secret missions in all of the twentieth century. The ISI was responsible for supplying, arming and, most importantly, training fighters. The agency was involved with assisting fighters in learning to use U.S. made Stinger missiles, which were incredibly valuable when it came to engaging Soviet helicopters. It was also important to establish bases along the Afghan-Pakistan border to act as relief stations, training grounds and recruiting centers.

Although these bases were meant to remain secretive through the entirety of the war, the Soviet Union was well aware of their existence. According to *Inside ISI* by S. K. Datta, “the ISI had two forward detachments at Quetta and at Peshawar” in order to be close to the Afghan border.⁴ Even though these bases were technically protected by the Pakistan border, there was one specific case in which the Soviet Union executed a mission by crossing the border. This base, Krer, located on the Kunar River, supplied the entire Kunar Province. A Spetsnaz force, commanded by a LTC Babushkin, were tired of the constant ambushes and the fact that Mujahideen fighters could slip in and out of Afghan-Pakistan border with ease. They noticed during their raid into Pakistan how well the Mujahideen had been dug into bunkers and systematic defenses across the border.⁵ As a result, the Soviet Union conducted a number of raids pushing closer toward the camp; however, the Mujahideen had been far more prepared. The base was heavily armed and well manned. There were also sporadic rebel groups within the area which were hard to keep track of.

1 Datta, S. K. *Inside ISI: The Story and Involvement of the ISI in Afghan Jihad, Taliban, Al-Qaeda, 9/11, Osama Bin Laden, 26/11 and the Future of Al-Qaeda*. New Delhi: United Service Institution of India, 2015, 59.

2 Datta, S. K. *Inside ISI: The Story and Involvement of the ISI in Afghan Jihad, Taliban, Al-Qaeda, 9/11, Osama Bin Laden, 26/11 and the Future of Al-Qaeda*. New Delhi: United Service Institution of India, 2015, 58.

3 Yousaf, Mohammad, and Mark Adkin. *Afghanistan - the Bear Trap: The Defeat of a Superpower*. Barnsley: Cooper, 2005.

4 Datta, S. K. *Inside ISI: The Story and Involvement of the ISI in Afghan Jihad, Taliban, Al-Qaeda, 9/11, Osama Bin Laden, 26/11 and the Future of Al-Qaeda*. New Delhi: United Service Institution of India, 2015, 69.

5 Grau, Lester W., and Ali Ahmad Jalali. “Forbidden Cross-border Vendetta: Spetsnaz Strike into Pakistan during the Soviet-Afghan War.” *The Journal of Slavic Military Studies* 18, no. 4 (2005): 661-72.

Although the Soviet Union was technically successful in destroying the base, the withdrawal from Pakistan resulted in a mass of casualties. After the battle had taken place, the Soviet Union was forbidden from conducting any further cross-border missions.¹ The Krer base was rebuilt and Mujahideen forces were able to start supplying the Northeast part of the country. This not only complements the fluidity and perseverance of the Mujahideen fighters, but it also shows how important these Pakistani bases were to the war.² Considering how new and quick this establishment was created, the ISI was able to execute an incredible goal. How the ISI decided to formulate this plan, provide appropriate housing for the Mujahideen and conduct such a great amount of support, is astonishing. Who the ISI decided to support determined the future of international relations regarding the Middle East.

Sponsorship of Islamic Extremism vs. Support of Moderate Islam

The CIA found themselves in a positive position, as they were able to fund a covert operation through the ISI. They were able to expel Soviet forces from Afghanistan by maintaining plausible deniability, meaning that if the Soviet Union was to make accusations against the U.S. for direct involvement, there would be no substantial evidence to link it to the conflict. The U.S. was only represented by those the ISI had endorsed, among them were leaders from some of the most prominent tribes in Afghanistan.

When the Communist government had taken over the country, many rebels fled to Pakistan in hopes of gaining support. The two most important men to flee Afghanistan during this time were Ahmed Shah Massoud and Gulbuddin Hekmatyar. Massoud was a Tajik-Afghan freedom fighter during the early days of the conflict. He was trusted with executing a number of fights throughout Afghanistan but found himself defeated. He was also known for his moderate Islamic tendencies and his pro-nationalist sentiment. He and a number of other non-Pashtun fighters decided to join the Jamiat-I Islami, a nationalistic resistance group, during the Soviet-Afghan War. His ability to lead non-Pashtun fighters so effectively against the Soviet forces earned him honorable titles across the country.³ Jack Devine, a CIA operative in Afghanistan, described Massoud as a “warrior” who was greatly respected amongst his fighters.⁴ He became a figurehead for a truly free nation run by moderate Islamic ideals and nationalism.

CIA operative Milt Bearden had visited a contact in Islamabad on an assignment to touch base with some of the public figures the U.S. was supporting. The most important of these people was Hekmatyar. During the 80's, he was considered the most brutal warlord of all the

1 Grau, Lester W., and Ali Ahmad Jalali. “Forbidden Cross-border Vendetta: Spetsnaz Strike into Pakistan during the Soviet-afghan War.” *The Journal of Slavic Military Studies* 18, no. 4 (2005): 665.

2 Grau, Lester W., and Ali Ahmad Jalali. “Forbidden Cross-border Vendetta: Spetsnaz Strike into Pakistan during the Soviet-afghan War.” *The Journal of Slavic Military Studies* 18, no. 4 (2005): 671.

3 Vincent J. Tumminello II. “Snake Oil: US Foreign Policy, Afghanistan, and the Cold War.” *E-International Relations*. Accessed May 10, 2018

4 Interview by Scotto, Ian.”Episode 326: CIA veteran of 32 years Jack Devine discusses intervention and Afghanistan.”*Sofrep.com*. February 14, 2018.

tribes in Afghanistan. In one instance, he threw acid in the faces of unveiled women. He had no issue with condemning someone to execution for even the smallest infraction on religious law. Milt Bearden recalled his interactions with this warlord in Islamabad's Pakistani Intelligence Headquarters. In the report, Bearden claimed that he was the most funded man in all of the country because of the efficiency he had against the Soviet forces. U.S. and Pakistani intelligence were able to put aside the strong Islamic rhetoric and also ignored the fact that he was incredibly anti-American. This gives great insight into the type of people the U.S. and its allies in this region were investing their money into, and if they had made the right decisions by supporting certain tribal leaders.¹

Hekmatyar was the perfect candidate for the ISI. He was a ruthless fighter of the Pashtun ethnicity (Pashtun is the same ethnicity in Pakistan) and planned on supporting an Islamic run Afghanistan after the war had ended, which sat well with Pakistani leaders. Although he received the most funding from the U.S., he still remained staunchly anti-American throughout the war and refused to publicly admit his reliability on non-Muslim support. On a visit to the U.N., he had refused to meet with President Reagan for diplomatic purposes. Despite the fact that the U.S. was the greatest monetary supporter, Hekmatyar felt that he would be betraying the Muslim cause by allowing him to be seen as an American pawn. Thus, it was clear that Hekmatyar was a strict fundamentalist who was dedicated to committing his life to jihad.² Even though his supplies and armaments came directly from the U.S., he was determined to get rid of any Western powers in the Middle East.

Gulbuddin Hekmatyar led the group of Hezb-I Islami, which, similar to the Jamiat-I Islami, was against the communist government in Kabul. The only difference between the two is that this group was severely against the nationalist movement which other groups had sponsored. Eventually, Hekmatyar had used the funds and supplies to wage war against rival Mujahideen groups, who were considered less radical. Hekmatyar understood that after the war a power vacuum would emerge.³ The only other group standing in Hekmatyar's way was Jamiat-I Islami, which happened to be run by Massoud. The two fought in a civil war while fighting the communist government throughout Afghanistan. On some occasions, Hekmatyar sent his troops to assassinate some of Massoud's officers in attempts to dismantle his group. This interwar period followed through the end of the Soviet-Afghan War and continued through the mid-1990s.⁴ Not only did this fragmentation of the Mujahideen jeopardize the strength of the movement, but it also had grave effects on the future of the country. Still, the ISI continued to heavily support Hekmatyar and his group in order to create a stabilized alliance between the two

1 Crowley, New Republic: Our Man in Kabul?, 2.

2 Yousaf, Mohammad, and Mark Adkin. Afghanistan - the Bear Trap: The Defeat of a Superpower. Barnsley: Cooper, 2005, 15

3 Yousaf, Mohammad, and Mark Adkin. Afghanistan - the Bear Trap: The Defeat of a Superpower. Barnsley: Cooper, 2005, 15

4 Maley, William (2002). The Afghanistan Wars. Palgrave Macmillan. p. 176

countries.

For the eight years that General Akhtar was the Director-General of the ISI, there was a policy that made the agency sole executor of supplying preferred Mujahideen groups. According to Yusef, “no one outside of the ISI, including President had any say or control over the allocation of arms, ammunition and allied logistic stores.” The ISI had total control over who it wanted to supply in Afghanistan and it was only the CIA that strongly could insist that it had a say over where supplies went.¹ Later in the war, the U.S. became wary of its relationship with the ISI. It determined that it paid more than half of the funds for the Mujahideen (the other supporters included Saudi Arabia and Britain) and it should have a say over who the supplies should be distributed to.²

The U.S. started to become concerned about the next government to take over the country and feared that it may become an Islamic Fundamentalist state. Toward the end of the war, the Soviet Union began considering its withdraw from Afghanistan. The U.S. had become more focused on driving the Soviet Union out of the country rather than establishing a legitimate nation. In an interview with SOFREP, Jack Devine mentions the original situation of the country, agendas and goals of the CIA. He mentions that the country had widespread fundamentalist influence before the U.S. had ever become involved. From the beginning of its involvement, the CIA had no intention of “nation building” because it would involve being a permanent occupier. The ultimate goal remained; expel the Soviet Union from the country and maintain a low imprint in Afghanistan.³ The CIA was required to keep plausible deniability, so becoming an active cog in the war was against the agency’s best interest.

While the ISI had solidified its relationship with Hekmatyar; Massoud had looked to the West for his support. Massoud gained a great deal of funding from both the British and French governments. He also sent representatives to Washington D.C. pleading for U.S. support. By 1989, the U.S. had begun secret monthly transactions of 200,000 dollars going directly against the deals with the ISI. This not only shows how comfortable Massoud was with Western powers, but it is clear that the U.S. was looking for additional alternatives other than funneling money through the ISI to Hekmatyar.⁴ Massoud had been considered an independent man who symbolized brave resistance.⁵ The U.S. would supply Massoud with monthly funds for the next two years (1989-1991) until the Soviet Union dissolved.

On February 14, 1989, the Soviet Union withdrew its last remaining soldiers from

1 Yousaf, Mohammad, and Mark Adkin. *Afghanistan - the Bear Trap: The Defeat of a Superpower*. Barnsley: Cooper, 2005. 66

2 Yousaf, Mohammad, and Mark Adkin. *Afghanistan - the Bear Trap: The Defeat of a Superpower*. Barnsley: Cooper, 2005. 66

3 Interview by Scotto, Ian.”Episode 326: CIA veteran of 32 years Jack Devine discusses intervention and Afghanistan.”Sofrep.com. February 14, 2018.

4 Coll, Steve. *Ghost wars: the secret history of the CIA*.

5 Coll, Steve. *Ghost wars: the secret history of the CIA*.

Afghanistan. The Soviet Union had dedicated itself to a ten-year conflict and that had worn it down both militarily and economically. The Mujahideen proved to be an unbeatable force for the Soviet military. Its conventional style of warfare could not match the efforts of rebel groups who were devoted to committing jihad. On the day of this occasion, a statement was made by the Soviet Military Command in Afghanistan. The statement immediately defends against the parallel between this event and the US' defeat in the Vietnam War. The Soviet Union claims it had not gotten involved in Afghanistan for selfish goals, rather for its presence repeatedly being requested. The Soviet Union also claims that this was not a flight from the country, but a strategic withdrawal from the country. This shows how important it was for the USSR to avoid looking defeated on the world stage.

By December 25, 1991, the Soviet Union had collapsed and the Communist threat had finally come to an end. As a result, the US through the CIA felt that its presence was no longer needed in countries, which had been threatened by communism. This abandonment of countries included Afghanistan. By the fall of the Soviet Union, the CIA had pulled funds from various militia or rebel groups. Massoud was amongst these groups. The excuse of the United States was that Afghanistan just wasn't sparking its interest any longer. The long lasting alliances that the US had developed were dismantled and put to the wayside. This goes along with the CIA's mission to expel the Soviet Union and create a small imprint on the country.

The ISI continued to fund Hekmatyar and the Hezb-I Islami for years following the withdrawal and collapse of the Soviet Union. The Soviet government had mentioned in that same report "we did everything we could not to allow the withdrawal of the last Soviet soldier from Afghanistan to become the beginning of a civil war." Unfortunately, this is exactly what happened to the country as an interwar period had broken out between rival factions in the country.¹ In April of 1992, the Peshawar Accords were signed which offered multiple warlords government positions and created the Islamic State of Afghanistan. Massoud accepted a position within the government as defense minister while Hekmatyar refused to accept a position for himself.² Hekmatyar continued to wage war against the Masoud led pro-government forces.

The only way that he could keep up with the fighting was with the endless help of the ISI. The Pakistanis were interested in creating a preferred regime within the city of Kabul; having a deep rooted alliance with a government that shares the same political and religious values was strategically vital.

With this support emerged the Taliban, an Islamic fundamentalist political movement devoted to creating a new government in Afghanistan. It had completely emerged as of 1994

1 "Defense Intelligence Agency, Defense Intelligence Digest." National Security Archive, September 29, 2011, 5-9. Doc# 23.

2 Frowein, Jochen Abr. Max Planck Yearbook of United Nations Law, 400.

and immediately caught the interest of the ISI. Eventually, the Pakistanis had moved focus from Hekmatyar to the Taliban because they had been more successful and in a way fulfilled the image Pakistan was looking for. The ISI would continue to help the Taliban with training and supplying weapons and fuel for aircraft.

According to Steve Coll in *Ghost Wars*, by 1996 the country had been out of all electricity for the past three years, thousands died in the countryside from malnutrition and hundreds of thousands of people residing in Kabul depended on international charities to eat. Neighboring countries, including Pakistan, were funding proxies that they felt would be the best fit for the country. According to Coll, Ahmed Shah Massoud remained Afghanistan's most formidable military leader, willing to share power and only used violence when necessary. In September of 1996, the CIA sent Gary Schroen, who happened to be the same agent who transported the monthly 200,000 dollars five years prior. He went to Kabul to touch base with Massoud, who was still conducting operations out of the capital city. Schroen had mentioned that the U.S. was becoming concerned with the state of Afghanistan and was willing to reopen relationships with past allies.¹

The greatest threat the U.S. noticed during the mid-90s with the rise of the Taliban, was the growing threat of terrorism. By this point, the CIA was interested in surveilling certain extremists, including Hekmatyar and an Arab man by the name of Osama Bin Laden. Bin Laden, the seventeen son of a billionaire, had fought independently throughout the Soviet-Afghan War and had been on the CIA's radar for years. The CIA had never funded him because he was a foreign fighter and not seen as a crucial ally. Massoud described the Taliban and Bin Laden's efforts in the movement as a "poisonous coalition." Bin 44 Laden had created his own group, known as Al-Qaeda, which had been given respect and protection by both the Pakistanis and the Taliban in Afghanistan.² Osama Bin Laden also had connections with Hekmatyar throughout the 90's. Massoud was particularly against the Taliban and Bin Laden because he believed in a pro-democratic nation based on Islamic values, not a country run by Islamic fundamentalism. This way Al-Qaeda could spread its influence under the blanketed protection of the Taliban regime. Schroen had offered a possible deal to Massoud as long as he could keep intelligence on Bin Laden. Unfortunately, a week after Schroen had left the country, the Taliban conquered Kabul causing Massoud to flee toward Tajikistan. The Taliban officially declared itself the Islamic Emirate of Afghanistan in late September 1996.

Although the new Islamic Emirate of Afghanistan had declared itself the official government, internationally the Islamic State of Afghanistan was still recognized. Massoud, being a leader of the Islamic State, was recognized as one of the main leaders of the country on the international stage. In April of 2001, Massoud visited the European Parliament with a group of his commanders in the Northern Alliance (collective ethnic groups fighting the Taliban). His

1 Coll, Steve. *Ghost wars: the secret history of the CIA, Afghanistan, and bin Laden, from the Soviet invasion to September 10, 2001*. London: Penguin, 2005.

2 Coll, *Ghost wars: the secret history of the CIA*.

message to the world was to stop Pakistani support toward the Taliban and provide humanitarian aid to the suffering people of his country.¹ He warned diplomats in Parliament that if they did not take action against the Pakistanis, Afghanistan would become a breeding ground for extremism and terrorism. He stated during a press conference, "If I could say one thing to President Bush, it would be that if he doesn't take care of what is happening in Afghanistan the problem will not only hurt the Afghan people but the American people as well."²

On September 9, 2001, Massoud was being interviewed by two suicide bombers posed as cameramen. He was pronounced dead just after the attack. Two days later the U.S. would experience the worst terrorist attack in its history.³ The U.S. had finally been hit with the blowback that it had always feared for so many years. The threat of extremism and terrorism that Massoud had warned Bush about was now a reality. Its support through the Pakistanis and the ISI had finally come full circle. The attacks on September 11 were executed by members of Al-Qaeda with Osama Bin Laden as the mastermind. The same man who had been on the CIA's radar for so many years was able to conduct the unexpected and worst surprise attack on American soil since Pearl Harbor. Had the U.S. taken Massoud's warnings more seriously or refrained from funding Islamic fundamentalism, this may not have happened.

The CIA and the ISI both succeeded in forcing the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan. The CIA entrusted its funds through the ISI and as a result, ended up in the hands of Islamic extremists. Its decisions to side with pro-democratic nationalists including Ahmad Shah Massoud were not made with sufficient effort. Although it had made a close relationship with Massoud, its absence from the country between 1991 and 1996, was a grave mistake. Once the CIA tried to rekindle its relationship, it was too late. The ISI successfully drove the Soviet Union out of Afghanistan through its direct involvement with the Mujahideen. By offering training, supplies, weapons and safe havens, not only did Pakistan become a valuable asset, but also developed as the strongest ally for Islamic extremism. The ISI would transfer support between groups from Hekmatyar's Hezb-i Islami to the Taliban regime. The Pakistanis were more interested in promoting Islamic fundamentalism than they were with keeping long lasting alliances. Their assistance would jeopardize international safety as their alliances would cause the spread of terrorism across the globe. The term blowback is perfectly fitting for this situation; all of the effort that went into defeating the Soviet Union, the US' greatest enemy in the 20th century, in turn manifested the creation of terrorism which is now considered the biggest threat to the modern world.

1 Junger, Sebastian. "Massoud's Last Conquest." The Hive. January 31, 2015. Accessed May 10, 2018. <https://www.vanityfair.com/news/2002/02/junger200202>.

2 Junger, "Massoud's Last Conquest."

3 Anderson, John Lee. *The Lion's Grave: Dispatches from Afghanistan*.

Bibliography

- Anderson, John Lee. *The Lion's Grave: Dispatches from Afghanistan*.
Central Intelligence Agency "Predicting the Soviet Invasion of Afghanistan: The
Intelligence Community's Record." Central Intelligence Agency Archive. June 28, 2008.
- Crowley, Michael. "New Republic: Our Man in Kabul?" *The New Republic*. 4th ed.
Vol. 241.
- Coll, Steve. *Ghost wars: the secret history of the CIA, Afghanistan, and bin
Laden, from the Soviet invasion to September 10, 2001*. London: Penguin, 2005.
- Datta, S. K. *Inside ISI: The Story and Involvement of the ISI in Afghan Jihad,
Taliban, Al-Qaeda, 9/11, Osama Bin Laden, 26/11 and the Future of Al-Qaeda*.
New Delhi: United Service Institution of India, 2015.
- Frowein, Jochen Abr. *Max Planck Yearbook of United Nations Law*.
- Grau, Lester W., and Ali Ahmad Jalali. "Forbidden Cross-border Vendetta:
Spetsnaz Strike into Pakistan during the Soviet-afghan War." *The Journal of
Slavic Military Studies* 18, no. 4 (2005): 661-72.
- Interview by Scotto, Ian. "Episode 326: CIA veteran of 32 years Jack Devine
discusses intervention and Afghanistan." *Sofrep.com*. February 14, 2018.
- Johnson, Chalmers. "Blowback." *The Nation*. June 29, 2015. Accessed May 10,
2018. <https://www.thenation.com/article/blowback/>
- Junger, Sebastian. "Massoud's Last Conquest." *The Hive*. January 31, 2015.
Accessed May 10, 2018. <https://www.vanityfair.com/news/2002/02/junger200202>.
- Office of the Chief of Staff Files; Series: Hamilton Jordan's Confidential Files,
Afghanistan 1979-80.
- Sawe, Benjamin Elisha. "Ethnic Groups Of Afghanistan." *WorldAtlas*. September
14, 2016. Accessed May 10, 2018.
<https://www.worldatlas.com/articles/ethnic-groups-of-afghanistan.html>.
- Tsongas. "S.Con.Res.74.A concurrent resolution to encourage and support the
people of Afghanistan in their struggle to be free from foreign domination."
Congress.gov. October 4, 1984.
- Vincent J. Tumminello II. "Snake Oil: US Foreign Policy, Afghanistan, and the
Cold War." *E-International Relations*. Accessed May 10, 2018.
<https://www.e-ir.info/2015/12/27/snake-oil-u-s-foreign-policy-afghanistan-and-the-cold-war/>.

The Supernatural in History

In Section III, we explore aspects of the supernatural and its role throughout history. The essays in this section involve analyses of demonic possession in early modern Europe, female spiritual authority in medieval Europe, and a re-examination of the role of religion in the Thirty Years War.

Classifying the Thirty Years War

Gabriella Gutierrez

The political unrest that plagued the Holy Roman Empire and its surrounding territories during the 1600s is undeniable. The economic situation at the time was falling into ruins and the unpredictable climate only increased the deterioration of stability. As conflicts spread far and wide the common people faced constant uncertainty and fear. All of these problems were unfolding under the umbrella of the Thirty Years War. The elements involved in this conflict are tightly interwoven and complex to analyze. This can be seen within the debate over the classification of the war. While there are religious elements of the dispute they do not outweigh the political motivations. The key political figures involved in the Thirty Years War were motivated by the desire to increase their political control. Since the political figures were more interested in increasing power than in eliciting religious change, the Thirty Years War cannot be deemed a religious war.

In order to argue that the Thirty Years War was not a religious war, the qualifying characteristics of a religious war must be laid out. A religious war is a conflict in which theological disputes must outweigh any other factors as motivators for the subsequent fighting. This means that the war would be understood in fundamentally religious terms and those involved in the conflict would be acting to fulfill some divine plan or scheme. The mere presence of religious disputes is not enough to categorize a war as a religious war. This means that a war may have religious aspects intertwined with other areas of the dispute, yet if the religious conflict does not make up the majority of the struggle then the war cannot be labeled a religious war. The religious disagreement must be the main focus of the war. In terms of the Thirty Years War, this distinction is vital as these qualifications are not fulfilled. Amongst political leaders the desire to increase power outweighs any theological disputes. This sentiment of following the divine scheme was absent amongst leaders and common people alike as they enacted war. For this reason, the Thirty Years War does not meet the requirements necessary to be labeled a religious war.

Political motivations outweighed religious conflicts since the start of the war. This can be seen when Frederick V, the elector of the Palatinate, was crowned king of Bohemia. By gaining this title this meant that Frederick V held two electoral-college votes to cause a drastic change in the balance of political authority throughout the empire. Instead of justifying his claim to the crown in predominantly religious terms, Frederick V explained that his motivations align more so with the restoration of rights, liberty, and peace in Bohemia. He does so as he stated that the Bohemian estate, "had many important, established, legitimate, and sufficient reasons to make the intended change in their government, and so more firmly secure their liberty and renowned ancient right of free election."¹ Frederick claimed that the people elected him in order to restore the common liberty and welfare. This aligns with political terms rather than religious ones. In this claim, Frederick explained that the actions he took aligned with the legitimate political

1 Tryntje Helfferich, *The Thirty Years War: A Documentary History* (Indianapolis/ Cambridge: Hackett Publishing Company, 2009), 36.

framework and the decision should be respected as it was the “ancient right” of the people to have this say in the government.

The political motivations to Frederick’s claim to the crown can be further seen as he accused the previous ruler, Ferdinand II, of abusing the power of this position. Frederick V described that under the reign of Ferdinand II, “the [Bohemian] territories were suffering so greatly and had been driven to such extremes that they seized the means by which they might deliver themselves from such overwhelming hardships.”¹ This passage shows that Frederick was chosen in order to restore the rights of the citizens that Ferdinand had neglected. Rather than desiring to change the religious landscape, Frederick expressed his motives as undoing the wretched and dangerous state of Bohemia that Ferdinand has caused. Frederick claimed he was elected into this position in order to restore Bohemia and end the suffering of the citizens as his political duty rather than following a divine scheme.

As Frederick justified his claim to the crown through overwhelming political terms, he did mention religion throughout the piece. For instance, he stated, “we have not rushed into this great work, but first faithfully appealed to God the Almighty (who takes and gives kingdoms to whomever He will) to put the proper inclination into our hearts.”² This does not serve as a motivation for taking the crown. Rather, as a Calvinist it would make sense that he would mention this as a justification, opposed to a motive, for the actions he takes. The elicitation of religion here explains that while Frederick V acted to increase his political power, these actions were still aligned with his Calvinist affiliation and a theological framework. Religion was heavily intertwined into the political nature of this time period, so it would have been incredibly difficult to completely ignore the religious aspect of any action. With that being said, the presence of religion here was not the main focus of Frederick’s motivation rather it acted as a secondary form of support. The political nature outweighed the religious claims of the actions of Frederick V as he was motivated by the need to restore the liberties and rights of the citizens of the Bohemian estate.

In response to the claims made by Frederick V, Ferdinand II condemned the actions that were taken. Ferdinand described the actions taken by the Bohemians to be politically unjust. He came to this conclusion while noting that, “they seized and took up arms, and without the least respect for their absent but duly reigning king and lord... they thereby far exceeded both the goal and means of the defense of religion... [these acts] can be considered nothing less than a public and hostile defiance and rebellion.” The “absent but duly reigning king” was Ferdinand himself. He wrote to defend his political authority as he claimed that he was still the proper authority for the estate. Ferdinand analyzed the events that unfolded to be politically unjust. He saw this as a secular rebellion against the rightful king whom was himself. He saw the Bohemians to be exceeding their rights as this was an attack on imperial and royal authority. This conflict between Frederick and Ferdinand and the dispute as to who the rightful ruler should be was defined in

1 Helfferich, *The Thirty Years War*, 36.

2 Helfferich, *The Thirty Years War*, 40.

political terms as Ferdinand explicitly acknowledged that these actions were not taken to defend religion. Ferdinand condemned the actions taken to remove his rightful political authority as he saw the rebellion as a political power grab by Frederick as opposed to an attempt to better align with theological convictions.

Ferdinand furthered his response to Frederick by explaining that he intended to act to protect the citizens and regain the throne. He did this as he stated, “we testify before God and the entire world that we had heretofore wished nothing more than to bring forth peace and quiet in our kingdom and lands, and to rescue poor subjects from complete destruction and ruin.”¹ Even though Ferdinand evoked religion in this phrase, he did so in order to state that his actions were not motivated by religious convictions or the divine scheme. He used this phrase in order to show that he acted to protect the rights of the citizens and to correct what he saw as the political wrongdoings of Frederick. Ferdinand was clarifying in the phrase that he was not acting to change the religious landscape but was acting to fulfill his political duty and protect the common people. The main force of motivation was the restoration of peace and to protect those within his estate. These political desires outweighed theological convictions.

Once the political disagreement had unfolded between Frederick V and Ferdinand II, the experiences of the soldiers hired to fight for either side clearly show a lacking of religious quality of the war. The account from Peter Hagendorf detailing his experiences as a soldier has traces of religious ideology as he mourns the loss of many family members. As he experienced these hardships he stated, “God grant [my wife] and the child and all of the children a joyous resurrection, amen. For in the blessed eternal life we will see each other once again.”² Hagendorf dealt with many encounters with death of family members during his time as a soldier. These moments elicited a response that was of a religious nature in order to make sense of the death. This occurrence can be expected as most people of the time had religious affiliations. As Hagendorf’s religion became apparent in hard times, the religious ideology was absent from all other details of his account of the war. This points to the concept that Hagendorf removed religion as a justification or explanation of the war. While there was suffering, God was not seen as the source or cause of the death as this war was understood to be a human war. It is logical that religion would appear in Hagendorf’s account of his daily life, yet this does not show any religious quality of the war itself. This points to the separation of religion from the war and attributes human motivations to the war rather than the divine.

Another account depicting the actions of soldiers points to the absence of religious justification behind the war. A common citizen, Hans Heberle, recalled that, “the fleeing cavalry were already with us at midday... Whoever could run, ran... this was absolutely necessary, since the enemy was at our throats. And we got nothing from the Swedes. Whatever they could grab from us in our flight, that is what they did in their flight, so that we had both at our throats.”³ The

1 Helfferich, *The Thirty Years War*, 44.

2 Helfferich, *The Thirty Years War*, 286.

3 Helfferich, *The Thirty Years War*, 315.

Swedes were affiliated with the same religion as Heberle and his fellow citizens. Therefore, if this truly was a war dominated by religion then the Swedes would be on the same side as Heberle. The Swedes pillaged and ransacked them despite of this similarity of religion. The conflict could not truly have been a war over religion or the soldiers would have protected those of the same religion, instead of pillaging them, especially since these citizens were unarmed. This is yet another example that this was not a religious war as religious ideology was not the largest component of the war.

This conduct of soldiers continues to be a telling sign of the true nature of the war since they were the ones in charge of enacting the goals of the war. This is seen once again as the occupying soldiers whom were supposed to be protecting the citizens acted with ulterior motivations rather than with theological ones. This can be seen in an account of a nun as she explained that, “two soldiers who had asked our sisters for protection showed themselves to be wicked by demanding we give them a lot of money or they would take a sister... as soon as I sent away the first, the second appeared and demanded even more.”¹ As these soldiers demand a high payment to protect these religious figures, the nuns, it shows that this war lacked strong religious ties. If this war was truly fought for religious purposes, then these soldiers would have had a duty to protect the sisters. Instead, the soldiers sought additional payment and would have left the nuns to fend for themselves if the payment was not made. In this scenario, economic corruption outweighed any remanence of acting out a divine scheme.

This lack of focus on religion was not a localized occurrence as this sentiment was shared across many estates. In Austria, for example, the peasants created a list of demands they desired to achieve through their rebellion. Out of this list of twelve demands nine were political, two were religious, and one was over the restoration of property.² The breakdown of these demands shows that their motivations for war mainly revolved around changing the political climate since only a few involved religious elements. Even when the demands include religious elements, these still relate back to the political nature of the estate more so than theological convictions or the divine scheme. While there was a religious presence, political demands were more pressing.

The actions that unfolded during the war are clear indicators of a lack of any strong religious motivations behind the war. The subsequent treaties that ended the conflict are even more telling of the scarcity of sacred elements of the war. The first indicator of this occurrence is that these treaties acted strictly as legal documents. Within them there is no mention of the Bible or theological explanations for the established resolution. The lack of theological grounding and justification for the conclusion of the war shows that the war could not have been the enactment of any divine scheme as it lacks true religious inspiration.

This theme is prevalent in the imperial city of Augsburg when a declaration was published to outline the revised rules governing the people. Included in this declaration was an oath that was mandatory for all political figures to take throughout the city. By taking the oath

1 Helfferich, *The Thirty Years War*, 84.

2 Helfferich, *The Thirty Years War*, 84.

one pledged to, “properly adhere to and obey decrees and bans in political and worldly manners, promote that which is honorable, good, and useful for and Honorable Council and the common city... [and to] pay taxes.”¹ This resolution forced political and economic compliance. Instead of revolving around religion, this document was intended to reinforce political and economic control. The value that is placed on these two elements shows that the restoration of peace was centered around political and economic concerns rather than religious practices.

This emphasis on regaining governmental control was continued amongst other treaties.

While the people gained religious rights, the government maintained a monopoly of power. This assertion of control is revealed within the Peace of Westphalia as it stated, “Those adherents of the Augsburg Confession who are subjects of Catholic estates and those Catholics who are subjects of estates of the Augsburg confession who did not have either public or private exercise of their religion... be patiently tolerated and have freedom of conscience and private devotion in their homes.... Yet these freeholders, vassals and subjects should perform their duty in all other things with due deference and submission, and without giving occasion to any disturbance.”² This allowance of religious discernment was implemented to protect the government from the same kind of rebellions over religion that repeatedly plagued the region. This can be seen as another measure to maintain government power through the appeasement of the common people since religion was a prevalent aspect of daily life. As religion was tightly wound into society, it did have to be mentioned within the new stipulations of peace. With that being said, the war was not fought or settled for theological reasons, but this had to be addressed in order for government figures to maintain the power they won.

While this decision permitted for the citizens to have freedom of conscious, the government maintained all authority and power. This is seen in the concluding statement that ensures, despite this religious freedom, that all citizens still had to comply to all governmental regulations. This concern over maintaining authority shows the prioritization of politics over religious desires during the conclusion of the war. Even though new regulations were laid out to end the war, these settlements did not replace the preexisting Peace of Augsburg. This is relevant as the new Peace of Westphalia served in part to legalize existing practices that the government previously failed to successfully oppress. This can be seen as it was previously required for citizens to declare one religion, either Protestant or Catholic, in order to help quell religious tensions. Despite this rule, people still practiced what they wished and even practiced multiple religions as shown by the accounts of court interrogations that state, “[the man in question] has in the matter of religion thus far been free... he has at times listened to the preachers of the Augsburg Confession, and at times also listened to the Catholic preachers... but he doesn’t really adhere to either one or the other of the confessions.”³

1 B. Ann Tlusty, *Augsburg During the Reformation Era: An Anthology of Sources* (Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company, 2012), 284.

2 Helfferich, *The Thirty Years War*, 262.

3 Tlusty, *Augsburg During the Reformation Era*, 55.

This shows how the court would question and persecute those who did not adhere to one single religion, Catholic or Augsburg Confession, as had been outlined by the Religious Peace of Augsburg. Despite the efforts by political officials to enforce this regulation prior to the Thirty Years War, the common people continued to practice as they wished. Since the government could not stop these infractions from occurring they instead codified the existing practices in order to regain control. Through the process of legalizing existing practices that they had previously been unable to oppress this restores the power to the leaders as it eliminates the common peoples' violation the laws. Rather than changing these laws to simply allow greater religious liberties, this change was still an attempt to regain political power.

The attempt by the government to regain power can also be seen in the new tolerance of Calvinism. The Religious Peace of Augsburg had officially made the practice of Calvinism illegal. Despite these efforts to remove the Calvinist religion some powerful estates still had declared themselves Calvinist such as the territory of Palatinate under Frederick V's rule. Rather than accepting the law of the time, many individuals and even some government figures disobeyed the overarching political authority. To regain control of the diverging populations, the Peace of Westphalia allowed, "whatever rights or benefits are granted to estates and subjects that are either Catholic or adherents of the Religious Peace... these shall also be granted to those who call themselves Reformed."¹ Evoking the term Religious Peace included Protestants and the term "Reformed" referred to Calvinists as this was what they called themselves at the time. As the Calvinists were previously excluded from legally practicing they still continued to do so. This showed rebellion against political authority. Calvinism was then legalized at the end of the war in order for political authorities to regain power and control over the common people.

Religion was woven deeply into the context of the conflict because religion was such a fundamental and important aspect of daily life for the common and political people during this time period. It is impossible to understand any dispute of this time without also analyzing the surrounding religious tension. If any conflict with some religious element were to be labeled a religious war than every dispute during the 1600s would have been a religious war. With that being said, the political factors of this war were the true driving force of the conflict. The religious tensions existed within the confines of politics. While religion is present amongst the conflicts of this war, the desire for political gains outweighed the religious influences. Religious changes after the war only occurred due to the desire of government figures to increase their power and maintain ultimate control. It is easy to see the religious components of the war, yet the war was truly a conflict of political power.

1 Helfferich, *The Thirty Years War*, 264.

Bibliography

Helfferich, Tryntje. *The Thirty Years War: A Documentary History*. Indianapolis/ Cambridge: Hackett Publishing Company, 2009.

Thurst, B. Ann. *Augsburg During the Reformation Era: An Anthology of Sources*. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company, 2012.

Leonarde's Ghost: Why It Didn't Become a Case of Demonic Possession

Meredith O'Reilly

In the era of witchcraft in early modern Europe, one recurring theme was the idea of demonic possession. Primary scholars on the issue of possession include Erik Midelfort and Moshe Sluhovsky. While most instances of spiritual interaction with humans became questions of witchcraft and possession, this was not always the case, as seen with the case of Leonarde's ghost. In order to understand why Leonarde's ghost did not become an issue of possession, it is necessary to first understand what happens in cases that did turn into possession.

Both Midelfort and Sluhovsky provide case studies for the category of possession. Midelfort, while mentioning cases such as Judith Klatten, tends to focus more on the question of the narrative of possession as a whole. He claims that society is broken down into two basic categories, the learned and the unlearned (illiterate). While these two groups have different life styles and different upbringings, they nonetheless share certain ideas. In particular, they share ideas about the devil and possession. For example, Midelfort points out that, "the devil was a frequent figure in popular speech, in slogans and epithets and aphorisms..."¹ He observes that the devil is a frequent topic of conversation in early modern Europe, familiar even to the illiterate. From here, Midelfort presents how the world with witchcraft functioned.

Midelfort claims, "there were, fundamentally, only two kinds of spirits in the world: good angels and bad; and of the two, devils were far the more active."² From this observation alone makes clear that whenever a spirit would present itself, most would assume it to be evil until proven otherwise. This assumption is one reason that most cases of possession were assumed to be of demonic origin. Unless the spirit could provide substantial evidence to disprove its evil nature, it would be assumed evil and an exorcism would take place to dispel the spirit. This statement suggests that few had positive experiences with spirits during this time, and therefore people generally feared any case of possession.

Another element of Midelfort's framework points to the crucial element of bodily harm being inflicted upon the victims, a point also support by Sluhovsky. When describing , a possessed girl from Platten, he says, "Suddenly at shrovetide she was taken sick with seizures, so that her parents thought she had epilepsy...she began to display such classic signs of possession as eyes that bugged out of her head, a tongue that would stick out a whole handspan, and a head that was wrenched around to face backwards."³ In addition, the motif of seizures appears in both Midelfort's and Sluhovsky's analyses. Sluhovsky describes the specific case of Nicole Obry, which seemed to parallel that of Huguette's, at least initially. After Obry's family failed to complete various pilgrimages successfully, she started to experience seizures and "temporary paralysis."⁴ The idea of bodily ailments and demonic possession go hand-in-hand in this time, and these ailments were often seen as first tell-tale sign that a spirit was demonic, not divine, in origin.

1 Oldridge, Darren, ed. *The Witchcraft Reader*. London: Routledge, 2010. 243

2 Oldridge, *The Witchcraft Reader*, 242

3 Oldridge, *The Witchcraft Reader*, 247

4 Oldridge, *The Witchcraft Reader*, 255

The spirit that haunted Nicole Obry claimed to be her recently deceased grandfather. As in Leonarde's story, her grandfather claimed that he was stuck in purgatory and needed Obry's family to complete pilgrimages to free his soul. They are able to complete all but one, and while they travelled, Obry could sense everything that they were doing, and they were able to confirm that she was correct. However, when the spirit of her grandfather was informed that they failed to fully comply with his request, "Nicole started to suffer from involuntary seizures."¹ A meeting with a Dominican friar revealed that the spirit of her grandfather is actually the devil in disguise, and Obry began to undergo a series of exorcisms to remove the devil from her body.²

Both sources do a good job of painting a picture that helps to present the idea of demonic possession to modern minds. Both emphasize that some sort of harm starts to befall the victim, usually through seizures at least. Since both scholars make this observation, it is fair to assume that it was common in cases of demonic possession. Midelfort also is able to provide ample background information on the time period to help readers understand fully how spiritual apparitions become demonic, while Sluhovsky is able to show how sometimes the spirits would disguise themselves as good spirits in need of help before causing harm to their victims.

While the scholarly debate covers the information regarding how mysterious cases became issues of possession, they fail to acknowledge that this connection was not always made. More importantly, it is necessary to see why it was not, and to do this, one simply needs to look at the story of Leonarde's ghost.

In spring of 1628, the young, sick, and pregnant Huguette Roy was approached by a woman clothed in white. This woman, seeing Huguette's suffering, tried to alleviate some of her pain the best she could, by cleaning up her room and making Huguette's bed for her. After completing these tasks, she left. When more friends came to visit Huguette, she asked about the mysterious woman, but no one in town knew who she was, nor did anyone see her enter or leave the room. During thirty days of testing the friendliness and intentions of the ghost, the ghostly spirit was revealed to be Huguette's aunt, Leonarde Colin. Then on the thirty-ninth day, Leonarde revealed that she has been suffering in purgatory for seventeen years because she was a bad Christian, and she needs Huguette to make three pilgrimages for her so her sins can be absolved and she can gain entrance into heaven. On the fortieth day, she claimed her duty to help Huguette have been completed and once again asked for Huguette to take the pilgrimages in her newly recovered.³ Many more details involved in this story will appear below. In order to understand everything else, it is important to understand the basic narrative.

Leonarde's ghost is a fascinating story to study because in so many similar cases, as seen with Nicole Obry, the focus almost immediately switched to the idea of witchcraft and demonic possession. This, however, does not happen with Leonarde and Huguette, and there are a few reasons for this. The first is the biblical motifs presented in the story. The first motif to look at is the number forty. After Leonarde's fortieth visit, she says that her tasks have been completed: "The next day, which should be the fortieth of the coming of the spirit and the last of its

1 Oldridge, *The Witchcraft Reader*, 254

2 Oldridge, *The Witchcraft Reader*. London: Routledge, 255

3 Mercier, Christophe. *Leonarde's Ghost: Popular Piety and "The Appearance of a Spirit" in 1628*. Edited by Kathryn A. Edwards. Kirksville Mo: Truman State University Press, 2008.

service...’Huguette, my good niece, my services are completed.”¹ The fact that her services had been completed on the fortieth day is significant because the number forty appears many Biblical stories: the Israelites wandered the desert for forty years after failing to obey God’s will; Goliath waited forty days for the fight with the Israelites; Jesus wandered the desert for forty days while being tempted by the devil; and after Noah had built the ark it rained for forty days when God had become angered by people’s sins. Not only is the idea of forty significant in this case, but in almost every instance, it comes up after people had failed in their duties to God. In Leonarde’s case, she had been a poor Christian in her earthly life, and in order to try and do penance, she spent forty days serving Huguette. Had this been an evil demon, as in the cases of Nicole Obry or Judith Klatten, the apparitions would have continued for an indefinite amount of time. However, since this was a spirit sent by God, the motif of forty reappeared.

Another reason that the case of Leonarde’s ghost did not become an instance of possession issue was the lack of bodily afflictions that were present in other cases. As modern historians have noted, seizures and other ailments would have started to affect the possessed, as described in the cases above. In Huguette’s case, none of these “classic signs of possession” presented themselves, so the constant stream of clergy that crowded her room would have no reason to believe that a possession was indeed taking place.

Additionally, at no point did the spirit ever try to harm Huguette, nor did it ever demonstrate any ill intent, something that has been a main attribute of witches, as noted by Cotton Mather who stated, “They are not only strange things, but Ill Things, that witches are doers of.”² There were instances where people believed the spirit might have been turning violent, but the spirit always claimed a rational thought process behind every decision it made. For example, between the second and ninth day, after Huguette had had her baby, the spirit was seen violently rocking the crib, even though the baby was not present in it. When Huguette questioned her about this, her response was “it would not break the cradle and it was not useless to obey God who had sent it there for this purpose; it would not have moved the said cradle with so much force if the child had been lying in it as he should have been.”³ Other examples of misinterpreted violence include when a sword was discovered to be hanging above Huguette, but Leonarde dismissed this, claiming she was just trying to get Huguette’s husband to perform his duty as a guard, and she lured him into doing this by misplacing his sword.⁴ Had any harm befallen Huguette or the newly born Claude, the case would have no doubt been turned into a case of witchcraft, but Leonarde did no harm, so no one voiced those suspicions.

Another piece of evidence that points to Leonarde being a holy spirit rather than a demonic one was her interaction with holy objects. Throughout the episode, Leonarde interacted with a friar’s rope, a sacred rosary, and a crucifix. Of these, the rosary has the most significance. When the friar visits Huguette, he tells her that the rosary has touched many holy relics, and that

1 Mercier, *Leonarde’s Ghost*, 95-96

2 Mather, Cotton. “A Discourse on Witches.” In *Witchcraft in Europe: 400-1700: A Documentary History*, edited by Alan Kors and Edward Peters. Vol. 2. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2001. 268

3 Mercier, *Leonarde’s Ghost*, 58

4 Mercier, *Leonarde’s Ghost*, 66-67

no unholy spirit would be able to lay a hand on it. Then, when Leonarde visited that night, she was asked to grab the rosary, which she did; while the friar could not see her in the room, he could see the cord of the rosary floating in the air.¹ After seeing this, the friar exclaimed that this spirit could not be in any way demonic and that Huguette should feel blessed being in its presence. This interaction is significant because, as the friar said, if Leonarde had been an evil spirit she would be unable to touch the holy rosary. This moment pointed strongly to Leonarde's sanctity. Had she refused to take the rosary, or tried to do so and been repelled, the case would have instantly gone differently, and people would have suspected demonic possession. However, since she was able to hold it, no one saw her as demonic.

When discussing demonic possession, many scholars tend to only focus on the narratives that go from a spirit appearing, to its being declared demonic. However, using this lens to view this element of witchcraft is severely limiting, as it only manages to describe one view of the discussion. Studying Leonarde's ghost along with other sources helps to provide a fuller picture of what constituted the perception of demonic possession, thus providing a better picture of the narrative of witchcraft overall. While it is important to understand the negative side of apparitions and possession, focusing only on the harm spirits were supposed to do does a great disservice to the debate as a whole.

The story of Leonarde's ghost permits new aspects of the analysis of possession and spirits. While cases such as Leonarde's were not as common as those deemed demonic in early modern Europe, their scarcity does not mean their absence. Focusing only on the negative stories is like studying witchcraft without researching male witches as well; it provides a strong foundation, but in the end it fails to provide a fully rounded picture of the issue. So, while the secondary sources do a good job at describing demonic possession in general, they often disregard cases like Leonarde's, which ultimately modify their arguments.

Bibliography

Mather, Cotton. "A Discourse on Witches." In *Witchcraft in Europe: 400-1700: A Documentary History*, edited by Alan Kors and Edward Peters. Vol. 2. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2001.

Mercier, Christophe. *Leonarde's Ghost: Popular Piety and "The Appearance of a Spirit" in 1628*. Edited by Kathryn A. Edwards. Kirksville Mo: Truman State University Press, 2008.

Oldridge, Darren, ed. *The Witchcraft Reader*. London: Routledge, 2010.

¹ Mercier, *Leonarde's Ghost*, 64

Revered or Burnt at the Stake

John Reynolds

Some medieval women wielded considerable spiritual authority. Grace Jantzen, a former professor of religion, culture, and gender at Manchester University, writes, “Many of these women castigated bishops and prelates, popes and kings about the injustices they found around them. Furthermore, they were all giving spiritual and theological instruction without being qualified to do so in terms of the formal education usually considered essential for such activity.”¹ Jantzen shows that there were opportunities for women to find themselves in authoritarian positions, and exercise significant power that sometimes placed them spiritually above members of the clergy. These women were also able to act as spiritual advisors, another role usually restricted to men. Jantzen also says,

In a society where authority was seen largely as a male preserve, women had internalised the low esteem in which they were held, exacerbated by their lack of formal education and ecclesiastical position. Any authority they claimed had to have some form of special validation.²

All four women examined here, Christina Mirabilis, Hildegard of Bingen, Catherine of Siena, and Joan of Arc, possessed a “special validation,” namely each claimed to experience visions of God.

The authority these women possessed stemmed directly from their divine visions, however the support of the Church and high-ranking members of the clergy legitimized their authority. Joan of Arc, however, did not have the support of high-ranking Church officials, and was eventually burned at the stake for heresy. Another attribute that Christina, Hildegard, and Catherine all had in common was their acceptance of the “female condition.” These women accepted their place in society as females, and conformed to what was expected of them and their gender. Joan of Arc did not. She took on male attributes, and this eventually contributed to her demise.

Today Christina is known as Christina Mirabilis. Mirabilis is a Latin word translated either as “astonishing” or “miraculous.” The name by which she is remembered shows just how amazing Christina’s life was. Christina was famous for the many miracles she performed, most of which had to do with the immense pain she suffered. Christina Mirabilis lived during the early part of the part of the thirteenth century in Sint Truiden, Belgium. She is famous for a number of miracles that she supposedly performed. Her history was written down in her vita by Thomas of Cantimpré, but she was also mentioned by Jacques of Vitry. Thomas never knew Christina personally, he recorded her vita based on information he obtained about her from Jacques and Bishop James.

Christina Mirabilis succeeded in convincing her male superiors that she possessed considerable spiritual authority. A number of miracles were attributed to Christina that helped her to gain that authority. The first occurred when she was a young woman whose parents had died, leaving her with her two sisters. Christina eventually grew “[S]ick in body through the exercise of inward contemplation and died.”³ After her death, her sisters arranged a funeral service for her and during the requiem mass Thomas describes her body as ascending to the top of the church and then eventually descending and rising from the dead.⁴ After she rose from the

1 Grace M. Jantzen, *Power Gender and Christian Mysticism*. (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 169.

2 Jantzen, *Power Gender and Christian Mysticism*, 169.

3 Thomas of Cantimpré, “The Life of Christina the Astonishing,” in *Thomas of Cantimpré the Collected Saints’ Lives* by Barbara Newman. (Turnhout: Brepols Publishers, 2008), 130.

4 Thomas of Cantimpré, “The Life of Christina the Astonishing,” 130.

dead, she returned home with her sisters and ate some food to restore her strength. She then told her spiritual friends about her journey through death. She was first shown a place which she assumed to be Hell because of all the suffering she saw, however, she learned it was purgatory. She was next shown Hell and then was carried to Heaven where she met God. God offered Christina the option of either staying in Heaven with Him, or returning to Earth. Christina chose to return to Earth.¹

God proposed his choice to Christina with a catch. If Christina returned to Earth she could suffer the purgatorial pains of others while on Earth in order to free some of the suffering souls from Purgatory.² Most of Christina's miracles relate to her suffering incredible pain, inflicted either by others or herself. The pain caused by others came usually at the hands of her sisters and close friends. They were convinced that Christina was demonically possessed and would chain her up to stop her from hurting herself. Her self-inflicted pains included throwing herself into cauldrons of boiling water, jumping into icy rivers, sitting in hot fires, and even hanging herself among thieves and remaining there for a day or two. Despite all the pain and torment her body endured, it remained whole and unharmed.³ Thomas hints in Christina's vita that the reason she could endure such tremendous pain and suffering and remain unscathed was that she had divine aid.

Thomas notes many occasions where Christina harmed herself in the vita. On one such occasion she climbed into a fiery oven where bread was baking. People were able to hear Christina's screams from the oven, but when she exited the oven her body was unharmed. She was known to remain under the icy waters of the Meuse River in the winter for six or more days. She would voluntarily put her limbs on the instrument used to torture brigands. A brigand was a gang member that ambushed travelers in the forest and mountains. She provoked the dogs of the town to chase her through the woods and returned bloody from thorn wounds. When she was cleaned, and the blood washed away, there were no wounds on her body.⁴

It is quite easy to see why her family and friends were so worried about her. In response they chained her up for her own safety. With the help of God, Christina escaped the chains and fled into the deserted forest. She lived in the forest for nine weeks, miraculously living off her own breast milk despite the fact that she was a virgin. On another occasion her friends and sisters hired a man to capture her, which he then did, breaking her shin bone in the process. Christina was returned to her family, and was again bound to a pillar, this time so a doctor could treat her broken bone. Christina threw off her bandages claiming that it was shameful to have anyone but Jesus Christ treat her wounds. God must have heard her, because Thomas wrote that she was then healed, unbound from the pillar, and given the strength to throw a stone with such force that it created a hole in the wall through which she escaped.

Christina was again captured by her loved ones, and was again bound. She was fed only bread and water. Her breasts then began to flow with oil, which she used on her wounds as ointment and put on her bread as flavoring. After seeing this, Christina's family and friends finally came to believe that Christina's miracles were of divine origin.⁵ Christina's final miracle happened on her own deathbed. In the final months of her life Christina spent much of her time

1 Thomas of Cantimpré, "The Life of Christina the Astonishing," 131.

2 Jennifer N. Brown, *Three Women of Liège*. (Turnhout: Brepols Publishers, 2008), 225.

3 Brown, *Three Women of Liège*, 230.

4 Thomas of Cantimpré, "The Life of Christina the Astonishing," 134-135.

5 Thomas of Cantimpré, "The Life of Christina the Astonishing," 137-138.

at the monastery of Saint Catherine in Sint-Truiden.¹ She died and was called back by a nun named Beatrice. Christina briefly awakened from her death, answered Beatrice's question and then died again, finally achieving what she had longed for her entire life: to be with God.

Christina put herself through so much pain in order to free souls from purgatory. She suffered on Earth in order to take on some of the suffering of people in purgatory. The pain she endured in her life always benefited others. News of Christina's miracles spread, as did her authority and influence. Brown writes, "Christina is not relegated merely to a language of the body. She speaks, counsels, predicts, and advises—all male traits, associated with reason and not corporeality."² Christina, because of her miracles and visions, gained influence and was able to exercise certain powers that were typically reserved only for males. She became a spiritual advisor to the nobleman Count Louis of Looz. Louis caught wind of her saintliness and began to follow her counsels and advice, even to the point of calling her mother. Count Louis even recited his sins to Christina on his deathbed. He knew that Christina could not offer absolution, as a member of the clergy could, but he hoped that she would pray for him. Upon Louis's death, God granted Christina the right to suffer half of Louis's purgatorial punishments with him.³

Christina in this sense resembles Jesus Christ, who took on the sins of humanity and suffered on the cross for them. Christina took on the sins of others, like Count Louis, who visited her in visions from purgatory, and suffered on Earth for the eventual salvation of others. Brown calls this *imitatio Christi*, a Latin phrase meaning "The Imitation of Christ."⁴ Christina imitated Christ by taking on and suffering and sins of others. Barbara Newman, a professor of English and religion at Northwestern University, offers insight into *imitatio Christi*. She explains, "Thus a devout woman's self-offering for souls in purgatory and her imitation of—or better, participation in—Christ's passion were on the deepest level not two actions, but one."⁵ Newman makes it seem as if in suffering for the souls of purgatory Christina was not merely imitating Jesus Christ, but had instead become an active participant in the suffering of Christ. People must have been attracted to the idea of a person not only imitating their lord and savior but, in a way becoming one with Christ and suffering with Him.

Thomas says at the beginning of the *vita*, "Furthermore, I would never have presumed to have written this if the revered Bishop James had not previously testified to most of these events."⁶ Bishop James's interest in Christina shows that she was a topic of interest for the male clergy. She was also supported by the clergy, as Thomas clearly stated that he would not have bothered writing the *vita* had Bishop James not confirmed information about her. Support from the clergy was crucial for influential religious women. Dr. Brenda Bolton, a modern historian from the University of Kent, agrees. She states that Christina was "[C]laimed by Benedictines, Cistercians, and Premonstratensians alike but... in reality was not attached to any religious order nor beguine group."⁷ Almost every order of clergy sought to claim Christina as their own. They all failed, however, because Christina did not follow any structured religious devotion, nor did

1 Thomas of Cantimpré, "The Life of Christina the Astonishing," 150.

2 Brown, *Three Women of Liège*, 231.

3 Thomas of Cantimpré, "The Life of Christina the Astonishing," 148-150.

4 Brown, *Three Women of Liège*, 231.

5 Barbara Newman, *From Virile Woman to WomanChrist: Studies in Medieval Religion and Literature*. (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1995), 120.

6 Thomas of Cantimpré, "The Life of Christina the Astonishing," 128.

7 Brenda M. Bolton, "Vitae Matrum: A Further Aspect of the *Frauenfrage*," in *Medieval Women* ed. By Derek Baker. (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1978), 260.

she live in any formal religious community. Christina seemed to have done things her own way, but nonetheless she garnered support from the male hierarchy of the Church, who all tried to associate themselves with her and her miracles.¹

Christina definitely possessed great spiritual authority and was recognized by multiple clerical orders, a bishop, and nobles. She was well versed in Holy Scripture and understood Latin. Thomas noted that her friends would ask her very obscure questions about the Holy Scripture and she would openly explain them. He also stated, “But she did this most unwillingly and rarely, for she said that to expound Holy Scriptures belonged to the clergy and not to the ministry of such as her.”² Despite Christina’s many miracles and the fact that she had supposedly spoken to God herself on more than one occasion, she maintained that the interpretation of Holy Scripture, and hence the real authority of the religion, belonged in the hands of the male clergy. This also could have contributed to the male clergy’s acceptance of Christina as a mystic, and hence her spiritual authority.

Hildegard of Bingen was another woman who gained significant spiritual authority during the Middle Ages. Augustine Thompson, a history professor and author at the Dominican School of Philosophy and Theology, writes, “Hildegard... is best understood not as a mystic, but as a visionary prophetess.”³ Hildegard exceeded even the role of mystic to become a holy prophet. Hildegard was born the tenth child of a wealthy, aristocratic family in the village of Böckelheim in 1098. Newman explains, “At the age of three, Hildegard tells her biographer, she shuddered at the vision of a dazzling light which she was still too young to describe.”⁴ Newman refers to the visions that Hildegard experienced throughout her life, beginning at a very young age. These visions, along with the fact that she was the tenth child of the family led Hildegard’s parents to place her as a tithe in a nunnery at Disibodenberg. At the age of thirty-eight Hildegard became abbess of the Benedictine monastery of Disibodenberg.⁵ Shortly after her appointment to abbess she decided to leave Disibodenberg and take eighteen nuns with her and move to Rupertsberg, just outside of Bingen to start a convent there.

Hildegard began having visions and seeing “dazzling lights” as an infant. When she was a young girl she would tell people about her visions and sometimes even predicted the future. When she became a teenager, however, Hildegard became embarrassed and afraid about her visions because she realized that she was the only person experiencing this phenomenon, and stopped sharing her experiences with others.⁶ These visions continued throughout the rest of her life, but it was not until the age of forty-two that she began speaking about her experience again. It was then that she received a vision of Jesus Christ and suddenly came to understand the meaning of Holy Scripture, without any human instruction. After this prophetic experience, Hildegard began her public work.⁷

Hildegard wrote three separate books, the *Scivias*, the *Liber vitae meritorum* (The Book of Life’s Merits) and the *Liber divinorum operum* (The Book of Divine Works). These books

1 Brown, *Three Women of Liège*, 221.

2 Thomas of Cantimpré, “The Life of Christina the Astonishing,” 148

3 Augustine Thompson, “Hildegard of Bingen on Gender and the Priesthood,” in *Church History*, Vol. 63, No. 3 (September 1994), 349.

4 Barbara Newman, “Hildegard of Bingen: Visions and Validation,” in *Church History* Vol. 54, No. 2 (June, 1985), 165.

5 Jantzen, *Power Gender and Christian Mysticism*, 161.

6 Newman, “Hildegard of Bingen: Visions and Validation,” in *Church History*, 165.

7 Newman, “Hildegard of Bingen: Visions and Validation,” in *Church History*, 165.

present Hildegard's experiences in her visions, then offer her own interpretation of the vision. In the *Liber vitae meritorum*, Hildegard depicts human vices and virtues metaphorically as interacting emblems such as a scorpion for anger. The overall message of *Liber vitae meritorum* was a call to reflect upon the human condition. The *Liber divinorum operum* took a different approach. Here Hildegard painted a picture of the complex relationship between the cosmos and humanity. This work also contained a detailed vision of the future.¹ Hildegard was almost never an active participant in her visions. She recorded her visions as somebody who witnessed an event but did not influence it in any way. Jantzen offers this metaphor: "Watching a film made especially for her and out of which God spoke to her,"² to describe the way that Hildegard experienced her visions. Thompson helps to make sense of what exactly Hildegard's visions were like for her. He says, "Her visions and her interpretations of them are not expressions of her personal experience of the deity... Rather, they are vehicles by which God communicates truths about Christian belief and practice."³ Hildegard's visions were obviously quite different from those of Christina. Christina's visions were personal experiences with God or souls in purgatory, where God gave her a choice or the people in purgatory asked her to suffer for their sins. Hildegard's visions involved no interaction and were not personal like Christina's. The visions were revelations more than directions or requests. God gave Hildegard these visions to make sense of the human experience, and help others to understand Sacred Scripture.

Hildegard enjoyed great authority and fame. Newman states the abbess, "[G]ained such fame that multitudes flocked to her convent, from curiosity or devotion, to seek prophecies and prayers."⁴ Hildegard became so renowned that people converged at Rupertsberg to hear her speak and, they hoped, to receive her prayers and blessing. Hildegard's authority stemmed from a number of sources. For example, she could use the power that came with her birth into a noble family. Jantzen points out, "She (Hildegard) used her aristocratic family connections to secure support for her scheme."⁵ Hildegard decided to move herself and some of her nuns from Disibodenberg to Bingen. The monks of Disiboden, the male house of the double monastery that Hildegard intended to leave behind, opposed this decision because they profited from the nuns. Hildegard used her status as the child of an aristocratic family to gain support for her decision. Hildegard's authority, like that of Christina, was bolstered by the male clergy. Newman takes note of one particular Flemish monk, Guibert. After Hildegard sent Guibert a detailed account of the visions she was having, he "[D]eclared that no woman since the Virgin Mary had received so great a gift from God."⁶ After reading some of Hildegard's *Scivias*, Pope Eugene III also legitimized her visions. The support of the clergy definitely reinforced Hildegard's status.

Kent Kraft, a former professor at the University of Georgia, identifies another source of Hildegard's authority as her ability to lead.⁷ Kraft reports that Hildegard was unanimously elected abbess by her sister nuns after the death of Jutta, the former abbess, in 1136. Hildegard further proved her abilities as a leader when she left Disibodenberg and led nuns to establish a new abbey outside Bingen in Rupertsberg. Hildegard also claimed authority on the grounds that

1 Kent Kraft, "The German Visionary: Hildegard of Bingen," in *Medieval Women Writers*, ed. By Katharina Wilson. (Athens: The University of Georgia Press, 1984), 112.

2 Jantzen, *Power Gender and Christian Mysticism*, 163.

3 Thompson, "Hildegard of Bingen on Gender and the Priesthood," 349.

4 Newman, "Hildegard of Bingen: Visions and Validation," in *Church History*, 163.

5 Jantzen, *Power Gender and Christian Mysticism*, 161.

6 Newman, "Hildegard of Bingen: Visions and Validation," in *Church History*, 163.

7 Kraft, "The German Visionary: Hildegard of Bingen," in *Medieval Women Writers*, 110.

she was divinely blessed. She pointed that she understood Holy Scripture with almost no knowledge of theological literature, despite having spent almost her entire life in a monastery and undoubtedly studied the Bible from a young age. If Hildegard did not possess this knowledge herself and was unable to grasp it because she had received only basic schooling, God Himself must have infused her with this knowledge. Hildegard used this divinely sent knowledge and understanding of Holy Scripture as a call to high authority.¹

Hildegard was well aware of her own authority. In all of her books she threatened anyone who tried to tamper with her work with God's wrath. In *Scivias*, Hildegard said, "As for anyone who rejects the mystical words of this book, I the Lord will stretch forth my bow against him and pierce him with the arrows of my quiver."² In this instance Hildegard speaks as the Lord, clearly showing certainty in her role as prophet and mouthpiece of the Lord. Hildegard expressed herself here in a way totally unlike the way she referred to herself elsewhere. Usually Hildegard referred to herself with humility, pointing out her flaws as a human and especially as a woman. This gave credence to the idea that when she spoke with authority it was indeed the Holy Spirit speaking through her.

Another important reason that Hildegard was accepted as a figure of authority by the male hierarchy was her tendency to belittle herself, and accept her inferior status as a woman. Hildegard often referred to herself as "a poor little figure of a woman."³ Her humility was esteemed and compared to that of Mary, the mother of Christ. Hildegard seems to have fully accepted her inferior status as a female. Jantzen observes that at the beginning of the *Scivias* Hildegard points out her "[L]owliness, not merely as a human being, but as of that gender of human being identified with Eve and with all of the sin she brought into the world."⁴ The all-male clergy clearly supported the fact that this prophetic woman, who experienced divinely inspired visions, confirmed what they held as true about the world. Furthermore, Jantzen reports, "As long as Hildegard was willing to bow to the judgement of the pope and his representatives, they could affirm her visions without undue threat."⁵ Jantzen implies that the clergy and papacy acted as "mystic-makers." Without proper authorization from members of the clergy people might not have accepted Hildegard as a female mystic and prophetess and might have viewed her visions as illegitimate, or even worse, demonic. Hildegard was also avidly against the ordination of women as priests within the Church. She wrote in the *Scivias*,

Therefore, just as the earth cannot plow itself, a woman must not be a priest and do the work of consecrating the Body and Blood of my Son; although she can sing the praise of her Creator, just as the earth can receive rain to water its fruits.⁶

Hildegard again agreed with the male hierarchy of the Church regarding femininity and the place of women in the Church and in the world. Hildegard's tendency to comply with the Church definitely boosted the authority that she held, because so long as she supported the Church and its edicts, it would support her. The support of the Church legitimized her as a prophetess of the Lord and validated her writings and visions.

1 Newman, "Hildegard of Bingen: Visions and Validation," in *Church History*, 169.

2 Hildegard of Bingen, "Scivias," in "Hildegard of Bingen: Visions and Validation" by Newman, 171.

3 Jantzen, *Power Gender and Christian Mysticism*, 170.

4 Jantzen, *Power Gender and Christian Mysticism*, 170.

5 Jantzen, *Power Gender and Christian Mysticism*, 186.

6 Hildegard of Bingen, "Scivias," in "Hildegard of Bingen on Gender and the Priesthood" by Thompson.

Hildegard's authority extended far and wide. Kraft notes that between the years of 1158 and 1161 Hildegard went on a series of preaching tours that took her all over Germany.¹ Newman explains what makes this feat so remarkable: "In an age when the Apostle's command that 'no woman is to teach or have authority over men' (I Tim. 2:12) was rigorously enforced, only through visions could a religious or intellectual woman gain a hearing."² Women were not permitted to teach or have any authority over men. Hildegard preaching to groups of people put her in a position where she was both a teacher and in a position of authority. Because she was not preaching only to women, her actions clearly contravened what was customary to medieval society, and testifies to the authority that Hildegard held by virtue of her visions and status as a female prophet. Had Hildegard not been confirmed by the Church and validated as a prophetess, it is very unlikely that she would have been granted the privilege of traveling to preach, and had she tried without permission, the Church would have most likely declared her a heretic.

Saint Catherine of Siena was another woman who came to possess substantial authority. Catherine was born in Siena in the year 1347. She was the twenty-third of twenty-five children of her parents. Her father was a dryer, and of the lower class.³ J. M. Perrin, a Dominican priest and scholar, wrote Catherine's biography in the early 20th century. At the age of eighteen Catherine joined the Mantellate, a Dominican order of widows. As the first unmarried girl admitted to the order, Catherine took to drastic measures.⁴ She shut herself into a cell she created within her home, and only left to go to the Dominican church near her house. She took a vow of silence, which she broke only to confess her sins. Moreover, Catherine also abstained from food and sleep for long stretches of time. Her self-imposed cell became the grounds for extraordinary visions, ecstasies, and mystical graces.⁵ Catherine continued in this vein for some time, until one day she received an image of Jesus Christ telling her, "Go, it is dinner time... Go and join [your family]."⁶ From that point on Catherine abandoned her life as a recluse and rejoined the world. Perrin suggests that those years as a recluse were essential, as the Holy Spirit formed her, and taught her the principles that she would need to guide her life and her actions. She learned to live with her soul "plunged in God," meaning, to live completely in accordance with God's will for her.⁷

Similar to Christina Mirabilis, Catherine learned the value of suffering, and how enduring suffering made the soul more like Christ. Perrin also gives an account of an exchange of hearts between Catherine and Jesus Christ. Perrin explains that one day Catherine was begging for Christ to give her a "clean heart," and she felt the Lord took her heart from her body. He returned a few days later, and gave Catherine His own heart. Perrin also recounts another experience of Catherine resembling one of Christina. Catherine appeared to die when she was twenty-three years old. Upon her apparent death, Christ offered her a choice: she could either go immediately with Him to heaven, or she could return to the world and work for the salvation of others.⁸ This choice offered to Catherine by God was very similar to that offered to Christina Mirabilis when her body had ascended into the rafters of the church during her funeral mass.

1 Kraft, "The German Visionary: Hildegard of Bingen," in *Medieval Women Writers*, 112.

2 Newman, "Hildegard of Bingen: Visions and Validation," in *Church History*, 170.

3 J. M. Perrin, *Catherine of Siena*. Trans. by Paul Barrett. (Westminster: The Newman Press, 1965), 4.

4 J. M. Perrin, *Catherine of Siena*. Trans. by Paul Barrett. , 6.

5 J. M. Perrin, *Catherine of Siena*. Trans. by Paul Barrett. , 7.

6 J. M. Perrin, *Catherine of Siena*. Trans. by Paul Barrett. , 7.

7 J. M. Perrin, *Catherine of Siena*. Trans. by Paul Barrett. , 7-8.

8 J. M. Perrin, *Catherine of Siena*. Trans. by Paul Barrett. , 10.

After this experience Catherine really began her public work. She took on the mission of attempting to convert others to Catholicism and acting as a spiritual director.¹ Perrin points out that her action in this regard was supported by the Church, as “ [I]n 1376 Pope Gregory XI issued a bull which provided that she was to be accompanied by three confessors with special faculties to absolve the sinners she converted.”² Catherine had the support of the Church and the male hierarchy in her spiritual endeavors. Mary Jeremy Finnegan, another modern scholar, provides some background regarding the state of affairs in Catherine’s hometown of Siena at this time. Finnegan explains, “At this time the number and deadliness of family feuds had made a battleground of Siena. Relentless hatreds and stony refusal of reconciliation brought anguish to many families, particularly when unrepentant feudists were at the point of death.”³ Catherine immediately got to work, trying to save the souls of her neighbors. At first, the people of noble families in Siena had little respect for Catherine as a woman with no authority. However, as she successfully resolved different feuds, her fame as a counselor grew.⁴

As Saint Catherine’s authority increased, she was in constant correspondence with high-ranking members of the clergy, including the pope, and also high-ranking secular nobles, such as dukes and queens. Finnegan provides one specific example of Bernabo Visconti, the Duke of Milan. The duke had spent most of his life vigorously fighting the Church and its authority. He had violently seized ecclesiastical lands and slaughtered citizens and clergy. He was excommunicated more than once by multiple popes. Eventually, in 1372, Pope Gregory XI declared war on Bernabo. After realizing the trouble that he was in, Bernabo appealed to Catherine. Catherine responded by telling him to never again meddle in Church affairs, and to keep his cities in peace.⁵ This particular example shows the real power that Catherine possessed. The duke, having found himself at war with the Church, turned to Catherine, implying that he truly believed that the best chance of finding his way out of trouble was through her. It is quite remarkable that a nobleman saw his best chance of appeasing the pope was appealing to Catherine, the daughter of a poor dryer from Siena.

Karen Scott, a history professor at DePaul College of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences who specializes in analyzing the letters written by Saint Catherine of Siena, provides another example where Catherine acted as a mediator between two warring parties, in this case Pope Gregory XI and the government of Florence. Catherine left Italy to travel to Avignon and promised the Florentines that she would defend their interests. She waited with the Pope in Avignon until Florentine ambassadors arrived to discuss peace between the groups.⁶ Catherine worked with both sides, the government of Florence and the pope, to resolve their differences and conclude a peace. Catherine’s role in this affair clearly indicates her significant authority. She acted as a mediator between the highest-ranking Church official, and therefore the entire Church and the government of Florence. Also, during her time in Avignon, Catherine was able to persuade the pope to return to Rome, which he did shortly after Catherine’s visit to Avignon.⁷

1 J. M. Perrin, *Catherine of Siena*. Trans. by Paul Barrett. , 12.

2 J. M. Perrin, *Catherine of Siena*. Trans. by Paul Barrett. , 12.

3 Mary Jeremy Finnegan, “Catherine of Siena: The Two Hungers,” *Mystics Quarterly* Vol. 17, No. 4 (December 1991), 174.

4 Finnegan, “Catherine of Siena: The Two Hunger,” 174.

5 Finnegan, “Catherine of Siena: The Two Hunger,” 175.

6 Karen Scott, “St. Catherine of Siena, ‘Apostola,’” *Church History* Vol. 61, No. 1 (March 1992), 38-39.

7 Joseph Berrigan, “The Tuscan Visionary: Saint Catherine of Siena,” in *Medieval Women Writers*, ed. by Katharina Wilson. (Athens: The University of Georgia Press, 1984), 253.

Certain secular figures were skeptical of Catherine's motives, and believed that they seemed dangerously political. Scott also helps to make sense of how Catherine acted as a peacemaker in a spiritual and not political capacity. She states, "She intended her words to preach a religious message of salvation, not a political agenda, but she also affirmed that practicing the love of neighbor is the best way to manifest the love of God, and that could mean working for peace and church reform."¹ Catherine's motives were sometimes political in the sense that she sought to make peace between two warring factions. But, this role as a peacemaker coincided completely with Catherine's overall aims: "Catherine's mission is to preach to all people of good will, and to serve as an instrument of God's will for the peace and salvation of the world."² Catherine desired peace for the whole world, because God had told her in a vision that her mission was to seek peace not only for herself and her immediate circle, but also for all Christians and non-Christians alike.³ So, while some activities Catherine engaged in may seem political, at their heart her spiritual desire to see peace on Earth underlay all her actions.

Catherine was similar to Hildegard in the sense that her humility played to her advantage. Catherine did not stress the phenomenal aspects of her life. She rarely told stories about the miracles that she had performed. Scott explains, "She believed that she was guided in her speaking by God, but she did not view her work as supernatural in any extraordinary way."⁴ Catherine allowed her miracles to speak for themselves. Had she stressed the miracles she performed and promoted herself in any way, she easily could have lost the support of the Church, which might even have deemed her a heretic for stepping out of line. It is important that Catherine always placed the emphasis on her work and what God was doing through her, instead of trying to claim any responsibility for herself. Catherine's humility rang true in her letters as well. In a letter to Pope Urban VI she began with, "Most holy and most dear Father in sweet Jesus Christ. I, Catherine, the servant and the slave of the servants of Jesus Christ."⁵ The similarities to Hildegard here are apparent. Catherine refers to herself as a "servant and slave," clearly belittling herself and making herself seem lowly.

Joan of Arc was another woman who held considerable religious authority in her times. Though her story resembles those of the other women, it also differs significantly. Joan of Arc was born in 1412 in the village of Domremy, France. Like Hildegard and Catherine, she began experiencing visions at a young age. Joan was twelve years old when her visions began.⁶ Joan claims to have heard a voice, who she believed was Saint Michael the archangel, that was almost always accompanied by a light. Before long the voice that Joan was hearing was telling her, "[T]o go to Charles VII, lead his armies to victory, and take him to Rheims where he could be properly crowned as king."⁷ Joan tried to speak to her local governor to acquire armed protection to get her to Charles. On her first request, when she was sixteen, he denied her request, but when she repeated it to the same governor again at seventeen she was able to convince him to give her a small guard to find Charles VII.

Joan made it to Charles, and informed him that she was to lift the siege of the city of Orléans and escort Charles to the Cathedral of Rheims, where he would be crowned king. Joan

1 Scott, "St. Catherine of Siena, 'Apostola,'" 37.

2 Scott, "St. Catherine of Siena, 'Apostola,'" 38.

3 Scott, "St. Catherine of Siena, 'Apostola,'" 37.

4 Scott, "St. Catherine of Siena, 'Apostola,'" 37.

5 Saint Catherine, "To Urban VI," in "The Tuscan Visionary: Saint Catherine of Siena" by Joseph Berrigan, 255.

6 John P. Frank, "The Trial of Joan of Arc," *Litigation* Vol. 23, No. 2 (Winter 1997), 51.

7 Frank, "The Trial of Joan of Arc," 52.

was given troops and sent out for Orléans, but not before being interrogated by Charles's church officials. In Orléans, she participated in the battle and was wounded by an arrow. She pulled the arrow out with her own hands and returned to battle. With Joan's help, the French won the battle, and then won again at Patay. Joan had accurately predicted the French victories, and was also correct in stating that after the English were driven out, they would not return. Shortly thereafter, Charles was crowned King of France at the Cathedral of Rheims. Having completed her mission, Joan sought to return home and tend to her flock, but remained with the army at the request of the king. Shortly after, Joan was captured by the Burgundians and sold to the English.¹

The English decided to hand Joan over to the Church court, but for political reasons. If the Church could convict her of heresy, she could be burned at the stake as a witch, which would rid the English and their Burgundian allies of Joan. Joan had become a powerful symbol for the French; moreover, her conviction would also cast doubt on the legitimacy of Charles, the king she had helped. During her time in English custody awaiting trial, Joan attempted to escape and fell between sixty and seventy feet, yet suffered no injury. Depending on allegiances, people viewed this either as divine intervention or as the Devil's will. Both Joan's request for an unbiased tribunal to hear her case, and her request for independent counsel were denied. Joan was never made aware of what she was charged with, which was nine counts of heresy for the voices she heard, one count of wearing men's clothing, one count of attempted suicide, and one count of being overtly militant and rough on the English. Joan was asked extensive questions about the voices she heard, the angels she saw, and her refusal to give up wearing male clothing.

The voices Joan heard remained with her throughout the trial. Joan was sentenced to death, but at the foot of the stake was given a chance to recant her sins. She agreed to no longer bear arms, no longer dress like a man, and no longer wear her hair short. No one made any mention of her voices. Joan was taken back to prison, and was found the next day bloody and again dressed in men's clothing. She claimed she resumed her male garb because she did not feel safe among the guards who kept trying to violate her.² Having broken her agreement, Joan was burned at the stake, not for her claim to visions nor for hearing the voice of God and angels, but for wearing men's clothing. Ironically, Taylor writes, "Gelu (Archbishop Jacques Gelu of Embrun) insisted that Joan must wear men's clothing if she were to live among soldiers."³ So the clergy killed Joan for wearing male clothing, a condition another cleric had insisted on. This conflict reveals the highly politicized nature of the clergy at the time.

During her trial Joan was asked a series of questions regarding her supposed divine visions among other topics such as her charge of attempted suicide. The rounds of questions continued on for weeks. She was asked what she was doing when she heard the voices, what the voices said to her, and if the voices spoke to her before she summoned them. Joan's questioners examined nearly every aspect of her supposed visions of God. Her replies almost always had to do with God, or divine will. Nonetheless, she was condemned a heretic by her persecutors.⁴

[W]e say, decree and pronounce that you have gravely sinned by falsely simulating revelations and apparitions, by seducing others, by lightly and rashly believing, by uttering superstitious prophecies, by blaspheming God and His saints, by prevaricating to

1 John P. Frank, "The Trial of Joan of Arc," *Litigation* Vol. 23, No. 2 (Winter 1997), 52.

2 John P. Frank, "The Trial of Joan of Arc," *Litigation* Vol. 23, No. 2 (Winter 1997), 53-54.

3 Larissa Juliet Taylor, "Joan of Arc, The Church, and The Papacy, 1429-1920" *The Catholic Historical Review* Vol. 98, No. 2 (April 2012), 220.

4 Wilfred T. Jewkes and Jerome B. Landfield, *Joan of Arc: Fact, Legend, and Literature*. (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1964), 14-20.

the law, the Holy Scripture, and the canonical sanctions, by despising God and his sacraments, by fomenting seditions, by apostasy, by falling into the crime of heresy and erring on many points in the Catholic faith.¹

Joan's visions were not validated by Church officials, instead they deemed her visions illegitimate and called her a liar and a deceiver. Only through the disqualification of Joan's status as a visionary could the Church officials condemn her a heretic. Those presiding over Joan's trial claimed that before their verdict was reached, they consulted with the highest ranking and most learned members of the institution. It was with this backing that the Church court was able to find Joan guilty of heresy.

The English burning Joan at the stake was definitely politically charged. Joan was a threat to the English-Burgundian coalition. The French rallied behind her to defeat and drive out the English-Burgundian forces. As long as she was alive, she hindered her enemies' political ambitions in France. A few clear signs made it easier for them to condemn Joan as a heretic, however. Joan's status among the clergy was questionable from the very beginning of her mission. Larissa Juliet Taylor, a historian and professor of history at Colby College, states, "[S]he was sent quietly to Poitiers for the first of many examinations in her short public career. For the next three weeks, at least eighteen churchmen interrogated Joan."² Before the male clergy members among Charles's advisors could assess her and her message they first had to question her. After they were satisfied with their questioning the churchmen recommended that "[T]he king neither reject Joan nor believe her too readily."³ Even before Joan's public career really began her status among the male clergy was uncertain. They were unsure what to think of her. The fact that they did not explicitly deny her some legitimacy from the beginning allowed her to achieve her goal of seeing Charles VII crowned as king. The all-male members of the clergy did not definitively support her and her mission outright, however, like Hildegard and Catherine.

Joan was also unlike Christina, Catherine, and Hildegard in another way. These three women accepted and often proclaimed their role as inferior in gender, and lived within the acceptable bound of women within their society. Joan, by contrast, discarded her female role and essentially lived as a male, dressing as one and actively engaging in battle. Taylor notes, "Between May and September, Joan received two arrow wounds, was knocked off a ladder, and stepped on a spiky trap in the field. Many talked about her skills with artillery."⁴ Joan clearly did not represent a "poor feeble woman" like Hildegard. Instead Joan seems to have presented herself, whether consciously or unconsciously, as a strong and capable woman — or even a man.

Joan's motives were also questionable. All the other women, Christina, Hildegard, and Catherine, explicitly stated their motives for their words and actions. They always worked for the benefit of others, and saw themselves only as vessels of God's will. Joan's motives do not seem as clear. Taylor even claims, "She demonstrated both a sense of invincibility and an increasing sense of pride as she wore knightly clothing and accepted costly gifts."⁵ Invincibility and pride are not qualities of pious people, and especially not of pious women. The clergy believed that truly religious individuals would take no credit for themselves, as Hildegard, Catherine, and

1 Jewkes and Landfield, *Joan of Arc: Fact, Legend, and Literature*, 14-20.

2 Taylor, "Joan of Arc, The Church, and The Papacy, 1429-1920," 218.

3 Taylor, "Joan of Arc, The Church, and The Papacy, 1429-1920," 219.

4 Taylor, "Joan of Arc, The Church, and The Papacy, 1429-1920," 221.

5 Taylor, "Joan of Arc, The Church, and The Papacy, 1429-1920," 223.

Christina did, and instead give all the glory to God. Joan's visions of God and her mission could have been totally legitimate, but that does not mean that success and fame did not corrupt her and increasingly made her act more for her own benefit than through God's will.

Joan's response to the supposedly divine voices she heard was also very different than that of the other women. Hildegard, Catherine, and Christina all responded to their visions of God with grace and humility. Hildegard even tried to hide her visions from the rest of the world until God commanded her to share them. Joan, however, took a different approach. She immediately trusted her visions and began following them as a soldier follows orders from an officer. Joan's God seems very different from the God of the other three women. Hildegard's God asked her to spread learned knowledge of Holy Scripture to the world through her books. Catherine's God called her to promote peace on Earth. Christina's God requested that she suffer the sins of those in purgatory. The God that Joan experienced in her visions seems more like a general in the army. He gave her specific orders, that she followed like a subordinate soldier. There was no greater purpose in the case of Joan, like the other women.

Christina Mirabilis, Hildegard of Bingen, Catherine of Siena, and Joan of Arc represent four medieval women who each wielded considerable power and spiritual authority. The authority that they exercised began with some kind of divine revelation that began when they were very young. Each woman had for herself a divinely inspired mission. Christina was to suffer for the sins of those in purgatory. Hildegard was to share the message of her visions with the world in her books, which helped to make sense of the human experience. Catherine's mission was to serve as an instrument of God's peace and salvation for the world, and Joan was to lead Charles VII to victory in driving out the English and see him crowned king. The authority of these women originated in their visions, but the content of the visions validated them and gave the women authority.

The missions of Hildegard and Catherine were clearly backed by the Church, whose clergy contributed to the authority that the women possessed. The Church openly recognized them as women who held certain authority. Hildegard was deemed a prophetess by the pope, and Catherine was allowed to act as a mediator between the pope and the Florentines. The Church's support of Christina was not so clear early on, but by the end of her life she had won the approval of the clergy. Joan's status among the clergy was murky from the very beginning of her journey. The clergy of Poitiers would not sanction Joan's visions and mission as legitimate, nor did they deem it illegitimate. Instead they left their status uncertain, waiting to see how events transpired. After Joan was captured she did not have the support of the English clergy, who regardless of their spiritual judgement, had solid worldly reasons to condemn her.

The ecclesiastical court could find grounds to condemn Joan because of her nonconformity to female roles and attitudes. Unlike Christina, Hildegard, and Catherine, Joan did not accept a traditional female posture of humility, nor did she have the explicit backing of male authorities. Hildegard and Catherine especially deferred to the Church, and recognized its overarching authority. They made sure that what they preached accorded with church doctrine. Joan, by contrast, seemed less concerned with gaining ecclesiastical approval, and persisted in decidedly unfeminine behavior, namely dressing like a man and participating in battles.

All four of these women: Christina, Hildegard, Catherine, and Joan represent examples of women that held ample spiritual authority during medieval times. These women expressed this power by counseling and offering spiritual guidance, as well as preaching. The main claims to their authority were the visions of the divine that they experienced, the support that they had from the Church and the male hierarchy, and their overall acceptance of the female's place in the

world according to the standards of the time. Joan was the one woman mentioned that did not stay directly in line with those standards and she was burned at the stake.

Bibliography

- Berrigan, Joseph. "The Tuscan Visionary: Saint Catherine of Siena." In *Medieval Women Writers*, edited by Katharina Wilson, 252-268. Athens: The University of Georgia Press, 1984.
- Bolton, Brenda M. "Vitae Matrum: A Further Aspect of the Frauenfrage." In *Medieval Women* edited by Derek Baker, 253-273. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1978.
- Brown, Jennifer N. *Three Women of Liège*. Turnhout: Brepols Publishers, 2008.
- Finnegan, Mary Jeremy. "Catherine of Siena: The Two Hungers." *Mystics Quarterly* Vol. 17, No. 4 (December 1991): 173-180.
- Frank, John P. "The Trial of Joan of Arc." *Litigation* Vol. 23, No. 2 (Winter 1997): 51-54.
- Jantzen, Grace M. *Power Gender and Christian Mysticism*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- Jewkes Wilfred T., and Landfield, Jerome B. *Joan of Arc: Fact, Legend, and Literature*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1964.
- Kraft, Kent. "The German Visionary: Hildegard of Bingen." In *Medieval Women Writers*, edited By Katharina Wilson, 109-130. Athens: The University of Georgia Press, 1984.
- Newman, Barbara. *From Virile Woman to WomanChrist: Studies in Medieval Religion and Literature*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1995.
- Newman, Barbara. "Hildegard of Bingen: Visions and Validation." *Church History* Vol. 54, No. 2 (June, 1985): 163-175.
- Perrin, J.M. *Catherine of Siena*, translated by Paul Barrett. Westminster: The Newman Press, 1965.
- Scott, Karen. "St. Catherine of Siena, 'Apostola.'" *Church History* Vol. 61, No. 1 (March 1992): 34-46.
- Taylor, Larisa Juliet. "Joan of Arc, The Church, and The Papacy, 1429-1920." *The Catholic Historical Review*, Vol. 98, No. 2 (April 2012): 217-240.
- Thomas of Cantimpré, "The Life of Christina the Astonishing," in *Thomas of Cantimpré the Collected Saints' Lives* edited by Barbara Newman, 127-157. Turnhout: Brepols Publishers, 2008.
- Thompson, Augustine. "Hildegard of Bingen on Gender and the Priesthood," *Church History*, Vol. 63, No. 3 (September 1994): 349-364.