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Editors’ Note

Dear Reader,

The level of historical scholarship produced by Harvard’s undergraduates is always overwhelming, and our board was pleased to sample a wide array of pieces. For this Fall 2019 issue, *Tempus* is proud to present the following three papers.

Our board was delighted to see Gavin Moulton’s deep dive into French restorer and architect Léon Parvillée’s influence upon and relationship with the architectural identity of the Ottoman Empire in the mid-19th century formative years of nationalistic restoration. Andrew “Drew” Mammel’s examination of Harvard’s role in the early Native American history of Massachusetts comes at a critical moment for Harvard, especially as the community deals with the institution’s role in those early conflicts and land transactions which define where Harvard stands today. Lastly, Vivien Tran’s insightful investigation into the deliberate sanitization of Dr. Martin Luther King Jr.’s legacy during the establishment of his eponymous holiday questions the image of bipartisanship.

Harvard undergraduates continues to engage in historical scholarship that transcends historiography, genre, and geographical areas. The editorial board of *Tempus* is grateful for the support it receives from the Harvard History Department. This publication continues to make strides toward being accessible as both a digital and physical publication. To that end, we look forward to finding new ways to present Tempus digitally in the future.

The process of reading, selecting, and editing essays is never easy. Over the course of each semester, we love to learn about times and places that are not the focus of our own studies, and we enjoy learning from our writers as we continue our own scholarship.

Sincerely,

The Editors
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Restoration and Representation

Léon Parvillée’s Cross-Continental Moderation of Ottoman Architectural Identity, 1851-85

By Gavin Moulton
As a restorer, tile-maker, and architect Léon Parvillé (1830-85) held a unique place in conversations on Ottoman architectural identity in the mid-19th century. He reinterpreted Ottoman architecture by heavily-handedly restoring the earthquake-damaged early Ottoman dynastic monuments at Bursa, transmitted Ottoman tile techniques and imagery to Europe through his influential ceramics company, and represented the Ottoman state designing the Empire’s 1867 pavilion at the Universal Exposition in Paris. In spite of his impact on diverse fields and cross-continental influence, Parvillé is most often analyzed in singular aspects of his complex identity. Scholars have considered Parvillé in his role as a restorer of Ottoman monuments, as an innovator in French ceramics, or as a key figure in the Universal Expositions. However, this compartmentalization denies the various ways in which his varied activities influenced each other. For instance, Parvillé’s restorations of early Ottoman monuments in Bursa grounded his conception of what characterized authentic Ottoman art and architecture in a manner that greatly influenced his presentation of the Empire’s architectural identity at the Universal Expositions in Europe. Explaining these relationships is further complicated not only by his own multi-faceted identity, but also by the reception of his works on opposite sides of the continent. I will focus on three particular episodes in Parvillé’s career while drawing upon his other projects to bring new meaning to what has already been written: the restorations in Bursa, 1867 Universal Exposition in Paris, and the publication of his *Architecture Et Décoration Turques Au XVe Siècle* in 1874. Throughout this discourse, I uphold that Parvillé understood Ottoman art and architecture through the rationalizing framework of French architect and restoration theorist Viollet-le-Duc (1814-79), as other scholars have demonstrated, but argue that the extent to which nationalism and economics influenced Parvillé’s understanding has been underestimated, especially given Parvillé’s employment by the Ottoman state and creation of a tile manufacturing business in France.

In 1854, Parvillé’s teacher, Viollet-le-Duc, posited that restoration was a modern phenomenon, claiming that no other civilization had ever restored their buildings.¹ Such a claim may seem outlandish, but it actually demonstrates Viollet-le-Duc’s redefinition of restoration. First, Viollet-le-

Duc clarifies that restoration is “...not to preserve... to repair, or to rebuild,” thereby allowing himself to utterly innovate the concept of restoration by dismissing these three historical methods of mitigating and managing decay. In his framework, the true nature of restoration “is to reinstate it in a condition of completeness which could have never existed at any given time.” Since the idea of “completeness” is dependent on one’s conception of the essence of the original structure, restoration is a unique field amongst the arts of building because it requires deeper understanding of what defines a building.

This understanding of restorative efforts is much in line with European nationalist thought at the time. New nation states, such as Germany, as well as more established ones, such as England and France, sought to clarify national traditions of art and architecture, transforming them into pure expressions of national identity. Of course, such unadulterated, mono-ethnic structures never existed, in the same sense that Viollet-Le-Duc’s heavy-handed restorations also created new buildings that had never existed. While the national search into the past for suitable ethnic styles also lent a legitimacy to modern revivals, restorations of historical buildings (which some may consider rebuilding) gave nascent nation states historic examples of their own architectural expression. For the Ottomans, the 19th century French neo-gothic revival was more pertinent than the earlier 18th English revival, as the former continued contemporaneously to the Ottoman revival and was easily diffused to key figures in the francophone Ottoman elite.

These ideas on restoration were brought to the Ottoman Empire by the Frenchman Léon Parvillée, who as a disciple of Viollet-le-Duc, totally absorbed his aforementioned ideas on restoration. Just as Viollet-le-Duc applied rationalism to French Gothic architecture, so too did Parvillée claim to discover the rational principles undergirding Ottoman architecture. In fact, it was at the suggestion of Viollet-le-Duc that Parvillée accepted an offer to work in the Ottoman Empire and with Viollet-le-Duc’s blessing that he continued to study the geometries of Ottoman architecture. Parvillée’s reconstruction of the damaged early dynastic monuments in Bursa ignited his rearticulating of Ottoman architectural identity in designs for the 1867 Universal Expositions in Paris that showcased the rationalism of early Ottoman architecture which he discovered during the restorations. His concepts and work at Bursa are especially reflected in the *Usul-i Mi’mar-i*
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1. Duc clarifies that restoration is “...not to preserve... to repair, or to rebuild,” thereby allowing himself to utterly innovate the concept of restoration by dismissing these three historical methods of mitigating and managing decay. In his framework, the true nature of restoration “is to reinstate it in a condition of completeness which could have never existed at any given time.” Since the idea of “completeness” is dependent on one’s conception of the essence of the original structure, restoration is a unique field amongst the arts of building because it requires deeper understanding of what defines a building.

2. Since the idea of “completeness” is dependent on one’s conception of the essence of the original structure, restoration is a unique field amongst the arts of building because it requires deeper understanding of what defines a building.

3. Parvillée’s reconstruction of the damaged early dynastic monuments in Bursa ignited his rearticulating of Ottoman architectural identity in designs for the 1867 Universal Expositions in Paris that showcased the rationalism of early Ottoman architecture which he discovered during the restorations. His concepts and work at Bursa are especially reflected in the *Usul-i Mi’mar-i*.
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* Viollet-le-Du, 9.
'Osmani', the first modern publication focused on Ottoman Architecture, funded by the state for the 1873 Vienna Exposition and published in Ottoman, French, and German editions. Yet, as a French ceramicist he also produced tiles in an Orientalist fashion, belying his deep historical understanding of the topic and designed completely anachronistic structures for the 1867 pavilion. How should the two sides of this eminent architectural thinker and actor be considered? In the 20th century, the works of Parvillée have been accepted as being at the forefront of architectural thought of the time, and even much ahead of his time. As Parvillée’s primary characterization of Ottoman architecture as rational has continued to dominate the historiography, especially in the Early Republican period in modern Turkey, a better understanding of how Parvillée arrived at his conclusions is needed.

**Turning to the Medieval**

Before turning to the restoration activities of the Ottoman State, we must consider why the medieval era became the period of choice for European national architectural identities and how those national identities were shaped. Although such revivalist architecture was concurrent to and influenced by the rise of nationalism, it is also more broadly linked to other ideas such as rationalism and romanticism; therefore, is should not be understood exclusively through a nationalist mindset: for example, influential architectural theorists John Ruskin, A.W.N. Pugin, and even Viollet-Le-Duc himself all valued gothic architecture for non-nationalist reasons.

Yet, widespread gothic restoration and construction projects in this period held a national significance and were often funded on a national scale, as opposed to by the local city or region. Furthermore, the presence of high-profile national projects such as the rebuilding of the Palace of Westminster in London starting in 1840 in gothic revival styles shows the overwhelming extent to which the movements can be considered political.

**Ottoman Medievalism**

It is no coincidence that the use of the “term and concept of the Middle Ages” is first seen in the Ottoman context “through translations made from French sources” in the late 1800’s. French cultural currents ran
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6 Collins, 101.
7 Ahmet Ersoy, “Ottoman Gothic: Evocations of the Medieval Past in Late Ottoman Architecture,” in *Manufacturing Middle Ages: Entangled History of Medievalism in*
strongly through the upper echelons of the Ottoman Empire, via translations of major literary and historical works as well as in other fields such as theater, and even in smaller cultural centers. For example, Governor of Bursa and future Grand Vizier Ahmet Vefik Pasha (1823-91), who oversaw Parvillée’s restorations and was involved with reform efforts in the empire, also kept up with the latest French dramas, helped construct a new theater in Istanbul, and even translated a Molière play.

Though the Ottomans had no gothic medieval monuments of their own, the underlying discourse of European revivalism, namely a deep connection with a fictionalized past, had a corollary in the Ottoman Empire. The 1853-56 Crimean War revealed the deep need for reform and great extent to which the Empire had lost the international power it held in previous centuries. The rapid initial expansion and glory of the Ottoman state stood in stark contrast to its 19th century economic and political woes. Although this conception of the past differed from the ethno-nationalist European construction, the view that the early dynastic period was a purer version of the Ottoman Empire paralleled European ideas. The Empire’s decay could be blamed upon foreigners who penetrated the system and weakened the Ottomans, a phenomenon reflected in contemporary European-style architecture. The desire for an Ottoman revival thus specifically fought that trend and led to the early monuments of Bursa becoming an Ottoman Medieval period as part of a “proto-nationalist agenda of Ottomans glorifying the dynastic past.”

Europeans in the Ottoman Capital

Léon Parvillée was one of the many European architects invited to work in the Ottoman capital. He first came to the Ottoman Empire in 1851 at the request of an Ottoman aristocrat to be involved with the construction of a palace on the Bosporus. However, this effort did not materialize, and Parvillée was left to find other artistic employment in Constantinople. He
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Miyuku Aoki Girardelli, “Léon Parvillée’s Early Years in Istanbul: Cezayiroğlu Mansion and the Church of Surp Krikor Lusavoric in Kuzguncuk,” in *14th International Conference*
seems to have had no problem in this effort, being quite active in the Ottoman capital building a church, decorating parts of the Dolmabahçe Palace, and co-designing a Parisian style café. These works were covered extensively by the French press, evidencing the cosmopolitan nature of the Pera neighborhood of Constantinople and the international links of its inhabitants. Parvillé’s success is evidenced by the later establishment of his firm with a local Armenian architect. Through these activities, Parvillé brought the latest in European artistic and architectural trends to elites of the Ottoman Empire.

Parvillé is by no means a unique example of such foreign and local collaboration in high profile Ottoman projects at this time. Other foreign artists and architects such as Stanisław Chlebowski (court painter to Sultan Abdulaziz) and Gaspare Fossati all worked on major private and state projects. The extent to which these collaborations Europeanized Ottoman art and architecture of the era is a controversial topic. Until recently, the dominant historiographic trends lambasted the period as corrupting traditional architecture and being symptomatic of the overall decline of the empire. These ideas were held by many of Parvillé’s acquaintances during his years in Istanbul. In the city, he frequented social circles with leading architectural thinkers such as Gaspare Fossati and Pietro Montani, the former one of the first European architects in the capital and the latter involved with Ottoman projects for the World’s Fairs. Yet in spite of their view that Ottoman architecture was being subsumed by Western influence, Parvillé contributed to influx of European artists and architects when he called E. Mainard and other Frenchmen to Istanbul in the 1860’s to work in his practice.

**Bursa Restorations**

Parvillé’s best known work is the restoration of the monuments of Bursa after they were left decimated by an earthquake in 1855. As it was the first capital of the Ottoman Empire, the Bursa’s monuments constituted an unparalleled collection of early dynastic architecture. Parvillé is largely
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of *Turkish Art*, ed. Frédéric Hitzel (Fourteenth International Congress of Turkish Art, Paris: Collège de France, 2011), 85.

13 Aoki Girardelli, 85-86.


17 St. Laurent, 182.
responsible for the current appearance of the monuments; specifically, he restored the Yeşil Mosque, Tombs of Mehmed I, Sultan Orkan, Murad II, and the Ulu Mosque. While there is little documentation of the specific steps Parvillée took as part of his restoration, he did have with him Viollet-le-Duc’s seminal 1863 text *Dictionnaire de l’Architecture Française* containing the articulation of restoration as being the process of completing a building by transforming it into a state greater than its original. Viollet-le-Duc had been involved with restoration projects for several decades by the time that he published his two works addressing restoration in 1854 and 1863. Immediately before Parvillée’s work in Bursa, was the restoration of Notre Dame in Paris—a project with which Parvillée likely would have been familiar. Thus, Parvillée’s hand in restoration should be considered as much in line with the ideas of his teacher, especially because his work in Bursa immediately follows Viollet-le-Duc’s publication of writings on restoration.

The single most important source of information on Parvillée’s restoration is his own, *Architecture Et Décoration Turques Au XVe Siècle*. This text published in 1874 in Paris at the behest of Viollet-le-Duc, is a testament to the strong relationship between the two restorers and evidences the extent to which Parvillée applied his teacher’s ideas in Bursa. Given the totally ruined state of many of the monuments with which Parvillée was tasked, he had ample opportunity to reconstruct in new or more complete forms à la Viollet-le-Duc. For example, the tombs of Orhan and Osman Gazi were totally destroyed and only partially rebuilt with the remaining materials from the original site. Additionally, he may have reduced the number of fountains surrounding the Yeşil Mosque. However, it is difficult to say with great certainty if the changes that Parvillée made to the monuments were of a political or aesthetic nature due to the dearth of sources.

Another similarity between Viollet-Le-Duc’s restoration methods
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19 St. Laurent, 183.
21 Parvillée had begun preparing the text by 1869, see: *The Architect* vol 2, 244, 273.
22 St. Laurent, 129.
and that of Parvillée’s is the incorporation of new technology. For example, Edhem Pasha recorded in 1873 that before the restoration there was great concern for the Ulu Mosque’s dome was on the brink of collapse - to prevent demolition of the dome the new technique of pouring liquid concrete to fill cracks in the dome was successfully applied.  

**Nationalism and Reception**

Though Parvillée is known for his rational conception of Ottoman architecture, he was also one of the first Europeans to use classify Ottoman monuments as Turkish. In contemporary European thought, Turkish art was relegated as a minor branch of art and understood to be a corrupting influence on the purity of Arab and Persian art. The importance of Parvillée’s denomination becomes clear when considering the reception of his *Architecture Et Décoration Turques Au XVe Siècle* in Europe. Viollet-le-Duc, as well as reviewing arts publications, all criticized his use of the term Turkish art. This critique is even seen in the book itself as its introduction was written by Viollet-le-Duc who decries Parvillée’s decision, stating “But this art seems to me rather a branch of Persian and of what one calls Arab, as opposed to having Turkish properties.”  

Such views were expressed for many decades: a 1910 review of Parvillée’s book stated, “Turkish art seems to have little to do with the magnificent ‘series de tiles’ – the work of the potters of Persia, Rhodes, and Egypt.” Additionally, whenever Parvillée displayed his Ottoman-inspired tiles they were without exception referred to as Persian, Moorish, or rarely (if slightly more progressively) as “Turkish-Persian.” In spite of this harsh undermining of what is a central point in Parvillée’s text, Viollet-le-Duc’s introduction also serves to contextualize his study. Viollet-le-Duc compares his study of Gothic monuments and the search for rules underlying their harmony to Parvillée’s work in unveiling
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25 Parvillée, iii.

26 The mention of Rhodes refers to the disproven idea that certain style of Iznik ceramics were produced at Rhodes, see conclusion: L.M. Solon, *Ceramic Literature: An Analytical Index to the Works Published in All Languages on the History and the Technology of the Ceramic Art; Also to the Catalogues of Public Museums, Private Collections, and of Auction Sales in Which the Description of Ceramic Objects Occupy an Important Place; and to the Most Important Price-Lists of the Ancient and Modern Manufactories of Pottery and Porcelain* (London: C. Griffin & Company, 1910), 325-326.

the rational properties of Ottoman architecture.\textsuperscript{28}

In contrast to Viollet-le-Duc’s disproval of reviving Turkish art is his adamant stance on the revival of traditional Russian art in the face of centuries of Westernization.\textsuperscript{29} In 1877, Viollet-le-Duc published a book advocating for the revival of Russian architecture, with the same publisher who produced Parvillée’s tome on the Ottoman empire. His ideas reflect the sentiments of national revival for which the authors of the \textit{Usul-i Mi’mari-i ‘Osmani}\textsuperscript{30} also advocated. The \textit{Usul} was a “proto nationalist” text that emphasized the rationalism and dynastic connections of Ottoman architecture, using these ideas to praise the Ottoman revival movement. Their aim to “raise” Ottoman architecture “to a higher level than its former apogee” through an architectural revival parallels Viollet-le-Duc’s ideas on reviving Russian art.\textsuperscript{31} Just as the authors of the \textit{Usul} blame the downfall of Ottoman architecture squarely on the Westernization of Ottoman architecture, stating “Artists, sculptors, painters, decorators...altered the purity of Ottoman architectural taste just to the point of denaturing it completely, as we can see in the most shocking manner at the Nur-i Osmani and Laleli mosques,”\textsuperscript{32} so too did Viollet-le-Duc despise the adoption of Western forms in Russian art. Another strand of thought on the subject that merits consideration is nationalism, extensive use of terminology such as the “Ottoman nation” and “Neo-Turkish” school, show that even though the project is an assertion of Ottoman identity, nationalism is at play—especially considering that the most important architects of the time were Armenian, and the \textit{Usul} specifically mentions their failures.\textsuperscript{33}

In contrast to Viollet-le-Duc, both Parvillée and the \textit{Usul} assert the Ottoman contributions to the monuments of Bursa. Like other European reviewers of Parvillée’s book, Viollet-le-Duc failed to realize the novity of Ottomans architects at Bursa, instead merely noting the pervasive non-Ottoman cultural influences, such as the Persian tradition of tile-making. To critique this common misconception, Parvillée and the \textit{Usul} place special

---

\textsuperscript{28} Parvillée, iv-ii.

\textsuperscript{29} “Après plusieurs siècles employés en imitations stériles des arts de l’Occident, la Russie se demande si elle n’a pas son génie propre, et, faisant un retour sur elle-même, fouillant dans ses entrailles, elle se dit: «Moï aussi j’ai un art tout empreint de mon génie, art que j’ai trop longtemps délaissé; recueillons-en les débris épars, oubliés, qui’il reprenne sa place!»” Eugène-Emmanuel Viollet-le-Duc, \textit{L’Art Russe; Ses Origines, Ses Éléments Constitutifs, Son Apogée Son Avenir}. (Paris: Vve A. Morel, 1877), 3.

\textsuperscript{30} For a comprehensive study of the Usul see Ahmet Ersoy’s \textit{Architecture and the Late Ottoman Historical Imaginary}.

\textsuperscript{31} de Launay et al., VI.

\textsuperscript{32} Ibid., 7.

\textsuperscript{33} Ibid., VII, 7.
emphasis on the Yeşil Mosque. The *Usul* states that foreign influences had “already been profoundly modified by the Ottoman taste, as at the Yeşil Mosque,” and Parvillée recognized the contributions of the Persians, Greeks (Byzantines) and Arabs, but prioritized the centrality of overlaying “geometric principles” that characterize all Ottoman architecture.

**Ottoman Identity at the 1867 Universal Exposition**

Of the “Mohammadan exhibiting nations” at the 1851 Great Exhibition in London, Owen Jones decried the Turkish pavilion as the, “least perfect.” This negative reception would likely have weighed on the minds of Léon Parvillée and Giovanni Barborini as they were given the challenge of designing the Empire’s 1867 pavilion for the Universal Exposition in Paris. Perhaps in response to Jones’ comments, architecture was given a particularly privileged place by the Ottomans in Paris. This was acknowledged by the French Imperial Commission that administered the fair, as in their review the “architectural projects and drawings” were noted as particularly distinguished, but the pavilion that as a whole was decried as, “not on the artistic side of things,” —a certain reflection of the dominant European trend to devalue Turkish art.

The part of the exhibition most directly related to Parvillée’s restoration work is a small mosque. At first glance it seems to be a copy of the Yeşil Tomb (Tomb of Mehmed I), with its tilework and Turkish triangles supporting a large central dome at half the size of the original in Bursa. From an analytical viewpoint though, the mosque is a complete aberration from the Ottoman tradition and a total invention of Parvillée. The plan is divided into three parts, the salle du mihrab, salle des horloges, and two symmetrical verandas. Past scholars have described the mosque “as an awkward marriage of Ottoman architectural forms and the rules of French academicism,” but at the time the structure was understood as a rationalist construction inspired by an application of Viollet-le-Duc’s new idea that behind harmonious buildings were proportions governing
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34 Ibid., 4.
35 Parvillée, 12.
38 de-Laumay, 2.
39 Ersoy, 54.
40 Çelik, 100.
41 Ibid., 98.
architectural design."

The reception of the structure as “awkward” should be considered in relation to Viollet-le-Duc’s ideas on restoration as being a “completion” of a historic structure. Parvillée takes the Yeşil Tomb, but totally reinvents it in a new context where it takes on a new meaning for a primarily European audience. The original structure is of the tomb is not a limitation. Parvillée moves the entrance from the Yeşil Mosque, combining it with the structure of the Yeşil Tomb. To underscore the emphasis on rationalism, he supplies drawings marked with lines describing the relationships he claimed to have discovered. The Yeşil Tomb is a relevant structure for Parvillée as it is where he first understood these harmonious principles, which he then realized were applicable to all subsequent Ottoman mosques. The links to early Ottoman monuments in Bursa were manifested in both the architectural references of the mosque, as well as in the dedication of interior space to drawings of his restorations in Bursa. The overall effect is to promote the rationalism, antiquity, and legitimacy of Ottoman identity in the face of constant European criticism of the independence of Turkish art and architecture.

Though Parvillée was not successfully in creating a representation that either the Ottomans or French found particularly likeable, an architectural journal describing the Ottoman Pavilion, signaled Parvillée’s rationalism and the decorative value of the tiles as the two strongest points. Given the general European idea at the time that “Oriental” art was romantically driven, this recognition of Parvillée’s proposal that Turkish decorative elements were rationally organized must be recognized as radical.

**Economic Implications of Tile Production**

Beyond the importance of restoring the tombs of the founders and the monuments of the birthplace of the Empire, Ahmet Vefik Pasha, the leader of this effort, had economic reasons to support the restorations in Bursa. Edhem Pasha and his son Osman Hamdi Bey were campaigning to revive the languishing tile industry of the Ottoman Empire, then concentrated at Kütahya. This desire coincided with the desperate need for new tiles in the restoration of the Bursa monuments, as well as for the numerous urban renewal projects that Ahmet Vefik Pasha planned in the
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42 Ibid., 97-99.
43 Avcioglu, 265.
45 St. Laurent, 65.
city. The efforts to give new life to the Ottoman tile industry were successful enough to triple the number of tile workshops in Kütahya by the end of the 19th century.\textsuperscript{46} The importance of the Ottoman tile revival can be seen through the inclusion of tiles and their improving reviews at the Ottoman Pavilions of the World’s Fairs. Parvillé was involved in these efforts through his designs for the 1867 Ottoman Pavilion at the Universal Exhibition in Paris, which extensively used tiles.\textsuperscript{47}

The need for tiles in restoring Islamic architectural sites was acutely felt, not just in Anatolia, but also across the broader region. Apparently, the technical expertise for ceramic tile production had been lost and “rulers especially in Turkey, Egypt, and India were obliged to give orders to European artists to build palaces or to renovate older buildings.”\textsuperscript{48} This was a logical trend as European building materials were being exported in large numbers to the region, and, in some areas, European construction companies dominated the market.\textsuperscript{49} Léon Parvillé was at the forefront of this trend. His Bursa restorations were contemporaneous to the work in Persia of the French ceramicist Eugène Collinot, who was in the employ of Shah Nasir-ad-Din.\textsuperscript{50} On the European front, Collinot would also become a future competitor to Parvillé’s tile business. The growing popularity of Islamic ceramic designs and architectural usage of tiles in Europe must be understand as phenomena that fueled each other’s growth. Though Ottoman-inspired designs only began to be produced in the 1850’s, the growth was explosive, as, by the end of the century, over sixty ceramics producers were incorporating Islamic motifs.\textsuperscript{51}

Developing Islamic Ceramics in Europe

Knowledge of ceramic designs from the Middle East was transferred to Europe largely through pattern books and collections of Islamic pottery held by various museums and companies.\textsuperscript{52} The pages of pattern books were filled with designs from historic monuments that could be applied to modern artistic practice. The best-known example of such a pattern book is Owen Jones’ 1856, \textit{The Grammar of Ornament}, which was influential not just for its patterns but also for its classification of styles, especially pertaining to the Islamic world. Jones characterized Arab art as “pure” with Turkish and Persian being lesser “mixed” styles that had a

\textsuperscript{46} Ibid., 62-65.
\textsuperscript{47} Çelik, 100-105.
\textsuperscript{48} Hagedorn, 158.
\textsuperscript{49} Ibid., 164-65.
\textsuperscript{50} Ibid., 158-59.
\textsuperscript{51} Hagedorn, 157.
\textsuperscript{52} Ibid., 157.
corrupting influence on the geometry of Arabian art.\textsuperscript{33} Despite their differences, these styles were taken to primarily have decorative, that is ornamental value, which in part made Parvillée’s application of Viollet-le-Duc’s ideas to Ottoman architecture radical for the time.\textsuperscript{34}

Should Parvillée’s \textit{Architecture Et Décoration Turques Au XVe Siècle} be considered a pattern book? Ostensibly, it was a pattern book as it consists primarily of plates, with a focus on ornament over architectural design. Its content, however, complicates such a simple interpretation. That Parvillée’s articulation of rationalism as the salient characteristic of Ottoman architecture has remained the primary lens through which scholars have analyzed Ottoman monuments speaks to the quality of his analysis. Yet, Parvillée’s conclusions on the rational nature of Ottoman architecture must have been personally beneficial because they would have pleased Viollet-le-Duc and further solidified Parvillée’s persona as an expert on the Ottoman Empire. In spite of his surprisingly accurate understanding of geometry and personal evangelization of rationalism, Parvillée admits at the end of his text that his “goal would be to [share the principles of Ottoman decoration with] amateurs of Oriental art...and artists,” making it hard to declare the text solely as a treatise on Ottoman rationalism due to the author’s own emphasis on the practical patterns that could be used decoratively.\textsuperscript{35}

Besides pattern books, another source for the European ceramicists and amateurs to whom Parvillée addresses his text would have been physical collections. Parvillée actively contributed to this trend, removing a vast quantity of original, high quality tilework from the Yeşil Mosque and Yeşil Tomb during the Bursa restorations and replacing it with his own tiles of poorer quality.\textsuperscript{36} The advantage of creating new pattern books and European collections of Islamic ceramics was that it was no longer necessary for Orientalist ceramicists to travel in search of new

\textsuperscript{33} Jones, Ch 11, p. 1., Ch. 9 p.1.
\textsuperscript{34} Ibid., Ch 11, p. 1., Ch 9 p. 1.
\textsuperscript{35} Parvillée, 16.
\textsuperscript{36} Eroğlu argues that tiles held in LACMA and the V&A were sold by Parvillée’s sons and were taken from the Yeşil Türbe and Yeşil Mosque during the renovations, also suggesting that Parvillée’s restoration work was not well received at the time and significantly changed the nature of the monuments, see: Süreyya Eroğlu, “Victoria and Albert Müzési Deposunda Bulunan Yeşil Cami ve Yeşil Türbenin Çinileri ile Leon Parvillée ile İlişkisi,” \textit{Journal of International Social Research} 9, no. 47 (2016): 331–52., 334-35. See also, Binney 204-205. In addition to the V&A and LACMA collections, Binney suggests that fragments from the Bursa monuments are also held in private collections, see: Edwin Binney and Walter Denny, \textit{Turkish Treasures from the Collection of Edwin Binney, 3rd : An Exhibition at the Portland Art Museum : January 16-February 18, 1979} (Portland Art Museum, 1979).
designs. Although early pioneers of revival tiles such as Parvillée and Collinot did travel extensively in the Middle East, fewer of their followers did.

**Industry Economy and Restoration**

Finding patterns to ensure the flow of “an ever-gushing fountain in place of a half-filled stagnant reservoir” of forms, as Owen Jones metaphorically diagnosed the work of European decorators, was not the only challenge revivalist ceramicists faced.\(^{37}\) It was also necessary to resuscitate ancient methods of production that had been lost. Parvillée struggled with the task for years. He was self-taught in the ceramic arts, vigorously collecting texts and traveling to inform his own knowledge.\(^{38}\) Apart from a presumed visit to the center of Ottoman ceramics production in Kütahya, Parvillée traveled to Murano in 1875 to learn how to control the process of vitrification to make his tiles stronger and “more luminous,”\(^{39}\) since this was especially needed for colors. The quality of ceramics was important for a number of reasons. As tiles became increasingly used for architectural purposes, strength and durability were economically important factors. The application of color and luster also contributed to the desirability of tiles.\(^{40}\) The knowledge Parvillée accumulated on the subject was showcased in his 1884 *Étude sur L’Enseignement Raisonné de l’Art Céramique*, co-authored by his son Achille, in which he recounts the development of his techniques, serving as a manual for other ceramics producers.

World’s Fairs provided an opportunity to showcase such advancements in tile technology. Tiles were displayed at Ottoman pavilions from the very beginning,\(^{61}\) but took on a greater significance with each new exhibition as the industry grew, and European ceramicists became more interested in Ottoman designs. At the 1867 Paris Exhibition, there is a specific mention of a collection of majolica displayed by Parvillée, but it is unclear if it was his collection of tiles from Bursa or majolica tiles he produced himself. Tiles were also used in all of the three parts of the Ottoman Pavilion that year. Concerning Parvillée’s decorations and rational ideas, an architectural newspaper noted “knowledge of these processes is a precious source for artists, who can find in them inexhaustible resources for decoration, especially today as...it seems appropriate given the [ceramic]
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\(^{37}\) Jones, 1.

\(^{38}\) Achille Parvillée, 4.

\(^{39}\) Gronier, 8.

\(^{40}\) St. Laurent, 199.

\(^{61}\) St. Laurent, 62.
materials being industrially produced.” The relationship between exotic decorative patterns and industrially produced ceramics was thereby solidified.

This trend continued with the 1873 Vienna Exposition that immediately preceded the publication of Parvillé’s *Architecture Et Décoration Turques Au XVe Siècle*. The exhibition was specifically dedicated to the applications of arts for industry. As economies developed and industrialized, there was a look to the past for new forms and techniques. Therefore, a goal of these international expositions was to facilitate interaction between various decorative and industrial traditions. This was expressly stated to be a key goal at Vienna in particular where both collectors and national committees were invited to display collections of domestic wares from past and present. The success of this endeavor can be seen in sales records as applied-arts museums from around the world collected Parvillé’s expensive ceramics to bring back to their own countries. In addition to the ceramic wares displayed by Parvillé new tiles were used to recreate examples of historic buildings such as the replica of the Ahmed III Fountain in 1873 in the Ottoman section. The cumulative effect was to promote the industry as a whole, with a specific section even dedicated to the new tiles from Kütahya and Çanakkale.

**Parvillé Beyond Ottoman Exoticism**

Though earlier examples of his work, such as the 1867 Paris Mosque, can be understood as historicist due to their direct relationship to his restoration work, Parvillé’s detailed studies of Ottoman tiles did not prevent him from participating in the European Orientalist bonanza. These two sides of Parvillé may seem difficult to reconcile but can be accounted for by the close relationship between historicism and exoticism in the European context. In terms of major projects, he was active in two efforts capitalizing on the exotic value of his architectural tiles. The first is the Chateau d’Abbadia, which was designed by Edmond Duthoit, who, like Parvillé was a student of Viollet-le-Duc and went abroad to study rational
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62 Baudot, 265.
63 Ersoy, 38-39.
64 Blake also records that “one of the finest examples – a vase of peculiar form, with a tall neck and sculptured handles – was secured by a citizen of Boston for the Art Museum in that city.” (Perhaps object 90.93 in the MFA?), see: William Blake, “Ceramic Art: A Report on Pottery, Porcelain, Tiles, Terra-Cotta and Brick, with a Table of Marks and Monograms,” in *Volume of Reports of the Massachusetts Commission to Vienna* (New York: D. Van Nostrand, 1875), 37–38. Blake 37.
65 Ersoy, 83.
66 Ersoy, 65.
67 Collins, 34.
principles in foreign architectures. In fact, Duthoit is mentioned by Viollet-le-Duc in the preface to Parvillé’s book where he notes that Parvillé had reached the “identical results” as Duthoit had in his studies of Cairene and Algerian architecture. This is part of the broader European trend to group all Islamic architecture in a monolithic category, a concept that is certainly applied in the eclectic Chateau d’Abbadia with its usage of Andalusian, Persian, Egyptian, Turkish, and Sicilian elements.

Parvillé’s contribution to the chateau was a series of highly decorated polychrome tiles used in the “fumoir arabe.” The combination of decorative elements is an expression of the “inexhaustible” vocabulary that European Orientalist ceramicists hoped could be developed from study of foreign civilizations. In Parvillé’s ceramics at Abbadia, there are no direct references to historic forms, only historic designs, completely decontextualizing the work. In the foreword to his book on Bursa, Parvillé decried the “faux art oriental” that was all the rage in Europe because it jumbled together styles from diverse historical periods. Hypocritically, he also participated in this trend through his cooperation with Duthoit. For the second major exotic project, Parvillé created Japonisme style tiles for a spa complex, which opened after his death in 1885. For a tile firm that primarily produced “Persian” decorative pieces, the addition of Japanese style works should be considered with the broader European framework of the exotic and the search for new forms that helped to establish the popularity of Orientalist tiles. The connection of bathing to exotic forms is not unique to architecture, it is present in the paintings of Jean-Léon Gérôme, the most high-profile Orientalist painter, amongst many other examples.

Conclusion

In Europe, the use of Islamic forms in the decorative arts was a continuing trend that would eventually spread to the Americas and beyond. Parvillé had played a key role in establishing this trend, through his importation of both plans and objects from the Ottoman Empire. His son Achille would take up his legacy and work at the company as industrial production made ceramics an increasingly relevant part of architectural design and décor. Though many of Parvillé’s products were luxury objects,
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the use of tile paneling for murals is a predecessor to widespread use of tile for aesthetic and practical reasons.

In the Ottoman Empire, the seeds of Turkish nationalism that can be seen in the writing of Parvilléée and other Europeans present in the Empire such as Marie-de-Launay, would fuel the later works of Mimar Kemaleddin and Vedat Tek that were inspired by historic architectural monuments. The rationalism Parvilléée proposed remains a crucial lens through which scholars understand Ottoman architecture. Especially in the Early Republican period when European modernism became the official architecture of the state, Ottoman monuments were reclaimed through an emphasis on their simplicity and proportions.

Tiles may seem an insignificant subject in the broader deluge of Orientalist art, but in the Ottoman context they are particularly interesting and insightful. Not only were ceramic panels an essential part of Ottoman architectural decoration from the 15th to 19th centuries, but the production of these tiles supported an economically important industry. The quality and variety of the classical era tiles produced at Iznik could not be believed by European scholars who created new denominations for Ottoman wares such as Rhodes and Damascus. In this context Parvilléée stands out as a scholar and artist who appreciated and attempted to understand the value of Ottoman art, even if he had many failures as historic preservationist.
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Indigenous History as Harvard History

By Andrew Mammel
Over a weekend in June of 2018, hundreds of people gathered at a powwow. There were dancers, drummers, and even t-shirts with special logos honoring the event. Ceremonies and potluck dinners came one after another as the days passed. The attendees sewed a massive quilt embroidered with the signatures of those in attendance. Tribal leaders from across New England were present, including Tall Oak Weeden, Ramona Peters, and others from the Pequot, Wampanoag, and Narragansett tribes. To any outside observer, this powwow may have well occurred in Rhode Island or Massachusetts. But this ceremony, called the “Reconnection Festival,” was taking place 775 miles away from the New England seaboard on St. David’s Island in Bermuda.  

Scholars who assert that New England Indigenous people were entirely eliminated by white settlers, or those who fail to account for the mass flow of American Indians away from the North American continent would find themselves at conundrum. First, the very presence of modern New England native people stands in direct opposition to the claim that they were completely eliminated. Moreover, “reconnection” calls into question the other side of this link. With whom were they connecting, and why in Bermuda?

On April 27, 2019, some one hundred Harvard students and alumni gathered in Tercentenary Theatre to protest the University’s investments in problematic industries, mainly, fossil fuels and private prisons. The protest followed a week of panels, sit-ins, pamphlet distribution, and civil-disobedience training. The Mayor of Cambridge spoke at the event, calling on Harvard “to do more and do better,” while student groups from across campus, including the Undergraduate Council, endorsed the protesters’ efforts.  

To those who view school as first and foremost a place of learning, such a protest might seem odd. Why does Harvard profit off of explicitly non-educational entities? Did similar profits exist in the past? For a school which prides itself as a beacon for knowledge and justice, such investments seem incongruous.

As any historian might suspect, the answers to these questions were buried in the archives. But in the process of finding them, an altogether new question arose. In the Harvard University Archives is a collection titled

---

“Record of Land and Property owned by Harvard University, 1643-1835.” A researcher does not need to go past the second box to find evidence of Harvard profiting from Native land-taking. In the aftermath of the Pequot War, the General Court of Massachusetts wrote a land transfer contract, granting the University 2,100 acres of Pequot territory taken by war. The contract begs the question: How did Harvard profit from the colonial conquest of Indigenous people during and after the Pequot war?

The answers to this driving question is far more complex than land transfers; they are merely the tip of the iceberg. Harvard profited not only from physical land taken from Pequot people during the war, but just as importantly, from the displacement of Pequot survivors and their subsequent enslavement. This was through valuable in-kind gifts from English Caribbean islands like Bermuda and the Bahamas, as Native and African slave labor on these islands often produced such gifts. This driving question also heavily involves intersections between Native survivance and the role of academic institutions in the historic, and ongoing, oppression of Indigenous peoples. Thus, answering the question of how Harvard benefited from Indigenous oppression in the aftermath of the Pequot War will better inform both how the modern Native American presence manifests in celebrations like Bermuda’s Reconnect Powwow and how Harvard’s current investments contribute to the maltreatment of Indigenous peoples.

The strategy in answering the driving question is itself a historiographical argument, as it demonstrates that Native people themselves are vital components in such narratives. Using a narrow lens like one that focuses solely on land acquisitions to answer such a question is inadequate, as it fails to see the entire picture. Examining how the acquisition of land benefited colonial institutions is important, but doing so in isolation fails to account for the people who were dispossessed of that land. As the following paragraphs will find, the stories of those people are vital in order to understand the role of colonial institutions like Harvard in the oppression of Native Americans. In fact, focusing merely on land and failing to include the stories of Native survivors plays into the white colonial trap of writing indigenous people out of both historical narratives and current discussions.

---


4 Vizenor, Manifest Manners: Narratives on Postindian Survivance (Lincoln: Nebraska, 1999), vii. First used in the context of Native American studies by theorist Gerald Vizenor, survivance refers to “an active sense of presence, the continuance of native stories, not a mere reaction.”
By focusing on Native people themselves, we find histories to explore, which follow such themes as Native resistance, Native captivity, Native education, and perhaps most under-examined, Native slavery. Linford D. Fisher of Brown University notes that Native enslavement is a piece of history that has been glossed over: “between 1492 and 1880, between 2 and 5.5 million Native Americans were enslaved in the Americas in addition to 12.5 million African slaves.”

The case of Harvard and Pequots provides an excellent example of the utility of such multi-faceted narratives. As the following evidence and arguments will prove, a history which uses only a land-based lens of colonial expansion would fail to answer the various questions posed. However, a history which accounts for the Native people who survived disease and warfare comes much closer to answering exactly how a colonial institution like Harvard ultimately benefited, and continues to benefit, from the oppression of Indigenous people.

The Pequot War represents one of the first armed conflicts between Indigenous peoples and English settlers on the North American continent. Fought between 1636 and 1638, but doubtless a mere segment in a longer history of Indigenous resistance to English settlement, the war resulted in nearly 700 Pequot deaths and countless instances of resistance. Although the origins and motivations for the Pequot War are varied and complex, a few events were notable catalysts. In 1634, the Niantics, a tribe closely associated with the Pequots, killed Englishman John Stone, possibly believing he was Dutch. Earlier that year, Pequot Sachem Tatobem attempted to trade with the Dutch, but met hostility. They captured him and eventually killed him along with several other Pequot men. Possibly believing Stone to be Dutch in 1634, the Pequots were attempting to avenge the murder of Tatobem, although the English later rejected this claim, thus adding to tensions.

The next year, the Great Hurricane of 1635 destroyed English food supplies, which fostered an incentive to raid Indigenous food stores. Finally, on July 20, 1636, a Narragansett-allied tribe killed English trader John Oldham on Manisses (Block Island) in an attempt to thwart further colonial trade expansion. The Pequots offered sanctuary to the tribe after the English colonies declared them guilty of murder. Later in August, the Massachusetts Bay colony sent a party of 90 men to Block Island, killing

---

14 Niantic people and burning two villages to the ground. The war had begun.

The English strategy of warfare was simple: burn homes, kill fleeing survivors, and take the remaining captive. Mentions of such a strategy abound in colonial histories. “In the afternoon,” one New England historian of the early nineteenth century narrates, “a company was sent out into the country, where they burnt 150 wigwams, killed seven and took eight of the enemy captive.” At the Mystic Massacre on May 26, 1637, Captain John Mason along with 90 of his troops as well as 70 Narragansett and Mohegan allies arrived at Siccanemos (a Pequot village). Mason ordered the exists to be blocked and the village to be set aflame. Anybody attempting to flee was to be shot. Historians estimate 400 to 700 Pequot people were murdered that night, including women, children, and elderly. The Narragansett and Mohegan allies were appalled; they refused to continue fighting with the English after witnessing such violence. Two months later, the English asked the Narragansets and Mohegans to sign the Treaty of Hartford, which granted the signing parties authority over the Pequots. In an attempt to erase the tribe’s history, the agreement also stipulated that the survivors should never be referred to Pequots again, only as Mohegans or Narragansets. The fact that the surviving Pequots had no representation in the signing of this treaty can be interpreted as the colonizers’ unwillingness to recognize them as worthy belligerents, but is also explained by the preemptive resistance of the Pequots as a distinct entity, which often included fleeing or taking captives of their own.

After the war, the colonial government of Massachusetts annexed thousands of acres of land gained through the killing, expulsion, or enslavement of the Pequots once residing there. They credited their victory to God: “Thus the lord was pleased to smite our Enemies in the hinder Parts, and to give us their Land for an Inheritance.” The colonial government was heavily involved in the establishment and well-being of their institutions and with their newly acquired land, they aimed to support such fledgling institutions, including Harvard College.
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10 Bradford, 296-297.
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For the first 15 years of its existence, Harvard was beset by financial strife, even closing its doors for an entire academic year in 1639. In an effort to aid the school, the General Court of Massachusetts transferred them land, tilted “Pequot Country,” throughout the 1650s, ultimately totaling to 2,100 acres. The final transfer was authorized on May 19, 1658, and gave land throughout modern Massachusetts and Connecticut so that it was “most commodious & convenient for them”. The court documents outlining the transfers closely resemble other colonial land transfer contacts in their structure, as they define the land’s boundaries by geographic features and award Harvard total freedom in taking it.

Over the course of the following two decades, however, legal issues complicated Harvard’s claims to the land. In 1658, Connecticut challenged Massachusetts’ jurisdiction in awarding the territory, and following this dispute, “land-hungry and rent-hating pioneers” began to settle the lands. The College quite ironically describes these new residents as “committing many acts of outrage and violence towards some of us, possessing our lands and dispossessing our tenants...pulling downe some of our houses, burning up our fences, takeing away our grass...with diuer other injuries and wrongs.” As the years followed, the College continued to file for redress but ultimately to no avail—“the College was never able to collect rent; all drifted into the hands of squatters.” If this examination used a solely land-based lens, the story would likely end here. Harvard seemingly profited off of the conquest of Pequots via colonial land transfers but nothing truly came of it. However, the natural simplicity of this narrative suggests the necessity for a more expansive approach, one which centers Indigenous people as its focus. To do so, we must return to the historical narrative, this time tracing the lives of Pequot men and women and their experiences after the war.

Pequot survivors took several different paths following the war. Some fled Northwest to seek asylum with tribes like the Pocumtuc and Mohawk. Others surrendered to the English or English-allied tribes like the Narragansett, hoping for better treatment than they would otherwise
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receive under the English.\textsuperscript{19} Many resisted, and their defiance represents some of the first instances of opposition to slavery in North America.\textsuperscript{20} For most, the future held either forced labor in English towns, or a journey across the Atlantic to perform forced labor in the even more frightening Caribbean plantations. A captive’s ultimate placement depended on their gender, as the English “enact[ed] their gendered cultural ideologies on the material bodies of captive Indians.”\textsuperscript{21} In line with the English understanding of women as domestic bodies, women Pequot captives were sent to English settlement homes. Since Pequot men were viewed as a hostile and threatening presence by the English, they were sent away. In discussing how he planned to distrubte captives from the war in a letter to William Bradford, Governor John Winthrop noted that he is sending the “male children to Bermuda, by Mr. William Pierce, and the women and maid children are disposed aboute in the townes.”\textsuperscript{22} Like food products sent to the Caribbean, New England settlers shipped Pequot men, as doing so bolstered their own ability to exert power. By displacing men from tribal communities, the English were able to limit Pequot power though the disruption of kinship ties. Furthermore it strengthened their trade network with the Caribbean, a commercial tie on which they were significantly reliant. This cycle of slave exportation naturally struck fear into Pequot communities, to which they responded with reluctant acceptance and defiant resistance.

Unlike their kin who were killed in battle or died from disease, the surviving Pequots resisted English enslavement, which manifested in three ways: (1) strategically seeking captivity under English-allied tribes, (2) simply running away, or (3) retaliating. Referencing the conclusion of the Pequot war in his discussion of King Philip’s War, English settler William Harris notes in August 1676 that “soon after peace is concluded they will run all away againe as ye captives formerly did after ye pequot war forty years since.”\textsuperscript{23} The statement supports theories that near the war’s conclusion, several Pequot survivors sought shelter with neighboring tribes. During the war, Pequot warriors drew upon traditional captive-taking methods to rival English captive-taking. In doing so, they did not shy away from force. One colonial account describes the fate of a captive Englishwoman at the hands of a Pequot man: “[she] resisted so stoutly with scratching and biting, that

\textsuperscript{19} Andrea R. Cremer, “Possession: Indian Bodies, Cultural Control, and Colonialism in the Pequot War,” \textit{Early American Studies} (Fall 2008): 304.
\textsuperscript{20} Fisher, 12.
\textsuperscript{21} Cremer, 300.
\textsuperscript{22} John Winthrop to William Bradford, July 28, 1637.
\textsuperscript{23} William Harris to Sir William Josephson, August 12, 1676.
the Indian, exasperated therwith, cast her downe on the Earth, and beate out her braines with his Hatchet.”

Yet Native captive-taking and English captive-taking differed crucially; whereas Native-held English captives were either integrated into the tribe or returned to English settlements for ransom, English-held Native captives were less often returned. Instead, their labor was commodified and their personhood stripped by a mercantilist economy which valued their production over their liberty. The captives for whom resistance proved ineffectual experienced a subsequent life of slavery.

Most enslaved Pequot men were shipped to Bermuda by English trader William Pierce, and once they arrived, they could expect further journeys south (to the Bahamas or Barbados) or an immediate commencement of intense physical labor. Their duties included: clearing trees, building ships, fishing, and house work. Some were sold to plantations where they labored alongside African slaves, although overtime this practice curtailed as white owners became increasingly afraid of cross-racial solidarity in slave uprisings. In Bermuda alone, slave uprisings occurred in 1629, 1656, 1673, 1730, 1761. In all cases, the perceived instigators were “executed, whipped, or branded.” A strong argument exists for the historical trauma of such treatment, as Fisher notes: “historians are only beginning to adequately recognize the full trauma and long-term effects that this and many other wars represented for Native nations—psychologically, spiritually, materially, politically, and socially. At the center of this monumental disruption were enslavement and the threat of enslavement.” The number of Pequot people imported to Bermuda varies, although historian Ethel Boissevain estimates the number to be near 300.

Slaves were regularly whipped, beaten, and raped but perhaps most unsettling, constantly under threat of expulsion. Although they had already
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25 To trace the lives of both women and men would certainly yield the best historical answer to the driving question. As noted above, women were often sent to homes in English settlements whereas men were shipped away. Because of this gendered dichotomy, enslaved women were less often recorded in transactions. Thus, following women’s journeys proves far more difficult. While the following examination will focus on men’s labor in Caribbean islands, women’s labor in English towns was likely just as profitable for colonial institutions, and such a topic indeed warrants additional research.
27 Boissevain, 110-111.
29 Fisher, 2.
30 Boissevain, 110.
been “cut off abruptly and completely from their cultures,” they faced further shipment for perceived bad behavior. Since freed slaves presented the greatest perceived threat to white colonizers, they were regularly ordered away to an island called Eleuthera to undertake apprenticeship, which “was near slavery.” The white settlers from Bermuda who first came to Eleuthera in 1648 named the island after the Greek word for “liberty.” The island originally supported the Taino people, though they were later displaced or killed by the Spanish. When the Puritans came in 1648, they quickly realized how inadequate their own labor force was in supporting their colonies. Slaves and near slave “apprentices,” both Pequot and African, were sent from Bermuda to meet the demand. Another institution came to Eleuthera’s rescue too. That same year, when the town of Cambridge received news that their “Puritan brethren” were in need of aid, they sent “several hundred pounds’ worth of provision and other necessaries” to the island. The reciprocal relationship which followed marks a formative chapter in Harvard’s history.

The fruits of enslaved labor were sent far and wide to nearly everyone but the enslaved themselves. The increased extraction and supply of raw goods benefited the investors in Britain. The increased demand for food in the Caribbean enriched New England merchants. The traders, ship owners, banks, and all those involved in the pan-Atlantic trade profited from human bondage. However, the gifts of this profitable network found their way into more distant hands too. In 1650, to express their gratitude of Cambridge’s support, Eleuthera, the island to which Native slaves from Bermuda were expelled, sent a shipment of “ten Tuns” of brazilwood to Harvard, along with a letter permitting the school to do with the wood as they please. Valued for its sturdiness and beautiful red color, brazilwood easily surpassed other exotic woods in its price and quality. Treasurer Danforth’s record shows Harvard sold the shipment for an impressive
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31 Ibid, 112.
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33 Samuel Morison, “The Strange History of the Eleuthera Donation,” Harvard Alumni Bulletin XXXII (1930), 1067. In fact, one of the men who founded the Eleuthera colony, Patrick Copeland, received at least twelve Pequot captives from Governor Winthrop ten years earlier while still in Bermuda. Whether these same captives followed him to Eleuthera remains uncertain.
34 Morison, Harvard College in the Seventeenth Century, 41.
35 Morison, Harvard College in the Seventeenth Century, 42. Harvard was just one of the institutions in Cambridge who donated to the Eleutheran cause, although Eleuthera addressed their return gift specifically to Harvard. According to Morison, this is most likely because the man who directed this donation, Eleuthera resident Nathaniel White, was himself an alumnus of the College, a member of the class of 1646.
£124.\textsuperscript{36} Harvard historian Samuel Morison emphasizes that this was the single largest donation the college had yet received, save for John Harvard’s namesake gift of 1638.\textsuperscript{37} It came at an opportune moment, as Harvard’s financial struggles persisted. President Dunster noted in his journal in 1650: “And when the Colony could not relieve us, God hath sent supplies even from poor Cyguotea to enlarge our room” (Cyguotea referred to the Eleuthera).\textsuperscript{38} With these funds, Harvard nearly doubled the size of the Old Yard by purchasing the Goffe house and the adjoining cow-yard adjoining. Morison notes this constituted “the most important addition to the college grounds and buildings” since Harvard’s founding.\textsuperscript{39} Harvard subsequently renamed the house Goffe College and on the same piece of land would later build its Indian College in 1655. This piece of land is now colloquially referred to as the ‘Old Yard.’

While Native slaves and near-slave apprentices did labor on Eleuthera and their tasks generally included cutting trees, it is not yet entirely evident that Native slaves felled that specific shipment of brazilwood. Nevertheless, given the crucial role of Native enslavement in the enrichment of the Caribbean-New England economy, it is safe to conclude that Harvard’s most formative early donation was rooted in Native captivity, displacement, and enslavement. Admittedly, given the interconnectedness of capital markets, this narrative seems inconsequential if its only purpose is to tangentially implicate Harvard in the Native American slave trade. Fortunately, this conclusion adds to several modern discussions. First, Indigenous peoples like the Pequots were not wholly decimated. Many were killed by disease and brutal warfare, but many others were also displaced and sent to labor in the Caribbean. This historical relationship forms the basis of modern reconnection festivals which celebrate the Native ancestors of many Bermudans. The connections between Bermudians and Pequot, Wampanoag, and Narragansett peoples as represented by the Reconnection powwow suggest a deep Indigenous history, one that extends beyond a convenient narrative of total elimination. Native Americans should not be relegated to the past; they remain a vital subject in modern discussions.

Likewise, Harvard’s ties to problematic industries exist not only in the past. Its role as an agent of exploitative capitalism remains, as it

\textsuperscript{36} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{37} Morison, “The Strange History of the Eleuthera Donation,” 1070.
\textsuperscript{38} Memorandum of Henry Dunster, 1653 December (typewritten transcription, 2007 October) UAI 15.850 Box 1, Folder 17, Harvard University Archives & Morison, \textit{Harvard College in the Seventeenth Century}, 39.
continues to invest billions of dollars of its endowment into industries like private prisons and fossil fuels. Understandably, those who wish Harvard to uphold its vision of truth and justice protest its profits from such industries. The exploration, extraction, and transportation of fossil fuels damages the environment and often disrupts Native communities, as Nick Estes’s *Our History is the Future* makes abundantly clear. Private prison complexes profit from the incarceration of human beings, many of whom are people of color. This includes Native Americans, who are incarcerated at a rate 38% higher than the national average. Finally, Harvard’s rapid purchasing of farmlands and water rights in recent years has worried researchers, actually causing one board member of the Harvard Corporation to resign in 2018, citing concerns over Harvard’s possible disregard for Indigenous rights. A report by nonprofit GRAIN states “Harvard’s farmland acquisitions were undertaken without proper due diligence and have contributed to the displacement and harassment of traditional communities, environmental destruction and conflicts over water.”

If Harvard truly wishes to uphold its goal of educating fair world leaders, perhaps the school should first re-examine its ongoing role in modern-day instances of exploitative capitalism. Ultimately, this narrative proves that in order to best understand colonial histories and realities, we must use broad lenses which center the experience of Indigenous people. In the aftermath of the Pequot war, Indigenous peoples fled, resisted, or became enslaved. This long network of possibilities forms the basis of arguments of survivance, indigeneity, and recognition that Native peoples are, in fact, still here. Their stories continue to inform complex historical questions and pressing modern issues.

---
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A Bipartisan Effort to Sanitize a Legacy

The Making of the Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. National Holiday

By Vivien Tran
The election of Ronald Reagan in 1980 signaled a striking conservative shift to the right in American politics.116 With this shift, polarization began to split the country, and hasn’t stopped since.117 The debate on when exactly polarization began still rages on but either way, the late 20th century introduced a growing divide between Democrats and Republicans that has made discourse and compromise almost impossible. Yet even in the growing partisan atmosphere, there were still instances of bipartisanship, especially during Reagan’s presidency. One case in point was passing the 1983 bipartisan bill to create a federal holiday in honor of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. During the 1960s, many were wary and contemptuous of the powerful orator who espoused radical ideas that criticized the government and who expressed unpopular opinions about American society.118 Fifteen years after his assassination in 1968, though, America had begun singing a different tune. Between his death and the creation of Martin Luther King, Jr. Day, Dr. King had gone from being a threat to national security and a man held in contempt by most Americans to a beacon of American progress and a symbol of freedom and equality. This success was due to the ways in which Democrats and Republicans had jointly framed his character and personality, despite their different motives and approaches. This sanitization of Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. provides insight into the conditions that allow bipartisanship to flourish in an increasingly polarized country, suggesting that one of the few goals both parties share is hiding the shortcomings of the nation with false narratives of progress and achievement.

In the last years of his life, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. was a man with few allies, often criticized for speaking out on matters other than civil rights issues. J. Edgar Hoover, convinced Dr. King was a communist, had him under FBI surveillance from 1955 until his death. Dr. King’s consistent push for equality eventually unsettled even liberal white Americans, and his willingness to publicly express his antiwar sentiment created widespread public animosity: in 1966, polls indicated that only 28 percent of Americans
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held a favorable opinion of Dr. King. In his famous Riverside Church speech on April 4, 1967, Dr. King called the American government “the greatest purveyor of violence in the world today,” and received a huge amount of backlash especially from the media. People like Carl Rowan, a leading black journalist of the time, wrote, “Martin Luther King has alienated many of the Negro's friends and armed the Negro's foes, in both parties, by creating the impression that the Negro is disloyal.” By the time of his death, Dr. King was shunned by members of the NAACP, a persona non grata to President Johnson, and still suspected of being a Communist by Hoover and the FBI. He spoke out against American militarism and materialism, and he consistently called for policies like guaranteed minimum income and the decrease of America’s defense expenditures. He was more than a civil rights leader. Dr. King’s vision for equality and peace meant exposing and fixing American poverty, fighting against all forms of violence, including wars, and involving people of all class, ethnicities, and races. Until his untimely death, he stood for a plethora of American issues, many of which society refused to face at the time.

Today, we recognize Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. for his civil rights work and the commitment to nonviolence that especially marked his leadership style. One of the great legacies Dr. King leaves in our collective memory is his famous “I Have a Dream” speech, with one of the most famous quotes in American history: “I have a dream that my four little children will one day live in a nation where they will not be judged by the color of their skin, but by the content of their character.” The numbers confirm his place in U.S. history. Compared to his dismal ratings in 1966, by 1987, 76 percent of Americans held a favorable view of him, and today, 96 percent of Americans have heard of Dr. King and his famous 1964 speech. Dr. King embodies the undoubted progress of a country that began the 20th century with legally enforced segregation to today’s colorblind country that is accepting of all peoples. Yet in the span of a few decades, the last years of Dr. King’s life have been all but erased from national memory. Somehow,
we have made Dr. King into a “universally loved moderate” who bears little resemblance to the complicated man he was. To understand how our memory of Dr. King has so drastically changed, we must understand how Congress passed the Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. federal holiday bill.

Creating a federal holiday for Dr. King was a fifteen-year struggle. Action began just four days after Dr. King’s assassination on April 4, 1968, when Congressman John Conyers introduced legislation to create such a holiday. From that point forward, Conyers and the Congressional Black Caucus (CBC) worked together to bring forth legislation that would honor Dr. King is some way every year. However, it wasn’t until 1979 that Conyers’ effort gained traction. At that point, 118 House members and 24 senators cosponsored the respective bills to create a new federal holiday for Dr. King, the highest number of cosponsors to date, which signaled a breakthrough in the fight for the holiday. These events led to joint hearings on March 27 and June 21, 1979, held by the Senate Judiciary Committee and House Post Office and Civil Service Subcommittee on bills S. 25 and H.R. 5461. At the time, there were few Republican supporters of the bill; it seemed as though passing this small piece of legislation would necessarily turn into an issue between Democrats and Republicans.

In the hearings, Democrats, with Senator Bayh and Congressman Conyers as leading supporters, emphasized Dr. King’s achievements in civil rights and his constant efforts to create a better American society. There were frequent mentions of his “I Have a Dream” speech, alongside the fact that he was the youngest person to receive the Nobel Peace Prize. In opening statements given by Senator Bayh and Congressmen Garcia and Conyers, attention was drawn to Dr. King’s commitment to his “dreams” of justice and equality, each arguing that honoring the civil rights leader would show America’s commitment towards achieving fairness and a better country. Witnesses like Coretta Scott King, Dr. King’s wife, pointed out the importance of having a national holiday that would honor a black American and serve as a reminder to the practice of nonviolence in America and
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throughout the world. Dr. Lowery, president of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC), gave Dr. King his utmost respect and admiration, and stated eloquently:

“His leadership helped Americans gain a new understanding and appreciation for our interdependence in the journey toward our national goals. Martin lifted our level of awareness that the paths to fulfillment for all Americans, regardless of race or color, are intersecting paths.”

It was clear in the hearings that this might have been a bill to honor and memorialize Dr. King, but it also would serve as a day to celebrate the successes and admirable goals of the American experiment. For Democrats, it was imperative to paint King as a man who represented the country as a whole, even if that meant downplaying his criticisms of American war and poverty. They chose to see Dr. King as an American, and therefore his efforts and accomplishments were America’s efforts and accomplishments. As a result, proponents of the bill believed the need for a federal holiday was based on moral and ethical reasons. It was of the utmost importance to memorialize the achievements of a man who represented the country’s efforts towards progress.

On the other hand, the hearings implied that Republicans were more critical of a new federal holiday. Leading the opposition, Senator Strom Thurmond (R-SC) cited in his opening statement five different reasons against the addition of the holiday, with the main two being expenses and Dr. King’s controversial life. For the most part, those who opposed the bill did so due to the loss in federal revenue (195 million dollars) there would be if another federal holiday was created. This was something Senator Thurmond expressed whenever he spoke, and he received a great deal of testimony and support from witnesses who came from various groups such as the Virginia Taxpayers Association and the Calendar Reform Political Action Group.

The rest of the witnesses Thurmond called to testify spoke of different reasons to oppose the holiday: Dr. King’s supposed connections to the Communist Party and the notions that he actually wanted to incite violence. These witnesses included former Communist Party members Julia Brown and Karl Prussion, director of Young Americans for Freedom Clifford
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White, and a few other pundits including the conservative columnist Alan Stang. One surprising witness was Congressman Larry McDonald from Georgia, a conservative Democrat. Considering his zeal for conservatism and the fact that he emerged as the leader of the New Right movement in the eighties, he was very much an outlier among his fellow party members, and as such I will treat him and his beliefs as an aberration of the Democratic Party. He in particular expressed the views many of the witnesses held and testified in the hearings. Beyond claiming Dr. King “was wedded to violence,” McDonald accused King of being a Communist. During Dr. King’s years as a civil rights leader, he was under the FBI’s surveillance, which witnesses continually referred to in order to reinforce suspicion of Dr. King’s alleged connections to Communism. Such “evidence” and other murky conjectures led people like Prussion to say that “Martin Luther King—regrettably—whether wittingly or unwittingly, was aiding and abetting the objectives of the Communist International.” In fact, while the economic concerns were persuasive, many of the witness testimonies argued against the bill because they considered Dr. King a Communist, and therefore a traitor and un-American.

When Congressmen Conyers and Garcia introduced H.R. 5461 to the House floor on November 13, 1979, only one Republican, Ben Gilman, spoke out in favor of the bill, and in the end, the House failed to approve the bill as it was five votes short of a two thirds majority. These votes at the end of the debate showed a partisan split: 86 percent of votes for the bill were Democrats, and 74 percent of votes against the bill were Republicans. In the debate, Congressman John Ashbrook’s explanation of Dr. King’s legacy highlights how Republicans’ image of Dr. King differed from that of the Democrats:

“The common misconception is that if one speaks ill of M. L. King, he or she opposes the concept of civil rights. That is a lot of malarkey and I think my colleagues understand that... At that time, many of my colleagues publicly shared my opinion. It was not difficult to

---

132 Martin Luther King Jr., Holiday: Hearings on S. 25, Day 1, Before the Senate Judiciary Committee and House Post Office and Civil Service Subcommittee, 96th Cong. 1 (1979), III.
134 Martin Luther King Jr., Holiday: Hearings on S. 25, Day 2, Before the Senate Judiciary Committee and House Post Office and Civil Service Subcommittee, 96th Cong. 46 (1979) (statement of Karl Prussion).
think that way because we could see him in action. We could easily take notice of his anti-American rhetoric and his penchant for violence.  

Ashbrook labelled Dr. King un-American for criticizing the government’s display of militarism and its involvement in Vietnam. Rather than emphasizing Dr. King’s successful efforts in civil rights like many supporters did during the debate, he chose to point out King’s controversial opinions. His use of the word “colleagues” both in the past and present tense also suggested that his fellow peers still felt the same contempt towards Dr. King that they felt before his death, and Ashbrook made sure to articulate this contempt by charging King with a “penchant for violence,” claiming that he was a man who “believe[d] that America [was] the enemy”. Such views, paired alongside the number of Republicans that ended up voting against the bill, revealed that in 1979, there were still feelings of skepticism about the legacy of Dr. King’s life. In the end, the bill failed in the House and proposals for similar bills would be scarce until 1983. The 1979 hearing and House debate prove that even with the growing public support to honor Martin Luther King, Jr. for his civil rights triumphs, it was Republicans who made sure America didn’t completely ignore all the other aspects of his life.

It was between 1979 and the eventual signing of the federal holiday bill in 1983 that saw the final sterilization of the civil rights icon. In these four years, Republican and Democratic opinions of Dr. King became interchangeable, and the passage of the bill solidified the national memory of Martin Luther King that we have today. Since such an event could never have occurred without Republican support, we have to wonder: what made Republicans change the ways they viewed Martin Luther King Jr.? The most obvious answer is how politically advantageous supporting Dr. King became. After Dr. King’s death in 1968, there had been growing public support for a Dr. King holiday. The media downplayed his stances on the Vietnam War and poverty, and focused on a few keywords like “civil rights” and “I Have a Dream.” In their goal of creating a federal holiday, Democrats did whatever they could to create positive sentiment about Dr. King as they deemphasized his antiwar stance and other concerns that had made Americans wary of him in the first place. These were just some of the
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factors that played a role in the widespread support that was spreading across America.

However, the public truly sprang into action after Stevie Wonder released his single “Happy Birthday,” a tribute to the late Dr. King. For Stevie Wonder, the 1980s marked his heyday as an artist, but also as a political activist. His popularity gave him a platform where he could actively campaign and help promote the idea for a federal holiday in honor of Dr. King. Soon after the release of his single, Stevie called for a march on January 15, 1981. The Rally for Peace Conference received lots of publicity from newspapers across the country, like The Los Angeles Times, which described participants in Washington, D.C. as “an estimated 20,000 persons [who] braved snow and subfreezing temperatures to walk down Pennsylvania Avenue from the statehouse to the Washington Monument.” Other newspapers covered the event with positive enthusiasm, shedding light on Wonder’s campaign for the holiday and focusing attention onto the “massive black turnout.” Wonder’s campaign was an illustration of the growing movement for a Dr. King holiday. It was getting harder and harder to speak out against Dr. King, as everyone persistently focused on his ideas about equality and unity for the country. For Republicans especially, supporting the bill meant a more secure vote for any upcoming elections.

As a result of increasing popular backing and highly publicized attention on Dr. King’s civil rights merits, the 1983 push for the bill to create a federal holiday came as a bipartisan measure. The effort began once again with Congressman Conyers and the CBC as they introduced H.R. 800, a bill to designate a federal holiday for Dr. King on January 15. They held a hearing before the Subcommittee of Census and Statistics on June 7, 1983. While many players from the previous effort, including Senator Kennedy, Coretta Scott King, and Conyers, spoke once more of how Dr. King’s lasting civil rights legacies described the “American phenomenon,” two new and unusual speakers entered the conversation. The first was Stevie Wonder, who testified and declared that “Dr. King did not speak for all black people or all Hispanics. He spoke the truth, which represented every living American member of the melting pot.” The oversimplification of Dr. King’s message
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to include all Americans was a point Representative Dan Lungren, a Republican who had voted against the bill in 1979, hit on as well. He said of King’s “I Have a Dream” speech, “to me it was one of the most powerful speeches I had ever heard. It didn't just speak to black people, it didn't just speak to Indians, it didn't just speak to white people; rather, it spoke to all of us.” In the end, Wonder and Lungren supported the same interpretation of Dr. King: namely, that King was a peaceful human being who stood for American values.146 It was this idea of King representing American values that could bring together a black liberal artist and a white conservative congressman, and it was this idea that would bring together Democrats and Republicans to allow the passage of the bill to come to fruition.

As the hearing on H.R. 800 ended, a new player (with the backing of the CBC), Democratic congresswoman Katie Hall, brought H.R. 3345 into the picture on June 16, 1983. This bill quickly replaced H.R. 800, and was identical in all aspects except that the designated day of the holiday was to be the third Monday of January rather than the 15th. The final version, H.R. 3706—identical to H.R. 3345 but created so that more members could be listed as original sponsors—was introduced on July 29, with 109 cosponsors, including 5 Republicans. The bill immediately went to the House floor on August 2, where members debated about the bill much more extensively than they did in 1979.147

The energized character of the debate was due to the surprising number of Republicans who joined the discussion. Two that stood out were Newt Gingrich and Jack Kemp, Republicans from Georgia and New York, respectively. Gingrich, who many have credited with intensifying partisan combat and polarization, was a strange member to have supported the bill.148 Yet while he gave no reason as to why he didn’t support the bill in 1979, he insisted in this debate that “while Dr. King was black and the fight to end segregation directly affected the black community, his birthday should be celebrated by all Americans as a demonstration of the virtues of freedom and a free society.”149 These were words coming from the man that would eventually advise his Republican peers to demonize Democrats using words
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like “betray, pathetic, and traitors.”\[^{150}\] This goes to show that even for the staunchest Republicans, honoring the Dr. King who represented progress and equality in America was not a partisan issue. As for Kemp, he expressed that he changed his position from opposing to supporting the bill because “I really think that the American Revolution will not be complete until we commemorate the civil rights revolution and guarantee those basic declarations of human rights for all Americans.”\[^{151}\] Essentially, Kemp viewed the holiday as a demonstration of the United States’ greatness and the final push for an equal society about which the country can boast, and this view was not uncommon in both parties. The Democrats’ rhetoric was similar. Congressmen like Tip O’Neill and Edward Markey professed that Dr. King’s message was for “all of America,” his character was a reminder of the values “on which this Nation was founded,” and his dream was something that “would symbolize our commitment to world peace and love of mankind.”\[^{152}\]

One thing was clear: Democrats and Republicans had come to an agreement that the legacy of Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. was intertwined with America’s legacy.

The passing of H.R. 3706 in the House was evidence of how deeply the simplified image of Dr. King had permeated throughout the two parties. The bill was passed by a vote of 338 to 90, with over half of the Republicans and the majority of Democrats voting in favor of the bill. In fact, 26 of the supporters were Republicans that had opposed the bill in 1979. Republican opposition even acknowledged Dr. King’s legacy. Many opposed to H.R. 3706 cited economic concerns, rather than the controversial nature of King’s character, a turnaround from the concerns of Republicans in the 1979 House debate. Of course, there were still men like McDonald, who pushed for Dr. King’s Communist connections yet again in the debate, but his opinions had become the minority in Congress by 1983.\[^{153}\] Overall, there was a general sense of camaraderie among both parties as they exploited Dr. King to fit their shared perspective of America.

When it was the Senate’s turn to vote on the bill, the debate was full of “acrimonious and occasionally eloquent” discussion on the pros and cons of the bill. The beginnings of the debate on H.R. 3706, now called S.400, began on October 3\(^{rd}\), and Congress was determined to have a vote in by the end of the day, but Republican Jesse Helms launched a filibuster that ended


up delaying discourse for two more days, October 18th and 19th, before finally passing the bill on the 19th. This debate would prove much more intense than the House debate as the opposition leaders, Helms and Republican John P. East, chose to attack Dr. King’s character. It was a move that was not well received by much of the Senate chamber during the three days of debate. In one specific instance, Democrat Patrick Moynihan took the binder full of FBI investigations on Dr. King that Helms had been passing around and in an enraged act, flung it onto the ground. The charged atmosphere made it fairly easy to recognize the stark ideological differences between Helms and the rest of the Senate as they argued about the symbolic importance of Dr. King.

Since many Democrats would go on to repeat the same ideas and praises of King that they held during the S. 25 and H.R. 800 hearings, and in the 1979 and 1983 House debates, I believe it is much more interesting and revealing to tackle the Senate debates through the lens of various members of the Republican Party. Even though plenty of Republicans voiced their opinions during the three long days of debate, there were three main ideas that Republicans tended to expound the most. The first idea was supported by senators like Helms and East. On the first day of the Senate debate, Helms immediately brought up King’s Communist relations, and filled the pages of the Congressional Record with material from witness testimony and FBI documents alleging King’s relationship with Communism and the Communist Party. At one point, he even stated that “Dr. King’s action-oriented Marxism about which he was cautioned by the leaders of this country, including the President at that time, is not compatible with the concepts of this country.” East supplemented Helms’ argument by imploring the Senate to take caution when promoting Dr. King’s role in history, saying, “I do not think we have an opportunity for accurate, historical perspective, and that is vital and that is important if you are going to go beyond the precedent of President Washington.” But by arguing this angle, Helms and East had become an anomaly in politics and among the American people. While they did misinterpret King’s message, both men nonetheless were unwilling to forget King’s other comments on American militarism and poverty and could not see Dr. King as a symbol for America’s progress. Unfortunately, they were making a case for a Dr. King that no longer existed in the minds of the other Senate members, even the more conservative Republicans. The disconnect between the two unyielding senators and the

other members of the Senate proved too big for Helms or East to make any real argument against the passing of the bill.

There were also other Republicans who opposed the bill, but for different reasons. Senators like James Abdnor and Don Nickles brought up economic concerns and argued that the then-poor economic state of the country would become worse if they added a new federal holiday. However, both these senators—two among many others who opposed the bill because of the expected loss in revenue—made sure they praised Dr. King and the vision he stood for. Abdnor, for example, declared, “I believe, and have stated many times, that Martin Luther King probably was the most outstanding leader of black citizens in our country and individually contributed most to the advancement of civil rights in our country.” This view was expressed countless other times, in different words and methods, by various other Republican senators. Abdnor succinctly clarified the feelings of most Republicans in his statement. According to Abdnor, barring economic concerns, Dr. King represented the struggle and victory for civil rights and deserved praise because he was a man who singlehandedly pushed for a better America and achieved it, proving that America had improved and was an even better country than it was previously. For Abdnor, Nickles, and other senators, celebrating Dr. King meant that they were at the forefront of civil rights issues.

On the other hand, there were Republicans that didn’t need to reassure the populace that they admired King because they actually approved of the measure. These were senators like Bob Dole and Charles Mathias, both of whom were ardent supporters for H.R. 3706. The Congressional Weekly even noted that “some conservative Republicans, particularly those from states with large black populations, voted for the bill.” Obviously, such senators meant to curry favor with their voters by supporting the bill, and this could not be more evident than in the case of Senator Strom Thurmond. Just four years ago, Thurmond was leading the opposition for the bill during the S. 25 hearings. Yet in a surprising twist of fate, Thurmond came out as a supporter when the Senate debate for H.R. 3706 began. To explain his turnaround, he admitted to listening to the people:

“I might say, Mr. President, that I have extensively discussed this issue with presidents of the historically black colleges, black elected officials, and a wide spectrum of other minority leaders in South Carolina and across the Nation. Clearly, the overwhelming

---


preference among our minority citizens is for a holiday honoring Dr. King, and I respect these views.” 160

The people have spoken, Thurmond said, and they wanted a holiday to memorialize Dr. King. The overwhelming support was enough to make Thurmond change his mind about opposing the bill and develop a positive outlook on Dr. King’s legacy, and there were many Republicans who followed in Thurmond’s footsteps. In the case of these Republicans, they further sanitized Dr. King by publicly endorsing him as a symbol for civil rights and equality.

Despite the flood of amendments that the opposition brought up during the last two days of the Senate debate, the measure was eventually passed by a vote of 78 to 22, with over two thirds of Republicans and more than 90 percent of Democrats voting for the bill. 161 On November 2, 1983, Reagan signed the bill, and a flurry of newspapers across the country covered the event, making note when the president saluted King as a man who “stirred the nation to the very depths of its soul.” 162 Papers like The Chicago Tribune also remarked on Reagan’s fluctuating feelings on the bill since he had previously opposed the measure due to the economic effects of it. 163 Still, the media covered the event positively, and with the signing of the bill, the sanitization of Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. was complete.

What had started out as a partisan issue had become bipartisan just a short four years later. By 1983, just by looking at the reaction to Helms and East, it seemed to be blasphemous to call Dr. King a demagogue, a Communist, or any one of the labels that everyone so easily used a few years prior. In the same vein, Dr. King’s critiques of militarism and economic justice, the comments that led media and the government to label him as a threat, were no longer a part of the national memory of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. All that was left of the man was his leadership in civil rights and his “dream” of equality and freedom for all. And people could get behind an idea like that.

Republicans realized the political utility of this quickly. The media picked up on the Republican shift. The New York Times indicated that if Republicans were to retain control of the Senate, they needed to attract more black voters, and they saw supporting the bill as a way to “enhance their
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support among blacks.”  

Even Helms, who still argued against the bill, said out loud that “it [was] political suicide to oppose this proposal.” But beyond the advantages of supporting the bill, King’s image became something even Republicans found easy to get on board with. These events not only made Congress members water Dr. King down to a simple symbol of freedom and equality, they made him synonymous with progress and success of the country, making civil rights a seemingly closed issue. James Wertsch explains it well in his article “National Memory and Where to Find It,” where he states, “in creating a continuing presence of the past, a mnemonic community tends to streamline accounts of events in self-interested ways.” The creation of a King holiday allowed the government to mold Dr. King’s complex image into a simpler one that Democrats and Republicans alike could digest more easily. As Senator Dole stated, the one area Congress has faced bipartisanship is in civil rights legislation, because as seen in both Democratic and Republican rhetoric during the debates, both parties were eager to celebrate a triumphant America, even though in reality it still has a lot to work on, especially in civil rights legislation.

In the end, Congress achieved bipartisanship, a feat that has only become harder and harder to replicate, at the cost of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.’s true legacy. His memory now serves as an indication of progress and accomplishment despite the fact that if we take his full legacy into consideration, we find Dr. King stood for more than civil rights. He was a true visionary who fought for peace and equality by not just tackling de facto segregation, but the ghettos in Los Angeles and the Vietnam War. And that’s why bipartisanship was guaranteed in this instance, because one of the few things Americans can agree on, despite their party affiliation, is how amazing the country is. Democrats, with their best intentions, tried to honor a man who did much for his country, but did so by silencing all other aspects of King’s dream. Republicans not only wanted to gain public support but found it effortless to support an icon that represented the country’s progressivism. And no one needed a man whose full unrealized dream attacked America’s very core beliefs. The sanitization of Dr. King thus provides us with an important lesson about humility and progress: the only way to honor a man and allow the country to continue to move forward is to make sure we
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acknowledge all our faults and imperfections along with the improvements. Otherwise, the “dream” that King spoke of will never be reached.
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