

**9<sup>TH</sup> ANNUAL UNDERGRADUATE HISTORY CONFERENCE**  
**SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 11, 2017**  
**THE STEEL DYNAMICS KEITH E. BUSSE IPFW ALUMNI CENTER**

- 8:15-8:45 AM Breakfast (coffee, pastries)
- 8:45-8:50 AM Opening Remarks (Dr. Richard Weiner, History Department Chair)
- 8:50-9:50 AM **Panel: “Genocide, War, and Memory”**  
Cody Fuelling (History/Political Science), “Buried in the Sands of Time: The Armenian Genocide and the Turkish State of Denial”  
Seth Carpenter-Nichols (History), “Saddam Hussein: Kurdish Extermination”  
Heather Dewey (History), “Mass Graves and Remembrance: Scholarly Memory of the Red Terror in Spain”  
Chair/Moderator: Dr. Jeffrey Malanson (History)
- 10:00-11:20 AM **Panel: “Ideals of Revolt and Revolution”**  
Katlynn Rushing (History), “Spartacus and the Third Servile War”  
Fyodor S. Wheeler (History), “Redemption by Revolution: The Cult of Reason Within the Religious History of France”  
Brandon Perry (Secondary Education), “The Enlightened Despot: Napoleon”  
Phylea Anderson (Communications), “The Haitian Revolution’s Impact on Freedom and Abolition in the Americas: The Cases of Simon Bolivar and Frederick Douglass”  
Chair/Moderator: Dr. Deborah Bauer (History)
- 11:25-12:45 PM **Panel: “Imperialism and International Diplomacy in the Modern Era”**  
Rosie Macqueen (History), “Us and Them: The English-Formed Identity of Colonial India”  
Ceitidh MacDonald (Political Science), “The Emperors of Mexico: The Empire Strikes Out”  
Andrew Hakes (History), “The National Reorganization Process: Argentina’s Past in the Dictatorship Era”  
Matthew Danielson (English/ Political Science), “New Directions: The Break of United States Hegemony in the Colombian Conflict”  
Chair/Moderator: Dr. Richard Weiner (History)
- 12:50-1:40 PM **Lunch** (pre-registration required)
- 1:40-3:00 PM **Panel: “Contested Identities in United States”**  
Fiona Sackett (History), “Republican Motherhood and the Cult of Domesticity: Their Own Separate Spheres”  
Bre Anne Briskey (History/ Psychology), ““The Road to Hell is Paved with Good Intentions” Eugenic Advocates in Indiana”  
Hannah Smith (Secondary Education), “The American Dream: All for One or One for All”  
Holly Holland (Secondary Education), “American Dream: Inclusion by Ethnicity and Family”  
Chair/Moderator: Dr. David Schuster (History)
- 3:05-4:05 PM **Panel: “The Perils of Politics: Social, Legal, and Philosophical Battles from Ancient Greece through Twentieth-Century America”**  
Kyler Hudson (History/ Political Science), “Parallel Resistance: Protestors and Delegates at the 1968 Democratic Convention”  
Jessica Hale (History), “The Pre-Socratics: Origins of Philosophy and Science”  
James Crump (Legal Studies), “An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of Judicial Review”  
Chair/Moderator: Dr. Christine Erickson (History)



## Student Biographies and Abstracts

### **Panel: “Genocide, War, and Memory”**

#### **Cody Fuelling**

**Title:** “Buried in the Sands of Time: The Armenian Genocide and the Turkish State of Denial”

**Faculty Advisor:** Dr. Ann Livschiz

**Paper written for:** History J495: Senior Seminar—War and Memory (Spring 2016)

**Cody Fuelling** is in his fourth year at IPFW, pursuing majors in History and Political Science, an Honors Certificate, a Certificate in International Studies, and a Minor in Psychology. He has been a research assistant for two professors in the Department of History and currently works as a teaching assistant in the Department of Political Science. He presented at the 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> Annual History Conferences, has received two scholarships from the Honors Program, and works as an Assistant Book Review Editor for *Enterprise and Society*.

#### **Abstract**

For millennia atrocities have been forgotten, buried beneath the sands of time as the gap between the past and present grows wider. Such has been the case with the genocide of 1915 in which as many as 1.5 million Armenians were marched out of their ancestral homeland of 2,500 years and into the deserts of present-day Iraq and Syria in a mass execution orchestrated by members of the failing Ottoman Empire. In the 100 years since these events, the Republic of Turkey—the Empire’s successor state—has devoted resources and manpower to a denialism campaign, employing vaguely-worded legislation on nationalism to silence domestic dissidence while simultaneously funding scholars and lobbyists in the United States to espouse the Turkish official narrative and cast doubt on the veracity of the “Armenian question” abroad. Through these and other elaborate efforts, Turkey has thus far found success in its approach.

With Istanbul’s control over the Strait of Bosphorus, Russia’s new warm water ports in Crimea offer limited benefit, and with the rise of ISIL in Iraq and Syria and a still-tense U.S.-Iranian relationship, Turkey’s placement as a bridge between Europe and Asia maintains importance well-past the Cold War, and the Republic knows this. Despite overwhelming evidence and expert consensus, the work of Turkey and its associates abroad has muddied the waters of scholarship and convinced the United States and other countries that official recognition and use of the word “genocide” to describe the events of 1915 is untenable with respect to the Western geopolitical strategies in the Middle East and Black Sea, as Turkey’s threats to impair these interests have been backed up with real action, including ending multi-million dollar military contracts, withdrawing ambassadors, shutting down military access, and threatening to prevent the United States from entering its airspace.

Scholars and policymakers continue to debate whether U.S. recognition of the events as “genocide” is worth the geopolitical losses; such recognition, as everyone knows, cannot bring victims back, but it may help establish a no-tolerance precedent of genocide where no country has impunity. Such a precedent, it is believed, may deter future atrocities. Others, however, hold that the political capital the U.S. would lose from recognition would make it less situated to address the ongoing massacres of today, specifically those that have generated millions of refugees from the same countries where the Armenians were death-marched a century ago.

### **Bibliographical Note**

This essay focuses on Turkey’s denial of the Armenian genocide in the post-Cold War Era, interrogating which scholars contribute to the controversy and how the U.S. and Turkish nations view recognition of the events as “genocide.” Among the primary sources consulted were collaborative letters vying for official recognition of the “genocide” by the United States, works of Armenian genocide denialists, and advertisements and websites from FactCheckArmenia.com, which many have held to be anti-recognition propaganda. For secondary sources, I used various works by experts Taner Akçam, David Holthouse, and Samantha Power, among others. In 2016, because of the centennial of the Armenian genocide, commemorations among world leaders took place and new examples of Turkish state-level denialism came about; these were incorporated into the essay as well.

## **Seth Carpenter-Nichols**

**Title:** “Saddam Hussein: Kurdish Extermination”

**Faculty Advisor:** Dr. Ann Livschiz

**Paper written for:** History B311: Holocaust and Modern Genocides (Fall 2016)

I am **Seth Carpenter-Nichols** and I graduated from IPFW as a History major in December 2016. I became a History major in the Spring 2014 semester and I actively participated in each of my history classes. Even now that I have graduated, I still expand my knowledge on history. I always had a deep passion for history since I was in elementary school. My expertise in history consists of United States Presidents, World War II, world dictators, and the Cold War. I had the honor of participating in last year’s History Conference, when I presented my paper on President Kennedy and the Cuban Missile Crisis. I am glad that I was able to return to this year’s History Conference with a paper on Saddam Hussein and the Kurds.

I chose to write about the mass murder of the Kurdish population by Saddam Hussein because it is one of the worst acts of mass murder in the Middle East and the modern world. Saddam’s power was at full strength in the Middle East, and there was nothing to stop him. The real interest, however, was not that Saddam was able to kill the Kurds, but that he was able to get away with it. The United States government knew what was happening to the Kurds but did nothing to stop it for several years. What I discovered in my research was that greed and stability came first over basic human rights. That is the real tragedy overall in my paper.

### **Abstract**

The triumphs of the twentieth century have been offset by the many tragedies that took place in world, wars, oppression by despotic leaders, and even worse, mass murder. We saw such mass murders in the nations of Nazi Germany, Cambodia, Bosnia, and Rwanda. In the Middle East, a clear example of a similar tragedy was in Iraq under Saddam Hussein. With an iron fist, Saddam controlled Iraq for decades by fear, violence, paranoia, and death, destroying every obstacle in his way for stability and absolute power. Saddam horribly mistreated his people, but the Kurds, in particular, felt the brunt of his wrath. Saddam targeted the Kurds because the Kurds were a stateless people in Iraq, and they were seen as traitors for siding with the Shia Muslims in Iran during the Iran-Iraq War, and whose nationalist aspirations were viewed as a threat to the stability of Iraq. Fueled by anger and paranoia, Saddam set out to exterminate the Kurdish population in Iraq. Despite evidence of prior discrimination and mistreatment, and with evidence of violence against the Kurds reaching genocidal levels, the U.S. government cared more about its geopolitical and economic interests than about Kurdish lives.

### **Bibliographical Note**

The primary sources I used for my presentation were personal stories compiled from survivor and insider accounts about Saddam Hussein. Newspaper articles and government documents served as evidence that the United States knew about Saddam’s

atrocities, as well his use of chemical weapons against the Kurds. Secondary sources included scholarly articles on Kurdish history, the Iran-Iraq War, and Samantha Power's best-selling book, *A Problem from Hell*.

## Heather Dewey

**Title:** “Mass Graves and Remembrance: Scholarly Memory of the Red Terror in Spain”

**Faculty Advisor:** Dr. Ann Livschiz

**Paper written for:** History J495: Senior Seminar–War and Memory (Spring 2016)

At the end of this semester, **Heather Dewey** will graduate with a History major, an Honors Medal, minors in Spanish and Creative Writing, and a certificate in International Studies. Afterwards, she hopes to be accepted into a doctoral program to continue her studies in the effects of political regimes and historical narratives on the memories and historiography of nations like Chile, Spain, and the Soviet Union. Over the summer, she will be taking courses in Russian and will continue to practice Spanish. In her spare time, she writes psychological horror stories and is working on a novel that she and her sister (an illustrator) hope to self-publish. Attending IPFW has been one of the greatest times of Heather’s life, and she would like to thank everyone in the History Department and others who have helped her develop and grow as a scholar and as a person.

### **Abstract**

The Spanish Civil War (1936-1939) was fought between the Second Spanish Republic and the Nationalists led by Francisco Franco. The Nationalists won and Franco became dictator, resulting in the continuation of the White Terror, a period of executions, murders, and oppression of former Republicans and their supporters. However, these actions were not written about for a long time due to repression by the dictatorship. When Franco died in 1975, the deceased Republicans were still not discussed because the two political sides of the government wanted to preserve the nascent democracy by not dredging up old wrongs. However, in 2000 the exhumations of Republican mass graves began in earnest, and many organizations and individuals started to push for the inclusion of the White Terror in scholarly memory.

In addition to the White Terror, the Civil War saw a period known as the Red Terror, which included violent actions and murders of political fascists and clergy members by the Republicans. The Red Terror, then, is the term used to describe the surge of violence that swept through the Republican side of the war, and included murders, attacks, and church burnings. Changing public opinion has resulted in the Red Terror being explained by scholars as the result of select “uncontrollables” not related to the Second Spanish Republic. These “uncontrollables” would not have been encouraged in any form by the government, but would have been acting through their own sense of justice. The people targeted were those associated with the old hierarchical regime of Spain, which was why many in the clergy were chosen as victims.

While it has 1/3 of the death toll of the White Terror, it is still important due to its significance in the Civil War and how it changes the perception of the Republican side. After studying changing public opinion in Spain and the gradual inclusion of the “uncontrollable” narrative in scholarly sources, I have determined that a growing idealization or development of a positive public image of the Republicans affected

collective memory. The change in collective memory in turn morphed scholarly memory, demonstrating how historians are affected by their environments in the writing of history.

### **Bibliographical Note**

Because my project was focused on changing trends in scholarly memory, many of the sources were secondary source books written about the Spanish Civil War and Republican violence. The other main source of knowledge came from the archives of two of the most popular Spanish newspapers, *ABC* and *El País*. I translated many of them from the original Spanish, and was also able to access the official archives of the Francoist regime to see how the Red Terror used to be discussed. I chose these sources because I wanted to determine how collective memory changed due to the exhumations of mass graves, and how this in turn affected the scholarly memory of academic resources.

## **Panel: “Ideals of Revolt and Revolution”**

### **Katlynn Rushing**

**Title:** “Spartacus and the Third Servile War”

**Faculty Advisor:** Dr. Suzanne LaVere

**Paper written for:** History C388: Roman History (Summer 2016)

My name is **Katlynn Rushing** and I am a senior History major here at IPFW. I recently graduated this past May from IPFW with a Legal Studies (Pre-Law) degree with a History minor. I came back to study history because I have a passion to learn it and enjoy taking the history classes here at IPFW. I will be done again with my degree this May and plan to take the LSAT this September. My ultimate goal is to go to law school in the Fall of 2018 to study and eventually practice law.

### **Abstract**

The Third Servile War, also known as the Spartacus War, was the only one of three slave wars to directly threaten the heart of Rome due to its repeated victories over the Roman army and rapidly expanded numbers. The rebel slave responsible for the success of this uprising was Spartacus. Originally from the land of Thrace, Spartacus was an auxiliary of the Imperial Roman army. It was not until after Spartacus received formal Roman gladiatorial combat training at what was called a “ludus” that he was able to spark a slave rebellion that shook the very foundation of Rome’s ideologies and culture.

Slave defiance, let alone full-fledged slave uprisings, was a rarity within Rome because slavery itself was a norm in its caste system. The fact that Spartacus, along with his other fellow gladiators, was so successful is a nuance that merits great historical analysis to this day. In this paper, I aim to illustrate how the perception of Spartacus and what he represents has changed throughout time. During this era, the slave uprising posed as a mere political opportunity to advance those already in power such as Marcus Crassus and Pompey. To the Romans themselves, this revolt was a threat to their traditional social system and their own personal well-being. Today, the legacy of Spartacus represents how a slave can reverse the traditional role and epitomize the very thing he was denied during this time— freedom.

### **Bibliographical Note**

I used a variety of primary and secondary sources in my paper. However, to further my thesis on deciphering the “how” and “why” the slave revolt led by Spartacus was more successful and groundbreaking than previous revolts, I narrowed my research on secondary sources to gauge the overall story of the revolt itself.



## Fyodor S. Wheeler

**Title:** “Redemption by Revolution: The Cult of Reason Within the Religious History of France”

**Faculty Advisor:** Dr. Deborah Bauer

**Paper written for:** History B314: Europe from the New World to Napoleon (Spring 2016)

**Fyodor S. Wheeler** is a junior history major and religious studies minor focusing on Western civilization and the history of the Christian Church. His first paper presented at the IPFW Undergraduate History Conference (2016) was “Empires of the Air: The Beginning of Radio,” at the 2016 conference. He currently serves as a tutor- not Tudor- for Western Civilization Part I.

### **Abstract**

"Redemption by Revolution: The Cult of Reason Within the Context of the Religious History of France" is an examination of the attempted dechristianization during the French Revolution (1789-1799). The revolutionaries' opposition to traditional religion is evaluated within the framework of France's unique religious history and expression of Christianity. Focusing on the Cult of Reason, this paper traces the roles of the Gallican Church and the Enlightenment in the development of an atheistic religion, and why it ultimately failed. At the center of this study is the Festival of Reason in 1793, which marked the installation of Reason as the figurehead of this new non-religion, scandalizing the country. The Cult of Reason has received little attention despite its reputation among historians as a bizarre and even shameful part of the Revolution, and even less attention has been paid to its religious significance. The general image of the Cult is of an atheistic religion, and the movement of which it was a part is oversimplified as the attempted transition from religion to rationalism. However, this interpretation obscures its place in the French Revolution and its culture. France's deeply ingrained religious nonconformity had existed long before the Revolution in the form of the Gallican Church, which was often at odds with the papal authority in Rome. This rejection of traditional authority combined with the Enlightenment ideals of Reason over superstition and Revolutionary opposition to the *ancien regime*, its power structure, and its longstanding tradition of religious intolerance. The result was a backlash against religion. This backlash is discussed within its philosophical and religious contexts, as the Cult of Reason can only be understood through this framework.

### **Bibliographical Note**

Primary sources consulted in this study include the works of Pierre Bayle, Jean-Jacques Rousseau, and Voltaire along with royal French edicts and the religious scholarship of Clifford Geertz. Secondary sources include the scholarship of Christopher Dawson, Mona Ozouf, and Daniel Roche.



## Brandon Perry

**Title:** “The Enlightened Despot: Napoleon”

**Faculty Advisor:** Dr. Deborah Bauer

**Paper written for:** History B314: Europe from the New World to Napoleon (Spring 2016)

My name is **Brandon Perry**, and through this short biography I hope to convince you to aspire to follow whatever dream you may have. I began my collegiate career on track to be a financial advisor, yet I learned that I could never sit behind a desk 10 hours at a time crunching numbers. Instead, I switched my career path to the wonderful world of education in which I hope to inspire the young minds of today. I am in my final year here at IPFW and currently am student teaching at Carroll Middle School, teaching 8<sup>th</sup> grade Social Studies. Currently the kids and I are tackling the War of 1812. I want you audience member to follow your dream, your pursuits whatever that may be. I am searching for employment out in California, so if you may have a connection, I'd love to buy you a cup of coffee. Believe it or not, I am finishing my collegiate journey with a solid 3.8 GPA. The 20<sup>th</sup> century is by far my favorite century as the world begins to modernize to what it is today. My favorite invention, the automobile, begins to be experimented and tested in order to complete unbelievable feats. Like the automobile, I too, and so should you member of the audience, aim to aspire to something bigger and extraordinary. Who knows, perhaps the future may call me to become a professional stunt driver. One can dream.

### **Abstract**

The Age of Reason (1685–1800), or the Enlightenment, enabled people to question the natural order, which encouraged *philosophes* (thinkers) such as John Locke, Voltaire and Rousseau to pursue uncharted views. John Locke's words “life, liberty, and property” became a central theme of the Enlightenment and inspired the leaders of the French Revolution that began in 1789. Concepts such as natural universal rights, popular sovereignty, and the general will laid the foundation towards reform. As the Revolution began to go off the rails, the nation's *cahiers de doléances* (notebooks filled with complaints) fed the frustration and resentment against authority; especially among the middle and lower classes, known as the Third Estate. Themes such as abolishing hierarchy, despotism, and privilege overshadowed Locke's teachings, and the French state became consumed by anarchy. The establishment of the Committee of Public Safety in 1793 enacted a terror across France, which prioritized the aims of the Revolution over the well-being of its people. Instead of stabilizing the Revolution's chaotic nature, Maximillian Robespierre headed the Committee of Public Safety, which unleashed a hellish regime that focused on drastically reforming the old order. The radical nature of change continued during the subsequent government, known as the Directory (1795-1799), which presented itself as a constitutional government, but was riddled with corruption.

The Directory collapsed in 1799 when Napoleon Bonaparte seized power in a *coup d'état* and established a governmental order that promoted the people's interest. During

Napoleon's reign from 1799–1815, he brought Enlightenment themes back into French society, allowing him to be viewed as an enlightened despot who promoted equality, religious toleration, and meritocracy. Napoleon stabilized internal and external problems that emerged during the reign of the Terror and the Directory. The development of the Civil Code (1804), the establishment of religious toleration with the Concordat (1801), and a social hierarchy that embraced meritocracy allowed Napoleon to embrace popular sovereignty and the people's general will. He envisioned France to be an all-mighty power, and he wished to incorporate enlightened themes into foreign lands. Individuals could once again believe in life, liberty and property; they could practice their faith without fear of prosecution. As an enlightened despot, Napoleon liberated French society and recaptured Enlightenment ideals that promoted equality, religious toleration, and a meritocratic system.

### **Bibliographical Note**

The majority of all sources I used were primary sources, which I located through various compilations found in source books. I also used IPFW's IUCAT program, which allowed the source hunt to be much smoother. Never once had I thought that IUCAT would be a resource I would contend using, but after my mentor sat down with me and explained how quickly the books arrive, I thought this was magic. While researching, skimming, and annotating numerous primary sources, I determined each source must be associated to one of three themes: equality, meritocracy, and religious toleration in regards to Napoleon. After learning the phrase "Enlightened Despot," I concluded Napoleon to be labeled as such based upon each theme.

Secondary sources helped me to understand and grasp context of specific mechanics such as the Legion of Honor, but they were not a prime focus in terms of research. Instead secondary sourcing was used infrequently to provided context, but not the juicy details of the past. I wanted to find specifics in regards to Napoleon's Civil Code and the establishment of the Concordat. While researching secondary sources, I wanted to gain a historian's perspective on Napoleon; specifically lighting policies or measures enacted that had Enlightenment origins

## Phylea Anderson

**Title:** “The Haitian Revolution’s Impact on Freedom and Abolition in the Americas: The Cases of Simon Bolivar and Frederick Douglass”

**Faculty Advisor:** Dr. Richard Weiner

**Paper written for:** History F342: Latin America, Evolution and Revolution (Fall 2016)

**Phylea Anderson** is a senior at IPFW. She will be earning a degree in Communications with a concentration of interpersonal and organizational. Along with her B.A., she will also be receiving a certificate in Peace and Conflict Studies (PACS). Each of these disciplines has allowed her to see farther than the world she lives in and the people that surround her. Her biggest joy is volunteering for the annual Harambee Festival in Fort Wayne. Founded over 20 years ago by Phylea’s grandmother, it has enabled her to continue the legacy of goodwill and peace.

### **Abstract**

Haiti became the second independent republic in the western hemisphere when it won its independence from the France in 1804. It was the only colony to gain independence and abolish slavery simultaneously. Haiti’s revolution became synonymous with abolition and because of that many revolutionaries and nations shied away from tying themselves to Haiti. Many leaders in other nations feared that the slave uprising in Haiti had the potential to spread, and because of that did not want to be associated with Haiti and her ties to abolition and black freedom. Nevertheless, the Haitian Revolution had positive consequences on abolitionism and freedom, and the revolution’s impact varied in different contexts. We can see these diverse positive consequences through the distinct impact the Haitian Revolution had on two individuals: Simon Bolivar (1783-1830) and Frederick Douglass (1818-1895).

Bolivar is known as “*el liberator*” due to his great influence on the independence movements of Venezuela, Bolivia, Columbia, Panama, Ecuador, and Peru. He was born into a prominent family, but was orphaned at a young age. As a teen he traveled to Europe where he was exposed to those who opposed Spanish rule in the New World. He promised then to liberate his homeland. After many defeats, in 1815, Bolivar arrived to the southern part of Haiti seeking aid and relief from President Alexander Sabes Petion. This aid was granted with the promise to end slavery in any country that became independent. Succeeding in 6 countries, Bolivar kept his promise and took initial steps that eventually led to the abolition of slavery in those independent South American nations.

Douglass was a very influential black abolitionist. Born a slave, Douglass was able to eventually buy his freedom and then became a champion for black freedom. Unlike Bolivar, Douglass was not seeking independence from Europe, but looking for the same freedoms that the Haitian people enjoyed after their own revolution to be granted to American blacks. Haiti was a "promised land" that Douglass and other black Americans

looked towards. While Douglass's direct involvement with the island did not come until later in life when he was a diplomat (1871 and 1889-1891), the Haitian model of abolition and black freedom influenced Douglass throughout his life. Although Bolivar and Douglass had differing opinions over their years as revolutionaries, Haiti, albeit in distinct ways, influenced both of their movements for abolition and freedom.

### **Bibliographical note**

To start my research I began looking into secondary sources. Sources such as "Haiti: Revolution" by Bob Clement, were able to give me a more in depth view of the revolution. Setting the groundwork, I was then able to discover my primary sources that were written by Simon Bolivar and Frederick Douglass. The primary sources make up a majority evidence for my thesis. For example, there is a correspondence that occurred between Bolivar and Haitian President, Alexandre Petion, discussing the terms to the aid Bolivar would receive from Haiti. Sources such as the correspondence were able to provide concrete evidence of the impact Haiti had on Bolivar and the Americas.

## **Panel: Imperialism and International Diplomacy in the Modern Era”**

### **Rosie Macqueen**

**Title:** “Us and Them: The English-Formed Identity of Colonial India”

**Faculty Advisor:** Dr. Deborah Bauer

**Paper written for:** History J495: Senior Seminar – European Imperialism in the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> centuries (Fall 2016)

**Rosie Macqueen** writes: I am a history and international studies student, especially interested in the Baltic Region and the intricacies of abstract concepts like national identity and patriotism. I studied abroad for a semester at the University of Tartu, in Estonia, and have traveled frequently in Europe and North America. I am a senior student in my final semester at IPFW, and a part-time education specialist at Science Central children’s museum. After graduation, I plan to move to Washington DC and do work with the Smithsonian Institute, ideally with the American Indian Museum, or the African American History and Culture Museum. I thrive on the chance to teach a curious audience, especially on subjects that are not well known in the American cultural psyche.

### **Abstract**

The period of English colonial rule in India came alongside the Enlightenment in Europe, which established ideas of nationality, self-determination, and the sovereignty of rulers within their own countries. However, those European nations with empires were not willing to let their colonies go for the sake of post-Enlightenment ideology and morals, and so manufactured reasons to continue colonial rule while staying within the “moral high ground” of the Enlightenment and the Civilizing Mission. This was how England justified colonizing and ruling the Indian subcontinent. Through both the East India Company (1600-1858) and the Raj (1858-1947) governments, English imperialists and Orientalists created justifications to rule India, and to counter every possible reason for independence or autonomy. To cement their “rightful” position as ruler of India, imperialists and Orientalists picked apart India’s history, society, and religions, searching for “proof” of India’s barbarism, which in contrast, would imply England as a civilized nation. This was during a time where “sciences” like social Darwinism were legitimate, and so there was little doubt to the truth of these findings. However, the reasons derived from this “proof” were inherently contradictory, applying inconsistent and “flexible” stereotypes and characteristics to the peoples, religions, and cultures of the subcontinent. Hinduism was barbaric because it was a “polytheistic” religion, yet at the same time, it was put on par with the pantheons of ancient Greece and Rome. India had a grand, ancient history, yet its people were stuck in the past, unable to move on without England’s help. The hierarchical society, or caste, was condemned as barbarous, yet encouraged to ease administration. Indian Muslims were brutal savages and killers, yet they were respected as warriors. Indians were expected to get an English education, yet the opportunities to use those educations in a career were extremely limited. Hindu men

were submissive and effeminate, yet sexually savage and violently lustful. Throughout the 18th and 19th centuries, English imperialists forced these contradictory ideas to coexist, manufacturing new “reasons” to rule every time locals would object or attempt to revolt. Stereotypes of Indians were so ingrained into the English mentality that the “noble” Civilizing Mission could never be fulfilled in the subcontinent, resulting in the systematic and continuous oppression of the peoples of India, and aggressive backlash towards any attempts to make Indians equal. Despite these stereotypes, Indians were absolutely capable of nationalist thought and action, creating multiple national movements in the 19th and 20th centuries, which eventually culminated in Gandhi’s popular, non-violent revolt, and the independence of India and Pakistan in 1947.

### **Bibliographical note**

I generally used secondary sources as my starting-off point, tracing them back to their primary sources and corroborating that information. I cross-referenced those primary sources against one another, finding frequent contradictions in the English interpretation of Indians, sometimes even within the same document. I highly recommend Thomas R. Metcalf’s *Ideologies of the Raj* (University of California Press: Berkeley, 1994) as an excellent introduction to British perceptions of India with numerous primary sources listed, as well as *A History of Modern India: 1480-1950*. (ed. Claude Markovits, trans. Nisha George and Maggy Hendry. Anthem Press: London), which tells events more from the Indian side.

## C. Ceitidh MacDonald

**Title:** “The Two Emperors of Mexico: The Empire Strikes Out”

**Faculty Advisor:** Dr. Richard Weiner

**Paper Written For:** History F342: Latin America- Evolution & Revolution (Fall 2016)

**Ceitidh (Katie) MacDonald** is currently an IPFW senior majoring in Political Science, International Relations, Pre-Med and History. After a 20 year military career, Ms. MacDonald decided to further her academic studies as a precursor to a law program with hopes of a new career in Immigration and Veteran laws as well as Constitutional and International law.

### **Abstract**

At the turn of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, the power structure of the world was changing. The age of empire and colonies was turning in on itself. As the great powers of the age began warring each other, conflict alternated between hot wars and proxy wars. The greater result was the loss of colonies on almost every side. No longer able to influence the great amount of people in those colonies, both native and colonial, the imperial grip of power loosened enough for the New World to wiggle free. Independence, however, didn't entirely free the western hemisphere from European monarchical models of governance, as the case of independent Mexico clearly illustrates. This paper examines the two short-lived and failed attempts to establish empires in independent Mexico, both of which were thwarted liberal republican resistance. The first attempt was under Emperor Agustin I at the onset of Mexican independence (1821 – 1823), and the second attempt was decades later under Emperor Maximilian I (1864 – 1867), who was invited in by Mexican conservatives after their liberal counterparts had defeated them in the war of the reform at the end of the 1850s. On face value these two empires couldn't appear more distinct. The first was engineered by Iturbide, a leader in Mexico's war for independence against Spain, and the second orchestrated by Maximilian, a foreign invader supported by tens of thousands of French troops. Nevertheless, by focusing on the contentious political climate in which both empires existed this paper finds similar explanations for their failures. In both cases, instability and sharp divisions in Mexico help explain their failures.

### **Bibliographical Note**

Historical papers tend to be more focused on the action of the primary actors instead of the influences that caused them to act as they have. The Mexican Revolution was no different. The actions of the two Emperors of Mexico are scrutinized, but the politics of the time influencing them, gets glossed over. The following references each provide an accounting of the politics surrounding the coronations and the reasons for their ultimate failures: Timothy E. Anna's book, *The Rule of Agustin de Iturbide: A Reappraisal*, and H. Montgomery Hyde's book, *Mexican Empire, The History of Maximilian and Carlota of Mexico*.



## Andrew Hakes

**Title:** “The National Reorganization Process: Argentina's Past in the Dictatorship Era”

**Faculty Advisor:** Dr. Ann Livschiz

**Paper written for:** History B311: Holocaust and Modern Genocides (Fall 2016)

**Andrew Hakes** is a history major in his last year at IPFW. His focus in history is conflict and revolution during the Cold War, with a leaning towards Latin America. He recently studied abroad in Argentina and conducted research over the legacy of Ernesto “Che” Guevara. He is currently working on his Honors Project—an examination of the impact of the EZLN (Zapatistas) throughout the Americas. He has presented at the history conference twice before over the topics of Babi Yar and the relationship of the Cuban and US governments after the Cuban Revolution. Currently he is considering post-graduate education and looking at his options.

### **Abstract**

Towards the end of the 19th century, Argentina was an aspiring power in the Americas, only to have its dreams dashed by several military coups after 1930. Before 1930, the future of the River Plate country appeared bright, as it challenged the United States in conferences, while its wealth and resources were the envy of several Western European countries. From 1930 to 1976, the military leaders who ruled the country for thirty years and the civilian leaders who governed for fifteen years were unable to match or come close to achieving Argentina’s former potential. During this time, phenomena appeared that would dictate Argentina’s future: torture, terrorism, and Peronismo, an ideology based around the populism of Juan Perón. For some Peronismo was totalitarianism, and for others it was democracy, depending on whether they liked Perón or not. Argentinian views on democracy did not place the doctrine as exclusively good, just as their views on dictatorship were not of it being inherently bad. Juan Perón polarized Argentine society and challenged the traditional elite of Argentina: the military, landowners, businessmen, and Church. He enacted economic policies that served to protect the Argentine economy and improve the lives of the working class. Due to his Fascist leanings, he promoted national unity through riling up the populace against a certain group of people, and used violence and torture to crush all dissent. Though overthrown and exiled twice, Perón had a profound impact on Argentina. When he returned from exile for the last time, he ramped up a campaign against “subversives,” a designation targeting guerrilla groups he had originally ordered to be created. These actions set into motion a greater usage of Argentina’s oppressive apparatus and the terror that ensued brought death to the forefront of Argentine society. The 1976 coup that ended Perón’s time in power, replaced him with the military-civilian dictatorship that killed anywhere from 10,000 to 30,000 Argentine citizens. The polarization of society and politics created by Juan Perón assisted in creating the conditions that caused the 1976 coup and led to the disappearances of thousands of Argentines. Under the junta, the foundation of Peronismo was destroyed and its base was targeted. Under the “National Reorganization Process” the junta engaged in a large social engineering project, killing any in society who disagreed.

During the dictatorship certain groups were targeted, such as Jews, Communists, Unionists, and anyone with deemed leftist leanings.

### **Bibliographical Note**

To conduct his research over the dictatorship in Argentina, Andrew used primary sources from Argentina and secondary sources from both the United States and Argentina in order to get a less-biased understanding. Finding information that was not overly politicized was difficult, considering the role the United States played in the Latin American dictatorships and the changing opinion of the United States in Argentina.

## Matthew Danielson

**Title:** “New Directions: The Break of United States Hegemony in the Colombian Conflict”

**Faculty Advisor:** Dr. Richard Weiner

**Paper written for:** History F342: Latin America, Evolution & Revolution (Fall 2016)

**Matthew F. Danielson** will be graduating this spring with degrees in Political Science and English with a concentration in writing. His senior project in Political Science explored the diversity of Indiana’s political culture, and his senior English project, which is also his senior Honors project, uses the literary theory of New Historicism to examine the Merrie Melody cartoons of 1952. He is a current recipient of the Withers Scholarship and is in the process of applying to law schools.

### **Abstract**

The Colombian conflict over drugs and politics (1948-2016) evolved over time, moving from a war between elites, to a war of peasants and elites, to a besieged government assaulted by right and left ideologies, and finally to a victorious government that successfully negotiated a peace agreement with the support of a nation suffering from war fatigue. This paper examines the role that international actors played in the evolution and ultimate resolution of this conflict. The paper argues that the post-Cold War era, a period when violence in Colombia subsided, marked a turning point. At that time the impact of the United States waned and the weight of Europe and Latin America grew, a changing international climate that helped pave the way for a successful peace settlement in Colombia.

To develop this thesis the paper examines the nuances of international relations, showing that the loss of leadership by the United States in Colombia is more incremental than total, and demonstrates both a success and failure of US policy with the exhibition of a new willingness by Latin American states to enter the world stage to break with the US. The conflict in Colombia is notable by the dominance of policy by the United States of America, a nation present since the very beginning of the conflict. And yet while hostilities were ongoing, there was a lack of intervention by the USSR (as seen in Cuba), the UN (as seen in Korea, the Congo, etc.), or other international organizations. While some of these organizations were new and untested in the early days of the conflict in Colombia, the lack of intervention should be blamed more on the presence of violence than on the inexperience of the organizations. As noted by major scholars and by the documents of the organizations, the influence of actors like the European Union (EU) and the Organization of American States (OAS) only began to rise in the early days of the twenty-first century following reductions in violence. As groups like the FARC and drug cartels underwent brutal total war by the Colombian and United States governments, and militias, the levels of violence were reduced to levels that allowed alternative methods for peace to occur. The reduction in violence also allowed the Colombian government to begin forging independent diplomatic relationships with other countries, including support for fundamental changes of international organizations. The OAS task force on

drugs, created in 1976, did not spawn its “Hemispheric Plan of Action on Drugs” until 2011, which recommended policies that did not necessitate the militarized resolution of drug fueled conflicts in Latin America. With such evidence, the hegemony of the United States is demonstrated to have waned even as the cooperation of international organizations and states grew. Once out from the burden of violence, Colombia worked to forge its own style of international relations.

### **Bibliographical Note**

The sources used to examine the Colombian conflict include scholarly articles and books that described both the historical context of the conflict, and the history of the drug war in Latin America. Secondary and primary sources included official policy positions by the European Union, the United States of America, the Organization of American States, and non-profit organizations with published statistical information.

## **Panel: “Contested Identities in the United States”**

### **Fiona Sackett**

**Title:** “Republican Motherhood and the Cult of Domesticity: Their own Separate Spheres”

**Faculty Advisor:** Dr. Jeffrey Malanson

**Paper written for:** History A303: United States from 1789-1840 (Fall 2016)

**Fiona Sackett** is a senior History major with a minor in Theatre in the Honors program. She is interested in American women’s movements and cultural histories such as popular fashion and etiquette. She is currently planning on applying for grad school in Dramaturgy after her graduation. Fiona is from Huntington, Indiana.

### **Abstract**

When considering women’s equality in the United States, the average person considers examples such as the Suffragist movement at the turn of the twentieth century or the Feminist movement of the 1960s and 1970s. These two movements did not just occur on a whim. They were often inspired by previous movements and expectations held for women that they felt was necessary to modernize and adapt, much to the chagrin of the traditionalists of their respective time periods. The same can be said about both Republican Motherhood and the Cult of Domesticity. While overlapping, the two movements have many nuanced differences. The first to appear, Republican Motherhood was the post-Revolutionary War movement for women. Higher expectations for knowledge and education were the main goal in order to raise better American citizens, and also to give a husband an intellectual partner. In contrast, the Cult of Domesticity began to develop after Andrew Jackson was elected as president in 1828. While education remained a major focal point in the home, the real priority was morality in the community, starting from the domestic sphere. Women were often seen in reform movement groups, such as education or temperance groups. The work that is done by both the Republican Motherhood movement and the Cult of Domesticity are large factors that have inadvertently influenced American feminism.

### **Bibliographical Note**

My research consisted primarily of secondary documents varying between Cult of Domesticity and Republican Motherhood, which explained the general understanding of a woman’s place in the world at the time. My research also included primary documents from Abigail Adams’ letters, as well as information my own personal genealogy.



## **Bre Anne Briskey**

**Title:** “‘The Road to Hell is Paved with Good Intentions:’ Eugenic Advocates in Indiana”

**Faculty Advisor:** Dr. Christine Erickson

**Paper written for:** History H217: The Nature of History (Fall 2016)

**Bre Anne Briskey** is a third-year Chapman Scholar, majoring in history and psychology. She is a member of Alpha Sigma Alpha, Phi Kappa Phi, Psi Chi, The National Society of Leadership and Success, and the current president of Phi Eta Sigma. Bre Anne is participating in the Honor Program at IPFW where she has earned the Honors Pin and is a member of its student group, the HonorDons. Bre Anne presented her statistics research project at the 2015 Student Research Symposium along with presenting at the 8<sup>th</sup> Annual Undergraduate History Conference. Her historical interests consist of a wide array of topics, including Tudor England, Mexico, and the history of science and medicine. After graduating from IPFW, Bre Anne plans on attending graduate school.

### **Abstract**

During the twentieth century, the ideology of eugenics – improving the population either through restricting certain groups from reproducing and/or encouraging the reproduction of other groups – became popular worldwide. In the United States, Indiana led this movement. On March 9, 1907, the sixty-fifth regular session of Indiana’s General Assembly voted and passed the first sterilization law in the United States. The policy’s makers wanted to restrict the reproduction of society’s “undesirables,” i.e. the “mentally defective” and criminals. Despite one’s initial reaction to this law, that lawmakers wanted to punish and oppress certain members of society from reproducing, this is not the case. The advocates behind Indiana’s 1907 sterilization law, which included people in the medical field and clergy, did not view the law as punishment, but rather as a tool to help society’s downtrodden and society in general. They believed that cycles of poverty and neglect would be prevented. Potential children would be spared from inheriting their parents’ genes for crime or mental deficiencies. Advocates believed that sterilization benefited the patients. Harry Sharp asserted that after sterilization, “you improve both his [the patient’s] physical and his mental condition. Is there any brutality in this? Is it cruel or inhuman?” Even though advocates of the 1907 Sterilization law viewed it as beneficial to society and constitutional, the Indiana Supreme Court ruled it as unconstitutional in 1921. However, the age of eugenics in Indiana did not end with this ruling; Indiana passed multiple sterilization laws over the course of the twentieth century. Only in the 1970s were the sterilization laws appealed. Indiana’s main sterilization law, passed in 1927 after the repeal of the 1907 law, received several amendments that allowed for its longevity. Indiana finally revoked the 1927 sterilization law in 1974 due to the emergence of new viewpoints regarding people’s rights. Eugenics in Indiana resulted from eugenicists’ genuine belief by that they were helping society’s downtrodden.

## **Bibliographical Note**

This project utilized a combination of primary and secondary sources. A majority of the primary sources focused on contemporaries' perspectives regarding Indiana's early eugenic policies; positions opposing Indiana's eugenics policies were analyzed along with advocates' viewpoints. Additionally, included in this project are the original eugenic laws in Indiana, along with the rationale and medical procedures behind these sterilization laws. Several of the secondary sources analyzed the historical origins of Indiana's eugenic policies along with the general context of eugenics in the United States during the early 20<sup>th</sup> century. Along with examining the motivation behind the advocacy for eugenic policies by various groups, several of the secondary sources examined the groups impacted from Indiana's sterilization laws.

## **Hannah Smith**

**Title:** “The American Dream: All for One or One for All”

**Faculty Advisor:** Dr. David Schuster

**Paper written for:** History H106: U.S. History Since 1877 (Fall 2016)

**Hannah Smith** is a sophomore and her major is Secondary Education. She relishes in all historical subjects, but is particularly interested in the Cold War. She plans and looks forward to teaching high school social studies, including history, political science, and sociology.

### **Abstract**

From Allen Ginsburg’s “Howl” to Barry Goldwater’s “Extremism in the Defense of Liberty,” the disparity of opinion as to what constitutes the American dream is as wide as the disparity in income today. This presentation serves as an analysis of Ginsburg’s “Howl,” the Sharon Statement, the Port Huron Statement, and Barry Goldwater’s “Extremism in the Defense of Liberty,” examining the American dream from both the left and the right. The rise of the new left and the new right in the 1960s gave way to new ideas of what needed to be done in order to achieve the American dream. The new left sees a vision of the American dream that involves community and participatory democracy, while the right sees a vision that involves individualism and freedom. That is to say, the left is one for all and the right, all for one.

### **Bibliographical Note**

All four sources presented in the paper were written in the 1960s as the “new” left and “new” right were on the rise. “Howl” is a poem written by beatnik Allen Ginsburg about American life. “Extremism in the Defense of Liberty” is a speech given by Barry Goldwater upon his acceptance of the 1964 Republican nomination. The Sharon Statement is a manifesto written by the Young Americans for Freedom, a group of young republicans, to outline their idea of the proper role of government. The Port Huron Statement is another manifesto written by the Students for a Democratic Society, a group of young democrats, in which they advocate for fair government, equality, and participatory democracy.



## Holly Holland

**Title:** “American Dream: Inclusion by Ethnicity and Family”

**Faculty Advisor:** Dr. David Schuster

**Paper written for:** History H106: U.S. History Since 1877 (Fall 2016)

**Holly Jean Holland** is studying Secondary Education with a concentration in Social Studies and a minor concentration in Psychology, Government and Citizenship, and a minor in TENOL here at IPFW. She is a first generation college student and part of the 21<sup>st</sup> Century Scholarship program. This is her first time presenting at the Annual Undergraduate History Conference. Holly was selected for the Bahrom International Exchange Program with Seoul Woman’s University and studied in Korea for a month in the Summer of 2016. Her historic interests consist of a wide variety of topics, including 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup>–century American History, Korean history and development, Native American history after Jackson’s Removal, and the history of revolutions and warfare. After graduating Holly plans to teach English in South Korea for a number of years before returning to America to teach Native American children and engage in politics to further America’s Education.

### **Abstract**

What constitutes the American Dream often invokes concrete goals and objects for many. For some, the American Dream is indicative of financial success, ownership of property, and fulfillment of employment, while for others the American Dream is made up of more abstract ideas. Due to its ever-changing nature, defining the American Dream is nearly impossible. Understanding what the American Dream constitutes, however, is achievable and applicable to today’s cultural and political climate. This paper explores the ways that generations of immigrants have grappled with their interpretation of what the American Dream represents. It locates a connective tissue between interpretations based on inclusion in American society and the process it undertakes.

Analysis of four primary sources from Eric Foner’s reprinted sourcebook titled *Voices of Freedom: A Documentary History, Volume 2*, suggests that the American Dream is contingent upon accepting one’s ethnic identities and the ability to form and enjoy a stable family structure. With accounts from an immigrant named Puwat Charukamnoetkanok, to even former President Lyndon B. Johnson, each presents his or her own notion as to what the American Dream is. Counter-intuitively, only through accepting one’s ethnic identity can the Protestant American Dream, i.e. buying a home and having economic stability, be achieved. Accepting one’s identity, however, is only half the battle to achieving the American Dream; the other aspect to achieving the American Dream involves family structure and stability. Expressed primarily by former President Lyndon B. Johnson, only through maintaining the family structure, which would ensure equality and assurance, could the African American community be included in President Johnson’s ideal American Dream. The family unit is congruent with accepting one’s identity, as identity is often derived from family. It is then only by being accepted by one’s ethnicity and family that one could achieve the American Dream.

Due to the idea of the American Dream and its ever changing presence in both American politics and culture, it is paramount that we are able to understand the nuanced ideas of what the American Dream is: a sense of common identity though ethnically diverse that is felt. It is with this more nuanced understanding that the idea of the American Dream can be applied to the 21st century political and cultural landscape in a viewpoint that will perhaps challenge the idealist notion of the American Dream and gear more positive discussion regarding immigration and terrorism. While many think of the traditional version of the American Dream/ Protestant American Dream, it is essential to understand the core to what the American Dream is, this core being ethnically accepted and the ability to form and enjoy a stable family structure.

### **Bibliographical Note**

This paper primarily used four sources from one reprinted sourcebook by Eric Foner titled, *Voices of Freedom: A Documentary History, Volume 2*. The first primary source is from the point of view of an immigrant in America named Puwat Charukamnoetkanok and was written in 1990 describing his search for identity and conflicting feelings regarding his different identities: Thai, Chinese and American. His reflective search to fit all three together ends with an optimistic saying of America being the land of opportunity. However, as Puwat points out, one can only reap from this land if they put in the hard work. The second primary source is an editorial written by the LULAC, or the League of United Latin American Citizens, that strives for inclusion of Latin Americans in American society written in 1945. Founded in 1929 it is still in operation today and continues to fight for Hispanic American rights and inclusion. The third primary source is an arranged speech by Martin Luther King Jr. and is titled *Meeting at Holt Street Church*. Martin Luther King Jr. is the most recognized civil rights leader and his historic speech titled, *I have a Dream* left a huge imprint on the American conscious. King Jr. often used non-violent protests in accordance with Christian beliefs that took America by storm during the late 1960s. The last primary source is another reprinted speech by former President Lyndon B. Johnson at Howard University. In his speech, he addresses the Civil Rights movement and its successes, but calls for even more progress. Johnson's concerns lie within maintaining the African-American family structure.

## **Panel: “The Perils of Politics: Social, Legal, and Philosophical Battles from Ancient Greece through Twentieth-Century America”**

**Kyler Hudson**

**Title:** “Parallel Resistance: Protestors and Delegates at the 1968 Democratic Convention”

**Faculty Advisor:** Dr. Christine Erickson

**Paper written for:** History H217: The Nature of History (Fall 2016)

**Kyler Hudson** is a junior at IPFW, majoring in history and political science. His historical interests include WWI, presidential politics, and the Supreme Court. He plans on completing his undergraduate degrees next spring and is currently contemplating law school. He hopes to remain in the Fort Wayne area, ideally finding a position at a law office or local television station.

### **Abstract**

The 1968 Democratic Nominating Convention in Chicago was the most chaotic that the party had ever seen. Delegates at the convention disrupted the proceedings, while protesters on the streets carried out demonstrations that turned violent with the Chicago police. The pandemonium in the city was transmitted across the country via nightly television news programs and daily newspapers. Protestors and convention delegates both opposed the Democrats’ nominating process and the party’s policy regarding Vietnam. The two groups expressed their condemnation in similar ways; both carried out nonviolent protests, supported symbolic candidates, lobbied for an open convention, and earned attention from the press.

Like many of their compatriots on the streets of Chicago, convention delegates opposed to the nomination process had been supporters of Robert Kennedy during the primaries. After his assassination in June, Kennedy supporters backed fringe candidates like Lester Maddox, George McGovern, and Channing E Phillips, who had little chance of capturing the nomination. Likewise, protestors at Civic Center Plaza symbolically nominated their own candidate: a pig named “Pigasus.” Additionally, both groups lobbied for an open convention, so that representatives could “vote their conscience.” Delegates worked to abolish the unit rule at the convention, while protestors created the Coalition for an Open Convention. Both groups disapproved of the likely nominee, Hubert Humphrey, and used the established rules in an attempt to nominate a different candidate.

Convention delegates and protestors were also opposed to the Democratic Party’s stance on Vietnam, and voiced their disapproval similarly. Both groups protested nonviolently and used television and newspaper coverage to draw attention to their cause. Like the opposition to the nomination process, many anti-war supporters were former followers of Robert Kennedy and disliked Hubert Humphrey. The two groups also faced similar

responses from authority figures. Richard Daley, Mayor of Chicago and host of the convention, used his power to try and silence both the opposition delegates and the street protestors. He manipulated the schedule of the convention to minimize the attention delegates received from the press and used the convention band to drown out protest songs and chants. As mayor of the city, Daley also wielded power over the demonstrators on the streets. He ensured that protestors could not demonstrate near the convention hall and allowed the Chicago police to beat protestors into submission.

During the 1968 Democratic Nominating Convention, delegates and street demonstrators opposed the Party's nominating process and its Vietnam policy. The two groups expressed their displeasure in similar ways: participating in nonviolent protests, supporting symbolic candidates, pursuing an open convention, and using the press to generate attention. In addition, the two groups faced similar responses from authority, particularly Mayor Daley. These aspects demonstrate the parallel opposition expressed by convention delegates and street protestors.

### **Bibliographical Note**

This research paper employed a number of primary and secondary sources. Contemporary newspaper articles, particularly from the *Chicago Tribune*, were used to present specific situations that supported the main argument. Additionally, *The Presidential Nominating Conventions 1968*, published by the Congressional Quarterly Service, included primary documents along with commentary that provided context for the speeches, letters, memos, etc. Secondary sources, such as *Election Year 1968* by Dennis Wainstock, were used to present a broad timeline of events and background information that was not directly related to the August Nominating Convention, such as Robert Kennedy's assassination and the spring primaries.

## Jessica Hale

**Title:** “The Pre-Socratics: Origins of Philosophy and Science”

**Faculty Advisor:** Dr. Suzanne LaVere

**Paper written for:** History C368: History of Ancient Greece (Fall 2016)

**Jessica Hale** is currently a senior at IPFW majoring in history. She is presently interning at ARCH Inc., a non-profit organization that advocates for the historic preservation of Fort Wayne and northeast Indiana’s architectural and cultural heritage. After graduation she is preparing to go on to graduate school at the University of Notre Dame. Her primary interests revolve around world history, global affairs, and historic preservation.

### **Abstract**

This research paper examines the significance of the Pre-Socratic philosophers of the 6th and 5th century BCE and looks at the momentous role they played in the development of philosophy and modern science. This work draws upon both primary and secondary sources to present a multi-faceted study of how this group of thinkers set off an intellectual revolution by introducing a new model of inquiry into the world. By examining this intellectual revolution, I clarify the process by articulating some of the most important contributions of influential Pre-Socratic philosophers and demonstrating how their ideas have been further built upon throughout time. Their ideas unleashed a chain reaction into the rational inquiry of nature that was later expanded upon and diversified into other fields of inquiry. By rejecting the attribution of natural phenomena to divine authority and instead basing their theories on natural explanations, the Pre-Socratic philosophers inadvertently invited others to participate in critical discussions about the physical world. Previously the critical discussion of nature was not discussed because the mythological interpretation of nature was dogmatic in character. A myth does not contain any evidence that can be supported or refuted by another’s argument. The postulates presented by the Pre-Socratics allowed others to react against their assumptions which have led to a process of innovation and development of modern science. In order to create an intellectual revolution, this group of thinkers first had to overturn a set of existing beliefs and then replace them with something new.

These ancient Greek philosophers were unique in their tendency to separate the natural world from the supernatural world. Instead, they attempted to explain natural phenomena on their own inherent terms. For example, Thales’ assertion that water was the beginning of all things served as a catalyst to the conception of science. To choose water, which was able to turn into vapor, and exist in gas and solid states was a natural way to overcome the problem of previous cosmologies presented in the works of Hesiod and Homer. Up until this point, traditional cosmologies began with a genealogical series of births to explain the origins of the universe. However, Thales’ postulate was able to overcome something that previous cosmologies were not, the problem of regression into infinity. Where does Hesiod’s Chaos come from? Thales’ explanation overcame Hesiod’s and Homer’s series of births and replaced them with a circle of transformation. While his postulates left many questions with unsatisfactory answers and his theories were soon

countered by his successors, the principles behind Thales' ideas are still accepted today. With each Pre-Socratic philosopher mentioned, this research paper ties together each thinker with a major contribution to science and philosophy. Thales suggested a physical basis of the world that led to a generalized approach to the problem of change. His assumptions prompted others to ask if there was anything stable in the world and thus inspired the works of Heraclitus, the Pythagoreans', the Eleatic reaction to Ionian philosophy, which in turn led to the reaction of the Atomists and so on. . . This research paper attempts to do justice to each of these ancient Greek philosophers and then explains why each was significant in regards to the historical progress of science.

### **Bibliographical Note**

This paper utilizes to its best abilities both primary and secondary sources. It is important to note, however, that very scant amount of original works written by the Pre-Socratic philosophers has survived. Most of what we know of this group of thinkers comes from Plato, Aristotle, Isocrates, and Diogenes Laertius, all of whom lived after the Pre-Socratics' time and are considered secondary sources. While this paper does analyze some original fragments written by Heraclitus, most of the sources used in this work are secondary and consist of books, academic journals and articles, and other ancient writings.

## James Crump

**Title:** “An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of Judicial Review”

**Faculty Advisor:** Dr. Jeffrey Malanson

**Paper written for:** History A303: United States from 1789-1840 (Fall 2016)

My name is **James Bradley Crump**. I am a legal studies senior here at IPFW, and will begin a graduate program for a Master of Law in the fall of 2017. I also spent six years in the Army. I have held various undergraduate legal internships, some of which have been in the Fort Wayne area. These include Malloy Law LLC and the Allen County Prosecutor’s Office. I have also held various research positions. Regionally, I have conducted research with the Center for Social Research at IPFW. Nationally, I was recognized as a research assistant for The Federalist Society for Law and Public Policy Studies. At The Federalist Society, my work included the National Lawyers 2016 CLE, extensive research into public discourse and cognitive scientist George Lakoff for grant proposals, critique of Akhil Amar’s *The Constitution Today*, and *inter alia* content edit of the newly released book, *DC Confidential: Inside the Five Tricks of Washington*. While in DC this past summer, I was also awarded a fellowship with the Fund of American Studies. I attended various lectures from bi-partisan and partisan think tanks, the South African embassy, the State Department, and a multitude of high-level executives and government officials. Additionally, I completed a course through The Fund of American Studies and the Reagan Foundation on Leadership and the American Presidency, which resulted in academic excellence and deeper appreciation for the uncertainties that face a presidency. Today, I am here to open all to a new world and deeper understanding of judicial review.

### **Abstract**

Long before the Constitution was ratified, the notion of judicial review is found. The basic understanding of judicial review is that it is the prerogative of the judiciary to validate or invalidate law. Was judicial review merely a consequence of Marshall’s “shrewd politicking,” as legal historians Benedict and Urofsky claim? Was *Marbury v. Madison* (1803) a divergence from the intent of the General Convention and framers? Is it a validation of judicial activism? The weight of the evidence will show the contrary. Notwithstanding contemporary wisdom from many in the academy, judicial review was not manifested in *Marbury v. Madison* (1803), judicial review was not an act of loose construction (and therefore not a validation of Living Constitution theory of contemporary times) or shrewd politicking; rather, judicial review was *de facto* known, implied by a consensus, and ubiquitously applied. This truism is “too plain to be contested.”

### **Bibliographical Note**

Sources used entail: The Federalist Papers, The Ideological Origins of American Federalism, Intellectual Origins of American National Thought, Blackstone’s Commentaries on the Laws of England, American Constitutional History, Madison’s

Hand, various cases and writings. Moreover, two dominate legal authorities on the matter: “Marbury v. Madison and the Doctrine of Judicial Review” by Crowin, and “A Critical Guide to Marbury v. Madison” by Alstyne.

## Selected Student Awards and Accomplishments

Students in the Department of History have many opportunities for research and professional development outside the classroom:

**Alexander Allison** (B.A. History 2015) was awarded a Fulbright English Teaching Assistant scholarship for the 2016–17 academic year, in order to teach English in Quibdó, Colombia. The Fulbright Program is the flagship international educational exchange program sponsored by the U.S. government. Fulbright scholarships are highly competitive; only 17% of applicants for Fulbright awards to Columbia have been successful in the last three years. Fulbright recipients spend an all-expenses-paid year abroad to research, teach, or study. Allison is one of only three students in IPFW history to receive a Fulbright scholarship.

Over the past year, **Bre Anne Briskey** (History/Psychology) has achieved several accomplishments. In the fall, she received the IPFW Honors Program Honors Pin for completing nine Honors course credits. Bre Anne received a paid internship for the IU Oral History project (see below). In addition to this internship, she received a research assistantship for Dr. John Licato of the Computer Science department. In the Analogical Constructivism and Reasoning Lab, Bre Anne researched cognitive concepts such as Representational Redescription and how they can be applied in the computer science realm, specifically to artificial intelligence; currently a paper for a conference is being prepared. In November, Bre Anne was named as one of the co-presenters for a research poster, *Interest in mutual sexual attraction as a factor related to sexual behavior*, presented at the Society for the Scientific Study of Sexuality; she is continuing to work in Dr. Hill's psychology lab. Last spring, Bre Anne presented at the 2016 IPFW Student Research and Creative Endeavor Symposium with her poster, "The Struggle for Recognition during 19<sup>th</sup> Century Mexico." This poster examined the strategies that the Second Mexican Empire utilized to gain legitimacy during the French Intervention. In addition to these academic accomplishments, Bre Anne is the current student representative for the Curriculum Committee in the College of Arts and Science.

**Evan Frauhiger** (B.A. History 2015; Honors Medal) is currently a second year law student at the William and Mary College of Law in Williamsburg, Virginia. He spent Summer 2016 doing an internship in Geneva with International Bridges to Justice, and is currently on the Environmental Law and Policy Review. Evan plans to go into international human rights law after graduation. Evan was a presenter at the 2014 Undergraduate History Conference.

**Cody Fuelling** (History/Political Science) received an Honors Research Assistantship to work with **Dr. Deborah Bauer** on her research project into the history of French colonialism in Madagascar at the end of the nineteenth century for Fall 2016.

**Nicholas Miller** (History) is an intern at the *Early Ford V-8 Museum* in Auburn this semester. He has been volunteering there since the summer of last year, and recently enrolled in the internship program this semester.

**Aaron Ostermeyer** (History/Econ) will be travelling to South Korea for 2 weeks during Summer Session I as part of IPFW's ECON E477 class, called the "Korean Economy and Culture." The trip and class are sponsored by the IPFW Economics Department. The combined course and trip are intended to increase students' knowledge of South Korean culture as well as its economy. Aaron was selected for the trip following an application process involving an essay and an interview with the selection committee. In addition to his History degree, Aaron will also be earning a B.A. in Economics this year. Aaron has presented at the Annual Undergraduate History Conference twice, in 2015 and in 2016.

**Alexandra Rairigh** presented her poster "Soviet Espionage Before and During the Great Patriotic War" (written for **Dr. Livschiz's** T335 Soviet Union in WW2 class) at the 2016 Research and Creative Endeavor Poster Symposium.

**Fyodor Wheeler** (History/ Religious Studies minor) has served as a history tutor for American history and Western Civilization for two years. He received the Judie and Ralph Violette Scholarship for history in 2016 and one of his drawings, "Portia and the Painting" was featured in a blog post by Dr. Gregory Nagy of the Harvard Center for Hellenic Studies the same year. He also presented a paper, "Empires of the Air: The Beginning of Radio" at the 2016 Undergraduate History Conference.

Three IPFW History majors – **Bre Anne Briskey, Garrett Chrisman, and Andrew Hakes** – have been awarded paid internships with the IU Oral History Project during the 2016-2017 academic year. The Indiana University Bicentennial Oral History Project (BOHP) is a commemorative project tasked with interviewing Indiana University alumni, faculty, and staff about their memories of their time at an IU campus in preparation for the Indiana University Bicentennial. As interns for the project, our students are tasked with the actual interviewing of alumni, staff, and faculty from IU Bloomington and its subsidiary campus locations. They subsequently transcribe the interviews, assisting in archiving the interviews digitally, so that the history of Indiana University can be available for future generations.

In his position as Associate Editor of Reviews for *Enterprise and Society: The International Journal of Business History*, **Professor Richard Weiner** collaborates with History majors and graduates, **Jessica Cortesi** (B.A. History 2014) and **Cody Fuelling** (History/Secondary Education), who serve as assistant book review editors. Jessica was a presenter at the 2014 Undergraduate History Conference. In Summer 2016, **Heather Dewey** joined Jessica and Cody as a Book Review Editor Assistant for *Enterprise and Society*.

A record number of History majors will be presenting at the Spring 2017 Honors Showcase: **Cody Fuelling, Heather Dewey, Adam Gay, Andrew Hakes, Kathryn Sherrod**. A successful presentation at the Honors Showcase means that students will receive an Honors Medal at the May 2017 Commencement Ceremony.

A few IPFW students are volunteering to work at the National Military History Center in Auburn this semester. They are **Bryn Strubing** (History), **Nicholas Miller** (History), and **Brooke Bieszke** (Political Science).

## Faculty and Staff Updates

**Dr. Deborah Bauer** continues work on two different research projects. The first, focused on intelligence and espionage history in France at the turn of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, will be the subject of an upcoming book chapter in a compiled volume on *Cultures of Intelligence*, and also serves as the subject of her book manuscript, *Marianne is Watching: Knowledge, Secrecy, Intelligence, and the Origins of the French Surveillance State (1870-1914)*. Dr. Bauer's second research project centers on French imperial history in late nineteenth-century Madagascar. She was recently awarded a research grant in the form of a course release for work on this project.

**Dr. Christine Erickson** is continuing to work on her book manuscript, *Fraternity on the Frontier: The Montana Ku Klux Klan in the 1920s*. She is also working on a second project: the anti Vietnam War movement in western Montana. She recently presented a paper on Grand Dragon Lewis Terwilliger at the Western History Association's annual conference in Oregon and published an article on the Harlowton Klan.

**Dr. Suzanne LaVere's** book, *Out of the Cloister: Scholastic Exegesis of the Song of Songs, 1100-1250* was published by Brill in April 2016. Her chapter "'A Priest Is Not a Free Person': Condemning Clerical Sins and Upholding Higher Moral Standards in the *Gemma Ecclesiastica*" will appear later this year in a volume about the 12<sup>th</sup> century cleric Gerald of Wales from the University of Wales Press. Dr. LaVere is currently conducting research for two projects; a book on Church reform and pastoral care in the High Middle Ages and articles on 19th-20th century American interpretations of Joan of Arc.

**Dr. Ann Livschiz** is excited to return full time to teaching and research in the Department of History, having reached the end of her term as Director of the Honors Program at IPFW. She received an IPFW 2017 Summer Grant to work on her project on the memory of the Holocaust in Belarus.

**Dr. Jeffrey Malanson's** first book, *Addressing America: George Washington's Farewell and the Making of National Culture, Politics, and Diplomacy, 1796-1852*, was published in 2015, and was released as an audiobook in 2016. He is currently conducting research for his next book project, *Madison and Hamilton: Nationalism and Political Principle in the Early Republic*. In addition to his teaching and research, Dr. Malanson serves as Presiding Officer of the IPFW Faculty Senate.

**Dr. David G. Schuster** studies the history of American culture and medicine from 1865 to the present. In particular, he is fascinated with how Americans have developed often competing ideas of what constitutes "normal" and "abnormal" behavior. When not working on his research, lesson planning, or reading papers, David can be found walking and bicycling around town. He tries to avoid using his car and encourages other people to do the same.

**Dr. Richard Weiner** has been collaborating with History majors. His forthcoming articles “Mexico” (coauthored with Jessica Cortesi and Melissa Norton) and “Chile” (coauthored with Alex Allison) will appear in *Women’s Lives Around the World: Volume 2: the Americas* (ABC-CLIO Greenwood Press). He is currently coauthoring an article with Heather Dewey ("The Tannenbaum Controversy in the Age of the Mexican Miracle") for a special issue of the Inter-American journal FIAR on Human Rights and Development. He presented a paper titled "Alexander von Humboldt's Critique of Mercantilism" summer 2016 at a Humboldt Conference in Paris, France, and he is scheduled to present a paper titled "Debates over the Causes of Rural Poverty in Revolutionary Mexico" at a conference on Agrarian Reform and Resistance at the National University of Ireland in June 2017.

**Carter Ringle** recently wrote a film review of the documentary *Love Between the Covers* for *Enterprise & Society: The International Journal of Business History* and is working on a book review of *From Boom to Bubble: How Finance Built the New Chicago* for the same journal.

#### Sam Thorn Retires!

**Sam Thorn**, an instructor for the History Department, will retire this spring after well over a decade of teaching. Sam earned a B.A. in History at IPFW in the 1970s, and went on to a successful career in education. As an undergraduate he took classes with Professor Jim Haw. In the early 2000s Professor Haw invited Sam back to serve as an instructor in American History. The department is very happy that Sam accepted Dr. Haw's offer, for he has done an excellent job teaching for the department, and has been a very popular instructor. The department thanks Sam for his excellent service and wishes him the best in his retirement.

**Memorial for Jim Haw, Department of History**  
(December 11, 1945–January 9, 2017)

After an illness of several years, James Haw died in January 2017 at the age of 71.

James Haw came to IPFW in 1972 with a Ph. D. from the University of Virginia. He retired in 2009, after almost 4 decades of extraordinary service to IPFW. His main research field was the era of the American Revolution. Jim published two books, eleven journal articles, and various other works. His books, which were very well received, are both biographies of American Revolutionary leaders, Maryland's Samuel Chase and John and Edward Rutledge of South Carolina. Both are the first and only full-length scholarly biographies of their subjects.

Professor Haw taught a variety of courses in U. S. history from the colonial period through the Civil War, plus U. S. foreign policy. Most of those courses had not been offered at IPFW before his arrival and represented important additions to the curriculum.

Jim effectively and generously served the university and the department in a variety of capacities. He served as chair of the History Department for six years. Perhaps his most enduring service contribution came during the period when the Indiana and Purdue programs at IPFW were being combined into one. Jim was one of the four-member committee that wrote IPFW's unified academic regulations. As chair of the Educational Policy Committee of the Senate in 1983-1985, he helped design a number of important policies, including the Campus Connection for high school students and policy governing departmental involvement in Continuing Education.

Jim was a respected and active scholar and one of the most effective teachers in the department. He was also very generous and helpful. His door was always open to students and to younger history faculty who needed advice on teaching strategies, student engagement, and all matters pertaining to IPFW policies.

Beyond his career at IPFW, Jim was also a noted and avid bird watcher (and not just his revered St. Louis Cardinals). He was known in NE Indiana for his expertise and generosity to all people who were interested in bird watching. As the president of the local Audubon society stated, Jim "really was a mentor for all [birders] in northeastern Indiana." Jim, in his fifty some years of birding, was a meticulous observer and note-taker of different birds. He not only compiled an impressive "life list" of over 700 bird species, but also kept careful records on bird populations. For many years, Jim organized the local Audubon society's annual spring and fall field trips and the Christmas Bird Count.

Jim is buried in his home state of Missouri. We will miss him very much.



## Special Announcements

Did you enjoy today's presentations? Interested in learning about presentations from earlier conferences? Information about the 2009-2016 History Department Undergraduate Conferences is available through Helmke Library on Opus: Research and Creativity at IPFW ([opus.ipfw.edu](http://opus.ipfw.edu)). This year's conference material will be uploaded in the next few weeks.

\*\*\*

The IPFW **History Club** is a student-run organization that brings together lovers of history to: discuss topics of contemporary and historical significance; develop local history; take field trips to regional museums and archives; engage in lively play over historical simulation games.

For more information, check out their Facebook page ("IPFW History Club").

The **Department of History is on Facebook!** ([www.facebook.com/IPFWHistory](http://www.facebook.com/IPFWHistory)) This is a great way for current students and alumni to keep in touch with the IPFW History community and spreading information about classes, events, and news.

Do you know of an event on campus or in town that you think other History majors would be interested in?

Have you read a new History book that you especially enjoyed?

Do you have an accomplishment that you would like the Department to know about?

Post it on our page!

If you haven't done so already, please "Like" us, and we hope to hear from you soon!

\*\*\*

The Department of History continues to offer credit and non-credit **internship opportunities** for history majors.

If you are interested in doing a history internship for credit, please contact Professor Christine Erickson.

The Department of History has partnered with Career Services to expand a number of internship opportunities available to students. Check out [www.ipfw.edu/career/students/job/historyinternships.shtml](http://www.ipfw.edu/career/students/job/historyinternships.shtml) for more information.



## **Thank You!**

### Conference Planning Committee

Dr. Deborah Bauer  
Jessica Cortesi  
Teri Luce

### Master of Ceremonies

Dr. Suzanne LaVere

### Department of History Full-Time Faculty

Dr. Deborah Bauer  
Dr. Christine Erickson  
Dr. Benton Gates  
Dr. Suzanne LaVere  
Dr. Ann Livschiz  
Dr. Jeffrey Malanson  
Dr. David Schuster  
Dr. Richard Weiner, Chair

### **The Department of History would like to thank the following people for their help and support:**

Michele Shawver, Honors Program (cover design)  
Printing Services Staff  
Bernard Lohmuller, CATV  
Cameron Smolinske and his weekend team, CATV  
Susan Huller, Special Events  
Karen Burtnette, COAS  
Cathleen Carosella, COAS Publications