

D

DALAI LAMA

According to Tibetan tradition, the Dalai Lama is the incarnation of Avalokitesvara, the Buddha of Compassion, who chose to be reincarnated so that he could serve the people. To date there have been 14 Dalai Lamas.

The First Dalai Lama was called Gedun Drupa. Born in 1391 in the Tsang region of Tibet to a nomadic family, he was ordained in 1411, became a renowned scholar of Buddhist teachings, and founded the Tashi Lhunpo monastery in Shigatse. He died in 1474.

The Second Dalai Lama, Gedun Gyatso, was born to a farming family near Shigatse in 1475. When he was 11 years old, he was recognized as the reincarnation of the First Dalai Lama. He died in 1542.

The Third Dalai Lama was called Sonam Gyatso and was born in 1543 near Lhasa to a wealthy family. In 1546, he was recognized as the reincarnation of Gedun Gyatso. He was fully ordained when he was 22 years old. He established the Namgyal monastery in 1574, which still serves as the Dalai Lama's personal monastery. The Mongolian King Altan Khan conferred on him the title of Dalai Lama, which means "Ocean of Wisdom." Sonam Gyatso died in 1588.

Yonten Gyatso was the Fourth Dalai Lama. Born in 1589 in Mongolia to the Chokar tribal chieftain, he was educated in Mongolia by Tibetan Lamas. He traveled to Tibet in 1601 and was ordained in 1614. He died at the age of 27.

The Fifth Dalai Lama, Ngawang Lobsang Gyatso, was born in the Tsang region in 1617. Although he was identified as the reincarnation of the Dalai Lama, his discovery was kept secret until 1642, once the political turmoil had settled down. He was a great scholar and wielded international political influence. He began the construction of the Potala Palace, which was not completed before his death in 1682. His death was kept secret for 15 years by telling people that the Dalai Lama was engaged in a retreat. Occasionally, someone masqueraded as the Dali Lama so it would appear he was still alive.

Tsangyang Gyatso, the Sixth Dalai Lama was born in 1682 in the Mon Tawang region of India. In 1697 the Emperor and the people were finally informed of the death of the Fifth Dalai Lama and discovery of the Sixth. In 1701 his advisor was killed and the young Dalai Lama, greatly disturbed by this event, rejected the monastic life and never became fully ordained.

In 1708, two years after the disappearance and assumed death of the Sixth Dalai Lama, the Seventh, Kelsang Gyatso, was born in Lithang. The uncertain political situation prevented the young Dalai Lama from traveling to Lhasa to be trained, so he received his training at Kumbum monastery. He was ordained in 1726. Under his reign, the Dalai Lama became the spiritual and political leader of Tibet. He died in 1757.

The Eighth Dalai Lama, Jamphel Gyatso, was born in 1758 in the Tsang region. His parents traced their ancestry to one of Tibet's legendary heroes. He was taken to the monastery in Shigatse at two and a half years old. He was ordained in 1777 and died in 1804.

The Ninth Dalai Lama, Lungtok Gyatso, was born in 1805. He died in 1815 when he was 9 years old.

Tsultrim Gyatso, the 10th Dalai Lama, was born in 1816. He was fully ordained when he was 19 years old. He was always unhealthy and died in 1837.

The 11th Dalai Lama, Khedrup Gyatso, was born in 1838. He was recognized as the new Dalai Lama in 1841 and at a young age took over the political and spiritual responsibilities of the office. In 1856, he died unexpectedly.

Trinley Gyatso, the 12th Dalai Lama, was born in 1856 near Lhasa and was recognized in 1858. In 1873, he took over the political and spiritual responsibilities of Tibet. He died at the age of 20 in 1875.

The 13th Dalai Lama, Thupten Gyatso, was born in 1876 to a peasant couple and was recognized in 1878. He assumed political power in 1895. He and some of his officials fled to India in 1909 after a Chinese invasion. In 1911, he returned to Tibet, where he exercised strong political power, attempting to modernize Tibet and to eliminate some of the more oppressive features of the Tibetan monastic system. He was responsible for establishing the Tibetan postal system, strengthening the Tibetan military, and establishing the Tibetan Medical Institute. He died in 1933.

The 14th Dalai Lama is Tenzin Gyatso. He was born in 1935 in a small village in northeastern Tibet to a peasant family and was recognized at the age of two. In 1949, China invaded Tibet, forcing the Dalai Lama to take over political control of Tibet in 1950. In 1954 he attended peace talks in Beijing with Mao Tse-tung and other Chinese leaders. However in 1959, he fled to India to escape China's brutal suppression of the Tibetan uprising in Lhasa. Dharamsala in northern India is the seat of the Tibetan government-in-exile. The Dalai Lama's appeals to the United Nations resulted in the General Assembly adopting resolutions on Tibet in 1959, 1961, and 1965.

Today, more than 120,000 Tibetans live in exile. The Dalai Lama saw one of the roles of the Tibetan government-in-exile as preserving Tibetan culture. Tibetan refugees and their children have educational and cultural opportunities that maintain their language, history, religion, and culture. The Dalai Lama has also worked for a democratic government for Tibet. He has declared that when Tibet is free, he will

surrender all political power and resume his life as an ordinary citizen. Although he is the political and spiritual leader of Tibet, he sees himself as a Buddhist monk.

The Dalai Lama is widely known as a man of peace and as a promoter of inter-religious understanding. He consistently advocates nonviolent policies and received the 1989 Nobel Peace Prize for his nonviolent struggle for the liberation of Tibet. In 1987, the Dalai Lama proposed a Five-Point Peace Plan for Tibet to make Tibet a free and safe zone for everyone. He has traveled throughout the world and has met with many heads of state, religious leaders, and even famous scientists. He has written numerous books, and has received numerous prizes and awards acknowledging his commitment to peace and unity.

—Lynn W. Zimmerman

Further Readings

- Dalai Lama. (1983). *My land my people, memoirs of the Dalai Lama of Tibet*. New York: Potala.
- Dalai Lama. (1990). *A policy of kindness*. Ithaca, NY: Snow Lion.
- Dalai Lama. (1991). *Freedom in exile: The autobiography of the Dalai Lama*. San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco.
- Dalai Lama. (1992). *Worlds in harmony: Dialogues on compassionate action*. Berkeley, CA: Parallax Press.
- Dalai Lama. (1996). *The good heart: A Buddhist perspective on the teachings of Jesus*. Somerville, MA: Wisdom.
- The Nobel Foundation. (1989). *The 14th Dalai Lama*. Retrieved May 1, 2006, from <http://nobelprize.org/peace/laureates/1989/lama-bio.html>
- The Office of His Holiness the Dalai Lama. (n.d.) *His Holiness the 14th Dalai Lama of Tibet*. Retrieved May 1, 2006, from <http://www.dalailama.com>
- The Office of Tibet. (1999). *The government of Tibet in exile. His holiness the Dalai Lama*. Retrieved May 1, 2006, from <http://www.tibet.com/DL/index.html>

DALTON, ROQUE (1935–1975)

Roque Dalton was a writer and revolutionary born in El Salvador on May 14, 1935, and murdered on May

10, 1975. He studied law and anthropology at the universities of El Salvador, Chile, and Mexico; worked in journalism; and dedicated himself to literature. He received several national and international awards. Because of his activities and militant politics, he was imprisoned several times and lived in exile in countries such as Guatemala, Mexico, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Korea, and North Vietnam.

During his life he wrote, struggled, suffered, loved, and died at the hands of his own companions, and that is why Dalton is considered such a nuisance for those who still deny that another world is possible.

Dalton's literary works were published worldwide and have been gathered in dozens of anthologies (some of them bilingual) in the United States, Europe, and Latin America. Some of them are *Mine, Together With the Birds* (1958), *The Window in the Face* (poetry, Mexico, 1961, introduced by Mauricio de la Selva), *Testimonies* (poetry, La Habana, UNEAC, 1963), *Cesar Vallejo* (essay, LA Habana, 1963), *The Other World* (1963), *Poems* (1967), *Intellectuals and Society* (conversations with writers, Mexico D.F., 1969, translated to Italian), *The Tavern and Other Poems* (1969, Casa de las Americas Award), *Little Hells* (poetry, Barcelona, 1970, introduced by Jose Goytisolo), *Is Revolution the Revolution?* (1970), and *The Forbidden Stories of Tom Thumb* (prose and poems, Mexico, 1974). In 1997, Dalton was named "Meritorious Poet of the Republic" in El Salvador.

—Adrian Oscar Scribano

See also FMLN

Further Readings

Dalton, R. (1996). *Small hours of the night*. Willimantic, CT: Curbstone Press.

García Verzi, H. (1986). *Recopilación de textos sobre Roque Dalton*. La Habana: Casa de las Américas, serie Valoración Múltiple.

antithesis of the values of modern-day capitalism, providing a vehicle for building community and understanding across social boundaries, resisting oppression by contributing to the cultural continuity of oppressed peoples, asking questions and reflecting on sociopolitical discourse through choreography, and embodying social change, simultaneously creating and reflecting social movements toward equality.

The history of dance is somewhat difficult to document, given the ephemeral nature of the form. Dance leaves traces only in pictures, in written and oral descriptions, and by being passed on from dancer to dancer through generations. It can be hypothesized that dance has existed in every culture throughout history, and has served social, religious/spiritual, and artistic functions. In many ways, dance maintains the status quo. In social dances, gender roles and rules of acceptable social behavior are defined. In court dances of all cultures, the aristocracy or monarchy is heralded and praised. Religious/spiritual dances pass on traditional modes of worship. The presentation of dance on proscenium stage, and the development of dance as an entertainment, divided spectator and performer and developed a particular elitism in the art form, connected to the development of physical virtuosity and highly selective skills that segregate dancers from the general public.

However, dance is used in many ways to challenge and change the status quo. Dancing is rooted in physical activity of the body and therefore produces physical awareness. This body consciousness is a counterpoint to the body/mind separation of Western culture. The body/mind separation subordinates kinesthetic knowledge in a hierarchy of knowledge that privileges logical reasoning and concrete evidence instead of the knowledge that is located in the body: emotions, intuition, and physical skill. Dancing subverts this hierarchy by affirming the body's knowledge and its importance, with the potential to develop a morality that is based on emotional responsiveness. Furthermore, dancing inherently resists the lexicon of capitalism. There is no product to buy or sell. Once a dance is over, it is gone. It cannot be effectively captured or purchased. The act of producing dance defies capitalism's emphasis on efficiency, using time and resources for an end result that is transitory and impermanent. Dancing creates

DANCE AND ACTIVISM

Dance contributes to social change, civic engagement, and activism in multiple ways. Dance can be the

community and cross-cultural understanding, unifying participants and offering a transformation that is viscerally experienced. From head-banging to ballroom dancing, movement produces a physical release that counteracts the weight of oppression and cultivates joy. Through dancing, people connect with each other. Additionally, learning the steps of another culture's dance contributes to cross-cultural understanding. Although movement is not a universal language—different cultures have different symbolic systems—the body is a universal instrument that every human can relate to. In this way, physicality is a uniting force, a common ground for creating community. When harnessed to form solidarity and inclusiveness, dance can be a powerful tool for ending social isolation and segregation.

Dancing contributes to cultural continuity, playing an important role in resisting colonialism, imperialism, and cultural obliteration. Only one of many examples, African slaves used dance to maintain their cultural traditions and identity, during (and after) slavery in the Americas. This continuity can be seen in contemporary settings in hip-hop and reggae dances, which carry the same emphasis on polyrhythms and body part isolations. People of the African diaspora also use dance to continue their religious traditions, which use dance and music as a means of worship. The continuation of African-based religious practices in the Western Hemisphere demonstrates the power of dance as a means of resistance to cultural obliteration.

In addition to the inherent ways dance contributes to activism, in the 20th and 21st century, choreographers have used dance as a vehicle for making political statements and asking questions about the world. There is a long tradition of anti-war choreography, beginning with Kurt Jooss's ballet *The Green Table*, *War Lyrics* by Jose Limon, *Docudance: Nine Short Dances About the Defense Budget and Other Military Matters* by Liz Lerman, *Oh Beautiful* by Deborah Hay, and *one: an anti-war dance* by Juliette Mapp. Choreographers have created work about a wide breadth of sociopolitical issues: race and racism, the HIV/AIDS epidemic, poverty, gay/lesbian/bisexual/transgender identities, and feminism and the experience of women. Because dance begins with the body,

dance often relies on an element of personal history, a unique lens on sociopolitical issues. Of many choreographers, Ralph Lemon and Maura Nguyen Donahue use personal history as a portal to reflecting on larger sociopolitical issues of race and identity, incorporating performance traditions from around the world.

Choreographers also address sociopolitical issues through working in communities. Jawole Willa Jo Zollar and her company, Urban Bush Women, are committed to using dance theater as a catalyst for social change through telling the stories of disenfranchised people, focused especially on the traditions of women in the African diaspora. To that end, Urban Bush Women also engages in community work, through programs like their Summer Institute, which connects professionals and community artists to further the use of dance for social change. Zollar also includes community members in the creation and refinement of her choreography. For *Hair Stories* of 2001, Zollar held "hair parties," gatherings at various community and homes through which Zollar invited participants to discuss hair, view sections of the performance, and build relationships between themselves and the company.

The Liz Lerman Dance Exchange is renowned for its community-based work, pursuing the expansion of the definition of dance and dance with an intergenerational group of dancers, and working on projects to involve communities in the process of making dance. Liz Lerman began working with performers of diverse backgrounds in 1975 in her piece *Woman of the Clear Vision*, which included professional dancers and adults from a senior center. Since then, Liz Lerman has been celebrated for developing innovative ways to make community-based art.

In addition to community-based work, choreographers have developed ways to involve the audience in their performances, challenging the passive role of the spectator. Based on the recognition of the audience as integral in creating meaning through their individual interpretations of choreography, interactive dance performance emphasizes the agency and power of the audience member. In *Pulling the Wool: An American Landscape of Truth and Deception* from 2004, Jill Sigman transformed a two-story gymnasium into a multimedia performance carnival for audience members to

navigate, making choices about how they interacted and reacted to the performance. Sigman views this ability to shape their experience as an expression of civic agency. Instead of expressing a single political statement, the performance revealed ambiguity and was open for multiple interpretations. In this way, questioning is activism as it cultivates an engagement with the world.

Similarly, site-specific choreography offers the potential to involve the audience by offering the passerby an unexpected experience. If placed in a prominent and public space, the performance disrupts the flow of everyday life and shifts the viewer's consciousness, developing an interface between performer and the public. In *Salvage/Salvation* from 2001, Clarinda Mac Low created environments on a site, using only the discarded materials found there. The piece always generated conversation with pedestrians who asked about what they are doing. Through dialogue and shifted awareness, choreography has the potential to transform the individual.

Developments in dance—such as the birth of modern dance, contact improvisation, and dance accessibility—embody, create, and reflect social change. The beginning of modern dance in the early 20th century demonstrated (and somewhat preceded) changing social values. Discarding the formality of ballet and the perceived superficiality of vaudeville, modern dance reveled in more natural, organic movement that cherished individual expression, dance for dance's sake, and the human condition. In the 1960s the growth of contact improvisation reflected changing roles between genders, eradicating the status quo in dance where only men lift and support women, and creating instead fluid partnerships between all genders, where everyone could play a physically supporting role. Contact improvisation was part of dance investigations happening at Judson Church in Greenwich Village, where many choreographers were questioning what dance is, stripping dance down to movement essentials and rejecting ideals of virtuosity and special technique. These developments can be seen as a demonstration of the social changes happening in America during the civil rights and anti-war movements, where many social norms were questioned and equality demanded. Similarly, the dance accessibility movement in England

reflects the growth of the disability rights movement. Several professional dance companies in England are dedicated to the inclusion of differently abled dancers and challenge ideas of who can be a dancer.

When used intentionally, dance is a powerful tool for asking questions about the world, connecting people, reflecting and discussing political viewpoints, and awakening personal change. Dance is literally the movement of social movements, the embodiment of change and transformation.

—Jesse Phillips-Fein

See also Guerrilla Girls; Hip-Hop; Performativity; Play, Creativity, and Social Movements; Postmodernism; Radical Cheerleaders

Further Readings

- Albright, A. (1997). *Choreographing difference: The body and identity in contemporary dance*. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press.
- Albright, A. (2001). *Moving history/dancing cultures: A dance history reader*. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press.
- Auslander, P. (1992). *Presence and resistance*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Banes, S. (1983). *Democracy's body: Judson dance theater, 1962–1964*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Daly, A. (2002). *Critical gestures: Writings on dance & culture*. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press.
- Daniel, Y. (2005). *Dancing wisdom: Embodied knowledge in Haitian vodou, Cuban yoruba, and Bahian condemlé*. Chicago: University of Illinois.
- Foster, S. (1995). *Corporealities: Dancing, knowledge, and power*. Oxford, UK: Routledge.
- Graff, E. (1997). *Stepping left: Dance and politics in New York City, 1928–1942*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Martin, R. (1998). *Critical moves*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

DARROW, CLARENCE (1857–1938)

Clarence Darrow has been called the Attorney for the Damned. In his long legal career as a courtroom

lawyer, he defended African Americans, murderers, communists, anarchists, labor radicals, socialists, and iconoclastic classroom teachers. Darrow was a long-time opponent of the death penalty, and his celebrated cross-examination of William Jennings Bryan in the infamous Tennessee “monkey trial” of biology teacher John T. Scopes set back the anti-evolution forces for many decades in the public schools.

Darrow was born in Kinsman, Ohio, the fifth child of Amirus and Emily Eddy Darrow. His father had been prepared in theology, but somewhere in his education he lost his faith and never preached. Growing up, Darrow recognized that his father was considered the village infidel, a sobriquet he accepted rather proudly.

Darrow never liked school and even through law school he devalued formal education, believing it produced narrow minds and not true learning. He was particularly critical of the morality embedded in the school books of the day. The young Darrow deeply resented the forced attendance at Sunday school, which later became the source of a lifelong irreverence for organized religion.

Although Clarence briefly attended Allegheny College, he did not graduate. He became a school teacher in a nearby town. As a teacher he abolished corporal punishment in the school and expanded the lunch break. He also had time to study law. Later he attended the University of Michigan’s law school but again did not graduate. He apprenticed to an attorney and passed the Ohio bar at age 21. A short time later he began the practice of law, first in Andover and later in Ashtabula. He learned that he could not be a dispassionate advocate. He had to believe in his client and in the cause. He moved to Chicago in 1887. Almost immediately he became involved with John P. Altgeld, the leading Democratic radical of his time, who later became governor of Illinois. During this period, Altgeld gave Darrow many lessons on power politics.

From his Chicago law office, Clarence Darrow was at the heart of many celebrated cases in the turbulence of the early 19th century. He became the attorney for the United Mine Workers. In 1906 he went to Idaho to defend Big Bill Haywood, secretary-treasurer of the Western Federation of Miners, who was accused of murdering ex-Governor Frank Steunenberg. Darrow

gave a long and impassioned plea to the jury. Bill Haywood was acquitted.

Darrow went to Los Angeles, where he defended three union men accused of being involved in the bombing of the *Los Angeles Times*. What Darrow faced in California was bleak. One of the men arrested with the bombers had turned state’s evidence and confessed to the plot. It was soon revealed that his clients were actually guilty. Darrow did not want a trial and he did not want certain documents made public implicating the union. He tried for a negotiated sentence. The bombers changed their plea to guilty. The unions backing them were aghast, and Darrow’s days as a union attorney ended. A short while later, he had to defend himself against charges that he had tried to bribe prospective jurors. While Darrow pled innocence and spent 8 months defending himself, a careful review of his case by Geoffrey Cowan, a public interest lawyer and a faculty member at UCLA, concluded that he indeed had tried to bribe two jurors in this case. However, after a long and tearful plea by Darrow at his trial, he obtained a not guilty verdict. Darrow then restarted his legal career with a public pledge to continue to help the poor. With few exceptions he stuck to his word.

Darrow today is known as the lawyer who defended John T. Scopes in the famous Tennessee evolution trial encapsulated in the Broadway play and film *Inherit the Wind*. His defense of Loeb and Leopold, who tried to commit the perfect murder, the plot of the novel and film *Compulsion*, was another legal epoch. His defense of an African American family who defended themselves against a white mob in Detroit with an all-white jury in 1926 resulted in a verdict of not guilty.

Clarence Darrow was neither the perfect man nor the perfect lawyer. But few in his profession have left a record of serving the cause of social justice for the poor or the oppressed as well as he did, then or now.

—Fenwick W. English

See also Activism, Social and Political; Anarchism; Communism; Debs, Eugene V.; Dissent; Gompers, Samuel; Marshall, Thurgood; Southern Poverty Law Center; Violence, Theories of

Further Readings

- Cowan, G. (1993). *The people v. Clarence Darrow*. New York: Random House.
- Tierney, K. (1979). *Darrow: A biography*. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell.
- Weinberg, A. (Ed.). (1989). *Attorney for the damned: Clarence Darrow in the courtroom*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. (Original work published 1957)

DARWIN, CHARLES (1809–1882)

Charles Darwin was the British naturalist who first formulated the theory of biological evolution by natural selection, widely regarded as the most significant scientific achievement of the 19th century. Darwin's paternal grandfather was the 18th-century physician and freethinker Erasmus Darwin, who wrote a speculative work on biological evolution, titled *Zoönomia*, in the 1790s. His maternal grandfather was Josiah Wedgwood, founder of the famous pottery. Darwin grew up in Shropshire and later attended Edinburgh University to study medicine, but soon discovered he did not have the stomach for it. Transferring to Christ's College, Cambridge, he came under the influence of John Stevens Henslow, professor of botany. In 1831, Henslow arranged for Darwin to join a surveying voyage on HMS Beagle as personal companion to the ship's captain, Robert FitzRoy. The voyage lasted nearly 5 years and was the turning point in Darwin's life. The Beagle took him to South America, the Galapagos Islands, Tahiti, New Zealand, Australia, and southern Africa, before returning to England in 1836.

During his long trip, Darwin made detailed geological, botanical, and zoological observations and accumulated a large collection of specimens. Back in England, he gained respect for his work as a geologist, including a novel theory of the origin of coral reefs, but by this time Darwin had also privately rejected orthodox accounts of the origin of biological species, which viewed them as having been created in pretty much their present forms. His observations of the similarities between living and fossil mammals, and

between the distinct species of plants and animals on the Galapagos Islands and their counterparts on the South American mainland, persuaded him that biological evolution had taken place, even though he was not yet sure how. Within a few years, Darwin had elaborated his entire theory of evolution, the crucial idea being that evolution is the result of natural selection, whereby organisms that are better adapted to their environments are more likely to survive and reproduce, thus passing on their advantageous traits to the next generation.

Although Darwin formulated his theory as early as 1837, it was to be more than 20 years before he finally made it public. The main reason for this delay was his nervousness about challenging the dogmas of orthodox religion, regarded by the upper classes as a bulwark of the status quo during a period of social unrest in early Victorian Britain. In 1839, the independently wealthy Darwin married his cousin, Emma Wedgwood, who unlike him was devoutly religious, adding a personal dimension to this conflict. Darwin and his wife moved to Down House in Kent, and from this period onwards, Darwin was in poor health, which some have speculated was exacerbated by his intellectual anxieties.

Darwin did not go public until 1858, after learning that the young Welsh naturalist Alfred Russel Wallace had reached similar conclusions. The following year, Darwin published his masterpiece, *The Origin of Species*, which makes a methodical case for evolution. Darwin argues that natural selection is a real process, analogous to the way in which plant and animal breeders can dramatically alter the characteristics of a group of organisms over a series of generations by permitting only individuals with desired traits to reproduce. In the natural world, a population of organisms can become better and better adapted to its environment over time, and the characteristics of its members at the end of the process may be very different from those of their ancestors. Darwin goes on to argue that natural selection is capable of giving rise not simply to new varieties but to new species, and that it can in principle account for all the characteristics of existing organisms, even organs of extreme perfection like the human eye.

Finally, Darwin presents an enormous quantity of evidence that natural selection is not only a possible explanation of the origin of species, but that it is the only reasonable one. The data range from the pattern of development revealed in the fossil record, to facts about the geographical distribution of organisms, to structural and developmental similarities between otherwise very different living things. Darwin demonstrates that his view can provide satisfying explanations of such matters, while from the point of view of those who believe in divine creation, they remain conundrums.

Even though Darwin avoided the issue of human evolution in the *Origin* (a subject he was later to discuss at length in *The Descent of Man* of 1871), its publication inevitably sparked intense controversy. Darwin's theory banishes preordained purposes from nature and implies that mental phenomena emerge when matter is arranged in complex ways. One early reviewer condemned Darwin's views for their unflinching materialism, and figures such as Samuel Wilberforce, the Bishop of Oxford, attacked evolution from a religious perspective. But Darwin, who did not engage in the public debate, was ably defended by his scientific supporters, including Joseph Hooker and Thomas Huxley. Within less than a decade, the bulk of the scientific establishment had been won over to evolution, although it took longer for natural selection to be accepted as the central mechanism.

Although Darwin's ideas were initially viewed as a challenge to the existing social order, attempts were soon made to use them in its support. The political theorist Herbert Spencer formulated the doctrine of Social Darwinism, defending laissez-faire economics on the grounds that it represented the principle of the "survival of the fittest" applied to human society. Darwin's cousin, Francis Galton, founded the eugenics movement, which viewed social inequalities as having a biological basis and advocated intervention to "improve" the human stock. Eugenics went out of fashion following its use by the Nazis in the 1930s and 1940s, but new attempts to use Darwinian ideas to explain social inequality have emerged in recent decades, including sociobiology and evolutionary psychology. In turn, these developments have been

criticized as ideological misapplications of Darwinism by biologists such as Stephen Jay Gould.

—Philip Gasper

See also Eugenics Movement

Further Readings

- Desmond, A., & Moore, J. (1994). *Darwin: The life of a tormented evolutionist*. New York: W. W. Norton.
- Hodge, J., & Radick, G. (Eds.). (2003). *The Cambridge companion to Darwin*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Ridley, M. (Ed.). (1996). *The Darwin reader* (2nd ed.). New York: W. W. Norton.

DAVIS, ANGELA (1944–)

Angela Yvonne Davis represents both the typical and the paradoxical in the most-celebrated black American experience. Typical is the convergence in her of the brilliant intellectual—she is a philosopher, a theoretician of black liberation, a feminist theorist, and a writer—and the indefatigable activist. Paradoxical is her having once been among FBI's 10 most wanted criminals, and having later been recognized by the establishment as a historical force with whom to be reckoned.

Davis was born on January 26, 1944, in Birmingham, Alabama. She was inspired from an early age by the alert consciousness of members of her family. Her mother, Sallye Davis, as a college student, participated in the campaign for the freedom of the Scottsboro Boys and was an activist of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), despite the ban on that organization in Birmingham.

Davis went to Carrie A. Tuggle Elementary School in her hometown, which had the distinction of offering classes in African American culture. She later attended Elisabeth Irwin High School in New York, where she was enrolled in a program for promising southern black students, sponsored by the American

Friends Service Committee. It was there that she came across the *Communist Manifesto*, which, in her own words, had a most powerful impact on her. The origin of her commitment to concrete, practical contribution to the struggle for social change can also be traced to this time. Her earliest activities revolved around Advance, a youth organization associated with the Communist Party.

Immediately upon completion of her high school studies, Davis was offered a scholarship by Brandeis University. She was one of only three black first-year students. Two of her greatest experiences at Brandeis were hearing James Baldwin and Malcolm X on campus. A number of other events accounted for the growth of her international vision. She was a delegate to the Eighth World Festival for Youth and Students in Helsinki, Finland. She was also sent for her junior academic year to the Sorbonne, in France, which was in the grips of youthful revolutionary fervor.

In 1962 Davis met the renowned philosopher Herbert Marcuse, who became her tutor. After graduating from Brandeis, Davis proceeded for graduate work in philosophy to the University of Frankfurt, in Germany. Another famous philosopher, Theodor Adorno, agreed to supervise her Ph.D. dissertation, which was to be in the area of critical theory.

At Frankfurt, Davis was receiving news of the escalation of the black liberation movement. She was shocked by the Birmingham bombing of 1963. Then, in 1965, Malcolm X was assassinated, and unprecedented riots broke out in Selma, Alabama, and in Watts, Los Angeles. Davis realized that she could not continue with her academic work unless she was also politically involved.

She returned to the United States to continue her postgraduate research under the supervision of Marcuse at the University of California at San Diego (UCSD). There, she successfully campaigned for the introduction of programs in ethnic studies, and black studies in particular. Her argument was that the philosophical viewpoint contained in the literature of black experience was superior to that propounded by privileged white philosophers, and it had a transformative power.

While at UCSD, she also ran a so-called liberation academy for a poor black community at Los Angeles.



Angela Yvonne Davis (1944-)

Source: Photo by Nick Wiebe.

Together with Huey Newton, Bobby Seale, and others, in 1966 she set up the Oakland-based Black Panther Party, and was involved in the national Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee. Most significantly, she became a member of the Communist Party of America, a decision that was to have grave consequences for her life.

Having passed her preliminary doctoral examinations, and without adequate financial means to continue with her dissertation, Davis applied for and was granted a teaching position at the University of California at Los Angeles (UCLA). She was assigned a course in Recurring Philosophical Themes in Black Literature. Her two initial lectures on the life and times of Frederick Douglass offer an analysis of freedom and the role of education in reaching a level of consciousness that requires that the recognition of one's freedom by others be seen as an absolute condition for life. Illustrious examples of scholarship, they were published in 1971 under the title *Lectures of Liberation*.

Davis's first term at UCLA had just started, when the governor of California, Ronald Reagan, and the University of California Board of Regents decided to fire her because of her membership in the Communist Party. Several years of legal battle followed. Eventually, the court fight against the state law prohibiting state universities from hiring communists ended successfully for her, and her contract at UCLA was renewed.

In 1970, Davis was charged in court with conspiracy, kidnapping, and murder, and if convicted, she was to face the death penalty under California law. This was in connection with an attempt by a young black man to rescue three black convicts, who were falsely accused of killing a Soledad Prison guard. Evidence of Davis's proclaimed complicity in the operation was sought due to the fact that one of the guns the youth carried was registered in her name, and also because of her active involvement in the campaign for the release of the three victims, who had become commonly known as the Soledad Brothers. She had persistently argued that they were political prisoners and not criminals, as viewed by the state. (Years later the murder charges against them were dropped.) Her long-standing commitment to prisoners' rights has its origin in that experience.

Frightened by the horrendous frame-up, Davis went underground, earning her a place on the FBI's ten most wanted list, and she was hunted nationwide. She was soon apprehended and incarcerated. Almost immediately after her arrest, a worldwide "Free Angela Davis" movement sprang to life. In July 1972, after 21 months in jail, denied bail, maltreated, Davis was acquitted by a jury of all three charges. By this time she had become an international symbol of the black liberation movement.

In prison, Davis devoted much of her time to the education of incarcerated women and the development of a spirit of solidarity among them. Today she remains a staunch advocate of prison abolition; she has also offered a sustained criticism of racism in the criminal justice system.

She was still in custody when the collection of essays, *If They Come in the Morning: Voices of Resistance* of 1971, which she edited, was published. Soon after, she embarked on her second book, *Angela Davis: An Autobiography* (1974). Besides being what she calls a political account of the people, events, and forces that formed her involvement in the struggle of black Americans, the book is also a philosophical discussion of such issues as race, class, gender, revolution, social transformation, commitment, organizational work, and political prisoners.

Since 1972, Davis has always had a large national, as well as international, platform to address through

public speaking, articles in magazines and journals, and books. She has lectured throughout the United States, as well as in Africa, Europe, and the Caribbean. She has continued to actively participate in many political struggles for freedom and justice.

Central to her career has been her work in education. She has taught at various departments at a number of California universities, her lengthiest association having been with San Francisco State University (1978–1991) and the San Francisco Art Institute (1977–1989). In 1990 and 1991 she was an instructor in the Education Program of the San Francisco County Jail. In 1994, she was granted the prestigious appointment to the University of California Presidential Chair in African American and Feminist Studies. Since 1995, she has been a professor in the History of Consciousness Department at the University of California at Santa Cruz, teaching critical theory. Through her writing, especially her books, *Women, Race, and Class* (1981); *Women, Culture, and Politics* (1989); and her most recent works, Davis has played a significant role in the reformation of Marxism and the development of critical theory, black liberation theory, and feminist theory.

—Emilia Ilieva

See also Activism, Social and Political; Advocacy; Anti-Prison Movement; Anti-Racist Teaching; Baldwin, James; Black Panther Party; Black Power; Civil Rights Movement; Communism; *Communist Manifesto*; Communist Party USA; Douglass, Frederick; Feminism; Literature and Activism; Malcolm X; Marcuse, Herbert; Marxist Theory; Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC); Youth Organizing and Activism

Further Readings

- Davis, A. (1971). *Lectures on liberation*. New York: New York Committee.
- Davis, A. (1974). *Angela Davis: An autobiography*. New York: Random House.
- Davis, A. (1981). *Women, race, and class*. New York: Random House.
- Davis, A. (1989). *Women, culture, and politics*. New York: Random House.
- Davis, A. (1996, Summer). Black women and the academy. *Callaloo*, 17(2), 422–431.

- Davis, A. (1998). *Blues legacies and black feminism: Gertrude 'Ma' Rainey, Bessie Smith, and Billie Holiday*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Davis, A. (2003). *Are prisons obsolete?* New York: Seven Stories Press.
- Davis, A., & Aptheker, B. (Eds.). (1971). *If they came in the morning: Voices of resistance*. New York: Third Press.
- Perkins, M. (2000). *Autobiography as activism: Three black women of the sixties*. Jackson: University Press of Mississippi.

DAVIS, OSSIE (1917–2005)

Ossie Davis was one of the most renowned African American personalities in modern American culture, as well as a passionate advocate for social justice. As an actor, playwright, producer, and director, he not only enriched American life through the excellence of his theatrical and cinematic achievements, but also helped transform it along the lines of multicultural humanism.

Davis studied playwriting at Howard University in Washington and then moved to New York to pursue acting under Lloyd Richards. He forged friendships with Father Divine, W. E. B. Du Bois, A. Philip Randolph, Langston Hughes, and Richard Wright. Davis joined the Rose McClendon Players and first appeared in *Joy Exceeding Glory* in Harlem in 1941.

Back from military service after World War II, he made his debut on Broadway in *Jeb*, where he played the title role of a returning soldier who faces racist attacks. He became distinguished for roles dealing with racial injustice and imbued with dignity.

In 1959, he starred on Broadway in *A Raisin in the Sun* by Lorraine Hansberry. It was named best American play of that year by the New York Drama Critics Circle. In such other notable stage performances as *No Time for Sergeants*, *The Wisteria Trees*, *Green Pastures*, *Jamaica*, *Ballad for Bimshire*, *The Zulu and the Zayda*, and *I'm Not Rappaport*, he brilliantly articulated the pride, the hope, and the suffering of being black in America.

Davis's first movie role was in *No Way Out* in 1950, Joseph L. Mankiewicz's lauded story of racial

hatred, starring Sidney Poitier. His television debut was in 1955 in *The Emperor Jones*. He wrote and directed *Cotton Comes to Harlem* in 1970, one of the first "blaxploitation" films (a genre that refashioned black characterization), and many other films. His breakthrough as a playwright came in 1961 with *Purlie Victorious*, a satire on racial stereotypes. *For Us the Living: The Story of Medgar Evers* is among his best-known television films.

Davis was married to fellow actress Ruby Dee. They became a revered couple of the American stage, two of the most prolific and courageous artists in American culture, and two of the most prominent black role models in Hollywood. Throughout their careers, Davis and Dee worked toward overcoming racial exclusion in the entertainment world and helped open new opportunities for African American actors.

In the 1950s, the couple was nearly blacklisted for protesting the communist witch-hunting of McCarthyism. They raised legal fees for black victims of racial injustices and spoke out on such issues as voting rights and police brutality. The two were among the key organizers of the 1963 March on Washington. Two years later, Davis delivered a memorable eulogy for his assassinated friend, Malcolm X. Davis supported progressive causes until his death.

—*Emilia Ilieva and Lennox Odiemo-Munara*

See also Activism, Social and Political; Advocacy; Civil Rights Movement; Du Bois, W. E. B.; Evers, Medgar; Film; Hansberry, Lorraine; Hollywood Blacklists; Hughes, Langston; Malcolm X; Multiculturalism

Further Readings

- Cutler, J. K. (1999). *Struggles for representation: African American documentary film and video*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Davis, O., & Dee, R. (1998). *With Ossie and Ruby: In this life together*. New York: Morrow.
- Donalson, M. (2003). *Black directors in Hollywood*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Hill, E. G., & Hatch, J. V. (2003). *A history of African American theatre*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Rhines, J. A. (1996). *Black film/white money*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

DAY, DOROTHY (1897–1980)

Dorothy Day is best known as the cofounder of the Catholic Worker movement. In 1932, Day and Peter Maurin established a radical, pacifist organization rooted in the Catholic tradition that provides direct services to the poor and promotes social justice through nonviolent protest and activism. By her own recognition, her life was divided in two parts. Her early years were marked by her devotion to radical causes, as well as a bohemian lifestyle that included love affairs, an abortion, a common-law marriage, and the birth of a child out of wedlock. This phase ended with her conversion in 1927 to Roman Catholicism, an act that was the culmination of nearly a decade of spiritual searching, shortly after the birth of her daughter. Her extraordinary gifts began to reach their full fruition 5 years later when with Maurin she married her deep commitment to Catholicism and her radical beliefs by establishing the Catholic Worker movement. A journalist throughout her life, she is well regarded for her substantial body of writing (much of it first printed in her daily column in the movement's newspaper, the *Catholic Worker*). At the time of her death in 1980, she was widely heralded both for her activism in service of the poor and for her singular contribution to American Catholicism in the 20th century.

Dorothy Day was born in Brooklyn, New York, on November 8, 1897, the third of five children. Early in Day's life, her family moved briefly to San Francisco, but after the earthquake in 1906 they settled permanently in the Chicago area. Although she was baptized as an Episcopalian, Day later actively rejected religion. She attended the University of Illinois for 2 years, but dropped out prior to graduation in order to move to New York City in 1916 to become a writer for a variety of socialist publications. She joined the Industrial Workers of the World (IWW), participated in numerous protests, and was jailed while demonstrating in favor of women's suffrage. Her friends and companions included activists, artists, writers, and journalists who supported radical and socialist causes, including Jack Reed, Malcolm Cowley, and Eugene

O'Neill. Even during this period of agnosticism, however, she would often follow a night of drinking in a Greenwich Village saloon with friends like O'Neill with silent participation in mass at St. Joseph's Parish across the street, as she reports in her autobiography *The Long Loneliness*.

In 1918, she worked briefly as a nurse's aide in Kings County Hospital. While there, she met an orderly with whom she had a brief affair, resulting in a pregnancy, which she terminated. She drifted after this, traveling and working as a journalist. In Chicago, Day worked on a communist newspaper, and while staying in an IWW flophouse she was mistakenly arrested as a prostitute in a raid. She documented this experience, as well as other prison stays, in her writing, which to this day remains a vivid account of the indignities experienced daily by the poor in the criminal justice system.

Although she did not mention her union in her own accounts of her life, recent biographies of Day establish that this period was followed by a very brief failed marriage when she returned to New York. It hardly lasted as long as her honeymoon trip to Europe. The great love of Day's life was Forster Battenham, an anarchist and biologist whom she would later call her common-law husband. In 1924 she published a novel, *The Eleventh Virgin*, which was largely based on her own life, including her abortion. With the proceeds of this unremarkable book she was able to buy a small cottage on Staten Island near the ocean, in a colony known as the Spanish Camp. Here she lived a bohemian existence with Battenham, Cowley, Caroline Gordon, and others.

The seeds of Day's conversion to Catholicism took root in her domestic life with Battenham when she discovered that she was once again pregnant. Deeply happy, she determined to have her child baptized a Catholic. She named their daughter Tamar Teresa, the former name a Hebrew word meaning "tree," the latter in honor of a great saint and doctor of the Roman Catholic Church. Her own baptism followed shortly after, an act that Day knew would result in the dissolution of her relationship with Battenham, who as an anarchist and an atheist would neither marry her nor accept her new devotion. Day herself gives the best reports of this spiritual journey in two books. The first,

From Union Square to Rome, was an account of her conversion (from the perspective of a former communist, as Paul Elie has noted) published in 1938. The second is a more candid and spiritual account, her autobiography *The Long Loneliness*, published in 1952.

After her split with Tamar's father, Day and her daughter survived on a variety of freelance writing jobs that took her to Hollywood, Mexico, and other places, finally returning to New York. In her autobiography, Day describes how in 1932 she found herself in Washington observing a communist march in support of the poor. Day credits her disenchantment with the anti-religious stance of communism, her subsequent visit to the National Shrine of the Immaculate Conception in prayerful search for new, Catholic-inspired work for the poor, and the near miraculous appearance of Peter Maurin when she returned to New York with the formation of her life's work, the *Catholic Worker*. From that point on Maurin was a seminal influence on her thinking.

Maurin was a French Catholic peasant who believed that Catholic thought needed to be married to the radical commitment to the poor embodied by some social movements of the time. An itinerant preacher and philosopher, he proclaimed his truths on soapboxes in Union Square and by all accounts was a compelling if eccentric figure. He and Day conceived a movement that eventually would be founded on three pillars: publication of a daily newspaper, the *Catholic Worker*, sold on street corners for a penny; the creation of houses of hospitality to provide respite and food for the poor and indigent; and the creation of communal, self-sufficient farms to support this work.

From these beginnings, the Catholic Worker movement evolved under their tutelage to encompass steadfast advocacy of radical social justice. For Day, this meant undertaking a voluntary life of poverty with the movement as the center of her life. The movement stood for pacifism, even in the midst of World War II, for equality for all races, and most importantly as a voice for the poor and dispossessed of society. As she had indicated earlier in her life, Day looked to the saints not merely to help slaves, but also to end slavery.

To comprehend fully the essence of Dorothy Day, one must take account of her Catholic faith and her

lifelong commitment to what Paul Elie has termed the *traditional piety* of devotions such as the rosary, the office, and the daily celebration of mass. Prior to her conversion, Day wrote in her autobiography that she did not know what she believed, though she had tried to serve a cause. With her baptism she embraced the simple and radical Christianity she found expressed in the work of another great convert, St. Augustine, in his *Imitation of Christ*. The connection of the Catholic Worker movement to her Catholic faith did not belie her dissatisfaction with the imperfections she saw in the institutional Church. But she remained committed to the sacraments of the Church until her death, despite her permanent dissatisfaction. Only through the Church could one receive the sacraments.

Throughout most of the 20th century, Day's work realized in a particular way the aspirations and dilemmas of Catholics in an American Church seeking to remain faithful to the teachings of the Beatitudes. In her later life, Day welcomed and explored the *aggiornamento* in the Church brought forth by the Second Vatican Council at the urging of Pope John XXIII. In the 1960s and 1970s, the Catholic Worker welcomed many who worked within the Church to promote radical change and to protest the Vietnam War, most notably the Catholic priests Philip and Daniel Berrigan. As her fame grew and she became the symbol for generations of young people who came to participate in the Catholic Worker in search of social justice, she was known to admonish admirers by saying that she did not want to be called a saint, because she did not want to be dismissed that easily. Despite her protests, others took up her cause for sainthood upon her death and a case for canonization is proceeding. One miracle attributed to her intercession (according to a *Washington Post* report) has been described by author and psychiatrist Robert Coles, an early devotee whose wife's cancer was cured after an encounter with Day.

Another contribution of Day's that continues to grow in significance is her role as a writer on spiritual as well as secular matters. The author of seven books, including two autobiographies and an account of the Catholic Worker movement, *Loaves and Fishes*, she was a frequent contributor to a variety of Catholic publications, including *Commonweal*, and a faithful

correspondent to other writers and public figures of her day.

Although *The Long Loneliness* never received the wide popular acclaim of *The Seven Storey Mountain*, her friend Thomas Merton's account of conversion, it remains an influential story of a 20th-century unbeliever's encounter with the deep spiritual truths of contemporary Catholicism. Day and Merton were frequent correspondents, and she remained friends with him until his untimely death in 1968.

Perhaps Day's most significant journalistic contribution is her column "On Pilgrimage," printed daily in the *Catholic Worker* for more than 30 years. In collected short pieces from this source and others published after her death, she emerges as an eloquent as well as passionate advocate for social justice, as an acute observer of her times, and as a transcendent voice for the spiritual life enacted day to day. Like her favorite authors Dickens and Dostoevsky, her writing made the daily plight of the poor a vivid reality for her readers. Contemporary assessments of her writing by critics take her contribution to American Catholic writing of the 20th century quite seriously, and Paul Elie has suggested that together with authors Flannery O'Connor, Walker Percy, and Thomas Merton she is part of a literary School of the Holy Ghost.

Dorothy Day died on November 29, 1980. Her funeral was attended by poor people served in Catholic Worker houses, as well as by the cardinal archbishop of New York. Buried in a simple wooden coffin in Staten Island, she is survived by her daughter Tamar Hennessey, several grandchildren, and the continuing legacy of the *Catholic Worker*.

—Mary Erina Driscoll

See also Berrigan Brothers; Catholic Worker Movement; Merton, Thomas; Religious Activism

Further Readings

- Day, D. (1963). *Loaves and fishes*. San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco.
- Day, D. (1978). *From Union Square to Rome*. New York: Arno Press. (Original work published 1938)
- Day, D. (1997). *The long loneliness*. San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco. (Original work published 1952)

- Elie, P. (2003). *The life you save may be your own: An American pilgrimage*. New York: Farrar, Straus & Giroux.
- Ellsberg, R. (Ed.). (1992). *Dorothy Day: Selected writings*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books.
- Ellsberg, R. (2000). *All saints: Daily reflections on saints, prophets, and witnesses for our time*. New York: Crossroads Press.
- Martin, J. (2006). Living in her world: Dorothy Day. *My life with the saints* (pp. 209–228). Chicago: Loyola Press.
- Rosin, H. (2000, March 17). Vatican to weigh sainthood for reformer Dorothy Day. *Washington Post*, p. A03.

DEATH PENALTY

See ANTI-DEATH PENALTY MOVEMENT

DE BEAUVOIR, SIMONE (1908–1986)

Simone de Beauvoir was a French existential philosopher, novelist, feminist, and internationally recognized public intellectual. Her ideas on human freedom, ethics, politics, society, and gender relations influenced European and American women's movements of the 1970s and prefigured contemporary disciplines of cultural studies, discourse studies, and women's studies. De Beauvoir wrote incessantly, narrating her life through personal correspondence with family, friends, and lovers, especially with Jean-Paul Sartre, her lifelong partner. Their relationship, self-defined as essential rather than contingent, helped, but did not determine, de Beauvoir's notoriety. She self-consciously and unapologetically wrote into existence the conditions for fame and posterity, compiling more than 40 years of fiction, philosophy, commentary, travel logs, and memoir. Intellectually and politically active to the very end, de Beauvoir renounced the existence of God, never married, loved and slept with numerous men and women, flaunted her high intelligence, and lived a life that often reflected her existentialism: Human beings are communal, responsible for their own actions, and free to conform or challenge social limits.

Born in Paris, de Beauvoir was raised by her mother, a devout bourgeoisie Catholic, and her father, a politically conservative atheist. Her parents' encouragement in her childhood to read and write waned later on as they judged her life actions. De Beauvoir had two early companions, her younger sister, Helene, nicknamed Poupette, and her friend, Elizabeth Mabille, nicknamed Zaza. Poupette often acted as de Beauvoir's first student, and Zaza's early death in 1929 influenced de Beauvoir's existentialism. Her formal education began at an all-girls private Catholic school. She earned a baccalaureate in mathematics and philosophy, and later studied mathematics at the *Institut Catholique* and literature and languages at the *Institut Sainte-Marie*. Her studies continued at Sorbonne, where she prepared for her *agrégation* in philosophy. During this time de Beauvoir met a group of students from the elite school, *École Normale Supérieure*. Jean-Paul Sartre was one of those students. At age 21, de Beauvoir was the youngest student ever to pass her *agrégation*. Her exam scores ranked second only to Sartre, and it was his second attempt. She went on to teach at different secondary schools until a scandal broke out in 1943—she had taken up romantic relations with one of her female students. After an investigation, the school dismissed her and, by choice, she never taught again. De Beauvoir's first novel, *She Came to Stay*, was published also in 1943, beginning her lifelong authorial career. She went on to write numerous novels, often using autobiographical material, especially romantic liaisons, as a source for fiction.

During the early 1940s Nazi occupation of France, de Beauvoir took up politics. She, Sartre, and others founded the left-wing politically independent journal, *Les Temps Modernes* in 1945. Her novel, *The Blood of Others*, published the same year, investigates personal and social responsibilities, and *All Men Are Mortal* (1946) explores the search for immortality as a denial of the present. Her most famous novel, *The Mandarins* (1954), explores the political responsibilities of the intellectual and won the prestigious French literary award, the *Prix Goncourt*. In 1947, de Beauvoir was invited onto the American college lecture circuit. *America Day by Day* from 1948

chronicles her reflections on America. She would write another travel book, *The Long March* in 1957, about communist China. De Beauvoir's appreciation for America did not blind her to American imperialism, and while she often and perhaps naively defended Russian-style communism, she never joined a communist affiliation. De Beauvoir denounced the U.S. bombing of North Vietnam, supported the May 1968 student rebellions, presided over the League of Women's Rights, and symbolized Second Wave Feminism.

The Second Sex (1949), her most famous work, explores Western society's construction of womanhood. The text calls into question the long-standing assumption that the male counterpart—man—is the measure of all things. This social construction, promulgated by science, literature, psychoanalysis, philosophy, and others, becomes an unquestioned myth, relegating women to second-class humans. De Beauvoir argues that institutions, ideas, and everyday people, especially men, have created asymmetrical gender relations. However, women too have created, and to a degree desire, this situation. Rather than blaming the victim, de Beauvoir points to the inauthentic desire to be taken over by another. While de Beauvoir calls for serious institutional change, she also calls for women to assume an authentic attitude by embracing their freedom to choose and act on their own accord. These ideas, which many people considered heresy, encountered both controversy and acclaim.

De Beauvoir's lifelong intellectual reflections concerned human freedom and our ethical responsibilities to ourselves, each other, and oppressed people. *Pyrrhus et Cineas* (1944) and *Ethics of Ambiguity* (1947) argue that human beings inherently influence and are influenced by others, forever implicating us in the great sociohuman drama. Ignoring and/or denying this influential process prevents our actions from circulating beyond themselves. Such inauthenticity is overcome by consciously choosing life-projects that seek to expand our personal experience and have an impact on the wider world. In her later years, de Beauvoir investigated her obsession with aging. *The Coming of Age* in 1970 critiques social perceptions of the elderly

and argues that old age must continue to be a time of productive and committed work. This book followed *The Woman Destroyed* (1968), three novellas that explore the older, no longer sexually desirable woman. Her writings reflected not only her wants and curiosities but also her fears.

Much of what we know about de Beauvoir comes from her own admissions. *Memories of a Dutiful Daughter* (1958), *The Prime of Life* (1960), *Force of Circumstance* (1963), and *All Said and Done* (1972) comprise a four-volume autobiography. *Adieux: A Farewell to Sartre* (1981) chronicles the final years of her relationship with Sartre. And her personal correspondence, published posthumously, enumerates her life as an independent, free woman. Simone de Beauvoir died on April 14, 1986, of pulmonary edema.

—Jason Del Gandio

See also Camus, Albert; Nietzsche, Friedrich; Sartre, Jean-Paul

Further Readings

- Bair, D. (1990). *Simone de Beauvoir: A biography*. New York: Summit Books.
- Card, C. (Ed.). (2003). *The Cambridge companion to Simone de Beauvoir*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Fallaize, E. (Ed.). (1998). *Simone de Beauvoir: A critical reader*. London: Routledge.
- Simons, M. (Ed.). (1995). *Feminist interpretations of Simone de Beauvoir*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press.

DEBS, EUGENE V. (1855–1926)

The premier representative of native-born American socialism in the late 19th and the early 20th centuries was Eugene V. Debs. Debs was originally a labor union leader who made his reputation as an organizer of unskilled railway workers in the 1890s and as a champion of industrial unionism and workers' control.



Eugene Debs (1855–1926) is considered to be the public face of the political socialist movement in America in its early decades.

Source: Courtesy of the Library of Congress.

As the head and three times presidential candidate of the Socialist Party of America, and an exceptionally effective and inspiring public speaker, he became the public face of the political socialist movement in America in its early decades of heady success and advance. Through his example, a uniquely American amalgam of Marxian, populist, and ethically based social activism came to characterize a significant section of the U.S. left.

Born as the son of a prosperous grocery shop owner in Terre Haute, Indiana, Debs worked as a railroad fireman before his father arranged a clerkship for him at a local department store. In the years immediately following, Debs was involved in local politics and, through his secretary-treasurership of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen, in labor union activities. He fully embraced the conservative politics of the Firemen's Brotherhood, claiming that all Americans were equal worker-producers capable of rising to affluence through thrift and hard work. A Democrat by party affiliation, Debs tried to practice what he preached through the various local and state offices that he held, including his brief stint as an Indiana state assemblyman in 1884.

His creation of the American Railway Union (ARU) in 1893 started Debs's gradual transformation into a socialist. The ARU was an industrial union; that is, it accepted as members all, whether skilled or unskilled, who worked on the railroads, and it sought not just higher wages and better working conditions, but also a number of broader social and political goals. These included an end to the court injunctions with which employers tried to prevent strikes, unionization, and collective bargaining, and the building of a nationwide organized labor movement so unified in its class solidarity that it could not be divided by employers' attempts at buying off sections of it. In both regards, Debs's union differed dramatically from the American Federation of Labor (AFL) affiliated craft unions that catered only to the "labor aristocracy" of the skilled.

Debs's message proved appealing, and within a year of its founding, the ALU had some 150,000 members. In a series of aggressive sympathy strikes in the 1890s, Debs proceeded to put the union's mass power to the test, and he proved both an effective mobilizer of his constituency and an astute strategist in industrial conflict. Victories in the Pacific Union and Great Northern strikes were, however, followed by defeat in the legendary Pullman Strike (each in 1894), in which Debs fought to improve the conditions of the manufacturers of Pullman train cars. After some of the strikers tampered with federal mail trains, the railroad employers' organization procured a federal injunction and had federal troops suppress the strike and the ALU. For his role, Debs was imprisoned for 6 months.

While in jail, Debs began to convert to socialism. The extent, exact timing, and agency of his conversion remain open to question, but the end result was Debs's final abandonment of old-style producerism and his embrace of selected aspects of the Marxian social analysis. By no means did Debs become a fully fledged Marxist, for he never entirely accepted Marxian theories about labor value, immiseration, and coming collapse of capitalism, nor the then-popular supposition that corporate concentration was a key agency of socialization. Rather, Debsian socialism revolved around an iconoclastic combination of class-based and semi-evangelical exhortations to social transformation by a unified working class. To him, the corporate capitalist system failed

on ethical grounds, and the supposedly cooperationist instincts of the (broadly defined) working class were the only possible alternative, one that should gradually supplant capitalist values, institutions, and modes of operation. The way forward that Debs sketched consisted, on the one hand, of continual self-education of the working class into ever-deeper realization of its ethical superiority and, on the other hand, of workers' control in workplaces that acted as laboratories of the coming socialist order.

For some time, Debs continued to witness for this vision as a supporter of the Populist Party, but in 1897 he joined a number of Western labor activists in founding the Social Democracy of America. A year later, Debs switched to the more doctrinaire Marxist group, the Social Democratic Party, which called for an eventual socialist revolution and issued a number of so-called immediate demands, including demands for workers' unemployment and accident insurance; reduction of hours of work; public works projects; the initiative, referendum, and recall; and the abolition of war. These demands were largely carried over into the Socialist Party of America, which emerged in 1900 after Debs's group merged with another, more Marxian group from the East.

In the Socialist Party, Debs represented the left wing. He continued to champion the industrial unionism model and became an early enthusiast for the Industrial Workers of the World (IWW), a syndicalist group originally composed of Western miners that tried to take industries under workers' control. When this group embraced sabotage and revolutionary violence, Debs disassociated himself from it, but he continued to fight against the craft unionist AFL and against the moderate reformist wing of his party. Throughout the 1910s and the early 1920s, he subjected to severe criticism all those who de-emphasized class war and he hoped to make the Socialist Party into a regular parliamentary group seeking support from the progressively minded in all classes. The passion of his argument alienated reformist Socialists like John Spargo, Victor Berger, and Charles Edward Russell, but endeared Debs to all those whose investment was in the confrontational, ethically charged style of class politics.

Socialist Party presidential candidate for the first time in 1900, Debs did not become a major national figure until 1912. In the elections of that year, he received an unprecedented 900,000 votes. This did not translate into further party growth, however, for in the years following the election, President Woodrow Wilson co-opted many of the Socialists' reform proposals and drained the party both of popular support and many of its leading intellectuals. The anti-war position that Debs championed and his party embraced during World War I made things even worse, although for a brief while in 1917 and 1918 anti-war radicals inflated the party's share of the votes. When he was imprisoned for treasonous speech, Debs himself became a martyred symbol of all those whose anti-war and socialist politics were suppressed under wartime subversion and sedition laws. He was in federal prison from April 1919 to December 1921, and from there he fought his last election campaign.

Pardoned by President Warren G. Harding, Debs returned to public life, but he never fully regained the place in the public's esteem that he had held before the war. For those to whom he was the living, almost mythical embodiment of the American social conscience, his wartime ordeals only added to his luster, but others were all too conscious of how his siding with anti-war radicals and syndicalist revolutionaries had hurt the Socialist Party image and cause. The critics had one further cause to count against him when in the early 1920s Debs became an apologist for the Russian communist dictatorship. Posthumously, however, these grievances tended to be forgotten as Debs's memory was eagerly appropriated by all sections of the American socialist movement. The remembered Debs became the symbol that held together most left-of-center groups and his ethical, populist call for comprehensive change the chief legacy of Debsian socialism.

—Markku Ruotsila

See also Anarcho-Syndicalism; Democratic Socialism; Gompers, Samuel; Industrial Workers of the World (IWW); Marxist Theory; Social Democracy; Social Gospel Movement; Socialism

Further Readings

- Brommel, B. J. (1978). *Eugene V. Debs: Spokesman for labor and socialism*. Chicago: Charles H. Kerr.
- Fittrakis, R. J. (1993). *The idea of democratic socialism in America and the decline of the socialist party*. New York: Garland.
- Ginger, R. (1949). *The bending cross: A biography of Eugene Victor Debs*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Karsner, D. F. (1919). *Debs: His authorized life and letters*. New York: Boni & Liveright.
- Salvatori, N. (1982). *Eugene V. Debs: Citizen and socialist*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Tussey, J. Y. (Ed.). (1970). *Eugene Debs speaks*. New York: Pathfinder Press.

DEBT RELIEF MOVEMENT

During the last decade of the 20th century, a network of organizations from several countries formed to address the issue of Third World debt. The escalating level of debt owed by the governments of developing nations was so crippling that basic services in many of those countries began to collapse. Countries owed money to the governments of developed countries, as well as to international economic organizations such as the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund (IMF). The G7, the seven most powerful and wealthy nations, financially backed these organizations.

The debt forgiveness movement demanded an immediate and complete abolishment of all debt owed by the poorest countries. The movement expanded globally in 1996, with the formation of Jubilee 2000. Originally the idea of retired political scientist Martin Dent, Jubilee 2000 was based in the biblical concept of *jubilee*, or the forgiveness of debts and liberation of slaves every 50 years. The Jubilee campaign grew in both the North (developed world) and the South (Third World). Much of the international leadership, however, was based in Great Britain. The Debt Crisis Network (DCN) formed in the United Kingdom as a coalition of debt campaigning agencies. The campaign set the millennium as the deadline. In April 1996, Ann Pettifor, from DCN, became the organization's lead coordinator, and in 1997, Jubilee 2000 and DCN merged to become the Jubilee 2000 Coalition.

It was a high-profile campaign, holding huge public protests and attracting a large celebrity support base. The movement drew a lot of celebrity support. Desmond Tutu became Jubilee 2000 president of the campaign. Pope John Paul supported the movement, as did American evangelical Pat Robertson. Irish rock star Bono became an international spokesperson. The retired boxer Muhammad Ali also became a public supporter of debt forgiveness.

Jubilee 2000 truly represented a grassroots movement. It was both global and citizen-initiated. The organization framed the debt situation in easy-to-understand terms. A central tool of the campaign was a global petition. The Jubilee 2000 coalition's petition went to 166 nations and held a total of 24.2 million signatures. Under Jubilee 2000's criteria, 52 nations qualified for debt forgiveness. This equaled an estimated \$350 billion in debt.

Jubilee 2000 ended on December 31, 2000. It succeeded in establishing a popular international social movement and was partially successful in completing its vision. Following the Cologne Summit in 1999, the G8 committed US\$100 billion toward relief of multilateral debt and another US\$10 billion for bilateral debt. Despite these commitments, by the end of 2000, only two countries had received debt relief. The debt campaigns continue in many countries, but without the international leadership and focus provided by Jubilee 2000 during the late 1990s.

—Kristen E. Gwinn

See also Ali, Muhammad; Bono; Tutu, Desmond

Further Readings

- Addison, T., Hansen, H., & Tarp, F. (Eds.). (2004). *Debt relief for poor countries*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Buxton, B. (2004). Debt cancellation and civil society: A case study of Jubilee 2000. In P. Gready (Ed.), *Fighting for human rights* (pp. 54–77). London: Routledge.

DE CERTEAU, MICHEL (1925–1986)

A historian of religion, Michel de Certeau became one of the most inventive, interdisciplinary, and

collaborative contributors to what we now call cultural studies. De Certeau was born in Chambéry, southeastern France. He was a youth when France capitulated to Germany in 1940. Vichy collaboration disillusioned and enraged him; the extent of the Church's compliance was particularly disillusioning. De Certeau's genius owed much to his ability to feel these passions without capitulating to cynicism.

In the wake of the war, in 1950, he joined the Society of Jesus, and he was ordained in 1956. His scholarly work was focused on the origins of the Jesuits, and on mysticism in early modern Europe, but domestic and world events stimulated a critical and dramatic enlargement of his scholarly concerns.

When in May 1968 French students and laborers took to the streets, de Certeau was editor and contributor to several Catholic journals and magazines. The "Events of May," he said, exposed a breach between what *needed* to be said (by workers, by youth) and what *could* be said (as prescribed or authorized by the reigning conventions). Because what needed to be said could not be said, the protesters were capturing speech, by practicing the social conventions, but in ways that disrupted their authority.

The May protests faltered. However, the fruitfulness of de Certeau's approach would be elaborated in reference to a vast range of themes, including the "discovery" of the Americas, urban experience, language and politics, psychoanalysis and history, and religious belief.

In all this work, de Certeau displayed a keen interest in the microdynamics of social change. His best-known work in English translation, *The Practice of Everyday Life*, discusses the ways of making do that ordinary people fashion out of the dictates of their social position. Always, he attended keenly to these ruses—witting and unwitting—by which those who are situated as objects of knowledge and of power manage to use, and slip by, the structures intended to confine them.

Perhaps most important is the general thrust in de Certeau's body of work to interrogate the advance toward knowledge (the story of history, in an unusually general sense of the word). De Certeau conceived of the writing of history as a recovery of other voices.

Of necessity, history appropriates the voices on which it relies in ways that reflect historians' techniques and institutional expectations.

De Certeau demonstrated how these techniques and expectations were often repressed from the record, thereby constituting—along with the voices appropriated—a veritable hubbub of activity quite unlike the concentrated self-possession of so many historical narratives. In his own histories, he always strived to enable his voice to be altered by its relations to these various others. In this way, de Certeau provided a model of openness to otherness that could not be fixed by his own or any system's tendency to present others as objects of knowledge and as tokens of power.

—Andrew B. Irvine

See also Postmodernism

Further Readings

- Ahearne, J. (1995). *Michel de Certeau: Interpretation and its other*. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press.
- de Certeau, M. (1984). *The practice of everyday life* (S. Rendell, Trans.). Berkeley: University of California Press.
- de Certeau, M. (1988). *The writing of history* (T. Conley, Trans.). New York: Columbia University Press.
- de Certeau, M. (2000). *The Certeau reader* (G. Ward, Ed.). Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

DECONSTRUCTION

Deconstruction, the demonstration of multiple, competing, and often contradictory meanings within seemingly stable univocal positions, came to prominence in the mid-1960s and continues to exert a powerful influence across a broad range of disciplines. Although Jacques Derrida coined the term *deconstruction* in his early works, a history of deconstructive analysis can be traced to Friedrich W. Nietzsche and beyond, connecting with Martin Heidegger and Edmund Husserl along the way. Deconstructive analysis, as practiced by Derrida, demonstrates that the substance and coherence of a text—broadly conceived from the traditional notion of a written text to social practice—is as much related to

assumptions and derivative ideas that are excluded, as it is to those that that are included. In other words, meaning is inextricably linked to the constitutive other—silences and exclusions—of the text. Deconstruction aims to render the constitutive other explicit. The exposure of silences and exclusions, together with the contradictions that may ensue, draws sites for activism into clear relief.

The term *deconstruction*, however, has been pejoratively equated with *destruction*. Environmentalists Gary Lease and Michael Soulé exemplify this view, claiming that deconstruction is as destructive to the environment as chainsaws and bulldozers. More generally, however, the charge of destruction is abstract; critics claim that deconstruction shatters unities and leaves it to others to pick up the pieces. As a result, many critics of deconstruction and proponents who are influenced by them emphasize the importance of *reconstruction*. Derrida has repudiated the claim of destruction in numerous interviews and rejected the binary opposition of deconstruction to reconstruction. His rejection of the binary opposition is twofold: first, the opposition invites the misreading that deconstruction is destructive; and second, while supporting the importance of generative analysis, he argues that reconstruction is inadequate. Derrida argues that reconstruction maintains the status quo by simply making something again in the same image. In terms of activism and social justice, the reconstruction of human rights, for example, would replicate existing states of affairs. Derrida insists, however, that deconstruction aims to go further, to displace, change, and improve the current state of affairs. Deconstruction, then, is a deeply political enterprise that has an overt ethical agenda.

Derrida's deconstructive works can be read as posing questions to, eliciting complex responses from, and going beyond the initial formulations of key Western thinkers, including Marx, Saussure, Freud, and Heidegger, and Derrida openly acknowledges that deconstruction is indebted to each. The term *deconstruction* owes its name to Derrida's critical appropriation and translation of Heidegger's terms *Destruktion* and *Abbau*, and questioning, responding to, and going beyond Marx, Saussure, and Freud illuminated leading and interrelated motifs in deconstructive analysis.

The first of these motifs, the critique of the “metaphysics of presence,” problematizes the notion of a direct relationship, or immediacy, between speech and writing, thought and consciousness, or the word and the world. The critique of the metaphysics of presence disrupts the purported stability and unity of a text. This argument is, perhaps, best understood through Derrida’s deconstruction of Ferdinand de Saussure’s structural linguistics. Saussure identified language as a system of signs, which consist of two indissociable elements: spoken words or their written equivalents (signifiers) and concepts (signifieds). For Saussure, signs are arbitrary; they derive their meaning from their opposition to each other rather than through a relationship with a referent, thus, severing the link between the word and the world. Language, then, is a floating system of differences. Consequently, signifieds do not possess meaning in and of themselves. Meaning is continuously differed and deferred, which challenges notions of unity, stability, and truth. Derrida, however, demonstrates that Saussure’s argument unavoidably admits the possibility of signifieds without signifiers. In other words, Saussure’s argument admits that meaning is not necessarily transacted relationally through a system of differences, but that pockets of pure meaning can exist. This surreptitiously reinstates the metaphysics of presence. Thus, Derrida replaces Saussure’s signifier-signified complex with the signifier-signifier, which ensures the endless play of difference that cannot be resolved into a positivity. Derrida introduces the term *différance* to refer to this irrepressible difference.

The second and interrelated motif that emerges in Derrida’s engagements with Marx, Saussure, Freud, and Lévi-Strauss is *decentering* the text. This repudiates the belief that words, writings, ideas, and systems of thought are validated by a “center” whose truth they convey. The concept of center is clearly developed at the beginning of Derrida’s deconstruction of Claude Lévi-Strauss. Then, performing an immanent critique, adhering strictly to the “rules” that configure the thesis, Derrida demonstrates that Lévi-Strauss implicitly depends on that which he explicitly rejects, thus dismantling the center of the thesis. Demonstrating such contradictoriness, in policy or

law for example, can be of great strategic value to social activists. However, decentering necessarily installs an alternative center. Thus, decentering results in cascading centers; decentering cannot rest and the reassuring certitude that centers engender cannot be reclaimed. This will not necessarily motivate social activists to commit to endless deconstruction as Derrida advocates, but it may serve as a salutary and cautionary reminder their successes repose, in turn, upon systems of privileges, silences and exclusions rather than a natural order.

Derrida’s famous remark that there is nothing beyond the text has been widely misread as a denial of embodied existence in the material world. If this were the case, Derrida’s ideas and social activism would be incommensurable. However, Derrida insists that the statement that there is nothing beyond the text does not deny the existence of the world. This may appear to be an irreconcilable contradiction, but oppositions between the world (sensibility) and text (intelligibility), and between interiority and exteriority, are required for the contradiction to exist. In relation to the former, Derrida’s broad conception of text problematizes the opposition of the world and text, and in relation to the latter, his work on the limit problematizes any simple opposition of inside and outside. The apparent contradiction resolves in the view that there is no recourse to an acontextual world.

The statement that there is nothing beyond the text is germane to social activists beyond the acknowledgment that there is no recourse to an acontextual world. Cherished ideals such as social justice, human rights, and freedom do not lie beyond reach of deconstruction. Derrida would exhort activists to interrogate such ideals in order to “expose” their constitutive blindnesses. As a matter of logical consistency, the term *deconstruction* also needs to be deconstructed. Deconstruction cannot, and does not try to, escape this double movement. Every deconstructive gesture is indebted to its constitutive other, which makes the term notoriously elusive.

—Joy Hardy

See also Derrida, Jacques; Nietzsche, Friedrich; Other, the; Postmodernism; Semiotic Warfare

Further Readings

- Caputo, J. D. (2000). For love of the things: Derrida's hyper-realism. *Journal for Cultural and Religious Theory*, 1(3), 4–18.
- Derrida, J. (1976). *Of grammatology* (G. Hopkins, Trans.). Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press. (Original work published 1967)
- Derrida, J. (1978). *Writing and difference* (A. Bass, Trans.). Chicago: Chicago University Press. (Original work published 1967)
- Derrida, J. (1981). *Positions* (A. Bass, Trans.). London: Althone Press. (Original work published 1972)
- Derrida, J. (1982). *Margins of philosophy* (A. Bass, Trans.). Brighton, UK: Harvester Press. (Original work published 1972)
- Soulé, M. E., & Lease, G. (1995). *Reinventing nature? Responses to postmodern deconstruction*. Washington, DC: Island Press.

DEEP ECOLOGY MOVEMENT

The first usage of the term *deep ecology* was in a 1973 article written by the Norwegian eco-philosopher Arne Naess, who was greatly inspired by Rachel Carson's seminal work *Silent Spring*. Deep ecology describes a divergent, long-term approach to the mounting ecological crisis that faces industrialized nations, which is distinct from shallow (or reform) ecology. While shallow ecology is often focused on finding short-term solutions for mitigating pollution or fighting resource depletion, deep ecology seeks to combat the approaching ecocatastrophe by establishing an entirely new ontological understanding of the human relationship to nature and the world.

One of the forces working against deep ecology is the prevailing rational/economic ideological paradigm, which commodifies the natural world (hence terms like natural *resources*) and asserts a detached, teleological model of our relationship to nature. Philosophy is particularly well suited to tackle this misconception, because the human-centered understanding of the natural world is deeply rooted in Cartesian Dualism. The bifurcation of our being into the two independent modalities of mind and body, an understanding that we owe to Descartes's *cogito ergo sum* ("I think therefore I am"), considers human

consciousness as a transcendent entity that is beyond, and separate from, the natural world.

Thus, deep ecology becomes a philosophical project of cultivating ecological consciousness, by positing humans as inseparable from their environs, and championing intuition instead of logical arguments or deductive reasoning. It promotes a perspective of *biospherical egalitarianism*, which involves a respect and veneration for all forms of life, and *voluntary simplicity*, which entails a personal self-realization about our patterns of consumption and environmental impact.

The rapid adoption of new (typically consumer) technologies is another element of contemporary culture that worries proponents of the deep ecology movement. Borrowing Heideggerian notions of caution in the face of technological innovation, they question the uncritical passivity with which it is often met, and criticize the notion that the adoption of a new technology is invariably progressive and/or inevitable.

Despite the theory-laden underpinnings, deep ecology is not simply a movement of unembodied or inert ideas. Direct action is central to the deep ecology platform, because, as Naess argues, wisdom without underlying action is useless. For example, in 1970 Naess tied himself to the Mardalsfossen waterfall in Norway to protest the building of a dam. He refused to leave until the plans were dropped and was eventually successful in stopping it from being built.

Arne Naess and George Sessions highlight eight points of the deep ecology platform.

1. The flourishing of human and nonhuman life on earth has intrinsic value, independent of the usefulness they may have for narrow human purposes.
2. Richness and diversity of life forms are values in themselves and contribute to the flourishing of human and nonhuman life on earth.
3. Humans have no right to reduce this richness and diversity except to satisfy vital needs.
4. Present human interference with the nonhuman world is excessive, and the situation is rapidly worsening.
5. The flourishing of human life and cultures is compatible with a substantial decrease of the human population. The flourishing of nonhuman life requires it.

6. Significant change of life conditions for the better requires change in policies. These affect basic economic, technological, and ideological structures.
7. The ideological change is mainly that of appreciating the life quality, rather than adhering to a high quality of living. There will be a profound awareness of the difference between big and great.
8. Those who subscribe to the foregoing points have an obligation directly or indirectly to participate in the attempt to implement the necessary changes.

In 1990, inspired by George Sessions's book *Deep Ecology: Living As If Nature Mattered*, Doug Tompkins and Jerry Mander established the Foundation for Deep Ecology (FDE) in San Francisco, California. They promote the deep ecology platform through book publishing, radio programs, holding events and conferences, and grant-making. Their mission is to support education, advocacy, and environmental initiatives that advance the causes of sustainability, conservation, and the collective reevaluation of our relationship to nature.

—Thomas Kristian Peri

See also Alternative Movements; Carson, Rachel; Climate Change and Global Justice; Direct Action; Environmental Movement; Green Party; Rainforest Action Network; Sierra Club; Voluntary Simplicity

Further Readings

- Abram, D. (1996). *The spell of the sensuous*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Naess, A. (1989). *Ecology, community, and lifestyle*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Sessions, G. (1985). *Deep ecology: Living as if nature mattered*. Layton, UT: Peregrine-Smith Books.

DEES, MORRIS (1936–)

Born December 16, 1936, Morris Dees is one of the most significant legal figures to advance civil rights and social justice for historically underserved groups. Despite his upbringing in segregationist Alabama, his parents imparted strong Christian values to Dees that

compelled him to redress criminal and civic wrongs through the justice system. Warm interactions with black families, coupled with troubling class-based experiences among whites during his youth, further nurtured his dedication to eradicating the detrimental impact that race and social class exert on individuals' lives. Although Dees was a successful entrepreneur, the reading of Clarence Darrow's *The Story of My Life* provoked him to sell his mail order business and open a law practice devoted to civil rights legislation. The resultant partnership law firm, Levin & Dees, evolved into the Southern Poverty Law Center (SPLC) in 1971.

Dees' legal career is marked by a number of landmark cases and decisions. Examples include integrating the Montgomery, Alabama, Young Men's Christian Association (YMCA) and the Alabama State Troopers, as well as holding white supremacist organizations financially and criminally responsible for unlawful actions against communities of color and immigrants. Substantial monetary awards against groups such as the United Klans of America and Aryan Nations, in fact, have forced some organizations to disband. Despite the critical advances against hate groups, Dees' decision to emphasize Klan activity as a SPLC priority prompted some of its personnel to leave the organization over ideological differences regarding the new legal focus. Additionally, critics outside of the SPLC have accused Dees of drawing few distinctions between white supremacists and other organizations that support limiting immigration, controlling population growth, or upholding the right to bear arms. Detractors primarily question Dees' use of legal approaches that suggest guilt by association rather than evidence of direct involvement.

Beyond the legal arena, Dees gained national prominence as a successful fund-raiser for presidential hopeful George McGovern, former President Jimmy Carter, and Senator Ted Kennedy's 1980 bid for the Democratic presidential nomination. Professionally, Dees received his undergraduate and law degrees from the University of Alabama. He has authored two books, *Hate on Trial: The Case Against America's Most Dangerous Neo-Nazi* and *Gathering Storm: America's Militia Threat*. His autobiography *A Season for Justice*, later rereleased as *A Lawyer's Journey: The Morris Dees Story*, was published in 1991. He is the recipient of numerous awards,

including the Martin Luther King, Jr., Memorial and Friend of Education Awards from the National Education Association, Young Lawyers Distinguished Service Award from the American Bar Association, and the Roger Baldwin Award from the American Civil Liberties Union, among other distinctions.

—Carla R. Monroe

See also Southern Poverty Law Center

Further Readings

Chalmers, D. M. (2003). *Backfire: How the Ku Klux Klan helped the civil rights movement*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Klebanow, D. (2003). *People's lawyers: Crusaders for justice in American history*. Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe.

DE LA CRUZ, SOR JUANA INÉS (1648–1695)

Juana Inés Ramirez de Asbaje was born in San Miguel Nepantla, Mexico, in 1648 (although some biographers say 1651). She was a writer, a scholar, and a servant of God in the Baroque period. Sor Juana was also an advocate for women's rights in education because she believed future generations of women needed to have educators of their own gender. According to Sor Juana, a society can benefit when women are educated, and withholding women from pursuing knowledge went against the tradition of the Catholic Church. Her outspoken stance on controversial subjects, of course, did not please the Church. In 1690, the bishop of Puebla, Manuel Fernandez de Santa Cruz, published a letter Sor Juana had written to him. He introduced it with a letter of his own as "Sor Filotea." In *Carta Atenagorica*, he advises Sor Juana to leave her secular studies and writing and focus on theology. Sor Juana responded with a letter of her own, *Respuesta a Sor Filotea* (1691), in which she defends women's right to higher education. Eventually, she was forced to give up her books and her studies and she spent the last months of her life helping her sisters, until an epidemic took her life in 1695.

In her autobiography, Sor Juana claims she learned how to read and write Latin before the age of 10. From an early age, she had a passion for knowledge and she was known for her beauty, intelligence, and charisma. In 1664, Sor Juana became a lady-in-waiting to the viceroy's wife, marquise of Mancera, in Mexico City. However, court life was not fulfilling. Sor Juana decided that the only way to pursue her passion for knowledge was to become a nun. Because she came from a poor family and was an illegitimate child, she knew her options were limited. As a single woman living in 17th-century Latin America, she did not have the power to continue her studies.

In 1667, Sor Juana entered the convent of the Discalced Carmelites of St. Joseph, but she only stayed 3 months because the monastic life was too harsh on her health. She did not give up. In 1669, she entered the Hieronimite order at the convent of St. Jerome, and she never left its confines until her death. Her most creative period began in 1680. It was during this period that the new vicereine's wife, marquise de la Laguna, countess of Paredes, helped publish three volumes of Sor Juana's work. Sor Juana spent her time at the convent writing poetry, comedies, religious dramas, and liturgies; her apartment-like cell became a salon, a gathering place to exchange ideas. Some scholars and biographers argue that Sor Juana set an example for modern feminism.

—Maria Delis

See also Feminism; Religious Activism

Further Readings

Kirk, P. (1998). *Sor Juana Inez de la Cruz: Religion, art, and feminism*. New York: Continuum.

Paz, O. (1988). *Sor Juana or, The traps of faith* (M. S. Peden, Trans.). Cambridge, MA: Belknap.

DELLINGER, DAVID (1915–2004)

Active nonviolence and social protest were central to the life of David Dellinger, a student in the 1930s and son of an economically and socially prominent family

who became involved in politics as he was studying economics at Yale University. He was arrested at a protest where he was supporting the trade union movement. Dellinger left Yale for a time during the Great Depression. He decided to ride the freight trains, sleep at missions, and eat at the soup lines. He then spent a year working in a factory in Maine, in 1936, after finally graduating from Yale.

Dellinger received a fellowship to Oxford University, and became a supporter of the Popular Front government in Spain. When he returned to the United States, he enrolled at the Union Theological Seminary in New York. In 1940, Dellinger refused to register for the military draft. He was arrested and sentenced to a year in prison, and, while in prison, he organized protests against the segregated seating arrangements. His activism led to solitary confinement in the prison. After being released, he was arrested again for refusing to join the armed forces when the United States entered World War II. He was sentenced to another 2 years in prison.

After the war, Dellinger helped create the *Direct Action* magazine in 1945, and criticized the use of atomic bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. A short time later he became the editor of *Liberation*, a position he maintained for more than 20 years.

Dellinger also was a prominent activist in opposition to the Vietnam War. He helped organize the 1967 protest march on the Pentagon. In 1968, he was one of the activists charged with conspiring to incite riots at the Democratic Party Convention. His codefendants included Tom Hayden (Students for a Democratic Society), Bobby Seale (Black Panther Party), Rennie Davis (National Mobilization Committee), and Abbie Hoffman and Jerry Rubin (Youth International Party). These activists, part of the famous Chicago Seven, were eventually acquitted. Dellinger was painted as a stern, evangelical Christian Socialist, and as the chief architect of the conspiracy because of his position as the chairperson of the National Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam.

Dellinger wrote a number of books, including *Beyond Survival: New Directions for the Disarmament Movement* (1985), *Vietnam Revisited: From Covert Action to Invasion to Reconstruction* (1986), and *From*

Yale to Jail: The Life Story of a Moral Dissenter (1993).

He continued to be active in politics, and even into his eighties he continued to take part in protest marches. He was a primary figure in the demonstration against the North American Free Trade Agreement in Quebec City in 2001. He also held regular fasts in an effort to change the name of Columbus Day to Native American Day.

The life of Dellinger suggests to activists that we have more power than we know. Traveling across every state, speaking at gatherings large and small, he was fond of pointing out that efforts for peace and justice were larger and more substantive than at the height of the 1970s. He noted that in the past 30 years that efforts were simply more locally based, and covered a wider range of issues.

—Pat Lauderdale

See also Chicago Seven; Direct Action; Draft Resistance; Hayden, Tom; Hoffman, Abbie; Nonviolence and Activism; Seale, Bobby

Further Readings

- Gara, L., & Gara, L. M. (Eds.). (1999). *A few small candles: War resisters of World War II tell their stories*. Kent, OH: Kent State Press.
- Hunt, A. (2006). *David Dellinger: The life and times of a nonviolent revolutionary*. New York: New York University Press.

DELLUMS, RONALD (1935–)

Ronald Vernie Dellums was born into a working-class ethnic community in west Oakland, California, and it has been the base from which he has carved out his reputation as an outspoken critic of oppression both at home and abroad through almost 40 years of public life. On leaving high school in 1954, Dellums joined the Marines. Turned down for officer training on account of his race, he left after the 2 years he needed to qualify for college financial assistance through the GI Bill. He took degrees at Oakland City College and

San Francisco State University, and a master's degree in social work at UC Berkeley in 1962. While employed as a psychiatric social worker, Dellums got his second education, this time in political activism. He served on Berkeley city council from 1967 to 1970, and in 1971, having run on an anti-Vietnam War platform, Ron Dellums became the representative for California's ninth congressional district.

In early 1971 he called for a full-scale inquiry into U.S. war crimes in Vietnam and, when none was forthcoming, chaired ad-hoc hearings on the issue himself. Dellums also established positions for himself on a range of other important issues throughout his congressional career, from apartheid in South Africa to a national health service, and from support for Israeli-PLO negotiations to the issue of defense spending.

Between 1971 and 1988, Dellums pushed a succession of bills aimed at imposing sanctions on the South African government to end apartheid. While his bills met with conservative opposition in the Senate and the White House, Dellums was at the forefront of positioning the United States within the international sanctions movement. His efforts in support of a national health service met with no such success, as deal-making from the left in pursuit of less radical, seemingly more workable proposals gradually emasculated the legislative efforts of Dellums and like-minded colleagues throughout the 1970s.

In 1973, with the assistance of the Congressional Black Caucus—of which he had been a founding member—Dellums became a member of the House Armed Services Committee (HASC), providing a voice of considered opposition to large defense spending increases throughout his tenure. He was the first member of Congress to call for the termination of funding for the MX missile in 1977 and the Pershing II in 1979; he also opposed the construction of the B-1 bomber and President Reagan's SDI or *Star Wars* program. In 1991 Dellums opposed U.S. military action in Iraq, and in 1993, as chairman of HASC, he sought to persuade President Clinton to honor his campaign commitment to lift the ban on gay men and lesbians in the military.

In 1998 Dellums retired from Congress and took on the presidency of Healthcare International

Management Company, a for-profit organization that focused on the provision of coordinated health care in southern Africa. He has also acted as a lobbyist for a range of interests on Capitol Hill. While this seemed to mark the end of his political career, it proved to be only a hiatus. By late 2005 his career had come full circle as he returned to Oakland politics with his candidacy for mayor.

—Dean Williams

See also Anti-Apartheid Movement; GI Bill; Lobbying; Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO)

Further Readings

- Dellums, R. V., & Halterman, H. L. (2000). *Lying down with lions: A public life from the streets of Oakland to the halls of power*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Dellums R. V., Miller, R. H., & Halterman, H. L. (1983). *Defense sense: The search for a rational military policy*. Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.

DELORIA, VINE, JR. (1933–2005)

Vine Deloria, Jr., an American Indian from the Standing Rock Sioux tribe, was both an advocate for American Indian rights and a scholar of American Indian culture, history, and law. During the mid to late 1960s, he acted as Executive Director of the National Congress of American Indians (NCAI), a pan-tribal organization that worked on behalf of tribes and lobbied the U.S. Congress in order to secure Indian rights. Under his leadership, the NCAI became increasingly financially sound and became one of the most well-respected American Indian advocacy groups. In 1969 he published *Custer Died for Your Sins: An Indian Manifesto*, a set of essays that critiqued Native Americans' treatment by non-Indians and lauded many of the native cultural traditions that European Americans attempted to eliminate from the American landscape. His work was widely read by Indians and non-Indians alike, many of whom saw it as a refreshing attempt to deromanticize commonly

held views of Indian people. This book launched his career as one of the most adamant, articulate, and witty social critics of the era. He went on to a career in law, writing dozens of books on the topic of federal Indian law and policy.

He was born in 1933 to Barbara Sloat and Vine Deloria, Sr., and grew up near both the Pine Ridge and Standing Rock Indian Reservations. His father, a Sioux and an Episcopal missionary, was a well-known figure among many of the reservation communities. He encouraged his son to pursue higher education, and the younger Deloria received his undergraduate degree in the sciences from Iowa State University, and a degree in theology from Lutheran School of Theology in Illinois. His law degree, which he earned from the University of Colorado, Boulder, in 1970, provided the basis for much of his legal scholarship and activism.

Witnessing the grave poverty on the reservations and the surrounding communities, the Deloria became a critic of U.S. Indian policy and agencies—particularly the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA)—which he saw as being destructive to the people they pretended to help. He became a spokesperson for Indian sovereignty and self-determination. For him, sovereignty meant allowing American Indian people to develop their own governments, institutions, and policies for improving their lives and lessening the federal government's intrusion. He also promoted a return to the treaty-making process, which the federal government abolished in the 1870s. If the federal government went back to making government-to-government agreements with Indian nations, then this would raise Indian nations to the level of sovereign states and grant a new level of respect to Indian tribal governments.

Outside of advocating a revision of U.S.-Indian relations, Deloria was a great critic of Western science, particularly the social science of anthropology, which he derided as an attempt to fragment the world into its constituent pieces in order to understand them. This method of study, he argued, denigrated the interconnectedness of people, animals, and the planet. Instead, he supported a study of the world and human beings that examined the relatedness of all material and spiritual things. In pursuing this relatedness, he

believed that the broader U.S. population could learn a great deal from Native American culture and thought, which had a long history of examining and learning from connections, rather than encouraging disintegration of the bonds between the spiritual and biological entities in the world.

—Thomas J. Lappas

See also American Indian Movement; Deconstructionism; Ecopaganism; Judicial Activism; Law and Social Movements

Further Readings

- Cowger, T. (1999). *The National Congress of American Indians: The founding years*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Deloria, V., Jr. (1969). *Custer died for your sins: An American Indian manifesto*. New York: Macmillan.
- Deloria, V., Jr. (1999). *Spirit and reason: The Vine Deloria, Jr., reader*. Golden, CO: Fulcrum.
- Johnson, K. (2005, November 14). Vine Deloria, Jr., champion of Indian rights, dies at 72. *New York Times*, p. A25.

DEMOCRACY

The term *democracy* originates from ancient Greek and means rule by the people (*demos*). Traditionally, political theorists begin their considerations about democracy with aristocratic philosophers like Plato and Aristotle and deduce from there that ancient Greek philosophers opposed the concept of democracy. This is true in one way or another as far as these philosophers concerned, but many other philosophers were critical of Athenian democracy from a humanist perspective—just because it rested upon slavery and excluded women and foreigners from decision making. Epicurus' anti-political position, for example, might be read as a search for a much more comprehensive concept of democracy to include all subordinate classes and sections of society in decision making.

The development of the concept of democracy was not solely due to the ancient Greeks. Democracy as an institution to run general affairs of society is an

innovation of a much earlier period. What we read in Plato's and Aristotle's writings is in fact why in Athens the implementation of an earlier form of democracy became problematic. It has to do with the division of society into social classes with contradictory material interests, which throws also some light on the modern problems of democracy. A society with social classes like ancient Greek societies could no longer assimilate the earlier form of democracy that allowed all male and female adults to participate in decision making.

In modern political thought, traditionally the theories of democracy are categorized on how they conceptualize the people, citizenship, majority, and minority. This approach touches one of the most crucial problems of the theory of democracy only on the surface because it takes the division of society into the majority and minority for granted or it leads to a distorted presentation of the problems involved if it accounts merely for elections and issues in governments. Political manipulation and distorted presentations may result in misperceptions of the issues in question; this manipulation may result in elections that may reverse what is the majority and the minority in reality. In Aristotle's political thought, the majority referred to the poor—that is, expropriated sections of society—and the minority is described as propertied nobility. John Stuart Mill's consideration about the tyranny of the majority has to do with the question of what might be the result if subordinate classes, the vast majority of population, are franchised. Provided they are conscious of their real interests, they could easily vote aside propertied classes and expropriate the expropriator. This worry motivates Aristotle in antiquity, as well as Mill in modernity, in the construction of what might be the best form of government. It is this worry that also gave rise to the elitist theory of democracy; for example, the work of Joseph Schumpeter. With Mill's proposal to weight votes in favor of richer and the better educated, the bourgeois democratic thought gives up one of the most essential concepts of democracy: the concept of equality, which is a contribution of Protestant Reformation to modern theory of democracy. This may also explain what Norberto Bobbio observed; namely, that liberal democracies tend to restrict the rights of the people if

they express their will to participate in decision making rather than leaving it to the elites in governments.

Unlike the 19th-century bourgeois democratic thought, however, the 18th-century bourgeois democratic thought has a comprehensive view of democracy, both contractual (Hobbes, Locke, Kant, Rousseau) and historical (Machiavelli, Montesquieu, Hume, A. Smith, J. Millar). It takes into account the problems arising from the structural problems of civil society, as well as those of the state. In the 19th century, however, it comes more and more to be confined to the governmental realm. This is valid as well as for Ronald Dworkin's theory of procedural democracy and Jürgen Habermas's theory of deliberative democracy. Permanently changing structural power relations in civil society in favor of monopolies and monopoly bourgeoisie is no longer problematic. Among contemporary political philosophers, David Held and Peter Singer are perhaps the only ones to refer to the growing power of monopolies in civil society and to the dangers arising from it.

The concepts of both representative and direct democracy are creations of 18th-century bourgeois democratic thought. In the 19th century it assumed representative democracy. Even contemporary bourgeois thought, despite the fact that modern communications and computers removed many obstacles to direct democracy, accepts Schumpeter's hardly justifiable argument that direct democracy is not compatible with responsible government. But at least since Condorcet's establishment of Jury Theorem, it is almost a common sense that a decision of a large number of only moderately competent people may be more reliable than few hundred experts in governments.

Classical Marxist theory of democracy draws primarily on the study of the broad history of humanity, more particularly on the analysis of the structures in civil society, as well as institutional development of the capitalist state and government. But it inherits also all bourgeois and utopian socialist progressive democratic thought and profits from the Paris Commune experiments. The Marxist theory of democracy is not about establishment and strengthening of the state against society as opposed to bourgeois democratic thought. On the contrary, it is above all concerned about finding ways to abolish the state and bring back the

management of general social affairs into society. It wants to democratize all aspects of social life. It is, in other words, foremost concerned about establishing a direct democracy. The socialist state, which is thought to be necessary in the transitory society from capitalism to fully developed communism, is thought to be no longer a state in its classical sense; namely, to be an instrument to suppress the majority by a handful minority of property owners. It is rather envisaged to be a state of the majority to suppress the minority of property owners if (and only if) they act against the establishment of socialism and eventually communism. This aim leads Marxist democratic thought to the historical investigation of the origins of the state. Like many 18th-century bourgeois social and political philosophies, it explains the origins of the state by referring to the establishment of private property and contradictions in civil society. But unlike these philosophies, Marxism does not want to justify private property but substitute it for a common ownership; therefore, it focuses on the question of how private property may be turned into common ownership.

In the light of the experience of the Soviet Union, many contemporary Marxists philosophers suggest that some aspects of Marx's democratic thought needs to be reconsidered, because in the Soviet Union the abolishment of private property in the means of production did not lead to the weakening of the state. They suggest to develop further Marxist democratic thought based on the socialist experiences in the 20th century and on the democratic thought of Lenin, Gramsci, and Luxemburg.

The most interesting and new aspect of contemporary debates of democracy is about cosmopolitan or world democracy and ecological democracy. David Held's theory of cosmopolitan democracy draws on a revision of the Kantian notion of perpetual peace. But it could perhaps be more appropriately and comprehensively developed on the basis of what Marx worked out about Paris Commune. The theory of ecological democracy is relatively new and still needs to be worked out in many respects in detail.

—Doğan Göçmen

See also Civil Society; Communism; Gramsci, Antonio; Lenin, V. I.; Marxist Theory; Mill, John Stuart; Plato

Further Readings

- Bobbio, N. (2005). *Liberalism and democracy*. New York: Verso.
- Held, D. (1996). *Democracy and the global order: From the modern state to cosmopolitan governance*. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Held, D. (1997). *Models of democracy*. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Honderich, T. (1991). *Conservatism*. London: Penguin.
- Lenin, V. I. (1992). *The state and revolution*. London: Penguin.
- Wood, E. M. (1995). *Democracy against capitalism: Renewing historical materialism*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

DEMOCRATIC SOCIALISM

The relationship between democracy and socialism is a curious one. Both traditions are rooted philosophically in the concept of equality, but different aspects of equality are emphasized. Democracy appeals to political equality, the right of all individuals to participate in setting the rules to which all will be subject. Socialism emphasizes material equality—not strict equality, but an end to the vast disparities of income and wealth traceable to the inequalities of ownership of means of production.

Of course there can be material equality without democracy, as well as democracy without material equality. Plato advocated a material equality for the “guardians” of his ideal state. (Those entrusted with ruling would live modestly, take their meals in common, and, to forestall the temptation to enrich themselves, keep their storehouses open for inspection and never handle gold or silver.) Many religious orders have practiced a material egalitarianism while emphasizing strict obedience to one's superiors. Conversely, in most contemporary democratic societies, material inequalities are vast and growing. (The upper 1% of U.S. households now own nearly 40% of all the privately held wealth of the nation.)

From the beginning it has been recognized that political equality is likely to produce demands for material equality. If people are truly *equal*, why

should a few be so rich and so many so poor? If the majority can make the laws, what is to prevent them from redistributing the wealth? Political theorists from Plato through the Founding Fathers of the United States, from John Stuart Mill to the present, have warned of this tendency.

Plato saw democracy as inevitably degenerating into tyranny, for the *demos* would try to redistribute wealth, the wealthy would rebel, and the people would call on a strongman to aid their cause, but he would not relinquish power once installed. Alexander Hamilton urged that first-class people, the rich and well born, be given a permanent share of the government, so as to check the imprudence of democracy. Mill worried that the majority would compel the wealthy to bear the burden of taxation, so he proposed that the more intelligent and knowledgeable be allowed multiple votes and that mode of employment serve as a marker for intelligence. He took it to be self-evident that the employer of labor is on average more intelligent than a laborer.

More recently, the Trilateral Commission, a gathering of elites from the United States, Western Europe, and Japan (the brainchild of David Rockefeller and forerunner of the World Economic Forum) issued a widely read report warning that the democratic distemper of the 1960s and early 1970s threatened to render capitalist countries ungovernable.

Unlike the pre-eminent political theorists from antiquity, until quite recently, virtually all the early self-described *socialists* (a term that seems to have been first used as a self-ascription by Robert Owen in 1827) were ardent democrats. Marx and Engels in their *Communist Manifesto* proclaimed that the first step in replacing capitalism with a new and better economic system is to raise the proletariat to the position of ruling class. Marx and Engels and virtually all of their socialist contemporaries saw the political empowerment of society's disenfranchised as a necessary step in the transformation of capitalism into a more humane social order.

Few socialists prior to the 1920s would have imagined a "contradiction" between socialism and democracy. Prior to the Russian Revolution, there were no socialist countries anywhere, nor any fully democratic

ones. (In no country did women have the right to vote. Racial minorities were often excluded from the political process. Dominant capitalist countries presided most undemocratically over their colonial empires.) It seemed obvious to socialists everywhere that democracy was a stepping stone to socialism.

The Russian Revolution changed the equation dramatically. Many socialists began to question the link between socialism and democracy. On the one hand, existing democracies showed themselves to be deeply hostile to socialism. On the other hand, existing socialism turned out to be anything but democratic.

The United States, for example, having gone to war to "make the world safe for democracy," reacted swiftly to the events in Russia (well before the Bolshevik Revolution had become Stalinist), imprisoning the nation's leading socialist, Eugene Debs, along with dozens of other socialist leaders. (Debs had garnered 6% of the vote in the 1912 presidential election, and hundreds of socialists were elected to public office.) Socialist legislators were expelled from office, and the socialist press was banned from the mails.

Moreover, there was virtually no resistance on the part of democratic capitalist countries to the spread of fascism throughout Europe. Indeed, the United States, France, and Britain remained resolutely neutral while the forces of General Franco, aided by fascist Italy and Nazi Germany, waged a successful civil war against the democratically elected government of Spain. So long as anti-democratic forces were anti-socialist or anti-communist, they could count on the support of the democratic governments of the West. Meanwhile, the one country in the world calling itself socialist turned out not to be *democratic* in any recognizable sense of the term.

Some socialists tried to reconcile these deeply disappointing developments by distinguishing between "bourgeois democracy" and "proletarian democracy," the former viewed as fraudulent. Some went on to argue that, given the implacable hostility of powerful capitalist countries to socialism, a dictatorial phase was necessary in order to make the transition to authentic (proletarian) democracy.

Others felt that Stalin had betrayed the revolution. The Soviet Union was declared to be neither

democratic nor socialist. Still others, nonsocialists as well as socialists, argued that democracy was a political category, whereas socialism designated an economic system. Hence any of four categories is possible: democratic capitalism, nondemocratic capitalism, democratic socialism, and nondemocratic socialism. There is no necessary connection between democracy and either form of economic organization.

Following World War II, the discourse took another turn. The Soviet Union was no longer the sole representative of actually existing socialism. The Red Army had defeated Hitler's army on the Eastern Front and driven it out of Eastern Europe. As it retreated, pro-Soviet regimes were installed in its wake, none of them democratic. Moreover, a socialist revolution occurred in China, and many were brewing elsewhere in the Third World. In almost all instances these movements, inspired by the successes of Russia and China, had little sympathy for bourgeois democracy.

As the cleavage between socialism and democracy appeared to widen, the connection between capitalism and democracy seemed to grow stronger. Having lost the war, Japan and Germany lost their colonies. So too, soon enough, did most of the other European nations (reluctantly and often only after fierce struggle). The United States, for its part, granted (quasi-) independence to the Philippines. With capitalist fascism and overt colonialism mostly gone (Portugal would retain its African colonies into the 1970s), a new pair of equations gained prominence: capitalism = democracy, socialism = totalitarianism.

Of course the first equation could not be defended intellectually, however much it was embedded in popular consciousness. (In the United States, the Cold War was typically seen to be a battle between democracy and communism.) After all, there had been and still were nondemocratic capitalist countries. Moreover, capitalist democracies continued to support nondemocratic regimes abroad, however brutal, so long as they were anti-communist. On occasion, capitalist democracies would even instigate the replacement of democratically elected governments with viciously authoritarian ones.

The second equation, however, had its intellectual supporters. Milton Friedman (later to be awarded a

Nobel Prize in Economics) argued that capitalism was a necessary, although admittedly not sufficient, condition for democracy. He argued that socialism involves replacing decentralized market mechanisms with conscious central planning, and that such central planning is not only inherently inefficient, but it necessarily concentrates power in the hands of the small class of planners. With economic power so concentrated, the concentration of political power is inevitable. Moreover, this concentration virtually rules out dissent, because all media, indeed all jobs of any sort, are controlled by these planners. The inevitable outcome is totalitarianism.

Friedrich von Hayek (also awarded a Nobel Prize in Economics) went still further, arguing that even social democratic reforms intended not to overthrow capitalism, but only to curb the excesses of the market, would have the same result, being nothing less than the road to serfdom.

Hayek's argument was in part a response to a new division that had emerged among socialists, the division between *social democrats* and *democratic socialists*. The former had made peace with capitalism and concentrated on humanizing the system. Social democrats supported and tried to strengthen the basic institutions of the welfare state—pensions for all, public health care, public education, unemployment insurance. They supported and tried to strengthen the labor movement. The latter, as socialists, argued that capitalism could *never* be sufficiently humanized and that trying to suppress the economic contradictions in one area would only see them emerge in a different guise elsewhere (e.g., if you push unemployment too low, you'll get inflation; if job security is too strong, labor discipline breaks down.)

This division has become ever more pronounced since the demise of the Soviet Union. Today the major "socialist" parties of Europe, as well as the Labour Party of Great Britain and many former communist parties, have explicitly distanced themselves from socialism as traditionally understood and are now social democratic parties. There remain smaller parties in almost all countries, often split-offs from the major parties, that retain their allegiance to socialism. In the United States those small parties still bearing

the name *socialist* (e.g., Socialist Party USA, Socialist Workers Party) are still committed to socialism, as is the largest socialist organization, the Democratic Socialists of America, an organization that does not consider itself a political party.

Today there are few socialist organizations or self-identified socialist thinkers or activists who do not consider themselves *democratic* socialists. Indeed, the argument is now often made, more forcefully than ever before, that a true democrat, a *radical democrat*, must be a socialist. This argument—a mirror-image of the Friedman argument—purports to show that it is capitalism, not socialism, that is incompatible with genuine democracy.

It is argued that capitalism inevitably gives rise to vast disparities of wealth, and that this economic power inevitably translates into political power. In support of the first clause of the argument, one points to the ever-increasing concentration of wealth in capitalist countries following the collapse of capitalism's ideological rival, the existence of which had checked somewhat capitalism's rapacious tendencies. In support of the second, one points to the enormous role that money plays in contemporary elections, and the fact that virtually all the major media are owned by corporations, which are, in turn, controlled by the wealthy. To these considerations is added a theoretical argument. If an elected government should make a serious attempt to rein in the power of capital, an "investment strike" would ensue, bringing on a severe economic downturn that will have a negative impact on everybody. The offending government will be quickly voted out of office. So long as a small class has such power, real democracy is impossible.

This argument raises a deep question about the meaning of the term *democracy*. Are capitalist democracies truly democratic? The term *socialist* is also much contested. Virtually all socialists have distanced themselves from the economic model long synonymous with *socialism* (i.e., the Soviet model of a nonmarket, centrally planned economy). The validity of the Friedmanite critique of this specific form of socialism has been (at least implicitly) acknowledged. Some have endorsed the concept of *market socialism*,

a postcapitalist economy that retains market competition but socializes the means of production and, in some versions, extends democracy to the workplace. Some hold out for a nonmarket, participatory economy. All democratic socialists agree on the need for a democratic alternative to capitalism. There is no consensus as yet as to what that alternative should look like.

—David Schweickart

See also *Communist Manifesto*; Debs, Eugene V.; Democracy; Engels, Friedrich; Fascism; Harrington, Michael; Marx, Karl; Mill, John Stuart; Owen, Robert; Participatory Economics; Social Democracy; Socialism

Further Readings

- Bobbio, N. (1987). *Which socialism? Marxism, socialism, and democracy*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Busky, D. (2000). *Democratic socialism: A global survey*. New York: Praeger.
- Callinicos, A. (1993). Socialism and democracy. In D. Held (Ed.), *Prospects for democracy* (pp. 200–212). Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Cunningham, F. (1987). *Democratic theory and socialism*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Cunningham, F. (1994). *The real world of democracy revisited and other essays on democracy and socialism*. Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Humanities Press.
- Dahl, R. A. (1985). *A preface to economic democracy*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Dahl, R. A. (1989). *Democracy and its critics*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Gould, C. (1987). *Rethinking democracy: Freedom and social cooperation in politics, economy, and society*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Harrington, M. (1972). *Socialism*. New York: Bantam.
- Howard, M. (Ed.). (2001). *Socialism*. Amherst, NY: Humanities Press.
- Schumpeter, J. (1942). *Capitalism, socialism, and democracy*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Schweickart, D. (2002). *After capitalism*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

DEMONSTRATIONS

See STRATEGIES AND TACTICS IN
SOCIAL MOVEMENTS

DERRIDA, JACQUES (1930–2004)

Jacques Derrida is one of the most important intellectual figures associated with poststructural and postmodern theory—although he never used the latter term—and is credited with creating the notion of deconstruction. His reassessments of classical metaphysics have posed a substantial challenge to philosophy, his readings of structuralist anthropology have forced serious reconsiderations of thinking in that area, and his discussions of language and literature have had a great impact on these and related fields. In his later life, Derrida increasingly turned his investigations to issues of ethics, justice, and the law, analyzing the legacy of Marxist thought in the wake of the Cold War.

His voluminous writings and broad consideration of questions of *being* in a secular world make him one of the most important thinkers of the 20th century, one whose influence is still in the process of being assessed and whose work is difficult to summarize accurately. He has proven controversial for those engaging in questions of activism and social justice, as his assertion that there are no absolute or transcendental cultural values has challenged people attempting to assert the value of universal human rights. At the same time, his goal of creating an inclusive society to come, one that remains open to change in the future, presents his readers with ways of conceptualizing a world beyond the dichotomies of inside and outside, or inclusion and exclusion.

In 1930 Jacques Derrida was born to a family of Jewish descent in the French colony of Algeria. He grew up in El-Biar and was expelled from his *lycée* by a government eager to please the Vichy regime's anti-Semitic policies in France. His family later moved to France in order to help him pursue his education. Derrida succeeded in the French system, becoming a student and then lecturer at the elite *École Normale Supérieure* in 1952, where he studied under Michel Foucault and Louis Althusser. He met his future wife Marguerite, a psychoanalyst, in 1953, and in 1957 they married in the United States and eventually had two sons. During the Algerian War of Independence,

Derrida avoided military service by teaching soldiers' children French and English. After this period, Derrida became associated with the leftist avant-garde literary group *Tel Quel* while teaching at the Sorbonne and the *École Normale Supérieure*. He later dissociated himself from this group, maintaining a complicated position with their political leanings, as he did with most political movements. He finished his *d'état* (roughly equivalent to a doctoral thesis) in 1980, and became the director of studies at the *École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales*. He was a founder of the International College of Philosophy and held a number of visiting and permanent positions at universities in the United States, though he made his home in Paris. He received a number of honorary doctoral degrees and traveled widely prior to his death from pancreatic cancer in 2004.

Derrida emerged into the intellectual spotlight in the late 1960s with his publications "Structure, Sign, and Play in the Discourse of the Human Sciences" and *Of Grammatology*. "Structure, Sign, and Play" was first delivered as a lecture at Johns Hopkins University and then published in the volume *Writing and Difference*. The paper's initial purpose was to critique the vogue of structuralist theory, which was then dominant in much intellectual thought, and which sought the underlying structures that govern all social relations. In it, Derrida proposes a radical rupture against this thinking, asserting that no such underlying structures exist. These early works suggest the project of deconstruction, a notion derived from Martin Heidegger's use of the term *destruction*. Derrida uses the concept of deconstruction to dismantle the assumptions that are present in any text or discourse. He works from the premise that any center or metaphysically grounding notion—such as God, truth, or transcendence—can be demonstrated to be a false or incomplete explanation of how meaning functions. Deconstruction proposes to unsettle sedimented thought patterns. As such, it has the potential to liberate thought from its static or fixed forms and to allow new thinking to occur. Deconstruction is motivated by attempts to disrupt the hierarchical and dualistic modes of thought on which much of Western philosophy, as derived from Plato, is based. The supposed

differences or oppositions between, for example, culture and nature can be shown to be artificial through this process, and the valuing of one over the other becomes an arbitrary judgment rather than a transcendent truth. *Of Grammatology* pursues such an investigation by deconstructing the opposition between writing and speech. Once a text relying on such an opposition is destabilized, its meaning opens up and become fluid, enabling alternative interpretations. As a result, deconstruction proposes a challenge to the notions of limits developed in analytic philosophy.

A euphoric explosion of poststructural thought followed Derrida's early works, even as skeptics queried the ethics of this decentered system. Alongside the development of deconstruction and poststructuralism, Jean-François Lyotard and others began to articulate the mind-set of postmodernism, which became inextricably linked to Derrida. Lyotard's statement that the postmodern is evidenced by what he calls an incredulity toward metanarratives—or underlying patterns of thought, such as the ideology of progress—parallels Derrida's disavowal of metaphysics. Critics from Jonathan Culler to Fredric Jameson and Terry Eagleton seized on Derridean and postmodern thinking in their assessments of culture, making postmodernity a dominant mind-set in the last quarter of the 20th century. Processes of deconstruction allowed thinkers like Judith Butler to demonstrate that the dominant sex and gender systems of Western society are social constructs based in what she calls *performativity*, rather than natural modes of being, just as Derrida's thought has enabled the writings of the critic Gayatri Spivak, who has sought to empower subaltern women in the Third World.

Derrida's thinking has proven to be highly controversial. He is sometimes dismissed as too obscure or esoteric in his writing, and many segments of the field of philosophy in particular, have been hostile to Derrida's propositions. In 1992, a group of professors at Cambridge University came to prominence over their objections about plans to award Derrida an honorary degree, while a *New York Times* obituary decried Derrida as obscure, leading to a protest petition from supporters. Critics have charged that Derrida is not only difficult to read, but that his notion of the

deconstruction of values leads society into a cultural relativism in which it may no longer be possible to assert that any one thing is better than any other.

Partly in response to his critics and the questions surrounding Martin Heidegger's debated affinities with Nazism, Derrida increasingly turned toward direct investigations of ethics and politics, while insisting that his initial project of deconstruction was founded on these very considerations. His later works sought to demonstrate how deconstruction might free us to construct new, open-ended societies that can become welcoming of difference and remain flexible into the future. His later analyses delved into Marxism, death, the law, and the politics of friendship. He engaged in political advocacy, although he had kept himself distant from conventional politics since his disappointments after the May 1968 student uprisings in France. He contested the American war in Vietnam, was active in cultural activities linked to the anti-apartheid movement against the South African government, and was arrested in 1981 in Czechoslovakia after attending a conference. He met with Palestinian authorities in 1988, protested against the death penalty, supported the release of Mumia Abu-Jamal, and supported Lionel Jospin's socialist candidacy for president of France in 1995. At the time of his death, he was actively opposing the American-led invasion of Iraq in the aftermath of the attacks of September 11, 2001.

Throughout his later writings, Jacques Derrida sought to contrast, for example, justice and the law, discussing the gap between the two and creating a vision of a future justice to come. This vision is in part derived from a Marxist leaning, but one that is based on recognition of the impossibility of making any political or social decision. Once the arbitrariness of the choice is recognized, argues Derrida, its alternatives become visible and might be enacted. The exclusions of the world and its dichotomies can be undone, leading to a deconstructed world of unassimilated differences.

—Kit Dobson

See also Abu-Jamal, Mumia; Anti-Apartheid Movement; Anti-Death Penalty Movement; Deconstruction; Identity

Politics; Intifada (1987–1992, 2000–2003); Marxist Theory; May Revolution, France; Performativity; Plato; Postcolonial Theory; Postmodernism; Rousseau, Jean-Jacques; Spivak, Gayatri

Further Readings

- Beardsworth, R. (1996). *Derrida & the political*. London: Routledge.
- Derrida, J. (1976). *Of grammatology* (G. Spivak, Trans.). Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press. (Original work published 1967)
- Derrida, J. (1978). *Writing and difference*. (A. Bass, Trans.). London: Routledge. (Original work published 1967)
- Derrida, J. (1994). *Specters of Marx: The state of the debt, the work of mourning, and the new international* (P. Kamuf, Trans.). New York: Routledge.
- Lyotard, J. (1984). *The postmodern condition: A report on knowledge* (G. Bennington & B. Massumi, Trans.). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press. (Original work published 1979)

DEWEY, JOHN (1859–1952)

John Dewey was an educator, pragmatic and reconstructive philosopher, psychologist, and founder of the progressive education movement. His educational theories and practices in particular were groundbreaking, including support of teacher-student interaction, reflection and experience, and integration with community and democracy.

After obtaining a teacher of philosophy degree at the University of Vermont, Dewey began his educational career by working as a school teacher for several years and then enrolled in the graduate program in philosophy at Johns Hopkins University. There, Dewey studied with George Sylvester Morris, a Hegelian philosopher who became his mentor. He also worked with Stanley Hall, an important experimental psychologist who stressed application of scientific methodology to the human sciences.

After graduation, Dewey was hired into the University of Michigan department of philosophy. There he became increasingly interested in social, political, and economic issues, diverging from idealist

philosophy and moving toward pragmatism, struggling with religious issues, and philosophizing about the social nature of the mind and self. In 1886, Dewey married Alice Chipman and gradually began a shift of interests toward public affairs, social justice, and education, focusing on unity of theory and practice.

Dewey moved to the University of Chicago in 1894, as head of the department of philosophy, psychology, and pedagogy, becoming ever more involved in the philosophy of education. He defined the most significant problem of education as the harmonizing of individual traits with the social and moral, underscoring the need for improved theory of schooling and practice to address this problem. Emphasis on the connection of subject matter to the needs, interests, and cognitive development level of students was one of the most novel and enduring of Dewey's ideas. Dewey emphasized attention to both the cognitive and the moral and was strongly opposed to rote learning of facts. Dewey was one of the first educators to actively integrate experience with education.

Dewey founded the experimental University Laboratory School, known as the Dewey School, with the purpose of conducting educational experiments to develop and test educational theories; a platform for reform of pedagogical methods. The Laboratory School was all theory based and flexible in organization, structure, and opportunities. Students were grouped by interests and abilities and exposed to broad and varied curricula and methods. As one example, children learned science by investigating scientific processes as they took place during normal, participatory daily activities that they performed in their classes as experiments, true examples of learning by doing. Unfortunately, administrative difficulties resulted in the closure of the school after 7 years, well before Dewey was able to complete his experimentation.

Educational experimentalism was an underlying theme for much of Dewey's work from this time on. He viewed education as an endless and never fully generalizable experiment. Dewey preferred an educational approach that broadened intellect and developed problem-solving and critical-thinking skills, in direct contradiction to the traditional, back-to-the-basics, memorization-oriented educational programs.

In Chicago, Dewey also had the opportunity to work with many of the top American philosophers of the time and became involved with the political and social issues of the day, including immigration, urbanization, the labor movement, and technology.

Later, Dewey moved from Chicago to the Teacher's College at Columbia, continuing to work on educational issues, publishing, and becoming known worldwide for his work. He was a true public figure, considered by many to be the most public academic philosopher of the 20th century. The public knew him for his involvement in social causes, such as women's suffrage and unionization of teachers, and for his many articles on current social issues in popular magazines. Dewey toured and spoke internationally, visited schools, and continued educational research and the critical study of other educational movements of his day. He was politically active, involved in the American socialist party during the 1930s, committed to fully participatory democracy, and very much opposed to communism. Democracy is a recurring theme in his works, as he believed that only through a democratic society could education for all be improved and a better quality of life provided.

In general, Dewey focused his philosophical interests on theories of knowledge, considering education to be the process of forming fundamental dispositions, intellectual and emotional, necessarily engaged with experience, thinking, and reflection. Dewey believed that a general theory of education is theory of what is valuable enough to be taught to the next generation in order to promote effective adaptation of individuals to their physical and moral environment and prepare the young for future responsibility and success in life. He opposed imposition of education from above and supported educational experiences that utilized opportunities of present life. He felt that educational procedures should not start with facts and truths from outside the ordinary life experiences of the students and that educational experience should be organized and structured to fit the developmental stages of students. In this view Dewey was strongly influenced by Darwinian philosophy, from the standpoint of fit with environment and community, a philosophical perspective that Dewey referred to as *instrumentalism*.

Dewey was a proponent of diversity in education, recognizing that the potential of any given individual is unique, and believing that the goal of the educational system should be to help each individual achieve his or her full individual potential.

In many of his works during this period, Dewey stressed the social dimensions of inquiry. This was a philosophically productive time, during which Dewey and his colleagues were eventually responsible for developing biologically based functional philosophy. Emphasizing action, need, desire, and interest, it was a philosophy dependent on an understanding of the functional unity of individual and environment. Within this framework, Dewey now saw education as a social function, with pluralistic democracy being the best society to foster and sustain freedom, creativity, and growth. He believed democracy was necessary to support education in favor of an improved, shared common life. He argued that education on democratic habits should begin very early in a child's education, and that schools should encourage students to be active members of a community.

The educational ideas that Dewey publicized were very popular, and there is no doubt that he influenced the development of many new educational procedures, although his ideas were never integrated into American public school curricula to the extent he had hoped for. His ideas are viewed as inspirational by many educators (especially informal educators), but the implementation of progressive educational programs has been historically problematic. Dewey's writings are deep, complex, and often misinterpreted. The expansion of progressive education to include many other, often contradictory theories and practices has further complicated popular interpretation of much of Dewey's work. Progressive education was less dominant during the Cold War era, as analytic and phenomenological educational philosophies spread, but resurged in later years. Dewey's ideas are still an important educational philosophy, with ties to many modern curriculum reform efforts. There is great disagreement among adherents of progressive education with respect to Dewey's philosophical principles and school practices, making it very difficult to trace the extent of his influence on public school systems.

Dewey's ideas have often been severely criticized and are still open topics of debate. Critics point to a tendency for application of progressive methods that result in chaotic curriculum and excessive individualism, sometimes even blaming Dewey for what they perceived as the downfall of the American public education system. Dewey countered these critics by pointing out the tendency of some educators to respond to the need for improved education by seizing anything new and different without attention to the underlying theories. He stressed that progressive education is a departure from the old ways, which creates a new set of problems, requiring careful, planned implementation as a philosophy, not just a system. Everything depends on the quality of the educational experiences, with progressive organization of subject matter leading to an understanding of both content and meaning.

Dewey was both a very influential and prolific philosopher and author. Several of his most popular works for educators have been *How We Think*, *Logic: The Theory of Inquiry*, and *Democracy and Education*. In addition to writing on education, philosophy, psychology, logic, and democracy, Dewey also wrote on the subjects of human behavior, politics, aesthetics, ethics, the nature of a satisfied life, and religion. Today, Dewey's philosophies continue to be studied, continued, and expanded on worldwide, with the Center for Dewey Studies at Southern Illinois a key international focal point for research on Dewey's life and works.

—Susan L. Rothwell

See also Critical Pedagogy; Democracy; Hull-House; Progressive Movement, Education

Further Readings

- Baker, M. (1966). *Foundations of John Dewey's educational theory*. New York: Atherton.
- Boydston, J. (Ed.). (1967–1991). *The collected works of John Dewey* (Vols. 1–37). Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Bullert, G. (1983). *The politics of John Dewey*. Buffalo, NY: Prometheus Books.
- Dykhuizen, G. (1973). *The life and mind of John Dewey*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

- Hickman, L. (1990). *John Dewey's pragmatic technology*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Hook, S. (1939). *John Dewey: An intellectual portrait*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Mayhew, K., & Edwards, A. (1966). *The Dewey school*. New York: Atherton.

DICKENS, CHARLES (1812–1870)

Charles Dickens was a 19th-century British novelist, journalist, and social critic. Dickens was born in 1812 in Portsmouth, England, the son of a clerk in the navy pay office. When his father was imprisoned for debt, the young Charles, at the age of 12, was forced to work in a blacking warehouse in order to support the rest of the family. This youthful experience of poverty deeply affected Dickens. Its impact can be felt most poignantly in his novels, in his stories of poor boys like Oliver Twist, David Copperfield, and Pip in *Great Expectations*, who struggle to rise out of the impoverished circumstances of their childhoods to achieve success and respectability. Dickens's own struggles against poverty produced the central contradiction of his adult life and career. His experiences imbued his writing with an ever-present social conscience while at the same time they fostered his own material ambitions. Dickens the grown-up would always suffer from a profound fear of financial insecurity despite his ever-increasing wealth and celebrity.

After working as an office boy, Dickens became a Parliamentary reporter for the London *Morning Chronicle* and embarked on a career in journalism that would set the stage for his future success as a popular novelist and influential editor. The role of journalism in Dickens's career is frequently underestimated. Throughout his life, Dickens was a leading figure in the Victorian periodical press. All the novels that we know so well today saw their first publication in serial form in magazines or newspapers. From 1833 to 1835, Dickens published a series of articles on London street life, which were collected and published together under the title *Sketches by Boz* in 1836. These short pieces chronicled the lives of both the poor and the

wealthy in Victorian London, the first industrialized city in the world's history. For example, in a description of a typical London pawn shop, Dickens portrays the representatives of various social classes, each with their individual motives and life stories, gathered together at the pawn brokers to engage in the daily commerce enacted there. The huge success of *Sketches by Boz* led to Dickens's securing of a contract for his first novel, *The Pickwick Papers* of 1837, and launched his literary career. With the publication of the *Sketches* and of *Pickwick*, Dickens found himself a celebrity at the age of 25.

In 1837, Dickens published *Oliver Twist*, the story of an orphan who escapes through equal measures of luck and virtue first from life in a workhouse and then from his apprenticeship to an undertaker and makes his way to the metropolis of London, only to fall in with a gang of thieves, pickpockets, and prostitutes. While chronicling the misfortunes of young Oliver, Dickens simultaneously presented Victorian readers with a compelling portrait of the life of the poor and criminal classes, the left-behinds of British progress and prosperity in the early half of the 19th century. The publication of *Oliver Twist* and other successive novels secured Dickens's status as the most widely read author of his time. In 1842, Dickens visited America for the first time for a series of public appearances that underscored his popularity on both sides of the Atlantic. Dickens expressed his disillusionment with the United States in *American Notes* (1842), a series of travel sketches and dispatches, and in the novel *Martin Chuzzlewit*. His stereotyped portrayal of American life deeply offended his American audience. At the same time, Dickens became an impassioned advocate for the abolition of slavery in the United States.

Alongside his success as a novelist, Dickens also founded and edited a series of widely circulated and highly influential magazines and journals. These publications aimed to satisfy the Victorians' almost insatiable desire for the printed word. Among these were the radical paper *Daily News*, founded in 1846, which Dickens briefly edited; *Household Words*, established in 1850; and its successor, *All the Year Round*, which

Dickens edited from 1859 until his death. Beginning with the semiautobiographical novel *David Copperfield* in 1850, Dickens's various journals and magazines provided an outlet for the serialization of some of his best-known novels, including *Hard Times* (1854), a tale of life in one of the new factory towns of Victorian England; *A Tale of Two Cities* (1859), a treatment of the Reign of Terror in Revolutionary France; and *Great Expectations* (1861), the story of Pip, another poor orphan boy who realizes his dreams of wealth and social status, only to find that all his success is the result of an early, nearly forgotten encounter with an escaped criminal. In addition to his novelistic output, Dickens also involved himself in a number of theatrical productions, including adaptations for the stage of his own novels. He also gave a series of public readings, including a second tour of America in 1868 and 1869. These appearances proved immensely popular and profitable, and Dickens often played to stadium-sized crowds. They were also exhausting, both physically and emotionally, and the pace of Dickens's work and tours contributed to his sudden death in 1870. Dickens left his last novel, *The Mystery of Edwin Drood*, unfinished at the time of his death.

Although he has often been criticized for his inability to portray women realistically and for his constant craving after success and status, Charles Dickens throughout his novels and other writings remained a steady and constant voice for social reform in the midst of Victorian England's reckless embrace of industrial capitalism and technological progress.

—Tony Rafalowski

See also Abolitionist Movements; Literature and Activism

Further Readings

- Ackroyd, P. (1991). *Introduction to Dickens*. New York: Ballantine.
- Dickens, C. (1997). *Selected journalism, 1850–1870* (D. Pascoe, Ed.). London: Penguin.
- Drew, J. M. L. (2003). *Dickens the journalist*. London: Palgrave.
- Smiley, J. (2002). *Charles Dickens*. New York: Viking.

DIFFERENCE

The concept of *difference* has long existed in philosophy and social sciences, but it is only in recent decades, with the increased interest in multicultural and gender studies, that it has become a central part of debates in academic, social, and political circles. It is possible to identify two distinct definitions of difference: The first was developed in the modern era, beginning in the Enlightenment, and the second arose in the 20th century, from the 1960s onwards.

During the modern era, democracy appeared with the intention of establishing a universal concept of the human being. This required the elimination of special characteristics and differences and the promotion of equality and equal rights for all. This concept of equality attempted to remove the right to difference that aristocratic and religious elites had established for their own benefit in the form of privileges. However, in reality the new universal project concealed what was in fact the identification the subject's right with those of a white, Western, heterosexual male.

From this point of view, being different meant not being considered part of the human race and, consequently, exclusion from universal rights. Being different was always associated with being the "other," the "exotic," or the "inferior." As a result, much of the oppressed groups' struggle for emancipation was based on assimilation, on showing that those labelled as "different" were not in fact inferior and could carry out generic human tasks if they were given an adequate education and enjoyed equal opportunities. In this sense, cultural difference acted as an ideology that legitimated social inequality.

The positive affirmation of difference began in the social movements of the 1960s with what has been called the *struggle for recognition* of stigmatized and devalued identities. New groups and theories appeared within the feminist movement and began criticizing equalitarian feminism because it was believed that this approach victimized women. Instead, the affirmation of female difference was advocated. At the same time, other groups adopted

similar policies, taking the negative concepts of difference previously applied to them and redefining them in terms of pride and empowerment. This was expressed in slogans such as *Black Is Beautiful* and *Gay Pride*.

At the present time, the understanding that difference and diversity are intrinsically good seems to have triumphed, and current debates center on how difference and social equality can fit together satisfactorily. Proof of the acceptance of diversity can be seen in the policies of organizations such as the United Nations. However, the debate about the intrinsic worth of all cultural difference is not over because one important question needs to be addressed. This question is whether racist, sexist, and homophobic elements present in cultural diversity should be respected. Many nations accept that respect for human rights is a necessary requirement for respect of all cultural difference. However, some argue that human rights are in fact a cultural creation of particular societies.

—Ana de Miguel

See also Citizenship; Identity Politics; Postmodernism

Further Readings

- Taylor, C. (1992). *Multiculturalism and "the politics of recognition."* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Touraine, A. (2000). *Pourrons-nous vivre ensemble? Égaux et différents* [Will we be able to live together? Equal and different]. Paris: Fayard.
- Young, I. M. (1990). *Justice and the politics of difference.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

DIGITAL ACTIVISM

Digital activism is a form of activism that uses digital media, mainly the Internet, as a key platform for mass mobilization and political action. From the early experiments of the 1980s to the current *smart mobs* and *blogs*, activists and computer specialists have approached digital networks as a channel for militant action. Initially, online activists used the Internet as a

medium for information distribution, given its capacity to reach massive audiences across borders instantaneously. A more developed undertaking of digital activism or *cyberactivism* approaches the World Wide Web as a *site* of protest, turning virtual space into a ground that mirrors and amplifies street (or offline) demonstrations.

This use of the Web as a valid terrain for social antagonism comes from an understanding of the nomadic nature of the current configuration of hegemonic power. In this scenario, transnational labor and capital flow are indicators of how power is not tied to particular physical spaces but circulates smoothly through the information highway. Digital activists claim that, in order to disrupt the capitalist structures that are favored by the process of globalization, an effective activist action must confront power in its nomadic being by, among other tactics, blocking its free circulation across nation-state borders.

One of the fundamental goals of online activism is to make the body digitally active and not just the passive receptor of power's ubiquitous interpellation that confines individuals to different kinds of data banks. E-mail campaigning is one of the simplest ways in which activists use the Internet as a complement to street action. On the other extreme, *hacktivism* (a form of digital activism that comes out of the hacker culture of the 1980s) aims at breaking in and disrupting websites by altering the patterns of code arrangement. Hacktivists, such as the group Cult of the Dead Cow (cDc), operate based on the philosophy of freedom of information and the rights of people to have unrestricted access to digital resources.

Different digital tactics entail diverse uses of the electronic networks. Text-based practices include e-mail campaigns, text messaging, Web postings, and online petitions to advocate for a determined cause and to generate massive support. *Web defacing* or *cybergraffiti*, a more complex text-based online practice, is an action in which a specialized group of cyberactivists or hacktivists alters the home page of an organization by posting information that holds it accountable for its role in a given conflict. Another way of generating text to create awareness of a political matter is known as *HTML conceptualism*. It

consists of an action in which a group's request of nonexistent pages within an organization's website makes the server return error pages with a message reading, for example, "human rights not found on this server." More performative actions, like "virtual sit-ins" and "e-mail bombs," push the possibilities of online activism a little further, provoking a concrete disruption of the servers' functionality through the concerted action of participants around the world.

Although online political participation always brings up the issue of the digital divide, that is, of the unequal access that different social actors have to technological devices, in many cases online activists narrow the distance between both ends of this division by collaborating with disenfranchised groups in a networked manner. Ricardo Dominguez and his group the Electronic Disturbance Theatre (EDT) take traditional civil disobedience tactics to the Net in support of social movements like the Zapatistas in Chiapas, Mexico; the immigrants subjected to border patrol brutality on the border between Mexico and the United States; or the families of the murdered young women of Ciudad Juárez. In 1998, EDT automated the virtual sit-in, a form of online demonstration in which a networked community gathers on one or several sites to carry out an act of digital dissent. The action is undertaken through a Web-based program, FloodNet, that sends repetitive requests to the targeted Web pages. The protestors' automated "clickings," simultaneously enacted from multiple computers around the world, provoke such an excess of traffic that the targeted site's server is unable to handle it. By clogging the bandwidth, the action affects the site's technological efficiency, slowing down its capacity to retrieve information and eventually provoking its shutting down. In this way, the action combines the activists' appearance in virtual space with their intervention in time, because, as a result of this massive presence, the action disrupts the server's pace. In contrast with hacktivism, which achieves technological efficiency by operating at a *syntactical* level; that is, at the level of code programming, Dominguez locates the efficiency reached by EDT's virtual actions on a *semantic* level. In EDT's actions, myriad symbolic gestures—tied more to the politics of the question and utopia than to a revolutionary overthrowing of power—create disturbance

through a poetic reformulation of the link between the real and the virtual. EDT's activism takes much of its symbolic force from the Zapatistas, the Mexican indigenous insurrectionary movement who, through the *communiqués* delivered by their leader, the Subcomandante Marcos, unfolded a creative use of language and technology as powerful weapons against hegemonic power. EDT's actions fall into the category of *electronic civil disobedience*, and, to dissociate them from acts of cyberterrorism or regular hacking, activists ask that these online political gestures comply to certain rules: The actions should always represent a communal interest and not an individual agenda, their motifs and agents should be publicly exposed, they should also include a "live" element linking them to some sort of street action, and they should be easily appropriated and replicated by groups with little or no technological knowledge.

Concepts like *virtual sit-in* or *electronic civil disobedience* show the way in which cyberactivists refer to the rhetoric of the street and to traditional activism in order to make their actions intelligible and meaningful beyond techno-jargon. Similarly, online activism renames street actions as "offline" or "no-fi"; that is, involving no technology, to show the continuity between both online and "live" practices and their value as tactics that can be juxtaposed or alternated depending on the context.

One of the main debates in the field of online activism revolves around the issue of digital correctness bringing hacktivists like Cult of the Dead Cow against other digital activists such as the Electronic Disturbance Theater or The Electrohippies Collective, who carry out virtual sit-ins. The cDc claims that, by blocking access to certain web pages, virtual sit-ins provoke what is called a *denial of service* (DoS), an act that they deem unethical and illegal because it violates the rights secured by the First Amendment of the U.S. Constitution. Similarly, Dominguez from EDT regards cDc's actions as elitist and paramilitary in that they are highly technological and their efficacy does not rely on collective convergence, like EDT's populist campaigns do, but on the level of expertise of a single individual.

As a relatively new field of political action, digital activism invites the question of the concrete efficacy

of these gestures that are played out in the virtual realm, a space to which people have different degrees of proximity and engagement. The importance of this kind of activism should not be evaluated in terms of the number of servers that crash as a consequence of these actions. Born in the era of global capital, online activism strives for the generation of a "swarm effect" across borders, a gathering of bodies that is not predicated on corporeal physical presence but on body-machine associations and networked behavior. Digital activist actions always play in tandem with mass-media coverage; that is, a big part of their success depends on generating media attention, another way for the issues at stake to trespass borders.

Online actions can prove of importance in countries where public spaces are highly regulated or militarized. In these cases, online actions signify a better option than "live" actions, putting the electronic body on the front-line when the biological one is at risk. Online protest also plays a vital role when there is a need to assert collective agency against the transnational institutions whose decisions affect the future of local economies and natural resources.

Despite the efforts of online activists to link their actions to traditional protest culture, old-school activists are skeptical about digital activism's real capacity to effect social change. However, scholars in the field point out the importance of cyberactivism in that it generates a radical shift in the use of the Internet and digital technology as an instrument of hegemonic power to the digital as a valid infrastructure for grassroots political mobilization. Digital activism provides new ways for the body to inhabit this realm in an ideally transformative fashion, turning from consumer to agent. This is the principle that contemporary activists and artists follow to account for the power of bodily presence in both its online and offline manifestations. The establishment of governmental secret agencies and laws in an attempt to regulate not only cyberspace but also digital actions has already proved the efficacy of the online body as the radical administrator of its own code.

—Marcela A. Fuentes

See also Blogging; Civil Disobedience; Digital Equity; Electronic Democracy; Virtual Sit-Ins

Further Readings

- Critical Art Ensemble. (1994). *The electronic disturbance*. New York: Autonomedia.
- Critical Art Ensemble. (1996). *Electronic civil disobedience*. New York: Autonomedia.
- Critical Art Ensemble. (2001). *Digital resistance: Explorations in tactical media*. New York: Autonomedia.
- Fusco, C. (2003). On-line simulations/real-life politics: A discussion with Ricardo Domínguez on staging virtual theatre. *The Drama Review*, 47(2), 151–162.
- McCaughey, M., & Ayers, M. D. (Eds.). (2003). *Cyberactivism: Online activism in theory and practice*. New York: Routledge.
- Rheingold, H. (2002). *Smart mobs: The next social revolution*. Cambridge, MA: Perseus.

DIGITAL EQUITY

The term *digital divide* was coined in the 1980s to describe gaps in access to computers and the Internet among individuals and groups based on race, gender, socioeconomic status, first language, disability, and other social or cultural identities. Early conceptualizations of the digital divide tended to conceive access only in terms of *physical* access to or ownership of these technologies. In other words, if somebody lived in a household in which the Internet or a computer was available, or if she or he attended a school with a computer lab, that individual was perceived as having Internet or computer access.

But in the 1990s, as critical cultural theorists, social justice educators, and other scholar-activists began to situate and analyze the digital divide within larger analyses of racism, sexism, classism, linguicism, and imperialism, they found these early conceptualizations of the digital divide to be lacking complexity as well as sociohistorical and sociopolitical context. For example, by 2000 U.S. women had surpassed U.S. men to become a majority of the U.S. online population. This led many information technology scholars to hail the end of the gender digital divide. But girls and women continued to trail boys and men in educational and career pursuits related to computers and technology, due largely to a lack of encouragement, or blatant discouragement, from educators, peers, the media, and the

wider society. And women remained virtually locked out of the increasingly techno-driven global economy while men were more likely to recognize computers and the Internet as tools for economic and professional gain. The equalizing of Internet access rates between girls and boys and between women and men was a significant step toward the elimination of the gender digital divide—a step toward equality. But when more critical scholars with a deeper understanding of equity and social justice looked through a different lens, one painted with the full historical scope of sexism at local, national, and global levels, a much more complex conceptualization for “access” began to emerge. If we are to understand authentically the cross-group gaps in computer and Internet access, these scholars insisted, we first must understand these gaps as symptoms of existing systemic inequities. They began reshaping the digital divide dialogue, broadening its scope, and asking deeper questions about the role of cybertechnologies in education and the larger society.

Emerging from these efforts was the digital equity movement. This movement was, and continues to be, dedicated to (a) challenging the notion that computers and the Internet are inherently the “great equalizers” of society and the world, (b) uncovering ways in which an uncritical endorsement of technological “progress” in the form of educational computer technology is actually contributing to the cycle of inequities, and (c) expanding the digital divide concept of “access” beyond mere physical access to include social, cultural, and political access to these technologies and the social and economic benefits of that access. The base concern of the digital equity movement is that most conceptions of the digital divide, and as a result, most programs designed to close it, are too simplistic and thus replicate the very privilege and oppression continuum they ostensibly aim to dismantle. The base goal of the digital equity movement is to contribute to the larger social justice movement by eliminating digital inequities—racism, sexism, heterosexism, classism, linguicism, ableism, imperialism, and other forms of oppression—as replicated through these electronic media.

The leaders of the digital equity movement include a wide variety of individuals and organizations

spanning the world. As in any movement, those involved bring diverse lenses and priorities, some focusing on one dimension of equity (such as sexism), some specializing in a particular form of activism (such as organizing and lobbying government officials), some working in a particular sphere (such as education), and some leading grassroots efforts in a particular region or community. One of the central organizations that bridges these roles is the Digital Divide Network, providing information and points of connection for educators, activists, and policymakers committed to the digital equity movement. The Society for Information Technology and Teacher Education, a branch of the Association for the Advancement of Computers in Education, has also played a leading role in educating and organizing people to battle the digital divide. Digital Sisters, Inc., a nonprofit organization providing technology education for women and children who are traditionally underserved, has emerged as a model for anti-digital-sexism activism. The Center for Democracy & Technology provides several outlets for activism, promoting democratic values in a digital age. Meanwhile, many other organizations including some, like the American Association of University Women and the National Association for Multicultural Education, that are not focused centrally on technology, have become important advocates for the digital equity movement.

Among the many individual pioneers of the digital equity movement, several have made particularly unique and guiding contributions. Andy Carvin, coordinator of the Digital Divide Network, was an early leader of the movement and one of the first scholars to challenge narrowly defined conceptions of computer and Internet access. Cynthia D. Waddell led the fight to apply the Americans with Disabilities Act to the Internet, particularly advocating for accessible Internet content for people with disabilities and the elderly. Susan Herring, professor of Information Sciences at Indiana University, has pushed a broader vision for the gender digital divide since the early 1990s, especially with her studies of the genderization of electronic discourse. Bonnie Bracey, a George Lucas Education Foundation fellow, works as an educator, activist, and lobbyist for digital equity.

In order to highlight and address the complexities of digital inequity and to challenge prevailing shallow understandings of the digital divide, these and other scholars and activists have identified several guiding principles that drive the digital equity movement. One such principle is that we must broaden the meaning of access beyond that of physical access to, or usage rates of, computers and the Internet to include access to equitable support and encouragement to pursue and value technology-related fields, educationally and professionally. So, for example, while the digital equity movement supports the idea of having computers in every school classroom, it also insists that gender role stereotypes that discourage many girls from pursuing possible interests in technology must be eliminated in order to achieve digital equity.

Another principle of the digital equity movement is that all people must have equitably convenient access to computer technology resources (including hardware, software, wired infrastructure, and assistive technology when necessary). This principle pushes against the notion that wealthy people inherently deserve quicker and more convenient access to new technologies such as high-speed Internet access simply because they can afford them. It also challenges the idea that public computer and Internet access, such as that available in libraries and other public spaces, is comparable to computer and Internet access in the comfort of one's own home.

A third digital equity principle is grounded in research that shows that sexist, racist, heterosexist, and other oppressive dynamics observable offline are equally observable online. These dynamics, as manifested online, include the proliferation of Internet-based pornography, the abundance of white supremacist and other hate-based websites, the replication of male-dominated discussion patterns in online forums, and the prevalence of software, including computer games and educational programs, that draw on gender and racial stereotypes. According to this principle, digital equity can be realized only when all people have equitable access to inclusive, nonhostile software and Internet content.

The digital equity movement also is dedicated to the principle that all children must be exposed to new

technologies in progressive, pedagogically sound ways. Like the third principle, this one is grounded in research showing that educational uses of computers and the Internet mirror the inequitable practices prevalent when these technologies are not in play. It is not enough, this principle states, to have computers and the Internet in every classroom when some teachers (predominantly those at mostly white and mostly wealthy schools) use them to encourage critical and creative thinking while others (predominantly at schools with large percentages of students of color and students in poverty) use them to replicate the skills-and-drills and lower-level-thinking activities. This means that all teachers, regardless of the schools in which they teach, must have equitable access to continuous professional development on incorporating advanced technologies into their teaching in progressive, pedagogically sound ways.

A fifth principle stipulates that all people must have access to culturally relevant, meaningful, and consumable computer and Internet content. Digital equity scholars whose work digs most deeply into this principle argue, in essence, that simply providing access to software and Internet content is inadequate when little or no relevant content exists for a given group or individual. Research has shown, for example, that online content most relevant to poor or working-class families all over the world—information about jobs, affordable shelter, and assistance programs—is largely nonexistent. Moreover, despite the fact that most Internet users are not first language English speakers, less than one third of all websites are available in languages other than English. According to the global digital equity movement, conceptions of the digital divide concerned only with whether or not individuals or groups have physical access to computers and the Internet fail to capture these crucial intricacies.

Finally, a sixth principle asserts that the inequities that exist among these and other dimensions of access, and the fact that these inequities most negatively affect people already disempowered by racism, sexism, classism, imperialism, and other forms of oppression, necessitate a collective reconsideration of the growing global importance assigned to computers and

the Internet. The digital equity movement in this sense calls for a deep and complex reconsideration of the larger sociopolitical and socioeconomic ramifications of the corporation-led push for globalization and these technologies' roles in the globalization process. This principle is based on a central question: How does the growing merger of cyberculture with wider U.S. culture privilege those who already enjoy social, political, and economic access in the broadest sense?

Underlying all of these principles is an insistence that the digital divide be understood as a symptom of larger structures of inequity and injustice. By extension, any plan or program for eliminating the digital divide and achieving digital equity must be connected to and contextualized within larger movements for equity and social justice.

As the digital age spans into the 2000s and toward the 2010s, the digital equity movement continues to apply these principles, critiquing insufficient efforts to close the digital divide and constructing new initiatives to dismantle digital inequities. Meanwhile, the movement grows larger and more global each year as UNESCO and other international organizations begin to highlight, educate about, and fight digital inequities.

—Paul C. Gorski

See also Anti-Racist Teaching; Critical Literacy; Critical Pedagogy; Cyber Rights; Gender Equity Movement in Schools

Further Readings

- American Association of University Women (AAUW). (2000). *Tech-savvy: Educating girls in the new computer age*. Washington, DC: AAUW Educational Foundation Research.
- Blair, K., & Takayoshi, P. (Eds.). (1999). *Feminist cyberscapes: Mapping gendered academic spaces*. Stamford, CT: Ablex.
- Children's Partnership. (2003). *Online content for low-income and underserved Americans*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Lenhart, A. (2003). *The ever-shifting internet population: A new look at internet access and the digital divide*. Washington, DC: Pew Internet & American Life Project.

- Norris, P. (2001). *Digital divide: Civic engagement, information poverty, and the internet worldwide*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Solomon, G., Allen, N. J., & Resta, P. (Eds.). (2003). *Toward digital equity: Bridging the divide in education*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Warschauer, M. (2004). *Technology and social inclusion: Rethinking the digital divide*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

DIRECT ACTION

A political method in which persons, without the use of power holders, representatives, professionals, or indirect institutional means, engage practically in social life and realize stated goals. With direct action you realize the intention of the action directly without asking for permission. Direct action might be secret or public, nonviolent or violent, legal or illegal, as well as against or for something. In its most unique variation it transforms the goal into its means. For example, if you want free speech in a dictatorship, you practice free speech and ignore the rules, mind-set, and culture of censorship by publicly making your opposition known—as Charta 77 and other freedom groups did under dictatorship in Eastern Europe before 1989. Or a movement, such as the Plowshares, which wishes for disarmament of nuclear weapons but live in the United States, the most nuclear armed country in the world, put into practice their own disarmament actions at military factories and bases. With hammers, bolt cutters, and other household tools they disarm (or “destroy”) weapons equipment and thus enact the biblical prophecy of beating their swords into plowshares.

Thus, direct action attempts to achieve the aspired change through autonomous means, bypassing power holders. It is a kind of do-it-yourself (DIY) culture of politics in which you make wished-for changes yourself. Direct action is the direct intervention into something in society according to activists’ own values, ideas, or needs, where perceived problems are directly redeemed or possibilities realized. A popular slogan among direct actionists is “If not now, when? If not you, who?”

Its opposite is *indirect action*; that is, conventional representative politics. It would be indirect to ask

leaders, authorities, parents, experts, corporations, or civil servants to solve a problem for you. Direct action varies and might be practical work to create fair trade, ecological villages, direct democracy, cooperatives, or to make your own clothes. It might also be a matter of dramatic actions that confront power structures and state laws.

This tradition was developed in labor struggles and by anarchism since the 19th century (e.g., in Russia and Spain), 20th-century nonviolent movements (e.g., in India), and the anti-authoritarian movements of 1960s (e.g., the situationists in France). The concept is popular today within various radical movements (e.g., militant environmentalists in the United States, Australia, and Norway).

Both academic and activist literature often mistakenly equates the concept with civil disobedience, protest, or demonstration. Some even understand it as necessarily violent and secret. Such confusion increases by the frequent reference to, for example, anarchist assassinations of ruling elites in 19th-century Russia as a propaganda of the deed. Still, the U.S. civil rights leader Martin Luther King, Jr., used the concept regularly but preferred to add the word *nonviolent*. *Nonviolent direct action* is a common term today within various movements in the United States and United Kingdom, often simply as NVDA. An illegal and secret (and sometimes violence-prepared) direct action tradition is cultivated in diverse groups but similar DIY cultures, like the Animal Liberation Front in England, the Autonomen in Germany, and the Black Bloc in the United States.

At times direct action is treated as the opposite of symbolic action. In fact, all human actions that have meaning and are communicated are symbolic. And political actions are clearly meaningful; that is, they have a message beyond what is practically achieved. Instead, it makes more sense to speak about a stronger or weaker symbolism of certain direct actions. Then an action that really achieves its goal, here and now, becomes symbolically strong. If nothing real happens at all, political symbols become quite empty. Then they are only gestures or signs, like political badges or traffic signs. Yet, a new generation of mass-media users, such as the Ruckus Society, one of the organizers of the Battle of Seattle in 1999, transcends this old

and assumed dichotomy and use, direct action to increase the political strength of their symbols.

A relevant distinction is that between protest and direct action. The protest is an appeal to authorities to change their mind, policy, or decision, similar to the complaint subjects could present at the mercy of the sovereign in old times. A protest is not a direct change of matters, decisively benefiting those concerned. To shut off the light to save electricity is a legal direct action against nuclear power, while a blockade of a construction site for a power plant would be an illegal one. On the other hand we would have an illegal protest action when a vigil is done on the construction site without directly affecting the work, while a legal demonstration against nuclear power marching to the capital, would be the typical kind of protest.

Gandhi maintained that nonviolence is a form of direct action. In his view, nonviolence is both an effective tool and a value in itself. One's actions should not be guided by short-sighted results but by the strategy of making the means of struggle as much in accordance with the goals as possible. Thus, means are not separated from goals but are *goals in-the-making*, small seeds of the tree we hope for. Goals need to be expressed through the means if they are ever to materialize. So, to Gandhi, the more our way of struggling is formed by democracy, human rights, and solidarity, the more certain it is that we will reach that goal.

If you are against a motorway, then you can close it—like Reclaim the Streets in the United Kingdom—by organizing a street-party in the middle of the road. Then you have, instantly and without any intermediary authorities, defined the road as a party site. On Saturday the 13th of July, 1996, the motorway M41 in London was turned into a gigantic electronic dance-street. Among 10,000 wild dancing participants and under huge carnival figures walking on stilts with massive skirts, some activists with jack hammers broke up the concrete and planted trees in the middle of the motorway, trees saved from the construction of the M11. The goal was realized, autonomously, there and then. Because of direct action, an environmental problem and commercial culture were turned into a free and public space of desire and became a prefiguration of a new society.

Direct action does not necessarily create sustained social change. Its immediate effects or activity might be ignored, reversed, or manipulated, if the activists are too few and vague.

Groups sometimes compensate their small numbers with higher commitment or physical techniques. The “tree hut” people in the United Kingdom climb up in log-threatened trees, build small huts in the branches and connect them to a village with rope-bridges—and stay for months. Other activists might delay construction of a road by chaining themselves to machines or by blocking the road with “tri-pods,” (i.e., high platforms on which they sit, making it more difficult to remove them).

Still, the uniqueness of direct action is when the action is a goal in itself—directly *goal-revealing*—or rather when the action embodies, materializes, and realizes directly a value that is valuable in and by itself (what Max Weber described as value rationality). The action is oriented toward values that are intrinsically valuable, not distant goals in a classic understanding of means only valuable to reach an end (goal rationality). A house occupation has a value in itself for homeless—despite other potential consequences, positive as well as negative—which doesn't need external involvement to be fulfilled. Direct action is, therefore, primarily a matter of the self-realization of actors' internally legitimated values. However, the action might be used before, after, or parallel to dialogue, and as a tool to bring an issue to the political agenda and to create increased communication and understanding between parties. For example, when fair-trade activists create projects of actual fair trade, they also make their political demands more visible and attractive for others. This is more difficult for a direct action that stops something in society, is illegal, secret and encompasses a value that is not widely shared by others.

In a direct action you basically act as if you have the right to solve a common problem by yourself, as if legitimate decision makers or equal opponents did not exist. Direct action can thus be anti-democratic if activists avoid communication with others, such as by the use of secrecy and violence. The democratic problem with activists' secret identities is not that they avoid identification by the police (that is a legal

problem) but that they undermine democracy by blocking open and critical dialogue. Still, direct action groups are seldom that strong but have to, in the end, also rely on the indirect tool of deliberative democracy.

—*Stellan Vinthagen*

See also Anarchism; Earth First; Libertarians; Performativity; Praxis; Strategies and Tactics in Social Movements; Virtual Sit-Ins

Further Readings

- Epstein, B. (2002). The politics of prefigurative community: The non-violent direct action movement. In S. Duncombe (Ed.), *Cultural resistance reader* (pp. 333–346). New York: W. W. Norton.
- Knabb, K. (Ed.) (1995). *Situationist international: Anthology*. Berkeley, CA: Bureau of Public Secrets.
- Wall, D. (1999). *Earth first! and the anti-roads movement—Radical environmentalism and comparative social movements*. London: Routledge.

DISABILITY RIGHTS MOVEMENT

For many people, the disability movement began in the 1990s, due mostly to the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). They are wrong. For others, mostly those who are disabled, the disability movement began in the 1970s. They, too, are wrong. The disability movement began around the middle of the 19th century, gaining impetus after the American Civil War, from which many people returned with disabilities. The effects of rampant industrialization, though, first brought the disabled into the public arena. Since then, society has tried to keep the disabled out of the limelight and in their place. What is their place?

Definitions

There are many different definitions depending on what one is looking at. Over the years, especially since the 1960s, organizations have made adjustments to what they would consider disability. But these definitions have little to do with why there has been activism by people with disabilities. The disabled

have, throughout history, fought against exclusion and prejudice.

Most every nondisabled person will eventually become disabled, probably due to illness or disease, though accident cannot be ignored. At this writing, it is estimated that, at around 54 million, the disabled make up the largest single minority in America. But this number—approximately 20% of the population—is misleading; 54 million is only the number of disabled who are capable of working but are disallowed. Many people with disabilities are working. There are some who don't work and others who can't, mostly children. Many are retired; others have a disability but don't consider themselves disabled. So the number of disabled is somewhat greater than this figure. Yet, in the end, what is normal raises a big question.

Social Stigma

The definition of disability within society goes far deeper than numbers or looks, behavior or physical ability. The definition of disability includes social perceptions—bias and prejudice. These ideas stem from ignorance and fear, according to the literature. Within the public sector, a disabled person is someone who can't function like—and looks different from—the norm. The majority considers itself normal. Because people with disabilities can't do what normal people can in the same way, they are considered inferior or deficient.

People with disabilities are beggars and indigents. The disabled are objects of shame, pity, and ridicule. As such, they should be kept out of sight. Incarcerated, institutionalized, euthanized, prevented from being born, forbidden to marry, sterilized; some of these historical solutions are still practiced. Some children with disabilities are still forbidden schooling. The general population sees disability as a deficit in the individual that is in need of fixing; that is, these people need to be normalized. Many of these images hold even when society has caused the disability, such as due to war or workplace accident. Many of these images are medieval.

More than the physical barriers that keep people with disabilities from living a normal, full life, it is

464 Disability Rights Movement

these social attitudinal barriers that are the greatest hurdle to enjoying a good life and that need to be overcome, while the nondisabled enjoy a better or more productive life because of accommodations for the disabled: automatic doors, telephones, typewriters, American football's huddle, the umpires' hand signals in baseball.

History: 19th Century

In 1817 the first permanent school for children with disabilities in the West was cofounded by Thomas Hopkins Gallaudet: the American School for the Deaf. Despite the American Civil War, not much more was accomplished in the way of help for the disabled or their integration into society at large. Yet, the period from 1880 to 1930 was a time of major redefinition via policies and laws and medicine; however, isolating institutions remained the accepted way of dealing with disabilities. While offering more support and training than before, these institutions still took people with disabilities out of the public eye.

Early 20th Century

In 1920 the American Foundation for the Blind was organized and was subsequently supported by Helen Keller. Then, it was a clearinghouse for information and advocacy; now it is a publishing house. In the years leading up to 1920, Keller protested against labor practices and, as a result of her work and the work of others, child labor laws were enacted. It was hoped that, in doing so, disabilities could be prevented. Other laws sought to hold companies responsible for accidents that disabled workers.

The first vocational rehabilitation acts were passed in the 1920s to provide services for the many World War I veterans who were disabled. But the passage of these laws was the result of years of protesting and fighting for both recognition and rights within society. The League of the Physically Handicapped was formed during the Depression in response to the government's anti-disability policies. In 1940 the single most politically powerful organization for the disabled was founded: The National Federation of the

Blind. It was staffed by blind people. In the 1950s, concerned parents began to organize around developmental disability, leading to the founding of the National Association for Retarded Children (now, ARC, Association for Retarded Children) and the United Cerebral Palsy Association.

Late 20th Century

Although the spinal cord injured, those with polio, and psychiatrically disabled began to assert their rights in the 1960s, it was not until the 1970s that the disabled burst their bubble of marginalization and appeared ready for action on the public stage—and would not go away. Perhaps the most important people were Ed Roberts, who founded the first independent living organization in Berkeley, California, in 1972, a movement that has spread over the United States with more than 400 such centers today; and Judy Neumann, who organized Disabled in Action in New York City. Both began with protests over education, Judy winning the first disability-based employment discrimination case in New York City. Both went on to found the World Institute on Disability in 1983. By this time, Justin Dart had entered the fray, eventually becoming known as the “Father of the ADA.”

This more recent and far-reaching disability movement took its inspiration from the civil rights movement of the 1960s. Perhaps the most aggressive and effective organization for social change is the American Disabled for Attendant Programs Today (ADAPT), originally organized as the American Disabled for Accessible Public Transit in Denver. Its first action was a demonstration against the Denver transit system in 1978, disabling the running of buses for 24 hours. This action led to further such demonstrations that resulted in national legislation making buses accessible to those people with mobility impairments, including wheelchair users. ADAPT remains an aggressive civil disobedience organization, often relying on the bad press associated with police overzealousness and arrests of people who cannot walk or use their upper extremities.

The Rehabilitation Act of 1973—especially Section 504 that prohibits discrimination in federal

programs and services, as well as entities that receive federal funding, mandating removal of architectural barriers—was an important advancement for the movement. Coupled with the 1975 Education of All Handicapped Children Act (now IDEA: Individuals with Disabilities Education Act) and ADAPT's success, these were the most significant legal strides made in the 1970s for inclusion.

In 1985, the Mental Illness Bill of Rights Act, which required protection and advocacy for people with mental illness, was passed after a nearly decade-long battle by parents and families to override and control the abuse that passed for treatment. The Fair Housing Amendments of 1988 forbade discrimination by landlords against the disabled population and their service or companion animals. This was significant in the fight for deinstitutionalization and integration.

All of these piecemeal victories, gained after considerable grassroots activism, led to the signing of the ADA in 1990. Although this act provided broad legal protection everywhere in society, in public or private places, businesses and states have sometimes fought to limit and undermine the various entitlements for a variety of reasons, especially as relates to any kind or compensation for discrimination in employment (as mandated in Title I of the ADA). It is paradoxical that these entities admit the discrimination but claim there is no legal basis for compensation. For the most part, to date they have won the day. Grassroots activism may be effective, especially within the community, but government regulations are not. It is solely by grassroots activism that the government has seen to pass laws. But government regulations—laws—are fought tooth-and-nail as an imposition on the status quo.

Throughout this movement to inclusion, there had been many others who, both in and out of government, have worked assiduously for change, though sometimes not gaining public notice. These people include Frederick A. Fay, who pioneered use of assistance technology and convinced Hertz to provide hand controls in its cars—the first car company to do so. Tim Nugent was the founder of the first disabled student organization in 1947 and the National Wheelchair Basketball Association, while developing self-care techniques for the spinal cord injured and the first

hydraulic lift for buses. Mary Elizabeth Switzer exerted more influence on the upgrading of life for the disabled than anyone else between 1950 and 1969, as head of the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation (now Office of Vocational Rehabilitation). In 1967, she moved to the administration of Social and Rehabilitation Services at Health Education and Welfare.

Thus, despite advancements, the disability movement is still fighting for recognition and civil citizenship status for millions of stigmatized people with disabilities. Legal barriers have been overcome in many instances; attitudinal barriers—prejudice—are not so easily abridged.

—James L. Secor

See also Civil Rights Acts; Civil Rights Movement; Disability Studies; Keller, Helen

Further Readings

- Charlton, J. I. (1998). *Nothing about us without us: Disability oppression and empowerment*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Johnson, M. (2000). *Make them go away: Clint Eastwood, Christopher Reeve and the case against disability rights*. Louisville, KY: Avocado Press.
- Longmore, P., & Umansky, L. (Eds.). (2001). *The new disability history: American perspectives*. New York: New York University Press.
- Pelka, F. (1997). *ABC-CLIO companion to the disability rights movement*. Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO.
- Shapiro, J. P. (1994). *No pity: People with disabilities forging a new civil rights movement*. New York: Three Rivers Press.

DISABILITY STUDIES

Disability studies is an interdisciplinary area of study, based in the humanities and social sciences, that views disability in cultural, social, and political terms, rather than through the lens of biology or psychology. In these latter disciplines, the primary way of conceptualizing “disability” is typically connected to some form of deficit or measuring distance from the “norm”

for purposes of intervention, remediation, and bringing one closer to the established norm. Disability studies challenges this singular view of the construct of disability and aims to present a variety of perspectives on disability, both in contemporary society as well as those from a range of cultures and histories. One goal of disability studies is to challenge the idea of the normal/abnormal binary and to suggest and show that a range of human variation is “normal.”

Like African American studies, women’s studies, and Latino/a studies in the universities, which were outgrowths of the civil rights and women’s movements, disability studies has roots in the disability rights movement (DRM). In the United States, the DRM helped pass legislation relating to the civil rights of individuals with regard to employment (Rehabilitation Act of 1973; Americans with Disabilities Act, 1990), education (Education for All Handicapped Children Act, PL 94–142, 1975), and accessible transportation. The Society for Disability Studies (SDS) was started in 1982 by a group of academics led by Irving Zola. The original name was Section for the Study of Chronic Illness, Impairment, and Disability (SSCIID), part of the Western Social Science Association.

In the United Kingdom, the Union of the Physically Impaired Against Segregation (UPIAS), formed in 1972, was instrumental in politicizing disability. Mike Oliver, a disabled sociologist, wrote the *Politics of Disablement* in 1990, in which he analyzed how a social issue such as disability gets cast as an individual medicalized phenomenon.

While the political movements led social scientists to explorations of disability, the arts and humanities have also taken up the study of disability. The interdisciplinarity that characterizes disability studies allows for a variety of methodologies and approaches to be applied to the study of disability. Some of these include narratives of disability; analysis of representations of disability (in literature, the arts, the law, media); challenging the absence of disabled researchers in the academy; writing or rewriting histories of disability; creating visual art, performance, and poetry that highlights the experiences of disabled people in a world built for the nondisabled; analysis of the social organization of space that excludes people with

disabilities; philosophies of justice that speak directly to the interests of the disabled; and narratives and analyses of the experience of living with a disability and how this intersects with race, class, and gender status markers.

More recently, in 2000, Disability Studies in Education has been organized as a Special Interest Group (SIG) of The American Educational Research Association (AERA) as a critique of the segregation, low expectations, poor outcomes, disproportionate classification of students of color, and positivist epistemology that characterizes special education in the United States. The goal of disability studies in any arena is to broaden the understanding of disability, to better understand the experience of disability in society, and to contribute to social change for people with disabilities.

—Nancy E. Rice

See also Disability Rights Movement

Further Readings

- Albrecht, G., Seelman, K., & Bury, M. (Eds.). (2001). *Handbook of disability studies*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Davis, L. (Ed.). (1997). *Disability studies reader*. New York: Routledge.
- Gabel, S. (Ed.). (2005). *Disability studies in education: Readings in theory and method*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Oliver, M. (1990). *The politics of disablement: A sociological approach*. Basingstoke, UK: Macmillan.

DISSENT

Dissent came into English in the late 16th century as both a general term meaning disagreement in outlook or sentiment and as a specific term meaning difference of opinion in regard to religious doctrine or worship. With both meanings, dissent signified the opposite of consent or assent. Important correlatives threading through the centuries astride dissent include protest, nonconformity, and collectivity.

Dissent is contentious, adversarial, nonconformist political thought and activity that contests, opposes, or

transgresses entrenched, commonly expressed ideas, rules, topics, and norms of public interaction and deliberation. Dissent by definition is conflictual. Amid the throes of conflict, dissident citizens and groups often present significant challenges to the social order. Yet for dissident citizens, conflict is not an end; rather, it is a means toward public learning and possibly even the creation of newfound consensus.

Dissident citizens and groups meet the following three criteria: (1) They publicly contest prevailing structures of power and/or the underlying logic of public policy, (2) they engage in some extra-institutional, oppositional tactics, though they may be flexible actors that employ forms of action both inside and outside the institutional pathways of political power, and (3) on at least some issues, they have marginal stances that are not consistently entering the dominant political discourse.

While in its most general sense, the term *dissent* indicates the rejection of commonly held views or disagreement with the ideas, opinions, and views of the majority (e.g., a dissenting opinion in the judicial context: when at least one judge disagrees with the majority decision), dissent goes beyond disagreement or withholding assent. Dissent is a calibration more active than disagreement. Dissident citizens therefore not only disagree with predominant—or even hegemonic—political ideas of their time, but also take action to change their sociopolitical environment. In other words, dissent is the collective mechanism for initiating social change.

As such, dissent involves both a dedication to autonomous thinking as well as a willingness to act on behalf of nonconformist principles, ideas, and ideals. Dissident citizens disregard the resilient, pervasive social pressures to conform not only their thinking, but also their behavior. They often work for causes bigger than themselves, actively pushing to meet the goals and aims of these causes. Practitioners of dissent disagree with and actively oppose official, dominant, or hegemonic doctrines and explicitly express political difference with received ideas in an attempt to widen the path of freedom and improve the vibrancy of civil society.

Dissenting citizens remain outside of much democratic theory that focuses on deliberative democracy

and discourse. Dissidents move beyond the activity of deliberative citizens who participate in contained politics within the institutional structures of democracy. Dissident citizens—who see the deliberative role, regardless of how critical it may be, as merely a starting point, rather than an end in itself—engage in transgressive contention using innovative political action that is either unprecedented or prohibited. They take direct action against what they see as problematic political policies, practices, and procedures. They move vigorously against taken-for-granted hegemonic ideas, ideals, and institutions.

Rather than rely on voting, petitioning, and letter writing, dissident citizens create a variety of unconventional public spaces and events—such as protest marches, picket lines, worker strikes, consumer boycotts, and street theater—on the margins and in the fractures of the polity. Dissident citizens can come from anywhere on the political spectrum, but they share a propensity to engage in alternative forms of political engagement that are democratic, innovative, and oppositional.

Dissident citizens do not move beyond the realm of the deliberative, sanctioned public sphere merely for fun. In fact, they view the public sphere as problematic in that the seemingly benign call for cool-headed deliberation can actually be used as an instrument to dictate the terms of discourse that tend to dismiss subordinate, dissident groups. In stratified societies where social inequality exists, it can be very difficult to carve out distinct discursive spaces that allow dissidents to extricate themselves from the repercussions of these social inequalities, because deliberative procedures and processes in the public sphere tend to transpire to the advantage of dominant groups and to the disadvantage of subordinate or subaltern groups. Dissent places checks on the exclusionary nature of consensus-building procedures that are central in deliberative democracy in the public sphere.

In reality, the public sphere is animated by a bedrock contradiction. In order to forge policies that can enhance the freedom, liberty, and autonomy of all citizens, the general public relies on deliberative procedures and practices that exclude many individuals and groups as well as their ideas, interests, and

grievances. This chasm between democratic principle and on-the-ground democratic practice leads dissident citizens to forge alternative modes of participation. Rather than relenting to the illusory consensus-based conception of a monolithic, unitary “we,” members of historically subordinated groups—like women, racial minorities, gays and lesbians, and workers—form alternative spaces of dissent where they are able to process, adapt, and reformulate their ideas, strategies, and tactics. These zones of dissent provide safe intellectual arenas from which alternative discourses can be catapulted into the mainstream public sphere, thereby widening democracy.

While there are renegade dissident citizens who practice dissent alone (the Unabomber, for example), most work within social movements: concerted, sustained collectivities with common goals and purposes that are buoyed by solidarity and camaraderie as they engage in fractious relations with adversaries, elites, and people in positions of authority.

When faced with vigorous, organized dissident social movements, the state has four options for its response: (1) suppression, (2) mollification, (3) co-optation, or (4) ignoring these movements for change. The state’s efforts to suppress dissent, which are meant to discourage such organized contention and prevent it from widening, are a common reaction. Going back centuries, the state’s suppression of dissent has occurred in countries across the globe. In fact, the state’s propensity to resort to the suppression of dissent has been established both qualitatively and quantitatively by social scientists across time and place. During this time, a variety of dissident citizens and movements from numerous countries have experienced significant and sustained suppression, from Soviet dissidents like writer Andrey Sinyavsky to Chinese dissidents in Tiananmen Square, from African dissidents such as Congolese political leader Patrice Lumumba to U.S. dissidents such as Fred Hampton of the Black Panther Party.

Despite the state’s consistent—and sometimes vicious—efforts to suppress the endeavors of dissident citizens, political dissent functions as society’s safety valve, a pressure release. If dissidents are not allowed to publicly register their ideas and opinions, they are more likely to resort to violent forms of expression. In fact, by effectively plugging this safety

valve, thereby preventing the release of pent-up political pressure, the state may well encourage violent dissent. Such an equation harkens U.S. President John F. Kennedy’s admonition that those who stultify peaceful change make violent revolution more of a possibility. In extant democracy, countries are more likely to thrive socially and economically if they embrace dissent and support transparency. By definition, dissident citizens widen the social dialogue, and well-functioning societies benefit from thickened discourse writhing with variegated ideas and opinions.

Dissenting citizens not only speak to perceived dangers and problems in society, but they also speak to the opportunities and possibilities of vigorous political life. Dissidents challenge the axiomatic, taken-for-granted “realities” of prevailing societal discourse(s), as they question the silences, omissions, and limitations of these dominant social constructions. In historical hindsight, dissident citizens are often held up as national heroes. Certainly this is the case in the United States, from Sam Adams and his revolutionary comrades to Frederick Douglass and the slavery abolitionists, from Susan B. Anthony to Martin Luther King, Jr. It is difficult to deny the importance of these dissidents in U.S. history; they are held up as model U.S. Americans precisely because their dissident philosophies strongly challenged the prevailing social discourse of the time, as well as because of their persistent commitment in the face of risk, fear, and sometimes even danger.

As previously mentioned, the term *dissent* has religious roots. Dissent with a capital D designates those who actively opposed the hegemony of the Church of England in the 17th century. These Dissenters were members of Protestant denominations—primarily the Baptists, Presbyterians, Quakers, and the Independents (who later were dubbed Congregationalists)—who eventually combined to overthrow King Charles I before setting up the English Commonwealth.

With the rise of U.S. President George W. Bush, one of the most explicitly religious presidents in U.S. history (he has claimed he believes God wants him to be president), who has enjoyed the fervent support of the Christian Right, this more specific definition of dissent—disagreement with the form of religious worship that prevails or is authoritatively established—may be in line for a comeback. Bush’s prayer for the

vim and vigor to do the Lord's will in Iraq may engender a new wave of politico-religious dissent to match the fervor of the English Dissidents of previous times.

More commonly acknowledged practitioners of dissent from the contemporary era include Vandana Shiva, Edward Said, Njoki Njoroge Njehu, Oscar Olivera, Leslie Cagan, Nelson Mandela, Cornel West, Noam Chomsky, Robin Hahnel, Amy Goodman, José Bové, Aung San Suu Kyi, Arundhati Roy, Angela Y. Davis, Juan Gonzalez, and Wangari Maathai.

—Jules Boykoff

See also Activism, Social and Political; Battle of Seattle; Bové, José; Campus Antiwar Network; Chicano Movement; Christian Right; Civil Rights Movement; Davis, Angela; Direct Action; Earth First!; Environmental Movement; Government Suppression of Social Activism; Living Wage Movement; Maathai, Wangari; Mandela, Nelson; Nonviolence and Activism; Poor People's Campaign; Resistance; Roy, Arundhati; Said, Edward; Social Movements, Sociology of; Soviet Dissidents; Strategies and Tactics in Social Movements; Suu Kyi, Aung San; Tiananmen Square; Union Movements; Voices in the Wilderness; Welfare Rights Movement; West, Cornel; Women's International League for Peace and Freedom; Women's Suffrage Movement; Youth Organizing and Activism

Further Readings

- Benhabib, S. (Ed.). (1996). *Democracy and difference: Contesting the boundaries of the political*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Boykoff, J. (2006). *The suppression of dissent: How the state and mass media squelch US American social movements*. New York: Routledge.
- Elster, J. (Ed.). (1998). *Deliberative democracy*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Fraser, N. (1992). Rethinking the public sphere: A contribution to the critique of actually existing democracy. In C. Calhoun (Ed.), *Habermas and the public sphere* (pp. 109–142). Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Sparks, H. (1997). Dissident citizenship: Democratic theory, political courage, and activist women. *Hypatia*, 12, 74–110.
- Sunstein, C. (2003). *Why societies need dissent*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Tarrow, S. (1998). *Power in movement: Social movements and contentious politics* (2nd ed.). New York: Cambridge University Press.

DISSENT MAGAZINE

Perhaps the most important voice of social democratic thought in the United States, *Dissent* was the brainchild of Irving Howe, Stanley Plastrik, and Manny Geltman. First published in 1954, *Dissent* sought to provide an option between conventional liberal journals and the more doctrinaire, and outdated, organs of the old intellectual Left. Throughout the 1950s and 1960s, *Dissent* combined a steadfast anti-communist foreign policy with a commitment to domestic social and economic justice. *Dissent* was a passionate voice of opposition to the increased conservatism in American government in the latter 20th century, especially during the years of the Ronald Reagan presidency.

Howe was the primary force behind *Dissent* from its birth until his death in 1993. Howe wanted *Dissent* to provide a voice for genuine third-path democratic socialism. Virtually alone among the organs of ex-independent leftists, like *The Partisan Review*, *Encounter*, and *Commentary*, *Dissent* continued to concentrate on issues of labor and work. Throughout the late 1950s and 1960s, *Dissent* published articles on work and unions by such writers as Paul Jacobs, Frank Marquart, Harvey Swados, and Brendan Sexton. In the 1980s and 1990s *Dissent* continued to cover organized labor's declining fortunes. *Dissent* responded to and supported the mainstream civil rights movement from its beginnings.

Dissent was generally supportive of the student activism of the 1960s, but the attempts of Howe and others in the *Dissent* circle to engage many New Leftists often proved disastrous. Howe was leery of what he thought was a tolerance for authoritarianism among groups like the Students for a Democratic Society and his, at times, biting criticism hurt efforts to fuse a positive working relationship with the increasingly radical New Left as the decade wore on.

Howe and *Dissent* were criticized at times for not advocating unilateral withdrawal from Vietnam during the 1960s, but *Dissent* was still fiercely critical of American policy in Southeast Asia during the 1960s and early 1970s. *Dissent* remained sharply critical of American foreign policy in general throughout the 1970s and 1980s. The journal eventually moved from

a more pointed democratic socialist perspective to a position of representing the left-liberal wing of the Democratic Party. *Dissent* was modestly optimistic following the election of Bill Clinton to the presidency in 1992. Academics and former New Leftists like Michael Kazin and Todd Gitlin became contributors.

Key to Howe's vision of *Dissent* was the preservation of intellectual and political freedom. *Dissent* has remained to the left of the Democratic Party, but has never strayed from its anti-communist and anti-totalitarian roots.

—Gregory Geddes

See also Democratic Socialism; Harrington, Michael; Rustin, Bayard; Trotskyism

Further Readings

- Howe, I. (Ed.). (1967). *The radical imagination: An anthology from Dissent magazine*. New York: New American Library.
- Howe, I. (1982). *A margin of hope*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Sorin, G. (2002). *Irving Howe: A life of passionate dissent*. New York: New York University Press.
- Wald, A. (1987). *The New York intellectuals: The rise and decline of the anti-Stalinist left from the 1930s to the 1980s*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Walzer, M., & Mills, N. (2004). *50 years of dissent*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

DIVESTMENT

See BOYCOTTS AND DIVESTMENT

DJILAS, MILOVAN (1911–1995)

Milovan Djilas was a Yugoslav politician, activist, and dissident writer. He became known for his daring critique of Tito's communism and for his innovative analysis of the communist bureaucracy. Djilas was born in Podbišće (Montenegro) to a peasant family. He

studied law and literature in Belgrade, though he never completed his studies due to his engagement in the communist movement and his imprisonment for anti-royalist activities. Acquainted with Josip Broz Tito, who from 1937 headed the Yugoslavian Communist Party, Djilas joined the Central Committee in 1937 and the Politburo in 1940. He was actively involved in the resistance movement against the Nazi occupation and in the War of National Liberation. He headed the diplomatic mission to the Soviet Union and personally met Stalin, which he later detailed in his book *Conversations with Stalin*. In 1945 he became the Minister for Montenegro in the Yugoslav Government of National Unity; in 1948 he became the head of the Propaganda Department (Agitprop), and in 1953, he became vice president of the Yugoslav Republic. In 1950, together with Edvard Kardelj and Boris Kidrić, he formulated the doctrine of "worker's self-management" and advocated policies of economic decentralization.

Djilas expressed his views about Yugoslav communism in the newspapers *Borba*, *Nova Jugoslavija*, and *Nova Misao*. His democratic-socialist criticism of the undemocratic and centralizing reforms, as well as the authoritarian leadership style of the party, brought him in direct conflict with Tito. As a result, Djilas was denigrated at the Third Party Plenum in 1954 and removed from the government. Djilas subsequently resigned his party membership.

After an interview with the *New York Times* in 1955, Djilas was tried for spreading anti-state propaganda. He was imprisoned in 1956 for his support of the Hungarian Uprising and remained in prison for the next decade because of the publications abroad of the *New Class: An Analysis of the Communist System* of 1957 and *Conversations with Stalin* of 1962. In the *New Class*, Djilas argued that Soviet-style communism failed to realize the egalitarian claim of Marxism and instead facilitated the emergence of a privileged social stratum of party bureaucrats. As a result, the communist societies were devoid of the bonds of solidarity and comradeship. Commentators on the *New Class* have also emphasized that while it was written from the perspective of revisionist Marxism, it also signified Djilas's initial doubts regarding the accuracy of Marx's dogma of historical materialism.

During his imprisonment Djilas continued his literary activities; writing novels, political essays, a memoir titled *Land Without Justice* (1958), and a translation of Milton's *Paradise Lost* into Serbo-Croatian. When he was released from prison, Djilas continued his dissident writings while being subject to state persecution in the form of a travel and publication ban. In 1980, Djilas wrote Tito's biography, *Tito: The Story from Inside*, which was published abroad.

Djilas was officially rehabilitated in 1989. In postcommunist Yugoslavia, he opposed the Serbian nationalist politics of Milošević's era. He died in Belgrade on April 20, 1995.

—Magdalena Zolkos

See also Communism; Democratic Socialism; Dissent; Lenin, V. I.; Literature and Activism; Marxist Theory; Socialism

Further Readings

- Clissold, S. (1983). *Djilas: The progress of a revolutionary*. Middlesex, UK: Maurice Temple Smith.
- Reinhartz, D. (1981). *Milovan Djilas*. Boulder, CO: East European Monographs.

DOCTORS WITHOUT BORDERS

Doctors Without Borders (Médecins Sans Frontières) is an international medical and non-governmental organization that provides emergency assistance to individuals in more than 70 countries. Founded in France in 1971 by a group of doctors and journalists to address the famine in Biafra, Nigeria, this humanitarian organization continues to deliver emergency aid to areas of the world torn apart by armed violence, epidemic illness, inadequate health care systems, and disasters (natural and human-made). The health care workers in this organization include physicians, nurses, strategic planners, experts in water and sanitation, administrators, and other nonmedical staff. When intervening after an emergency, the Doctors Without Borders teams work closely with staff that they hire locally to provide the medical relief that is most effective and necessary.

This organization has provided relief in numerous armed conflicts, including the civil wars in Sri Lanka, Liberia, Somalia, Burundi, the Republic of Congo, and Sierra Leone. Doctors Without Borders has also intervened in war situations in Cambodia, Lebanon, the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, Central America, the Kurdish refugees in northern Iraq, Bosnia, the genocide in Rwanda, the Srebrenica massacre, the second war in Chechnya, the U.S.-led coalition invasion of Afghanistan, the U.S. invasion of Iraq, and fighting in the Liberian capital. Their work addressing famine relief includes countries such as Ethiopia, Somalia, North Korea, Southern Sudan, and Angola. In addition, the organization addresses widespread illness in countries, treating infectious diseases such as the epidemics of HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis, meningitis, and malaria in Africa. Regardless of the sociopolitical context of the crisis in a country, the organization methodically assesses the needs of the people in the country that requires assistance. Doctors Without Borders clearly communicates that their mission does not involve partisan politics. Rather, the decision they make about whether to



Throughout Sierra Leone, amputee communities exist and are in urgent need of help since the government does not provide assistance. Amputee communities depend on relief efforts from numerous international organizations. Doctors Without Borders works closely with NGOs such as Global Action Foundation to provide medical services.

Source: Photo by John Daniel Kelly/Global Action Foundation, <http://www.go-act.org>.

intervene in a country is based on their assessment of the specific needs of the individuals in that country.

Doctors Without Borders is internationally recognized for its rapid response to emergency situations around the globe. The medical teams arrive in countries requiring medical aid fully provisioned with the medical protocols and supplies needed to immediately begin saving lives. Supporting their efforts is their strategic organization of needed medical supplies. For instance, Doctors Without Borders have medical equipment and kits that are specially prepared and prepackaged to treat cholera. Therefore, when a cholera outbreak occurs, they can immediately provide the necessary medical assistance. Due to their effectiveness, the tools and organizing skills that the organization uses as a model of intervention have been replicated by numerous other international relief organizations.

The Doctors Without Borders teams typically work 6 to 12 months when responding to a crisis situation. The expenses that are incurred during assignments are covered by the organization, and sometimes a small stipend is provided as well. Recently, the organization has taken on an advocacy role based on the knowledge garnered from their interventions. For instance, Doctors Without Borders is highlighting the cost-prohibitive challenges of drug prices, the need for research of alternative treatments of illness, and the trade barriers that exist in accessing effective and necessary medical treatment.

—Anneliese Singh

See also Genocide Watch; Human Rights Watch; Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs)

Further Readings

Leyton, E., & Locke, G. (1998). *Touched by fire: Doctors without borders in a third world crisis*. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart.

Suen, A. (2002). *Doctors without borders*. New York: Rosen.

DORFMAN, ARIEL (1942–)

Ariel Dorfman is a playwright, essayist, fiction writer, and human rights activist. Born to a Jewish family in

Argentina, his family moved from the United States to Chile in 1954, where he would eventually both attend and teach at the University of Chile in Santiago. From 1970 to 1973, Dorfman was a member of the administration of President Salvador Allende, a socialist physician whom the American government had actively opposed. On September 11, 1973, Allende's democratically elected government was violently overthrown in a military coup that put the infamous dictator General Augusto Pinochet in power. Dorfman was forced into exile, living and writing in the United States until the restoration of Chilean democracy began in 1990. Since 1985, he has taught at Duke University in Durham, North Carolina, where he is currently Walter Hines Page Research Professor of Literature and Professor of Latin American Studies.

His play *Death and the Maiden*, perhaps his best-known work, was completed in Chile in the early 1990s as he observed his country's painful transition from authoritarianism to democracy. The politically charged play follows Paulina Salas, a former political prisoner in an unnamed Latin American country, whose husband unknowingly brings home the man she believes to have tortured and raped her more than 20 years before. It is a drama rooted in Chile's particular human rights crisis, yet the lyrical power of Dorfman's writing has made the play a touchstone for exploring similar issues around the world. It has been staged in more than 30 countries; Germany alone had 50 productions running simultaneously in 1993. In 1994 the play was adapted for film, starring Sigourney Weaver and Ben Kingsley, directed by Roman Polanski; one part of Dorfman's "Resistance Trilogy" with *Reader* and the novel *Widows*. Author of the novels *Blake's Remedy*, *The Nanny and the Iceberg*, and *Konfidenz*, Dorfman can be counted as part of the vibrant politically engaged Latin American literary tradition of Pablo Neruda and Gabriel García Márquez.

Dorfman has been a dedicated public intellectual and prolific commentator on issues related to Latin American politics, American cultural hegemony, war, and human rights, for the *Los Angeles Times*, *Washington Post*, *El País*, *Granta*, and *Le Monde*. He has also worked with organizations such as Amnesty International, Index on Censorship, and Human

Rights Watch. He used his firsthand experience of pre-Pinochet Chile, a functioning democracy with an independent press and judiciary and a military under civilian control, and its sudden end, as a platform for impassioned response to the attacks of September 11, 2001, in essays such as “Americans Must Now Feel What the Rest of Us Have Known” and “Chile: The Other September 11.” Dorfman now divides his time between the United States and Santiago.

—*Brook Willensky-Lanford*

See also Allende, Salvador; CIA Repression of Social Movements; Human Rights Watch; Literature and Activism; Neruda, Pablo; Socialism

Further Readings

- Dorfman, A. (1998). *Heading south, looking north: A bilingual journey*. New York: Farrar, Straus & Giroux.
- Dorfman, A. (2002). *Exorcising terror: The incredible on-going trial of General Augusto Pinochet*. New York: Seven Stories Press.

DOUGLAS, MARJORY STONEMAN (1890–1998)

Marjory Stoneman Douglas dedicated decades of her 108-year life to various social and environmental causes. She is most often remembered as the Protector of the Everglades. As a columnist, a short story writer, a novelist, and a social and environmentalist activist, Douglas was a force to be reckoned with in Florida because of her ability to garner attention and support from the public and the media.

Douglas was born in Minneapolis on April 7, 1890. She graduated from Wellesley College in 1912 and moved to Miami in 1915 to join her father, Frank Bryant Stoneman, a founder of the *Miami Herald*. Douglas soon became a member of the Florida Equal Suffrage Association and joined a group of women who failed to convince Florida's legislature to ratify the Nineteenth Amendment. Desiring an altruistic way to assist the war effort in Europe during World War I, Douglas volunteered with the Red Cross. She was assigned to the civilian relief department in Paris.

Douglas stayed on after the Armistice in order to help coordinate and publicize refugee relief efforts in the Balkans and other war-torn regions.

Following her return from Europe, Douglas began writing a column for the *Miami Herald*. She promoted women's rights and criticized Miami's housing boom. Two of her greatest achievements as a columnist included establishing the first charity not run by a church in Miami, which was a baby milk fund for the city's impoverished, and generating enough public outcry about the death of a young prisoner that the state legislature abolished the leasing and corporal punishment of convicts. Foreshadowing her work as an environmentalist, some of her columns included artful poems about the Everglades' subtle beauty in response to the descriptions of rapacious developers who characterized it as useless muck.

Douglas's championing of the Everglades continued when she became a professional short story writer. Between 1920 and 1943 she published more than 75 stories, mostly for the *Saturday Evening Post*. Douglas craftily used her enjoyable stories to explore progressive issues such as the New Woman, and to discuss the exploitation of nature by developers, as well as the role of duplicitous real estate agents in Florida's land boom. The unmistakable strength and independence of her often single female protagonists were as strong a model for female readers as any of Willa Cather's pioneering women.

Douglas was instrumental in the establishment of the Everglades National Park. A few weeks before the park's establishment in 1947, Douglas published *Everglades: River of Grass*, which was the first aesthetically pleasing text to describe how the Everglades are a complex and fragile ecosystem. The bestselling book catapulted her to fame, particularly in Florida, where she became the go-to person for queries about the Everglades. Following this success, Douglas used her fame for such issues as persuading Miami's water company to extend services to impoverished, mostly black neighborhoods and founding the first American Civil Liberties Union chapter south of the Mason-Dixon line, in 1955.

Decades later, as Douglas approached her 80s; she became the bonafide leader of the area's environmental movement when she founded the Friends of the

Everglades in 1969. Even as a centenerian, Douglas's public persona as the tiny but wily and energetic woman who wore the wide-brim hat, positioned her as a Davidesque figure who often triumphed over Goliath-like Big Sugar and other polluting industries in Florida. Douglas was awarded the Presidential Medal of Freedom in 1993. She died on May 14, 1998.

—*Horacio Sierra*

See also Ecofeminism; Environmental Movement; Women's Suffrage Movement

Further Readings

- Davis, J. (Ed.). (2002). *The wide brim: Early poems and ponderings of Marjory Stoneman Douglas*. Gainesville: University Press of Florida.
- Douglas, M. (1947). *The everglades: A river of grass*. St. Simons Island, GA: Mockingbird Books.
- Douglas, M. (with Rothchild, J.). (1987). *Voice of the river*. Sarasota, FL: Pineapple Press.
- McCarthy, K. (Ed.). (1990). *Nine Florida stories by Marjory Stoneman Douglas*. Gainesville: University Press of Florida.
- McCarthy, K. (Ed.). (1998). *A river in flood and other Florida stories by Marjory Stoneman Douglas*. Gainesville: University Press of Florida.

DOUGLASS, FREDERICK (1818–1895)

African American writer, autobiographer, abolitionist, and diplomat, Frederick Douglass, born Frederick Bailey, is truly one of the most inspiring individuals in American history. Born into slavery in 1818 on Maryland's eastern shore, Douglass grew up without knowing the identities of either his mother or father. In his autobiography, *The Narrative of the Life of Frederick Douglass, an American Slave*, he recounts how he heard rumors that his father was actually the master of the plantation. His mother, as he asserts, was deliberately separated from him when he was an infant to prevent familial bonds from forming between slaves; however, she sometimes visited him

surreptitiously at night, after curfew hours, risking punishment to spend some time with young Frederick. Despite her efforts, when she died, Douglass did not feel any connection to her. He laments this as a typical situation, in which slavery destroyed the natural bonds that should develop between parents and their children.

As a child, he did not experience physical violence, though he witnessed other slaves, including an aunt, being savagely beaten for minor offenses. In 1826, when he was a small child, Douglass was transferred to the household of Hugh Auld in Baltimore, Maryland. The brother-in-law of Douglass' master, Auld had requested a slave to employ as a household servant. Life in Baltimore differed tremendously from that on the plantation on the eastern shore, because many blacks in Baltimore were free—there were more free blacks, in fact, than slaves. Furthermore, while he had been either ignored or mistreated on the plantation, in the Auld household, Douglass received kinder treatment from his new mistress, Sophia Auld.

A woman who had previously earned her own living before marrying, Sophia Auld initially treated young Douglass with the same gentleness she showed her own son, Tommy. When Douglass asked her to teach him how to read, she embarked on the task with enthusiasm. Douglass rapidly made progress and could soon read simple words and string together short sentences. However, when Hugh Auld soon discovered that his wife was teaching a slave child how to read, he immediately stopped the lessons. Douglass recounts the experience as one of the most profound in his life.

The experience disappointed Douglass, who had been making rapid progress, but it also taught him something important—that slavery and oppression were maintained by deliberately denying slaves education and an opportunity for self-improvement; that is, by keeping them ignorant. When he discovered this secret of how whites continued to enslave Africans, Douglass became determined to continue his education, though he would have to rely on his wits.

One of the greatest scenes in American literature is undoubtedly that, recounted in his autobiography, in which Douglass bribes poor white children in his

Baltimore neighborhood with stolen loaves of bread to teach him unfamiliar words and pronunciations. In this steady, wily manner, Douglass cobbled together an education. He read as many books as he could obtain, teaching himself history and other subjects.

After 7 years in Baltimore, Douglass was transferred back to the plantation on which he was raised. He was hired out as a field hand under the supervision of Edward Covey, reputedly a vicious overseer. Having endured several violent beatings, a demoralized Douglass became determined to escape. After an unsuccessful attempt in 1836, he finally succeeded in September of 1838 with the help of abolitionists. Disguised as a sailor, he went to the North, where he began a new life. He married Anna Murray, an African American abolitionist who had helped finance his escape.

The couple lived in Massachusetts and in New York, where Anna turned their home into a station on the Underground Railroad to help other runaway slaves. Douglass became a close associate of William Lloyd Garrison, the era's leading abolitionist and publisher of the abolitionist newspaper, the *Liberator*. With the help of Garrison and his colleagues, Douglass was commissioned by the American Anti-Slavery Society to embark on a lecture circuit, addressing audiences in the Northeast on the evils of slavery, recounting his experiences in bondage.

In 1845, he published his autobiography, *The Narrative of the Life of Frederick Douglass, an American Slave*, in which he revealed his identity. This put him in danger of being discovered, meaning that his former masters could legally reclaim him and recapture him. He spent nearly 2 years in Europe until the danger of his exposure had largely passed.

On his return in 1847, Douglass immersed himself even more deeply in the abolitionist cause, as well as women's rights issues. He founded a newspaper, *The North Star*, in 1847. In July of 1848, he attended the Seneca Falls Women's Rights Convention. Around this time, he began having ideological differences with William Lloyd Garrison; essentially, they differed in their opinions over the U.S. Constitution. Garrison believed it supported and upheld slavery, while Douglass believed it could be used to overturn

and nullify the practice of slavery. They never could reconcile their ideological differences over the issue.

In 1853, Douglass published a short work of fiction, *The Heroic Slave*, which depicted a slave uprising based on a real historic event. His second autobiography, *My Bondage and My Freedom*, appeared in print in 1855.

During the Civil War, Douglass met privately with President Abraham Lincoln three times. He tried to persuade the president that African American soldiers should be allowed to fight in the Union army against the Confederate forces. After the war's end, Douglass eventually moved to Washington, D.C., where he began editing a weekly publication, *New National Era*, advocating civil rights. He also became more politically active and was recruited by government officials for public service, such as serving as the U.S. Marshall for Washington, D.C., and later as the ambassador to Haiti.

In 1882, his wife Anna Murray died, the same year that Douglass published *The Life and Times of Frederick Douglass*, another volume of his autobiography. Two years later he married Helen Pitts, a young white woman who was employed as his secretary. The daughter of fellow abolitionist, Gideon Pitts, Jr., Helen Pitts was almost 20 years younger than Douglass. Their interracial marriage caused a public uproar. In 1886, they took a honeymoon in Europe and the Middle East, touring the region for a year.

On February 20, 1895, Douglass died at his home in Washington, D.C. His legacy stands unparalleled in terms of his influence on later African American activities. He died a man respected by presidents, world leaders, and fellow activists and colleagues. Prominent people, including women's rights leader Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Booker T. Washington, and W. E. B. Du Bois, eulogized him. Douglass had made his mark not just as an abolitionist and black rights leader, but as an advocate for the rights of all oppressed people.

Historians note that his legacy was, undoubtedly, shaped by Frederick Douglass himself. While his life story is a remarkable one, Douglass carefully crafted its presentation through the various volumes of his autobiography and his many speaking engagements and

political appointments, always painting himself as a self-made man. Nonetheless, his success helped improve the situation and create opportunities for countless African Americans before and after the Civil War.

—Susan Muaddi Darraj

See also Abolitionist Movements; Du Bois, W. E. B.; Lincoln, Abraham

Further Readings

- Andrews, W. (Ed.). (1996). *The Oxford Frederick Douglass reader*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Douglass, F. (1845). *Narrative of the life of Frederick Douglass, an American slave*. Boston: Anti-Slavery Office.
- Gates, H. L. (Ed.). (1996). *Frederick Douglass: Critical perspectives past and present*. New York: Amistad Press.
- McFeely, W. (1991). *Frederick Douglass*. New York: W. W. Norton.

Dow, Unity (1959–)

Unity Dow, Botswana lawyer and human rights activist, was appointed as the first woman judge on the High Court in 1998. She established a women's rights center in her home village, was a cofounder of the Botswana women's rights organization Emang Basadi! (Stand Up, Women!) and of the Women and Law in Southern African research project (WLSA). She is a member of International Women's Rights Watch, and became well-known in Botswana for the Citizenship Case in 1991.

Dow grew up in Mochudi, a large village north of the capital, Gaborone. She received law degrees from the University of Botswana and from the University of Edinburgh. She worked in the Botswana Attorney General's office before going into private practice with a woman partner. In 1986 she joined with other women lawyers, academics, journalists, and political activists, including Athaliah Molokomme, to found Emang Basadi! as an advocacy group for women's

rights, and with women lawyers and researchers from the region to form WLSA. She founded the Methaetsile Women's Information Center to provide legal information and counseling for women who could not afford to pay for legal services.

Emang Basadi! launched a campaign to educate women about their rights and to advocate for reform of laws regarding child support, rape, and married women's property and citizenship rights. From the nation's independence in 1966, citizenship in Botswana's multiparty democracy had been based on birth in the territory. The new law passed in 1984 based citizenship on descent in terms that discriminated against women. Men who married noncitizens could pass on their citizenship to their children, but women who married noncitizens could not. Citizenship carries many educational and economic entitlements in Botswana as well as legal rights. In frontline Botswana in the 1980s, children of women who married exiles from apartheid South Africa would be left stateless.

Advocacy to change the law failed and women's rights groups shifted to a judicial strategy. They supported Dow in filing suit against the law in 1990, based on her marriage to a U.S. citizen and the denial of a passport to their younger daughter, born after passage of the new law. The suit argued that the citizenship law violated the Botswana constitution. The case was decided in her favor in 1991, a victory that was a catalyst for the women's rights movement and led to extensive further reforms of discriminatory laws and to greater inclusion of women in political activism and in public office.

In 1998 Dow was appointed as the first woman judge on the High Court. In addition to her legal work, Dow has written four novels strongly expressing the struggles of girls and women in Botswana for equality and justice, *Far and Beyon'*, *The Screaming of the Innocent*, *Juggling Truths*, and *The Heavens May Fall*.

—Judith Imel Van Allen

See also African Women and Social Justice; Anti-Apartheid Movement; Anti-Colonial Movements, Sub-Saharan Africa; Feminism; Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs); Socialist Feminism

Further Readings

- Holm, J., & Molutsi, P. (Eds.). (1989). *Democracy in Botswana*. Athens: Ohio University Press.
- Van Allen, J. (2000). "Bad future things" and liberatory moments: Capitalism, gender and the state in Botswana. *Radical History Review*, 76, 136–168.

DRAFT RESISTANCE

Since America's inception, the debate over the federal government's right to compel Americans into military service (i.e., the right to draft) has evoked passion and dissidence. Some resisters questioned whether the federal government had the authority to compel military service while others disagreed with the premise of the war they were being drafted to fight in. Still a great many others resisted purely on the grounds that they wanted no part of military life, especially if they might have to make the ultimate sacrifice and die for their country. Nonetheless, the debate over the draft predates the Constitution. Americans have been resisting the federal authority to draft American citizens since before Congress was established.

During the constitutional conventions, the founders debated the conditions and authority that could precipitate a draft. Federalists believed a federal draft violated core American values of liberty and republicanism. They compared the prospects of federal authority to compel military service to the recent memory of tyrannical British occupying forces. On the issue of the federal authority to draft, anti-federalists effectively concurred. Their opposition stemmed from a fear of the consequences of juxtaposing the power of the purse and sword. No member or organ of government ought to have the power to fund and raise an army. This consensus on the draft manifested in the resultant language of the Constitution; there was no explicit mention of the power to draft—it is neither condoned nor forbidden. The founders left the question to future generations of politicians. Given the federalists' concern about inalienable rights and the anti-federalists' concern about aggrandized federal power, the final language of the Constitution only mentions militias: state-based

organizations with the understood purpose of national (local) defense.

Despite this understanding of the draft and the seemingly universal opposition thereto, 3 years into the War of 1812 and having just witnessed the burning of the White House, President James Madison called for a draft. However, Congress rejected his request citing the founders' concern that they did not have the right to conscript an army. Representative Daniel Webster led the congressional resistance, arguing a draft would infringe on civil and personal liberties and embrace despotism of the worst form.

Thirty-nine years later, President Abraham Lincoln also faced a war and a manpower deficit; however, his draft request met with greater success. On March 3, 1863, the first federal draft in American history took effect. As with every draft since, some potential inductees resisted service by legal means while others employed illegal tactics. Legally a man could avoid service by providing a substitute or paying a \$300 commutation fee. For all the resistance efforts to the Civil War draft, none were more infamous than the July 1863 New York City draft riots.

Many New Yorkers resented "Lincoln's War," lamenting that the Civil War had become a rich man's war but a poor man's fight. These tensions culminated on July 13, 1863, when the first draft calls commenced. A fire brigade actually started the riots, setting a draft office ablaze when one of their own was denied exemption as a public servant. Five days of mayhem ensued, engulfing lower Manhattan in a rioting flurry of draft resistance. Though some scholars argue that the riots were more a manifestation of race and class tension than draft protest, the catalyst for the riots is indisputable. The riots began as a direct result of the implementation of the Draft Act and the execution of the first draft calls in New York City.

After the Civil War and in light of the New York City riots, a moratorium on drafts ensued, lasting more than 50 years until World War I when the need for troops trumped fears of a repeat of July 1863. Passed hastily in 1917 as America entered the fight, the Selective Service Act elicited opposition and resistance from numerous Americans. Commutations and substitutions were outlawed; however, a system of

deferments replaced them, providing new means to legally avoid service. Though there was no repeat of the New York City riots, there were some prominent episodes of draft resistance. Among them, the two most publicized incidents played out not in the streets or in Congress, but in the U.S. Supreme Court.

The court ruled in 1918 on the constitutionality of the draft itself in *Arver v. United States*, the litmus case for a series of decisions collectively known as the Selective Draft Law Cases. Chief Justice Edward White, writing for the court, ruled for the government, endorsing the constitutional legitimacy of the Selective Service Act and dismissing Arver's argument that a draft violated the Thirteenth Amendment. White ruled a draft was a duty to serve one's country—not a condition of servitude. Scholars debate the accuracy of the historical precedents White cited in his decision; nonetheless, the decision represented a major legal blow to draft resistance. The highest court in America concluded that the framers of the Constitution endorsed compulsory military service.

The second major Supreme Court decision regarding draft resistance during World War I regarded the wartime limits of protected speech. In 1919 in the case of *Schenck v. United States*, the court defined the constitutional limits of speech acts, delineating between protected speech and condemnable actions against the state. Charles T. Schenck distributed pamphlets that encouraged people to talk to their members of Congress in opposition to the Selective Service Act. Writing for the majority, Associate Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes contended speech was not protected when it creates a clear and present danger to an evil Congress is combating. Thus, the court ruled that Schenck was guilty as charged. His encouragement of draft resistance was deemed illegal and unconstitutional.

Though the strain on the draft during World War II and the Korean War was relatively minor (in fact the draft was briefly abandoned in 1947 and 1948), there was a large debate in Congress in 1940 as to whether the United States should return to a policy of drafted manpower, especially in light of the riots during the Civil War and the fallout from the World War I draft. To preserve American readiness, a draft was passed (the Burke-Wadsworth Act) and a selective service

system was implemented before American troops entered World War II and before America declared war on any country. Thus, the 1940 draft represented the first peacetime draft in American history, setting a precedent for the next 33 years.

Ultimately, every draft in the 20th century before the Vietnam War met predominant support and compliance. The preponderance of resistance changed, however, during the Vietnam War. Arguably the most pronounced period of draft resistance in American history, it certainly was and remains the most popularized. Nevertheless, many of the means and methods that are now the subject of countless books and movies were tactics already perfected by pockets of resistance during previous wars. Opposition stemmed from the politics behind the war as well as the semantics of the selective service's prosecution of the draft. Some resisters did not support the motivations behind American participation in the war while others were guided simply by self-preservation and a desire not to join the growing death toll. Still others were enraged at the racial and class disparity in the selection process.

Much like during the Civil War, loopholes allowed some men to legally avoid service. The selective service system for draft classification provided various categories for individuals who were not fit or available to serve. The most controversial loophole corresponded to category IV-F, reserved for those physically, morally, or psychiatrically unfit to serve. These conditions ranged from flat feet to homosexuality. While many Americans were legitimately unfit to serve, many more cheated their way into this status. Many men found or paid a friendly doctor to vouch that they had a condition that precluded them from service. Others successfully feigned such conditions when called for induction.

Regardless of one's status, once classified the government issued each young man a draft card. This piece of government identification was to be carried on person at all times and could not be marred or defaced in any way. Thus, when many draft resisters chose to burn their draft cards, they were not only making a political statement, they were overtly defying the law and the selective service system.

Resistance also frequently manifested in terms of evasion. If men could not be found, they could not serve. This logic led between 60,000 and 100,000 men to flee into exile in Canada. Having not implemented a draft in Canada since World War I, and given Canadian political opposition to American participation in the Vietnam War, draft evaders found a haven north of the border. Even after the war ended and President Jimmy Carter pardoned draft evaders in 1977, many exiles chose to remain in Canada.

Draft reforms in the late 1960s remedied some of the larger inequities in the selective service system. Some of the more disparate exemptions were removed, and a lottery system based on birthdays established a colorblind and class-blind determinant of service. Nonetheless, draft resistance continued through 1973 when American ground troop participation in the war ceased and the all-volunteer force replaced the draft. Even then, without a draft to resist, the movement continued to fight for reconciliation and amnesty for draft evaders. Their efforts were rewarded when Jimmy Carter issued his aforementioned pardon in 1977. However, despite early placation of draft resisters, in 1980 Carter reinstated draft registration. This did not resume active calls to duty but did reinstitute the selective service registry, minimizing the start-up time for the draft machinery should Congress ever decide to resume draft calls. However, since 1973 American military personnel needs have been satisfied without resorting to compulsory service.

This is technically the current status of the draft. Yet, in light of recent political events and military engagements in Afghanistan and Iraq, a new debate over the draft has emerged. As the American military presence abroad increases, the personnel burden has become increasingly strained. This has resulted in what pundits have dubbed a backdoor draft. Stop-loss programs and extensive call-ups of reserve troops have offset increased personnel needs without officially returning to a drafted army. However, this strategy has not duped opponents who ardently oppose any policy and action that constitutes the spirit, even if not the letter, of a draft. While some activists object to this strategy, Congress preferred the status quo to reinstating a draft. Proof of this political reality was most recently

provided on January 7, 2003, when Representative Charles Rangel proposed the Universal National Service Act of 2003. Whether it was a serious suggestion or a political stunt is still debated by scholars; however, despite the efforts of Rangel and his cosponsors, the bill failed in the House by an overwhelming vote of 2 to 402, proving there does not appear to be another draft on the horizon. It also proved that congressional resistance to the draft remains strong.

Ultimately, no draft has ever been enacted without significant debate and subsequent resistance. The quantity and fervor of each have varied in American history based on the popularity of the war and the feelings of the public at the time. Some resisted on philosophic grounds, purporting the government had no right to make the decision to serve for them. Others had more political objections, refusing to support—and in fact fight—for a cause they did not believe in. Still, the largest group remains those who were simply not inclined to risk their life in the army. The debate over the draft in America has always existed and will always exist so long as America has military commitments abroad.

—Jason Friedman

See also Carter, James Earl; Counter-Recruitment; Lincoln, Abraham; Roosevelt, Franklin D.

Further Readings

- Bernstein, I. (1990). *The New York City draft riots: Their significance for American society and politics in the age of the Civil War*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Fallows, J. (1975). What did you do in the class war, daddy? *Washington Monthly*, 7(8), 5–20.
- Freedman, L. (1969). Conscription and the constitution: The original understanding. *Michigan Law Review*, 67, 1493–1552.
- Kusch, F. (2001). *All American boys: Draft dodgers in Canada from the Vietnam War*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Levine, P. (1981). Draft evasion in the north during the Civil War, 1863–1865. *Journal of American History*, 67(4), 816–834.
- Lofgren, C. (1976). Compulsory military service under the constitution: The original understanding. *William and Mary Quarterly*, 33(1), 61–88.
- Surrey, D. (1982). *Choice of conscience: Vietnam era military and draft resisters in Canada*. New York: Praeger.

DRUG LAWS, RESISTANCE TO

The origins of U.S. drug prohibition lie in the early 20th century. Prior to 1906, there was no drug regulation in the United States and crimes such as drug dealing and drug possession did not exist. The first regulation came with the 1906 Pure Food and Drug Act, which required labeling of ingredients. Passed in the wake of public disgust over Upton Sinclair's slaughterhouse exposé *The Jungle*, the law also required patent medicine and similar nostrums to disclose their ingredients, which often included a healthy dose of morphine or cocaine. The Harrison Act in 1914 banned the distribution of opiates and cocaine and began the prohibition of drugs as a national policy. Although the act had a clause allowing doctors' use in their practices, in 1917 this was interpreted to not allow heroin maintenance to patients.

The Marijuana Tax Act of 1937 was passed with little fanfare. Many legislators were unsure exactly what marijuana was, and there was minimal debate leading up to the floor vote. Sociologist Howard Becker attributed this law to the moral entrepreneurship of Harry Anslinger, the long-standing head of the Federal Bureau of Narcotics, who promoted marijuana as a threat to public safety and luridly linked the drug with Mexican immigration into the Southwest. (The Federal Bureau of Narcotics was the precursor to the Drug Enforcement Administration.)

Early drug laws did not have a major impact on the criminal justice system because of the limited use of some drugs (marijuana) and the medical acceptability of others (cocaine, morphine). The significance of early drug laws lies in the vast expansion of incarceration and the criminal justice system during the 1990s, driven in part by the addition of mandatory minimum sentencing for drug offenses. Resistance to drug laws now focuses mainly on the criminal justice system and the cost and scope of the war on drugs.

During the 1960s and 1970s, marijuana use diffused through the population, greatly increasing the number of people who had tried the drug. As well-educated, middle-class people used marijuana, sentiments toward decriminalization became increasingly favorable.

Jerome Himmelstein's analysis of news reports found that descriptions of the *physical effects* of marijuana changed as the reference group of users changed—marijuana was no longer associated with violence and addiction, but passivity and dependence instead. As drug law affected more middle-class young people, support for drug law reform grew among civil society and politicians concerned about a seemingly unrealistic legal regime of prohibition. The American Bar Association and the American Nurses Association passed resolutions in favor of decriminalization. The New York State Congress of Parents and Teachers Associations passed a similar resolution in 1976.

The possibility of reform seemed to be at its peak in 1977 when President Jimmy Carter spoke to Congress with the message that penalties against drug use should not be more damaging to an individual than the use of the drug itself; he tied this explicitly to the laws against the possession of marijuana in private for personal use. Carter's statement had precedent in earlier reports and official statements. President Nixon commissioned a study of marijuana law and policy in the United States, headed by Raymond Shafer, Republican ex-governor of Pennsylvania. Published in 1972 with the title *Marihuana: Signal of Misunderstanding*, the Shafer commission concluded the criminalization of possession of marijuana for personal use was socially self-defeating and, in the overall scheme of things, did not rank high in ranking of social concerns in the United States. The study recommended de-emphasizing marijuana as a problem.

This conclusion greatly displeased Nixon but suggested the depth of opposition to the nascent drug war. In 1975, the Ford administration released the *White Paper on Drug Abuse*, which also de-emphasized marijuana in relation to other drug problems. It concluded that in light of its widespread recreational use—and the relatively low social cost associated with this type of use—the federal government has been de-emphasizing simple possession and use of marijuana in its law enforcement effort for several years. The Senate also held a number of hearings on relaxation of drug law during the 1970s, with titles such as "Considerations For and Against the Reduction of Federal Penalties for Possession of Small Amounts of Marihuana for Personal Use."

Public opinion measures from the General Social Survey (GSS) saw increasing support for decriminalization in the 1970s, with a peak of more than 30% in 1977. After a long decline in support during the late 1970s and 1980s, the GSS and the data from the Bureau of Justice Statistics find that support for marijuana decriminalization is as high now as it was 30 years ago, with slightly less than a third of the population supporting decriminalization. Among college freshmen, support rises to around 50%, though it is important to note there has always been a gender gap with men more likely to support decriminalization.

The National Organization to Reform Marijuana Laws (NORML) was founded in 1970 and has been the pre-eminent organization advocating against marijuana prohibition. During much of the 1970s, NORML was successful in advancing the agenda of decriminalization of marijuana, with 11 states adopting laws by 1976. However, the emergence of the parental anti-drug movement that framed drug use a threat to youth, combined with an increasing governmental focus on the potential health effects of marijuana, stopped federal-level decriminalization from ever being instituted.

NORML has long attracted celebrity support, especially from musicians, filmmakers, and writers. Hunter S. Thompson, Willie Nelson, and Robert Altman have all been members of the board of directors. NORML funds extensive public relations campaigns and recently presented billboards in New York City with Mayor Michael Bloomberg quoted as enjoying his youthful marijuana use.

In 1994, financier George Soros helped found the Lindesmith Institute as part of the Open Society Institute. Public policy professor Ethan Nadelmann left his job at Princeton to become director of the Lindesmith Center in 1994. In 2000, the Lindesmith Center merged with the Drug Policy Foundation to form the Drug Policy Alliance. Like NORML, the Drug Policy Alliance has found common ground with limited-government conservatives; Ethan Nadelmann, founder and executive director of the Drug Policy Alliance, wrote a 2004 cover story for *National Review* opposing marijuana prohibition.

Opposition to the American drug war has taken new forms in recent years. First, Law Enforcement Against

Prohibition, founded in 2002 by mostly retired police and police chiefs, has become increasingly active and vocal in criticizing current drug policy. Because of the credibility of these officials, their opposition to drug law is often well documented in the news media.

Also, student organizations have organized against the war on drugs, especially its educational provisions. Students for a Sensible Drug Policy (SSDP) was founded in 1998 as a response to a federal education spending bill, the Higher Education Act, that denies grants and student loans to anyone convicted of a drug crime. At the time of this writing, SSDP had more than 100 chapters in the United States.

Finally, there is limited development of an international drug users' movement. Activists in Vancouver have had some success with the Vancouver Area Network of Drug Users, which is involved in shaping the city drug policy and negotiating the construction of a safe injection site in downtown Vancouver. Similar networks exist in England, Australia, Belgium, and Thailand, often centered on sexually transmitted disease mitigation. Activist organizations have also been involved in harm-reduction techniques surrounding drug use at public venues. Most notable is DanceSafe, an organization that tests ecstasy pills at raves and publishes the results online.

Many countries also have marijuana-centered political parties. Canada, New Zealand, the United Kingdom, Spain, and Israel all have parties participating in parliamentary elections. The U.S. Marijuana party has chapters in 29 states.

The increasing medicalization of drug use has altered the landscape in reform. The movement for medical marijuana in the 1990s produced several victories, the most far-reaching of which was the passage of California's Proposition 215. Also known as the Compassionate Use Act, the California Proposition passed with 55.6% of the vote and allowed doctors to recommend marijuana to patients. As of this writing, Rhode Island had most recently instituted a medical marijuana law, bringing the number of states with medical marijuana laws to 11. Many municipalities, especially large university towns, also have decriminalization ordinances.

The medical marijuana bills created a conflict between federal prohibitionist drug policy and the

ability of states to experiment in a federalist system. The test case was *Gonzales v. Raich* (originally *Ashcroft v. Raich* before John Ashcroft's resignation as attorney general). Angel Raich was a California cancer patient who consumed marijuana under the Compassionate Use Act; along with Diane Monson, a patient whose home was raided by the Drug Enforcement Administration, she brought suit against the government. Their lawsuit questioned the constitutionality of the Controlled Substances Act, which classifies marijuana as having no currently accepted medical use. The root constitutional question was the range of the Commerce Clause, which allows the federal government to regulate both interstate commerce and intrastate commerce that may affect national markets. Raich and Monson argued that because there was no commercial element (all of the marijuana was produced at home or given as gifts) and because the operation was wholly contained to California, the federal government lacked the jurisdiction to regulate this behavior.

In 2005, the Supreme Court ruled 6 to 3 against Raich, concluding that the Commerce Clause was applicable and that the federal government had the right to pre-empt state law. This overturned the 2003 Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals ruling that found in favor of the plaintiffs.

Public opinion polls indicate majority support for medical marijuana nationwide, with little difference by age or gender. Although medical marijuana has been a successful referendum issue at the local and sometimes the state level, the model has for the most part not been extended to other drugs. One exception is the case of Baltimore, with the largest intravenous drug problem in the United States. Mayor Kurt Schmoke created a furor in the 1980s by calling for decriminalization of heroin. However, this reform was never implemented as policy and Schmoke has since retired from office.

Mandatory minimum sentences, which remove judicial discretion in sentencing, have increasingly been applied to drug crimes and have contributed to the growth in incarceration in the United States. Several organizations oppose mandatory minimum sentencing, often with a particular focus on drug offenses. A 1986 Omnibus Crime Bill introduced

mandatory minimum for many drug crimes, based on the weight of drugs involved. Although mandatory minimums have been used since the colonial era as a deterrent tool, these laws increased the number of offenses subject to mandatory minimums and made many drug crimes felonies that required a 5- to 10-year prison sentence.

The Sentencing Project was incorporated in 1986 and has become the major source of research and advocacy opposing mandatory minimum sentencing. A related organization, Families Against Mandatory Minimums, was founded in 1991 to advocate for flexibility in sentencing and is active in 24 states and the District of Columbia. The Sentencing Project has released several reports highlighting the racial disparities in criminal justice that stem from mandatory minimum sentencing. Other research by sociologists found that for certain age groups of black men, prison was a more likely life experience than completion of higher education, in part because of mandatory minimum sentencing. Some critical scholars have argued that the greatly expanded criminal justice system and the war on drugs funnel minorities directly from ghettos to prisons.

Activists have developed several sites dedicated to disseminating information in the drug law reform effort. In addition to the organizations mentioned above such as NORML and Drug Policy Alliance, other notable organizations include the Drug Reform Coordination Network (DRCNet), and DrugSense. The Media Awareness Project, the largest project of DrugSense, focuses on media coverage of drugs and drug law. "Newshawking" volunteers compile drug-related editorials and stories from local, national, and international news sources for dissemination via websites and listserves. DRCNet runs a large newsletter and hosts the Schaffer library of drug policy, with archives of major studies of drug policy and drug law in the United States and abroad. Resistance to drug laws has taken many organizational forms, largely focusing on changing criminal law surrounding drugs and highlighting and combating the inequities of the war on drugs.

—Adam Jacobs

See also Judicial Activism; Law and Social Movements; Moral Panic; Prison-Industrial Complex

Further Readings

- Baum, D. (1996). *Smoke and mirrors: The war on drugs and the politics of failure*. Boston: Little, Brown.
- Becker, H. (1963). *Outsiders: Studies in the sociology of deviance*. New York: Free Press.
- Bonnie, R., & Whitebread, C. (1999). *The marijuana conviction: A history of marijuana prohibition in the United States*. New York: Lindesmith Center.
- Himmelstein, J. (1983). *The strange career of marihuana: Politics and ideology of drug control in America*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Massing, M. (1998). *The fix*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Musto, D. (1999). *The American disease: Origins of narcotics law*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Simon, D., & Burns, E. (1998). *The corner: A year in the life of an inner-city neighborhood*. New York: Broadway Books.

DUBČEK, ALEXANDER (1921–1992)

Alexander Dubček was the leader of Prague Spring from 1991 to 1992, an effort by reformists within the Czechoslovakia Communist Party to open the political system and introduce economic changes, personified in his slogan “Socialism with a human face.” Born in the small Slovak village of Uhrovec, Dubček spent much of childhood in the Soviet Union and later participated in the Slovak Uprising against Nazi occupation during World War II.

Dubček was recruited to become a party administrator in 1949, rising rapidly to become a provincial secretary in 1953, national party secretary for industry in 1960, and Slovak first secretary in 1963. In the early 1960s, Dubček was a member of the Kolder Commission, a party investigation of the Stalinist purges of a decade earlier. His participation on this commission, along with his oversight of industry, solidified his belief in structural reform. Reaching the top ranks of the party in the early 1960s, Dubček cautiously worked to create the necessary conditions to implement his reforms, gathering together like-minded reformists. A cautious approach was necessary because entrenched Stalinists opposed all but the most tepid reforms, and the Stalinist party head and

president, Antonin Novotny, repeatedly tried to oust or demote Dubček, at one point launching a police investigation of Dubček that failed. The attacks on Dubček, led by Novotny, centered on false accusations of “bourgeois nationalism”—for which some senior party officials were jailed during the 1950s—were manufactured over Dubček’s continuing advocacy of more industrial investment in the Slovak Republic, which lagged behind the Czech lands.

Economic stagnation, rising tensions between Czechs and Slovaks, and pressure for reforms from below created the conditions for changes in the party leadership by late 1967, and in January 1968 the party leadership elected Dubček first secretary, the highest office. Although his reformist credentials and wider anti-Novotny sentiment were important factors in his elevation, another factor was that Dubček was a Slovak; all previous party heads were Czechs and most high party positions had been held by Czechs. A key goal for Dubček was the party renewing its popular support, which was to be done in part by ending the party’s pervasive close management of all aspects of government. Through 1968, a majority in the party leadership solidified behind Dubček, but he continued to have to maneuver around internal oppositionists and repeated demonstrations of disapproval from the Soviet Union. In August 1968, Czechoslovakia was invaded by the Soviet Union and four other Warsaw Pact nations, and Dubček was kidnapped from his office by Soviet intelligence agents. Dubček refused to denounce his program but was allowed to remain as first secretary when the Soviets failed to install the coup leaders in power. Although his followers were removed from their offices, he remained in his office in an attempt to stave off reversals of his reforms.

Dubček was forced from office in 1969, stripped of his party membership, and harassed by the secret police for the next 20 years. He worked as a mechanic before retiring, but when the communist regime collapsed in late 1989, Dubček became the head of the national parliament. He energetically opposed the split of Czechoslovakia into two nations. But although a lifelong, unwavering believer in socialism, Dubček was deeply saddened by the betrayal of his ideals and became the leader of the Social Democrats. His return

to public life ended prematurely when he was severely injured in an automobile crash in September 1992; he died 9 weeks later.

—Pete Dolack

See also Communism; Prague Spring

Further Readings

Williams, K. (1997). *The Prague spring and its aftermath: Czechoslovak politics, 1968–1970*. London: Cambridge University Press.

Du Bois, W. E. B. (1868–1963)

William Edward Burghardt Du Bois was a central figure in the initiation of the Negro protest movement in America, a founder of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), an advocate for equal rights, a persistent critic of colonialism, the architect of Pan-Africanism, and a pre-eminent scholar of the black race. Du Bois was born on February 23, 1868, in Great Barrington, Massachusetts. He studied at Fisk and Harvard Universities in the United States and the University of Berlin in Germany. In 1895, he became the first African American to obtain a Ph.D. from Harvard. His “The Suppression of the African Slave Trade” of 1869 opened the authoritative *Harvard Historical Studies* series. In 1894 to 1896, he served as professor of Greek and Latin at Wilberforce University, and in 1896 and 1897, he taught at the University of Pennsylvania.

His academic career was primarily associated with Atlanta University. Du Bois was first there between 1897 and 1910 as professor of history and economics. Alongside teaching, he completed *The Philadelphia Negro* in 1899—an exemplary empirical research in urban sociology with anthropological and demographic dimensions. It is considered the first attempt by an American social scientist to develop a methodology for the discipline of sociology.

In Atlanta, Du Bois organized a series of conferences on urban black people and authored a number of works that defined the situation of blacks in America in striking and insightful ways. Central among them was the much acclaimed *The Souls of Black Folk* of 1903, which has now gone through some 30 editions.

With these works, Du Bois had already asserted himself as a distinguished scholar. But he strongly felt that his academic pursuits would only be meaningful if they were practically linked to the historic demands of the epoch. For him, the greatest challenge of the 20th century was, in his memorable words, the “problem of the color line.” To deal with it meant to transform America into a racially integrated society and to achieve the unity and liberation of the whole of Africa. This new turn toward action was stimulated by the deterioration of the racial situation in America, especially in Atlanta, where Du Bois himself was subjected to all manner of restrictions and humiliation off-campus, and where he witnessed lynching every week.

Du Bois created a platform for his work that openly challenged the program and policies of Booker T. Washington. Instead of Washington’s insistence on accommodation and submission by black people, Du Bois proposed a demand for equality through all possible means. In opposition to the philosophy of individual education, Du Bois outlined the prospect of the Talented Tenth, an intellectual elite that would lead the black masses to freedom and progress.

As a first step, in 1905, Du Bois founded the Niagara Movement, which sought full citizenship rights for African Americans. He was its general secretary until 1909. In the same year, he was among the founders of NAACP, and from 1910 up to his resignation in 1934, he worked as its director of publicity and research. He was also the editor of its influential organ, *The Crisis*. Through this magazine, Du Bois effectively shaped the character of the organization, set the agenda for black protest, and made Africa an important theme and concern for black Americans.

A pragmatic leader, he had early on emphasized the need for what he called economic democracy. This concern acquired added urgency with the coming of the Great Depression. Du Bois reexamined the whole program of NAACP and proclaimed that it required

fundamental revision. In the new situation of further economic marginalization of black people, it was futile to stick to the old liberalism and appeal merely for broad justice and legal reforms. What was essential was to provide opportunities for these people to earn a living, protect and raise their income, and expand their employment. He, therefore, proposed such concrete steps as the establishment of a cooperative commonwealth in the black ghetto, the formation of producer and consumer cooperatives, and the socialization of such crucial black professional services as those of medical doctors and lawyers. But far from being solely a pragmatist, Du Bois also insisted on what he saw as the black people's special mission in the world and envisioned the creation of, in his words, a new and great Negro ethos.

World War I, which Du Bois saw not only as long, cruel, bloody, and unnecessary, but also as unashamedly racist, became that watershed in his life, which made him regard the cause of black Americans as part of the larger cause of colored people everywhere. He concluded that the freedom of Africa is a condition for the emancipation of the descendants of Africa the world over.

In 1919, the Second Pan-African Congress took place in Paris and Du Bois rose as the world leader of that movement. These congresses called for—at the level of internationally formalized opinion—the liberation of the African colonies. They served to highlight the predicament of Africans throughout the world and to create awareness about the indignity of racial discrimination, the wrong of the very existence of the colonial system, and the urgent need of emancipating Africa. Inspired by Du Bois's Pan-Africanism, as a political theory and practical strategy, upon returning to their respective countries, African leaders engaged in the creation of movements for their liberation. The most famous was the Fifth Pan-African Congress, which Du Bois chaired in Manchester in 1945. Among those who attended was Jomo Kenyatta of Kenya and Ghana's Kwame Nkrumah. It is said that this was the event that fired their imagination and led to the decolonization of Africa.

Despite his intense activist involvement, Du Bois continued with his scholarly work. *The Gift of Black*

Folk came out in 1924. The year 1933 marked his return to Atlanta University as professor and chair of sociology. He founded and became the editor of *Phylon*, the Atlanta University Review of Race and Culture and initiated the project *Encyclopedia of the Negro*. Another major book of the second Atlanta stint was *Black Folk: Then and Now* from 1939.

Immediately on retirement from Atlanta in 1944, Du Bois returned to the NAACP as director of special research. Later he served, successively, as consultant of the United Nations Organization at San Francisco, chairman of the Council of African Affairs, and chairman of the Peace Information Center. It was for his activities in this latter capacity that he was jailed during the Cold War years of 1950 and 1951. In 1957, he was denied a passport to travel and attend the independence celebrations of Ghana. Du Bois joined the Communist Party of America in 1961.

His most important works of that period are *Color and Democracy* of 1945 and *The World and Africa: An Inquiry into the Part Which Africa Has Played in World History* of 1947. His writings on Africa, in their entirety, constitute a response to his own pioneer call for the honest interpretation of the history of that continent and its people.

Du Bois was also a columnist for the *Pittsburgh Courier* (1936–1938), *Amsterdam News* (New York, 1939–1944), *Chicago Defender* (1945–1948), and *People's Voice* (1947–1948). He wrote for *Current History*, *Journal of Negro Education*, *Foreign Affairs*, and *American Scholar*.

On the invitation of President Krumah, in 1961, Du Bois and his wife, Shirley Graham Du Bois—who was also his close associate, the first editor of *Freedomways*, a leading writer, and a composer—moved to reside in Ghana. Soon after, the family chose to become Ghanaian citizens. Du Bois's attention at that stage was focused on his grand project, *Encyclopedia Africana*, whose aim was to trace the developments in the social, political, cultural, historical, and technical spheres in Africa throughout the centuries of its existence.

Du Bois died on August 27, 1963, in Accra. He was accorded a state funeral.

Du Bois was a man of peace. In his 30-year sponsorship of the Pan-African congresses, he insisted on the formulation of programs and tactics of nonviolent and positive action. But he postulated that peace was inseparable from freedom and warned that if force continued to be used by the West as a method of governance in the world, then Africans may, as a last resort, also apply it, to their own detriment and that of humankind. In the same way, he cautioned against compromising the concept of democracy. He was convinced that the prevalence of the problems of poverty, ignorance, disease, and crime made a mockery of the democratic ideal. In 1952, he was awarded the International Peace Prize.

Du Bois was also one of the talented early writers in American literature. He is the author of the drama *The Star of Ethiopia* of 1915 and the novels *The Quest of the Silver Fleece* of 1911 and *Dark Princess: A Romance* of 1928. *The Black Flame* (1957–1961) is a trilogy of historical novels. *Selected Poems* and *The Autobiography of W. E. B. Du Bois* were published posthumously.

Du Bois greatly impressed the minds of his contemporaries. For Paul Robeson he was a leader in the truest sense of that word, and not only of America and the black race, but of the world. Martin Luther King, Jr., emphasized the significance of his pride in the black man, pride that Du Bois derived not from some vague greatness related to color but from the real achievements of black people in struggle, which, he believed, had advanced humanity. His life and work continue to inspire many today. Professor K. Onuwuka Dike sees him as the 20th century's greatest prophet, particularly insofar as the issue of race and the value of human equality are concerned.

—*Emilia Ilieva*

See also Activism, Social and Political; Advocacy; Anti-Colonial Movements, Sub-Saharan Africa; Anti-Imperialism; Anti-Racist Teaching; Civil Rights Movement; Communism; Communist Party USA; Democracy; King, Martin Luther, Jr.; Liberalism; Literature and Activism; National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP); Nonviolence and Activism; Pan-Africanism; Robeson, Paul; Socialism

Further Readings

- Dike, K. O. (1978). Message from Professor K. Onuwuka Dike. In J. H. Clarke (Ed.), *Pan-Africanism and the liberation of South Africa: A tribute to W. E. B. Du Bois* (p. 70). New York: African Heritage Studies Association Publications Centre.
- DeMarco, J. (1983). *The social thought of W. E. B. Du Bois*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.
- Du Bois, W. E. B. (1903). *The souls of black folk: Essays and sketches*. Chicago: A. C. McClurg.
- Du Bois, W. E. B. (1924). *The gift of black folk: Negroes in the making of America*. Boston: Stratford.
- Du Bois, W. E. B. (1945). *Color and democracy: Colonies and peace*. New York: Harcourt Brace.
- Du Bois, W. E. B. (1947). *The world of Africa: An inquiry into the part which Africa has played in world history*. New York: Viking.
- Du Bois, W. E. B. (1968). *The autobiography of W. E. B. Du Bois: A soliloquy on viewing my life from the last decade of its first century*. New York: International Publishers.
- Lester, J. (Ed.). (1971). *The seventh son: The thought and writings of W. E. B. Du Bois*. New York: Random House.
- Rudwick, E. M. (1960). *W. E. B. Du Bois*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

DUNAYEVSKAYA, RAYA (1910–1987)

The life of Raya Dunayevskaya fused intense philosophical investigation with active engagement in liberatory social struggles. Dunayevskaya advanced a unique theory of state-capitalism, originated the philosophy of Marxist-Humanism, and founded News and Letters Committees.

Dunayevskaya, born in the Ukraine, settled in Chicago in 1922. As a teenager, she was active in the Young Workers League, a communist youth organization, and the American Negro Labor Congress. Dunayevskaya worked as Leon Trotsky's Russian-language secretary from 1937 to 1938 in Mexico. Following the Hitler-Stalin pact, Dunayevskaya broke with Trotsky, rejecting his defense of Russia as a workers' state.

This break led to her collaboration with C. L. R. James, a Trinidadian Marxist. In 1941, they formed the state-capitalist, or Johnson-Forest Tendency, in the

American Trotskyist movement. In the early 1940s, Dunayevskaya undertook a seminal study of Russia's first Five-Year Plans and concluded that Russia was developing in a state-capitalist, not a socialist, direction.

Dunayevskaya's analysis is unique in that it treats state-capitalism as a new phase in the development of global capitalism. She posited, in opposition to this new phase, both new revolutionary subjects—rank and file workers, African Americans, women, and youth—and new philosophical ground, by way of an original engagement with Marx's *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844* and V. I. Lenin's 1914 *Philosophic Notebooks*.

In 1953, Dunayevskaya composed two letters on the “absolutes” of G. W. F. Hegel. In this controversial reading of Hegel, Dunayevskaya locates a dual movement: a movement, in her words, from practice that is itself a form of theory and a movement from theory reaching to philosophy. The letters posit the self-development of revolutionary subjects, through engagement with a philosophy of revolution, as an alternative to both the vanguard party and the view that spontaneous activity alone will give rise to a new society. Dunayevskaya would later identify these letters as the philosophic breakthrough from which her Marxist-Humanism developed.

Dunayevskaya, in 1955, founded a Marxist-Humanist organization, News and Letters Committees. In 1958, she published *Marxism and Freedom*, which explores such diverse ground as the influence of the Paris Commune on Marx's *Capital*, Lenin's plunge into the Hegelian dialectic with the outbreak of World War I, and the struggle of American workers against automation. In her 1973 *Philosophy and Revolution*, Dunayevskaya focuses on the integrality of philosophy and revolution, tracing the relation historically, and emphasizing the Hegelian concept of absolute negativity.

Dunayevskaya's 1982 *Rosa Luxemburg, Women's Liberation, and Marx's Philosophy of Revolution* discusses Luxemburg's feminism and anti-colonialism, explores Marx's *Ethnological Notebooks*, and introduces the pejorative category of “post-Marx Marxism,” beginning with the work of Frederick Engels. As her life was drawing to a close, Dunayevskaya prepared

extensive notes for a book on philosophy and organization titled *Dialectics of Organization and Philosophy: The “Party” and Forms of Organization Born Out of Spontaneity*.

—Seth G. Weiss

See also Luxemburg, Rosa; Marxist Theory; Trotskyism

Further Readings

Dunayevskaya, R. (2002). *The power of negativity: Selected writings on the dialectic in Hegel and Marx*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.

DUSSEL, ENRIQUE (1934–)

Enrique Dussel is widely recognized as one of the most important thinkers of Latin America and the father of a philosophy of liberation. A philosopher by academic training, he has also worked on the history of Latin America, the relation between history and theology of liberation, and the construction of the Americas by the European colonial empires. He has also constructed an elaborate model of social ethics and economics and has lectured widely on economics, philosophy, and social theory. He is one of the most prolific writers of 20th-century Latin America, and his works have been translated in most Western European languages.

The young Dussel started his studies of philosophy at the Universidad Nacional del Cuyo in Mendoza in 1957 and later completed a doctorate of philosophy in Madrid in 1959, a licentiate in religion in Paris in 1965, and a doctorate in history at La Sorbonne in 1967. On his return to his native Argentina, he taught ethics at the Universidad Nacional de la Resistencia (Chaco, 1966–1968), at the Instituto Pastoral del CELAM (Quito, Ecuador, 1967–1973), and at the Universidad Nacional de Cuyo (Mendoza, 1968–1975). However, after Juan Domingo Perón's death in 1974, Argentine underwent a political polarization with escalating violence. Within that violence, right-wing

paramilitary groups targeted Dussel, and after a bomb exploded in his home he left for Mexico in 1975 together with his family. In 1975 Dussel became a professor of church history and religious studies at ITES (Mexico, D.F.) and a professor of ethics and philosophy at the Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana/Iztapalapa. Mexico became his adopted country, and years later Dussel took Mexican nationality. Meanwhile, in his native Argentina, communities suffered political repression by the military and long years of democratic instability.

Dussel stresses the importance of oral delivery and the following interaction with an audience as a methodological tool of spoken discourse and recognizes that written texts can never convey the whole depth of spoken lectures. Dussel uses history in order to set the context for a liberating project that includes the liberation from economic structures *ad intra*, as well as the liberation from a Christian situation of empire symbolized in the development of Christianity as a persecuted religion to a colonizing system of Christendom. Within contemporary discussions on economics, philosophy, and ethics, Dussel has made the important distinction between social morality and ethics by suggesting that social moral orders as agreed systems of morality are not always necessarily ethical and can be challenged by Christians as social activists who strive for a just society here and now.

—Mario I. Aguilar

See also Abuelas de Plaza de Mayo; Postcolonial Theory

Further Readings

- Dussel, E. (1981). *History of the church in Latin America: Colonialism to liberation 1492–1979*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.
- Dussel, E. (1985). *Philosophy of liberation*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis.
- Dussel, E. (1988). *Ethics and community*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis.
- Dussel, E. (1995). *The invention of the Americas: Eclipse of the other and the myth of modernity*. New York: Continuum.
- Dussel, E. (2001). *Towards an unknown Marx: Commentary of the manuscripts of 1861–1863*. London: Routledge.

DWORKIN, ANDREA (1946–2005)

As a radical speaker and writer, Andrea Dworkin was known for her work against pornography, which she argued led to violence against women. Her theories can be found in books, including *Woman Hating*, *Intercourse*, and *Life and Death*.

Andrea Dworkin was born September 26, 1946, in Camden, New Jersey, to Harry Dworkin and Sylvia Spiegel. Her father was a teacher and devoted socialist who contributed to her social consciousness. Her mother was frequently sick, suffering from heart failure and a stroke before Andrea was of adolescent age. Her mother passed away at the age of 26.

Dworkin attended Bennington College, where she studied literature and actively opposed the war in Vietnam. She was arrested at an anti-war protest at the U.S. Mission to the United Nations and given a forceful physical examination, resulting in lingering pain. She went public about the mistreatment, making domestic and international news. A few years later, the prison in which she was held closed down. Dworkin moved to Greece, where she spent time on her writing before moving back to Bennington for a couple years, resuming her literature studies and campus activism.

Dworkin moved to Amsterdam to interview anarchists associated with the Provo countercultural movement, a Dutch group who incited violent reactions from authorities through nonviolent taunts. She married one of the anarchists, who later abused her. After fleeing the relationship, Dworkin was stuck in the Netherlands for a year enduring hard times, which included working as a prostitute to survive. Her former husband found and beat her. In 1972, Dworkin agreed to smuggle drugs in exchange for a plane ticket to America. The drug deal fell through, but she still was able to return home.

John Stoltenberg, a gay male feminist writer entered Dworkin's life in 1974 and married her in 1998, even though both claimed to be gay. Dworkin died April 9, 2005, in her Washington, D.C., home at 58 years of age. She had been suffering from

osteoarthritis in her knees and had been treated for blood clots in her legs, potentially results of hardships and abuse she faced on the streets.

—*Maha Shami*

See also Anti-Pornography Activism; Feminism

Further Readings

Dworkin, A. (1988). *Letters from a warzone: Writings, 1976–1989*. New York: Dutton.

Dworkin, A. (1989). *Pornography: Men possessing women*. New York: Dutton.

Dworkin, A. (1997). *Intercourse*. New York: Free Press.

Dworkin, A. (1997). *Life and death*. New York: Free Press.

DYLAN, BOB (1941–)

American singer and songwriter, musician, and poet, Bob Dylan is best known for his political protest songs from the 1960s. An icon of the American social unrest that characterized the decade, he incorporated politics, social commentary, philosophy, and literature in his lyrics and produced songs that still enjoy considerable popularity today. Although his more recent work has often received critical acclaim, his subsequent achievements have not attained the wide popularity of his work in the 1960s and 1970s, a time in the United States characterized by social upheaval and turmoil.

Born Robert Allen Zimmerman in Hibbing, Minnesota, to a middle-class Jewish family, Dylan had a fairly uneventful childhood. He exhibited an early interest in music and was particularly intrigued by the emerging genre of rock 'n' roll. Dylan came of age at a time when authority, including parental authority, was being questioned and conventional values were considered suspect. A new era was beginning, and Dylan was there to not only help usher it in but also to shape its direction.

After high school graduation, Dylan enrolled at the University of Minnesota in Minneapolis, where he rarely attended class but often performed folk songs

written by others at coffeehouses. It was during this period that he began introducing himself as Bob Dylan or Dillon. He has never explained exactly the source for the pseudonym, sometimes alluding to an uncle and sometimes acknowledging a reference to the Welsh poet Dylan Thomas.

Dylan dropped out of college at the end of his freshman year. In 1961 at the age of 19, he traveled to New York City, finding refuge in Greenwich Village and again playing in coffeehouses. At the time, Greenwich Village was a community known for its support of personal and artistic freedom, and coffeehouses were the venues for aspiring young singers, musicians, poets, and actors.

Dylan was an ardent admirer of Woody Guthrie, the famous country-folk singer who wrote "This Land Is Your Land." Guthrie, hailed by the political left as a true folk poet, had an undeniable influence on Dylan's early music and persona. Indeed, the young Dylan styled himself in appearance, mannerisms, and music after the famed folk singer and owes much of his earlier musical style to Guthrie. Part of the early Dylan mystique arose from people's knowledge that, having learned that Guthrie was dying in a New Jersey hospital, Dylan visited the incapacitated singer and reportedly sang for him.

After playing the coffeehouse circuit in Greenwich Village, Dylan gained some public recognition after a review in the *New York Times* by critic Robert Shelton. John Hammond, a legendary music business figure, signed him to Columbia Records. Dylan's first album debuted in 1961. It contained only two original songs and was destined to mediocre sales and publicity. Despite the undistinguished start, the company approved a second album, *The Freewheelin' Bob Dylan*. Consisting almost entirely of original compositions, this album included two of the most memorable songs of the 1960s, "Blowing in the Wind" and "A Hard Rain's A-Gonna Fall." Dylan attracted growing attention from the folk community with the release of this album.

To understand the immense popularity Dylan gained during the 1960s, one must recognize the importance of the folk movement. The folk music revival existed in juxtaposition to the emerging rock

'n' roll movement. Many folk singers were political radicals who merged politics and culture to offer social commentary, and rock 'n' roll was viewed by them as somewhat hackneyed and banal. Characterized as liberal left-leaning pacifists, the folk community was also in stark contrast with middle-class, right-wing conservatives. Folk musicians used topical song writing to deliver their criticism of middle-class America. For Dylan, folk music reflected the complexities of life.

With the release of *The Freewheeling' Bob Dylan*, influential members of the folk community believed they had found a champion to convey their rage about commercialism, inequities in power, and prejudice. The themes of civil rights and imminent apocalypse were woven into his songs. Through his music, Dylan pointed the finger of guilt at the war makers and the war profiteers. "A Hard Rain's a-Gonna Fall," a song with metaphorical imagery making veiled references to nuclear apocalypse, struck a chord as the Cuban Missile crisis developed only a few weeks after Dylan began performing it. At a time when segregation was the norm, "Blowing in the Wind" challenged the social and political status quo of the period and heralded the shift of mainstream white American opinion behind the civil rights movement. With these songs, there was an apparent new direction in modern songwriting. Dylan developed a unique blending of stream of consciousness poetry with social consciousness, often set to the stylings of traditional folk music.

During this period, numerous Dylan songs point to the systemic nature of the problems that agitated many young people through the lens of specific individuals in specific settings. In "Who Killed Davey Moore?" Dylan points his finger at the ethical complicity of a whole society in the death of a boxer killed in the ring. Similarly, in "North Country Blues," a song about a woman in an iron mining town in Minnesota, Dylan decries the results of market forces, perhaps one of the initial musical protests against globalization.

Rather than continue to perform primarily for his white liberal fans (and following in the footsteps of Guthrie), Dylan expanded his audience. In 1963 he sang at a voter registration concert in a cotton field to a mainly black audience. The song "Only a Pawn in Their Game" suggested that the white assassin of Medgar Evers, an official from the National Association for the

Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), was in fact part of a system that was racist at its core and that focusing solely on the assassin would not bring the guilty to justice. That same year Dylan took part in the March on Washington and performed this song and another before Martin Luther King, Jr., delivered his "I Have a Dream" speech that came to epitomize the movement. Joining other folksingers, including Odetta, Joan Baez, and Peter, Paul, and Mary, Dylan helped usher in a new movement that placed the demand for equality at the center of American consciousness.

The Times They Are A-Changing was released in early 1964, and indeed the political, social, and cultural climate was shifting. *Another Side of Bob Dylan*, released in the summer of 1964, reveals that personal changes were taking place for the young singer, suggesting that his former identity as protest singer for the folk community was dissipating. Gone were the "finger-pointing" songs that had made him famous and in their place came more personal ballads and love songs.

Defying all efforts to categorize him, Dylan was clearly uncomfortable with the label of "protest singer" but even more so of "voice of his generation." Even as he was being hailed as Woody Guthrie's heir, master of the topical folk song, Dylan was refocusing his attention. The folk community became increasingly skeptical when he started writing surreal narratives instead of the topical songs expected of folk musicians. When Dylan replaced his acoustic guitar for an electric one, the folk purists viewed this as the final betrayal.

Recorded in 1965, *Bringin' It All Back Home* included both acoustic and electric songs but definitely sent the message that Dylan had turned away from his folk music roots. Rather than the sole singer on stage strumming his acoustic guitar and blowing his harmonica, Dylan now made his musical statements with an electric guitar and a back-up band. He made his breakthrough to the pop world in the summer of 1965 with the release of "Like a Rolling Stone" from the album *Highway 61 Revisited*, his first full-fledged rock 'n' roll album.

Dylan's first electric performance at the Newport Folk Festival in 1965 earned him boos from about half the crowd, a scene that would be duplicated on his European tour, where he was called "Judas" for apparently forsaking the acoustical folk music that had made him an

icon. Without doubt, his decision to expand into electrical music was influenced by the British bands that were appearing on the pop charts. However, his refusal to be pigeonholed by any musical label was a strong motivator (and continues to motivate him today), and Dylan ultimately outgrew the movement that had helped gain him recognition.

Seen with the hindsight of 3 decades, the drama of Dylan's break with the folk movement seems more of an evolutionary change than a revolutionary one. Undoubtedly, the "defection" of Dylan had an impact on the folk music movement, but perhaps most notably on the careers of folk musicians. They watched the spotlight of popular culture dim around them while the melding of poetry, music, and protest, heralded by Dylan moved to the rock scene. Despite the allegations that he had "sold out" by "plugging in," Dylan brought to electric music the same complexity and social insight he had used to transform acoustical music, delivering many unforgettable songs in a way that brought the worlds of music and literature together. While songs about specific instances of social injustice were rarer, Dylan's migration made it acceptable for other rock musicians, including, for example, John Lennon, to use their music to express their social views, something unheard of before.

In 1966 Dylan sustained injuries in a motorcycle accident. After the accident, he became a recluse. By his own admission, the accident provided him the opportunity to get away from the overwhelming spotlight that had followed him for the past few years. The mystique and intensity that was Dylan transformed fan adulation into stalking and deification, to the point that Dylan felt persecuted. During this period, he preferred to focus on his growing family obligations but still produced albums and wrote the soundtrack for a film, *Pat Garrett and Billy the Kid*, which included the classic, "Knockin' on Heaven's Door."

In 1971 Dylan was cajoled into playing for the Concert for Bangladesh at Madison Square Garden. He appeared in 1974 with other singer-songwriters of the 1960s at a Friends of Chile benefit aimed at helping prisoners of the Pinochet regime. In 1976, he released "Hurricane," a narrative meant to raise awareness about Rubin Carter, a boxer convicted of murder on suspect evidence and eventually released

from prison in 1985. In late 1978 he announced he was a born-again Christian and released a series of Christian albums. He returned to secular recording with the 1983 release of *Infidels*.

In the 1980s, Dylan made a case for not playing Sun City in South Africa and promoted American farmers at Live Aid, which in turn gave rise to the Farm Aid project. But the purpose and drive of the 1960s was not readily apparent when he performed in 1985 at the first Farm Aid with Tom Petty & the Heartbreakers and later toured intermittently with them and other big-name groups. He enjoyed some fame as a member of the musical group, the Traveling Wilburys. In 1988 he began the Never Ending Tour. To this day, Dylan tours year-round, playing both large venues and small, sharing the stage with numerous icons of American music.

Dylan's accolades are numerous. He received a Lifetime Achievement award in 1991 at the Grammy Awards and played at President Bill Clinton's inauguration. His first album of original material in 7 years was released in 1997, *Time Out of Mind*, which earned him the Best Album award at the 1998 Grammys. He authored a first installment of his memoirs in 2004 titled *Chronicles: Volume 1. No Direction Home: Bob Dylan*, a Martin Scorsese documentary, followed in 2005. This documentary included rare interviews with the normally reticent Dylan as he recalled his rise to fame in the 1960s. He recently released, through a large coffee chain, the *Live at the Gaslight 1962* album and also contracted to host a radio show for XM satellite radio.

Dylan's successes are many. He has stood as a symbol of societal protest, made innovative music, wrote remarkable lyrics, and executed lucrative business deals, all the while maintaining the position of cynical observer and outsider. He has written and performed songs in nearly every American musical genre, including not only folk and rock, but also country, blues, gospel, and Latin American as well. Yet, he refers to himself simply as a song and dance man. His career is marked with various highs and lows, but his impact has been enormous . . . and he is not done yet.

—Susan R. Wynn and Harris Cooper

See also Benefit Concerts; Guthrie, Woody; Protest Music; Rock 'n' Roll

Further Readings

- Dylan, B. (2004). *Chronicles* (Vol. 1). New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Edmonds, B. (2005). Revolution in his head. In M. Blake (Ed.), *Dylan: Visions, portraits & back pages*. New York: DK.
- Kane, P. (2005). Boy wonder. In M. Blake (Ed.), *Dylan: Visions, portraits & back pages*. New York: DK.
- Marqusee, M. (2003). *Chimes of freedom: The politics of Bob Dylan's art*. New York: New Press.
- Scorsese, M. (Director). (2005). *No direction home: Bob Dylan* [Motion picture]. United States: Paramount Pictures.
- Shelton, R. (1986). *No direction home: The life and music of Bob Dylan*. New York: Beech Tree Books.
- Stuart, B. (2005). Protest and survive. In M. Blake (Ed.), *Dylan: Visions, portraits & back pages*. New York: DK.