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Mission Statement

We are a student-run journal dedicated to publication of work in history and economics. We wish to promote scholarly discussion by providing students a forum in which to publish and share work with their peers. Our editorial staff works directly with authors at each stage of the publication process. As a journal, we hold ourselves to a high standard of excellence. We value honest academic research and strong theses. We look for papers of a high quality that demonstrate a clear understanding of the material, draw meaningful conclusions, and present new and interesting ideas. Our goal is to foster a community that encourages thoughtful and creative writing in history and economics.

Criteria for Submission

All submissions must be written by a U-High student during their tenure at U-High for a history and economics class or independent study course. Papers must meet the following formatting and length criteria:

- Between 4 and 20 pages in length
- Include proper citations (footnotes/endnotes and works cited list) in Chicago Turabian format (guidelines here)
- Include a cover page which contains: title and class for which paper was written
- Double spaced
- 1 inch margins
- 12 pt., Times New Roman font
- Header with page number
- Illustrations, maps and tables are welcome but should be properly cited

All submissions are reviewed anonymously by the student board. No decisions may be repealed, however all students are encouraged to revise and resubmit their papers if not accepted. No special consideration is given to papers that have received external recognition. InFlame typically publishes between 3-5 papers an issue.

Submissions should be sent in via the Inflame Turnitin Class. For instructions on how to do this, visit https://hshapir.github.io/inflamejournal/. Questions about any of our policies should be directed to cgerst@ucls.uchicago.edu.
The Partition of India: An Inevitable Tragedy

The Partition of India incited one of the bloodiest upheavals in modern history. Thousands of women were raped, over ten million people were displaced, and at least one million were killed. The result: a division that separated British India into two independent states – India and Pakistan. Partition is often remembered for its “corpse” or “blood” trains after people were massacred while traveling across the Indian subcontinent. However, these horrific facts show only some of the extreme violence. Many are forgotten. Historians have no accurate account of how many people lost their lives in the deadly riots and mayhem. Even less known are the stories of people who were left behind as their families migrated to avoid discrimination because of their religious beliefs. The seeds for the division and senseless violence were sown years beforehand. The Partition of India and its aftermath of mass migrations and violence were inevitable due to the political atmosphere of the Muslim League, communal tensions between Hindus and Muslims, and the British empire’s hasty and poorly executed withdrawal.

The political forces of Muslim nationalism leading up to Partition originated in the formation of the Muslim League. Lord Curzon, Viceroy of India from 1899 to 1905, introduced the Partition of Bengal that took place in 1905. The British declared that the province was too large to be administered by a single governor. Although they provided administrative justifications, the British officials’ real motivations were political. The Partition separated Muslim majority areas from Hindu majority areas, exemplifying Britain’s “divide and rule” policy, which promoted political divisions between Hindus and Muslims; similar instances of

1 This paper was inspired by my grandparents and their experiences during India’s Partition. My maternal grandparents both told me compelling stories about their families, and my father explained how his mother’s family was separated during the ordeal. This paper is for them.
3 See Appendix 1: Gurdip Kaur, "Interview with Gurdip Kaur on India's Partition," interview by author, February 17, 2018; See Appendix 2: Ragbir Singh, "Interview with Ragbir Singh on India's Partition," interview by author, February 17, 2018.
5 Prasad, A Nation Within a Nation, 96; Singh, The Partition of India, 9.
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the British empire’s “divide and rule” policy existed throughout the world in other colonies such as Nigeria. The political atmosphere in 1905 motivated Muslims to form their own political organization, the Muslim League. British officials also encouraged Muslim feudal princes and leaders to create their own “Muslim Party” in 1906 as they were worried about the Indian National Congress Party’s growing opposition to the British Raj. The Muslim League aimed to protect the rights and interests of Muslims in India. At first, Hindu and Muslim leaders only thought of freedom for the Indian subcontinent. In fact, Mohammed Ali Jinnah, whom Pakistanis consider to be the founder of their nation, was a member of the Congress Party, which was majority Hindu. However, he resigned in 1920 and joined the Muslim League when he recognized that the policies of the Congress were detrimental to Muslims. Jinnah feared that Muslim rights would not be upheld. Thus, after two Round Table Conferences in December 1930 and September 1931 did not yield any consensus regarding how Hindus and Muslims would share power in India, he began to advocate for the idea of separate nations for Hindus and Muslims. The Congress Party’s success in the 1937 elections demonstrated its strength in India’s various states. Out of the 1161 seats it contested, it won 716. The elections showed that the League lacked support in Muslim-majority provinces. Tensions grew between the Congress Party, led by Mohandas Gandhi and Jawaharlal Nehru, and the Muslim League, headed by Jinnah. The Congress stood for a united India while the League promoted separate states and the creation of Pakistan. Their irreconcilable differences strengthened the Muslim League’s resolve to seek an independent nation.

The precedence of religious identity over national identity for Indian citizens provoked communal violence between Hindus and Muslims. Britain’s “divide and rule” policy separated
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8 Caldwell, Pakistan, 64.
10 Wolpert, Shameful Flight, 5, 86.
Hindus and Muslims as two cultural bodies in order to encourage religious nationalism.\textsuperscript{11} Between 1919 and 1939, Hindu-Muslim and Muslim-Sikh conflicts increased in many parts of India, resulting in riots between Hindus and Muslims. The two movements at the heart of these riots included the cow-protection movement and the effort to make Hindi the official language instead of Urdu.\textsuperscript{12} While Hindus consider cows as objects of veneration, Muslims do not believe in any such reverence and slaughter cows for beef. The juxtaposition of these two opposing views resulted in widespread rioting that spread to various states in India.\textsuperscript{13} This cow-protection movement was intertwined with the language campaign. As Hindus were the majority population in India, they demanded that Hindi replace Urdu as the official language for educational and administrative purposes. They argued Urdu was an alien language that the majority of the people living in villages did not understand.\textsuperscript{14} These two undertakings heightened communal tension and violence. The press and political and religious agitators often promoted riots, which consisted of looting, arson, and executions.\textsuperscript{15} The worst communal riots prior to Partition took place on what the Muslim League termed, “Direct Action Day,” Friday, August 16, 1946.\textsuperscript{16} However, it was unclear what the League intended as Jinnah declined to comment. Most provincial members of the League called for peaceful demonstrations. Calcutta was the only province in which rioting took place. Two days earlier, the Muslim League’s Prime Minister, H.S. Suhrawardy, had asked for a public holiday on August 16 to avoid communal conflict.\textsuperscript{17} Consequently, troops remained in their barracks, Bengal’s police force was given a holiday, and thousands of innocent lives were lost. These events further solidified British leaders’ opinions that Hindus and Muslims would never be able to live in a unified nation. Communal prejudices continued to split the two groups apart, culminating in the widespread violence seen during Partition.


\textsuperscript{12} Prasad, The Foundations of Muslim Nationalism, 38.


\textsuperscript{14} Prasad, The Foundations of Muslim Nationalism, 37.

\textsuperscript{15} Singh, \textit{The Partition of India}, 13.

\textsuperscript{16} Ibid., 61; Wolpert, \textit{Shameful Flight}, 119.

\textsuperscript{17} Singh, \textit{The Partition of India}, 62; Wolpert, \textit{Shameful Flight}, 119.
Britain’s hasty and poorly executed withdrawal from India inevitably led to Partition and the carnage that ensued. Britain’s involvement in World War II destroyed its economy and left it too weak to maintain control over India. The British realized that they would not be able to oppose a movement led by the Congress Party. The Viceroy at the time, Lord Wavell, advised the Labor cabinet in early 1946 that the British should withdraw from India by June 1948. Prime Minister Clement Attlee appointed Louis Mountbatten as Britain’s last Viceroy. Attlee hoped Mountbatten would be able to make Gandhi, Nehru, and Jinnah come to a resolution; this way, Britain could take credit for leaving India unified and withdraw its troops with dignity. However, the leaders failed to come to an agreement, and Mountbatten decided to divide British India into two separate states, India and Pakistan. Sir Cyril Radcliffe, one of England’s most respected jurists, hastily drew the lines of division through North India’s two largest provinces, Punjab and Bengal. Radcliffe had never set foot in Punjab or Bengal and instead relied on outdated maps to demarcate the boundaries. This was the so-called “second Partition” as it split up the two Muslim-majority provinces. Both these territories were multi-cultural and composed of Hindus, Muslims, and Sikhs. In Punjab, the total population was 28.4 million: 16.2 million of whom were Muslims, the rest Hindus and Sikhs. In March 1947, the Congress voted for a division of Punjab into two states, one with a Muslim-majority and one with a Hindu/Sikh-majority, and proposed the same principle for Bengal. Eventually, the western part of Punjab became part of West Pakistan and the eastern part became the Indian state of East Punjab. Bengal was similarly split into East Bengal in Pakistan and West Bengal in India.
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19 Singh, The Partition of India, 88; Wolpert, Shameful Flight, 1.
20 Wolpert, Shameful Flight, 1, 10.
22 Wolpert, Shameful Flight, 1.
23 Ibid., 91.
25 Wolpert, Shameful Flight, 103.
Mountbatten’s decision to change the date of transfer of power from June 1948, first to October 1947 and then to August 15, 1947, contributed to the bloodshed that followed Partition.\textsuperscript{26} Administrative reasons seemed to lead Mountbatten to change the date of transfer of power; he believed the Congress might join the Commonwealth and that an earlier date would stop the communal violence from escalating.\textsuperscript{27} The Boundary Commission was instructed to establish the boundaries of Punjab and Bengal based on majority areas of Muslims and non-Muslims. Evan Jenkins, the Governor of Punjab, warned Mountbatten that the Sikhs would cause trouble if the governments of India and Pakistan were set up before the Boundary Commission finalized the lines of demarcation. Jenkins asked Mountbatten to announce the lines before August 15 to avoid panic and mass movements of populations between territories.\textsuperscript{28} However, Mountbatten waited until India’s “Independence Day” festivities were over. As a result, the governors of Punjab and Bengal were unable to anticipate the violence that was to follow. Additionally, no British officers or troops remained in India to keep the peace in shattered regions, including Punjab, Bengal, Jammu, and Kashmir, with the greatest number of massacres of Hindus, Muslims, and Sikhs occurring in the divided state of Punjab.\textsuperscript{29} Scholars believe that the migration of populations could have been conducted in a safer manner with less bloodshed and mayhem had Mountbatten not moved up the date of transfer and had the boundaries been demarcated more diligently prior to the granting of independence to the two nations.

The aftermath of Partition continues to affect Indians and Pakistanis in the present day. Following Partition, mass migrations and religious frenzies led to violence all over India. Many scholars deduced that people living along the western border between India and Pakistan around 1951 were more likely to move due to greater perceived threats. Historians estimate that 14.5 million people migrated into India, Pakistan, and Bangladesh within four years after Partition.\textsuperscript{30} These mass migrations led to a humanitarian crisis. Millions of refugees moved across North

\textsuperscript{27} Singh, The Partition of India, 81-82.
\textsuperscript{28} Ibid., 140-141.
India: Hindus and Sikhs hurried to leave their homes in the newly created country of Pakistan, while Muslims fled India.\textsuperscript{31} The fear of violence forced people to leave their homes and separated families. In Punjab, migratory flows resulted in a remarkable homogenization of the population by religion. In 1931 and 1941, the population of Punjab at a district level was religiously diverse. By 1951, it had become almost uniform.\textsuperscript{32} More Hindus moved to India from Pakistan compared to the number of Muslims who moved to Pakistan from India. In fact, the number of Muslims in India and Pakistan today are about equal. Nevertheless, despite the mass migrations, many Muslims remain in India.

The legacy of the violence of India’s Partition persists today, and one of the most violent ongoing disputes continues in Kashmir. After Partition, several states were left to choose whether to join India or Pakistan or remain independent. Hindu Maharaja Hari Singh ruled the largest princely state of Jammu and Kashmir. It had a predominantly Muslim population, but the Maharaja initially decided to remain independent, eventually joining India under pressure.\textsuperscript{33} This territorial conflict over Kashmir has been the cause of three wars between India and Pakistan since 1947.\textsuperscript{34} The seventy years that have elapsed since Partition have not brought an acceptable solution to the Kashmir predicament, and over a billion people live in the shadow of Partition. After analyzing the environment in which Partition took place, one can conclude that it was inescapable. The political forces of Muslim nationalism surrounding the Muslim League’s formation, increasing communal violence between Hindus and Muslims, and the British Empire’s ill-conceived exit from India guaranteed that Partition was inevitable. However, despite its inevitability, if Mountbatten had announced the lines of demarcation earlier and sent troops to curb the violence, the British could have mitigated the magnitude of riots, displacement, and massacre. This, in turn, could have led to less bitterness and prevented the fraught nature of diplomatic relations between India and Pakistan.

\textsuperscript{32} Hill, “The Demographic Impact of Partition,” 168.
\textsuperscript{34} Hajari, \textit{Midnight’s Furies}, 178; Wolpert, \textit{Shameful Flight}, 11.
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Appendix A: Transcript of Interview with Gurdip Kaur


**Q: What was Partition’s connection to the independence of India?**

A: It was decided by the British government that they will give the charge to the Indian people of governing. But at that time they did not distribute the power in such a way so that both communities would be satisfied. So one community, which was Muslim community, did not feel that the distribution of power was fair, so they went to show their anger. It was a rampage, and there was a lot of bloodshed between the two communities, the Muslims and the Hindus. The Muslims started it because they were the aggrieved party. Then both the parties were killing each other.

**Q: Why did Muslims want their own country?**

A: When the Partition was made, the Hindu majority took the government management. That is why the Muslim community wanted their own country. The English people did not play a very wise role. They should have marked boundaries earlier.

**Q: Did they also want their own country so they could win the majority in elections?**

A: When the British left, there was no government for the Hindus or the Muslims. There was no rule, and it was left for India to decide. They did not transfer power in a rational way. The British had this way of life to divide and rule. When the English left, it was chaos and anarchy.

**Q: Where were you when Partition occurred?**

A: I was in Jullunder which is in east Punjab, so we didn’t have to move. We were close to the boundary line, almost 60-70 miles from the boundary line. Amritsar is almost 50 miles from Jullunder, and the boundary line is around 10 miles away from Amritsar. The Indo-Pakistan border is called Wagah border.

**Q: How did it affect your immediate and extended family?**

A: On my father’s side, my second uncle’s family had to move. They had their homes and land in Pakistan, so they had to move but no one got hurt. Both the communities attacked each other at nighttime. We used to put all the kids in a room with luggage and boxes and lock the door so they wouldn’t come out and get scared because then the grown-ups wouldn’t be able to fight. Even the ladies would get dressed up like men at night so people would think that more men were fighting there. Otherwise, the other community would be very bad to the women. My father
Ramani was in the Indian Army Accounts Branch and he was stationed in Lahore, Pakistan during Partition. So my mother made a plan with the dairy farm truck driver, who was Muslim, to get my dad out of Pakistan. The manager of the dairy farm told my mother that if my dad was alive, he would have already come back home, and asked that if she died, what would happen to her kids? My mother said that if she died, it was ok. She dressed up as a Muslim woman. The driver drove her to Pakistan and told anyone who stopped his truck that his mother was in the truck with him. When my mother got to Pakistan, she got my dad. When she got him, they were in an area with Hindus and Sikhs. From Lahore, they took a train to Ferozepur and from there, they took a train back to Jullunder. They reached Jullunder in the middle of the night, and when they got off at the train station, they realized that there were no taxis or rickshaws. So they started walking home on the road. And as they were walking, someone shot at them. So my dad told my mom to lie down so the person who was shooting from a distance would think they were dead. They laid down for 15 minutes and then slowly started walking back home. Then my mother realized that if they walked for a few more minutes, they would reach the house of the man who used to bring bricks on his donkey. He was known to us. His name was Mulah Bakhash and he was also a Muslim. They stayed the night at his house and in the morning, they came home.

**Q: Do you think the violence was avoidable or unavoidable?**

**A:** I think it was avoidable. If the English people had played their role fairly, all this violence would not have happened. There would not have been any bloodshed.
Appendix B: Transcript of Interview with Ragbir Singh


Q: Why do you think Partition occurred?

A: After World War 2, the British thought they couldn’t hold on to India any longer. The Muslims wanted a country of their own and that’s why partition took place. It became west Pakistan and east Pakistan. Hindus did not want Partition, but the Muslims were very determined to get the state of Pakistan. The Muslim League wanted Partition. Hindus bitterly did not want Partition. The killing started before the Partition because the Hindus didn’t want Partition and the Muslims did. On these lines, they started killing each other. Western Punjab, the Northern Frontier, Bhalujistan, and Eastern Bengal had the majority of Muslims. The rest of the Muslims were spread out all over India. Eastern Bengal went to Pakistan. Western Punjab was majority Muslims, and Eastern Punjab was majority Hindus. In the whole of Punjab, there was a majority of Muslims. The Hindu majority and the Sikhs with them did not want Partition. The violence started because of this.

Q: Did violence occur all over India or was it concentrated in a certain place?

A: There was not much movement in South India. Hyderabad was not part of India. It was one of the princely states but there was still British control.

Q: What was the point of the killing? Why did it begin?

A: In Partition, Muslims killed Hindus and then Hindus killed Muslims. They started killing each other because they didn’t agree with each other. One way of making change is killing so the work will get done. When the Hindus in India saw that Muslims were killing Hindus in Pakistan, they started killed Muslims in India.

Q: Why did the mass migrations occur?

A: The Muslims thought that if they stayed back in India, they would be considered a minority and second-class citizens. Similarly, Hindus in Pakistan thought they would be treated badly by the Muslims, so they moved to India. If Hindus had stayed in Pakistan, the laws would be very different because Pakistan was a Muslim state. So Hindus would not be treated the same and there would always be problems of riots. There was bloodshed going on already and Muslims wanted the Partition so Mountbatten was the person who tried to quicken the Partition. You never know if they had not partitioned India soon, the Muslim League chief Jinnah was not having good health, so maybe if it was delayed, Partition may not have taken place. There was no good alternative to Partition because the Muslims, although in minority, had been ruling India before the British took over. So they thought they must have a country of their own.
Q: How were Partition and independence related?

The Hindus in the 15th century were not one whole India, there were small kingdoms. The Muslims came and conquered the Hindu lands and became the rulers. The Indian population wanted the British to leave India because they thought they were not good for India. The British were the rich people who had everything. They did whatever was in favor for Britain from India. They imported cheap cotton from India and send back cloth woven by machines. When the cloth was woven by machines, it became cheaper. In India, all cloth was made with hand looms, but this was costly. When the British sent back the machine made cloth, people bought it more because it was cheaper. So the Indians lost most of their livelihood. Also, India was made up of Muslims and Hindus. If there was independence of India as a whole, the Hindus were about 80% and Muslims were 20%. The Muslims wanted Partition rather than just independence. Before independence, the British gave special rights to Muslims so they were not treated poorly, they were treated as citizens. When independence was given, then the Hindu majority may not have treated the Muslims as equals. At least, the Muslims thought this way. So they wanted to have their own country.

Q: Did they also want their own country so they could win the majority in elections?

A: Yes, because then Muslims would rule in their own country.

Q: Where were you when Partition occurred?

A: We were all born and brought up in Burma. I did college and everything in Burma. I shifted to India in October of 1948 because I got into Rudki University for Engineering, which was the best one in India and Burma. I did my Civil Engineering in Rudki and stayed in India. My other family was still in Burma. Though I wanted to go back to Burma, my father advised me to stay in India because after Burma’s independence, Indians would have to move to India. My family moved slowly. Burma got independence in 1948 and my last family member moved in 1965.

Q: How did it affect your immediate and extended family?

A: My entire family was in Burma. My aunt was in Western Punjab and then she moved to Eastern Punjab after the Partition. My dad’s elder brother’s wife (aunt) was in India during the Partition and she moved to India from Pakistan as a refugee. The place where she was staying became Pakistan. If she had stayed there, she would have been killed or not treated properly, so she had to move. Similarly, my mother’s brother’s family (uncle’s family) was in West Punjab which became Pakistan. They moved to India as refugees. They left all their immovable property. They brought their valuables but some of it was looted along the way to India. My uncles had all their land in Pakistan and they were rich. They left all their lands there and moved to India because they knew they wouldn’t be safe in Pakistan.
Q: Why did East Pakistan become Bangladesh?

A: The east Pakistan was all Bengalis. West Pakistan was Punjabis (Hindus, Sikhs, Muslims, Christians) and Sindhis (Hindus, Muslims, some Sikhs). When Partition took place, the western part people took over the government. When elections took place, the Bengalis became the majority but the Punjabis didn’t allow them to make the government so there was always trouble. So the Muslim Bengalis were against the Punjabi Muslims, so there were always problems. The army of Pakistan killed the Bengali Muslims and Bengali Hindus so that they would not rise against the government. The western Pakistanis did not treat the Eastern Pakistan properly and didn’t want them to come to power. The Bengalis won the election but were not allowed to form the government.
The Preservation of an American Religion in Nazi Germany:

The Conflict between Christian Science and National-Socialism

Mary Baker Eddy was born in 1821 as the daughter of a devout Protestant father. As a young girl, she held that God did not condemn people to eternal damnation as her father believed; rather, she felt that all were God’s children whom He loved, not punished. Often sick as a child, she saw herself as created in God’s perfect image and likeness, and, in this affirmation, she achieved healing. She held that everyone was spiritual, and therefore sin, disease, and death were powerless. Mary Baker Eddy went on to establish her own Christian sect in 1866, naming it Christian Science, for it practiced the science of healing. At the turn of the 20th century, Christian Science was brought to Germany, most notably by Frances Thurber Seal, who attracted new members with its message of healing. Forty years later, after Hitler claimed power and established the Third Reich, Christian Science was persecuted and in 1941 ultimately banned. The conflict between Christian Scientists and National Socialists arose from the nature of Christian Science to stand against hate and violence as well as the sect’s roots in America. The First Church of Christ, Scientist, also known as The Mother Church, is located in Boston, Massachusetts. The metaphysical practice, for which the religion is named, was disputed by Nazi medical professionals who asserted the religion to be a danger to society. Even though these factors contributed to the eventual destruction of literature, countless arrests, and the watchful eye of the Gestapo, Hitler initially left Christian Scientists alone because of their pacifist stance. Furthermore, members persevered through persecution because of supplies and literature sent by churches in America and their unwavering faith. Although the fundamental laws that govern Christian Science such as nonviolence, internationalism, and the science of healing were responsible for its clash with National-Socialists, the same values protected the Christian sect early in the Third Reich and sustained members through hardship, preventing their extinction in Germany.

The innate pacifist outlook, American origin, and spiritual mindset of Christian Science led to its persecution and restriction in the late 1930s, culminating in a direct ban in 1941. The violence that National-Socialists employed to achieve their visions differed greatly from
Christian Science, which was considered to hold that “[…] problems should never be settled by violence but always by reason and that he who draws the sword will perish by the sword.” As in the Bible, Christian Scientists promoted love rather than hate for the enemy. Because of their expectation of human good, Christian Science was classified as a false ideology. The Nazi concept of fatherland was undermined by English books available in the German Nation and the loss of wealth through contributions sent to the Mother Church in Boston. The ideal Nazi religion was intra-national with German leaders; therefore, the international nature of Christian Science, supervised by the Christian Science Board of Directors in Boston, became a target. In 1935, the Reich Security Service hindered practice of Christian Science through a general ban on foreign-language literature and donations. Members require the study of these books for understanding realized in healing. Nazi physicians viewed this method as a mere theory as it was not grounded in medical science, and thus life-threatening to the public. In 1937, a report targeted Christian Science as the potential cause for an outbreak of a contagious disease. The cumulation of these pressures caused Christian Science to be prohibited on June 4, 1941, along with nine other Christian sects. A direct ban was then issued one month later on July 14th that prevented its re-establishment under a different name. Church buildings were confiscated, arrests and interrogations were made, and members were sent to concentration camps.
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3 From Our Correspondent, “Nazis And Christian Science.”
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8 Ibid., 170.
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Threatened, the visible population of Christian Scientists in Germany decreased.\(^\text{12}\) The fundamental teachings of this Christian sect were the ultimate cause for its persecution under the Nazi Regime.

Christian Science members were tolerant, and in some cases supportive, of the Nazi Regime in its early stages, and were therefore considered less threatening to rising National-Socialists. Many British Christian Scientists were sympathetic towards Germany because the Treaty of Versailles prevented the restoration of German national sovereignty.\(^\text{13}\) One of the most staunch supporters of the Nazi Regime for this reason was Philip Henry Kerr, the 11th Marquess of Lothian. Up until Christian Science was persecuted in the late 1930s, Kerr maintained that Hitler’s actions were reasonable given Germany’s circumstances, and he sought to come to a settlement that would eventually moderate the Regime.\(^\text{14}\) Hitler’s popularity grew specifically amongst Christian Scientists because of his defiant stance against Communism: “Hitler believed that the Soviet Union was the first country in which the Jews had triumphed and that the Jews were using the Communist state to enslave the Slavic population.”\(^\text{15}\) As most Christian Scientists were wealthy enough to stand to lose from the reign of Communism, Hitler’s hatred of this government system attracted members.\(^\text{16}\) The general acceptance of Christian Scientists to the opening stages of the Nazi Regime, along with a firm declaration not to discuss the violence of the world, led the Christian Science Monitor (CSM), a nationally read daily newspaper by 1933, to not dwell on the brutality: “The CSM did not deny that certain attacks may have occurred, but it often suggested that the reports of these actions were ‘exaggerated’ by enemies of the Nazi regime and by those ‘inclined towards hysteria.’”\(^\text{17}\)


its own activities and tended to not interfere with politics. By refraining from condemning Hitler, The Christian Science Monitor safeguarded branches in Germany. The National Socialists prioritized the persecution of other groups, such as the Jews and gypsies, because of the peaceable stance of Christian Science. Seeing the best in all, Christian Scientists failed to comprehend the severity of the Nazi Regime in its early stages, but its approach saved the religion from persecution until later in the 1930s. Had persecution started earlier, and thus lasted longer, Christian Science might not have survived through the period of oppression.

The efforts of churches in America to smuggle literature and supplies through Nazi barriers were vital in the continuation of Christian Science. Because World War II was in progress, many citizens faced food shortages and loss of income, sometimes leading to starvation. Furthermore, houses were bombed, hindering the lives of many. A Christian Scientist who refused to manufacture ammunition in his factory lost all but one of his workers, who were forced by the government to work elsewhere. Christian Scientists were aided by clothing and food sent by The Mother Church and branch churches in the United States, the importance of which is apparent from numerous letters of unbounded gratitude. A “Literature for Germany” fund was formed in December of 1937 that helped support Christian Scientists. German barricades, however, prevented Christian Science texts from entering Germany; thus, “Christian Scientists [in Germany] found themselves cut off from direct contact with officials of
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21 Verhulst-Goudriaan, “Life-lessons learned during World War II: When I wanted to die, I found a reason to live.”
The Mother Church.\textsuperscript{26} To overcome this barrier, Christian Science texts were transferred secretly and referred to in code, even over the telephone. For example, the central book, \textit{Science and Health with Key to the Scriptures} by Mary Baker Eddy, was referred to as “the book on philosophy” or “the grammar book you have.”\textsuperscript{27} Christian Science literature, both previously owned and newly distributed, was hidden or buried in homes.\textsuperscript{28} Christian Scientists, by hiding literature, were able to benefit profoundly from the supplies sent in from America, giving them spiritual and physical nourishment in an otherwise excruciating time.

The Christian Science faith held that God would protect them, and this gave individuals in Germany the willpower to persevere in secret. As the bans progressed, Christian Scientists in Germany became more isolated from each other.\textsuperscript{29} Although some, faced with interrogation and concentration camps, resigned their membership, Christian Scientists on the whole took a firm stand for their faith.\textsuperscript{30} Marcel Silver, the Christian Science Committee of Publication for France, continued to print Bible Lessons at a Nazi print shop in Occupied Paris in order to distribute them through an underground network into Germany.\textsuperscript{31} Groups would meet discreetly in private homes or vacant fields, and individual families would read literature and pray. One such family reported listening to a broadcast of a Mother Church service that renewed feelings of unity with the congregation.\textsuperscript{32} Crowded places, such as train stations, were also meeting places for groups, for they went unnoticed.\textsuperscript{33} Christian Scientists strove to continue their practice despite risking their lives: “They forgot that nobody can take away what is within one's heart, and so in my family we went on working and waiting and thanking God for His omnipresence and care in all circumstances.”\textsuperscript{34} As a result of members’ steadfast faith, Christian Science churches were able

\begin{flushright}
27 Ibid., 257.
28 Ibid., 249.
30 Ibid.
33 Freeman, Mary E., Interviewed by David H. Smith.
\end{flushright}
to reopen immediately after territories were claimed by the Allies. In 1946, a Christian Scientist in Germany wrote of their reestablished church: “After the American Army came here, steps were taken at once to reopen our beloved church. This took place on May 31, 1945, with a congregation of about two hundred persons, and the Readers who held office at the time the church was closed.”\textsuperscript{35} The pressure of the Nazi Regime had not ceased the practice of those most devoted, for so many were ready and eager to attend. Notices were put up on telephone poles simply to gather the community, and, in the case of Meda Freeman, literature was obtained from American soldiers for these early services.\textsuperscript{36} The Christian Science faith gave strength for Christian Scientists to endure hardship, allowing them to recover from the oppression of the Nazi Regime.

The foundation of Christian Science guided members through a period of great terror in which they would have otherwise been crushed. The strength of the sect came from its devoted community. Decades later, the dedication of members persists, but so does the stigma against them, primarily deriving from their healing work. Although countless healings have been recorded, many of which disprove medical theory that would declare the disease or injury fatal, society as a whole continues to condemn the metaphysical science of prayer just as Nazi physicians did. While religious vaccination exemption laws remain on the books in many states, the recent movement by medical associations to narrow these laws directly conflicts with Christian Science thought and threatens religious liberty protected by the 1st Amendment. Although Christian Scientists hold a sincerely held belief of the power of prayer against contagion, society coerces them to oblige and, once again, they are labeled a danger to society. Since the 1940s, general societal perception on Christian Science has not changed markedly. With all Christian Scientists endured from refusing to give up their faith, it is necessary to ensure continued education and legal protection for their religious practices.


\textsuperscript{36} Freeman, Mary E., Interviewed by David H. Smith.
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Proslaveryism as a Religious Truth

Between 1820 and 1860, Presbyterians and Catholics utilized the Old and New Testaments, social doctrine, ethics, and morals in order to defend slavery. It is possible to ascertain the role that religion played in the justification of slavery by analyzing the specific manner the institution was defended. Presbyterians and Catholics altered and employed interpretations of their religious doctrines and beliefs to establish perceptions of logic, reasoning, and morality in their defense of the institution of slavery, against abolitionists and others who did not accept their beliefs.

Presbyterians and Catholics required the justification of slavery in order to defend and protect their way of life. The transformation of Southern Presbyterian life, considering economic change, required vindications for the institution of slavery. One such economic change was the invention of the cotton gin, which increased the production of cotton as it became a practical and easily grown cash crop. Slave labor became a crucial component to cultivate cotton, and cotton production became the basis for the Southern economy.¹ This was a turning point for Southern Presbyterians. During the colonial era, Southern Presbyterians had generally been poor whites. However, the invention of the cotton gin allowed them to increase their wealth and become slaveholders, thus, they looked for ways to justify the practice of slavery.² Southern Presbyterians’ new found wealth meant that they needed a means by which to defend their lifestyle since slaveholding became a lucrative business. Before the invention of the cotton gin, Southern Presbyterians, who represented a poor white population, were required to compete with slave labor in order to feed their families. The invention of the cotton gin led to Southern Presbyterians’ gain in wealth, their position as slaveholders, and signified that they no longer were required to contend with slave labor. This gave Southern Presbyterians a stable life and necessitated a defense of slavery against abolitionists as they needed to protect their newly obtained way of life.

¹ Verle Lyndon Barber, The Slavery Controversy and the Presbyterians (1928), 51.
² Barber, The Slavery Controversy, 52.
Catholics required justifications for slavery to protect their minority within the United States. Between the years of 1820 and 1860, there were more Protestants than Catholics in the South and more Catholics in the North than the South, meaning Catholics had become a minority in Southern-slave holding states. Due to a predominant Protestant population throughout the United States, Protestants saw a threat to their views and way of life by Catholic immigration and the Catholic vote. This anti-Catholic sentiment fueled nativists, those who promoted the views of the United State’s native residents over immigrants’ and who believed that Catholicism was irreconcilable with American beliefs and establishments. As a result, Catholics saw a need to protect their existence within the United States against Protestants by affirming Catholic sentiments of pro-republicanism and the laws of the Union, which included the defense of slavery. Rev. James Ryder, in his “Proslavery oration,” explains a number of resolutions put forth during the meeting of the Roman Catholic congregation of Richmond, Virginia and considers Catholic beliefs about maintaining the laws of the Union: “The Catholic feels his obligations to his country…He knows that love of country is a sacred and holy passion, which reason and religion approve;…and that he cannot be faithful to his G-d, if deficient in fidelity to his country.” In this oration, Ryder clarifies how Catholics inescapably promote the laws and views concerning American republicanism. He states that Catholic religious beliefs require protection of the Union’s laws, even slavery, as Catholics cannot be loyal to G-d, without being loyal to their country and consequently, the laws which the country maintains. This oration illustrates a need for Catholics to preserve their religious lifestyle within the United States as Ryder explains that Catholicism does not conflict with American beliefs for it is pro-republican and respects civil authority and the laws of the Union. The preservation of Catholicism would necessitate the defense of slavery in order to prove that Catholics were intertwined with respect to American beliefs and laws against anti-Catholic Protestants. Thus, both the Presbyterians and
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Catholics required a means by which they could justify slavery and religion was a manner that allowed the vindication of this institution.

Presbyterians and Catholics altered and cited the words of the Old and New Testaments as a rationale for slavery against abolitionists and others who did not accept their views. Both proslavery Presbyterians and Catholics argued G-d’s specific ordainment of slavery through the Old Testament. In regard to Presbyterian doctrine, Presbyterians believe that only the scriptures, such as the Old Testament, hold a complete truth as G-d was divulged in scripture alone. 

Furthermore, Presbyterians believe that there is to be a new understanding of the scriptures by interpretation of the words they already contain. These central Presbyterian beliefs on the infallibility of scripture and the ability of church members to interpret it could allow proslavery Presbyterians to use the words of the Bible in ways that pronounced slavery a legitimate institution. Robert L. Dabney, a Presbyterian pastor and professor, gives evidence of Abraham as a slaveholder in the Old Testament to illustrate how slavery consisted of a G-d-ordained relationship between the enslaved and their master. Dabney relates that when Abraham was told to circumcise himself to show his covenant with G-d, he was also to circumcise any enslaved people he owned.

Dabney further reports his interpretation of this evidence: “…we have the relationship of domestic slavery sanctioned…by a participation in the holiest sacrament of the ancient church. Would a holy G-d thus baptize an unholy relation?”

Dabney’s interpretation of the Old Testament follows the Presbyterian belief of the unerringness of the scriptures as Dabney argues that G-d would never sanctify the relationship between the enslaved and their master if G-d did not see that this relationship was holy. The fact that G-d asked Abraham to circumcise himself with those he enslaved illustrates an instance where G-d did not mention the erroneousness of slavery and made the “covenant,” or promise between Abraham, G-d, and the enslaved, a holy promise. The inclusion of the enslaved in this promise is thus crucial because Dabney argues that G-d has authorized a relationship between the enslaved and the master to be
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in accordance with G-d’s wishes. Therefore, Dabney employed evidence from the Old Testament to establish a sense of logic in his argument in favor of slavery.

Moreover, Catholic beliefs, including the supremacy of the words of the Pope, contributed to Southern, Catholic views on the Old Testament, which allowed Catholics to apply its content to the 19th century justification of slavery. From the beginning of the Catholic church to the 19th century, papal bulls (a public decree given by the pope) and proclamations of the church often justified the practice of slavery. As a central Catholic belief included the authority of the Pope, and Popes in Catholic history often legitimized slavery, proslavery Catholics were supplied with doctrinal means by which they were able to justify slavery through the Catholic church. Furthermore, the rationalization of slavery through the church also signified that Catholics in the 19th century were able to use scripture in their defense of slavery. John T. Noonan, Jr., a Senior Circuit Judge, recounts how proslavery Catholics utilized the “Curse of Canaan” in the Old Testament to legitimize slavery. In the story of Ham, Noah becomes drunk after planting a vineyard. Noah’s son Ham sees Noah’s drunken and naked state. After Noah awakes and discovers Ham’s sin (which has never been elucidated), he curses Ham’s son, Canaan, and all of Ham’s future descendants into slavery. Then, Noonan relates proslavery Christian (including Catholic) views on this story: “Some theologians, in later generations, would read it as showing slavery established by divine command. By a peculiar twisting of the text, Africans became identified as the Children of Ham.” Noonan’s impartation of how proslavery Catholics and other Christians used the Old Testament to justify slavery by a means of religious ordainment through a Christian holy scripture highlights a way that Catholics and Protestants alike were able to twist the meaning of the Old Testament in favor of slavery. The fact that Catholics and Protestants further interpreted the text to mean that Africans (blacks) were the successors of Ham implied that those with proslavery views would be able to justify the specific enslavement of a people who were separate from whites. This enslavement of Africans
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illustrated an instance for proving racial slavery since blacks, who were designated as the
descendants of Ham, would always be cursed into being enslaved under religious guidelines.
Thus, Noonan demonstrates how Catholics were able to contort the words of the Old Testament
to provide “sound” reasoning as to why Africans were specifically meant to be enslaved as a
result of Catholic beliefs in the power of the church and its stance on scripture and slavery.

Catholics and Presbyterians both utilized translations for words in the New Testament to
explain how G-d and the apostles ordained slavery. Noonan chronicles how the Greek word for
male slave, or “doulos,” in the Greek translation of the New Testament, became “servus” in the
Latin translation. The word was often translated to “servant” in English. The word “servant”
often contained the meaning of the word “slave,” and the interpretation of the word “servant” in
the minds of Southern, slaveholders, including Catholics, meant an interpretation of the word in
terms of slavery from their Bibles. Proslavery Catholics were able to use specific translations
of the word “doulos” in the New Testament to convey how slavery was authorized in religious
scripture by using the translations to mean “slave.” Consequently, Catholics and other Christians
were able to manipulate translated words of the bible to convey what they wished in the context
of their own lives. They achieved this by employing what they saw as logic and reason in regard
to finding evidence of the existence of slavery and its vindication as a regular occurrence in the
New Testament and thus ordained by G-d.

Dabney further argues a Presbyterian view on the translations of “doulos.” Dabney
writes of how many abolitionists often refused to see the word “doulos” as meaning “slave” and
how they translated the word to mean “son”, “hired servant”, or even “subject.” Dabney then
goes on to state the wrongs of abolitionists in their translation and their evasion of the word
“slave” as “doulos…means in the mouth of Christ and his apostles a literal, domestic slave.”
Dabney explains the illegitimacy of the abolitionist view point that did not accept the term
“doulos” to mean “slave” as he states that Christ and the apostles saw the word to mean “slave”
and thus recognized and could ordain the institution of slavery in the New Testament and thereby
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justify slavery’s application in the 19th century in regard to Presbyterian views on the infallibility of scripture. Dabney argues that the errors in abolitionist thinking mean that abolitionists would not admit that the scriptures contained slavery and reasons that their logic ignores fact. Therefore, Dabney was able to create a sense of logic to prove the erroneousness of abolitionist views on the existence and ordainment of slavery in the New Testament by establishing that their thinking disregarded the truth as “doulos” meant “domestic slave” and not “hired servant” or any other meaning other than “slave.”

In addition to the Old and New Testaments, Catholics and Presbyterians justified slavery through social doctrine, morals, and ethics. Proslavery Catholics and Presbyterians sanctioned slavery as a required societal format. Br. Joseph P. Mobberly, SJ., a Jesuit Coadjutor and teacher at Georgetown University, argues that G-d created a sense that certain people are meant to retain authority over others because G-d established different orders within the world and a human society based on these.19 Mobberly goes on to relate the different cases of concerning authority within society and their relation to the will of G-d: “It is according to right reason that the wife obey the husband because being the weaker of the two she depends on him for support and protection… For a similar reason servants are bound to obey their masters.”20 Mobberly uses the notion of a divinely-ordained social order to justify slavery, as he equates the relationship between a wife and husband to that of the enslaved to their master. Due to divinely-created orders in society, as commanded by G-d, the enslaved must obey their master since they “depend” on the master “for support and protection” just as the wife obeys her husband in this way. In this respect, Mobberly also insists a sense of morality in the relationship between the enslaved and their master because their relationship allows the enslaved safety in life. Therefore, Mobberly defends slavery by using the reason that there is a social order, ordained by G-d, and that this social order cannot be broken in order to maintain G-d’s wishes. Thus, slavery cannot be abolished as it would disturb the social order.

Rev. Fred A. Ross, D.D., a Presbyterian pastor, further solidifies the relationship between the enslaved and their masters. Ross asserts that not every person is created equal by G-d, believing they are not the same in their intelligence and other aspects and, as such, “government over such men cannot rightfully rest upon their consent.” Ross’s words on a Presbyterian case for slavery reinforce Mobberly’s views on a divinely-ordained social order because Ross asserts that not all people are equal and thereby require others to rule over them and that this rule need not be through “consent.” Thus, slavery is considered to include a divinely-ordained relationship between the master and the enslaved, where the master does not need the consent of the enslaved to control them because they are made to be unequal to the master since G-d created some to retain authority and some to comply to those with this power. Consequently, Mobberly and Ross use logic and reason to argue Catholic and Presbyterian positions on religious social doctrine as necessitating slavery because G-d-created specific orders in society.

Proslavery Catholics and Presbyterians supported slavery by representing its benefits in terms of morality. Mobberly argues a Catholic viewpoint on how slavery could be considered beneficial to the enslaved and to society. Specifically, Mobberly maintains that a large number of beggars existed in Europe in 1823 and that with the help of a benign master, their lives could be ameliorated. He then argues the benefits that slavery could provide in regard to establishing a superior society: “Society would be relieved from a troublesome burden…Where slavery exists, beggars are rarely found. We must therefore conclude that slavery is not only lawful, reasonable and good, but that it is also necessary.” Mobberly asserts his views as a Catholic and uses reasoning and morality to illustrate how slavery could be seen as an improved state of living to the impoverished because a master would take care of them and give them stability in their lives. This was a Catholic and Christian way of thinking because Christians of all denominations see helping and taking care of others as part of being a good Christian who follows G-d’s wishes.

21 F. A Ross (Frederick Augustus), Slavery Ordained of God (Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott & Co., 1857), 128.
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Mobberly argues that slavery does not only improve the entire state of society, but also improves individual lives as a sense of morality could be applied to slavery by suggesting that it created a superior state of life to poverty and aided the lives of others. Thus, Mobberly was able to defend slavery by using logic and Christian morals to prove slavery’s benefits in all of society.

Additionally, Presbyterians sanctioned slavery as being beneficial and only a form of good if it was used correctly. A proslavery Presbyterian view included a belief that slavery could be justified if the slaveholder were a good person and consequently, a good Christian, if the peoples who were enslaved were treated well, and if they were compensated fairly for their work. Therefore, slavery could be justified if the enslaved were treated properly by Presbyterian and general Christian standards and morality. George D. Armstrong, D.D., a Presbyterian pastor, states the duties of a master to the enslaved in order to justify slavery as a good institution: “They are to give their…slaves ‘that which is just and equal;’… which their contract with them or the natural laws of G-d require; that take care of them in sickness; that provision in old age…” Armstrong’s words consider the duties of masters to the enslaved by contending that masters needed to compensate those they enslaved fairly for their labor since reimbursement could be necessitated by G-d. This kind treatment of enslaved peoples could also be seen as beneficial; a good master would treat them well and would give them quality of life, even in old age, by G-d’s ways. Accordingly, slavery could be justified by Presbyterians as a master, through his being virtuous and a good Christian, could make the institution acceptable in terms of Presbyterian and Christian logic and morals.

The Presbyterian and Catholic justifications for slavery exemplify that religion is often intertwined with all aspects of life. This is a result of human traditions that for centuries have looked to G-ds and other deities to help them distinguish right from wrong. A supreme being and their words, including scripture, have been an infallible source of truth. Religious scriptures are still used today to justify certain systems and actions, such as violence and misogyny, illustrating the power of religion as a precise social code and way of life. Therefore, G-d’s truth not only

gave proslavery Presbyterians and Catholics a faultless and certain source to prove their views on slavery, but it also became a widely-used tactic for the vindication of many practices that are still in effect today.
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