

favorite novels in Volume I.

6 Fleishman, "Socialization," 649.

7 For example, Austen noted that the Tilney's appreciation of landscape was shaped by their knowledge of the skill of drawing, as described above.

8 Nikolaus Pevsner, "The Architectural Setting of Jane Austen's Novels," *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 31 (1968): 407-11.

9 Matthew Taylor, "Traipsing into the Forest: Landscapes and Rivalry in Jane Austen's *Mansfield Park*," *Anthropoetics* 14.2 (2009): 1-16. Taylor cites, in particular, the outing to Sotherton and the "play-within-a play" of Volume I.

10 *Ibid.*, 5.

"The Supremacy of Human Rights Everywhere": The Struggle against Jim Crow during World War II

Thomas Harvell-DeGolier

On January 6, 1941, a mere eleven months before the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor dragged the United States into war, President Franklin Delano Roosevelt gave his eighth State of the Union address. In this speech, Roosevelt articulated the Four Freedoms that constituted his vision for a peaceful, democratic world order: freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom from want, and freedom from fear.¹ These freedoms were an essential component of FDR's proclamation that "Freedom means the supremacy of human rights everywhere." While this idea became important to the rhetoric of the Allies during World War II, it revealed an unsettling split in American policy abroad and the domestic treatment of African Americans and other minorities.

Indeed, while FDR promoted his four freedoms abroad, these freedoms were not fully enjoyed by all men and women in America. Specifically, African Americans did not enjoy many of FDR's espoused freedoms, with their treatment in the South being especially heinous. By championing these values, Roosevelt opened up America to charges of hypocrisy from African American intellectuals, the African American press, and foreign powers.² These criticisms formed the basis upon which African American intellectuals and black presses, during and after World War II, advocated for civil liberties and civil rights. By seizing upon FDR's four freedoms, African American intellectuals and presses advocated for the dismantling of Jim Crow, comparing the Jim Crow South to Nazi Germany, and they seized upon differences between America's stated

ideals and its imperfect reality to support the emergence of a fairer, more democratic system built upon the supremacy of human rights.

These hypocrisies, inherent in America's positioning of itself as a human rights champion, allowed African American thinkers, influenced by government indifference to Ethiopia's plight during its war with Italy, to sympathize with and defend Japan's ascendance as a triumph of colored races over western colonizers.³ For example, W.E.B. DuBois, when asked to support the idea that American foreign policy in Asia was "evolutionary and pacific" while "Japanese policy [was] militaristic and aggressive," responded that Americans regarded the Japanese as "lesser breeds" and that America wanted Japan to be its industrial and commercial backyard.⁴ Furthermore, DuBois, remarking that he did not remember "Mr. Stimson's protest on Ethiopia," revealed that the lack of an Ethiopian intervention had created bitterness and anger among African American elites. This bitterness towards American inaction in Ethiopia made it easier for African Americans to find common cause with Japan, which had upended western dominance in the Asian Pacific. Yet Japan was an inaccurate analogue for the Jim Crow South, which left Germany, the other main member of the Axis, to be the chosen analogue for the racial hierarchy of the American South in the African American press.

Germany, likely noticing the ambivalent attitudes towards Japan in the African American press, treated African American soldiers and African soldiers mildly in the hopes of dividing America's home-front.⁵ Indeed, Germany even made use of "Negro Spies," an idea which, in light of their racial ideologies, gave the impression that they were trying to gain sympathy from the American black populace.⁶ However, as Larry Greene remarks, Germany, with its virulently racist ideology, made a better mirror for criticizing the prejudicial Jim Crow system than Japan did.⁷ As such, Germany's efforts came to nothing. Indeed, some of the earliest criticisms of German fascism noted that laws imposed upon Jews in Germany bore remarkable similarities to Jim Crow.⁸ These similarities rendered Germany's attempts to court favorable opinions among African Americans ineffective. Indeed, for African American presses Germany became a go-to comparison used to criticize Jim Crow.

Over the course of the war, the black press conflated the battle against Nazism with the battle against Jim Crow, giving birth to the Double V Campaign, which advocated for victory both abroad and at home.⁹ This campaign's name originated in a letter by the African American soldier, James G. Thompson, who wrote that:

The V for Victory Campaign sign which was being displayed prominently throughout the Allied Countries should be adopted by African Americans as a "Double VV" with the first V for victory over our enemies from with-

out, the second V for Victory over our enemies from within. For surely those who perpetrate these ugly prejudices here are seeking to destroy our democratic form of government just as surely as the axis forces.¹⁰

By equating the the Axis Powers with segregation, this letter pointed out that both European fascism and southern fascism posed a clear and present danger to democratic institutions. As such, the Double V Campaign cloaked itself in the soaring morality espoused by FDR, who articulated a worldview contrary to Nazism and its principles. Specifically, African Americans embraced the idea that "Freedom means the Supremacy of Human Rights Everywhere."¹¹ Further, while they embraced FDR's four freedoms, they added a fifth, the right to be free from segregation.¹² By adding this freedom, African Americans modified and readapted the four freedoms to advance both a domestic human rights struggle and an international one, and they asserted that America's self-proclaimed mantle as a human rights defender required fighting domestic human rights violations.

The Double V campaign reoriented the four freedoms to meld together two enemies of African Americans: the crushing oppression of Jim Crow and Hitler's Aryan supremacist, genocidal, German regime. In his poem, "Beaumont to Detroit: 1943," for example, Langston Hughes wondered, "how long I got to fight / BOTH HITLER AND JIM CROW." Commenting that "You tell me that hitler / Is a mighty bad man. / I guess he took lessons / From the ku klux klan," Hughes painted American white supremacy as an antecedent for Hitler's doctrine of Aryan superiority.¹³ Moreover, Hughes's typographic rendering of both the "ku klux klan" and "hitler" indicates that both groups shared the hood of white supremacy, and that both were unworthy of capitalization in a world where Roosevelt's stated ideals should reign. Ultimately, using the rhetoric that arose from both Roosevelt's criticism of Nazi Germany and his stated ideological positions, African American leaders lambasted southern politicians and institutions and pushed for desegregation of national industries.

This campaign revealed that by fighting oppression abroad, while maintaining domestic systems of oppression, America opened itself to caustic criticisms from the contemporary black presses and leaders. These leaders, while recognizing Germany was the greater current threat, unhesitatingly compared the conditions of the Jim Crow South to Nazi Germany.¹⁴ Indeed, writers such as Hughes stated that "segregation, [and] separate blood banks" were "so closely related to Hitlerism practice" that "if we [marched] into Berlin playing DIXIE in our hearts, instead of THE STAR SPANGLED BANNER, as far as colored people [were] concerned" it would be the same as if Hitler stayed in power.¹⁵ Here Hughes implies that there was no difference between the leadership of Hitler and leadership of the Jim Crow South. According to this portrayal, the

South and Hitler's Nazi Germany were cut from the same (white) cloth. In the eyes of many African Americans, Dixie and Nazi Germany were indistinguishable. This painted racism as a global problem that, in the spirit of the Double V Campaign, needed to be defeated at home and abroad.

The notion that American racism was similar to the Nazis' racial beliefs was expounded in the *Kansas City Plaindealer*, which stated that "Hitler ... Rankin, Bilbo et al." should be put in blackface so that they can "experience the indignities which are the daily lot of the American Negro."¹⁶ This statement showed that these African Americans felt that if white people, including Hitler, dealt with the conditions black people faced they would gain a greater measure of humanity. The crux of this argument was that once white supremacists suffered the indignities of oppressed populations, they might be able to realize the follies of their racism. Essentially, this rhetoric built up the idea that African Americans had to undergo conditions that most white Americans would balk at. Two years earlier, the same newspaper advanced a similar argument in response to another editorial:

[Americans] would have to work where they were told to work ... children would be taught what Hitler wanted them taught ... [Americans] would be arrested by any official flunkee, with or without reason Our officials killed or jailed ... [Americans] would lose every vestige of humanity relegated to a place of inferiority.¹⁷

These images (paraphrasing the other editorial) convey what white Americans believed would happen to them if Germany conquered the United States. Responding to these fears, the *Kansas City Plaindealer* cuttingly remarked that this "picturesque description reflects in some respects the condition of the American Negro under the present setup of discrimination, segregation, disenfranchisement, lynching, [and] injustice." This specific reaction showed that African American writers did not viscerally fear the consequences of losing to a white supremacist nation. They already lived in one. This African American editorialist accordingly had little sympathy for white Americans who feared losing to Nazi Germany. This characterization of the Jim Crow South revealed that, in sum, African Americans viewed discrimination against Jews in Europe as similar to the persecution undergone by African Americans during Jim Crow.¹⁸

These comparisons between the South and Nazi Germany extended, even more cuttingly, into the realm of the personal and structural. Personal comparisons between Southern politicians and German officials revealed that African American presses and intellectuals viewed the actions of southern governors (and Jim Crow's existence) as analogous to Hitler's Germany. Accordingly, these comparisons were quite caustic. For example, the *New York Amsterdam News* put out an article called "Talmadge Copies Hitler,"¹⁹ comparing the in-

cumbent executive governor of Georgia, Eugene Talmadge, to the German dictator. Further, the *New York Amsterdam News* noted that Hitler "burned books and purged all people who believed in the equality of man," while Talmadge also "burned books and purged more than 1,000 teachers." "Hitler [stated] that Negroes are born half ape," while Talmadge "stated that negroes are inferior." In essence, the *New York Amsterdam News* systematically built up a case showing that Talmadge and Hitler were two sides of a single coin forged in the fires of racial hatred. The newspaper implied that, in the eyes of African American journalists, the southern viewpoints did not differ noticeably from Nazi viewpoints. Thus, the black press argued that defeating Nazi ideology would require fighting its cousin, southern white supremacy, at home. In this analogy, Eugene Talmadge became an American Hitler.

Accordingly, when Talmadge lost reelection, the *Chicago Defender* hailed the defeat of this "Fascist Governor," who created a "poll tax dictatorship," as "the progress of Democracy."²⁰ The rancor displayed towards Talmadge, especially the characterization of his "poll tax dictatorship," revealed that the African American press, or at least the *Chicago Defender*, was unafraid to paint Talmadge's Georgia as a parallel Third Reich. The *Chicago Defender* rhetorically transformed Talmadge's Georgia into Germany and specifically showed that Nazi authoritarianism already existed in the United States. The *Chicago Defender* thus illuminated the jarring dichotomy of a country that claimed to fight dictators abroad while enabling dictators at home.

This inconsistency was brought to sharp relief by the poll tax, which the *Chicago Defender* called the "main instrument by which reactionary congressmen maintain their power."²¹ The poll tax was a discriminatory measure that required payment in order for someone to vote, predominantly hurting poorer southerners and meant to prevent African Americans from voting. Indeed, during World War II, more people voted for two congressmen from Rhode Island than voted for the 32 combined representatives from Mississippi, Alabama, Georgia, and South Carolina.²² In such an environment, black presses fearlessly criticized southern leaders of states that maintained poll taxes, calling the Governor of Alabama, Frank Dixon, for example, the "Alabama Hitler" because of his support for poll taxes.²³ This derogatory nickname revealed that African American intellectuals and leaders viewed the poll tax as a tool of tyranny.

In a similar vein, when an anti-poll tax bill failed, the *Chicago Defender* asserted that its defeat was a victory for fascism.²⁴ Poll taxes, due to their regressive nature and ability to restrict voting rights, were used widely by southern leaders to maintain southern white supremacy. This created another avenue in which the Jim Crow South mirrored Nazi Germany. In essence, poll taxes deprived minority populations of power and allowed the majority to trample civil liberties, which created a kind of dictatorship of the majority easily com-

pared with Nazi Germany's, which oppressed the Jews and other minorities. The South's mechanisms of repression shared, in the eyes of the African American press, many similarities with the race laws of the German Reich, which had in fact borrowed elements of its race laws from America.

Further, while Talmadge and Dixon met with harsh criticisms for their states' similarities with Nazi Germany, they were merely two among the many southern politicians who faced intense criticism throughout the war, e.g., Theodore Bilbo, a Mississippi Senator, and John Rankin, a congressman known to be a "Negrophobe," were frequently lambasted by the African American press.²⁵ The always-cutting Langston Hughes remarked that these two "talk just like Hitler about Negroes and Jews, [while] other senators remain silent."²⁶ This criticism implied that people like Hitler, Rankin and Bilbo flourished while others remained quiet, also indicting the so-called moderates who tolerated Rankin and Bilbo.

Criticisms of these moderates and the white supremacists they empowered often took on religious undertones. For example, Earl Conrad, a writer for the *Chicago Defender*, described Bilbo and similar southern congressmen as "Christless spiritless Hollow Infidels ... who have sought to restore sectionalism and White supremacy to the mainstream of American Life."²⁷ Conrad shamed senators who, while claiming moderation, refused to condemn the racism and extremism of their southern colleagues, effectively condoning the actions of these "Infidels." The acerbic language in this column used religious imagery to portray segregation as heretical and its proponents as false prophets set against a righteous natural order and attempting to instill their views across the South. Conrad also called these figures "Neo-confederates" who possess more "hatred, bigotry and danger ... than Hitler," and he thus invoked America's discriminatory history and a "special style American fascism" that predated Hitler. Conrad called on this tradition to insinuate that while Germany had been defeated only two months earlier, America was still fighting the war against fascism, specifically the oppression of African Americans that predated World War II.

By calling for a unified war against fascism both at home and abroad, African American leaders and newspapers, as Thomas Sugrue notes, saw their mission as a crusade which united black people against the evils of Jim Crow, fascism, and segregation.²⁸ However, while African Americans fought against fascism abroad, Jim Crow was a more durable figure, one that took more time to overcome. Activists accordingly focused on segregation. In 1940, for example, A. Phillip Randolph, who led the brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters, began calling for a march on Washington.²⁹ During a speech he made stumping for this march, Randolph advocated "the integration of Negroes in the Armed forces" and "for the abolition of Jim Crowism in all government departments and defense employment." This clarion call urged African Americans to advo-

cate for full inclusion in fields critical to national defense before and after the war. While the march was going to occur before the United States entered World War II, America was already acting as an "arsenal of democracy," providing war materials to Great Britain in its fight against the Nazis.³⁰ A united front to support Great Britain, whose navy Roosevelt considered important to America's national defense, was essential. This gave African American civil rights activists unique leverage to advocate for desegregation in the defense industry.

Understanding that African Americans had this unique leverage to press for desegregation in the defense industry, Randolph stated:

If American democracy will not defend its defenders; if American democracy will not protect its protectors; if American democracy will not give jobs to its toilers because of race or color; if American democracy will not insure equality of opportunity, freedom and justice to its citizens, black and white, it is a hollow mockery and belies the principles for which it is supposed to stand.³¹

Randolph cut to the core of America's hypocrisy in claiming to fight for freedom when it did not fully support equal opportunities for all Americans. By pointedly remarking that America should be helping everyone, regardless of race, Randolph implied that this duty was not being met. Randolph suggested that American democracy itself was not worth defending until African Americans "[secured] equal participation in [the] national defense," that is, until segregation was ended, and he thus tied the struggle for desegregation to the institution of democracy itself.

By connecting the struggle against segregation to democratic institutions, Randolph challenged FDR, "a great humanitarian and Idealist," to live up to his soaring rhetoric. Specifically, he seems to have in mind FDR's idealistic claims that "freedom means the supremacy of Human Rights everywhere," that democracy was "the most humane ... [form] of human society," and that, as such, America's democratic nature allowed all people to find "a life new in Freedom" within its borders.³² In essence, FDR suggested that America's democratic freedoms should be enjoyed by all. Randolph, by remarking that segregation and Jim Crow had transformed American democracy into "a hollow mockery" of itself, challenged FDR to ensure that his statements were more than just rhetoric.³³ Randolph thus showed that, by fighting the Nazis in the name of protecting democracy, Roosevelt left himself vulnerable to attacks from marginalized communities demanding equal participation in American life.

Further, grounding his argument in a uniquely African American patriotism, Randolph rooted his call in the actions of "Denmark Vessey, Gabriel Prosser, Harriet Tubman, and Frederick Douglass." By evoking historic civil

rights activists, Randolph centered his call for desegregation within a long civil rights tradition that united African Americans. In doing so, he transformed his call for a march on Washington into a movement that continued the work of previous activists. When combined with his appeals to Roosevelt's idealism, this speech cloaked activism against segregation in a patriotism that was rooted in both the past struggles against slavery and the continuing struggle for civil rights and liberties.

Regardless of its possible final outcome, Roosevelt's administration was nervous about the prospects of Randolph's march going forward and the dangers it presented.³⁴ Specifically, they were afraid the march would lead to violence. The Roosevelt administration met with Randolph to prevent the march from occurring. Following this meeting, President Roosevelt issued Executive Order 8802, establishing that there should be

full participation in the national defense program by all citizens of the United States regardless of race, creed, color, or national origin, in the firm belief that the democratic way of life within the Nation can be defended successfully only with the help and support of all groups within its border.³⁵

Whether due to pragmatism or idealism, Roosevelt conceded to some of Randolph's demands. Further, by using language that emphasized American unity, Roosevelt cultivated an inclusive sense of national unity that starkly contrasted with the exclusive national identity promoted in Nazi Germany. In effect, this projected an image of an ideal America, where all Americans were included and needed to promote the common good, in stark contrast to Nazi Germany's persecution of Jews and other minorities. The executive order was not only a concession to civil rights activists but a rebuke to Nazi ideologies. Of course, this executive order would have been meaningless without a way to enforce it. The order accordingly established "a committee on Fair Employment" practices, which "would enforce Executive Order 8802's provisions." This committee received and investigated "complaints of discrimination" that violated "the provisions of [the order]," and it could "take appropriate steps to redress" grievances. This committee represented a victory for Randolph.

By establishing this commission, and giving it the power to resolve conflicts, Roosevelt showed that the African American community successfully could pressure him to put his rhetoric about the supremacy of human rights into practice domestically for all Americans.³⁶ This illustrated that America's pragmatic needs in the war gave civil rights activists a powerful bargaining position, based on the recognition that a strong national defense needed what the *Chicago Defender* called "a free, happy, and united people."³⁷ By withholding unity until FDR rectified discrimination in the defense industry, civil rights activists forced concessions from his administration. These concessions provid-

ed African Americans with measurable victories against what was portrayed, at least by the comparisons made of the Jim Crow South, as a domestic Reich.

World War II invigorated the civil rights movement. By giving African Americans and white Americans a common enemy, it provided African Americans a proxy for the Jim Crow South—Nazism—that white Americans opposed. When discussing the evils of Jim Crow, African American leaders and presses quickly drew comparisons between southern white supremacy and Jim Crow. These caustic, acerbic attacks on the southern institution of Jim Crow, which compared it to Nazi Germany, unified into a campaign against fascism both at home and abroad and allowed African American leaders to hold Roosevelt to his assertions that America was a champion of "human rights everywhere." African Americans thus secured victories like the desegregation of the national defense industry, which would eventually be followed by the military's desegregation.³⁸ Ultimately, World War II strengthened the civil rights movement by giving civil rights activists and white Americans a common enemy, which increased white sympathy, at least in some corners, with the African American cause.³⁹ World War II was thus a watershed moment that, by creating this universal enemy, gave birth to a stronger civil rights movement, which could secure immediate victories and which continued to advocate for domestic civil rights long after World War II ended.

Thomas Harvell-DeGolier is a senior majoring in History. He prepared this essay as part of Professor Lauren Turek's seminar on United States Foreign Relations (HIST 3469) in Spring 2017.

NOTES

- 1 Franklin D. Roosevelt, "January 6, 1941: State of the Union (Four Freedoms)," available from: <https://millercenter.org/the-presidency/presidential-speeches/january-6-1941-state-union-four-freedoms> (accessed 31 March 2017).
- 2 See Neil A. Wynn, *The African American Experience during World War II* (Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield, 2010), 36–41, and Patricia Sullivan, "Movement Building During the World War II Era," in *Fog of War*, ed. Kevin Kruse and Stephen Tuck (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012), 71.
- 3 Brenda Gayle Plummer, *Rising Wind: Black Americans and U.S. Foreign Affairs, 1935–1960* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1996), 70–71.
- 4 W.E.B. DuBois, "As the Crow Flies," *New York Amsterdam News (1938–1941)*, Feb. 24, 1940, 1.
- 5 Plummer, *Rising Wind*, 77.
- 6 "Negro Nazi Spy Trapped in S. America," *New York Amsterdam News (1943–1961)*, Aug. 26, 1944, 2.
- 7 Larry A. Greene, "Race in the Reich: The African American Press on Nazi Germany," in *Germans and African Americans: Two Centuries of Exchange*, ed. Larry A. Greene and Anke Ortlepp

- (Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 2011), 71-84.
- 8 Thomas Sugrue, "Hillburn, Hattiesburg, and Hitler: Wartime Activists Think Globally and Act Locally," in *Fog of War*, 89.
- 9 *Ibid.*, 84; Kruse Kevin and Stephen Tuck, "Introduction," in *Fog of War*, 3-14.
- 10 James G. Thompson, "Should I Sacrifice to Live," in *The African American Experience*, 110-111.
- 11 Roosevelt, "Four Freedoms."
- 12 Jane Dailey, "The Sexual Politics of Race in World War II America," in *Fog of War*, 151.
- 13 Langston Hughes, "From Beaumont to Detroit; 1943," in *The African American Experience*, 124.
- 14 Paul Alkebon, *The African American Press in World War II: Toward Victory at Home and Abroad* (Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2014), 28.
- 15 Langston Hughes, "Here to yonder: If Dixie Invades Europe," *The Chicago Defender (National Edition)* (1921-1967), July 24, 1943, 14.
- 16 "White Scholar looks at Negro World: Not only Hitler, but Bilbo, Rankin Et Al," *The Kansas City Plaindealer* June 2, 1944, 7.
- 17 "How things stand," *The Kansas City Plaindealer*, May 29, 1942, 7.
- 18 Note that the horrors of the Holocaust were not yet known.
- 19 "Talmadge Copies Hitler," *New York Amsterdam Star-News* (1941-1943), Oct. 4, 1941, 5.
- 20 "Lessons of Talmadge Defeat," *The Chicago Defender (National Edition)* (1921-1967), Sept. 26, 1942, 14.
- 21 "Abolish Poll Tax," *The Chicago Defender (National Edition)* (1921-1967), Oct. 3, 1942.
- 22 Jason M. Ward, "A War for States' Rights," in *Fog of War*, 134.
- 23 Dixon's father wrote racist novels. J. Mills Thornton III, "Segregation and the City," in *Fog of War*, 56. "Poll Tax Dixon of Alabama," *The Chicago Defender (National Edition)* (1921-1967), Feb. 27, 1943, 14.
- 24 "The Poll Tax Barbarians," *The Chicago Defender (National Edition)* (1921-1967), Dec. 5, 1942, 14.
- 25 Green, "Race in the Reich," 134-36.
- 26 Langston Hughes, "Here To yonder: Over-Ripe Apple," *The Chicago Defender (National Edition)* (1921-1967), Aug. 19, 1944, 12.
- 27 Earl Conrad, "Yesterday and Today: Bilbo A Modern Calhoun," *The Chicago Defender (National Edition)* (1921-1967), Jul. 28, 1945, 13.
- 28 Sugrue, "Hillborn, Hattiesburg, and Hitler," 90-91.
- 29 A. Phillip Randolph and Neil A. Wynn, "A. Phillip Randolph Calls for a March on Washington (1941)," in *The African American Experience*, 102-03.
- 30 Roosevelt, "December 29, 1940: Fireside Chat 16: On the "Arsenal of Democracy," available from: <https://millercenter.org/the-presidency/presidential-speeches/december-29-1940-fireside-chat-16-arsenal-democracy> (accessed 1 May 2017); Wynn, *The African American Experience*, 25.
- 31 Randolph and Wynn, "March on Washington," 104-105.
- 32 Roosevelt, "Four Freedoms"; Roosevelt, "January 20, 1941: Third Inaugural Address," available from: <https://millercenter.org/the-presidency/presidential-speeches/january-20-1941-third-inaugural-address> (accessed 1 May 2017).
- 33 Randolph and Wynn, "March on Washington," 105.
- 34 Wynn, *The African American Experience*, 34-35.
- 35 Roosevelt, "Executive Order 8802," in *The African American Experience*, 106.
- 36 Julian E. Zelizer, "Confronting the Roadblock," in *Fog of War*, 38-40. Roosevelt, "Four Freedoms."
- 37 "National Defense," *The Chicago Defender (National Edition)* (1921-1967), Jul 27, 1940, 14.
- 38 Roosevelt, "Four Freedoms."
- 39 Wynn, *The African American Experience*, 88.

Slutty Embellishments: Elizabethan Fashion and Projections of Decadence in Marlowe's *Hero and Leander*

Brian Holmes

On June 15, 1574, in Greenwich, Queen Elizabeth I delivered an address enforcing statutes of apparel, lamenting that "the excess of apparel and the superfluity of unnecessary foreign wares thereto belonging now of late years is grown by sufferance to such an extremity that the manifest decay of the whole realm generally is likely to follow."¹ In response to such apparent decay, Elizabeth's sumptuary laws tailored clothing to meet rigid restrictions within her court. These laws thus created a visual rhetoric in which embellishments functioned as the materialization of both a spoken limitation on class-related self-presentation and an unspoken lexicon of ambitious hierarchical extravagance. As Elizabeth meticulously named within each and every statute the pedigree of those who would qualify for exceptions to the rules of specific dress-codes, the purpose of her sumptuary laws became clear: to define a social hierarchy in order to maintain control. Elizabeth's obvious goals were to assert her power as a feminine, authoritarian monarch and to exercise control of her subjects. As she grappled with the anxieties of emergent modernity and the controversy of being a female monarch, Elizabeth's reign focused primarily on maintaining appearance—a means of governance ruled by an obsession with self-display—to enforce political stability.

On the surface, the sumptuary statutes attempted to restrict expenditure on foreign fashions and extravagance out of fear of the rhetorical power ornamentation carries—a language of sartorial economics that should only be spoken and understood by those who need to look the part.² The confusion of