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Introduction and Acknowledgements

This 2013 edition is the second annual publication of the Ripon College Journal of Ethics and Communication. Our hope is that this journal will engage young people in discussions about ethics, communication, and the world around them. The theme of this year’s journal is “Ethics, Communication and Marginalized Voices.” History is filled with examples of groups who have struggled to have their voices heard by mainstream society. Perhaps the most well-known instance of this in our own history is the Civil Rights movement of the 20th century. However, many other groups exist whose fight for equality is not as well-known. For example, Irish and German immigrants in the 19th century were discriminated against and had difficulties finding jobs and supporting their families. It is voices such as these that we attempt to lift up within this journal.

This project would not be possible without the help of several people. First, we would like to thank Dr. Carolyn Calloway-Thomas, the President of the World Communication Association and a professor of Communication and Culture at Indiana University Bloomington, who wrote the preface for this journal. Second, we also thank the Ripon College Communication Department, Class of 2012 for their work in the creation of the first Ripon College Journal of Ethics and Communication. We would also like to recognize Ric Damm, Director of Publications and Institutional Image at Ripon College, for his help with the graphic design of the journal. Finally, we would like to thank Dr. Jody Roy, a professor of Communication at Ripon College. Jody has served as our advisor for this project as well as throughout our collegiate careers.

Thank you,

Ripon College Communication Department, Class of 2013
Preface
Carolyn Calloway-Thomas, Ph.D.

At the end of On Anger, after advising his brother Norvatus that “life is too short to waste it being angry,” and after admonishing Norvatus that we should concentrate our empathetic attention on “virtue alone,” Seneca writes one of the most moving comments in the annals of cultural history that should serve as a guide for universal respect: “At any moment now, we shall spit forth this life of ours. In the meantime, while we still draw breath, while we still remain among human beings, let us cultivate humanity.” Seneca gave to the world a lovely idea about how to treat other humans whether their voices are marginalized or not. Marginalized voices are voices that are crying out for recognition and humane treatment by others. The words “marginalized voices” also contain within them a troubling, perceptual idea, which is that some actors, forces, or agencies have placed the marginalized on the edges of human existence, which is contrary to Seneca’s version of humane treatment by others. Clearly, we need inject more “mindfulness” into the world in order to promote more decency and inclusion among humans. But how does one cultivate mindfulness in an age of iPhones, Twitter, YouTube, Internet, Facebook and other dynamic social media? The answer is not as difficult as one would imagine if one practices goodwill and kindness toward others.

According to Martha Nussbaum (1994), one of the most authoritative scholars on the subject of Seneca and Stoics, one needs the gift of “universal respect for the dignity of humanity in each and every person regardless of class, gender, race, and nation – an idea that has ever since been at the heart of all distinguished political thought in the Western tradition” (p. 12). Pragmatically, the notion suggests that some citizens may feel “as if” they are on the outskirts of humanity for many complex and various reasons,

Carolyn Calloway-Thomas is President of the World Communication Association, President of the Bloomington Faculty Council, and Professor of Communication and Culture at Indiana University Bloomington. She is author of Empathy in the Global World: an Intercultural Perspective, coauthor of Intercultural Communication: a Text/Reader and Roots and Routes, as well as coeditor of Martin Luther King, Jr. and the Sermonic Power of Public Discourse. She lectures widely on intercultural communication, empathy and civic engagement—both nationally and internationally. In the fall semester of 2012-2013, Dr. Calloway-Thomas served as the Ripon College Forum on Ethics and Communication Scholar.
many of which are relatively easy to remedy if we practice the art of inclusion and mindfulness. To model the idea, let us imagine what “ought” to happen when one sits around the “proverbial” student, university, organizational or corporate table to discuss ideas, whether mundane or lofty. While seated, in the role of world citizen, ask the following crucial questions about what one ought to do, how, with whom, and under what circumstances. Who is present and who is absent, and why? Whose voices are being heard and whose voices are not being heard? Whose suggestions are given careful and serious consideration? Whose ideas and recommendations are ignored, and why? And what principles are faithful to empathetic communication practices? These are general questions, and will, of course, vary from situation to situation and from person to person.

There is still another way that we can grapple with the messy issue of marginalization, and it is this: Imagine that the stranger is a friend! Our “moral neighbors” are people who are close to us spatially as well as those who are removed from us in time and space. As war and tribal violence in former Yugoslavia republics, Kenya, Sudan, East Timor, Iraq, Rwanda, Syria, and other places reveal, it is easy to kill, maim, hate, and even destroy others when we put them in the enemy category. “If I love another,” said Isabel in Alexander McCall Smith’s (2004) enticing novel, The Sunday Philosophy Club, “then I know what it is to be that other person. If I feel pity—which is an important emotion, isn’t it?—Then this helps me to understand the sufferings of others . . . We develop a moral imagination” (p. 46). And soon, the margins are gone!
Gold, Silver, Bronze, Failure:
The Marginalization of Fourth Place Olympians
Michelle Matter

Competing in the Olympics is considered by many people—athletes and non-athletes—to be the ultimate athletic achievement. After all, the Olympics are seen as the competition among the best athletes in the world—every country sends its strongest athletes to measure their skills against those of the athletes from other countries. The Official Website of the Olympic Movement, Olympic.org, specifically states that “athletes wishing to be entered for the Olympic Games must be exceptional in their sport.”1 Thus, the chance to win a medal at the Olympics by placing first, second, or third in an event “represents a springboard to fame and fortune.”2 However, even if an athlete does not earn a medal, simply being able to compete in the Olympics is certainly an impressive feat. Despite this, many news reports about Olympic athletes who finish in fourth place portray these outstanding athletes as failures. An analysis of news coverage of the Olympics reveals that news stories depict Olympic medalists as successful and complex or “round” characters while fourth place finishers are single-characteristic or “flat” failures.

Framing

An old way of describing the difference between optimists and pessimists involves a glass that is only half filled with liquid—the optimist says the glass is “half full” while the pessimist sees the glass as being “half empty.” Neither view changes the reality of the situation, but the individuals react to and understand the situation differently. Similarly, in our daily lives, our personal understanding and interpretations of events have a significant impact on how we understand the reality of the world around us. For example, in a class a student does not enjoy,
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does he/she say “it’s only half over” or “there’s only half the time left”? Does an individual who is let go from his/her job see the experience negatively, as a “closed door,” or does he/she view it, at least partially, as an opportunity to take his/her life in a new direction? Ultimately, the way we think about events and experiences alters how we respond to them and impacts our understanding of reality.

However, we can be led to think in specific ways about a given situation by how that situation is presented to us. This practice of choosing a certain way to present or portray reality is often referred to as “framing” and can alter people’s perception of the event. For example, this can be seen in the practice of photography. When a photographer decides to capture an image or experience in a picture, he/she needs to decide what to include in the picture “frame” or scene. Because the camera’s scope is not as wide as one’s range of vision, the entire scene or experience cannot be captured within the picture. Thus, one must choose what should be included or left out of the shot.

Language functions in a very similar way. Whenever a person wants to tell a story, he/she needs to decide which details to include and which ones to leave out. These decisions ultimately impact the listener’s understanding of the story. This is especially important in news coverage of events. There are many ways to frame any news story, and the frame affects how people think about the events that took place. In news coverage about the Olympics, the stories could take a positive approach, highlighting how talented the athletes are for qualifying and competing at the Olympics. The stories also could adopt a negative frame, however, focusing on how poorly certain athletes performed or pointing out the mishaps that took place during the competitions. The same event, therefore, can be covered in multiple different ways, and the frame chosen—which
details are included, word choice, emphases and highlights, etc.—determine how the listener understands the reality of what happened. Thus, even if a story is supposedly “a reflection of reality . . . it must be a selection of reality; and to this extent it must function also as a deflection of reality.” In other words, when telling a story, one includes certain details but in that process also naturally excludes other details. Therefore, whenever any story is told, framing is present.

**Olympic Fourth as Failure, Medalists as Successful**

As a society, we seem to have a “fourth place equals failure” mentality which is reflected in the news media. An evaluation of news coverage of the Olympics reveals a noteworthy distinction between the frames of stories about athletes who place in the top three at the Olympics and those who finish fourth or below. Athletes who finish fourth are primarily depicted as failures by news reports which center on how these athletes “fell short” of a medal. For example, several articles about fourth place finishes from the 2012 Olympics include the following phrases:

“**Itasca's Sarah Zelenka and her partner Sara Hendershot finished fourth in the women's pair rowing event Wednesday, narrowly missing out on a medal in the Olympic regatta.**”

“They missed the medal stand by two-tenths of a second.”

“The disappointing fourth-place finish, however, has her reconsidering those plans [to retire].”

“**U.S. Star Loses Chance To Win Her Third Gold**”

“**On Wednesday evening, with an unprecedented third consecutive gold medal in sight, Zagunis collapsed to the point that she did not even make the medal stand.**”

“**Seth Kelsey, also came just short of a medal, falling in extra time of the épée bronze medal match to lose, 12-11.**”

“**Matthew Centrowitz almost medaled in the 1,500-meter race here Tuesday night, but for several might-have-beens. But the 22-year-old . . . is accepting the heartbreaker of a finish in his first Olympic Games.**”

“**Sarah Groff comes up 10 seconds short of a bronze medal in the final segment of the women's triathlon, the 10K run.**”

“At the end, however, she came up one charge short.”

“**Once again, Gay walked away empty-handed from the Olympics when he finished fourth in the 100-meter final.**”
“With a slight limp, he made the field for the Olympic final and almost earned a medal. ‘Almost’ made it even more painful.”

In these articles, fourth place Olympians receive coverage focused on what they did not do (receive a medal) rather than what they accomplished (competed in the Olympics and proved themselves to be the world’s fourth best athlete in that sport). In general, then, fourth place Olympic athletes are framed as failures by the news media.

In contrast to these negatively framed news articles, Olympic medalists are framed positively as successes. Many reports focus on the athletes’ ability to overcome adversity in the final stages of their Olympic competition, showing how despite difficulties, the athletes “pulled through” to earn their medals. For example, one article from the Washington Post describes how Terrence Jennings just barely won the final fight to claim the bronze medal in taekwondo after a close match. Another article from the Chicago Tribune explains that Jordan Burroughs’ gold medal wrestling match was difficult and the win was only possible after years of preparation for that kind of match. Likewise, Haley Anderson, silver medalist in the women’s 10-kilometer marathon swim, had to triumph over others’ doubts as explained by one Chicago Tribune article. Anderson’s older sister won a gold medal in another swim event, and the article explains, “It’s not that she resented her sister’s accomplishment. She just wanted a medal, too. . . There was just one problem with Anderson’s plan: No one really thought she could make the podium in the women’s 10-kilometer marathon swim.” Thus, she had to overcome low expectations and defy others’ lack of confidence in her athletic abilities in order to earn the silver medal at the Olympics.

In these and other examples, Olympic medalists are depicted as great successes whose athletic ability allowed them to prevail in the face of challenges. These news articles are clearly framed differently than stories about fourth place Olympians. Whereas articles about fourth place
athletes draw attention to what the athletes did not do, articles about Olympic medalists are
framed positively and focus on what the athletes did to prevail and become successful. Therefore,
one might conclude that the only way to achieve success at the Olympics is by earning a medal;
simply qualifying or competing is not enough.

**Flat and Round Characters**

When any reporter or storyteller is deciding how to frame a story, one choice he/she must
make is how to portray the individuals or “characters” in the story. A narrator can choose to fully
develop these individuals, describing and showing their multiple traits and therefore creating
“round” characters, or he/she can focus on “one or just a few dominating traits,” depicting the
correct as “flat.” In many news articles about the Olympics, certain athletes are portrayed as
relatively flat while others are more round. In general, U.S. athletes who earn medals at the
Olympics are portrayed as round characters; in these cases, news stories highlight the athletes’
other various traits and interests beyond athletics. In contrast, those athletes who finish in fourth
place are usually flat characters, as the news stories key on a single characteristic—their athleticism.

**Olympic Fourth as Flat, Medalists as Round**

In negatively framed news stories about fourth place Olympic athletes, the athletic failure
of these athletes is often the sole focus of many articles, reducing the individual to a one-
dimensional or flat character. In a few cases where the articles do mention other character traits of
the fourth place finisher, the discussion is brief and that characteristic is not a focal point of the
article. For example, one article quoted the mother of Mariel Zagunis (who placed fourth in the
2012 saber competition for fencing) explaining that Zagunis loved to cook. However, the quote
is a single line in the article, and there is no further discussion about Zagunis’ other hobbies or
interests. In this and other articles about fourth place Olympians, the stories tend to skim over or entirely exclude the athletes’ other interests and personality traits.

In contrast to these flat portrayals of fourth place athletes, U.S. Olympic medalists are generally depicted as multifaceted individuals. Articles about these athletes often highlight other qualities of the individual besides his/her outstanding athleticism. In numerous U.S. news reports about recent Olympics, medalists were praised for overcoming adversities, not only in their sport but also in other areas of their lives. For example, one *New York Times* article about the 2012 judo gold medalist, Kayla Harrison, includes a discussion of how she was sexually abused by a coach in her childhood. The story develops her character by describing her suffering and resilience, labeling her as “good-natured” and composed, and bringing in opinions and quotations from her family and friends about the “type” of person Harrison is. The story closes with a discussion of her other hobbies and dreams, showing that she is, in many ways, still a normal teenager.\(^\text{11}\) In this story, the gold medal seems to represent Harrison’s ability to overcome her past to ultimately achieve greatness—more than simply an outstanding athlete, she is a hero.

Other articles also portray Olympic medalists as round characters. One story from *USA Today* depicts the two 2010 U.S. silver medalist ice dancing partners as being round characters who have lives beyond the Olympics.\(^\text{12}\) Although this article discusses their skating routine and Olympic experience in great detail, it also includes other information which gives the reader a better understanding of the athletes as people. The article mentions the dancers’ school, friends, and other interests besides ice dancing. Furthermore, a large portion of the article is devoted to the friendship between the partners. Thus, these dancers are portrayed as more than athletes—they have other hobbies, are good friends, and are just like “normal” people. In these and other news
articles about Olympic medalists, the Olympians are portrayed as “round” characters with many characteristics in addition to their incredible athleticism. Fourth place Olympians, on the other hand, are generally only given one trait in these stories—their athleticism—which ultimately was not enough to earn them a medal.

Implications

Framing fourth place Olympians as flat characters who failed in their Olympic efforts is detrimental to these athletes. This practice reduces their complex human qualities to a single characteristic: an athlete who simply was not good enough. However, this marginalization of those just outside the “winners’ circle” is not limited to Olympic athletes. In our society, there seems to be a tendency to believe that if someone (or something) is not the best, then he/she has failed, which leads many people to forget about or largely ignore that individual. For example, in the workforce, the “best” employee receives promotions, while others are sometimes portrayed as not working to their full potential. Similarly, students might be divided into three general groups: the above-average honor roll students, the “at-risk” students in danger of failing or dropping out, and the “average” students, who consistently earn grades in the “B” or “C” range. Framing might lead us to believe that the “average” students are not putting enough effort into their schoolwork and are “failing” to be like the top students. Thus, these individuals are supposedly “falling short” of the “A” grade. As a society, then, the strong focus on being the best leads to the marginalization of those who are not at “the top,” especially when they come close to being the best.

Ultimately, this tendency to focus on people’s “failures” rather than on their achievements causes many individuals to “fly under the radar.” Their talents and abilities often go unrecognized, and they are marginalized to the realms of the “underachievers.” As a result, participation can be
discouraged. People might conclude that if they cannot be the best, they should avoid putting forth too much effort due to fear of failure, a particularly troubling thought in an era when being the fourth greatest athlete in the world is considered “failure.” In order to truly appreciate others and their abilities, we as a society should try to see individuals—not only fourth place Olympians but also the people we encounter daily—as being unique, complex, and talented. We should try to stop focusing on their shortcomings, as doing so reduces them to flat characters when, in fact, every person is an intricate, multifaceted individual with many interests, talents, and character traits. By recognizing and altering our pessimistic frames towards the “non-best” individuals around us, we will be more appreciative of all people and will eventually begin to see greater potential in each person, so our society’s “glass” will always be half full.

Comprehension Questions:

1. What is “framing”?

2. How does framing affect a story?

3. What is a flat character? What is a round character?

Discussion Questions:

1. Do you see this phenomenon of marginalizing the “non-best” in any other areas or situations besides the Olympics?

2. How might this phenomenon be reflected in the American school system?

3. Where else do you see examples of flat characters? What consequences does this have?

4. Watch or read a recent news story. Does the report describe the individual(s) involved as multifaceted and round or reduce the character(s) to be one-dimensional and flat?
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Marginalization and the Video Game Community

Jessie Lillis

If you were to browse through the “Arts” section of a newspaper, you would likely find advertisements for upcoming concerts, articles on art exhibits, and even a handful of movie reviews. Chances are, however, that you would not find anything detailing the release of the newest video game or a profile on an up-and-coming game designer. The creation of a video game requires exceptional creativity from designers, artists, writers, producers, directors, actors, and musicians, and yet the end product is not widely considered to be “art.” Despite the fact that the gaming industry has become an economic giant in recent years, earning over twice as much money as the movie and music industries combined in 2011, it still has not been given the recognition it deserves within the art community.\(^1\) In this case, money clearly does not equal power.

Members of the gaming community regularly find themselves excluded from important conversations that take place within the larger art community. This marginalization harms all members of the artistic community, as it limits the number of voices and opinions that can be heard, while simultaneously devaluing a large portion of the community’s work. The video gaming community is just one recent example in a long list of groups that have been marginalized by the art community over the centuries. In order to better understand the challenges faced by the video game community, I will detail the eighteenth century belles lettres movement and then apply those concepts to the contemporary art community in order to demonstrate how and why this marginalization occurs. Finally, I will identify what can be done to decrease this marginalization in the future.

---

\(^1\) Jessie Lillis is from Coldwater, MI. She has a major in Communication, as well as a minor in Theatre. Following graduation, she will be living in Washington, D.C., working in marketing or event planning.
The Belles Lettres Movement

In the late eighteenth century, a movement arose in Western Europe that focused on a standard of taste and beauty as the most important feature of rhetoric and art. Essentially, this movement introduced the distinction between high or fine art and low or common art. This movement was popular among the British aristocracy and among the American elite in later years.

One of the main tenets of the belles lettres movement was that all humans are born with a standard of taste and beauty, but that some people have a more sophisticated sense of taste than others. This movement was, at a very basic level, a type of justification for classism. Proponents of the belles lettres movement believed that the upper class inherently had a better sense of taste than the lower class, which gave the elite the power to determine what was appropriate and tasteful to be studied, admired, and preserved for future generations. During this time period, being a member of the aristocracy automatically gave a person a high level of credibility in discussions of style and taste.

Contemporary Application of the Belles Lettres Movement

While the belles lettres movement is not actively acknowledged in our society today, remnants of its impact are still present within our culture, particularly within the realm of education. Within the educational community, one of the most powerful signs of credibility is possessing a Ph.D. Members of the educational community who have earned Ph.D.’s are typically the ones determining curriculum, and therefore get to choose what is acceptable for formal study in schools. For example, this is apparent in the world of music. When the jazz and rock-and-roll musical movements first emerged, they were seen as lower-class entertainment that was immoral and unfit to be taught in an educational setting. Over time, however, mindsets shifted, allowing
jazz and rock-and-roll to be included in the category of “art.” Today, many doctoral programs in music history allow specialization in jazz or rock-and-roll, and courses about the “History of Jazz,” for example, are often found at the undergraduate collegiate level, and even in some high schools.

This high art/low art mindset can be seen in the current issues facing the video game community. Video games were only recently developed, having only become a significant part of our culture in the last forty years. The term “video game” often carries with it a number of negative stereotypes. Video games are frequently seen as immature pastimes enjoyed by teenage boys in their parents’ basements. However, this image is incredibly inaccurate, as the average gamer is now 35 years old, and 47% of gamers are women. Despite these statistics, false stereotypes about gamers are still prevalent within our society. These preconceived notions can have a profoundly negative impact on the general public’s view of the gaming community by perpetuating the myth that games are frivolous, irrelevant, and only important to lazy or unmotivated individuals. Video games are not seen as legitimate forms of art by those in power, so they are devalued and seen as “low” culture. Looking again to the world of education, in order to have sufficient ethos, or credibility, to suggest that a field is relevant as high art, one must typically possess a Ph.D. However, a limited number of programs exist that enable an individual to earn a Ph.D. in game studies, making it difficult to change the cycle of negativity surrounding the gaming community.

How Marginalization Occurs

The argument over whether or not video games are art has been raging for years and will likely continue for some time. However, at a very basic level, the creators of video games should be considered artists due to their many similarities to other professions that are recognized as being
artistic. The creative team behind a video game is comparable to that of a movie. Films have writers, actors, directors, animators, special effects teams, and producers. Similarly, video games have scriptwriters, voice actors, game directors, animators, programmers, and producers. Video game design teams do many of the same tasks as the production team for a film. It seems unfair, even unethical, to deem the work of a game design team as less relevant or important to the art community than comparable work from a film crew, yet that marginalizing judgment is common.

Although video games involve many similar tasks as other art forms, forms such as film, television, and music have numerous highly-publicized events at which the best in the specific field are recognized for their achievements. Video games have yet to be acknowledged in quite the same way. While the Screen Actors Guild (SAG), a labor union representing actors around the world, recognizes voice actors in video games as members, the SAG Awards contain no categories in which these actors can be nominated. The Academy of Interactive Arts and Sciences hosts an awards ceremony that is widely considered the Oscars of the gaming world. While this event takes place during the same season as many other award ceremonies, it has never been televised live. These exclusions silence the voices of the thousands of artistic minds that participate in the creation of video games.

Today's society takes several of its cues on art and popular culture from people whom we consider to be experts in the field. One of the biggest factors contributing to the marginalization of the gaming community is that several well-known “experts” in the art world do not consider video games to be a valid art form. Famed movie critic Roger Ebert has said repeatedly that video games are not and never will be an art form. Similarly, Jonathan Jones, an art critic at the U.K.’s Guardian newspaper, argued that video games have no place in a museum, as they cannot be works
of art. Dennis Dutton, author of The Art Instinct, said, “Video games are good fun, but why do they need the validation of being called ‘art’? Isn’t being fun enough?” With these critics and other experts arguing against the inclusion of video games as an art form, it is not surprising that much of the rest of the world follows suit.

**Prevention of Marginalization of the Gaming Community**

Fortunately, several organizations have started to include the video game community in the larger art world. For example, in 2011, the National Endowment for the Arts replaced their guidelines for the Arts in Radio and Television grants with new standards referred to as the “Media Arts.” Because of this, grants can now be applied to all media platforms, including the Internet, interactive technologies, and digital games. In the summer of 2012, the Smithsonian American Art Museum hosted an exhibit called “The Art of Video Games.” Perhaps most notably, a 2011 Supreme Court decision declared that video games are art and, therefore, worthy of First Amendment protection. In 2012, the National Academy of Recording Arts and Sciences renamed the category at the Grammy Awards now known as Best Score Soundtrack for Visual Media, in order to include video game scores in the nominations. As more organizations follow this trend and work to include members of the gaming community into the larger art community, the marginalization pattern of the last four decades finally may be broken.

In the education system, a handful of programs have started offering degrees in new media, which focus specifically on the study of video games. While there are not many of these programs, a few college professors have also taken the initiative to extend their studies outside of the classroom by creating extremely popular video game-related blogs. Michael Abbott and Ian Bogost are two professors whose areas of study include video games. Each of them have acquired a
large online following, Abbot on his blog *The Brainy Gamer*, and Bogost on his self-titled website. These blogs bring to light important issues in gaming, while retaining the scholarly credibility that is necessary in order to make strong pro-gaming arguments.

While the issue may seem trivial at first glance, the marginalization that is actively happening within the art community is detrimental because it is a form of intellectual and artistic bigotry. Marginalization in any form can be damaging, particularly when it degrades such a large portion of a community. Hopefully, the changes that have been made thus far to include game designers and enthusiasts in the art world are just the beginning, and these once marginalized individuals will soon find themselves fully-involved, valued members of the community.

**Comprehension Questions:**

1. What was the belles lettres movement?
2. What are some of the ways that the art community marginalizes the video game community?
3. What is the importance of the educational community in determining what is high or low art?

**Discussion Questions:**

1. What other artistic movements (such as jazz or rock-and-roll) can you think of that may have experienced similar marginalization to video games?
2. What additional steps do you think can or should be taken to reduce the marginalization that occurs within the art community? What can individuals do to help this effort?
Knowing now that this marginalization exists, can you think of a situation in which you witnessed or experienced this type of marginalization? Which side of the marginalization were you on? How might you handle a similar situation differently in the future?
Southern Unionists and Scalawags: 
The Marginalized Voices of the Civil War and Reconstruction
Sam Poullette

1861 marked a very defining time in American history. The Southern states had just announced their secession from the Union in January of 1861, which also marked the start of the Civil War. On the surface, the Civil War is generalized as simply the North, or the Union, fighting to free the slaves and the South, or the Confederacy, fighting to protect the right to own slaves. Yet, the Civil War was much more complex than that and even the Mason-Dixon Line, the line used to separate the Union from the Confederacy, was a bit blurred throughout the time of conflict. The issue of states’ rights played a large role in the secession, with Southern states wanting a stronger state government rather than a stronger federal government to rule all of the states.¹ Even before his election to the presidency, Abraham Lincoln outlined the Union’s view clearly in his “Cooper Union Address,” in which he argued for the necessity of all states to stick together as a union and that a union could not stay together if states chose whether or not they would allow the institution of slavery to exist.²

Regardless of which side of the Mason-Dixon Line anyone stood, the Civil War was inevitable as soon as the first Southern states seceded. Thus, newly-elected President Lincoln and the Union went to war to coerce the newly-found “Confederate” states back to the Union in what Dr. James McPherson calls the most destructive war in between the Napoleonic Wars and World War I.³ For most high school students in the United States, the Civil War is a vital part of the U.S. history curriculum. Due to time restraints and making sure to meet state and federal mandated
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curriculum standards, many amazing stories from our nation’s history are, for better or for worse, pushed aside. This article highlights lesser known stories, hardships, injustices, and future successes of the dissenting contingency of marginalized voices in the Southern states – the Scalawags. The article concludes with a consideration of the effect that marginalizing later had during the Reconstruction era of the United States.

**Background of a Developing Nation**

The Antebellum Period was wedged between the founding years of America and the Civil War (1781-1860). After the Revolutionary War had been won and even after ratifying the Constitution, the nation set about building a strong foundation for the future. The institution of slavery within the Southern states soon began to create a rift within the political sphere of the nation and, coupled with the ongoing state versus federal rights battles, threatened the nation’s cohesion. As the Confederate economy grew with the increasing number of farmers who could afford to purchase and maintain slaves on their plantations, so did the rift between the free soil states and the slave states.⁴

With the institution of slavery increasing primarily in the South and the simultaneous westward expansion of the nation, the major debate of the time was whether or not the new American territories should have the opportunity to determine for themselves if they would like to allow slavery within their boundaries or whether they should automatically be admitted as free soil states. Republicans, mostly from the North, were against the idea of slavery and did not want to see it grow larger than it already was. The Democrats, mostly from the South, argued in favor of letting the newly acquired territories be allowed to set their own laws regarding slavery. As each
side tightened their grip on the issue, the political climate of the era intensified until war broke out in 1861.⁵

The Scalawags

During the time of the American Civil War, Scalawags were union sympathizers, or Southern Unionists, living in the Confederacy. Scalawags were under social and even legal pressure not to speak out or to plot against the Confederacy.⁶ Scalawags were scorned in the South during the Reconstruction, the period immediately following the Union’s victory in the war; Scalawags were attacked for their dissenting political ideology, which matched closely to the Union’s views of the necessity of abolishing slavery in order to hold the Union together. Michael W. Fitzgerald, a professor of history at St. Olaf College, wrote an article in 2002 that shows this political climate shift on a micro scale as the article solely concentrates on Mobile, Alabama’s Union sympathizers.⁷ Although this article only tells the story of one major Confederate city’s own Unionists, Mobile was the fourth largest city in the Confederacy and was chosen for analysis because of the commonalities Mobile had to the rest of the South.⁸ Fitzgerald explains that Mobile perfectly illustrated a microcosm of the rest of the South, because of Mobile’s stronghold of Confederate sentiment, which dominated public discourse in the local newspapers. Mobile’s scalawag minority not only dissented from the majority political thought in the South, but only about twenty-five white men actually identified themselves as Scalawags at that time in Mobile.⁹

An article by Ted Tunnell furthers this point, explaining how the public discourse that was created around the Southern Unionists distinguished between “carpetbaggers,” Northerners who traveled to the South to take economic advantage over the wounded South during and after the war, and “Scalawags,” those who already lived in the South during the war and Reconstruction and
endured injustices for their dissenting views. He concludes that the construction of the terms “Carpetbaggers” and “Scalawags” in speeches and newspapers along with the existing prejudice against both parties in the public, created an even stronger bias for the majority of Confederates and later, ex-Confederates. It is important to see here how a bias in the media can affect the ideology of the majority. Dehumanizing a minority group with dissenting political views marginalizes their ideology and their voices in public discourse. As a country, the prevailing ideology was very much with the Scalawags, but in the South during the Reconstruction, the majority of public sentiment was still very bitter after having lost the war.10 Thus, the Southern majority marginalized, and at times, fully silenced the Scalawags.

During the Civil War, the Scalawags opposed the very existence of the Confederacy, which was the largest reason why they gained support among the Southern African American population. Hostility quickly grew between the majority southern ideology and the Scalawag position. Yet, in 1861 a British reporter could find extremely little evidence of the opposition because the “intimidation ... silenced many critics of the Confederacy.”11 The societal pressures of the southern majority kept the Scalawags’ disaffection for the Confederacy quiet. Authorities in Mobile, Alabama declared martial law, or military rule of a specific area during a time of emergency, which gave them the right to enroll previously draft-exempt men for militia service. Refusal to join the militia service for any reason meant a man had to take an oath of loyalty to the Confederacy. Refusal to take the oath of allegiance to the Confederacy consequently meant imprisonment.

One the most famous men who refused to pledge his loyalty to the Confederacy was a Scalawag merchant by the name of Gustavus Horton, a Massachusetts native, who ultimately was brutally punished for his defiance. He literally was dragged down the street to his imprisonment,
even though before the war Horton was a prominent figure within Mobile, having served on the city school board and as an elder in his Presbyterian church. Moses Foote, another prominent Scalawag figure in the area, owned a business that was frequented mostly by other Unionists. He claimed that just walking into his store was enough for anyone around to stamp someone as a “Yankee.” For this, Foote was arrested no fewer than three times a day, charged with conspiring against the Confederacy.\(^\text{12}\)

**Implications of Marginalization in Reconstruction**

The stories of Horton and Foote clearly demonstrate the injustices against the Scalawags in the South. But, what could they do besides cowardly denounce their allegiance to the Union? At the time, it was absolutely impossible to speak out against the injustices without some judicial consequence. There was virtually no aid from the Union for this small group of known political martyrs, who were specifically identifiable in public, as a Confederate put it.\(^\text{13}\) Pointing out the injustices against the Scalawags and the lack of any voice the Scalawags had begs the question of why? Fitzgerald claims that the Scalawags’ intent was never malicious against the majority’s Confederate ideology and that they never “plotted” in any way against the South.\(^\text{14}\)

However, when the bloodiest war on American soil had come to an end, these Southern Unionists were still living in what were then the decimated Southern states. In fact, as the Union overtook major Confederate cities, local Unionists were put in charge of recruiting for the Union Army, as well as other political offices in those respective cities. Because of their loyal political ties to the Union, and their resultant roles in government, the Scalawags came to be viewed in an ever more negative light by Confederates.\(^\text{15}\)
The Scalawags’ voices, even as the war drew to an end, were still not taken with much respect by the majority of Southern citizens, which made the Reconstruction Era in the United States an even tougher battle to mend a wounded nation. The Union sympathizers who recently had been imprisoned for speaking or “conspiring” against the Confederacy were now placed in political offices throughout the South. Thus, the ex-Confederates were being governed by the small group of Scalawags, who they had previously mistreated for their dissent from the Confederacy. For the most part, Union officials did not allow any of those who previously supported the Confederacy back into office; instead, they placed carpetbaggers and Scalawags in political positions. As a result, in the Reconstruction era, the prevailing ideology of the lawmakers in the South was that of the Union.\(^\text{16}\) Not allowing past supporters of the Confederacy to help reconstruct the war-torn nation created a political atmosphere based on what some perceived as uncompromised and forceful tactics. The Scalawags’ placement into power over those Southern communities who had oppressed them throughout the war soon created a rebounding effect for a majority of ex-Confederates; when the marginalizers become the marginalized, a new wave of violence erupted.

The reactionary backlash of the marginalized ex-Confederates illustrates the dangers inherent in marginalizing a group of people. Throughout history, many groups’ response to becoming marginalized has been similar to that of the primal “fight or flight” response; some marginalized groups accept the abuse and, essentially, “flee” into silence, while others fight back with violent aggression. In this case, some ex-Confederates fought back by giving birth to some of America’s most infamous radical hate groups like the Ku Klux Klan and the White Leagues.\(^\text{17}\) The Unionist-dominated Reconstruction government, supported by the allegiance of newly
enfranchised African Americans, inspired some ex-Confederates to assemble groups in secret to plot against Unionist power.\textsuperscript{18} Tragically, the groups also lashed out violently at African Americans.

The history of the abuse of Scalawags during the Civil War and their role in Reconstruction is not normally a focus of general history curriculum. Yet, it provides important historical lessons in the dangers of marginalization. From the silencing of the Scalawags during the war to the violent response of hate groups during and after Reconstruction, marginalization cost many American’s their liberty and many their lives.

Comprehension Questions:

1. Where did the Union and the Confederacy, respectively, stand on the issue of states’ versus federal rights?

2. What were the differences between Carpetbaggers and Scalawags?

3. How did the treatment of Scalawags differ during the Civil War and during the Reconstruction Era?

Discussion Questions:

1. How might marginalization of the Scalawags during the Civil War have inhibited the nation’s ability to mend after the Civil War?

2. Which other groups, since the Civil War, have had their voices and views marginalized much like those of the Scalawags?


\textsuperscript{2} Abraham Lincoln, "Abraham Lincoln's Cooper Union Address," Public Broadcasting Service,
3 McPherson.
5 Ibid.
10 Fitzgerald, 106-107.
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13 Ibid., 109-111.
14 Ibid., 114.
15 Ibid., 114-115.
16 Baggett, 95-98.
17 Ibid., 180-191.
18 Ibid., 192-199.
“Friend”-less: Marginalization in the Era of Facebook
Lauren Ott

Not long ago when people met and wanted to keep in contact, they would exchange phone numbers or even email addresses. Now, the typical phrase used when meeting someone is, “I’ll find you on Facebook.” A social media site originally designed only to connect the students at Harvard University, Facebook has become many people’s main method of connection and social interaction.¹ In fact, many people, especially those in high school and college, treat Facebook as though it is the “standard” for existence. When someone says, “I do not have Facebook,” the reaction is usually negative. There are many reasons why someone might not use this rapidly growing social media site; perhaps they cannot due to lack of computer or Internet access, or maybe they simply have no desire to join Facebook. It is difficult for most Facebook users to understand why someone would choose not to share in a piece of the social pie. With much of the world connected through social media in its different forms, those who are not “connected” are perceived as outcasts: they are marginalized.

Facebook

Facebook has an assortment of features and functions which its members can enjoy daily. Users have the opportunity to find accounts of other members, add them as “friends” and allow them access to all of the information on their profile page. Once someone is able to view a profile, they can look at that user’s pictures, see status updates, check out what other members are posting and even comment on or “like” anything on the profile. As a social media site, Facebook allows users to connect and stay in touch with other users in informal ways. When someone sees a status
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update of a “friend” on Facebook, they have three options: “like” it, comment on it, or ignore it. If
the status is something they actually like, all they have to do is press the little button that says
“like.” A simple click alerts the status updater that one of their “friends” “liked” something they
said. This is a casual way of agreeing with someone. Similarly, a comment can be made on a status.
For Facebook users, taking the time to comment generally shows a more formal connection
because more thought goes into a comment than is required to click “like.” These are just a couple
of the common practices Facebook users know and exercise when they log on to their accounts.

While the etiquette of Facebook is common knowledge to its connected members, the
customs of Facebook are largely unknown to non-members. Unlike other forms of social media
such as Twitter or YouTube, non-members have no access to Facebook. One must be logged into a
Facebook account to reap the benefits. This can sometimes make Facebook seem mandatory in
order to keep up socially. It has been reported that between October 2012 and March 2013, there
were over 163 million people on Facebook in the United States alone.2 This includes both females
and males ranging in age from 13 to over 65 years old; 52 percent of the U.S. population now uses
Facebook, with much higher percentages among those under the age of 30.3

The Members

There are a variety of reasons why people use Facebook. Some people want to catch up
with old friends, others are interested in seeing pictures of family members they do not see in
person very often, many use it as a form of entertainment, and some even make use of it as a type
of electronic diary. The use of social media actually allows some people to portray themselves in
the way they want to be seen, rather than showing who they really are. This can be an advantage to
someone who is socially shy or is insecure with their self-identity. Users can choose what people
can see of the things they “like,” the people they are friends with, activities they participate in, events they go to and even their pictures. They also can tell their friends what is on their mind and receive feedback. Many people get real satisfaction when they get a certain number of “likes” on a status or are genuinely upset when they are “de-friended,” even if by someone they have never spoken to in real life. Social media can have strong personal effects on users, but Facebook has very real consequences in the corporate world as well. Nowadays, some companies are using Facebook accounts to decide which candidates they should invite to interview for positions. Whether having a Facebook account impacts social life or careers, the fact remains that it is now considered normal.

Pictures or It Didn’t Happen

There is an anonymous quotation (among Facebook members) that says: “pictures or it didn’t happen.” In general, this means that if someone does not have and post to Facebook photographic evidence of something like a birthday party, people might not believe the event actually occurred. This practice is one of several ways in which social media popularity marginalizes those who do not use Facebook. People who are not on Facebook are unable to instantly share their pictures with others. If the pictures aren’t “shared” do they “exist”? If someone does not make their romantic relationship “Facebook official,” many other people may not be aware—or believe—they are in a relationship. This tendency to require Facebook proof of events and even relationships raises an even deeper question: if someone who is able to have a Facebook account does not have one at all, do they “exist” in a socially-mediated world? If an individual cannot be searched and seen on the most popular social media site, it could be argued that they are almost fully ostracized from today’s society.
This concern carries not only social, but also potential economic concerns. Many, if not most, employers now check the Facebook pages of potential employees to look for “red flags.” In 2012, Forbes Magazine cited a recent study published in the Journal of Applied Social Psychology that stated Facebook accounts could tell a company if a person is worth hiring. The researchers argued that an individual’s Facebook account may be a fairly accurate reflection of how good an individual will be at a job. The researchers hired Human Resources employees to look at what was publicly available on potential job candidates’ pages, such as photos, status updates, and conversations with friends. These Human Resources professionals then assigned each person a score for a number of qualities important to being a good employee. The qualities included degree of emotional stability, conscientiousness, extroversion, intellectual curiosity and agreeableness. Hiring decisions were then made based on the scores. The researchers later checked back with those businesses to see if the companies were pleased with the employees; all those who responded were satisfied.

A similar study was conducted comparing and analyzing students’ Facebook accounts and their academic success. The same researchers did an assessment of students’ Facebook selves and also had the students take personality and IQ tests. They then evaluated the students’ transcripts and found that a student’s academic success was more accurately predicted by patterns on his/her Facebook page than by cognitive tests. While college admission processes, to date, generally do not use prospective students’ pages for decision-making, this study suggests that perhaps they should.

Whether or not Facebook should have such an impact on society can be debated. A site that was created simply for entertainment has grown into the fabric of our culture. Facebook can now be used to help or hinder its users’ futures. Pictures of a spring break trip could be dangerous
when job hunting or even applying to school a few months—or years—later. Those on Facebook are judged by many people daily because of their profiles. Thus, it might seem to some people that it would be better to not have an account at all. However, those not on Facebook at all are judged the most harshly; they are marginalized.

How Members Marginalize Non-members

Facebook has become one of the most popular forms of social media in our culture, used by millions to create and maintain connections with other people. By having a Facebook account, members are facilitating relationships; without it, non-members are missing connections and are often perceived by users as making life difficult for those who try to connect with them. Those on Facebook are able to marginalize those not on Facebook because of the way society values connectivity. This notion of how one group has the ability to marginalize another is related to Michel Foucault’s theory of episteme. The episteme, defined as the total discourse or communicative practices of a culture, is like a circle. Inside the circle, at the very center, are those who are the elite or influential members of the society. These members have the ability to dictate what the culture considers knowledge or “truth.” The elite establish that knowledge by controlling discourse, practices, or rhetoric, the roles of communication. The power the elite group has gives them control over what can be talked about, who is allowed to speak and/or write, and the proper forms that the discursive practices must have in order to be considered knowledge. While the specific rules change with time, Foucault’s theory suggests an episteme is always in existence and, through it, elites will always control how we communicate.

In recent centuries, for example, our episteme has favored written communication as a way to conduct business. In 21st century America, it is very difficult for an illiterate adult to function in
society because most daily tasks require the ability to read and write. Those who cannot read and write are marginalized; they are excluded from the episteme because they cannot use the discursive norms to participate in key social, economic and political functions of the culture. As a result, they are looked down on by those who are literate, those who play by the rules of the episteme. It is this cultural norm—not intelligence or ability—that marginalizes those who cannot read.

Viewed through the lens of Foucault’s theory of the episteme, Facebook may be the latest discursive practice used to exert power to marginalize others. While Facebook is free, the computer hardware and internet connection required to access it are not free. While Facebook is now open to all over the age of 13, originally membership was restricted to only Harvard students and for several years after that only those with .edu (or official college/university) email addresses. Even with today’s “open” access to Facebook, the biases of its roots remain; for instance, the profiles template highlights users’ collegiate areas of study.

Members of Facebook are able to socially connect more frequently, on different levels, and with more people than those who are not members. They have the “virtual” voice to be heard by all of their “friends.” Those who are not Facebook members are, therefore, marginalized because they literally have no voice within this new, powerful communication medium. Without a profile, there is no access. With no access, one cannot participate. With no participation, one cannot stay on the same level of social connectivity as others and may also risk loss of access to jobs. Often unintentionally, then, members marginalize those not on Facebook just by using the site. In 2013, being a Facebook member is not as critical as being able to read, but it could be someday. If at some point those with the power to control communication begin primarily communicating using Facebook, those individuals without Facebook access will be completely marginalized.
Those at Risk of Marginalization

When looking at non-users from a global standpoint, citizens in countries like China, Cuba, Iran, and North Korea do not have accounts because the government restricts or bans the site. The majority of the people who do not have Facebook accounts in the United States are those who are at or below the poverty line since they do not have regular access to computers and the Internet. However, lack of access is not the only reason why some people do not have Facebook. Other people who have yet to create themselves online are professionals who understand the site’s potential negative consequences and do not want to risk having clients, patients, co-workers or employers see their accounts.

Still, there is a definite stigma associated with non-members between the ages of fourteen and thirty. Matthew Myron, an author who studied online privacy in 2009, said that not being on Facebook is social suicide. “Many people feel they have to be a part of Facebook to socialize. Such sites are the modern equivalent of a mobile phone. They have grown into fashion accessories and they are a must-have for people who do not want to be social outcasts.” Clearly, when individuals do not have Facebook, by intention or not, Facebook members marginalize them.

Comprehension Questions:

1. What are three reasons a person might not be on Facebook?
2. What are some positive aspects of Facebook? What are some negative aspects of Facebook?
3. What was Facebook originally created for, and what is it used for now?
Discussion Questions:

1. Is it ethical for companies to analyze the Facebook pages of potential employees?

2. Should colleges be able to select students based on Facebook profiles? Why or why not?
   What are the ethical implications of this selection process?

3. Do you know anyone who is not on Facebook? Do you think they are marginalized?
   Why or why not? If not, why do you think some people believe non-Facebook users are marginalized?

---
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Medical Marginalization
Brian Gonya

There is an increase in the use of prescription drugs among adolescents. According to Dr. Fred Baughman, a pediatric psychiatrist, 20% of school-aged Americans are on behavior-altering drugs. Frequently, the family does not really have a choice in the matter, and the patient is complacent. This phenomenon serves as an example of how an institution can function to marginalize members of society. To examine how institutionalized medicine marginalizes people, it is relevant to begin by examining what an “institution” actually is.

According to an article written by Professors Roy Suddaby and Royston Greenwood entitled “Rhetorical Strategies of Legitimacy,” institutionalization occurs as a response to societal shifts in “technologies,” “practices,” and “industries.” For example, when people began to drive automobiles, institutionalization was required to set and regulate legal limitations on the “practice” of driving. Today, we know that particular institution to be the Department of Motor Vehicles. “Technology” like the automatic weapon warrants the creation of an institution to ensure that the “technology” is being used and managed in the correct way. “Industries” generally involve new “practices” and/or “technologies.” When an industry begins to control and monitor the use and accessibility of its practices and technologies, the “industry” itself becomes a legitimized “institution.” The medical profession is no exception.

The relatively recent surge of medical advancements required the medical practice to institutionalize. Institutionalized medicine is essential because it solidifies the industry to function with a shared approach. The United States would be a dangerous place if a person’s diagnosis was dependent on the particular hospital to which he or she went during an emergency. Without set
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methodologies in place, one hospital might label a set of symptoms a migraine, whereas another might label the same symptoms as brain cancer. The institutionalization of medicine has made modern medicine relatively consistent. In order to be consistent, an institution must have a shared language.

In 1977, Professor Murray Edelman published the book, “Political Language: Words that Succeed and Policies that Fail.” Edelman asserts that “language is always an intrinsic part of some social situation.” This is so with institutionalized medicine. According to Edelman, language is not “simply a tool for description.” Edelman asserts that language plays a “profound part in creating social relationships.” The language of institutionalized medicine creates a relationship wherein the general public perceives the doctors and professionals within institutionalized medicine as having a high degree of ethos. A person with “ethos” is considered “credible,” trustworthy, and reliable. Doctors are inherently perceived as credible, or as having ethos, because the public perception of doctors is positive. The public has faith in the institution of medicine to ensure quality and consistency of practice. Doctors are generally perceived as being educated, disciplined, and capable of performing occupational tasks that most people cannot. Terms that were initially constructed by institutionalized medicine are sometimes used to describe non-medical entities. These metaphors can heighten the ethos of institutionalized medicine.

Many terms used by institutionalized medicine have been integrated into American media and even American colloquialism. Many of these terms are referred to as “ultimate terms.” “Ultimate terms,” coined by the rhetorical theorist Richard Weaver, are categories of terms that have an emotional impact on people and, therefore, society. The two types of “ultimate terms” are “god terms” and “devil terms.” In Weaver’s own words “god terms” and “devil
“Terms” are words or phrases that “have a power which is not derived, but which is in some mysterious way given.” Ultimate terms evoke strong emotional responses. The language of institutionalized medicine is filled with “god terms” and “devil terms” that the general public respects, reveres, and fears. In recent history, communism was compared to “cancer.” Jean Baudrillard of Harper’s Magazine once said that terrorists are like a “disease,” and Mark Fabiano of Wright State University compared “terrorism” to a “plague.” Medical terms that are used as analogies for negative entities reinforce the importance of the doctor in our society, carrying medical ethos beyond the walls of the hospital. Medically and politically, the demonization of “illness” functions to build the “ethos” of institutionalized medicine. If the term “cancer” is vilified, then, logically, the term “doctor” is glorified because doctors treat cancer. The language of institutionalized medicine often shapes, by analogy, how we understand political issues. It is arguably the most powerful when applied directly to medical issues, where the doctor’s “ethos” can actually silence patients.

A doctor can back up a claim with clinical evidence, support from his colleagues, access to incalculable amounts of information, and an expensive degree. The average citizen cannot compete with a doctor’s ethos. Indiana University School of Medicine’s Dr. Richard Frankel conducted a study which concluded that only 1.5% of patients will ask for their doctors to clarify “what was discussed.” Frankel’s study illustrates Dr. Nancy Ainsworth-Vaughn’s theory of the “fundamentally asymmetrical” relationship, as outlined in her book Claiming Power in Doctor-Patient Talk. A fundamentally asymmetrical relationship consists of one party having possession of “structural power”; in this case, the structure is institutionalized medicine. The ethos of institutionalized medicine is so powerful that, apparently, many people may not even realize that
questioning a doctor is an option. Dr. Frankel’s study concluded that less than 2% of patients will question, or even ask for clarification from, their doctors.  

Patients who defer to the “ethos” of doctors may accept treatment for a “disorder” that they are not entirely sure that they have. A patient may accept a treatment with which he or she is not entirely comfortable. The patient who accepts a doctor’s treatment because the patient deferred to the physician’s ethos is subject to inadvertent marginalization. The patient is marginalized because he or she is silent, and therefore, subjugated to some extent.  

Direct marginalization occurs when a person is “silenced” and, thus, unable to protest the application of institutionalized medicine. When patients are under eighteen, direct marginalization not only affects the patient, but also the patient’s parent or guardian. A particular concern about such marginalization occurs when the patient is diagnosed with a condition that institutionalized medicine finds controversial within itself. In recent years, such conditions include Attention Deficit Disorder, Attention Deficit Hyperactive Disorder, and related disorders that are contingent upon behavior. In many cases, the people who are actually making preliminary diagnoses are teachers and guidance counselors—people who, though not part of the medical institution, are a part of the powerful educational institution. School faculty have “ethos” that they can use to recommend parents to have their children evaluated. When doctors, members of institutionalized medicine, confirm a diagnosis of ADHD or ADD, they often prescribe a powerful, potentially addictive drug like Adderal as treatment. In this diagnosis and treatment process, young patients and their parents are presented with two levels of “ethos” that they have been socialized not to question: the educational and medical institutions. Yet, there are many questions about the process of diagnosing ADHD and still more about how to treat it. ADHD is
not a “disease.” There is no blood test, type of scan, or way to swab for ADHD. It is a “disorder.” “Disorders” are diagnosed by evaluation of a patient’s behavior. Some people within the medical institution are beginning to question the integrity of that diagnostic process, especially since a 2013 study by the Centers for Disease Control recorded a 53% spike in the diagnosis in the past decade.¹⁷

The institutionalization of medicine has numerous advantageous for society, particularly the institutional ability to establish requirements for doctors to follow regarding training and treatment of people with diseases or illnesses. Yet whenever institutionalization occurs, those on the “outside” have the potential to be marginalized. In the case of institutionalized medicine, the voices most at risk of marginalization can sometimes be those the institution is designed to serve—the patients.

Comprehension Questions:

1. What are “ultimate terms”?
2. What are some attributes that give doctors “ethos”?
3. Why are “ultimate terms” powerful?

Discussion Questions:

1. How does “institutionalization” affect an industry’s language?
2. How does a doctor’s ethos affect how he/she is perceived?
3. How can patients use the understanding of institutionalized “ethos” to better advocate for their own medical concerns?
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“Sons of Liberty”:
Marginalized Voices Created the Foundation of America
Matthew L. Rohrbeck

The American people did not always enjoy the benefits of being a superpower. Originally considered territorial colonies of numerous empires, the United States of America today grew out of the once marginalized voices of British colonists because “the most protracted and bloody agitations occur when control is high in power.” These individuals spoke out and revolted against the British government and Crown. This article will examine the unendurable acts enacted by the British government against their colonies, analyze the colonists’ arguments that unified numerous marginalized voices into a revolution, and finally, detail the essential role the Sons of Liberty played in communicating the colonists’ message.

The Spark of the Revolution
In the eighteenth century (1700-1799), the empire of Great Britain was considered an economic and military powerhouse. Early in the century, Great Britain “had become the world’s greatest trader on the seas, possessed the world’s largest navy, and had laid the foundation of a vast overseas empire.” The British Empire “possessed colonies along the eastern seaboard of North America, numerous sugar islands in the Caribbean and a foothold in Bengal.” In order to preserve their great power on the continent now known as North America, the British Empire operated under mercantilism. Mercantilism was an economic theory and policy that allowed for absolute government regulation by controlling foreign trade in order to ensure the military security of the country. Seemingly, the British Empire functioned under the mentality of superiority to all
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other nations, cultures, and most importantly, the colonies. This led the British Crown to pass some controversial legislation concerning the colonies, thereby limiting their freedom through taxes and restrictions.

The British Empire’s first effort in practicing mercantilism was demonstrated in the passage of the Navigation Acts. These acts, passed between 1650 and 1750, “granted English ships a monopoly of all imperial trade, required most foreign goods bound for the colonies to pay duties in English ports first, and even taxed intra-colonial cargoes to induce Americans to ‘buy English’ instead.” Great Britain used this power to ensure that the colonies remained dependent on British goods, allowing Great Britain to profit immensely. Specific acts included the Molasses Act of 1763 and the Royal Proclamation of 1763. The Molasses Act “placed a prohibitive duty on the import of sugar, rum and molasses from foreign possessions into British colonies or Great Britain.” Not only did the Navigation Acts restrict trading, they also “closed off the frontier (land west of the Appalachian Mountains) to colonial expansion,” through the Royal Proclamation of 1763. In other words, the colonists were not allowed to expand westward and were ordered to stay within the boundaries of the British colonies, which were easy for Britain to monitor.

These laws, however, were not well-enforced and the colonists refused to obey them. They continued to secretly trade with other countries, such as France, Spain, and the Netherlands because these countries “had become mutually dependent” on each other’s economic interests. As a result, in order to discipline the colonies, the British Crown authorized broad search warrants known as Writs of Assistance, which allowed British officers “to search in unspecified locations for unspecified illegal goods.” In response to these in 1761, a Boston lawyer named James Otis filed a lawsuit against officers and argued that the writs issued by the British government were a
violation of the colonists’ constitutional rights. Otis’s primary argument against the British would become a world famous phrase still used in today’s society: “a man’s house is his castle.” Even though Otis lost the court case, John Adams documented the lawsuit, saying “then and there the child Independence was born.” In fact, the colonists considered the passage of the Navigation Acts unethical, because the colonists had little control over the decision. As a result, the acts created a hostility that would forever change the relationship between the British Crown and the colonies.

While the Navigation Acts sparked discontent from the colonists, the British Crown’s next five acts limited the powers of the colonies even more. The Sugar Act of 1764 expanded on the Molasses Act’s restrictions by also ordering “more foreign goods to be taxed including sugar, certain wines, coffee, pimiento, cambric and printed calico, and further, regulated the export of lumber and iron.” In the same year, the British Crown passed the Currency Act of 1764, which allowed the British Empire to assume “control of the colonial currency system... [while prohibiting] the issue of any new bills and the reissue of existing currency.” In the following year, the British Crown enacted the first direct tax on the colonies known as the Stamp Act of 1765. This act levied over fifty new direct taxes onto the colonies. All thirteen colonies vehemently protested these acts. Therefore, in order to ensure enforcement of the acts, the British Crown passed the Quartering Acts of 1765, which required British soldiers to be quartered in colonists’ homes at the homeowner’s expense in certain areas. One year later, the British Crown demonstrated some sympathy for the colonists by repealing the Stamp Act, but instead passed the Declaratory Act of 1766, which delegated full power of laws regarding the colonies to the British Crown “in all cases whatsoever.” The British Crown continued to impose more taxes and restrictions on the colonies
without their consent, which ultimately marginalized the voices of the colonists. Nevertheless, the British Crown did not ease up on the colonists.

Although these five acts were already harsher than the Navigation Acts, three subsequent acts hammered the final nail in the coffin leading the colonies to declare war against the powerhouse British Empire. The Townshend Acts of 1767 resurrected bad blood from the Stamp Act. These acts placed “taxes on glass, paint, oil, lead, paper, and tea,” which led the colonists to boycott these goods and refuse to purchase them from Great Britain.\textsuperscript{19} Then, similar to the Royal Proclamation, the British Crown implemented the Quebec Act of 1774, which extended territorial boundaries of the Province of Quebec to include the Ohio River Valley Territory and closed the claims of the thirteen colonies to this territory.\textsuperscript{20} Finally, the Intolerable Acts of 1774 consisted of four of the harshest laws ever imposed against the colonies. The first of the Intolerable Acts was the Massachusetts Government Act, which formally abolished the Province of Massachusetts Bay charter by restricting town meetings while granting the British-appointed governor additional numerous powers.\textsuperscript{21} The second law in the Intolerable Acts was the Administration of Justice Act, which removed all arrested British soldiers from the colonies’ custody and granted them a trial in Great Britain.\textsuperscript{22} The third law, known as the Boston Port Act, closed the port of Boston until the colonies compensated the Crown for damages and lost tea from the Boston Tea Party protest.\textsuperscript{23} Lastly, the Quartering Acts allowed British-appointed governors the authority to order British troops into the home of any citizen without notice or permission from the land owner.\textsuperscript{24} By enacting numerous punitive restrictions on the colonies, the British Empire’s persistent and harsh actions demonstrated their power, authority, and control over the colonists.
Marginalized Voices United

When the British Empire implemented these acts, the colonists were angered. The argumentation structure used by the speakers opposing the British Crown was based on the writings of John Locke. Among other prestigious titles, Locke has been called “the Philosopher of the American Revolution.” His writings, especially Two Treatises of Government and A Letter Concerning Toleration, were the foundations of arguments in support of the revolution against the British Empire. In Locke’s Two Treatises book, he introduced the concepts of social contract, natural rights, and “that men are by nature free-born.” The theory of social contract obligates the citizens under their natural rights to overthrow the leaders of an abusive, uncivil government.

Furthermore, Locke created the new political ideology known as republicanism, which became the motivating force behind the colonists’ revolution. Republicanism is defined as “the principles of a theory of government in which the supreme power rests in the body of citizens entitled to vote and exercised by representatives they elect directly or indirectly and by an elected or nominated president.” Locke’s republicanism concept influenced numerous American founding fathers, particularly Samuel Adams, Patrick Henry, John Adams, Benjamin Franklin, Thomas Jefferson, Thomas Paine, George Washington, James Madison, and Alexander Hamilton. Following the passage of the Stamp Act of 1765, colonists began organizing boycotts and protests against the British Crown, using Locke’s theories as the “fire” behind the movement. One particularly important revolutionary group, the Sons of Liberty, was born from opposition to the Stamp Act and used Locke’s ideology as its basis.
The Sons of Liberty originated early in the summer of 1765 in Boston, Massachusetts. Sons of Liberty chapters began forming with the pledge “to stop, by violence if necessary, any attempts to put the Stamp Act into effect.” The first notable action by the Sons of Liberty was involvement in organizing the Boston Tea Party. Members of this secret group held various professions, including shopkeepers, artisans, and merchants. This varied group of individuals was united and motivated by the single cause of forcing “Stamp Distributors throughout the colonies to resign.” The Sons of Liberty organized and chanted against stamp distributors, shouting, “Liberty, Liberty and Stamp’d Paper,” until the distributors resigned or stopped collecting stamps. The Sons of Liberty used two main approaches to communicate their message to the public: violence and the written word. The British refused to hear the Sons’ concerns voiced before normal government channels, so in order to communicate their message, the Sons of Liberty were left with few options, leading them to violence and written literature.

The organization used violence against any enforcer of the British acts, and their violent actions earned them the reputation that “no one dared to respond to such violent force.” Their “dynamics involved in these agrarian revolts prefigured the most radical tactics to be employed by those who would pursue revolutionary reforms: civil disobedience, paramilitary action, defiance of established authority, and insistence that human rights in some cases were superior to property rights.” The British government refused to hear the colonist’s complaints against them, which forced Sons and others into “destroying the hated stamps, picketing royal offices, and burning British officials in effigy.” Over time, the Sons of Liberty would establish a violent reputation throughout all the colonies, but one of their first known violent actions that started that reputation took place on August 14, 1765.
On that day, Andrew Oliver, a British Distributor of Stamps for Massachusetts, “was found hanging in a tree on Newbury street, along with a large boot with a devil climbing on it.” The boot with a devil was a direct message to the Earl of Bute, the British Prime Minister, and this incident created an ominous connection between Oliver and the Stamp Act. The Sons of Liberty did not stop there, however, as they burned down Oliver’s property and killed the people living in the house. In fact, “the Sons of Liberty had displaced the royal government in nearly every colony” by instilling fear in the British militia, sheriffs, justices, royal troops, and governors. The violent actions of the Sons of Liberty instilled fear into British loyalists and law enforcement, allowing the Sons to increase their influence throughout the colonies. Without proper representation in the British government, activist colonists like the Sons of Liberty decided that violent action was warranted to insure their voices were heard.

While creating this fear amongst the British loyalists, the Sons of Liberty also began writing in local newspapers, as many of the members were printers and publishers for different newspapers across the colonies. They were not shy with their writings as “they publicized their proceedings, advertised their ‘field meetings,’ and crafted their political speeches after fiery sermons.” Their writings reached wide audiences. For example, in a 1765 article in the Boston Gazette, Samuel Adams, American statesman and political philosopher, referred to the anti-Stamp Act activists for the first time in print as the “Sons of Liberty.” Adams stated: “The Sons of Liberty on the 14th of August 1765, a Day which ought to be for ever remembered in America, animated with a zeal for their country then upon the brink of destruction, and resolved, at once to save her.”

Besides Adam’s writings in these newspapers, Patrick Henry, Virginian attorney and politician, delivered inflammatory speeches locally that were then published in newspapers across
the colonies. One of his treasonous speeches warned “that as Caesar had his Brutus and Charles I his Cromwell, so might George III.” Henry connected the concept that the citizens of Great Britain should have the same liberties as the colonists, maintaining that “any effort to tax them except through their own assembly 'has a manifest Tendency to destroy British as well as American Freedom.'” In other words, he argued that the colonists should have the same freedoms and representation as all other British citizens, based simply on fairness and justice. From these and other writings, the Sons of Liberty established a motto: “No taxation without representation.” The Sons of Liberty used newspapers to communicate their anti-Crown messages across the colonies because the British government marginalized their voices and concerns from being heard before the government itself.

**Conclusion**

Prior to the Sons of Liberty, the colonists’ voices were largely marginalized because the British government refused to listen to their concerns. This forced the colonists into virtual silence. Therefore, as the Crown continued to tax the colonies, the colonist’s agitation increased. The Sons of Liberty changed the landscape of the colonists’ chances of challenging the British Empire through their strategic use of violence and newsprint to break the silence imposed upon them by British forces.

**Comprehension Questions:**

1. What were the Intolerable Acts? How were they similar to or different from the other acts of the British Crown?

2. Who was John Locke? What was his importance to the American Revolution?
3. What were the two forms of communication used by the Sons of Liberty to express their message? Why could they not rely solely on public speaking, the most common form of political communication at the time?

Discussion Questions:

1. What, if any, political groups today are marginalized?

2. What forms of communication might a marginalized political group use today to promote their message?

3. Violence can be an effective way to force change, but can it be ethical? When? Why?

7 Ibid.
9 Robson, 6.
13 McDougall, 97.
30 McDougall, 215.
31 Robson, 17.
35 Nash, 72.
36 McDougall, 217.
38 Ibid.
41 Ibid.
42 McDougall, 216.
43 Historic Tours of America, Inc, 2013.
44 Ibid.
45 McDougall, 216.
46 Ibid.
47 Ibid.
48 Historic Tours of America, Inc, 2013.
Marginalization of Cross-Dressers in the Public Sphere

Honey Zaw

Danica Ali, a female who was dressed as a male, entered a highway rest stop. She was coming back from New Haven, Connecticut, with some friends and stopped to get something to eat and use the restroom, just like countless others do. When Danica Ali entered the building’s restroom, the manager pulled her aside and asked to see her ID to determine whether she was a male or a female. In addition, the manager told her that if she did not show her ID, the police would be informed that a man was using the women’s restroom.\(^1\) Whether at work, in a restaurant or passing through a train station, everyone needs to use a public restroom at some point while away from the comforts of home. However, for cross-dressers\(^1\), this basic human function is not that simple because they face significant problems in public spaces as Danica Ali discovered. Cross-dressers are discriminated against because they do not dress in ways that society deems “appropriate” for their assigned sex. As such, cross-dressers pose an interesting case study of marginalization in contemporary society. In order to understand the challenges cross-dressers face, I will explain the different struggles faced by male-to-female and female-to-male cross-dressers, analyze the ways in which they are marginalized in the public sphere, and finally, discuss a possible social movement for cross-dressers in the future in the United States.

\(^1\) Among several marginalized gender groups, transgender is one identity that is often prominently marginalized; transgender is defined as relating to or being a person (as a transsexual or transvestite) who identifies with or expresses a gender identity that differs from the one which corresponds to the person’s sex at birth. Transvestite is the term historically used to describe cross-dressers. However, as “transvestite” is now considered derogatory, in this paper, I will be using the term cross-dressers.

Honey Zaw is from Yangon, Myanmar, graduating with a major in Communication and a minor in Leadership Studies. She plans to pursue a career in non-profit advocacy and program coordinating.
Background

“Cross-dresser” is a type of gender identity where both females and males feel the need not just to dress but also to behave as a member of the opposite gender. One way they express themselves in public is by dressing in the mode of the opposite gender, often in hopes of “passing” as a person born to the gender in which the cross-dresser is dressed. While some cross-dressers are easily accepted in some areas, others are ostracized because their sex does not match the social norms for dressing or behaving as they do. Therefore, on a daily basis, many cross-dressers bear the brunt of “social marginalization due to discrimination based on their gender identity or expression.”

On the whole, female-to-male cross-dressers have an easier time portraying a different gender identity from their biology than do male-to-female cross-dressers. Dani Danger, a former performer for Tucson’s Dragstar Cabaret, first began cross-dressing for school plays. She continued to do so in middle school because she was uncomfortable with public attention to her breasts. Today, she does not cross-dress on a daily basis, but she is frequently mistaken for a man and, at times, for a man in drag. Because people who see Dani in public often assume she is a man, they treat her accordingly. For her, cross-dressing is usually not very problematic.

However, Jared Squee Leve has been a male-to-female cross-dresser from a young age. He prefers women’s clothing because he feels that his physical features are not “well suited by what is often characterized as masculine fashion.” He has been in street fights, fired from jobs, insulted, banned from homes, and has faced discrimination by the parents of his significant others.

In our society, being and acting masculine involves strength and power while being a female or acting feminine by wearing women’s clothing is sometimes seen as weak. Society often
cannot understand why a man would “give up” his power in order to look like a female. Therefore, male-to-female cross-dressers often find it more difficult to cross-dress compared to female-to-male cross-dressers.

**Marginalization Patterns**

When cross-dressers cross-dress in public and fail to be acknowledged for who they portray themselves as, they often face marginalization as they are ignored, picked on, or even bullied and abused. An alarming 78% of those who expressed a different gender identity than their biologically determined sex during grades K-12 reported that they experienced harassment, 35% experienced physical assault, and 12% experienced sexual violence. In addition, they are also often denied access to essential gender-appropriate facilities, such as bathrooms and housing.

In the workplace and in schools, many cross-dressers feel they are judged not on the quality of their work, but because of their sexual orientation or gender identity. In addition to the workplace and school, some even suffer discrimination when they rent or buy housing, due to trans-phobic landlords and property managers. Some cross-dressers sometimes face an outright refusal of services simply because of their gender identity when attempting to access a host of public accommodations such as restaurants, parks, hotels, libraries, buses, and museums, among others. Unfortunately, no federal laws exist explicitly to protect cross-dressers from such discrimination.

When cross-dressers cross-dress, they become a “threat” to the idealized or supposedly “normal” groups that comprise the culture. A culture consists of groups of people whose identities are considered “normal” by society and thus are automatically accepted in society. The accepted groups usually have no name or label for their identity; typically, only rejected or marginalized
groups are given names and labels by those who are accepted. For example, in a school, there may be labelled groups such as “goths,” “nerds,” “emos,” “geeks,” etc. The individuals in those groups are pushed away by those labels. The individuals who do not fit into any of those or other derogatory categories comprise the group with the power to assert their identity as “normal,” and thus, to marginalize those who are different.

Richard Weaver, a rhetorical theorist from the early twentieth century, introduced an idea called the “tyrannizing image.” A tyrannizing image is the cultural ideal that a society upholds of its perfect person; although no one person can actually be the tyrannizing image, theoretically speaking, members of the society are socialized via communication to seek to become a mirror of that image. Thus, the tyrannizing image organizes the ideal beliefs and actions of the people who are living in the culture. Cross-dressers do not conform to the tyrannizing image; in fact, they overtly rebel against the tyrannizing image. Thus, society tends to reject cross-dressers, pushing them aside from the public sphere.

**Future of Cross-Dressers**

Although they are pushed aside from the physical public sphere, cross-dressers are finding “space” in cyberspace. Websites now exist to help cross-dressers through difficulties, encourage them emotionally, and provide a forum where they may share personal experiences and offer advice. Due to the general marginalization of cross-dressers by the society, such online groups can be a critical stepping stone for cross-dressers to form the community necessary to eventually advocate for changes in society at large.

Throughout the history of the United States, there have been a number of important and notable social movements that have changed how we define society. For example, the Civil Rights
and Women’s Rights movements played key roles in combatting the marginalization of racial minorities and women. The virtual community of cross-dressers is now gathering and speaking up about marginalization and the need for equality. Their websites may begin to encourage and empower more people to take on these issues, speak up for a change, and eventually expand the space of cross-dressers in the public sphere in the future.

Comprehension Questions:

1. What role do labels play in marginalization?
2. What is a “tyrannizing image”?
3. Why do male-to-female cross-dressers face greater difficulties than female-to-male cross-dressers?

Discussion Questions:

1. In your opinion, what would be the best solution for cross-dressers to gain access to more public accommodations, such as public bathrooms?
2. What rules govern your school’s bathrooms, locker rooms, sports teams, etc.? Might some people be marginalized by these rules?
3. How can students help expand gender-inclusive spaces in school areas?
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A Collective Apology:
Canadian Prime Minister Harper’s Speech to the Aboriginal People
Lori Schroeder

When marginalized groups speak out in protest of the actions against them, there is no guarantee that their voices will be heard. Sometimes, however, voices of marginalization can create a spark in a society that grows until a response to the original offense is demanded. One such case occurred in Canada a few years ago. The aboriginal tribes in Canada, the groups of people who had resided in the area before European exploration, had been marginalized by government policy and inaction for over a century. However, by raising their voices collectively and insisting on telling their stories of abuse instead of remaining silent, the aboriginal tribes caught the attention of the Canadian government. In 2008, an official government apology for the past atrocities was issued by the person who held the highest elected position in the Canadian government, Prime Minister Stephen Harper.

Unfortunately, all apologies are not created equal, and an apology by itself by no means atones for over a century of abuse and marginalization. In order to determine if Prime Minister Harper’s speech was an effective response to the historic marginalization, one must look beyond the apology’s words to the context of the apology and the government’s actions. By identifying the abuses against Canadian aboriginals that occurred and their lasting effects, in conjunction with analyzing the Prime Minister’s speech itself and reactions to it, I will show that the Prime Minister’s speech was not a successful apology.

Lori Schroeder is from Mounds View, Minnesota. She has a major in Communication and minors in Latin and Non-Profit Management. After graduation, she plans to work in nonprofit fundraising.
History and Context

In the late 19th century, Canada opened a group of schools referred to as “residential schools” for children of aboriginal tribes. Funded by government money, these schools were often run by Christian churches with the purpose of assimilating aboriginal children to “white” ways. Children as young as five years old were taken from their families and placed in these boarding schools. In addition to learning basic reading and mathematics skills, any form of aboriginal cultural expression was drilled out of the students. They were beaten for speaking their native language and forced to dress in European-style clothing. Federal legislation made it mandatory for all aboriginal children to attend these schools. Over 150,000 native children went through the programs designed to assimilate them into white, Christian society. Accounts of physical and sexual abuse at the institutions have emerged in the last decade. Many children died while attending these schools and were buried in unmarked graves without parental notification.

Once “graduated” from these schools, most students no longer felt like they fit into their home communities because of their years of separation and forced “learning.” This rift left many families uncertain of how to treat returning residential school students who no longer dressed like, talked like or believed the same things as their family members. This created a cultural chasm between the traditional aboriginal way of life and the way that residential school students lived. Just as these students found doors being closed to them within their own tribes and communities, most students were rejected on the basis of the color of their skin from the white world they were trained to imitate. This isolation made it difficult for these students to become active and productive members of society.
Although most of the residential schools closed by 1970, some schools remained open until 1996. Around this time, the aboriginal people began to share stories about what happened within these schools. A report generated by the Canadian Royal Commission in 1996 concluded that these residential schools had severed the “artery of culture” that connected aboriginal families to each other and to their established traditions. Residential school survivors demanded acknowledgement of their suffering and asked for compensation for these abuses.

While most of the churches that ran the schools issued statements of apology in the 1980’s and 1990’s, a formal response from the government of Canada, which funded these schools for nearly 150 years, did not occur until June 11, 2008. On this day, the Prime Minister of Canada, Stephen Harper, offered a public apology in the Parliament chambers that was televised live across the country.

Collective Apologies

Much has been written on the topic of apologies. Scholars have attempted to determine what makes an apology authentic. Most scholars’ definition of apology includes a feeling of regret and a commitment not to repeat the offending actions. In other words, an apology must be accompanied by repentance and change in behavior. Nick Smith, a scholar on apologies, notes that in order for an apology to be authentic, the apologizer must move beyond expressions of sympathy and take responsibility for what occurred. Keeping that in mind, Smith continues that one should approach the words “I am sorry” in a way similar to how one would say “I love you.” The words alone may be meaningful, but in order to determine if the words are true, the individual’s actions also need to be examined.
When an apology is issued on behalf of a collective people, the question of an apology’s meaning becomes more complicated. Prime Minister Harper was not personally apologizing for the abuses he committed. Harper, as well as others in authority in 2008, had not made the decision to create residential schools nor had they been in power at any point at which the schools were running. They did not “have any connection with the original perpetrators of the crime.” Instead, the government of Canada was accepting responsibility; Harper was simply the spokesperson. This creates an interesting rhetorical situation. As important as an apology was for the survivors of residential schools, it could not be issued by the government which actually funded the schools. Instead, Prime Minister Harper had to take symbolic responsibility for these actions in which he took no part.

The Apology

The Prime Minister’s address took place on June 11, 2008, in the middle of the afternoon in Parliament. Five aboriginal leaders and six residential school survivors were allowed into Parliament as special guests. More than one thousand people watched from outside Parliament where big screen televisions were mounted outside the Commons and on the Parliament lawn. In addition, more than thirty speech-watching events were organized in communities across the country. Countless individuals also watched on televisions at home or listened on the radio.

Prime Minister Harper apologized for the government’s role in residential schools and acknowledged the devastating effect the schools had on aboriginal families. For the first time, the government, embodied by Harper, said the words, “We are sorry.” In addition, Harper promised to move forward collectively as a country and to address the wrongs committed against the aboriginal people. This action alone was momentous and should be considered an
accomplishment. However, the language of the speech and the surrounding context of the speech counteracted the authenticity of the apology.

Prime Minister Harper’s speech avoided the use of pronouns, especially second person (or “you”) pronouns. This linguistic choice distanced Harper himself and also key members of the audience from what had occurred. The lack of second person pronouns left the injured party out of the address entirely. For example, the Prime Minister acknowledged it was wrong to “separate children from rich and vibrant cultures” not that it was wrong to “separate your children from your rich and vibrant culture” or even that it was wrong to “separate aboriginal children from their rich and vibrant culture.”

In addition, the context surrounding the speech hindered the full effect of the apology. The Prime Minister was criticized for reading the speech directly from his notes situated on the lectern in front of him. He looked around the entire parliamentary chamber while speaking, addressing members of the government as well as the aboriginal leaders seated in the room, but he never spoke into the camera which broadcasted his apology to thousands of aboriginal viewers across the country. “He was reading and reading and there was nothing, no contact with the camera, nothing. It didn't come from his heart...he's just doing it, it's an action that he has to do,” described former residential school student Rita Blind. Furthermore, members of Prime Minister Harper’s political party clapped whenever the Prime Minister paused between points. One aboriginal viewer, “believe[d] this pat-on-the-back-clapping showed disrespect to the aboriginal people” and felt that the applause weakened the apology by making it a political issue instead of a heartfelt apology.
In accordance with the definition of an apology, the government of Canada enacted several policies after the official apology that changed its relationship with aboriginal tribes and addressed the lasting impact of residential schools. The Truth and Reconciliation Commission was set up to hear cases of abuse from residential school survivors.\textsuperscript{16} Part of this process includes a Common Experience Payment, which pays victims of the residential school system and their family members. This fund is part of a $4 billion “compensation and healing package” for residential school abuse survivors.\textsuperscript{17} To receive payment, however, candidates must go through the Independent Assessment Process, which is a lengthy court process verifying the victim’s presence at a residential school.\textsuperscript{18}

**Reactions**

Much has been said and written about this apology: Did it go far enough? Was it too little, too late? Some were pleased that an apology had finally been issued and believed that change would follow. For example, Aboriginal Affairs Minister John Duncan believed in the success of the apology so much he unveiled a stained-glass window that will be hung in the Parliament to recognize the official apology and its lasting effects.\textsuperscript{19}

However, just as many listeners remained skeptical of true change. Tom King, a politician and former residential school student, dismissed Harper’s apology. "It is a symbolic act, and it is really in the end no more than that," he criticized, adding that the apology, "is not going to change the history that we have had to live with and that many people will have to deal with. It is not going to change the damage that was done to native families, to reserves, to tribes across Canada."\textsuperscript{20}

Likewise, many listeners argued that regardless of the intention of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission, no amount of money can remove the trauma of the past for
residential students or bring back traditional dress, languages, and ways of life that were assimilated out of the aboriginal peoples. Indeed, the Harper apology did not “wipe away” the damage done by residential schools, and the effects of the new policies are moving slowly. One residential school survivor decried the government’s attempt to “buy off” the aboriginal people instead of providing a comprehensive plan to help erase the lingering effects of the residential school system: “This must include investment in the long-term healing of aboriginal and non-aboriginal people through decolonization and cultural reclamation, together with increased and longer term investment in literacy, education and training, housing and job creation.” Many aboriginal leaders have stepped forward to argue that not enough action has been taken.

Residential school victims and families throughout the country continue to this day to live in destitute conditions or struggle with unemployment because of the trauma of their schooling. These issues were not addressed under the Truth and Reconciliation Commission.

In the end, Prime Minister Harper’s apology, while bringing important focus to the abuses of residential schools, was not effective. Stephen Harper was not apologizing for himself, but on behalf of a previous government and on behalf of the Canadian people as a whole. However, his delivery was not personal, and the claims for progress in the future remain stifled. While the aboriginal efforts in Canada succeeded in making their voices and their cause heard, they were not able to convince the marginalizing party to fully address the consequences of its actions.

**Comprehension Questions:**

1. What were some of the lasting effects of residential schools?
2. What was the significance of the apology’s location?
3. What were some responses to the apology? With which, if any, do you agree?

Discussion Questions:

1. Does the form and presentation of a government apology matter? Why or why not?
2. How else might a government respond to its own former marginalization of a group?
3. What, if any, meaning can a government apology bring to a marginalized group?
4. For further investigation on this topic, research the United States’ “Native American Apology Resolution.” Do you think this served as an effective apology to the United States’ aboriginal populace? Was it more or less authentic than Canada’s apology?
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Prime Minister Harper’s Apology to the Aboriginal People

This appendix includes the full text of the speech analyzed by Lori Schroeder in the essay “A Collective Apology.” As a response to aboriginal activism in Canada, the Prime Minister offered a formal apology for their marginalization that occurred throughout Canadian history. The text is below.¹

The treatment of children in Indian Residential Schools is a sad chapter in our history.

For more than a century, Indian Residential Schools separated over 150,000 Aboriginal children from their families and communities. In the 1870’s, the federal government, partly in order to meet its obligation to educate Aboriginal children, began to play a role in the development and administration of these schools. Two primary objectives of the Residential Schools system were to remove and isolate children from the influence of their homes, families, traditions and cultures, and to assimilate them into the dominant culture. These objectives were based on the assumption Aboriginal cultures and spiritual beliefs were inferior and unequal. Indeed, some sought, as it was infamously said, "to kill the Indian in the child". Today, we recognize that this policy of assimilation was wrong, has caused great harm, and has no place in our country.

One hundred and thirty-two federally-supported schools were located in every province and territory, except Newfoundland, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island. Most schools were operated as "joint ventures" with Anglican, Catholic, Presbyterian or United Churches. The Government of Canada built an educational system in which very young children were often forcibly removed from their homes, often taken far from their communities. Many were inadequately fed, clothed and housed. All were deprived of the care and nurturing of their parents, grandparents and communities. First Nations, Inuit and Métis languages and cultural practices were prohibited in these schools. Tragically, some of these children died while attending residential schools and others never returned home.

The government now recognizes that the consequences of the Indian Residential Schools policy were profoundly negative and that this policy has had a lasting and damaging impact on Aboriginal culture, heritage and language. While some former students have spoken positively about their experiences at residential schools, these stories are far overshadowed by tragic accounts of the emotional, physical and sexual abuse and neglect of helpless children, and their separation from powerless families and communities.

The legacy of Indian Residential Schools has contributed to social problems that continue to exist in many communities today.

It has taken extraordinary courage for the thousands of survivors that have come forward to speak publicly about the abuse they suffered. It is a testament to their resilience as individuals and to the
strength of their cultures. Regrettably, many former students are not with us today and died never having received a full apology from the Government of Canada.

The government recognizes that the absence of an apology has been an impediment to healing and reconciliation. Therefore, on behalf of the Government of Canada and all Canadians, I stand before you, in this Chamber so central to our life as a country, to apologize to Aboriginal peoples for Canada’s role in the Indian Residential Schools system.

To the approximately 80,000 living former students, and all family members and communities, the Government of Canada now recognizes that it was wrong to forcibly remove children from their homes and we apologize for having done this. We now recognize that it was wrong to separate children from rich and vibrant cultures and traditions that it created a void in many lives and communities, and we apologize for having done this. We now recognize that, in separating children from their families, we undermined the ability of many to adequately parent their own children and sowed the seeds for generations to follow, and we apologize for having done this. We now recognize that, far too often, these institutions gave rise to abuse or neglect and were inadequately controlled, and we apologize for failing to protect you. Not only did you suffer these abuses as children, but as you became parents, you were powerless to protect your own children from suffering the same experience, and for this we are sorry.

The burden of this experience has been on your shoulders for far too long. The burden is properly ours as a Government, and as a country. There is no place in Canada for the attitudes that inspired the Indian Residential Schools system to ever prevail again. You have been working on recovering from this experience for a long time and in a very real sense, we are now joining you on this journey. The Government of Canada sincerely apologizes and asks the forgiveness of the Aboriginal peoples of this country for failing them so profoundly.

Nous le regrettons
We are sorry
Nimitataynan
Niminchinowesamin
Mamiattugut

In moving towards healing, reconciliation and resolution of the sad legacy of Indian Residential Schools, implementation of the Indian Residential Schools Settlement Agreement began on September 19, 2007. Years of work by survivors, communities, and Aboriginal organizations culminated in an agreement that gives us a new beginning and an opportunity to move forward together in partnership.
A cornerstone of the Settlement Agreement is the Indian Residential Schools Truth and Reconciliation Commission. This Commission presents a unique opportunity to educate all Canadians on the Indian Residential Schools system. It will be a positive step in forging a new relationship between Aboriginal peoples and other Canadians, a relationship based on the knowledge of our shared history, a respect for each other and a desire to move forward together with a renewed understanding that strong families, strong communities and vibrant cultures and traditions will contribute to a stronger Canada for all of us.

Your Facebook Profile: What Companies Are Looking For

As Lauren Ott explains in the essay “Friend’less,” your profile on Facebook reflects your likes, dislikes, and personality and is potentially more useful to employers in seeing what kind of employee you could be than an interview. It is important to be aware of how your Facebook profile represents you, and what potential employers are looking for on your account. Here are some tips on how to have your Facebook represent you the best.

• Privacy: “Friends Only.” When setting the privacy on your account, select the “Friends Only” option for your entire profile. This means that people can search you but they will only see your name and profile picture. You should be checking your privacy settings often because when Facebook changes their layout, sometimes the settings you pick revert to default and you are left visible to anyone.

• Clean Up Your Profile. Employers look for a variety of things when searching through your Facebook profile. Although your profile might not contain anything too dreadful, things which seem socially acceptable could still cause employers to decide to pass on you. Here is a list of Top Ten Turn-Offs for Employers on Social Network Sites:

1. References to drugs
2. Extremist/intolerant views including racism and sexism
3. Criminal activity
4. Evidence of excessive alcohol consumption
5. Inappropriate pictures
6. Foul language
7. Links to unsuitable websites
8. Lewd jokes
9. Silly email addresses
10. Membership in pointless/silly groups

• Keeping your Profile Clean. Your Facebook profile is still under watch after you are hired for a job. Once your Facebook profile is clean, it is still important to monitor what you post and share. Three easy ways to do this are:

1. Selective Updates. Negative statuses reflect poorly on you and your company. It is important not to post negatively, especially about anyone you work with or the company itself. Too much information given in a status can be bad, too. If you tell your boss you are sick but “Check In” at a water park, the boss may have grounds to fire you. Think before you update.
2. Selective Photos. Is it really something you want your office colleagues and boss to see? Or your mom?
3. Selective Commenting. Think about what your words might convey to someone who wasn’t in on the joke or the conversation. Would you look narrow-minded, ignorant or insensitive?

How Your Voice Can Matter:  
Ways to Get Involved and Prevent Marginalization

As the articles in this journal have demonstrated, marginalization can occur in many different forms. Sometimes young adults feel as though they do not have a way of sharing their concerns about these issues. If there is a cause about which you are passionate, here are some ways that you can work to prevent marginalization in your community.

• **Change your attitudes.** If you notice marginalization happening, make sure that your actions and attitudes do not contribute to the problem. Sometimes, involuntary or unconscious decisions can have a negative impact on others.

• **Get involved at your school.** Start or join a club, have an awareness day, or host a fundraiser to support a local organization for the cause. Make sure you talk to your teachers or administrators to ensure that your actions are compliant with school policies.

• **Get involved in your community.** Many communities have open city hall meetings. If there is an issue you are passionate about, consider bringing a proposal to the board. Additionally, look for activist groups and organizations in your area that deal with your interests.

• **Go political.** Write a letter to your political representatives at all levels: city, state, and national. Express your concerns and note some possible solutions that you might see. It is their responsibility to listen to the voices of their constituents when considering future legislation.

• **Get involved on a national scale.** Several national organizations exist that work to further the causes of marginalized voices. Become a member of one of these groups, attend national conferences, or start a local chapter. Frequently, national groups can provide you with access to resources you can use to promote issues within your own community.
As you read in these journal articles, marginalization is still present in our culture. Throughout the history of the United States, there have been— and still are— many protests and social movements organized by individuals who feel their voices are being ignored or marginalized. Here are just a few examples of the diversity of marginalized voices that have “spoken up” throughout our nation’s history.
Online Resource Evaluation
Use this tool to help assess the quality of online information.

Title of website: ________________________________________________________________

URL (address): _______________________________________________________________

AUTHORITY:  Name of Author: _______________  ___Not Available
              Name of Organization: _______________  ___Not Available
              Domain: ___org ___com ___net ___edu ___gov ___other
              Can the author be contacted?  ___yes ___no

CURRENCY:   Date created: ____________  ___Not Available
              Last updated: ____________  ___Not Available
              Current enough for your topic?  ___yes ___no

COVERAGE:   Is the information presented thoroughly?  ___yes ___no
              Does the site seem to present good, educational information?  ___yes ___no

ACCURACY:  Do you think the information is accurate?  ___yes ___no
              If the document quotes statistics, can you tell if the
              statistics are from a reliable source?  ___yes ___no ___N/A
              Is the site free from typos and/or grammatical errors?  ___yes ___no

OBJECTIVITY:  Is the information presented with a bias from one side
              of the issue or is it presented fairly and objectively?  ___biased
              ___objective
              Is there advertising on the page from organizations
              with a bias?  ___yes ___no ___unsure

              What is the purpose of this site?  ___to persuade  ___to entertain
              ___to inform  ___to sell  ___other

Note: Adapted from materials contributed by both high school and college faculty.