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The purpose of this thesis is to detail African-American support for the Vietnam War. Samples of such prowar sentiment were taken from magazine articles during the Vietnam War period and Vietnam history texts. These written opinions are from a wide range of people. African-American leaders during the Vietnam period are included as well as common GIs. This portion of the thesis illustrates the variety of African-Americans who supported the war and the strength/legitimacy of their opinion. Opinions from African-Americans who were critical of these people make up the final portion of the thesis. This final portion, along with the conclusion, is used to prove the significance of prowar African-Americans to American intellectual history both then and today.
When one considers African-American attitude toward the Vietnam War, visions of radical, charismatic leaders earnestly protesting United States policy in Southeast Asia are what generally come to mind. It is true that there were several highly regarded African-American thinkers at the time of the war, including Martin Luther King, Jr., who actively protested the war and the African-American community's involvement in it. For example, King devoted an entire speech to the subject entitled "Declaration of Independence from the war in Vietnam" in which he vehemently criticized United States involvement:

They watch as we poison their water, as we kill a million acres of their crops. They must weep as the bulldozers destroy their precious trees. They wander into the hospitals, with at least 20 casualties from American firepower for each Viet Cong-inflicted injury. So far we may have killed a million of them—mostly children. What do the peasants think as we ally ourselves with the landlords and as we refuse to put any action into our many words concerning land reform? What do they think as we test out our latest
weapons on them, just as the Germans tested out new medicine and tortures in the concentration camps of Europe? Where are the roots of the independent Vietnam we claim to be building?(1)

The Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, with Stokely Charmichael as one of its most outspoken members, also issued statements arguing against the war in Vietnam:

We believe the United States government has been deceptive in its claims of concern for the freedom of the Vietnamese people, just as the government has been deceptive in claiming concern for the freedom of the colored people in such other countries as the Dominican Republic, the Congo, South Africa, Rhodesia and in the United States itself. We recoil in horror at the inconsistency of this supposedly free society where responsibility to freedom is equated with responsibility to lend oneself to military aggression. We take note of the fact that 16% of the draftees from this country are Negro, called on to stifle the liberation of Vietnam, to preserve a "Democracy" which does not exist for them at home.(2)

Certainly, such an opinion should be cited on the subject. However, to illustrate African-American resistance exclusively is to neglect a very important part of the story.

There were many African-American leaders during the war, both well-known and anonymous, who actively supported the Vietnam War on several grounds. In contrast to such names as Stokely Charmichael and King, one could easily counter with names such as Whitney Young and Carl Rowan, just two African-American thinkers who supported United States involvement in Vietnam. Many others would join them-
-some merely in a humble letter-to-the-editor in an African-American publication, others with well-developed arguments intended to counter the more well-known opinion shared by King and Charmichael.

A number of African-American critics of the war attacked its black supporters. The majority of African-American thinkers who turned on their own dissenting brethren were quick to dismiss people with such opinions as modern-day Uncle Toms in the vein of Booker T. Washington. However, even the most casual study of these thinkers easily contradicts such an opinion.

In truth, African-American supporters of the war were as varied in their reasons for it as African-Americans are concerning any other issue. It is only because of the mass support for the antiwar community that their stereotyping has gained such legitimacy. It is the goal of this paper to first introduce these pro-war African-Americans and secondly to detail the complex reasons for their opinions.

If one statement could encapsulate the plight of African-American pro-war thought since the 1960s, it would be found in a paragraph in an excellent anthology on African-American protest against the war. Clyde Taylor, the editor of Vietnam and Black America: An Anthology of Protest and Resistance, writes a poignant introduction to the work. In this introduction he devotes his final paragraph to African-American support of the war:
This book includes no writings in support of the war. If the polls are to be believed, many, and in the earlier stages of the war a majority of Black Americans, went along with national war policy. But these polls, which also show Black opposition steadily in advance of national opposition as the war dragged on, apparently reflect a large camp-following mentality among many Black people. Their arguments, when expressed, tended to run along stereotypical lines like "We may as well fight them there as in San Diego." In fact, very little reasoned Black opinion in favor of the war, from any theoretical basis, actually got into print. Presumably, the mass media spoke for this segment. . . . (3)

Taylor is quick, possibly intentionally so, to dismiss a rather formidable body of belief. While Taylor's implication that African-American protest far outweighed support in sheer volume is probably true, it hardly justifies writing the whole lot of it off as represented sufficiently in the mass media. Contrary to Taylor's statement, African-American support for the war can in no way be represented accurately in the mass media. Just as in African-American protest, African-American support was uniquely African-American.

Although they were in the minority, African-American supporters of the war were as varied as those who opposed it. They ranged from members of the intellectual elite to the common foot soldier. The sources in which they expressed their opinions are equally varied. Such mainstream periodicals as Harper's and Reader's Digest were just as valuable in researching this topic as a more traditional forum for African-American thought, Ebony.
This fact is of utmost importance because it gives Taylor little justification for his handling of their thought. If the views of African-American supporters of the war were tucked away in elite, scholarly journals, then it would be plausible to write them off, since their impact on the masses of African-Americans and whites alike would be minimal. However, this was not the case. In fact, Taylor, like any other American, could walk down to the local news-stand and pick up a copy of the Harper's in which Whitney Young discussed for seven pages how the integrated American fighting force in Vietnam could not help but improve race relations in America. Furthermore, at this very same news-stand, Taylor could find a copy of Ebony and read letters-to-the-editor by ordinary African-Americans expressing their support for the war effort. For example, Specialist William Henry Harris wrote the following letter in Ebony:

This letter is directed toward the protesters and demonstrators against the Viet Nam policy. I am a Negro soldier, now serving in the Republic of Viet Nam. The demonstrations on the Viet Nam policy back there in our country in our country are very disturbing to all of us here. I wish some of those demonstrators and protesters would think twice before carrying signs in the street.

I would like to give my opinion or view of why we are here in Viet Nam. The answer to the question is simple. I am here because Communism threatens not only my country, but the rest of the free world. There is an international drive to impose Communism on every country in the world.
including ours. The Americans fighting over here, both black and white, understand, even if some of our clergy and intellectual demonstrators and protesters don't. I am a Negro and a fighting American who is proud of his country. Thank God for that. (4)

How odd it is to read this letter, which advances such a seemingly uncommon opinion. With the 20/20 hindsight of today, it is easy to find Harris's view horribly misguided. However, in the context of the times, one would find this opinion quite understandable except for one very important fact: the author is African-American. This simple fact would cause as many raised eyebrows in the late 1960s as it does today. Had the author been white, the opinion would not have been considered unusual.

Harris's letter does not represent what would be considered the typical opinion of African-American soldiers concerning the war. Modern attention has been given to the marijuana-smoking, peace loving African-American GI. In fact, in most movies made on Vietnam, the only soldiers portrayed as pro-war are a handful of radical Southern whites considered dangerous by the rest of the characters. One need only look at the several Vietnam War movies released in the 1980s such as Platoon or Full Metal Jacket to see this stereotype.

Harris was by no means alone, even on that page of the magazine. Albert Glenn, Jr., a sergeant serving in Vietnam, wrote a very comparable letter:
Mr. Muhammed Ali along with Mr. Charmichael and Dr. King would not be able to tell the Negro youth to refuse to fight if our Communist enemies were running the U.S. How about telling the ones at home that are protesters, and the ones in the riots to get with us and see to it that we get the supplies we need to win this thing over here and come home to our wives and loved ones. (5)

This letter restated the communist threat as the reason for American involvement in Vietnam. It was also similar to the Harris letter in that it did not make any appeals specifically to African-Americans. Although the author of the second letter did refer to three African-American opponents, like Harris, he was making a point that is racially universal. The two letters argued to all Americans.

Support of the Vietnam War from African-American GIs can be found in arenas other than random letters-to-the-editor. An article in the August 1967 issue of Ebony is an excellent example. The piece profiled a young African-American serviceman named Ulysses C. Kendall. Through his story one learns a great deal about the sort of person who supported the war, either Black or white. Kendall grew up in the slums of South Chicago, the son of deaf mute parents. He played football in high school solely to gain an athletic scholarship to college. In college he married and earned a bachelor's degree in elementary education. While working on a master's degree, Kendall was drafted. As a
married college student, Kendall was sent to Germany and then assigned to Vietnam. (6)

One would probably assume that Kendall felt a great deal of anger over being drafted with such an obvious justification for exemption. However, this was not Kendall's view at all:

We're fighting for a cause over here, both to protect the U.S.-in the long run-and to protect the rights of the Vietnamese people. . . . We're also helping to rehabilitate the people. We've never had a war on our home-front, and these protestors would change their tune if they could see how these people have to live because of the Viet Cong. (7)

Kendall also discussed the impact of the war on race relations at home: "You just can't live in a foxhole together, drink out of the same canteen, cover for each other and then go back and say 'Go to Hell.'" (8)

Although Kendall did discuss his views on race relations, he also reiterated the racially universal argument discussed previously. He mentioned altruistic reasons for American involvement; we were there to "rehabilitate" the Vietnamese people. Fighting the spread of communism was another reason for the United States' involvement in the war. Kendall implied that if Americans did not fight in Vietnam, then it might become necessary to fight Communism right in their own backyards.

Carl Rowan, an African American journalist, also questioned African-American involvement in the anti-war
movement. Rowan's article in the September 1967 issue of Reader's Digest was highly critical of one very prestigious Vietnam protestor, Martin Luther King, Jr. In this article, it becomes readily apparent that Rowan was speaking for quite a large, though silent, proportion of African-Americans who felt uneasy with the outspoken statements of King and others:

But in no conflict has a Negro with King's prestige urged Negroes to shun battle because they have nothing to fight for. King must have assumed that the "new Negro" full of frustration as he is, would be sympathetic to this argument. But a recent Harris survey showed that almost one of every two Negroes believes that King is wrong—and another 27 percent reserved judgment.

I find this opposition to King remarkable considering the amount of emotion and anger involved in the Negro revolution. It suggests that most Negroes are proud of the integrated performance of colored GIs in Vietnam; that most Negroes still think of America as their country and do not want to seem unpatriotic. (9)

Essentially, Rowan was representing the opinions of millions of African-Americans who did not follow the beliefs of King, Carmichael, and a host of other African-American antiwar protestors. In Rowan's article one sees this silent majority speak out. Taylor, as well as many others, would have the world believe that the African-American community was firmly behind the statements of such men as King, and the beliefs of "deviants" who supported the war were quite rare. In Rowan we see that this is simply not the case. His final paragraph states this quite clearly:
It is a tragic irony that there should be any doubt about the Negro's loyalty to his country—especially doubt created by Martin Luther King, who has helped as much as any man to make America truly the Negro's country, too. (10)

*Bloods*, an oral history of the Vietnam conflict by Wallace Terry, chronicles the experiences of African-American soldiers in the war. Although most of the GIs interviewed by Taylor held very strong antiwar views, the opinions of Archie "Joe" Biggers, a First Lieutenant, were quite the opposite. Biggers talked in great detail about his discouragement with African-American resistance to the war. To him the war was a noble cause, and he was frustrated by his treatment when returning to the United States as a Black man in uniform:

But the one thing that really hurt me more than anything in the world was when I came back to the States and the people considered me as a part of the establishment. Because I am an officer. Here I was, a veteran that just came back from a big conflict. And most of the blacks wouldn't associate with me. You see, blacks are not supposed to be officers. Blacks are supposed to be those guys who take orders, and not necessarily those that give them. If you give orders, it means you had to kiss somebody's rear end to get into that position.

One day I wore my uniform over to Howard University in Washington to help recruit officer candidates. Howard is a black school, like the one I went to in Texas, Jarvis Christian College. I thought I would feel at home. The guys poked fun at me, calling me Uncle Sam's flunky. They would say the Marine Corps sucks. The Army sucks. They would say their brother or uncle got killed,
so why was I still in. They would see the Purple Heart and ask me what was I trying to prove. The women wouldn't talk to you either.
I felt bad. I felt cold. I felt like I was completely out of it. (11)

Biggers had fallen victim to what affected many who openly supported the war. By merely wearing his uniform at a predominately Black university, he had shown his prowar stance and was ostracized accordingly. Biggers felt that he no longer fit in with the prevailing African-American attitudes of the time. Those who opposed the war tended to oppose American society in general as well. Biggers discussed his concern with the rash of riots and protest from the African-American community:

Let's face it. We are part of America. Even though there have been some injustices made, there is no reason for us not to be a part of the American system. I don't feel that because my grandfather or grandmother was a slave that I should not lift my arms up to support those things that are stated in the Constitution of the United States. Before I went to Vietnam, I saw the "burn, baby, burn" thing because of Martin Luther King. Why should they burn up Washington D.C. for something that happened in Memphis? They didn't hurt the white man that was doing business down there on 7th street. They hurt the black man. They should have let their voices be known that there was injustice. That's the American way. (12)

Although Biggers' statements could be considered a digression because of their lack of explicit support of the war, his opinions are applicable for several reasons. First of all, Biggers discussed the typical reaction of antiwar
African-Americans to fellow African-Americans who supported the war. Biggers was not famous nor were his opinions published, like Whitney Young's. However, by his simple act of wearing his uniform to a African-American college, and by his officer status, Biggers was expressing his involvement in and support of the Vietnam War. This was met with disdain and ostracism. Secondly, Biggers exemplified how prowar African-Americans tended to criticize African-American anti-war protesters. Biggers argued a very pragmatic position that dwelling on past injustices will not be conducive to advancement. Furthermore, he stated that violent rioting, like that which occurred following King's assassination, could only hurt the cause of African-Americans.

To this point, the majority of opinions discussed have been racially universal and voiced by ordinary African-Americans. However, most well known black supporters of the war dealt explicitly with racial issues. It seems to be a special goal to prove that Vietnam is not only a good war for Americans, it is a specially good war for Black America. An article written by Whitney Young Jr., Director of the National Urban League during the height of the conflict, in the June 1967 issue of Harper's, deals exclusively with the issue of race in Vietnam.

The article chronicles Young's trip to Vietnam to assess the role of African-American servicemen in the war. The article contains several quotes from African-American
soldiers which reinforce their own beliefs on the war. An excellent example is taken from an anonymous GI: "If they can't pass the civil-rights bill [1967-1968] because it's the just and right thing to do, they should do it in recognition of what the Negro guys have done and are doing in Vietnam. That's reason enough."

This statement clearly illustrates a very common point among African-American supporters of the war. This soldier, as well as Whitney Young, believed that African-American achievements in Vietnam could provide justification for increased civil rights at home. The speaker admitted that it is unfortunate that it requires the superior performance of African-Americans in Vietnam to gain the rights all Americans should expect. However, he showed his pragmatism by stating, essentially, that the ends justified the means. Protesters against the war would stand in direct opposition to this belief, deeming it an atrocity that young African-American men must be so savagely sacrificed in order to gain rights that should come at birth.

Young also argued that the war had brought the races together in a way that would otherwise have never taken place. Young quotes captain Lucious Reeves:

"When you're out in these hills, no one has time for race. Everybody that has U.S. on his sleeve is a buddy. I've seen white guys hugging and kissing their Negro platoon sergeant after he's brought them through a fire fight. And I think a lot of white guys are leaving here with a completely different attitude." (14)
Young's view was further reinforced by a white general speaking to Young about African-American servicemen:

"My people in the Army were made to integrate in the early 1950's long before the rest of the country. But we are sure glad it happened. Today, here in Vietnam, there is absolutely no difference between the caliber of white and Negro soldiers. The Negroes are good. In fact, I think they try just a little harder. They won't let that white guy in the foxhole with them do better than they." (15)

Here was a ringing endorsement from a white man of considerable authority praising the values of integration. Certainly Young used this in direct opposition to King's argument that the Vietnam conflict hindered African-American advancement at home.

Young himself argued the benefit of Vietnam to African-Americans:

Having been given the opportunity—not readily available in civilian life—to demonstrate their skills, ability for leadership, and precision performance in combat and in man-to-man contact, the Negro in Vietnam has earned the deep-down respect of the white soldiers, a respect that often takes the form of total dependence. In the guerilla warfare of Vietnam, discriminatory attitudes can command a high price, even the price of life itself. (16)

In anticipation of African-American protesters screaming Uncle Tom, Young added to the statement:

It is true that the Negro victory for equal opportunity and the full deserts of democracy must
and will be won on American soil. But it is equally true that what has happened—and is happening—to the Negro and white soldier in Vietnam will have a profound and far-reaching effect on the whole race situation in America during the next decade. For in this war there is a degree of integration among black and white Americans far exceeding that of any other time or place in our domestic life. The impact of this experience on both white and Negro servicemen in Vietnam has formidable ramifications for the future of all Americans. (17)

Young successfully dodged the Uncle Tom stereotype and instead argued pragmatism. Although civil rights for African-Americans should be won at home, and ideally should have been gained over a century ago, the fact remained that they had not been. All African-Americans should take advantage of the opportunity given the Black community to prove themselves to stubborn whites that they are in fact equal.

A number of African-Americans, especially beginning in the late sixties, were vehemently critical of the war and equally critical of members of their community who supported it.

When these anti-Vietnam writers turned to criticism of supporters of the war within the Black community, their tendency was to stereotype them into well-defined personae. Two excellent examples of stereotyping of pro-Vietnam African-Americans can be found in Taylor's anthology.
In his introductory essay, for example, Taylor criticizes African-American support of the war for its "prove yourselves worthy" doctrine. He explains that the doctrine is drawn from a larger-scale belief which he terms "Black Redemptionism":

The redemptionist view of Black people accepts a Black-white view of the world and blocks from sight much of whatever falls outside this drama. It sees the Black man as uniquely damned to a lot of unprecedented suffering and condemnation in the Euro-American Christian framework. . . . And it looks to the inevitable day when Black people will be redeemed in a glory as unprecedented and unique in its height as their ordeal has been in its depths. . . .

In other words, Black redemptionism is the larger set of attitudes out of which, in wartime, a "prove yourselves worthy" doctrine will naturally arise. (18)

Taylor believes the "prove yourselves worthy" doctrine is understandable but by no means justifiable. He also states that such a belief was actually invented by white people to ensure keeping Black Americans on the outside looking in:

The one special mark of Black redemptionism as it operated in these years was its subordination of itself to the American deal. Through the "prove yourselves worthy" kind of argument, it reinforced the white supremacist command to "stay in your place." (19)

The proponents of the "prove yourselves worthy" doctrine arrived at these beliefs by accepting a white-
supremacist view of the America. By stating that the "prove yourselves worthy" doctrine is a manifestation of whites wishing to put African-Americans in their place, Taylor is able to view the lot of them as modern day Uncle Toms.

Another telling example of stereotyping from the Taylor anthology is written by Addison Gayle, Jr. Gayle examines a view, attributed to Dick Gregory, in which certain African-Americans, to ease white apprehensions, are hired out to advance an opinion comfortable to the white community. These African-American "thinkers" tend to sprout up during any period of African-American upheaval to assure the white majority that these dissenters are in fact representative of a small minority of African-American people in the country. The "Hertz Rent-A-Negro Corporation," coined by Gregory, is the term used to describe the phenomena. (20)

Gayle's example concerns two young African-American soldiers, straight from the bush, who were interviewed because of their support of the war effort. One was a private, the other a captain. Gayle argued they were chosen to contrast with Stokely Carmichael and Martin Luther King, two very vocal African-American opponents of the war. The private, a handsome, proud young man, was to be Carmichael's alter-ego. The older, paternal, mature captain was to counter King. Both soldiers dismissed the protest of their fellow African-Americans at home as misguided opinions indicative of people not knowing the whole story. They, of course, professed to have knowledge of the whole story and
believed their cause in Vietnam to be in the best interest of all Americans, black or white. (21)

Gayle's denounces the two soldiers as frauds. He considers them to be perfect examples of the "Hertz Rent-A-

Negro Corporation" at work:

As a Black man, my first response to these two spokesmen was to question the lack of opportunity for soldiers of differing persuasions and temperament to air their views. If my information is correct, there are many black soldiers who do not share the views of these two men. On reflection, it became clear that the job of these two men was simply to rebut two popular figures in the black community, not in an attempt to appeal to Black America, but rather to appease and comfort white America.

America is a country in which comfort is more important than anything else and the statements of Carmichael and King regarding the Vietnam conflict have caused extreme discomfort. It is not comforting to know that a large number of Black men would prefer to die fighting tyranny, oppression, hunger and disease in the Black ghettos of America than to die in the jungles of Vietnam for an abstract freedom for the Vietnamese. (22)

Gayle thus offers a second stereotype of pro-Vietnam African-Americans. He argues that such people's beliefs are arrived at through the request of, or coercion by, the white community. These "Black Leaders" consistently ignore the actual opinions of African-Americans and instead tell white America essentially what it wants to hear. By ignoring the beliefs of the people they supposedly lead, these leaders achieve personal gain while alleviating the apprehensions of
whites. This action, of course, suggests another aspect of the Sambo stereotype in the supporters of the war but simultaneously runs deeper. As opposed to the proponents of the "prove yourselves worthy" doctrine, these African-American supporters of the war, Gayle believes, allowed themselves to be manipulated by the white establishment. Gayle explains:

Yet the most recent event demanding the continual involvement of the Negro leaders had been the war in Vietnam. Almost daily, "responsible leaders" of the Young-Wilkins variety are paraded before the American public, their statements taken as gospel by the American people—despite evidence to the contrary—much in the way that the statements of the two soldiers were taken as evidence that the overwhelming majority of black people in America support the Administration's Vietnam policies; and that the statement made by Stokely Carmichael before nine hundred cheering students and faculty members in a speech at Hampton Institute in 1967—"Hell no, we won't go!"—represents little more than emotionalism, irrationalism, and youthful iconoclasm, completely lacking any basis in fact, and is inapplicable to most black Americans. (23)

Essentially, Gayle has written off any African-American supporter of the war as unrepresentative of African-American thought. He refuses to accept the fact that these people were in fact African-American and their views were as well. By his statements Gayle has professed his belief that the African-American "community" is monolithic in thought and voice. Any African-American whose thoughts fall outside these rather narrow boundaries is dismissed, in so many
words, as un-African-American. Gayle considers them to be nothing more than simply instruments of white establishment.

Based on the samples of prowar African-American views provided in this paper, such opinions as Gayle's and Taylor's seem misguided. Gayle's argument is the most easily discounted by his arguing that African-American support for the war was directed at white people. Of the sources used, articles by Carl Rowan (Reader's Digest) and Whitney Young (Harper's) are the only ones appearing in periodicals with a primarily white audience. The other sources are found in printed media primarily targeted toward African-Americans. Furthermore, Gayle states that African-American supporters of the war functioned to attack antiwar African-Americans. Of Young and Rowan, only Rowan does this in his attack on the policies of Martin Luther King, Jr. However, not even Rowan can qualify for Gayle's stereotype because Rowan cites specific data revealing that a sizeable proportion of African-Americans who did not support King's views. It would be difficult to believe that millions of African-Americans who disagreed with King did so to specifically ease the tensions of the white community.

Taylor's argument is a bit more difficult to discount because of its radical generalizations. Taylor harps upon the "prove yourselves worthy" doctrine because it suggests capitulation to white institutions. There is no question that Young's article advocates the "prove yourselves worthy" argument. While Taylor may scream "Uncle Tom" at Young, or
even Joe Biggers, one could easily argue that they are merely intelligent pragmatists. History reveals that African-American pragmatists, such as Booker T. Washington and Madame C.J. Walker, have always been labeled "Uncle Toms." By writing them off this way, the African-American community fails to realize the contributions these individuals have made for the African-American struggle for equality.

It is truly unfortunate that a man like Joe Biggers, who achieved so much while dispelling so many stereotypes by his performance in Vietnam, could be written off by such radicals as Taylor as an "Uncle Tom." In fact, if one compared the contributions of Biggers and Taylor to the civil rights movement, one could easily conclude that the efforts of Biggers are far more valuable.

If anything, this is the main thrust of this thesis. These African-American supporters of the war were not Uncle Toms but pragmatists. Instead of blowing idealistic smoke about inequality and atrocities, these men decided to make the most out of the situation.

It is unfortunate that these thinkers are forgotten voices in the African-American community. The United States Armed Forces of today is the model for integration and meritocracy for the rest of the nation. The superior performance of African-American servicemen in the Vietnam War has contributed greatly to this achievement. Young, Biggers, and Harris realized the opportunities for racial
advancement in the war. While many African-Americans during the war supported activists such as King and Charmichael, it is important to note that there were also many who did not. It is time that America began appreciating these prowar African Americans, and that their contributions be recognized.
Endnotes


7. Ibid., 35.

8. Ibid.


10. Ibid.


12. Ibid., 135-136.

14. Ibid., 64.
15. Ibid., 63.
16. Ibid.
17. Ibid.
19. Ibid., 12.
21. Ibid.
22. Ibid., 47.
23. Ibid.
Bibliography


