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The latest issue of *Y Ddraig Goch: An Interdisciplinary Honors Journal*, under the editorial leadership of Jenny Lois Francisco, recently joined by Fox Rivera, brings together a dynamic set of articles from across the sciences and humanities. As with past issues of *YDG*, the editorial team worked diligently with contributors and faculty members to present another compelling example of rigorous and creative academic research that is being carried out by undergraduate students. Bravo to our editors and student contributors! And much gratitude to our faculty members.

Readers, we warmly welcome your comments, questions, and suggestions as we continue building our ever-expanding community of artists, scientists, and humanists (or, perhaps, more accurately, artists-scientists-humanists) dedicated to learning and development with Lloyd International Honors College’s guiding motto: *Ludite, Explorate, Perficite!* (Play, Experiment, Perform!). My e-mail is ohali@uncg.edu.

Congratulations all!

Omar H. Ali, Ph.D.
Dean and Professor, Lloyd International Honors College
Letter from the Editors

From the complex biology of rangelands and savannas to the extensive history of fascism and the biblical past, this edition encapsulates the wide scope of interests that students hold. This edition is a reminder of the mission of *Y Ddraig Goch* as a platform for undergraduate students to publish their pieces on academic research and creative writing. In addition to class courses and extracurricular activities, students dedicate time to dive further into the wonders of science, the profundity of humanities, and the beauty in the fine arts. We hope this work continues to inspire and encourage everyone to share their passion and ideas, as it is an opportunity for bigger discoveries and deeper conversations.

We would also like to express our gratitude to the authors contributing to this edition. The editorial team is grateful for their patience, collaboration, and hard work throughout this process. Beh, Jasmine, and Fox have graciously collaborated with the authors and edited these wonderful pieces for us to read and learn. So it is our pleasure to present the fourth issue of *Y Ddraig Goch: An Interdisciplinary Honors Journal*!

For comments and suggestions, please email them to Jenny at j_franci@uncg.edu or Dr. Omar Ali at ohali@uncg.edu.

Jenny Lois Francisco (left), Editor-in-Chief
Beh Reh (middle), Associate Editor
Jasmine Madjd-Sadjadi (right), Associate Editor
Fox Rivera, Associate Editor
Impact of Invasion on the Insect Communities of Montana Rangelands

Zachary Bunch and Morgan Frost
The College of Arts and Sciences, University of North Carolina Greensboro

Abstract

Invasive species have threatened nearly every ecosystem on the planet, negatively affecting resident populations via competition leading to a reduction of native biodiversity. In this project, we investigated the multi-trophic consequences of invasion by *B. arvensis* in Montana rangelands, including the plant, insect, and soil microbial communities. This study was a multi-year experimental field study at Fort Keogh Livestock and Range Research Laboratory in Miles City, Montana. Insects were transported from our field site in Montana to our lab where we sorted, weighed, and identified them. We will use this data to assess the impacts of *B. arvensis* on insect biodiversity in Montana rangelands. We concluded that *B. arvensis* had no statistical effect on insect biodiversity. This may be an indicator that the spread of *B. arvensis* across other rangelands will not be impactful to insect biodiversity.

Introduction

Invasive species threaten nearly every ecosystem on the planet, negatively affecting resident populations via competitive marginalization leading to a reduction of native biodiversity. Grasslands, which cover nearly 40% of the Earth's land area, are incredibly important for their ecosystem services but are frequently dominated by invasive plant species. Invasive species’ presence in grasslands poses an alarming threat to the U.S.

---

1 Huxel, “Rapid Displacement of Native Species by Invasive Species”; Dickson, Hopwood, and Wilsey, “Do Priority Effects Benefit Invasive Plants More than Native Plants?”
2 Gibson, *Grasses and Grassland Ecology.*
agricultural industry, causing billions in losses annually. Grasslands are frequently used as working rangelands, but invasive species harm livestock production by negatively affecting forage quality.\(^3\) \textit{Bromus arvensis} is an invasive, C3 winter annual grass species intentionally introduced to the United States over 100 years ago. Since then, \textit{B. arvensis} has spread rapidly across U.S. rangelands, including the Great Plains and northern mixed grass prairies.\(^4\) \textit{B. arvensis} is known to alter fire patterns, increasing length and severity, which can have devastating ecological consequences.\(^5\) However, even though \textit{B. arvensis} is widespread, it is not currently known how \textit{B. arvensis} specifically impacts the complex multitrophic food web of rangelands, including the native plant, soil microbial, and insect communities. Understanding how invasive species affect our rangeland ecosystems across trophic levels is important for long-term rangeland utilization.

In particular, diversity of the insect community is vital to upholding key ecosystem services that have various ecological benefits, including pollination and composting organic matter.\(^6\) Insects present in rangelands may compete with cattle for native forage, and an invasive grass species that is disliked by both the insects and cattle may increase pressure on native forage. With a decreased supply of the preferred native forage, it is possible that insect biodiversity may decrease, damaging native ecosystems.

In this study, we analyzed the impact of varying levels of the invasive \textit{B. arvensis} on insect biodiversity within the context of Montana rangelands. It is likely that \textit{B. arvensis} will use available resources and space that would otherwise be used by insect-preferred native species. In this study, we hypothesize insect biodiversity will decrease due to the strains on insect-preferred native species caused by \textit{B. arvensis}.

**Methods**

During June of 2021, Frost collected all insect samples for this project from an ongoing multiyear field experiment set up in the mixed grass prairies of Fort Keogh, Montana. Fort Keogh is a 55,000-acre USDA

\(^3\) DiTomaso, “Invasive Weeds in Rangelands.”
\(^5\) Brooks et al., “Exotic Annual Bromus Invasions.”
\(^6\) Noriega et al., “Research Trends in Ecosystem Services Provided by Insects”; Dangles and Casas, “Ecosystem Services Provided by Insects for Achieving Sustainable Development Goals.”
Agricultural Research Service facility used for livestock grazing and range research on mixed grass prairie. In Fort Keogh, we have plots set up along 8 natural invasion gradients. Each gradient consists of three, 4m² plots across three levels of invasion by *B. arvensis* (low (~0%), medium (~50%), high (~100%)). Frost collected insect samples from the center 1m² of each plot by using a modified vacuum leaf blower.

In Fall 2021, Bunch processed all insect samples, collected from all 24 plots. Bunch sorted all insect samples from plant debris and identified each to Order and Family. Bunch also weighed all Orthopteran samples individually, all samples within an Order for each plot, and all samples together for total biomass for each plot (data not included). Order identification allows us to understand how invasion impacts insect community functioning and is used to develop abundance datasets. Family identification will allow us to assess changes in feeding guilds, which is important for further understanding specific functions altered by invasion. This analysis is still ongoing. We used a linear mixed model ANOVA to assess the effect of invasion percent on total average insect abundance. We also visually assessed differences in insect Orders.

**Result**

As shown in Figure 1, average total insect abundance is highest in the plots with a medium level of invasion by *B. arvensis*. Further, the spread in insect abundance is greatest in the plots with low levels of invasion. However, we found no significant impact of invasion on insect biodiversity (*P*=0.4545, Figure 1), meaning insect abundances do not change across invasion levels. When assessing the changes in insect order across invasion levels, we found eight orders present at 0% invasion, seven orders present at 50% invasion, six at 100% invasion, suggesting that while total abundances may not change across invasion levels, diversity may slightly decrease.
Comparison of insect abundance by order per invasion percent.

Discussion

We predicted that *Bromus arvensis* would decrease the levels of insect biodiversity present on Montana rangelands. Figure 1 allows for visual variation in the average presence within a given invasion percentage. Figure 2 shows a visually distant difference regarding the variation in the upper and lower quartile and averages in the box plot. However, these differences are also statistically insignificant and should not be attributed to changes in invasion level. This means our results do not support our hypothesis. *B. arvensis* does not appear to reduce insect biodiversity. It is possible that this lack of change is due to native forage...
being responsible for local insects and is not the limiting factor in their biodiversity. Other possible reasons may include water availability caps and insect biodiversity. Perhaps some other resource, such as water availability caps insect biodiversity in this context. While other studies have found invasive species generally decrease diversity, our data asserts that this may not be the case.\footnote{Schirmel et al., “Impacts of Invasive Plants on Resident Animals across Ecosystems, Taxa, and Feeding Types.”}

Throughout this study, we gained a better understanding of the impacts of the invasive *Bromus arvensis* on the insect biodiversity of Montana rangelands. More broadly, this project contributed to the knowledge surrounding the impacts of invasive plants on rangelands in a broader context. This matters because rangelands are used extensively for grazing cattle, a vital factor in global food production.

### References
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The Fourth Synoptic: A Re-evaluation of the Gospel of John

Jonathan Jefferson

College of Arts and Sciences, University of North Carolina Greensboro

Abstract

The New Testament contains four gospels chronicling the life of Jesus of Nazareth. Three of those gospels—Matthew, Mark, and Luke—are considered Synoptic, because they share many of the same stories, while the Gospel of John is not considered a Synoptic gospel, as 90% of its material is widely regarded as unique. In this paper, I combat this scholarly consensus to argue that the Gospel of John is more similar to the Synoptics than it receives credit for. John’s usage of the Synoptics is revealed by breaking down the chapter containing details of John the Baptist. My analysis shows that nearly every verse in this story reveals an awareness of the Synoptic gospels, both in vocabulary and subject matter. John’s gospel shows an awareness of the Gospel of Matthew’s account of John the Baptist confronting the Jewish authorities about “Abraham’s children,” but restructures it so that Jesus, not John, argues with the Jews regarding their status as “Abraham’s children,” to emphasize Jesus’ oneness with God and status as the I AM. While John’s gospel followed the subject matter of Matthew, linguistic similarities also show he used Mark, as he discusses Jesus’ baptizing with the “Holy Spirit,” while Matthew and Luke added “fire” to their text. However, he also follows Luke in his usage of “stooping down” to emphasize Jesus’ humility, a detail not found in Matthew or Mark. While the text betrays this reliance on the Synoptics, it is clear that John’s gospel rearranges the
Synoptic material to emphasize his own theological points regarding the worldly rejection of Christ, perpetuated by the Johannine community in which the gospel originated from. These details among others will be analyzed to prove that the author of the Gospel of John used all three Synoptic gospels in writing his account, thus solidifying its place as the “Fourth Synoptic.”

Introduction

An age-old question in Biblical scholarship is whether the Gospel of John relied on the Synoptic gospels—Matthew, Mark, and Luke—when writing his gospel. The issue arises from the fact that, as Bart Ehrman points out, except for the Passion narrative, almost none of the material in John reflects significant commonality with the Synoptics. As he notes, “One perennial question is whether John had access to, and made use of, the Synoptic Gospels. The question is somewhat thorny, and… many scholars continue to be persuaded that he did not utilize the Synoptics” (Ehrman, 2020, p. 177).

Ehrman offers three reasons why this is the case. First, there seems to be no reason why John would omit most of the Synoptic stories (apart from the Passion) if he knew them, especially considering he wrote his gospel at least fifteen years after the other three (Ehrman, 2020, p. 178). Secondly, of the similar traditions between John and the Synoptics, Ehrman attributes them to common independently circulating oral traditions and not a knowledge of the Synoptics (Ehrman, 2020, p. 179-180). Thirdly, based on evidence of writing style, repetition, literary seams, and other factors, John used different sources in writing his gospel—including the Signs Source, Discourse Source, and Passion Source—from the Synoptic gospels which were not part of the sources (Ehrman, 2020, pp. 181-182). To investigate this claim, I will analyze and compare the scene on the Baptism of Jesus in the Gospel of John to its counterparts in the Synoptic tradition.

Jesus’ baptism in the Synoptics is depicted as happening in the context of John the Baptist’s sermon. After the baptism, depending on which of the Synoptic gospels you are reading, the Holy Spirit in the form of a dove, either “lands” and/or “descends” on Jesus, and a heavenly voice declares Jesus to be, “my Son, the Beloved, with whom I am well pleased” (Matthew 3:17; Mark 1:11; Luke 3:22). In John’s gospel, however, there is no such description. Instead, it is John the Baptist who describes seeing the dove
descend on Jesus “and remain on him” (John 1:33). There is no heavenly voice speaking or even a description of Jesus’ baptism. However, as I will argue, the author of John’s gospel is fully aware of the Synoptic tradition, and he recontextualizes the material to fit his own theological and narrative purposes, as will be shown below.

Several factors that may have influenced John’s inclusion, exclusion or transformation of the Synoptic material include; the gospel’s emphasis on the division between the Jewish community and John’s community, John’s refutation of false claims that had arisen partly because of the Synoptic accounts regarding John the Baptist’s identity, and John’s focus on the preexistence of Jesus and his oneness with God, including presentation of Jesus’ Passion as part of the plan ordained by God before the world was even created. The depiction of John the Baptist at the start of the fourth gospel will be broken down and analyzed verse-by-verse to show how vital elements that John’s gospel includes in the story can persuasively be traced back to the Synoptics, from where John carefully picks which gospel to use, depending on how best it fits his literary and theological purposes.

**John the Baptizer vs the Jewish Authorities (John 1:19)**

John the Baptist is introduced in the Gospel of John when a group of Jewish priests and Levites are sent by the Pharisees in Jerusalem to question him concerning his identity. This encounter is portrayed more like a court trial where John the Baptist is forced to give an account of himself (Brodie, 1993, p. 148). This scene draws parallels to the Baptist’s introduction in the Gospel of Matthew, which also includes a confrontation between the Baptist and Jewish authorities, although in an entirely different context. In Matthew’s account, John the Baptist directly addresses the Jewish authorities who have come, not to interrogate him like in John’s gospel, but to be baptized by John.

“So when [John the Baptist] saw many Pharisees and Sadducees coming for baptism, he said to them, ‘You brood of vipers! Who warned you to flee from the wrath to come? Bear fruit worthy of repentance. Do not presume to say to yourselves, ‘We have Abraham as our ancestor’; for I tell you, God is able from these stones to raise up children to Abraham” (Matthew 3:7-9).

Such a confrontation is missing in the Gospel of Mark altogether, but in Luke’s gospel, John the Baptist, in essentially verbatim language to that in
Matthew, condemns the entire gathered crowd, rather than just the Jewish leaders (Luke 3:7-14):

John said to the crowds that came out to be baptized by him, “You brood of vipers! Who warned you to flee from the wrath to come? Bear fruits worthy of repentance. Do not begin to say to yourselves, ‘We have Abraham as our ancestor’; for I tell you, God is able from these stones to raise up children to Abraham (Luke 3:7-8).

Both Matthew and Luke use the same exact quote, but each applies it to different audiences. Returning to the topic of John's gospel, while he does not include this condemnation by John the Baptist towards anyone, his application of the confrontation between John the Baptist and Jewish authorities reflects the author’s awareness of the existence of such a conflict in Matthew’s gospel. Additionally, just like Matthew and Luke, above, apply an identical speech by John the Baptist to two different contexts, John repurposes Matthew’s passage regarding “children of Abraham” into a discourse by Jesus later in the gospel (John 8), in the context also of a conflict with the Jewish leadership regarding true Abrahamic sonship. When the Jewish leaders say that “Abraham is our father,” Jesus retorts that “if you were Abraham’s children, you would be doing what Abraham did, but now you are trying to kill me, a man who has told you the truth that I heard from God. That is not what Abraham did. You are indeed doing what your father does” (John 8:39-41). Jesus goes on to specify that the devil is their father and that, not only has Abraham seen Jesus and rejoiced at his arrival, but “Before Abraham was, I AM” (8:44, 56, 58).

John’s gospel recontextualizes John the Baptist’s confrontation with the Jewish leadership (and/or crowds - Synoptics) regarding “Abraham’s children” into a later scene, where instead it is a conflict between Jesus and the Jewish leadership regarding their status as Abraham’s children. John also uses it as a moment to emphasize Jesus’ divinity and preexistence (“Before Abraham was, I AM”), indicating that not only did Abraham prophesy the coming of Jesus, but Jesus exceeds Abraham by claiming equality with God. John’s gospel serves as strong evidence to his awareness of the Synoptic traditions but, just like the other gospel writers, chooses to utilize the Synoptic tradition in a way that best suits his own literary and theological purposes.

1 “I AM” is the name God gave to Moses in Exodus 3:14. By calling himself the I AM, Jesus was equating himself with God, and so the Jews tried to kill him for blasphemy, the punishment dictated by Moses’ Law (Leviticus 24:11-14).
“I am not the Messiah” (John 1:20)

The first question the Jewish authorities ask John the Baptist in John’s gospel is, “Who are you?” Perhaps assuming him to be making messianic claims, as this would be a primary reason for their interrogation in the first place. John the Baptist responds by openly rejecting their suggestion: “I am not the Messiah” (John 1:20). Still, John’s immediate response to deny his messiahship is interesting given it was without direct prompt. When looking into the Synoptics, however, a possible answer is found in the Gospel of Luke. Luke points out that “all were questioning in their hearts concerning John, whether he might be the Messiah” (Luke 3:15-16). In Luke, John the Baptist’s response is an indirect and roundabout way of answering the question—“I baptize you with water; but one who is more powerful than I is coming.” (Luke 3:15-16)—while in John’s gospel the Baptist’s answer is explicit: “I am not the Messiah” (John 1:20). It is noteworthy that this question does not appear in either Mark or Matthew. ² It is possible John’s gospel did this to refute those who believed John the Baptist to be the Messiah. Even well into the second century, John the Baptist had remaining followers who professed that he was the true Messiah, and so John’s gospel was possibly refuting this false belief by being the only gospel to explicitly do so (Culpepper, 2017, p. 158). As D. Moody Smith explains:

More attention is paid the Baptist in the Fourth Gospel than in any of the others, if only to make sure that the reader keeps him in his proper, subordinate place. Indeed, the fourth evangelist finds it necessary to declare at the outset that John was not the light but came to bear witness to the light (1:8) and to have John, in his very first words, subordinate himself to Jesus (1:15, cf. verse 30). The concern to keep the identity of the Baptist in proper perspective accords with John’s concertation upon the true and proper confession of Jesus as the Messiah and Son of God (Smith, 1995 p. 104).

“Are you Elijah?” (John 1:21)

The Jewish authorities next ask John the Baptist if he is Elijah, which John denies (John 1:21). Within the context of John’s gospel,

² John’s statement that “I baptize you with water for repentance, but one who is more powerful than I is coming after me” is found in Matthew (3:11) and in a fragmented capacity in Mark (“the one who is more powerful than I is coming after me...I have baptized you with water; but he will baptize you with the Holy Spirit”, Mark 1:7-8). Both gospels, however, lack the question of John the Baptist’s messiahship which prompts the response only in Luke’s gospel.
however, the question does not make sense given that John (the gospel writer) provides no reason for John the Baptist to be identified with Elijah. The answer, instead, is found only in the Synoptic gospels. Both Mark (1:6) and Matthew (3:4) mention John the Baptist’s clothing of camel’s hair and leather belt as an allusion to Elijah’s description in 2 Kings 1:8—“They answered him, ‘A hairy man, with a leather belt around his waist.’ He said, ‘It is Elijah the Tishbite.’” This reference is combined with another Elijah allusion, this one concerning John the Baptist’s diet of locusts and wild honey as part of his nomadic lifestyle, similar to how Elijah lived in the wilderness and was fed by ravens (1 Kings 17:5-6).

In contrast, while Luke also makes no mention of the Baptist’s clothing, he connects John the Baptist with Elijah in a much more explicit manner. At the start of Luke’s gospel, the angel Gabriel appears to the high priest Zechariah and prophesied that Zechariah’s wife shall give birth to a son named John, and that his son shall “turn many of the people of Israel to the Lord their God...with the spirit and power of Elijah he will go before him” (Luke 1:16-17). Given that the Gospel of John does not include allusions to John the Baptist being Elijah, either explicitly or implicitly, he must have assumed his readers were aware of the Synoptic accounts. Otherwise, the Jewish authorities’ question would make no sense to his readers regarding John the Baptist specifically.

Moreover, John’s gospel has John the Baptist respond to the question of if he is Elijah with an adamant “no” (“I am not”; John 1:21). Nowhere in the Synoptics does John the Baptist explicitly deny the claim that he is Elijah—although he never directly affirms it, either—but Jesus does. In the Gospel of Matthew, Jesus speaks very highly of John the Baptist, saying that “among those born of women no one has arisen greater than John the Baptist; yet the least in the kingdom of heaven is greater than he” (Matthew 11:11). Jesus continues that “all the prophets and the law prophesied until John came; and if you are willing to accept it, he is Elijah who is to come” (Matthew 11:14). A few chapters later, after Elijah appears at Jesus’ Transfiguration, and Jesus explains to his disciples that “I tell you that Elijah has already come, and they did not recognize him, but they did to him whatever they pleased” (Matthew 17:12), with Matthew adding “then the

---

3 Granted, the Gospel of John’s Jewish audience would be fully aware of the tradition that Elijah would come before the Messiah’s arrival, which originated from the fact that according to 2 Kings 2:1-18, Elijah never died and instead went straight to heaven in a fiery chariot. However, John’s gospel states no reason why John the Baptist specifically should be identified as Elijah.
disciples understood that he was speaking to them about John the Baptizer” (Matthew 17:13).

Jesus’ words draw a comparison to the angel Gabriel’s announcement to Zechariah in Luke 1:17. Evidently, these passages caused some confusion given that many Christian commentators in the early centuries wrote against the “false doctrine” that John the Baptizer was the physical reincarnation of Elijah. For example, Saint Remigius in the fifth century wrote that, “Whoso has ears of the heart to hear, that is, to understand, let him understand; for He did not say that John was Elias in person, but in the Spirit” (Böer, 2012, p. 414-415). The fourth-century Saint Jerome also wrote that:

> John then is said to be Elias, not according to the foolish philosophers, and certain heretics who bring forward their metempsychosis, or passing of the soul from one body to another; but because (as it is in another passage of the Gospel) he came in the spirit and power of Elias and had the same grace and measure of the Holy Spirit. But in austerity of life, and fortitude of spirit, Elias and John were alike; they both dwelt in the desert, both were girded with a girdle of skins; because he reproved Ahab and Jezebel for their wickedness, Elias was compelled to fly; because he condemned the unlawful union of Herod and Herodias, John is beheaded (Böer, 2012, p. 414).

The Gospel of John may have been combatting this misunderstanding from the Synoptics by having John the Baptizer explicitly deny that he is Elijah, again revealing his awareness of the Synoptic accounts, particularly the Gospel of Matthew in this case.

**“Are you the prophet?” (John 1:21)**

> While the four gospels have differing viewpoints regarding John the Baptizer’s relationship (or lack thereof) to Elijah, one passage that all four gospels includes in the Baptism section is the prophesy from Isaiah 40:3, with all four gospels identifying John as— “The voice of one crying out in the wilderness: ‘Prepare the way of the Lord, make his paths straight.’” Interestingly, Mark is the only gospel to also include an amalgamation of Malachi 3:1—“See, I am sending my messenger to prepare the way before me”—and Exodus 23:20— “I am going to send an angel in front of you”—in his quotation of this prophesy: “See, I am sending my messenger ahead of you, who will prepare your way” (Mark 1:2), while the three other gospels omit this amalgamation in favor of only the Isaiah text (Kazmierski, 1996, p. 31). Yet, John the Baptizer in John’s gospel reveals to his close disciples, but not the Jewish authorities, that he, John, “came baptizing with
water for this reason, that [Jesus] might be revealed to Israel” (John 1:31). These words, placed in John the Baptist’s mouth, draw on the Marcan amalgamation (“See, I am sending my messenger ahead of you, who will prepare your way”) and paint John the Baptist in a new light, less as a prophet and more as one who bears witnesses. According to D. Moody Smith,

“Certainly the Johannine version, and particularly the words of John the Baptist, can readily be understood as an adaptation based on the Marcan narrative. John’s words, and the description of the Baptist, have been shaped so that he becomes a witness only, rather than a prophet in his own right (Smith, 2008, p. 104).

Therefore, all four gospels all indicate that John the Baptist is this “messenger” who Isaiah prophesied: a man who lives in the wilderness preaching the imminent arrival of the Messiah. The issue for John’s gospel, however, as with the question of John’s identity as Elijah, is that no context is given for the reader to understand this identification with Isaiah’s “messenger” unless they were aware of the Synoptic descriptions of John the Baptist. Only the Synoptics specify that John’s “appearance in the wilderness” marks him as the fulfillment of this prophecy. According to Mark 1:4, “John the Baptist appeared in the wilderness”; for Matthew (3:1-2), “In those days John the Baptist appeared in the wilderness of Judea, proclaiming, ‘repent, for the Kingdom of Heaven has come near’”; and in Luke 3:2, “…the word of God came to John son of Zechariah in the wilderness.” While all three Synoptics imply this, only Matthew explicitly links this prophecy to John the Baptist: “[John the Baptist] is the one of whom the prophet Isaiah spoke” (Matthew 3:3).

Nowhere in John’s gospel does he mention John the Baptist living in the wilderness, and so the connection between John the Baptist and the “messenger” is lost to John’s readers unless they are aware of the extra details regarding John the Baptist’s lifestyle, found only in the Synoptics. Additionally, after John the Baptist himself denies the identification with Elijah and the prophet (1:21), those sent by the Pharisees ask John one more question, “Why then are you baptizing if you are neither the Messiah, nor Elijah, nor the prophet?” (John 1:25). Once again, John’s gospel assumes his readers’ familiarity with the Synoptics, as John’s gospel never mentions before this point that John the Baptist was baptizing people.

Jewish Community vs John’s Community (John 1:19-23)
It is also noteworthy that, according to some scholars, the questions the Jewish authorities asked John the Baptist regarding his identity carried exclusively Jewish connotations that only a Jewish audience would understand. [The questions] are all in terms of concepts that a non-Jew could neither conceive of nor understand: ‘Are you the messiah?’ ‘Are you Elijah?’ ‘Are you the prophet?’ Only Jews used the term ‘messiah.’ Only the Jews developed a mythology around their messianic hopes that involved the return of the prophet Elijah to prepare the way for the messiah. Only the Jews would understand ‘the prophet’ to be the one whom Moses was said to have promised that God would raise up in the last days (Deuteronomy 18:15) (Spong, 2013, pp. 34-35). Here begins the distinction between the Jewish authorities (“of the world”) and John’s/Jesus’ followers (“not of this world”) in the Gospel of John’s account (c.f. John 1:10; 17:16). After addressing his own identity, John the Baptist turns his attention to the coming Messiah, noting to the Jewish Priests and Levites, “I baptize with water [but] among you stands one whom you do not know, the one who is coming after me; I am not worthy to untie the thong of his sandal” (John 1:26-27).

John the Baptist’s first statement here about the world not knowing Jesus, recurs throughout the Gospel of John. Having John the Baptist say, “among you stands one whom you do not know” calls back to a statement made in the gospel’s prologue, only a few verses earlier, regarding “the true light,” or Jesus Christ—“He was in the world, and the world came into being through him; yet the world did not know him. He came to what was his own, and his own people did not accept him” (John 1:10-11). This theme is also echoed later in the gospel by Jesus himself, while praying for his disciples shortly before his arrest in Gethsemane: “the world has hated them [Jesus’ disciples] because they do not belong to the world, just as I do not belong to the world… the world has hated them because they do not belong to the world, just as I do not belong to the world” (John 17:14, 25).

Thomas Brodie also argues that “among you stands one whom you do not know” carries an apocalyptic expectation with it and is thus a call back to the Baptist’s preaching in the Synoptics about harvesting and burning rotten fruit (Mark 1:7-8; Matthew 3:10-12). While the Baptist’s statement in the Gospel of John is far less dramatic, it still carries the Synoptic theme of the coming Christ fundamentally disrupting “set ways of thinking and doing” (Brodie, 1993, p. 73) and further reveals John’s awareness of the Synoptic traditions, even as he chooses to recontextualize the passage.
“I am not Worthy to Untie the Thong of His Sandal” (John 1:27)

While the “rejection of Jesus by the world” is mainly a Johannine theme, John the Baptizer’s next phrase in John is found in the Synoptics. In saying that the Baptizer is unworthy to untie Jesus’ sandals, the author of John’s gospel showcases his penchant for picking different material from the Synoptics. In this particular case, he chooses to follow Mark 1:17 and Luke 3:16, rather than Matthew 3:11, when referencing the specific action the Baptizer is claiming to be unworthy to perform: “untie the thongs of” Jesus’ sandals. In contrast, Matthew has John the Baptizer say that he is unworthy to “carry” Jesus’ sandals (c.f. Mark 1:7; Luke 3:16; John 1:27; Matthew 3:11). With the consensus among scholars that Mark was the first gospel to be written and that Luke and Matthew both used Mark in their writing, then it would seem that Matthew chose here to change Mark’s text, while Luke chose not to. This is important because, as noted above in the “Abraham’s children” confrontation, John prefers Matthew’s language. However, it is interesting that here he prefers not to side with Matthew.

Untying someone’s sandals in Jesus’ day was the duty of the lowest servants in the household, the slave, and by saying that he was unworthy to even perform the lowest of lowest actions for Jesus, John the Baptizer shows great humility (Barnes, 2001, note on Mt. 3:11). Matthew may have changed “untie” to “carry” as that action is less demeaning—though still low—but the Gospel of John chose to follow Mark and Luke in order to further showcase John the Baptizer’s humility at declaring him unworthy to be Jesus’ lowest servant. Although the Gospel of John follows Mark here, it is possible he is also aware of Luke’s gospel, as not only does Luke have “untie the thongs” rather than Matthew’s “carry,” but Luke omits Mark’s detail of John the Baptizer being unworthy “to stoop down and untie…” (Mark 1:7), and therefore parallels John’s gospel in that both simply state: “I am not worthy to untie the thong of his sandals” (Luke 3:16; John 1:27). If John also chose to omit this minor detail, it would be odd given that Luke chose to, as well, possibly indicating that John was using both Mark and Luke when writing his account of John the Baptizer.

“The one who is coming after me” (John 1:27)

In this phrase, the Gospel of John chooses his terminology based on different Synoptic equivalents in his description of Jesus coming after John the Baptist. In verse 27, John the Baptizer calls Jesus “the one who is
coming after me,” just as he does to the crowds he speaks to in the Synoptics:

Mark 1:7—“The one who is more powerful than I is coming after me.”
Matthew 3:11—“But one who is more powerful than I is coming after me.”
Luke 3:16—“But one who is more powerful than I is coming after me.”

Notice that Matthew and Luke use identical wording, while Mark emphasizes that Jesus is “the one,” rather simply a “one.” The Gospel of John follows Mark’s phrasing in calling Jesus “the one who is coming after me,” indicating he may have been using that Gospel in particular rather than Matthew or Luke in order to emphasize Jesus’ specialness. These vocabulary pairings with the Gospel of Mark show that John’s author chose to follow Mark much more closely with this sentence. These close similarities to Mark could not be accidental given the changes Matthew and Luke—but not John—made throughout this account. John’s gospel, however, makes the interesting choice of omitting the detail found in all three synoptic verses that Jesus is “more powerful than I” and simply has John the Baptist tell the Jewish authorities that the Messiah is “coming after me.” Instead, the Gospel of John moves the phrase so that John the Baptist only reveals Jesus’ higher status over himself to his private disciples and not to the Jewish authorities, as he later tells his disciples that Jesus “ranks ahead of me,” a detail he neglected to reveal to the Jewish authorities (John 1:30).

In the Synoptics, Jesus approaches John the Baptist and is baptized while John is speaking to the crowds (see Matthew 3:12-13; Mark 1:8-9; Luke 3:21). The Gospel of John, however, splits John the Baptist’s discussions about Jesus into two separate conversations, with two separate groups of people, on two separate days: “The next day [John the Baptist] saw Jesus coming toward him” and began to speak about Jesus (John 1:29). While it is unclear who the Baptist is speaking to, it is reasonable that John uses the phrase “the next day” to indicate a change of audience, meaning that the Baptist is no longer speaking with the Jewish authorities in this context (John 1:29). Such a view is supported by John 1:35, where “next day” more clearly indicates a different audience: “The next day, John again was standing with two of his disciples, and as he watched Jesus walk by…”). Only in this private setting with his disciples does John the Baptist reveal
more details about Jesus’ identity in John’s gospel, details that are also found in the unified account of John’s preaching in the Synoptics.

**John’s Baptism with Water and Jesus’ Baptism with the Holy Spirit (John 1:33)**

When the Jewish authorities questioned John the Baptist about his identity, John simply said of to Jesus that, “I baptize with water” but there is “one who is coming after me” (John 1:26-27). In the Synoptics, however, John the Baptist gives more details about the nature of the baptism that the “one who comes after me” will perform. According to Matthew 3:11⁴ and Luke 3:16, ⁵ it would involve the “Holy Spirit and fire,” but in Mark (1:8), ⁶ only the “Holy Spirit” is mentioned, and “fire” is omitted. Though the author of John followed Luke and Matthew in the some of the previous texts, here he follows Mark again, giving evidence that he is aware of all three Synoptic gospels and their distinct content.

The Gospel of John chooses to split this conversation in two, having John the Baptist tell the Jewish authorities on one day that he baptizes with water, with no mention of Jesus baptizing with the Holy Spirit (and fire), and then has John the Baptist tell a different group of people—possibly only his close disciples—on a separate day that Jesus “is the one who baptizes with the Holy Spirit” (John 1:33). John the Baptist reveals here that he was given, by God, the key to figuring out who the Messiah would be: “I myself did not know him, but the one who sent me to baptize with water said to me, ‘He on whom you see the Spirit descend and remain is the one who baptizes with the Holy Spirit’” (John 1:33). Now, he reveals it to his closest disciples and not to the Jewish authorities (Segovia, 1998, p. 88). Not only does this continue the theme of division between the Jews (“of this world”) and John/Jesus’ followers (“not of this world”), but once again, John’s gospel chooses to follow Mark in terms of vocabulary, considering that both Mark and John only mention Jesus’ baptizing with the “Holy Spirit,” while only Matthew and Luke add “and fire.” The possible reason for Matthew and Luke’s addition of “fire” is probably due to them also being the only gospels to extend John the Baptist’s sermon to include a description of what

---

⁴ “I baptize you with water for repentance, but one who is more powerful than I is coming after me…He will baptize you with the Holy Spirit and fire.

⁵ “I baptize you with water; but one who is more powerful than I is coming…He will baptize you with the Holy Spirit and fire.”

⁶ “I baptize you with water; but he will baptize you with the Holy Spirit.”
happens to sinners: “Even now the ax is lying at the root of the trees; every tree therefore that does not bear good fruit is cut down and thrown into the fire” (Matthew 3:10; Luke 3:9). Both Mark and John omit this verse about casting bad fruit into the fire, which may also explain why they also omit the “fire” reference in the description of the type of baptism Jesus performs.

“He was before me” (John 1:30)

John the Baptist also reveals to his inner circle that not only does Jesus’ rank ahead of him, as he also told the Jewish authorities, but that Jesus “was before me” (John 1:30); a detail he neglected to tell the authorities. This temporal reference is unique to John’s gospel. John the Baptist does not add “he was before me” while discussing Jesus to the crowds in the Synoptic gospels, because the Gospel of John constructs Jesus’s pre-incarnation in a way not referenced in the Synoptics. John’s gospel even opens by describing Jesus as the Logos (Word): “In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. He was in the beginning with God. All things came into being through him, and without him not one thing came into being…and the Word became flesh and lived among us” (John 1:1-3, 14).

This opening to the Gospel of John shares linguistic similarities to the creation story in Genesis—“in the beginning, God created the heavens and the earth” (Genesis 1:1)—stating the gospel’s notion that Jesus was the true creator of the world and all life in it from the opening verse. Additionally, some scholars, such as David Jeffrey and Leon Morris, believe that the use of logos as identification for Jesus in the prologue to John’s gospel, may be derived from the Gospel of Luke’s introduction, which predates John’s gospel. 7 In the introduction to his own gospel, Luke references the sources he used in writing his own gospel, and says, “just as they were handed on to us by those who from the beginning were eyewitnesses and servants of the word” (Luke 1:3). If so, it is but another example of the Gospel of John showcasing his awareness of the Synoptic gospels. Besides this, there are numerous explicit references to Jesus’ preexistence with God in the Gospel of John. During the Farewell Discourse Jesus delivers shortly before his arrest, for example, he prays, “Father, glorify me in your own presence with the glory that I had in your presence before the world existed” (John 17:5). Jesus also says on multiple occasions that he descended from heaven (3:13;

6:33) and is not from this world (8:23; 16:28), at one point saying, “You are from below, I am from above; you are of this world, I am not of this world” (8:23). Most explicitly, Jesus says that “Before Abraham was, I AM,” using the name of God in the Old Testament while simultaneously affirming that He existed before Abraham (8:58), as well as saying “the father and I are one” (10:30). Except for the virgin birth story in Matthew and Luke, which by itself indicates the preexistence of Christ, the Synoptic gospels do not contain nearly as many references to Jesus being preincarnate as John’s gospel, although there are a few noteworthy references. In the Gospel of Luke, for example, Jesus says “I watched Satan fall from heaven like a flash of lightning,” referring to an event that happened at Creation, long before Jesus was born in the flesh (Luke 10:18; c.f. Ezekiel 28:13-19) and says he is the “I AM” when asked at his trial if he is the Son of God, using the name of God (Luke 22:70; c.f. John 8:58). By not having John the Baptist tell the Jewish authorities that Jesus is the preexisted Christ come in the flesh, the Gospel of John combines its emphasis on Jesus’ preexistence and the world’s rejection of Him. After all, later in John’s gospel, Jesus tells the Jewish authorities of his preexistence and they attempt to stone him to death for claiming it: “Jesus said to them, ‘Very truly, I tell you, before Abraham was, I AM.’ So they picked up stones to throw at him, but Jesus hid himself and went out of the temple” (John 8:58-59).

**Jesus vs “the Jews” (1:37)**

Although the passage regarding Abraham, as found in the Baptism section in the Synoptics and Jesus’ self-identification as the I AM comes later in John’s gospel (John 8), the diametric reactions of Jesus’ followers—who leave John the Baptist to follow Jesus upon hearing of Jesus’ preexistence (John 1:37)—and that of the Jewish authorities—who attempt to kill Jesus upon hearing his claim of preexistence (John 8:59)—furthers the split communities that the Gospel of John portrays.

This separation of “the Jews” from Jesus and his followers is a reoccurring theme in the Gospel of John. For example, Jesus often distances himself from “the Law of Moses,” and describes it as the Law for the Jews, not himself and, by extension, not for those who believe in Him: “In your law it is written that the testimony of two witnesses is valid” (8:17); “Is it not written in your law, ‘I said, you are gods’?” (10:34); “It was to fulfill the word that is written in their law, ‘They hated me without a cause’” (15:25). Instead of new “laws,” Jesus instead gives his followers new
“commandments”: “I give you a new commandment…” (13:34); “If you love me, you will keep my commandments” (14:15); “They who have my commandments and keep them are those who love me” (14:21). This distinction between “your law” and “my commandments” serves to distinguish Jesus’ commandments under the new covenant from Moses’ Law under the old Covenant (Fraser, 2003, section 3).

Raymond E. Brown offered the following explanation to the Gospel of John’s division of communities:

[The Gospel of John’s author] may well have been a Jew by birth; yet most often he uses this expression with a hostile tone for those of Jewish birth who distrust or reject Jesus and/or his followers. “The Jews” include Jewish authorities but cannot be confined to them; and the generalizing term may be an attempt to portray the Jewish opponents in the synagogue of John’s time—opponents who are persecuting John’s community (16:2) even as Jewish opponents in Jesus’ time were remembered as persecuting him. Consequently, most often “the Jews” seem to be a disliked group separate from the followers of Jesus; and Jesus at times speaks like a non-Jew (or, at least, not as one of those “Jews”): “written in your Law” (10:34); “in their Law” (15:25); “as I said to the Jews” (13:33) (Brown, 1997, p. 339, footnote 13).

The Passion Starts at the Baptism (1:28)

When John the Baptist sees Jesus coming towards him, he declares “here is the Lamb of God who takes away the sin of the world” (John 1:29). The reference of Jesus as “the Lamb of God” is almost exclusively Johannine and is not found in the Synoptic accounts. This is an allusion to the Passover lamb sacrificed to commemorate the Israelites’ freedom from slavery in the book of Exodus. The Gospel of John includes material in his telling of the baptism scene that alludes to Jesus’ eventual Passion, and by referencing the Passion right from the start of Jesus’ appearance, it furthers the notion that John’s gospel has, that this has been planned from before the world was even created. The Book of Revelation, another Johannine work, describes a great “marriage supper of the Lamb” where Jesus, the Lamb, celebrates his union with His bride, the Church (Revelation 19:6-9). While

---

8 See also John 15:10, 12, 14. 9 Revelation 1:1 identifies the author of the book as “John,” but most scholars agree that Revelation and the Gospel of John were authored by different people due to differences in language and eschatology, although there is some consensus that whoever wrote Revelation was at least aware of the Gospel of John and attempted to replicate some of its major themes, which is why both works are counted among the Johannine literature of the New Testament (Cross, 2005, “Revelation, Book of”).
the Synoptic gospels also use wedding imagery, particular through parables, the Gospel of John contains a unique narrative story exclusive to his gospel, that being the wedding feast at Cana (John 2:1-11). It is here that Jesus performs his first public miracle, immediately after attracting disciples—including two of John the Baptist’s followers. Shortly after this story, John the Baptist appears in the Gospel of John for the final time, in which his disciples inform him that Jesus is attracting more followers than John (John 3:22-26). John the Baptist replies with a wedding metaphor to explain his relationship with Jesus Christ:

John answered, “No one can receive anything except what has been given from heaven. You yourselves are my witnesses that I said, ‘I am not the Messiah, but I have been sent ahead of him.’ He who has the bride is the bridegroom. The friend of the bridegroom, who stands and hears him, rejoices greatly at the bridegroom’s voice. For this reason, my joy has been fulfilled. He must increase, but I must decrease.”

Besides the wedding imagery, reminiscent of the Johannine Book of Revelation and its imagery of the “marriage supper of the Lamb”, Jesus is only explicitly called “the Lamb of God” twice in the Gospel of John (1:29, 36), both times by John the Baptist and only in this passage, although the Gospel of John reuses the motif at the end of the gospel to symbolically link Jesus’ death to that of the lamb sacrificed at Passover for the atonement of people’s sins. The Gospel of Mark says that Jesus was crucified around 9:00 a.m. on the day after the Passover meal was eaten, while John’s gospel has Jesus crucified around noon on the day the Passover lamb was being prepared (Ehrman, 2020, p. 92). Given the Gospel of John’s awareness of the Gospel of Mark, as established above through linguistic similarities, John’s gospel amends the day of Jesus’ death to further emphasizes Jesus’ identity as “the Lamb of God.” As Bart Ehrman explains:

In the Fourth Gospel, Jesus’ death represents the salvation of God, just as the sacrifice of the lamb represented salvation for the ancient Israelites during the first Passover. Perhaps John (or his source) made a change in the day and hour of Jesus’ death precisely to reinforce this theological point. In this Gospel, Jesus dies on the same day as the Passover lamb, at the same hour (just after noon)—to show that Jesus really is the Lamb of God (Ehrman, 2020, p. 92).

---

10 See the Parable of the Wedding Banquet (Matthew 22:1-14); the Parable of the Ten Bridesmaids (Matthew 25:1-13); the Parable of the Great Dinner (Luke 14:15-24).
Not only does the Lamb imagery draw allusions to Jesus’ death from his very first physical appearance in the Gospel of John, but John’s is the only gospel to mention that this all took place “in Bethany across the Jordan where John was baptizing” (John 1:28). Bethany has a special significance in the Synoptic gospels, as the first time it appears in them is as the city where Jesus began his entry into Jerusalem on Palm Sunday (Mark 11:1; Luke 19:29), the official start of his Passion week. After his resurrection, Luke’s gospel also mentions that it was in Bethany that Jesus ascended into heaven (Luke 24:50). By introducing Bethany here rather than at the start of Jesus’ Passion, the Gospel of John symbolically alludes to the fact that—for John’s gospel at least—Jesus’ death was predestined since before the world was created (John 17:4-5). John’s gospel also furthers the connection between Bethany and Jesus’ death by having it as the location where Jesus raised Lazarus from the dead—an event exclusive to the Gospel of John—after four days, which in John’s gospel not only foreshadows Jesus’ own resurrection after three days of his death, but is also given as the direct reason the Jewish authorities sought to kill Jesus (Moloney, 1998, p. 325). By introducing Bethany so early, the Gospel of John places Jesus’ coming death into his reader’s mind from the very start.

Bethany is also the location in the Gospels of Matthew, Mark, and John that Jesus is anointed in preparation for his death. John’s gospel, rather explicitly, states he expects his readers to be aware of this event; in John 11:1, he states, “Now a certain man was ill, Lazarus of Bethany, the village of Mary and her sister Martha. Mary was the one who anointed the Lord with perfume and wiped his feet with her hair; her brother Lazarus was ill.” The issue here is that, while John does depict his version of this anointment, he waits to do so later, and by mentioning it here in the manner he does, he clearly expects his readers to not only understand what he is talking about, but probably also to make the connection—which Jesus states in Matthew, Mark, and John—that the woman “has anointed my body beforehand [to prepare] for its burial” (Mark 14:8; c.f. Matthew 26:12; John 12:7). The general facts of Jesus being anointed by a woman with expensive oil is mentioned in all four gospels, however the details between each of the accounts, particularly Luke in relation to the other three, \(^{11}\) has led some

---

\(^{11}\) While a full discussion of this is not possible here, some of the most notable differences between Luke’s account and Matthew, Mark and John’s include: Luke’s account takes place twelve chapters before Jesus enters Jerusalem, whereas the other three gospels have the incident taking place a few days before Jesus’ death; it occurs at Simon the Leper’s house in Luke, but at Simon the Pharisee’s house in Matthew and
scholars to believe Jesus was anointed at least twice, once earlier in his ministry as described in Luke’s gospel, and the second time mere days before his crucifixion as described in Matthew, Mark and John’s gospels (Mack, 2008, pp. 85-106). While it seems clear from the details between the four gospels (see footnote) that John was describing the anointing in Matthew and Mark, he does share one important commonality with Luke’s account: the spot where Jesus was anointed with oil by the woman. Matthew and Mark say it was poured on Jesus’ head, but John’s gospel follows Luke’s account in stating that it was on Jesus’ feet. This complicates the issue of the unity of the events, however, this specific reference to the feet indicates John may be referencing Luke’s account. Only in Luke’s gospel does Jesus rebuke his host, Simon, for judging the women by saying “I entered your house; you gave me no water for my feet, but she has bathed my feet with her tears and dried them with her hair. You gave me no kiss, but from the time I came in she has not stopped kissing my feet. You did not anoint my head with oil, but she has anointed my feet with ointment” (Luke 7:44-46). Simon did not perform the custom of washing his guest’s feet, and the Gospel of John’s parallel to Luke’s account—the only one to further emphasize the feet—not only reveals John’s knowledge of Luke, but his other details as they relate to Matthew and Mark’s account emphasizes his connection of this event—and the location where it took place—to Jesus’ Passion narrative.

Furthermore, only in John’s gospel does Jesus wash his disciples’ feet at the Last Supper, illustrating his teaching that “servants are not greater than their master,” and so this connection to Bethany, combined with John the
Baptizer discussing how he is unworthy to untie Jesus’ sandals draws a comparison in his reader’s mind to this later scene which occurs at Jesus’ Passion (John 13:1-20).

**Jesus’ Baptism and the Dove (John 1:32)**

Finally, there is the way in which the Gospel of John handles Jesus’ actual baptism. Rather than including it in narrative form, he simply has John the Baptist describe his seeing the dove descend on Jesus. Interestingly, however, John’s gospel never states that Jesus was baptized. Similar to John the Baptist only explicitly denouncing his Messiahship in John’s gospel (1:20), probably to combat John’s followers who falsely (to the author of the Gospel of John, at least) believed it so, the baptism of Jesus by John could have been used by these same followers to hold John the Baptist above Jesus.

A similar situation is reflected in Matthew’s gospel, where John the Baptist responds to Jesus’ request to be baptized by saying it should be the other way around: “‘I need to be baptized by you, and do you come to me?’ But Jesus answered him, ‘Let it be so now; for it is proper for us in this way to fulfill all righteousness’” (Matthew 3:13-15). Only after Jesus’ reassurance does John baptize him. If Jesus was the Messiah, and yet John baptized him, would this not, by implication, place John at a place of greater authority, above Jesus? Could this also not be seen as embarrassing for Jesus’ followers, in relation to John the Baptist’s followers? (Powell, 1998, p. 47; Casey, 2010, p. 35; Theissen, 1998, p. 207). It is possible then that the Gospel of John omits references to Jesus being baptized so that this detail would not be used to hold John the Baptist in higher esteem than Jesus Christ.

However, the Gospel of John does include elements from the baptism scene. In John 1: 32-34, while John the Baptist is speaking to a separate group, the day after his confrontation with the Jewish authorities, he states that:

> “I saw the Spirit descending from heaven like a dove, and it remained on him. I myself did not know him, but the one who sent me to baptize with water said to me, ‘He on whom you see the Spirit descend and remain is the one who baptizes with the Holy Spirit.’ And I myself have seen and have testified that this is the Son of God.”

In this passage, John the Baptist directly references elements from the Synoptic accounts of Jesus’ baptism, including “the Holy Spirit,” in the form
of a “dove,” landing and remaining on him. Compare, for example, with the following:

Matt 3:16: “And when Jesus had been baptized, just as he came up from the water, suddenly the heavens were opened to him and he saw the Spirit of God descending like a dove and alighting on him.”

Mark 1:10: “And just as he was coming up out of the water, he saw the heavens torn apart and the Spirit descending like a dove on him.”

Luke 3:21-22: “...when Jesus also had been baptized and was praying, the heaven was opened, and the Holy Spirit descended upon him in bodily form like a dove”.

Note that Matthew mentions the dove “alighting,” or “settling,” on Jesus rather than simply “descending.” Here, John, follows Matthew once again, by mentioning the added detail that the dove did not simply descend on Jesus, as in Mark and Luke, but also “remained”/”settled” on him. However, he follows Luke by referring to the “Holy Spirit” in contrast to Mark’s “Spirit” and Matthew’s “Spirit of God.” But does not follow Luke’s description of the dove being “in bodily form.”

So, while John’s gospel does not find it necessary to retell the baptism itself, as found in the Synoptics, a closer analysis of its language and content, allows one to see the similarities shared with the Synoptics. These details give the impression that John is familiar with and aware of the versions of the story as it appears in the Synoptics. Yet, John chooses to carefully use them selectively, in order to focus exclusively on his literary and theological purposes. The theological message he wants to focus on is that Jesus is the pre-incarnate Word, affirmed by the Holy Spirit publicly, as prophesied by Isaiah (Sysoev, 2020, pg. 9-11).

It is for the same reasons also, that John omits the reference to the “voice from Heaven” which accompanies dove in the Synoptics, saying, “You are my Son, the Beloved, with whom I am well pleased” (c.f. Matt 3:17, Mark 1:11, Luke 3:22). This is because John, the author, has already introduced Jesus (Word) as originating from God/Heaven in his opening verse of the gospel: (“The Word was with God, and the Word was God”; John 1:1). The Synoptics do not make such a claim. It is also possible that John, in an attempt to not repeat himself later, omitted this declaration here, for his own unique and iconic verse about God’s love for Jesus in John 3:16: (“For God so loved the world, that he gave his only Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life”). Although the
most widely quoted translation of this verse is the King James Version, which translates the verse as “gave his only begotten Son,” the Greek word used is monogènes, which more closely means “only one of its kind or class” (Houdmann, “What Does It Mean…,” pg. 2-4).

John’s gospel also recontextualizes the “heavenly voice” in another text unique to his gospel. Following Jesus’ triumphal entry into Jerusalem (John 12), he speaks to a crowd about his upcoming death. Jesus asks his Father to glorify his name, and then a “thunderous voice from heaven,” which all the people standing around hear, says, “I have glorified it, and I will glorify it again” (John 12:28). Jesus then explains to the crowd that this voice is for their sake, so that they may believe (John 12:30). As many scholars have pointed out, John is specifically alluding to Jesus’ baptism through the wording, and by placing the voice from heaven here rather than at the baptism, John is emphasizing that Jesus’ true glory was manifested upon his death and resurrection, rather than at his baptism. Once again, the author of the Gospel of John proves his awareness of the Synoptic traditions by reorganizing the material for his own theological and thematic purposes.

Conclusion

In conclusion, it is clear from our analysis that the author of the Gospel of John is using all three Synoptic accounts in his telling of John the Baptist’s story. He is aware of the Gospel of Matthew’s account of John the Baptist confronting the Jewish authorities about Abraham’s children, but restructures it so that John the Baptist is confronted by the Jewish Priests and Levites, and only later does Jesus, not John, argue with the Jews regarding their Status as “Abraham’s children,” in order to emphasize Jesus’ oneness with God and status as the I AM.

---

15 John is also possibly referencing the transfiguration, in which a voice from heaven also spoke similar words (Matthew 3:17; Mark 1:11; Luke 4:22), although that story is not included or mentioned in John’s gospel.
16 See Ellicott’s Commentary for English Readers: “[John] records here a fact parallel to those recorded by the other Evangelists at the Baptist… the death and resurrection are to reveal God’s character, and therefore glorify the Father’s name to all the world” (Ellicott, 1901, note on John 12:28). Also, Matthew Henry’s Concise Commentary: “The voice of the Father from heaven, which had declared him to be his beloved Son, at his baptism, and when he was transfigured, was heard proclaiming that He had both glorified his name, and would glorify it. Christ, reconciling the world to God by the merit of his death, broke the power of death, and cast out Satan as a destroyer” (Henry, 1706, note on John 12:28).
The question of John the Baptist’s identity as Elijah is presented without a context as if John (the gospel writer) expects his audience to be aware of the Synoptic background of John the Baptist’s clothing and lifestyle, both of which mirrored that of Elijah. The Gospel of John also reveals an awareness of the Gospel of Matthew by having John the Baptist explicitly deny that he is Elijah, possibly to combat a false understanding of Jesus’ words in Matthew that John the Baptist and Elijah were one and the same. John’s gospel also reveals an awareness of the Gospel of Luke in that he has the Baptist explicitly deny that he is the Messiah, possibly in response to Luke’s roundabout portrayal of the Baptist, which left some of the Baptist’s followers convinced that he was the Messiah. John’s gospel also includes language About the Baptism that mirrors the one in the Synoptics—such as the Holy Spirit in the form of a dove landing on Jesus—showing his awareness of the event, particularly of how it is described in Matthew, but omits any explicit mention of Jesus being baptized by John, so as to combat false teachers who used the story to exalt John the Baptist’s status over Jesus Christ. Vocabulary similarities and differences across Synoptics also reveal that John’s gospel carefully chooses which one to follow at different points. For example, John follows Mark and Luke rather than Matthew, by having John the Baptist be unworthy to “untie” Jesus’ sandals, as opposed to Matthew’s “carry.” He even seems to be using Luke, specifically, in this case, as both omit Mark’s addition of “stooping down to untie.”

More so, John uses Mark when describing Jesus as “the one,” rather than using Matthew and Luke, who both depict Jesus as simply a “one,” and recontextualizes Mark’s exclusive amalgamation of verses from Malachi and Exodus into the Isaiah passage. John’s gospel follows Mark again by having Jesus baptizing only with the “Holy Spirit,” rather than Matthew’s and Luke’s addition of “and fire.”

John further rearranges the material so that John’s confrontation with the Jewish authorities that takes place on a separate day from his meeting of Jesus and telling his disciples more information about Jesus, in order to reflect the split between the Johannine community and the Jewish community he was writing against. There is no need for a heavenly voice in John’s gospel because the author has already introduced Jesus as originating from God/heaven (Jn 1:1) and instead resituates the voice from heaven into two new settings, later during Jesus’ Passion.
Finally, John’s gospel introduces Bethany here as the location of Jesus’ baptism and John the Baptizer’s confrontation with the Jews. Drawing on the Synoptic traditions, that Bethany is where Jesus began his triumphant entry into Jerusalem for his death, was anointed in preparation for his burial, and also ascended to heaven from Bethany. Moving Bethany’s initial introduction to the Baptism scene, combined with references to Jesus as the “Lamb of God,” thematically link this event with the start of Jesus’ Passion, enforcing his idea that it was part of God’s preordained plan even before the world was created.
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Abstract

Facial trustworthiness is a fundamental aspect of face perception guiding initial impressions and subsequent social interactions by affecting how people are motivated to approach others. Faces that appear highly trustworthy, relative to untrustworthy, are considered more approachable, an evaluation reflected in those faces being evaluated as more likable. Much work establishing facial trustworthiness effects on initial impressions has been conducted by examining facial characteristics in the absence of other cues people receive alongside faces in everyday life, however. Many of these cues (e.g., group membership) are also well-established as affecting likability evaluations (e.g., through ingroup favoritism). If and how such cues interact to affect likability evaluations is unclear. To address this gap in the literature in the current experiment, faces were labeled with political affiliations to examine how group membership affects the positive relation between facial trustworthiness and likability evaluations. Specifically, participants evaluated the likability of faces ranging in trustworthiness and that were shown with Republican and Democrat labels or with no group information. Ingroup membership strengthened the positive relationship between trustworthiness and likability and outgroup membership weakened this relation. These patterns suggest that ingroup cues and high facial trustworthiness are additive in relating to likability, such that a trustworthy face is evaluated as being especially likable when it belongs to an ingroup member.
Introduction

Trustworthiness is a fundamental dimension of face evaluation that determines the relative threat posed by another person. The importance of trustworthiness to face evaluation has been determined by, for example, showing participants non-expressive faces. Participants identified what facial characteristics (e.g., aggressive) they derived from neutral faces. The traits were submitted to a principal component analysis to summarize how the traits clustered into distinct dimensions. Facial trustworthiness and dominance emerged from this analysis, suggesting that facial trustworthiness is a core evaluation people make from emotionally neutral faces. Facial trustworthiness is so fundamental to person perception that people automatically evaluate it. Facial trustworthiness evaluations allow people to make quick judgments about approaching others. If people’s faces are perceived as trustworthy, people are perceived as being “good,” as approachable, and as having other positive traits. Showing the far-reaching consequences of these evaluations, facial trustworthiness relates to many decisions that people make. For example, people with more trustworthy faces receive more lenient sentences for serious crimes.

Literature Review

Facial Trustworthiness

Although trustworthiness evaluations of faces happen automatically and affect many decisions, these evaluations are not highly accurate. That is, facial trustworthiness evaluations do not necessarily align with how people actually behave. Because facial trustworthiness evaluations are not
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highly accurate, they can result in unfair treatment,\textsuperscript{7} face-biased electoral outcomes,\textsuperscript{8} and discriminatory behavior such as social exclusion.\textsuperscript{9} This pervasive use of facial trustworthiness despite its negative consequences makes facial trustworthiness evaluations critical to study. Although these findings have been highly influential to understand how people use faces as social cues,\textsuperscript{10} a caveat to this work is that it has mainly considered faces in isolation from additional cues known to affect the relative positivity of people’s impressions. One reason for this methodological choice is that it isolates effects of faces from evaluative stereotypes that may be introduced by, for example, faces of varying races (e.g., using White and Black faces).\textsuperscript{11}

Yet, faces are not evaluated in a vacuum. To expand on past work, the relationship between facial trustworthiness and likability must be considered together with other evaluative cues. Group membership is a powerful evaluative cue that often results in people favoring ingroup members and derogating outgroup members. Thus, to more comprehensively understand how people evaluate facial trustworthiness, how group cues interact with relative trustworthiness to affect impression positivity is an important open question. To examine this potentially interactive relationship, participants in the current study evaluated likability after group labels were randomly assigned to faces varying in trustworthiness.\textsuperscript{12}

**Group Membership**

As mentioned, group membership is one contextual cue that highly influences people’s evaluations of others. A shared group membership creates a sense of belonging fueled by social identity.\textsuperscript{13} Despite this positive outcome, group membership can also lead to negative outcomes as the people might have biased evaluations of both ingroup and outgroup

\begin{thebibliography}{99}
\bibitem{7} Oosterhof and Todorov, “The Functional Basis,” 11087–11092.
\bibitem{8} Todorov, “Evaluating faces on trustworthiness,” 208-224.
\bibitem{11} Oosterhof and Todorov, “The Functional Basis,” 11087–11092.
\end{thebibliography}
members. Whereas a shared sense of identity may result in ingroup favoritism, it might also result in outgroup derogation when aspects of identity are not shared. In one study illustrating these far-reaching effects, participants were shown faces varying on trustworthiness and told to decide which faces they would label as ingroup or outgroup members. Results showed highly trustworthy faces were labeled as ingroup members and highly untrustworthy faces were labeled as outgroup members. These findings suggest that group membership may have additive effects on the relationship between facial trustworthiness and likability evaluations. If a face is evaluated to be highly trustworthy it would subsequently be judged as highly likable. Ingroup membership might strengthen this relationship between facial trustworthiness and likability such that trustworthy ingroup faces will be judged as being extremely likable.

Continuing with how group membership affects impression formation, one study measured how group membership affects how positive people view others’ emotional expressions. Participants were randomly assigned to arbitrary groups with no prior meaning to them (i.e., Blue Team, Green Team) to control for extraneous variability from real-world social constructs (e.g., race, gender) and the stereotypes associated with them. Then, they were shown expressive male and female faces (i.e., happy, fearful, neutral) labeled as ingroup and outgroup members. Participants were instructed to rate the valence of the faces using a valence grid that ranged from displeasure to pleasure. Despite the emotion displayed (e.g., fear), people consistently rated ingroup faces as more positive (i.e., higher in valence) than outgroup faces. This study revealed that ingroup faces are evaluated more positively than outgroup faces even when they convey negative cues, thus suggesting that there is a positivity bias relative to judging the expressions of ingroup members. This study suggests that relative facial trustworthiness will be evaluated more positively given ingroup versus outgroup membership. Thus, a relation between facial trustworthiness and likability is likely to also be more strongly positive given ingroup versus outgroup cues because ingroup cues may add to the positivity conveyed by trustworthy facial characteristics.
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Many studies examining group membership effects on evaluations do so using visible group categories like race, gender, or age;\(^ {16}\) however, there are non-visible categories that need to be examined. Some less visible categories are among the most salient cues eliciting group membership effects across social cognition research. Political group membership, for example, is an extremely salient evaluative cue eliciting rampant polarization (e.g., Iyengar and Westwood, 2015).\(^ {18}\) Methodologically, less visible categories are more concealable, meaning they can be assigned to different faces while the faces themselves are held constant.\(^ {19}\) Thus, we can guarantee that group membership, rather than specific properties of a face, drives evaluative differences.

One group category reliably eliciting ingroup favoritism and outgroup derogation is political affiliation.\(^ {20}\) Unlike group constructs like race and gender, open disdain for and disagreement with the outgroup is more readily encouraged and accepted amongst partisans. Thus, people with beliefs across the political spectrum do not receive as much backlash for expressing or belittling an opposing belief. Importantly, opposing partisanship often creates an “othering” of the outgroup that results in openly derogating stigmatized outgroup faces and favoring faces with similar beliefs.\(^ {21}\) Because political ideology strongly elicits biases toward and against, respectively, ingroup partisan and opposing partisan individuals, it was an excellent candidate group construct with which to examine how group membership affects the positive relationship between facial trustworthiness and subsequent evaluations.

Group membership is clearly one external cue that is important to forming impressions. Yet, there is a critical gap in the literature as facial trustworthiness studies are often conducted without supplying faces with


\[^{20}\text{Iyengar and Westwood, “Fear and loathing across party lines: New evidence on group polarization,” 690-707.}\]

\[^{21}\text{Brittany Cassidy, Colleen Hughes, and Anne Krendl, (Under review), “Characterizing group disclosure effects on first impressions of faces.”}\]
additional information. Thus, we assigned political affiliation (i.e., Democrat, Republication) to White male faces pre-rated on trustworthiness to examine how likability evaluations differed with group information. Political affiliation was our chosen group construct because it reliably creates ingroup and outgroup biases, such as favoritism towards co-partisan faces. We used the same set of White male faces and manipulated the label paired with them across task versions. This manipulation was beneficial because it held the faces constant while only manipulating the label paired with them. Thus, the properties of the lab, and not the faces themselves, drove any emergent effects. Therefore, we examined the effects the group labels have on participants' likability evaluations, not other characteristics of the face. This methodological choice means that it was prudent to keep other aspects of group membership constant, supporting the use of only White male faces. White male faces were used to limit other properties of the faces (e.g., facial features) changing by group label. To isolate specific group label effects, as this study intended, other aspects of the group information (e.g., race) could not be changed across conditions. A simple paradigm was needed to isolate what happens to the trustworthiness/likability relationship. Intersecting group constructs (e.g., varying both race and political affiliation) leads to further complications that should be studied in future studies now that these initial effects of group membership on the relationship have been established.

There has been much work dedicated to displaying the importance of trustworthiness in face evaluation, its outcomes, and the inclusion or exclusion to groups. However, no research has been dedicated to studying how group membership affects the positive relationship between facial trustworthiness and likability. As an initial step to fill this gap in the literature, the current study was designed to examine how group membership, manipulated using political affiliation, affects the known positive relation between facial trustworthiness and likability evaluations. Namely, we researched if relative group membership strengthens or
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weakens this positive relationship. Indirectly supporting the possibility that group membership affects the relation between facial trustworthiness and likability, recent work suggests that facial trustworthiness affects who is included in groups. People include more trustworthy than untrustworthy faces as ingroup members.\(^{26}\) This finding suggests that trustworthy faces are perceived as especially likely to have shared values that maintain a group’s image. Untrustworthy ingroup faces may be evaluated as more positive than untrustworthy outgroup faces due to their ingroup status, but their facial characteristics may prohibit the positivity of evaluations to an extent. Thus, one possibility was that the positive relation between facial trustworthiness and likability would be stronger for ingroup faces than for outgroup faces and faces for which no group information was provided.

**Hypothesis**

Based on the reviewed literature, we formed two hypotheses:

**Hypothesis 1**

We expected that partisans would have a stronger positive relation between facial trustworthiness and likability evaluations for ingroup partisan relative to outgroup partisan faces and relative to faces with no group information. As political beliefs are strongly held, ingroup partisanship would strengthen the relation between facial trustworthiness and likability evaluations.\(^{27}\) Patterns within an interaction between Facial Trustworthiness, Group Information, and Participant Ideology would support this hypothesis. Due to the importance of trustworthiness to group membership inclusion, and findings that participants view faces more favorably after co-partisanship has been shared, we expected to find that faces shown with ingroup information would be judged as more likable and trustworthy, irrespective of how trustworthy/untrustworthy the faces appear to be.\(^{28}\) This is because outgroup partisanship invokes less favorable actions and opinions than ingroup partisanship.\(^{29}\) Faces with outgroup information would lower the relative positivity of the trustworthy
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face, thus weakening the relationship between facial trustworthiness and likability. Contrasting the expected pattern for ingroup partisan faces, we expected a weaker relation between facial trustworthiness and likability evaluations among outgroup partisan faces.

**Hypothesis 2**

Due to prior findings on the importance of group membership to social identity and research that highly trustworthy faces lead to group inclusion tendencies, we predicted high facial trustworthiness and ingroup partisan would result in an additive effect such that trustworthy faces will be rated as being extremely likable.  

**The Importance of Using Faces with No Information**

Including faces with no group information was important for several reasons. This choice allowed for the opportunity to more precisely determine how group membership affects the relationship between facial trustworthiness and likability. If there was ingroup favoritism, it should strengthen the relationship. If there was outgroup derogation, it should weaken the relationship. However, if there was no outgroup derogation, there should be no difference in the relation based on no information and outgroup faces. Because people often view undecided partisans more favorably than opposing partisans, we expected a stronger relation among faces with no group information than faces with outgroup information.

**The Current Study**

The results of this study may enhance our understanding of how facial trustworthiness affects face evaluations. If group membership does affect the positive relationship between facial trustworthiness and likability evaluations, it would suggest that cues external to faces have additive effects on this widely established positive relationship. Thus, if the prior predictions are confirmed it will further bridge a connection between the literature on facial trustworthiness, group membership, and social
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identity, and this relationship (e.g., Todorov, 2008). Furthermore, if the predictions of this study are supported, it solidifies the importance of group membership to impression formation. Prior literature has noted that trustworthiness leads to relatively efficient impressions, but not ones that are always accurate. If group membership does appear to affect facial evaluations, it could compound the extent to which people believe their impressions are accurate or not. Alternatively, if results indicate that group membership does not affect the relation between facial trustworthiness and likability evaluations, it might mean that facial characteristics are more important than external group cues to evaluate faces. Thus, this research is necessary to disentangle these possibilities and thus to better understand how people initially evaluate others.

Design
This study had three independent variables: 1) target group membership (Republican, Democrat, none), 2) facial trustworthiness (established using database norms), and 3) participant political ideology. The dependent variable is the likability evaluation of each face. Because participants will see a combination of Republican, Democrat, and unlabeled faces across a wide range of facial trustworthiness, target group membership, and facial trustworthiness are within-subject variables. As participant political ideology is a participant-level variable, it is a between-subjects variable. The proposed study utilizes within-subjects and between-subjects variables. Thus, the study uses a mixed-methods design.

Participants
Of the 150 participants surveyed ($M_{age} = 38.79$ years, $SD = 12.58$, 94 male), 131 identified as White. Like similar studies (e.g., Tracy et al., 2020; Wilson & Rule, 2015), subjects were recruited from Amazon Mechanical Turk (MTurk). All participants provided informed consent, were debriefed at the end of the study, and were paid $1 for their participation. This study was approved by the Institutional Review Board for Human Subjects at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

Face Stimuli

Ninety pictures of neutrally expressive White male faces were obtained from the Chicago Face Database. Database norms determined the trustworthiness value of each face. Based on norms, the selected faces ranged from appearing very untrustworthy to very trustworthy. Participants saw all 90 faces during the task. 30 faces were labeled as Democrat, 30 were labeled as Republican, and 30 supplied no group information. There were three task versions counterbalancing the information paired with each face (Democrat, Republican, or no information). This counterbalancing created three sets of faces. Using database norms, we verified that these sets of faces were similar in age, attractiveness, dominance, trustworthiness, and unusualness, all Fs < 1.13, ps > .33. Participants were randomly assigned to task versions.

Task

After providing informed consent, participants completed a face likability task. Similar to Tracy et al. (2020), participants evaluated each face. The instructions detailed how subjects were to evaluate the likability of each face (“How likable is this face?”) using a scale ranging from 1 (not at all likable) to 7 (extremely likable). Participants were shown one face at a time. For each face, the word Republican, the word Democrat, or no information was listed above each face. Participants were told to use that information as they saw fit. At the end of the face task, subjects were asked to identify on a scale of 1 (not at all) to 5 (completely) how randomly they rated faces (M = 1.16, SD = 0.60). As an attention check, participants were then asked to respond if they had evaluated faces or cars in the task. All participants indicated that they had evaluated faces.

Measuring Partisanship

Participants’ political ideology was tested to examine whether individual differences polarized impressions of partisans. We characterized how ideology mapped onto different variables associated with group information by measuring its relationships to a sense of belonging with political categories and the threat associated with political categories. To this end, participants completed four measures in a random order.

Political Ideology
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We measured political ideology in two ways. Our primary measure involved asking participants to share their political ideology overall and on social, economic, and foreign policy issues using a scale from 1 (extremely conservative) to 7 (extremely liberal). Responses to the items were reliable (Cronbach’s alpha = .95) and were averaged to create a composite political ideology score (M = 4.72, SD = 1.69). Participants also indicated which of the two major political parties best fit them (Republican = 45, Democrat = 105).

**Category Belonging**
Participants indicated how much they felt they belonged to each of three categories (Republicans [M = 2.45, SD = 2.04], Democrats [M = 4.01, SD = 2.27], having no political affiliation [M = 3.27, SD = 2.17]) on a scale of 1 (not at all affiliated) to 7 (strongly affiliated).

**Threat Perception**
Participants responded to four items each concerning how threatening they perceived Republicans, Democrats, or people having no political affiliation to be: “How much of a threat do a person of the following category [Republican, Democrat, no political affiliation] poses to you [society]” and “How much of a threat do a person of the following category [Republican, Democrat, no political affiliation] who is also an elected official poses to you [society]” using a scale of 1 (not at all a threat) to 7 (an extreme threat). Responses to the four threat items that each regarded Republicans, Democrats, and people having no affiliations were reliable (Cronbach’s alphas at least .92) and were averaged to create three composite threat scores (M_{Republican} = 4.05, SD = 1.91; M_{Democrat} = 3.07, SD 1.89; M_{none} = 2.47, SD 1.21). Lastly, participants provided demographic information.

**Results**
**Examining Political Ideology and Category Belonging**
To validate that political ideology indexes a feeling of belongingness to a group, we regressed political ideology (standardized around the overall mean), the group categories, and their interactions on belongingness ratings. The model was significant, F(5, 444) = 62.67, p < .001, R² = .41. Having a more liberal ideology related to a lesser sense of belonging with Republicans, b = -1.51, t = 10.60, p < .001, a greater sense of belonging with Democrats, b = 1.66, t = 11.73, p < .001, and did not
significantly relate to a sense of belonging with people having no political affiliation, b = -0.20, t = 1.42, p = .16.

Examining Political Ideology and Perceived Threat

To characterize participants’ attitudes toward partisans, we regressed political ideology (standardized around the overall mean), the group categories, and their interactions on threat ratings. The model was significant, F(5, 444) = 51.26, p < .001, R² = .36. Having a more liberal ideology related to Democrats being perceived as less threatening, b = -0.92, t = 7.73, p < .001, Republicans being perceived as more threatening, b = 1.23, t = 10.29, p < .001, and did not significantly relate to people having no political affiliation being perceived as threatening, b = -0.12, t = 1.02, p = .31.

Characterizing Group Membership Effects on the Relation between Facial Trustworthiness and Likability

To test our primary hypotheses, we fit a linear mixed-effects model entering Group Information (Republican, Democrat, and none), Facial Trustworthiness (standardized around the overall mean), Participant Political Ideology (standardized around the overall mean) and their interactions as fixed effects (Table 1). We treated participants and face identity as random effects. To decompose a potential interaction, we examined Facial Trustworthiness effects at partisan extremes (two standard deviations below [more conservative] and above [more liberal] the mean composite political ideology score).

Three-way interactions supported our hypotheses (Figure 1). Supporting Hypothesis 1, Facial Trustworthiness positively related to evaluated likability for more conservative and more liberal participants across all levels of Group information. Supporting Hypothesis 2, the strength of these positive relations varied by relative group membership. For more conservative participants, the positive relation was stronger for Republican than Democrat faces, b = -0.11, z = 2.07, p = .04, and stronger for faces with no group information than Democrat faces, b = -0.16, z = 3.03, p = .003. No difference in the relation emerged between Republican faces and faces with no group information, b = 0.05, z = 0.94, p = .35. For more liberal participants, the positive relation was stronger for Democrat than Republican faces, b = 0.16, z = 2.92, p = .004, and stronger for Democrat faces than faces with no group information, b = 0.10, z = 1.94, p = .05. No difference in the relation emerged between Republican faces and faces with no group information, b = 0.05, z = 1.00, p = .32.
**Discussion**

The current study used political ideology to characterize how group membership affects the positive relation between facial trustworthiness and likability. Overall, ingroup partisan faces were evaluated as more likable than outgroup partisan faces, reflecting ingroup favoritism. Critically, group membership affected the positive relation between facial trustworthiness and likability. Importantly, analyses suggest there is an additive effect, as high facial trustworthiness and ingroup partisan did result in an additive effect such that trustworthy faces were rated as being much higher in likability than faces that supplied no group information or an opposing group affiliation. For example, Conservative participants rated faces of ingroup members to be higher in likability than outgroup (i.e. Democrat) faces. Thus, relative political affiliation is a powerful factor that vastly positively skews this positive relation.

Our finding extends prior work showing that political beliefs are salient in affecting impressions of others by showing that relative partisanship augments how facial trustworthiness is perceived (Tracy et al, 2020).\(^{38}\) It supports other discoveries that participants view faces more favorably after co-partisanship has been shared, and more general work on ingroup favoritism.\(^{39}\)

In support of the first hypothesis that group membership would affect the positive relation between facial trustworthiness and likability, we found for very conservative participants that faces with Republican labels were evaluated as being more likely than faces labeled as belonging to Democrats and faces that disclosed no group label. In further support of our hypothesized group effect, we found very conservative participants perceived faces that supplied no group information to be more likable than faces that indicated opposing partisanship (i.e., faces with Democrat labels). Our results were similar for very liberal participants as faces with Democratic labels and no group information were rated as being more likable than those paired with a Republican label.

In support of our second hypothesis, we found that high facial trustworthiness and ingroup partisanship resulted in an additive effect on
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likability evaluations, such that highly trustworthy ingroup faces were often evaluated to be extremely likable. The interaction between target group membership, participant ideology, and participant ideology resulted in likability evaluations being higher for ingroup faces by both very conservative and very liberal participants. We analyzed this three-way interaction by comparing the strength of the relation between facial trustworthiness and likability for faces labeled as Democrats and Republicans, and faces with no labels, among more extreme partisans. In support of our second hypothesis, the slope differences at political extremes for both very conservative and very liberal participants (see Figure 1) showed that facial trustworthiness did have an additive effect on group information and facial likability. Suggestively, the additive effect indicates that positive facial and group cues especially increase likability evaluations. A remaining question is whether arbitrary and salient, or only salient, forms of group membership affect the relationship between facial trustworthiness and likeability.

For very conservative participants, results indicated that the additive effect on likability evaluations was stronger for faces with Republican labels than faces with Democrat labels; for conservative participants, there was no ingroup favoritism nor a decrease in likability for faces that supplied no group information. During our comparisons of slope differences for very conservative participants, we found that 1) when Republican faces were compared to Democrat faces, the Republican line was higher, and 2) when Republican faces were compared to faces with no group information, there was no difference in the line, and 3) when Democrats faces were compared to faces with no group information, the Democrat line was lower. Thus, for conservative participants, the results were as expected. Democrat labels had a weaker additive effect than faces that supplied no group information. Similar effects were found for very liberal participants regarding their ingroup. Notably, for very conservative participants, we found there to be no difference in the additive effect on facial likability for faces that presented no information or Republican labels.

When we compared slope differences for very liberal participants, we found 1) when Republican faces were compared to Democrat faces, the Democrat line was higher, 2) when Republican faces were compared to faces with no group information, there was no significant effect, and 3) when Democrat faces were compared to faces with no group information,
the Democrat line was marginally higher than the line representing faces with no group information.

In short, our results suggest that liberals, unlike conservatives, do encounter an additive effect when ingroup information is given but not when outgroup information is given. Critically, these results may suggest that conservatives are more sensitive to outgroup information when it interplays with facial trustworthiness. In contrast, liberals are more sensitive to ingroup information when it has an interaction with facial trustworthiness.

One possibility is that this additive effect of ingroup membership and high facial trustworthiness on likability evaluations suggests it is partly due to group inclusion tendencies and self-protection motivations. Larezus et al. suggest that top-down positivity effects on evaluations can result from group membership activation. Yet, this positivity bias when it comes to evaluating ingroup members’ emotional expressions can be exacerbated by competitive groups, even minimal group constructs (i.e., Blue Team vs Green Team), such as Larezus et al. utilized. Such a positivity bias would be even more pronounced with a salient group construct that often concludes in ingroup favoritism and derogation. Arguably, likability evaluations amongst competing groups result in a positivity bias because of their functionality to the motivations and endurance of the group. Merely labeling faces with the major opposing U.S. political party names perhaps triggered the “us” vs. “them” debate that often ensnares Democrats and Republicans.

This additive effect may not just be due to the propensity to like or evaluate ingroup faces more favorably. This may also be supported by the need to include “model” faces as ingroup members and other motivations about protecting the reputation of one’s group. One possibility is that this additive effect is partly a result of group over exclusion practices. Often, group members will reserve group membership for those who embody the positive characteristics of the group; this includes those with highly trustworthy faces. We believe this additive effect is a result of what we
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refer to as ingroup projection, such that, when evaluating the face of a disclosed ingroup member, a rater would consider them to be especially positive due to a belief that, because they are deserving of group inclusion, they must also have exceptional traits (i.e., high likability). Furthermore, we suggest that this additive effect might be due to the need to have positive members in the ingroup. Predictably, ingroup partisans were rated higher in likability because of thoughts that, “they must be likable if they are a Democrat like me.” Much like Tracy et al.’s suggestions (2020), we perceive this attitude might be because it is functional to the ingroup. Viewing oneself and ingroup (which might be viewed as an extension of one’s self) as positive is essential to maintaining positive perceptions of the group. Thus, it was potentially important to raters that trustworthy ingroup members (the “model” members) were rated as being extremely likable because of their shared membership and knowledge that this evaluation might be reflective of the group as a whole. After all, if the most trustworthy of the bunch are not evaluated as being likable, what might that say about other group members?

Interestingly, our findings indicated that liberals showed ingroup favoritism when slope differences were analyzed at political extremes (see Figure 1). Yet, conservatives showed both ingroup favoritism and outgroup derogation. These results are similar to other findings that liberals typically show less hostility towards outgroups, such as immigrants and racial minorities. This is partly because liberals endorse behaviors aligned with more fairness and less harm towards outgroups than conservatives.

Similar to our findings from liberal participants, Stewart and Morris’s study on the moral foundations of liberals and conservatives resulted in liberals displaying less negative attitudes and bias, and less perceived threat from the outgroup (i.e., immigrants). An explanation for conservatives in our study showing ingroup favoritism and outgroup derogation may be their orientation for threat. Conservatives may be more watchful of perceived threat cues. As a result, when compared to liberals, conservatives might show ingroup favoritism because they desire to limit

47 Tracy et al., “Facial trustworthiness predicts ingroup,”
https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.579908
49 Stewart and Morris, “Moving Morality Beyond.”
50 Stewart and Morris, “Moving Morality Beyond.”
risk from the outgroup, not just because they favor their ingroup more than opposing groups. Additionally, threats (whether it be to one’s self, country, or group) lead to individuals expressing more conservative ideology. Furthermore, conservatives are more likely than liberals to hold outgroup misperceptions; their response bias to these misperceptions is higher, also. Thus, our findings that liberals showed ingroup favoritism while conservatives showed ingroup favoritism and outgroup derogation are suggestively explained by liberals’ smaller propensity to derogate and conservatives’ orientation for threat.

Most importantly, the current results showcase the biases people have when making likability evaluations. Also, it supplies the foundational information needed for future work on likability evaluations resulting from faces of various group identities (e.g., race, gender). Thus, the current research adds new information to the current literature on the relationship between facial trustworthiness and positivity when group membership cues are available. Critically, these findings may suggest the perceived positivity of a face shift based on the contextual cues available.

**Limitation and Future Research**

A limitation of this study is its limited generalizability. White male faces were utilized in the stimulus set to control for effects race may present. We desired to hold race and gender constant. Introducing racially diverse faces would have introduced more group distinction. If more category information was involved, participants might have asked more questions about the faces they were shown. The intersection between race and other forms of group membership should be addressed in future research. Testing with only White male faces and political partisanship limits the generalizability of the findings. To fully measure the positive relationship between trustworthiness and likability, examining more category intersections such as faces of varying races and group memberships should be considered. Future research should explore this to determine if this relationship is affected by any group membership or only those that are salient.

**Conclusion**

In closing, the findings of this study on the effects of group membership on the positive relationship between facial trustworthiness and likability (e.g., Todorov, 2008) support hypotheses that group membership does affect this relation. Namely, after applying a salient group construct label (i.e., political affiliation) to faces that ranged from very trustworthy to very untrustworthy, our analyses showed significant results that participants evaluated ingroup faces to be higher in likability than outgroup faces. This finding supports prior literature on the significant effect of group membership as an evaluative tool in impression formation (e.g., Lazarus et al., 2016; Tracy et al., 2020). However, the current study extends prior research by utilizing a salient, non-visible form of group construct to examine its effects on the well-established relationship between facial trustworthiness and likability. Critically, our study suggests that salient forms of group membership affect this relationship and is a powerful evaluative tool that sways decision making and character judgments. This study proves to be a first, necessary step towards establishing how group membership and other forms of non-visible cues affect this relation and social judgments.
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Abstract
This paper explores the successes and failures of European fascist regimes in implementing their methods for the “total education” of youth, diving into the educational policy of Fascist Italy, Nazi Germany, Salazarist Portugal, and Francoist Spain, with a special focus on the German case. It reassesses the challenges and contradictions of fascist education, and the intrinsic failures of these educational models that led to the emergence of dissent among youths, as well as the development of nonconforming subcultures opposed to the hegemonic official ones. I conclude that the structural failures of fascist educational models, rooted in ideological irregularity, contradictory and decentralized policy, and the attempt to control all aspects of youth socialization in ways that conflicted with generational and universal youth values, inevitably created nonconformity. This nonconformity came in several forms and was shaped by social context and class divisions. At times, group behavior developed into broader subcultures that, by rejecting official and doctrinaire youth values, assumed political meaning.
In the years preceding 1933, the mean age of affiliation to the Nationalsozialistische Deutsche Arbeiterpartei (National Socialist German Workers’ Party, NSDAP) was thirty-one years, far below that of most German political organizations and second only to the Communist Party. From 1925 on, the young face of Nazism became increasingly important for the party’s propaganda at the same time that it developed a more cohesive ideological line. During those street fighting years, when National Socialism was in its infancy, war cries such as “Make way, you old ones!” accompanied the marches of still young but battle-hardened Great War veterans and the many boyish faces with whom they shared their brown uniforms. Not far to the south, Benito Mussolini’s Partito Nazionale Fascista (National Fascist Party, PNF) had already mastered youth-oriented propaganda by portraying itself as a movement of the daring and the audacious, ready to use the youth’s virility to lift Italy above the old and failed European nations. From the squadrista period up to the late 1920s, the new regime saw the high point of youth political involvement and support.1

As Europe went through the social, economic, and political convulsions of the interwar period, fascist parties emerged all over the continent as a new alternative for modernity, opposing the “dangers” of Soviet communism or the “failed” western liberalism that had resulted in the 1922 and 1929 crisis. At the dawn of the twentieth century, traditional collective allegiances based on family and community were giving way to new forms of identification that powerfully reshaped political and social life. Prime among them were nationalism and age-group identification, both of which had been consolidated by the Great War: in the same way that the veteran generation identified itself in relation to its shared experiences at the front, the next one defined itself around issues of nonparticipation, irredentism, and disillusion with the old. When the fascist movements of Europe then promised to give youth a leading role in the political drama, allowing young people to define their nations’ futures through a complete national rebirth, they found many willing cadres. Unlike the old nobilities, liberal plutocracies, or Bolshevik working-class
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1 Michael Kater, Hitler Youth (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2004), 10-2; Tracy H. Koon, Believe, Obey, Fight: Political Socialization of Youth in Fascist Italy, 1922-1943 (Chapel Hill and London: University of North Carolina Press, 1985), xvi-xix. Squadismo was the name given to the Fascist militia action, organized into squadres d’azione, that is, action squads.
rule, the new fascist elite would consist of bright nationalist youths. And young people across borders and social classes were listening.² As these movements achieved and consolidated power, however, the many and grandiose promises of fascism to its youth failed to realize. As youth groups and traditional education merged into all-encompassing, party-controlled spaces of socialization, youths responded in several different ways to their disillusionments with their respective regimes. The “total education” models of fascist pedagogues intended to create the next generation of fascists in isolation from the “decadent” influences of the past by combining traditional education, youth groups, and the monopoly of extra-curricular activities, all under party control. However, the generations growing up under fascism faced growing military demands as expansionist and imperial plans unfolded. The ideological irregularities and increasingly clear dissonance between propaganda and reality generated responses that ranged from unquestioning loyalty to political apathy, nonconformity, and outright opposition.

Outside of the Rome-Berlin axis, the two Iberian fascistic regimes that survived the Second World War experienced the same problems throughout their existence. The Portuguese Estado Novo (New State) and the Francoist regime in Spain were gradually abandoned by their youngest generations, who turned to the widespread pluralistic and democratic ideas of even younger populations. These ideas and the aversion to the colonial wars underway in the 1970s clashed with the imperialistic, Catholic-traditionalist, and authoritarian character of the Portuguese and Spanish state machines.³

Since the 1960s, several books and articles dedicated to understanding education in Nazi Germany and Fascist Italy have appeared, normally focusing on either education or the youth groups.⁴ Rarely were both topics explored as complementary subjects until the late 1980s and

early 1990s. Tracy H. Koon’s *Believe, Obey, Fight* and Lisa Pine’s *Education in Nazi Germany* are prime examples that combine the two topics. However, little attention has been given to young resisters. For a long time, most youth resistance was disregarded as naïve, lacking relevance in the broader study of fascism. The camp has significantly expanded since Daniel Horn’s 1970s research on the topic and Detlev Peukert’s groundbreaking 1980 and 1982 books *Die Edelweißpiraten* and *Inside Nazi Germany: Conformity, Opposition, and Racism in Everyday Life*, but youth resistance remains a neglected subject. More recently, Brooks, Geerling, and Magee’s article *Faces of Opposition* refreshed the idea that juvenile resistance should not be, as it had previously been, dismissed as exceptional, naïve, unorganized, and pointless, but instead studied more deeply as a broader phenomenon. Even when youth resistance is the main theme of research, though, studies are most often geographically narrow, focusing on the Third Reich, and tend to overlook class divisions. That focus may be a consequence of the larger effort of scholars and institutions in Germany and abroad to preserve the memory of resisters and victims of Nazism, making many more such sources available. For both these reasons, recent works like Louie Dean Valencia-García’s *Antiauthoritarian Youth Culture in Francoist Spain* have added much to this still underdeveloped camp.

Setting out to reassess the successes and failures of fascist regimes in implementing their methods for the total education model, with a special focus on the German case, this paper explores the challenges and contradictions of fascist education and the emergence of dissidence among youths, as well as the development of nonconforming subcultures opposed to the hegemonic official ones. I conclude that the structural failures of fascist educational models, rooted in ideological irregularity, contradictory and decentralized educational policy, and the attempt to control all aspects of youth socialization in ways that conflicted with generational and universal youth values, inevitably created nonconformity. This nonconformity came in several forms and was shaped by social context and class divisions. At times, group behavior developed into broader subcultures that, by rejecting official and doctrinaire youth values, assumed political meaning.
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Before Power: Creating a Mass Youth Movement

Fascism is a malleable ideology, capable of adapting to different political contexts and national narratives. The importance of youth, however, was a key element of all early twentieth-century fascisms. Children and adolescents promised national redemption, a cure for the supposed “degradation” and “decadence” caused by the forces of modernity. In Italy, youth would continue the Fascist revolution and return the nation to its Roman glory. In Germany, they would avenge the Great War by rebuilding an idealized Reich and perpetuate a new communal order free of the moral and racial “corruptions” of Weimar. In Portugal, they would preserve the Catholic-traditionalist regime and defend the country against its real and perceived enemies. In Spain, they would rebuild a nation destroyed by civil war to its renaissance glory, purging the “corrupt” forces and ideas that gave birth to the second Spanish Republic. At the same time, however, untamed youth posed a potential existential threat to fascist regimes. If young people could not be fully indoctrinated, the regimes would be unable to perpetuate their existence. Youth were the future, and they could not be poisoned by hostile ideologies, delinquency, and counter-narratives.\(^6\)

Appealing to the Young

If the fascisms of Europe had initially presented themselves as mass movements, by the mid-1920s they had assumed the identity of mass youth movements. Echoing the notion of tabula rasa, they saw in their youth projects a chance to create the new übermensch of Europe, raised to embody, physically and mentally, ultranationalist ideals and unconditional loyalty to their national community. Eventually, all these fascisms understood the need to win over youth, even if some took longer than others, as was the case of the Portuguese regime.\(^7\) António de Oliveira Salazar’s União Nacional (National Union) had first bet in a demobilized youth, believing that a politically uninvolved population would smooth the
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regime’s rule. 8 Always refusing to politically define the New State as fascist, he had called Mussolini’s Italy a “pagan Caesarism” and condemned the largest Portuguese fascist movement, Rolão Preto’s National-Syndicalism, for its agitation of the national youth, among other things. By 1935, however, the model was beginning to show its weaknesses, and Salazar finally learned from Hitler and Mussolini that, if he wanted his social and political ideals to be perpetuated, he would need to indoctrinate the next generation accordingly. This change came at the same time that splinter factions of Preto’s movement joined the governing coalition, and the civil war in Spain dragged the regime further to the right. As for the NSDAP, PNF, and the Spanish Falange (Phalanx), the appeal to different groups of youths was achieved through different means, and in different ways before and after taking power.9

Fascism mobilizes masses through othering, playing off the fear of the “other” while creating a homogeneous cultural identity for “us” that embraces chauvinist and exceptionalist narratives.10 For youth, however, there were many other attractions. Initially, as these movements emerged, their appeals rested in ideas of independence, belonging, and power. For upper-class adolescents who joined movements early on, fascism embraced their longing to rebel. Seeking autonomy and change, they joined the ranks of paramilitary organizations that promised to give youth the lead in politics, a way of declaring independence from the home and boring bourgeois circles while feeding the dream of changing the world. At the same time, working-class and lower middle-class cadres saw in fascism the opportunity to lead, to have access to power, and to be part of a cause worth fighting – and dying – for. Uniformed blocs of men and boys marching through the streets chanting nationalist songs and revolutionary slogans promised some of the things underprivileged teenagers were most eager for: a greater purpose, comradery, and some sort of authority derived from the uniforms.11
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10 Valencia-García, Antiauthoritarian Youth Culture in Francoist Spain, 14.
Mass mobilization, in fact, remained a key element of appeal during and after the transition to power. Among hundreds of examples, the torchlight ceremony in commemoration of Hitler’s appointment as Reich chancellor in 1933 is noticeable because it gave youth a place of prominence, where other youngsters could see them. Their slogans, the exaltation of their dead comrades of the Sturmabteilung (Stormtroopers, SA) and Hitlerjugend (Hitler Youth, HJ) who had perished during the street fighting years, all was architecture to attract the young. The mystique of mass mobilization, as Mussolini and Hitler found early on, was in the creation of a sense of belonging, of unity as opposed to individualism, and in conveying the idea that action was being taken and those sitting out would miss the opportunity to mold the future.\(^\text{12}\)

**Creating Fascist Education**

Mussolini did not trust those born before the “Fascist Revolution” to live up to their potential. He believed they had been “poisoned” by the liberal, socialist, or communist ideals of pre-Fascist Italy, and thus, their conversion to fascism could never be fully completed. Only those educated after the March on Rome had the potential to become the new Italian men and women who would carry the fascist torch once the old guard was gone.\(^\text{13}\) This was the common view among fascist leaders. The pre-fascist state, as Hitler put it, was not “inculcating in the youth a lively sense of their German nationality” instead making them “the devotees of such abstract notions as ‘Democracy’, ‘International Socialism’, ‘Pacifism’, etc.”\(^\text{14}\) The only way to guarantee the perpetuation of their regimes, then, was to focus on the total education of youth raised under fascist control. As Lisa Pine explains, fascist pedagogy centered on the use of both in-school education and party-controlled spaces of socialization to create a national identity, self-perception, and a perception of others congruent with fascist ideals. In this way, fascists believed they could build upon the generational breaks with the old by “eroding traditional loyalties,” changing the way the future generation thought about themselves and the collective. Education could then move away from the needs of individual development and in
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\(^\text{13}\) Alessio Ponzio, *Shaping the New Man: Youth Training Regimes in Fascist Italy and Nazi Germany* (Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 2015), 4-5.

\(^\text{14}\) Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, 97-98.
the direction of the needs of the national community, creating not autonomous citizens but extensions of their states.  

Identity Building: Molding the Future of Fascism

If participation of the younger generations, who had not had any contact with the pre-fascist institutions and could fully embody the values of the new regimes, was essential for the fascist project, then all sorts of incentives for joining the party-controlled education spaces had to be created. Initially, membership in a party or state youth group was generally not mandatory, but once power was in the fascist movement’s hands, all types of incentives and disincentives could be offered for young people to join. In Spain, for example, participation in the Frente de Juventudes (Youths Front) was supposedly voluntary, but all children attending school were to be enrolled in the organization if they wanted to participate in extra-curricular activities. Both Hitler and Mussolini advocated for the prominence of youth groups, gradually diminishing the importance of formal schooling until it became secondary. Youth, they thought, should be taught, trained, and led by youth. By having older boys and girls leading younger children in the Hitler Youth or the Opera Nazionale Balilla, Fascist Italy’s first youth group named after a medieval infant hero, they aimed at creating a feeling of empowerment. For many, seeing people not much older than themselves in leading positions was proof that their time to write the future had come, and served as a stimulus to join. As Hitler wrote, “the ties that unite ten-year old boys to one another are stronger and more natural than their relationship to adults.” This idea was then translated into one of the Hitler Youth’s mottos “Jugend von Jugend geführt werden soll” – youth should be led by youth. Hitler believed this would also ease the process of selecting the future party and state leadership, as indicated by his 1942 remark that “in this way, I have set up in their very early years a process of selectivity amongst young people, whereby the little group leaders soon select themselves.” The same idea can also be found in the 1926 law creating the Balilla, where it was
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15 Pine, Education in Nazi Germany, 1-3
17 Savage, Teenage: The Creation of Youth 1875-1945, 269-70.
established that educating the Balillas (eight- to fourteen-year-olds) was the role of the Avanguardistas (fourteen- to eighteen-year-olds).

After the war, collective memory drew upon concepts of a Nazi or Fascist “normalcy” and the victimhood of young children, supposedly easier to pressure and uncappable of discerning good from bad, to soften individual choices on education and joining youth groups. In Germany, specifically, where the stigma of Nazism loomed large over the post-war lives of former Hitler Youth and Bund Deutscher Mädel (League of German Girls, BDM) members, memoirs tend to emphasize the victimhood of children and adolescents, disregarding their power of choice. For example, Helga Brachmann, born in 1928, remarked in her memoir that she would respond to questions about her time in the BDM by saying “that I was eleven years old by the time war broke out, and that I didn’t hear about the concentration camps or the other things that happened until after the war was over and everything came to light.”

Unclear Instructions: The Theoretical-Methodological Chaos of Fascist Education

In the late 1980s, Detlev Peukert argued that the vague character of fascist ideology and the contradicting sources of information from where children would learn it – at schools, home, church, and the different youth groups within the same town, which at times worked independently from one another – allowed them to pick and choose what values to hold in accordance with personal preferences. In this way, the Nazi regime failed to create universal generational tendencies. Moreover, the Führerprinzip (“leader” or “leadership” principle) that guided fascist hierarchical structures created room for internal competitions within the party and state machine, and thus, a decentralized and confusing educational policy. It is a contra-intuitive thought, but one that explains much of the coherence problems within fascist policymaking: the reactionary character of Nazi policy allowed different ministers, ideologues, officials in the inner leadership circle, and even bureaucrats, all to compete for the favor and
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attention of the leader. Seeking power and influence, they acted independently to undermine one another, sometimes acting only to later seek retroactive recognition if their ideas proved fruitful. Policy, then, emerged from several different centers of power, and actors competed for approval. This framework, which scholars continue to employ today, was developed in the German context but can also be applied to other fascist regimes.22 This is especially true in cases where the hegemony of the local fascist party was disputed or divided with other interest groups in the dictatorship’s coalition, such as in Spain and Portugal. The Catholic Church’s influence in the Mediterranean countries, for example, called for ideological compromises that further mutated the information absorbed by youth. Faced with several competing narratives, incoherent in crucial points, children and adolescents were left to believe in the values they held dearest, creating divergent worldviews that reflected their own backgrounds.23 The churches were not the only contenders for the monopoly of education, and even – or rather, especially – within the fascist parties themselves, constant conflict about who controlled which aspects of educational policy was common.

In Italy, the ascension of the Fascist regime was built upon a coalition with the traditional Italian economic elites, the political power structures, and the Catholic institutions. Mussolini, as the leader, was also the mediator of the Church, the monarchy, big capital, landowners, and the army. To that was added the PNF, although Mussolini’s growing importance tended to overshadow its role. From 1929 on, the fascistization of education escalated quickly, creating conflicts between traditional education, historically controlled by the religious institutions, and the youth groups. The growing militarization of both youth and society also clashed with traditional interests, as fears of concentrated power in the hands of the top Fascist officials plagued relations with the political and economic elites.24

Internal tensions in the PNF for the control of educational policy were also high, never more so than in 1937, when the Balilla was replaced by the Gioventù Italiana del Littorio (Italian Youth of the Lictors, GIL). It
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22 Pine, Education in Nazi Germany, 3; 21-2.
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began with the escalation of tensions between PNF Secretary Achille Starace and Opera Nazionale Balilla leader Renato Ricci. These two high-ranking Fascists clashed constantly between 1935 and 1937, which stoked fears among the leadership that Ricci might have been nurturing separatist tendencies, and could even attempt to use the ONB in a coup d’état. The Duce, holding the ultimate power to decide the dispute, took too long to act. He was a long-time friend of Starace, with whom he had marched on Rome in 1922, but he was also a firm believer in Ricci’s educational policies. Moreover, he feared any move against Ricci could ignite riots among the Balillas and Avanguardisti. Their dispute did not regard philosophical or pedagogical differences – both were committed Fascists with the highest party credentials. It was purely a struggle for power. Both wanted to be on the forefront of education and youth policy, one of the most powerful roles in any fascist state. By playing off the weariness of Ricci’s image after eleven years as the Balilla’s head, Satarace was able turn Mussolini to his side and take over the organization, making it his own by rebranding it the Gioventù Italiana del Littorio.25

In Germany, several individual actors and organizations struggled over the control of areas of responsibility in education policymaking. Hitler’s loose ideological guidance served as the backdrop for educational policy, but competition for the power to mold the future of Germany (and for the Führer’s attention) brought some of the top NSDAP members into conflict. Besides Reich Minister for Education and Science Bernhard Rust, several high-ranking Nazis had their own ideas about education, including Propaganda Minister Joseph Goebbels, the two Reichsjugendführers Baldur von Schirach and Artur Axmann, Martin Bormann, Nazi ideologue Alfred Rosenberg, head of the Labor Front Robert Ley, SS leader Heinrich Himmler, and others. Even the bureaucrats and civil servants serving under Rust at the Education Ministry often undermined his authority. Prime among his competitors were Bormann, von Schirach, and Axmann. Bormann, as head of the Party Chancellery, had to approve all of Rust’s decisions, while the Hitler Youth leaders often contended with him, demanding exceptional treatment for their cadres.26

Soon other party leaders were carving out new educational institutions outside of Rust’s ministry and sphere of influence. Elitism was
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26 Pine, Education in Nazi Germany, 3; 21-22.
essential for the new National Socialist order, but the new elite class was to be different from the old one. Through loyalty and racial purity, the Nazis’ new class organization was to determine who was valuable, and thus at the top, and who was expendable. It was a system that disproportionally benefitted the middle and upper classes though, especially for its loyalty and time dedication requirement. The Nationalpolitische Erziehungsanstalten (National Political Institutes of Education, commonly abbreviated as Napolas) were the first elite schools of the Nazi state, placed initially under direct control of the Education Ministry upon their creation in 1933. However, in 1937, Labor Front leader Robert Ley reached an accord with Baldur von Schirach to establish their own “Adolf Hitler Schools” (AHS), party institutions that did not respond to the state ministry. Soon, the AHS and Napolas became competitors, following their leaders’ rivalry. Working to undermine Rust’s power over youth policies, they joined forces with Himmler in getting the Napolas under SS control, while also establishing their own parallel path for future Party officials through the AHS and the SS’s Ordensburgen (Order Castles). The future Nazi elite were to be selected in the Deutsche Jungvolk at the age of fourteen through the evaluation of physical, academical, personality, and racial standards. As they grew up in the Hitler Youth and Adolf Hitler Schools, they would work in several party offices, jobs they might take in the future. After finishing their secondary education, the future party elite would spend six months in compulsory labor service, then two years in the army, until they finally joined the workforce in their desired profession. After that, they could be selected for finishing school at the SS Ordensburgen, where they would spend four years undergoing all sorts of physical, political, ideological, and practical training.27

In Spain, during the later years of the Spanish Civil War, the rebel forces organized around General Francisco Franco began the process of reorganizing their loose alliance into the working governing coalition that would rule the country for almost forty years. Although scholars continue to debate whether Francoism itself should be labeled fascist, the Phalanx remained a central part of the ruling group even as its influence diminished in the post-WWII era. Within an environment where traditional conservatism and fascism had to work in conjunction, what really changed
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from the 1940s on was the balance of power within the coalition. The constant shifts caused ideological and structural contradictions that directly affected education and official youth policy. In fact, as the Axis powers disappeared in the aftermath of the war, the Catholic Church gained much space in the realm of educational policy, even establishing its own parallel youth group in direct competition with the Youths Front. By 1946, the Acción Católica (Catholic Action) had over 400,000 members, and education would become even more Christian-centered during the Cold War, although it never lost its fascist roots. A similar development happened in Portugal, where the many small and ill-defined radical-right, military, and religious groups that came together under the umbrella of the Liga Nacional 28 de Maio (May 28 National League) had in common only that they wanted to perpetuate a new traditionalist and authoritarian system. Salazar, like Franco, became the indispensable administrator of all these interests. During the late 1930s, the fascist pressure group within the governing coalition monopolized education, but increasing Catholic prominence during and after the war led to a redistribution of power. As time went on, attempts to coopt the Mocidade organization to enforce more Catholic values began to achieve increasing success.

The Church and the Home: Cooperation and Competition

The first task of the new fascist pedagogy was to move education away from the family and towards the party-designated spaces for socialization. For fascist pedagogues, and especially for the Italian education experts, the family was too rooted in the old social traditions and thus could not be trusted to educate children alone. Even schools, which had their content set by the regimes, had their roles reduced to teaching, while educating became the responsibility of the youth groups. The primary and secondary teachers who Hitler and Mussolini (a former teacher himself) held so much contempt for, were to be replaced by “people’s educators,” both within the school environment and in the youth groups. Instead of teaching through the traditional methods, they were tasked with educating through action and the “experience of community.” However, acquiring total control of children’s education was not an easy
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task. Prime among the state’s competitors for the minds and hearts of kids were the churches, and the Catholic Church in particular. In Italy, Portugal, and Spain, the Roman Catholic Church had its deepest roots. In these countries, the Church was a strong part of the governing coalitions and embodied some of the main ideological points of Mediterranean fascisms, so compromises were essential.

In Italy, the Balilla had initially been held as complementary to religious education. Its creation charter established that “religious instruction shall consist in the teaching of Catholic ethics, Christian doctrine, the Old Testament and the Gospels. [...] The form of worship is that practiced by the Roman Catholic Church.” 32 In 1931, the Catholic Action youth group was dissolved, despite the Pope’s complaints and the Lateran Treaty of 1929, largely due to the institution’s attempt not only to influence but to monopolize education. The Church was allowed to keep operating smaller youth groups in the country, although their membership never surpassed the official Fascist ones. As New York University Education professor Philip W. L. Cox noted during his 1935 trip to Rome to study the Balilla, the youth organization was “accepted originally by [Fascist ideologue Giovanni] Gentile and by the Catholic Church, without enthusiasm, as potentially valuable supplements to the school and to the church” but was then “largely replacing them both.” 33

In Portugal and Spain, the support of the local Catholic churches was a pillar of the regimes’ power. The New State in particular had a hard time penetrating the familiar environment, where most initial education took place, despite its deep Catholic roots and especially due to its initial resistance to mobilizing youth, and so it focused on other forms of creating consent. In the Iberian countries, the role of women and mothers as educators was especially emphasized, and the Salazarist regime attempted to use that to its advantage. By focusing on the indoctrination of women through its own official organization for mothers, the Obra das Mães para Educação Nacional (Mother’s Work for National Education), they hoped that children would receive at home the basis of the new Portuguese ideology. The organization, however, never achieved the size of similar
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institutions in Italy and Spain. After several failed attempts to create engaging spaces for the Portuguese youth and their parents to voluntarily participate, the regime finally settled for the creation of its own youth group for children over the age of seven in 1936, the Mocidade Portugesa (Portuguese Youth). Membership was initially optional, becoming gradually mandatory through the end of 1937, and by 1942, all other legal youth associations had been either dissolved or absorbed. The Catholic influence on all matters related to youth was evident, as church members were in charge of censoring juvenile literature and had to be consulted about youth group activities and relations to other youth organizations. Church officials even successfully pressured the government into cancelling joint activities with the Hitler Youth and a visit from the German Reichsjugendführer (National Youth Leader) Baldur von Schirach to some Mocidade youth camps in 1938 due to the Nazi’s “pagan orientation.”

In Germany, the situation was quite different regarding religious influence. Religious instruction was reduced drastically after the Nazi ascension, and even the Catholic schools, protected by the 1933 Concordat with the Vatican, were gradually replaced through legal mechanisms alongside private institutions. In some cases, religion was completely removed from the curriculum. Nazi authorities found it more difficult to implement these measures in rural areas, where Catholic teachers made the new rules less efficient. Moreover, the limited authority offered by the Hitler Youth uniform allowed for confrontation with traditional figures of power, such as teachers, parents, and priests. This was especially true when it came to overlapping Hitler Youth and religious or school activities, in which claiming youth group obligations would alleviate students from other matters. Having HJ marches happen on Sundays was common, as to purposely conflict with Christian church services so that religious influences became secondary.

In contrast, the Spanish regime fully embodied Catholicism. During the Republic, the Catholic Church had been in constant conflict with the
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secular education model, at times accusing the state of trying to “decatholicize” Spain. By 1936, Falangist ideologue José Permatín already had the basis for post-war education laid out. Charged by Franco with the planning of secondary and higher education, he wrote in 1938 that “because our fascism is eminently Catholic” its educational model should be different from “other fascist states.”36 Baptizing its ideological orientation as “National-Catholicism,” dictator Francisco Franco created a dogmatic ideology that united fascism and Roman Christianity under his figure. Franco himself was presented to children as the only one capable of holding together the cohesion of God and Patria. Children’s books, approved by church censors, made Christianity the central theme of school life, in accordance with the directions of the “17 July 1945 Law for Primary Education,” which established “Family, the Church, and the State” as the main concerns of Spanish education. Lessons on the Christian faith and its nationalist ties were covered in every textbook approved, and some of the main takeaways were never to challenge authority, be it from parents, educators, religious figures, or the state.37 In time, the internal balance of power between the Falange and the Church for the control of education completely shifted to the Catholics’ side, as will be explored in the following section.

**Educating Through Action: The Youth Groups**

The content of fascist education varied greatly according to nationality, but some underlying concepts appeared consistently. At the top of the list were ultranationalism and the prominence of youth groups over formal education. These went hand-in-hand as the youth groups became the main tool for the political education of children and adolescents. Nationalism could assume various forms, and by the 1930s, the ethnical component of a nation was as emphasized as its common cultural traits, especially in Italy and Germany. According to the Fascist School Charter, approved by the Italian Grand Council of Fascism in 1939, the role of the school was to “bring into reality the principle of popular culture that finds inspiration in the eternal value of the Italian race and its civilization.” That same document made Italy’s second youth group mandatory for all
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children and adolescents under twenty-one.\textsuperscript{38} In Germany, the official handbook for Hitler Youth leaders opened with a restatement of the “foundation of the National-Socialist outlook on life [...] the perception of the unlikeness of men”.\textsuperscript{39} The Nazi regime’s enactment of the December 1936 “Law on the Hitler Youth” gave a step forward on the road to absorbing all of the country’s “ethnic German” youth. “Non-German” children were excluded from the organization, defined by purely eugenistic standards and not by culture or place of birth. At this point, most children and adolescents were already part of the group, but the new law established that “besides being reared in the family and school, German youth shall be educated physically, intellectually, and morally in the spirit of National Socialism to serve the people and the community” and so “\textit{all German youth in the Reich} will be organized within the Hitler Youth.”\textsuperscript{40}

Similar language can be found in laws and decrees of all case studies, especially in relation to Jews and the colonial empires, but in the Iberian countries, race and ethnicity were not as central to nationalism. These regimes focused much more on forcibly homogenizing cultural traits within their borders to create unquestioning loyalty than excluding and persecuting ethnic minorities. The law that established the Portuguese Youth organization also mandated that teachers’ selection for all levels was to rank the candidates’ commitment to the national spirit higher than their formal education, and that the \textit{Mocidade}’s goal was to guarantee “the full development of physical capacity, character formation, and devotion to the patria.”\textsuperscript{41} In establishing the \textit{Frente de Juventudes}, the Spanish regime made clear that the institution’s duties included “the political education in the spirit of the Traditionalist Spanish Phalanx’s doctrine” and the mandatory enlisting of all primary and secondary students.\textsuperscript{42} Besides being a space where children and teenagers were supposed to be completely inoculated against foreign and subversive ideas, the youth groups were the
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tools for the realization of two important and correlated aspects of fascist educational policy: physical education and military training.

*Training the Body to Discipline the Mind: The Role of Sports*

Using sports to attract and keep children and adolescents was a point of convergence for the fascist regimes. By improving the physical health of the youth, the fascists simultaneously created spaces for political socialization. Sports events became massive rallies of patriotic propaganda and a showcase for the fascist ideals of discipline, service, endurance, unity, and strength. Outdoor activities, physical education, and massive sports events became hallmarks of the fascist youth program. Hiking and camping trips were designed to attract children and adolescents and to devise some of the ideal fascist values, applying them to action and not only thought. All these youth organizations eventually acquired a monopoly on sports competitions and festivals. But while boys trained to be soldiers, girls had to strive for ideal health conditions that, in the fascist rationale, would allow them to give birth to healthy children.\(^{43}\)

In the memoirs and reports of several Hitler Youth members, gymnastics and sports are said to have been one of the most successful aspects of the organization’s program. Walter Meyer, in a 1996 interview, recounted that he joined the *Deutsches Jugenvolk* (Hitler Youth chapter for children between ten and fourteen years) at the age of ten because he preferred to be marching, singing, or playing instead of going to church. By the time he had to move on the Hitler Youth, though, participation was already mandatory, and he had grown to resent the organization. What kept him there a little longer before defecting was the possibility of swimming competitively, something impossible to pursue outside of the group. His status as a competitive athlete allowed him to skip some of the Hitler Youth’s otherwise mandatory chores, and he and the other swimmers were assigned to the navy branch of the organization.\(^{44}\) In his memoir, Peter Brücker, likewise notes that gymnastics and sports were where the National-Socialist ideology reached him and other skeptical peers, saying that “young people’s pleasure in using their bodies, in fending off their sexual instincts, their liking for physical competition, and the ideology of
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the Nazi state all came naturally together in the playing fields of the Third Reich.” 45 This observation was consistent with the objectives of Nazism for its youth, and unlike several aspects of education, was applied to both the male and female youth groups, as laid out by Hitler in these two passages of Mein Kampf:

The extravagant emphasis laid on purely intellectual education and the consequent neglect of physical training must necessarily lead to sexual thoughts in early youth. Those boys whose constitutions have been trained and hardened by sports and gymnastics are less prone to sexual indulgence than those stay-at-homes who have been fed exclusively with mental pabulum.

The People’s State will have to consider the physical training of the youth after the school period just as much a public duty as their intellectual training; and this training will have to be carried out through public institutions. 46

In Italy, both the Balilla and its successor, the Italian Youth of the Lictors, had been implementing the same education-through-action model early on. “After school, Saturdays Sundays, and holydays […] the Balilla activity is continuous, varied, and intensive” wrote Dr. Cox in 1935, “extra-school activities are chiefly athletic and cultural.” 47 Fascist pedagogues believed that education through physical activity was the best way to learn the new ideological compass of the Italian nation. In 1926, they had established that “the Balilla was intended to give moral and physical training to the young” as to “make them worthy of the new Italian standard of living.” 48 In 1937, the so-called Sabatos Fascistas (Fascist Saturdays) were introduced, in which school children participated in special athletic events. 49

In Spain, physical education was made mandatory for all teachers’ curriculum as a means to advance the political and ideological training of their pupils. For the Francoist regime, sports were a way of mobilizing the masses and a key part of the pedagogic plan of formation through action. In 1941, a National Sports Delegation was created to coordinate educational and athletic goals. Its first director, General José Moscardó,

46 Hitler, Mein Kampf, 200; 321.
declared at the agency’s creation that “for its extraordinary educative powers [sports] have become the weapons of governments, which all peoples consider when they think of their youths’ formation.” Sports were, for the Falange, a matter of political action, integration of youth into the National Movement, and a decoy from other matters. The post-war period in Spain would be one of extended crisis, and sports were commonly used as a way of distracting youths from the hardships of everyday life, especially because all athletic clubs and delegations were under state control of either the National Sports Delegation or the Youths Front. This fact, though, also created conflict between these two organizations, as well as between the female Sección Feminina and the many religious elements that composed important governing institutions. All wanted a say on the form and content of sports and extra-curricular activities, and their competing pedagogical approaches led to poor investments and political decisions as the government had to work on compromises. Sports and physical education administrators were appointed not according to their expertise but rather according to political negotiations, which led to several consecutive failures for the regime’s political goals for sports.50

Military Training: When War was the Norm and Peace the Exception

Hand-in-hand with sports, military training occupied an important role in the physical and ideological education of male children and adolescents. Much more than just the principles of Fascism or National Socialism, education was aimed at preparing boys for war. For those educated in the 1930s in Italy, Portugal, and Germany, peace was not the standard state of affairs. Instead, children were taught that the time of peace they were growing up in was an exception, and that war was the inevitable natural state of nations. The Great War loomed large in the classrooms of the fascist-educated generations, and the idea that a new conflict was coming was certain.51 Nowhere was the reality of war more immediate than in Spain, where the Falange and its allies spent most of their formational decade fighting the Republican forces in a bloody civil war. But it was in Germany and Italy where creating soldiers instead of citizens found its highest priority.

Karl-Heinz Schnible, who would later be arrested for distributing anti-Nazi pamphlets alongside Helmut Hübener, grew up believing that
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war was an inevitable part of life. Looking back, he wrote that everything he learned in the Nazi youth organizations was to prepare him to be a soldier.52 Others who grew up under Nazi rule reported similar views, as was the case of Günter Lucks who later wrote “everywhere we had been warned of the awful ‘Bolshevik danger.’ And we wanted to help to defend Germany against that. When young people today idolize celebrity footballers or youth bands, our idols were Werner Moelders, Guenther Prein or Otto Skorzeny, these were legendary fighter pilots.”53 As part of their Hitler Youth education, they were taught about the concept of a German Lebensraum (living space) and patterns of Aryan migration, relating that to the Germans’ purported “natural ties” with the lands of central and eastern Europe. There was also in the handbook for youth leaders of the Third Reich a whole section on the German “right to colonies,” supposedly unfairly taken from them by the Treaty of Versailles. The booklet closed with the promise that “the German Reich will at all events never cease to demand the restoration of its colonies.”54

In Italy, the expansionist model of the Roman Empire required the training of generations of soldiers. By law, the president of the Opera Nazionale Balilla had to be “chosen from among officers of the militia ranking not below Console General”, and the Avanguardisti were structured as a paramilitary organization directly under the control of the Prime Minister.55 If Italy was to become the new Roman empire, it would need loyal, disciplined, and well-trained soldiers. The concept was later well translated in the Italian Youth of the Lictors’ motto, “Believe, Obey, Fight!”, and its official oath of membership: “In the name of God and Italy, I swear to carry out the orders of the Duce and to serve with all my strength, and if necessary my very blood, the cause of the Fascist Revolution.”56

52 Karl-Heinz Schnible, Blair R. Holmes and Alan F. Keele, When Truth was Treason, German Youth Against Hitler: The Story of the Helmut Hübener Group Based on the Narrative of Karl-Heinz Schnible with Documents and Notes (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1995), 17-18.
In Portugal, the necessity of training boys to be soldiers became evident for the regime in 1936 as civil war erupted in neighboring Spain. Fearing that the conflict would spill over into the Portuguese borders, especially because the regime openly supported the rebels’ side, two supposedly complementary youth organizations were established, the Mocidade Portuguesa for children between seven and seventeen and the Legião Portuguesa (Portuguese Legion), a paramilitary organization for those eighteen and older. Their main goal was to guarantee that youths were “in capacity of defending [the country] if needed.” In time, the military training provided by these organizations was so advanced that graduates from the Mocidade could skip the first cycle of classes in the military academy for officials and sergeants, which created several conflicts with both the military components of Salazar’s coalition and the paramilitary Legion. Instead of working as complementary organizations, they behaved much more like rivals, a symptom of the individual interests present in the leadership of each group. During the early 1940s, a push for further integration resulted in better relations between the Portuguese Legion and Youth, but attrition with the military remained.57

Youth, Gender, and Sexuality in Fascist Education

Fascism proposed to shape a new society through a new generation. It was, however, an inherently gendered endeavor. While boys were trained to become the next fascist elite as soldiers of the national revolution, girls had the incompatible tasks of becoming both submissive, abnegating wives and mothers, and politically active nationalists involved in the public life.58 This was evident in the laws and decrees directed at educating girls, as well as in the social expectations of the girls themselves. The Italian Fascist School Charter addressed this issue in its twenty-first article, establishing that “the destination and social mission of women, which are quite distinct in Fascist life, have as their foundation different and special educational institutes. […] The Order for Girls’ Schools will prepare [girls] spiritually for home management and for teaching in the nursery
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schools.”

This traditionalist gender ideology was also shared by the other fascist regimes.

**A Gendered Worldview**

“I accepted that being a housewife like my mother was my life’s goal,” wrote Ursula Marten in her memoir. She was born in 1929 and grew up to become a youth leader in the Third Reich’s *Bund Deutscher Mädel*. Marten was an example of educational success for the Nazi state and of the profound contradictions of its gender policies. Her desire was to become a perfect housewife, and her loyalty was to the party and the party only. But her profound dedication to National Socialism and the successful Nazi subversion of traditional allegiances also allowed her to assume the role of a soldier when the necessity arose. Her refusal to admit defeat in 1945, when her grandfather refused to let her join other armed civilians in the street battles against the Red Army during the fall of Berlin, illustrates the paradoxical behavior rooted in the ideological confusion of National Socialism. “Here I was,” she later wrote, “a member, a leader really, of the Hitler Youth and someone lowly like my grandfather was telling me what to do. Didn’t he realize how important I was to the cause? That I was becoming a grown woman and could think for myself? Mostly though, I thought, there he goes again. He’s not willing to fight for this country to win this war.”

Not only she understood herself as part of the vanguard of National Socialism, a young leader of the new German order, but the passage also exemplifies her definite break with the “old” in the figure of her “unpatriotic” grandfather.

The BDM was underdeveloped if compared to the male Hitler Youth. Although the basic structure of both organizations was the same, education and activities were highly gendered. Both focused on hierarchy and sports, but while these features served the formation of boys as soldiers, for girls they were aimed at creating attractive, submissive, and healthy wives who could bear many children. This principle of *Glaube und Schönheit* (Faith and Beauty) was the name of the organization for girls between seventeen and twenty-one, which young women were supposed to join once they reached the maximum age for the BDM. There were no
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female elite schools besides three Napolas created for war necessities, and the Gymnasiums, where Latin was taught, were male-only, which also prevented girls from entering most higher education courses. In 1933, the government had capped the number of young women entering colleges and universities at one for every ten boys, but the war effort called for ideological compromises, and so this imbalance changed as more young men left for the fronts. In 1939 the number of female students enrolled in universities was 6,342, but by 1942, that number had risen to over 42,000, or 64 percent of the student population.\(^{61}\)

The training received by girls focused on their future role as child bearers, caretakers of the home, and at times, agricultural workers. Their function in a fascist society was to serve and reproduce.\(^{62}\) According to another BDM youth leader, Ursula Söllner, girls received and taught courses consisting of “various topics such as sports, gymnastics, dance, sewing, cooking, art and of course political education — in preparation for the ‘marriage of the German woman.’”\(^{63}\) This was consistent with the educational goals of other fascist states. In Italy, the presence of women in important academic positions was perceived as problematic, as was the overreliance on female teachers. The Fascist pedagogues believed this could create pacifist and passive students, incapable of virile behavior and competitiveness. For this reason, the educational prospects of women had to be curbed early on, limited to traditional “womanly” professions such as nursing.\(^{64}\) The gender barriers created by early Fascist policies remained in place even as broader educational values changed and adapted. Giovanni Gentile, the pedagogue and early Fascist ideologue tasked by Mussolini with molding Fascist education in the 1920s, famously believed that women were inherently different, and could only truly begin to learn once they had accepted their inferior nature. During his time as Minister of Public Education, women were prohibited from teaching several “intellectually sophisticated” subjects, such as letters, Latin, Greek,
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History, Philosophy, etc. The elite *Liceo Feminini* (female finishing schools) were reserved for the daughters of the elite, and at the time were denounced by Italian feminists as a machine for creating luxury “servants” who would marry the “masters” of the boys’ elite schools.65

Nowhere, though, was the gendered educational division as clear and ideologically important as in Spain. The *Falange Española Tradicionalista y de las JONS* (Traditionalist Spanish Phalanx of the National Syndicalist Offensive), the main fascist element of the Francoist ruling coalition, was itself divided according to gender. Women were organized in a separated wing of the organization named the *Sección Feminina* (Female Section), and its youth group followed suit. The Female Section was led by Pilar Primo de Rivera, daughter of ex-dictator Miguel Primo de Rivera and sister of Phalanx’s founder and early martyr, José Antonio. Her role in Spanish society during the whole of Franco’s regime is interestingly contradictory: she was both the model of a pious, submissive daughter and sister, who never married so she could serve her father and brother long after their deaths, and the ideological successor to José Antonio, a central political figure who held immeasurable influence and power. Under her command, Spanish girls were raised in subordination to men, following a radical understanding of Catholic patriarchy. She was the architect of Francoist education, merging religious, nationalist, and fascist values to create new Spaniards.66

*Education and Sexuality Paradox*

For much of the twentieth century, fascist concepts and ideals regarding sexuality were misremembered. This is due, mainly, to three correlated factors: first, the different ways in which these themes were addressed by the various fascist regimes; second, because of the stereotypical image of sexuality in popular media during the 1930s and 1940s; and finally, due to the contradictory nature of official legal and ideological policy on sexuality within each regime, which was also hard to enforce. This last point was especially true in Italy and Germany, where populational growth according to set expectations was an absolute priority, and where the predominance of the racial factor in social relations was especially exacerbated when it came to sex. Mass media and official

education did not allow sexuality, and especially female sexuality, to be addressed. Nevertheless, propaganda and education emphasized the importance of healthy reproduction. In Italy, teenagers were offered neither sex education nor biology, while in Germany these subjects were replaced by genetics.67

In gathering support to achieve power, fascists claimed to be upholding bourgeois traditionalist values, especially in regard to institutions that they perceived as being under attack by liberals and Marxists: marriage and family. But while they reinforced taboos coherent with upper-class values about sexuality, measures were also taken to guarantee a constant growth of population in accordance with the Fascist and National Socialist ideological goals. This was a time when female sexual pleasure was no longer denied, but because the Christian traditionalist understanding of female sexuality was prevalent, that only made the necessity of early marriage all the more urgent. In Italy, the legal age for marriage was lowered, disproportionately so according to gender, to fourteen for girls and sixteen for boys. Having affairs after marriage, however, was socially acceptable for both sexes; after all, they were born to procreate. In Germany, sexuality was perceived pretty much in the same way as youth: if left unchecked, it constituted an existential threat to the racial state, but the Nazis could not achieve their goals without it. Their solution rested on ideologically contradictory policies that would fulfil their empirical needs. It is safe to say that, although many times officially discouraged in order to please the traditionalist elements of the governing coalitions, sexuality itself was not repressed indiscriminately in these two regimes. Instead, heterosexual, “racially pure” sexuality with the goal of reproduction was incentivized while all other forms were constrained.68

In a 2005 publication, Dagmar Herzog argued something similar. For her, the fascist – and in this case, the Nazi – goal was not to suppress sexuality completely, but instead to “reinvent it as the privilege of non-disabled, heterosexual ‘Aryans.’” It had to stimulate and validate young people’s sexual desires at the same time that it insulated youth from
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“deprived” behavior associated with “lesser” races. It was politically easier to rhetorically condemn all sexuality outside of the moralistic Christian discourse while encouraging Aryan reproduction.\(^6\) This is consistent with the curricular changes implemented by the Nazi regime, both in schools and the Hitler Youth. While adolescents had to be shielded from sexual themes, it was essential that they knew that, if they were to have sex, it should be with another “pure Aryan” with whom they could generate offspring. Like Nazi policy more generally, the regime’s policies regarding sexuality were inherently contradictory. If following these directives, “promiscuity” could be overlooked even within the Hitler Youth and the BDM.\(^7\) In 1933, sex education was banned from the Third Reich’s classrooms, and just a few weeks later, it was stipulated that “more emphasis shall be placed on the study of genealogy,” as expressed in conference minutes of a Kassel high school at the time.\(^8\) The same process can be observed in the HJ and BDM official material, which prepared youth leaders to tackle questions about genetics, pregnancy, \textit{Rassengesetzen} (race laws), but not sexuality.\(^9\)

In this sense, Geoffrey Giles has characterized sex in a fascist society not as a pleasure but a duty. On the opposite of the Marxist and liberal slogans that promised youth – and especially girls – that “your body belongs to you,” fascist education insisted that their bodies belonged to the national community.\(^10\) Contradictions aside, reproduction was a tool of empire-building for fascists, and a healthy expanding nation required many children. The incompatible ideological paths to achieve and justify that line of thought were present not only outside but also within the fascist parties themselves. In 1938, for example, Nazi physician Dr. Ferdinand Hoffmann claimed that “depraved Jewish sexual behavior” was infecting the National Socialist regime, and a deeper turn to traditional marital values was essential to guarantee the survival of the \textit{Volk}. He blamed decades of “Jewish media” for the “libertine” epidemic in the Third Reich. Three years later, in a 1941 lecture to high-ranking party officials, Nazi


\(^8\) “Conference Minutes from Horst Wessel School in Kassel (1933)”, in \textit{The Third Reich Sourcebook}, 243-7.


race theorist Dr. Hans Endres argued that it was in fact the “Oriental Christian mentality” that was responsible for suppressing “our healthy Germanic instincts in sexual matters,” and thus a turn away from those values was the path that would guarantee Aryan supremacy.74

These conflicting ideas affected youth more than any other strata. The liberal governments that preceded all the studied fascist regimes had seen plenty of advancements in sexual freedom, which were promptly curtailed by the new social-conservative coalitions that lifted fascist leaders and parties to power.75 But youth, especially in the elite and working-class circles as opposed to the middle-class, interpreted the mixed messages about sex according to their own backgrounds and desires. For the upper-class adolescents, ideas of independence and breaking with the old that had moved so many in the direction of Nazism in the 1920s continued to be prevalent after the Nazi ascension. Having the privilege of access to foreign culture, they were able to consume literature, music, and movies that dealt with sexuality more openly. In Italy, by the late-1930s, books about sex education became more widespread as curious pieces of amusement among upper-class urban circles, but they were never made available for the general population. In Germany, a similar thing happened with English, French, and American films and songs, which allowed youths to misinterpret these countries’ cultures as overly sexualized. Access to these amenities, however, was an upper-class exclusivity.76

For the working-class youths, the imposition of traditionalist bourgeois values was much more problematic. The Nazi attempt at creating a homogenized national culture centered on the bourgeois-nationalist moral simply clashed with working-class values regarding, among several aspects, sexuality.77 The lack of sex education also contributed to exploration and the creation of an aura of curiosity around these issues, which lower-class teens had to inquire by themselves. For example, Walter Meyer commented that his sources for information about sex were other teenagers and an older mailwoman with whom he developed a relationship. Nevertheless, at the age of thirteen, he had to
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seek his father’s help to arrange an illegal abortion for his same-age girlfriend.⁷⁸ Despite the stereotypical image of sexuality under fascism, it is clear from both memoirs and official regime documents that teenagers and adolescents engaged in sexual experimentation, both within and outside the fascist ideal behavior.

An Educational Failure: The Development of Dissent

Despite all the tools and mechanisms employed in their pursuit of the total education of youth, fascist regimes witnessed the gradual erosion of their capacity to control their younger citizens. Consensus seems to reign among historians that fascist education failed in its ultimate goals in all places where it was implemented.⁷⁹ This was already noticeable to the exiled German Social Democrat Party members who, in a 1938 Sopade report, noted that winning over youth was easier than keeping them.⁸⁰ By that point, they could already observe that “youth have been particularly disappointed by the current regime. They were made big promises, and only a very few of them have been fulfilled.”⁸¹ This development was common to all the studied fascist regimes: as the new governments consolidated their rule and new power structures matured, it became clear that youth mobilization did not necessarily translate to faith and support.

The revolutionary character of fascism that had attracted so many young people in its early years withered away once it became the status quo. After fascist movements achieved power, the battle had been won, the street fighting years were over, and the revolutionary discourse had failed to materialize. The life experiences of youth were simply not what had been promised by propaganda, and the political influence they thought they would have never came to exist.⁸² By the mid-1930s in Italy and Germany, the disjunction between the revolutionary rhetoric and the
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normalizing reality had become clear to the point where youths began seeking new forms of revolutionary political participation. As Tracy Koon points out, the base plan of creating an environment of total dedication to the cause could never be realized, and as reality dawned upon fascist youths, it generated all sorts of responses ranging from fervorous orthodoxy that simply ignored the contradictions between ideology and reality, apolitical behavior, and outright opposition. If these issues were already apparent in peace time, they were only aggravated when fascism went to war. Be it the Second World War or the colonial wars of the 1970s, the toll of expansion and empire fell disproportionately upon the young, and as the end of the regimes approached, harsher repression to dissent backfired by generating even more grievances.

As we have seen, new forms of elitism, constantly-mutating and ideologically incoherent policy, compromises and disputes for power, failures to make good on their grandiose promises, and the imposition of cultural principles incompatible with working-class and universal youth values, were all common features of the new fascist order. In time, different types of dissidence appeared, guided by social and historical context and cultural values. Some developed into outright political opposition, while others assumed apolitical character. Some were ephemeral actions of small groups, sometimes connected to larger networks, while others developed into fully-fledged subcultures with hundreds or even thousands of members.

The development of dissent, however, was largely shaped by two underlying factors: social class and political, or ideological, reasoning. For this reason, I separate my discussion of the development of dissent not by nationality or timeframe, but by class and political or ideological considerations. I have found that working-class and upper-class youths had different motives, means, and objectives when engaging in nonconforming behavior, and that the comparative potential of the topic is better employed when these groups were matched with similar cliques, both within and across national borders, against youths in different social contexts. The same applies to cases where ideological or political reasoning informed nonconformity and those where there was none. In the latter case, however, political motivations were routinely attributed to apolitical behavior by the
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fascist regimes, independently of the self-understanding of members. For this section, Germany and Spain serve as my main case studies, due to the current availability of sources.

Rebellious middle-class youths present an interesting development. Their loose identification as a class and relative gains from fascist, and especially Nazi, policy, when compared to others, prevented these youths from establishing broader rebellious tendencies of their own. Adults from this stratum remained the most consistent Nazi supporters throughout the Third Reich, and similarly, their children did as well. The character of Nazi educational policy disproportionately benefited them, as can be seeing by the numbers of middle-class representatives in the regime’s elite institutions: 64.3% of students in the Napolas and 76% on the Adolf Hitler Schools were the children of civil servants, white-collar workers, and small business owners. Prioritizing middle-class youths does not seem, though, to have been a deliberate decision. The deeply stratified society of 1920s and 1930s Europe, the material and economic disparities it caused, as well as the differences in upbringing of working and middle-class children, all contributed to this development. Instead of developing a subculture of their own, select youth dissidents from the middle-class more commonly joined working-class and upper-class circles, whose groups, actions, and motivations I examine below.

Working-Class Apolitical Nonconformity: Pirates, Punks, and Rebels

Throughout the 1930s, the elitism of the new Nazi order and the increasingly coercive character of the Hitler Youth alienated many young people, especially in the working-class. The petit-bourgeois and middle-class character of the Nazi youth project made it so that most youth leaders and students of elite institutions were representative of those strata, despite the majority of cadres coming from the working-class. Most leadership positions required additional devotion of time and preparation, understood by the Nazis as a sign of loyalty, which were simply not available for the lower strata that composed the rank-and-file of the organization. While middle-class youths were educated to be ambitious, to plan ahead, and to accept the highly controlled environment of Nazi education, working-class, and especially working-class boys, were raised in a system where immediate needs were much more urgent than long-term
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ones. They provided for themselves and family members, apprenticed in shops and factories, and had to attend mandatory Hitler Youth service. Their time and resources, requirements for leadership positions, were much more limited.\footnote{Horn, “Youth Resistance in the Third Reich: A Social Portrait”, 30-2; Pine, Education in Nazi Germany, 71.}

On top of that, the leisure activities that had attracted so many to the Hitler Youths in its early days were gradually replaced as the organization was made mandatory. Instead of hiking trips and sports, paramilitary training and exercises of obedience became the norm. According to a study conducted after the war, 46.4 percent of former rank-and-file Hitler Youth members said that what they disliked the most in the organization were the military features. By the Germany invaded Poland in September 1939, harsher regimentation and punishments were implemented, which only escalated the paranoia caused by the fear of fifth column actions in the later years. Temporary imprisonment and disciplinary punishments became common ways of putting perceived slackers in their place. The older youth leaders were also replaced; Germany needed soldiers, and so increasingly, younger youth leaders had to be selected. Younger leaders, sometimes even younger than their cadets, were left to apply tougher training routines and punishments. Chores were much more energy and time-consuming, as Hitler Youth members took on the work left by conscripted soldiers. All of these factors, Daniel Horn argues, show that the Hitler Youth was effectively creating its own opposition.\footnote{Peukert, Inside Nazi Germany, 155; Horn, “Youth Resistance in the Third Reich: A Social Portrait”, 29-33.}

The reflection of stratification in the selection of the new youth leaders was also a point of discontent; as in other spheres of education, middle-class youths were disproportionally represented, and their social origin could be seen in both their behavior and relationships with other cadres. Because they were selected by loyalty, they lacked experience and leadership skills and had to assert their power in other ways. In a Düsseldorf Gestapo interrogation file, a boy identified as G.G. explained why he had left the HJ two years prior: “the leadership of our motor-HJ was primarily composed of higher [education] students, the majority of whom were younger than I. On the basis of their acquaintance with the top HJ leaders and through favoritism these higher students became unity leaders.” G.G. was reported to have worked as an auto mechanic, and
claimed that, despite the fact that he knew much more about cars and motorcycles, his unity leaders insisted in “bossing him around.” Something similar happened to Walter Meyer and his unity comrades. He explained that “we resented those punks who wanted to tell us what to do and what not to do and we were supposed to salute them.” One day, they had had enough: “We all got together and said ‘did you see Fritz? You see he’s got a star now? We are supposed to salute him! Let’s make life difficult for him.’”

The story of Meyer and G.G. is a common one. Young boys bullied by their superiors, resenting their abuses, decided to do something about it. In time, skipping Hitler Youth duties with their friends became a habit; they preferred to be spending their time enjoying whatever break they had from work away from the coercive environment of the HJ. Gradually, small circles of friends grew into larger groups of like-minded children and adolescents, who would meet in parks, cafes, taverns, by a corner or square, or anywhere far away from the Nazi sphere of total authority, to drink, sing, play, and engage in all types of behavior that the Hitler Youth denied them. These groups became known as the Edelweißpiraten, the Edelweiss Pirates. “It was nothing but a gang. Not more and not less,” explained Meyer,

we were much too young to have ideological convictions. We just didn’t like these guys, [...] that they became leaders and they told us what to do and they forced us to salute them. [...] We used to put condoms on their bicycles, on the little reflector. We used to deflate their bikes, steal their saddles. We did everything that would bring them physical and mental harm of some sorts. Then I think I went too far.

According to the Gestapo records, G.G. became one of the leaders of a gang of Edelweiss Pirates in Krefeld, and Meyer in Düsseldorf. The name “Edelweiss Pirates” was not their invention though. As several gangs of “Pirates” appeared throughout the Reich, many adopted the name of the Edelweiss, a flower of the Alps that only grows in the mountains, or
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Kittelsbach, a brook in-between Düsseldorf and Duisburg. On weekends, they joined together with other gangs and traveled as large groups through the country, hiking or cycling for dozens of kilometers. In this way, they met others who enjoyed the same activities in nearby towns, camped below the stars away from any figures of authority, shared songs and stories, and had the chance to mingle with kids of the opposite sex, something denied to them by the Nazi youth group. By themselves, they could enjoy all the things that had initially attracted so many youths to the HJ in the early 1930s, but now charged with a new, rebellious meaning. Their nearly daily after-work meetings helped to consolidate what became effectively a whole working-class subculture completely unlike the official one. Much of their expression as a group came in the form of songs, in which they expressed their hate for Hitler, the HJ, and the regime, as well as common themes of contempt for work, complaints about low wages, or simply their desire to have fun. Most of these gangs were concentrated in the highly industrialized Rhineland-Ruhr region, and as the war progressed, their childish pranks evolved, as they made good on their slogan “eternal war on the Hitler Youth.”

Emboldened by their numbers and capacity to disappear into the crowds, the Pirates’ clashes with the Nazis evolved into violent confrontations, especially against the HJ- Streifendienst, the Hitler Youth patrols tasked with policing the streets as the soldiers and police officers of the Third Reich were needed at the front. They ganged up on the patrols, beating them up while chanting subversive songs and slogans, and venting their contempt for the authoritarian presence in their lives on the members of an organization that frequently humiliated them. By 1940, Gestapo reports mentioned complaints from youth leaders about violent beatings from wild gangs. In 1941, a Mühlheim SA unity reported that “The HJ are taking their lives in their hands when they go out in the streets.” By 1943, the Gestapo was being informed that wild youth cliques were painting anti-Nazi slogans all over Grafenberg, and a Duisburg party official wrote that the rebellious youths “ruled and terrorized” the outskirts
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of town, so much so that “the majority of the HJ and Jugenvolk” in the area no longer wore their swastikas.\footnote{NSDAP Ortgruppenleiter Meiderich-Berg to Kreisleitung NSDAP Duisburg, 20 October 1943, cited in Horn, “Youth Resistance in the Third Reich: A Social Portrait”, 35.}

In Spain, the 1960s and 1970s saw a moment of economic boom as the Spanish state gave up on its autarkic ambitions. At the same time, the country witnessed the rebirth of several popular pre-Francoist traditions. Economic growth did not greatly transform the conditions of the Spanish working-class, but it allowed working youths for the first time to acquire the money and the ability to enjoy regular time off. The weekends became a universal refuge from the capitalist reality and the perfect moment for working and lower-middle class youths to come together and develop their own ideas of leisure away from the authoritarian control of the regime. Moreover, greater access to products, tourists, and ideas from other European states brought with them some of the pluralistic and democratic values that the regime had struggled so much to end. As Valencia-García has argued, the surveillance and censorship apparatus of the dictatorship led young people to search for spaces where their growing pluralistic ideas could be expressed, creating counter-publics eager both to consume and create new cultural productions.\footnote{Radeliffe, Modern Spain, 222; Valencia-García, Antiauthoritarian Youth Culture in Francoist Spain, 25; 63-4.}

Drinking from long-forbidden cultural traditions as well as the new international trends brought form abroad by increasing economic integration, especially the deep working-class-rooted tradition of the Carnaval and the English Punk scene, Spanish youths began to develop their own counterculture. Carnaval, forbidden in the early days of Francoist rule for its “libertine” traditions, was known for its subversion of gender norms and satirical critiques of figures of authority, especially in the form of Coplas, satirical songs with religious and political themes. The English Punk underground gave the old traditions a new, rebellious spin, becoming common on the underground scenes of urban and industrial centers such as Madrid and Barcelona. These clandestine gatherings were surrounded by the themes youth wanted to engage with but had no spaces to do so in the Francoist society, like sex, alcohol, foreign culture, rock, and punk. Influencing one another, bourgeois youths brought foreign music and styles to Spain while working-class youths adopted and adapted them. These working-class punk and rock groups were at the heart of what
slowly developed into a cross-class working subculture, known at first as the *nueva ola Española* (new Spanish wave) or *el rollo*, but that after the transition developed into the broad cultural movement known as the *Movida Madrileña* (Madrid’s scene).⁹⁹

**Politically-Ideologically Motivated Working-Class Youths: The Bolsheviks are Coming!**

In the early years of fascist governance, a repeated problem faced by different regimes was the so-called “lost generation” that came of age just as fascism arose: they were too young to be out of school, but too old to be inoculated against pre-fascist values. Among the bourgeois and upper-middle classes, this was not as much of a problem, since these were the strata where the fascists initially found their largest political support. But the working-class youths, where the Social Democrat and Communist ideas that fascists were determined to purge found their strongholds, proved to be a problem. The German author Wolfdietrich Schnurre, born and educated in Weimar Germany, was thirteen when the Nazis took power. Born to a poor family in Frankfurt, he later wrote that he considered himself psychologically shielded from National Socialism: “Because you were constantly condemned to listening to Nazi speeches, your disgust, mercifully, kept on being reinforced; at the same time, your skepticism and self-imposed distance made you anxious and alert enough to pick up what was going on.”¹⁰⁰ Facing the changing reality around them, youths who came from working-class families with Communist or Socialist backgrounds experienced some of the most brutal actions of the early years of the Third Reich. Friends and family members with SPD (*Sozialdemokratische Partei Deutschlands*, German Social Democratic Party) or KPD (*Kommunistische Partei Deutschlands*, German Communist Party) connections were detained, arrested, or disappeared daily, and the Communist and Socialist youth groups were quickly disbanded.

One such youth was Hanno Günther, born in 1921, and a member of the Communist Boy Scouts and Young Pioneer organizations before their prohibition by the Nazis. In 1940, as Germany declared victory over France, Günther organized a small circle of resistance around himself and his friends, communist nurse Elizabeth Pungs and the young Jewish
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communist Wolfgang Pander. Their meetings to read and discuss illegal Marxist literature continued until July 1941, when several members of their growing group were arrested, including the three, who had been writing and distributing anti-Nazi literature. In 1942, Günther and Pander were sentenced to death by the Third Reich’s People’s Court alongside five other friends. Their leaflets, named “The Free Word” (Das Freie Wort), denounced Hitler’s warmongering as the interest of “the gentlemen of coal and iron,” who profit out of conflict and thus “want war, now and in the future.” For them, even if Germany could defeat the Allied nations, it would only benefit “the major industrialists who win every war.” They praised the Soviet social advances, comparing them to the consequences of war on the German population, accusing the Nazi leadership circle of “[making] us into slave laborers and cannon and bomb fodder with no will of our own.”

As previously discussed, working-class youth felt increasingly alienated from the regime as time went on, and the war only aggravated tensions. New working-class, politically motivated groups appeared, some even out of the Edelweiss Pirates culture. That was the case of the Leipzig Meuten (packs). Inspired by the region’s working-class roots and left-wing political organizations, these youths shared many characteristics with the Pirates, such as their territorial gang organization, love for countryside trips, strong relation to music, larger exploration of sexuality, and violent clashes with the Hitler Youth. But because of their Communist and Socialist roots, these youths were more receptive to Soviet propaganda, adapted popular communist and Soviet songs to their own realities, eagerly accompanied the developments of the Spanish Civil War, and created a much more politicized class identity. Similar gangs also existed in Dresden, Halle, Erfurt, Hamburg, and Munich, and the struggle against

them mobilized even Heinrich Himmler, who in 1944 gave instructions on how to deal with these types of gangs.

A centralized organization does not, in general, exist. […] Membership dues are usually not collected, but in some cases identification badges are issued. […] Formation of a gang usually involves common affiliation in a factory, school, some other organization, or simply [through] residing in the same district. […] It is not unusual to be able to trace the activity back to a single antisocial or criminally inclined fellow who knows how to bring the others to heel and can direct their harmless desire for adventure instead towards dangerous avenues.

Himmler’s description of a single politically informed individual influencing others into Socialist and Communist ideas had its base, although the Nazis tended to exaggerate the role of “ringleaders” and minimize the effects of their own policies on the emergence of dissent. In a 1944 Ministry of Justice report about “youth gangs,” the ironic remark that “they follow a leader uncritically, to whom they sometimes submit themselves totally” shows just how blinded by ideology were the Nazis tasked with combating youth rebellion.

In the case of Helmuth Hübener and the resistance group that developed around him in Hamburg, however, they were partially right. Karl-Heinz Schnible, one of the young boys who was later arrested and put on trial with Hübener, exhibits in his memoir many of the characteristics of an Edelweiss Pirate in potential; Schnible complained about the harsh treatment he received from his Hitler Youth unity leader “who was not any older than I was” and yet “wanted to drill me terribly with push-ups, crawling, and all of that nonsense.” One day, after getting scolded for not wearing his Hitler Youth uniform, he got into a fight with the HJ leader and beat him up in front of the whole unit, which resulted in his expulsion from the organization. His friend Rudolph Wobbe had also been involved
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in a fight with some Hitler Youth members, and both sometimes got into brawls with Streifendienst patrols at night. But they had not thought of themselves as resisters until their friend from the Mormon Church, Helmuth Hübener, invited them to illegally listen to the allied transmissions in his shortwave radio. Hübener was an extraordinary young man. In their circles, he would always conduct the conversation, making remarks about politics and even preaching about communism and revolution. When he invited them to distribute the anti-Nazi leaflets he had been writing, based on the BBC’s broadcasts he listened to, their reluctance was easy to overcome.108

The pamphlets they distributed called on “German boys” to abandon the Hitler Youth, exploiting the resentments that he knew personally from his time in the organization. “They feel very much in their element when they can tyrannize intimidated young boys,” he wrote, “when they can tyrannize you. Or do you deny that they want to bend your will with all the means at their disposal?”109 He also denounced the war as the fruit of the profit-driven Nazi elite’s class interests, as in his piece about Hermann Göring: “The Nazi’s air marshal may well still be drawing a horrendous dividend from his ammunition factories – he is a wily war profiter and businessman.”110

In the People’s Court verdict and sentence, Hübener was described as “[demonstrating] an intelligence that stands far above the average for youths of his age,” affirming that, upon reading the leaflets, “no one would guess, even if he knew that their contents were composed from transcripts, that they were written by a youth of only 16 or 17 years.” For the Nazis, though, this also meant that “consequently, the defendant was to be sentenced as an adult.” While Schnible, Wobbe, and another one of the group’s members, Gerhard Düwer, were all sentenced to time in prison, Hübener was sentenced to death.111
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In the same way that groups like the Meuten or Hübener’s developed out of the Edelweiss Pirates, in Spain politically charged music, comics, texts, and activist groups developed out of the Movida. In this case, however, the influence of the debates going on at the higher education centers also had a lot of influence, especially because the spaces created by the Movida were shared across the class barrier. Socialism and Communism were very much present and alive in the Spanish academic debate by the 1970s, with the Republican memory of the Civil War being slowly revived and the influence of the Cold War in the worldview of young Spaniards. As censorship relaxed due to both outside and inside pressure, the political ideas that Franco had tried to purge now permeated Spanish society once again.112

Political-Ideologically Motivated Upper-Class Youths: Fascism Against Higher Education

In the mid-1930s, the so-called problema dei giovani (problem of the youth) became a common theme for Fascist Italy’s press. Increasingly, educated youths from the urban centers of Italy demonstrated disillusion with the Fascist regime. At the time, the reasons were not clear enough for the Fascists to respond effectively; after all, these were generations completely raised under Fascist rule. Analyzing the question more deeply, historians have come up with fitting explanations. Italian Fascism had a clear class bias towards the urban elite youth, despite its working-class rhetoric. Educating the next batch of Fascists was always a priority. For this reason, the young intellectuals of Italy had a privileged place in Fascist society and were the focus of educational, physical, and creative incentives. As in other fascist societies, they enjoyed relaxed censorship that supposedly allowed for a better academic development. Opposition among some of these bourgeois, well-educated youths had the interesting characteristic of having a self-understanding as the “pure Fascist” ideology, opposed not to Fascism itself but to the way it was being implemented. Because the regime’s ideological rhetoric regarding youth was much related to the themes of war and the 1922 “revolution,” by the 1930s, young academics felt disconnected from the promised opportunity of contributing to change. They became one of the groups that demonstrated more dissatisfaction with the status quo, alongside urban workers. They had been allowed to learn and experiment with concepts of
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modernity outside of the fascist scope, but not to make their ideas into reality.  

The Fascist regime’s response was partially successful but was still a long way from resolving the issue. First, it came up with policies that prioritized young people in civil service and post-graduate academics, as well as patronage programs for young intellectuals and artists. This was especially well-suited due to the late-1930s economic problems that Italy was undergoing. It was a male-centered response, though, relying heavily on the deliberate exclusion of women as to create room for more attention and resources for the males. This generated a stronger gender identification among young female intellectuals that sometimes surpassed any generational understanding of self, as the Fascists had intended. Their other partial solution came in the form of the 1935 Ethiopian War, propagandized as the opportunity for action that youths had awaited. It was sold as the next step of the Fascist revolution: expansion. This ploy worked for many who were anxious for the feeling of agency, but not for all. At best, disillusion grew into political apathy, a general disinterest for politics and the party. At worst, it grew into criticism of the regime, then into agitation against it, until finally becoming antifascism. As young university students, a position reserved for the children of the elite, realized that change could not come from within, they began looking elsewhere. 

In Germany, similar problems arose. As in Italy, access to higher education outside of the elite party schools was a privilege for the few. Having access to knowledge otherwise inaccessible to others, and to spaces where a limited political debate could happen, it made sense that youths in this group developed more complicated political and philosophical understandings. The prime example of this development is the Weiße Rose (White Rose) students. Composed initially of petit-bourgeois students at the University of Munich, the White Rose developed its own network of like-minded resistance actors springing from Munich to Cologne, Essen, Stuttgart, Frankfurt, and Nuremberg. Most well-known among its members were the siblings Hans and Sophie Scholl and their friend Christoph Probst, all of whom were prosecuted, sentenced,
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and executed on February 22, 1943. According to their sentence, the feared People’s Court, in the form of Chief Justice Roland Freisler, found that they had “called for the sabotage of the war effort and armaments and for the overthrow of the National Socialist way of life of our people, have propagated defeatist ideas, and have most vulgarly defamed the Führer, thereby giving aid to the enemy of the Reich and weakening the armed security of the nation.”

Like their Italian counterparts, the core Munich group was composed of youths who had previously been enthusiastic Nazis. Sophie had even been a BDM leader before university. Disillusion, aggravated by the war, changed their perspectives on National Socialism.

The White Rose leaflets reflect their class biases as well as their shift away from Nazism. Idealizing Germany’s recent liberal democratic experience, they did not relinquish patriotic values, but instead denounced Nazism in ways that would not attribute blame to those who followed it blindly in the hopes that it would save Germany from decay. For them, the Nazis were “an irresponsible clique of rulers driven by dark desires.” National Socialism was an “unintellectual” ideology without a coherent theoretical base that did not represent Germany, “the nation of poets and thinkers.” They excused those who supported Nazism before, claiming that “up until the outbreak of war, the majority of the German people were blinded, the National Socialists did not reveal their true nature,” an assertion that is doubtful at least. They also aimed for a reticent neutrality that validates some Nazi rhetoric in order to reach out to a people deeply indoctrinated with Nazi propaganda. An example of that can be observed in the excerpt from the group’s second leaflet that reads “the Jews are people too – no matter what position one takes on the Jewish question.”

Nevertheless, they call Germans to action, incentivizing them to engage in passive resistance through
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sabotage in companies vital for armaments and the war, sabotage in all meetings, rallies, festive occasions, organizations initiated by the Nazi Party, prevention of smooth running of the war machinery (a machine that works only for the Nazi Party and its dictatorship) [...] Sabotage of all scientific and intellectual areas active in continuing the present war – be it universities, higher education institutions, laboratories, research institutions, technical bureaus. Sabotage in all events of cultural nature [and] all branches of the fine arts, in all writing, all newspapers.\textsuperscript{120}

“Military victory over Bolshevism”, they wrote in another of their leaflets, should not be a priority over “the defeat of the National Socialists” because “our current state [...] is the dictatorship of evil.”\textsuperscript{121}

After the deaths of the main Munich group, other White Rose members who had found ways to copy and distribute their leaflets became much more active. The Hamburg section, led by Heinz Kucharski, Hans Leipelt, Greta Rhote, and Traute Lafenz, had been distributing leaflets before, but saw a period of radicalization after 1943. They expanded their circles by recruiting ex-\textit{bündische} youths and some “swing kids,” especially followers of local jazz bands resentful of the Hitler Youth. These were rebellious teens, mostly coming from elite and upper-middle class circles, whom the White Rose members thought they could organize into a structured resistance movement, and whose case I will tackle in the next section. Unfortunately, their resistance project came to a premature end in October and November of 1943, when most members of the Hamburg White Rose were arrested.\textsuperscript{122}

In Spain, the regime faced broad university-based resistance from its outset. Many university students took over the job of turning the civil war’s resistance movements in the rebel-controlled universities into oppositional ones. The now illegal \textit{Federación Universitaria Escolar} (University School Federation, FUE) went underground to become the main university resistance to the Phalanx’s \textit{Sindicato Estudiantil Único} (Unified Student’s Union). Violence and repression, which were normally concentrated in the factories and the lives of the working class, were
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present daily in the educational institutions of Spain, affecting students across the class barrier. Throughout the 1940s, opposition was more veiled, especially because a large part of students were Falangists collecting their benefits for service during the Civil War and as part of the Blue Legion in the Second World War. Those caught for subversive activity, such as holding illegal FUE meetings or painting anti-Francoist and republican slogans in university buildings, could expect imprisonment, torture, and forced labor in the Francoist war memorial Valley of the Fallen. Other anti-Francoist student organizations appeared, mostly directed by the Catalan, Basque, or other nationalist regional movements that were at the time becoming the main enemy of the homogenizing regime. After the fall of Berlin, the Phalanx watched in disarray as youths moved away from fascism and in several directions; some became apolitical, some based their pro-regime identity on Catholicism, and others joined the opposition. By the mid-1950s, the anti-Francoist student movement gained steam and came to control university spaces. Influenced by Communists and Socialists, they led massive demonstrations uniting nonconforming youths across classes and clashing with the Francoist youth and student organizations.123

In 1956, Madrid students published a historical manifest denouncing the regime’s “monopoly over thought” and its control over universities through “an artificial structure that does not allow for the authentic manifestation and representation of the students.” Moreover, they demanded “the formation of a Congreso Nacional de Estudiantes (National Students’ Congress) the guarantees a representative structure,” with democratically elected representatives protected by the Education Ministry.124 In that same week, law students tried to hold an election for their representatives but faced repression from the Phalanx’s Centuria 20 and Guardia de Franco (Century 20 and Franco’s Guard). The next day (February 8), student organizations all over Madrid manifested their condemnation of the repression. On February 9, they took to the streets to disrupt a Youths Front parade in honor of Phalanx students who had died in the civil war, which ended in violent clashes. Although several students
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identified as “leaders” of the demonstrations were arrested and accused of serving foreign communists in a plot against the regime, most were quickly released due to their wealthy or even important Falangist families. The notoriety they gained in the Francoist media backfired, allowing the opposition movement to grow and spread during the next decade.\textsuperscript{125}

\textit{Apolitical Upper-Class Youths: From Swing to Superman}

Classified by the Nazis as “liberal-individualistic gangs,” apolitical, upper-class nonconforming groups were one of the first symptoms of the larger issues with Nazi education.\textsuperscript{126} Resenting the military escalation of the Hitler Youth, its coercive character as participation became increasingly mandatory, the regimentation and escalating repression that came with war, and what they perceived as the low level of the National Socialist cultural production, some upper-class youths rejected the organization’s values and activities, instead turning to other lifestyles and products from abroad. Hamburg, as Daniel Horn has argued, was particularly suited for this type of nonconformity due to its cosmopolitan composition, patrician tradition, and anglophile culture.\textsuperscript{127} Unlike other youths, the money and status of upper-class adolescents allowed them access to foreign clothes, literature, cinema, and music, as well as to private spaces such as exclusive night clubs and spacious private houses. Away from the public sphere, parents, and authority figures, they enjoyed free leisure time engaging with these foreign cultural products outside of the Nazi-controlled spaces of socialization. They refused to listen solely to “Germanic” völkisch (popular) music and ballads, instead enjoying jazz and swing music imported from the United States and England, and their widespread colloquial use of English slangs and catchphrases as well as Weimar mannerisms were a source of horror to the Hitler Youth leaders.\textsuperscript{128} This very factor was the source of their nicknames, swingjugend (Swing Youths) or schlurfs.\textsuperscript{129} Swing youths dressed expensively, attempting to mimic American Hollywood vestments and English aristocracy styles. Union Jacks and star-spangled pins were a common lapel accessory,
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according to their idealized ideas of the two countries. But their main characteristic, much to the disgust of the NSDAP, was their love for swing.

The swing movement quickly spread through upper-class circles from Dresden to Vienna, and even occupied France, where the Zazous or Petit Swings had given the Nazis a hard time since 1940. The success of the swing kids, though, was due in large part to the lack of entertainment diversity in National Socialist society. Their ever-growing parties attracted other rich kids, who in turn spread the movement to other parts of the country. Initially, these live dances had been allowed to happen publicly, until all public dances were banned. In October of 1940, the police broke into an event attended by over 400 youths, arresting sixty-three people as “ringleaders.” Still, internal documents show that large events were also happening privately, as was the case of dance parties in 1939 and 1940 organized by the “Flotbeck group,” attended by over 500 youths and, according to undercover Nazis, were “marked above all by sexual promiscuity.” During one of the last publicly held Swing Festivals in Hamburg in 1940, an internal Hitler Youth report noted that “the participants accompanied the dances and songs, without exception, by singing the English words. Indeed, throughout the evening, they attempted only to speak English; at some tables even French.” But despite the treasonable elevation of the Reich’s enemies’ cultures, for the Hitler Youth member who wrote this report, the worst element of the swing festival was the dance itself. It was described as “a swing of the worst sort,” in which “sometimes two boys danced with one girl, sometimes several couples formed a circle, linking arms and jumping, slapping hands, even rubbing the backs of their heads together. [...] They all ‘jitterbugged’ on the stage like wild creatures” and “several boys could be observed dancing together, always with two cigarettes in the mouth, in one corner.”

The Nazi officials were terrorized by their swinging, complaining in official communication that “hot and swing music demonstrations of
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young anglophile circles in Hamburg” were “treasonable and reactionary-disruptive” events promoted by “degenerate and criminally inclined, racially mixed youths.”134 When informed of the situation, Goebbels recommended that all involved youths be enrolled immediately in the labor service, while SD reports worried that the swing boys were opposed to the war, possibly even kin to the enemy, and that the girls seemed to “flit from bed to bed.” They related that “their [the youths] obsession for modern, Anglo-American dance music” was “nearly psychotic,” and that the “sole bond that holds many of these youngsters together is their addiction to this music.”135 Because the words and descriptions of the Nazi reporters in these documents are completely shaped by their own ideological pre-conceptions of these youths, it is safe to assume that much of the behavior they attribute to the swing boys and girls were actually exaggerated projections of the things repressed by National Socialist norms, especially when it came to sexuality. They denounced that “even the youngest of female members indulged in sexual intercourse with several partners consecutively” and that “these parties were marked by alcoholic excesses at which people ‘swung’ and ‘hotted.’”136

In the end, the harsher Nazi crackdown on these groups drove them to the private sphere, contributing to the development of the Swing movement into a viable subculture among upper- and upper-middle class youths. It also ensured the radicalization of its members as clashes with the regime became more frequent. As Throsten Müller, a young jazz musician engaged in the Hamburg resistance movement alongside the local White Rose chapter put it, “it was not that we were opposed to the Nazis, rather that the Nazis were against us.”137 In 1942, Himmler responded to the appeals of Hitler Youth leader Axmann to end the movement by ordering “the radical extermination of the whole infestation,” placing the “ringleaders” in concentration camps and revoking their right to attend
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higher education institutions once they were out. He closed his letter to Reinhardt Heydrich by stating that “only by acting brutally shall we be able to avert the dangerous spread of this anglophile trend at a time when Germany is fighting for her life.”

A wave of arrests followed, with the Gestapo and Hitler Youth first dissolving the Hamburg Curious-Haus Fête and the Frankfurt Jazz group “Harlem Club,” considered priority targets.

By the 1950s, 60s, and 70s, when Portugal and Spain watched in disgust as their own upper-class youths consumed foreign culture and turned away from the ultranationalist values of their regimes, Swing was not the problem anymore. Instead, the Cold War alignment with the United States had brought the unexpected consequences of economic and cultural imperialism, dreadful for the pseudo-autarkic Iberian regimes which wished to develop their own mass culture. The enemy proved to be resilient: Superman. American comic books had failed to gain a large public when they were first introduced in the 1940s, but by the 1950s publications boomed. In both Spain and Portugal, Superman was by far the most popular character. In Spain, a special youth censorship commission was brought together, composed of church, education, and youth officials, and tasked with ensuring that youth literature was compatible with the regime’s ideals.

In 1964, after years trying to make the DC superhero as “clean” and Spanish as possible, Superman was banned. The character’s stories represented not only the American liberal-democratic values but also pluralistic ideas that the regime sought to purge. As Louie Dean Valencia-García argues, reading and collecting illegal Superman comics, an expensive hobby fed by international travel only available for a moneyed few, became an act of dissent. The Francoist regime tried to promote its own comic books, but none were as popular. Secret trading groups were common, and the use of nicknames to mark comics demonstrate that youths knew that what they were doing was illegal. In Portugal, Ricardo Pinto observed a similar process: American culture was perceived by censors as full of “vice, sensuality, and scandal.” They capped the publication of foreign literature at 25 percent and ruled that all
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139 Kater, “The Impact of American Popular Culture on German Youth”, 47.
140 Valencia-García, Antiauthoritarian Youth Culture in Francoist Spain, 97-100; Pinto, “Salazar Contra Superman, Banda Desenhada e Censura Durante o Estado Novo,” 292-4
morally “good” characters that might serve as inspiration to children had to be rebaptized with Portuguese names.\textsuperscript{141}

But what was it about Superman that made him so dangerous to the Iberian regimes? According to data from the justifications for the censorship of Superman comics, two aspects of the comic book especially worried the censors: Superman was a false idol god-like character, and his relationship with Lois Lane represented a socially unacceptable inversion of gender roles. The idea of treating Superman as a false messianic figure, propelled by the Church censors, is a twisted one but makes sense within an understanding of fundamentalist Christianity. The inversion of gender roles rationale demands a better explanation. For the censorship commissions, these comics presented a “submissive” Superman dominated by an adventurous, working, and independent woman. Louis Lane challenged gender roles not only in her profession, but also in her clothing and relation to “weak” Clark Kent. She acted as a hero of her own, going on adventures and performing heroic deeds that, in Francoist and Salazarist culture, were reserved to men. Her character also echoed the Republican women heroes of the Spanish Civil War, a memory both regimes wanted to avoid. In Spain, the witch-hunt against Superman was headed by Alfonso Alvarez Villar, the head of the Spanish Journal of Public Opinion. In justifying his position, he wrote “the relations between the protagonist and Lois Lane reveal a terror on the part of Superman towards an authentic sexual bond” which he believed “negatively influences the long-term sexual formation of boys and adolescents.”\textsuperscript{142} Just as the swing kids before them, young Spaniards who consumed this “dangerous” foreign culture were engaging in an otherwise completely apolitical behavior that, by defying the regime’s positions, acquired political meaning.

**Conclusion**

In 1975, Francisco Franco died. One year prior, the Carnation Revolution had toppled the Estado Novo regime, which had been slowly crumbling since Salazar’s death in 1970. Thirty years after the deaths of Mussolini and Hitler, and the end of Fascist Italy and the Third Reich, the

\textsuperscript{141} Valencia-García, *Antiauthoritarian Youth Culture in Francoist Spain*, 100-2; Pinto, “Salazar Contra Superman, Banda Desenhada e Censura Durante o Estado Novo,” 294-8.

last far-right fascist dictatorships of Europe finally underwent a process of democratic transition. Unlike Germany and Italy, where war and foreign intervention curtailed the regimes’ lifespan, Portugal and Spain saw a relatively peaceful process of democratization. It was not the case that high-ranking figures in the power structure decided to open the country’s economy and politics, though. In both these cases, the transition from autocracy began from below, propelled by students and generations of fascist-educated people who took advantage of the regimes’ moment of weakness. By creating new spaces where they could safely subvert the seemingly universal authority of the regimes, these youths developed entire nonconforming subcultures that spread the pluralistic ideas that allowed for a democratic transition.¹⁴³

The end of Europe’s longest fascist experiences had at its foundation a failed educational model, incapable of realizing the all-encompassing and homogenizing character it strove to achieve. This model’s attempt to undermine class identifications and homogenize cultural values through the creation of a synthetic sense of national community never succeeded in extinguishing the diverse cultural movements inherent to every stratified society. Beyond the failure of the total education model, the patterns of ideological irregularity, escalating militarization, and internal competition for the control of education that led to contradictory educational policy, all contributed to the alienation of children and adolescents. Although fascism grew and ascended to power as a youth movement, the life experiences of young people growing up under it proved inconsistent with what they had been promised. Nonconformity then developed in various forms, with different cultural tendencies and patterns throughout social classes. Many engaged in resistance out of a political understanding that led them to opposition, but for those otherwise apolitical youths who ended up clashing with fascism, resistance arose from necessity, and evolved at the same pace that it became clear that the survival of their subcultures depended on a limited political opposition that could even evolve into direct confrontation. At the same time, while working-class teens struggled to adapt to the new social structures of the fascist order, seeing the bulk of cultural and political repression,

upper-class youths grew disillusioned with the course of their national revolutions.

Although the reasons and tactics for rebellion varied, these youth movements distinguished themselves from the regimes’ official values through their behavior, dress, ideas, leisure activities, music, and demeanor.\footnote{Peukert, Inside Nazi Germany, 169-70; Valencia-García, Antiauthoritarian Youth Culture in Francoist Spain, 14-28.} Many of the rebellious young people who dared to express their contempt and their revolt paid for it with their lives, but the acts of resistance they performed were the first step in the birth of a new democratic order. By the time all these regimes came to an end, large parts of their youth had already begun transitioning into the plural-minded citizens needed for enacting larger and democratic social change.
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Impact of Burn Frequency on Arthropod Communities in North Carolina Longleaf Pine Savannas
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Abstract
Land managers and restorationists have focused heavily on restoring the diversity of the longleaf pine savanna understory which has suffered from habitat fragmentation, fire suppression, and clear-cutting for hundreds of years. Little is known about the composition of the arthropod community in this ecosystem or the impact that land management has on the diversity and richness of that community. Three 1000 m² sites were selected in the NC Sandhills region to compare the effects of burn frequency, disturbance, and plant community diversity on arthropod diversity in the NC longleaf pine savanna. D-vac, sweep net, and hand collection were used to sample arthropods from two 25 m² plots within each of the three sites to capture a representative sample of the arthropod community. There was a total of 19 orders of arthropods found with 86 total family taxa. The highest abundance was recorded in the disturbed site which was burned every two years and had the longest time to recover from its last burn in 2020 at the time of collection. The lowest diversity was recorded at the undisturbed site which was burned every two years and had experienced a high intensity burn eight weeks prior to the collection, indicating that burned blocks in the savanna may take up to one year to recover from fire. There was no significant difference between order evenness or diversity across the three sites and between the number of plant species at each site. These results suggest that disturbance from shelterwood cutting and prescribed burns in the NC longleaf
pine savanna enables the diversity of the arthropod and plant communities to persist.

**Introduction**

The longleaf pine (LLP) savanna is a fire-dependent ecosystem, requiring burning to limit the intrusion of invasive hardwoods and woody shrubs.¹ These types of vegetation outcompete grasses and forbs in LLP savannas, drastically altering the understory environment, leading to the migration of arthropods out of this ecosystem in search for the sunlight and species richness that they prefer.² Increased woody vegetation results in decreased arthropod species richness in fire-dependent tallgrass prairies, indicating that fire may indirectly positively influence arthropod communities³. However, fire may have a negative impact on the biodiversity of arthropods depending on the time and frequency of burning⁴. Although some insects are attracted to the heat and smoke of burn conditions, many depend on neighboring unburned areas to take refuge in during prescribed burns.⁵ Grass species are the fastest to recover in areas that have been burned most recently, leading to an increase in herbivorous arthropods which prefer grass in recently burned savannas.⁶ In areas which have had years to recover from burning, increased prevalence of forbs and leaf litter attract a more diverse arthropod community.⁷

Scientists and land managers have been working to restore plant diversity in the longleaf pine ecosystem for years, finding it exceptionally difficult to reintroduce species that were lost from the anthropogenic destruction of this once robust habitat.⁸ Despite the attention on diversity restoration, there is a scarcity of information about the arthropod species
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² Catherine C. Reed, “Responses of Prairie Insects and Other Arthropods to Prescription Burns,” in *Natural Areas Journal* (Natural Areas Association, 1997), 382.
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⁵ Reed, “Responses to Prescription Burns,” 381.
⁶ Reed, “Responses to Prescription Burns,” 382.
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composition in the longleaf pine savanna. Understanding the composition of the longleaf pine savanna arthropod community will allow researchers to track diversity loss as the planet grapples with insect extinctions. The decline of global insect populations threatens every ecosystem on earth, as 95% of all animal species are invertebrates and contribute significantly to the areas they inhabit.

Since the colonization of the United States, the longleaf pine savanna ecosystem has struggled to persist. At less than 3% of its original range, the longleaf pine savanna has suffered from fire suppression, clear-cutting and a lack of forest management. Previously maintained by indigenous tribes, the fires essential to preserving this ecosystem’s biodiversity became few and far between. Nearly 900 flora are endemic to the ecosystem with 29 federally threatened or endangered fauna that are relying on conservation of the longleaf pine savanna for survival of their species. Less than 500 trees per acre provides the optimal habitat for a diverse variety of birds and arboreal species and permits the exposure of sunlight that the herbaceous understory requires to sustain a high diversity of insects, reptiles, and mammals. Understanding the dynamics between plant and insect communities will assist restoration efforts by informing land managers about which plant species are more common in areas with higher insect diversity. This will lead to restoration of the lost diversity of the understory community composition in areas of the ecosystem that are threatened by unsustainable land use practices.

In the longleaf pine savanna, arthropods are critical for the survival of the ecosystem for a variety of reasons. Many are detritivores, that help break down litter and debris between burning periods which allows sunlight to reach the soil in order to maintain diversity of plant and insect species that would otherwise leave the savanna in search of those conditions.

Others serve a key role in the food chain, composing the bulk of the diet of many of the savanna’s insectivores, including birds, reptiles, amphibians, and small mammals. Furthermore, over 70% of understory plants require insects to successfully reproduce.14 This study aims to inform longleaf pine restoration and conservation efforts across the range, as well as provide insight on the impact of burn frequency and understory diversity on arthropod community management.

In this study, I collected arthropods from various sites that were burned regularly every two or three years but at different times since fire and different disturbance regimes. The sites are managed by the North Carolina Wildlife Resources Commission in the Sandhills game lands; one site is used for shelterwood cutting and two sites are undisturbed. I hypothesize that the site with the most recent burn and no disturbance from logging will have higher arthropod richness because invertebrate abundance is positively correlated with the higher prevalence of quality plant tissue following a prescribed burn.15 Moreover, blocks which surround the selected study sites were burned throughout the summer which is likely to have a positive impact on arthropod biodiversity in the focal plots. Winter burns are more detrimental to plant community composition than summer burns due to the decreased ability to recover the productivity of the understory.16 The plots of interest and surrounding areas were burned in the summer, which is the best time to burn to preserve diversity and plant species populations. Secondly, I hypothesize that the site with disturbance will also have higher species richness than those without because studies have shown that disturbance is correlated with species richness.17 Finally, I hypothesize that there will not be a significant difference in order diversity and evenness between disturbed and undisturbed sites because shelterwood cutting allows the understory to maintain diversity by permitting more sunlight to reach the ground and limiting root competition.18

15 David M. Engle, Samuel D. Fuhlendorf, and Aaron Roper, “Invertebrate Community Response to a Shifting Mosaic of Habitat,” in Rangeland Ecology & Management (Elsevier, 2008)
Methods

Site 1 is undisturbed and is managed with prescribed burn every two years. It was burned eight weeks before our collection took place. Site 2 is disturbed by shelterwood logging and burned every two years. The last burn at Site 2 took place in 2020. Site 3 is undisturbed and burned every three years, with the last burn in 2020 giving both Sites 2 and 3 one year to recuperate from the burn regime.

My collections took place in the summer, between July and August, in the time of year when arthropods are most abundant in the Southeast United States after their emergence in spring. Three collection methods were used to capture a more comprehensive picture of the arthropod community in the understory. Arthropods were collected by hand and with a modified leaf-blower (d-vac) within four 1 m quadrats in two 25 m blocks within each of the three 1000 m² sites (Fig.1). Each collection was timed for consistency across all plots. The D-vac was used to vacuum a majority of common arthropods from between the grassy foliage of the understory. This method captures juvenile and micro invertebrates. Each quadrant was vacuumed for 30 seconds before the mesh liner inside the D-vac was removed and bagged (Fig.2). Hands-on exploration of the understory was used to pick up larger macroinvertebrates that are not typically targeted by the other methods used. Additionally, this method reduces the impact of the study on the LLP ecosystem via catch and release. Hand collections were completed with visual surveys and capturing insects in magnifying boxes, focusing on larger grasshoppers and spiders, shown in Figure 3 (n = 2 blocks x 3 sites = 6
samples: Fig.1). The collections were timed for five minutes inside each of the four 1 m quadrats.

A transect-sweep net was used to collect larger arthropods, such as plant bugs and crickets, which are associated with above-ground plant biomass (Faeth & Rambo 1999). This occurred by taking 36 sweeps along a single 30 m long transect measured within each site (n=1 transect x 3 sites = 3 samples; Fig.1).

![Image of field collection](image1)

**Figure 2.** Removal of inner mesh bag after 30 second collection with D-vac

![Image of Orthopetra Acrididae](image2)

**Figure 3.** Orthopetra Acrididae captured in magnifying box for observation and classification

In the field, all samples were stored in a cooler. Upon return to campus, collected arthropods were stored in the lab freezer prior to
identification. The samples collected from within the four 1 m quadrats were combined into a single vial when the arthropods were separated from the debris in the lab (n = 2 blocks x 3 sites = 6 samples: Fig.1). Arthropods from the sweep net, D-vac, and hand-collected samples were identified by separating the specimens from litter and debris and using a stereo microscope to observe organism phenotypes to discern distinctions between family groupings (Fig.4). Other arthropods from the hand collections were classified to family by analyzing pictures taken in the field. The samples were moved to a warmer freezer because ice crystallization was damaging the specimens. However, the moisture which accumulated after the transfer continued to threaten the condition of the samples, so they were stored in the drying oven after thawing to prevent the growth of molds or fungi in the vials.

Figure 4. Eye arrangement and hairs on the legs place this arthropod in the family Oxyopidae, the color of the hairs and body morphology differentiate *Hamataliwa helia* from other members of the taxon

After the individuals were identified, they were moved to a vial of 50% ethanol for preservation. Arthropod species composition data was analyzed using T-tests and Simpson’s diversity index with R and excel, then compared to understory plant species composition, which was collected in collaboration with Graduate Student, Alyssa Young. Plant species composition was recorded in the field at each of the three sites in the same summer as the arthropod collections. A boundary was marked by a 1 m² quadrant and percent cover for each identified species was recorded for fifty 1 m² plots at each site. My analysis compared the total number of plant species to the total number of arthropod orders at each site.
Results

Out of the 1,028 arthropods collected, 984 were classified into a family with 86 different families observed. 118 arthropods were classified into different species with 28 different observed. Of those, 118 arthropods were classified to different species. The largest abundance of arthropods (475 individuals) was seen at Site 2, which was burned in 2020 and had a disturbance from shelterwood cutting. The lowest abundance (132 individuals) was seen at Site 1, which was burned eight weeks prior to collection and was undisturbed (Fig. 5). Site 1 also had the lowest number of orders and families, signifying lower diversity and richness. Site 2 had the highest diversity among arthropod orders (Fig. 6) and Site 3 had the highest diversity of arthropod families (Fig. 7). The difference in order richness between either of the three sites was not statistically significant. The biggest difference was between Sites 1 and 3, though the difference was not significant (p=0.06; Table 1). There were 69 plant species identified at Site 1, 71 species identified at Site 2, and 67 species identified at Site 3. There was no significant difference in plant species diversity between the three sites (data not shown).

Figure 5. The abundance of arthropods across sites, with 132 individuals in Site 1 (burned every two years with no disturbance), 475 individuals in Site 2 (burned every two years with disturbance from logging), and 421 individuals in Site 3 (burned every three years with no disturbance)
Figure 6. The order diversity across sites, with 14 orders in Site 1 (burned every two years with no disturbance), 15 orders in Site 2 (burned every two years with disturbance from logging), and 19 orders in Site 3 (burned every three years with no disturbance).

Figure 7. The family diversity across sites, with 37 families in Site 1 (burned every two years with no disturbance), 73 families in Site 2 (burned every two years with disturbance from logging), and 79 families in Site 3 (burned every three years with no disturbance).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P-value</th>
<th>Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.0980348</td>
<td>1 and 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0621566</td>
<td>1 and 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.7961517</td>
<td>2 and 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. T-test results for the difference between order diversity at each site.

Araneae had the highest species richness at Site 1, Hymenoptera had the highest species richness at Site 2, and Hemiptera had the highest species richness at Site 3 (Fig.8). Coleoptera and Thysanoptera were found at all sites except Site 1. Orthoptera, Hymenoptera, Hemiptera, Diptera, Lepidoptera, Trombidiformes, Araneae, Entomobryomorpha, Opilliones,
Psocodea, and Symphypleona were found at all three sites (Table 2). Araneae, Hemiptera, and Hymenoptera were most prevalent across the three sites. The Simpson’s diversity index for Site 2 was 0.14 and the diversity index for Sites 1 and 3 were 0.06 and 0.05.

Figure 8. Order richness across sites with the number of individuals classified as a member of each order at each site. The order with the highest richness was Hemiptera, which had 32 individuals in Site 1 (burned every two years with no disturbance), 132 in Site 2 (burned every two years with disturbance from logging), and 112 in Site 3 (burned every three years with no disturbance)
Table 2. Total number of orders, with 132 individuals composing 14 orders in Site 1 (burned every two years with no disturbance), 475 individuals composing 15 orders in Site 2 (burned every two years with disturbance from logging), and 421 individuals composing 19 orders in Site 3 (burned every three years with no disturbance)

**Discussion**

This study informs restoration efforts for the threatened longleaf pine savanna ecosystem by providing insight into the relationship between arthropod community composition, the time since the savanna was last burned, and disturbance. Arthropods were collected then classified by order from three sites which differ in fire frequency and disturbance level using a transect sweep net, a modified leaf blower, and hand-selection. The plant species diversity, fire intensity, and site location were also considered as factors that influence the understory arthropod community. Sites 1 and 3 were undisturbed, while Site 2 had disturbance from logging.

Sites 2 and 3 were burned in 2020, a year before the collections, and both had higher diversity in plant and arthropod communities. Site 1 had the lowest level of arthropod diversity and richness, likely due to the prescribed burn that took place eight weeks prior to the collection. Araneae, Hemiptera, and Orthoptera were most common in Site 1, which is supported by studies that show that flying invertebrates are the first to
return to a site after landscape disturbances such as fire (Moretti et al. 2006). Organisms frequently associated with higher quantities of leaf litter and aboveground biomass such as Springtails (Entomobryomorpha) and Thrips (Thysanoptera) were more abundant at Sites 2 and 3. The results of this study indicate that it takes more than eight weeks, and up to one year, for the arthropod community to recover from a prescribed burn.

The data supports the hypothesis that disturbance promotes species richness. The intensity of the fire scorched much of the canopy due to the dry climate and accumulation of litter leading up to the burn, which is a possible explanation for the lower abundance of arthropods present post-burn because those that typically seek refuge in the canopy had to evacuate to bordering unburned blocks of the savanna. The abundance of arthropods at Site 2 could be explained by its proximity to Site 1, which was recently burned. This indicates that Site 2 may have acted as a refuge for all the prominent families found in Site 1 except for Acrididae (Short-horned grasshoppers) who had the mobility to repopulate the site quickly.

Sites 1 and 2 are burned every two years and Site 3 is burned every three years. The longer period between burns at Site 3 may explain the higher diversity of arthropod orders and families identified in samples from this site. The Simpson’s diversity indices for all three sites were <0.2, indicating an overall evenness in arthropod orders across all three sites without any one order dominating the community composition. The results are in agreement with our understanding that the regular burn interval for all three sites is supporting a wide range of diversity of both flora and fauna. The insignificant difference between plant species diversity at each site supports the hypothesis that disturbance from shelterwood cutting does not have a negative effect on community evenness and allows the understory to maintain its diversity.

Further studies are needed to gain a more comprehensive understanding of the arthropod community. Expanding upon the methods used in order to collect adult stages of the arthropods and classify individuals to a lower taxon would patch some of the holes in the picture painted by this study. The d-vac sampling method resulted in significant damage to many of the sampled arthropods, preventing classification past infraorder. Additional collections in other seasons would give a clearer idea of what different families are present in the savanna throughout the year and how seasonal
changes in temperature and rainfall impact species composition. The evidence gathered from this study supports that shelterwood cutting is not detrimental to arthropod or plant species diversity, the arthropod community takes longer than eight weeks to recover from fire, and a burn interval of two to three years effectively maintains species richness in North Carolina longleaf pine savannas.
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CONTRIBUTORS

Luiz Francisco Guizzo Gutierrez Osario graduated from the University of North Carolina at Greensboro with a degree in History and Political Science. He was born in Brazil and moved to the United States in 2018. From an early age, the study of fascism and right-wing extremism more broadly have been his primary areas of interest, moved by the global resurgence in far-right politics during the 2010s, which continues to greatly affect Brazilian politics.

Caroline S. Malloy is a graduate of the University of North Carolina Greensboro, where she majored in psychology with minors in business and German. She is a currently a first year Ph.D. student in the Industrial Organizational Psychology program at Baruch College, where she hope to study how race and emerging technologies affect personnel selection decisions.

Jonathan Jefferson graduated from the University of North Carolina Greensboro in May 2022 having successfully completed Disciplinary Honors in both of his majors, Media Studies and Religious Studies. At the time of graduation, he had published three papers in Religious Studies and completed a feature-length documentary in Media Studies, in addition to a number of short films. He is currently working in the film industry in Atlanta, GA.

Page Turner graduated from the University of North Carolina at Greensboro in May 2022 with a B.A. in Biology and a minor in Spanish. She is currently pursuing her Masters of Science in Sustainability and Environment. A majority of her work focuses on community ecology and science education; she plans to continue her career in research as a field technician, taxonomist, and environmental educator.
Zachary Bunch graduated from the University of North Carolina Greensboro with a degree in Biology. He is now a first year M.S. Biology student with the Komatsu Community Dynamics Lab.

Morgan Frost is a plant community ecologist. Her research focuses on the impacts of invasive plants in grassland communities under global climate change. In particular, much of her work has focused on the consequences of invasive grasses for rangelands in Montana and Wyoming. Through her research, Morgan hopes to inform scientists, stakeholders, and the general public of the importance of invasion, especially in the context of climate change.
Y ddraig goch means “the red dragon” in Welsh. First recorded around 829 C.E. in Historia Brittonum, the red dragon has long been a symbol of Wales and appears on the Welsh flag. The red dragon is also the mascot of Lloyd International Honors College in honor of its benefactress, Rebecca A. Lloyd, whose parents came to the United States from Wales. In 2013, the Honors College began a tradition of sending students abroad with a small red dragon to take a picture with and send back. See the There Be Dragons Honors College student blog at lihcdragonblog.blogspot.com.
REBECCA A. LLOYD was a 1950 graduate of Woman’s College (the name for the University of North Carolina at Greensboro prior to 1963). In 2006 she gave her family’s name and her financial support to establish and endow Lloyd International Honors College by donating $4 million, the largest alumni gift the university has ever received. Of her support for the Honors College, Lloyd said, “The Honors College will give students the international viewpoint that’s needed in their education. To the extent that my gift can help world peace come about, I’m happy to be making it.”
Good evening, Lloyd International Honors students, faculty and staff, and welcome to Let’s Learn! students from around the world.

I want to thank Dean Omar Ali for inviting me to deliver this lecture, and beyond that, for bringing into being a college with the slogan, and more importantly, the educational practice, of “Play, Experiment, Perform.” I’m pretty sure there is no other school within a state university system in the world with such a playfully radical approach to learning and development.

Lloyd International Honors College is a special place. It is, of course, academically demanding and rigorous. Yet its approach to education is not the one-way, monologic, acquisitional model that dominates in both the West and East, the Global North and Global South. Lloyd, under Dr. Ali’s leadership, is experimenting with an approach to learning that is based on very different premises. It’s striving to create environments in which teachers and students move beyond just the passing on of information to the joint activity of making discoveries and creating meaning together. As Dean Ali is fond of saying, “Everyone has something to teach, everyone has something to learn.” How is Lloyd International Honors College doing this? As its slogan says, by playing, experimenting and performing.
Which brings me to the topic of my talk and our subsequent conversation—performance activism.

Performance activism is a new approach to educating, to engaging social issues and to building community that is emerging spontaneously all around the globe. It consists of people, usually non-actors, building performance ensembles outside the institutional framework of the theatre to collectively imagine and act on new possibilities. The performance approach to education being experimented with here at Lloyd is a part of this larger movement. And, as the full title of this talk implies, “Performance Activism: A Reconstructive Approach to Social Activism and Generating Possibility,” it’s a movement concerned with finding creative, positive ways to reconstruct not only teaching and learning but the ways we do politics, the ways we deal with conflict, the ways we do healing, and the very ways we think about ourselves. It is uses play and performance to engage, reorganize and transform the often oppressive and violent patterns of behavior that we’ve been socialized into.

In order for my remarks to make sense, I’m going to ask you listen and to think in a way that is probably new to most of you. I need you to embrace, at least for the duration of our time together, that everything is what it is and also what it is not, that something (and somebody) can be two things, three things or more at the same time, that we all are who-we-are and simultaneously who-we-are-becoming. I’m asking you to relate to people and the world not as a set of discrete, static things, but rather as a series of interconnected unending processes. I realize this may go against every rational and emotional fiber in your body. It is not the dominate worldview we all grew up with. The worldview we all grew up with was succinctly summed up by the 17th Century philosopher Bishop Butler who said, “Everything is what it is, and not another thing.”
Yet there is another way of seeing the world. In the Western tradition it goes back to the ancient Greek philosopher Heraclitus who famously said, “No man ever steps into the same river twice.” His belief that the universe is in constant flux was taken up and developed by the later Greek Epicurus, the Roman Lucretius, and in modern times by Hegel and Marx. In the East this way of approaching the world is represented by, among others, Laozi, the founder of Taoism. Flux, transformation, and what the western world calls “contradiction” is also an integral part of most indigenous worldviews.

The first case of something being what it is and something else at the same time that I ask you to consider is performance activism itself.

Performance is usually considered as entertainment, as an art and/or a diversion. We think of it as something done by specialists called actors, who pretend to be people other than themselves acting out a story for us while we sit still and watch passively. Oh yes, and it’s fun. Activism, on the other hand, is related to as being political and sometimes risky. It means being committed to a cause and to being discontent with the world the way it is. Oh yes, and its serious, very serious.

Now let us consider performance activism, which includes all of the attributes I’ve just noted for performance and activism. Performance activism uses techniques, tools, and exercises that originated in the theatre. As in the theatre, people pretend to be other than who they are. They make up images, movements and stories. It’s fun. It’s also deadly serious in its intent and its impact. When Dean Ali, blowing on his trombone, lead a playful procession to the Lloyd Honors College Orientation on August 15th they were having fun. Does that mean they weren’t serious about education? Of course not. In fact, I would argue that they were more serious than those who unthinkingly follow university precedent and tradition. They were saying, in effect, “This is our education that we’re creating and we’re going
to try something new, something we enjoy, something that might, in fact, work better.” In a profound sense, that is what all of performance activism is saying, “This is our world. We don’t like how it’s going. Let’s try performing something new and see if it works better.”

Performance activism is, in a way, a new approach to theatre. It’s also, in a way, a new approach to activism. Of course, when we bring two very distinct social activities together what we have is neither of them (at least as we knew them to be). We have created something other than either of them, something new.

How is performance activism different from theatre, particularly political theatre, theatre that views itself as opposed to the status quo and believes that it has a contribution to make in the struggle for a better world? Political theatre goes back at least 150 years, and it’s where I come from. I started out in theatre as a teenager creating and performing in skits at rallies against the War in Vietnam. In 1969 and ’70 I was an actor with the New York Street Theatre Caravan. The Caravan devised plays with political messages and performed them on the back of a flatbed truck. We worked with local community groups, who would close a block for the evening. We would drive in, take the sides off the truck, plug our lights into a friendly storefront and perform for people standing in the street and sitting on their stoops and fire escapes. In the summer of 1970 we toured the country, performing in many cities, Native American reservations, the lettuce fields of California and the coal mining towns of West Virginia. Our audiences were organized prior to our arrival by the radical progressive organizations of the time: the Black Panther Party, the Young Lords, the American Indian Movement, the United Farm Workers and radical caucuses within the Oil, Chemical and Atomic Workers and the United Mine Workers.
Those of us in the Street Theatre Caravan considered our theatre work to be educational political work. We were striving to bring performance and activism together. But we were still doing theatre in the traditional sense. We made up the plays and performed them for audiences who stood or sat and watched us. For much of my life I thought that if you did good political theatre, if you gave people the right ideas and provided them with beautiful aesthetic experiences, that could help enlighten or inspire them to change the world. However, what I and other political theatre artists were doing bore a strong family resemblance to traditional education in which the teacher “knows” and the student “learns.” It wasn’t dialogic in any meaningful sense. The audience could cheer and applaud or boo and walk out. But beyond that, the audience had no role to play in creating meaning with the performers.

I know that great theatre experiences—like any great artistic experience—can stay with you for the rest of your life. It can even become, in a sense, a part of who you are. However, after more than 50 years of creating theatre, I’ve come to the conclusion that in-and-of itself theatre can’t change people’s minds or cause them to become politically engaged. It doesn’t provide the tools for that. What theatre does provide us with is performance.

A key difference between traditional theatre and emerging performance activism is what is being done with performance and who is doing the performing.

Which brings us to the question: What is performance anyway? Is it simply faking? Is it being insincere as many non-theatre people assume? Or is it, as most actors will tell you, a way of discovering more of who you are, of who you might become? It’s both—and that’s why it’s such a creative and transformative activity. Performance, as I and other performance activists
have come to understand it, is the conscious activity of simultaneously being who-you-are and who-you-are-not. Meryl Streep is always Meryl Streep whether she’s performing Margaret Thatcher or Sophie Zawistowski, a Jewish mother escaping Poland during World War II. She knows that and we know that. Acting, which is one form of performing, is being yourself and your character at the same time.

However, you don’t need a character written by someone else in order to perform. Performance, in the broader sense, is creating different versions of yourself; it’s who-you-are and who-you are becoming; it’s relating to yourself as a dynamic process who is always coming-into-being, not a static thing. Performance in this broader sense is something that comes naturally to human beings. When we’re babies our parents, grandparents, older siblings talk to us even though we can’t understand them. They relate to us as speakers and we creatively imitate them. We babble in response to their words and by the family performing together we babies develop into speakers; we become who we were not. As children we play. We perform as parents, as doctors, as teachers, as the characters we see on television or in comic books. By creatively imitating we learn how to behave as adults. This happens in all human cultures everywhere. Performance is not something alien to any of us. It is not something you have to go to college or a conservatory to learn. It is a developmental skill that everyone has.

The challenge is that after ten or twelve years of being encouraged to play and perform in this way, we’re told to stop. Now we have to behave “like a young lady.” Now we have to “be a man.” The fun is over. Stop fooling around. Now that you’re growing up, it’s time to be serious. Now is the time for work—school work and work to earn a living. We have learned the roles that our cultures have created for us and are told, in effect, that we’re now locked into them. That is who we are. A very small group of us are allowed to keep playing and performing, actors. But that performing is
confined to the stage and screen. It has been classified as an art form; it is no longer related to as a life skill.

Performance activism takes that intrinsic human capacity to play and perform, to simultaneously be-who-we-are and who-we-are-not off the stage and says to everyone: “This is something you can do, and you can do it not only to tell a story to others but to discover your own story, to deconstruct the stories you feel trapped in and reconstruct them into narratives you find more growthful, to explore, to come to terms with, and perhaps to transform the pain you’ve been through, to relate to others in new and more growthful ways, to imagine and play with new possibilities.” I could go on. You get the picture. Performance activism gives people permission to try new things, to be aware that in playing with who they are not, they can bring into existence who they are becoming. Play and performance in daily life is not something that need end with childhood. Indeed if we are to continue growing and developing as individuals, as groups, as communities, as nations and as a species we have to perform that development.

Which brings us to activism. Activists are citizens who take an active role in politics. Politics in the broad sense is the collective activity of organizing our social and power relations. It is the process, which goes on for generations, centuries, millennia, of determining who has authority, how authority is exercised, how wealth is generated and who is allowed access to it. It involves the institutions we create to meet our needs and to serve those in authority: schools, the police, the prison system, the military, congresses and parliaments, political parties. Politics also encompasses the ways we’ve been taught to relate to each other in daily life: as women and men, as blacks and whites, as gays and straights, as rural people and urban people, as students and teachers. All of that is fundamentally connected to who has authority, who has privilege, who has wealth—to how we are organized socially.
Activists are people who are either forced by circumstance or who make an ethical decision to play an active role in some or all of that. You can be an activist by circulating a petition among you neighbors to get a stop sign at a busy intersection; by attending meetings of your local school board to work for changes in how your kid’s school is run; by getting involved in an electoral campaign for a candidate who you hope will represent your needs; by organizing a union where you work to get better pay and working conditions; by joining a demonstration against police violence; by occupying an administration building on campus to demand, for example, a Black or Gender Studies Department; by occupying Wall Street to draw attention to economic inequality and to agitate for a more equitable sharing of the wealth that we all create. Activists are active citizens seeking to make small improvements or they can be active in hopes transforming everything—and, of course, the small and the grand are connected; they’re part of the same totality, the same everchanging social process of politics, of creating our culture.

How, then, can performance be activism? As I said earlier, when we bring two distinct social activities together what we have is something new.

The two common threads in all activism are discontent and the exercise of power. There is something about the social organization we have inherited that an activist doesn’t like. That’s why they become active. They’re against poverty; they’re against war; they’re against racism and sexism and homophobia; they’re against the destruction of our environment; they’re against their local town council. The other common thread in activism is the exercise of power. By power I mean people organizing into groups to effect change, to challenge the authorities (the boss, the administration, the police, the government, etc.) and impact on our social organization, our politics. Authority, as I use it here, comes from the top down; it’s forced on us.
Power is an activity from the bottom up, it’s generated by ordinary people organizing into groups, it’s emergent, it creates itself through its activity. Performance activism retains those two characteristics. How it differs from traditional activism is in how its discontent is expressed and how its power is exercised.

At least in part, performance activism is emerging in response to the failures of the old ways of doing activism. Petitions, boycotts, elections, demonstrations, occupations, riots, revolutions, none seem to be working very well any more. The marches all over the world on February 15, 2003, involving tens of millions of people, the largest synchronized protest in human history, failed to prevent the American and British invasion of Iraq. The Occupy Movement, which spread rapidly from New York to major cities all over the globe, generated a lot of talk, but had no impact on the unequal distribution of wealth. The Black Lives Matter movement has resulted in the conviction of a handful of killer cops, but has not impacted on the institutional racism of police departments in the United States. The Arab Spring has led to violent repression, the civil war in Syria, the displacement of millions of refugees, and a military dictatorship in Egypt that is worse than the one they started with.

This activism failed for many and complex reasons, including of course, the violence that authority is willing to rain down on those attempting to exercise power. Yet to my way of thinking, the root cause of these activist failures is that they have been overdetermined by what we are against and therefore leave little room for the activity of discovering what it is that we want. Traditional activism is an exercise in deconstructive power. It is the activity of opposing, deconstructing, tearing down what we feel threatened, oppressed and dehumanized by. It is an important and necessary part of activism. However, since deconstructive power, quite understandably, focuses on being against what exists, it gives little attention to exercising our power in a way that can help us discover what might work better.
Deconstructive activists usually don’t ask, “What happens after the demonstration?”

There is another way to exercise power. It’s called reconstructive power, and it does provide the space to ask that question. It is the exercise of power to create alternative organizations and ways-of-life that work better than those imposed on us by authority. It involves people creating their own schools, youth programs, medical and therapeutic groups, unions, cultural centers, community support groups, and ways of doing electoral politics—all financially and institutionally independent from the existing institutions of authority. Reconstructive power, by organizing people to build new things together, creates the conditions in which people can begin to play with new ways of seeing, being and relating to each other. Unlike deconstructive power, it allows us to find positive things to do with our rage against the machine—it takes us beyond resistance to reconstruction.

This is where the “performance” in “performance activism” comes in. All performance is done in ensembles, in groups. When it steps off the stage it can involve whole villages and neighborhoods, radiating into larger and larger communities. Through Zoom and other apps it is organizing people into groups from different countries and cultures. It gives us a way to be activists who are not defined only by what we oppose.

At this point, I fear, performance activism may remain something of an abstraction to you, so let me briefly share a few examples of what performance activism has done and is doing.

During Zimbabwe’s 15-year armed struggle to liberate itself from the racist settler state of Rhodesia, villagers and guerrilla fighters together evolved a new form of participatory political theatre out of an old and, at that point, fading, cultural activity—the *pungwe*, a gathering to
exchange stories and songs. At night, in violation of a government-imposed curfew, villagers would sneak off to meet the revolutionary fighters. Ross Kidd, who spent many years leading performance workshops in Zimbabwe, recalls, “This wasn’t one-way communication—guerrillas simply standing up and giving speeches. This was … a highly participatory activity involving everyone in the creation of culture. People joined in singing, contributed their own sketches, music, and dances, responded to the politicization talks with slogans and bursts of song, and participated in the discussions which punctuated the various cultural presentations. Villagers and the fighters acted out and danced commitments and build up their strength and through collective music-making.” (Kidd, 1984, pp. 9-10)

The pungwes played a significant role in organizing the rural population to support the revolution. Joshua Mpofu, a guerrilla fighter wrote at the end of the war that the pungwes were part of the process of establishing an alternative power base capable of challenging the authority of the white settler state: “Behind the ostensibly quiescent normal peasant existence … there grew up activities [such as the pungwes]and structures of a system of dual power challenging the settler state.” (Cliffe et al., 1980, p. 51)

Another example. In the Indian state of Tamil Nadu a group called the Association of the Rural Poor began by holding adult education classes in the Dalit community. In English, Dalits are called Untouchables and they are the lowest caste in Indian society. The conversations in the classes led to acting out stories from the participants’ lives. Felix Sugirtharaj, one of the teachers, reports that they played scenes, for example, about a Dalit being beaten up by a money lender because he was unable to pay his debt. Or how another’s daughter was raped by goons of the landlord. They then began extending the scope of their performance to rehearsing how to confront the
local landlord. These rehearsals included not only what they would say, they also “blocked” the encounter, deciding where the spokesperson should stand in relation to the landlord and where the “cast members” should position themselves.

When the group felt ready, they marched to the landlord’s house. Sugirtharaj recalls, “There were 100 people and he was caught totally by surprise. … Of course, the landlord refused to raise the wages, claiming he was losing money already. So, we went back and decided to go on strike. That evening and the next we went around to the neighboring villages to present short drama pieces on the potential positive and negative effects of a strike. The strike itself lasted one week. … We succeeded in raising the wage from six to eight rupees per day.” (Quoted in Van Ervin 1992, pp.133-134). Having evolved from an adult education course to a performance group, the Association of the Rural Poor made yet another transformation, becoming a union called the Rural Dalit Agricultural Laborers Association, which eventually spread to some five hundred villages. (Sugirtharaj 1990).

In 2006, in NYC, Sean Bell, a 23-year-old unarmed Black man was shot 50 times by undercover police officers while he was sitting in his car on the night before his wedding. Dr. Lenora Fulani, a friend and colleague of mine for 40 years whose papers are archived here at the University of North Carolina, led demonstrations against the police killers, as she had done in response to police brutality for thirty years. “At the same time,” she recalled in 2014, “I realized that anger and reactive demonstrations had for many years failed to change the culture of fear and hate between poor youth of color and the New York Police Department. I had seen it many times: the community is hurt and outraged, they demonstrate angrily; the police, and their media defenders, get defensive. Eventually, the demonstrations die down and it happens all over again.” (L. Fulani, personal communication, December 12, 2014).
While she believed criminal charges should be filed against the police and that legislative and regulatory action was called for, she also realized that changes imposed from the top-down would mean little until the deeply entrenched attitudes of mutual distrust between police officers and young people of color can be reorganized. What was needed, she concluded, was a change in the culture of police-community relations. (L. Fulani, personal communication, December 12, 2014). Thus was launched Operation Conversation: Cops & Kids. Within a month of Bell’s death, Fulani invited some young people she had worked with and some New York police officers she knew to sit down with her at the African American Benevolent Society in Springfield Gardens, Queens and have a conversation together. “The first meetings were awkward and strained,” she recalls, “I quickly learned that we couldn’t have the conversations without play and performance first” (L. Fulani, personal communication).

So Fulani transformed these gatherings into performance workshops in which she starts by having the cops and kids play theatre games together and then create improv skits on silly topics before they get down to building a conversation. There have been hundreds of Cops and Kids performance workshops in New York City and versions of it are now also conducted in Newark, New Jersey and Dallas, Texas.

“Let me tell you why it works,” Fulani said in an address at a gala of the All Stars Project, which sponsors the workshops. “It works because we use performance and improvisation to break down the walls. We pretend that cops and kids can actually speak to one another, and through this pretense, they actually can. When you start playing new roles, characters other than yourself, it’s amazing how quickly everyone is smiling and laughing. I’ve found that even the most sullen kids and the most reserved police officers become hams in two minutes.” (Fulani 2012).
Those are just three examples of what performance activism looks like. There are hundreds of other examples unpacked in much more detail in my recently-published book, *Performance Activism: Precursors and Contemporary Pioneers*. You should make sure that the UNC library system gets this book. But even from these brief sketches, I think you can get a sense of how performance is emerging as the means which enables people to discover their collective reconstructive power to build their own organizations. It is the method by which we are challenging the patterns of abusive behavior that have keep most of us humiliated, passive and powerless for centuries. It is, if you will, the revolutionary activity with which we can collectively imagine a different future through the activity of building it in the ruins of the old.

Remember my request at the start of my talk that you try to view the world as a process in which everything is what it is and what it’s not, what it’s becoming. I hope that that request, that invitation, has helped you to understand what performance activism is and why it’s impacting in so many positive ways. It brings together activities that we have not brought together before: play and power; performance and activism; fun and seriousness; discontent and hope. It is something new under the sun and it still very young; it has a lot of becoming in front of it.
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Nota Bene

Hydrogen

A tiny atom, not yet bright,
Born in the heat of the Big Bang's light.
In the beginning, just a spark.
In a universe, vast and dark.
Time passed on, and joining others, forming new elements, ever-larger:
Helium, Lithium, Carbon, Nitrogen
Gases swirling, stars emerging.
Light and life, forever converging.
Our atom drifted through space and time.
Riding on the winds of a cosmic rhyme.
Seeing stars born, some stars die.
Galaxies collide, new life arise.
And then on Earth, a new place of birth.
Joining with others, molecules forming.
Organisms living, always transforming.
Bacteria, plant, animal, sea to sky.
Our atom's journey never ceased to fly.
Flowing through veins, breathing in air.
A part of life, beyond compare.
And now full circle,
its journey complex yet simple.
From the universe's origin, to this day,
Its story, our story, all stories... so they say.

— OA and AI
Is it the dawning of a new era? A new period of uncertainty? Or, as Dr. Lois Holzman, Visiting Fellow at Lloyd International Honors College, shared in a series of conversations with the Honors community, hasn’t there always been uncertainty—no new eras, but continuations, that is, continuations of ongoing human creation? With the advent of ChatGPT (and GPTZero to ‘counter’ this machine learning AI), can we think about this new technology as a continuation of the many ways we are already aided by technology—from the light we turn on to read at night, to the computers on which we type, when we Google something on our phones, or use YouTube to learn something, from spell checking our work to predictive texting? So why not machine learning AI to help us in our process of learning and creating? I don’t know, as I suspect there are many (many) views on this emerging. For the moment, I offer this poem, which I wrote with AI. It was actually deemed “Your text is likely to be written entirely by a human” when running it through GPTZero after I worked on what came out using ChatGPT with the prompt “Please write a poem about the history of the universe as told through a single atom.”

As Dr. Chris Kirkman, Honors Senior Academic Advisor at Lloyd, recently commented to me in a text exchange: “Last week Harvard University hosted Kal Khan of Khan Academy to talk about technology and education. He still places the highest value, I understand, on the student/teacher (in person) relationship. Much of his talk though was about ChatGPT and its enormous value to society … I think we may have to rethink the lingering Romantic concept of the ‘genius’ of the individual author even more now. For writing, it offers the potential to open new ways of constructing concepts, new juxtapositions, new phrasings. But it might also entrap us in structural relationships from which we’re trying to evolve out of. I don’t know. I’m very curious to see how this changes us.”

Building on this philosophical curiosity, as Dr. Nadja Cech, Lloyd Honors Council member and Distinguished Professor of Chemistry recently stated in an email exchange with me, “AI [might be] the ultimate form of collaboration … it learns from all of us and synthesizes what we have each contributed … collective mind, not artificial.”

What do you think?
Omar Ali, ohali@uncg.edu
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