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Misinformation, Gaps, and Silences: What Is Missing? What is true? What is false? What is fact? What is fiction? These questions are timeless in their urgency, and their answers lie with the story of information. For the past two years, our world has confronted crises—those moments when our deepest beliefs are tested, when the foundations of society tremble with disease, war, and political strife. Information drives crises, directing or misdirecting when we are at our most vulnerable; it is the lifeblood of society, and the narratives and rhetoric we encounter relentlessly shape our day to day lives. Information is also our primary tool for determining “the truth”—that mystifying concept which encompasses everything from subjective opinions to scientific facts. Reaching an agreement on what the truth means in times of crisis is vital to government, science, religion, and ethics. Chasing the desire to get to the bottom of it all—to know with certainty things as they truly are—is one of the fundamental pursuits of humanity. But if you have come to this exhibit with the hopes of discovering a complete truth, you will be disappointed. When chaos and fear reign, the truth is murky. The truth is contested. The truth does not exist. I hope to show you why.

This exhibit draws from primary sources from Haverford’s Quaker & Special Collections, and tries to draw wisdom from them. It examines four moments: the English Civil Wars from 1640 to 1660; the French and Haitian Revolutions of the late eighteenth century; the yellow fever epidemic that struck Philadelphia in 1793; and one man’s perspective on the Vietnam War from 1960 to 1973. These were times of deep crisis, when panic drove people to their limits, when beliefs clashed, and those same people disagreed about what was happening around them, sometimes violently. The people documented in this exhibit were often terrified. They feared for their lives, for their souls, for the essence of their nation, and they faced difficult choices with limited time and limited knowledge.

To understand these sources, we first have to interrogate the tangled concept of “truth.” It is useful here to distinguish between the individual convictions and beliefs that make up an individual’s subjective “truth,” from logically provable, capital-T “Truths.” Some objective Truths are easy to describe—like “one plus one equals two”—and it is tempting to believe that there is an objective truth to all things, an inalterably real and logical core to the facts, narratives, and information that swirl around us. But more often than not, objective truth is unknowable. How, for example, could you verify the claim that “people in my hometown are nice?” Who gets to define what “nice” means? What if someone else disagrees with my response? The point is this: We live in a world where we do not have all the answers; where research into deep questions is ongoing and incomplete; where experts can disagree; where ethical and spiritual beliefs color the way we view the world; where well-read individuals can reach opposite conclusions about reality. Thus, this exhibit is concerned with personal “truths”—because history is a study of the actions of human beings, and the choices we make are often rushed, illogical, and based more on our own prejudices and preconceptions than a rigorous study of facts. How, in such a world, can we make sense of the information we take in—and how can we construct any sort of truth?

One place to start is with the idea of narrative. Looking into the past, we cannot understand every detail of every event, because the amount of extant information on most historical moments is both incomplete and vast. As Michel-Rolph Trouillot argues in Silencing the Past, history is inherently filled with “silences,” inescapable gaps in our records and retellings—for, “…if the account was indeed fully comprehensible of all facts, it would be incomprehensible.” A precise computer-generated report of every detail of every aspect of an event would be uselessly vast; the human labor it would take to extract meaning from that report would be unimaginable. Thus, we need narratives. Narratives are the stories we tell ourselves and each other, a path to understanding, a way to extract the most important details from a mass of information. The best narratives enrich the facts they synthesize into a more complete and digestible whole, and foster genuine understanding of an event. But narratives are also painfully fallible. We build with broken bricks,
incomplete archives, and develop narratives which often fall into the “accepted” discourse around a topic. As Trouillot notes, “When reality does not coincide with deeply held beliefs, human beings...devise formulas to repress the unthinkable and to bring it back within the realm of accepted discourse.” Narratives reflect the power structures of the group that crafts them. Racism, classism, religious conflict—these evils erupt from and are supported by the stories we tell ourselves.

What then is “information,” and how does it relate to the narratives we construct? Laura Miller offers a starting point. Her book, A Matter of Facts: The Value of Evidence in an Information Age, defines “...an evidence-based truth as a conclusion or perspective reached as a result of the analysis of an accumulation of facts.” Under this definition, information is the path to personal truths, which are composed of those facts, narratives, and lies we incorporate into our worldview. Following Miller, we can work backwards, broadly defining “information” as any knowledge which leads an individual, group, or society to truth. This lens for viewing information is useful, because it allows us to grapple with the wide variety of sources we encounter in history, including the objects displayed in this exhibit. Dive into any archive, and you will find rhetoric, propaganda, records, novels, and historical narratives. All of it is information, though each variety has a different effect on its reader. In a world where we cannot read everything, the information that we privilege has immense power over us. My favorite high school history teacher used to warn us against studying a lot of Friedrich Nietzsche’s works at once. “If you read too much Nietzsche, you’ll start to think like Nietzsche. You’ll see the world as he saw it,” he said humorously. Read any one type of source on a topic, and you limit your intake of information to a single lens, a bounded stream of narratives. The things people read, the information they consume, matter deeply to their everyday decisions and beliefs—and one of the goals of this exhibit is to show the ways that different streams of information have changed the actions and beliefs of people of the past.

I also hope to highlight silences in our own archives, as “…the making of archives involves a number of selective operations: selection of producers, selection of evidence, selection of themes, selection of procedures—which means...the exclusion of some producers, some evidence, some themes, some procedures.” I have tried to acknowledge gaps in our historical understanding of these events, as well as the gaps in our own archives. These gaps are meant to encourage you to be vigilant, to interrogate the objects I have assembled, and to recognize that both you as the viewer and I as the creator are working with limited context, materials, and time to take in all of this information.

Our archival collections at Haverford were historically focused on Quakers, and this limits our ability to get at more diverse narratives. Records can be “…haunted, the silences of those not represented inciting a spectral presence among the traditional telling of history,” echoing Trouillot. While “…confronting the ghosts—the missing narratives in the archives—puts archivists into an incredibly challenging and vulnerable position because it acknowledges the inherent biases within archival practice and subsequently opens up all preceding archival actions for critique,” we must endeavor to fill those archival gaps no matter the discomfort.

The creation of history takes time: time for events to settle, for the crisis of the moment to fade, for people to try to piece events together and paint a picture broader than anyone living in the moment could have created. Yet those pictures we paint come at a cost; historians build off of the narratives they are given, producing new ones. Their retrospect will always, in some way, cloud events. It is this eternal struggle of encountering the past that I want to highlight in this exhibit: the challenge of confronting both the confusion of living through history, and the distortion of retrospect which necessarily comes with looking back on it. Creating narratives magnifies our personal or cultural biases. Like all archival institutions, we have weaknesses, and like all historians, I have deficiencies. As you look through the narrative I am trying to construct, I encourage you to read the evidence for yourself. What are the sources saying? How did the people of these times feel? What did they believe to be true? And—perhaps most importantly—what is missing?

Informing the Masses: Propaganda, Politics, and Popery in the English Civil Wars, 1640–1660

It is easy to assume that issues of information and misinformation are intrinsic to the digital age—but publications from the English Civil War provide an opportunity to glimpse a conflict over truth from long before the digital age. Though couched in the now-antiquated language of “sundry letters” and biblical denunciations, a culture of fierce debate about the nature of truth
was alive and well during the two decades of unrest in England from 1640 to 1660. This, too, was a time of crisis; the conflicts in these years altered the fabric of English society, reordering the basic political and religious assumptions which had grounded the nation for decades. King Charles I was an Anglican, but he had a Catholic wife, which spurred distrust among the Anglican elite, and eventually led to war. These years saw multiple conflicts rock the nation, split between “Parliamentarians,” those who leaned into radical Protestantism and distrusted the popish tendencies of Charles, and “Royalists,” who stood by the king. Following Charles’ defeat, a Puritan, Oliver Cromwell, took power, acting as a quasi-dictator from 1653 to 1658. After his death, the nation was rocked by more instability until the Restoration, which put Charles’ son Charles II on the throne, establishing a constitutional monarchy balanced between parliament and the crown. These decades brought religious, political, and military strife, and were a time of deep instability in which the nobility, clergy, and members of the public fought over the future of England.

During the struggle, these groups produced many documents, printed for the purpose of arguing against those forces of malicious rumor which threatened to lead the faithful astray. Members of each side believed themselves to be the legitimate guardians of the essence of England, the true believers, the rightful government—and their words reflect this certainty. As Charles lost power, his censorship was weakened, and “…obnoxious, unlicensed publications spewed from London’s presses.” Though parliament eventually clamped down on unfettered printing, the inconsistent controls on the press allowed for the printed dissemination of new ideas, which came to a reading public newly energized by Protestant religious fervor. These documents offer a glimpse at the culture of printed conversation in seventeenth century England, and a look at how the people of the early modern world grappled with the notion of truth on their own terms.

One prolific writer of the English Civil War was William Prynne, a fiercely Puritan lawyer. Prynne was a vigilant man, and he spotted Catholics in every corner of his nation. He was obsessed. Prynne believed that Jesuits—an order of Catholic priests—were everywhere, and could “metamorphosize themselves into any shape.” Despite the fact that there was scant evidence that Charles I was preparing anything close to a mass conversion of his nation, men like Prynne fanned the flames of rumor in the lead up to the English Civil War. In 1643, he published The Popish Royal Favourite, which promised “A Full Discovery of His Majesties Extraordinary Favours to, and Protections of notorious Papists, Priests, and Jesuits, against all prosecutions and penalties of the Laws enacted against them.” Prynne’s document directed fear and rumor against the king with wildly exaggerated royal offenses. He desperately hoped that the nation would “…fully open our eyes to behold the extreme imminent dangers…our Church, Religion, Lawes, Liberties, Estates, Lives, Parliament, Kingdom, Nation, are now actually threatened by the prevailing blood-thirsty Popish party.” Such vivid denunciations of all things deemed Popish constituted the bulk of Prynne’s introduction, and his invocation of an English identity in contrast to the Popish fear supports Diana Purkiss’ argument that “So widespread was the fear, that ‘popery’ was coming to mean something close to ‘anything in religion or politics that I don’t approve of or like’…Or, to put it another way, the English…increasingly developed their national identity in response to the perceived menace of popery. To be truly, properly English or Scottish was to stand against Rome…” Though the English fear of Catholics stoked rumor and wild accusation, it is doubtful that Prynne was willfully trying to deceive; crucially, he believed what he wrote, believed it wholeheartedly to be the truth—for his was a truth upheld by the fear of a threat to his religion and nation, those things he held to be most dear.

Twelve years later, Prynne attacked a group of fellow Protestants, denouncing Quakers in The Quakers Unmasked, and proclaiming the group “clearly detected to be but the Spawn of Romish Frogs, Jesuits, and Franciscan Friars.” Despite the fact that he was attacking a radical Protestant sect instead of the more conservative faith of Charles I, Prynne managed to somehow still tie the group to the pope. Why did he pivot so abruptly? By 1660, there was an audience for publications against Quakers, and a growing hostility towards them. Quakers were seen as a group of “excess,” strange radicals preaching strange beliefs. Part of the hostility can also be attributed to popular ignorance of the sect. For the ordinary person of England, “While they may not have entirely swallowed the image of a secretly bloodthirsty sect…who disparaged the scriptures, threatened the stability of church and state, and were in all probability Jesuits in disguise, some of the mud would have stuck.”
William Prynne. *The Quakers Unmasked, and Clearly Detected to be but the Spawn of Romish Frogs, Jesuits, and Franciscan Friars, Sent from Rome to Seduce the Intoxicated Giddy-headed English Nation.* 2nd ed. (London: Edward Thomas, 1655)
One of the most famous images of seventeenth century England, the frontispiece to the *Eikon Basilike* portrays Charles I as a martyr, kneeling in the image of Christ as he exchanges his worldly crown of thorns for a heavenly crown of glory.

*Eikon Basilike. The Portraiture of His Sacred Majestie in His Solitudes and Sufferings. Whereunto Are Annexed His Prayers and Apotheogms.* (London: W.D. in R.M., 1649)

Catholicism threatened Anglicans from one side of the religious spectrum, radical Protestants like the Quakers threatened them from the other, in their determination to push a personal interpretation of God’s words to a level too extreme to be comfortable for many English people.

Prynne flings his mud by relating the story of an anonymous “informant,” who tells the tale of an “Irish Coppinger,” who claimed to have recognized among the leaders of the Quakers some men he had known while in a monastery in Rome. Bolstered by this hearsay, Prynne’s rhetoric once again turned apocalyptic, arguing that if Quakers were not “…speedily, diligently, restrained, repressed, [they] will soon utterly overturn both our church, religion, ministry, and state too…” Such claims threw fuel on the fire of fear raging through the populace in these years, where the early Quakers were “…at times scapegoats for the tension generated by a society in flux. Like witches they could be used to account for the unaccountable.” I suspect, with the hindsight of a few centuries, that if Prynne has slapped the word “popery” next to any noun, it could have become threatening. Accusing someone of popish activities acted as a strong rhetorical strategy, as it quickly marked something or someone as dangerous. For many in the Parliamentarian camp, Prynne’s words held much weight, and were backed by the strong possibility that he spoke a religious truth.

Here, it is key to recognize that most people in 17th century England had a different conception of truth and information from what many of us now champion. For them, faith was truth, with material, “objective” fact merely a path to reach a stronger faith. Prynne’s information, no matter how flawed, played to their worst fears, tapping into their entrenched devotion to a pure, Anglican faith. In this way, his rumours and exaggeration played to those hegemonies and hierarchies Trouillot alerts us to. In an environment where many people were already primed with a loathing of Catholicism, Prynne’s writings attacked any potential foes by casting them as outsiders, shaving away trust, and whipping frenzy into all who read his words.

The competing narratives of who was to blame for the conflicts are also on display in a writing attributed to Charles I, penned before his execution by radical Parliamentarians in 1649: the *Eikon Basilike*, or *The Portraiture of his Sacred Majestie in his Solitudes and Sufferings*. Historians disagree over whether or not Charles is actually the book’s author. Some believe that the bishop John Gauden wrote the book for Charles, or based it off of the king’s writings or dictation. Regardless of the exact nature of its authorship, this piece of royalist propaganda enjoyed immense success. For simplicity’s sake, we will assume that Charles played some part in its creation, and use his name. The king was sensitive to the chaos caused by the works of men like Prynne; in the *Eikon*, Charles laments, “…it were hard for Mee to stand out against those stratagems and conflicts of malice which by Falsities seek to oppress the Truth.” The king paints himself as a warrior of the truth, dogged and attacked by “Those foul and fals...
aspersions [which were] at first employed against My People’s love of Mee: that, undermining their opinion and value of Mee, My enemies, and their’s too, might at once blow up their affections, and batter down their Loialtie.”24 Charles pins his loss of favor with his subjects on these few malicious actors spreading rumors through the populace. Unable to confront the possibility that he may have genuinely lost the people’s favor, the disgraced monarch concludes that the greatest problem was simply that “…So many were persuaded that these two were utterly inconsistent, to be at once Loail to Mee, and truly Religious toward God,” suggesting again the force of faith-based truth.25

So who was telling the truth? The answer may be that each side was, in a sense. Certainly both the king and Prynne believed what they were writing—each speaks eloquently and passionately in favor of his narrative of events. Yet it is crucial to recognize that both Prynne and Charles were engaged in acts of framing; one wished to establish himself as a warrior of the true faith, a protector of his nation against treason and foreign interference. Another wished to alert his populace to the malicious forces which had turned them against a divinely appointed sovereign. Both had reasons to exaggerate, to assuage their wounded conscience, or to rile up righteous anger.

These conflicting writings lead us to an uncomfortable conclusion: persuasion, propaganda, and rhetoric acted as information four hundred years ago, and they remain sources of information today. Then, as now, thousands adopted pieces of each side of this propaganda war into their own religious and political conceptions of “the truth,” eschewing a search for objective facts in favor of passionate arguments. Human beings are not automatons, and emotional pleas pack a greater punch than logic. What is most convincing is not always what is most logical or most supported by evidence.26 Most people do not search doggedly for an accurate summary of events; we have a limited amount of time and energy—and finding any objective truth takes labor. Thus, we fall back on narratives, persuasion, and rhetoric, for the ease and power with which they can present a simplified summary of events, wrapped up nicely with strong words, and seasoned with a dash of our own preconceived beliefs.

These documents have never been impartial: not for those who first bought the copies Haverford owns, not for the historians who have examined them for centuries, not for you and me today, puzzling over the ink-blotted words. At all times, there are people who sell conflicting narratives, who tell themselves different stories because it serves their worldview. As historians, and casual readers, we have to try to dig past these layers to get to anything close to a full truth. But we must also notice those layers, and examine them with equal intensity; for if we can understand why and how these authors persuaded an entire nation, we may learn something about our own susceptibility to rhetoric.

Informing Revolution: J.P. Brissot and La Société des Amis des Noirs

In the early stages of the French Revolution, La Société des Amis des Noirs de Paris (The Society of the Friends of the Blacks) organized a petition to end the slave trade. Their words came at a time of crisis for the French nation. The abolition of privileges for the nobility and clergy in regards to taxation and censorship, as well as other reforms, created a society founded on equality...

The Encyclopédie aimed to categorize all known information, including knowledge as obscure as the various tools used in stonemasonry.

before the law, at least for some. The introduction of a National Assembly and the decreased authority of King Louis XVI undermined the power of the monarchy. When the Declaration of the Rights of Man established in 1789 that all citizens could speak, write, and print freely, French publishing exploded. That the essays of the Société were produced at this time is no coincidence; a crisis creates opportunities. Composed of prominent revolutionaries, the group included the likes of the Count of Mirabeau, the Marquis de Lafayette, the Marquis de Condorcet, and Henri Gregoire. Their goal was straightforward: convince the newly minted National Assembly to abolish the slave trade. The act of convincing politicians required presenting a more compelling narrative than those involved in the slave trade, substituting their information for what others had claimed. As Brian Resnick writes, "Because of… the faith of its publicist leadership in the printed word, the primary mode of action of the French Société was through newspapers and pamphlets... The effect of the emphasis on pamphlet and journal warfare, however, contrary to Brissot's expectations, was to alarm the opposition without stirring up a constituency for reform." In the case of the slave trade, that opposition was largely made up of captains of slave ships and wealthy colonial planters, who had much to lose if the trade in enslaved people was abolished.

A pamphlet published in 1790, entitled Address to the National Assembly for the Abolition of the Slave Trade attempted to refute the arguments of the captains. "They will tell you that the country occupied by blacks is a dreadful and sterile land, that men there are cannibals, always at war," the Société writes. These are "lies, denials by those same captains" who wished to continue to profit off of the trade. The Société also explained that those captains "...will tell you that the abolition of the slave trade will deal the most fatal blow to the navy, to public revenue, to the colonies, to commerce." The authors employ a variety of tactics to refute these claims, identifying and addressing every argument made in favor of the trade. In one segment of the pamphlet, they argue that the economic loss of the slave trade would be insignificant, because the enslaved already in the colonies would be able to repopulate the islands. At other times, the pamphlet condemned the slave trade on moral grounds, appealing to the Assembly's espousal of human rights. "There is no gain," they write, "which can legitimize the premeditated murder, traded for millions of men." Today, it is debated whether or not the Société would have been more persuasive in using economic or moral arguments. Resnick argues that the group failed to mobilize grassroots support and successfully combat the planter's arguments that abolishing the trade would lead to economic collapse. Alan Forrest writes that the Société failed to generate the same enthusiasm in France as English abolitionists like Thomas Clarkson, who appealed to the French through "...the moral tone of his writings, the insistence that abolition was not only a dictate of Reason but a cry from the heart and a response to the suffering of Africa." Here again, then, is the tension between logic and emotion in information, and the question of which tactic is more effective. Though the Société agreed with the emotional arguments of Clarkson, they opted for a more logical framework of persuasion, in the hopes that, in their particular time and place, that strategy would be more effective.

Jacques Pierre Brissot, a writer and founder of the Société, believed that the challenge lay in convincing other countries about abolition. This image was a ubiquitous marker of abolitionist literature across Europe and the United States. The inscription wrapped around the man's head reads, "Am I not your brother?" La Société des Amis des Noirs. Adresse à L'Assemblée Nationale, pour l'Abolition de la Traite des Noirs. Paris: L. Potier de Lille, February 1790.
members of the Assembly that his information was true. In a letter written to A. M. Barnave, he chastises his friend for failing to support the effort to abolish the slave trade, and laments the way that fear could warp the conscience. He condemned the influence of the French colonial planters, who “…in this assembly, where they should never have been admitted, they circulated calmonies, fables, terrors: and terror has so much influence on ignorance!” Brissot’s observation distills one of the primary themes of this exhibit: terror indeed has a profound influence on ignorance. Fear of the consequences of abolishing the trade—unassuaged by the arguments of groups such as the Société—infected the Assembly, and obstructed their commitment to revolutionary rights: “…but how cruelly the public hope has been deceived! Seduced by planters, you adopted their principles…you were young, and therefore you had to be credulous, and therefore again, it was easy for deeply wicked and shrewd men to seduce you.” Brissot’s letter reflects the pressures of a fast-paced political crisis. Ultimately, the Société failed to convince the Assembly that their truth was a better one—and this lack of action by the French government was one cause of the uprising in the French colony of Saint-Domingue (now Haiti), where enslaved people emancipated themselves on their own terms. Unable to enact gradual emancipation, in February 1789 Brissot could not envision the coming Haitian Revolution, still thinking that the enslaved “rely on the courage, on the zeal, of those writers who work to burst their chains….” Brissot displays an inability to conceive of enslaved people with the autonomy to envision freedom themselves, a belief which would be demolished in a few short months.

The publications of the Société stand as a testament to strategies of persuasion in a time of crisis, and they illustrate a failed attempt to enact change within the force of a moment. Though they employed both the logical arguments of economics and the moral language of the French Revolution, they failed to persuade enough members of the Assembly to take up gradual abolition—and instead faced the reality of revolution in Haiti.

Informing History: Pestilence and Panic in Philadelphia’s Yellow Fever Epidemic of 1793

In the yellow fever epidemic that ravaged Philadelphia in 1793, the lives of ordinary men and women were turned upside down in a matter of days. Spread by mosquitoes, the fever erupted at the end of July, moving quickly through the early republic’s largest city. As disease spread, panicked citizens latched onto gossip and fear; a contemporary chronicler of the event, Matthew Carey, noted that “The hundred tongues of rumour were never more successfully employed, than on this melancholy occasion.” The popularity of strange “cures,” unsupported by any real evidence, mirrors the recent experience of millions of Americans. In attempting to protect themselves, Philadelphians employed cigars, garlic, and other items which they hoped would keep the disease away. When people are scared, they are more apt to believe those stories which confirm their worldviews, or deliver some path through their present crisis. In
times of crisis it can be exceedingly difficult for people tangled in that fear to recognize their own susceptibility to rumors. There is often much at stake for misinformed citizens—for, if garlic truly does work as a cure, it could save them; it could save their child’s life. While it is easy for us to mock the people of Philadelphia for their superstitious quackery, we would be wise to remember that we look at their situation with hindsight, comfortable in the knowledge that garlic does not work, and unafraid for our own lives or the lives of our loved ones.

One theory for the origin of yellow fever was championed by the renowned physician Benjamin Rush, who believed that it arose from a shipment of rank coffee rotting on the harbor. Contemporary critics argued that Rush’s hypothesis was “altogether chimerical,” and that he “carried the spirit of discovery too far in tracing its origins.” Yet citizens like James Brinthurst subscribed to the coffee hypothesis: “…I heard from several others that some called it the plague, some the Yellow Fever, and one person said some coffee had been thrown, or dropped in the street near where it raged, and smelled very bad, so that a person made a fire over it to destroy it, and that person I think they said, was the first who died with it.” Despite there being no evidence beyond hearsay that rank coffee was responsible for the disease, Brinthurst was convinced, and his words showcase a few cogs in the vast machine of rumor that worked upon the citizens of the city at a time when they desperately needed knowledge. This is the anatomy of misinformation: “I heard from several others;” “I heard the account;” “I think they said.” Hearsay ignites in panic, and in this way, false tales of rotten coffee spread from person to person, each desperate for a logical truth and a clear explanation.

Perhaps the most striking disagreement of the epidemic arose not during the outbreak, but in the accounts of the disaster. At the start of September, near the peak of the crisis, Absalom Jones and Richard Allen, two leaders of the Philadelphia Free African Society, approached mayor Matthew Clarkson with an offer of help. As a letter written by Daniel Offley notes, it was widely believed at the time that “…not one black person has taken the infection, which renders them of consequence as nurses, and buryers.” The belief that African Americans were somehow immune to the disease was patently false. Desperate for manpower, Clarkson accepted Jones and Allen’s offer, and the members of the Society performed work around the city for the next four weeks, taking on the unpleasant and dangerous tasks of gravedigging and caring for the sick. Despite this, the Free African Society’s contributions to fighting the epidemic were largely ignored or maligned in early records. In John Pemberton’s *Account of the Rise, Progress, and Termination of the Malignant Fever*, a history which claimed to be constructed “From Authentic Documents,” the Black community was given a decidedly mixed review. Pemberton’s words are complex, sometimes giving praise, noting that “had

Some suspected that the weather had an effect on the spread of the disease, so careful meteorological observations were recorded.

Matthew Carey. *A Short Account of the Malignant Fever, Lately Prevalent in Philadelphia…. 4th ed.* (Philadelphia, PA: Published by the Author, January 16th, 1794)
it not been for the exertions and attentions of some of these despised people, the calamity and distress of the city would have been greatly aggravated." Yet he also notes that "some parts of their conduct may have the appearance of ingratitude to the citizens of Philadelphia...who have always generously and humanely exerted themselves to defend and release them from the oppressive hand of slavery," suggesting that the Society somehow owed its labor to the benevolent city.48

It was chroniclers like Pemberton, with this set of beliefs and values, who began to craft a story of the crisis. His prejudices minimize or exclude facts, propagate rumors, and manufacture an account decidedly in favor of his own biases.49 Matthew Carey's first account of the epidemic also criticized the Free African Society, writing that "the great demand for nurses afforded an opportunity for imposition, which was eagerly seized by some of the vilest of the blacks...Some of them were even detected in plundering the houses of the sick."50 For the Black community, such brief and scathing acknowledgements of their immense contributions were insulting. After having saved their city when it was on the brink of collapse, the Free African Society was rewarded with ridicule, while white nurses were unequivocally praised.51

In response to Carey, Jones and Allen published *A Narrative of the Proceedings of the Black People During the Late Awful Calamity in Philadelphia*, subtitled, "A Refutation of some Censures Thrown upon them in some late Publications." This account aimed "to step forward and declare facts as they really were," and fight against those "...unprovoked enemies, who begrudge us the liberty we enjoy, and are glad to hear of any complaint against our colour, be it just or unjust."52 Jones and Allen refuted a number of accusations, including "...the generally received opinion in this city, that our colour was not so liable to the sickness as the whites."53 They wrote that "we can assure the public we have taken four and five black people in a day to be buried," yet "when the people of colour had the sickness and died, we were imposed upon and told it was not with the prevailing sickness, until it became too notorious to be denied, then we were told some few had died but not many."54 Also given special mention is the "...partial, censorious paragraph, in Mr. Carey's second edition, of his account of the sickness...where he asperses the blacks alone, for having taken advantage of the distressed situation of the people."55 Jones and

By displaying the amount of cash spent and received, Jones and Allen tried to dispel claims that the Free African Society had stolen from the sick during the epidemic. Absalom Jones and Richard Allen, *A Narrative of the Proceedings of the Black People During the Late Awful Calamity in Philadelphia in the Year 1793...* (Philadelphia, PA: Printed by William W. Woodward, 1794)

Allen exposed the double standard of Carey's words, arguing that "...we know as many whites who were guilty of it; but this is looked over, while the blacks are held up to censure—Is it a greater crime for a black to pilfer, than for a white to privateer?"56

The mention of Carey's "second edition" alerts us to the popularity of his text, as well as the fact that his words changed over time; indeed, by the fourth edition, a note had been added to his charge against the "vilest of blacks" that "The extortion here mentioned,
to save, and it is impossible to know what slipped through the archival cracks. Still, his papers are a chance to read what he read, and it is useful to examine them before we turn to his own decisions. The form of these papers matters too. Though they seem distinct from the extensive histories of Carey or the verbose tracts of the English Civil War, many of these brochures share an affinity of purpose with these earlier works. Prynne’s documents are considerably longer, but Thompson’s pamphlets also aimed to convince their reader of a certain viewpoint. They were printed en masse, and distributed cheaply—ideas, mass marketed, waiting to make their case to any mind interested in them. These pamphlets acknowledge their own biases, often attempting to refute government claims about the war. The charity Thompson eventually volunteered for in Vietnam, The American Friends Service Committee (AFSC), produced a “White Paper on Ending the War” in 1969, which argued that “We believe U.S. military government leaders are fostering illusions in regard to Vietnam. Our own experience in Vietnam is so at variance with official interpretations that we cannot reconcile what we have seen with what is officially reported.”62 The bulletin worked to expose a web of government-funded misinformation about a deadly war—tilted facts and aggressive rhetoric, which caused “An entire nation [to be] physically, morally, and spiritually destroyed.”63 As Tarik Kamil writes, “…in the new peace movement of the early 1960s, the AFSC was increasingly challenged in its attempts to confront political and social ills through nonviolent means. In response to this challenge…the AFSC widened its peace activities” to become more overtly political in their goals, by publishing materials, meeting with government officials, and joining protest movements.64 Tarik notes that this evolution was based in part on their earlier 1955 publication, Speak Truth to Power, which advocated for a stronger, more political pacifism.65 In adopting a more aggressive print culture and in pushing stronger ideals, the AFSC began to radicalize into an organization devoted to an active pacifism.

In times of war, when passions flare, it is easy for opposing sides to exaggerate, minimize, or erase information in service of what they believe wholeheartedly to be right. Indeed, in an introductory pamphlet, the AFSC embraces its active bias towards pacifism, acknowledging that “We are not neutral. We work for a world society that is nonviolently ordered and in which men are neither debased nor exploited for any reason or for any purpose. We work for it because we think it is the kind of world God intends men to live in.”66 Such pamphlets should be recognized as propaganda designed to convince—and here, as with Prynne’s polemics, religion enters the fray, further blurring the line between truth and belief.67 Any study of a personal system of belief must take into account the bedrock assumptions of that person—and Rick Thompson was a devout Quaker, who wrote that “…I believe the creative force in the universe to be Love. God is Love, the supreme infinite love that created the divine order in all things.”68 At this micro level of belief, studying one person’s convictions, we are again backed into an uncomfortable conclusion: nearly everyone trusts in information which has no basis in logic. For Thompson, the path to truth ran through his faith—and the information which served as his personal path to truth had to take into account his faith as well.

Thompson’s pamphlets are remarkably diverse; there are materials from Jewish, Quaker, Protestant, Catholic, and secular organizations, all devoted to nonviolence. One pamphlet, written by the Catholic monk Thomas Merton, makes spiritual skepticism of facts explicit, framing it as a necessity in an Orwellian fight against what Merton calls the “state of mind.” This state of mind consisted of broad assumptions about the world found in mass media, which wore away at individualized perceptions of reality. “One is not protected against this moral combustion merely by rational statements of principles or of fact. Something much deeper is required. One must have profound and solid grounding in spiritual principles, one must have a deep and persevering moral strength, a compassion, an attachment to truth and to humanity…”69 In Merton’s words, to do what was right was not synonymous with knowing the facts. Indeed, facts did not necessarily lead one to the truth. The path to truth instead involved ethics, spiritual certainties, and moral strength.

As a Quaker, Thompson considered his own morals and Inner Light to be supreme; he notes that “Only through the Light Within can I gain insight to the order God has created and my purpose in His will.”70 At the heart of Thompson’s struggle was the question of how to engage with a conflict which violated his commitment to nonviolence. Merton argues that “Peace demands
the most heroic labor and the most difficult sacrifice. It demands more heroism than war.”71 Without doubt, Thompson's commitment to pacifism was fierce. In a typed companion to his application for conscientious objector status, he answered the form's question of “Under what circumstances, if any, do you believe in the use of force?” with a powerful explanation:

I do not believe in the use of force in my personal relations with other individuals. I attempt to live with real understanding and consideration of another's beliefs and actions...Neither do I believe in the use of force on the government level. A perfect government would not require force to achieve its goals...Neither do I believe in force on the international level. War is an aberration of God’s will...Therefore, I do not believe in the use of force, under any circumstances...72

Crucially, these sentiments were reflected in the information Thompson read. In one pamphlet published by the AFSC, “Violence is Any Sword,” nonviolence is defined as “…the attempt to fill human needs, to affirm the dignity and release the promise of every human life, and to create a wider and deeper community among men. More than the negation of force, it must be not less than the initiatives taken by love to overcome evil with good.”73 In this way, nonviolence is construed as an active choice, instead of a passive withdrawal.

Again and again in the pamphlets he read, Thompson confronted pleas for passionate, active pacifism, pacifism which embodied the necessity to “…face individually the need for an ultimate and fundamental break with violence” as outlined in Speak Truth to Power.74 Such a pacifism was radical, aggressive, and able to withstand Merton's “state of mind.” It was to take the shape of another quote cited in Speak Truth to Power, by Rufus Jones, which echoed Merton's willingness to abandon facts for the tenets of one's faith: “It takes immense faith to swing out thus from the main social current of the world on a unique venture, to make an experiment in the practice of Love when everybody else insists that nothing else will work but force. It means flying in the face of ‘hard facts.’75 It is a cause of actions, which ‘common sense’ at once refuses.”76

It was this flavor of rhetoric which helped push Thompson to go further than simply applying to be a conscientious objector, and led his pacifism to an active, all-encompassing level. After applying for and receiving conscientious objector status in 1968 and 1969, Thompson returned his draft card in 1971, writing to his local board that “This must serve to inform you I
can no longer comply with Selective Service Regulations or your administration...”

Thompson goes on to elaborate his decision, in the hopes that “other young men will pursue similar action...I realize I am heir to a militaristically-oriented country...Conscription is the machinery that enables a few individuals to conduct a war against the will of the populace. I cannot be party to this system.”

There is a certain radicalization present in Thompson's thinking. Various pamphlets confirm that the ethics of the Selective Service were on his mind; as time progressed, Thompson took the active definition of nonviolence as “more than the negation of force” to heart. Indeed, passive acceptance of the conscientious objector label, where “…two years of civilian service ‘contributing to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest’” were mandated grew increasingly unappealing to him.

Thompson's papers, and the information he used to educate himself, offer glimpses of what may have persuaded him to become an active resistor. One letter, filed with Thompson's draft documents, tells the story of Richard M. Boardman, and his decision to return his draft card. Boardman's story contains remarkable parallels with Thompson's. Boardman was accepted as a C.O., and tried to work with the AFSC, but the proposal was rejected by his local draft board. Eventually, Boardman came to believe that “…to accept any classification is to tacitly accept the legitimacy of the system of conscription and the military for which conscription exists. I cannot do this. As a pacifist I must totally reject both conscription and militarism...By resisting the draft I am combating the first ranks in the forces of an evil system—the military—that affects all young men throughout the United States.”

Such reasoning echoes Thompson's arguments that...
this country, the Selective Service has made a mockery of freedom and has subjugated the American people with its oppressive power. For both men, the Selective Service subverted the popular will, and compliance within such a system meant an acceptance of violence, a tacit approval of everything the military represented. For Broadman, to accept that association “…would be to violate the dictates of my conscience and thus do a disservice to myself, my country, and humanity.” Similarly, Thompson’s choice to reject that association was his “response to a disquieted conscience.”

Thompson’s decision to serve with the AFSC as a volunteer in Vietnam may have also been informed by Broadman. There is a massive amount of AFSC literature among Thompson’s papers, and many of the foundational ideas in his writing were linked to this Quaker organization, whose thinking was both idealistic and practical, religious and political. Such materials would have bolstered Thompson as he contemplated how to spend his coming years in the spring of 1972, as recorded in his diary: “It is possible that AFSC would send me to Vietnam for two years. This in itself is unsettling to consider, though exciting and to my liking… To accept would be to cut myself off from [family and friends] before even encountering the mission. To not accept would be to avoid a task which would test me regularly and fully. Am I up to this?” Uncertain of his own beliefs and their consequences, on the line between passive and active resistance to a crisis he felt was unwarranted and unnecessary, Thompson needed information—and he received it in his pamphlets, intertwined with rhetoric, religion, and a spiritual basis of truth.

Ultimately, Thompson decided to join the AFSC, to perform charitable work in a hospital in Vietnam, helping to outfit wounded children in Quang Ngai with prosthetic limbs. On November 17, 1973, he was flying in a typhoon when the plane smashed into the side of a mountain, killing everyone on board. His death, like so many others during this period, was tragic, a young man struck down in his prime. But his story lives on in the papers and pamphlets present in his collection. This information guided Rick Thompson and helped him to make sense of the world in a time of moral crisis. It pushed him to become the sort of person who risks his life in Vietnam to aid others—who rejects a system he believes to be wrong, and who strives to listen to the Light inside of him. In the information he sought, Rick Thompson privileged the Light within—and in
that choice, he mirrors most of us today, with our own moral beliefs which, at times, we must hold to despite evidence to the contrary. I hope that by looking at these papers, and this life, you will feel a sense of empathy with Rick Thompson, who, like all of us living in the modern world, was swimming through a sea of information, seeking out answers, and striving to satisfy his personal search for truth.

The Narrative About Narratives: A Little Story Is A Potent Thing

Read enough Nietzsche, and you might start to think like him. Read enough anti-war literature, pushing you to eschew everything in favor of your conscience, and you just might do it. In times of crisis we need guidance, and information offers that guidance, no matter the form it may take. Sometimes, the information we choose to immerse ourselves in takes the form of objective truths; more often than not, we turn to half-baked theories, rumours, propaganda, emotional rhetoric, or those biases we already hold and want so desperately to reinforce. Pressured by limited time, scared, angry, attacked, we instinctively turn to simplified narratives which help us traverse a crisis: the neighbor who is surely a papist; the ship captain who assures us that without slavery, our economy will collapse; the garlic which could save our children; the religious rhetoric which bolsters our deepest beliefs.

It is tempting to judge people of the past, wondering how they could be naive enough to believe what we now know to be false. Indeed, historians do this, all of the time, and it is important to take lessons from the past; informed judgement is a piece of that process, a step towards learning something from what other people experienced. Yet I hope that any informed judgement you may make is coupled with a sense of empathy. Reading documents related to the yellow fever epidemic today gave me an eerie sense of déjà vu. Matthew Carey noted that “the old custom of shaking hands fell into such general disuse, that many shrunken back with a fright at even the offer of the hand,” an experience we are all too familiar with today. One resident of the city, John Morton Jr., wrote to his father that “Every family I believe that can move from the city has left. Isaac Wharton has bought a place from the city of about 15 acres...for which he gave 6000 dollars, and has moved his family in it.”

His account outlines an exodus reminiscent of the Manhattan upper crust’s flight to the Hamptons in March of 2020, leaving poorer residents behind to face the brunt of covid-19. Crawling out of a pandemic and political turmoil ourselves, this seems like the kind of moment where we may be able to better reflect on the fact that our panic and confusion are not new; although innovations like the internet have shaped the way we consume information, we continue to work with the same minds we had four hundred years ago, imperfect brains burdened with the same inclinations to nationalism, prejudice, and bias. There is perhaps, then, a certain comfort in the confusion, manipulation, and downright lies we see baked into these historical sources; people of the past, too, struggled to know what was true amidst a tide of conflicting narratives.

I also fear, with this exhibit, that it will leave some viewers with a negative opinion of narratives—so I wish to stress here: narratives are not evil. Nor does a recognition of narratives render information useless. As Trouillot writes at the end of Silencing the Past, “Positions need not be eternal to justify a legitimate defense. To miss this point is to bypass the historicity of the human condition. Any search for eternity condemns us to the impossible choice between fiction and positivist truth, between nihilism and fundamentalism, which are two sides of the same coin.” Indeed, the stories we tell ourselves are necessary; if you tried to understand every problem of the world in perfect detail, you would not only waste your life—you would fail. Ultimately, we need narratives. They help us make sense of the world, sort through the information and misinformation we confront daily, and help us walk our own path to truth. But the first step to dismantling damaging stories is recognizing that they are there. My humble hope is that, by looking at the lives of diverse people, across thousands of miles and hundreds of years, you will see in this exhibit that narratives constructed to manage information are a part of us—they always have been, and they always will be. If an exhibit is designed to educate, then the lesson of this one is that we must be aware of those narratives we build with our information, and acknowledge their presence and power in every aspect of our societies, our communities, and ourselves. A little story is a potent thing.

Keep your eyes open to the stories you’re choosing to believe.
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