



Penn History Review

Volume 16
Issue 1 *Fall 2008*

Article 1

10-1-2008

From the Editor

Kojo Minta

University of Pennsylvania, minta@alumni.upenn.edu

FROM THE EDITOR

Kojo Minta

The Editorial Board is pleased to present the first issue of the sixteenth volume of the *Penn History Review*. The *Review* continues to publish outstanding undergraduate papers based on original primary research. This issue of the *Review* will be different from previous ones, in that its focus is on the intersection of Postcolonial, Subaltern and Transnational Studies within the study of History.

Do these studies serve to shore up the traditional study of history, or do they work to subvert it? Leszek Kolakowski described the Left as negation, “the opposite of affirming existing condition.” Can we view the program of Postcolonial, Subaltern and Transnational Studies as fulfilling much the same goal? Do they exist to combat a normative form of discourse? And if so, can or do these studies work in tandem with the study of History, or do they exist as perennially antagonistic foes?

Walter Benjamin, in his *Theses on the Philosophy of History*, describes an Angel of History, whose “face is turned towards the past. Where *we* see the appearance of a chain of events, *he* sees one single catastrophe, which unceasingly piles rubble on top of rubble and hurls it before his feet. He would like to pause for a moment so fair, to awaken the dead and piece together what has been smashed.” Perhaps these studies could be viewed as an act of construction, a project of excavation and radical reevaluation. Do these studies then exist without History?

To this end we have dedicated three papers and an interview section to exploring these issues. The interviews were conducted with influential academics in History, English and Anthropology. The papers discuss issues and concepts, such as nationalism, diasporas and protest movements, that are integral to the questions discussed in the interviews.

Eric Augenbraun considers the interlocking factors which bore a “radical” group of Caribbean immigrants at the century’s turn. The paper demonstrates how these men and women would draw from their unique transnational histories to pave a new oppositional politics. In doing so, the piece pays particular attention to noteworthy figures such as Marcus Garvey in order to shed new light on how to situate Caribbean immigrants’ political

ideologies within the larger Atlantic world.

Maia Lichtenstein studies the native Hawaiian population's protest against American annexation in the nineteenth century. She argues that many of the political, social, religious, and land reforms enacted in Hawaii were a subtle means of deterring American annexation efforts by attempting to form Hawaii into a politically legitimate nation in the eyes of Europe and America. This paper will draw from protests included in Hawaiian Queen Liliuokalani's memoirs, her protest submitted to Congress, and petitions from native Hawaiians also submitted to Congress, in order to show how the language used furthered this strategy of opposition to annexation.

The remarkable intellectual ferment of Mahatma K. Gandhi's political writings served as a backdrop to India's successful bid for independence. In expressing a change of direction that resonated across India's provinces, Mahatma Gandhi's Non-Cooperation movement (1920-22), Civil Disobedience movement (1930-32), and Quit India movement (1940-42) conditioned the state for future political success. Joseph S. Friedman argues that often omitted from this well-known trajectory, however, are suggestions in Gandhi's writings that undermined the effectiveness of his message, and obscured the ideological underpinnings of his appeal.

The collection and publication of these papers was the collaborative effort of many individuals. The *Review* would like to thank the many members of the history faculty who encouraged their students to submit essays for publication. The Editorial Board would like to especially thank Dr. Ann Moyer, the undergraduate chair of the History Department, for her continued support, and Dr. Susan Miller, the undergraduate departmental advisor, for her guidance. Finally, we thank the University of Pennsylvania and the History Department in particular for its financial support of the *Review*, its efforts to foster undergraduate research, and the commitment of its faculty to cultivating future historians.

Kojo Minta
Editor-in-Chief