



FCH Annals
Journal of the Florida Conference of Historians

Volume 25
June 2019

Michael S. Cole, Editor

<http://www.floridaconferenceofhistorians.org/>

FCH Annals: The Journal of the Florida Conference of Historians
ISSN 2373-9525 (Print)

ISSN 2373-9541 (Online, <http://www.floridaconferenceofhistorians.org/>)

The *Annals* is published annually by the Florida Conference of Historians, and includes a selection of papers presented at the most recent annual meeting. Inquiries or requests to purchase copies should be directed to mcole@fgcu.edu, or to Michael S. Cole, Florida Gulf Coast University, 10501 FGCU Boulevard South, Fort Myers, Florida 33965.

Copyright: © 2019 The Florida Conference of Historians. All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced without the prior written permission of the copyright holder. Requests should be directed to mcole@fgcu.edu, or to Michael S. Cole, Florida Gulf Coast University, 10501 FGCU Boulevard South, Fort Myers, Florida 33965.

Disclaimer: The Florida Conference of Historians and the editors cannot be held responsible for any errors or consequences resulting from the use of information published in this journal. The opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect those of the editors or the Florida Conference of Historians.

Senior Editor

Michael S. Cole, Florida Gulf Coast University

Editorial Board Members

Campbell Award Committee Members

Dr. Leslie K. Poole, Rollins College

Dr. David Harvey, New College of Florida

Patricia Farless, University of Central Florida

Browne Award Committee Members

Dr. Blaine Browne, Broward College

Dr. Michael Butler, Flagler College

Dr. Rowena Hernández-Múzquiz, Broward College

Clarke Award Committee Members

Dr. Michael S. Cole, Florida Gulf Coast University

Dr. Mike Epple, Florida Gulf Coast University

Dr. Sean McMahon, Florida Gateway College

Published in memory of Dr. Thomas (Tom) M. Campbell, the driving force behind the creation of the Florida Conference of Historians.

**Florida Conference of Historians
Officers 2016-2017**

President

Patricia Farless
University of Central Florida

President-Elect

Thomas Donaldson
Florida Southwestern State College

Treasurer

Jesse Hingson
Jacksonville University

Secretary

David Proctor
Tallahassee Community College

Senior Editor

FCH Annals: Journal of the Florida Conference of Historians
Michael S. Cole
Florida Gulf Coast University

Thomas M. Campbell Award

Beginning with Volumes 6/7, the Florida Conference of Historians has presented the Thomas M. Campbell Award for the best paper published in the Annual Proceedings (now Annals) of that year.

Thomas M. (Tom) Campbell was the driving force behind the creation of the Florida Conference of Historians, at that time called The Florida College Teachers of History, over 40 years ago. It was his personality and hard work that kept the conference moving forward. Simply put, in those early years he was the conference.

Tom was a professor of U.S. Diplomatic history at Florida State University. The Thomas M. Campbell Award is in his name so that we may recognize and remember his efforts on behalf of the Florida Conference of Historians

Recipients

2018: Javiera N. Reyes-Navarro, Independent Scholar

2017: Michael Davis, Northwest Florida State College

2016: Tom Aiello, Gordon State College

2015: Leslie Kemp Poole, Rollins College

2014: Michael D. Brooks, M.A. Candidate, University of Central Florida

2013: Andrew Fede, JD, Independent Scholar

2012: Christopher Williams, Ph.D., University of Warwick

2011: Frank Piccirillo, Florida Gulf Coast University

2010: Amy M. Porter, Ph.D., Georgia Southwestern University

2009: Christine Lutz, Ph.D., Georgia State University

2008: Vincent Intondi, ABD, American University

2007: Steve MacIsaac, Ph.D., Jacksonville University

2006: Dennis P. Halpin and Jared G. Toney, University of South Florida

2005: David Michel, Ph.D., Chicago Theological Seminary

2004: Robert L. Shearer, Ph.D., Florida Institute of Technology

2002-3: J. Calvitt Clarke III, Ph.D., Jacksonville University

2000-1: J. Calvitt Clarke III, Ph.D., Jacksonville University

Blaine T. Browne Award

Beginning with the current volume, the Florida Conference of Historians will present the Blaine T. Browne Award, given to the best paper written by a graduate student who presents at the annual meeting and publishes in the Annals.

Dr. Browne earned a doctorate in American history at the University of Oklahoma in 1985. He subsequently taught at several universities and colleges before joining the faculty at Broward College in 1988. An active participant in the Florida Conference of Historians since 1994, Dr. Browne has presented at annual meetings and published in the *Selected Annual Proceedings of the Florida Conference of Historians*, the predecessor of the *Annals*. Now retired from Broward College, in 2014 Dr. Browne generously provided the seed money for this award.

Recipients

2018: Colin Cook, University of Central Florida

2017: Brad Massey, Polk State College and University of Florida

2016: Khali I. Navarro, University of Central Florida

2015: Jenny Smith, Valdosta State University

J. Calvitt Clarke III Award

Beginning with volume 20, the Florida Conference of Historians has presented the J. Calvitt Clarke III Award for the best undergraduate research paper published in the Annals.

In 2012, Dr. Clarke, Professor Emeritus at Jacksonville University and a strong supporter of undergraduate research, graciously provided the seed funding for this important award. He is a frequent contributor and the founding editor of the predecessor to the *Annals*, the *Selected Annual Proceedings of the Florida Conference of Historians*.

Recipients

2018: John Lancaster, University of Central Florida

2017: Frankie Bauer, Middle Georgia State University

2016: Nicole Kana Hummel, New College of Florida

2015: Tyler Campbell, University of Central Florida

2014: Michael Rodriguez, Florida Gulf Coast University

2013: Amy Denise Jackson, Wesleyan College

A Note from the Editor

It is my pleasure to present volume 25 of *FCH Annals*, featuring selected papers presented at the 57th Annual Meeting of the Florida Conference of Historians, which was hosted by Florida Southwestern State College, and held at the Charlotte Harbor Event and Conference Center, Punta Gorda, Florida, March 10-12, 2017. As always, a wide variety of topics and time periods are covered in this volume. Congratulations to this year's award winners, including Javiera N. Reyes-Navarro for "The Power of the Familiar: Intertextuality in Anime and Manga through Hirano Kouta's *Hellsing*" (Campbell Award); Colin Cook for "Scottish Identity and Presbyterianism in Antrim, 1613-1670" (Browne Award); and John Lancaster for "Politicizing Health: The Nazis' Forgotten Anti-Smoking Campaign and Twentieth-Century Eugenics" (Clarke Award). Finally, I am pleased to welcome Dr. Leslie K. Poole of Rollins College as the newest member of the Campbell Award Committee.

Michael S. Cole
11 May 2019

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|-----|
| <i>Florida Journalism Pioneer: Miami Women's Page Editor Billie O'Day</i> Kimberly Voss | 1 |
| <i>Leon J. Canova and Pancho Villa's Columbus Raid of 1916</i> Heribert von Feilitzsch | 9 |
| <i>Ancient Women in Film: On-Screen Deaths as Feminist Martyrdom</i> Andrea Schwab | 23 |
| <i>Scottish Identity and Presbyterianism in Antrim, 1613-1670</i> Colin Cook | 41 |
| <i>BMEWS, NIKE-ZEUS and Eisenhower: A Do Something President</i> Patrick Gallagher | 49 |
| <i>The Purpose of the Industrial Workers of the World within America's Labor Movement</i> Michael Gromoll | 61 |
| <i>The Power of the Familiar: Intertextuality in Anime and Manga through Hirano Kouta's Hellsing</i> Javiera N. Reyes-Navarro | 71 |
| <i>How Did Jumonville Die? The Death That Sparked the French and Indian War</i> Aaron Lewis | 79 |
| Special Section: Selected Undergraduate Articles | |
| <i>The Grievances of British Colonials in Jamaica Leading to the War of Jenkins' Ear</i> William Cobb | 95 |
| <i>Revolutionaries and Refugees: From France to Haiti to the United States</i> Samantha Sanford | 105 |
| <i>Politicizing Health: The Nazis' Forgotten Anti-Smoking Campaign and Twentieth-Century Eugenics</i> John Lancaster | 113 |

Florida Journalism Pioneer: Miami Women's Page Editor Billie O'Day

Kimberly Voss
University of Central Florida

For many years, it was the women's pages of newspapers that created community – sharing information, connecting residents, and advocating for causes. Readers knew the reporters and editors by name. Readers sent in recipe requests and called for advice. The women's page journalists raised the stature of women's clubs and their causes. They reinforced a place for women outside the home and did not speak down to those who chose to stay at home. The women's page journalists were a significant voice for women in their communities, although often overlooked by historians.

Miami News women's page editor Billie O'Day was one of those journalists. She was a significant journalist who has often been overlooked, largely because of the end of the *Miami News* newspaper and the marginalization of women's pages in journalism history. She was a two-time winner of Penney-Missouri Awards – the top recognition for the women's pages in the 1960s. She also had a career in Miami music and radio prior to her tenure in the women's pages.

This is a biographical sketch of O'Day, who worked during the Golden Era of the women's pages.¹ Although the sections were significant in their communities, they are rarely included in newspaper histories – instead considered as the stepchild of the profession.² Further, few women's page editors have saved papers in archives and few are included in oral history projects. The story of O'Day adds to the historical record of women's page journalists in Florida.

The women's pages were part of newspapers going back to the 1880s. While the content of many of these sections was often based on traditional women's roles of wives and mothers, as society evolved so did the sections. Along with the coverage of weddings, food, and fashion they published stories about politics, reproductive issues, and employment regulations. It was a mix of hard and soft news – sometimes known as quilted news.³

The editors of these sections were smart, feisty, and ahead of their times. They left a great legacy for today's women journalists. In addition, they were the ones who spread the message of the women's movement in a way that allowed women in their communities to feel empowered. They also changed the course

¹ Kimberly Wilmot Voss and Lance Speere, "Marjorie Paxson: From Women's Editor to Publisher," *Media History Monographs*, 2007-2008, 1-18.

² The reference to women's pages as the "stepchild of the profession" was used by Ishbel Ross, *Ladies of the Press* (New York: Harper, 1936), 425. Repeated in Kay Mills, *A Place in the News: From the Women's Pages to the Front Pages* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1990), 114.

³ Kimberly Wilmot Voss and Lance Speere, "Quilted News: Mixing Hard and Soft News to Create a New Definition for Women's News," Florida Communication Association Conference, Orlando, October 18, 2013.

of women's page journalism. This was especially true in Florida, where one-third of all Penney-Missouri Awards were granted to the state's women's page editors during the 1960s (the awards were given in several circulation categories). Award winners traveled to Missouri and took part in workshops to share their strategies with other women's page editors. It was one of the few networking opportunities for women journalists at the time.

Her Background

She was born Billie Corrine Womack in Pine Bluff, Arkansas in 1919 – an only child. Billie O'Day was her radio name, which she continued using as her own. Her father, William Womack, was a piano tuner and owned a music store. As a child she played sports and musical instruments. At thirteen years old she won a district contest by playing the violin. Her father rewarded her by giving her a catcher's mitt. Her mother pitched her oranges in place of a baseball, to hit and get exercise.

When she was fourteen her father died. She and her mother developed a bond that would last the rest of their lives, and she often wrote columns about her mother, known as "Mo." In the seventh grade she was a member of the all-male football team and won a championship. This was until her "figure betrayed her" and she was taken off the team. She said it was for the best: "My music teachers were always worried that I would hurt my hands." Her journalism career started early. She could reel off baseball stats and soon became the first female sports editor in Pine Bluff history. (Her interest in football continued into her adult years. She was a big fan of the University of Miami football team and was a regular on the sidelines).

She earned an undergraduate degree in music at Hendrix College. Her mother worked at a dry-cleaning shop to support her daughter's education. After graduation, the pair moved to Miami. O'Day began taking graduate classes at the University of Miami. She also played violin for the University of Miami Symphony for several years. She became the conductor of the Miami Symphonic Society Orchestra, also known as the Miami Businessman Symphony, in 1949 and remained in the position for more than a decade.⁴ O'Day's role began as an accident when the original conductor failed to show up at rehearsals. O'Day filled in and she eventually took over. Proof of her work as a conductor can be found in issues of the 1960s *Jewish Floridian* in the University of Florida Digital Collections, and an obituary for a violinist mentioned her playing in the Billie O'Day Orchestra.⁵ A woman as a conductor was shocking in the 1960s – and still unusual today. There are few

⁴ "Library Marks Music Week," *Jewish Floridian*, 29 April 1960, 8-A.

⁵ "Josie S. Kupersmith," *Sun-Sentinel*, 14 September 1994.

women as conductors in American symphonies – this is despite half of doctorates in conducting going to female students.⁶

In 1944 she became the music librarian at radio station WIOD. Later she teamed up with Jack Berry for the weekday program “Billie and Jack,” which is when she began using the name Billie O’Day. She interviewed numerous celebrities, including Dracula actor Bela Lugosi in 1948. A local reporter covered the event with the women’s pages featuring a photo of Lugosi leering over the shoulder of a young O’Day. The cutline was: “Look out, Billie O’Day!”⁷ In 1954 she was named the Miami Young Woman of the year for her work at Radio WIOD; she was thirty-five at the time. In 1955 O’Day hosted a radio show called “Teen Age Juke Box,” which ran each Saturday from 9 a.m. to noon. Some weeks she received more than 1,000 requests for songs to be played and she chose which to play.⁸ More and more women were gaining on-air radio jobs in the 1950s.⁹

Women’s Page Career

O’Day was hired as the club editor in the women’s pages at the Miami News in 1958. Coverage of club activities was a significant part of women’s news. These clubs were active in South Florida, as they were across the country. There were several hundred women’s organizations during this time period – many of them with chapters in Miami. As has been noted, “the story of how women’s civic associations changed in the 1950s is part of a larger narrative about American political development and the forces that shape political change.”¹⁰

These scenarios were playing out across Florida as women’s clubs supported legislation that helped children and built libraries. According to early women’s historian Anne Firor Scott, “while the social shibboleth was that ‘woman’s place’ was in the home, the fact was that for a certain kind of woman (generally, but not always, of the middle class) ‘woman’s place’ was clearly in the voluntary association.”¹¹ Journalist Roberta Applegate worked to elevate the image of club women in the pages of the Miami Herald and as a speaker at club meetings. In one speech, she said: “for many years, women’s clubs have been the butt of jokes – their hats, their pink teas and their gossip. I object to that interpretation of clubwork. Women do so much that is fine and outstanding, both in their own right and as a prod to the men.”¹²

⁶ Hannah Levintova, “Here’s Why You Seldom See Women Leading a Symphony,” *Mother Jones*, 23 September 2013.

⁷ Grace Wing, “City Disappoints Lugosi – People Don’t Die Here,” *Miami Daily News*, 3 September 1948.

⁸ Cash Box, 26 March 1955, 10. American Radio History.com (Broadcasters Foundation of America), <https://www.americanradiohistory.com/hd2/IDX-Business/Music/Archive-Cash-Box-IDX/50s/1955/CB-1955-03-26-OCR-Page-0010.pdf#search=%22billie%20o'day%22>.

⁹ Susan J. Douglas, *Listening In: Radio and the American Imagination* (New York: Random House, 1999).

¹⁰ Lanethea Mathews-Gardner, “The 1950s, Women, Civic Engagement, and Political Change,” American Political Science Association Conference, Chicago, Illinois, September 2, 2004, 4.

¹¹ Anne Firor Scott, *Making the Invisible Woman Visible* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1984), 282.

¹² Roberta Applegate, “Association News and the Club Editor,” undated speech, Coral Gables. Papers of Roberta Applegate, National Women and Media Collection, State Historical Society of Missouri.

Part of the reason for the success of women's club campaigns was the publicity that women's page journalists gave them. At times it was for the fundraising activities and other times it was a matter of writing about issues that gave credence to the cause. As Dallas women's page writer Pauline Periwinkle wrote: "printer's ink judiciously applied to the club idea is a great lubricator and will make it run further and smoother than anything I know."¹³ Toward this end, most women's sections held annual contests to reward women's clubs for their projects – something the Miami News also did.¹⁴

In the post-World War II era, these club women were taking on a new, more serious public role. As one researcher noted, "leaders from each association walked a fine line between adopting new and more overtly political modes of organization at the national level and, at the same time, convincing local members that their fundamental purposes as civic groups were not in jeopardy."¹⁵ Women's page editors also walked that line between tradition and progress. As journalism researcher Pamela Creedon wrote, to remain in any field "women must conform in some ways to the norms."¹⁶

By the early 1960s, O'Day became the women's page editor at the Miami News where she won her Penney-Missouri Awards. Women's page editors who rejected the traditional model were congratulated for their changes with the recognition. This is not to say there was complete support for the women's work. A two-page story on the 1964 Penney-Missouri Award workshops in the industry publication *Editor & Publisher* included the insulting headline: "Through Long Eyelashes."¹⁷ In the papers of the Penney-Missouri Awards there is an image from a Missouri hotel room with a gathering of women's page editors, including O'Day, and legendary Miami Herald editor Marie Anderson.¹⁸ There was a strong community of women's page journalists in South Florida who socialized regularly.

The University of Missouri connection to Miami continued through the years, as many of the female students from the University of Missouri were recruited to work in Florida women's pages, such as Nancy Taylor who had been hired by the Miami News to work as an assistant to O'Day.¹⁹ The South Florida women's page community was strong. In 1964, Applegate was hired as an assistant professor of

¹³ Pauline Periwinkle, *Dallas Morning News*, 4 June 1900. Cited in Jacquelyn Masur McElhane, *Pauline Periwinkle and Progressive Reform in Dallas* (College Station: Texas A & M Press, 1998), xvi.

¹⁴ For example, the Miami Junior League was named the Outstanding Club for its work on the Museum of Science. *Make It Miami* (Orlando: Moran Printing Company, 1990), 4.

¹⁵ A. Lanethea Mathews-Gardner, "The 1950s, Women, Civic Engagement, and Political Change," American Political Science Association Conference, Chicago, Ill. September 2004, 35.

¹⁶ Pamela Creedon, "Framing Feminism: A Feminist Primer for the Mass Media," *Media Studies Journal*, 1993, 71.

¹⁷ "Through Long Eyelashes: Editors of Women's Pages Given Advice," *Editor & Publisher*, 18 April 1964, 64.

¹⁸ Kimberly Wilmot Voss and Lance Speere, "A Women's Page Pioneer: Marie Anderson and Her Influence at the *Miami Herald* and Beyond," *Florida Historical Quarterly* (Spring 2007): 398-421.

¹⁹ Marie Anderson, letter to Paul L. Myhre, 4 September 1967. Penney-Missouri Awards Papers, State Historical Society of Missouri.

technical journalism at Kansas State University. Upon hearing that Applegate was leaving, O'Day remarked "what a loss for Miami."²⁰

One of the reasons that the women's page editors achieved so much in Florida was the several progressive managing editors in Florida who saw the potential for a more significant women's section. It was these forward-thinking editors who aided women's page editors in making a difference in traditional content. Jim Bellows, who went on to lead several newspapers, was an editor at the Miami News from 1959 to 1961. A women's page journalist said: "Bellows was the radical. He was always ahead of the times and ready to stick his neck out to back writers or editors who challenged the status quo."²¹ While at the News, he received a plaque of appreciation from the women's department. Bellows wrote of the honor: "the ceremony in the women's department of the Miami News was not as formal as the signing of a peace treaty. Just very sincere. They seemed to appreciate the support I gave the women in the newsroom, the recognition and the promotion."²² An example of that support can be found in his encouragement of sending women's page journalist Rollene Saal to cover the 1959 Patterson-Johansson boxing match in Miami.²³

Bellows was an early advocate for women journalists and was one of the few men to champion many to positions of authority in his newsrooms prior to the women's movement.²⁴ Rollene Saal, who went on to be editor-in-chief of Bantam Books, wrote: "back then we were Jim Bellow's gals. Jim was tall, handsome in that loose-limbed Gregory Peck way. Every one of us in the Women's Department was a little in love with him."²⁵ He hired a collection of talented women including food editor Bertha Hahn and society writer Myrna Odell. (Odell would become well-known after marrying tire heir Russell A. Firestone, Jr.) Saal noted: "Jim hired these women, was able to give us space to stretch in, and admired and encouraged our work."

Bellows said that his small stature when he was young had given him his view of what it was like as an underdog. He wrote in his book: "early in my newspaper days I noticed that the few women in the newsroom were much more eager to accept unusual assignments and work hours than men. Of course, in retrospect, I realize they had nothing to lose, because they were going nowhere to begin with. I also probably identified with their second-place citizenship in the newspaper fraternity."²⁶

²⁰ Roberta Applegate, letter to her parents, 15 June 1964, folder 75. Papers of Roberta Applegate, National Women and Media Collection, State Historical Society of Missouri.

²¹ Jim Bellows, *The Last Editor: How I Saved the New York Times, Washington Post and Los Angeles Times* (Kansas City: Andrew McMeel Publishing, 2002), 83.

²² *Ibid.*, 77.

²³ *Ibid.*, 79.

²⁴ The Last Editor. www.thelasteditor.com/film. Accessed 10 2006.

²⁵ Bellows, 78.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, 217.

During her time at the Miami News, O'Day covered the arts along with the typical women's page fare, including fundraising benefits and visiting celebrities.²⁷ There were also local features. Just as women from Betty Friedan to Erma Bombeck questioned the value of housework in women's lives in the 1960s, so did local women's page journalists. For example, an article written by O'Day, Flora Supworth – a mother of two teenagers who at forty years old was graduating from college. The main focus was Supworth's professional achievements. She had decided to finish her degree because she wanted to help teens in a local detention center in a paid position rather than volunteer work. Supworth was quoted as saying:

I'm not knocking organizational work – it's creative, too. And women in organizations accomplish plenty. But the higher you go in work like that, the further you're removed from the work. You end up sitting at head tables with a hat on your head. That's not for me.²⁸

O'Day's success at the newspaper led to media coverage of her work, such as a 1962 Associated Press wire story, written by Jean Sprain Wilson. The profile focused on her work as a journalist and a musician, as well as her interest in football. While the article was the same in all newspapers, headlines differed. Three of the newspapers that ran the story featured the following headlines and demonstrate the different framing of a news topic: "Reporter by day, conductor at night,"²⁹ "Woman Scribe Is Conductor of Symphony,"³⁰ and "Football and the Classics Keep Her Too Busy for Love."³¹ The third headline is especially interesting as the question of dating was not even mentioned until the end of the lengthy story. The profile ran with two photos: one with O'Day in front of her typewriter and another of her conducting the symphony.

The women's section of the Miami News ended in the 1970s and became a lifestyle section – as was common at most newspapers.³² It was the result of a combination of women's changing roles in society and a change in thinking by newspaper management.³³ O'Day went on to be the music and television editor at the Miami News. She continued to cover the arts in the post-women's page years,

²⁷ Billie O'Day, "Women Who Bring Culture to Miami," *Miami News*, 30 December 1962.

²⁸ Billie O'Day, "Mom Will Wear the Cap and Gown," *Miami News*, 19 May 1963.

²⁹ Jean Sprain Wilson, "Reporter by Day, Conductor at Night," *Cedar Rapids Gazette*, 23 September 1962.

³⁰ Jean Sprain Wilson, "Woman Scribe is Conductor of Symphony," *Gettysburg Times*, 9 February 1963.

³¹ Jean Sprain Wilson, "Football and the Classics Keep Her Too Busy for Love," *Greeley Tribune*, 12 September 1962.

³² Maurine Beasley and Sheila Gibbons, *Taking Their Place: A Documentary History of Women and Journalism* (Washington, D.C.: The American University Press, 1993). Kay Mills, *A Place in the News: From the Women's Pages to the Front Pages* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1990). Eileen M. Wirth, *From Society Page to Front Page: Nebraska Women in Journalism* (Lincoln, Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press, 2013).

³³ Judith Martin, "In Defense of the Women's Pages," *Washington Post*, 14 December 2014. Kimberly Voss, "Remembering the Real Pioneers of Lifestyle Journalism," *Ms Magazine* blog, 5 November 2014, <http://msmagazine.com/blog/>.

including a visit from artist Andy Warhol.³⁴ She retired from the newspaper in 1984.

In her 2013 obituary in the Miami Herald, she summed up life: “I believed Anita Hill. My favorite TV shows are ‘Sherlock Holmes,’ ‘Brooklyn Bridge,’ ‘Murder She Wrote,’ ‘The Civil War,’ and any other documentary by Ken Burns.” She continued: “I watch CNN and C-Span. I go to lunch every day with my next-door neighbor, a Juilliard grad and a terrific vocalist and pianist.”³⁵ Her life was largely devoted to music and journalism.

Conclusion

Even when it comes to newspapers’ own histories, women received little attention. The 2003 book *Orange Journalism* highlighted several significant Florida women but not women’s page journalists, other than a brief reference to Anne Rowe.³⁶ Like many stories of women in journalism history during this time period, it was usually the woman who reached a management position or became an investigative journalist that caused her to have historical significance. Rarely do women who wrote for women’s pages get historical acclaim. Yet, in post-World War II-era Florida, women’s page journalists were worthy of study. They were winning national awards and creating a new direction for content being copied across the country.

Women’s pages have long been looked at as the place for tradition to be reinforced. Their content has long been defined in journalism history as that which reinforced a woman’s role as wife and mother. As one reporter wrote, “it never occurred to me that anything meaningful could come out of the editorial department whose beat, after all, includes food, clothing and shelter. The women’s page was for frivolous, boring, puffy, irrelevant, 86-ways-to-make-tuna casserole news.”³⁷ This view has been reinforced by numerous historical studies describing the sections as simply the four Fs of family, fashion, food and furnishings – or what has been described as “fluff.” When looking at these sections through today’s more liberated eyes, it is easy to pass judgment. Yet, a closer examination shows change was being made in these sections. Amid the fashion photos and the recipes, questions about women’s roles in the post-World War II era were beginning to take shape. Women’s liberation was not solely the result of a specific book or organization. It was a complex web of events and people – much of which and whom have yet to be examined. O’Day’s career is a good addition to the scholarship of women’s pages in Florida.

³⁴ Billie O’Day, “Andy Warhol Visits Miami,” *Miami News*, 2 September 1980.

³⁵ “WIOD Host, Miami News writer Billie O’Day Dies,” *Miami Herald*, 15 May 2013.

³⁶ Julian M. Pleasants, *Orange Journalism: Voices from Florida Newspapers* (Gainesville, Florida: University Press of Florida, 2003).

³⁷ Lindsay Van Gelder, “Women’s Pages: You Can’t Make News Out of a Silk Purse,” *Ms Magazine*, 112.

Leon J. Canova and Pancho Villa's Columbus Raid of 1916

Heribert von Feilitzsch
Independent Scholar

On 9 March 1916, Pancho Villa crossed the border at Palomas, Chihuahua and attacked the town and garrison at Columbus, New Mexico, in what is, at least in the United States, the most famous skirmish of the Mexican Revolution. That attack has been laid at the feet of Leon J. Canova by historians. But they were wrong.

The American government decided to recognize Venustiano Carranza, head of the militarily prevalent faction in the Mexican Revolution, as president in October 1915. Because of this decision, Pancho Villa raided Columbus in March 1916, triggering a huge military intervention in Mexico. Researchers have misunderstood Leon Canova's role in this particular decision of the Wilson administration. While he did conspire with American businessmen and Mexican exiles to mount a military offensive in Mexico, he did not influence the American president in his decision to recognize Carranza. Notable historians have called Canova "corrupt" and the "Colonel Oliver North of the state department."¹ The role of Canova in the events leading up to Villa's raid of 1916 indeed was quite the opposite of what Friedrich Katz termed the "Canova Plot."² When President Wilson decided in favor of Carranza against the apparent guidance of his state department and the head of the Mexican desk, Canova had lost the ear of the president.

Historians have missed this important fact, because Leon J. Canova had been a rising star in the state department and played an important role in Mexican-American relations between 1912 and up to the infamous raid of 1916. He was born on 22 February 1866 in St. Augustine, Florida. Initially he pursued a career as a journalist in Florida, then moved to Havana, Cuba, in the 1890s with his wife, Virginia Ranson, also a native of Florida from Palatka. As editor-in-chief of the influential daily *La Lucha* from 1906 until 1911 the Canovas became respected members of Cuban society. Nominally independent, but often critical of the Cuban government, the paper flourished during his tenure and had the highest circulation of any Cuban daily.³ Canova also was one of the founding members and treasurer of the Chamber of Commerce. After 1911, he held several business-related posts with the Cuban government. In several articles, he promoted the close economic relationship between Cuba and the United States. When William Jennings Bryan dispatched his friend George Cupples Carothers as special envoy to Pancho Villa in 1913, Canova joined him. In his capacity, first as an aide to Carothers, then a special envoy of the Wilson administration in Mexico, he got to know Pancho

¹ Friedrich Katz, *The Life and Times of Pancho Villa* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1998), 506-507.

² *Ibid.*

³ *The Printers' Ink*, The Bates Advertising Company, Vol. L (New York: 15 February 1905), 44.

Villa, Venustiano Carranza, Alvaro Obregon, Emiliano Zapata, Felix Sommerfeld and other important players of the Mexican Revolution.

The story of Canova and Pancho Villa began in the fall of 1914. Colonel Eduardo Iturbide, a former police chief of Mexico City, and governor of the Federal District, had become part of a sensitive diplomatic situation that had developed in the Mexican capital. It greatly affected Pancho Villa's productive relationship with the United States and the Department of State in particular. After President Victoriano Huerta was forced into exile in July 1914, Iturbide kept order in the capital. For that the police chief enjoyed widespread admiration among the foreign colony. The American government especially appreciated Iturbide's courage to stay behind and wait for the forces of Alvaro Obregón to take control of the capital. American officials and the large colony of foreign businessmen shuddered at the thought of Emiliano Zapata's "wild hordes" ransacking the city and murdering foreigners for entertainment.⁴ Iturbide kept his commitment. However, the protection of the foreign colony in the capital was not sufficient to protect him. Without question, Iturbide featured prominently on Villa's and Zapata's blacklists.

Fearing for his life, he went underground, protected by the American diplomats, Consul John R. Silliman and Special Envoy Leon J. Canova. He hid in the residence of H. Cunard Cummins, the British charge d'affairs.⁵ Silliman and Canova convinced the Mexican President Eulalio Gutiérrez on 21 December, 1914, to issue a safe conduct pass for Iturbide.⁶ Both diplomats acted on orders of the state department. In the previous week, on 13 December, Secretary of State William Jennings Bryan had instructed Silliman: "do everything in your power to save Iturbide. He acted for Carvajal [sic] and turned the city over to the Constitutionals thus saving much loss of life as well as preventing disorder. It would be most unfortunate if he were dealt with harshly."⁷ Accordingly, Silliman created a passport for "a citizen of Mexico sojourning in the United States."⁸ With Villa and Zapata hot on Iturbide's heels, Silliman and Canova decided to smuggle him out.

Canova decided to hide Iturbide in his special railcar, in which he enjoyed diplomatic immunity. None other than Pancho Villa himself saw Canova, and even briefly chatted with him, at the train station in Mexico City on 22 December.⁹ After the train left, Villa's secret service reported to him that Iturbide had been observed with Canova and that he had disappeared. Villa put together what had occurred

⁴ "Zapata Hordes in Mexico City," *New York Times*, 25 November 1914. Throughout the revolution, the fear of Indian warriors from Morelos ransacking the capital was represented in numerous reports and caricatures in the foreign press of Mexico City.

⁵ Louis M. Teitelbaum, *Woodrow Wilson and the Mexican Revolution, 1913-1916* (New York: Exposition Press, 1967), 220. He refers to H.C. Cummins. H. Cunard Cummins had been the consul at Torreón and moved to the embassy in Mexico City in the summer of 1914.

⁶ "Says U.S. Consul Accepted Bribe," *El Paso Herald*, 26 December 1914.

⁷ As quoted in Teitelbaum, *Woodrow Wilson and the Mexican Revolution*, 220.

⁸ Teitelbaum, *Woodrow Wilson and the Mexican Revolution*, 221.

⁹ *Ibid.*, 223.

and, after throwing one of his well-known fits, issued a call for Iturbide's arrest. Cables went out to garrisons all along the rail line to stop Canova and search his compartment. The situation grew tense. Villa had ransacked a British consulate to get Luis Terrazas Jr. three years earlier. Certainly, he was capable of extracting Iturbide from Canova's railcar. In fact, he vowed to get Canova and Iturbide himself if his commanders would not dare to. Villa's secret service agents boarded the train in Aguascalientes. Canova refused to allow a search and managed to fend off the Villistas. A few hours later, the train stopped again, this time in Zacatecas. The next day at Torreón, Canova intimidated a whole company of troops and demanded to complain directly to Pancho Villa. Not knowing what to do the officer in command permitted the train to continue.¹⁰ In Chihuahua City, the Villistas evacuated the whole train, claiming a defective engine. A search party finally entered the compartment when Canova exited his railcar. Iturbide was gone! He had exited the train just south of Aguascalientes hours before the first attempt to search the compartment, and was making his way up to the American border on foot. Canova had so misled Iturbide's pursuers by refusing a search that they lost his trail. As the train with the American consul arrived in El Paso on Christmas day 1914, Iturbide relied on his skills and sheer luck to make it across the border to safety.¹¹ "I rode on that train . . . just one day for I realized that the secret service men were trailing me and that an order for my arrest would come at any minute. I wrote my will and gave it to Mr. Canova and slipped off the train just south of Aguascalientes. I walked around aimlessly for sixty miles and finally got a horse on a ranch. For fifteen days I rode, disguised as a rancher and made my way to the American border, eluding troops and police by traveling mostly at night and sleeping by day."¹²

Villa was furious. He declared Canova a persona-non-grata. Rather than ruining Canova's diplomatic career, Villa's refusal to let him come back to Mexico got the native Floridian a huge promotion: Secretary of State William Jennings Bryan decided to appoint the former journalist and special envoy to head the Mexican desk of the state department.

President Wilson was holding out for an eventual unity government in Mexico that could count on popular support and issued an ultimatum on 2 June, 1915 to the various Mexican factions to come to an agreement or the U.S. would intervene militarily.¹³ A flurry of action started within the state department as a result. William Jennings Bryan resigned as Secretary of State on 9 June over his frustration with Wilson's foreign policy towards Germany, which he believed would eventually drag the United States into World War I. Robert Lansing came in his place, who,

¹⁰ "Canova bars out Mexicans," *Boston Evening Transcript*, 28 December 1914.

¹¹ Silvestre Terrazas Papers, University of California at Berkeley, Bancroft Library, M-B-18, Part 1, Box 40, Silvestre Terrazas to Leon Canova, December 25, 1914.

¹² "Protest to Carranza," *Boston Evening Transcript*, 15 January 1915.

¹³ NA RG 65 FBI Case Files, M1085, Roll 856, File 232-101, President Wilson to all chiefs of factions in Mexico. Also, "Wilson will set limit for Mexico," *New York Times*, 4 June 1915.

as counselor of the state department, had advised the president on a stricter course towards Germany. However, Lansing also believed that the continuation of the Mexican Revolution posed a national security risk for the United States.¹⁴ His main adviser on Mexico now was Leon Canova.

Canova supported a group of American investors and Mexican exiles including Iturbide. This group saw the only chance for saving Mexico from endless chaos in a unity government, the goal President Wilson had set. It would have to include the main military factions in Mexico, Villa, Carranza, and Zapata, as well as the main exile factions representing the pre-revolutionary government, the Catholic Church, and the old federal army. One of the most vocal and active members of this group of New York businessmen was Andrew Meloy, an American railroad investor. He had managed to establish connections between Wall Street, several exiled Mexican factions, as well as the Carranza and Villa representatives in the United States. He negotiated with his longtime friend, lawyer, and Carranza lobbyist, Charles A. Douglas, and Villa's envoy in the United States, the German naval intelligence agent, Felix A. Sommerfeld. Douglas, in turn, was connected closely to the Counselor of the U.S. state department, Robert Lansing. Lansing had mingled in Mexican affairs as a legal adviser to the former President Victoriano Huerta before he joined the state department.¹⁵

Through Sommerfeld, Meloy also contacted the German government and traveled to Berlin, hoping to enlist financial support for his plan. The German government was interested not because it wanted to create peace in Mexico, but rather to perpetuate the trouble which caused the United States to focus resources on its southern border rather than Europe. Securing the border, the German government hoped, would redirect American war supplies from Germany's enemies to the U.S. military. The new Mexican insurgency would also consume American arms and munitions, driving the prices up for the Allies and reducing available capacities.

Meloy hoped that if his plan succeeded, a new insurgency that was well-financed (by Germany), with a powerful military presence, and was supported by the majority of the political factions in Mexico, would eventually receive the stamp of approval from the American government. If successful, American investments would be safe again. Initial talks between Meloy, Sommerfeld, and Douglas in the winter of 1914-1915 seemed to have given the American businessman the impression that a grand coalition of the different Mexican factions was indeed possible. By then, Villa and Carranza started to fight against each other in earnest, virtually guaranteeing a perpetuation of the civil war in Mexico for years to come. Meloy wrote, "when the Villa-Carranza split occurred . . . the finances of Villa were directed in New York by Mr. Felix Summerfield [sic] and Frederick [sic]

¹⁴ Katz, *The Life and Times of Pancho Villa*, 529; Robert Lansing, *War Memoirs of Robert Lansing, Secretary of State* (New York: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, 1935), 308.

¹⁵ "Lansing's Mexico Service," *New York Times*, 6 September 1915.

Stallforth [also a German intelligence agent]. These two men came to wield a very considerable influence over Villa and immediately in my plans for a reorganization of Mexico assumed a position of great importance.”¹⁶ Frederico Stallforth promised to “cultivate with Villa the possibility of an arrangement [to join a group of former officials in the Diaz regime].”¹⁷

Sommerfeld and Stallforth seemed to have kept Meloy in the belief that such an alliance between Mexican reactionary exiles and Villa would be possible. There certainly was a large incentive to keep this impression alive as long as possible: intelligence. It was crucial for both agents to remain in the know of what the exile community was planning. The same held true for the representative of Carranza in the United States, Charles Douglas. He, too, seems to have egged on the naiveté of Meloy. The American businessman told American officials in 1915, “I had conferences with him [Douglas] of exactly the same character as my conferences with Stallforth.”¹⁸

The situation in Mexico in the spring of 1915 and the personal disposition of both Carranza and Villa towards these exiles makes Meloy’s scheme seem unrealistic on the surface. Carranza, in particular, had no reason whatever to veer from his track of achieving total control of Mexico. His main commander, Alvaro Obregón, was continuously gaining ground against Villa. In April 1915, Villa had suffered his hitherto most devastating defeats in the two battles at Celaya. In another engagement in the first week of June, at the battle of León, Obregón lost his arm but won decisively against Villa’s Division of the North.

Meloy’s optimism appears less strange under scrutiny. Members of the state department backed, maybe even concocted, Meloy’s plan. Canova submitted a proposal to Secretary of State Bryan in May 1915, in which he claimed that Villa was ready to lay down his arms. A newly configured faction would be able to absorb his forces and pacify Mexico.¹⁹ Canova added that he would be able to enlist former federal officers (represented by Blanquet, Mondragón, and Angeles), rally the support of the Catholic Church (represented in the group through Felix Díaz and Eduardo Iturbide), receive financial support from the American oil and railroad industries (represented by Andrew Meloy, Charles Douglas, and Sherburne Hopkins), and mount this new opposition force quickly and efficiently. Mexico would be pacified by eliminating both Carranza and Villa.

The plan Canova submitted to Secretary Bryan and the plan Andrew Meloy pursued are almost identical. After his arrest in England in the summer of 1915 for traveling with the notorious German sabotage agent Franz Rintelen and carrying some of his files, Meloy described his ideas for pacifying Mexico to the American

¹⁶ NA RG 59 Department of State, file 341.112 M49/17 Walter Hines Page to Robert Lansing, 10 September 1915, Statement of Andrew D. Meloy.

¹⁷ Ibid.

¹⁸ Ibid.

¹⁹ Katz, *Life and Times of Pancho Villa*, 506-507.

Ambassador Walter Hines Page. Meloy's statement matched Canova's plan almost verbatim.²⁰ The American businessman claimed that through Sommerfeld and Stallforth, he had assurances that Villa would step aside, that he had broad support from different factions in Mexico, members of the old federal army, the Catholic Church, and important American financiers and industrialists. Even the information Meloy gave with respect to Carranza's refusal to be part of any unity government closely matched what Charles Douglas told the American president, as well as Lansing and Canova after meetings in Veracruz: Carranza would not yield nor participate in any unity government.²¹ Certain that he would win the revolutionary war on the battlefield, he vowed not to negotiate with any other faction.²² Further linking the Canova plan to Meloy, the arrested businessman perplexed the American ambassador in London by repeatedly referring to Douglas as "Mr. Charles A. Douglas of Washington, whom he describes as 'Counselor to the Department of State for Latin American affairs.'"²³ That title belonged to Leon Canova. The embarrassment for Canova to have been involved in a scheme in which German agents also participated, grew in the months to come. The head of the Bureau of Citizenship in the state department told Canova in September 1915, "it appears to me that Meloy is engaged in a scheme of considerable proportions to foment a new revolutionary movement in Mexico, with German aid."²⁴

Historians until now have not explored the links between Meloy, the state department, and Leon Canova. Secretary of State Robert Lansing certainly knew of Canova's activities, if he did not participate in meetings with the Mexican exile groups and their lawyers and lobbyists himself. As soon as the arrest of Andrew Meloy uncovered the fact that he had been linked to German agents, Leon Canova suddenly seemed absent from the front lines of policy making as evidenced in the lack of archival documents. This fact is particularly apparent because in August and September 1915 there was a flurry of activity regarding Mexico, such as several meetings of the Pan-American Conference and tough negotiations with Pancho Villa over confiscated American property.

As Canova took a back seat because of the embarrassing news of connections to German agents, American foreign policy towards Mexico changed significantly. Secretary of State Robert Lansing, at the insistence of President Wilson, removed Canova from negotiations with Mexican factions. Instead the president mobilized an old war horse and Wilson confidante, Army Chief of Staff Hugh Lenox Scott to head to El Paso and negotiate with Pancho Villa. He also dispatched his friend Paul Fuller to negotiate with Carranza.

²⁰ NA RG 59 Department of State, file 341.112 M49, Statement of Andrew D. Meloy, London, 23 August 1915.

²¹ *Ibid.*

²² "Says Germany Used Huerta Against us," *New York Times*, 4 August 1915.

²³ NA RG 59 Department of State, file 341.112 M49, Statement of Andrew D. Meloy, London, 23 August 1915.

²⁴ NA RG 59 Department of State, file 341.112 M49/17, Counselor Warren to Leon Canova, 15 September 1915.

With the help of Felix Sommerfeld, General Scott had successfully settled serious border disturbances with Villa throughout the Mexican Revolution, most recently the standoff at Naco in the winter of 1914. At issue now were Villa's desperate moves to raise funds for his dwindling army. Villa resorted to expropriating foreign, mostly American assets, and blackmailing the international business community in Chihuahua as Carranza's forces closed in on the *División del Norte*. Dangling the prospect of recognition of a Mexican government under his auspices, Secretary Lansing dispatched Villa's "friend" to the border to negotiate for the release of millions of dollars worth of American assets. Though Villa had been wary of the U.S. state department and especially Canova, he agreed to meet with the Army Chief of Staff in El Paso in the middle of August 1915. Sommerfeld acted as Villa's negotiator.

General Scott complained in his memoirs about the state department, which during the entire month of July 1915 "would not say either yes or no" to his request to see the two Carrancista generals behind the First Chief's back.²⁵ Scott complained, "I almost had a nervous prostration, feeling like a dog tied up in the back yard, longing for my collar to be taken off."²⁶ Lansing and Canova clearly boycotted the President's efforts. In the meantime, Villa's military situation went from bad to worse. Closely following the power shift in Mexico and most likely objecting to his own state department activities, President Wilson reined in his new Secretary of State. He instructed Lansing on 11 August not to insist on the elimination of Carranza in the next meeting of the Pan-American Conference.²⁷

This fundamental shift in American policy towards Mexico happened in isolation, without any public pronouncements or consultations with anyone within or outside the U.S. government. Secretary Lansing still clearly supported a solution without Carranza in the beginning of July.²⁸ He informed President Wilson as late as 6 August, "in the discussions [in the Pan-American Conference] I found that there was unanimous agreement that Carranza was impossible."²⁹ The people involved in finding a solution for Mexico, state department officials, special envoys, Mexican exiles, and the ranking members of the Pan-American Conference meeting in New York in the beginning of August, had no reason to doubt that a unity government for Mexico was the ultimate goal. The *New York Times* reported on 2 August under the headline "Wilson Peace Plan Ready for Mexico," that the American president would "recognize some member of the Madero cabinet approved by factions."³⁰

President Wilson's thoughts in this crucial time are not well documented. He retreated to Cornish, New Hampshire from the end of July until the beginning of

²⁵ Katz, *Life and Times of Pancho Villa*, 505.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, 506.

²⁷ NA RG 59 Department of State, file 812.00/15753 ½, Wilson to Lansing, 11 August 1915.

²⁸ NA RG 59 Department of State, file 812.00/15410 ½ a, Lansing to Wilson, 5 July 1915.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, 6 August 1915.

³⁰ "Wilson Peace Plan Ready for Mexico," *New York Times*, 2 August 1915.

the Pan-American Conference on 4 August, ostensibly to contemplate a solution for the Mexican problem. It appeared to most observers that he sincerely tried to look at all options. He conferred periodically with Robert Lansing; however, he did not disclose his thought process to him. The President clearly arrived at a different conclusion while at Cornish, all the while keeping Robert Lansing and his various envoys in the belief that a unity government for Mexico remained the stated foreign policy goal. The president had arrived at the conclusion that a unity government excluding the man who led the strongest faction in the Revolution and who had gained the upper hand against Villa was doomed to fail.³¹ By the beginning of the Pan-American Conference on 4 August, Wilson had made up his mind to recognize the victorious Carranza as the next president of Mexico. Despite his change of heart, Wilson continued to allow the Pan-American Conference to proceed under the false assumption of finding a unity solution. He also made no effort to stop a multitude of interest groups lobbying his administration. In the end, all of them felt deceived, most notably Pancho Villa and the people who had supported him.

General Scott, as well as most Mexicans who had supported the unity government idea, could not understand how the Wilson administration could have reversed its policies from 2 June, when President Wilson appealed to all factions to come to the table or else – to October, when Carranza became the de facto president of Mexico. The general wrote in his memoirs that President Wilson “did not reveal his intentions then [when General Scott met him in the end of August] but he recognized Carranza in a few months, . . . I never knew why. I asked the officers of the state department, junior to the secretary [likely Leon Canova], why such a thing had been done and they said they did not know. . . . That information has always made the President’s step even more of a mystery to me.”³² President Wilson never explained his motivations, even to his closest associates.³³ Like most mysteries, this one created a host of speculative conspiracy theories but that also would have grave consequences for the United States. What did the Carranza faction concede to the American government to sway the President’s opinion?

The fertile ground of the unknown provided a golden opportunity for Felix Sommerfeld to churn the rumor mill with “opinions” that implicated Canova and the state department in a secret plot to take control of Mexican sovereignty. After all, there were clear indications that such a secret agreement with Carranza and the Wilson administration existed. Sommerfeld had been a negotiator on Villa’s behalf in August with General Scott and Leon Canova, who as a state department

³¹ See a discussion of Wilson’s thought process in Arthur S. Link, *Wilson: The Struggle for Neutrality, 1914-1915* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1960), 491.

³² Hugh Lenox Scott, *Some Memories of a Soldier* (New York: The Century Company, 1928), 517.

³³ Clarence Clendenen, *The United States and Pancho Villa: A study in Unconventional Diplomacy* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1961), 203-205. It seems unlikely that, as Clendenen claimed, Wilson simply wanted to preserve the liberalism of the revolution and was influenced, in part, by the AFL endorsement of Carranza while becoming convinced by the anti-Villa propaganda portraying him as a tool of big business.

representative directed Scott in his meetings with Villa. Sommerfeld also had other important connections in the Wilson administration. Sommerfeld sent one of over a dozen letters and telegrams, preserved in Secretary of War Lindley M. Garrison's papers, on 7 September 1915. He included a clipping from the *New York Evening Post* concerning the "attitude of the A.B.C. powers [Argentina, Brazil, Chile, the leading members of the Pan-American Conference] in case of a possible intervention in Mexico, which I sincerely hope, will not occur."³⁴ Apart from the fact that Sommerfeld apparently maintained an open and direct channel of communication with the Secretary, he also alluded to previous discussions on the Pan-American Conference. "It [the article in the *New York Evening Post*] verifies my statement to you."³⁵ Sommerfeld, more than any other member of the Villa faction in the United States, had been privy to the wrangling within the administration and the sudden, unexplained shift of policy towards Carranza. Villa, who used Sommerfeld's direct access to the secretary of war, as well as to Secretary of State Bryan on multiple occasions, thus knew of the German agent's connections to the Wilson cabinet.³⁶

In a speech in Chihuahua in the fall of 1915, Pancho Villa declared war on the United States and accused Carranza of having concluded an eight-point secret agreement that dismantled the sovereignty of Mexico. There was much more evidence than historian Katz and others cited bolstering the judgment that most of these eight points were indeed part of a secret understanding, even if it was never formally put to paper. Pancho Villa did have ample reason to believe that this agreement existed. John R. Silliman, the U.S. consul in Saltillo, approached the revolutionary chieftain in December of 1914, and offered recognition of his government for "the use of lower [sic] California [by the American navy], Magdalena Bay [as a naval station], and the Tampico oil fields."³⁷ Villa declined. The American lawyer James M. Keedy approached Villa with a message from Leon Canova, the head of the Mexican desk in the state department in September 1915, after Villa had conceded to General Scott whatever the state department required to recognize his faction. Canova demanded the power to name Villa's cabinet in case of recognition.³⁸ As it turned out, Keedy was a German secret service agent, whom Sommerfeld likely had dispatched. Sommerfeld, whose mission was to create an American military intervention, thus maintained his distance from the plans of

³⁴ NA RG 165 Military Intelligence Division, File 5761-1091, Sommerfeld to Garrison, 7 September 1915.

³⁵ *Ibid.*

³⁶ *Ibid.*, see for example Sommerfeld to Garrison, 3 September 1914, 26 August 1914, 27 September 1914. Also Garrison to Bryan, undated note (5 March 1915).

³⁷ Katz, *Life and Times of Pancho Villa*, 505.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, 508.

a conspiratorial faction within the state department, while remaining intricately involved.³⁹

General Scott's papers are incomplete insofar as to the total list of demands as a prerequisite to the recognition he presented to Villa in August. It could well have contained items such as the use of Magdalena Bay and American control over the Mexican railways. Undoubtedly, there were more attempts to wrest territorial and financial concessions from Villa as he grew more desperate in the fall of 1915. Villa cited such attempts to his confidantes, for example to the Chihuahuan secretary of the treasury, Silvestre Terrazas.⁴⁰ However, Villa had clearly rejected any such proposals. Given the knowledge of the state department's desires for territorial and financial concessions one cannot blame Villa and his supporters, including General Scott, for wondering what Carranza had offered that got him such prompt recognition. Roque Gonzales Garza, one of Villa's closest advisers and negotiator in Washington and New York, wrote to his Mexican chief on 29 October, "you have always been miserably deceived. . . . I do not entirely know what has been decided concretely, but I am convinced that something very dark has been agreed on; for I have no other explanation for the sudden change in U.S. policy against our group and in favor of Carranza."⁴¹

The *New York Times* reported that the new board of directors of the National Railways of Mexico had been elected on the day after Gonzales Garza wrote to Villa that there must have been foul play.⁴² Wrangling over control of the railroads had driven American support away from Porfirio Díaz to Francisco Madero, and now to Venustiano Carranza. It was stacked with favorites of Charles Flint and Henry Clay Pierce. Alberto Pani remained the head of the board. He had been installed through Sherburne Hopkins for Henry Clay Pierce in 1914.⁴³ Carranza clearly was cooperating in this for the U.S. critical industry and this was one of the important points of Villa's charges. Carranza released some political prisoners and immediately started to return confiscated properties.⁴⁴ He allowed that American financiers stacked the National Railways' board in their favor. The First Chief also immediately began eliminating all fiat money and issued a new currency in the

³⁹ Friedrich Katz, "Pancho Villa and the Attack on Columbus, New Mexico," *The American Historical Review* 83, no. 1 (Feb., 1978): 127. Katz identified Keedy as a German agent but related him to Kurt Jahnke. The German Naval Intelligence was still headed by Karl Boy-Ed in the fall of 1915 (until his expulsion in December). Sommerfeld headed the Mexican missions for Boy-Ed and maintained control of the intervention mission into 1916.

⁴⁰ As quoted in Katz, "Pancho Villa and the Attack on Columbus, New Mexico," 114.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 530.

⁴² "New Railways Boards," *New York Times*, 31 October 1915; "Directors are Elected for National Railways," *El Paso Herald*, 3 November 1915.

⁴³ See von Feilitzsch, *In Plain Sight*, 367.

⁴⁴ Katz, "Pancho Villa and the Attack on Columbus, New Mexico," 117. Katz cautioned that Carranza would have released confiscated properties in any case. This is highly doubtful given the development of the new constitution for Mexico at the same time that set foreign property confiscation into law. In any case, the fact that Carranza moved on this issue exactly at the time Villa alleged the agreement to have been consummated is enough evidence to suppose a link.

spring of 1916.⁴⁵ Fascinatingly, although maybe just a fluke, the *El Paso Herald* printed right below the article reporting on the new board of directors for the Mexican railways that Carranza had not signed any secret agreement: “Denies That U.S. Imposed Any Condition on Carranza.”⁴⁶ He might not have signed anything concrete. However, his actions subsequent to U.S. recognition in October tell a story much in line with Villa’s accusations. Whether formally committed to paper or through informal channels, Villa had ample reasons to believe that Carranza had offered concessions to the United States that put Mexican sovereignty into question, especially if advisers close to him including Felix Sommerfeld told him so.

The avalanche of reports in the American press of Villa’s rage against the United States and President Wilson, in particular, precipitated the last known letter from Felix Sommerfeld to Secretary of War Lindley M. Garrison in defense of Pancho Villa. Sommerfeld wrote on 12 November 1915, “I am enclosing a clipping from today’s N.Y. American with an alleged interview of one of the Hearst reporters [John W. Roberts] with General Villa. . . . I do wish to protest most emphatically against these intentionally and willfully false statements created in the mind of an irresponsible reporter who might have received instructions from headquarters to write such stuff in order to conform with [sic] the political tendency of the paper.”⁴⁷ Roberts had written under the heading “Whiskers Tie Mexico’s Fate, Writes Villa.” “Tell Mr. Wilson that he is not a democrat. Tell him I say he prefers whiskers [i.e. Venustiano Carranza] to valor, egotism to personal honor, shamelessness to the welfare of the Mexican people.”⁴⁸

Villa’s fall from preeminence in Mexico in the spring of 1915 to utter destruction nine months later was nothing short of astounding. Historian Katz termed it “defeat snatched from the jaws of victory.”⁴⁹ Military defeat translated to lack of recruitment and money in the Mexican Revolution. Sommerfeld’s attempt to bridge Villa’s financial woes in the summer of 1915 failed to make much difference. The extraction of serious financial concessions from Villa in August, to which Sommerfeld was part and parcel, ended the Mexican revolutionary’s chance to fill his munitions accounts with loot. President Wilson and, once on board, Secretary Lansing, finished him off. Villa’s bitterness towards the United States, therefore, cannot be surprising.

General Scott wrote in his memoirs, “after Villa had given up millions of dollars at the request of the state department [in August 1915], expressed through me, they made him an outlaw. He was a wild man who could not be expected to know the difference between the duties of the State and War Departments, and might very

⁴⁵ “Currency Reform on Trial in Mexico,” *New York Times*, 30 July 1916.

⁴⁶ “Denies that U.S. Imposed Any Condition on Carranza,” *El Paso Herald*, 3 November 1915.

⁴⁷ NA RG 165 Military Intelligence Division, File 5761-1091/14, Sommerfeld to Garrison, 12 November 1915.

⁴⁸ “Whiskers Tie Mexico’s Fate, Writes Villa,” *New York American*, 12 November 1915.

⁴⁹ Katz, *Life and Times of Pancho Villa*, 487.

well have thought that I double-crossed him, had he not had the confidence in me that he did. No white man, no negro, no Indian, no Moro nor any person, however humble, ever had as much right as Villa to believe I had turned against him, yet he telegraphed a mutual friend in New York [Felix A. Sommerfeld] that General Scott was the only honest man north of Mexico – he had once included the President but now he dropped him altogether.”⁵⁰

While the old Indian fighter remained an apologist for Villa until his death, the Wilson administration had cast its lot against the revolutionary chieftain in favor of Venustiano Carranza. The choice would prove to play into the hands of German agents in the United States and Mexico. Secretary Lansing’s decision not to intervene militarily in Mexico under any circumstances, even as Villista soldiers fired at U.S. army units, temporarily blunted German efforts to create an intervention. Neither fiery speeches in meeting halls along the border, nor supplying Villa’s disintegrating army with millions of rounds of ammunition, had the desired outcome. It was the unexplained reversal of U.S. foreign policy towards Mexico that created the volatility for a major upheaval along the vulnerable Mexican-American border.

Carranza turned out to be a bad choice for the United States. He played German and U.S. interests against each other for his own favor during the remainder of the war, while preparing a constitution that squarely aimed at U.S. financial interests in Mexico. Simultaneously, a marginalized Villa, blinded by the perceived injustice of his downfall, would produce the intervention that Germany so much desired. He attacked the little New Mexican hamlet of Columbus in March 1916, prompting an immediate military response from the United States. Within six months the United States was virtually at war with Mexico. Most of the U.S. army was on the Mexican-American border or in Mexican territory. Wilson’s choice of Carranza, in combination with the ruthless elimination of Villa, became a boon for German strategists.

Canova remained in the state department until 1918. While historian Friedrich Katz and others suspected his manipulations to have been behind the unexplained reversal of American foreign policy in October 1915, Canova himself never officially described the extent of his activities. The American entry into World War I in 1917 and President Carranza’s declaration of loyalty to the United States obscured the many open questions that remained. Historians, including Friedrich Katz, missed the link of Lansing and Canova with Andrew Meloy and the German government. More importantly, Canova believed that his activities to achieve a unity government in Mexico closely followed the stated American foreign policy goal. The plan he officially submitted to Secretary Bryan in May 1915 speaks to that argument. Far from being an “Oliver North in the state department,” he

⁵⁰ Scott, *Some Memories of a Soldier*, 517.

unknowingly came into the realm of German secret service activities and was put on ice as a result.

Canova lost, if he ever had, the ear of President Wilson, who also reined in his new Secretary of State and decided against his state department to reverse his policies towards Mexico in the fall of 1915. Thus, the “Canova plot,” Katz described and others cite, that supposedly caused Pancho Villa’s raid on Columbus, New Mexico in March 1916, did not exist. President Wilson’s secretive decision-making process, and the lack of clarification of the reasons behind his foreign policy reversal opened the floodgates to conspiracy theories. Felix Sommerfeld, the real plotter behind Villa’s attack, thus received ample arguments to convince Villa of an American conspiracy against Mexico and pushed him to attack the hamlet of Columbus. Canova remained head of the Mexican desk until 1918, when he resigned for reasons of “ill health.”⁵¹ He died on 12 October 1947 of a heart attack in Flagler Beach, Florida.

⁵¹ *Washington Post*, 17 December 1918.

Ancient Women in Film: On-Screen Deaths as Feminist Martyrdom

Andrea Schwab
Florida Atlantic University

I have never wanted to be a queen! Cleopatra was a role, and I am an actor, so it was fun to play one, but it's not real. The real Cleopatra had an incredibly complicated life, and she had to be very, very canny to survive as long as she did. For me, the most interesting thing about her was her passion. The things that are important to me – being a mother, a businesswoman, an activist – are all things that were borne out of great passion.

Kim Kardashian, *Harper's Bazaar*, 9 February 2011

Kim Kardashian, an American socialite and fashion icon, interviewed actress Elizabeth Taylor nearly 50 years after her pinnacle role as Cleopatra in Mankiewicz's 1963 reproduction, *Cleopatra*. Kardashian, a globally recognized name for fashion and trendsetting, publicly proclaimed Taylor's influence on her business and aesthetic, practically relaunching Taylor's career back under the lens of twenty-first century America, a move that needed little assistance once the classic blue-eyed Cleopatra reappeared for the re-release of the film for its anniversary in 2013. Taylor's depiction of the infamous Egyptian queen persists in the American cultural conscious with such pervasiveness that it is near impossible to separate the two, either on a public or a scholarly level. David Lodge explores the consequences of using a permanent modern lens through which we view historical figures, lamenting that "we can't avoid reading Shakespeare through the lens of T. S. Eliot's poetry. I mean, who can read Hamlet today without thinking of 'Prufrock'?"¹ While modern perspectives often shed light on historical (and in Lodge's case, narrative) sources, they also become so intertwined that anachronistic values cloud the true historical significance.

The advent of moving pictures and recording technology would only perpetuate and spread modern cultural interpretations at a rapid rate. During the last century, historians have studied the role cinematic reproductions have had on the understanding of the past. For the filmmaker, the historical film genre is one rife with engaging narrative and dynamic characters, but one that presents its own set of challenges: The time that separates modern audiences from historic events forces filmmakers to establish identifiable elements, resulting in largely anachronistic adaptations that are more reflective of twentieth century values. The classical world has proven to be no exception, and as a popular film subject since

¹ David Lodge, *Small World: An Academic Romance* (New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., 1984): 52. Charles Edelman also applies this theory to his examination of Shakespeare. See Charles Edelman, "Shakespeare and the Invention of the Epic Theater: Working with Brecht," in *Shakespeare Survey: Volume 58, Writing about Shakespeare*, ed. Peter Holland (London: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 130-136.

the widespread use of media technology in the late 1800s, it has demonstrated the success in its blending of two distinct periods.

Film scholars debate the impact such anachronistic elements would have on the public perception of history, and the potential problems that come with condensing extensive textual sources into a relatively short window. Scholars such as Pierre Sorlin, Robert Rosenstone, Natalie Zemon Davis, and Philip Rosen all address historical cinema as an expressive avenue to be taken as a credible academic source. There is an apparent split in the historiography, however, over whether or not historical films distort contemporary accounts. Sorlin contended, “even if [historical films] are based on records, they have to reconstruct in a purely imaginary way the greater part of what they show,”² resulting in at least some baseline for creative reinterpretation of history. Zemon Davis argues in a similar fashion, contending most films seek periodization through costuming and props, capitalizing on what is deemed the ‘cultural capital’ of a specific time and place; all of these factors contribute to the authenticity of film, its goal to convince the audience that the events presented are true to the accounts. This goal becomes less clear-cut the more directors insert their own vision into history, suggesting multiple possibilities for telling the same story, a phenomenon shared with historical documents.³

Modern depictions of the classical world often exploit gaps in the textual accounts, taking advantage of the lack of knowledge to supplant their own interpretations. This occurrence is perhaps most apparent in depictions of ancient Roman women, who are largely absent from historical accounts but wildly influential in cinematic reproductions. Throughout the twentieth century, ancient Roman women have been fashioned (both physically and ideologically) from modern aesthetics, resulting in characters who are representative of their contemporary releases rather than their historical origins. Cleopatra VII, Livia Augusta, and Servilia Caepionis, specifically, become agents of modern feminism in their characterizations; famous actresses depicted each of these figures (Elizabeth Taylor, Siân Phillips, and Lindsay Duncan, respectively), further propelling their characterizations as representative of contemporary thought. These characterizations, while anachronistic and improbable, reveal how American audiences perceived ancient Roman women, and how twentieth century rhetoric distorts the actual influence these women had in history.

One of the more revealing facets of these depictions was the on-screen death of each figure: While all three women left behind similar historical legacies (namely as agitators of Roman virtue), cinematically, their deaths were more reflective of the modern notion of feminism and patriarchal oppression. As I will demonstrate,

² Pierre Sorlin, *The Film in History: Restaging the Past* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 1980), 19.

³ Natalie Zemon Davis, “‘Any Resemblance to Persons Living or Dead’: Film and the Challenge of Authenticity,” *Yale Review* 76, no. 4 (1987): 461.

each character (Cleopatra, Livia, and Servilia) not only embodies a different development within modern feminist rhetoric, but also is a dynamic metaphor for martyrdom.

The Historical Cleopatra

In order to fully understand the modern discrepancies with characterization, it is pertinent to examine how these women were understood within their own time. Unlike her counterparts, Cleopatra VII has a more consistent presence throughout contemporary records, making her a popular subject for entertainment through the centuries, because of not only the unusually large amount of information available (in comparison with other female contemporaries), but also because of key gaps within her account. Relatively, her upbringing as Egyptian royalty is unknown, her personality away from diplomacy even more unknown, leaving later cinematographers ample room to create a Cleopatra fitting to their narrative.⁴ Cleopatra's involvement in Roman politics as a foreign woman made her an unorthodox topic of discussion for several Augustan authors, such as Plutarch and Tacitus. While her upbringing is unclear due to the lack of Egyptian textual sources, by the time Cleopatra appears on the Roman record in 50 BC, she is already described as "a clear-headed, resourceful, and above all, ambitious young queen."⁵

Political tensions between Rome and Egypt reached an apex after the Battle of Actium in 31 BC, in which Octavian's clear victory resulted in the deaths of both Cleopatra and her lover, Marc Antony.⁶ Their deaths would change the course of Roman political organization, and would remain in the public mind for centuries after. Shakespeare would readapt the infamous affair in his play, *Antony and Cleopatra*, just one of many renditions that reflects a more modern understanding of historical events. Cleopatra's notoriety made her a figurehead of sexual charm and decadence; symbolically, Cleopatra was anti-patriarchal in her unorthodox nature, an ideal agent for the early feminist movements in twentieth-century America. As Lodge suggested, there is one depiction of Cleopatra that stands out as the epitome of cultural blending on film: Mankiewicz's 1963 epic film, *Cleopatra*. This version reveals more about 1950s American ideology and fashion than it did about ancient Rome. Taylor's public life would only add to Cleopatra's historical identity as a sexually voracious figure, immortalizing the modern woman as separable with that of Cleopatra's.

⁴ Roman sources, largely xenophobic and political commentators, dictated the historical image of Cleopatra as a corrupt and manipulative figure. That is, there are scant Egyptian sources that detail key information regarding Cleopatra's life, leaving biased accounts as a foundation of evidence for later scholars and dramatists.

⁵ Stanley M. Burstein, *The Reign of Cleopatra* (Westport.: Greenwood Press, 2004), 11.

⁶ There are several varying contemporary accounts over this matter. Roman poets Horace and Propertius, writing within ten years of the event, claim a poisonous asp killed Cleopatra. Later sources and modern scholars, however, challenge this notion as implausible and overdramatized. See Horace, *Odes*, 1.37; Propertius, *Elegies*, III 11.

Cleopatra as a Modern Woman

As Lodge contended, critics of Mankiewicz's epic were unable to separate historical content from modern embellishments, some even claiming, "it is impossible to separate ... the film from the individual lives which have been caught up in the bringing to the screen."⁷ It was clear the iconic 1950s aesthetic dominated much of Mankiewicz's attempts to appear historically authentic, and although he may have succeeded in terms of narration, the film's trendiness (both visually and socially) made it a modern spectacle.⁸ *Cleopatra's* substance perhaps left contemporary audiences desiring more, but most American moviegoers were not seeking films with historical accuracy. Just like its predecessors, *Cleopatra* represented the cultural identity at the time of its production; audiences flocked to see the film not to learn about Cleopatra, but to see what \$30 million and the image of the 1950s would produce. As the *New York Times* noted upon its release in 1963:

Elizabeth Taylor's Cleopatra is a woman of force and dignity, fired by a fierce ambition to conquer and rule the world ... but she is not an ancient queen, mind you, in the quality of her thought – nor, indeed, in the modified style of her exceedingly lower gowns, Mr. Mankiewicz has wisely not attempted to present us with historical copies.⁹

Mankiewicz's *Cleopatra* was clearly not a "historical copy" of the mysterious queen, but was rather a vehicle for Fox's extravagant image of the ancient Far East in which outspoken, politically driven women ruled.

On an even larger scale, *Cleopatra* (both the film and the figure) is a macrocosm for a burgeoning liberal movement and the conservative backlash it would face; women's changing role in film spoke to their growing independence achieved after suffrage. In 1966, the Motion Picture Association of America (MPAA) would enforce more strict censorship for future films, making *Cleopatra* one of the last films to remain true to contemporary popular culture until the MPAA lessened its grasp in 1966. Although *Cleopatra* is mild in comparison with other contemporary taboo films, the prospect that viewers would experience the tumultuous affair firsthand both excited and worried the MPAA. While Theda Bara and Claudette Colbert's depictions were largely popular at the time of their release, it was Taylor's version that would resonate most with American movie audiences as the over-the-top aesthetic and public scandal were not seen in prior depictions.

⁷ "Cleopatra," *Los Angeles Sentinel*, 28 November 1963, <http://ezproxy.fau.edu/login?url=http://search.proquest.com/docview/564645229?accountid=10902>

⁸ It should be noted that some reviews skip over Taylor and Burton entirely, a concerted effort to shine light on a film despite its scandalous reputation. *Variety* named Mankiewicz as the genius behind the film for his ability to finish a seemingly doomed project. See "Review: 'Cleopatra,'" *Variety*, 31 December 1962, <http://variety.com/1962/film/reviews/cleopatra-2-1200420431/>.

⁹ Howard Thompson, "Unveiling 'Cleopatra': Director-Scenarist Outlines Concept, Growth, Trials of a Screen Epic High Hurdles," *New York Times*, June 1963, <http://search.proquest.com.ezproxy.fau.edu/docview/116364825?pq-origsite=summon&accountid=10902>.

Taylor's embodiment of female independence made her a figurehead for first wave feminist ideology, which sought fundamental political and societal equality. Her death, therefore, was the ultimate expression of resistance to an oppressive Roman patriarchy, drawing modern parallels to the struggles of the postwar American woman.

Noble Suicide and Patriarchal Resistance

There is historical consensus that Cleopatra committed suicide before then-Octavian could overtake Egypt. Cleopatra's suicide placed Octavian in a precarious position. Diplomatically, her death would prevent Octavian from having a Roman triumph, a somewhat necessary event that would have propelled Octavian into a new state of popularity while cementing xenophobic beliefs regarding Egypt.¹⁰ Her death also placed onus on Octavian to take care of both Caesar and Antony's heirs, as killing children would have seemed excessively cruel to Roman citizens. In Mankiewicz's rendition, Taylor's Cleopatra handles her own mortality with grace, consoling her sobbing servants as she dips her wrist into a snake-filled basket; her calm demeanor reveals a sense of acceptance, not in feeling forced to commit suicide (in fact, it was an occurrence Octavian wanted to prevent), but rather an acceptance of her demise as a woman in what was ultimately a patriarchal world.

In this instance, Mankiewicz uses Taylor's poise to sell the audience on Cleopatra's feminism, one that would resist patriarchal norms in the most extreme way. Her final words in the film typify Mankiewicz's efforts: "how strangely awake I feel...it's as if I've been living a dream, someone else's dream. Now finished at last. But now will begin a dream of my own, which will never end."¹¹ Her dream, to rule unquestioned beside Marc Antony, was one that could not have been realized in Rome. Thus, her suicide was the ultimate feminist expression: By forcibly removing her corporal significance to Octavian and slighting him in an irrevocable way, Cleopatra seizes permanent control over her legacy. Mankiewicz's depiction, while temporally removed from first wave feminism, suggests a foreshadowing of new ideologies that would expand on the idea of legal equality to one of social and sexual equality.

Mankiewicz's Cleopatra proved itself as both unique and representative to the burgeoning post-World War II identity of the American woman. Aesthetically, Taylor embodied the ultimate luxury. Her porcelain skin and dark hair made her an ideal candidate to portray the infamous Cleopatra, at least within a 1950s American context; her notoriety outside film sets would also serve as free publicity for Fox Studios. It would not be until the color television became more accessible in the early 1970s that American filmmakers would more adamantly return to

¹⁰ The triumph, an excessive public display of conquered peoples and loot, would have cemented Octavians' capability as a leader.

¹¹ *Cleopatra*, directed by Joseph L. Mankiewicz (Twentieth Century Fox, 1963).

classical themes. In 1970, Hartford N. Gunn Jr. founded the Public Broadcasting Service (PBS), granting North America regular access to the plethora of European productions; the extravagant style largely appealed to American audiences, renewing the demand for more historical epics. Historical mini-series became the media of choice, offering a less expensive, and often more accurate, option for budding independent production companies. Mini-series also allowed for longer run times, giving more opportunity for both character and plot development. Despite these potential advantages for antiquity-based cinema, American producers centered their attention on early Christianity rather than Augustan Rome.¹²

PBS began its *Masterpiece Theater* series in 1971, a programming endeavor that would expose Americans to popular British television classics. One of these popular mini-series entitled *I, Claudius*, would play an integral role in reimagining what it meant to be a powerful woman in ancient Rome, and in modern America. Emperor Augustus' wife in the series, Livia Augusta, is key to understanding American's changing cinematic perspective on antiquity. While she is not as popular a historical figure as Cleopatra, her unorthodox presence in Roman politics builds upon how ancient Romans are treated both by their contemporaries and by twentieth-century cinematographers.

Livia Augusta: The Damnable Empress of Rome

As a modern figure, Livia represented the inclusive rhetoric of second wave feminism, her age and influence unique to previous depictions. Welsh actress Siân Phillips portrayed the infamous empress, taking advantage of both her presence and her life experiences as a 1950s woman to its fullest potential; the final product encompassed not only a powerful woman in antiquity, but also a powerful woman in 1970s western culture. Livia Augusta's contemporary representation, however, is one of treachery and manipulation, casting a shadow over her capability as a ruler and Roman matron. Historically, she is the wife to Augustus Caesar, one of the most powerful rulers in Roman history. Livia obtained access to unmatched power and influence through their marriage, all during a critical transition in Roman political history. Her closeness to such power made her a subject of scandal and speculation, especially during the Augustan succession crisis and its ensuing social changes.

Scholars, both contemporary and modern, agree that Livia is a model matron during a time of sexual deviancy, an atmosphere that many contemporaries blame on corrupt morals and an overwhelming amount of wealth entering Rome as war spoils. Livia "embraced and embodied age-old concepts of ideal Roman womanhood, [making] her public persona a deliberate sop to nostalgia for a

¹² Jon Solomon provides a thorough account of both American and international biblical films since *Cleopatra's* release: "In the Wake of *Cleopatra*": The Ancient World in the Cinema since 1963," *The Classical Journal* 91, no. 2 (1995): 121-3.

mythical, more virtuous past.”¹³ Despite the praise Livia receives as a model woman, the Latin authors also condemn her for her speculated involvement in Augustus’s affairs. Livia, having entered her marriage to Augustus with two sons (Tiberius and Drusus), had a strong claim to imperial power, especially since Augustus had no sons of his own. Thus, authors such as Tacitus, Dio, and Suetonius speculate that the string of deaths within the imperial family were Livia’s doing. According to Tacitus, her early political maneuverings would come to fruition when Augustus departed for his final campaign in AD 14. Augustus became plagued by diarrhea and fevers, and as soon as their company split from that of Tiberius’s his condition became worse, prompting Tacitus to blame it on the only constant: Livia’s presence. Both Tacitus and Dio speculated that Livia smeared poison on figs that Augustus personally picked for himself, both however were careful in placing their accusations. There was no definitive proof of Livia’s involvement, and even less so of Tiberius’s, but what could be deduced was the uncertainty of the events surrounding the dying emperor.¹⁴

Livia’s public persona greatly differed from her private life, in which she purportedly used underhanded and fatal tactics to manipulate the imperial lineage in favor of her own family. Popular figures such as Marcellus, Drusus, Julia the Elder, Germanicus, Piso, and even Augustus himself may have fallen victim, but Livia’s legacy is undeniable, and her influence over imperial politics shaped a large part of Roman history. The late empress even molded the way in which women would situate themselves in future Roman politics, her life becoming an example in practically all aspects.

Augustan Women in British Cinema

Both Robert Graves and the producers of *I, Claudius* note their usage of historical documents to reconstruct what life could have been like in the Julio-Claudian household, particularly regarding the emperors. Early in the show, there is careful purpose in highlighting Augustus’s goals for a perfect Roman family – his constant desire to increase the Roman population through early marriages and several children are a core part of his social laws, and one that would fuel his actions during his reign. For example, his daughter Julia and Livia’s son Tiberius maintain a tumultuous marriage, to which Augustus advises Tiberius, “we can’t go cutting the knot every time we get into a quarrel!”¹⁵ even acknowledging that they were imperfectly matched. While the general storyline follows in accordance to the original sources, creative licensing most notably takes precedence in the shows’ dialogue, creating a large space for the series to

¹³ Freisenbruch, *Caesar’s Wives*, 31.

¹⁴ At the time of his death, Augustus had not officially announced his successor. The few options left, however, made it probable that the aging Tiberius would take over.

¹⁵ *I, Claudius*, season 1, episode 1, “A Touch of Murder,” directed by Jack Pullman, aired September 20, 1976.

reinterpret not what happened, but how. Their main tool to manipulate events is Livia, as she stands out as unorthodox; the consistent accusations against her only assist in her portrayal as the cunning empress. Even her son Tiberius comments on her unusual behavior by exclaiming, “just for once I wish you’d act as a normal Roman woman,” to which Livia cleverly retorts, “in order to do that, I’d have to be surrounded by normal men!” emphasizing her need to adapt to the civil struggle occurring around her.¹⁶

There were few moments in *I, Claudius* in which Livia reveals her motives, but in one particular scene with Plautius, she clearly details her plan by exclaiming: “oh no, I shan’t tell [Augustus]. He wouldn’t appreciate it coming from me. You see, he would in his mind, my motives. No, no. It must be someone else.”¹⁷ By giving the audience a glimpse into Livia’s mind, the situational irony in the next scene is more obvious. She convinces Lucius, Julia’s son, that he is guilty by association since he would not come forward with information he allegedly knows, molding the situation to her advantage as demonstrated by their banter:

Lucius: But – but I thought that, like everybody else, he knew and had just closed his eyes to it.

Livia: Shame on you. [snatches list of names from Lucius]. Shame that you should think him such a man when he thinks so highly of you.

Lucius: She’s my mother, would you have me inform on her?

Livia: You could have come to me! You could have come to me. Do you think, if I’d known, I’d have stood by and done nothing? Don’t you think I’d have tried to save her for her own sake? And now it’s too late to save either of you!

Lucius: Ye gods. I should have told you, it’s true.¹⁸

I, Claudius’s Livia is a deft manipulator, and the insight in this scene with Plautius highlights this aspect. Livia clearly forces Lucius to tell Augustus the new information regarding Julia in an effort to avoid having her motives questioned. She claims: “that you did nothing was bad enough. But what you did was much worse, you aided and abetted. . . . You acted as her proprietor and her pimp!”¹⁹ By not only noting his passivity, but also further implicating Lucius in the scandalous behavior, Livia corners Lucius into telling Augustus.²⁰ Pulman and Graves clearly interpreted Livia as the main proponent to the Julio-Claudian lineage, despite the absence of concrete evidence suggesting so.

As a historical mini-series, *I, Claudius* had an advantage in longer on-screen time, removing the need for ornate set designs to compensate for historical

¹⁶ Ibid.

¹⁷ *I, Claudius*, season 1, episode 2, “Waiting in the Wings,” directed by Jack Pullman, aired September 27, 1976.

¹⁸ Ibid.

¹⁹ Ibid.

²⁰ Livia eventually convinced Lucius to tell Augustus by exclaiming, “and to think that I, his wife, must expose the corruption within his own family,” perhaps one of Siân Phillips’ most ironic lines in *I, Claudius*.

aesthetic. The directors focus on dialogue instead, showcasing Livia's intelligence rather than her sexuality by giving insight to her motivations. Whereas Taylor's Cleopatra was more unorthodox because of her sexuality, Phillips's Livia was unusual for her dialogue and direct affiliation with murder, a facet never introduced with Cleopatra. Neither *Cleopatra* (1963) nor *I, Claudius* show their female leads directly committing murder, but when Taylor's Cleopatra orders a death, such as her sister's, it is not treated as a crime but rather a political maneuver. Although Livia has similar intentions as Cleopatra, to figure out and manipulate Rome's inner workings, her acts are considered far more treacherous. Both figure's actions have insurmountable consequences for Roman history, yet each receives vastly different treatments by modern interpreters. Taylor's Cleopatra, partly shaped by off-set scandals and preconceived notions of the queen, coincided with the decadent Art-Deco movement sweeping America. The push for gender equality, coupled with Livia's more advanced age, would result in a much more conservative (yet no less menacing) depiction of another ancient Roman woman.

These depictions, however, come with their own set of unique challenges. The transplanting of the written word onto a moving screen is subject to wide interpretation, especially regarding ancient sources which have no material substantiation. Unlike other historical epochs, such as post-World War II America or the European Renaissance which contain a myriad of sources, the classical world does not have the advantage of a printing press, let alone a largely literate population. Most ancient sources are fragmented and often incomplete, classical languages themselves even offer vastly differing meanings in their diction due to authors transforming words to better suit their writing style. While these authors are reaching a fairly narrow audience with their comprehensive historical works, they still seek to immortalize both themselves as authors and Rome as a glorious empire; these desires most likely led to a degree of embellishment, usually pertaining to both heroes and the morally corrupt. Livia is no exception. Though most sources extensively implicate her with the various Julio-Claudian murders, only merely suggesting she is involved, it left future historians and filmmakers ample room to exaggerate the account. Therefore, the cinematic depiction of Livia is unsurprisingly sinister.

Livia's Death as a Humanizing Action

Livia's final episode, "Queen of Heaven," reveals her true intentions behind her actions. On her deathbed, Livia chooses her great-grandson Caligula to hear her final wish: to be deified just as Augustus was, granting her access to heaven and spiritually saving her from her wicked deeds.²¹ His response foreshadows the corruption that would follow the Julio-Claudian lineage:

²¹ Tiberius's son Castor falls victim to his unfaithful wife Livilla, who is having an affair with the head of the Praetorian guard, Serjanus. Serjanus, in hopes of putting his own lineage on the throne, convinces Livilla to

Caligula: You're going to stew in hell forever and ever. Let me tell you something. [lays next to Livia] Drusillus has made another prophecy, told Tiberius. He said that one who is going to die very soon will become the greatest god the world has ever known. No temples will be dedicated to anyone but him in the whole Roman world, not even to Augustus. Do you know who that one is? [whispers] Me. [louder] Me. I shall become the greatest god of them all.

Livia: [a single tear rolls down her cheek].

Caligula: And I shall look down at you, suffering all the torments and I shall say, "leave her there, leave here there forever and ever and ever." [kisses Livia on the lips] Goodbye great-grandmother.²²

In comparison with previous episodes, Livia's weakened appearance comes as a shock to the audience. What few words she utters are barely audible, reminiscent to Augustus's own death bed. Both scene's camera angling remains on the dying, directing the audience to focus on the character's reaction rather than the dialogue. In this case the audience witnesses Livia shedding a single, poignant tear. Her reaction to Caligula's damnation speaks volumes to both her character motivation and development: it is originally thought that Livia murders to have her family on the throne, but her emotional display towards not being deified proves her ultimate desire to have a lasting legacy through deification. Even her first marriage was an attempt to become a legacy, and although it failed due to political strife, her second marriage to Augustus proved to be her direct line to notoriety. Her infamy, however, was more so due to her unorthodox behaviors and supposed murders, marking her as yet another corrupted woman in Roman history and another subject for later reinterpretation.²³

I, Claudius succeeds in humanizing Livia only through her death. Her insidious actions were the consequence of an oppressive environment, both from patriarchal control as well as the deft maneuverings of the younger women present.²⁴ On a larger scale, her quest for deification is a microcosm for the feminist quest of equality: to be deified as her husband was, Livia would be recognized as comparably important to Roman society, an honor not granted to many women.

murder her husband by promising her marriage. Sticking to true *I, Claudius* themes, they gradually poison the emperor prospect, leaving the imperial household baffled at his mysterious death. Tiberius is quick to appoint Caligula as his heir, given their shared interest for the sexual taboo. At this time, the emperor is the sole entity that could grant deification.

²² *I, Claudius*, season 1, episode 6, "Queen of Heaven," directed by Jack Pullman, aired October 25, 1976.

²³ For more information regarding Roman legacies see Elke Hartmann, "Wealthy Women and Legacy Hunters in Rome during the High Roman Empire," *Annales* 67, no. 3 (2012): 605-28; S. E. Smethurst, "The Growth of the Roman Legend," *Phoenix* 3, no. 1 (1949): 1-14; James S. Ruebel, "Politics and Folktale in the Classical World," *Asian Folklore Studies* 50, no. 1 (1991): 5-53; Mary T. Boatwright, "Theaters in the Roman Empire," *The Biblical Archaeologist* 53, no. 4 (1990): 184-92.

²⁴ Pulman portrayed most of *I, Claudius*'s other female characters as equally sinister, yet less capable perhaps due to a youthful naïveté. Julia, Agrippina, Messalina, and Julia Drusilla (Caligula's brother) are just a few examples.

What is perhaps most telling of Livia's significance is the fact that, cinematically, she died from natural causes.²⁵ Livia's ability to survive in a rapidly changing political environment speaks to her abilities, making her unfulfilled final wish even more tragic, especially to spectators sympathetic to societal oppression.

Livia as a Modern Woman

The Civil Rights movement and push for racial equality gave feminists, especially black and Hispanic feminists, a platform to discuss workplace equality and reproduction rights. With this social change came a new perspective on how Americans viewed themselves, especially with the influx of European programming by the British Broadcast Company (BBC). BBC's *I, Claudius* gave American audiences a very different picture of ancient Rome, one that Livia Augusta manipulated for her own bidding, and this characterization would prove dramatically different from Taylor's flamboyant one. Whereas Cleopatra was the ideal figure for the commercialized 1950s woman, Livia culminated the inclusive nature of second wave feminism, and while there was little change to ethnic diversity in casting, Siân Phillips's depiction of Livia granted power to a little known Roman matron, a far cry from Taylor's seductive Cleopatra.

I, Claudius marked a movement away from monumental productions, instead focusing on the character development and political atmosphere shaped throughout the season. Phillips's depiction, coupled with *I, Claudius*'s microcosmic focus, altered how Americans envisioned ancient Rome as well as older women. The extreme situations brought by Livia's lack of maternal instinct questioned how 1970s Americans viewed motherhood, both in antiquity and in their own time. Livia is thus transformed into a conniving and murderous character, radical in her presence and in her dialogue, reflective of modern political and social values in America.

Sandra Joshel comments on the impact of Phillips's dialogue for modern cinematography:

Reviewers turn horror at Livia into humor, and their almost patronizing appreciation of Siân Phillips's performance lessens the sting of any allegorical associations with the feminism of the present. Claudius tells us that Livia is a "wicked woman," Cooke that she is "a lady of unsleeping malevolence." However, through the knowing eyes of the New York Times reviewer, Livia's malevolence becomes "gorgeous," (O'Connor 1977). Time reduces Livia to "the wicked witch of the Tiber."²⁶

It is apparent that Phillips's Livia encapsulated nonconformist values that echoed the more radical rhetoric of second wave feminism. Contemporary historians and

²⁵ Historically, Livia Augusta dies from old age as well. Her death is a step away from the depictions of the other two women examined in their project.

²⁶ Joshel, *Imperial Projections*, 149.

modern filmmakers alike categorize Phillips's Livia into a strict duality of doting mother and evil villainess, a characterization that reflects the popular perception of women. These characterizations, while condensing the importance of historical women like Livia, also create a relatable environment of patriarchal resistance, especially in the continuing momentum of modern feminism.

The liberal ideology of second wave feminism persisted into the American cultural conscious, perpetuating an image of the unruly woman fighting against conservative values. Cleopatra and Livia manifested these beliefs as dichotomous representations, but Duncan's portrayal of Servilia in HBO's *Rome* blended these depictions to become an identifiable feminist figure in the twenty-first century. Duncan's characterization of the Roman matron was an amalgamation of Livia's wiles and Cleopatra's sexuality, resulting in a very modern interpretation of ancient Roman women as sexually independent and constants of history. Unlike *Cleopatra* (1963) and *I, Claudius*, *Rome* gave more agency to its female characters by largely centering on their interactions outside the typical Roman exchanges. HBO approached ancient Rome in the most inclusive way, featuring class interactions perhaps neglected by earlier renditions. Economic status and social mobility dictated how *Rome*'s female characters progressed through the series, and their reliance (or lack thereof) on the surrounding men shaped their twenty-first-century depictions.

Rome marked a cinematic departure from traditional predictions of the ancient world, challenging the traditional and elitist 'sword and sandal' approach in favor of highlighting the unpredictable nature of high politics. Unlike previous depictions, which echoed the popular top-down approach to history, *Rome* presents history in a non-linear fashion, attributing pivotal events to chance accidents. This difference assigns more influence to seemingly unimportant people in Roman society, including women and slaves, intertwining social aspects that previously were neglected by cinematographers. HBO's innovative approach to depicting the ancient world spoke to the modern social movements sweeping 1990s and 2000s America, especially the most recent resurgence in feminist scholarship.

For Americans, third wave feminism was a reaction to social concerns regarding the degrading environment and the stigmatization of non-mainstream sexuality. Third wave feminism also challenges the essentialist rhetoric of the previous two waves, criticizing over-generalizations as non-representative of the diverse American population. HBO reflected this school of thought in its various depictions of Roman women, taking special care to establish a narrative that focused on the influence each woman had. Servilia, perhaps the most complex of the women depicted, echoed modern values that spoke out against patriarchal paradigms and ageist rhetoric. A large part of *Rome*'s narrative revolves around the idea that Servilia, a widowed Roman matron, manipulated the powerful men around her

to bring down Caesar, an anachronistic occurrence that makes Servilia equally important to the politics and war commonly recognized.

Servilia's Role in History

Servilia Caepionis, or Servilia of the Junii, is most recognized as the mother to famed defector, Brutus.²⁷ On a lesser level, she is also described as Julius Caesar's mistress until 64 BC, before his campaigning in Alexandria. Of the three women examined, Servilia was the least acknowledged in the contemporary sources, and warranted only scant references that were tied to her involvement with Caesar. Although there is little known of her initial upbringing, Plutarch and Suetonius detail her two marriages, both of which ended unceremoniously. There is also little mention of Caesar and Servilia's first meeting, but Suetonius and Plutarch note her presence as his mistress by 64 BC.²⁸ Her role as the great ruler's mistress was a subject of scandalous speculation by her contemporaries, who often lambasted Caesar for his public rejection of his wives. In his *History of the Twelve Caesars*, Suetonius claims that Caesar loved Servilia "beyond all others," purchasing a black pearl worth six million sesterces for her, well before he ascended to dictatorship. Suetonius also posits that Servilia may have been prostituting her youngest daughter, Junia Tertia, to Caesar.²⁹ Caesar's campaigns against Pompey would seemingly slow his relationship with Servilia, and after Pompey's defeat and subsequent retreat after the Battle of Pharsalus, Caesar would turn his attention towards Egypt. It is at this point in the account that Latin authors direct their attention to Cleopatra, largely leaving Servilia out of the narrative until Caesar's assassination in 44 BC.

The lack of contemporary information on Servilia makes her ideal as a modern cinematic depiction. Filmmakers can exploit gaps in the account to interject their individual creative visions, resulting in more prevalent modern influences that make historical plotlines more relatable to cinematic audiences. In the case of Servilia, Duncan's portrayal was more reactionary to third wave feminism, capitalizing on the taboo nature of a sexually promiscuous Roman matron. The manipulation of Servilia's historical presence transformed her into a vehicle of modern feminism, attributing the downfall of Caesar to her influence (and on *Rome*, her revenge as a slighted lover). Servilia's status as a sexually independent matron, both in the historical account and in the modern portrayal, also builds on the modern identity established around both Cleopatra and Livia.

²⁷ Although Servilia had other children, namely three daughters, they are largely left out of the accounts.

²⁸ Plutarch, *Brutus*, 5.2; Suetonius, *Lives of the Twelve Caesars*, 50.1.

²⁹ His speculation derived from a particularly lucrative real estate deal between Caesar and Servilia during the Civil Wars. See Suetonius, *Lives of the Twelve Caesars*, 50.1.

HBO's Rome and Misperceived Agency

The similarities between *I, Claudius* and *Rome* are numerous, partly due to HBO's affiliation with the BBC, which would provide both aesthetic and casting connections that proved integral to the modern understanding of Rome. The BBC maintained a reputation for historical verisimilitude in their programs, as showcased by *I, Claudius* and *Doctor Who*.³⁰ HBO's affiliation with the BBC also gave it more direct access to some of Great Britain's most prominent actors. In several interviews, Duncan cited the appeal American interpretations of Roman women held:

I met Bruno [Heller, the writer] and Michael Apted [director of the first two episodes]. They sold it to me. They talked about this woman who I've never heard of and they told me of the two key relationships that would be of most interest to anybody now, which was mother of Brutus and lover of Caesar – not just a lover, because there were thousands, but a very important one. . . . I thought, 'well, she's got to be interesting.' And I was curious as to why no-one's [sic] ever heard of her, although I don't have any answers about that.³¹

Duncan comments on Servilia's historical ambiguity, but that *Rome's* writing gave the largely fictionalized character more dimension. According to the *New Yorker*, HBO adopted BBC's capitalization of the 'Great Woman Theory,' the notion that "pillowtalk and poison" propelled historical events; a similar outcome for several female characters in *I, Claudius* as well.³² While historical documents do not substantiate these characterizations, they reveal the extent of modern impositions on the ancient world.

Roman women's involvement in high politics was perhaps not as pervasive as suggested by modern cinema. *Rome* operates, at least in several episodes, under the paradigm that "men do not move or act in a war that is clearly theirs without first being influenced by at least one woman."³³ The series would mark a departure away from prior depictions of the classical world in that it would move away from the 'sword and sandal' style that had become so popular. American audiences had long since equated historical epics with monumental sets, ultimately a hindrance for the relatively small television studios. *Rome*, for its multi-million dollar gross cost, lacked the spatial enormity that many critics expected. This limitation could perhaps be attributed to the BBC's influence, and its preference over attention

³⁰ BBC's critically acclaimed *Doctor Who* showcased a similar attention to details when it came to set designs, for both futuristic scenes and those set in actual historical events. See: Fiona Hobden, "History Meets Fiction in 'Doctor Who, the Fires of Pompeii': A BBC Reception of Ancient Rome on Screen and Online," *Greece & Rome* 56, no. 2 (2009): 147-63.

³¹ "Lindsay Duncan plays Servilia," BBC Press Office, 18 October 2005, http://www.bbc.co.uk/pressoffice/pressreleases/stories/2005/10_october/18/rome_duncan.shtml.

³² Tad Friend, "Power Play: 'Rome' returns to HBO," *New Yorker*, 15 January 2007, <http://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2007/01/15/power-play-2>.

³³ "Analysis, Episode V: *The Ram has Touched the Wall*," *Rome: An Historical Analysis of Season 1*.

to detail. Duncan even lauded this facet in several interviews, claiming that she agreed to the project without needing a script.³⁴

Like other HBO programs, sex and violence are in the forefront during the first half of the show, perhaps as a device to engage the viewers' attention. More critical themes emerge, however, after this point. Power, persuasion, and adaptability all divert the ultimate focus of *Rome* from the ancient world to the modern one. The influence of women remains a constant throughout the series and serves as the root to many historical inaccuracies. It is clear that modern cinematographers placed emphasis on the relatively unknown, or completely fictional, Roman women. This anachronistic shift is evident in the fictionalized rivalry between Atia and Servilia, a contentious relationship that is not historically based, and places both women in manipulative perspectives. According to HBO's description of Servilia, she is "sophisticated, elegant, and subtle, and considers herself several rungs above Atia in the social hierarchy, a fact that chafes Atia."³⁵ While there was likely social tension between the two, given their proximity to Caesar, the "almost cat-like actions between both ... seems to deviate greatly from what would have been expected of women at this time."³⁶ *Rome* suggests that women held more influence than what was likely, and places several of its female characters in relatively independent roles despite the prominence of *patria potestas*.

Servilia's Attack Against the *Patria Potestas*

Although she succeeded in coordinating Caesar's murder (a clear discrepancy), she is unable to maintain her control over an especially fragile Brutus, who makes concessions with Antony in the aftermath of the assassination. Brutus's death in the episode "Philippi" severs Servilia's political influence and only male connection to upper Roman society, forcing her (and in a modern context, other radical feminists) to rely on their physical body as a tool of power and expression. The episode entitled "Death Mask" opens to the Junii household in mourning. Servilia attempts to wear Brutus's *imago* (or, death mask), an expression of a mother's grieving as well as a symbolic yearning to maintain political power in the patriarchal society. Enraged over Brutus's death, Servilia angrily proclaims, "no more sleep!" and enacts *fidem implorare* ("to ask for restitution,"), a ritualistic embodiment of humility and demand for justice.³⁷ Servilia spends two days in front of the Julii home in tattered clothing, and with no food, until Atia meets her in person. Servilia

³⁴ "Lindsay Duncan plays Servilia," *BBC Press Office*, http://www.bbc.co.uk/pressoffice/pressreleases/stories/2005/10_october/18/rome_duncan.shtml.

³⁵ "Rome: Servilia of the Junii," HBO Rome Wiki, 2005. http://hbo-rome.wikia.com/wiki/Servilia_of_the_Junii.

³⁶ "Analysis, Episode V," Rome: An Historical Analysis of Season 1, <http://www.anselm.edu/infernet/classics/Rome/SUMMARIES/05.html>.

³⁷ Antony Augoustakis provides a more thorough discussion on the historicity of the ritual, including the significance behind the disheveled, humbling appearance. He concludes that the comparison between Atia's coiffed persona and Servilia's impoverished one would shame Atia, both publicly and personally. Antony Augoustakis, "Effigies of Atia and Servilia: Effacing the Female Body," in *Screening Antiquity: Rome Season Two: Trial and Triumph*, ed. Monica S. Cyrino (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2015): 122-123.

abandons social restrictions on her physical body in the ultimate public display – a ritualistic curse against the Julii family that is not substantiated in the sources, but rather symbolically epitomizes the modern feminist struggle:

gods below, I am Servilia of the most ancient and sacred Junii, of whose bones the seven hills of Rome are built. I summon you to listen. Curse this woman! Send her bitterness and despair for all of her life. Let her taste nothing but ashes and iron. Gods of the Underworld, all that I have left I give to you in sacrifice, if you will make it so.³⁸

Then, without hesitation, Servilia stabs herself in the chest, in a fashion similar to Lucretia.³⁹ Servilia's suicide is a final effort for vengeance against Atia, and illustrates the polar stances modern cinematographers took regarding Roman women. Atia, and to a lesser extent, Octavia's, reaction, represented a more traditional view regarding women: demure, humble, and socially acceptable. Servilia, on the other hand, manifested the extreme measure of anti-patriarchal feminism. Through her vengeful suicide, Servilia relinquishes patriarchal control over her physicality and symbolically warns spectators of the Julii's growing power. Servilia's suicide, while more of a direct act against Atia, also placed a curse on the entire Julii family, effectively cursing the ultimate *paterfamilias* of Rome. Historically, Servilia survives the subsequent political purging after the second triumvirate, her death due to natural causes rather than a heroic suicide.⁴⁰ This disparity between representations highlights the modern influence on historical women; rather than depicting the values of ancient Rome, Servilia is instead a vehicle for modern feminist rhetoric, a more familiar concept to twenty-first-century audiences.

Ancient Women and Cinematic Deaths

Each woman showcased, Cleopatra, Livia, and Servilia, became sensationalized, and were popular among audiences for their bravado and keen fashion, capitalizing on trends both in production and in terms of spectator habits: *Cleopatra* (1963) was a monumental affair that reflected the excess of later 1950s consumerism while *I, Claudius* was more small-scale (both on set and in distribution). The unique direction *I, Claudius* took partially explains Phillips's characterization of Livia, who was less flamboyant than the other women examined. HBO's *Rome*,

³⁸ *Rome*, season 2, episode 7, "Death Mask," directed by John Mayberry, aired March 4, 2007 on HBO.

³⁹ Sextus Tarquinius, one of the nearest successors to the Tarquin throne, made camp with his fellow brothers after a failed siege of Ardea. While making camp, Livy subtly scolds them for their excessive "feasting and carousing among themselves." During one of their bouts, the princes enter a heated debate over who had the most virtuous wife, in which Tarquinius Collatinus proclaimed his the most worthy. After the group travelled to Rome and saw their wives "feasting and frolicking with their friends," a practice heavily frowned upon in early monarchical Rome, they sped off to Collatia to find Lucretia hard at work. Tarquinius, enthralled with Lucretia, violates her chastity. In response, Lucretia stabs herself in public as a declaration against the corruption of early Roman monarchy. For the complete story, see Livy, *The Founding of Rome*, 66-8.

⁴⁰ Plutarch, *The Parallel Lives*, 247.

however, was broadcasted during a large upswing in primetime programming; its popularity bolstered by its especially sexual content, which also reflected a change in audience preferences.

The global fascination over the ancient world has been longstanding, compelling different cultures across time to compare themselves with the failures of such pervasive empires. Scholarly interpretations and narrative retellings allowed various audiences to access a far-flung culture, shedding light on the changing perceptions of historical figures. Ancient Roman women are just one small part of the historical narrative, yet they become key perpetuators of major events through seemingly insignificant actions, bringing into question the impact their characterizations would have on the popular perception of historical women. Although each figure examined, Cleopatra, Livia, and Servilia, are shaped by distinct modern values, their similar identity as agents of feminism makes them key to understanding the portrayal of ancient Roman women; their deaths acting as extreme examples of resistance.

The women implicated in the changing Roman politick, while largely unaccounted for or ambiguous, become an important plot device for filmmakers to advance narrative. Women such as Cleopatra, Livia, and Servilia become historical figures transplanted into modern situations, contributing to the link cinematographers create between antiquity and the present. Taylor and Phillips embodied two of the common characterizations for historical women, easily recognizable as the classic seductress and deft manipulator, respectively. Servilia, the least present in the historical accounts, received the most creative reinterpretation of the all three figures, resulting in a noteworthy blend of not only historical figures, but also of modern values. While each figure died in distinct methods within their own depictions, their common goal of changing Roman politics was reflective of the continued (and relatively unchanged) perception of ancient Roman women: as intelligent, yet dangerous, figures who served to derail patriarchal Roman politics.

Scottish Identity and Presbyterianism in Antrim, 1613-1670

Colin Cook

University of Central Florida

During the past several decades, Northern Ireland has been the site of extensive ethnic tension and religious rivalries. Irish historian Liam de Paor asserts that modern conflicts in Northern Ireland are mostly centered around “the ideas that Ulster Protestants have today about what happened in the seventeenth century.”¹ Consequently, the origins of these modern struggles can be traced to the British colonization of the Ulster region. This colonization took place over several centuries; by the seventeenth century, the English Crown began creating a series of plantations in the region. On these plantations, English and Scottish undertakers controlled large tracts of land, which were leased to English, Scottish and native Irish tenants.²

The Ulster Plantation was the largest, comprising the northern Irish counties of Armagh, Cavan, Donegal, Fermanagh, Tyrone and Londonderry. The eastern counties of Antrim and Down were not included in this Crown-funded settlement, but they were privately settled with their own separate plantations as well. Controlled by Sir Arthur Chichester, the Antrim Plantation was closest to Scotland, and it experienced a significant wave of immigration by Scottish settlers during the early seventeenth century.³ Chichester originally envisioned Antrim as a mostly English settlement, but it eventually became dominated by Scottish immigrants, who brought their Presbyterian religion with them.⁴

Historians writing about the British colonization of Ireland in the early seventeenth century have focused on the plantations in Ulster, the Scottish settlers, and the Irish Rebellion of 1641. There are several gaps in these overlapping historiographies which this research attempts to address. Most histories of English and Scottish settlers focus on the larger Ulster Plantation, ignoring or minimizing the importance of the smaller Antrim settlement.⁵ Also, much of the scholarly work on the Scottish settlers, or Scots Irish, tends to highlight the late-seventeenth century and beyond, looking at the influences of the Scots Irish on

¹ Liam De Paor, *Divided Ulster* (Middlesex: Penguin, 1970), 14.

² Nicholas P. Canny, *Making Ireland British, 1580-1650* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), 177-240.

³ De Paor, *Divided Ulster*, 20.

⁴ Margaret Dickson Falley, “Emigrations to Ulster,” *Irish and Scotch-Irish Ancestral Research – Repositories and Records* (Baltimore: Genealogical Publishing, 1981), <<http://homepages.rootsweb.ancestry.com/~mcclell2/homepage/ulster.htm>>.

⁵ For early histories focusing on the Ulster Plantation, see George Hill, *An Historical Account of the Plantation in Ulster at the Commencement of the Seventeenth Century, 1608-1620* (Belfast: M'Caw, Stevenson & Orr, 1877); Cyril Falls, *The Birth of Ulster*, 2nd ed. (London: Methuen, 1973). For a more recent example of this focus on Ulster, see Jonathan Bardon, *The Plantation of Ulster: The British Colonization of the North of Ireland in the 17th Century* (Dublin: Gill & MacMillan, 2013).

British colonization in North America.⁶ Many of these histories have minimized the importance of Presbyterian belief and identity for the Scottish settlers during the early seventeenth century, but this belief was crucial for the development of a distinct Scottish identity in the Antrim Plantation at this time. In addition, this research makes use of sources from the 1641 Rebellion to provide a more Scottish-centered view of the conflict, focusing on the Scottish settlers' identification with Presbyterianism in particular.⁷

The Scottish settlers of Antrim retained a strong Scottish and Presbyterian identity throughout the early stages of colonization in the 1610s, and through the tumultuous years of the 1641 Irish Rebellion and its aftermath. The Scots spread their Presbyterian religion as they colonized Antrim and the rest of the Ulster region, with ministers arriving from Scotland and establishing congregations as early as 1613. These ministers engaged Scottish settlers with their enthusiastic and vibrant style of preaching. The Presbyterian Scots continued to practice and expand their religion even as they became the victims of Anglican authorities, who repressed them harshly. With the onset of the Irish Rebellion of 1641, the Scottish settlers became even more committed to their Presbyterian faith, as Scottish forces arrived in Antrim to help protect their communities and churches. This conflict only served to reinforce the importance of Presbyterianism to Scottish identity among the Antrim settlers.

The Establishment of Presbyterianism in Antrim

Presbyterianism unified the Scots around a set of Protestant beliefs which were different from their English and Irish neighbors. Initially, there was a mix of different religious and ethnic groups in Antrim – Presbyterian Lowland Scots, Catholic Scots, Irish Catholics, and Anglican English settlers. From the 1620s onward, this religious and ethnic composition evolved, as Presbyterian Scottish influence gradually increased within the Antrim settlement.⁸

Some historians have asserted that the influence of Presbyterianism in the region at this time was minimal.⁹ However, Presbyterian church records show that six Presbyterian congregations were founded in the Antrim Plantation during this

⁶ For examples of this trend, see Patrick Griffin, *The People with No Name: Ireland's Ulster Scots, America's Scots Irish, and the Creation of a British Atlantic World, 1689-1764* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001); Andrew R. Holmes, *The Shaping of Ulster Presbyterian Belief and Practice, 1770-1840* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006); Emily Moberg Robinson, "Scottish Covenanters and the Creation of an American Identity," *The Journal of Presbyterian History* 83, no. 1 (Spring 2005): 54-70; Robert Whan, *The Presbyterians of Ulster, 1680-1730* (Irish Historical Monographs. Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2013).

⁷ Many histories of the 1641 Rebellion have been divided between "Protestant view" historians and "Catholic view" historians. For a useful articulation of this historical division, see Eamon Darcy, *The Irish Rebellion of 1641 and the Wars of the Three Kingdoms* (London: Royal Historical Society, 2013). John Cunningham also examines the rebellion from a more Scottish and Presbyterian view in his article on the 1641 Rebellion, in a micro-history focused on Wexford County, "Anatomising Irish Rebellion: The Cromwellian Delinquency Commissions, the Books of Discrimination and the 1641 Depositions," *Irish Historical Studies* 40, no. 157 (May 2016): 22-42.

⁸ J. Michael Hill, "The Origins of the Scottish Plantations to 1625," *Journal of British Studies* 32, no. 1 (Jan. 1993): 39, 40, 43.

⁹ For example, see Hill, "The Origins of the Scottish Plantations," 39-40.

period. While the official founding of these churches did not occur until 1642, most of them were operating decades earlier, with roots in the community as early as the 1610s.¹⁰

First, some context on the development of Presbyterianism and its relationship with the dominant Anglican religion is necessary. During the early seventeenth century, the Scots lost significant power politically.¹¹ Radical Scottish Protestants, including substantial numbers of Presbyterians, began migrating to Antrim and the rest of the Ulster region in search of greater religious freedom.¹² This migration began in 1613 with the arrival of Reverend Edward Brice in Antrim, and continued in greater numbers for the next several decades.¹³

Despite their expectations, the Scottish immigrants soon found that Thomas Wentworth, the Irish governor during this period, was very hostile toward any religious practices which diverged from the accepted Anglican religion. During the 1620s, Wentworth and the local Anglican clergy began arresting and deposing Presbyterian ministers and churches, as well as other non-conforming Protestant faiths. Many of the persecuted Scottish ministers were forced to flee back to their homeland. They banded together in Scotland and Antrim, resisting the Anglican suppression even more fiercely. Scottish resisters rallied around the Scottish Covenant, a pledge to support Presbyterianism in Scotland and to resist Anglican attempts to impose a different religion. Some Presbyterian Scots also attempted to escape this repression by emigrating to the British colonies in North America. The situation in Antrim worsened further in 1639, when Wentworth imposed the Black Oath on non-conformists, requiring them to reject the Covenant and causing many of them to return to Scotland.¹⁴

However, the Presbyterian Scots continued resisting Wentworth and the Anglican authorities, and the Irish Rebellion of 1641 led to a much stronger Presbyterian presence in the region. This uprising was started by dissatisfied Irish Catholics in Ulster, aiming to gain greater control of lands in the region and to obtain greater toleration for Catholicism. In 1642, Scottish forces arrived in Antrim and Ulster to protect the Scottish settlers and put down the rebellion. Army chaplains also arrived with these forces, and they reestablished and protected all

¹⁰ Presbyterian Historical Society of Ireland, *A History of Congregations in the Presbyterian Church in Ireland, 1610-1982* (Belfast: Presbyterian Historical Society of Ireland, 1982).

¹¹ The Scottish Privy Council was reformed and lost most of its power in the English government. At the same time, King James VI and James I forced the local Church of Scotland to become more of a moderate episcopal church, enraging some of the radical and militant Scottish Protestants. See C. V. Wedgwood, "Anglo-Scottish Relations, 1603-40," *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 32 (1950): 32-39; Canny, *Making Ireland British*, 559.

¹² Canny, *Making Ireland British*, 559.

¹³ G., "On the Tombstones of the Early Presbyterian Ministers of Ireland," *The Belfast Magazine and Literary Journal* 1, no. 4 (May 1825): 352 (note that the author of this article is identified only as "G." in the publication); Canny, *Making Ireland British*, 560.

¹⁴ This Anglican persecution continued during the 1620s and 1630s. See Canny, *Making Ireland British*, 408, 560-561.

of the Presbyterian Congregations in the area during the early to mid-1640s.¹⁵ Next, twenty-six Presbyterian churches across the Ulster region signed the Solemn League and Covenant in 1644, an additional agreement which reinforced their Scottish and Presbyterian identity by pledging to band together in order to resist persecution. After several decades of oppression, the Presbyterian Scots finally enjoyed a certain amount of increased freedom and toleration for their religion – until Oliver Cromwell's regime in the mid-1650s.¹⁶

As previously mentioned, Presbyterianism began growing in the Antrim community as early as the 1610s, with several churches and ministers establishing themselves in the region. Between 1619 and 1642, six Presbyterian congregations were founded in Antrim, including Ballymena, Antrim First, Templepatrick, Cairncastle, Larne and Carrickfergus.¹⁷ The Antrim First Congregation, located in the central-west region of the county, was the first Presbyterian church in the area to open its doors. The church records for Antrim First proudly proclaim that Presbyterianism in this area “has always been a thing to be reckoned with,” emphasizing that a congregation “existed in Antrim since 1619,” when John Ridge was appointed its first minister.¹⁸ Soon thereafter, the Larne Congregation began operations when George Dunbar became its first minister in 1620. Larne is considered “one of the oldest congregations in the Presbyterian Church.”¹⁹ Also in 1620, the Carrickfergus Congregation was established, with Rev. Mr. Hubbard as its minister.²⁰ This was followed by the opening of the Ballymena Congregation in 1624, the Templepatrick Congregation in 1626, and finally the Cairncastle Congregation in 1642.²¹

The founding of these six congregations during the early seventeenth century shows the roots of Presbyterianism which developed among the Scottish settler communities in Antrim, even during the earliest stages of colonization. By 1642, the Presbyterian religion formed an integral component of Scottish settler communities in Antrim, largely due to the groundwork which was established by these early congregations.²² However, the congregations would not have been successful if it were not for the diligence and enthusiasm of the Presbyterian preachers themselves.

¹⁵ Robert Armstrong, “Ireland's Puritan Revolution?: The Emergence of Ulster Presbyterianism Reconsidered,” *The English Historical Review* 121, no. 493 (Sep. 2006): 1048.

¹⁶ “The Presbyterians in Ulster: Heritage Trail,” AncestryIreland, <<http://www.ancestryireland.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/Presb-Trail-Map-Part-2.pdf>>; Canny, *Making Ireland British*, 551-555.

¹⁷ Presbyterian Historical Society, *A History of Congregations*, 16-17, 78-79, 261, 273, 579, 773.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 17.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 579.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 273.

²¹ *Ibid.*, 78-79, 773, 261.

²² Hill, “The Origins of the Scottish Plantations,” 40-43; De Paor 20.

Scottish Presbyterian Ministry and Anglican Repression

Scottish Presbyterian ministers brought an engaging style of ministry to settler communities in Antrim, which helped to further the spread of the religion during the early seventeenth century. The first Presbyterian minister to migrate from Scotland to Ireland was Edward Brice, who arrived at the Antrim Plantation in 1613. Brice is credited with establishing the first elements of Presbyterianism in the region, beginning his ministry at a meetinghouse in Ballycarry and eventually serving at several other congregations in Antrim. Brice's ministry was successful, and his tombstone in the church graveyard indicates that he “begun preaching of the Gospell in this parish 1613, continuing with great success” until his death in 1636.²³

A contemporary of Brice's was Josias Welch, a Presbyterian minister who also migrated to Antrim in 1626. Welch was the grandson of John Knox, a Presbyterian minister at Edinburgh who was one of the founders of the Presbyterian religion. After his arrival, Welch became the first minister at the Templepatrick Congregation, and he was praised for his “extraordinary awakening and rousing gift,” inspiring many members of his Scottish congregation.²⁴ Welch was a particularly enthusiastic preacher, known for ministering “on the mountains, and in the fields, to crowds of followers.”²⁵ When Welch was first invited to become the minister at Templepatrick, the resident Episcopalian minister heard about the appointment and tried to occupy the church, preventing Welch from entering the building. Welch was so committed to the Presbyterian cause that he refused to back down, remaining outside the church and contacting the local authorities. Eventually, the courts ruled in Welch's favor and he was awarded the position at the church, driving the Episcopalians out.²⁶ According to Presbyterian tradition, Welch approached his preaching with such zeal that it ultimately took his life. He often ministered to crowds from an open window; eventually he became ill after one of these ministry sessions, and passed away in 1634 shortly after the session.²⁷

Welch's successor at the Templepatrick Congregation, Anthony Kennedy, continued this vibrant and successful ministry. Appointed in the mid-1640s, Kennedy became known for his sincerity and his pious ministry style.²⁸ Another important aspect of Kennedy's tenure at Templepatrick was his longevity, as he was the minister of the congregation for over five decades. His tombstone at the church notes that Kennedy, “at Temple-Patrick for more than 58 years, . . . faithfully

²³ For more information on these tombstones, see G., “On the Tombstones of the Early Presbyterian Ministers of Ireland,” *The Belfast Magazine and Literary Journal* 1, no. 4 (May 1825): 351-355. For Brice's tombstone, see p. 352.

²⁴ Presbyterian Historical Society, *A History of Congregations*, 773.

²⁵ G., “On the Tombstones of the Early Presbyterian Ministers,” 353-354.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, 354.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, 354; Presbyterian Historical Society, *A History of Congregations*, 773.

²⁸ James Seaton Reid and William Dool Killen, *A History of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland: Comprising the Civil History of the Province of Ulster from the Accession of James the First* (London: Whittaker, 1853), 39.

preached, promulgated, and supported” Presbyterianism, despite the “subtlety of persecution” which he faced during this time.²⁹

The “subtlety of persecution” Kennedy faced was not unusual for Scottish settlers in this period. Many of the earliest Presbyterian ministers at congregations in Antrim had to deal with this repression, and some of them were deposed, arrested, or forced to return to Scotland. This is particularly ironic because most of the early ministers migrated to Antrim in search of greater religious freedom.

There are numerous examples of this persecution of Scottish Presbyterian ministers at congregations throughout Antrim in this era. Reverend George Dunbar, the first minister at the Ballymena Congregation, was “deposed for non-conformity” by the local Anglican authorities and sent back to Scotland in 1636. Furthermore, after Dunbar's exile, “[n]o Presbyterian minister was allowed to officiate” at Ballymena until the early 1640s.³⁰ The congregation at Antrim First suffered a similar fate, as its first minister, John Ridge, was deposed in 1636 and fled to Scotland. Antrim First did not have a full-time minister again until Archibald Ferguson was appointed in 1645, but he was imprisoned during the mid-1650s as Oliver Cromwell's government also began persecuting Presbyterians.³¹ In a similar manner, the Larne Congregation was without a minister from 1636 until 1646, when Thomas Hall became the leader of the church. Only a few years later, Hall was forced to move back to Scotland to escape repression from Cromwell's Republican forces in the mid-1650s, although he was able to briefly return to the congregation in 1660.³²

Presbyterianism During the Irish Rebellion

In the midst of this ongoing repression from Anglican authorities, the Scots experienced a turbulent conflict as the Irish Rebellion of 1641 erupted across the entire island, particularly causing major disruptions in Antrim and the greater Ulster region. During this uprising, the Scottish settlers' faith in Presbyterianism actually increased, as they became further committed to protecting their Scottish and Presbyterian ideals. The rebellion began in October 1641, as members of the Irish Catholic gentry seized key garrison fortifications throughout Ulster. Sir Phelim O'Neill led the insurrection, but he lost control as the rebellion gained momentum in Ulster. Dissatisfied Irish Catholics throughout the region attacked English settlers, seizing their lands and possessions. However, O'Neill tried to at least ensure that only English settlers were targeted, and the Irish rebels did not attack Scottish settlers as frequently.³³ During the 1650s, Oliver Cromwell's

²⁹ G., “On the Tombstones of the Early Presbyterian Ministers,” 354.

³⁰ Presbyterian Historical Society, *A History of Congregations*, 79.

³¹ *Ibid.*, 16-17.

³² *Ibid.*, 579.

³³ Canny, *Making Ireland British*, 469-482.

regime established a Commission to collect depositions regarding the experiences of English, Scottish and Irish individuals during the 1641 Rebellion.³⁴

Testimony from these 1641 depositions reveals the increased commitment to Presbyterianism which flourished among the Scottish settlers of Antrim.³⁵ Thomas Theaker, a Presbyterian settler from Antrim, proclaims that Scottish settlers in Belfast “have erected a Presbytery there consisting of about Twenty Elders and fower [four] Deacons.”³⁶ Theaker notes that the Scots are requesting that they be allowed to freely elect representatives for their Burrough of Belfast, and that these representatives must have subscribed to the Presbyterian “Covenant for reformation of religion for the true worship and service of god.”³⁷

The “Covenant” which Theaker refers to is the aforementioned Solemn League and Covenant, a pledge by the Scottish Presbyterian churches in Ulster to defend their faith. This Covenant was particularly important to Scots during the 1641 Rebellion, and their insistence on electing representatives who follow the Covenant shows that they did not want to remain beholden to Anglican authorities. The Covenant and the importance of Presbyterianism are also discussed by several officers in the Scottish military operating in the area.³⁸ Arthur Gore, a Sergeant Major in the Scottish forces in Antrim, expressed excitement about the signing of the Covenant by Scottish Presbyterian leaders.³⁹ This sentiment was echoed by Theophilus Jones, a Scottish Sergeant, who noted a “mutinous disorder” among his Scottish troops when he returned to Belfast after a military engagement. He observed Scottish troops as they “publicly tore in peeces their English Cullors [colors],” declaring that the Covenant among Presbyterian Scots was more important to them than their alliance with the English.⁴⁰ The experiences of Gore and Jones indicate that Presbyterianism and Scottish identity were foremost in mind for Scots in the region. Finally, all of these depositions show that Scottish settlers in Antrim were very concerned about protecting their religion, as their faith in Presbyterianism increased during the chaotic uprising.

Conclusion

Many historians have written about the Scots Irish and the plantations in the Ulster region. However, the development of Presbyterianism and Scottish identity during the early period of colonization has been largely neglected or minimized

³⁴ 1641 Rebellion Depositions, Trinity College Dublin, MSS 809-841, <<http://1641.tcd.ie/index.php>>.

³⁵ These depositions have recently been digitized and sorted by county. There are over 2,000 depositions in the collection, including 341 depositions from Antrim County. The depositions were all collected between 1642 and 1655, although most of them were collected in the early to mid-1650s.

³⁶ Examination of Thomas Theaker, 1641 Rebellion Depositions (TCD, MS 838, fols 007r-008v), <<http://1641.tcd.ie/deposition.php?depID=838007r005>>.

³⁷ Examination of Thomas Theaker (TCD, MS 838, fol. 7v).

³⁸ Examination of Arthur Gore, 1641 Rebellion Depositions (TCD, MS 838, fols 003r-004v), <<http://1641.tcd.ie/deposition.php?depID=?php echo 838003r003?>>; Examination of Theophilus Jones, 1641 Rebellion Depositions (TCD, MS 838, fols 005r-006v), <<http://1641.tcd.ie/deposition.php?depID=?php echo 838005r004?>>.

³⁹ Examination of Arthur Gore (TCD, MS 838, fol. 3r).

⁴⁰ Examination of Theophilus Jones (TCD, MS 838, 5v, 6r).

by the current historiography. This was a crucial era for the evolution of Presbyterianism, as the Scots were continually persecuted by English authorities and faced difficulties during the 1641 Rebellion. Despite these hardships, the Scots always retained a focus on the Covenant and their Presbyterian identity, defending their own communities and surviving the hardships of the mid to late-seventeenth century. Eventually, the Scots Irish successfully persevered as a people and influenced the development of Britain, Ireland, and the British colonies in North America.

BMEWS, NIKE-ZEUS and Eisenhower: A Do-Something President

Patrick Gallagher
Florida Gulf Coast University

President Dwight D. Eisenhower had a direct role to play in the establishment of the Ballistic Missile Early Warning System (BMEWS); specifically, the creation of the NIKE-ZEUS Program. As evidenced by the BMEWS and the NIKE-ZEUS program, he was an active president and succeeded in his goal of attempting to create an effective fighting unit while cutting cost. In recent years Eisenhower's presidency has been given a makeover as historians have begun to reevaluate its characteristics. One characteristic was Eisenhower's desire to balance the budget while making an effective military through efforts such as the BMEWS and the NIKE-ZEUS program. This article will examine how the NIKE-ZEUS program developed throughout Eisenhower's presidency. We will see the role that Eisenhower played in the program, but also how it reflected on his dream of having a fiscal friendly military that was still very effective. This article will focus on congressional reports, presidential memorandums, and declassified documents from the GALE Declassified Documents Reference System, and lastly from the Dwight D. Eisenhower Presidential library.

The NIKE-ZEUS was a program developed as an anti-ballistic missile by the United States Army to work in conjunction with the BMEWS to shoot down both mass ballistic missiles and enemy bombers. The NIKE-ZEUS program developed as both an anti-ballistic missile and anti-air missile system. The original system was dubbed the NIKE-AJAX, first developed in 1954 and early 1955, as an anti-air missile to take down strategic bombers. By 1954, the Nike-AJAX system had four operational launchers and batteries and by 1955 it had over 26.¹ Once the threat of ICBMs was understood, the NIKE-AJAX system transformed into the NIKE-ZEUS program. The NIKE-ZEUS program held three different names depending on the type of missile that was being used. The original NIKE was also known as the AJAX. The NIKE II was known as ZEUS, and NIKE B was known as HERCULES. In this article all three names will be synonymous, as it will examine the program as a whole, unless specifically noted.

Eisenhower's Role. What was the NIKE-ZEUS Program?

Eisenhower's presidency had been misinterpreted at its conclusion. Past views have been that he was adrift in his role and let others create policy. Recent historical analyses, however, have begun to shed favorable light onto Eisenhower and his

¹ Barry Leonard, ed., *History of Strategic and Ballistic Missile Defense: Volume II: 1956-1972* (DIANE Publishing, 2011), 37.

presidency. Eisenhower's time as president was spent fulfilling the ambition to cut down on inter-service rivalry, to create a streamlined and effective military, all while creating a balanced budget.

Fred Greenstein, professor of politics emeritus at Princeton University, was one of the first to begin this new look at Eisenhower with his article "Eisenhower as an Activist President: A Look at New Evidence." According to Greenstein, Eisenhower's administration was in fact distinctive and consciously thought-out instead of being adrift.² Eisenhower used his subordinates in a type of "pseudo-delegation" rather than true delegation.³ It allowed him to hold his hand closer to the chest. Chester Pach and Elmo Richardson, co-authors of *The Presidency of Dwight D. Eisenhower*, examined how Eisenhower desperately wanted to cut the federal budget. During the fiscal year of 1954 Eisenhower reduced the budget by \$5 million and cut the deficit in half.⁴ Eisenhower thought the military was bloated. In-fighting and mismanagement had diminished the capabilities of the military and made it a budget nightmare. Gerard Clarfield, author of *Security with Solvency: Dwight D. Eisenhower and the Shaping of the American Military Establishment*, stated that as supreme commander during the Second World War, Eisenhower witnessed that one could develop a highly effective fighting force with 75 percent of the manpower and spending used by the United States.⁵ This achievement was one of the driving factors behind Eisenhower's presidency and he succeeded in passing resolutions to try and fix the military with his 1958 Reorganization Act. These four interpretations reflect that Eisenhower is no longer viewed as a do-nothing president who let others handle all the work.

Eisenhower wanted a balanced budget, but also wanted to be able to defend against any aggression, current or future, from the USSR. The Soviet Union had the capacity to launch a nuclear strike that would produce casualties of over twenty-five million.⁶ The U.S. response was the BMEWS. James R. Killian, Special Assistant for Science and Technology to Eisenhower from 1957 to 1959, reported that the United States must be prepared for a surprise attack by the Soviet Union, which was increasing its offensive capabilities, and at any moment could launch a devastating attack that would destroy the United States.⁷

Eisenhower's aims and ambitions were evident with the establishment of the BMEWS and the NIKE-ZEUS program. The BMEWS was developed by the United States Air Force to track and warn about possible enemy ballistic missile launches targeting the United States. The BMEWS was a system of about twelve

² Fred Greenstein, "Eisenhower as an Activist President: A Look at New Evidence," *Political Science Quarterly* 94, no. 4 (1979-1980): 596.

³ *Ibid.*, 584.

⁴ Chester J. Pach, Jr. and Elmo Richardson, *The Presidency of Dwight D. Eisenhower*, rev. ed., (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1991) 53.

⁵ Gerard Clarfield, *Security with Solvency: Dwight D. Eisenhower and the Shaping of the American Military Establishment* (Westport: Praeger, 1999) 18.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 104.

⁷ Leonard, *History of Strategic and Ballistic Missile Defense: Volume II*, 11.

radar installations meant to give an early detection warning of a mass ballistic missile attack of about fifteen to twenty minutes. The system had an effective range of about 2,000 nautical miles. With the establishment of the BMEWS the Air Force reactivated its anti-ballistic missile project, Project WIZARD, in 1955. Project Wizard was shut down in 1949 because of budget cuts and the perceived threat of bombers being more significant than missiles. However, in 1955 the Army announced and actively tested its own anti-ballistic missile system, NIKE-ZEUS project. To keep a balanced budget the Pentagon ordered the Air Force to scrap Project WIZARD because of the success of the NIKE-ZEUS, while Project WIZARD was still in a paper and pen state. The Air Force was to focus solely on the radar and let the Army handle the hardware. The settlement of each branch focusing on one specific task reflected Eisenhower's fears of constant infighting creating an ineffective fighting force that raised the cost of everything, and his desire for a streamlined and budget-friendly military.

Cost, Benefit, and Construction of the BMEWS

The Ballistic Missile Early Warning System was essential for the security and longevity of the United States. Pre-1955 the only practical way to transport a nuclear payload was with a bomber. However, in 1951 the United States believed that by 1960 the Soviet Union would have a working ICBM that could ferry a nuclear warhead. Thus, to insure security, the Joint Chiefs of Staff (JCS) agreed to acquire an adequate BMEWS as soon as possible.⁸ The Weapons System Evaluation Group estimated that the BMEWS system would be completed by late 1960 to early 1961.⁹ However, Jerome Wisner who was a member of *Project Cadillac*, which was the precursor to the AWAC system, sent a memorandum to James R. Killian stating that the United States had the capacity to create four installations to detect ICBM's by 1960. This would meet the demands of the JCS. Wisner even suggested that the installations could be established earlier, by 1959, if priority was given to the system.¹⁰ Thus, the United States was ultimately on track to develop the security systems to protect against the Soviet Union's new ICBMs that it had demonstrated with the launching of Sputnik in 1957. However, to guarantee that the BMEWS and later NIKE-ZEUS program ran smoothly and did not over tax itself, Eisenhower assigned the Science Advisory Committee (SAC

⁸ Department of Defense, "Consideration given to the development of the Ballistic Missile Early Warning System," Issue Date: Mar 28, 1951, Date Declassified: Jul 13, 1979, Unsanitized, Complete, 10 page(s), from Declassified Documents Reference System (GALE), p. 5.

⁹ *Ibid.*, 6.

¹⁰ Jerome Wisner, "Anti-Intercontinental Ballistic Missile early warning system discussed," White House, Issue Date: Nov 25, 1957, Date Declassified: Aug 07, 1991, Unsanitized, Complete, 2 page(s), from Declassified Documents Reference System (GALE).

— not Strategic Air Command) to oversee everything.¹¹ Throughout the 1950s and 1960s SAC would hold sway and reflect Eisenhower's wishes. In the end, three questions emerged regarding the BMEWS. How would the BMEWS be paid for and how much would it cost? Second, how would the BMEWS be constructed? Third, would the BMEWS even be beneficial for securing the United States?

Concerning the first question, how would the BMEWS be paid for and how much would the system cost, Eisenhower had to deal with a conflicting situation to his priorities. Eisenhower had desperately attempted to cut the funds going to the military as he viewed it as mostly excessive waste. However, with the BMEWS, Eisenhower would have to deal with a new military expense that would be a major cost. A report by the Weapons System Evaluation Group estimated that the BMEWS would cost about \$600 million.¹² William E. Bradley, a member of Eisenhower's Science Advisory Panel and chair of the subcommittee on missile defense, gave a much more alarming estimation that the BMEWS could cost the United States from around \$400 million, upwards to over a billion dollars.¹³ Charles A. Haskins, a member of the Department of Defense, agreed with Bradley's estimation of upwards of a billion dollars.¹⁴ Haskins stated this in a Memorandum to White House advisor Brigadier General Robert Cutler. Haskins also stated that the secretary of Defense had already allocated \$127 million for the project. An interesting side note, the Air Force, which had operational command of the BMEWS originally estimated the cost being around \$721 million, and in the end costing \$1.3 billion.¹⁵

Eisenhower wanted to cut the military's budget by cutting over-priced research projects, and now the BMEWS fit into that category. Haskins helped defend the BMEWS by stating that in early 1958 the Air Force had 165 bombers patrolling the skies to defend the United States, but by 1959, the number had dropped to 142. Ultimately, the bombers were becoming obsolete. By 1960, the United States could not rely on a high survival rate of bombers to both defend and attack foreign targets

¹¹ The President's Science Advisory Committee, "Report on Early Warning Panel of the President's Science Advisory Committee on the status of the Ballistic Missile Early Warning System (BMEWS) and on other means for providing warning of ballistic missile attacks," White House, Issue Date: Mar 13, 1959, Date Declassified: Aug 07, 1991, Unsanitized, Complete, 11 page(s), from Declassified Documents Reference System (GALE). p. 1.

¹² Department of Defense, "Consideration given to the development of the Ballistic Missile Early Warning System," p. 6.

¹³ William E. Bradley, "Questions regarding funding of the Ballistic Missile Early Warning System and earliest date for making the Zeus system operational," White House, Issue Date: Apr 23, 1958, Date Declassified: Jul 09, 1981. Unsanitized, Complete, 1 page(s), from Declassified Documents Reference System (GALE).

¹⁴ Charles Haskins, "Memorandum to White House advisor Brigadier General Robert Cutler from Charles Haskins regarding the Gaither Report (Ford Foundation Commission study on deterrence and survival in the nuclear age) for the implementation of an anti-intercontinental ballistic missile (ICBM) early warning radar system," National Security Council, Issue Date: Apr 23, 1958, Date Declassified: Apr 03, 1992, Incomplete, 2 page(s), from Declassified Documents Reference System (GALE). p. 1.

¹⁵ William Minshull, "Status of Ballistic Missile Early Warning System (BMEWS) detailed," White House, Issue Date: May 21, 1958, Date Declassified: Aug 07, 1991, Unsanitized, Complete, 1 page(s), from Declassified Documents Reference System (GALE). and The President's Science Advisory Committee, "Report on Early Warning Panel of the President's Science Advisory Committee on the status of the Ballistic Missile Early Warning System (BMEWS) and on other means for providing warning of ballistic missile attacks," p. 2.

because technology had surpassed them.¹⁶ Thus, the BMEWS would take up the slack and give adequate defense for the United States.¹⁷ In the end Eisenhower agreed that the BMEWS was essential and authorized the project to go into full swing alongside the NIKE-ZEUS program.

During the 85th Congress, 2nd Session, Congress authorized, in 1958, \$189 million to be used for the BMEWS and \$112 million for the NIKE-ZEUS program.¹⁸ These funds would go towards “operational and training facilities, maintenance and production facilities, research, development, and test facilities, supply facilities, hospital and medical facilities, administrative facilities, housing and community facilities, utilities, land acquisition, and ground improvements.”¹⁹ This gave the BMEWS the ability to immediately start with the funds authorized by both Congress and the Secretary of Defense, and become operational before the latest reported deadline of 1961. To accelerate the program even further the 86th Congress authorized the Secretary of Defense to use \$150 million from the Emergency Fund to fund the BMEWS.²⁰ Ultimately, to help pay for the BMEWS the Department of Defense, Secretary of Defense, and Congress got together and came up with the funding all under the watchful eye of Eisenhower and his handpicked representatives from SAC to guarantee that the BMEWS did not fall prey to the infighting and excessive funding of the past.

The BMEWS was meant to be an early warning system against any ICBM launches by the Soviet Union; consequently, construction took place in locations close to the Soviet Union. The goal was to be able to detect an ICBM launch and give a warning window of fifteen to twenty minutes.²¹ In the beginning, the BMEWS was authorized at three installations in Greenland, Alaska, and Scotland.²² Bradley reported in October of 1958 that only the Greenland and Alaskan installations had been fully authorized and that Killian needed to get Scotland’s pushed through.²³

¹⁶ Jeremy J. Stone, “Bomber Disarmament.” *World Politics* 17, no. 1 (Oct., 1964): 18.

¹⁷ William Minshull, “Status of Ballistic Missile Early Warning System (BMEWS) detailed,” p. 1.

¹⁸ Statutes at Large, “Public Law 85-325 AN ACT To authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to establish and develop certain installations for the national security, and to confer certain authority on the Secretary of Defense, and for other purposes,” 85th Congress, 2nd Session. Public Law 85-325 (H.R. 9739). Wednesday, February 12, 1958, p. 11, <http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys>.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 11.

²⁰ Statutes at Large, “PUBLIC LAW 86-167-AUG. 18, 1959, SECT. 633,” 86th Congress, 1st Session. Public Law 86-167 (H.R. 4405). Monday, August 17, 1959, p. 383, <http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys>.

²¹ Leonard, *History of Strategic and Ballistic Missile Defense: Volume II*, 14.

²² Department of Defense, “Consideration given to the development of the Ballistic Missile Early Warning System,” p. 7.

²³ Donald A. Quarles, “Report for President Dwight D. Eisenhower from Acting Secretary of Defense Donald A. Quarles regarding the anti-ballistic missile weapon system program. Topics include: early warning system; NIKE-ZEUS system; supporting research.” Department of Defense, Issue Date: Oct 15, 1958, Date Declassified: Oct 17, 1996, Unsanitized, Complete, 13 page(s), from Declassified Documents Reference System (GALE), p. 6.

Bradley theorized it would cost over \$77 million per installation.²⁴ By 1959, the first two installations were granted a total budget of over \$800 million.²⁵ The Greenland installation, located at Thule Air Base, was estimated to be completed by September of 1960, and fully operational by September 1961. The Alaskan installation would be operational by December 1961. Lastly, the Scotland installation would be operational late in 1962.²⁶ As projected earlier, the BMEWS would not be fully operational until late 1961, a year after it was estimated that the Soviet Union would have a fully operational ICBM program. However, with help from SAC, Eisenhower and the Department of Defense were able to get the Greenland installation up and running by September of 1960, which gave the United States the ability to detect ICBM launches from anywhere within the Soviet Union.²⁷

Throughout the entire development of the BMEWS, Eisenhower played an active role. He placed competent individuals into positions to make sure things got done. With the support of SAC, the BMEWS was completed on time, and by 1960 the United States had the ability to detect any launch of Soviet ICBM's. If Harry Watters's prediction that the first two installations would cost a total of \$800 million was correct, then each individual BMEWS installation would cost a total of \$400 million. Thus, all three installations would cost over \$1.2 billion, which roughly agrees with the Air Force prediction that the total BMEWS program would cost \$1.3 billion. Overall, Eisenhower and SAC made sure that the installations were constructed in a budget friendly manner, however, the BMEWS was only one step in securing the United States's borders from Soviet aggression. The BMEWS was only a radar system meant to alert the United States of a launch. It did not secure the United States by taking out Soviet Union's ICBMs. To do that, and guarantee U.S. security, Eisenhower and SAC devised and authorized the NIKE-ZEUS program. The NIKE-ZEUS program would work in conjunction with the BMEWS to provide overall security, but also to guarantee that the BMEWS would survive, as they too were vulnerable to ICBM attack.²⁸

²⁴ William Bradley, "Status of Ballistic Missile Early Warning System (BMEWS) outlined," Department of Defense, Issue Date: Oct 10, 1958, Date Declassified: Aug 07, 1991, Unsanitized, Complete. 1 page(s), from Declassified Documents Reference System (GALE).

²⁵ H.J. Watters, "Harry Watters expresses his views on budget proposals for the Ballistic Missile Early Warning System (BMEWS)," White House, Issue Date: Mar 10, 1959, Date Declassified: May 12, 2004, Complete 3 page(s), from Declassified Documents Reference System (GALE), p. 1.

²⁶ William Bradley, "Status of Ballistic Missile Early Warning System (BMEWS) outlined."

²⁷ "Acting Defense Secretary James H. Douglas' memo to President Eisenhower on progress on the anti-Ballistic Missile Weapons System for three-month period ending 10/15/60, topics include: Ballistic Missile Early Warning System (BMEWS); NIKE-ZEUS Anti-Missile Guided Missile Defense System; ATLAS," Department of Defense, Issue Date: Dec 12, 1960, Date Declassified: Oct 25, 1994, Unsanitized, Incomplete. 3 page(s), from Declassified Documents Reference System (GALE), p. 1.

²⁸ Leonard, *History of Strategic and Ballistic Missile Defense: Volume II*, 50.

Cost, Benefit, and Construction of the NIKE-ZEUS PROGRAM

With the BMEWS becoming operational, the next step for the United States was to get the NIKE-ZEUS program off the ground. As stated earlier the NIKE-ZEUS program had its origins in the NIKE-AJAX system for security against air threats. By 1958, there were over 241 AJAX launchers and batteries.²⁹ With the confirmation of Soviet ICBM capability, through the launch of Sputnik, the United States needed a way to defend itself. The BMEWS was a method to alert the United States of ICBM launches; however, the United States needed a way to destroy the ICBMs. Thus, Eisenhower and his administration took steps to convert the NIKE-AJAX system into the new NIKE-ZEUS program to take out Soviet ICBMs if ever launched. The new NIKE-ZEUS program would work in conjunction with the BMEWS to ensure U.S. security.

Eisenhower tried to corral the inter-service rivalries that plagued the military. By doing so, he hoped to bring down duplicate and exuberant spending by the different military branches. This philosophy and administrative attitude also applied to the BMEWS and NIKE-ZEUS program. Eisenhower ordered the BMEWS to be in the hands of the Air Force, while the NIKE-ZEUS would solely be under the command of the Army. This was to insure there would be no rivalry and that spending would be kept under control. As with the BMEWS, a couple questions emerge. How would the NIKE-ZEUS program be paid for and how much would the system cost? How would the NIKE-ZEUS program be constructed? Lastly, would the NIKE-ZEUS program even be beneficial for securing the United States against the Soviet threat?

Concerning the first question, how would the NIKE-ZEUS program be paid for and how much would the system cost, Eisenhower had to deal with a conflicting situation to his priorities. As stated, earlier Eisenhower desperately attempted to cut funds to the military as he viewed it as mostly excessive waste. However, regarding the NIKE-ZEUS program, Eisenhower had to deal with a new military expense on top of the funding already diverted to not only the BMEWS but also the original NIKE-AJAX system. The new NIKE-ZEUS program would be a major cost to the United States. As with the BMEWS, the NIKE-ZEUS program began in 1956 with the first contracts issued in February of 1956.³⁰ On 3 September 1957, a report by the Department of Defense estimated that a fully operational NIKE-ZEUS system would cost over \$300 million. In addition, the first NIKE-ZEUS battery would be operational by 1963.³¹ However, the \$300 million estimate was way below what the actual cost would be.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, 37.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, 181.

³¹ Department of Defense, "Report on the progress of the NIKE-ZEUS anti-missile missile system," Department of Defense, Issue Date: Sep 3, 1957, Date Declassified: Feb 08, 1979, Unsanitized, Complete, 2 page(s), from Declassified Documents Reference System (GALE), p. 2.

Bradley informed Killian through a memorandum on 29 October 1958 that the NIKE-ZEUS program would cost the United States at least \$1 billion on average over a five-year period.³² However, Bradley defended the program by stating that the alternative to the NIKE-ZEUS program was a continuation of the Strategic Air Command's bomber defense with a total cost of around \$1.5 billion. Bombers had the ability for a partial defense, but bombers could not stop all the new Soviet ICBMs. An ICBM could carry 5 to 20 nuclear warheads, and a bomber could only focus on one warhead at a time. For the NIKE-ZEUS system, each anti-ballistic missile could deliver a respectable number of warheads against Soviet ICBMs, thus providing a more secure situation.³³ So to Bradley, the NIKE-ZEUS program was the better choice.

To cut costs a plan came about to convert already existing NIKE-AJAX facilities over to the new NIKE-ZEUS system.³⁴ In effect, the conversion of the NIKE-AJAX into the NIKE-ZEUS would only cost about \$200,000 each.³⁵ To begin the funding for the NIKE-ZEUS program Congress authorized \$112 million to be used for facilities, production, and research.³⁶ Consequently, in the end the NIKE-ZEUS program was given the go ahead with both an understanding of how much the entire program might cost and Congress's blessing. However even with the funding, the NIKE-ZEUS program was plagued with many developmental issues and setbacks that shaped its construction.

The NIKE-ZEUS program from the beginning had to deal with unforeseen circumstances that not only raised the cost, but also delayed its fully functional capacity; however even with technical issues, the NIKE-ZEUS program continued. One issue was there were not enough testing facilities. The NIKE-AJAX missiles had a maxim range that kept it within a continent's boundaries, thus the Army only needed a testing facility with limited range. However, with the NIKE-ZEUS missiles needing to be able to travel a greater distance, a much larger facility would be needed. Thus, the Army would have to either redesign old facilities, or create new ones. One base the Army considered was the Atlantic Missile Range, as it

³² William Bradley, "[Guided missiles] Effectiveness of the Nike Zeus System against ICBM Attack [the compound or cluster warhead containing six to fifty individual bombs in the onehundred kiloton range is a threat against which Nike-Zeus could be completely ineffective. The cluster warhead would demand a great rate of fire from an active defense system, use of decoys would complicate the defense problems, radar blackout and bending due to the effects of defensive warhead blasts would reduce Nike-Zeus's effectiveness, and the Zeus target acquisition radar dishes would be vulnerable to very low blast pressure. The provision of 200-psi shelters for SAC aircraft could produce the same defensive result for a cost of \$1.5 billion with less doubt about reliability]," Presidents Science Advisory Committee, Issue Date: Oct 29, 1958, Date Declassified: Nov 04, 1980, Sanitized, Incomplete, 3 page(s), from Declassified Documents Reference System (GALE), p. 1.

³³ *Ibid.*, 2.

³⁴ Christopher J. Bright, *Continental Defense in the Eisenhower Era: Nuclear Antiaircraft Arms and the Cold War* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), 98.

³⁵ John A. Giles, "244 Revamped NIKE Sites to Cost \$200,000 Each," *Washington Evening Star*, 20 March 1957.

³⁶ Statutes at Large, "Public Law 85-325 AN ACT To authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to establish and develop certain installations for the national security, and to confer certain authority on the Secretary of Defense, and for other purposes," 85th Congress, 2nd Session, p. 11.

had suitable available targets for practice. But the Atlantic Missile Range had a drawback in that it was not large enough. To make up for this the Army also looked at the Pacific Missile Range and the White Sands Missile Range.³⁷

Ultimately, the White Sands Missile Range would be one of the major testing sites for the NIKE-ZEUS program. At White Sands, the Army tested the NIKE-ZEUS missiles with both degrees of success and failure. On 28 April 1960, the Army had a successful test of the NIKE-ZEUS missile.³⁸ But on 16 November of the same year a NIKE-ZEUS test had to be terminated seconds after launch because of a propulsion error.³⁹ With the hit and miss success rate of the NIKE-ZEUS program during its conception, research, and development, the hopeful timetable of having a fully working anti-ballistic missile system by 1963 was delayed.

By 4 March 1959, the timetable for the NIKE-ZEUS program was delayed. A memorandum to Killian on 3 December 1958 called into question the effectiveness of the NIKE-ZEUS program, stating that by 1963 the Soviet Union would have 300 operational ICBMs aimed at the United States's Strategic Air Command locations. Thus, the NIKE-ZEUS program had to go into further research and development that theoretically would push the operational timetable of the entire program until possibly 1965. Furthermore, the memorandum stated that the current NIKE-ZEUS system would not be able to affectively shoot down enough ICBMs to allow even ten Strategic Air bases to survive.⁴⁰ Besides this report to Killian there were other situations and construction problems, and the once hopeful timetable of having a working anti-ballistic missile system by 1963 had become a pipe dream. Killian stated at a 4 March 1959 conference with the president that the NIKE-ZEUS program could not be a factor in the defense of the United States until late 1964 or early 1965.⁴¹ SAC further supported this estimate on 18 October 1960. During

³⁷ Donald A. Quarles, "Progress report on the anti-ballistic missile weapon system, December 10, 1958," Dwight D. Eisenhower Presidential Library, Museum, and Boyhood Home (Online Documents Declassified Documents - Fiscal Year 2011), http://www.eisenhower.archives.gov/research/online_documents.html.

³⁸ "WH staff notes; topics include: Titan, Nike, and Zeus launchings at Atlantic Missile Range; FHA announces lowering of down payments on housing valued above \$13,500; Cuba to send delegation to discuss acquiring Nicaro nickel company," White House, Issue Date: Apr 29, 1960, Date Declassified: Apr 10, 1990, Unsanitized, Complete. 2 page(s), from Declassified Documents Reference System (GALE), p. 1.

³⁹ "Acting Defense Secretary James H. Douglas' memo to President Eisenhower on progress on the anti-Ballistic Missile Weapons System for three-month period ending 10/15/60, topics include: Ballistic Missile Early Warning System (BMEWS); NIKE-ZEUS Anti-Missile Guided Missile Defense System; ATLAS," Department of Defense.

⁴⁰ B. McMillian "Memo regarding risks involved in the Nike-Zeus program, December 3, 1958," Dwight D. Eisenhower Presidential Library, Museum, and Boyhood Home (Online Documents Declassified Documents - Fiscal Year 2011), http://www.eisenhower.archives.gov/research/online_documents.html.

⁴¹ "(Guided missiles. Discussion of active and passive defense systems for the ballistic missile program; passive tactics are considered to be cheaper; Nike-Zeus will not be operational before 1964 or 1965; "hardening" of launch sites will force the Soviet offensive missile needs upwards by a factor of 10 to 15, i.e., 200 weapons will be required to destroy a hard target instead of five for a soft site; aircraft protection is discussed; BMEWS and a backup system should be pursued as quickly as possible.) Memorandum of Conference (Dwight D. Eisenhower, Pres.; Donald A. Quarles, Dep. Secy of Defense; Gen. Nathan Twining, Chairman, JCS; Dr. J. R. Killian, Jr., Spec. Asst. to the Pres. for Science and Technology; Gordon Gray, Dir., ODM; Gen. Andrew Goodpaster, Staff Secy to the Pres.; other government officials). Mar. 17, 1959.," White House, Issue Date: Mar 17, 1959, Date Declassified: Jan 20, 1977, Sanitized, Incomplete, 4 page(s), from Declassified Documents Reference System (GALE), p. 1.

the SAC meeting, it proposed that the NIKE-ZEUS program was not needed at the current time because the large-scale batteries, numbering around 70 as proposed by NORAD, were not justifiable.⁴² The reasoning was that the NIKE-ZEUS missiles were not as successful as all had hoped, and further research would be needed.

Overall, both SAC and Killian had a hand in delaying the production of the NIKE-ZEUS program. Even though there was a great fear that the Soviet Union would out-produce the United States in terms of ICBMs, these individuals were able to prevent a massive expenditure in a program with many faults. Consequently, the NIKE-ZEUS program took the time it needed to produce accurate and successful security defense systems able to secure both the BMEWS and the United States. In the end, though, the NIKE-ZEUS program did not play as major a role in the securing of the United States as the BMEWS did because the entire program was mostly a Research and Development project. It did not get fully established until after many delays had occurred, unlike the BMEWS, which had operational functions by 1960. However, the NIKE-ZEUS program did establish for the United States a method to test future anti-ICBM missiles and gave peace of mind that the United States was not just actively producing a method to warn about a future attack, but also taking steps to provide a means to shoot down any incoming ICBMs.

Conclusion

In conclusion Eisenhower was not a do-nothing president. As seen with the BMEWS and the NIKE-ZEUS program, he was an active president and succeeded in his goal of attempting to create an effective fighting unit while cutting cost. Eisenhower was active not because he was a hands-on individual who directly influenced how the programs materialized. Instead, he knew how to delegate tasks so that those individuals who were most qualified to handle the situation were in power. However, contrary to the opinions of those who accused Eisenhower of only delegating tasks, he made sure, as shown throughout this essay, that the individuals to whom he delegated tasks always reported back to him. These individuals made sure that the security of the United States was paramount, but in a cost effective manner. In regards to the BMEWS and NIKE-ZEUS programs, these individuals recommended to Eisenhower that to cut down on military infighting the two programs had to be segregated. Thus, the BMEWS went to the Air Force and the NIKE-ZEUS program went to the Army.

To guarantee that the BMEWS and later NIKE-ZEUS program ran smoothly and did not over tax itself, Eisenhower put the Science Advisory Committee in charge of overseeing everything. Throughout the 1950s and 1960s SAC would

⁴² "President's Science Advisory Committee reports on Nike-Zeus program," White House, Issue Date: Oct 18, 1960, Date Declassified: Aug 07, 1991, Unsanitized, Complete, 3 page(s), from Declassified Documents Reference System (GALE), p. 1.

hold sway and reflect Eisenhower's wishes. For the BMEWS, SAC guaranteed that the program got funding and was established in a timely manner. While in regards to the NIKE-ZEUS program, SAC made sure that funds were directed to priority targets, and when it was deemed that the NIKE-ZEUS program was less urgent, SAC recommended that the program be delayed until it was bug-free and cost effective. Overall, SAC enabled Eisenhower to create a budget friendly defense initiative that was not as heavily plagued by in fighting. Thus, in the end, the new historical view of Eisenhower as an active president who was not a do-nothing, and did everything possible to create a budget-friendly military that was still supremely effective is supported by how the Ballistic Missile Early Warning System and NIKE-ZEUS program were handled, funded, and constructed.

The Purpose of the Industrial Workers of the World within America's Labor Movement

Michael Gromoll
University of Central Florida

Recognized as one of the most rebellious labor unions in America during the early twentieth century by the general public and the federal government, the Industrial Workers of the World (IWW) advocated tactics which, the organization believed, would strengthen the country's labor movement. These tactics included "dual unionism" and a stance against politically affiliated groups. During a period of poor labor conditions and inadequate income with long working hours the United States experienced a swell of labor unions that looked to change the status quo. The IWW fought for industrial workers as opposed to craft workers. The IWW was created in response to the monopoly the American Federation of Labor (AFL) held over the rest of the labor unions. One of its primary qualities was that the IWW separated itself from the AFL and other labor groups by enforcing its dual unionist stance, which prohibited any IWW member from infiltrating said labor unions.¹ The IWW was a change from previous labor groups, but became stagnant as the organization refused to alter its tactics. IWW grew to be considered one of the most radical labor groups in the early twentieth century. However, reluctant to change their approach, the organization was short-lived. The IWW was a sensationalist group that temporarily attracted popularity. Acting as a transitional organization in between past labor unions and the Communist Party, the IWW was never made to last.

Towards the end of World War I the Bolshevik Party inside Russia overthrew the Tsar and the provisional government during the Russian Revolution. The Bolsheviks then created a state in which the workers held control of the country. While the Communist ideology and the syndicalist beliefs of the IWW were not identical, leaders of the IWW saw advantages in supporting Communism.² However, the General Executive Board (GEB) of the IWW prohibited any affiliation with the Communist Party, as the organization felt threatened by the party's popularity. Remaining firm in its stance as a dual unionist organization, the IWW disassociated itself from the Communist Party. The inability of the GEB to compromise on tactics that could have potentially amalgamated the two groups shrank the organization. Former IWW members, such as Bill Haywood, William Z. Foster, and James P. Cannon, left the IWW and joined the Communist Party with hopes of furthering America's labor movement. Through these three men

¹ Walter Linder and Martin Stevens, "Dual Unionism: Outmoded Strategy or Useful Tactic?" *New England Free Press* 12, no. 1 (July-August 1967): 56.

² Ralph Darlington, *Radical Unionism: The Rise and Fall of Revolutionary Syndicalism* (Chicago: Haymarket Books, 2008), 177.

one can grasp a better understanding of how and why IWW members joined the organization only to alter their allegiance to the Communist Party.

Beginning with its creation in 1905, the IWW was on a crusade to topple capitalism. Many labor unions attacked the capitalist model and wanted to replace it with an alternative system. Historians have used such terms as syndicalism, anarcho-syndicalism, radicalism, revolutionary, and industrial unionist to describe the IWW.³ However, the correct label to place on the IWW is still debatable. The group itself could not decide on one description. Members boasted about their radical agenda, while at the same time the GEB denounced any sort of mischievous behavior.⁴

Either way, the concern is not with what label the IWW should receive but rather the tactics the group used and did not use. The IWW used a strategy known as dual unionism. The American historian, David J. Saposs, identified dual unionism as the division of ideologies where groups of workers differentiate themselves by the different philosophies practiced by the organization. Saposs classified the IWW as a radical union based upon their revolutionary elements in comparison to that of the conservative practices of the AFL.⁵ Historians Walter Linder and Martin Stevens suggested dual unionism was used by the IWW in order to strengthen industrial unionism. Linder and Stevens argued that the IWW thought industrial unionism, while under the syndicalist ideology, could free the working class from capitalism. In other words, the workers could hold dominion over the workforce only if the unskilled led the fight against the status quo.⁶ A former member of the IWW, James P. Cannon, interpreted dual unionism internally, unlike Saposs and many other labor historians who understood dual unionism as an external conflict between different unions. For Cannon, dual unionism was used by the IWW as a way to unite all workers and at the same time function as a sectionalist revolutionary party bent on spreading propaganda. Internal discord increased with the debate on whether the IWW should operate within other labor unions or maintain their separate status. This became known as the “boring from within” and “dual unionism” dilemma.⁷ Boring from within essentially means that one group infiltrates a second group in order to persuade the second group’s opinions in favor of the first. The tactic of boring from within was rejected by the IWW’s General Executive Board for practical reasons. Organizations such as the AFL and the Communist Party were disregarded because they were thought to be corrupted by politicians. Rather than chance contamination with the boring from within tactic, the IWW remained firm with their dual unionist stance.⁸

³ John S. Gams, *The Decline of the I.W.W.* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1932), 178.

⁴ Paul F. Brissenden, *The I.W.W.: A Study of American Syndicalism* (New York: Columbia University, 1919), 9.

⁵ David, J. Saposs, *Left Wing Unionism: A Study of Radical Policies and Tactics* (New York: International Publishers, 1926), 29.

⁶ Linder and Stevens, “Dual Unionism,” 56.

⁷ James P. Cannon, “The IWW” *Fourth International* (Summer, 1955): 77-78.

⁸ Linder and Stevens, “Dual Unionism,” 57.

The IWW struggled to gather members during its first two decades for numerous reasons. Historian John S. Gambs suggested the decline of the IWW stemmed from three factors, the first being the counter offensive by federal officials. During the First World War charges of conspiracy to obstruct the war by carrying out sabotage and speaking out against the draft were placed against IWW officers and members. While all charges of sabotage were dropped, IWW members still served time due to the Espionage Act.⁹ Another reason for IWW's decline, Gambs argued, was because of the friction within the organization. There was a dispute as to whether the IWW should remain centralized or provide the rank and file more freedom to manage themselves. Divisions of labor within the IWW argued for local administration across the United States. The GEB insisted upon the rule of the rank and file, but discouraged the decentralization of the executive board. Sections of the organization were denied more autonomy, which in turn discouraged members to cooperate. As the GEB tightened its hold against allowing members to infiltrate other unions they also renounced the demand for adjustments.¹⁰ Gambs's third reason for the IWW's decline was the rise of the Communist Party. Gambs classified the IWW as a revolutionary industrial union, which shared similarities with the Communist Party, but untimely splintered its members to choose one side over the other. With no agenda of potentially expanding the IWW into the newly formed Communist party, the GEB secluded itself. However, the similarities attached IWW members to the Communist ideology.¹¹ Because dual unionism was enforced, IWW members were left with an ultimatum to either remain with their group, which was in dramatic decline, or leave.

The Industrial Workers of the World's myopic tactic of dual unionism restrained it from negotiating with the AFL. As World War I came to a close, the Communist Party in Russia became recognized around the world. The IWW used the same tactic of dual unionism with the Communist Party and experienced similar setbacks with compromising as it did with the AFL, however, this time many left their organization in favor of the Communist model. While all three factors provided by Gambs account for the IWW's decline, this article argues that the organization was not created for longevity.

It is important to understand the GEB's resistance to compromise with other labor unions. William Z. Foster was a member of the GEB who left the IWW to join the Communist Party. In his article, "The Bankruptcy of the American Labor Movement," Foster explained the weakness of running a dual union, arguing that dual unionism cuts off the ability to negotiate with other labor parties, or in this case

⁹ American Civil Liberties Union, *The Truth about the I.W.W. Prisoners* (New York: American Civil Liberties Union, 1922), 3.

¹⁰ Gambs, *Decline of the I.W.W.*, 177.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, 178.

with the Communist Party.¹² The GEB acted as the voice of the IWW. However, its inability to adjust its standards resulted in the organization's dismemberment.

The Comintern became influential within the American labor movement by aiding select labor unions, but never gained the IWW's acceptance. Shortly after World War I the United States went through a period known as the Red Scare, during which the federal government aggressively attacked radical unions, including the IWW and Communist organizations. Towards the end of 1919, U.S. Attorney General A. Mitchell Palmer set in motion a series of raids to round up alien radicals.¹³ The Department of Justice drafted seventeen bills to increase the government's control over free speech during the United States's entry into the War and Congress passed several of these bills and turned them into acts, such as the Espionage Act, the Trading with the Enemy Act, the Sedition Act, and the Alien Act.¹⁴ Because the United States did not agree to the Versailles Treaty, technically it remained at war into the 1920s, and as a result many of these acts spilled into the time of the Red Scare.

The Communist Party sought to spread the proletarian revolution by attracting support from Europeans and American workers. Amongst the confusion and uncertainty over the cooperation with the American Communist parties, the Comintern turned its attention to the envelopment of the IWW. Because its members never shied away from confrontation against its opponents, the IWW never worked underground as an organization. Working aboveground, the IWW encouraged animosity from its capitalist aggressors as well as the mass media. While the attention they created might have assisted the government's repression against the organization, IWW members felt their troubled image acted as a beacon for the rest of the oppressed industrial working-class. Consequently, when the Comintern showed signs of camaraderie towards the IWW, its anticipation of a possible unification with the labor group was no secret.

However, according to Grigory Zinoviev, head of the Communist International, Alexandr Lozovsky, head of the Profintern, and Vladimir Lenin, head of the government of the Russian Soviet Federation Socialist Republic, syndicalism went against the progress of the world revolution. Lozovsky stated, "the more the IWW is isolated from the masses, the more aloof their organizations will be, the longer and slower the development of class consciousness among the American proletariat. . . . Thus the coordination and unity of action within the AFL locals

¹² William Z. Foster, *Bankruptcy of the American Labor Movement* (Chicago: Trade Union Educational League, 1922), 23-24.

¹³ Harvey Klehr and John Earl Haynes, *The American Communist Movement: Storming Heaven Itself* (New York: Twayne Publishers, 1992), 27.

¹⁴ Larry Ceplair, *Anti-Communism in Twentieth-Century America: A Critical History* (Santa Barbara: Praeger, 2011), 12. Many of the acts passed as a result of the government's attempt to quell the domestic aggression at home while the United States was at war.

affiliated to the Profintern was obligatory for the IWW.”¹⁵ Lenin stated, “in the present instance, particularly as regards the Industrial Workers of the World in the U.S.A., . . . we are dealing with a profoundly proletarian and mass movement, which in all essentials actually stands by the basic principles of the Communist International.”¹⁶ Communists, Lenin felt, should establish Communist groups in all trade unions, thereby bringing all trade unions under Communist control. A positive relationship between Zinoviev and any syndicalist group never materialized. Zinoviev declared that the Comintern would have to “put an end to all syndicalist prejudices,” and that the Communist party will have to “separate the Communist wheat from the Syndicalist weeds.”¹⁷ The additional IWW leaders who joined the Communist party did not end Zinoviev’s frustration, as these leaders failed to recruit the rank and file to follow their lead. The failure of the United States and Europe to foment the workers’ revolution as quickly as the Bolsheviks hoped for put pressure on the Russian state. The Comintern rejected any middle ground with the IWW. Historian Ralph Darlington argued that Zinoviev bullied the organizations the Comintern looked to absorb, thereby creating more friction with the GEB.¹⁸ Zinoviev turned against the IWW who he felt were the “bearers of bourgeois ideology.”¹⁹

While every member of the IWW who left for the Communist Party cannot be accounted for there were a few who held higher positions and wrote about their transformation. Three ex-IWW members are examined to better understand the reasons why IWW members chose to support Communism. Through the writings of Bill Haywood, William Z. Foster, and James P. Cannon one gains a stronger evaluation of the average industrial worker and the shift within the IWW organization. That is not to say these are the only IWW members who spoke out on the topic of Communism and labor activism. Others who held the position of general secretary of treasury, such as George Hardy and Thomas Whitehead, voiced their advocacy of Communism in America, but their writings on the topic were limited.²⁰ Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, who played a leading role inside the IWW,

¹⁵ Alexandr Lozovsky, *Resolutions et Decisions: Du I-er Congrès International des Syndicats Révolutionnaires* (Moscow: Feltrinelli, 1921), 24-25.

¹⁶ V.I. Lenin, “Theses on the Fundamental Tasks of the Second Congress of the Communist International,” *Progress Publishers*, vol. 31. (July, 2015), 200.

¹⁷ Darlington, *Radical Unionism*, 195. Also see *Communist International*, no. 11-12, June-July 1920, 2133-2134.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 195.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 196.

²⁰ New York Legislative Documents: One hundred and Forty-Fourth Session, 1921 (Albany, 1921), 1932. In a response to the Philadelphia longshoremen who attacked Russian workers by means of explosives, Thomas Whitehead apologizes for their act and asks to remain in the Communists’ good graces. Whitehead, along with a handful of GEB members, signed the document just after the incident and asked the Communist party to overlook the disastrous misconception of how the IWW viewed its Communist counterpart. George Hardy, “Shop Organization the Base of the I.W.W.,” *The One Big Union Monthly* (June 1920). Hardy voiced his idea on how to organize the IWW in a hybrid structure similar to the present time IWW and the Communist Russian apparatus where the job branches are sectioned off by industrial districts, which all lead to the Central Branch Councils. During the time of this publication rank and file members of the IWW disputed amongst itself over the possibility of becoming a more decentralized organization. Through Hardy’s writings he made clear he was not in favor of a decentralized organization, but rather he fought for a strong centralized power similar to the Communist model already achieved by the Russians.

joined the Communist Party, but not until the late 1930s, as she spent her energy in the 1920s mainly fighting for women's rights.²¹ Haywood, Foster and Cannon worked under the organizational tactics the IWW enforced, but later found the Communist model more suitable for achieving their end goals of a workers' state.

While the IWW and Communism had many differences, their similarities cannot be ignored. Both fought for the working class under an industrialization model. Those who led the IWW saw stagnation within their organization. A decline in numbers and enthusiasm weakened the group, which all stemmed from the tactics that were being practiced. Members of the IWW could not fulfill their revolutionary aspirations within this organization. Ex-IWW members felt that using the Communist model was their best chance at achieving real change.

William Dudley Haywood, also known as "Big" Bill Haywood, was recognized as one of the prominent radical leaders of the early twentieth century. Born in Salt Lake City, Haywood worked as a miner and later in life became affiliated with the Western Labor Union, which in turn met frequently with the Western Federation of Miners (WFM) where he was given a position on the executive board. Working as a miner during the latter half of the nineteenth century was dramatically different than for the previous generation of miners, as new technology changed the process of mining altogether. The Pacific Railroad was completed just three months before Haywood was born in 1869.²² With the ability to transport raw material, work supplies and workers themselves, mining changed from a local profession into a large-scale industry dominated by capital.

This transformation revolutionized how men mined. Instead of using a pickaxe and pan to excavate raw materials to sell regionally, men worked for wages anywhere they could find work. While Haywood never experienced the life of a prospector, he highlighted the juxtaposition between the old way of working as compared to the revolutionized burden of mining in his day and age. Haywood joined the labor movement because he wanted to help the working class overcome the struggles that were created by capitalism. The best way to accomplish capitalism's defeat was through industrial syndicalism, which meant those working in an industrial environment would hold ownership of their job, thereby liquidating the grip of the employer and in turn the whole system of government.

Before World War I, Haywood's best solution for working class troubles was through a general strike in which multiple unions would collaborate and simultaneously stall the capitalist machine by halting productivity for major industries. This process did not include any aid from politicians or any compromising with unwanted unions, such as the AFL. However, it showed that Haywood was

²¹ Lara Vapnek, *Elizabeth Gurley Flynn: Modern American Revolutionary* (Colorado: Westview Press, 2015), 106.

²² Joseph R. Conlin, *Big Bill Haywood and the Radical Union Movement* (New York: Syracuse University Press, 1969), 1, 12, 21.

willing to expand his organization for the good of the labor movement. In an interview with the American writer Max Eastman, Bill Haywood explained his change of heart over his position within the IWW. In the beginning of his unionist career Haywood fought to give workers more control over their jobs, but after the success of the Russian Revolution he promoted the idea of a working class state. Haywood told Eastman that “it is simply because they have done wonderful things over there that we have been dreaming about doing over here. It is the fact, the example, that has caused any change in me that may seem contradictory. And even now I would hesitate to confirm such a movement if everything that emanated from Moscow did not show that they want to put the workers in control, and eventually eliminate the state.”²³

Haywood had been fighting for the working class all his adult life. Neither he nor any other American labor activist knew much about what was going on in Russia until the Bolsheviks took power in late 1917. For this reason, the American labor movement was something separate from the Communist model that resulted from the Russian Revolution. What occurred in America after The Great War was a mixture of America’s past labor movement mixed with the presentation of Communism. Influenced by both its history in labor activism and its relationship with the introduction of Communism in America, the American labor movement became a hybrid of ideologies that meshed syndicalism with Communism. The two organizations’ position on political parties clashed as their tactical approach contested one another. However, Haywood represented someone who had opposing views of the specifics of Communism, but could change his attitude towards the party.²⁴

Similar to Bill Haywood, William Z. Foster did not start his labor activist career with the IWW. Foster joined the Socialist Party of America at its creation in 1901. In 1905, at the time of the IWW’s formation, Foster remained loyal to the Socialist Party. However, much like Haywood, the syndicalist appeal of the IWW caught Foster’s attention and he later joined the organization in 1909. Unsatisfied with the tactics of the IWW, Foster would leave the organization and join a handful of other unions including the Syndicalist League of North America (SLNA), the Brotherhood of Railway Carmen, and his final occupation with the Trade Union Educational League (TUEL) led by the Communist Party.²⁵

Dual unionism, as Foster understood it, crippled America’s labor movement. In a dual setback, the policy of dual unionism led thousands of the very best worker militants to desert the mass labor organization and led them to waste their efforts to construct idealistic and impractical unions. Foster stated that “dual unionism

²³ Max Eastman, “Bill Haywood, Communist,” *The Liberator* (April 1921).

²⁴ *Ibid.*

²⁵ Victor G. Devinatz, “Labor Philosophy of William Z. Foster From the IWW to the TUEL” *International Social Science Review* 71, nos. 1/2 (1996): 3.

has poisoned the very springs of progress in the American labor movement and is primarily responsible for its present sorry plight.”²⁶ Foster wrote, “I am satisfied that the only way for the IWW to have the workers adopt and practice the principles of revolutionary unionism is to give up its attempt to create a new labor movement and by building up better fighting machines within the old unions . . . revolutionize those unions.”²⁷ The Bolsheviks used the tactic of boring from within by means of their militant minority or vanguard, as opposed to standing as a dual unionist organization. For Foster, the Communist Party was the pinnacle of everything he fought for during his years as an American labor activist. While Foster attempted to pull the IWW in his direction of interests the organization would not cooperate. Instead, Foster left the group behind in favor of the Communist model and what he saw as a party that would provide the American labor movement’s best chance at success.

James P. Cannon’s involvement within the American labor movement was also extensive, stretching from his early years with the Socialist Party of America, to his commitment within the IWW, and finally his formation of the Workers’ Party, which acted as the first aboveground legal communist party in the United States.²⁸ The same revolutionary appeal that drew Cannon to the IWW lacked the stability to have a long-lasting impact against capitalist America. Cannon stated that as “a revolutionary organization proclaiming an all-out fight against the capitalist system the IWW led many strikes which swelled the membership momentarily. But after the strikes were over, whether won or lost, stable union organization was not maintained.”²⁹ The negligence of the IWW to engage sufficiently with political parties and their isolated method of encountering the public by means of street confrontations was criticized by Cannon, who found himself once again as a member of an organization that lacked effectiveness.

Cannon was one of the many IWW members who left the organization in favor of the Communist party. However, this did not mean he abandoned his previous group. On the contrary, he appealed to the IWW to reconsider its position on issues, including its anti-Communist stance. As Cannon expressed in one of his writings while he was a Communist Party member, the IWW “are separated from the party mainly by doubt, hesitation, and pessimism. And they lack confidence in the party. All of these difficulties can be overcome by systematic work and a friendly, sympathetic attitude towards them.”³⁰ Cannon believed the IWW could still be salvaged despite its preconditions. He was also against exclusionists and felt the Communist party should strive for additions to their ranks. Cannon’s position

²⁶ Foster, *Bankruptcy of the American Labor Movement*, 23.

²⁷ William Z. Foster, “As to My Candidacy,” *Industrial Worker*, 2 November 1911, 3.

²⁸ Bryan D. Palmer, *James P. Cannon and the Origins of the American Revolutionary Left, 1890-1928* (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2007), 16-17.

²⁹ Cannon, “The IWW,” 75.

³⁰ James P. Cannon, “What Kind of a Party?,” *The Worker* vol.6 (March 3, 1923), 1-2.

contradicted his previous organization's approach towards gaining members. While Cannon cried out, "Broaden the Party!" as what he believed should stand as the Communist slogan, the IWW distanced itself from other labor unions and also from the Communist party.

In one of his writings, Cannon addressed the IWW's phobia towards political parties and attempted to clarify the differences between parties, stating "the IWW has not yet come to the point where it makes a distinction between capitalist politics which are aimed against the working class and Communist politics which are aimed against the capitalists."³¹ All of the differences the IWW held against politics took a toll on Cannon who confessed that he was "shaken up on my anti-political wobblyism."³² The lack of progress within the organization brought on by the IWW's insecurity with politicians drove Cannon from syndicalism towards the direction of leftwing socialism. It was not until the Bolshevik Revolution that Cannon found his true calling as an American labor activist. In his pamphlet titled, "The IWW: The Great Anticipation," Cannon addressed his views on politics by stating,

It took the First World War and the Russian Revolution to reveal in full scope the incompleteness of the governing thought of the IWW. . . . The turning point came with the entrance of the United States into the First World War in the spring of 1917, and the Russian Revolution in the same year. Then "politics," which the IWW had disavowed and cast out, came back and broke down the door. From one side, this was shown when the Federal Government of the United States intervened directly to break up the concentration points of the IWW by wholesale arrests of its activists. . . . From the other side, the same determining role of political action was demonstrated positively by the Russian Revolution. The Russian workers took the state power into their own hands and used that power to expropriate the capitalist and suppress all attempts at counter-revolution.³³

The question was not, how can the radical labor movement progress against the power of politics, but instead, how can the movement use politics to its advantage? By using politics to their benefit Cannon felt America's working class had a chance at making a difference for the labor movement. The juxtaposition between America's use of politics and the Bolshevik's control over politics led Cannon to reexamine his position with the IWW as well as the IWW's position within the American labor movement.

Haywood, Foster, and Cannon would play crucial roles for both the IWW and the Communist Party in each groups' effects on the labor movement. All three

³¹ James P. Cannon, *James P. Cannon and the Early Years of American Communism* (New York: Spartacist Publishing Company, 1924), 193.

³² Palmer, *James P. Cannon and the Origins of the American Revolutionary Left*, 90.

³³ James P. Cannon, *The First Ten Years of American Communism* (New York: Pathfinder, 1962), 292.

eventually understood the significance of utilizing the method of boring from within other unions, even if Haywood came to this realization only after he joined the Communist Party. These three men symbolized the inadequacy of the IWW's tactics and the solution of abandoning the organization in order to further the labor movement. While each of these men had a part in creating the IWW they did not disconnect themselves from the rest of the labor movement by remaining chained to the organization. They used the IWW to benefit their needs in furthering the movement and were not used by the IWW for the sole purpose of aiding the organization. Because the IWW was not willing to change its methods it was left behind by the more successful unions and party organizations. During a time of uncertainty and dramatic change the last maneuvers an organization wanted to enforce were stagnation and separation.

The Power of the Familiar: Intertextuality in Anime and Manga through Hirano Kouta's Hellsing

Javiera N. Reyes-Navarro
Independent Scholar

Advances in production capability and an increase in consumer demand have caused the anime and manga industry to release more works yearly than ever before. With such a prolific output, there is bound to be repetition and unoriginality, which has been decried by creators and critics alike as a degeneration of the medium. In this context, Hirano Kouta's horror manga *Hellsing* remains a work that, while popular among fans, is usually seen as just another highly-commercialized product with excessive fan service in the form of gore and sexual innuendo. Without necessarily denying the previous statement, I propose that the strength of *Hellsing*'s narrative lies not in its originality, but in the successful and intentional use of intertextual references to previous works and traditional anime and manga conventions. I wish to explore these characteristics by looking first at the general world building of the author, which relies on knowledge of previous works known to fans of the genre, and, second, at the saturation of cliché imagery that is enjoyed by both author and audience due to a shared cultural background in anime/manga fandom.

As with any medium, the popularity and profitability of anime and manga has led to excessive production of unoriginal work and the repetition of formulas. Manga artist Hirano Kouta is a self-declared otaku. Moreover, he stems from what is usually considered the lowest of the genres within manga: *ero-manga* (usually just called hentai in the West), and not just any adult manga, but *dōjinshi*.¹ I perceive this not as a negative aspect, but a vantage point. Hirano, as both creator and audience, can interact with other fans through his work without the need for explicit dialogue. From the names of the manga chapters, each of them the title of a videogame, to the way he builds his characters and storyline, Hirano's work is not just a homage to those who have come before him, but to himself and his own way of approaching fandom that resonates with his readers' own experiences.

Lien Fan Shen theorizes that "like aesthetic pleasure, the pleasure of viewing anime must have a common ground — anime works. It is also to say that the pleasure of viewing anime is both individual and communal. Second, anime works often present various themes related to sexuality. . . . Thus it may be argued that anime pleasures often deal with the deployment of sexuality."² As a manga that is the product of the anime and science fiction otaku subculture of the 1980s and

¹ Fan-made comics, usually about pre-existing works, independently produced and commercialized among fans in events such as Comiket.

² Fan Lien Shen, "Anime Pleasures as a Playground of Sexuality, Power, and Resistance," *International Conference 2007 MIT5, Media in Transition: Creativity, Ownership, and Collaboration in the digital Age*, 12, http://web.mit.edu/comm-forum/mit5/papers/Shen_fullPaper.pdf.

1990s, Hellsing's pleasure relies on referencing conventions that are familiar to the audience.

Hellsing was published in the *seinen*³ manga magazine *Young King Ours* between 1997 and 2008. It has been twice animated: once as a 13-episode TV series in 2001-2002, and as a 10-episode original video animation from 2006 until 2012. The plot follows the secret Hellsing organization, which serves the British Crown and Church of England by hunting vampires. Ever since Van Helsing imprisoned Dracula himself (called Alucard in the manga), the family has used him to destroy his own kind. Standing as a competing group hunting the undead is another secret section of the Vatican, Section XIII Iscariot. The level of animosity between both groups and their members seems frozen in Counter Reformation times and elevated for the sake of entertainment. To top it all off, the main antagonist is revealed to be made up of Nazis that have formed an army of vampires. Using the name Millennium, they have remained hidden in Brazil ever since they were defeated by Hellsing during World War II, waiting for the perfect time to bring an all-out war to Britain, which will lead to an epic clash of the three organizations.

This outline already contains elements that those who have watched anime or read manga can identify as staples of the medium and of the *seinen* genre in particular: vampires, gore, guns, secret organizations, religious imagery, and Nazi occultism, among others. What guides the use of these intertextual motifs is not only their basic need to make any text function, but the pleasure that the author derives from inserting elements that he recognizes from being a consumer of the very same medium that he is producing.

Because of these elements, I believe Hellsing is a prime example of pastiche in manga. The term is used to “describe a work of art that imitates the style, gestures, or form of an old work or antique model.”⁴ In order to be pastiche, there ought to be some common cultural knowledge and model from which to borrow elements while maintaining its entity as a separate work. I propose that the existence of Hellsing, in its excess and intentional imitation of formulas, demonstrates that the anime and manga industry has grown to the point that it is possible to create works that function intertextually within it.

Ingeborg Hoesterey affirms that “postmodern pastiche is about cultural memory and the merging of horizons past and present. One of the markers that set aesthetic postmodernism apart from modernism is that its artistic practices borrow ostentatiously from the archive of Western culture that modernism.”⁵ Hirano relies heavily on the existing works of others for his world-building, one that can only function within a system of fictional conventions and traditions. From the title

³ Seinen/青年: “young man.” In manga, it refers to works targeting young male adults.

⁴ Roland Greene, ed., *The Princeton Encyclopedia of Poetry & Poetics*, 4th ed. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2012), 1005.

⁵ Ingeborg Hoesterey, *Pastiche: Cultural Memory in Art, Film, Literature* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2001), xi.

itself, he capitalizes on his audience's shared knowledge; the name Hellsing cannot fail to suggest vampires or some supernatural theme to the work as it indicates that the events of the manga are somehow related to those in Bram Stoker's *Dracula*. Apart from the eye-catching advertising possibilities of such a tactic, it offers both author and audience a platform on which the storyline can be built. Vampires are also a well-known subject in horror, for whom characteristics vary only to a degree. The need for blood, the weakness to the sun and silver, the mixture of horror and eroticism in the vampire's bite; the reader will expect most, if not all, of these elements to be present in vampire media.⁶ When asked about the reason for the use of vampires, the author's answer was blunt: "everyone likes vampires, right? I like them too."⁷ He is aware of the popularity of vampires as subjects because he himself enjoys them and believes that other elements, such as violence and weapons, are only enhanced by appearing in a vampire-centric story.

Occultist Nazis as the ultimate enemy is also a common fictional trope. Nazis have come to represent utmost evil and their symbols work as signifiers of authoritarianism and horror. In a case study of media containing Nazi antagonists, Eva Kingsepp identified five elements that were always present. Unsurprisingly, Hellsing has them all: *apocalypse*, in the final Nazi attack on London and worldwide that threatens to consume it all in war; *mystery*, in the initial investigation about the surge of vampire attacks; *hubris*, in the attitude of many of the commanders of Millennium when fighting and underestimating humans, *medical aberration* in the form of artificial vampires whose formula is derived from the tortured corpse of Mina Harker, which looks eerily similar to *Neon Genesis Evangelion's* Lilit; and, finally, *exoticism*, othering the enemy with both occultism and picturesque villains. There is no place to debate the evil of Millennium or the role of its members as villains.⁸ Their leader, simply designated as The Major, explains his motivations in a speech that borrows heavily from Joseph Goebbels's 1943 speech and exalts warfare without ideological foundation.⁹

While it is true that these two important elements are Western, they are also part of the anime repertoire. Vampires and Nazis are present in works such as *Vampire Hunter D*, *Monster*, *Spriggan* and *Mobile Suit Gundam*,¹⁰ all of which Hirano has admitted to watching. And although Hellsing is set in the West, it is a very particular version of it. Britain, much like Asia has been for western fiction,

⁶ Tim Kane, *The Changing Vampire of Film and Television: A Critical Study of the Growth of a Genre* (Jefferson: McFarland & Company, 2006).

⁷ Kohta Hirano, Interview, in Kohta Hirano /OURS Publishing Division, 平野耕太/OURS 編集部, *HELLSING Official Guidebook* (Tokyo: Shōnen Gahōsha 少年画報社, 2012), 148-149.

⁸ Eva Kingsepp, "Hitler as Our Devil?: Nazi Germany in Mainstream Media," in *Monsters in the Mirror: Representations of Nazism in Post-War Popular Culture*, ed. Sarah Buttsworth and Maartje Abbenhuis (Santa Barbara: Praeger, 2010), 35.

⁹ Kohta Hirano, *Hellsing* v. 4, trans. Duane Johnson (Milwaukie: Dark Horse Manga, 2003), 186-198

¹⁰ Gundam does not explicitly deal with Nazism, yet some of the imagery is reminiscent of the Third Reich representing authoritarianism.

becomes a distorted version of itself, a location in which desires can be projected. In it, afternoon tea and gentlemanly attire are always respected. Likewise, the fervor of the Catholic Church is exalted almost to the point of ridicule: its members are fanatics who spew Bible verses as they murder, crosses always shining in battle scenes, and Bible pages are even used as weapons in a way similar to how Japanese Shinto talismans are used in other manga.

However, most of the references that Hirano works with are in the form of visuals and characters. If, as Umberto Eco proposed, a characteristic of bad taste in mass media is the attempt to elicit a particular response from the audience by employing conventions, anime would be an exemplary proof that excessive reproduction brings bad taste.¹¹

This is not to say that *Hellsing* is not cleverly assembled pastiche. Hirano showcases his knowledge of niche interests in clues throughout the manga, going from appearances by Bruce Willis and Christopher Walken within dream sequences to the more obscure *Ripley Scroll*, but they are so far removed from their original context that they threaten to become empty signifiers.¹² The only principle guiding *Hellsing* is the pleasure of repeating patterns that are familiar.

Many of these are linked to Hirano's experience as a consumer and producer of hentai. *Hellsing* is overloaded with clichés in a visual feast of fetishes. From the author's fixation on suit-wearing women and glasses to actual sexual innuendos, any visual element that is pleasurable is used with no mind to restraint. They are a sort of wink to the audience; there are no sexually explicit scenes, but many of them have elements that suggest the theme, usually combined with extreme violence: the relationships of Master and Servant, unnecessarily elongated tongues, and guns, which are common fixation among anime fans and are not only displayed but described in vivid detail. Their phallic symbolism is heightened when paired with women carrying and using them, and Hirano exaggerates it even more by making them unrealistically large.

Perhaps the most iconic moment for this theme is the death of one of Millennium's officers, Rip Van Winkle, whose name, again, belongs to another work but is never explained within the manga's context. Framed as a reenactment of Weber's opera *Der Freischütz*, the execution of the vampire by Alucard cannot fail to remind readers of scenes in adult manga in general and of Hirano's in particular, many of which have dubious consent or no consent whatsoever. Blood consumption is coupled with that of the soul of the victim, yet devoid of the sensuality and pleasure of vampire lore: while no explicit image is shown, her impalement with her own rifle, already a phallic image; the way that Alucard's shadows hover over in a way similar to tentacles; and her flushed cheeks in her agony make her death horrifying, violent, and sexual. The image is extended and reproduced not only to

¹¹ Umberto Eco, *The Open Work* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1989), 185.

¹² Melissa Saltzman, "Hellsing: Behind the Blood," panel, Anime Midwest, Chicago, July 9, 2016.

test the reader's withstanding of the brutality, but within the manga as well, as the rest of Millennium observe it in a giant screen.¹³

The characters that navigate through these images are also familiar to the public as stock characters. Colin Bulman defines these as "characters that recur again and again in particular genres of literature and are identifiable by common character traits, behavior and manner of speech and the way they are regarded by and behave towards other characters."¹⁴ Although they are an essential element of fiction, their overuse can render a work stereotypical or even lazy. Regardless of this, Hirano purposely makes his characters fulfill the stereotype to the point of self-parody. Every single character in *Hellsing* is a stock character, a recognizable archetype whose behavior, looks, and even actions can be anticipated by the reader. Again, it is the expansion of the anime and manga mediums that have created stock characters specific to them.

Ian Condry argues that anime, although at a higher production level, is not so much about storyline as it is about the characters and the relationships between them.¹⁵ This is, to a certain degree, true for *Hellsing* as the storyline is not particularly complex. Therefore, almost the totality of it consists of the interaction between stock characters. Hirano does not offer a deconstruction of the stock characters and the tropes associated with them in which they turn out not to fulfill their assigned role and break free of it. In fact, he hyper-emphasizes that very same role in a manner that is consistent with the plot. However, *Hellsing* is not only an amalgam of references to works by others: most of the characters are re-imaginings of characters featured in others of Hirano's work including his original hentai short manga, making it also self-referent in his artistic practice.

His main antihero, Alucard, resembles others from the time even in his attire, wearing a red duster similar to both Trigun's Vash The Stampede and *Final Fantasy VII*'s Vincent Valentine. The attempt at hiding his identity by merely turning his name around is both risible, in a manga that never takes itself too seriously, and a nod to another work that had used the same device: Alucard is a moniker that had been used in *Castlevania III*, although spelled differently in katakana. Hirano, a video game enthusiast, brings another element from a work he has enjoyed and incorporates it into his story without attempting to mask the reference. The director of *Hellsing*, Sir Integral Fairbrook Wingates Hellsing, fulfills a female dominant and stoic role, something that is heightened by her wearing suits and smoking cigars. The *Hellsing* butler, Walter C. Dornez does the same for the role of retired hitman who is usually underestimated and, later, that of traitor, because, by default in fiction, the culprit must always be the butler. Section XIII Iscariot, on the other

¹³ Kohta Hirano, *Hellsing* v. 5, trans. Duane Johnson (Milwaukie: Dark Horse Manga, 2003), 130-136.

¹⁴ Colin Bulman, *Creative Writing: A Guide and Glossary to Fiction Writing* (Cambridge: Polity, 2006), 215.

¹⁵ Ian Condry, *The Soul of Anime. Collaborative Creativity and Japan's Media Success Story* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2013), 56.

hand, has amongst its members a bayonet-wielding priest, a nun with dissociative identity disorder, and, in Hirano's own words, a *futanari* (hermaphrodite) gunslinger.¹⁶

Some of the stock characters are slightly twisted with a sense of humor: since every manga ought to have a lolita character, Hirano fulfills such requirement by making Alucard himself assume the form of a cute girl, and, because its counterpart of a shotacon¹⁷ boy is also common, his rendition of younger Walter is at the very same age range that shota boys are and uses suggestive, hip-thrusting poses. That the inspiration for these designs comes from hentai sub genres is acknowledged by Japanese fans, among whom they are respectively called Lolicard (ロリカード) and Shorutaa (シヨルター).¹⁸

This does not mean that they are not well fleshed out or gratuitous. Seras Victoria is not only the carrier of a big gun, but she stands out for being scantily clothed in a setting in which most characters, male and female, wear suits, and for having unrealistically large breasts, again in a manga whose other female characters' bodies are rarely even shown. Her design, initial attitude, and encounters during the first chapters make her a recognizable stereotype: naive and still unused to being a vampire, she is constantly being attacked, groped, and having her breasts shot through or stabbed.¹⁹ The fact that she is all of this does not prevent her from being a well-constructed character, whose actions and growth are not oversimplified. In fact, despite the impracticality of her attire, there is only one moment in which her underwear is shown. Hirano manages to have these scenes, a wink to hentai enthusiasts that will recognize them, without making his female characters into cheap caricatures of sexuality.

However, I believe that the primary example of the successful use of stock characters is in that of Schrödinger, a Nazi with cat ears. He first appears almost as a comedic relief and his looks are somewhat out of place in a vampire anime, with the appearance of a young boy dressed in short pants that suggest shotacon references. Characters, usually young females, with cat ears have been present in manga and anime for decades, although it has become even more prevalent as production companies look for these markers of cuteness to obtain advantages in the market. Character designer Ito Noizi explains that cat ears are used usually because “they are a symbol of fantasy, of what does not exist in reality. . . . Besides, cats are cute! If you add cat ears to a girl then it doubles the cuteness.”²⁰

¹⁶ Kohta Hirano, Interview, *HELLSING Official Guidebook*, 151.

¹⁷ ショタコン, short for Shōtarō complex: slang for the attraction to young boys, or the genre in manga that depicts boys of pubescent or prepubescent age suggestively.

¹⁸ It is interesting to note that the English-speaking fandom either is unaware or shies away from this connection, instead calling Alucard in this form simply *Girlycard*.

¹⁹ In the animated versions, this is even more cliché as her exclamations of pain are pitched in a way that suggest moaning.

²⁰ Noizi Ito, interview by Patrick Galbraith. In Patrick Galbraith, *The Moé Manifesto. An Insider's Look at Manga, Anime, and Gaming* (North Clarendon: Tuttle Publishing, 2014), 114.

Schrödinger's introduction does not suggest that his appearance is anything more than the inclusion of a cute cat-human hybrid for cuteness' sake until his role starts becoming darker, usually transporting before other Millennium members to deliver messages right before they die. However, Hirano has no intention of having him destroy the traditional idea of the cat person and digs deeper into it to the point that it fits the plot. Schrödinger is, indeed, a cat, and his name is not an empty reference: as Schrodinger's cat, he is quoted as having the ability to be everywhere and nowhere. This capacity proves crucial to the plot when he slits his own throat (again, a rather gruesome scene for the delight of the audience) and allows Alucard to consume him, thus rendering him unable to recognize himself among the millions of souls he possesses and become, in the Major's words, a "cluster of imaginary numbers."²¹ Whether the explanation of the author makes sense or not is irrelevant — the cat-human hybrid that is present in so many anime here has a particular purpose and, while pleasant to the audience and recognizable as a stock character, has a value that is intrinsic to the plotline.

In the last pages of the manga, Hirano finally grants his readers a gratuitous view of Seras's underwear, something that, despite the looks of it, is not merely fan-service: it is a reminder that, together with a well-constructed story and appealing characters that are more nuanced than they appear, the manga is still the work of an otaku who started by drawing hentai, made to be primarily enjoyed by others like him.

Hellsing is a self-indulgent work, built on the blending of intertextual references and excesses that appear to fulfill any fan's desires and, within this, fixations that border on fetishism. The interesting aspect of it is not that it is original, but that it is so overtly unoriginal that it becomes refreshing in an industry that thrives on the recycling of themes, yet does not always acknowledge them to be recycled. Hirano presents his manga as a hedonistic embodiment of otaku desire and self-recognition, created by an insider to be best understood by those who share similar popular culture literacies, and creates a form of communion between creator and audience. Not just homage to individual works, it is a celebration of the elements that make up his otaku identity. If seen as postmodern pastiche, Hellsing and other works with a similar composition go past the binary of originality versus plagiarism. Repetition does not need to signal the decadence of the medium; it can also be a sign that the anime and manga corpus has grown to the point that it is able to function as a self-referencing system.

²¹ Kohta Hirano, *Hellsing* v. 10, trans. Duane Johnson (Milwaukie: Dark Horse Manga, 2003), 61.

How Did Jumonville Die?

The Death That Sparked the French and Indian War

Aaron Lewis
University of South Florida

The French and Indian War began after an expedition into Pennsylvania in 1754. Led by George Washington, it resulted in the Battle of Jumonville Glen and the death of a French commander, Joseph de Jumonville. The manner in which Jumonville was killed remains contested due to four firsthand accounts that do not agree on a cause of death. These firsthand accounts come from George Washington; Adam Stephen, an officer who served alongside Washington; Captain Contrecoeur of the French army; and Denis Kaninguen who was a native of the Seneca tribe, which was allied with the British. Considering the known firsthand accounts of the battle, there is a question as to whether Jumonville was killed by musket fire during the battle or by one of Washington's native allies after the French had already surrendered. It is not difficult to believe that some of the reported details surrounding the battle are incorrect. A group of fifty men likely saw different occurrences during the battle. However, the point of contention is that they cannot agree on when Jumonville was killed and who killed him. Using the four firsthand accounts, correspondence between Washington and Virginia Lieutenant Governor Robert Dinwiddie, and newspaper articles from the colonies, I argue that the lack of agreement in these four firsthand accounts suggests the authors had differing political agendas, which influenced how they related the event that, as they realized afterward, had national and international consequences.

The French were outraged at the death of Jumonville, who they believed had been attacked and murdered by Washington and native allies of the British. Washington anticipated French retaliation and braced for an attack in a hastily-created Fort Necessity, which amounted to no more than a simple wooden palisade. Washington suffered a defeat at Fort Necessity and was forced to sign a peace treaty, which included an admission that Jumonville had been "assassinated." The use of the term "assassination" painted Washington and the British as aggressors against France, and gave the French ample justification for war with Britain. Jumonville's death is an important event for understanding the strained relations between Britain and France that led directly to the French and Indian War.

Primary Source Evidence

Determining exactly how Jumonville was killed may be impossible. However, it is no mystery that Jumonville's death was the result of an increase in hostility between the French and British over the land west of the Appalachian Mountains. Washington led a small expedition into the Ohio Region in 1753 for the sole purpose of delivering a letter from the Lieutenant-Governor of Virginia, Robert

Dinwiddie. This letter warned the French of their encroachment onto British land following construction of the Fort Presque Isle and Fort Le Boeuf.¹ While the French commander received Washington and promised to forward the letter to his superior officer, Dinwiddie did not wait for a reply and made plans to send a military force into the Ohio region to drive the French out. In order to fully understand the circumstances surrounding Washington's expedition in 1754 and Jumonville's subsequent death, I will examine the correspondence between Washington and Dinwiddie and the terminology used in Washington's orders.

Correspondence Between Robert Dinwiddie and George Washington

According to Dinwiddie, in a January 1754 letter to Lord Fairfax, "it is for His M'y's Service and the Protection of the Settlem'ts of this Dom'n to do all in our Power to prevent [the French from] building and Forts or making any Settlem'ts on that river."² Washington was given the rank of Major, assigned one hundred men, and immediately set out to Ohio to "build a Fort, and to resist any Attempts on [British settlements in Ohio]."³ On 4 May Dinwiddie sent a letter to Washington ordering him to proceed to the Monongahela River, secure it, and also meet with the "Half-King," Tanacharison, an ally of the British. Dinwiddie specified that Washington should have "frequent Occasions of seeing [Tanacharison] and agree in Council what is fittest to be done in the present Emergency."⁴ Washington replied to Dinwiddie on 9 May and informed him that the French had upwards of 800 men in the region and that Tanacharison had been pleased with Washington's correspondence and promised to send fifty of his own men to meet personally with Washington.⁵

Another letter sent from Washington to Dinwiddie on 3 June details the attack Washington made on Jumonville. In this letter, Washington specifies that he was pressured into attacking Jumonville by Tanacharison, who assured Washington that the French were "sent down Ohio to Kill or take Prisoners of all the English they'd meet with."⁶ It was with this information that Washington felt he had to make a strike at Jumonville for the protection of British lives. In addition, Washington also informed Dinwiddie that he had "just finish'd a small palisado'd Fort," which would be known as Fort Necessity, and that he "[did] not [fear] the attack of 500 men."⁷ On 1 August, Dinwiddie wrote to Washington ordering him to "immediately march over the Allegany Mount's, either to dispossess the French of their Fort, or

¹ Jared Sparks, ed., *The Writings of George Washington*, vol. II (Boston: Charles Tappan, 1846), 184-186.

² Letter from Dinwiddie to Lord Fairfax, January, 1754, in R. A. Brock, ed., *The Official Records of Robert Dinwiddie, Lieutenant-Governor of the Colony of Virginia* (New York: AMS, 1971) [hereafter Brock], 49.

³ *Ibid.*

⁴ *Ibid.*, 149.

⁵ Letter from Colonel Washington to Dinwiddie, 9 May, 1754, Brock, 151-152.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 192.

⁷ Brock, 193.

build a Fort in a proper Place.”⁸ This letter came nearly a month after Washington’s defeat at Fort Necessity.

As for Washington’s account of the Battle of Jumonville Glen, the information he presents is sparse, to say the least. According to Washington’s diary, the French discovered Washington and his men hiding in the trees. Upon being discovered, Washington ordered his men to open fire, although his company did not receive return fire. That fire was directed at “Mr. Wag[gonn]er’s company.”⁹ Furthermore, Washington wrote,

we killed Mr. de Jumonville, the Commander of that Party, as also nine others; we wounded one, and made Twenty-one Prisoners. . . . The Indians scalped that Dead, and took away the most Part of their Arms, after which we marched on with the Prisoners and the Guard, to the Indian Camp.¹⁰

This entry lacks crucial detail about the events surrounding Jumonville’s death. Washington never specifically names the person responsible for killing Jumonville. Instead, the only description of Jumonville’s killer is “We.”¹¹ This may indicate Washington’s hesitation to chronicle potential wrong-doing on his part.

In sharp contrast, Washington provides a much more detailed description of the march back to the Indian camp and the information he extracted from the prisoners he captured. During the march back to the Indians’ camp, the prisoners informed Washington that their mission was to deliver a summons to Washington, ordering him to leave the Ohio region. However, Washington dismissed this as “A plausible Pretence to discover our Camp, and to obtain the Knowledge of our Forces and our Situation!”¹² Washington continued to deny the French camp’s true mission, arguing that they came “secretly” and wanted to gain knowledge of “Roads, Rivers, and of all the Country as far as *Potowmack*.”¹³ He also argued that they moved and camped in a way that made them appear more like “Deserters than Embassadors.”¹⁴ Finally, Washington acknowledged the possibility of direct French intervention following the battle. He was concerned that two Frenchmen who had escaped would alert “M. *de Contrecoeur*” of Washington’s location and Contrecoeur would “send his detachments to inforce the Summons as soon as it should be given.”¹⁵ However, he was ultimately willing to accept a challenge by the French, as evidenced by his statement of fighting 500 French soldiers.¹⁶

⁸ *Ibid.*, 262.

⁹ George Washington’s Diary entry for 27 May 1754 in the 1754 expedition, *George Washington Papers*.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*

¹¹ *Ibid.*

¹² *Ibid.*

¹³ *Ibid.*

¹⁴ *Ibid.*

¹⁵ *Ibid.*

¹⁶ See Letter from Dinwiddie to Lord Fairfax, January, 1754, in Brock, 151-152.

Washington's position as one of the leaders of the expedition creates controversy when examining his account of the Battle of Jumonville Glen. The fact that his report contains few details surrounding the battle and the death of Jumonville raises concerns that he intentionally omitted information. One possibility is that Washington did not wish to incriminate himself. If he were the aggressor in this situation, it would paint him in a negative light which could potentially harm any future military or political career. Fred Anderson argues that a potential massacre of the French prisoners after the battle might point to Washington's abbreviated account. By "collapsing" the account of the battle, Washington made it seem as though all of the French who died were killed during the battle. This also explains Washington's insistence to Dinwiddie that he not believe anything the prisoners told him. Finally, Anderson also argues that Washington may have distorted the details of the battle to protect his own competence as a military officer.¹⁷

Additionally, Washington's refusal to believe the French prisoners lends credibility to Washington's potential deception of Dinwiddie. He asserts that the French were sent to scout out Washington and his camp, indicating a belief that the French might take aggressive action towards the British. Washington certainly acknowledged that the French might retaliate following Jumonville's death. From Washington's point of view, it would be important to portray his attack on Jumonville's camp as a sort of "defense through offense." That is, Washington may have wanted colonial officials to believe that he attacked first because he feared a French assault while being unprepared.

Major Adam Stephen's Account of the Battle of Jumonville Glen

Colonel Adam Stephen was an officer who presided over a portion of the Ohio expedition of 1754 alongside George Washington. He was also present during the Battle of Jumonville Glen. According to an account written in 1775, two decades after the event, Stephen claimed that Washington commanded the right flank of the attack and tasked Stephen with the left side. According to Stephen, Jumonville was "kill'd the first fire."¹⁸ In that same 1775 account, he claimed that Jumonville was killed by musket fire, but in a letter to the *Pennsylvania Gazette* on 19 September 1754, soon after the battle, he claimed that the British soldiers' ammunition was wet and they withheld their fire. Rather, the British advanced with fixed bayonets, opting to take fire from the French, who had dry ammunition, and charge them straight on.¹⁹ Stephen's letter does not agree with Washington's diary entry which claims, "we were advanced pretty near to them, as we thought, when they

¹⁷ Fred Anderson, *Crucible of War: The Seven Years' War and the Fate of Empire in British North America, 1754-1766* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2000), 59.

¹⁸ Adam Stephen, "The Ohio Expedition of 1754," *The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 18 (1894): 46.

¹⁹ For Stephen's account from 1754, see *Pennsylvania Gazette* (Philadelphia), 19 Sept. 1754.

discovered us; whereupon I ordered my company to fire.”²⁰ However, Stephen’s letter does agree with his correspondence to Robert Dinwiddie.

These accounts of Stephen and Washington are some of the most peculiar and controversial of the Battle of Jumonville Glen. The key component of both of these testimonies is the manner in which the British assaulted the French camp. Stephen’s 1754 account is the only one that claims the British advanced with bayonets drawn. Washington’s account is vague and it never clarifies whether the British volleyed at the French or advanced with bayonets. The two other accounts explicitly state that the British fired volleys at the French and there was no mention of bayonets being the primary weaponry used.²¹ Stephen reversed himself in his 1775 narration of the battle. In this account, he claimed that Jumonville was “kill’d the first fire.”²²

Why did Stephen change his story? It is unclear why Stephen reversed his story later. Did he hide the truth following the battle and decide to be more forthright later on? Perhaps, like Washington, Stephen was motivated in 1754 to disguise an aggressive move by Washington as a safety precaution against French aggression. This change by Stephen may also mimic Washington’s fear of his military competence being called into question. While Stephen might have had less to worry about because he was following the orders of his superior, Washington, it may have reflected poorly upon him no matter what.

Contrecoeur’s Account of the Battle of Jumonville Glen

Another major account of the battle is a report compiled by Captain Contrecoeur from Fort Duquesne. He recorded eyewitness accounts from a French soldier who was a part of Jumonville’s company and a member of Tanacharison’s camp. The French soldier, Monceau, explained that the British fired two volleys at the French camp but their native allies did not. Jumonville called for a cease-fire, which was granted by the British. Jumonville read an order that told the British they were in French territory and must leave. French soldiers began to gather around Jumonville at which time Monceau fled further into the woods and made his way to Fort Duquesne. The final part of the battle is given by a native, Denis Kaninguen, of Tanacharison’s camp, who claimed that Jumonville “was killed by a Musket-Shot in the Head, whilst they were reading the Summons.” Kaninguen also claims that the British would have executed all of the French troops had the British’s native allies not run in between the two groups.²³

Contrecoeur’s compilation is one of two accounts that explicitly states who was responsible for the cease-fire after the fifteen minutes of fighting. Neither Washington nor Stephen give any indication of who called for a cease-fire.

²⁰ George Washington’s Diary entry for May 27, 1754, *George Washington Papers*.

²¹ See “Contrecoeur’s Account” and “John Shaw’s Account.”

²² Stephen, “The Ohio Expedition of 1754,” 46.

²³ Anderson, *Crucible of War*, 53-54.

Monceau, the French soldier who witnessed the battle, claims that Jumonville called for a cease-fire which means he was still alive following the volleys by Washington's men. This, of course, contradicts Stephen's account, which claims Jumonville was killed by musket fire during the battle. Washington's account is too devoid of details to provide any indication of when exactly Jumonville was killed. Kaninguen claimed that Jumonville was killed following the cease-fire, an action that would have demonstrated extreme aggressiveness and even broken one of the rules of war.

Monceau and Kaninguen's combined account certainly portrays Washington in a negative light. It counters the previous two accounts which indicate the British either did nothing wrong or simply acted in self-defense. Kaningue's account is particularly damning. Curiously, Monceau was a Frenchman who appeared to tell a straightforward story. There is no apparent indication of him attempting to spin the story to portray the French as victims. However, Kaninguen, a native from Tanacharison's camp, provides one of the most damning accounts of the battle. A native ally of the British sought shelter with the French and told a story that portrayed the British in a very negative light: murderers of a French envoy who had called for a cease-fire.

On this point, David Dixon argues that the natives intended to stay neutral throughout the European colonization process by manipulating the Europeans into fighting amongst themselves.²⁴ According to Dixon's analysis, Kaninguen saw an opportunity to potentially sow more hostility between France and Britain and took it. Whether he acted alone or was supported by others of the tribe is unknown. In addition, James Hadden argues that only the intervention of Washington prevented the natives from killing and scalping the French prisoners.²⁵ Hadden's argument presents a counter to Kaninguen's account which may indicate another effort by Kaninguen to create more hostility between the French and the British.

Private John Shaw's Account of the Battle of Jumonville Glen

Private John Shaw gave an account of the battle as a statement to the South Carolina governor on 21 August 1754. Shaw was not present during the battle and his statement was created after hearing detailed accounts of soldiers who were present during the battle. According to Shaw, Washington and his troops had come upon French troops early on the morning of 28 May and startled the French troops with one soldier firing a shot out of panic. Washington then ordered his troops to fire upon which several French soldiers were killed. The rest attempted to escape into the woods but were apprehended by Tanacharison's men who had flanked the French camp. Then, according to Shaw,

²⁴ David Dixon, "A High Wind Rising: George Washington, Fort Necessity, and the Ohio Country Indians," *Pennsylvania History: A Journal of Mid-Atlantic Studies* 74, no. 3 (2007): 10.

²⁵ James Hadden, *Washington's and Braddock's Expeditions* (Uniontown, Pa.: self-published, 1910), 25.

Some Time after the Indians came up the Half King took his Tomahawk and split the Head of the French Captain having first asked if he was an Englishman and having been told he was a French Man. He then took out his Brains and washed his Hands with them and then scalped him.²⁶

Shaw's testimony is argued by some historians to be the most plausible and complete account of the battle. While there is reason to believe Washington, Contrecoeur, and Stephen altered their accounts for political and propaganda purposes, Shaw's affidavit seems much more plausible and believable. Francis Jennings argues that it "has a disquieting ring of circumstantial authenticity, Shaw had "no axe to grind," and the event was reported not long after it had occurred.²⁷ Tanacharison's role is also substantiated by a news account on 27 June 1754 in the *Pennsylvania Gazette* which stated, "one of those Five [Frenchmen] which were killed and scalped by the Indians, was Monsieur Jumonville, an Ensign, whom [Tanacharison] himself dispatched with his tomahawk."²⁸ While it is possible that Shaw had political motivation behind his affidavit, the evidence presented by Jennings and other historians puts that possibility in serious doubt.

The Master Narrative Account of the Battle of Jumonville Glen

The account of Private John Shaw is generally accepted by historians to be the most complete account of the battle. It may also be the most credible in that it is substantiated by multiple accounts from British soldiers. However, there is still much speculation about the various accounts. The attack and subsequent death of Jumonville is not nearly as contentious as one might assume given the lack of continuity among the firsthand accounts of the battle. Most recent historians take the firsthand accounts into consideration and create a typically uniform, generic account of the battle: Washington and Tanacharison attacked the French camp, at some point during or after the battle Jumonville was killed, and the French retaliated later at Fort Necessity. The only real point of contention, besides whose idea it was to attack in the first place, is the time and manner in which Jumonville was killed. Historians acknowledge that there is inconsistency in the firsthand accounts, but they also have collectively decided which account to legitimize by writing it into the typical narrative of the French and Indian War.

Testimony of the "Chief Warrior" of the Ohio Iroquois

Recent research by David L. Preston has uncovered new information regarding the Battle of Jumonville Glen. While researching in the United Kingdom for his new book, Preston uncovered a previously unknown testimony by a "Chief

²⁶ "Affidavit of John Shaw," in William L. McDowell Jr., ed., *Colonial Records of South Carolina: Documents Relating to Indian Affairs, 1754-1765* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1970) 4-5.

²⁷ Francis Jennings, *Empire of Fortune* (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1988), 69.

²⁸ *Pennsylvania Gazette* (Philadelphia), 27 June 1754.

Warrior” of the Ohio Iroquois, who he tentatively identifies as being Silver Heels, which was given at a 1754 Indian Conference at Fort Cumberland in Maryland. The Chief Warrior was present at the ambush and was part of Tanacharison’s group of natives. According to the account, the joint British-native force had advanced to the outskirts of the French camp, where Washington was directed by his native allies. The account clearly demonstrates that Washington relied heavily on the advice of his native allies. Tanacharison directed Washington to take a position on a rocky ledge overlooking the French camp, while he and his warriors moved to the left to block a potential French escape.

This part of the account undoubtedly supports the information Washington provided about the attack. However, the most intriguing information about this newly found account is the different role that Washington played. According to the Chief Warrior, as soon as the British came to the top of the hill, “Col. Washington begun himself and fired and then his people, which the French returned, two or three Fires of as many Pieces as would go off, being a rainy Weather, and then run off.”²⁹ Despite the Chief Warrior’s assertion that Washington may have literally fired the first shots of the French and Indian War, Preston argues that the warrior does not disclose whether the French immediately fired, which Washington argues, or if the French attempted to read a summons, which is argued in Contrecoeur’s account. The account also argues that Tanacharison was not nearly as invested in fighting the French for control of the Ohio region as he was protecting his and his warriors’ families in what was increasingly viewed as a future battlefield between the French and the British.³⁰

Historiography of Jumonville’s Death

For the purpose of this essay, I will be providing a short explanation of the historiography of Jumonville’s death, but most of the specific arguments from historians will be analyzed in the next section. The arguments historians make in regard to Jumonville’s death generally differ. There are two main schools of thought among scholars. One group argues that Jumonville was killed after the surrender of the French troops. This group argues that after a ceasefire and surrender by the French, Tanacharison approached Jumonville and asked him if he was an Englishman, and when he said he was not, Tanacharison split his head open and washed his hands with Jumonville’s brains.³¹ However, there are some in this group who argue that Jumonville was killed by a musket shot to the head following a surrender.³² Regardless, Jumonville was killed after surrendering in

²⁹ David L. Preston, *Braddock’s Defeat: The Battle of the Monongahela and the Road to Revolution* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2015), 27.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, 28.

³¹ Anderson, *Crucible of War*, 52-59; Jennings, *Empire of Fortune*, 68-70; Edward G. Lengel, *General George Washington: A Military Life* (New York: Random House, 2005), 37-38.

³² Walter O’Meara, *Guns at the Forks* (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1965), 87-88.

both scenarios. The other group of historians argues that Jumonville was killed during the approximately fifteen minutes of skirmishing.³³ This argument puts Washington in an unfavorable light but does not portray Washington and his native allies as brutal assassins like the other group.

It would appear that most of the historians who argue in favor of Jumonville having been killed after the skirmish with Washington's men published their findings relatively recently, although that is not a definitive correlation as Miller and Molesky's book was published in 2004 and O'Meara's book was published in 1965. In addition to this, most of the historians exploring this topic do not consider all of the firsthand accounts of the battle. Rather, only Washington's and Contrecoeur's accounts are analyzed, or at least cited in the footnotes, by the authors. I have created a table to show which authors mention and/or analyze the accounts of John Shaw, Adam Stephen, and Denis Kaninguen. I also considered Kaninguen a separate account because only Fred Anderson mentions that his testimony was part of the Contrecoeur letter.

| Author ³⁴ | Date Published | John Shaw | Adam Stephen | Denis Kaninguen |
|----------------------|----------------|-----------|--------------|-----------------|
| Bradley | 1902 | | | |
| Hadden | 1910 | | | |
| Leduc | 1943 | | X | |
| O'Meara | 1965 | | X | |
| Eccles | 1969 | | | |
| Jennings | 1988 | X | | |
| Anderson | 2000 | X | X | X |
| Miller and Molesky | 2004 | | | |
| Lengel | 2005 | | X | |
| Preston | 2015 | | | |

While Washington's and Contrecoeur's accounts are extremely important to understanding the death of Jumonville, Adam Stephen's account is the only one that is consistently cited and analyzed.

Why is John Shaw's account left out by everyone except Anderson, Jennings, and Dixon? Shaw's account has been cited as the "most plausible, relatively complete"

³³ John J. Miller and Mark Molesky, *Our Oldest Enemy: A History of America's Disastrous Relationship with France* (New York: Doubleday Publishing, Inc., 2004), 22-24; A. G. Bradley, *The Fight with France for North America* (New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., 1902), 67-69; Gilbert Leduc, *Washington and "The Murder of Jumonville"* (Boston: La Societe Historique Franco-Americaine, 1943), 89-94; Hadden, *Washington's and Braddock's Expeditions*, 24-25.

³⁴ Bradley, Hadden, Miller and Molesky, and Eccles do not discuss Shaw's, Stephen's, or Kaninguen's account. W. J. Eccles, *The Canadian Frontier 1534-1760* (Albuquerque: New Mexico University Press, 1969). Leduc, O'Meara, and Lengel only discuss Stephen's account. Jennings and Dixon only discuss Shaw's account. Anderson is the only author in the chart to consider all of the known firsthand accounts of the Battle of Jumonville Glen.

account of the battle because it is a compilation of the accounts of several soldiers present during the fight.³⁵ Only two of the sources in the table, Leduc's *Washington and "The Murder of Jumonville"* and Dixon's "High Wind Rising," deal entirely with the circumstances surrounding the death of Jumonville and Leduc does not mention Shaw or Kaninguen. Only Washington's, Contrecoeur's, and the "Chief Warrior's" accounts appear in the David Preston's book, although the book's main focus is on Braddock and his defeat. Despite this, there is a mention on Monceau's role in the relaying of information from Jumonville Glen, but curiously not from Kaninguen. Essentially, Contrecoeur's account in Preston's book is incomplete. Anderson has the most complete analysis of the battle and Jennings and Dixon at least consider a third major account of the battle, yet they fail to consider the accounts of Adam Stephen. While it is doubtful that this would invalidate their analysis, the omission of Stephen, Shaw, and Kaninguen by the other authors is a glaring error.

Secondary Sources Discussion

Most of the secondary sources considered here agree that Washington met with Tanacharison, chief of the Senecas, before the battle, but they do not agree as to whose idea it was to attack the French camp. Most would agree that Washington was first aware of Jumonville's presence because of Tanacharison's scouts, but they disagree about who acted upon this information. Francis Jennings, for example, portrays Washington as "hotheaded and vacillating," implying that Washington was very eager to take the fight to the French and Tanacharison simply showed Washington how to surprise Jumonville at dawn the day of the battle.³⁶

David Dixon, in contrast, argues that Tanacharison had a desire to see both European powers driven out of the region and had set out to try to accomplish that. However, the Delawares and the Shawnees were wary of this course of action. They felt that if the French and British went to war over Ohio and Pennsylvania, they would be caught in the middle.³⁷ Despite opposition from the Delawares and the Shawnees, Dixon argues that Tanacharison was "eager to engage the French" and "encouraged Washington to join him."³⁸ Due to the way in which the scouts relayed messages about the French position, Washington was convinced his men would be attacked if he did not act quickly. Dixon also argues that Washington did not seem to consider that attacking the French, even though the French had yet to act aggressively towards the British in the area, would paint the British as hostile and aggressive.³⁹

³⁵ Anderson, *Crucible of War*, 55.

³⁶ Jennings, *Empire of Fortune*, 66.

³⁷ Dixon, "High Wind Rising," 10.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, 12.

³⁹ *Ibid.*

While Tanacharison may have been inclined to take the fight to the French, many of the other tribes of the Ohio Valley were not. According to W. J. Eccles, the natives of the area saw that allying with the British would do them no good. After the French had forced the British to surrender the land where they had attempted to build a fort (that would later become the French Fort Duquesne), the natives realized the French were able to ship military forces into the Ohio Valley much more quickly than the British.⁴⁰ Occurring just a few months prior to the death of Jumonville, this shift of alliances became apparent as Washington and Tanacharison struggled to find allies that would help them rid the Ohio Country of the French presence. In fact, Contrecoeur was informed of Washington's presence by native scouts and it is only due to this that Jumonville was sent on his fateful mission.⁴¹ This shift in alliances could have also been an attempt by native tribes to stay out of a European war, something that is reflected in Dixon's article.

Other historians have argued that Washington and Tanacharison are both at fault for the attack as they were both heavily in favor of attacking the French camp. According to Edward G. Lengel, Washington was already firmly in favor of attacking the French and was able to rally support from Tanacharison and his native allies by portraying the French as being aggressive towards the natives in the area. According to Lengel, Washington convinced the natives who were already with him that the French intended to "hunt down and kill" Tanacharison, which outraged the natives who "vowed to find the Frenchmen and kill them if they had so much as treated [Tanacharison] disrespectfully."⁴² Tanacharison also had a great desire to take the fight to the French because he believed the French had destroyed a fort of "his" at the Forks of the Ohio River in order to build their own.⁴³ In short, Washington, Tanacharison, or both were in favor of assaulting the French camp.

Fred Anderson argues that Tanacharison did, in fact, murder Jumonville following his surrender. Anderson also argues that most of the surrendering French soldiers were murdered by the natives, despite Denis Kaninguen's account arguing that native intervention prevented the massacre of the French troops. However, Anderson further argues that a massacre is indicated by the casualty figures recorded by Washington.⁴⁴ Furthermore, Anderson argues that musket fire was more likely to produce wounds than deaths, especially when firing downhill. As Anderson argues, this makes it "impossible to believe the Virginians killed thirteen men (or even, as Washington maintained, ten) while wounding only one."⁴⁵ According to Anderson, Washington's "abbreviated" account also indicates he wished to portray the French deaths as coming solely from the battle.⁴⁶

⁴⁰ W. J. Eccles, *The Canadian Frontier 1534-1760* (Albuquerque: New Mexico University Press, 1969), 163.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 164.

⁴² Lengel, *General George Washington*, 36.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, 37.

⁴⁴ Anderson, *Crucible of War*, 57.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 59.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*

Other historians have advanced arguments outside the mainstream scholarly debate. For example, John J. Miller and Mark Molesky argue that the discrepancy in the firsthand accounts is not about how Jumonville was killed but the manner in which the attack started. The two authors argue that Tanacharison murdered Jumonville in plain sight and that all of the French casualties during the battle were from musket fire, which challenges Fred Anderson's interpretation. However, Miller and Molesky question whether Washington ordered his troops to fire first or if the French fired out of panic, which set off the battle.⁴⁷ The manner in which the battle began does change the framework of how Washington is viewed. Ordering his troops to fire first indicates a clear aggression towards the French but a frightened French soldier firing a shot into the air and Washington returning fire does not seem quite so aggressive. Nevertheless, the authors are very much in the minority in terms of what is contested. They argue that "the immediate result [of the battle] is not in dispute," despite it being an obvious point of contention among prominent historians.⁴⁸ These authors essentially dismiss the cause of the battle but choose to argue that the events of the battle are easily understood. That is, they argue that the Battle of Jumonville Glen is a very clear event and that the controversy stems from how the battle began, rather than how Jumonville was killed.

Other historians focus on how the battle started but do not argue that it is the key to understanding both the battle and the death of Jumonville. Historians cannot agree on the details surrounding the beginning of the battle. Gilbert Leduc argues that the French first noticed the British and the natives creeping up on them and shouted "to arms."⁴⁹ Upon hearing this, Washington immediately ordered his men to fire. Leduc explains that some of the British weapons did not discharge due to them being wet which led the British to advance on the French camp with bayonets drawn. According to Leduc, the fight lasted for fifteen minutes, after which ten Frenchmen had fallen, including Jumonville. Leduc also presents a unique argument by stating that the path the natives used to find the French camp came from runners sent to Contrecoeur by Jumonville prior to the battle.⁵⁰ The argument that the French rushed to defend themselves before Washington ordered his men to fire is supported by other historians such as James Hadden. Hadden argues that the French first saw Washington and rushed to their arms and the fight lasted fifteen minutes. Hadden, like Leduc, argues that the French suffered ten casualties with one of them being Jumonville, who was killed during the first volley.⁵¹

Some historians argue that the secluded character of Jumonville's camp raised suspicions among the native scouts and Washington. A. G. Bradley argues that Jumonville was sent on a "quasi-diplomatic errand" to remove the British from

⁴⁷ Miller and Molesky, *Our Oldest Enemy*, 22-23.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, 22.

⁴⁹ Leduc, *Washington and "The Murder of Jumonville,"* 90.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*

⁵¹ Hadden, *Washington's and Braddock's Expeditions*, 24.

the Ohio Region.⁵² According to Bradley, Jumonville had in his possession a letter ordering the British to leave the region. Despite this being true, the French attempted to capitalize on Jumonville's death by portraying Washington as an assassin due to Jumonville's diplomatic mission. The French argued that Jumonville had waved the letter at Washington during the attack, urging him to cease fire, and that Jumonville was "treacherously shot."⁵³ However, this story is completely unfounded. Nevertheless, Bradley argues that because Jumonville's camp was concealed in the vicinity of Washington's superior force, it raised alarm. As Bradley argues, it was "scarcely the natural method of procedure for a peaceful convoy!"⁵⁴ It seems that Jumonville should be criticized for putting himself into a position where he could be seen as a spy or a small detachment of an aggressive force. This does take some of the blame away from Washington who had been deferring to Tanacharison's scouts as to the nature of Jumonville's camp.

Other historians support the argument that Jumonville was supposed to deliver the French letter in a diplomatic fashion. According to Walter O'Meara, Jumonville was ordered to "find a road to the English position; to hand the commander the summons, and report back his reply."⁵⁵ Jumonville's orders state that he should camp along, or at least follow, the road to Washington's camp. O'Meara also considers the true nature of Jumonville's orders. Was he truly a diplomat or was he a spy? While Jumonville was ordered to deliver the summons to Washington, O'Meara questions whether these summons were "bona fide" or if they were "cover." In the event Jumonville was killed or captured, the summons would show Jumonville was a diplomat, thus painting Washington as an assassin or an aggressor.⁵⁶ In addition, O'Meara also considers the number of soldiers Jumonville had with him. Having as many as 35 soldiers with him seems rather excessive when delivering a summons.⁵⁷

Conclusion

The recent scholarship is much more inclusive of all possible evidence. Kaninguen's and Shaw's accounts show a deeper analysis and understanding of the subject. This essay attempts to show that the discussion is far from over. Rather, instead of attempting to discern what actually happened to Jumonville, this essay seeks to explain why the firsthand accounts seem to disagree. While it is understandable that all people see an event somewhat differently, it is difficult to imagine why some of the inconsistencies exist the way they do unless these inconsistencies were made specifically to advance the political agenda each witness followed.

⁵² Bradley, *The Fight with France*, 68.

⁵³ Ibid.

⁵⁴ Ibid., 69. See also Leduc, *Washington and "The Murder of Jumonville,"* 82-83.

⁵⁵ Walter O'Meara, *Guns at the Forks*, 86.

⁵⁶ Ibid., 86.

⁵⁷ Ibid., 89. Leduc also supports this argument. *Washington and "The Murder of Jumonville,"* 151-152.

Washington's account was short and undetailed because he wanted to preserve both his military career and withhold the scalping and killing of captured French soldiers by British allied natives. Contrecoeur's account was filled with inaccuracies because he wanted to convince his superiors that the British were becoming radically violent toward the French. Adam Stephen's inexplicable reversal of his story likely demonstrates the same agenda Washington had and his reversal twenty years later was his effort to come clean. John Shaw's account was the only account in which historians have not been able to discern a political agenda. This is likely because the soldiers had no real political agenda because of their low rank. Washington and Stephen were officers who had blossoming careers and Contrecoeur had political ambition.

The evidence examined and presented supports the idea that the firsthand accounts of the Battle of Jumonville Glen were written in a way that best supported each eyewitness's political agenda. Most of the firsthand accounts came from soldiers and native allies. Perhaps these people were afraid that portraying the event in a certain light would ultimately lead to war. Perhaps they were more invested in relating the true nature of the battle. Perhaps they felt the need to lie to benefit their own people. The true narrative of the event may never be known, particularly with the possibility of the firsthand accounts having been deliberately falsified.

Special Section
Selected Undergraduate Articles

The Grievances of British Colonials in Jamaica Leading to the War of Jenkins' Ear

William Cobb
Florida Gulf Coast University

During the first half of the eighteenth century, Great Britain waged war across the world with other major imperial European powers such as France, the Netherlands, and Spain. The series of wars, spanning from 1701 to 1763, proved costly to all nations involved and the legacy left behind by one war became a major cause of the next. In 1739, after about a decade of peace, The War of Jenkin's Ear erupted between Great Britain and Spain. This paper explores the years between 1730 and 1739 and the rise of tensions between Britain and Spain over Spanish seizure of British goods and ships on the pretext of searching for contraband. British merchants and colonists in the Caribbean, in response to these seizures, wrote letters and petitions to Parliament and other government officials which detailed violent acts and theft committed by Spanish sailors and soldiers while searching their vessels and ports. These letters outraged members of Parliament and the British public, led to calls for reparations and retribution, and pushed Britain and Spain closer to war. This paper looks at a sample of letters, petitions, and transcriptions from the fourth and fifth sessions of the Second Parliament of George II in 1738 and 1739, when members listened to and debated the validity of the reports, and how to respond.

The attempts by British merchants and colonials to gain reparations from and retribution against Spain were numerous. The transcript of the fourth session mentions a petition originally sent to Parliament in 1728. By 1738 the same individual had sent seven more petitions addressed to the king and received by the Duke of Newcastle. Four other petitions were mentioned to have been received and sent to a committee. These petitions all contained grievances pertaining to "Spanish Depravations."¹ During the fifth session of Parliament, letters and petitions that contained similar material as past documents were only mentioned to have been sent to committee for further discussion and debate. If deemed necessary by the committee, the petitioners were then summoned to testify to their accounts.²

The letters and petitions in this study were chosen for the similar themes and grievances they shared that were representative of the petitions and letters known to have been sent and read to Parliament. These documents are also significant as they were among the last petitions read in parliamentary session and committee

¹ "Second Parliament of George II: Fourth session (5 of 9, begins 3/3/1738)," in *The History and Proceedings of the House of Commons: Volume 10, 1737-1739* (London: Chandler, 1742), 96-159. *British History Online*, <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/commons-hist-proceedings/vol10/pp96-159>.

² "Second Parliament of George II: Fifth session (4 of 4, begins 23/2/1739)," in *The History and Proceedings of the House of Commons: Volume 10, 1737-1739* (London: Chandler, 1742), 417-436. *British History Online*, <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/commons-hist-proceedings/vol10/pp417-436>.

before diplomatic relations between Britain and Spain broke down and open hostilities commenced.

Before looking at the grievances of the British colonials and merchants, this paper will first look at the main source of their grievances, the *asiento* agreements first made in the 1713 Treaty of Utrecht at the end of the War of the Spanish Succession, and their renewal in 1729 with the end of the Anglo-Spanish War and the signing of the Treaty of Seville.³ The Treaty of Utrecht gave the British South Sea Company exclusive rights to import slaves to the Spanish colonies, up to 4,800 per year, in exchange for certain goods, bullion, and coin.⁴ Another concession allowed Britain to send one commercial vessel per year, known as the Annual Ship, to trade in the Spanish port of Porto Bello. Spain considered these terms to be completely one-sided and excessive, while British merchants believed they were far too little.⁵

The Treaty of Seville, signed in 1729 at the end of the Anglo-Spanish War, expanded on the earlier treaties by giving Spanish warships the right to stop British merchant ships to confirm that the merchants still followed the *asiento* agreements and did not carry any illegal goods on board.⁶ The blocking of illicit trade posed certain issues for Spain. Smugglers sailing under the cover of night were near impossible to catch. The commanders of Spanish vessels had to rely on their own judgement about whether to consider certain British merchant vessels as legitimate or not. Also, certain Spanish colonies, such as St. Augustine, profited from trading illicit goods with British merchants (and often found it necessary for survival), which in turn undermined the authority of the Spanish government.⁷

This addition to the *asiento* agreement is a major factor in the increased tensions between Britain and Spain during the 1730s. The issue of Spanish warships stopping, and often seizing, British merchant ships and their cargo became among the most important of the grievances British colonials and merchants cited in their letters and petitions to Parliament in the decade leading up to the War of Jenkins Ear. One of the ships seized during this period, and the instance from which this war derives its name, was the *Rebecca*, under the command of Captain Robert Jenkins. While Jenkins's ship was being searched for contraband by a Spanish

³ The Treaty of Utrecht, 1713, ended the first major imperialist war of the eighteenth century, The War of the Spanish Succession, for Britain. The British won several early victories in the European theater, despite having little success in the Americas, against France and Spain. With the casualties and costs that had mounted for Britain, they sought peace, separate from their allies, with France and Spain and won it due to their early successes in the war. Along with the *asiento* agreement with Spain, the British also forced Spain to turn over Gibraltar and the Mediterranean island of Minorca to them. They also forced France to relinquish their claims on lands in the Americas such as Acadia, Newfoundland, Hudson Bay, and the island of St. Kitts. This large land grab in the Americas shifted the imperial gaze of Great Britain from European gains to maritime commerce in the Western Hemisphere. See Alan Taylor, *American Colonies* (New York: Penguin Group, 2001), 293.

⁴ Arthur S. Aiton, "The *Asiento* Treaty as Reflected in the Papers of Lord Shelburne," *Hispanic American Historical Review* 8, no. 2 (1928): 167.

⁵ Reed Browning, *War of the Austrian Succession*, new ed. (Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan, 1995), 21.

⁶ Lawrence James, *The Rise and Fall of the British Empire* (New York: St. Martin's Griffin, 1997), 59.

⁷ Joyce Elizabeth Harman, *Trade and Privateering in Spanish Florida, 1732-1763* (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 2004), xiii.

coast guard ship, one of the Spanish crewmen cut off Jenkins's ear.⁸ This account became a symbol in Britain of Spanish cruelty and aggression against British merchants and sailors.

Previous studies of this period and topic have tended to treat it from a macro-economic, political, and military point of view, or have just given it a passing mention. Both Spanish and English scholarship reflect these trends. Rafael Donoso Anes examined the South Sea Company as the middle man of the slave trade between Britain and Spain and their role in the escalation of tensions between the two countries.⁹ In *The War of the Austrian Succession*, Reed Browning only mentioned this period and the asiento agreements briefly, laying out the stipulations of the treaty, and putting it into a broad, global context as his goal was to cover the entire War of Austrian Succession from 1740 to 1748 from a more political and military point of view.¹⁰ Joyce Elizabeth Harman explored the asiento trade between Britain and Spain from a micro-economic point of view in *Trade and Privateering in Spanish Florida, 1732–1763*. While the book covered the period of this essay, it focused on the Spanish point of view and Spanish St. Augustine, and did not connect the trade issues between the British and Spanish colonies to a more global context, and how they brought the two nations closer to war as a result.¹¹

Commercial prosperity became an important motivator in British foreign policy during the 1730s. During this period trade boomed, and the rate at which Britain imported goods was greatly exceeded by its exports. Many countries in Europe with access to the sea enjoyed prosperous trade with Britain. This emphasis on prosperity as a policy, however, gave merchants a strong and legitimate voice in the political realm, which, as will be seen, caused Parliament to bend to the will of these merchants.¹²

Beginning in 1738, the British Parliament heard petitions made by merchants who traded in the Caribbean and ran into issues with Spanish coast guard vessels seizing their ships and cargo. Certain themes and grievances became apparent throughout all the petitions read. These included violations of the conduct of legal trade, of national sovereignty, and treaties which provided the guidelines of the asiento trade. Other common issues included the economic detriment which the Spanish seizures of British goods caused, and the mistreatment of British sailors and subjects at the hands of the Spanish coast guard.

On 3 March 1738, Parliament heard a petition by West India merchants and planters. The petition argued that at the rate at which the Spanish seized British

⁸ Albert Harkness, "Americanism and Jenkins' Ear," *The Mississippi Valley Historical Review* 37, no. 1 (1950): 61-62.

⁹ R. D. Anes, "La Compania del Asiento y La Guerra de La Oreja de Jenkins: Sus Causas Economicas y Algunos Aspectos Contables Relacionados*/The Company of Asiento and The War of Jenkins' Ear: with Special Emphasis on the Economic and Accounting Aspects," *Revista De Contabilidad*, 11, no. 1(2008): 9.

¹⁰ Browning, *War of the Austrian Succession*, 21.

¹¹ Joyce Elizabeth Harman, *Trade and Privateering in Spanish Florida, 1732-1763*.

¹² Browning, *War of the Austrian Succession*, 22.

merchant ships, the economy of the colonies of the West Indies, and subsequently the empire, would diminish greatly or perhaps completely.¹³ Merchants from the town of Glasgow also shared this grievance in a petition to Parliament, in which the merchants stated that the increase in Spanish seizure of British goods and ships caused a noticeable decrease in trade revenue, to and from the Americas. They argued that if these trends continued, trade and navigation along these routes would become “very much diminished, if not entirely lost.”¹⁴ In a letter written “by a person who has resided for several years in Jamaica” and James Knight, addressed to members of Parliament, the same grievance can be seen.¹⁵ This letter discussed how the economy of Jamaica had been greatly suppressed as a result of the loss of trade revenue.¹⁶

Another common grievance in the petitions and letters is the mistreatment of British sailors at the hands of the Spanish coast guard. A petition by the owners of the ship *Mary Snow*, read in Parliament on 16 March 1738, gave an account of this mistreatment. The owners claimed the crew, after having the goods on their ship seized, “were turned into their Long-boat, and left to the Mercy of the Waves to shift for themselves, and the said Ship and Cargo were carried into Porto Rico.”¹⁷ The petition by the owners of the ship *Betty Gally* described how their ship came under attack “by a Spanish Privateer under Turkish Colors,” and after a five-hour engagement they were forced to surrender. It described how for nine days after the end of the battle, the survivors were taken captive, kept naked, treated inhumanely, and condemned after reaching port in Malaga on 14 October 1727.¹⁸ A petition from West India merchants and planters gives an account of the captains of British ships that were seized being confined in Spanish colonies in the Americas, while the crews of those ships were being held in Spain where they were “inhumanely

¹³ "Second Parliament of George II: Fourth session (5 of 9, begins 3/3/1738)."

¹⁴ "Second Parliament of George II: Fourth session (6 of 9, begins 15/3/1738)," in *The History and Proceedings of the House of Commons: Volume 10, 1737-1739*, (London: Chandler, 1742), 159-182. British History Online, <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/commons-hist-proceedings/vol10/pp159-182>.

¹⁵ James Knight also authored or co-authored several other works in relation to the asiento treaty and its effect on the economy of Jamaica. Overall, Knight seemed to be against the asiento agreement. One of his major arguments against the agreement was that it starved the island of Jamaica of trade, due to the forced trade with Spain only in certain ports (Jamaica not included), even before the allegations of Spanish coast guard ships stealing British goods arose. Knight explained how this caused commercial traffic and trade revenue in Jamaica to drop, as well as sailors moving to other wealthier ports in search of more profitable opportunities. As a solution to these issues, Knight suggested that the South Sea Company establish a central port, or “factory,” in Jamaica, where slaves would be taken and sold to Spanish merchants and planters. He discussed how Jamaica’s geographical proximity to major Spanish ports in the Americas where the Spanish could go to purchase their slaves, and where slaves could be evaluated and sorted based upon sex, age, or anything that the slavers would classify as deficiencies in the slaves. It would also create a convenient central location from which goods could be sent back to the mother country. Knight also states this would help the Jamaican economy, as it would bring commercial traffic back to the island, thereby bringing the sailors back and helping the business of merchants and plantation owners.

¹⁶ A. B. (Person who resided several years at Jamaica), and James Knight, *The state of the island of Jamaica: chiefly in relation to its commerce and the conduct of the Spaniards in the West-Indies: address'd to a member of Parliament* (London: Printed for H. Whittridge ..., 1726), World Scholar: Latin America & the Caribbean, <http://worldscholar.tu.galegroup.com/tinyurl/46iJX2>.

¹⁷ "Second Parliament of George II: Fourth session (6 of 9, begins 15/3/1738)."

¹⁸ "Second Parliament of George II: Fifth session (4 of 4, begins 23/2/1739)."

treated.”¹⁹ A letter written “by a person who has resided for several years in Jamaica,” and James Knight, describes how British merchants who had their assets seized by the Spanish were left with nothing and were unable to provide for their families, leaving them with few options but to turn to piracy to earn a living. They also mention the more specific example of Major Thomas Cook, who lived in a port in the northwestern region of Jamaica, discussing how the port was raided and plundered by the Spanish coast guard, and among what they took were several slaves, some of whom belonged to Cook. They then go on to describe how Cook was unable to continue his sugar work without his slaves.²⁰

Several of the petitions read in front of Parliament mentioned how the Spanish coast guard openly violated the conduct of legal trade, national sovereignty, and the treaties that had been concluded between Britain and Spain and laid out the guidelines of the *asiento* agreement. The merchants and planters of the West Indies, in their petition, stated that their ships and goods were seized by Spanish ships “whilst they were carrying on their fair and lawful trade.” They argued that the Spanish arbitrarily searched and seized British merchant ships, for what they deemed to be contraband, and in the process violated the “Laws of Nations” and of national sovereignty, as well as the treaties which had been signed between the two nations.²¹ The petition made by the merchants of Glasgow also argued that the merchant ships which the Spanish had seized traded within their lawful bounds and were supposed to be under the protection of the British Crown. The merchants also asserted that “by stopping, plundering, and seizing several ships belonging to his Majesty's Subjects, in the defined course of their voyages to and from the British Colonies, condemning them, with their loadings, amounting to a considerable value, and by treating cruelly and inhumanly the captains or masters of some of these ships, with their crews,” they violated the “Laws of Nations,” as well as the treaties signed between the two nations.²²

After the reading of petitions, debates in Parliamentary session and committee began on what the proper course of action should be in response to the grievances given by the merchants and planters. One of the skeptics of these grievances of Spanish aggressions was Sir Robert Walpole. During the 1720s and 1730s, Walpole was a dominant British politician, and leader of the Whig Party, with numerous supporters. He became first lord of the treasury in 1721. From there, as chief minister, he expanded his authority within the British government. During

¹⁹ "Second Parliament of George II: Fourth session (5 of 9, begins 3/3/1738".

²⁰ A. B. (Person who resided several years at Jamaica), and James Knight, *The state of the island of Jamaica*.

²¹ "Second Parliament of George II: Fourth session (5 of 9, begins 3/3/1738)." The petitioners also stated that throughout the period in which the Spanish searches and seizures of British merchant ships took place, they were not aware of any diplomatic action towards Spain taking place, nor had they heard of any Governor or other colonial officials being removed from office due to negligence. The petitioners stated that by Spain taking it upon itself to search and seize British vessels as they chose, with no reaction being made by the British government in return, Spain essentially claimed sovereignty over the Atlantic Ocean and the British Parliament had allowed it to take place without any consequence.

²² "Second Parliament of George II: Fourth session (6 of 9, begins 15/3/1738)."

his term in office Walpole pursued diplomatic policies of peace, as he believed that peace allowed Britain to prosper.²³ Throughout this period, after having witnessed the wars of decades prior, many agreed with Walpole and preferred that the British government consider policies of peace and stability, as opposed to jumping into rash or aggressive action as a solution to certain diplomatic issues.²⁴ These ideas are evident when examining the debates Walpole participated in with the other politicians on the floor of the House of Commons.

After the reading of each petition, members of Parliament debated the validity of the content within the documents written by merchants and colonials trading with British plantations in the Americas. During a parliamentary committee hearing, Sir John Barnard, an opponent of Walpole and his policies, asserted his belief that the grievances stated in the petitions were based in fact, and that Parliament should skip the official procedures which it must normally go through when investigating grievances and act as quickly as possible to find a solution, either diplomatic or military, to the “depredations” which Spanish sailors committed against British merchants and colonials.²⁵ Mr. Pulteney also responded to the allegations made in this petition with outrage against the Spanish. He argued that for hundreds of years, Spanish ports in the Americas had remained closed to merchants and sailors from other nations regardless of whether they had been “driven by stress of weather, or want of provisions, or pursuit of pirates into their ports or harbors.” He also asserted that the Spanish did not possess the capability to claim dominion over the Atlantic Ocean, so they therefore had no right to search the vessels of British merchants.²⁶ Another representative in the same committee, Walter Plumer, believed going to war with Spain to be one of the only viable solutions in addressing the grievances of the merchants and colonials. Plumer argued that past treaties and diplomatic actions taken with Spain in attempts to obtain reparations proved to be less than fruitful, and that any future diplomatic venture with them would be just as successful. He believed that going to war, even a disadvantageous one, could make more progress in obtaining reparations than signing more treaties.²⁷

In response, Walpole urged caution. He stated his belief that the grievances were more “artfully aggravated” than based in fact. Walpole further stated that a just judgement of the situation could not be given if parliamentary procedure was so swiftly dismissed and if they gave into these grievances, which would lead them to take rash action. Walpole also explicitly warned that a war with Spain would be very costly and should be avoided at all cost.²⁸ Walpole spoke again in Parliament

²³ Browning, *War of the Austrian Succession*, 23.

²⁴ Alan Taylor, *American Colonies* (New York: Penguin Group, 2001), 422.

²⁵ “Second Parliament of George II: Fourth session (5 of 9, begins 3/3/1738).”

²⁶ “Second Parliament of George II: Fourth session (7 of 9, begins 30/3/1738),” in *The History and Proceedings of the House of Commons: Volume 10, 1737-1739*, (London: Chandler, 1742), 182-258. British History Online, <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/commons-hist-proceedings/vol10/pp182-258>.

²⁷ “Second Parliament of George II: Fourth session (7 of 9, begins 30/3/1738).”

²⁸ “Second Parliament of George II: Fourth session (5 of 9, begins 3/3/1738).”

on 30 March 1738, urging further caution when negotiating with Spain. He stated that the British government should not be too aggressive in their requests and demands with Spain, so as not to provoke a war with Spain and perhaps other European powers as well, who would see Britain as a warmonger. Walpole urged the other politicians to look carefully into the “justice and reasonableness” of their demands so that outrage from Spain would not be provoked.²⁹

Other representatives in Parliament, and King George II, appeared to be in favor of a more moderate solution, and pursued more active diplomatic courses of action with Spain. The king addressed Parliament on 4 April 1738, stating: “I will make use of the most proper and effectual means, that are in my power, to procure justice and satisfaction to my injured subjects, and for the future security of their trade and navigation.”³⁰ Sir W. Windham addressed a committee in a debate on the contents of a petition on 30 March 1728, in which he favored resolving the grievances through peaceful negotiation and through war. He stated that concluding a peaceful resolution with Spain was a preferable option to engaging in open war, however, he also stated that war was a preferable option to a shameful peace. Windham continued, saying “let the event be what it will” and that any man who cares about the honor of his nation would gladly see that nation go to war to preserve it.³¹

Relations between Britain and Spain continued to strain as 1738 transitioned into 1739. The final major attempt at a diplomatic solution came on 14 January 1739 at the Convention of Pardo. Representatives from the two nations met in Madrid to discuss the alleged “depredations” committed by Spanish coast guard ships and the dispute over the southern border of Georgia.³² The representatives came to terms and signed a treaty. This agreement met much opposition when brought back to Britain to be ratified by Parliament. In the Parliamentary session on 14 February 1739, one member expressed his displeasure with the agreement:

But when I saw this Convention, how greatly was I disappointed! Instead of their making Concessions to us, we have made, I think, most dangerous, I shall not say dishonorable, Concessions to them, and have got nothing in Return, no not so much as a Suspension of their usual Hostilities. Instead of their giving us a Pledge, we have given one to them, by agreeing that Things shall remain in Florida and Carolina, in the Situation they are in at present, without increasing the Fortifications there, or taking any new Posts. In short,

²⁹ “Second Parliament of George II: Fourth session (7 of 9, begins 30/3/1738).”

³⁰ “Second Parliament of George II: Fourth session (8 of 9, begins 7/4/1738).” in *The History and Proceedings of the House of Commons: Volume 10, 1737-1739* (London, 1742), 258-292. British History Online <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/commons-hist-proceedings/vol10/pp258-292>.

³¹ “Second Parliament of George II: Fourth session (7 of 9, begins 30/3/1738).”

³² Harman, *Trade and Privateering in Spanish Florida*, 28.

Sir, by this Convention, Spain has not even agreed even to suspend Hostilities, yet we have agreed not to provide for our Defense.³³

Another member stated his belief that doing nothing would have been a better option than signing the convention. Other representatives only regarded this convention as a preliminary treaty before a more concrete peace to be signed in the future. As a result, calls for increases in soldiers and spending in the military were made.³⁴ This measure was implemented by Parliament as a form of deterrent, and to force Spain into a treaty more favorable to Britain. The plan, however, only caused tensions to rise.

In October of 1739, Walpole and his policies of peace ultimately failed, and a belligerent Parliament ordered British warships to seize Spanish merchant ships in retaliation.³⁵ Official declarations of war were made soon after, first by Great Britain, then by Spain.³⁶ The debates that ensued in Parliament made evident how the petitions of merchants and colonials in the Caribbean had a major impact on British foreign policy towards Spain in the lead up to the costly War of Jenkin's Ear, in which thousands of British men, both colonists and men from Britain, lost their lives fighting the Spanish.³⁷

In March of 1741, British forces, numbering around 30,000 soldiers and thirty war ships, arrived at the Spanish fortress of Cartagena, guarded by around 3,000 Spanish troops. After about a month of blunders due to disagreement among military leadership, and heavy casualties taken due to numerous failed assaults and aggressive tropical diseases, British forces began retreating to Jamaica in April of 1741.³⁸ The failure at the Siege of Cartagena proved to be the final nail in the coffin for Walpole's time in office. His hesitance to go to war in the face of a Parliament flooded with petitions and letters crying out for retribution and reparation, as well as allowing France to eclipse Britain militarily and economically, diminished his popularity over time. After the loss, the popularity of Walpole's administration plummeted. His party lost the majority in Parliament in the general election of 1741.³⁹ Unable to sway policy further in his favor, Walpole gave way to Lord Carteret in February of 1742.⁴⁰

³³ "Second Parliament of George II: Fifth session (3 of 4, begins 14/2/1739)," in *The History and Proceedings of the House of Commons: Volume 10, 1737-1739*, (London: Chandler, 1742), 403-417. *British History Online*, <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/commons-hist-proceedings/vol10/pp403-417>.

³⁴ *Ibid*.

³⁵ Taylor, *American Colonies*, 422.

³⁶ *The King of Spain's declaration of war against Great-Britain: done at Buen Retiro on the 28th of November* (London: Printed for R. Amey ..., [1739]), World Scholar: Latin America & the Caribbean, <http://worldscholar.tu.galegroup.com/tinyurl/46xGiX>.

³⁷ Taylor, *American Colonies*, 422.

³⁸ Browning, *War of the Austrian Succession*, 61.

³⁹ Both Frederick II of Prussia and Maria Theresa funded the anti-Walpole faction in the general election of 1741. Maria Theresa did so because she wanted Britain's full military support in their war against Prussia. Frederick funded Walpole's opponents in hopes that Britain would no longer subsidize Austria. See Browning, *War of the Austrian Succession*, 100.

⁴⁰ Browning, *War of the Austrian Succession*, 100.

This major defeat in the Caribbean caused Britain to withdraw its position as mediator between Prussia and Austria in their conflict over Silesia. Having seen this move and sensing weakness, France and Spain moved in to support Prussia in its war against Austria. Britain, still in support of Maria Theresa, joined in the European conflict on the side of Austria, and thus the War of Jenkins Ear merged with the more global War of Austrian Succession, lasting until 1748.⁴¹

⁴¹ This more global war proved to be one in which many smaller wars merged into one, however the principle issue at the heart of the war and why how it got its namesake was due to the death of Charles VI Habsburg, Holy Roman Emperor, and the ascension of his daughter, Maria Theresa, to the throne of Austria. Charles VI, before his death, attempted to secure his daughter's succession through the Pragmatic Sanction. This was a series of assurances given to Charles from several other European states such as France, Spain, Prussia, the United Provinces, Britain, and Russia. These states agreed support the succession of Maria Theresa with concessions or promises given from Charles in return. Since 1438, the office of Holy Roman Emperor was held by a Habsburg. However, Imperial succession law forbade a woman from becoming emperor, which put Maria Theresa at odds with the rest of the German electors and states of the empire. See Browning, *War of the Austrian Succession*, 18. Prussia, having agreed to the Pragmatic Sanction, was not satisfied upon the death of Charles VI, as they were not awarded the provinces they were promised to receive as Maria Theresa ascended the throne of Austria. As a result, Prussia moved in and attacked territory of Silesia to try and force Maria Theresa's hand. When the new ruler of Austria did not fold, and instead sent troops to try to retake Silesia, the War of the Austrian Succession had begun. See Browning, *War of the Austrian Succession*, 41.

Revolutionaries and Refugees: From France to Haiti to the United States

Samantha Sanford
New College of Florida

The historiography surrounding the relationship between the Haitian, French, and American revolutions has defined perceptions of the intellectual relationships among the three, with the characterization of the Haitian Revolution being particularly subject to the explosive tensions and interactions between political and philosophical notions of historicity. The Haitian Revolution has been defined as a product of the Enlightenment and side-effect of the French Revolution, with the real political connections between the two revolutions simplified into the relationship a ripple has with a rock thrown in the ocean. It has also been written as one of the anti-imperial revolts of the eighteenth century, with the American Revolution taking up most of the scholarly attention due to its later political importance. These characterizations are more fair than the older ones, like those of H. P. Davis in the 1920s, when he wrote of the Haitian Revolution in *The Black Consul* as a race war that was the flashpoint result of tensions between slavery and antislavery in the New World. However, the historiography describing the Haitian Revolution not only mischaracterizes the revolution due to its reliance on the accounts of white Enlightenment thinkers in France, St. Domingue, and America, it also implies that those thinkers were correct, and that Haiti's struggles were due to its nature as a black republic.

The historiographical tradition, beginning with French Enlightenment thinkers and even continuing to the present day, fails to recognize the Haitian Revolution as its own independent historical moment and context, instead subsuming it to the thematic currents of a Western, post-Enlightenment understanding of history. In doing so, scholars imply that the revolutionary, liberal ideas of the Enlightenment were eventually going to naturally produce a Haitian Revolution. Subsuming the Haitian Revolution into a positivist view of history ironically retroactively makes the Haitian Revolution a part of the worldview that had originally made the Revolution "unthinkable," as the Haitian historian Michel-Rolph Trouillot characterizes it. The sense of "perfectibility" that Trouillot points to in the Enlightenment discourse about non-European races -- a discourse that considered black Haitians fundamentally incapable of self-government in the 1790s -- morphed into the positivist history that turned Haiti into a failed branch of state-building in the New World.¹

¹ Michel-Rolph Trouillot, *Silencing the Past: Power and the Production of History* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1995), 80.

However, it must be said that any attempt to put Haiti in its proper place in the complex network of eighteenth-century revolutionaries is hampered by the evidence. The paucity of written material made by Haitian revolutionaries (only Toussaint Louverture left extensive written works behind) can lead to American and French sources dominating the conversation, which is undesirable for the reasons outlined above.² As a result, a good faith effort has been made to prioritize the writings of Haitian historians and editors, in part out of a respect for a living history, and in another part as a means to avoid the American and French-centric framing of other historians of the revolutionary period. However, in some respects, the preponderance of American historical and racial categories is inescapable. Whenever this paper uses racial categories like black slave, white planter, and free people of color, it is with an understanding that, as Laurent Dubois (who is also American) puts it, the categories are the product of a society in conflict, not an explanation of the conflict.

While we will eventually come to the complex relationship between the Haitian and French revolutions, we should first untangle the origins of the historical myths surrounding the Haitian Revolution that I alluded to above. Most begin with the American response to the conflict. America was put in a difficult position by the Haitian Revolution; the heavy intellectual debt America owed to the French Enlightenment made America vulnerable to what it perceived as an Enlightenment-manufactured slave revolt. Edward E. Bishop discusses the American response to the Haitian Revolution in *The Half Has Never Been Told: Slavery and the Making of American Capitalism* as an almost two-part response: those who do not discuss the Haitian Revolution on account of its unthinkability, and those enslavers who responded to the revolt with preparation and brutality. Baron Joseph X. Pontalba, a New Orleanian, wrote in 1796: "I can only recall when our position in this colony was ever so critical; when we used only to go to bed armed to the teeth. Often then, I would go to sleep with the most sinister thoughts creeping into my mind; taking heed of the dreadful calamities of Saint Domingue."³

The Haitian Revolution was seen by contemporary Americans as a frightful example of Enlightenment discourse taken too far, a response that has not been fully represented in some mainstream discussions of the Revolution. However, America was fundamentally indebted to a slave revolt -- an irony not lost on the slaveowners in power. By successfully repelling Napoleonic forces in 1803, Haiti (as it would be known on 1 January 1804) prevented the French from solidifying their position in Louisiana and eradicated the most profitable colony in the

² Laurent Dubois, *Avengers of the New World: The Story of the Haitian Revolution* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2004), 6.

³ John T. O'Connor, "The Impact of the Haitian Revolution on Louisiana," Toussaint Louverture Historical Society, <http://toussaintlouverturehs.org/ImpactOfHaitianRevolut.htm>.

French empire.⁴ America's territorial gains in Louisiana were a direct response to the ability of black Haitians to defend themselves against an imperial power, an irony that Alexander Hamilton noted: "to the deadly climate of St. Domingo, and to the courage and obstinate resistance made by its black inhabitants are we indebted. . . . [The] truth is, Bonaparte found himself absolutely compelled to relinquish his daring plan of colonizing the banks of the Mississippi."⁵

However, some in America described the Haitian Revolution with the language of disease and contagion, not unlike yellow fever. The influx of refugees from across Saint-Domingue's social order contributed to a refugee crisis that fundamentally altered the American understanding of slavery. American authorities feared that the refugees, white and black, carried the ideals of Enlightenment thinkers a bridge too far, and as the United States was splitting away from its relationship with post-revolutionary France, it grew suspicious of the potential for contagion among those who may carry the ideas of black citizenship into a world where the category itself was unthinkable. The American narrative of violence and revolt in Saint-Domingue began as early as 1793, when the first witnesses of anti-planter violence fled to the United States. M d ric-Louis-Elie Moreau de St. M ry, a French writer who lived in Saint-Domingue and wrote extensively on the uprisings, began publishing his journals in 1793, influencing the American dialogue about abolition and slavery.⁶ St. Domingan refugees created an extensive refugee press centered in New York and Philadelphia, producing fiction and nonfiction to incense the American imagination.⁷ Americans were worried that French ideas, carried by refugees from Saint-Domingue, would drive American slaves to revolt as well.⁸ New Orleans and North Carolina banned black slaves and free people of color from St. Domingue.⁹ In October of 1793, South Carolina decreed that free people of color and black slaves from Saint-Domingue all had to get out of South Carolina within ten days of the bill being passed.¹⁰ South Carolina also forbade all free black people from the West Indies and Africa until 1803.¹¹ And yet, in 1791, the governor of South Carolina had sent a message to the Colonial Assembly of Saint-Domingue, in the midst of a slave uprising, saying: "we cannot but sensibly feel for your situation."¹² Thomas Jefferson had even written that "the situation of the

⁴ Edward E. Bishop, *The Half Has Never Been Told: Slavery and the Making of American Capitalism* (New York: Best Books, 2014), 47.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 48-49.

⁶ Dubois, *Avengers of the New World*, 8.

⁷ John T. Baur, "International Repercussions of the Haitian Revolution," *The Americas* 26, no.4 (April 1970): 394-418.

⁸ Jeremy D. Popkin, *You Are All Free: The Haitian Revolution and the Abolition of Slavery* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 289.

⁹ Baur, "International Repercussions," 397.

¹⁰ Popkin, *You Are All Free*, 316.

¹¹ Rebekah Nicholson, "The Enlightenment and Its Effects on the Haitian Revolution of 1789-1804," *McNair Scholar Journal* 10, no.1 (2006): 88-96.

¹² O'Connor, "The Impact of the Haitian Revolution on Louisiana."

St. Domingo fugitives (aristocrats as they are) calls aloud for pity & charity. Never was so deep a tragedy presented to the feelings of man.”¹³

The American political response to ongoing violence in Saint-Domingue, and later Haiti, was as ambivalent and vague as the popular response, in part due to the messy political situation in the nascent American government, and in part due to the tumultuous system of international alliances playing out in the Atlantic world. According to the U.S. government’s official history, Thomas Jefferson and Alexander Hamilton offered limited aid to the planters in Saint-Domingue to suppress the slave revolt and the French Revolutionary anti-slavery government, while expressing the need for a compromise between white planters and free people of color.¹⁴ The ugly ironies that Jefferson’s Democratic-Republican party faced led to a deliberate and incidental erasure of the Haitian Revolution from the story of eighteenth-century revolutions. Just as Jefferson’s Enlightenment ideals paled in the face of the violent turns of the French Revolution, they also could not allow St. Domingans to come into America and walk around as living examples of the contradictions and tensions at the heart of revolutionary discourse about man and liberty in a society founded on black slavery.

But can the Haitian Revolution really be said to be the result of Enlightenment discourse, a cousin to The Declaration of the Rights of Man and Citizen? What was the actual nature of the relationship between the French and Haitian Revolutions, both intellectually and politically? At the time of Jefferson’s moral dilemma, the prevailing belief was that the Enlightenment and the French Revolution had created the situation in St. Domingue, which alienated Americans from the French revolutionaries. Edmond Genet, the French diplomat who travelled from Paris to Saint-Domingue to America during 1793, worked to break American neutrality in the war between Britain and France, to the point of almost single-handedly ruining the American relationship with France.¹⁵ The popular debate surrounding him, as the Washington administration demanded France recall him, metonymically expanded into a debate about America’s relationship with the French Revolutionary state; the “Principles, Articles, and Regulations Agreed Upon by the members of the Democratic Society in Philadelphia” asserted that “the Rights of Man, the genuine object of Society, and the legitimate principles of government have been clearly developed by the successive Revolutions of America, and France,” and yet another newspaper article warned its readership to “keep a watchful eye on the true interests of the United States, and upon those naturalized Citizens who seem to prefer their own or a foreign interest to that of their new country.”¹⁶

¹³ Baur, “International Repercussions of the Haitian Revolution,” 395.

¹⁴ “The United States and the Haitian Revolution, 1791-1804,” *Office of the Historian*, <https://history.state.gov/milestones/1784-1800/haitian-rev>.

¹⁵ Popkin, *You Are All Free*, 295.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 298.

Over this debate loomed the specter of Saint-Domingue. Not only were the refugees in America providing a source of tension socially and politically, Genet was pledging his support to the representatives of Jacobin France in Saint-Domingue, Léger-Félicité Sonthonax and Étienne Polverel, both of whom had been radical supporters of the Haitian Revolution, as other Jacobins had been.¹⁷ This meant that Genet was supporting the emancipation and enfranchisement of free people of color within Saint-Domingue, a policy that the American slaveholding government could not support.

However, Americans fundamentally misunderstood the complexities of St. Domingue's racial categories and how they impacted and fomented the Haitian Revolution. Revolutionary France was not a beacon of racial tolerance, radically including those of African descent in the Declaration of the Rights of Man. As an illustration of the conflict in France over the state of slavery and the free people of color in Saint-Domingue, consider the two decrees of 15 May. On 15 May 1791, the Constituent Assembly of France enfranchised and granted the rights of citizenship to those free people of color whose parents had been freed.¹⁸ This decree was repealed that September.¹⁹ A year later came the second decree on 15 May, in contradiction of the first one. Pierre-François Page and Augustin-Jean Brulley were sent to France to get support for the Saint-Domingue Colonial Assembly's May 15th decree of 1792, which declared that "the colony of Saint-Domingue cannot exist without slavery" and that "a slave is the master's property; no authority can restrict this property."²⁰ However, Page and Brulley were swept up in the political conflict between Jacobins and Girondins. Unable to pass their decree, they were still able to take revenge on earlier government figures like Sonthonax, Polverel, and the 1791 governor Blanchelande, who was the first high-ranking revolutionary bureaucrat executed by the Jacobin regime.²¹ Page and Brulley were also later arrested by the Committee of Public Safety during the Reign of Terror, as a part of the tumultuous turns of fate and favor during the period.²²

However, the debates over the decree of 15 May 1791 illustrates the complicated relationship between the Haitian Revolution, the French Revolution, and the Enlightenment in a manner that Jefferson and his Democratic-Republicans were unable to see from their vantage point in the United States. In the American narrative which sees the Haitian Revolution as the ideological result of French revolutionaries carrying Enlightenment ideals of citizenship too far, the complex and multi-sided Haitian Revolution is simplified and erased. The Haitian Revolution created a specifically black republic under the rule of former slaves, a future and a

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 300.

¹⁸ Nicholson, "The Enlightenment," 89.

¹⁹ Popkin, *You Are All Free*, 329.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 329-330.

²¹ *Ibid.*, 338.

²² *Ibid.*

government that the Enlightenment was completely unable to conceptualize. Two uprisings were taking place in Haiti, and both had historical precedent. The uprising of free people of color opened the door for the slave uprising, and the generalized political tensions and violence led to the complex civil war. Despite the existence of two rebellions in Haiti, it was the revolt of the free people of color on the island that occupies the most complicated place in the American narrative. The story of these revolutionaries has recently become a point of interest in the scholarship, in part as a response to the way it had been ignored in favor of the old emphasis on race war. Free men of color were a destabilizing force in Saint-Domingue; they were impossible in the social rankings of the imperial, racist worldview that held that those of African descent were fundamentally servile and subhuman.²³ And yet, on the eve of the National Assembly back in France, the free people of color in Saint-Domingue drafted a *cahier de doléances* which demanded “equality for all non-whites and freedom for mulatto slaves.”²⁴ Julien Raimond, a free person of color and slave owner living in France, wrote in a pamphlet in 1791 of his hope that the National Assembly would recognize the citizenship of free people of color in Saint-Domingue.²⁵ Raimond wrote *Observations on the Origin and Progress of the Prejudice of the White Colonials against the Men of Color*, and was on the committee that drafted the decree of 15 May 1791.²⁶

By contrast, another person of mixed race living in France, Vincent Ogé, left for Saint-Domingue after the planter government refused to implement the emancipating decree of 15 May 1791, where he planned an insurrection, before being apprehended by Spanish authorities and turned over to the French for execution.²⁷ The incident with Ogé spread into a generalized discontent and uprising, with Spain and England invading Saint-Domingue as well, until the Revolutionary French state sent Sonthonax and Polverel to restore order in 1792.²⁸ Sonthonax promised freedom, at first, to those free people of color who would help fight for the Republic.²⁹ In late 1793, Sonthonax and Polverel abolished slavery, and the National Assembly did the same in February of 1794.³⁰

In the actions of the revolutionary French state, we see the shift in the contours of the violence in Saint-Domingue. Where the original uprising was to grant the franchise to free people of color, Sonthonax and Polverel abolished slavery -- an aim that slaveowners like Julien Raimond were not anticipating. The promise of enfranchisement in order to enlist free people of color in the conflict with slaves was not completely unprecedented. The “Chasseurs Volontaires d’Amérique” was

²³ Trouillot, *Silencing the Past*, 77.

²⁴ Dubois, *Avengers of the New World*, 81.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, 60-61.

²⁶ Nicholson, “The Enlightenment,” 91.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, 94.

²⁸ O’Connor, “The Impact of the Haitian Revolution on Louisiana.”

²⁹ *Ibid.*

³⁰ *Ibid.*

a military force composed of free men of color under white officers, dedicated to tracking down maroons.³¹ However, the final step, the creation of black citizens, was unthinkable to French and American political actors.

The notion of the Haitian Revolution being an inevitable ripple off the Enlightenment discourse on liberty taken too far fails to account for the fundamentally racist worldview of those writing in Europe in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. It is true that some writers in the period were anti-slavery. Louis-Sebastien Mercier wrote a time travel story in 1771, where he dreamed he found a statue of “a negro his head bare, his arm outstretched, with pride in his eyes and a noble and imposing demeanor” with the words “To the Avenger of the New World!” written at the base.³² As Dubois discusses, however, Enlightenment thinkers generally shared a belief in natural rights, and that the violently oppressed had a natural right to violent retribution.³³

The Abbé Raynal wrote a history of European colonialism, in which he observed that “all the negroes lack is a leader courageous enough to carry them to vengeance and carnage. Where is he, this great man, that nature owes to its vexed, oppressed, tormented children?”³⁴ By discussing enslaved Africans and those of African descent as nature’s children, even Raynal is operating within the Enlightenment dichotomy of nature, natives, and Africans versus men, Europeans, and citizens.³⁵ Rights in the French Republic were for “man and citizen,” but they were not for the subhuman position that Africans and people of African descent occupied.

After the success of the Haitian Revolution, the nascent Haitian Republic was deliberately sabotaged by the world around it. The Haitian writer Frankétienne described it as an “aborted miracle,” with “external abortionists” interrupting the nation-building process in Haiti out of fear of a black republic.³⁶ The Papacy did not recognize Haitian sovereignty until 1860, and the American government did not recognize Haiti until 1862 -- during the Lincoln administration.³⁷ The Haitian Revolution became “the revolution that the world forgot,” as Trouillot characterizes it, and a part of a racist narrative further alienating Africans from civilization, progress, and republicanism. The contradictions and complexities at the heart of America’s intellectual and cultural relationship with the Enlightenment, personified in how Americans dealt with the revolution in Saint-Domingue, necessitated Haiti’s failure as a republic. America could not allow a black republic, and so it

³¹ Sue Peabody, “The Battle of Savannah,” in *Revolutionary Freedoms: A History of Survival, Strength and Imagination in Haiti*, Cécile Accilien, Jessica Adams, and Elvide Méléance, eds. (Coconut Creek: Caribbean Studies Press, 2006) 19, 29-32.

³² Dubois, *Avengers of the New World*, 57.

³³ *Ibid.*, 58.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, 57.

³⁵ Trouillot, *Silencing the Past*, 82.

³⁶ Rachel Douglas, “An Aborted Miracle: The Significance and Aftermath of the Haitian Revolution in Frankétienne’s ‘H’èrosimères’ and ‘Miraculeuse.’” *Journal of Haitian Studies* 10.2, Bicentennial Issue (Fall 2004): 78-94.

³⁷ O’Connor, “The Impact of the Haitian Revolution on Louisiana.”

sabotaged the Haitian Revolution before American slaves saw themselves in the Enlightenment discourse of their masters.

However, we must be careful to not reproduce any of the schemata of the time, which have unfortunately filtered into earlier histories. Neither the Enlightenment nor the French Revolution encouraged black citizenship or the Haitian Revolution. The original free people of color like Julien Raimond who were operated in the mode and used the *cahiers de doléances* of the French Revolution did not wish to end slavery. Toussaint L'Ouverture's slave revolt was a truly radical, revolutionary break from the European worldview that shocked even free people of color. Enlightenment thinkers, as we saw, understood the slave revolt in Haiti as natural retribution, but did not believe that those of African descent were capable of a republic. Therefore, Haiti's struggles were because it was a black republic, not because the world had sabotaged it to prevent contagion. To reproduce these historical myths -- that the Enlightenment would naturally trigger the Haitian Revolution, and that Haiti was born to fail because its citizens were not ready-- that were born of a racist worldview is to empower and perpetuate them, stalling an honest assessment of the far-reaching impact of slavery in France and America, even among enlightened politicians and revolutionaries.

Politicizing Health: The Nazis' Forgotten Anti-Smoking Campaign and Twentieth-Century Eugenics

John Lancaster
University of Central Florida

In March 1942, nearly a decade after the National Socialists came to power in Germany, Adolf Hitler angrily corresponded with *Reichsmarschall* Hermann Goering over the commission of a statue. Hitler became annoyed that the statue was to bear the likeness of Goering with a fat, smoldering cigar clenched between its metal teeth. Though Goering had been one of Hitler's most loyal followers since the 1920s, even being named successor in 1941, his unhealthy habits—and particularly his love of tobacco—began to irritate Hitler and undermine the Nazis' health campaigns. "Do you think it looks good to be photographed with a pipe?" Hitler wrote in a letter after scolding the officer for his acceptance of the statue, and for being photographed smoking. Though Hitler was aware of the growing popularity of smoking tobacco in the twentieth century, he was harshly intolerant of creating associations between smoking and Nazis. He took considerably more issue with Goering's indifference toward being seen smoking in public than he did with the Reichsmarschall's smoking habit in general, though he disapproved of both. Goering's statue and photographs—as public and permanent as they were—ran aslant with the health-conscious, and self-conscious, Nazi Party.¹

The Nazis were obsessed with health, and particularly with combatting preventable diseases in an age of scientific advancement and modernity. Hitler's negative reaction to the statue plainly exemplifies how crucial health concerns were to Nazi ideology, but his chiding of Goering over a mere representation illustrates how deeply manipulative the Nazi Party was in conveying those health concerns to the public. Why were the Nazis so adamant that people stay healthy, and whose health were they most concerned about? Their stringent health campaign was fueled by an intense eugenic fervor to strengthen and preserve what they considered to be the master "Aryan" race. Eugenics refers to the pseudo-scientific belief that a race of people may be improved over generations through the encouragement of reproduction by those who have desirable traits, and the discouragement of reproduction by those who have undesirable traits. This idea of strengthening and preserving the race through eugenics became inseparable from Nazi health policy as Hitler and his followers put an enormous amount of weight on making sure so-called Aryans stayed healthy for reproductive purposes.²

¹ David Irving, *Goering: A Biography* (New York: William Morrow & Co, 1989), 518.

² Basil Aboul-Enein, "The Anti-Tobacco Movement of Nazi Germany: A Historiographical Re-Examination," *International Electronic Journal of Health Education* 15 (2012): 166-172.

Public information about what constituted healthy and what did not was often spread through propaganda imbued with eugenic attitudes and pro-Nazi ideologies. One German magazine from the late 1930s exemplified these attitudes and ideologies by proclaiming, “Brother National Socialist, do you know that your Führer is against smoking and thinks that every German is responsible to the whole [of the people] . . . and does not have the right to damage his body with drugs?”³ Quotations like this helped to construct the social and health standards for ethnic Germans, implying that if a person decided to “damage his body with drugs” like tobacco, he would not be doing his duty to the race. Racial and ethnic minorities, who had no such eugenic duties, were thus singled out and associated with smoking in an attempt to make the habit look less appealing to the *Volk*—ethnic, Aryan Germans. At the same time, these associations created enormous social pressures which sought to persuade ethnic Germans to comply with Nazi health standards; there were implications that smokers may be ostracized for engaging in unhealthy activities that conflicted with Nazi eugenic goals. Goering’s statue and behavior, then, presented real issues for someone as concerned about appearances as Hitler, who led the Nazi Party to condemn smoking as un-Aryan, and a threat to social growth, themes continuously found in Nazi eugenic propaganda.

Aryan Germans were expected to fulfill their eugenic duties of strengthening and preserving the race through selective reproduction, which required a maintained healthy lifestyle throughout an individual’s reproductive existence. In Nazi Germany, reproduction unquestionably connoted a feminine quality. As such, women were dissuaded from smoking in much more aggressive ways than men, both through propaganda and through legislation, the latter reaching a climax in 1944 when women were forbidden by law from buying tobacco.⁴ The same eugenic philosophies were at work in chiding women against smoking, as women were regarded as the mothers of the Aryan race, the ones producing the boys and girls who would ultimately make up future generations of racially pure Germans.

In 1939, Nazi scientists produced a groundbreaking study which for the first time linked lung cancer with smoking cigarettes.⁵ The year is important to consider, as the Nazis’ anti-smoking sentiments had been around since the formation of the party itself, long before 1939. A scientific study lent the Nazis more confidence in passing anti-smoking legislation and printing more racially insensitive anti-smoking propaganda during the 1940s, but the lack of one during the 1920s and 1930s did not stop the party from making eugenic associations between non-

³ George Davey Smith, “Lifestyle, Health, and Health Promotion in Nazi Germany,” *The British Medical Journal* 329, no. 1424 (16 December 2004).

⁴ Robert N. Proctor, “The Anti-Tobacco Campaign of the Nazis: A Little Known Aspect of Public Health in Germany, 1933-1945,” *The British Medical Journal* 313, no. 1450 (7 December 1996) <http://www.bmj.com/content/313/7070/1450>.

⁵ Tracy Brown Hamilton, “The Nazis’ Forgotten Anti-Smoking Campaign,” *The Atlantic* (9 July 2014), <http://www.theatlantic.com/health/archive/2014/07/the-nazis-forgotten-anti-smoking-campaign/373766/>.

Aryans and tobacco. Even when the Nazis referred to the risk of cancer from smoking, there were eugenic undertones which marred their rationale. Jews and other minorities were commonly considered a kind of cancer infecting the Aryan race, and “enemies of the Volk” because of this. Cancer and disease, brought on by smoking, presented significant social metaphors for the Nazis, as associations between racial minorities and ill-health created social divisions between so-called Aryans and non-Aryans.⁶ These divisions proved crucial to how the Nazis implemented their anti-smoking campaign.

Nazi Eugenics and Associations with Smoking

Spreading through Europe during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, eugenics became influential to both Hitler’s personal convictions, as well as to what would become Nazi policy. The goal of strengthening and preserving the Aryan race became an obsession for the Nazis, who went to severe extremes in their quest for racial purity. While they were systematically exterminating non-Aryans around Europe, the Nazis’ anti-smoking campaign at home further demonized these racial and ethnic minorities through stereotypical and insensitive connotations in propaganda and media.

As early as the 1920s, Jews began appearing in cartoons indulging in tobacco. In a cartoon published in a 1929 issue of the Nazi magazine *Der Stürmer*, two Jewish shop owners exploit German customers at Christmas. The caption reads, “One can do anything to those Goyim. Our people crucified their Christ on the cross, and we do a great business on his birthday.”⁷ This image was primarily intended to portray Jews as greedy and conniving, willing to shamelessly capitalize on the holiest day in the Christian calendar just to make some money. This type of image proved to be popular amongst publishers, as the religious dichotomy was easy to understand and prompted strong responses. The ways in which the Nazis would continue to demonize smoking through the coming years find their subtle roots in this image. Despite the intended purpose of the cartoon, it is hard to miss the two shop owners’ cigarettes, front and center in the frame. The smoke from one of them billows upward and obstructs the image of a German shopper. By placing cigarettes in the hands of the two Jewish men, the Nazis created negative associations between smoking and ethnic minorities. Non-Aryans were already considered undesirable, in many cases they were not allowed to reproduce as ethnic Germans were encouraged to do, because they exhibited undesirable traits. Smoking was considered an undesirable habit, so by depicting these outsiders as indulging in tobacco, Nazi propagandists and publishers hoped to instill into Aryan minds that smoking was not for them.

⁶ Proctor, *The Nazi War on Cancer*.

⁷ “Caricatures from *Der Stürmer*: 1927-1932,” German Propaganda Archive, <http://research.calvin.edu/german-propaganda-archive/sturm28.htm>.

Tobacco threatened Aryan well-being. The Nazis recognized this even before they published the 1939 study. They were critical of most everything foreign one could put into one's body, as it threatened to destroy their eugenic goals. Hitler was especially adamant about this, often bragging about his vegetarianism and abstinence from nicotine and alcohol, which ostensibly proved that he was doing his part in strengthening and preserving the race. In 1925, with the publication of *Mein Kampf*, he expressed his belief that all Aryans had an obligation to themselves, to each other, and to the future generations of Germans (all of the latter falling into the Nazi construct of the Volk) to live healthy lives. "We must . . . do away with the conception that the treatment of the body is the affair of every individual. There is no freedom to sin at the cost of posterity and hence of the race," he wrote.⁸

This collective eugenic idea crafted very potent ways of dissuading the Aryan population from smoking. It created enormous social pressures. In a state which so clearly preferred and idealized ethnic Germans, people were eager to show that they were part of that exclusive group of racial purity. This meant refraining from smoking, or else risk being clumped with the other undesirables— ethnic and racial minorities. Considering the health risks linked to smoking which could affect the length and vigor of one's reproductive life, Germans who did indulge in tobacco raised questions about their worth to the collective community. If one were to smoke, what duty to the race were they fulfilling?

In this sense, the campaign fits comfortably within the Nazi construct of the *Volksgemeinschaft*, or "the people's community," according to which the collective good of the people took priority over any individual desires.⁹ An individual's unhealthy desires, like those of Hermann Goering, for example, were a threat to the stability of the *Volksgemeinschaft*. Goering gradually became the embodiment of ill health in a regime obsessed with vitality, and was eventually removed from Hitler's will and the Nazi Party. While there were important political reasons for this, we are amiss to believe that Goering's obesity and smoking habit, both of which were clearly displayed to the public, had no bearing on his falling out of favor with the Nazis. His defeat thus stands as an example of the severe social pressures the Nazis created, and to the seriousness of their collective eugenic goal of strengthening and preserving the race.

Social Divisions and "Respectable Citizens"

Portraying racial and ethnic minorities as inferior to Aryan Germans inherently created wide social gaps between the two groups. These divisions helped construct the pressures ethnic Germans faced when confronted with tobacco, and became more of an extension of the state's health policy as the years of Nazi rule dragged

⁸ Adolf Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, trans. Ralph Manheim, vol. 1 (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1998), chap. 10.

⁹ Peter Fritzsche, *Life and Death in the Third Reich* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2009).

on. These divisions were not only portrayed to the public through eugenic means, though, and in fact found roots in history. The constructed past the Nazis created would be used time and time again to create a collective community for the Volk. One aspect of this collective community was the condemnation of unhealthy habits like smoking.

For example, the German writer Johann Wolfgang von Goethe—in many respects the German equivalent of Shakespeare to the English—also had a strong distaste for smoking. In the early 1800s he wrote, “smokers poison the air for miles around and suffocate respectable citizens” who refuse to smoke tobacco.¹⁰ Goethe was an admired figure for the ethnic Germans, and someone who embodied the essence of German nationality. By appropriating his views on tobacco, the Nazi regime furthered their eugenic goal of creating social divisions by constructing a history of disliking tobacco for Aryans, but failing to include non-Aryans in that same construct.

Nazi Germany was a “racial state,” which itself implied a close association between eugenic philosophy and national unity.¹¹ A state of people inherently shared a set of values and beliefs that made them all members of that unified nation. What made Nazis German citizens? While healthy Germans were regarded as “respectable citizens” of the state, fulfilling the eugenic duties the state demanded of them, minorities were considered the opposite. Goethe’s implication was that smokers were not “respectable citizens.” As the writer was less of a national icon for non-Germans, the Nazis took his notion to another extreme: non-Aryans, who were often associated with the unhealthy habit of smoking, were neither respectable, nor were they citizens at all, because they did not fit the eugenic mold the Nazis idealized, nor did they fit into the constructed history the Volk romanticized.

The relationship between smoking and what made a “respectable citizen” would come to full realization by the 1940s, as the anti-smoking campaign completely embraced eugenic associations to chide Aryans against tobacco. After 1939, the Nazi government found significantly more encouragement to further cast racial and ethnic minorities as smokers. The term “smoker” effectively became synonymous with the eugenic term “undesirable.”¹² An illustration from *American Scientist* depicts a group of minorities drawn to this degree—in a stereotypical fashion, and characterizing smoking as something entirely un-Aryan. The title “Vice by Association” points to the belief that tobacco was a vice—a sin, as Hitler wrote in *Mein Kampf*—simply because it was associated with ethnic and racial minorities. This was done in an effort to encourage Aryan admonishment of tobacco at the expense of the lesser races; but illustrations like this also provided an outlet to

¹⁰ Karen Slama, ed., *Tobacco and Health* (New York: Plenum Press, 1995).

¹¹ Michael Burleigh and Wolfgang Ippermann, *The Racial State: Germany 1933-1945*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991).

¹² “Vice by Association,” illustration, from *American Scientist*, <http://www.americanscientist.org/bookshelf/pub/a-breathtaking-study-of-the-real-antismoking-nazis>.

spew pro-German, class-based propaganda, which in turn created stark social divisions between the desirable and the undesirable. These divisions again placed pressures upon German citizens. If one were to smoke, one might risk being cast as an undesirable as well.

Social divisions were also fashioned through exploiting religious differences, which often fell down the same racial and ethnic lines. A unified state further required a state religion, and in Nazi Germany Christianity proved to draw in the majority of people.¹³ The Nazis notoriously squabbled with the church, but still seized upon the recognizable concepts found in religion to encourage people to stay healthy, and align themselves according to their philosophies.

One popular ethnic German mantra exhorted: "Put collective need ahead of individual greed."¹⁴ While this quotation obviously embodies the collective eugenic importance of maintaining one's health, the idea of greed surely connected with the religious idea of sin in many German minds. A cartoon from the 1940s, titled "Tabak-Kapital," even depicted the Devil raining down cigars, pipes, and cigarettes on Germany.¹⁵ The sin Hitler references in *Mein Kampf* is the sin of unhealthy tobacco, a sin which, in 1942, he further called "the wrath of the Red Man against the White Man."¹⁶ Despite the fact that in twentieth-century Germany, Native Americans presented no military or political threat to the Nazis, Hitler was still adamant enough about dividing the racially pure from the undesirable that he chose to further separate the two groups based on race. The familiar biblical sin of wrath made the idea even more potent for German citizens, who were constantly under the influence of social, political, and religious pressures and divisions.

The German Woman Does Not Smoke

The anti-smoking campaign especially targeted women in Nazi Germany, as they were crucial to fulfilling the eugenic goal of strengthening and preserving the master race. Tobacco was considered a "genetic poison" by propagandists, eventually to "lead to the degeneration of the German people."¹⁷ This anti-smoking rhetoric closely resembled Nazi anti-Semitic views—that Jews were the "paradigmatic example of a degenerative evolution, one that would lead eventually to the extinction of [the mythologized Aryan] race."¹⁸ These fascinating parallels speak again to the associations created between the anti-tobacco movement and Nazi eugenic philosophy.

¹³ "The German Churches and the Nazi State," United States Holocaust Memorial Museum (7 July 2016) <https://www.ushmm.org/wlc/en/article.php?ModuleId=10005206>.

¹⁴ Claudia Koonz, *The Nazi Conscience* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2003).

¹⁵ "Tabak-Kapital," Illustration, from *American Scientist* <http://www.americanscientist.org/bookshelf/pub/a-breathhtaking-study-of-the-real-antismoking-nazis>.

¹⁶ Proctor, *The Nazi War on Cancer*.

¹⁷ George Davey Smith, "Lifestyle, Health, and Health Promotion in Nazi Germany."

¹⁸ Avishai Margalit, and Gabriel Motzkin, "The Uniqueness of the Holocaust," *Philosophy & Public Affairs* 25, no. 1 (1996): 71, <http://www.jstor.org.ezproxy.net.ucf.edu/stable/pdf/2961917.pdf>.

Though smoking actually posed no genetic threat to an individual, the notion of tobacco as a “genetic poison” was an important one. German women had a eugenic responsibility to stay genetically healthy. This poison seemed a legitimate concern when propaganda linked smoking with the “atrophy of the ovaries,” and warned that “smoking [while pregnant] could cause spontaneous abortions.”¹⁹ These were powerful intimidations considering their direct complications to the Nazi woman’s reproductive responsibilities.

Women under Hitler’s regime were indispensable in the effort to strengthen and preserve the collective race. Mothers, after all, carried their children for nine months before birth, and were the ones who nursed and cared for them through their development. German mothers were encouraged to have many children, in an effort to ensure they serve their country effectively. This meant they had to remain healthy, refraining from things like smoking and drinking for the entirety of their reproductive lives. The idea of serving their country as reproducers narrowed women’s social and political prospects under Nazi rule, while at the same time creating another set of social pressures which significantly affected the female population. The notion of serving through reproduction permeated multiple facets of Nazi society, but especially targeted young women who still had their reproductive lives ahead of them. For example, the League of German Girls, in which young girls watched after infants whose mothers were away, advertised its aim “to prepare young Aryans to serve the *Reich* as mothers.”²⁰ From a young age, women were taught what their obligation to society was, and that obligation was steeped in eugenic ideology. Their duty to the race through reproduction was at the core of this eugenic policy, as only *Aryan* mothers were considered to have desirable traits, and thus encouraged to have many children.

In 1942, a German health manual asserted, “mothers, you must absolutely avoid alcohol and nicotine during pregnancy and when nursing. They hinder, they harm, they disrupt the normal course of pregnancy. Drink fruit juice.”²¹ An illustration from *American Scientist* reflects this sentiment in its depiction of a mother holding her child; a warning against using alcohol and nicotine floats above her. In front of her sits a bottle of apple cider, which proved to be a healthier alternative.²² This poster fits into the central idea of Nazi eugenics and the politicization of health because not only does it implore mothers to be conscious of what they consume, and make sure they retain their reproducing abilities for as long as naturally possible, but it also illustrates how the Nazi regime targeted women and mothers

¹⁹ Robert N. Proctor, “The Nazi Campaign Against Tobacco: Science in a Totalitarian State,” in *Medicine and Medical Ethics in Nazi Germany: Origins, Practices, Legacies*, ed. Francis R. Nicosia, and Jonathan Huener (New York: Berghahn Books, 2002), 40-58.

²⁰ Doris L. Bergen, *War and Genocide: A Concise History of the Holocaust*, 2nd ed. (Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, 2009), 62-64.

²¹ George Davey Smith, “Lifestyle, Health, and Health Promotion in Nazi Germany.”

²² “Motherhood,” illustration from *American Scientist*, <http://www.americanscientist.org/bookshelf/pub/a-breathhtaking-study-of-the-real-antismoking-nazis>.

as particular groups who should pay attention to the anti-smoking campaign. Women who smoked were, according to propaganda, consuming a genetic poison which could potentially leave them infertile. The idea behind this propaganda was to depict women living out their entire reproductive lives without having a child as horrifying. And it did come across that way for many. In light of the social stigmas which could be placed upon smokers due to their seeming lack of eugenic responsibility, German women were eager to show that they were a part of the group.

Being a part of the group, or the collective race of ethnic Germans, meant marrying young and capitalizing on that marriage quickly and efficiently. In Nazi rhetoric, marriage referred to reproduction and nothing else. Its purpose was defined simply: “to guarantee the increase and preservation of the species and the race. This alone is its meaning and its task.”²³ Nazi eugenics played a large role in constructing the racial state women lived in, as outlined by Hitler himself in the 1920s: “the German girl [will] belong to the state and with her marriage become a citizen.”²⁴ The young married women became the ideal for both the Nazi Party, who sought increasing birth rates, and Nazi women, who sought acceptance. It is no surprise, then, that the young married woman with multiple children closely played into the Nazis’ fondness for folksy, pastoral imagery and ideas in pro-Aryan propaganda. Around the world, modernization saw an end to marriage and reproductive practices that defined the pre-industrial age. In modern times, families no longer needed many children. Nazi imagery looked back to past times, often romanticizing them, to mirror the important obligations women had which were more attuned to historical trends, while at the same time trying to inspire women to comply with those trends.

Women and mothers were singled out most profoundly in the anti-smoking campaign as part of the eugenic web spun around what Hitler considered “the highest aim of human existence—not the preservation of a state, let alone a government, but the preservation of the species,” a species wholly dependent upon the health of Aryan mothers.²⁵ With this philosophy in mind, the Nazis complemented their influencing propaganda with anti-smoking legislation. In 1943, vendors were forbidden by law to sell tobacco to women under twenty five. In 1944, the ban was widened to all women.²⁶ The tobacco ban for women under twenty five points again to the eugenic undertones of the campaign, as up through one’s twenties proved to be prime reproducing age.

²³ Claudia Koonz, *Mothers in the Fatherland: Women, the Family and Nazi Politics*, vol. 24, (London: Routledge, 1987), 56.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, 55.

²⁵ Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, chap. 3.

²⁶ Jean-Denis G. G. Lepage, *Hitler Youth, 1922-1945: An Illustrated History* (Jefferson: McFarland and Company, 2008), 44.

In their compulsion to comply with Nazi ideology, many restaurants and cafés were required to hang up a sign that read “*Die deutsche Frau raucht nicht!*” (“The German Woman does not Smoke!”).²⁷ But this phrase was not meant as a proud national accomplishment. Rather, it was meant as a terrifying totalitarian warning, steeped in racial policy and eugenic agendas, once again highlighting the Nazis’ continued interest in creating intense social pressures to influence Aryan women. Although the laws passed at this time were harsh, they should be considered secondary measures to these pressures. The sign implied if a woman were to smoke, she would not be a German woman; if she was not German, she was not Aryan; if she was not Aryan, she was not part of the collective Aryan race; and if this last part was true, she had no reproductive duty or eugenic purpose to her country.

The Nazis’ crusade against tobacco, being the first of its kind, was a fascinating aspect of their national health campaign; however, it cannot be viewed as separate from Nazi eugenics and racial policy. Ethnic and racial minorities were continuously associated with tobacco to simultaneously cast both smoking and non-Aryans as undesirable, as both threatened the goal of Aryan racial and ethnic purity.

One of the last things Hitler committed to paper was his “Final Political Testament,” written one day before he took his own life in April 1945. In it, he outlined what he hoped the legacy of the Nazi Party would be, as well as what the party should do in the future. He wrote in the last sentence of the testament, “above all, I enjoin the government and the people to uphold the race laws . . . and to resist mercilessly the poisoner of all nations, international Jewry.”²⁸ The language Hitler used is important to consider, as he referred to the Jews as “poisoners” of the race in much the same way smoking was referred to as a “genetic poison” by propagandists, and called a “poison” by Goethe in the nineteenth century. These language similarities and broader implicit associations triggered by them highlight the acute importance of racial and ethnic preservation to Nazi ideology, which filtered down even to their domestic campaign against smoking.

²⁷ Ibid., 45.

²⁸ Adolf Hitler, “My Political Testament,” The Adolf Hitler Historical Museum, 29 April 1945, http://www.hitler.org/writings/last_testament/.