

**Selected  
Annual Proceeding  
of the**



**Annual Meeting**

**February 27-28, 2009  
Fort Myers, Florida**

**Volume 17  
February 2010**

**Editor of**

*Selected Annual Proceedings  
of the  
Florida Conference of Historians*

**Anthony D. Atwood, Editor**

**PRINTING OF THE VOLUME COURTESY OF  
THE FLORIDA CONFERENCE OF HISTORIANS**

**ISSN 1076-4585**

**@2010**

**Florida Conference of Historians  
<http://fch.fiu.edu>**

# **Florida Conference of Historians**

## **Officers 2008-2009**

President-Elect  
Blaine Brown  
Broward Community College

President  
Michael J. Epple  
Florida Gulf Coast University

Past President  
J. Calvitt Clarke III  
Jacksonville University

Treasurer  
Jesse Hingson  
Jacksonville University

Permanent Secretary  
David Proctor  
Tallahassee Community College

## Table of Contents

<i>From the Desk of the Editor</i>	5
<i>Letter from the President</i>	6
<i>Thomas M. Campbell Award Announcement</i>	7

---

<i>2009 Program</i>	8
---------------------	---

### *2009 Selected Papers*

<b>The Relevance of von Clausewitz to Modern Strategic Thinking</b>	
<i>Anthony D. Atwood</i>	20
<b>“Bloody Sunday” and Its Effect on the Irish Republican Cause</b>	
<i>Stefanie Babb</i>	27
<b>Reds and Whites in Ethiopia Before the Italo-Ethiopian War of 1935-1936</b>	
<i>J. Calvitt Clarke III</i>	35
<b>Clobberin’ Commies during the Cold War: Superheroes and Nationalism</b>	
<i>John L. Donovan</i>	44
<b>Governmental Crisis in Italy in November 1943: the Role of Count Sforza and the Position of the Western Allies</b>	
<i>Yana A. Pitner</i>	54

<b>The Last Will and Testament of a Spanish Borderlands Woman: Luisa Gertrudis de la Rúa and Her 1820 Will</b> <i>Amy M. Porter</i>	63
<b>Mercenaries of the Angevin Empire: Reputations and Royal Power</b> <i>Andrew Rice</i>	69
<b>Race, Class and Gender in Anti-Fascist Rhetoric of the Spanish Civil War</b> <i>Adam Schafer</i>	82
<b>Jane Addams and the Legacy of Hull-House</b> <i>Angela Webb</i>	89

**From the Desk of the Editor**

Dear friends, colleagues, and fellow historians everywhere:

This marks the conclusion of my tenure as editor of the Journal of the FCH. It has been a remarkable proceeding.

Five years ago, our friend Professor Joseph Patrouch took the helm as Editor-in-Chief of the journal, and beat the drum to raise interested assistants. Was I ever interested! For two years Joe edited the journal, and I watched and learned. For the next two years it has been my privilege to serve as the Editor. I hope good things come in threes, because this is my third and final year to write to you "from the desk of the editor."

I have the honor to report that the history team at Florida Gulf Coast University will assume the journal duties, and I am excited about the wonders that they will create. With hopes that this finds you all well and happy, and that you join in our rousing salute to the incoming Editors: *Salud!*

## **From the Pen of the President**

Dear Friends and Colleagues,

Welcome to the 2010 Florida Conference of Historians:

The Florida Conference of Historians began in 1962 as the Florida College Teachers of History. Its founders imagined an organization covering all fields of historical interest that would give faculty teaching in Florida colleges and universities a forum to share their scholarship and develop a share of collegiality. In 1992, the name was changed to the Florida Conference of Historians to encourage participation by historians outside of Florida colleges and universities. In 1993, we published the first volume of our Selected Proceedings. In recent years we have had an increasing number of Graduate students and undergraduate students participating in the conferences.

I have been honored to serve as president this last year. I have been involved in the FCH since coming to Florida in 2003. I have enjoyed the wide variety of historical fields that have been represented at the conferences and from a personal perspective I have appreciated the way in which my participation has been received by my colleagues. I want to thank everyone who has helped make the conferences that I have been involved in a success.

I would like to extend a special thanks to Florida International University which has helped support the FCH in past years and allowed it to lodge our website there. I want to especially thank Anthony Atwood for his years of service as the editor of Selected Proceedings. He is handing the editorship over to Nadya Popov-Reynolds at Florida Gulf Coast University and FGCU will host the FCH website after the present conference.

Thank you for coming and I hope you find the conference a rewarding experience

Michael J. Epple  
President  
Florida Conference of Historians 2009-2010

## **Thomas M. Campbell Award**

---

*Beginning with Volumes 6/7 in 1999, the Florida Conference of Historians has presented the Thomas M. Campbell Award for the best paper published in the Annual Proceedings 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 US 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***

- Volume 17: Amy M. Porter, Georgia Southwestern State University
- Volume 16: Christine Lutz, Georgia State University
- Volume 15: Vincent Intondi, American University
- Volume 14: Steve MacIsaac, Jacksonville University
- Volume 13: Dennis P. Halpin and Jared G. Toney, University of South Florida
- Volume 12: David Michael, Chicago Theological Seminary
- Volume 10/11: Robert L. Shearer, Florida Institute of Technology
- Volume 7/8: J. Calvitt Clarke, III, Jacksonville University
- Volume 6/7: J. Calvitt Clarke, III, Jacksonville University

**48th Annual Meeting**  
**February 27 through February 28, 2009**  
**Hosted by**  
**Florida Gulf Coast University**  
**Fort Myers, Florida**

**Local Arrangements**  
Erik Carlson  
Michael Cole  
Michael Epple  
Nicola Foote  
Florida Gulf Coast University

Selected papers and summaries of roundtable discussions will be  
published in the

*Selected Annual Proceedings of the Florida Conference of  
Historians*

**Committed to Undergraduate Research,**  
**the FCH offers**  
**Special Panels for Superior Undergraduate Presentations**

***Panel Meetings held at  
Harborside Event Center***

***1375 Monroe St  
Fort Myers, FL 33901  
239-332-6888***



**Friday, Feb. 27**

**8:30-10:00: Registration**

**9:00 - 10:30 Session**

Panel: "Florida History" Room 1

Chair: Sean McMahon, Lake City Community College

- "The Impact of the Smith-Lever Act on Florida Schools"
  - David Mock, Tallahassee Community College
- "Ransom Clark vs. Joseph Sprague: Will the Real Survivor of the Dade Massacre Please Stand Up"
  - Threse Aloia, Florida Atlantic University and Colleen Gleason, Atlantic Community High School
- "Rebuilding the Panhandle: Political Triumphs and Failures"
  - Michael Gattis, Gulf Coast Community College
- "Comparing George Gillman Smith's *The History of Methodism in Georgia and Florida* (1877) and John Atkin's *Memorials of Methodism in New Jersey* (1860)"
  - Martha L. Reiner, Independent Scholar
- "William Poe Duval: Florida Founder and Frontier Bon Vivant"
  - James Denham, Florida Southern College

Panel: "Age of Heroes, Eras of Man" Room 2

Chair: Julian Chambliss, Rollins College

- "'You Made Them Strong, We'll Make Them Army (Avengers) Strong': How the Marvel Universe's Story

Arc and Ad Usage Serve as Propaganda for Army Recruitment”

- Michael Lecker, George Mason University
- “Suburban Heroes: The Superhero Family in ‘The Incredibles’ and ‘Sky High’”
  - Claire Jenkins, Warwick University, UK
- “‘Clobberin’ Commies During the Cold War: Superheroes and Nationalism”
  - John Donovan, Air Force Academy
- “Wearing the Cape and Glasses: Dissolving the Dual Identity of Superman and Clark Kent”
  - Michael Goebel, George Mason University

Panel: “Starting the Second World War” Room 3

Chair: Mike Epple, Florida Gulf Coast University

- “Soviet Relations with Ethiopia Before the Italo-Ethiopian War, 1935-1936”
  - J. Calvitt Clarke III, Jacksonville University
- “Were the Western Powers Worth Having as Soviet Allies in 1939?”
  - Teddy J. Uldircks, University of North Carolina-Asheville
- “Governmental Crisis in Italy in November 1943: The Role of Count Sforza and the Position of the Western Allies”
  - Yana Pitner University of North Carolina-Asheville

Graduate Panel: “Witches, Religion, and Psychology” Room 4

Chair: Michael Cole, Florida Gulf Coast University

- “The Challenge of Recruiting American Indians into Psychology”
  - Don Routh, Florida Gulf Coast University
- “Reconsidering the Creationist Protest as an Ethno-religious Displacement: J. Gresham Machen and the Missing Triangulation of Science, Religion, and Law”
  - Josh Abraham, University of Florida
- “The Representation of Prostitutes, Witches and Murderous Women”
  - Alexandra N. Hill, University of Central Florida.

**10:30 - 11:00: Break**

**11:00 -12:30 Session**

Editor’s Roundtable: “Ages of Heroes, Eras of Men” Room 1

- Participants: Julian Chambliss, Thomas C. Donaldson, William Svitavsky

Panel: “Britain and the Empire” Room 2

Chair: Marco Rimanelli, St. Leo University

- “Nationalism and Communal Violence in Lucknow, India”
  - Eric Strahorn, Florida Gulf Coast University
- “Missionaries as Agents of Colonialism in the Kingdom of Buganda”
  - Krista Ziegler, Flagler College
- “Boxing , Race, and Resistance in Georgian England, 1780-1820”
  - Stanley Arnold, Northern Illinois University.

Panel: "American Politics" Room 3

Chair: Sean McMahon. Lake City Community College

- "Smoke and Mirrors: Presidential Rhetoric and the Politics of Inclusiveness in Mid-Twentieth Century America"
  - Heather R. Parker, St. Leo University
- "When Keynes 'Wasn't Cool': The Emergence of the Supply Side Paradigm, 1979-1980"
  - John Farris, Georgia Perimeter College.
- "Politics and the Park"
  - Greg Miller, Hillsborough Community College

Panel: "Racial Issues Around the World" Room 4

Chair: Nicola Foote, Florida Gulf Coast University

- "'No One Forgets the Oil': The Struggle of African American Civil Rights in Cold War Angola, 1956-1975"
  - Ashley Materio, Florida International University
- "Garrett Smith: Perspectives on Race"
  - Adam C. Molloy, Florida Gulf Coast University
- "Understanding A Shouting Man"
  - Brett Seferian, University of Florida
- "Tourist Paradise or Land of Plantation Servitude?: An Authentic Working History of Hawaii"
  - Matthew Diamond, Florida Gulf Coast University
- "Indians and the Inquisition in New Spain"
  - Michael Cole, Florida Gulf Coast University

**LUNCH 12:30 – 2:00 [On your own]**

## **2:00 - 3:30 Session**

Roundtable: "The Citrus Hall of Fame Project at Florida Southern College" Room 1

Chair: Tollin Hoffman, Florida Southern College

- Participants: Eugene Fanning, Richard Soash, and Ashleah Zigmond, Florida Southern College
- Discussant: James Denham, Florida Southern College

Panel: "History Education" Room 2

Chair: Michael Cole, Florida Gulf Coast University

- "Thirty-Year Old Cassette Tapes: A Catalyst for Learning"
  - Betty Sample, Maitland Historical Society
- "Undergraduate History Student Papers: The Effect of Library Instruction on Citation Quality"
  - Rachel Cooke and Danielle Rosenthal, Florida Gulf Coast University
- "Shepherding Students Through History-in-the-Making: The Importance of Foundation Learning in Study Abroad Programs"
  - Pamela Seay, Florida Gulf Coast University
- "Pop Goes Florida: Documenting Florida's History Through Fugitive Collections"
  - Cristina Favretto, University of Miami's Otto G. Richter Library

Panel: "Undergraduate Research on Social and Racial Injustice" Room 3

Chair and Commentator: John Cox

- "Jane Addams and the Legacy of Hull-House"
  - Angela Webb, Florida Gulf Coast University

- “The Consequences of Conviction: John Brown”
  - Lewisa Dove, Florida Gulf Coast University
- “The Social Injustices of ‘Bloody Sunday’ and their Effect on the Irish Republican Cause”
  - Stefanie Babb, Florida Gulf Coast University
- “U.S. Foreign Policy in Rwanda: A Success on its Own Terms”
  - Ajla Memic, Florida Gulf Coast University

Panel: “European Empires” Room 4

Chair, Mike Epple, Florida Gulf Coast University

- “The Suez Crisis in International History: Rethinking the Meaning of Empire”
  - Bard Keeler, Florida Gulf Coast University
- “Vladislav Surkov’s ‘Sovereign Democrac’’: Kremlin Ideology to Russian National Identity”
  - Jennifer Snyder, University of Central Florida
- “Reconceptualizing France: The Romantic Historians”
  - Renee Waller, Florida Gulf Coast University
- “The Relevance of Von Clausewitz to Modern Strategic Thinking”
  - Anthony D. Atwood, Florida International University
- “‘War Psychosis’: German Public Sentiment, The Spanish Civil War, and the Specter of Bombing”
  - William Greer, University of Florida

**Business Meeting 3:30-4:30** Harborside Event Center  
Conference Room

**Dinner Cruise 6.30-10.30 pm**  
***JC Cruises, 1300 Hendry Street, Fort Myers***

**Saturday, Feb. 28**

**8:30-10:00: Registration**

**9:00 - 10:30 Session**

Panel: "American Foreign Relations" Room 1

Chair: Mike Epple, Florida Gulf Coast University

- "A Survey of Ethiopian-United States Relations"
  - Altaye Alaro Alambo, Independent Scholar and Former Ethiopian Representative to London and Vienna
- "America's Atrocious Imperialism: From Jamestown to My Lai"
  - Roy Lechtreck, University of Montevallo
- "Guarding the Gates to Oblivion: Senator Arthur Vandenberg, Nuclear Secrets and the Truman Administration at the Start of the Atomic Age, 1945"

Joshua Goodman, Florida State University

Panel: "Women, the Law, Politics, and Media" Room 2

Chair: Heather Parker, St. Leo University

- "Married Women and Homestead Law in Illinois"
  - Patricia L. Farles, Instructor and GEP Coordinator, University of Central Florida

- “Edee Greene: Fort Lauderdale Editor and Advocate”
  - Dr. Kimberly Wilmot Voss, University of Central Florida
- “The Last Will and Testament of Spanish Borderlands Woman: Luisa Gertrudis de la Rua and Her 1820 Will”
  - Amy M. Porter, Georgia Southwestern State University
- “Satiric Inequality: Why Are There So Few Women Cartoonists in Newspapers Today”
  - Larry Bush, Florida Gulf Coast University

Panel: “Undergraduate Research on Race, Power, and Imperialism”  
Room 3

Chair: Bard Keeler, Florida Gulf Coast University

- “Responsible Accountability: An Examination Into German and American Medical Experiments on Humans”
  - Nicole Tesoriero, Florida Gulf Coast University
- “Why Rosewood?: Unprecedented Racial Violence in Peaceful Community”
  - Terri Crowley, Florida Gulf Coast University
- “Revering the Emperor: Understanding Twentieth Century Japanese Nationalism”
  - Andrew Cain, Florida Gulf Coast University
- “Mercenaries of the Angevin Empire: The False Portrayal and Their Effects on Royal Power”
  - Andrew Rice, Florida Gulf Coast University

Panel: “Cubans in the Americas” Room 4

Chair: Nicola Foote, Florida Gulf Coast University



- “Jose Marti: Revolutionary Organizer, Recruiter and Racial Unifier”
  - Rick Ramos, Florida Gulf Coast University
- “‘Sermons Mixed With Patriotism’: Reconstructing the Political and Religious Association of Cuban Émigrés in Key West, 1868-1878”
  - Sitela Alvarez, Florida International University
- “The Role of Women in the Formation and Activities of *La Resistencia*, 1899-1910”
  - Alexander Jordan, Florida Gulf Coast University
- “‘Vamos a la Conga!’: Reevaluating ‘Authentic’ Cuban Culture in New York City During World War II”
  - Julio Capo, Jr., Florida International University

### **11:00 - 12:30 Session**

Panel: “Florida Past” Room 1

Chair: Antony Esposito, St. Leo University

- “The Origins of Fort Caroline National Memorial”
  - David Seurkamp, Florida Gulf Coast University
- “Desperado Coast: The Union Presence at Fort Myers in the Civil War, 1864-65”
  - William Mack, Florida Gulf Coast University
- “‘I Pledge Allegiance to the American Way’: Florida’s ‘Americanism versus Communism Course,’ 1961-1989”
  - Andrea Oliver, Florida State University

Panel: “Undergraduate Perspectives on History” Room 2

Chair: Don Routh, Florida Gulf Coast University

- "'Sed Magis Amica Veritas,' or the Middle Way as a Philosophy of History"
  - Thomas J. Gillan, University of Central Florida
- "How the Irish Mythological Cycle Derived From Greek Mythology"
  - William Mattingly, Florida Gulf Coast University

Panel: "Undergraduate Research on American Politics and Society"

Room 3

Chair: Jack McTague, St. Leo University

- "Under Pressure: Pressures and Expectations Placed Upon Men's Lives in the 1950s"
  - Thomas Joyce, Stetson University
- "The Red Scare of the 1950s"
  - Andrea Stevens, Florida Gulf Coast University
- "Barry Goldwater and the Political Readjustment of the South"
  - Michael Murphy, University of Florida
- "The Progression of Women and the First Ladies of the American Presidency"
  - Heather Kiszkiel, Florida Gulf Coast University

Panel: "Law, Literature, and Fashion in Fascist Europe" Room 4

Chair: David Allen Harvey, New College of Florida

- "Race, Religion, and Anti-Fascist Rhetoric about the Spanish Civil War"
  - Adam Schafer, New College of Florida

- “Femininity and the Fatherland: The Interaction Between Fashion and the ideal Woman of the German Fascist State, 1933-1945”
  - Kinley Paisley, New College of Florida
- “Justice within Injustice? The German Legal System Within the Third Reich”
  - Chad Bickerton, New College of Florida

## **The Relevance of von Clausewitz To Modern Strategic Thinking**

*Anthony D. Atwood  
Florida International University*

Carl von Clausewitz (1780-1831) was a Prussian officer who fought in the Napoleonic Wars. He was active as an instructor at the Prussian military schools, rose to the rank of General and wrote about the subject of war. His book On War was published posthumously by his widow. It is considered a foundational analysis on the subject of war. The precepts of Clausewitz are today at the heart of modern United States strategic military thinking. His concept of Absolute War (referenced more generally among the American military today as Total War) informs the United States military establishment and makes up a large part of American military doctrine.

“Close with the enemy and destroy him and his will to resist,” is the axiom of the United States military, which is an establishment that is based in the mainstream of modern Western military development.<sup>1</sup> The axiom is a clear appreciation of Clausewitz’ central premise that the purpose of war is to achieve victory, and that victory is achieved by seeking out the armed forces of the opposing nation-state, bringing them to decisive battle, and destroying them. Either destroying them physically, or by so ruining the apparatus of the rival state and its infrastructure that continued resistance is impossible. Thus, in Total War fair game and target are any and all persons and works of man that support and sustain the enemy armed force. It could be argued that this tenet of annihilation in western war fighting harks back to the hoplites of classical Greece.<sup>2</sup>

Clausewitz’ relevance to modern strategic thinking is questionable in four areas.

- 1) Clausewitz’ emphasis is not on the small wars that comprise most human conflict.
- 2) Clausewitz does not address the Long War between East and West.
- 3) Some question Clausewitz’ doctrine of friction, arguing that it may be outdated and surpassed by technology.
- 4) Total War in the nuclear age does not render victory for any side.

---

<sup>1</sup> American naval doctrine has the specific corollary doctrine to keep the sea lanes open.

<sup>2</sup> Although not necessarily of Homeric Greece, whose warrior caste followed a more personal code of combat aligned with individual honor, fame and emotionalism.

At the turn of the last century the United States acquired the overseas holdings of Hawaii, Samoa, Guam, the Philippines, Puerto Rico (1898), Panama Canal Zone (1903), and the United States Virgin Islands (1917). Since then the modern United States military has always prepared for Clausewitzian Total War against likely rival nation-states. These preparations were originally calibrated in color-coded war plans. The advent of Hitler caused their modification to a global, two-ocean perspective, but the plan remained the same: mobilize the strengths of the nation-state, seek out the armed forces of the rival and concentrate such devastating force against them and their infrastructure as to destroy them. Following World War II this doctrine continued in force for 50 years. In the contest for global hegemony against the rival Soviet Union, the threat of overwhelming retaliation for trespassing across certain essential real estate boundaries, such as West Berlin, Fulda Gap, 38<sup>th</sup> Parallel, the DEW Line; was explicitly realized in the doctrine of Mutually Assured Destruction, the rational refinement to Clausewitz' *ideal absolute* war. War reduced to its irreducible element of unmitigated destruction.

But Clausewitz himself was the product of his own experience of the Napoleonic Wars, the first of the unusually devastating Total Wars of the Industrial Age. Napoleon's Total War was waged wielding the new instrument of the nation-state. This modern western invention is of a discrete geographic locale in which the inhabitants by sentiment, culture, linguistics and a contractual sense of identity as "citizens," supported by the organs of state, its laws, taxation, education, economic systems, and with some sort of representative management (a committee, diet, parliament) consider themselves to be all interconnected parts of the same national identity. Such was revolutionary France in the hand of Napoleon. With this new thing called the nation he waged war not for concessions and limited aims, but to destroy the ancient regimes of Europe. In this the arms of the citizen battalions of the new nation-state, armed with a common ideal and aroused identity, were emphatically successful in crushing the private mercenary armies of the princes of Old Europe. The Bonaparte innovations of the route march by column, field forage, concentration of force, unity of action and field artillery, potent enough in themselves, were less decisive than the basic instrument to hand, which was an entire people and their industry harnessed for and devoted to war. To this day, the inspired nation-state remains a most formidable means for prosecuting unlimited hostilities.

The lesson of the military strength of the aroused nation-in-arms was absorbed by Clausewitz. He lived through the spectacular battles and turbulence of the Napoleonic Total War. As is common with any generation that lives

through the cataclysm of total war, the experience was the formative one of his life and was always at the forefront of his memory and conscious thought.

Through the power and energy of its principles and the enthusiasm that it inspired in the French people, the Revolution had thrown the whole weight of the nation and its strengths into the balance that had formerly weighed only small standing armies and limited state revenues.... French military might strode defiantly across the land, contemptuous of the political calculus with which other governments anxiously weighed enmities and alliances, weakening the force of war and binding the raw element of conflict in diplomatic bonds. ...the French learned that a state's natural power and a great simple cause were far stronger than the artificial structure by which other states were ruled. ...in the fourteen years that separate 1806 from 1792 it might well have been concluded that we were facing a struggle against an entire people, a struggle for life or death.<sup>3</sup>

Yet most war is not total.

Military history is practically the record of trivial, ambiguous hostility. The inconclusive raid, the never-settled dispute, and the violent outburst of unpremeditated passion are the norm. Most human conflict is limited. Total War is, fortunately, the exception. Non-total and limited war may be considered *guerilla*; "Small War." In small war the very nature of the enterprise is changed. The object, the means, and the ends of small war are vastly different from Clausewitz' absolute war. It may be that the two forms of war are dichotomous and incompatible. Carpet-and-incendiary bombing are proven means of pulverizing an urban center into submission, just as a jackhammer is one means of cracking open an egg. But if the end in mind is not obliterating the egg, (or city), but, rather, making an omelet, then the means is inappropriate. In differentiating between Total War and Small War, even the concepts of victory and defeat itself become ambiguous. The idealized perception of victory as a symbolic choreography of the Biblical gesture of the foot upon the neck of the prostrate foe, the demonstrated and real finality of such occasions as Yorktown, Appomattox and Tokyo Bay, has no such counterpart ending in small war. Both the means and the ends of these two grim art forms are dissimilar.

---

<sup>3</sup> Clausewitz. Observations on Prussia. 76.

Small wars and peace operations are dominated by political, social, and cultural, not military, variables. Often these nonmilitary variables are beyond the control of any outside power, or, for that matter, local state authorities themselves.<sup>4</sup>

From revisions to Chapter One of On War, Clausewitz was rethinking his analysis to include deeper consideration of the small war, guerilla conflict.<sup>5</sup> He was in the process of revising his treatise when a recall to the field brought his writing to an end. Clausewitz does explore guerilla war, noting the central elements that it be carried on in the heart of the region, that no single defeat is decisive, that the seat of war be a considerable landmass, and that the terrain be of broken and difficult nature. He does observe that "Whether the inhabitants are rich or poor is also a point by no means decisive, at least it should not be; but it must be admitted that a poor population accustomed to hard work and privations usually shows itself more vigorous and better suited for War."<sup>6</sup> But his stress on the rare Total War as the benchmark and definition of the activity makes his analysis but partial. Especially his absence of analysis of potential non-European adversaries in small wars is a significant drawback to his relevance in the global village of war today.

Most war is not only small, it is non-Western.

It is in asymmetric small war that Clausewitz is least relevant to modern military strategic thought. In the context of the Long War, that perennial conflict between East and West, Clausewitz' Eurocentric doctrines are least applicable. From the Sea Peoples attack on Pharaoh and the Trojan Wars, hostilities between East and West are a recurrent aspect of the human conflict. Xerxes, Titus, Mohammed, Martel, Dick Plantagenet, Saladin, Suleiman, and Jan Sobieski have been world-historical figures embroiled in this contest. Tours, Roncal, Rhodes, Malta, Lepanto, Port Arthur, Pearl Harbor, and Desert One have been a few of its battlefields. East and West war against each other regularly. Clausewitz does not address the Long War. He does acknowledge its existence, pointing it out as the rationale for the system of the lines and frontier defenses of the European states bordering on Asia and Turkey in a digression on fortifications:

Certainly it is not sufficient to stop all inroads, but it will make them more difficult and therefore of less frequent occurrence,

---

<sup>4</sup> Stephen J. Cimbala. Clausewitz and Chaos. 101.

<sup>5</sup> Beatrice Heuser. Reading Clausewitz. 7.

<sup>6</sup> Clausewitz. On War. v. ii. 343.

and this is a point of considerable importance where relations subsist with people like those of Asia, whose passions and habits have a perpetual tendency to War.<sup>7</sup>

He does observe that military history has no European equivalent to the Western victory at Marathon, an indication of his perception that East-West conflict is basically unlike West-West conflict.<sup>8</sup> A passing reference to troops of "head-chopping Janissaries" may reveal his views further.<sup>9</sup> But the atavistic character of the conflict of East and West do not reconcile to Clausewitz' world-view of rational nation-states prosecuting hostilities along Eurocentric patterns.

In 2003 the United States military concentrated for the Second Middle East War and struck with Napoleonic "shock and awe," scattering the opposing Iraqi armed forces and removing the *ancient regime* with devastating certitude. However, it was not a nation-state that was engaged and toppled. There was genuine battle victory, but thereafter the Clausewitzian model did not hold. Because the place presently termed "Iraq" by the West is not a nation-state in the Eurocentric Clausewitzian context. The resultant anarchy there has been a lesson in *realpolitik*. Much of the earth's surface is inhabited by populations not organized into nation-states on the Western pattern. These regions are rife with tribalism, poverty, fanaticism, and youthful desperation. Also, in the modern day these places are often possessed of quick cash and plentiful modern weapons.

These peoples do not field armed forces of a Clausewitzian identity, nor are they sustained by recognizable nation-state apparatus. Much less do populations such as those of Algeria, Vietnam, Somalia or Mesopotamia think or behave as Europeans. It is small wonder the United States military occupation of Iraq has been received by the inhabitants with other than Western predictably.

The fog of war is axiomatic of Clausewitz and his doctrine of friction. He taught that the experience of war was fraught with difficulty in executing even the most mundane.

Activity in war is movement in a resistant medium. Just as a man immersed in water is unable to perform with ease and regularity the most natural and simplest movement, that of

---

<sup>7</sup> *On War*, ii. 298

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.* i. 194.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.* i. 188.



walking, so in War, with ordinary powers, one cannot keep even the line of mediocrity.<sup>10</sup>

Some recent United States military thought has argued that modern technology can see through the fog and negate the friction.<sup>11</sup> That satellite photography and GPS devices, night goggles and cell phones have fundamentally changed the battlescape to allow those controlling such technology to avoid the friction Clausewitz taught was inseparable from war. The point can be argued.<sup>12</sup>

My own conclusion regarding the argument that friction is obsolete and can be overcome by technology, is that the experience of the last few years has not borne out that contention. The marketplace speeds a ubiquitous release to technology and it cuts both ways. Al Qaeda in Iraq, using cell phone cameras, has been able to uplink complimentary footage of their military actions to pro-jihad television networks where it is broadcast in real time to the Middle East viewing audience, days before Coalition forces have had time to promulgate and disseminate their own response through official channels to the same audience, concerning the exact same event. The targeting of such nominally non-Western military targets as schools and kindergartens, marketplaces and clinics, and the cold blooded murder of non-combatants has torn apart the civil fabric of the region. Coalition Forces themselves are seldom attacked and remain a commanding battlefield presence, but are generally helpless to prevent the random and shocking violence, abetted by land rovers, text messaging, costumes and anonymity. Friction remains valid Clausewitzian doctrine that technology has not overcome.

Conversely, in the arena of nuclear war Clausewitz' has little appreciable relevance. Clausewitz could not imagine the invention of devices that would utterly destroy beyond remedy or repair. His doctrine is built upon the possibility of victory. By victory he means assuming power over another group of people, their land, and its resources. If all three are vaporized there can be no victory. The detonation of modern nuclear devices capable of wasting the land itself for the foreseeable future makes the notion of Clausewitzian victory in such an exchange irrelevant.

Clausewitz remains relevant to modern strategic thought concerning his overarching principles of conventional Total War between the modern nation-

---

<sup>10</sup> On War. v. i. 79.

<sup>11</sup> Clausewitz and Chaos. 45.

<sup>12</sup> Boot, Max. War Made New: Technology, Warfare, and the Course of History, 1500 to Today. 120.

states. To some extent his appreciations of small war are relevant, but in the arena of East-West guerilla conflict Clausewitz has little relevance. His model is built upon fighting between Western-type nations, who live similarly, and act and react likewise. This is not the case with most conflict today. In matters of nuclear war, Clausewitz is irrelevant.

## **“Bloody Sunday” and Its Effect on the Irish Republican Cause**

*Stefanie Babb*  
*Florida Gulf Coast University*

Eye-witness accounts of “Bloody Sunday” suggest strongly that the events were unjustified. The British government’s subsequent over-reaction, and its persistent display of anti-Irish bias, outraged many Catholics who had previously been indifferent to the nationalist cause. Thus, the massacre itself, and Britain’s subsequent mishandling of the crisis, helped generate support, locally and internationally, for the Irish Republican cause.

On January 30, 1972, thirteen civilians were shot and killed by British paratroopers during a peaceful civil-rights protest against internment in Derry, Northern Ireland.<sup>1</sup> Although the eyewitnesses, including British journalists and other protestors, stated the civilians were unarmed, the paratroopers were never convicted of murder. There was an inquiry into the events, but it concluded that the paratroopers felt they were in danger, and therefore that the deaths were justified.<sup>2</sup> After many years, British Prime Minister Tony Blair reopened the inquiry, which is, to this day, unconcluded.<sup>3</sup>

Fighting and unrest in Derry led up to the events of “Bloody Sunday.” Internment against the Irish was introduced in 1971 to help curtail the violence associated with civil-rights protests. Ironically, this caused more violent protests to occur.<sup>4</sup> The Provisional IRA was getting involved, and during the week prior to “Bloody Sunday” two British soldiers had been shot and killed. Some analysts and commentators have argued that the shootings on “Bloody Sunday” were inevitable, a “tragedy waiting to happen,” due to the unstable environment in the city.<sup>5</sup>

On January 30, the IRA had an agreement with the leaders of the protest to not get involved so that the march could remain peaceful.<sup>6</sup> According to Provisional IRA member Tony Miller, “many of the IRA personnel would

---

<sup>1</sup> Dermot P. J. Walsh, *Bloody Sunday and the Rule of Law in Northern Ireland* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 2000), ix.

<sup>2</sup> John Passmore Widgery, *Bloody Sunday, 1972: Lord Widgery's Report of Events in Londonderry, Northern Ireland, on 30 January 1972* (London: Stationery Office, 2001), 100.

<sup>3</sup> Patrick Hayes and Jim Campbell, *Bloody Sunday: Trauma, Pain and Politics* (London: Pluto Press, 2005), 145.

<sup>4</sup> Hayes and Campbell, 15.

<sup>5</sup> Hayes and Campbell, 16-17.

<sup>6</sup> Don Mullan and John Scally, *Eyewitness Bloody Sunday* (Dublin: Wolfhound Press, 1997), 86.

have been taking part in the march. Or (as civilians)...would have been home with their wives and children." His unit leader told him that no action should be taken, and that there should be no activity by the IRA that day.<sup>7</sup> During the protest, small groups of rioters began throwing rocks at some of the soldiers. This could have helped to provoke the paratroopers' violent behavior, but stoning was considered a common act during protests throughout Ireland. It is probable that the IRA showed this aggression, similarly with the Irish civilians; however, it does not justify the attacks against the unarmed innocent public.<sup>8</sup>

The setting for this tragedy was the Bogside area of Derry, where unemployment, overcrowded housing and anti-Catholic discrimination flourished. It was densely populated with Irish Catholics and nationalists, and already experienced a large amount of local conflict and violence.<sup>9</sup> The attitude of the British soldiers toward the Bogsidiers created weakness in character that led to the shootings. The hostility originated in the hundreds of years of conflicting ideas between the British and Irish. Six counties in Ulster province remained under the rule of Britain and the nationalists wanted them returned to the Republic of Ireland.<sup>10</sup>

In using the First Battalion Parachute Regiment to regulate the march, instead of the regular police, the British showed that they anticipated that battle skills would be needed.<sup>11</sup> This proves the British were eager to engage themselves in conflict. John Roddy, a witness, told the Inquiry that he received a warning from his friend, a soldier he had met at the Ebrington military barracks, that he should stay away from the protest because the paratroopers "were coming in and meant to do serious damage and even kill people."<sup>12</sup> The first shootings occurred about 20 minutes before the bulk of the attacks, when two people were wounded and later one died. It is believed that the paratroopers were trying to draw out the IRA. The IRA did not react in the way the soldiers wanted, so they created fictitious claims that the men had nail bombs.<sup>13</sup> It was the attitude and enthusiasm for blood that caused the paratrooper's aggressiveness and actions toward the Irish protestors and bystanders.

Further detail about offensive behavior from the British soldiers comes from the many witnesses on the day of "Bloody Sunday." Accounts of violence

---

<sup>7</sup> Peter Taylor, *Behind the Mask, The IRA and Sinn Fein* (London: Bloomsbury Publishing Plc., 1997), 144.

<sup>8</sup> Hayes and Campbell, 17.

<sup>9</sup> Hayes and Campbell, 2, 14.

<sup>10</sup> Tim Pat Coogan, *The IRA: A History* (Colorado: Roberts Rinehart Publishers, 1993), 481.

<sup>11</sup> Ed Maloney, *A Secret History of the IRA* (New York: W.W. Norton, 2002), 110.

<sup>12</sup> "Bloody Sunday' inquiry hears of Ministry of Defense Brutality," *Canadian Dimension* Vol. 35, no. 2, 2 March 2001, 14.

<sup>13</sup> Mullan and Scally, 86.

toward women and the elderly were evident in some testimonies. In one instance, housewife Margaret O'Reilly recalls that soldiers who invaded a house, lined men up against a wall, and then beat them. When she cried out at the soldiers to stop, one soldier replied, "there will be more of you pigs dead before the morning." According to O'Reilly the men who were beaten were nonviolent, and were just looking for shelter. This happened after she mentioned to a soldier that a woman who was shot might be bleeding to death and needed medical attention. Their response was simply a grin.<sup>14</sup> Another witness, William McC., tells of an old man running over to help three men who were shot. The man was shot in the shoulder on his way to the wounded, and when he asked the paratroopers for help, they opened fire on him.<sup>15</sup> Thirty-year-old postman Kevin L. remembered the abusive language used to try and provoke the Irish civilians. He said the soldiers would talk about the "things" they would like to do to Bernadette Devlin, a famous twenty-three year old leader of the Northern Ireland Civil Rights Association, who participated in the march. This type of arrogance resonated throughout the Bogside, and was certainly influential in stirring up feelings of infuriation by the Irish, leading to a nationalist solidarity.

As mentioned previously, the British soldiers created claims that by firing at the Irish they were responding to nail bomb explosions, therefore justifying the atrocities. These claims have been exposed as being false by a large number of statements from witnesses. In a specific example, according to the Inquiry, there were four nail bombs found on the body of Gerard Donaghy, who had been shot in Glenfada Park.<sup>16</sup> Leo Young, one of two men responsible for carrying Donaghy's body out of the park, searched Donaghy's pockets for identification. He found nothing at the time.<sup>17</sup> Gerard McCauley, who assisted Young, also found nothing. Dr. Kevin Swords, an Englishman visiting Derry, then examined Donaghy. He went on to state that he also had found nothing, and "could not have failed to notice" if Donaghy had in fact possessed any such weapons.<sup>18</sup> A reporter for the *Belfast Telegraph*, Charlie Hazlett, was present when Dr. Swords was giving his examination. Hazlett also saw no evidence of nail bombs. Raymond Rogan, the owner of the house Donaghy was brought to, helped put Donaghy in a car to take him to the hospital. He also saw nothing. The car carrying Donaghy was then stopped by soldiers, and Donaghy was examined by a British Army medical officer, who also claims to have seen

---

<sup>14</sup> Mullan and Scally, 234.

<sup>15</sup> Mullan and Scally, 195.

<sup>16</sup> Eamonn McCann, *Bloody Sunday Derry* (Dingle, Co. Kerry, Ireland: Brandon, 2000), 114.

<sup>17</sup> Mullan and Scally, 199.

<sup>18</sup> McCann, 114.

nothing. Young and Rogan were told to get out of the car, and when they asked about Donaghy needing medical treatment one soldier replied, "Let the bastard die." The soldiers then drive the car away, and minutes later Donaghy was dead.<sup>19</sup>

The first person to claim they actually saw nail bombs on the body was "Soldier 127," a bomb disposal officer.<sup>20</sup> The clothing Donaghy was wearing at the time had been washed in the hospital, preventing tests to be done to see if there was any gelignite residue.<sup>21</sup> The above statements were all told to the Widgery Tribunal, but Lord Widgery concluded, based "on a balance of probabilities," that the nail bombs were not planted, and had been there the entire time.<sup>22</sup> By not acknowledging the statements from witnesses and the wrong doings of the paratroopers, Lord Widgery poured the proverbial "salt in the wounds" of the people affected, and helped to escalate the negative views toward the British.

As the negative feelings from the Irish grew, so did their support for the Irish Republican Army. The attitude of the Irish changed and many people all over the world truly believed the Republicans were freedom fighters, fighting for justice against the many wrongdoings of the British. The initial response from the Irish was indignation, which spread throughout the Republic of Ireland and led to the British Embassy in Dublin being burned down.<sup>23</sup> The disposition of the Bogside was — according to the local leader of the Social and Democratic Labor Party, John Hume — now for "a united Ireland or nothing." The Irish minister of foreign affairs told the United Nations in New York that is was his "aim to get Britain out of Ireland," a forceful statement that was quite rare for a Republic of Ireland politician.<sup>24</sup>

The overall reaction of the Irish is evident in some *Guardian* newspaper articles written in the days following the shootings. Many felt that the conflict was inevitable, and the paratroopers were the first to shoot. One interviewee commented that it didn't matter who shot first because the soldiers fired into a crowd of people without a target in sight.<sup>25</sup> The articles show that everyone interviewed believed the same thing, that there were no nail bombs, or petrol bombs, and no shots fired at the army. The IRA called for revenge for the thirteen murders, which led to troops and police patrolling in groups, and not

---

<sup>19</sup> Mullan and Scally, 199.

<sup>20</sup> McCann, 115.

<sup>21</sup> Widgery, 70.

<sup>22</sup> McCann, 114.

<sup>23</sup> Coogan, 261.

<sup>24</sup> Maloney, 110.

<sup>25</sup> Simon Winchester, "13 Killed as Paratrooper Break Riot," *The Guardian*, (January 31, 1972).

entering the Bogside.<sup>26</sup> These articles show that the immediate response of the witnesses was greatly similar to their later statements given to the Widgery Tribunal. This gives certainty to their testimonies and helps to prove the attacks were unjustified.

An immediate response from the Irish in the Bogside that directly affected the growth of the IRA was on the evening of "Bloody Sunday," when hundreds of young people were lining up to join.<sup>27</sup> The previously small IRA brought in a significant number of recruits from the Catholic working-class in Derry and Belfast.<sup>28</sup> A more personal account of people joining comes from Don Mullan, who was present on "Bloody Sunday." He never joined the IRA, but after walking past the thirteen coffins at Saint Mary's Church, many of his friends did. More specifically, seventeen-year old Mickey Devine joined the Irish National Liberation Army and died in 1981 on the sixtieth day of a hunger strike. In the following statement he recalls the effects "Bloody Sunday" had on him.

I will never forget standing in Creggan chapel staring at the brown wooden boxes. We mourned, and Ireland mourned with us. That sight more than anything convinced me that there will never be peace in Ireland while Britain remains. When I looked at those coffins I developed a commitment to the Republican cause that I have never lost.<sup>29</sup>

Mullan reflected on the events of "Bloody Sunday," and not joining the IRA, wondering "why not?" The passion for the Republican cause in the years following "Bloody Sunday" was a direct reaction to the deaths. In a statement made by official Frank Steel, a member of Her Majesty's Secret Intelligence Service (MI6), the effect "Bloody Sunday" had on the IRA is obvious. Steel believed that it built them up, and relatable to the impartment of interment, gained volunteers, money and arms.<sup>30</sup> The impressive growth of the IRA during the seventies was a direct result of the mistakes of the British government.

The families who experienced death on "Bloody Sunday" had a hard time dealing with the trauma. A strong philosophy of anti-violence and anti-politics was created and the families tried to instill that in their children. It was

---

<sup>26</sup> Simon Hoggart, "Bogsiders Insist that Soldiers Shot First," *The Guardian*, (February 1, 1972).

<sup>27</sup> Maloney, 110.

<sup>28</sup> "'Bloody Sunday' inquiry hears of Ministry of Defense Brutality," 14.

<sup>29</sup> Mullan and Scally, 257-258.

<sup>30</sup> Taylor, 155-156.

important for them to show the future generations that there were other ways to fight for Irish freedom.<sup>31</sup> Margaret Bradley, who lost her brother on “Bloody Sunday,” tried to instill those ideas in her children. “I try to explain to them how my brother was killed and I tell them not to be bitter, but sometimes even when I’m saying it I can feel bitterness inside myself.” She goes on to talk about how her brother, Jim Wray, was shot once, then while lying on his stomach on the ground was shot again. “What damage could he have done them, lying there wounded.”<sup>32</sup> The anger caused by “Bloody Sunday” is just one of the many emotions the family members have to deal with. “We continue on living with part of our heart gone.”<sup>33</sup>

Justice was needed for the families to have closure and complete their grieving process. Not only did they have to deal with the death of a family member, but they had to deal with the government labeling the victims as gunmen and bombers. One woman was extremely skeptical that her brother was a terrorist, because “you would not be going out to shoot a gun or riot in a three-piece suit.”<sup>34</sup> In a photograph of the Rubble Barricade, Rossville Street where five people were killed, you can see Michael McDaid in his Sunday suit walking behind Michael Kelley who had just been shot. Just five or six paces later, McDaid — with his back to the paratroopers — was shot in the head.<sup>35</sup> The families’ initial reaction to these horrific events was anger and revenge, but that turned into a desire for justice from within the political system. They wanted the government to admit their wrongdoings and hold themselves accountable.<sup>36</sup> Due to the unresolved issues of injustice, anger and pain still surround the lives of the families affected by “Bloody Sunday.”

“Bloody Sunday” did not just affect the Irish people. Similar feelings of resentment echoed throughout the world, especially in America where the connection to Ireland is great. These emotions gained a large amount of support for the Republican cause through money and arms. During the 1970s the Federal Bureau of Investigation conservatively estimated that one arms supplier alone shipped over 2,500 weapons and millions of rounds of ammunition to Ireland.<sup>37</sup> The support from the United States has waned substantially in the

---

<sup>31</sup> Hayes and Campbell, 94.

<sup>32</sup> McCann, 32.

<sup>33</sup> McCann, 37.

<sup>34</sup> Hayes and Campbell, 100.

<sup>35</sup> Mullan and Scally, 119.

<sup>36</sup> Hayes and Campbell, 100-101.

<sup>37</sup> Taylor, 9.



present years, but as long as there is fighting in Northern Ireland, groups of Irish-Americans will support the Provisional IRA.<sup>38</sup>

Present conditions in Northern Ireland have changed dramatically over the past thirty years. The Bloody Sunday Justice Campaign, started by families of the victims of the shootings, which offered support to each other, was integral in pressuring the British to reinvestigate the happenings of "Bloody Sunday." They were criticized for "drugging" up the past by reporters of the British Broadcasting Company (BBC), and the Royal Ulster Constabulary (RUC) alike. This did not deter the campaign from continuing their quest for truth and equality.<sup>39</sup> "Bloody Sunday" will never be forgotten, and the Saville Inquiry, opened by Prime Minister Tony Blair, helped reassure families and Irish nationalist's that Britain is trying to make amends for the attacks in Derry. Although the inquiry is not concluded, it gives the people hope that there will finally be retribution for the deaths.<sup>40</sup>

When visiting the present-day city of Derry, it is not hard to remember the atrocities that happened there. The events of "Bloody Sunday" are commemorated through the cities murals painted on the walls of buildings in the Bogside. One of the more famous scenes painted is of Father Edward Daly waving his bloodstained handkerchief, leading a group of men carrying the body of Jackie Duddy, a seventeen year old boy who was shot and killed. Don Mullan, eyewitness to the murders, interpreted the mural. He believes that the civil-rights banner being trampled on represents the death of the civil rights movement in Derry.<sup>41</sup>

The IRA may have laid down their arms, but their ideas for freedom will remain in the hearts of the Irish nationalists until they are returned their freedom and join their Irish comrades in the Republic. Tony Parker, an Irishman in the British Army turned IRA member, offers insight into the minds of the Irish nationalists in this statement to the British public. "Try not to judge me and others like me too harshly from over the sea, in your respectable middle-class liberal *Guardian*-reading homes. You've no proper knowledge of our history, and if you had you'd understand why we feel the only thing left for us is to fight you to the bitter end."<sup>42</sup>

"Bloody Sunday" was a horrific event that affected all aspects of Irish life. Some people believe it was a conspiracy handed down through the ranks.

---

<sup>38</sup> Coogan, 448.

<sup>39</sup> Mullan and Scally, 267.

<sup>40</sup> Hayes and Campbell, 143.

<sup>41</sup> Mullan and Scally, 101.

<sup>42</sup> Tony Parker. "From Bloody Sunday to the Bitter End." *New Statesman & Society* Vol. 6, no. 255 (June 4, 1993), 20.

Others believe it was cold-hearted murder, while for some it was just a culmination of the already existing tension and violence surrounding the city of Derry. No matter how "Bloody Sunday" is defined, it was a mistake on the part of the British, whether through the actions of shooting unarmed civilians or the misunderstandings of the Inquiry. These events inadvertently strengthened the Irish nationalist movement, while casting a shadow of hatred toward the British for decades to come.

## **Reds and Whites in Ethiopia Before the Italo-Ethiopian War of 1935 and 1936**

*J. Calvitt Clarke III  
Jacksonville University*

State interests, communist ideology, and legacies of earlier Italo-Russian confrontation in Northeast Africa whipsawed Soviet policy toward Ethiopia between the two world wars. Russia's imperial efforts in the region had fallen within the pale of European power politics, and the Soviets suckled the milk of tsarist experience. Opportunism, vigorous opposition to British colonial power, recognition of the disruptive potential of indigenous nationalism, and exploitation of racial discontent flowed in post-revolutionary, Bolshevik policies. Marxist-Leninist ideology became the instrumental handmaiden that legitimized *realpolitik* and reassured Soviet leaders that in pursuing state interests, they also were marching in step with history's inevitable tune. The messianic faiths of Slavophilism and Communism justified Russia's expanding influence into Africa and its role in awakening the colonial world.

In approaching Ethiopia, the Soviets had to deal with the White Russian community there. In the fifty or so years before the First World War, many Russian adventurers—scoundrels and saints—explored Ethiopia and often formed close relationships with the country's rulers. Steeled by this tradition, following their defeat at Bolshevik hands between 1917 and 1922, White Russian émigrés, including doctors, engineers, lawyers, and military men, began arriving in Addis Ababa. Fearing Bolshevik agents, Ethiopian authorities initially refused entry to many, but, with time allowed more and more exiles a new home in the capital.<sup>1</sup>

In 1919, the last imperial Russian chargé d'affaires, realizing he would have no successor, mortgaged his legation to raise the funds necessary for him to leave Ethiopia. The Ethiopians rented the well-appointed house and fifty acres, which remained officially Russian property, to the local Belgian representative and set aside the income to help local Russians. The French legation protected some of the Russians émigrés and a few became Ethiopian subjects. The Ethiopian government employed many Russian engineers and doctors, at modest

---

<sup>1</sup> Carlo Zaghi, *I russi in Etiopia*, 2 vols. (Naples: Guida, 1972); Patrick Joseph Rollins, "Russia's Ethiopian Adventure, 1888-1905" (Ph.D. diss., Syracuse University, 1967); Czesław Jeśman, *The Russians in Ethiopia: An Essay in Futility* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1975).

salaries. Some rose to relatively high positions, but most got humdrum jobs unconnected with their old professions and many lived and died in penury.<sup>2</sup>

The Anglo-Italian explorer and journalist, Lewis Mariano Nesbitt, thought the Russians were all "of good social antecedents" and the most interesting foreigners in Addis Ababa. The Ethiopians, who had long-seen the Russians as friends, preferred these exiles when appointing foreigners to governmental positions. They had lost all ties with their own country and aroused no suspicions of harboring imperialist motives in flocking to Ethiopia. The government paid these Russians, despite their high-sounding titles, "barely enough to enable its officials to subsist." Their agreed-on salaries shrank while "passing through the various hands" before reaching them, and their homes were "the shabbiest, barely furnished with that which is absolutely essential for civilized people." Some Russians who could see the "contrast between their own life and that of universally indigent natives" sometimes felt "a glimmer of contentment. The others endure." Nesbitt finished, "Abyssinia then is not a promised land even for her friendly Muscovites."<sup>3</sup>

The Church of St. Nicholas served as their center. It existed for a decade between 1928 and 1939 under an ex-cavalry chaplain.<sup>4</sup>

Aleksander Mikhailovich, Grand Duke of Russia was among those who admired Ethiopia. He spent six months in June 1925 in Ethiopia as the guest of Ras Tefari, the future Emperor Hayle Sellase. The imperial train met Aleksander in Djibouti and had to stop each night of its travels for fear of desert bandits. Alexander arrived at the Addis Ababa station to honors, an old, Russian military band, and a group of about seventy-five Russians. Tefari extolled the virtues of the Russo-Ethiopian connection, and the two discussed at length the political moves and errors of the last tsar and his family. The grand duke later testified that Tefari's native wisdom had impressed him, and ". . . it dawned on me that we should have put an Abyssinian at the head of our Imperial Council."<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> Sergius Yakobson, "Russia and Africa," in Ivo J. Lederer, *Russian Foreign Policy: Essays in Historical Perspective* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1962), 453-87; Sergius Yakobson, "The Soviet Union and Ethiopia: A Case of Traditional Behavior," *Review of Politics* 25 (July 1963): 329-42; Alemé Esheté, "Ethiopia and the Bolshevik Revolution, 1917-1935," *Africa* 32 (1977): 1-27; A. V. Krenkhov, "Ropssiiskaia diaspora v Efiopii," in A. B. Letnev, ed., *Rossiiskaia diaspora v Afrike 20-50-e gody: sbornik statei* (Moscow: "Vostochnaia literatura," 2001), 91-108.

<sup>3</sup> Lewis Mariano Nesbitt, *Hell-Hole of Creation: The Exploration of Abyssinian Danakil* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1934), 25-26.

<sup>4</sup> Ješman, *Russians*, 147.

<sup>5</sup> Aleksander Mikhailovich Romanov, *Always a Grand Duke* (New York: Farrar & Rinehart, 1937), 174. His story of the visit can be found in 163-75. In his *Once a Grand Duke* (New York: Cosmopolitan Book Corporation. Farrar & Rinehart, 1932), 337, Alexander gives 1927 as the date of this trip.

For their part, the new Bolshevik rulers of Russia developed an early and definable interest in Sub-Saharan Africa, and the writings of the All-Russian Association for Research on the East reflected concern for the region's peoples and politics. Many of the contributors to its monthly periodical, *Novyi vostok* [New East], solidly based their work on tsarist scholarship and experience.<sup>6</sup>

In 1922, *Novyi vostok* published, without comment, a 1913 report on Ethiopia by a tsarist official sent to Addis Ababa to establish diplomatic ties and to explore trade possibilities. The report stressed that Ethiopia considered itself to be an Orthodox nation and Russia's co-religionist, both equally fearful of Roman Catholic missionaries. For the Russians, Ethiopia's political role was clear: to create an empire as a bulwark against Egypt and the unification of the British colonies in Africa. The report extolled Ethiopia's agricultural riches and stressed its proximity for trade.<sup>7</sup>

The Soviets began introducing themselves to the Ethiopians in the early 1920s. The Third Communist International (Comintern) and the Foreign Affairs Commissariat in 1922 detailed I. A. Zalkind to tour parts of Africa, including Ethiopia. He was to ascertain how Communist Russia might conduct propaganda to incite local populations against whites on racial, political, and economic grounds, and he was to study their culture, customs, and conditions of life and labor. He was also to investigate possibilities for establishing regular relations between Ethiopia and Soviet Russia. He traveled to Jerusalem to meet Ethiopia's representatives and then to Addis Ababa, where he stayed two months. Zalkind returned to Moscow in the first half of 1923 having concluded that Ethiopia held little political or economic interest for the USSR and provided

---

<sup>6</sup> The Soviets, e.g., republished, and published posthumously, some of the works of Boris Aleksandrovich Turayev. See, e.g. his work first published in 1913, *Istoriia drevnego vostoka*, 2 vols. (Leningrad: Sotsial'no-ekonomicheskoe izdatel'stvo, Leningradskoe otdelenie, 1935). See the articles in *Novyi vostok*: Mikhail Pavlovich, "Zadachi Vserossiiskoi nauchnoi assotsiatsii vostokovedeniia," 1 (1922): 3-15; K. M. Troianovskii, "Novyi peredel Afriki posle versal'skogo mira," 1 (1922): 86-93; S. Vel'tman, "Kolonial'nye romany," 4 (1923): 474-81; V. Khudadov, "Zheleznye dorogi Afriki," 5 (1924): 165-84; V. Kaisarov, "Zheleznye dorogi v Afriki," 6 (1924): 184-90; B. Bogaevskii, "Negri i novye problemy afrikanistiki," 6 (1924): 376-91; and V. Gurko-Kriazhin, "Velikie puti v mirovoi istorii," 8-9 (1925): 254-76. Also see Orel Eran, *Mezhdunarodniki: An Assessment of Professional Expertise in the Making of Soviet Foreign Policy* (Ramat Gan, Israel: Turtledove, 1979), 17-25; Nina Alekseevna Kuznetsova and Liudmila Mikhailovna Kulagina, *Iz istorii sovetskogo vostokovedeniia, 1917-1967*, (Moscow: "Nauka," 1970), 3-102; Milene Charles, *The Soviet Union and Africa: The History of the Involvement*, Jo Fisher ed. and trans. (Boston: University Press of America, 1980), 6-9.

<sup>7</sup> A. I. Kokhanovskii, "Abissiniia: Doklad ministru inostrannykh del' S. Sazonovu A. Kokhanovskogo, byvshego vracha pri imperatorskoi rossiiskoi missii v Abissinii, i iunია 1913 goda)," *Novyi vostok* 1 (1922): 316-33; Charles, *Soviet Union*, 170-72; Edward Thomas Wilson, *Russia and Black Africa Before World War II* (New York: Holmes & Meier, 1974), 88, 99, 269, 274. Cf. Roger Edwards Kanet, "The Soviet Union and Sub-Saharan Africa: Communist Policy Toward Africa, 1917-1965," (PhD dissertation, Princeton University, 1966).

but sterile ground for communist propaganda. He thought the Soviets, however, should try to set up a mission in Ethiopia to enable contact with local and neighboring revolutionary organizations in black Africa. The Comintern and the foreign commissariat adopted these conclusions.<sup>8</sup>

Zalkind returned to Ethiopia in December 1925. The foreign commissariat had directed him to begin negotiations leading to a political rapprochement with Ethiopia. If successful, the commissariat would send a delegation to Ethiopia to keep an eye on nationalist tendencies throughout Northeast Africa. Planning to take at least six months, he was to go to Alexandria and then up the Nile to Ethiopia.<sup>9</sup>

Following Zalkind's visits, in 1927 Moscow sent the "learned Soviet professor," N. I. Vavilov, to study agricultural possibilities in Ethiopia. After visiting Addis Ababa, he spent some time in the interior. On his return, Dr. Vavilov's report praised Ethiopia's potential for agricultural development.<sup>10</sup>

These approaches left the Ethiopians unimpressed. Two years after Vavilov's visit, they tried "to work up" a Bolshevik scare. They deported three, resident White Russians for spreading Bolshevik propaganda, and rumors suggested that the Ethiopians were planning more expulsions. Because Ethiopia had no laws or regulations on the admission, deportation, or regulation of communist propaganda, expelling Russians suspected of communist propaganda required an imperial command.<sup>11</sup>

Addison Southard, America's lead representative in Addis Ababa, explained the first expulsion, that of the Russian merchant and French protégé, Vadime Yonow. His small import-export business had worked through connections in France and earned him a modest living. A few months before his expulsion, the Ethiopians had caught him trying to smuggle in a small quantity of arms and ammunition from Djibouti. A commercial venture, those who could run the arms blockade from Djibouti made large profits.<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup> I. A. Zalkind [pseudo. I. Vanin], "Abissiniia," *Novyi vostok* 2 (1922): 525-42; M. Alsel'rod, "U vrat Abissiniia. Prazdnik 'Maskal' (Pis'mo iz Dzheddy)," *Novyi vostok* 16-17 (1925): 329-33.

<sup>9</sup> Coleman, Oct. 22, 1925: National Archives Microfilm Publications, *Records of the Department of State Relating to Internal Affairs of Ethiopia (Abyssinia), 1910-29* (Washington DC: The National Archives. National Archives and Records Service, General Services Administration, 1962), Microcopy 411, Roll 1 [hereafter cited as NARA Microcopy 411, Roll 1]; Andrei Andreevich Gromyko, "Sovetsko-efiopskie aviazi," *Narody azii i afriki* (1980): 6-7; Charles, *Soviet Union*, 9-10.

<sup>10</sup> Nikolai Ivanovich Vavilov, *Five Continents*, (Rome: International Plant Genetic Resources Institute, 1997), 95-107; Charles Fernand Rey, *In the Country of the Blue Nile* (London: Duckworth, 1927): 193.

<sup>11</sup> Southard June 17, 1929: NARA, Microcopy 411, Roll 1; Southard, Oct. 10, 1930: United States, National Archives (College Park, MD), Record Group 59, General Records of the Department of State, Decimal Files [hereafter cited as NARA] 884.55/unclear.

<sup>12</sup> Southard, June 17, 1929: NARA Microcopy No. 411, Roll 1.

Another incident provoked the charge of Bolshevism. The Ethiopians had caught Yonow smuggling in phosphorus and other ingredients for illicitly making matches, which upset highly-placed Ethiopians who profited from the match monopoly. Further, he had recently given up most of his French commercial contacts for American and German connections, which the French Legation called a heinous attack on "the good relations existing between France and Ethiopia." Hence his expulsion as a Bolshevik agent, the order signed by the French minister and an Ethiopian official. The American legation concluded that, although Yonow was not "a strictly law abiding citizen," it did "seem peculiar" that the Ethiopians had ascribed a political character to his acts.<sup>13</sup>

On the expulsion of the second White Russian as a Bolshevik agent, Southard noted an inspired article in the influential Amharic newspaper, *Berhanena Salam* [*Light and Peace*]. Clearly displaying court attitudes toward the Soviet Union, the article claimed that all Ethiopians looked favorably on foreigners. However, some had come with evil intentions and would return to their countries and publish calumnies against Ethiopia. "Enlightened people do not believe such propaganda," the article told its readers, but most, "including women, accept as truth anything that is printed."<sup>14</sup>

In Russia, *Berhanena Salam* charged, "vagrants, crooks, adventurers, thieves and vagabonds" had overthrown the Russian government. Now, "blood flowed like water in Russia." Some Bolsheviks "also travelled in foreign countries in the guise of exiles, for the purpose of making trouble." Nonetheless, those Russians who had come to Ethiopia with an aptitude for work had received employment. Ethiopia had taken in other Russians, even those with no profession, with kindness and had given them financial relief. The leaders and priests of the Ethiopian Church had joined with the Russians in Ethiopia to pray for the soul of Russia's last emperor. The Ethiopians, however, had discovered one, Dr. Gavrilov, to be a Bolshevik partisan through his speech and actions. First, he had publicly carried off the wife of one of his own countrymen and had driven him to attempt suicide. Next, he had advised his patients not to use doctors of other nationalities by stressing he was a Russian and an Orthodox Christian like themselves. "He thus caused much harm by preventing the sick from consulting other doctors." Last, the article charged that Gavrilov had treated another physician "with such haste and imprudence that it caused his sudden death." When the municipality discovered these facts, it dismissed Gavrilov. He then maneuvered against Ethiopia's interests and spread

---

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*

dissatisfaction and pernicious propaganda to his patients, who reported him to the authorities.<sup>15</sup>

The authorities then sent agents, whom Gavrilov took to be Bolshevik partisans, and he began to confide his secrets to them. He next wrote one of his friends in Sofia, Bulgaria, asking for explosives to assassinate the empress and other notables. He showed this letter a police agent. Three months later, Gavrilov received the reply to this letter, stating that the explosives and other materials were ready for forwarding. The letter then fell into the hands of the Chief of Police. The authorities found Gavrilov guilty of spreading propaganda to destroy the government. The police then arrested him on May 17, 1929 and placed him and his wife on a train leaving Addis Ababa that same day.<sup>16</sup>

Addison Southard, doubted the truth of the allegations. Southard believed the vengeful husband had written the letter as a hoax. Both Yonow and Gavrilov had offended the French legation that had protected them. Both probably were also victims of the zeal of an Armenian, also a French protégée, who headed Ethiopia's secret police. Southard further explained that the Ethiopians were fanatically religious, instinctively anti-foreign, and thoroughly committed to feudalism. Poor material for the Bolshevik experiment, he described Ethiopia as "the last country in the world" that Bolshevik propaganda would likely tempt. Southard believed the arrests laid in personal enmities and motives of revenge and obsession that Bolshevism might plant itself in Ethiopia.<sup>17</sup>

Southard elaborated. A man of considerable culture, education, and personality, Gavrilov for years had served as the physician to Empress Taytu and enjoyed her confidence. About 1927, he began his fall from grace. He incurred enmity from the Greek who had succeeded him as palace physician. After his ouster from the palace, Gavrilov received an appointment as doctor of the Addis Ababa municipality. However, the machinations of the Greek and weakness for palace intrigue and gossip, which had offended the French legation, had caused him to lose that billet too. Further, Gavrilov a few years before had seduced and "taken possession" of the wife of one of his local compatriots. The outraged husband, still employed by the Ethiopian government, had boasted that he had gotten Gavrilov deported. But, Southard noted that, given the "flexible" nature of Ethiopian mores, no one other than the husband was upset at the "transfer of affection."<sup>18</sup>

---

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*



The Ethiopians deported a third Russian émigré and French protégée, Niccolas Voronovsky, for "relations with the Bolsheviks," based on French information allegedly gotten from the Soviet embassy in Paris. A French colleague told Southard that Voronovsky had sent Moscow complete plans and a report on the project for building a dam at Lake Tana.<sup>19</sup>

Southard was skeptical about the French information. He presumed Voronovsky, an engineer, had gotten the plans in 1926, when he was a member of an official Ethiopian party surveying the proposed site. Voronovsky had visited Southard's office and had asked him to tell White Engineering, an American corporation, about his materials. He claimed his plans were much simpler and easier than were those of the British engineering commission which also had surveyed the dam site. Southard rhetorically wondered why Voronovsky would send his maps and plans to Moscow and why the Soviets would want them. "It is not apparent here what real interest Moscow could have in such documents," he wrote. Southard thought the incident unimportant.<sup>20</sup>

A year later, the mayor of Addis Ababa feared that communists might try to disrupt Hayla Sellase's coronation in November 1930. Then, in 1931, the Ethiopians allegedly discovered that communist cells, directed by Russian immigrants. Weapons had arrived in Ethiopia and authorities arrested an Ethiopian. Another alleged Ethiopian member of the Communist community was *Bajerond* Takle-Hawaryat, an Ethiopian trained in a tsarist military school and lead author of Ethiopia's constitution of 1931.<sup>21</sup>

Most White Russian émigrés never fell under the pall of suspicion. Most notably, Colonel Feodor Evgenii Kononov, worked in the Ethiopian Office of Public Works. He became an import adviser to Hayle Sellase during the Second Italo-Ethiopian War of 1935 and 1936.<sup>22</sup>

Undeterred by the scandal of expulsions, the Soviets in 1931 signed a contract with the Société Ethiopienne de Commerce et d'Industrie to sell

---

<sup>19</sup> Southard, July 27, 1929: NARA Microcopy 411, Roll 1.

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid*; *Japan Times*, Feb. 13, 1935.

<sup>21</sup> Alberto Sbacchi, *Legacy of Bitterness: Ethiopia and Fascist Italy, 1935-1941* (Lawrenceville, NJ: Red Sea Press, 1996), 40, 51 n. 34; Teobaldo Filesi, *Comunismo e Nazionalismo in Africa* (Rome: Istituto Italiano per l'Africa, 1958), 125-31; Bahru Zewde, *Pioneers of Change in Ethiopia: The Reformist Intellectuals of the Early Twentieth Century* (Oxford: James Curry, 2002), 109-10; Taura Masanori, "Nihon-Echiopia kankei ni miru 1930 nen tsusho gaiko no iso," *Seifu to Minkan Kindai Nihon Kenkyu*, 17 (1995): 148; Bahru Zewde, *A History of Modern Ethiopia, 1855-1974* (London: J. Currey, 1991), 92, 110.

<sup>22</sup> Fedor Eugenievich Kononov, "The Kononovoff Manuscript," (Hoover Institution. Stanford University, Stanford, CA), 246-48; Col. Th. Kononovoff, *Con Le Armate Del Negus (Un Bianco fra i neri)* (Bologna: Nicola Zanichelli, 1938); J. Calvitt Clarke III, "Feodor Kononov and the Italo-Ethiopian War (Part I)," *World War II Quarterly* 5 (Win. 2008): 4- 37 and (Part II)," *World War II Quarterly* 6 (Spr. 2008): 23-49.

Russian petroleum products in Ethiopia. This contract, a de facto monopoly, was a private agreement and included Ethiopia's emperor as a silent partner. To push Soviet oil products in Ethiopia the Ethiopians ironically put in charge of Société Ethiopienne a White Russian, who had no national, political, or social prejudice except his anti-Bolshevism. Wracked by leakage from poor packing, inferior quality, and Société Ethiopienne's inexperience in the oil business, a substantial loss fell on the emperor's private purse. The Ethiopians thereafter proved chary of dabbling further in the oil business.<sup>23</sup>

The Soviets, however, did not give up without a struggle. Seeking further commitments through Société Ethiopienne, another Soviet representative arrived in Addis Ababa in 1933. The Soviets and Ethiopians signed a new contract that tried to correct the problems with the old one. For sale on consignment, they added other Russian commodities, including sugar, flour, and cotton goods. Sales did not go well, however, and Moscow soon decided that it would export nothing more to Ethiopia without suitable diplomatic and juridical support.<sup>24</sup>

In October 1934, Moscow sent Ivan Kondrashev to Addis Ababa to negotiate a treaty of commerce and friendship that would provide the recognition Hayle Sellase had told Southard the year before he would never grant. In describing Kondrashev's visit, Southard noted that the royal family and older feudal chieftains still harbored sentimental memories of the tsarist regime as did the two hundred or so White Russian émigrés living in Ethiopia. Because Kondrashev fell ill, the negotiations did not go well.<sup>25</sup>

Two months later, on January 4, 1935, Ethiopia's foreign minister wrote Moscow asking to establish diplomatic relations. On February 16, Soviet Foreign Commissar Maksim Maksimovich Litvinov responded that he would gladly do so, and he suggested that their representatives should meet in Paris. The two sides may have begun their negotiations in Paris and Moscow in the Spring of 1936, just before Ethiopia's military collapse. Without providing

---

<sup>23</sup> In NARA 884.6363 Société Ethiopienne see: Southard, Oct. 22, 1931: /1; Nov. 18, 1931: /2; Jan. 16, 1932: /3; Dept. of State, Feb. 26, 1932: /4; Mar. 7, 1932: /7; Mar. 8, 1932: /12; Mar. 14, 1932: /13; Mar. 28, 1932: /14; Apr. 16, 1932: /15; May 3, 1932: /16; May 18, 1932: /17; May 28, 1932: /19; June 23, 1932: /21; July 18, 1932: /23; Aug. 6, 1932: /24; Murray, Mar. 5, 1932: /6; June 23, 1932: /18; Alling, Mar. 14, 1932: /10; Henry, Mar. 9, 1932: /9; Mar. 17, 1932: /11; July 20, 1932: /22; To Ethiopia, Mar. 10, 1932: /8; Walmsley, June 13, 1932: /20; and Name unclear, Feb. 26, 1932: /4. Also in NARA, see Southard, Mar. 7, 1932: 884.602/32.

<sup>24</sup> In NARA 884.6363 Société Ethiopienne, see: Southard, Jan. 19, 1933: /25; Feb. 7, 1933: /26; Feb. 16, 1933: /27; Sept. 21, 1933: /28; Oct. 24, 1933: /29. Also see the untitled short note in *World Petroleum* 3 (June 1932): 260.

<sup>25</sup> Southard, Oct. 8, 1934: NARA 761.84/1; Southard, Oct. 24, 1933: NARA 884.6363 Société Ethiopienne /29.

documentation, the editors of the Soviet Union's published foreign relations documents say that the negotiations did begin. The American legation in Addis Ababa, on the other hand, was skeptical. The legation reported that the minister who occupied the old tsarist legation had heard rumors but nothing definite on Soviet recognition of Ethiopia. He had an arrangement with Ethiopia's government whereby he was to receive at least three months' notice in event the Soviets wanted the legation. As it turned out, the USSR and Ethiopia did not establish relations until April 21, 1943—only a year before Moscow reestablished relations with post-Fascist Italy.<sup>26</sup>

By the beginning of 1935, clearly Benito Mussolini's Italy's was rushing toward war with Ethiopia, which he launched in October. The Soviet Union publicly offered warm support to Ethiopia facing an imperialist threat.<sup>27</sup> The reality was, however, that the Soviets now had to choose between its ideological, anti-colonial imperatives and *realpolitik*. Italy was crucial to the incipient collective security system the Kremlin was raising against German expansion, and the Soviets even had a role for Italy against Japan. Few at the time appreciated how willingly the Kremlin, seduced by security concerns, was willing to cuckold the central tenets of its most sacred beliefs. Moscow had had a celebrated fling with Addis Ababa, but its true passion was Rome. That the Latin liaison failed after Italy's conquest of Ethiopia in May 1936, was not from lack of courting by the Soviet Union.<sup>28</sup>

---

<sup>26</sup> Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Ministerstvo Inostrannykh del SSSR, *Dokumenty vneshniaia politika SSSR*, Vol. 18: *1 ianvaria-31 dekabria 1935 g.* (Moscow: Politicheskoi literatury, 1973): nos. 59, 64, n. 35; Bullitt, Mar. 19, 1936: NARA 761.84/2; Engert, NARA Mar. 26, 1936: 761.84/3.

<sup>27</sup> See the articles in *Revoliutsionnyi vostok*, esp. Boris Aleksandrovich Aleksandrov, "Abissiniia," 9 (1935): 138-51; M. Dzahallon, "Italo-Abissinskii konflikt (Novaya faza bor'by za peredel' Afriki)," 9 (1935): 174-88; Aleksander Z. Zusmanovich, "Italo-Abissinskaia vojna i ped'em natsional'nogo osvoboditel'nogo dvizheniia," 9 (1935): 43-54; and Andrea Marabini, "Kolonial'naia politika fashistskoi Italii," 10 (1936): 233-45. Finally, see Wilson, *Russia and Black Africa*, 84-89, 94-129, 154-56, 206-29, 263-79 and Charles, *The Soviet Union*, 4-12, 36-39.

<sup>28</sup> See the works by J. Calviatt Clarke III: *Russia and Italy Against Hitler: The Bolshevik-Fascist Rapprochement of the 1930s* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1991); "Italo-Soviet Military Cooperation in the 1930s," in *Girding for Battle: Arms Sales in a Global Perspective, 1800-1950*, Donald J. Stoker and Jonathan A. Grant, eds. (Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers, 2003), 177-99; "Periphery and Crossroads: Ethiopia and World Diplomacy, 1934-36," in *Ethiopia in Broader Perspective: Papers of the XIIIth International Conference of Ethiopian Studies*, 3 vols. K. E. Fukui and M. Shigeta, eds. (Kyoto: Shokado Book Sellers, 1997), 1: 699-712; and "Soviet Appeasement, Collective Security, and the Italo-Ethiopian War of 1935 and 1936," *Selected Annual Proceedings of the Florida Conference of Historians* 4 (Dec. 1996): 115-32. Also see Rosaria Quartararo, *Italia-URSS, 1917-1941: I rapporti politici* (Naples: Edizioni scientifiche italiane, 1997), 107-08, 167-74.

## **Clobberin' Commies during the Cold War: Superheroes and Nationalism**

*John L. Donovan*

*United States Air Force Academy*

The comic book superhero was created in the late 1930s as the embodiment of what is "Good" in the battle against "Evil." Throughout World War II, superheroes were depicted in comics fighting America's Nazi enemies, with no doubt as to who were the "good guys" and who were the "bad guys." After 1945, during the first 20 years of the Cold War, "Evil" was portrayed by the communists; American superheroes fought them in the harbors of New York, in the labs of nuclear scientists, in the jungles of Vietnam, and even on the moon. These superheroes always "clobbered" the communists in battle because of the comics' depiction of American superiority in power, values, ingenuity and moral fortitude (commonly referred to in the media as "truth, justice and the American way").<sup>1</sup>

By the late 1960s/1970s, as the country became more absorbed with its own social problems, the superheroes remained but the villains against which they fought began to represent current societal issues such as racism, women's liberation, and government corruption. By the 1980s, during the Reagan presidency, some superheroes even confronted the issues of controlling nuclear blackmail and the impact of nuclear weapons on foreign policy, at a time when many Americans were tremendously concerned about a re-escalation of the Cold War.

As the Cold War progressed, the depiction of the superhero reflected the changes in America's view of itself regarding nationalism and America's role in confronting evil. By the end of the Cold War, the depiction of ultimate evil had evolved from communism to our own social ills. The superheroes, while still representing Good, became less nationalistic, realizing that they were confronting a different villain threatening American values. The superhero was

---

<sup>1</sup> Glenn Yeffeth, ed., *The Man from Krypton: A Closer Look at Superman* (Dallas: BenBella Books, Inc., 2005), 1.

still ingenious and powerful in the war on evil, but the concept of evil moved away from the "black and white" world of anti-communism and dealt more with the shades of gray of America's internal problems. Supported by examples from comic books from 1945 - 1991, this essay shows how superheroes came to represent American nationalism during the Cold War, while evolving their attitudes and focus to meet new threats as the country changed and transformed both its national priorities and its perception of evil.

### A New Global Villainy

During World War II, comics often included depictions of superheroes such as Superman, Batman or Captain America battling Hitler, Tojo or Mussolini.<sup>2</sup> It was pretty clear that Nazis and fascists were the villains of the day, and that American superheroes represented patriotism and support for America's war effort.<sup>3</sup> Following the war, many comics of the 1950s depicted the villains in their stories as gangsters, aliens, super-villains, or communists (or combinations thereof), and readers were treated to examples of patriotism reminiscent of superheroes battling political "villains" from the World War II years. Throughout 1954, Atlas Comics featured stories about the Human Torch, Sub-Mariner and Captain America using storylines that involved communist agents trying to undermine American security.

In *Young Men* #25, Captain America and his sidekick, Bucky, confront and defeat Soviet agents who are trying to steal atomic secrets. In a classic final panel to the story, as Captain America and Bucky are viewing an atomic blast, Bucky states: "Wow! What a sight!" Captain America responds that it is indeed "a glorious sight...when it's on our side in the struggle for world peace!"<sup>4</sup> In Spring 1954, Captain America's comic had the words: "Captain America...Commie Smasher" prominently displayed on the cover.<sup>5</sup> To ensure that readers understood the nature of the Captain America's fight for freedom, communism was described as "spreading its ugly, grasping tentacles all over the world."<sup>6</sup> In one story, Captain America is told by U.S. Government and United Nations agents that Soviet spies are poisoning the food of communist prisoners of war in U.S. Korean prison camps so the United Nations could be accused of

---

<sup>2</sup> Two excellent examples can be seen on the covers of the DC Comics *World's Finest* #9 and *Batman* #18 from 1943 in which Batman, Superman and Robin are battling all three Axis leaders at one time.

<sup>3</sup> Bradford W. Wright, *Comic Book Nation: The Transformation of Youth Culture in America* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2001), 34.

<sup>4</sup> "Top Secret!" *Young Men* 25 (Atlas Comics, February 1954).

<sup>5</sup> *Captain America* 76 (Atlas Comics, May 1954).

<sup>6</sup> "The Betrayers!" *Captain America* 76 (Atlas Comics, May 1954).

mistreating the prisoners, and he is asked to deliver a drug to help the prisoners. Captain America states the role of Cold War relations at the time as the need to convince the prisoners "that their own masters are the real killers...and that the United Nations are the only ones who can cure what ails them...with freedom and democracy!"<sup>7</sup> Stories like this were designed to stir sentiments within the reader against the evils of communism.

In another case, the Human Torch and his sidekick, Toro, expose a rich U.S. candidate for governor who turns out to be a Red agent. Toro tells the Torch, "What I can't understand is why a man like Dean Prentiss, with all he had, became a Red!" The Human Torch replied that "in every society there are people who are mentally sick, Toro! Only a madman would forsake the glorious freedom of America for the unspeakable tyranny of communism!"<sup>8</sup> In this statement, the Torch has not only denigrated the lack of freedom under communism, but also associated its followers with mental illness. As opposed to the more serious-minded Atlas stories, one comic company of the time, Crestwood Publications, put out a comic called *Fighting American* that featured a superhero dedicated to fighting communist menaces done in a tongue-in-cheek manner.

Fighting American, a character created by Jack Kirby and Joe Simon (who also created Captain America right before World War II), took on communist villains such as Super-Khahalovitch whose power was an intense body odor. He is drawn in the comics with odor fumes emanating from his body. When he is hosed down and cleaned up, Super-Khahalovitch states that being clean "disqualifies" him as communist.<sup>9</sup> With this in mind, as well as the Human Torch's previous comments about communist followers, it would not be surprising if readers of the time associated communists with mentally-ill people with body odor. By late 1955, Atlas Comic superheroes and Fighting American would be cancelled. The next wave of anti-communist superheroes would begin six years later with the *Fantastic Four*, when the Atlas publishers relaunched their superheroes as the Marvel line of comics.

### **The Marvel Age of Clobberin' Commies**

In *Fantastic Four* #1, four superheroes gain their powers through exposure to cosmic rays in space by deciding to make their fateful journey for one main reason...to beat the Soviets into space. As Sue Storm (later to become the Invisible Girl) tells pilot Ben Grimm (who becomes the Thing) when he

---

<sup>7</sup> *Captain America* 77 (Atlas Comics, July 1954). This Captain America story is untitled.

<sup>8</sup> "A Spy There Was..." *Human Torch* 37 (Atlas Comics, June 1954).

<sup>9</sup> "Super Khahalovitch" *Fighting American* 6 (Crestwood Publications, February-March 1955).

expresses concern about traveling in space through cosmic rays: "Ben, we've got to take that chance...unless we want the Commies to beat us to it!"<sup>10</sup> The Fantastic Four would even encounter and defeat a communist villain, "The Red Ghost," who had traveled to the moon to claim it for the communist empire in *Fantastic Four* #13.<sup>11</sup> Another Marvel hero, the Incredible Hulk, was also associated with communism. Hulk stories from the early 1960s had him battling communist villains such as the Gargoyle (a Soviet scientist transformed into a monster by working on Premier Nikita Khrushchev's "secret bomb tests"),<sup>12</sup> and a Soviet soldier named Mongu who tries to capture him to learn the secret of the Hulk's great strength so he can build an army of Soviet Hulks,<sup>13</sup> as well as stories depicting the Hulk wreaking havoc behind the Iron Curtain by fighting Soviet soldiers, destroying Soviet tanks and demolishing MiG aircraft.<sup>14</sup> In addition to the Hulk, another Marvel character who encountered communist enemies, such as Soviet spies like Comrade X, was the miniature superhero known as Ant-Man.<sup>15</sup>

Ant-Man's wife, Maria (an escapee from communist-dominated Hungary), was killed by the Soviets. In her memory, Ant-Man (Henry Pym) dedicated his life to fighting anywhere "injustice is rampant" and "tyranny tramples the underdog" as he vows to strike back at "wherever rotteness exists!"<sup>16</sup> Little did the communists realize that they were responsible for Ant-Man's creation and fight against their political system. Pym, in his alternate identity as the enlarged Giant-Man, participated in the regime change of a Latin American country in 1964,<sup>17</sup> as well as freeing an imprisoned FBI agent from East Berlin while knocking down a section of the Berlin Wall.<sup>18</sup> Marvel superheroes also included Thor, a Norse god who carries an Asgardian hammer. Thor would take on MiGs in South America,<sup>19</sup> and even travel behind the Iron Curtain to free American scientists. In one scene, when Thor confronts a group of Soviet guards, one of the guards asks another one: "He carries a hammer...is he one of us??" The other guard responds: "He is our enemy! Stop him!" Thor

---

<sup>10</sup> "The Fantastic Four!" *Fantastic Four* 1 (Marvel Comics, November 1961).

<sup>11</sup> "The Fantastic Four Versus the Red Ghost and His Indescribable Super-Apes!" *Fantastic Four* 13 (Marvel Comics, April 1963).

<sup>12</sup> "The Coming of the Hulk!" *The Incredible Hulk* 1 (Marvel Comics, May 1962).

<sup>13</sup> "Gladiator from Outer Space" *The Incredible Hulk* 4 (Marvel Comics, November 1962).

<sup>14</sup> "On the Rampage against the Reds!" *Tales to Astonish* 65 (Marvel Comics, March 1965).

<sup>15</sup> "The Challenge of Comrade X." *Tales to Astonish* 36 (Marvel Comics, October 1962).

<sup>16</sup> "The Creature from Kosmos." *Tales to Astonish* 44 (Marvel Comics, June 1963).

<sup>17</sup> "No Place to Hide!" *Tales to Astonish* 54 (Marvel Comics, April 1964).

<sup>18</sup> "The Beasts of Berlin." *Tales to Astonish* 60 (Marvel Comics, October 1964).

<sup>19</sup> "The Mighty Thor vs. the Executioner." *Journey into Mystery* 84 (Marvel Comics, September 1962).

defeats the Red guards, rescues the scientists and destroys the prison fortress.<sup>20</sup> Thor would also fight a villain known as the Radio-Active Man who would be created by communists in Red China.<sup>21</sup> In addition to new superheroes such as Thor, Marvel comics also included updated versions of the popular Atlas superheroes.

The Fantastic Four team included a young teen-age Human Torch, different from the 1950s version, who also did his part in the fight against communism. He defeated a communist saboteur,<sup>22</sup> as well as a villain called the Rabble Rouser, whose dream was to turn Americans against each other, allowing the Soviets to take over the country so he can be “another Castro.”<sup>23</sup> Marvel also brought back Captain America fighting communists in the jungles of Vietnam<sup>24</sup> and Sin Cong (a fictional country north of Vietnam),<sup>25</sup> described as a “communist-ruled puppet state.” Captain America tells the people of Sin-Cong: “Be always on your guard! [The communists’] goal is nothing less than total world conquest, and world enslavement! Only constant vigilance and devotion to freedom can stop them!”<sup>26</sup> It would also be in the setting of the jungles of Vietnam itself that Iron Man, the epitome of Marvel’s 1960’s anti-communist superheroes, would make his debut.

Tony Stark, an America weapons inventor, was injured and taken prisoner in Vietnam. While there, he creates the Iron Man suit to keep his heart beating.<sup>27</sup> In the U.S., Iron Man worked with U.S. agents to foil a Soviet plot to steal an atomic bomb. The agents thank him by stating: “Good work, Iron Man! Thanks to your cleverness, another Commie spy ring has been rounded up!”<sup>28</sup> Later stories would show Soviet leadership wanting Iron Man defeated, and communist schemes would involve having Soviet superheroes created for the sole purpose of stopping Iron Man and demonstrating the superiority of communism. It would be Khrushchev who would have Soviet scientists create the metal-suited Crimson Dynamo who thinks to himself in one scene that if he can defeat Iron Man, he will “return home a national hero, powerful enough to replace even [Khrushchev] himself!” The Crimson Dynamo defects to the United States when he believes that Khrushchev is planning to have him killed upon his return to the Soviet Union because he is too powerful. This is an

---

<sup>20</sup> “Prisoner of the Reds!” *Journey into Mystery* 87 (Marvel Comics, December 1962).

<sup>21</sup> “The Mysterious Radio-Active Man!” *Journey into Mystery* 93 (Marvel Comics, June 1963).

<sup>22</sup> “The Human Torch” *Strange Tales* 101 (Marvel Comics, October 1962).

<sup>23</sup> “The Torch Goes Wild!” *Strange Tales* 119 (Marvel Comics, April 1964).

<sup>24</sup> “The Strength of the Sumo” *Tales of Suspense* 61 (Marvel Comics, January 1965).

<sup>25</sup> “Sin-Cong” *Marvel Atlas 1* (Marvel Comics, 2008).

<sup>26</sup> “When the Commissar Commands” *Avengers* 18 (Marvel Comics, July 1965).

<sup>27</sup> “Iron Man is Born!” *Tales of Suspense* 39 (Marvel Comics, March 1963).

<sup>28</sup> “Trapped by the Red Barbarian” *Tales of Suspense* 42 (Marvel Comics, June 1963).



excellent example of how communists in the mid-1960s Marvel Comics are depicted: suspicious of each other, and always ready to backstab one another to seize power. Learning of the defection, Khrushchev yells: "IDIOTS! TRAITORS! There is NO ONE I can trust!"<sup>29</sup> He even sends a Soviet spy, the Black Widow, to defeat Iron Man, but she also fails in her mission and realizes she will be punished for her failure by the Soviets.<sup>30</sup> An underlying theme is the nobility of Americans in fighting against communism, while communists are consistently shown as ruthless, untrusting and incompetent. The Black Widow character, just like the Crimson Dynamo before her, will also ultimately decide to defect to the United States. Despite these failures, communists wearing metal armor would continue to confront Iron Man. One of the most notable was the Titanium Man, who publicly challenged Iron Man to a fight to the finish in a battle televised worldwide. But, true to depictions of communist villains, and unknown to Iron Man, Titanium Man has planted explosives around the battlefield so he can defeat Iron Man in a "propaganda victory from which America will NEVER recover!"<sup>31</sup> This storyline epitomizes Marvel's depiction of communists as treacherous liars who can only win by cheating on the battlefield. It also demonstrates the ongoing struggle between the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. as a reflection of propaganda victories that could enhance the reputation of one country's political system over the other. Using a device called a reverser ray that renders Titanium Man's armor useless, Iron Man is victorious as Titanium Man surrenders.<sup>32</sup> By the late 1960s, superhero comics would increasingly move away from communist adversaries and confront instead social issues, as well as typical criminals and super-villains. Even former communists, such as the Black Widow, would take on social inequalities in American cities instead of trying to uncover and steal American defense secrets.

### **You say you want a revolution?**

Given her own series in September 1970, the Black Widow's earliest adventures show her putting her Soviet past behind her by fighting crime and injustice in the U.S. as a champion for social causes.<sup>33</sup> During the years

---

<sup>29</sup> "Iron Man Faces the Crimson Dynamo" *Tales of Suspense* 46 (Marvel Comics, October 1963).

<sup>30</sup> "The Crimson Dynamo Strikes Again!" *Tales of Suspense* 52 (Marvel Comics, April 1964).

<sup>31</sup> "If I Must Die, Let It Be With Honor" *Tales of Suspense* 69 (Marvel Comics, September 1965).

<sup>32</sup> "Fight On! For a World is Watching!" *Tales of Suspense* 70 (Marvel Comics, October 1965);

"What Price Victory?" *Tales of Suspense* 71 (Marvel Comics, October 1965).

<sup>33</sup> The Black Widow's commitment to social justice is chronicled in "Friend against Friend" *Amazing Adventures* 2 (Marvel Comics, September 1970); "The Young Warriors!" *Amazing Adventures* 2 (Marvel Comics, September 1970); "The Widow and the Militants" *Amazing*

associated with détente and the eventual drawdown of the Vietnam War, social issues would dominate many of the storylines in both Marvel and DC comics. DC's *Green Lantern/Green Arrow* series discussed issues related to racism, environmentalism, industrial pollution, overpopulation, Native American rights, child abuse, drug addiction, and urban violence. Issues of both the *Avengers* and the *Hulk* addressed the issue of Women's Liberation.<sup>34</sup> Additionally, an issue of the *Justice League of America* examined the effects of pollution associated with "obsolete" American military gas products being dumped into the ocean.<sup>35</sup> As opposed to the earlier comics of the 1960s, superheroes from this timeframe were willing to hold America accountable for actions which formerly would have been blamed on other nations or communists. By the mid-1970s, the Soviet Union would begin to form their own version of superhero teams as counterparts to American teams in both Marvel and DC comics that would be featured in stories throughout the end of the Cold War.

### Closing the Superhero Gap

In the mid-1970s, the Black Widow joined a Los Angeles-based group of superheroes called the Champions. A team of Soviet superheroes is sent to the U.S. to retrieve her, but although the Champions successfully keep the Soviet team from taking her, they could not have done so without internal dissension within the Soviet team itself. One of the Soviets expresses doubts about the methods and violence used to retrieve the Black Widow, and assists the Champions in defeating the other Soviets.<sup>36</sup> Additionally, this would begin a trend of Soviet super-heroes disagreeing with their government, such as a 1981 *Hulk* story that showed a new group of Soviet superheroes called the Soviet Super-Soldiers. Angered at being manipulated by the Soviet government to undertake a mission in which they did not have all the facts, they vow that "the Super-Soldiers will continue to battle evil – but we will never blindly follow any state or leader again!"<sup>37</sup> With the start of the Reagan presidency, the 1980s

---

*Adventures 3* (Marvel Comics, November 1970); and "Deadlock" *Amazing Adventures 4* (Marvel Comics, January 1971).

<sup>34</sup> Stories addressing social issues can be found in *Green Lantern/Green Arrow 76 – 87, 89* (DC Comics, April 1970 – April-May 1972); Women's liberation stories can be found in "The Revolution's Fine" *Avengers 83* (Marvel Comics, December 1970) and "They Shoot Hulks, Don't They?" *Incredible Hulk 142* (Marvel Comics, August 1971).

<sup>35</sup> "Plague of the Pale People" *Justice League of America 90* (DC Comics, June 1971).

<sup>36</sup> "Divide and Conquer" *Champions 8* (Marvel Comics, October 1976); "The Battle of Los Angeles!" *Champions 9* (Marvel Comics, December 1976); and "One Man's Son is Another Man's Poison!" *Champions 10* (Marvel Comics, January 1977).

<sup>37</sup> "To Hunt the Hulk" *Incredible Hulk 258* (Marvel Comics, April 1981).

issues of Marvel and DC comics would also begin to address tension between the two countries through the lens of distrust, espionage and the threat of nuclear proliferation. The comics would even depict both President Reagan and General Secretary Gorbachev as key figures in superhero stories dealing with the Cold War.

### The Cold War Heats Up, then Cools Down

In the mid-1980s, comics depicted Gorbachev creating “a cadre of Soviet Super-Agents,” who could serve the dictates of the Soviet government, called “The People’s Heroes.”<sup>38</sup> This Soviet team would partner with an American team, the Outsiders, to stop a renegade Soviet superhero named Fusion from blowing up the Statue of Liberty and assassinating President Reagan.<sup>39</sup> Gorbachev would even convince a member of the Green Lantern Corps to assist him in creating a team of armored Soviet heroes known as the Rocket Red Brigade.<sup>40</sup> Batman summarizes the state of Cold War superhero relations by stating that “the Russians are sorely lacking in superheroes” and that they are scrambling “to avoid a super-human gap with the West.”<sup>41</sup> In the spirit of soothing world tensions, the Justice League was re-designated as a “U.N.-sanctioned international peacekeeping force ... with embassies across the globe.” The part of the newly christened Justice League International (JLI) stationed in Moscow would include a Soviet member, Rocket Red #1.<sup>42</sup> In 1988, in the final major DC Cold War storyline, Batman would have the chance to confront the changes brought about by Glasnost and Perestroika when a KGB agent (the KGBeast) tries to kill President Reagan and scientists and politicians associated with the Strategic Defense Initiative; it requires cooperation between both governments to stop him.<sup>43</sup>

For Marvel, the last major communist storyline involved Captain America, when three members of the Soviet Super-Soldiers request asylum

---

<sup>38</sup> “The People’s Heroes” *Outsiders 10* (DC Comics, August 1986); “No Escape” *Outsiders 11* (DC Comics, September 1986); “Nothin’ Left to Lose!” *Outsiders 12* (DC Comics, October 1986).

<sup>39</sup> “... and the Rocket’s Red Glare ...” *Outsiders 23* (DC Comics, September 1987); “Night of Camp David” *Outsiders 24* (DC Comics, October 1987).

<sup>40</sup> A three-part storyline chronicled in “Red Lantern” *Green Lantern Corps 208* (DC Comics, January 1987); “Red Alert!” *Green Lantern Corps 209* (DC Comics, February 1987); and “See Red!” *Green Lantern Corps 210* (DC Comics, March 1987).

<sup>41</sup> “Make War No More!” *Justice League 2* (DC Comics, June 1987); “Meltdown” *Justice League 3* (DC Comics, July 1987).

<sup>42</sup> “Justice League ... International!” *Justice League International 7* (DC Comics, November 1987); and “Moving Day” *Justice League International 8* (DC Comics, December 1987).

<sup>43</sup> Chronicled in a four-part story titled “Ten Nights of the Beast” *Batman 417 - 420* (DC Comics, March 1988 – June 1988).

because they are disillusioned with the Soviet government and have decided to defect. They explain that they are “heroes of the Soviet people, not the Soviet Government,” and that they would be hounded by the Soviet government whenever they accomplished actions outside of Soviet directives. Allowed to stay in the U.S. as guests of the Avengers while the State Department is notified of their defection, the trio is attacked by a Soviet government team, the “Supreme Soviets,” sent to punish them as traitors. The Supreme Soviets tell the trio that they are “traitors to the Motherland,” and hope that their deaths will be blamed on the Avengers to spark an international incident. Fortunately for Cold War relations, the trio recovers.<sup>44</sup> In 1992, it would be revealed in the wake of the fall of the Soviet Union that the Supreme Soviets had stayed loyal to the Russian people, and would rename their team the “People’s Protectorate.”<sup>45</sup> By the time the Soviet Union collapsed, it appeared that Russia had finally made headway in closing the “superhero gap” with the United States.

## Conclusion

From the mid-1950s through the mid-1960s, with heroes such as Captain America, the Human Torch, Thor, Ant-Man, Iron Man, the Fantastic Four and the Avengers, Marvel comics would set the standard in superhero stories confronting communist villains. It was very clear to the reader that the Americans were the “good guys” and that the communists were the “bad guys.” The American superheroes were clean-cut, heroic figures defending freedom and liberty. The communists, on the other hand, were often depicted as petty, mean-spirited, vengeful, deceitful, treacherous villains (even at the highest levels of government). Nuclear weapons, as seen in 1950s issues of Captain America, were considered the epitome of American might in the struggle against communism. By the end of the Cold War, Captain America would be advocating that the Soviets and the Americans work together to combat evil around the world.

During the late 1960s and early 1970s, years of social upheaval in the United States, communist villains in comics took a back seat to social concerns such as racism, environmentalism, industrial pollution, overpopulation, Native

---

<sup>44</sup> “Refuge” *Captain America* 352 (Marvel Comics, April 1989); “The Great Bear” *Captain America* 353 (Marvel Comics, May 1989).

<sup>45</sup> “The Red Triangle Agenda” *Soviet Super Soldiers 1* (Marvel Comics, November 1992).

American rights, child abuse, drug addiction, urban violence, pollution, and women's liberation. But by the early 1980s, this would change.

DC Comics, with superheroes such as Batman, Superman, Wonder Woman, Green Lantern and the Justice League, seemed to avoid storylines that involved U.S./Soviet relations from the mid-1940s to the early 1980s. After President Reagan came to power, DC comics released stories during these years that had superheroes dealing with the impact of Gorbachev's political and foreign policy reforms, as well as the threat of nuclear war.

The transition in how superheroes were depicted clobbering commies during the Cold War very much reflected the concerns and fears of the American people during the turbulent times of the 1950s and the 1960s, when the threat of communism dominated political thought and nuclear annihilation seemed imminent. When the social fabric of America seemed to be unraveling in the late 1960s and the 1970s, then the comics reflected an American society more concerned with danger from within than the danger of communism from without. By the 1980s, with the advent of the Reagan administration and the growing fear of nuclear war with the U.S.S.R., as well as the rise of Gorbachev and his associated reform movements, comics tended to focus on those political issues that would alleviate tensions, warn about the dangers of nuclear conflict, and promote cooperation between the United States and the Soviet Union. More than just entertainment, comics during the Cold War were a reflection of the concerns of Americans in a politically dynamic and unstable world.

## Governmental Crisis in Italy in November 1943: the Role of Count Sforza and the Position of the Western Allies

Yana A. Pitner

University of North Carolina - Asheville

Historically, a seeming inconsiderable period of time from July to October 1943 became of critical importance to Italy. It was dense with events that would forever change the political life of this country. On July 24, 1943, shortly after the Allied forces landed in Sicily, the Grand Fascist Council voted a motion of no confidence regarding Mussolini. The next day, King Victor Emmanuel III dismissed Mussolini from office and ordered him arrested. P. Badoglio, who was the Supreme Chief of the Italian General Staff under Mussolini and as a member of the Grand Fascist Council assisted towards il Duce dismissal, was appointed a Prime minister of Italy by the king. On September 29, 1943 he signed an armistice with the Supreme Commander of the Allied forces in Europe, Dwight Eisenhower. By signing this armistice, Italy became the first "chain" which came out of a fascist block, and the first object of the appliance of Allied strategy. On October 13, Badoglio on behalf of the Kingdom of Italy declared war against Nazi Germany. In exchange, Italy received a "co-belligerent" status from the Allies.

The "co-belligerency" became the first *precedent* in International relations. An absence of any clear *mechanism for implementation* of this type of relationship between the states caused additional complications between Italy and Allies. Initially it gave lots of hope to Italians striving to regain a "decent place for Italy in the European civilization."<sup>1</sup> Badoglio's government considered this status as "trampolining" to the ally status. At the same time, Italian missions abroad were very confused about this new status and could not find a logical explanation for it. The Italian ambassador in Madrid, G. Paulucci, appealed to the British ambassador S. Hoare to "explain the meaning of *co-belligerent* status

---

<sup>1</sup> I Documenti Diplomatici Italiani (DDI). 10 ser., Vol. I, Doc. 3. Il Presidente Degli Stati Uniti D'America, Roosevelt, E Il Primo Ministro Di Gan Bretagna, Churchill, Al Capo Del Governo, Badoglio. 10 Settembre, 1943 (Roma: Libreria dello Stato, 1992), 4.

and to list all the advantages, which Italy could gain as a result.”<sup>2</sup> Moreover, he asked for an official confirmation of the “juridical recognition of the Badoglio government by the Allies. Paulucci explained his request as being necessary to prevent the Salo Republic diplomat mission being recognized as an official Italian representation by the Spanish government.”<sup>3</sup>

The Foreign Office did not hurry to fulfill his requests. An absence of the additional official confirmation of the Badoglio government recognition was explained as unnecessary. S. Hoare considered that the fact the Allies signed an armistice with the Badoglio government *by itself* was enough to show the legitimacy of the Italian government, and did not need any additional supportive proof for governments of other states.<sup>4</sup> \*\*

At the same time, Western allies also did not show their intention to upgrade the status of their relations with Italy and stressed several times that “co-belligerent” status did not provide any privileges by itself. One of the statements made in the House of Lords that later became public did not provide much enthusiasm to “co-belligerent” Italians: “The Declaration of war by Italy to Germany *does not* change an attitude of allies to the first one...until the peace treaty between the UK and Italy is signed these two states will continue to stay in a state of war...”<sup>5</sup> That idea found a reflection in a more veiled way in the official memorandum to the Badoglio government on October 18, 1943: “Co-belligerent relationships between the government of Italy and the government of the United Nations can not change the recently signed conditions of armistice by itself. These conditions should be fulfilled until Allies make a decision to change them. What can influence the Allies to change them is a considerable contribution of Italy into fight with Germany.”<sup>6</sup> An idea “to attract all the anti-fascists forces to the new Italian government” had also been mentioned in memorandum. Thus, the upgrading of the political status of Italy became dependent on two key factors: Italy’s assistance in the war, and representativeness of the government.

---

<sup>2</sup> Public Record Office (PRO), F.O. 371/37335, R 10677/8648/22. Relations between British and Italian Embassies at Madrid. From Madrid to F.O. from Sir S. Hoare, N 1817, October 17, 1943.

<sup>3</sup> PRO, F.O. 371/37335, R 11133/8648/22. Request for a Public Statement by His Majesty’s Government Recognizing the Badoglio Government. From Madrid to F.O. from Sir S. Hoare, N 1886, November 2, 1943.

<sup>4</sup> PRO, F.O. 371/37335, R 11133/8648/22. Request for a Public Statement by His Majesty’s Government Recognizing the Badoglio Government. From Madrid to F.O. from Sir S. Hoare, N 1667, November 11, 1943.

<sup>5</sup> N. Kogan, *Italy and the Allies*, (Cambridge, Harvard: Harvard University Press, 1956), 46.

<sup>6</sup> DDI. 10 ser. Vol.1. Doc 51. Il Vice Capo Della Missione Militare Alleata, Taylor Al Capo Del Governo, Badoglio. 18 Ottobre, 1943, 62.

It is very important to notice that the positions of two key actors in the European military theater, USA and UK, towards the Italian government and its potential enlargement differed considerably. The US State Department demanded immediate action pertaining to expanding the Italian government to include real anti-fascist representatives, even at the expense of the king and Badoglio dismissal. Roosevelt declared that "as long as Badoglio and the king were associated with the fascism, their mission after the signature of the armistice was over." According to Roosevelt's opinion, the opposition parties represented the real interest of the people.<sup>7</sup> At the same time, it is interesting to note that by referring to "opposition parties", Roosevelt meant only the "liberal wing" of the Committee of National liberation (not the left wing, which was considered being under the Soviet influence).<sup>8</sup>

The British Prime Minister, W. Churchill, and the Foreign Office stood on their position to keep Badoglio and the king, at least up to the time when all Italian people would have a chance to choose. They held firm this position based on the fact that the king and Badoglio always fulfilled their "co-belligerent" commitments and did not break the articles of the armistice. Secondly, Churchill and Eden worried that any radical change could become a threat to the Italian monarchy, which they considered as the only one real power capable of uniting all the forces to fight Germany. Moreover, any power change in Italy could negatively impact British control over Italy, and the implementation of the armistice articles.<sup>9</sup> UK's position could also be explained by its concerns for the British far-reaching strategic plans. First of all, Italy was considered to be as one of the bridgeheads for the allied troops advance to South-Eastern and Central Europe. The integrity of the British Empire and the safety of its communications in the post-war period depended greatly on control of the "Gibraltar-Malta-Suez" axis. According to the "Pax Britannica" model, Italy should have become a part of the British Mediterranean strategy and its "younger partner" in the support of peace in the European continent. The control over Italy should have helped Britain prevent the penetration of any potential competitors (first of all the USA) to the oil resources of the Middle East, through the Mediterranean. This should have also helped Britain organize a resistance to the possible strengthening of the Soviet influence on the Balkans. British ability to manage Italian policy was based on the armistice conditions and the loyalty of the Badoglio government. Badoglio, in his turn, felt this trend and showed his

---

<sup>7</sup> PRO, PREM, 3, 250/1 Roosevelt to Eisenhower, October 2, 1943.

<sup>8</sup> R. Ciuni, *L'Italia di Badoglio*, (Milano: Rizzoli, 1993), 246.

<sup>9</sup> PRO, PREM 3, 43/323. From Resident Minister's Office. Algiers to F.O. from Mr. Dixon. N 2200, November 1, 1943.



devotion to the British side. He realized that his "political survival" depended a tremendous amount on British support. Churchill stood on the idea of the king and the Badoglio government support. According to Churchill's opinion, any enlargement of the Italian government should be conducted through the inclusion of "democratic representatives" into the government, but not through its change.<sup>10</sup>

The idea of the "Italian government enlargement" got more radical interpretation in the USA. American approach was shared by leaders of the Italian antifascist parties. The demand of the "democratization of the government" and disagreement in implementation methods laid the prerequisites for the governmental crisis of November 6-10, 1943.

The return of Count Carlo Sforza from immigration to the USA to Italy became an important factor in the rise of the oppositional parties' activities (since Sforza was a very popular liberal figure among anti-fascists circles). The US State Department connected many hopes with Carlo Sforza, a leader who had the potential to unite all Italian democratic forces and impact political change.<sup>11</sup> Count Sforza was the minister for Foreign Affairs of Italy from 1920-1921, after which he was sent to Paris as an ambassador. After Mussolini came to power he was always in opposition to his regime and left the country in 1927. He lived in Belgium and France and then immigrated to the US in 1940. Being a strong opponent of fascism and monarchy, Sforza became very popular among Americans of Italian origin.<sup>12</sup> In British political circles, the candidature of Sforza did not create the same enthusiasm. That could first of all be explained by Sforza's anti-monarchical spirit and negative attitude towards Badoglio. The representative of the Foreign Office in Italy, Oliver Harvey, wrote in his diary: "Sforza is none other than an intriguer, who would never act in our (British) interests".<sup>13</sup> In the beginning, it was not by chance that British officials denied to issue a permission for Sforza to enter the Italian territory. However, Britain had to pursue the officially adopted allies' policy of "non-interference to the internal political affairs of Italy," and had to cancel the veto regarding his return to Italy. But British officials agreed, on the condition that Sforza had to pay a visit to London prior to his Italian trip and provide guarantees of his loyalty to the king, Badoglio, and to the British government.<sup>14</sup> Finally Count Sforza did his

---

<sup>10</sup> PRO, PREM 3, 43/323. From Resident Minister's Office. Algiers to F.O. from Mr. Dixon. N 2200, November 1, 1943.

<sup>11</sup> G. Bottai, *Diario 1935-1944*, (Milano: Rizzoli, 1982), 481.

<sup>12</sup> L. Woodward, *British Foreign Policy in the Second World War. Vol. II*, (L.: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1971), 508.

<sup>13</sup> *The War Diaries of Oliver Harvey*, S. Harvey ed., (L.: Collins, 1978), 303.

<sup>14</sup> Weekly Political Intelligence Summaries. July-December, 1943. N 22. October 20, 1943. (16431) [W14686/351/150], (Munchen: Kraus International Publications, 1986).

best to confirm to Churchill that he “would do everything possible to support the king and Badoglio, because it is not proper timing now to satisfy political ambitions.”<sup>15</sup>

In reality, Sforza had no intention of being faithful to his promises. He felt very strong support among anti-fascist democratic circles, in particular, among the Neapolitan liberals (headed by Benedetto Croce) and counted on rapid global changes in Italy. Upon his arrival to Naples, Sforza met with the minister of the House of Savoy – Duke Akvarone, whom, on behalf of the king, offered Sforza the opportunity to join the Badoglio government and accept a post of the Minister for Foreign Affairs, and to become Vice-President of the Council. But Sforza denied this offer. He made it clear that he would join the government only on the condition of the Italian king abdication in favor of his six-year old grandson, Victor Emmanuel, Prince of Naples.<sup>16</sup> This idea was subsequently supported by all leaders of the Committee of National Liberation – Casati, De Gasperi, Nenni, Marcesi and Lussu.<sup>17</sup>

On November 1 in Naples, Sforza repeated the same conditions during a meeting with Prime Minister Badoglio, whom arrived to Naples with the goal of enlarging the existing government. Sforza also mentioned that he could see Badoglio as a regent to the Crown Prince, after the abdication of the king. Badoglio tried to convince Sforza that he (Badoglio) could not influence the king to abdicate, only the Italian people had right to decide the constitutional question, which would be possible only after the entire country was finally liberated. Badoglio also decided to ask for support from B. Croce and the leader of the Italian Christian Democratic party, Giulio Rodino. However, they declared that their sympathies were on Sforza's side. Moreover, Croce stressed that the six parties of the “United Front” also insisted on the king's abdication. Such an uneasy situation stumped Badoglio. The only solution he envisioned was to get back to Brindisi and report to the king that he had failed the task of forming a new government and offer his resignation as head of the government.<sup>18</sup> That was exactly what Badoglio did upon his return to Brindisi.

That moment could be considered as the conditional beginning of the governmental crisis, which was multi-sided in character. From the one side, it was provoked by C. Sforza and B. Croce, both whom declined the invitation to

---

<sup>15</sup> PRO, CAB 65/48. W.M. (44) 162<sup>nd</sup> Conclusions Confidential Annex, December 7, 1944.

<sup>16</sup> P. Cacace, *Venti anni di politica estera Italiana (1943-1963)* (Roma: Bonacci, 1986), 28

<sup>17</sup> DDI. 10 ser., Vol. I., Doc.58. Il Primo Segretario Di Legazione Venturim Al Capo Del Governo, Badoglio. 23 Ottobre, 1943, 70.

<sup>18</sup> P. Badoglio, *Italy in the Second World War*, (L., N.Y., Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1948), 109.

participate in the government until abdication of the king. Since they were the most influential figures among the anti-fascist circles, new government without them did not make any sense. From the other side, Victor Emmanuel refused to transmit his powers to anyone and did not accept Badoglio's resignation. As for the king, Badoglio was the most acceptable figure as prime minister and served as a guarantee of the king's prerogatives protection. Accordingly, the governmental crisis could be solved in two ways: through the king's abdication in his grandson's favor, resignation of Badoglio and formation of the new government with Sforza or Croce at the head of; or preservation of monarchy with Victor Emmanuel III and Badoglio as a head of the new, but not enlarged government, supported by the allies.<sup>19</sup>

Churchill was not interested in the development of the first scenario at all. To prevent this outcome, Churchill sent a letter to Roosevelt on November 10, 1943, in which he expressed his feelings about the governmental crisis in Italy and non-support of possible political changes there.<sup>20</sup> Three days prior to writing this letter, Churchill informed the War Cabinet that despite of his support of the decision of non-interference to the Italian internal affairs, he would influence on the solution of the "governmental question" in Italy. He declared he would strongly resist any attempts to enlarge the government before the liberation of Rome.<sup>21</sup>

The principal moment in the Roosevelt – Churchill withstanding was that General Eisenhower supported Churchill's position. Eisenhower considered that the king's abdication in favor of his grandson, and setting up regency, would cause dire consequences, including a negative reaction from the Italian army (which swore allegiance to the king) and more importantly, the Italian fleet. Another argument in favor of supporting the Churchill plan was that Italian diplomatic missions abroad would be very confused receiving the news about such changes.<sup>22</sup> Eisenhower greatly influenced Roosevelt's thinking, and he agreed to keep status-quo in Italy until the liberation of Rome. Nevertheless, Roosevelt communicated to Churchill that he "did not understand why the Allies should hesitate in supporting the government formed by six anti-fascists parties. American public opinion would condemn such a long tolerance of the Allies and their obvious support of Victor Emmanuel".<sup>23</sup>

---

<sup>19</sup> PRO, PREM 43/388. To P.M. from A. Cadogan, November 5, 1943.

<sup>20</sup> PRO, PREM 43/388. From P.M. to Roosevelt. N. 499, November 10, 1943.

<sup>21</sup> PRO, CAB 65/36 Minutes of War Cabinet, November 7, 1943.

<sup>22</sup> PRO, PREM 43/388. To P.M. from A. Cadogan, November 3, 1943.

<sup>23</sup> R. Katz, *The Fall of the House of Savoy*, (L.: Macmillan, 1971), 366.

It is also interesting to note, the possibility of the governmental crisis resolution was given not so much by the Allied support, but by the internal contradictions in the Committee of National Liberation. Despite Rodino's declaration (regarding the united position of all regional political groups, which were in opposition to the king), this unity was illusory. The two powerful groups, Rome (led by Ivanoe Bonomi) and Neapolitan (with C. Sforza and B. Croce) had very difficult relationships. The reason being, they were competing for absolute power. I. Bonomi did not like C. Sforza, and would have more willingly supported the king than allow Sforza to become prime minister.<sup>24</sup> This attitude was proven by the letter, which Bonomi had sent to the king. In his letter, Bonomi confirmed that he was willing to participate in the government under the king, but at present moment he could not escape from Rome (which was occupied by Germans) to Brindisi. He also reassured the king that he was familiar with many politicians in Rome, all whom shared the same attitude. Bonomi advanced two acceptable conditions for the Badoglio government support: democratization of the government after Rome liberation and a solution of the constitutional issue on public referendum after the liberation of all Italy.<sup>25</sup> Such support entirely suited British interests and provided for the development of the situation in favor of the king and Badoglio.

British and American Public opinion did not approve the support of the Italian king and Badoglio by their governments. In particular, this was debated broadly in the House of Commons. Several times parliamentarians expressed their perplexity by the support of Badoglio and especially the king, "who had not been bringing anything but slavery and poverty for twenty years", support. They also asked the question: "How many British and American soldiers lives should we sacrifice because of the Italian king support?"<sup>26</sup>

On November 11, Badoglio formed a new cabinet which included non-party technocrats and experts, and thus governmental crisis was overcome. But that provided only a temporary solution to the problem. The government practically included three ministers: Minister for Foreign Affairs – P. Badoglio, Minister of Navy – R. De Corten, Minister of Air force – R. Sandali and so-called "deputy ministers." The first session of the new cabinet was conducted on November 28, 1943, where the "Action Program" was developed. The program envisaged the abolition of fascism and its laws, persecution of the fascist's leaders and restoration of the rights of those who suffered from

---

<sup>24</sup> H. Macmillan, *War Diaries. Politics and War in the Mediterranean*, (L., 1984), 283.

<sup>25</sup> PRO, PREM 43/323. From Resident Minister, Algiers to F.O. N 2218, November 3, 1943.

<sup>26</sup> Parliamentary Debates. House of Commons. 5<sup>th</sup> ser. Vol. 397; Vol. III of Session 1943-1944, (L., 1944), 915.

fascism.<sup>27</sup> At the same time, the program did not contain any concrete constructive suggestions. Incompetence of the government had been covering by declarations that the “internal affairs of Italy should temporarily be suspended in order to focus on liberating the entire country from the Germans”.<sup>28</sup>

The new Italian government was controlled by the Allied Control Commission, which was officially established on November 11, 1943. American General K. A. Joyce was appointed as president of the Commission. The Commission included four subdivisions: military, political, economic and administrative, which controlled the according offices of the Italian government.<sup>29</sup> But even that did not help much. C. Sforza intensified his anti-monarchical activity and attacks on Badoglio. Moreover, the CNL leaders proclaimed that they “would not give any support to the Badoglio government and reject any forms of cooperation with it”.<sup>30</sup> By the beginning of 1944 political drama escalated greatly. Constantly revealing government incompetence, and the fall of the king’s authority from the one side, and growing oppositional activity of the Committee of National Liberation parties from the other, catalyzed political changes. Finally, the question of power was solved in the CNL’s favor. \*\*\*

On April 21, representatives from the six CNL parties were included in the new Badoglio government, on the condition that Victor Emmanuel would transmit his powers to his son – Umberto, right after the liberation of Rome. That’s exactly what happened in June of 1944. Moreover the coalitional government refused to work under Badoglio and he was replaced by I. Bonomi. Badoglio’s dismissal caused very negative reactions in British political circles. W Churchill, in his letter to Stalin, wrote: “We have lost the only one competent person (Badoglio) whom we were dealing with and who had to serve our interests”.<sup>31</sup> Such change meant the weakening of the British political influence within Italy, and became a threat to its strategic plans.

#### Notes:

---

<sup>27</sup> Review of the Foreign Press. 1939-1945. Series A. Vol. IX. Enemy Countries. Politics in Southern Italy. N. 152, (Munchen: Kraus International Publications, 1980).

<sup>28</sup> DDI, 10 ser., Vol. I. Doc. 127. Il Capo Del Governo, Badoglio Al Presidente Degli Stati Uniti D’America, Roosevelt. 27 Gennaio, 1944, 159.

<sup>29</sup> Weekly Political Intelligence Summaries. July-December, 1943. N 215. November 17, 1943 (16442) [w 15964/351/50]

<sup>30</sup> P. Cacace, Venti anni di politica estera Italiana, (1943-1963) (Roma: Bonacci, 1986), 29.

<sup>31</sup> Perepiska Predsedatelya Soveta Ministrov SSSR s prezidentami USA i premier – ministrami Velikobritanii vo vremya Velikoy Otechestvennoy voyni, 1941-1945, Vol. I., # 278, (Moscow: Politicheskaya literatura, 1976), 270.

\*After Mussolini's arrest on July 25, he was rescued soon by the Germans. Adolf Hitler then ordered him to form a new fascist state; otherwise Italy would be treated as an enemy. Mussolini obliged, and the Italian Social Republic was proclaimed on September 23. Since that time, there technically emerged two Italian states: one with the capital in Brindisi, the Badoglio government and the king, and the second at Salò on Lake Garda headed by il Duce. Both claimed to represent the interests of all Italian people(s). In this article by "Italy," I define the liberated Southern part of Italy with Brindisi as a provisional capital.

\*\* According to the Foreign Office opinion, Italian diplomatic missions abroad should not be afraid of the competition from the Salò Republic representations. While studying multiple independent sources, the officers from the F.O. came to the conclusion that the Mussolini government, formed on the North of Italy, was used by the Germans only as a puppet and was thus hated by all Italians. Allies, in contradistinction, demonstrated their respect to the government of the South kingdom and "co-belligerent" status gave them more weight and more authority among Italian people, emphasizing its legitimacy (PRO, FO 371/37335, R 11133/8648/22 Request for a Public Statement by His Majesty's Government Recognizing the Badoglio Government. From Madrid to F.O. from Sir S. Hoare, N 1610. October 24, 1943). However, this argument is not persuasive enough; it seems more emotional than legitimate. From a legal point of view, for the neutral states especially, the government of Salò republic could have introduced the interests of all Italian people, equally with the Badoglio government.

\*\*\* CNL changed its tough position of "non-cooperation with Badoglio government after the Italian Communist Party Conference in Salerno on March 30, 1944. During this conference the Communist party leader, Palmiro Togliatti, proclaimed that the first task for the all anti-fascist forces was to defeat Germany, and that all the other party ambitions should yield to this end. According to his opinion, the Communist Party should have cooperated with the Badoglio government and the monarchical question could have been solved after the war (H. Macmillan, *War Diaries: Politics and War in the Mediterranean*, (L.: Macmillan Press, 1984), 383). To avoid the split of the CNL, other CNL parties decided to participate in the Badoglio government on the conditions of adopting the king's plan. According to this plan, the king would have to agree on abdication, and Umberto be appointment as a regent with all the powers, after the liberation of Rome. Actually, CNL leaders demanded that these changes should happen not after the Rome liberation, but immediately (M. Gat, *Britain and Italy, 1943-1949*, (Brighton: Sussex Academic Press, 1996), 64).

# **The Last Will and Testament of A Spanish Borderlands Woman: Luisa Gertrudis de la Rúa and Her 1820 Will**

*Amy M. Porter*  
*Georgia Southwestern State University*

In 1820, Luisa Gertrudis de la Rúa recorded her last will and testament in the Spanish city of San Antonio de Béxar in present-day Texas. Like many Spanish borderlands women, Gertrudis de la Rúa followed Spanish testamentary law in declaring her property and determining her heirs. She was a fairly wealthy woman, although she had limited access to cash, and she had much property to protect and pass on to her heirs. Unlike most borderlands women, Gertrudis de la Rúa revealed that her first husband died in a shipwreck off of the coast of Tampico, making her property and testamentary situation complicated. Luisa Gertrudis de la Rúa was originally from Pensacola in Spanish Florida, but she later moved to San Antonio.<sup>1</sup> In some ways her life as revealed in her last will and testament reflected the fact that Spanish borderlands women had extraordinary protections under Spanish law, yet her will also shows that women were limited in their access to public life, even in matters related to their property.

Luisa Gertrudis de la Rúa took advantage of Spanish laws which gave women the right to own property and write wills. Many women in the Spanish colonies of the present-day United States recorded last wills and testaments. These women were often wealthy and recorded wills to protect their property, but some women testators were poor. Under Spanish law, married women could own property.<sup>2</sup> Many women brought dowries into marriages, and while their husbands could use the property, the husband could not sell it without the consent of his wife. The dowry remained the wife's property to pass on to her

---

<sup>1</sup> Bexar County Archives (BCA), WE 98, 6/25/1820, Luisa Gertrudis de la Rúa. This paper will include comparisons with wills from the Bexar Archives and Bexar County Archives housed in San Antonio, Texas. There are forty-seven wills written by men and thirty-two written by women during this period.

<sup>2</sup> Silvia Marina Arrom, *The Women of Mexico City, 1790-1857* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1985), 66-8.

heirs.<sup>3</sup> Also, Spanish law allowed for community property. This meant that all property earned during a marriage belonged equally to husband and wife.<sup>4</sup> Finally, all children, sons and daughters, inherited their parents' property in fairly equal amounts under Spanish law. No one child could inherit more than one-fifth to one-third of the estate.<sup>5</sup>

All of these property laws are remarkable when compared to the property laws in the nearby British colonies. British law, which was not based upon Roman law as Spanish law was, said that when a woman married she lost her separate legal standing and became a covered woman or a *femme covert*. With such status, women could not own property in marriage; their husbands owned all of the property. This meant that women generally did not write wills in the British colonies. Also, widows did not truly receive any of their husband's property. When a woman was widowed she received dower rights, which said that she would receive one-third of her husband's estate upon which to live. She could not sell the estate. Once she died, the estate would pass on to the heirs determined by her husband.<sup>6</sup> Clearly Spanish property laws allowed women to maintain control over property, especially in comparison to British law.

The Dutch colony of New Netherlands, later called New York, provides a better comparison to the Spanish colonies. Dutch law included community property laws, and often married couples wrote their wills together. While it is unclear if the husband had more say in the composition of the will than the wife, the mutual will suggests that the spouses conceived of their property as shared. Also, women could write wills to disperse their half of the community property. Once the British invaded New Netherlands and renamed it New York, the Dutch residents slowly assumed elements of British law. By the 1750s, the writing of mutual wills had waned.<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> Asunción Lavrin and Edith Couturier, "Dowries and Wills: A View of Women's Socioeconomic Role in Colonial Guadalajara and Puebla, 1640-1790," *Hispanic American Historical Review* 59 (May 1979): 282-3, 293; Arrom, *The Women of Mexico City*, 145.

<sup>4</sup> Lavrin and Couturier, "Dowries and Wills," 299-300; Rosalind Rock, "'Pido y Suplico': Women and the Law in Spanish New Mexico, 1667-1763," *New Mexico Historical Review* 65 (April 1990):150.

<sup>5</sup> Edith Couturier, "Women and the Family in Eighteenth-Century Mexico: Law and Practice," *Journal of Family History* 10 (Fall 1985), 296.

<sup>6</sup> Carole Shammas, Marylynn Salmon, Michel Dahlin, *Inheritance in America from Colonial Times to the Present* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1987), 24-5.

<sup>7</sup> David E. Narrett, *Inheritance and Family Life in Colonial New York City* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1992), 12-14, 42, 45, 51, 68, 83, 94.



Luisa Gertrudis de la Rúa took advantage of the Spanish laws and wrote her last will and testament. She detailed her marriages as is typical in wills. Her first marriage was to Francisco de la Rosa, who died in the shipwreck. She had two children in this marriage. It was common for borderlands women to experience widowhood. For example in San Antonio, almost 85% of women who wrote wills between 1750 and 1846 had been widowed at least once.<sup>8</sup> It was also common for borderlands women to remarry once widowed. Gertrudis de la Rúa later remarried a man named Mariano Miguel López. With López, she had three children. Gertrudis de la Rúa was careful to name her children and to name their fathers, as the children from her first marriage would be entitled to the community property that she gained from her first marriage, and the children of the second marriage would be entitled to her share of the community property from the second marriage.

As to the property, Gertrudis de la Rúa's first husband was a very wealthy man. She noted that he had thousands of pesos in the treasuries in New Orleans and Saltillo. She also noted that she and her spouse did not earn any new property in her first marriage. Here, she was saying that she did not have a claim to community property from the first marriage, yet later she did claim capital that was earned from the money that the first husband had invested in the Royal Treasuries. She did mention moveable goods and slaves as property from her first marriage that she brought into her second marriage. She wrote:

And I declare that of the household goods, jewelry, and slaves that I brought into the second marriage I sold two slaves, one male and one female, twenty-four place settings of silver, twenty small silver spoons, a diamond worth 600 pesos, two silver spoons, a gold pin worth 100 pesos, a mahogany bed frame... The diamond that I sold for 600 pesos was sold by my husband Don Mariano López, and the rest was sold by me for my maintenance and the maintenance of my family as I do not have any other things that I can make for us.<sup>9</sup>

This section of Gertrudis de la Rúa's will reveals a great deal. First, she had a thorough understanding of Spanish property laws, and this was typical of borderlands women who wrote wills. It is unclear whether these women learned of the laws from the notaries who were transcribing the wills or from other relatives who passed on the knowledge.

---

<sup>8</sup> San Antonio will sample.

<sup>9</sup> This is my translation of the original will. See Bexar County Archives (BCA), WE 98, 6/25/1820, Luisa Gertrudis de la Rúa.

Second, Gertrudis de la Rúa was a wealthy woman. She owned two slaves and had recently sold two additional slaves. Slaveholding was not unheard of in San Antonio, but it was more common among settlers in Florida from which Gertrudis de la Rúa originally came. As to the remainder of her property, she also owned many luxury goods, including some jewelry. Yet, in this discussion, Gertrudis de la Rúa reveals that she had to sell some items, including two slaves and a diamond. She noted that she had no other means of taking care of her family. Here we see the limitations placed upon a woman in Spanish borderlands society.

Also, she noted that her husband sold the diamond for her. While women had the right to buy and sell property, many women had men act on their behalf as Gertrudis de la Rúa did. In another instance, Gertrudis de la Rúa's second husband filed the papers for her to recover the money earned from her first husband's investments. Again, while she had the legal right to this property, she found it easier to have her husband act on her behalf. Thus, while Gertrudis de la Rúa exercised her rights under the law, she had her husband speak for her rights on two important occasions. This is typical of borderlands women who often had male family members help them in court, with contracts, or other legal proceedings. Thus while Spanish law protected women's rights to own property, there were limitations on women's ability to protect or claim these rights. Also, while Gertrudis de la Rúa appeared to be a wealthy woman solely based upon her property listings, she did not have easy access to cash. Her wealth was tied up in property and debts she was trying to recover.

Just before her will cuts off, Gertrudis de la Rúa reveals several debts that men owed her and her husband. A priest owed her husband 1,000 pesos, and another man owed her 3,000 pesos. She listed these sums in her will so that her heirs could continue to try to collect those debts for her estate. Because of her earlier note that she had to sell some of her personal property for money with which to care for her family, Gertrudis de la Rúa appears to have been cash poor. While all of this money was due to her, she had a hard time collecting the money, and this situation was common in many wills. Much commerce in the borderlands was conducted based upon credit, and men's and women's wills commonly listed such debts.<sup>10</sup>

In other sections of her will, Gertrudis de la Rúa follows standard form. She begins with the prayer, "In the name of the Holy Trinity, Father, Son, and

---

<sup>10</sup> Jesús F. de la Teja, *San Antonio de Béxar: A Community on New Spain's Northern Frontier* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1995), 119; See also Ross Frank, *From Settler to Citizen: New Mexican Economic Development and the Creation of Vecino Society, 1750-1820* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000), 139-140.

Holy Spirit, three distinct persons, but one true God. Amen.<sup>11</sup>” She then continues with her procession of her faith as a Christian and asks that Mary, Joseph, her guardian angel, her name saints, and the saints of her devotion intercede on her behalf. Her will then continues with a request to be buried in a cemetery and shrouded in the habit of Saint Francis. She then notes:

Also, I declare that after my death, I shall give one peso to each of the mandatory bequests, one time only, and twenty-five pesos for the widows and orphans from the present war according to the Royal Decree on this issue.<sup>12</sup>

Most of these requests were fairly standard for the time and place. Testators chose their burial place. While testators from earlier periods usually requested to be buried inside churches, laws had changed for public health reasons requiring people to be buried in cemeteries. Nonetheless, some testators continued to request church burials, though Gertrudis de la Rúa did not.<sup>13</sup> Some like, Gertrudis de la Rúa, were members of the third order of Saint Francis and requested to be buried in a plain habit as Saint Francis wore. The mandatory bequests were donations to charitable causes. Testators always left money for the mandatory bequests. The newest bequest was to help out orphans and widows resulting from the Napoleonic wars.<sup>14</sup> This section of Gertrudis de la Rúa’s will is typical of borderlands wills and reveals the spiritual importance of leaving behind a last will and testament.

Much of Gertrudis de la Rúa’s will was typical of borderlands women’s wills from San Antonio de Béxar during the same period. She used routine testamentary form and language. She listed her husbands, children, burial place,

---

<sup>11</sup> BCA, WE 98, 6/25/1820, Luisa Gertrudis de la Rúa.

<sup>12</sup> Again, this is my translation of the original will. See Bexar County Archives (BCA), WE 98, 6/25/1820, Luisa Gertrudis de la Rúa.

<sup>13</sup> Martina Will explains these laws in her work and also finds that most people in New Mexico continued to request church burials after the new laws were passed. See Martina Elaine Will, “God Gives and God Takes Away: Death and Dying in New Mexico, 1760-1850,” Ph.D. dissertation (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico, 2000): 185, 193, 197, 221, 239. In San Antonio, more so than in New Mexico and Saltillo, testators in the early 1800s requested cemetery burials. See Amy Meschke, “Women’s Lives through Women’s Wills in the Spanish and Mexican Borderlands, 1750-1846,” Ph.D. dissertation (Dallas: Southern Methodist University 2004): 64.

<sup>14</sup> The mandatory bequests included the canonization of Felipe de Jesús, the beatification of father Gregorio López, the bishop Palafox and fray Sebastián de Aparicio, the liberation of Jerusalem’s holy sites, and the Virgin of Guadalupe. In 1785, the López beatification was no longer included, and by 1806, the only bequests remaining were for the Virgin of Guadalupe, the liberation of Jerusalem, and one to provide dowries for orphans and poor women of the Napoleonic wars. Will, “God Gives and God Takes Away,” 84.

religious devotions, property, and debts. What is somewhat atypical for a San Antonio woman was the ownership of slaves. There were a few San Antonio women who owned slaves, but they usually included provisions in their wills to free their slaves. Gertrudis de la Rúa did not include such provisions. Five women's wills in San Antonio between the years 1750 and 1846 noted that the testators owned black slaves, but four of these women demanded emancipation of their slaves. For example, María Ygnacia Nuñez Morillo, who wrote her will in 1800, freed her slave Anastacia, but left her in the care of Nuñez Morillo's son until Anastacia married.<sup>15</sup> Only two men in San Antonio during the same period noted that they owned slaves, and neither of these men made provisions to free their slaves.<sup>16</sup> In Florida, it was not uncommon for owners to free slaves, and slaves could earn and save money to buy their freedom in a process called *coartación*.<sup>17</sup>

Another unusual aspect of this will is Gertrudis de la Rúa's movement from Florida to Texas. Many San Antonio women had connections to other parts of the Spanish or Mexican empire, but these connections were usually to Saltillo or other bordering parts of Coahuila. Gertrudis de la Rúa had connections to Pensacola and Louisiana as well as Saltillo. Her first husband's travels and wealth brought them connections with other areas of the borderlands. Yet, Gertrudis de la Rúa wrote her will later in life in a situation typical of other San Antonio women. She was sick, cash poor, trying to recover debts, and had her current husband help her with her financial situation. Thus, Luisa Gertrudis de la Rúa's will illustrates the power that women had under Spanish law as well as the limits to this power in everyday life.

---

<sup>15</sup> BCA, WE 71, 9/12/1800, María Ygnacia Nuñez Morillo.

<sup>16</sup> BCA, WE 37, 1/8/1822, José Félix Estrada; BCA, WE 119, 5/19/1800, Antonio Gil Ybarvo.

<sup>17</sup> Jane Landers, *Black Society in Spanish Florida* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1999), 94-95, 139-144.

## **Mercenaries of the Angevin Empire: Reputations and Royal Power**

*Andrew Rice*  
*Florida Gulf Coast University*

A recurring idea throughout the medieval period was the struggle between the power of a centralizing monarch and the landed aristocracy. The balance achieved varied from region to region and even monarch to monarch, but there were some factors in the struggle that most often benefited the side of royal power. In the Angevin Empire, cobbled together from the hereditary claims and other acquisitions of the Counts of Anjou, particularly the kingship of England, one of the most striking factors in favor of the monarchy was the ready availability of paid military forces, or mercenaries.

Mercenaries have typically suffered from a rather dark reputation though, largely because of the way various medieval chroniclers have portrayed them. Even the blanket term used often by those chroniclers to describe bands of paid soldiers, *routiers*, means ravagers.<sup>1</sup> Mercenaries are certainly not completely innocent of the charges, and princes employed the majority of mercenary forces with the intent of unleashing them on enemy territory. And therein lies the core of the issue, the princes of noble origins were the ones dictating the course of warfare in the medieval period, and that course more often turned to ravaging and sieges than it did to set piece battles. The direction of the prince employing mercenaries had a much greater influence on the way they were perceived than did their innate qualities and behavior. The practice of ravaging, so condemned by the Church and other commentators, was simply the normal strategy of warfare, used by everyone from the noblest of knights to the lowliest of hirelings.

Mercenaries were not uncontrollable hordes ravaging the countryside, but rather they often acted as highly effective tools of the king in his attempts to exercise royal authority. The rather piecemeal construction of the Angevin political structure meant that the lines of power and loyalty were often quite convoluted, and that the royal will was often difficult to exercise as the monarch saw fit. Henry II, Richard I, and especially John Lackland all had major issues with exerting their royal will within their territories, and it was a problem

---

<sup>1</sup> John France, *Western Warfare in the Age of the Crusades: 1000-1300* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1999), 70.

compounded by the fact that the Angevin royal family itself owed homage to the French Crown for nearly all of their continental possessions.

The Angevins were more powerful and in command of greater wealth than the Capetian kings of France, and it was an unending source of tension for both parties which led to countless internal problems within the Angevin holdings. The Capetians applied nearly constant pressure to the Angevin territories throughout the reigns of Louis VII and Philip Augustus in an effort to regain their dominant position as the lords of France, which hugely exacerbated the internal disunity within the Angevin territories. All of these factors meant that the Angevins were often plagued with vassals who were loyal one day and in league with the Capetians the next. Henry II was even unfortunate enough to have his own sons turned against him by the wiles of Philip Augustus.

Ironically, mercenaries could be far more dependable tools for exerting royal authority for the Angevin kings than even members of their own family proved to be, and they could certainly be far more reliable than the barons of the Angevin Empire caught between two giants struggling for dominance. Changing sides was a way of life for many barons of the twelfth and early thirteenth centuries, and this was especially true of the barons in the strategic territories on the border between Angevin and Capetian lands. Mercenaries provided forces that the kings could depend on because they were largely unconnected with the frustratingly intricate web of alliances and loyalty, which was a way of life for Angevin barons. Mercenaries in the medieval period caused no more pain and suffering than any army levied by conventional means would have, and their usefulness to the Angevin Crown in the face of disloyal vassals and foreign threats made them indispensable regardless of how they were viewed.

### **The Angevin System**

The Angevin kings were all operating within a similar system of privileges and restraints; it is necessary to understand that system before an effective assessment can be made of mercenaries in the Angevin period. The most significant aspect of the Angevin empire that directly contributed to the evolution of royal power was taxation, especially in England. The feudal system allowed overlords to extract resources from their subjects, and the greatest overlord was of course the king. One of the best advantages the Angevins had was the highly developed administration of their royal seat of England.<sup>2</sup> When Henry II became King of England there was already a reasonably effective system in place thanks to the efforts of earlier monarchs such as Henry I. Henry

---

<sup>2</sup> John Gillingham, *Richard I* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1999), 38.

II would take steps to improve it throughout his reign, as would his successors.<sup>3</sup> The system of taxation would become so advanced that by 1282 Edward I felt confident that he could raise an entire army exclusively from mercenaries for a campaign against the Welsh, something that would have undoubtedly been extremely expensive.<sup>4</sup>

The expenses of maintaining the royal court were certainly significant, however the real purpose for the ever-improving system of taxation was to finance military endeavors. Traditionally, armies were built around knights serving at their own expense for forty days, and those knights were supported by infantry levied from the general population. The infantry was provided for but not meaningfully compensated.<sup>5</sup> This system became increasingly impractical for reasons that will be elaborated on later however, and princes increasingly preferred money from their subjects in lieu of or in addition to personal service.

This money was referred to as scutage, and was essentially collected as a tax on the knightly class and higher nobility. The Angevin monarchs would raise vast sums through scutage to finance the nearly constant warfare of the period. Quite early in his reign, Henry II employed the practice in England. The chronicler Gervase of Canterbury records the first collection of scutage in England by Henry in 1159, which raised a total amount of 180,000 pounds of silver.<sup>6</sup> Both Richard and John used scutage to finance their campaigns, and the Pipe Rolls of 1195 clearly record the scutage levied by Richard on all knight fiefs in the realm.<sup>7</sup> By the twelfth century, scutage had become a regular tax in England, and reflected the increasing desire of the monarchy to rely on paid mercenary forces over conventional feudal levies.<sup>8</sup>

The uniting thread in all of the administrative advances is the desire of the Angevin kings to centralize power. Henry, Richard, and John all sought to extract as much money as they could from their domains, and they used similar practices, such as scutage, to do it. The continuity of royal desire is most evident in the document written in direct opposition to the centralizing aspirations of the Angevins, the Magna Carta.<sup>9</sup> Even though the Magna Carta is most often associated with the reign of King John, multiple clauses in the document demonstrate the continuity of policies, and grievances against those

---

<sup>3</sup> France, *Western Warfare...*, 131.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>5</sup> Michael Prestwich, *Armies and Warfare in the Middle Ages: The English Experience* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1999), 58.

<sup>6</sup> "The Collection of Scutage: 1159-1195, The Internet Medieval Sourcebook, Fordham University, NY, <http://www.fordham.edu/halsall/source/scutage.html> (accessed October 29, 2008).

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>8</sup> France, *Western Warfare...*, 131.

<sup>9</sup> JAP Jones, *King John and Magna Carta* (London: Longman Group Ltd, 1971), 3.

policies, present in the reigns of all three Angevin kings. Specifically, clauses fifty-two, fifty-seven, and fifty-three all mention by name Henry and Richard.<sup>10</sup> Many other clauses may not mention Henry and Richard by name, however the practices they protest were not unique to the reign of John. Incidentally, many of those practices had to do with the raising of funds. The Angevin institutions started under Henry II allowed both Richard and John to raise funds on an entirely new scale relative to the earlier English kings, and they very commonly turned their substantial financial resources to the hiring of mercenaries.<sup>11</sup>

### Identifying Mercenaries

Chroniclers in the medieval period did not often use the term mercenary, as modern observers understand it, and thus the term cannot be as easily applied to military forces in the Angevin period as one might expect. Terms such as *routier* or *Brabanter*, or other names referring to place of origin, were much more widely employed because the word mercenary immediately brought to mind the idea of fighting for pay. Fighting for money was a common practice even in the higher social circles though, and chroniclers did not wish to offend potential patrons. Even crusaders commonly expected to be paid for various services performed at the behest of their social superiors.<sup>12</sup> A knight in the Angevin period would expect to be paid for his services beyond the required forty days, but he would still not necessarily be referred to as a mercenary because of his prestigious social status.<sup>13</sup> Their contemporaries did not consider such knights mercenaries, nor should modern observers, because the basis for their service was still the duty they owed to their lord.

The issue becomes further confused when the practice of money fiefs is considered. By endowing a knight with a guaranteed stipend for extended service, a king could essentially grant a knight the income of an estate without the granting of an actual title.<sup>14</sup> Contemporaries would have not viewed even this sort of arrangement negatively; however, it does begin to encroach on what can reasonably be seen as mercenary service. Where it crosses the line is when those knights were of foreign origin. The Angevin kings did not often employ money fiefs as a method of payment for their knights, but when they did, it was usually to pay knights from lands outside of Angevin control. King John relied

---

<sup>10</sup> Magna Carta, in *The High Middle Ages: 1000-1300*, ed. Bryce Lyon (Toronto, Ontario: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1964), 269.

<sup>11</sup> Prestwich, ...*The English Experience*, 150.

<sup>12</sup> France, *Western Warfare*, 73.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, 62.

<sup>14</sup> SD Church, *The Household Knights of King John* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1999), 77.



heavily on the knights in his personal service, and at any given time maintained around one hundred. Of those one hundred, only eleven are recorded as receiving money fiefs though, and nine of those eleven were knights from Flanders and other foreign territories.<sup>15</sup> The Angevin nobility would have viewed these knights negatively because of their transient nature, and it is perfectly reasonable to view them as mercenaries because that is how the Angevin elite would have seen them.<sup>16</sup>

The majority of mercenaries were not knights of course, and the mass of infantry supporting the mounted troops suffered most of the hardship of war. Mercenary forces of infantry often served as castle garrisons throughout the period. Baldwin of Hainaut hired over 3,000 mercenaries specifically for strengthening his castles during a conflict with the Count of Flanders, and the Angevin kings would have found them equally necessary to defend the castles dotting the long border with France.<sup>17</sup> John employed numerous small companies of crossbowmen to garrison strategic fortresses all across his realm, and hiring mercenaries often allowed the Angevin kings to gloss over tedious political complexities, which they would have had to deal with to raise feudal levies.<sup>18</sup> Such substantial forces were often easier to raise from mercenaries than they would have been from the general population simply because the mercenaries were actually willing to fight.<sup>19</sup>

Despite the difference in social status between knights and the infantry class, foreign origin again provides the clearest delineation between mercenary and conventional forces. The documents of the period clearly indicate the difference between foreign forces raised versus those raised domestically. Henry II's Dialogue of the Exchequer of 1171 addresses the reasons for scutage: saying it was levied when necessary "for the prince prefers to thrust into the vortex of war mercenary troops rather than domestic forces."<sup>20</sup> This demonstrates the difference seen by contemporaries between the two types of forces. It further demonstrates that, in contrast with knights, foreign mercenary forces of infantry might be looked on somewhat positively from a domestic perspective because it meant less of a burden on the common population. The Magna Carta further illuminates the fact that foreign origin was often synonymous with mercenary status. Clause fifty-one of the document specifically mentions "foreign born soldiers and crossbowmen" and demands

---

<sup>15</sup> Church, *The Household Knights...*, 79.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>17</sup> France, *Western Warfare...*, 60.

<sup>18</sup> Prestwich, *...The English Experience*, 152.

<sup>19</sup> France, *Western Warfare...*, 74.

<sup>20</sup> "The Collection of Scutage."

their removal from the realm.<sup>21</sup> Foreign forces of any variety were not seen in a positive light when they were used extensively inside the kingdom, but again the simple fact that they were foreign is at the forefront of their description. A reasonable definition to accept for mercenaries, whether they were infantry or cavalry, is foreign-born soldiers, speaking a foreign tongue, serving the Angevin crown.<sup>22</sup>

### The False Reputation of Mercenaries

Medieval chroniclers have often portrayed mercenaries as ravaging hordes bent on destruction. This portrayal, reflected in the usage of terms like *routier* and *coutereaux* to refer to mercenaries, does not bear scrutiny largely because of the personal background and inclinations of the chroniclers.<sup>23</sup> Canon Twenty-Seven of the Third Lateran Council issued in 1179 explicitly condemned and excommunicated mercenaries, and the chroniclers, in addition to largely being born to elite families, were nearly always ecclesiastically educated and employed.<sup>24</sup>

An actual examination of the practices of warfare in the Angevin period clearly indicates that the practices for which mercenaries were so staunchly condemned was simply the normal course of warfare. The *Gesta Stephani*, which records the reign of King Stephen of England (1135-1154), describes the rebellion of Bristol in some detail. The document describes forces comprised of "the people of Bristol" rampantly destroying neighboring territories within England.<sup>25</sup> The *Chronicle of Worcester* provides another example of domestic forces ravaging the lands of their opponents. In this case, the feudal levies of Miles of Gloucester captured the city of Worcester and then proceeded to ransack and burn the entire city. The army, described as "rabid and debauched," took those citizens who were not killed in the pillaging and led them away, coupled like dogs, into wretched captivity.<sup>26</sup> The nobles commanding the forces described in both of those examples had nothing close to the financial resources of the Angevin kings, and thus would have been unable to support large numbers of mercenaries. Yet the domestic forces they raised appear to have ravaged the lands of their opponents just as effectively as the paid mercenaries of the Angevin kings.

---

<sup>21</sup> Magna Carta, in *The High Middle Ages...*, 269.

<sup>22</sup> Gillingham, *Richard I*, 38.

<sup>23</sup> France, *Western Warfare* 70.

<sup>24</sup> The Third Lateran Council, in *Decrees of the Ecumenical Council*, ed. Norman P. Tanner.

<sup>25</sup> *Gesta Stephani*, "The Siege of Bristol and Other Matters," *De Res Militari* Collection, ed. KR Potter.

<sup>26</sup> John of Worcester, *Chronicle of Worcester*, "Siege of Worcester in 1139," *De Res Militari* Collection, ed. P McGurk.

Even the greatest icons of chivalric society and the leaders who directed the course of major warfare were often guilty of using ravaging as a strategy. Ravaging and siegecraft were preferred to the other potential methods of warfare because they were so much less risky than engaging in a pitched battle. Being defeated in a large battle often meant the total destruction of the losing army, and any ruler left without a force in the field had no sort of bargaining position in peace negotiations.<sup>27</sup> Philip of Flanders was a powerful noble during the time of Richard's reign who said "this is how war is begun: such is my advice, first lay waste to the land."<sup>28</sup>

The greatest knights and generals did just that. Henry II was engaged in one conflict or another for a significant portion of his reign, and yet he never fought a single pitched battle in his life. His son, Richard, widely considered the greatest general of the medieval period, never fought a single battle inside Europe, and only fought one major battle while on crusade.<sup>29</sup> The *Chanson de Lorrains* is contemporaneous with Richard's majority, and describes how Richard might have organized his army to advance through territory held by his opponents. Though Richard usually had mercenaries in his army, it would have been his plan that they were carrying out. At the forefront of any well-led force were the scouts and the incendiaries, followed closely by the foragers. According to the document, "the incendiaries set the villages on fire and the foragers visit and sack them. The terrified inhabitants are either burned or led away with their hands tied behind their backs...Peasants and shepherds scatter in all directions."<sup>30</sup> Even the great William Marshal, considered by his contemporaries to be the greatest knight in Christendom and later Regent of England for Henry III (1216-1272), often personally took part in ravaging enemy lands.<sup>31</sup> Even if mercenaries were the ones actually holding the torch, which they often were not, they were still merely following the direction of the nobles who dictated the course of warfare in the Angevin period.

## The Effect of Mercenaries on the Rule of Henry II

If there is a recurring theme to the rule of the Angevin kings, it is the disloyalty of their vassals. Henry's greatest advantage throughout the most serious challenges to his reign was always his ability to hire "large numbers of

---

<sup>27</sup> Prestwich, ...*The English Experience*, 11.

<sup>28</sup> Count Philip of Flanders, as quoted in *Richard I*, written by John Gillingham (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1999), 94.

<sup>29</sup> Gillingham, *Richard I*, 83.

<sup>30</sup> Excerpt from *Chanson de Lorrains*, in *Richard I*, written by John Gillingham (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1999), 93.

<sup>31</sup> France, *Western Warfare...*, 71.

mercenaries” with the “immense cash resources” the sophisticated administrative system supplied.<sup>32</sup> This did not always make him popular with the chroniclers though, and Gerald of Wales reflects this in his works. Gerald, who had both good and bad things to say about Henry, tells how the king drew the revenues of the church “into his own treasury..., as he was always in fresh troubles and engaged in mighty wars.<sup>33</sup>” The chronicler goes on to complain how Henry “expended all the money he could get, and lavished upon unrighteous soldiers what was due to the priests.<sup>34</sup>” Even if Henry earned the ire of a few chroniclers, he nevertheless kept himself in power through those lavish expenditures, something that the chronicler Roger of Howden describes in some detail.

The situation for Henry was quite dire in 1173 according to the Annals of Roger of Howden. In addition to the rebellion of all of his sons save John, who was only nine at the time, Henry was faced with an uprising of the “nearly all the earls and barons of England, Normandy, Aquitaine, Anjou, and Brittany.<sup>35</sup>” Roger may have overstated the issue somewhat, but even so the rebellion of what was clearly a significant faction including his sons whom he had endowed with large territories of their own posed a serious challenge to his continued rule. It also meant that he had to depend on his own resources to crush the rebellion. Fortunately for Henry, his resources at the time included a force of 20,000 *Brabanter* mercenaries according to Howden “who served him faithfully, but not without large pay which he gave them.<sup>36</sup>”

Henry was able to use his *Brabantes* to great effect. One thing that is consistent with the mercenaries of all three Angevin kings is the idea that the mercenaries allowed them to enforce their will in multiple places at once throughout their large empire. Henry II did just that with his *Brabantes* when he dispatched them to Brittany while he remained in Normandy to solidify his position. Not only that, but the *Brabantes* performed exceptionally well against the rebel forces of Brittany. Hugh, Earl of Chester, led the rebel forces, which were largely comprised of troops local to the area.<sup>37</sup> The *Brabantes* routed the rebel army in a pitched battle, and forced the Earl to retreat to the nearby fortress of Dol. Henry received the Earl’s surrender upon his arrival from Normandy following a brief siege by the mercenaries.<sup>38</sup>

---

<sup>32</sup> Gillingham, *Richard I*, 48.

<sup>33</sup> Gerald of Wales, *Expugnatio Hibernica*, in *The High Middle Ages: 1000-1300*, ed. Bryce Lyon (Toronto, Ontario: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1964), 237.

<sup>34</sup> *ibid*

<sup>35</sup> Roger of Howden, *The Annals*, ed. Henry T Riley (London: HG Bohn, no date given), 368.

<sup>36</sup> *Ibid*.

<sup>37</sup> Roger of Howden, *The Annals*, 371.

<sup>38</sup> Roger of Howden, *The Annals*, 372.

The swift defeat of the rebels in Brittany allowed Henry to sweep south and deal with rebels in Aquitaine and elsewhere, and the loss of rebel allies left those remaining somewhat out in the cold.<sup>39</sup> Eventually, a tearful teenage Richard literally begged for mercy at his father's feet, who generously accepted his son's profuse apologies.<sup>40</sup> If Henry had not had the resources and foresight to keep on hand a large number of mercenaries it is entirely likely he would have fared quite poorly in the rebellion of 1173. Even if he had been able to hold on to the kingship of England it is unlikely he would have been able to keep a grip on some of the less secure continental possessions, chiefly Aquitaine and certain territories within Normandy. The actions of Henry's *Brabanters* is just one example among many during his reign showing that a capable and dedicated paid military force allowed the King to enforce his will over the armed objections of magnates quite powerful in their own right.

### **The Effect of Mercenaries on the Rule of Richard I**

Mercenaries also played a key role in the rule of Richard I. Though they did not accompany him on his most famous military adventure, the Third Crusade, they helped him immensely in his efforts to maintain control over the vulnerable Angevin territories, which were constantly under pressure from the capable and cunning Philip Augustus. The most serious challenge to Richard's royal authority was that posed by disloyal vassals, urged on by Philip, while Richard was being held prisoner by the Holy Roman Emperor Henry VI, whom he had run afoul of in a somewhat roundabout way on his journey to and from the Holy Land.<sup>41</sup>

One of Richard's greatest losses during his involuntary stay at the German court was the major border fortress of Gisors, long thought to be a lynchpin of the Angevin bulwark in Normandy. The instability caused by Richard's circumstances had shaken the confidence of his nobles, and Richard's castellan at Gisors, a noble named Gilbert de Vascoeuil, surrendered the castle to Philip without a single sword being drawn. Gilbert was almost universally condemned as a traitor by the chroniclers, but his surrender of such a major fortress shattered the confidence a number of other Norman lords who then also promptly surrendered to Philip.<sup>42</sup> William of Newburgh records yet another disloyal vassal fleeing to Philip. In this case, Hugh de Nonant, Bishop of Chester, abandoned his holdings and took all of the money from his coffers to

---

<sup>39</sup> Frank McLynn, *Richard and John: Kings at War* (Cambridge, MA: De Capo Press, 2007), 51.

<sup>40</sup> Gillingham, *Richard I*, 50.

<sup>41</sup> McLynn, *Richard and John...*, 227.

<sup>42</sup> Gillingham, *Richard I*, 240.

Philip in order to purchase his safety.<sup>43</sup> In difficult situations, nobles had the means and opportunity to negotiate with the rivals of their overlords, whereas a mercenary who did such a thing would have been seen as a threat to the social order. Mercenaries were much more dependent upon their employer than a vassal was dependent upon his lord.

Richard had his revenge though, and in large part thanks to his mercenaries. Upon securing his release from Henry VI, Richard arrived triumphant in England and immediately put together a force largely comprised of what William of Newburgh calls "stipendiary soldiers" to take back to the continent. Richard does just that, and with his mercenaries acting as the principal element in his army, he recaptures the majority of fortresses taken by Philip in his absence, along with a number of castles that were originally held by Philip or his allies.<sup>44</sup> The mercenaries also scored some personal victories for Richard, such as the capture of the traitorous Count of Auvergne who had deserted from Richard's army.<sup>45</sup> Richard's most famous mercenary captain, Mercadier, once said of Richard "I fought for him strenuously and loyally. I never opposed his will, but was prompt in obedience to his orders."<sup>46</sup> The evidence suggests that the attitude of many of Richard's nobles was anything but obedient and loyal, and it would be a disloyal vassal that would ultimately lead to Richard's untimely death.<sup>47</sup> Nevertheless, Richard was able to pass on to his brother John an empire largely intact, in spite of Philip's best efforts to unravel it, because he could rely on the dutiful paid service of men like Mercadier.

### **The Effect of Mercenaries on the Rule of John Lackland**

John admittedly had a tough act to follow as King of England, and it is unlikely that even had he performed adequately he would have been looked on favorably by his contemporaries. His job was anything but adequate though in terms of maintaining the Angevin empire, and his long history of betrayal meant that he never had any sort of credibility with his nobles.<sup>48</sup> As with all discontent nobles of the Angevin territories, the King of France was waiting with open arms and even openly enticing some to betray their lord. In a letter written by Philip to Ralph of Exodun, Count of Eu, these enticements are made quite clear. Philip promised the Count of Eu 4000 £, a very substantial sum, and the service

---

<sup>43</sup> William of Newburgh, *History in The Church Historians of England*, trans. Joseph Stevenson (London: Steeley's, 1861), Chp 5.

<sup>44</sup> William of Newburgh, *History...*, Chp 15.

<sup>45</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>46</sup> Mercadier, as quoted in *Armies and Warfare in the Middle Ages: The English Experience*, written by Michael Prestwich (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1999), 150.

<sup>47</sup> Gillingham, *Richard I*, 323.

<sup>48</sup> Gillingham, *Richard I*, 338.

of 100 knights and 1000 foot soldiers if Ralph agreed to cede control of certain strategic lands and fortifications in Normandy.<sup>49</sup> Such an offer would have been a serious temptation. Ralph had every reason to doubt the reliability of John based his past misadventures, and the Count would have been quite aware that Philip was fully prepared to press his claims against Normandy with or without Ralph's aid. Richard had fought Philip to a standstill multiple times, while John had done little but cause trouble. In the perpetual struggle between the Angevin and Capetian kings, Richard's death meant that Philip was now the safe bet. John could clearly no longer rely on his vassals for much of anything.

It fell to John's mercenaries to see that his will was carried out, as it so often did for the Angevin kings. Admittedly the situation was more dire for John than it had been at any point for Richard, but that is a reflection of the vast difference in character between the two men. John would have most likely preferred to use his mercenaries and domestic forces to try to recapture Normandy and other territories taken by Philip shortly after John's accession, but his nobles would have none of it. On multiple occasions John's plans to recapture Normandy were thwarted by truculent nobles.<sup>50</sup> Even the revered William Marshal, long supporter of the Angevin monarchy, refused to participate in John's 1205 campaign against Philip, making the flimsy argument that he was a vassal to both Philip and John, a factor that never seemed to stop him from riding out with Richard or Henry.<sup>51</sup> John was forced to turn his attention inward just to maintain control over what he had been able to save from Philip, and he used his mercenaries to do his dirty work.

One of John's more questionable acts during his reign involving the services of his mercenaries was his treatment of the noble William de Braose. Fortunately, there are sources available which present both sides of the issue. John's account of the incident prominently figures the mercenary captain Gerard d'Athee. The mercenary acted as John's representative in the exchanges and as the muscle bullying William into submission. According to John, the dispute began over money owed to the crown by William, and he sent Gerard to collect the payment. William agreed to pay the debt and gave hostages to Gerard as security, along with ceding control of three castles on the Welsh border. After this things took a turn into the bizarre, and John claims that William waited for Gerard to depart and then proceeded to attack his own castles which he had just relinquished. Failing in the attempt, William then fled to Ireland with his

---

<sup>49</sup> Philip Augustus, "Philip Augustus' proposals to Ralph of Exodun, count of Eu," in *King John and Magna Carta*, written by JAP Jones (London: Longman Group Ltd, 1971), 121-122.

<sup>50</sup> Jones, *King John*..., 32.

<sup>51</sup> Jones, *King John*..., 12.

family.<sup>52</sup> The account was undoubtedly meant to portray John in a positive light, and yet there are some disquieting implications made. The document clearly indicates that John used his mercenaries to enforce his will on the elite baronial families as a matter of course, and it further reflects his constant pursuit of capital. John thought the situation he described would be plausible to his barons, and he may have been heavy handed but he was not a fool. Assuredly John was in need of money to keep paying his mercenary forces, which in turn he used to extract yet more money from the nobles. John had painted himself into a very uncomfortable corner that inevitably led to the rebellion of his English barons. In spite of this, the mercenaries were still useful to John because quite simply they did what he asked of them. It is not the mercenaries fault if the royal will they are enforcing is misguided.

The other perspective of the events is that of the medieval chronicler Roger of Wendover. The chronicle presents John in a much more negative light, and it actually gives an even clearer picture of the lengths to which John's mercenaries would go to enforce his will. Wendover writes that John was seeking custody of William's son to ensure the father's loyalty. William's wife, Matilda, balked at this owing to John's odious reputation when it came to hostages.<sup>53</sup> It is generally accepted that John murdered his own nephew and potential rival for the throne, Arthur of Brittany, while the sixteen year old was a hostage in John's custody.<sup>54</sup> Eventually, Wendover writes, John dispatched Gerard d'Athee to secretly arrest William and his family and throw them into prison.<sup>55</sup> John's own account shows that he could rely on mercenaries to openly deal with his nobles. Wendover's account shows that his mercenaries would go to even greater lengths to enforce his will by taking violent and aggressive action against the noble opposition. Ultimately John's actions would be more than the nobility would tolerate, but that does not detract from the fact that the king could depend on his mercenaries to do what was asked of them, and most often do an effective job of it.

## Conclusion

Mercenaries were an indispensable tool for the Angevin kings, and the high handed attitude of the medieval chroniclers is proven fallacious when the normal practices of medieval warfare are considered. Nearly all men of war in

---

<sup>52</sup> King John of England, "King John's account of William de Braose," in KJ and MC, in *King John and Magna Carta*, written by JAP Jones (London: Longman Group Ltd, 1971), 123-124.

<sup>53</sup> Roger of Wendover, "Wendover's account of William de Braose" in KJ and MC, in *King John and Magna Carta*, written by JAP Jones (London: Longman Group Ltd, 1971), 122-123.

<sup>54</sup> Mclynn, *Richard and John...*, 306.

<sup>55</sup> Roger of Wendover, "Wendover's account...", 122-123.



the medieval period were *routiers*, or ravagers, and the confinement of that term to the mercenary forces is more a reflection of their lower social status than it is an accurate description of their inherent tendencies. The Angevin kings built a system designed to effectively wage war and ensure the loyalty of their vassals, and mercenaries were a key component of that system. The efforts of the kings and their mercenaries held together a fractious empire that was enormously wealthy and powerful relative to the other European kingdoms. The fact that the empire did not survive the reign of John cannot be blamed on the system, or even on the mercenaries, but only on the failings of a man inadequate to the task set before him.

## Race, Class and Gender in Anti-Fascist Rhetoric of the Spanish Civil War

Adam Schafer  
*New College of Florida*

The Spanish Civil War is unique in the fact that it is the only conflict with a history better represented by the losing side—the Republicans—instead of the winners, the Nationalists. Why is this? While there are many answers to this question, international intellectuals played an important role in portraying this conflict in favor of the Second Spanish Republic. For the majority of these politically Left-leaning literary figures, the Spanish Civil War was *the* dynamic battle between good and evil—the outcome of which would decide the fate of the souls, bodies and, in their minds, the future of humankind.

My undergraduate thesis at New College of Florida examines the works of four such intellectuals from the Western Hemisphere—two North Americans, Langston Hughes and Edwin Rolfe; and two from South America, Pablo Neruda and César Vallejo. Our short time frame limits my focus to Hughes and Vallejo, and how these two authors incorporated their own ideas on class, race and gender into speeches, newspaper articles and poetry about the Spanish Civil War. In doing so, they not only contributed to the history of the war, but also defined the role of writers as “soldiers of paper and ink”<sup>1</sup> within that history.

During the 1920s and 30s, Hughes and Vallejo matured during the depths of a worldwide economic depression. This upbringing channeled the ideas and works of both men into a socialist worldview that emphasized class-consciousness. As a result, their politics effectively dictated how they came to view themselves as artistic heralds of an international workers’ revolution. They saw the Republic as the international symbol of that revolution.

Like many North American participants in the Spanish Civil War, Hughes went through France to get to Spain during the summer of 1937. In Paris, he solidified his political commitment to the Republican cause as a delegate to the Second International Writers Congress for the Defense of Culture. Hughes gave a speech entitled “Too Much of Race” to educate his audience on the importance of class in this struggle between socialism and fascism. He said, “We Negroes of America are tired of a world divided superficially on the basis of race and color—but in reality on the basis of

---

<sup>1</sup> Antony Beevor. *The Battle for Spain*. (New York: Penguin, 2006) 248.

poverty and power—the rich over the poor, no matter what their color.”<sup>2</sup> For Hughes, the Nationalist rebels represented the bourgeoisie in power on both sides of the Atlantic—plantation owners who kept African-Americans segregated, and landowners who exploited the Spanish peasant under the *latifundia* agricultural system. So, when Hughes called out to his fellow intellectuals that, “We represent the end of race,” he effectively contributed his American voice to a worldwide movement for radical social change. As he defiantly declared, “...when there is no more race, there will be no more capitalism, and no more war, and no more money for the munitions makers—because the workers of the world will have triumphed.”<sup>3</sup> With this proletarian mentality, Hughes crossed the French border into Spain.

César Vallejo, for his part, also drew upon his own socio-economic experiences to portray the Spanish Civil War with class-conscious rhetoric. Vallejo’s speeches and writings highlight the Civil War’s international nature while also urging his fellow intellectuals to combine forces with the workers of the world to fight fascism.

Vallejo was living in Paris at the time of the Second International Writers Congress, and was therefore named the Peruvian delegate, although he had not set foot in his home country for 14 years, since 1923. His speech at the closing ceremonies of this Congress not only exemplifies his class-conscious political perspective, but also alludes to his artistic commitment to the Republic as the center of the international revolution where, as he explained it, the “spirit” of the intellectuals combined with the “material” of the people in order to fight fascism.<sup>4</sup> Vallejo told his international audience of contemporaries that it was their job as poets, authors and philosophers to tear down the “secular barrier that exists between the intelligentsia and the people (el pueblo).”<sup>5</sup> It is significant that Vallejo describes the barrier as ‘secular’ because, in the first paragraph of his speech, he notes that this divide has its roots in the class inequality imposed by the monarchical system that had controlled Spain for so long. He argues that intellectuals and workers must work “horizontally, not vertically; shoulder to shoulder”<sup>6</sup> to overcome class inequalities imposed on Spain from the past, and the contemporary threat posed by the encroaching forces of fascism.

Fresh from the International Writers Congress, both Hughes and Vallejo populated their portrayals of the Spanish Civil War not with soldiers or

---

<sup>2</sup> Langston Hughes. “Negros in Spain.” *Volunteer for Liberty* 1, no. 14 (September 13, 1937) 3.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, 4.

<sup>4</sup> Cesar Vallejo. “La responsibilidad del escritor.” (Reprinted in Enrique Ballón Aguirre ed., *La Cultura peruana*. Lima: Mosca Azul Editores, 1973) 234. Translation mine.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*

politicians, but with workers as figures of power. In this way, they emphasized the importance of the proletariat and the collective agency of the worker who fights for a “worker’s Spain” and, by extension, a worker’s world.

Hughes wrote a newspaper article, “Soldiers from Many Lands United in Spanish Fight,” published in the December 18, 1937 Baltimore *Afro-American*. It is an illuminating example of this collective agency. He begins by noting that 37 nationalities have come to Spain to fight for the Communist-organized International Brigades, and he highlights several specific nations that have put in place deliberately oppressive economic institutions in order to prove his point that elements of fascism can be found outside of the Iberian Peninsula. More important though, is his argument that people from around the world are taking a stand against fascism in all its forms by fighting in Spain. Therefore, the Irish volunteer battles the Bank of England, the German combats the Nazi government’s suppression of labor unions and the Frenchman fights for representation in government and the right to strike. Hughes’ argument is that “class-conscious workers come to fight in Spain because they realize that the enemy now firing from the Fascist trenches is the same old enemy they have at home...”<sup>7</sup> By connecting these myriad economic (and social) experiences, Hughes gives the Spanish Civil War a world-political significance and admonishes his audience to act, lest the workers of the world resign themselves to suffering socio-economic despotism.

Likewise, in his poem entitled “Hymn to the Volunteers of the Republic,” Vallejo uses a surrealistic tone to personify the battles of the Spanish Civil War as “Passions...of common people.” He emphasizes the collective power wielded by individuals who never before had access to power, because they lived under repressive political and economic regimes. He devotes 26 lines of his “Hymn” to describing each archetype—the Proletarian, the Liberator, the Peasant, Agricultural builders—who, together, make up the strength of the Republic. Vallejo also imbues the Worker archetype with almost divine authority as a Christ-like figure that can save Spain as “our savior and redeemer, forgive us brother, our trespasses!”<sup>8</sup> Literary critic Joseph Adamson described it this way: “...such figures represent [Vallejo’s] visionary hope that ultimately man will abolish the order of nature and establish a New Jerusalem on the face of the earth.”<sup>9</sup> However, this hope of equality is not just for Spaniards to

---

<sup>7</sup> Langston Hughes. “Soldiers from Many Lands United in Spanish Fight.” (Reprinted in *Collected Works*, vol. 9. Columbia, MO: University of Missouri Press, 2002) 179.

<sup>8</sup> José Rubia Barcia and Clayton Eshleman eds. *Cesar Vallejo: The Complete Posthumous Poetry*. (Berkeley, CA University of California Press, 1978) 227.

<sup>9</sup> Adam Sharman ed. *The Poetry and Poetics of César Vallejo*. (Lewiston, NY: The Edwin Mellen Press, 1997) 162.

experience; Vallejo also notes the sacrifices of those volunteers from other countries who have come to fight against fascism in Spain:

“Italian volunteer, among whose animals of battle  
an Abyssinian lion is limping!  
Soviet volunteer, marching at the head of your universal chest!  
Volunteers from the South, from the North, from the Orient  
and you, the Westerner, closing the funereal song of the dawn!  
...volunteers who fight for life!”<sup>10</sup>

Editor and literary critic Adam Sharman said, “Vallejo views human beings as powerful creative forces who shape the non-human world in a ‘human’ direction.”<sup>11</sup> These volunteers who fight for the Republic are an example of just that. Vallejo recognized in them the significance and importance of collective action in the face of socio-economic injustice. Like Hughes, Vallejo sought always to use his creative pen to support class equality.

Although both writers supported the working-class values of the Republic, Hughes focused his newspaper articles on the subject of race and the important role that blacks played in the Spanish Civil War. At the same time, he also used the Civil War to comment on Jim Crow America, in effect creating connections between international fascism and American segregationism.

In his first article on the subject, “Negroes in Spain,” published in the *Volunteer for Liberty*, Hughes boldly states that, “In Spain, there is no color prejudice.”<sup>12</sup> Instead, Hughes meets “wide-awake Negroes from various parts of the world” on the Republican side who are fighting to prevent fascism’s advance, lest there be “no decent place for any Negroes—because Fascism preaches the creed of Nordic supremacy and a world for whites only.”<sup>13</sup> For Hughes, the sacrifices of 90 (known) African-American volunteers of the Abraham Lincoln Battalion flew in the face of such a world order. Black soldiers like these symbolized the African-American’s involvement in more than just Harlem or the segregated South, but also as an integral part of the international anti-fascist coalition. As such, Hughes championed these volunteers for his audience in America, later calling them “lovers of freedom and democracy,” even though they hailed from a democracy that still subscribed to a hollow, “separate but equal” racial philosophy. In contrast, Hughes portrayed Spain as the country to which people from America and elsewhere

---

<sup>10</sup> Barcia and Eshleman, 227.

<sup>11</sup> Sharman, xxii.

<sup>12</sup> Hughes, “Negroes in Spain.” 4.

<sup>13</sup> Hughes, “Negroes in Spain.” 4.

should come in order to stand up for their beliefs despite their own nations' racial hierarchies.

While he was in Spain, Hughes also reported on "Moors" conscripted into Franco's so-called "Army of Africa," comparing their experiences to those of African-American volunteers. His intent was to show his audience back home the racially-divided world that awaited them if the Republicans did not win the war against fascism. The "Negroes in Spain" article makes this comparison. In the text, "Negroes" is a term reserved for black American volunteers, while the "deluded and driven Moors of North Africa" are portrayed as having little or no agency in deciding their fate. Partly, this reflects the reality that by 1937, there was more than 60,000 black African troops serving in Franco's armies, many of whom were either forced to enlist, or as Hughes hypothesized, "deceived by false promises of loot and high pay."<sup>14</sup><sup>15</sup> Whatever the case, he used racial stereotypes about these soldiers to elicit support for the Republic. The Moors are painted as "savages," but only insofar as they have been kept that way by their white overlords, similar to that "peculiar institution" of American slavery—an institution which, in Hughes' mind, could raise its ugly head once more if fascism triumphs in Spain. Hughes plainly stated his view of the oppressive connection of a Nationalist Spain to slavery in the Baltimore *Afro-American* when he wrote: "Give Franco a hood and he would be a member of the Ku Klux Klan..." With examples like these, Hughes' message is both direct and powerful in forging a connection between America's enslaved past and Nationalist fascism—an ideology that he saw as enslaving the future.

While Hughes took a racial tack in his portrayal of the Spanish Civil War, Vallejo found the family more symbolic of the conflict, especially in his portrayal of "mother Spain" in the title poem from his book of Civil War poems published as *Spain, take this cup from me*.

The maternal figure plays an important role in Vallejo's Civil War poetry, as a symbol of both provider and teacher to future generations. In the poem, mother Spain becomes the international bastion of femininity that is set upon by the hyper-masculinity of Franco and his Nationalist cult of the "Caudillo"—or fatherly leader. Vallejo directly addresses the "children of the world" and cautions them that "mother Spain" could fall to the fascists, figuratively leaving humankind an orphan. Literary critic Guillermo Alberto Arévalo said, "If man, that is to say the future man, is left as an orphan of mother Spain, it is necessary [that the children] go and look for her, following the paths of the combatants," rather than be subjected to fascist patriarchal

---

<sup>14</sup> Beevor, 198.

<sup>15</sup> Langston Hughes and Faith Berry ed. *Good Morning Revolution: Uncollected Social Protest Writings*. (New York: L. Hill, 1973) 106.

rule.<sup>16</sup> Vallejo's portrayal of Spain works against the masculine imagery of the Nationalists to reclaim the true image of Spain as feminine. His linguistic support for this argument stems from two gender-specific Spanish words: "España" and "patria." The first, of course, is translated as "Spain" with a feminine definite article preceding it. The second also has a feminine definite article and can loosely be translated as "native country" but with an implied national sense of patriotism. So, when Vallejo—a Peruvian-born poet living in France—calls Spain his "mother country," it is the linguistic, as well as the ideological allegiance that prevails to create an artistic, maternal connection to Spain.

What also becomes apparent is the internationalization of mother Spain as the provider and teacher of the entire world. Vallejo uses the maternal metaphor to describe Spain to the world in the second stanza:

"Children of the world  
mother Spain is with her belly on her shoulders;  
our teacher is with her ferules,  
she appears as mother and teacher,  
cross and wood, because she gave you the height,  
vertigo and division and addition, children..."<sup>17</sup>

"Here, Spain is the Mother," Angel Flores has explained about this passage, imbuing the image with religious reverence. "[She is] the first person of the human Trinity of Vallejo..."<sup>18</sup> In this depiction, Spain is carrying her belly—which symbolizes the future—on her shoulders. This evokes the key part Spain has to play in giving birth to a better world. Accordingly, Vallejo steps in to poetically urge volunteers from every country to rush and help Republican Spain shoulder her familial and spiritual responsibility as international mother to them all, lest fascism take control of their futures.

Parallel to physical growth is intellectual growth, as symbolized by the mother teaching her children socialist values, and producing good citizens in the process. Vallejo takes Republican Spain as his ideal example of a socialist society. Not unlike Vallejo's own mother, the mother in "Spain, take this cup from me" gives her "children of the world" knowledge and wisdom, represented in the second stanza as "division and addition." This relationship is significant,

---

<sup>16</sup> Guillermo Alberto Arévalo. *Cesar Vallejo: Poesía en la historia*. (Colombia: Carlos Valencia Editores, 1977) 151-152. Translation mine.

<sup>17</sup> Barcia and Eshleman, 267.

<sup>18</sup> Angel Flores. *Aproximaciones a Cesar Vallejo, vol. 1*. (New York: L.A. Publishing Company, 1971) 350. Translation mine.

as literary critic James Higgins has emphasized, because it portrays Spain as "...educating humanity in collective and communitarian values."<sup>19</sup> Thus, mother Spain once again has the power to shape the socialist future, according to Vallejo.

Despite drafting such political works about the Spanish Civil War, neither Vallejo nor Hughes would ever really see these texts as part of their contribution to literature. In Vallejo's case, he died in April, 1939 leaving his unpublished manuscripts in the hands of his widow. They were not completely published until 1978. And although Hughes lived to see the adoption of equal rights in America during the 1960s, he disowned most of his political writings in the previous decade—including all the articles and poems about Spain—after being called to testify about his "Communist sympathies" before the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations led by Senator Joseph McCarthy.

Even so, these authors' works stand as significant contributions, both to history and literature. Hughes' work in Spain proves that he was more than a folk poet with a dream deferred, but a vociferous social and political poet with a dynamic dream of a better world through racial and class cooperation. And, from the ruins of defeat, Vallejo's political poetry gives birth to the hope of collective action in future generations. Through their class-conscious, racial and familial portrayals of Spain, both men shaped the history of the Spanish Civil War and, in doing so, they carried on the Republican cause long after the fighting was finished.

---

<sup>19</sup> Qtd. in Sharman, 13.



## Jane Addams and the Legacy of Hull-House

Angela Webb  
Florida Gulf Coast University

Jane Addams is the subject of many books. Different authors see what they want to see: Some portray her as a self-sacrificing saint, while others posit that she felt guilty about her wealth and sought forgiveness by leading a life of self-denial. In my research on Jane Addams, I discovered a woman who followed her desire to help people and subsequently found her purpose in life.

Laura Jane Addams was born in 1860 to John and Sarah Addams. Though her family was not outwardly religious, her parents' Quaker roots provided a moral compass for the family. When Jane was two years old, her mother died of tuberculosis. John Addams did not remarry until Jane was eight, so Jane spent a lot of time with her father and grew very close to him. Her father was a prominent member of their town of Cedarville, Illinois and in 1854 was elected state Senator.<sup>1</sup> With his own money, he started a town library that was full of books, but none that "entertained without improving."<sup>2</sup> He also rallied the community to rebuild and modernize the dilapidated schoolhouse.

One of Jane's early memories was accompanying her father to his business, which was near what was called "shantytown." It was here that she came face to face with the poor and the terrible condition in which the residents lived. She asked her father why those people lived in such small, ugly houses that had no room to play? Her father said, "It's because they have no money to live in better places." Jane said, "When I'm a grown-up lady, I'm going to live in a great big house, but I don't want it to be near other nice ones. I want to live right next door to the poor people, and the children can play in my yard."<sup>3</sup>

This story revealed Jane's precocious nature early in her life. Another example of this attitude is shown as she recounts a recurring dream she began to have at the age of seven. She dreamed that she was the only person alive and that she was responsible for making the iron wagon wheel that was needed to

---

<sup>1</sup> Winifred E. Wise, *Jane Addams of Hull-House* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1935), 8.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, 6.

<sup>3</sup> Wise, 25.

restart society. The day after she had the dream, she remembered going down to the blacksmith's shop to watch him make wagon wheels.<sup>4</sup>

After high school, she entered Rockford Female Seminary, which would later become Rockford College. In many ways, Addams' recollection of her time at Rockford was typical of any teenaged girl. She wrote about the parties and the drama over the preoccupation some of her classmates had with boys. One of her classmates was Ellen Gates Starr, who would later join her in starting the Hull-House settlement.

Throughout her life, Jane was very frail and sickly. Having suffered so much, she was quite sensitive to the sufferings of others. It was with this in mind that Jane decided that, after receiving her bachelor's degree, she wanted to become a doctor for the poor.<sup>5</sup> However, her repeated illnesses and the awareness that she lacked the necessary aptitude for science caused her to relinquish the idea of a medical career. After recovering from a lengthy battle with her chronic spinal condition, and for lack of any other direction, she wrote to Ellen Gates Starr: "It seems quite essential for the establishment of my health and temper that I have a radical change, and so I have accepted the advice given to every exhausted American, 'go abroad'."<sup>6</sup> From 1883 to 1885, Jane, her stepmother, and a group of friends went to Europe.

As wealthy Americans they went sightseeing and shopping. They also attended classes to study famous works of art and literature. It was common for young girls to explore Europe as a finishing touch to their education before marriage and motherhood.<sup>7</sup> Jane, however, often wrote in her journal about the poor and depressed. Her passionate personality conflicted with the passiveness of her travels. She was also sensitive to the disparity of her material comfort next to those forced to live without even the slightest of comforts.<sup>8</sup> She did not want to be a mere "spectator to the sufferings of the rest of the world," but was at a loss as to what to do with her life.<sup>9</sup>

During her time in London, the group took a missionary tour of London's East End. Here she was startled by the poverty, hunger, and sickness affecting its residents. She witnessed half-starved people grabbing for food that was too rotten to sell in the markets.<sup>10</sup> She noticed poverty among all of the beautiful sights in Europe and knew that the same conditions existed in

---

<sup>4</sup> Jane Addams, *Twenty Years at Hull-House* (New York: Signet Classics, 1961), 3.

<sup>5</sup> Wise, 74.

<sup>6</sup> Allen F. Davis, *American Heroine: The Life and Legend of Jane Addams* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1973), 32.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, 33.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, 34.

<sup>9</sup> Davis, 36.

<sup>10</sup> Addams, 43-44.

American cities. She was inspired by the rehabilitative work done for the poor at Toynbee Hall settlement in London. She wanted to replicate the effort in the United States. Jane brought her idea of starting a settlement house to Ellen Gates Starr, who jumped at the proposal.

At the time, settlements were not viewed favorably in the United States. Addams wrote that Americans do not want to face the fact that its citizens are broken up into classes, as that acknowledgement flies in the face of our perceived democracy. To admit the existence of class is to admit more similarity than difference with the European political structure.<sup>11</sup> Whether or not the acknowledgment was made, the plight of the millions of poor living in the urban areas of the United States could not be ignored.

Hull-House set a "pay-it-forward" example. As people came and received help finding work, learning language, reading skills and social skills, they in turn helped those in the community with like needs. The purpose of Hull-House settlement was to help people to help themselves.

Jane Addams and Ellen Gates Starr found the perfect location for their settlement home. It was a house built in 1856 for Charles J. Hull, and was situated on the thirty-two mile long stretch named Halsted Street. In September 1889, 335 Halsted Street (later changed to 800 Halsted) became the Hull-House settlement home. The location was in a predominantly southern Italian immigrant neighborhood. Polish and Russian Jews lived in the nearby neighborhood to the south of Hull-House, while Germans and Irish resided to the north. On this section of Halsted Street, the streets were dirty, the schools were inadequate, the street lighting was poor, and the sewage systems were dangerously unsanitary.<sup>12</sup> The mission statement set out by Addams and Starr was included in the Hull-House Charter of Incorporation. "To provide a center for a higher civic and social life; to institute and maintain educational and philanthropic enterprises, and to investigate and improve the conditions in the industrial districts of Chicago."<sup>13</sup>

At first, the people in the community were suspicious of two women who chose to live in the slums although they obviously could afford to live elsewhere. As the neighbors saw that Addams and Starr established Hull-House for the sole purpose of supporting the community, however, these suspicions faded. Even though the neighborhood was depressed, there were very few

---

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, 27.

<sup>12</sup> Mary Lynn McCree Bryan and Allen F. Davis, eds., *100 Years at Hull-House* (Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1990), 12-13.

<sup>13</sup> James Weber Linn, *Jane Addams: A Biography* (New York: D. Appleton-Century Company, 1935), 110.

occasions when the women felt afraid. There was one occasion when a vagrant broke into the house. Addams awakened and, upon ascertaining that he did not intend to hurt anyone, told him to come back at nine the next morning and perhaps they could help him find work. He did return, and they helped him find a job.<sup>14</sup>

In 1890, Hull-House welcomed Florence Kelley and Julia Lathrop as permanent additions to the staff.<sup>15</sup> Together, these four women worked day and night to establish a rapport with their neighbors. They looked after children while their parents worked long hours. They taught the children how to read and write in English. The older children learned to clean, sew, paint, cook and play instruments. They also provided healthcare services when needed; ranging from newborn delivery and nursing the sick, to preparing the dead for burial.<sup>16</sup>

The Hull-House's passion for its mission to help the community was contagious. Over the years, the resident staff grew from four to twenty. All the volunteers shared with the housework, cooking, and record keeping. Hull-House's reputation as a support center had spread among the community and all those needing help were welcomed. At first Addams and Starr financed Hull-House operations, but as the services expanded, they made requests for voluntary contributions. Not only did the financial contributions come, but also some of the daughters of wealthy families volunteered after school to work part-time at Hull-House.

Hull-House also provided clubs and classes for adults in the evening and on the weekends. The classes were predominantly educational, but the clubs provided men and women opportunities to socialize with their neighbors. There were also "theme nights." Monday evenings belonged to the French; the participants discussed music and literature as similar groups did in Parisian salons. Tuesday evenings, older boys would learn what to do in an emergency or learn simple science experiments. On Wednesday evenings, men would meet together to discuss labor issues such as the eight-hour day, child labor restrictions and strikes. On Thursday nights, a female doctor presented lectures for women on childcare, hygiene, cooking, and nutrition.<sup>17</sup>

The Hull-House public kitchen was a welcome addition to the original structure. Hot food was served to children attending classes during the day, and to working men and women in the evenings. The art gallery and dance hall were successful additions. Ellen Gates Starr oversaw these features. She felt it was necessary for poor people to be surrounded by beautiful things and to have a

---

<sup>14</sup> Linn, 114.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, 129.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, 113.

<sup>17</sup> Bryan, 18.

chance to have fun. These seemingly frivolous additions brought happiness into even the most ugly and miserable of lives.<sup>18</sup>

Jane's Club was the first women's cooperative association established in the United States. The cooperative provided six apartments to young, working women. The women contributed a small amount of money each month to fund a rent insurance pool. This self-financed safety net relieved young women of the fear of homelessness in the event they lost their jobs due to a strike or if they needed to leave dangerous work conditions.<sup>19</sup> Hull-House did not begin as a politically active organization. However, as an advocate for protections against conditions adversely affecting the community, politics sometimes became an issue.

Attorney Florence Kelley studied at Cornell University and in Zurich, Switzerland. Through her studies and her time in Europe, she became a socialist. She believed "that the State must prevent the modern industrial system from destroying its own workers, particularly women and children." After her divorce, she returned to America with her three children and took up residence at Hull-House. She made it her purpose at Hull-House to fight for the protection of women and children from injustice and danger in the work place. Through Kelley's efforts, Hull-House pushed to have a commission created to investigate Chicago sweatshops. In fact, Kelley was appointed the first Chief Factory Inspector in the United States. They also pushed for the passing of Illinois's first child labor law in 1891, which prohibited the employment "of children under the age of thirteen in stores, shops, factories and manufacturing establishments."<sup>20</sup>

Alice Hamilton joined the staff at Hull-House as the resident doctor. She received her medical degree from the University of Maryland and from Johns Hopkins.<sup>21</sup> She provided medical services throughout the Hull-House community. Hamilton, Addams and another resident attorney, Julia Lathrop, worked to bring to the forefront the health problems directly attributable to childhood poverty.<sup>22</sup>

Jane Addams was disturbed by the fact that many poor juvenile offenders were arrested for minor offenses but were incarcerated with hardened adult criminals. This lack of distinction between adult and juvenile offenders

---

<sup>18</sup> Linn, 131.

<sup>19</sup> Linn, 126.

<sup>20</sup> Linn, 137.

<sup>21</sup> Linn, 144.

<sup>22</sup> Karen Shafer Lundblad, "Jane Addams and Social Reform: A Role Model for the 1990s," *Social Work* 40, no. 5 (Sep 1995), 664

<http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.fgcu.edu/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=9509275459&site=ehost-live> (accessed November 26, 2008).

resulted in young boys spending many years behind bars. When and if they were released, they often became hardened criminals themselves, no longer comfortable with life outside of prison. Hull-House was behind the law passed in 1899, which provided for the first Juvenile Court in the United States.<sup>23</sup> By 1920, all but three states had Juvenile Courts.<sup>24</sup>

Jane Addams not only appreciated the national and cultural differences of immigrants, she was actually opposed to the “melting-pot” mentality. She wrote an article entitled *Democracy and Social Ethics* (1902) discussing the negative impact of segregation of social classes within immigrant communities. “Possibly another result of our contemptuous attitude toward immigrants who differ from us is our exaggerated acceptance of standardization. Everyone wants to be like his neighbors, which is doubtless an amiable quality, but leading to one of the chief dangers of democracy—the tyranny of the herd mind.”<sup>25</sup>

Besides injustices stemming from their differences with Americans, immigrants experienced problems within their own families. This problem was the cultural gulf that had grown between immigrant parents and their American-born children. Addams observed this breakdown and wanted to find a way to bridge the gap. One way she addressed this was by instilling pride in the children for their heritage by creating the Labor Museum. This museum showcased the work of done by immigrants in their native lands and how the work they did in America helped make the country great.<sup>26</sup>

The residents at Hull-House were also sensitive to the delicate issues involved in helping the poor in the Black community. They recognized that the presence of blacks at Hull-House events would discourage other groups from coming, so they used their influence to raise money and support for the Wendell Phillips Settlement on Chicago’s West Side, and the Frederick Douglass Center on the South Side. Jane Addams also served on the board of Chicago’s Urban League and the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.<sup>27</sup>

For forty-six years, Jane Addams, surrounded by a team of accomplished, socially-conscious women activists, greatly influenced the community she chose to be a part of. She succeeded in her search to find a meaningful vocation. Through Hull-House, she not only helped thousands of people, but she set a standard for settlement houses that continues to this day. At various times over the years, more than seventy people had taken up permanent

---

<sup>23</sup> Davis, 150.

<sup>24</sup> Lundblad, 664.

<sup>25</sup> Lundblad, 665.

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*, 665.

<sup>27</sup> Bryan, 133-134.

residence at Hull-House. Hull-House itself became a complex of buildings which housed an art museum, a theater, a boys music school, a coffee house, a gymnasium, a lunchroom, a library, a kindergarten, a discussion club, and an employment bureau, as well as apartments for working women and their children.<sup>28</sup>

In 1931, Jane Addams became the first woman to win the Nobel Peace Prize. She donated her prize money of \$16,000 to the two most important concerns in her life, the Women's International League for Peace, which still exists today, and to her neighbors around Hull-House. She remained the head of Hull-House until her death in 1935. At a party for her seventieth birthday, Addams said, "Humans beings are becoming more humane, but there are always new cases to work for, new conflicts to be resolved and settled, another foot of progress to be made."<sup>29</sup>

In 1913 the *Handbook of Settlements* listed 413 settlement houses scattered throughout thirty-two states. These included Lillian Wald's Henry Street Settlement in New York, and Robert Woods' South End in Boston. Today, there are roughly 300 settlements in eighty cities nationwide. In St. Louis there is a community that has adopted aspects of Member Organized Resource Exchange, or MORE. With MORE, services like child or elder parent care, auto repair, or to move furniture, and so on, are "paid" for with corresponding contributions. A computer network tracks the member's balance of points through an ATM-style card. More than 4,000 people are members in this exchange program and more than 70% have annual incomes below \$10,000.<sup>30</sup>

One way that community centers and settlement houses have changed from the days of Hull-House is that their activities are usually confined to neighborhood issues. They don't lobby for political change or seek to influence conditions outside of their immediate concerns.<sup>31</sup> In some ways this is good because the focus stays on the community and members are treated like citizens instead of clients.<sup>32</sup> In other ways though, perhaps it would be advantageous to work for changes from outside of the community as well. For example, Hull-

---

<sup>28</sup> Lundblad, 663.

<sup>29</sup> Stephanie Sammartino McPherson, *Peace and Bread: The Story of Jane Addams* (Minneapolis: Carolrhoda Books), 85.

<sup>30</sup> Howard Husock, "Bringing Back the Settlement House." *Public Interest* 109 (Fall 1992), 53  
<http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.fgc.edu/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=9301230008&site=ehost-live> (accessed November 26, 2008).

<sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*, 54.

<sup>32</sup> *Ibid.*, 55.

House's insistence on reform on a legislative level brought the plight of the poor to the attention of prominent people like Theodore Roosevelt.<sup>33</sup>

Although the need for teen-pregnancy prevention, pre-natal care, and family counseling is always needed, there are also opportunities to bridge ethnic gaps that still exist today. There are also labor issues, educational inadequacies, and nutritional poverty. In the beginning of the 1900s, Eastern and Southern Europeans were on the receiving end of American animosity. Today, we have similar issues with Mexican and Arab nationalities, to name two. We can eliminate the reservations that we feel today toward cultures different than ours by becoming familiar with them. Addams wrote that the American settlement has represented not so much a duty of the privileged toward the unprivileged, but a desire to equalize.<sup>34</sup>

The spirit of settlement houses is one of community. When the community breaks down, we view each other defensively. A spirit of compassion cannot thrive in that type of environment. Years have passed since the establishment of Hull-House, but the foundation of community spirit upon which it was built still thrives today.

---

<sup>33</sup> *Ibid.*, 56.

<sup>34</sup> Husock, 57.