Published by the History Graduate Student Association
in cooperation with the University of North Alabama

Volume 5, 2015

North Alabama HISTORICAL REVIEW

Florence, Alabama

The choice of subject matter and opinions expressed in each submission are solely the responsibility of the individual submitter and do not reflect on the editors or this institution.

Editor-in-Chief: Kayla Scott

Format/Layout: Kayla Scott

Section Editors

World History: Kayla Scott, Dylan Tucker

American History: Seth Armstrong, Matthew Fesmire

Public History: Jacob Grandstaff, Ashley Pentecost

Book Reviews: Matthew Fesmire, Seth Armstrong, Kayla Scott

Thanks,

Dr. Jeffrey Bibbee, Dr. Matthew Barlow, Dr. Carolyn Barske, Cathy Wood, Martha Francis Graham and David Justice.

A special thanks to Dr. George Makowski for giving this volume a final proofreading.

This volume is dedicated to the University of North Alabama's Public History Graduate Program, established in 2015.

On the front cover is a 1960s image of the Governor O'Neal Home. The home now serves as office space for the UNA Public History Center and the Muscle Shoals National Heritage Area. Photo courtesy of UNA Archives and Special Collections.

Table of Contents

WORLD HISTORY

The Political Conflict of the Anglo-Boer War **1**
Matthew C. Fesmire

Napoleon Meets His Waterloo: **21**
An Examination of Mistakes Related to the Battle
Kayla Scott

Scramble for Power: The Partition of **44**
Africa and German Aggression
Dylan Tucker

UNITED STATES HISTORY

The Blackstone Rangers and the Civil Rights **61**
and Black Power Movement in Chicago
Sam Keiser

An Affluent Anomaly: The Cultures **90**
and Economies of the Pre-Columbian Northwest
Jacob Grandstaff

Imagining George Washington: A Historiography **119**
of George Washington in Historical Memory
Amanda Knox

PUBLIC HISTORY

Collections Care at Pond Spring in Courtland, AL **137**
Ashley Pentecost

The Ins and Outs of Textiles **155**
Claire Eagle

BOOK REVIEWS **171**

INSTITUTIONAL/PROFESSIONAL CONTRIBUTIONS

Public History at UNA **189**
Dr. Carolyn Barske

Six Word Memoirs **194**
Dr. Matthew Barlow

Politicizing of History: The Role of Public History in an Ever-Changing Political Landscape **199**
John J. Gurner, M.A, MScR

WORLD HISTORY

The Political Conflict of the Anglo-Boer War

Matthew C. Fesmire

The Anglo-Boer War left a confusing, apathetic, and almost ambivalent political atmosphere in Great Britain from the beginning of 1899 to the end of the colonial conflict in 1902. For Great Britain, the end of the nineteenth century and the beginning of the twentieth century was the conclusion of the great Victorian era. However, the close of the Victorian era was unfortunate because the Anglo-Boer War (Boer War) changed the course of British politics. The ending of British colonialist expansion was the result of the Boer War. But why did the war have this effect after an entire century of rapid colonial expansion?

The answer is found in the rapid changing of British opinion concerning imperialism that occurred during and after the Boer War. Before the war, British opinion was generally in favor of colonialism. On the eve of the war, British opinion favored imperial paramountcy, the supersession of the authority of the Kruger Boer government in their rights as British citizens, over avoiding war. Most Britons felt

the war would be over quickly because politicians and the media assured them that the Boers were outmatched. However, that was not the case. The Boer War became an ugly conflict that changed the course of warfare in British history.

The reversal of British opinion on imperialist expansion was the result of several factors. The first was the issue of British imperialism at the close of the nineteenth century. The second was the political theory of British paramountcy in regards to British subjects in non-British republics or colonies. The third was the effect that the tragedies of the Boer War had on laying the foundation for political change after the war. The fourth was the apathy of the working-class in Great Britain concerning the nature of the conflict in the Boer War. The fifth was the Election of 1900 in which the Liberals mounted no opposition to the Conservatives in power. Finally, the last factor was the accusation that the wealthy were behind the Boer War for economic gains.

Boer War Imperialism

A statement by author Rayne Kruger about the Anglo-Boer War summarizes the confusing nature of the political conflict between Great Britain and the Boer states. He concluded, “Yet there never was

a less necessary war and nothing is odder about the strange conflict which was to follow than the ignorance on both sides as to what it was all about."[1] The politics of the Boer War are difficult to explain because of the complex nature of the feelings that British politicians and citizens had toward the Boer War as a colonial conflict. The important figures of the British government within the conflict were Colonial Secretary Joseph Chamberlain and High Commissioner Sir (eventually Lord) Alfred Milner. Some important secondary figures were Prime Minister Lord Salisbury, Arthur Balfour, St. John Broderick, Field Marshal Kitchener, Field-Marshal Viscount Wolseley, and Liberals Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, David Lloyd George, and Lord Rosebery. From the perspective of Joseph Chamberlain and Alfred Milner, the Boer War was not about white domination in South Africa; rather the war was about who would exercise paramountcy over South Africa.[2] At the close of the nineteenth century, Great Britain was looking to foment its place as a leading imperialist power moving triumphantly into the twentieth century.

---

[1] Rayne Kruger, *Good-Bye Dolly Gray: The Story of the Boer War* (Philadelphia and New York: J.B. Lippincott Company, 1960), 57.
[2] Eversley Belfield, *The Boer War* (Hamden: Archon Book, 1975), xxiv.

The Boer War was a seminal, albeit tragic, close to the Victorian era of Britain. What the Boer War marked for politicians in Britain was the spirit of imperialism, which dominated the 1890s in Great Britain.[3] From 1895-1900, the British government felt a rise in imperial enthusiasm amongst the British population. However, after 1900, the enthusiasm quickly turned into apathy, and then into disdain for imperialism.[4] After the "Khaki" election of 1900, the Conservatives maintained power. The Liberals were able to seize opportunity in 1906 by pursuing a vigorous campaign against aggressive imperialism. This strategy worked because of the British people's change of heart against imperialism after the Boer War.[5] Some British historians have labeled this short period the "braggart years," because the British government and people went away from what was deemed as acceptable British standards of morality for imperialism.[6] For the British government, the rejection of imperialism was a result of the tactics of Field Marshal Kitchener and the implementation of his scorched-earth policy of burning Boer farms, as

[3] Theodore C. Caldwell, "Introduction," in *The Anglo-Boer War: Why Was It Fought? Who Was Responsible?* edited by Theodore C. Caldwell (Boston: D.C. Heath and Company, 1965), vii.
[4] Ibid.
[5] Ibid.
[6] Ibid.

well as the establishment of concentration camps. Those two sets of events were major factors in ending support for imperialism after 1900. Those two policies were unbecoming of a civilized society like Great Britain and were two issues that allowed Liberals like Campbell-Bannerman and David Lloyd George to excoriate the imperialist policies of the Conservatives in power.

British Paramountcy

In the mind of the Conservative British politician, there was a single issue at the heart of the Boer conflict: British paramountcy in southern Africa. The goal of the British government was to assert their paramountcy in the Transvaal (South Africa Republic) and the Orange Free State in South Africa, both of which were under Boer control. Why the conflict between the Boer and the British even arose is as confusing as it is convoluted, but from the British perspective, it was for the protection of their subjects in the Boer states. These Uitlanders (Outlanders), as the Boers called them, were primarily British subjects. They were held in contempt by the Boer people because they were foreigners who came to the Transvaal in search of great wealth following the discovery of massive gold deposits on the Witwatersrand (The Rand) in 1886.

Contempt for the Outlanders resulted in the Boer government's opposition to the massive numbers of British subjects who came to the Transvaal. As a result, Outlanders were denied the right of the franchise (vote) to represent themselves in the Volksraad, the legislative body of the Transvaal. In addition, the Outlanders were forced to pay the majority (around five-sixths) of the taxes imposed by the Boers in the Transvaal, whereas the burghers (franchised Boer voters) paid little to none of the taxes.[7] Therefore, the idea of taxation without representation was an ironic malady for the Outlanders in the Transvaal republic, and this inequality made many politicians in Great Britain upset. Thus, the British were left with a conundrum of what to do in London: Do we negotiate with the Boers for the franchise in a foreign land for our subjects or do we eventually enter into war on behalf of our oppressed subjects? At first, the answer was negotiate; in the end, it was war.

Concentration Camps and Scorched-Earth Policy

During the Boer War, Field Marshal Kitchener established two policies that seemed sound, but were ultimately disastrous for the political powers in London. The first was the implementation of a

[7] Belfield, *The Boer War*, 6.

scorched-earth policy against the Boer families of burghers fighting in the war. The second was Kitchener's December of 1900 decree establishing concentration camps for Boer families of combatants and non-combatants. Both policies were toxic for the Conservatives in Parliament after 1900 when the horror stories of each policy made it back to the pro-Boer Liberals and the conscience of the public.

The scorched-earth policy had parallels to William Tecumseh Sherman's "March to the Sea."[8] Like Sherman, Kitchener left many Boer families to the harshness of the Veld (the grasslands) after the burning of all their buildings, the confiscation and slaughter of their livestock, and the scorching of all their planted crops. In addition, there were the Boer families that were made prisoners of war and sent to concentration camps.[9] Kitchener wished to demoralize the fighting burghers and their families by taking away everything they had on Earth. Kitchener set ablaze 30,000 farms and slaughtered nearly 3.6 million sheep in the process.[10] The result of Kitchener's madness was an absolute outcry of English indignity from people like Liberal leaders Henry Campbell-Bannerman, David Lloyd George, and even

[8] Ibid., xxiv.
[9] Byron Farwell, *The Great Anglo-Boer War* (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1990), 353.
[10] Ibid.

Winston Churchill, all three of whom were future Prime Ministers.[11] What caused further indignation in the minds of the British people was Campbell-Bannerman referring to the scorched-earth policy as "methods of barbarism." To call the British barbarous was preposterous, but the policy was, in reality, barbarous.[12]

The other policy that was just as heinous as the scorched-earth campaign was the concentration camps implemented by Kitchener. This was the ultimate tragedy of the Boer War. At one point during the war, concentration camps held about one hundred and sixty thousand prisoners of war comprised of mostly women and children, with some men.[13] In between sixteen to twenty thousand children under the age of sixteen died in the concentration camps within a single year due to horrible sanitary conditions and rampant disease.[14] Overall, about twenty-five thousand Boers died in the camps, a number that shows that the overwhelming majority were children.[15]

The perception espoused by the Boers after Emily Hobhouse exposed the camps was that the British were trying to exterminate the

---

[11] Ibid.
[12] Ibid.
[13] Denis Judd and Keith Surridge, *The Boer War* (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2003), 194.
[14] Farwell, *Anglo-Boer War*, 392.
[15] Judd and Surridge, *Boer War*, 196.

Boers.[16] This policy was unacceptable to Liberal leaders Campbell-Bannerman and Lloyd George. The two, along with Hobhouse, railed against Kitchener and the treatment of the Boer people, but Conservatives like Prime Minister Salisbury and Kitchener were unfazed by the allegations. Salisbury believed the Boers should have avoided interfering with the "Queen's dominions."[17] In addition, Kitchener said the Boers in the camps had "a sufficient allowance and were all comfortable and happy," which was an outright lie in the majority of camps.[18] Many Conservatives and advocates of the war defended the concentration camps after Hobhouse's report, but the damage had been done to the civilized image of British warfare and politics in the eyes of the world. Thus, the two policies created an opportunity for the Liberals to take control in 1906.

The Apathy of The Working-Class During The Boer War

The focus of politicians in wartime is always the consent and support of the people for war. Joseph Chamberlain was no different in this aspect. He wished for all people to support the Boer War wholeheartedly from the aristocrat to the working-class, but therein

[16] Ibid., 194.
[17] Bill Nasson, *The South African War 1899-1902* (London: Arnold, 1999), 222.
[18] Farwell, *Anglo-Boer War*, 410.

lies the problem. Most of the working-class was not concerned about war; they were concerned about employment, reasonable wages, and eight-hour days. In general, the working-class press was actually anti-war. Those periodicals focused on the death and destruction caused by the Boer War, not on converting popular working-class opinion to an anti-war perspective.[19] Where the working-class man exercised his ability to be political was in leisurely settings as a member of a men's club or union.[20] These clubs were important to the Liberals and Conservatives in Parliament as a means to convey their war platforms, but neither group proved to be effective in arousing working-class support for or against the war.

Why political groups seemed to be ineffective in rousing support for their ideologies in these club settings is that the clubs and unions resolved to stay away from politics.[21] That is not to say that the men's clubs and unions did not have political speakers come in and give lectures; they did do that and would typically have civil

[19] Richard Price, *An Imperial War and the British Working Class: Working-Class Attitudes and Reactions to the Boer War 1899-1902* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1972), 46.
[20] Ibid., 47.
[21] Ibid., 66.

discussions on the issues of the Boer War.[22] However, this desire to hear political lectures did not replace the working-class man's apathy to politics. Normally, the working-class man wanted to avoid politics and engage in recreation after a long day's work.[23] This apathy toward politics led to a lack of jingoism within the clubs and unions.[24] Conversely, most of the discussions that were held within the clubs and unions were primarily anti-war because wartime would hurt wages and the men did not support lost income.[25]

The working-class man was concerned for himself, he was concerned for his family, and he was concerned for his livelihood. Why the apathy of the working-class man for the Boer War is important is his lack of desire to participate in the political process during the 1900 election.[26] Neither side was able to motivate the working-class, so the need to participate in the political process was irrelevant in 1900.

[22] Ibid., 82-3.
[23] Ibid., 67.
[24] Ibid., 70.
[25] Ibid., 71.
[26] Ibid., 67.

Election of 1900

The Election of 1900 was perfect for Conservatives since the Boer War was raging in southern Africa. Conservatives in Parliament were able to maintain a 134 seat advantage over the combined Liberal and Irish parties in Parliament.[27] There are a few factors as to why the Liberals lost the election: the first was that majority party changes usually do not occur during a war; the second was the Liberal party never really mounted a campaign offensive against the Conservatives; the third was the Liberal party was fractured itself; and finally, the Liberal party just wanted to maintain the seats they already held. Why the Election of 1900 is significant is that it was the first time that imperialism and social reform became debated national issues.[28]

The first reason why the Liberals lost the election of 1900 is the Boer War was underway. Generally, countries do not change majority parties during war, and many Liberals hoped the 'swing of the pendulum' theory would work in their favor since the Conservatives won the last election in 1895.[29] Unfortunately, the Liberals were mistaken and the Conservatives had won their second

[27] Ibid., 97.
[28] Ibid.
[29] Ibid.

election in a row. It was not until 1906 that the pendulum moved back in favor of the Liberals.

The second reason why the Liberals lost was that the party never mounted anything close to what resembled an offensive campaign against the Conservatives. It was an unexciting campaign in 1900 because jingoism had a hold on Great Britain. Celebrations like Mafeking Night deterred Liberal constituencies from speaking against the Boer War.[30] The Liberals allowed many Conservative incumbents to retain power and go unchallenged because the party was demoralized and had fractured in 1900.[31] Thus, the Liberals allowed 143 seats to go uncontested, compared to just a 109 in 1895.[32]

The third reason why the Liberals lost in 1900 was the split of the party into pro-Boer Liberals (anti-war and anti-imperialists) and Liberal Unionists (pro-war imperialists). Much publicity was given to the pro-Boer faction of the Liberals, but it was negative. The media excoriated the pro-Boers by alleging that they were traitors to the Crown.[33] The mayor of Mafeking in the Transvaal went as far to say,

---

[30] Ibid., 98.
[31] Ibid.
[32] Ibid.
[33] Farwell, *Anglo-Boer War*, 313.

"A seat lost to the government is a seat gained by the Boers."[34] The Liberal Unionists supported Chamberlain and the war, so they were spared the excoriation. However, their support of the opposition created an ideological war in the Liberal party. In short, this political division did not allow the Liberal party the opportunity to contest the 1900 election.

The fourth and final reason the Liberals lost in 1900 was the Liberal party decided to shift the focus from the war, and instead campaigned on social reform to maintain what seats they had in Parliament. The Liberal party decided to criticize Conservative acts like the Workmen's Compensation Act and the Housing Act, which interested working-class rural constituencies. Voter apathy was still a problem.[35] Social reform was a topic that interested the working-class, and as discussed in the last section, the working-class man was concerned about his livelihood, not the "war fever" that had spread throughout England.[36] In the eyes of the working-class, the Liberals still held true to social reform, especially the pro-Boer Liberals who depended on constituencies that had a high concentration of working-

[34] Ibid.
[35] Price, *An Imperial War*, 105.
[36] Ibid., 114-16.

class men.[37] By the working-class supporting the majority of Liberals through tradition and social reasons, the Conservatives were not able to crush the Liberals like Joseph Chamberlain wanted.[38]

The Politics of British Wealth Interest in the Boer War

The influence of the wealth-interests in British politics during the Boer War is a controversial aspect of the conflict. Out of all the various points of view that have been researched, this is probably the most debatable aspect of why the British government entered into the Boer War. A prevailing point of view as to why Great Britain entered into war for economic interests concerned the "Park Lane millionaires."[39] The Park Lane millionaires were a group of men that were wealthy diamond and gold magnates. They owned important mines in the Boer republics, including the gold mines on the Witwatersrand in the Transvaal.[40]

Historian Rayne Kruger felt that the central factor to the British involvement in the Transvaal was gold. There was a massive shortage of gold that hit Great Britain during the 1880s.[41] By the 1890s, gold

[37] Ibid., 116.
[38] Ibid.
[39] Judd and Surridge, *The Boer War*, 221.
[40] Ibid., 221.
[41] Kruger, *Dolly Gray*, 19.

was essential as an everyday currency and the shortage of gold led to trade sagging, wage sagging, and other economic shortfalls.[42] Because the Rand was vital to the gold magnates of Park Lane, it was essential for the British government to protect their economic interest in the Transvaal.

Historian J.A. Hobson is the first historian to posit that the economics of the Rand was what drove Chamberlain and Milner to be aggressive in asserting paramountcy in the Transvaal. Hobson developed this theory after speaking with a passenger who was an Outlander on a voyage to the Transvaal. The Outlander was active in trying to achieve the franchise in the Transvaal, and told Hobson the grievances faced by Outlanders were for "British consumption."[43] The reason why they disliked the Boers so much was that they felt the Boers were "cocky" and "insolent."[44] This was "intolerable" to the Outlanders.[45] The Outlander felt the Boers deserved an outright "thrashing" so the Boer might know their place.[46] After interviewing

[42] Ibid.
[43] Hobson, "A Small Confederacy of International Mine-Owners" in *Boer War: Why Was It Fought?*, 18.
[44] Ibid.
[45] Ibid.
[46] Ibid.

many Outlanders, Hobson concluded that a sense of arrogance was the general attitude of the British in the Transvaal.[47]

Hobson believed that the Boer War was fought for "a small confederacy of international financiers working through a kept press."[48] There is no doubt the press was controlled by the wealthy mine owners in southern Africa, who in turn gave their stories to all British media outlets.[49] However, the paramount issue to Hobson was the amount of profits the mine owners would make if Great Britain took control of the Transvaal.[50]

Regardless of the criticism regarding how the wealthy had a major role in the invasion of the Transvaal, British capitalists and businessmen who were invested in the Rand felt it was time for change since Paul Kruger, President of the Transvaal and leader of the Boers, was not willing to compromise with the investors in the Rand.[51] Right or wrong, the British government had to intervene in the Transvaal to protect the British diamond and gold interests in the Rand. The economic investments of the wealthy British businessmen and the

---

[47] Ibid.
[48] Ibid., 21.
[49] Hobson, "The Forces of Press, Platform, and Pulpit" in *Boer War: Why Was It Fought?*, 49-50.
[50] Hobson, "A Small Confederacy of International Mine-Owners" in *Boer War: Why Was It Fought?*, 21.
[51] Judd and Surridge, *The Boer War*, 224.

oppression of the Outlanders in the Transvaal motivated Chamberlain to enter into conflict with Kruger and the Boers.

Conclusion

In short, the politics of Great Britain during the Boer War were a multifaceted issue with many internal and external factors. Overall, the British people changed their attitudes on imperialism and colonialization because of the Boer War. Did the Boer War cure the apathy of the working-class voter? No. However, the Boer War made the British people and government aware that atrocities can be committed by the most "civilized" of people. Did British paramountcy outweigh this sense of civility before and during the Boer War? The answer is yes, but the British people and government faced a watershed moment in their history that transformed the future of the country. No longer did the Victorian Briton hold the high ground in civility. The world had changed and the British had morphed into the twentieth century as barbarians from the Boer War. The perception of the British had changed, which led to a Liberal win in 1906 and a desire to return to their place of civility in the world.

Napoleon Meets His Waterloo: An Examination of Mistakes Related to the Battle

Kayla Scott

The Battle of Waterloo occurred on June 18, 1815, near Belgium.[1] The battle was fought between the French army under Napoleon Bonaparte and the British army and assorted allies under Lord Wellington. The forces of Lord Wellington were assisted later in the day by members of Field Marshal Blucher's Prussian command. The battle was a crushing defeat for Napoleon. Both Napoleon and Wellington made mistakes on this field of battle, but Napoleon's errors were far more numerous. Napoleon's overconfidence concerning the battle was immense, a fact that arguably blinded him more than once from seeing what actions needed to be taken at Waterloo.

Emperor Napoleon Bonaparte had been exiled to the island of Elba in April of 1814.[2] Napoleon had caused multiple battles in Europe, and it was decided that the only way to keep the ambitious warmonger from causing further bloodshed was to find a cubbyhole in

[1] David Howarth, *Waterloo: Day of Battle* (New York City: Galahad Books, 1968), 3-8.
[2] Ibid., 5.

which to confine him. Elba was chosen to be Napoleon's little empire for the rest of his time on earth. Napoleon was not happy with this arrangement, and managed to escape from his island before two years had passed.

Some historians believe that Napoleon was in ill health at Waterloo, and blame his illnesses for his mistakes and subsequent loss of the battle.[3] According to his brother Jerome, the former King of Westphalia, Napoleon was suffering from at least two painful health problems. One was cystitis, a problem that caused inflammation of the bladder. Cystitis alone could cause excruciating pain and even fever. Historian David Howarth considered these health problems as "enough to account for everything he did or failed to do."[4] Based on that belief, Napoleon's first mistake was committed when he left Elba.

Prior to Waterloo, Napoleon's faith in his destiny to win at battle was just as high as ever despite tales of ailments and ill health. He was sure of a positive outcome to the conflict. On the morning of the battle he bragged, "We have ninety chances in our favor, and not

[3] Ibid., 54-57.
[4] Ibid.

ten against us."[5] In a separate statement, he was said to have remarked before the battle, "Ah, I have them at last, these English."[6] Instead of fearing the possibility of defeat, Napoleon was afraid that Wellington's forces would retreat before an engagement could take place. The greatest illustration of Napoleon's overconfidence can be found by listing the contents of his carriage after the battle.[7] As the battle was ending, Napoleon's carriage was captured by the allied forces, with Napoleon narrowly escaping capture himself. Inside the carriage were several items, including a gold dinner service and a uniform with 2,000,000 francs worth of diamonds sewn into the lining. Also enclosed were a collection of flyers printed before the battle that declared Napoleon's victory. The first line read "The short-lived success of my enemies detached you for a moment from my Empire: in my exile on a rock in the sea I heard your complaints."[8] All of Europe had been relieved when Napoleon was exiled; perhaps the complaints he heard were his own. The second line followed with "The God of battles has decided the fate of your beautiful provinces:

---

[5] David G. Chandler, *The Campaigns of Napoleon: The Mind and Method of History's Greatest Soldier* (New York: Scribner, 1966), 1066-1067.
[6] Harold T. Parker, *Three Napoleonic Battles* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1983), 128.
[7] Howarth, *Waterloo,* 199-200.
[8] Ibid.

Napoleon is among you." Napoleon's whereabouts were never in doubt during the Hundred Days War, a series of battles that had led up to Waterloo. The supposed "God of battles" was definitely not listening to Napoleon on June 18, as he would find out before the day was over. The proclamation continued "You are worthy to be Frenchmen. Rise in mass, join my invincible phalanxes to exterminate the remainder of those barbarians who are your enemies and mine: they fly with rage and despair in their hearts."[9]

It was, in fact, the French army that flew (or, more accurately, staggered) from the battlefield of Waterloo. Napoleon did not have an announcement prepared for losing the battle, but he had an arrogant statement ready to deliver upon winning. These leaflets proclaiming Napoleon's victory ended up blowing across the battlefield in the mud. The emperor was fond of saying, "By its very nature, the outcome of a battle is never predictable."[10] However, it is clear that Napoleon was doing just that: predicting his own victory.

---

[9] Ibid.

[10] Alan Schom, *One Hundred Days: Napoleon's Road To Waterloo* (New York: Atheneum MacMillan Publishing Company, 1992), 289.

Napoleon held a planning meeting on the morning of June 18.[11] At this meeting, several points were made that Napoleon failed to take seriously. Napoleon's orders had previously sent Marshal Emmanuel de Grouchy with his detachment of 32,000 men on a march to find the Prussian army.[12] When Napoleon's Chief-of-Staff, Marshal General Jean-de- Dieu Soult, suggested that at least part of Grouchy's detachment should be brought back to join the main body of French forces, Napoleon dismissed the idea with contempt. He rebuked his subordinate, saying "Because you have been beaten by Wellington, you think him a great General. I tell you Wellington is a bad general, the English are bad troops, and this affair will be nothing more than a picnic."[13] Despite Napoleon's insults to Wellington and his army, the Emperor is said to have observed the allied troops of Wellington's force and exclaimed, "How steadily those troops take the ground! How beautifully those cavalry form! Look at those gray horses! Who are these fine horsemen? These are fine troops, but in half an hour I shall cut them to pieces."[14]

---

[11] Chandler, *The Campaigns of Napoleon*, 1066-1067.
[12] Parker, *Three Napoleonic Battles*, 122.
[13] Howarth, *Waterloo*, 57.
[14] Ibid.

The next topic of concern at the planning meeting was brought up by Napoleon's brother Jerome, who reported hearing of a conversation between two British soldiers.[15] The soldiers' discussion revealed a plan by Blucher and Wellington to join together during the battle. Napoleon, who should have at least considered the possibility, scoffed at this piece of intelligence.

Napoleon listened to a single suggestion made by one of his men at the meeting, but it was the suggestion that would have been best ignored: since the ground was wet, the battle should be postponed until later in the day.[16] The ground was said to be too soft to allow for easy maneuvering of field guns or to use ricochet fire, so the battle time was set for 1:00 p.m. According to historian David Chandler, this was the worst mistake Napoleon and his army made on that day. Chandler notes that, "Had even an inadequately supported infantry attack been launched against Wellington during the morning, the French must surely have won …" Blucher could not have arrived in time for an earlier battle. Historian Jac Weller also notes that

[15] Chandler, *The Campaigns of Napoleon*, 1065-1066.
[16] Ibid., 1066-1067.

Napoleon's delay of the battle was not a particularly prudent move.[17] "As things worked out," wrote Weller, "every hour that the French could have gained would have been in their favor." At the same time, Weller points out something that several historians fail to take into consideration: the French army could not have offered effective battle immediately on the morning of June 18. The troops needed time to clean their arms after the rains of the previous night. They also needed a chance to find their commissary supplies and eat, as a significant amount of time had passed since their last meal. Battle at daylight was clearly not a good idea. As for using the excuse of waiting for the battlefield to dry out, Weller is skeptical. "Strong sun and wind would only slowly dry soaked Belgian soil; a few hours under ideal conditions would have helped slightly," wrote Weller. [18] "There appears to have been no sun, negligible wind, and many showers." Napoleon's "chances would have been better if he had attacked just as soon as he could."[19] In short, waiting a few hours would have made little to no difference in field conditions, but probably made a notable difference in the outcome of the battle.

---

[17] Jac Weller, *Wellington at Waterloo* (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1967), 193.
[18] Ibid., 193-194.
[19] Ibid.

Marshal Grouchy's detachment would have been better used on the field at Waterloo, instead of miles away searching for Prussians. Napoleon made several errors where Grouchy was concerned. Weller contended that Grouchy should have been ordered to follow the Prussian army hours before he did so.[20] Grouchy should have pursued the Prussians on the morning of June 17, not the afternoon. Napoleon failed to keep Grouchy informed of his plans and positions during the day before and the day of the battle.[21] Grouchy was without new orders or information from Napoleon from noon on June 17 until sometime after 1:00 a.m. on June 18. Napoleon did not receive the dispatch that Grouchy had sent around 10:00 p.m. on June 17 until sometime after 1:00 a.m., and then he did not read it immediately. This lack of communication was a contributing element to Grouchy's absence from the field of battle.

On the night before the battle, cavalry patrols informed Grouchy of the Prussian army's movement to Wavre.[22] Grouchy erroneously concluded that at least a portion of the Prussian army was headed for Brussels. The Marshal decided to send General Dominique

[20] Weller, *Wellington at Waterloo*, 192.
[21] Parker, *Three Napoleonic Battles*, 132-134.
[22] Chandler, *The Campaigns of Napoleon*, 1069.

Vandamme and General Étienne Maurice Gerard to Brussels. In reality, these commanders could have been put to better use if they had been sent toward Gery and Moustier, where they would have had the opportunity for a flank attack on the Prussian forces. Even so, Vandamme did not move until two hours after he and his men were supposed to, making Gerard two hours late as well. A short time after 10:00 a.m., Grouchy sent a message to Napoleon confirming the movement of Prussian troops to the area of Wavre and stated his intention to insert his forces between Blucher and Lord Wellington. While this was not a bad idea, he was too late to be of assistance on the field. A substantial percentage of the Prussian forces were already on their way to Wellington before Grouchy acted.

At 11:30 a.m. the Battle of Waterloo began.[23] Grouchy and his men could hear the firing as it commenced to the west of their position. General Gerard encouraged Grouchy to follow the sounds of battle rather than continue with plans to intercept the Prussian troops. Gerard's idea was sound, but he failed to present it carefully and with tact. Gerard's manner is said to have annoyed Grouchy to the extent that he refused to consider Gerard's proposal for even a moment. Had

[23] Chandler, *The Campaigns of Napoleon*, 1069-1072.

Grouchy moved to the west as Gerard advised, it would have been possible to have caught up with Prussian forces at the River Dyle. Grouchy was determined to observe Napoleon's last order and that meant he was to go wherever he thought Blucher was. David Chandler cites Grouchy's refusal to move west as serving to eliminate the chance of a French victory at Waterloo. "Grouchy cannot fairly be blamed until the time that he heard the boom of guns at Waterloo slightly before noon," Weller wrote.[24] Weller defends Grouchy, pointing out that despite his knowledge of the raging battle he would have been disobeying orders if he had gone to the field.

Originally, the onset of the battle at 11:30 a.m. was supposed to begin with an attempt to divide Wellington's forces.[25] However, it turned into a full-scale attack. Jerome had been expected to make a simple attack on allied forces at Hougoumont, but became fixated on visions of grandeur and personal glory. Jerome decided to capture Hougoumont at all costs and commenced an all-out assault. His obstinate and repeated attacks led to severe casualties among his ranks. Instead of admitting defeat, Jerome called for reinforcements. Jerome's stubborn insistence on capturing the pointless position served

[24] Weller, *Wellington at Waterloo*, 195.
[25] Chandler, *The Campaigns of Napoleon*, 1072-1073.

to accomplish little else but to tie down French troops. Eventually, two divisions plus a portion of a third division were occupied there without serving a constructive purpose. Chandler notes that Jerome's actions were the first "grave tactical blunder of the day." [26]

While Jerome was off fighting at Hougoumont, French forces were putting a battery of 84 guns into position to prepare for General Jean-Baptiste Drouet d'Erlon's attack.[27] A short time after 1:00 p.m., Napoleon's men commenced firing. However, there were two problems that prevented the battery's assault from being effective. The first problem was that targets were scarce, with only a few men and artillery pieces exposed. Second, the ground was still too wet to allow for effective ricochet fire. Cannonballs were more likely to go straight down and become embedded in the earth instead of rolling around and causing the destruction for which they were meant. For these reasons, the initial attack by French artillery forces mostly wasted time and ammunition. The French lined up for battle in such a way that nearly all of the army could be seen by the opposing force. This was a psychological move, but it left the French army more exposed to danger than a more condensed arrangement would have. In

[26] Weller, *Wellington at Waterloo*, 196.
[27] Chandler, *The Campaigns of Napoleon*, 1073.

contrast, Wellington had placed his troops so that the vast majority were not available to use as long-range targets.

Napoleon positioned himself roughly a mile and a half from the main fighting, a vantage point that made it impossible for him to stay on top of the action.[28] He could neither observe nor be kept up to date with the minute-by-minute movements at this distance. Napoleon did not seem to make any serious attempt to stay involved, giving only six known orders during the first six hours of battle. Marshal Ney was really the one directing the battle. This was a serious error, as Ney had proven in the days prior to the battle that he was unreliable for such an important command.[29] The problem with his position on the field was the opposite of Napoleon's: he was too close.[30] Often in the thick of battle, Ney was unable to know what was needed in other areas of the fighting where he was not involved. Ironically, Ney had not originally been a Napoleon supporter. When Napoleon left Elba to begin the Hundred Days War, Ney had been among those who vowed to arrest him and had even publicly bragged about doing so. Upon meeting Napoleon, Ney had switched sides. At Waterloo, Ney had been in

[28] Howarth, *Waterloo,* 116-118.
[29] Chandler, *The Campaigns of Napoleon,* 1068.
[30] Howarth, *Waterloo,* 83-85.

command for fewer than three days. Napoleon's position away from the main arena of battle was a grave error that was thought to be made in part because he was ill that day. Napoleon committed two of his worst errors at Waterloo by not staying directly on the field himself and by allowing Marshal Ney to have so much authority with the battle plan.

When movement was observed about five miles away from Napoleon's position, French forces had differing opinions on what the movement actually was. It was not long before a captured cavalry officer was brought before some of the French commanders.[31] The movement, reported the Prussian prisoner, was the advance guard of a corps from Blucher's army. The Prussians were joining Wellington, just as Napoleon had been warned early that morning before the battle began. Napoleon continued to believe that he was invincible, even though he knew that Wellington was being reinforced. "This morning we had ninety odds in our favor. We still have sixty against forty."[32]

When the Prussian officer was brought in, Napoleon had just finished preparing a vague message to Marshal Grouchy.[33] The

[31] Ibid., 83-85.
[32] Ibid.
[33] Howarth, *Waterloo*, 83-86.

message was ambiguous enough that it appeared to give Grouchy permission to continue heading toward Wavre where the Prussians were thought to be. In light of the knowledge that Blucher was joining Wellington, Napoleon added a note to the already written message: "Do not lose a moment in drawing near to us and affecting a junction with us, in order to crush Bulow whom you will catch in the very act of concentrating."[34] Napoleon was wrong to believe, even for a minute, that Grouchy had a chance of reaching the field in time to be of assistance. It took two and a half hours for a courier on horseback to reach Grouchy.[35] For the army of 32,000 to move bag and baggage (not to mention cannons) would take too long for the battle to still be in progress.

At 1:30 p.m., Napoleon directed Ney to order d'Erlon to begin his assault on Wellington's left center.[36] For some unexplained reason, d'Erlon chose to use an awkward and outdated marching order to advance. Two hundred men marched in the front rank, with approximately twenty-four to twenty-seven ranks in all. As Captain Pierre Charles Duthilt of the 45th Regiment of the line noted, this

[34] Chandler, *The Campaigns of Napoleon,* 1076.
[35] Howarth, *Waterloo,* 83-85.
[36] Chandler, *The Campaigns of Napoleon,* 1076-1077.

formation plan "cost us dear, since we were unable to form square against cavalry attacks, while the enemy's artillery shot could plow through our formations to a depth of twenty ranks."[37] Three of the four divisions formed in this manner. If the use of battalion columns had been employed instead, it would have prevented numerous casualties during the approach. Also, flexibility and maneuverability would have been greatly increased.[38] While attack columns were psychologically intimidating, the formation was of little use otherwise.[39] A formation could have a maximum of three ranks deep and be able to fire effectively. The remainder of the formation, especially those in the middle, were essentially along for the ride as the column marched blindly forward. Such a tight formation diminished firepower as well as maneuverability and made sudden movement impossible. The columns also presented large targets for Wellington's artillery. The unwieldy force did not have enough time to accomplish deployment before the enemy fell upon them. D'Erlon was forced to retreat and did so without formation. It is worth noting that the fourth division under General Pierre François Joseph Durutte

[37] Ibid.
[38] Chandler, *The Campaigns of Napoleon*, 1076-1077.
[39] Howarth, *Waterloo*, 83-85.

used a different plan of formation that was much more flexible.[40] His men, deployed on the extreme right, notably met with greater success than the other three divisions. The use of attack columns was later heavily criticized by many, including Lieutenant Colonel Basil Jackson, a staff officer in Wellington's army. Jackson noted that such columns had been considered impractical since Gustavus Adolphus implemented linear warfare. "The least reflection," wrote Jackson, "must satisfy anyone that, while massed in close columns, an enemy is really only formidable to the imagination …"[41]

Yet another failure occurred when these four divisions were deployed without sufficient support from the cavalry. Only one cavalry brigade led by General Étienne Jacques Travers was used. As Chandler notes, "It was customary in French tactics for a cavalry attack to precede that of the infantry in order to induce the opposition to form square and thus reduce his output of frontal fire." [42] No attempt was made to adhere to this custom. However, in fairness it is necessary to note the presence of a formidable hedge that spanned the majority of the ridge that was to be attacked. Wellington's gunners

[40] Chandler, *The Campaigns of Napoleon*, 1077.
[41] Lieutenant Colonel Basil Jackson, *Notes and Reminiscences of a Staff Officer at Waterloo*, (New York: E. P. Dutton and Company, 1903), 90-91.
[42] Chandler, *The Campaigns of Napoleon*, 1077.

had cut holes in the massive shrubbery through which to fit the cannon muzzles. This arrangement would have necessarily made a cavalry attack less effective. Hedge or no hedge, the lack of adequate cavalry support doomed d'Erlon's assault. Even though d'Erlon's attack failed to be executed successfully, it led to the deaths of 4,000 infantry and 2,000 cavalry on the allied side.

A short time before 3:00 p.m., Napoleon received a message from Grouchy that had been sent to him at 11:30 a.m.[43] At this point, he finally accepted that Grouchy would not make it to the field in time to assist with the battle. Napoleon had two choices: he could retreat or make an immediate and massive onslaught using all the forces he had at hand. Being Napoleon, he chose the latter. At 3:30 p.m., Marshal Ney received a directive from Napoleon to take La Haye Sainte at all costs. This attack was a failure.

In the process of the attack on La Haye Sainte, Ney witnessed what he mistakenly thought was the beginning of a retreat by Wellington's forces.[44] In fact, the only movement Ney saw was the progress of allied wounded as well as ambulances and empty ammunition wagons to the rear. Wellington was not retreating.

---

[43] Chandler, *The Campaigns of Napoleon*, 1079.
[44] Ibid., 1080.

Without consulting Napoleon, Ney sent in a brigade of cavalry to speed the supposedly "parting" allied forces. More and more cavalry were sent into the fray, so that by 4:00 p.m. a minimum of 5,000 cavalrymen were committed. This cavalry charge was made without the aid of infantry or artillery, and it lacked coordination. The momentum of this charge was hampered by the muddy conditions, making a slow trot the highest speed attainable. In response to Ney's charge, Wellington's forces formed into twenty squares with field pieces positioned between them and in front. Without infantry and artillery support, and, of course, proper planning, the assault failed. In an attempt to rescue Ney, Napoleon sent Flahaut's and Kellerman's cavalry troops.[45] The rest of the Guard Cavalry followed, even though it had not been ordered to do so. Approximately 9,000 to 10,000 cavalry were now committed, and Napoleon was without a reserve cavalry force. These cavalrymen were also inadequately supported and thus were forced back. Only after 6:00 p.m. were infantry soldiers added as an afterthought. When 1,500 men from this force were killed in ten minutes, it was obliged to retreat as well.

[45] Chandler, *The Campaigns of Napoleon*, 1084-1085.

A short time after 6:00 p.m., Napoleon ordered Ney to charge La Haye Sainte, and this time Ney used infantry, cavalry, and artillery together successfully.[46] La Haye Sainte finally fell to the French and proved to be Wellington's only loss for the day at Waterloo.[47] Even then, Wellington's forces managed to hold their position there until approximately 6:15 p.m. and did so under heavy assault. It is arguable that even this loss might have been averted except for the lack of adequate ammunition by some of the allied units involved.

After the fall of La Haye Sainte, Ney requested reinforcements. Napoleon sent an angry reply to Ney, asking, "Troops? Where do you expect me to get them? Do you expect me to make them?" [48] Another source reported that he exclaimed, "Where the devil do you expect me to find them!"[49] Marshal Ney did not get his reinforcements, even though Napoleon could have sent all or part of the Imperial Guard and possibly have won the battle.[50] Napoleon chose to reinforce the line on another part of the field instead, making a costly mistake.

---

[46] Ibid., 1085.
[47] Weller, *Wellington at Waterloo*, 195.
[48] Howarth, *Waterloo*, 166.
[49] Schom, *One Hundred Days*, 286.
[50] Chandler, *The Campaigns of Napoleon*, 1085.

At 7:00 p.m., Napoleon ordered the Imperial Guard into battle and led them within 600 yards of the allied line before giving command to Ney.[51] At this point, Bulow appeared to the right of the French forces. Napoleon had his subordinates lie to the troops, spreading the news that Bulow's force was Grouchy coming to their aid.[52] The troops believed that Grouchy was coming to save the day and raised the cry, "Vive l'Empereur! Vive Napoleon!"[53] This raised morale for only a brief moment before the French rear was fired upon and the truth revealed. The shouts of "Vive l'Empereur!" changed to "Sauve qui peut!" or "Everyone for himself!" as the truth became known. The rapid transition from celebration to panic made morale plummet faster than it would have if Napoleon had simply stayed silent or told the truth. Chaos and deep despair spread at the news of Bulow's arrival. The Imperial Guard went forward, but was not supported by cavalry as it attacked.[54] Unable to withstand the infantry's onslaught unprotected, the Guard retreated.

Napoleon finally realized that a full scale retreat was imminent whether he ordered it or not. The remaining Imperial Guardsmen were

---

[51] Ibid., 1087.
[52] Ibid., 1087-1089.
[53] Schom, *One Hundred Days*, 290.
[54] Chandler, *The Campaigns of Napoleon*, 1087-1089.

ordered to go forward. Panic-stricken French troops ran straight into their ranks in their flight to escape the Allies, ruining the maneuver and forcing another retreat. Napoleon had called the Imperial Guard the "Bravest of the Brave," but even they could not withstand the battle.[55]

Napoleon saw that his forces were being overwhelmed and did what he had done on other occasions: ran. He fled the battlefield without calling for a retreat or notifying his subordinate officers. After the battle, Ney said it was as if Napoleon had "disappeared."[56] However, parts of his army did witness their leader's inglorious flight. "A complete panic at once spread throughout the whole field of battle," stated an official account of the scene.[57] The French army followed their leader, leaving the battlefield in "great disorder."[58] Napoleon's cowardice was a poor example, indeed. "Never had Bonaparte committed a greater error," Carl von Clausewitz said of Napoleon's flight. "There is a difference between leading an invincible army in an orderly withdrawal from a battlefield in the face of an overwhelmingly superior force, and returning like a veritable

[55] Ibid.
[56] Schom, *One Hundred Days*, 289.
[57] Ibid.
[58] Ibid.

fugitive, guilty of having lost and abandoned an entire army."[59] Napoleon helped make Waterloo his final battle by abandoning his shattered army in such a dishonorable fashion.

After the battle, Lord Wellington was not exultant as Napoleon undoubtedly would have been. Lieutenant Colonel Basil Jackson witnessed Wellington's mood after the battle and noted that he was "evidently somber and dejected."[60] Jackson further wrote, "The few individuals who attended him, wore, too, rather the aspect of a little funeral train than that of victors in one of the most important battles ever fought."[61] Wellington himself confirmed Jackson's observations in writing after the battle, "The losses I have sustained have quite broken me down, and I have no feeling for the advantages we have gained."[62]

Napoleon's loss of Waterloo signaled the end of the Hundred Days War. On October 15, 1815, Napoleon was deposited on yet another island, this one named Saint Helena.[63] As for the loss of Waterloo, he blamed everyone but himself. Napoleon failed to admit

---

[59] Ibid.
[60] Jackson, *Notes and Reminiscences of a Staff Officer at Waterloo*, 60.
[61] Ibid.
[62] Ibid.
[63] Schom, *One Hundred Days*, 289.

that he should have been in the thick of battle giving orders. Napoleon failed admit that he should have called Grouchy back to the field more quickly. Napoleon also failed to admit that his overconfidence had assisted in his downfall. Even after he had lost at Waterloo, he still retained his old arrogance. "Had I succeeded, I should have died with the reputation as the greatest man who ever lived," wrote Napoleon of Waterloo.[64] "As it is, although I have failed, I shall be considered as an extraordinary man. I have fought fifty pitched battles, almost all of which I have won."[65] Napoleon and his men made error upon error at the Battle of Waterloo. Napoleon must take the greatest part of the blame for it all, since he failed to place himself in the middle of the fighting to direct his subordinates. It is arguable that Napoleon lost Waterloo not so much by what he did, but by what he did not do.

[64] David Gates, "Napoleon as General," *History Today* 48, no. 6 (1998): 47, http://search.ebscohost .com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=aph&AN=689666&site=ehost-live (accessed October 12, 2015).
[65] Ibid.

Scramble for Power: The Partition of Africa and German Aggression

Dylan Tucker

It is a well-known fact that there were multiple factors that ultimately brought the world into its first great war. Some of these events were the assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand, the Balkan Wars, and the July Ultimatum. People tend to forget the European tensions that arose from the Partition of Africa in 1884. During this time, Germany was growing as an imperial power and seeking out any possible way to surpass Great Britain as the world super power. Germany wanted more power as years passed; they wanted to dominate commerce, land, and sea. In 1884, a conference in Berlin marked the climax of the European competition for territory in the continent of Africa. This conference would go on to create many rivalries and tensions between the European powers. Due to the conflict and rivalries that stemmed from the Berlin Conference, Africa can be seen as a microcosm for the events that sparked World War I.

Berlin Conference of 1884

Geopolitically, Africa was a major area of interest for most European countries. European diplomacy treated Africans the same as they did the New World natives by forming trade relationships with the tribal chiefs. By the mid-1800s, many Europeans considered Africa to be disputed for trade, settlement, and exploration. Europeans ignored the inner continent itself due to outer trading posts along the coastlines. King Leopold II of Belgium did not try to cloak his ambitions and desire for Africa. He felt that colonies existed for one reason: to make him and his empire rich.[1] He formed the International African Society in 1876 to help with research of the interior. Two years later, he formed The International Congo Society, which focused heavily on economic goals rather than on research or civilizing the continent. Leopold discreetly bought off foreign investors in the Congo Society, and the African Society became a philanthropic front. Tensions between the European imperialists began to rise as political leaders discussed the division of West Africa. During this time, Germany began to launch their own expeditions in Africa. This event caused a major concern for both British and French diplomats as they

[1] Adam Hochschild, *King Leopold's Ghost: A Story of Greed, Terror, and Heroism in Colonial Africa* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1998), 38.

saw that Germany was trying to expand. Leopold was able to convince France and Germany that common trade would be in the best interest for the countries.[2]

On April 26, 1884, Chancellor Otto von Bismarck talked with the French ambassador in Berlin. He informed European Powers that Germany was keen to discuss colonial affairs with the other Powers and definitely with France.[3] Bismarck took responsibility for settling the Congo dilemma. During the months of August and September, he contacted major European countries to attend his international conference held in Berlin. Reactions to the conference were favorable.[4] Other countries included in the conference were the Netherlands, Belgium, Spain, and the United States. The others invited were just for show, as the letter of invitation stated, "to ensure general agreement on the conference resolutions."[5]

The conference would deal with the following objectives:

1. Freedom of trade in the basin and mouth of the Congo.
2. Freedom of navigation on the Congo and the Niger based on the same principles as applied for the Danube.

---

[2] H. L. Wesseling, *Divide and Rule: The Partition of Africa, 1880-1914* (Westport, Conn.: Praeger, 1996), 111.
[3] Ibid, 114.
[4] Ibid, 115.
[5] Ibid, 115.

3. The definition of the formalities to be observed when taking possession of new territory on the African coast.[6]

This conference would become known as the Berlin Conference. The Conference opened up at two o'clock on November 15, 1884. The three months of the Conference managed to fix multiple points in the joint policy of the African continent. The Conference managed to resolve an end to slave trade, establish the Congo Free State as private property of the Congo Society, establish free trade throughout the Congo Basin, the Niger and Congo Rivers were free for ship travel, and European powers had a right to pursue legal ownership of land.[7] The Conference closed on February 26, 1885. France and Portugal, who were major rivals, had feverish debates about the recognition of the Congo Free State. Recognizing that the Congo Free State was private property of the Congo Society, the leaders signed the General Act of Berlin.[8] Germany and Britain gave most of the Congo Basin to Leopold.

Henri Blowitz, who was a *Times* correspondent in Paris, established a theory that Britain would come off worst at the end of the

[6] Ibid, 116.
[7] Olusoga, David; Erichsen, Casper W. (2010). *The Kaisers's Holocaust: Germany's Forgotten Genocide and the Colonial Roots of Nazism*. (London, UK: Faber and Faber), 394.
[8] H. L. Wesseling, *Divide and Rule: The Partition of Africa, 1880-1914*. (Westport, Conn.: Praeger, 1996), 118.

conference. Bismarck aimed to dismantle the relations between Great Britain and France, and planned to expose Britain's weakness to withstand the united will of the new allies, Germany and France. Blowitz hated Bismark with a burning passion. His theory seemed to coincide with that of the French government. French ambassador to Berlin, Baron de Courcel, expected Bismarck to diminish Britain's maritime ascendancy, just as he had diminished France's military fifteen years before. Courcel reported to Paris,

> "Indications tend to prove that he is preparing a fundamental attack on English power, calculated that to reach its vital parts, and to ruin England to the advantage of Germany's industrial and commercial greatness."[9]

The 'vital parts' that Courcel mentioned in his report referred to the Niger and Britain's empire on the east and west coast of Africa. Although the Conference expressed internationalist intentions and imperialist effects, it did prove to be a precursor to the partition of Africa. The Conference was also Germany's first steps into emerging as an imperial power and showed threats of German aggression.[10]

Jameson Raid and the Kruger Telegram

[9] Thomas Pakenham, *The Scramble for Africa, 1876-1912*. (New York: Random House, 1991), 250.
[10] Ibid, 250.

Technology is a power wielded over the natural world which provides defense against hostile environments and improves one's condition. Technology is often used to overpower people. The military rifles of the 1850s surpassed their previous counterparts, the muskets, in both accuracy and consistency. Muskets were usually slow, awkward to use, and fouled easily in damp conditions. The paper cartridges were vulnerable to moisture and difficult to load within the rifle. The major flaw of the musket was that soldiers had to stand whilst loading their rifles making them an open target for the enemy. The flaws of the muskets and the expansion of military called for a new technological innovation: breech loading rifles. In 1870, Europeans arrived with quick-firing breech-loaders that started an arms race within Africa. This gave Africans a powerful lure to acquire these new weapons. Africans were able to purchase weapons directly from the manufacturers on rare occasions.[11] Africans obtained rifles from various European countries. When the French rearmed with Gras rifles in 1874, their old Chassepots rifles were rebuilt and were available along African coasts. Africans in South Africa were able to obtain modern weapons from white settlers living in their territory.

[11] Daniel R. Headrick, *The Tools of Empire: Technology and European Imperialism in the Nineteenth Century*. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1981), 109.

Settlers had modern rifles that they either lost or gave away. Many of the mine operators realized that they could recruit Black laborers by offering the rifles as compensation for their work. Desperate for revenue, governments benefitted from the high taxes issued on firearms. Missionaries like David Livingstone provided most of their converts with rifles as a form of self-defense.[12] Due to the increase in weapon rates, many Africans could obtain a gun without having to struggle to acquire one. The Anglo-Zulu War in 1879 was supposed to increase British standing in South Africa, but it actually had the opposite effect on the area. Non-violent Boer opposition had increased even though the Zulu and Pedi lost the war. As years passed, the Boers realized that passive resistance was becoming futile. By 1895, Britain was gaining confidence in taking South Africa. Appointed to Colonial Secretary the following year, Joseph Chamberlain joined forces with Cecil Rhodes to develop and promote the British Empire in South Africa. The Drift Crisis between the Cape, Colony, and the Transvaal increased. The Cape finished constructing a railway line to Johannesburg and tried to reduce rates on the Transvaal's railway traffic. The Transvaal government increased the rates on the part of the

[12] Ibid, 111.

railway that ran through the Transvaal where the railway had crossed the Vaal River.[13] Goods were taken by train to the Vaal River, and then taken by wagon to avoid paying the high prices in the Transvaal. Paul Kruger, president of the Transvaal, reacted by blocking any access to the Transvaal. The Drift Crisis and the beginning of the Jameson Raid were the pinnacles of the Reform Movement with the support of Cecil Rhodes.[14] The Kruger government had been putting pressure on the mining companies in the form of taxes. They maintained monopolies over certain items like dynamite and other explosives for deep-level blasting. The Reform Movement decided to overthrow the government by taking up arms. With the help of Leander Starr Jameson, Chamberlain helped plan an assault that would be known as the Jameson Raid. The raid occurred on December 29, 1895, and would become a complete and utter failure. The German Kaiser Wilhelm became hysterical after hearing the news of the raid and spoke of declaring war on Britain. He considered proclaiming a German protectorate over the Transvaal, sending troops, mobilizing a fleet, and other various options. Instead, he decided to send a telegram

---

[13] H. L. Wesseling, H. L. *Divide and Rule: The Partition of Africa, 1880-1914*. (Westport, Conn.: Praeger, 1996), 306.

[14] "Jameson Raid". Retrieved March 12, 2015. http://www.sahistory.org.za/topic/jameson-raid.

to Kruger on January 3, 1896. The Kruger telegram was the first of Wilhelm's many mistakes. The British reaction was violent; dockers in London assaulted German merchant sailors, the windows of German shops were broken, and businesses were boycotted. The Kruger telegram united Britain in a massive wave of patriotism. Britain now saw that Germany was becoming increasingly dangerous, was the true rival, and was the one who was picking away at Britain's industrial and commercial supremacy.[15]

The Moroccan Crises

German aggression began to rise as the imperial rush for African land raged on. By 1888, Kaiser Wilhelm II rose to power and dismissed Chancellor Bismarck in the year 1890. The Kaiser set out to compete with the United Kingdom to become the world's dominant superpower. Under the reign of Wilhelm II, the foreign policy that Otto Von Bismarck had enacted became more aggressive. Under Wilhelm II, the foreign policy changed to a more aggressive manner by trying to separate the coalition of Britain and France. The Kaiser had no interest in Morocco; his central purpose was to schism the Anglo-French Entente. The Entente Cordial intended to be a settlement

[15] G. N. Uzoigwe, *Britain and the Conquest of Africa; the Age of Salisbury*. (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1974), 188.

of imperialist rivalries between the two countries, not form an alliance against Germany. Germany saw the alliance between Britain and France as a threat to its power.[16] Wilhelm focused his attacks on French chargé d'affaires Theophile Delcassé, who he blamed for two things. First, Delcassé signed treaties with all European countries with an interest in Morocco, but had not approached Germany. It seemed he would become a mediator in the Russo-Japanese War. If Delcassé was successful in this, he might become the leader of a Quadruple Alliance among France, Russia, Britain, and Japan. Germany wanted to do nothing more than make Delcassé resign. The German move came on March 31, 1905.[17] Germany had originally intended to stage a naval demonstration off the Moroccan coast, but it turned into a more peaceful alternative of having Wilhelm travel to Tangiers. The Kaiser did not care much for the idea of going ashore to Morocco. He felt nervous about braving the seas and was even more terrified of being assassinated by one of the Spanish anarchists whose presence was thought to be in Tangier. However, he did land in Tangier for the sake of national interest. During his speech to the sultan and the French

[16] Trevor Owen Lloyd. *Empire the History of the British Empire*. (London: Hambledon and London, 2001), 140.
[17] H. L. Wesseling, *Divide and Rule: The Partition of Africa, 1880-1914.* (Westport, Conn.: Praeger, 1996), 348.

chargé d'affaires, he came out in favor of an "open door" policy and against annexations and monopolies.[18] Germany's implication was clear enough: Germany would stand up for its interests in the Moroccan territory. Germany felt that it was in a strong position after the grand vizier said that Wilhelm had given a tremendous blow to France.[19] Germany believed that Britain would support France in Morocco, because France's only ally, Russia, was at war with Japan. Delcassé figured that this was a bluff from Germany; yet, the French government did not. Delcassé decided to take a defiant line against Germany, stating that there was no need for a conference. The German Chancellor Bernhard von Bulow threatened France with war over this problem. French Prime Minister Rouvier and his colleagues turned against Delcassé. Rouvier did not want to take the risk and have war with Germany. He made contact with the German ambassador Randolin and made hints that he was ready to dismiss Delcassé. He learned in twenty-four hours the French government wanted to let him go. The French cabinet yielded and Delcassé resigned on June 6, 1905. The Entente did not dissolve after Delcassé resigned.[20] An

[18] Ibid, 349.
[19] Ibid, 350.
[20] Ibid, 350.

international conference was held in Algeciras, Spain, in January 1906 to finalize the agreement about Morocco. The convention gave France a controlling interest in Moroccan affairs, but guaranteed the equality of trade and economic freedom for nations and limited colonial action without consulting other powers. The Act of Algeciras allowed France to have a military intervention whenever needed. The most important diplomatic result of the Algeciras Conference was that Germany was isolated and it failed to eradicate the Entente. This event did not stop Germany from trying to cause more trouble with France.[21]

Six years passed after Germany had tried to provoke international outrage. The Anglo-German tensions were high due to the naval arms race between Germany and Britain. French authorities stated that rebel tribes had besieged Fez, and Sultan Abdelhafid asked for French military assistance. France decided to occupy the city of Fez on May 21, 1911. Germany had thought France had instigated the rebel tribes to manifest an excuse to occupy the Moroccan city. Alfred von Kiderlen-Wachter, who was German foreign secretary, forgot to consult key personnel before sending the German gunboat, the *Panther,* into Agadir's bay. Britain became worried by the *Panther*'s

[21] "First Moroccan Crisis." History.com. Accessed March 12, 2015. http://www.history.com/this-day-in-history/second-moroccan-crisis.

presence in the Atlantic. They believed that Germany intended to turn Agadir into a naval base to increase their fleet size. Tensions between the powers began to rise.[22] Britain, backing France once again, decided to send a fleet just in case a conflict was to erupt. The French ambassador in Berlin, Jules Cambon, decided to join the negotiations. The solution to the problem was obvious. Germany wanted compensation for a French annexation of Morroco. They made their intention clear by sending a gunboat instead of troops. Germany's intentions were to intimidate, not to occupy the area. The compensation that they desired was African territory.[23] Alfred von Kiderlen-Wachter, the German foreign minister, wanted the French Congo. In order for this to happen, France wanted something in return. On November 4, 1911, Franco-German negotiations on the Franco-German agreement stated that Germany accepted France's position in Morocco in exchange for the French Congo. Nothing stood in the way for France to establish a protectorate over Morocco. On March 24, 1912, a French envoy arrived to present a treaty to the sultan.[24] A few

[22] "Second Moroccan Crisis." History.com. Accessed March 12, 2015. http://www.history.com/this-day-in-history/second-moroccan-crisis.
[23] H. L. Wesseling, *Divide and Rule: The Partition of Africa, 1880-1914.* (Westport, Conn.: Praeger, 1996), 353.
[24] Ibid, 355.

days after difficult discussions, Sultan Abdelhafid resigned himself and signed the Treaty of Fez on March 30. His Brother, Mulay Yussuf, abdicated the throne. Instead of making Britain turn against France, the increased hostility brought the two countries together. This reinforced the Entente and brought Russia in as well. The events that occurred in Africa increased the Anglo-German alienation and would eventually climax into World War I.[25]

In conclusion, the Partition of Africa was a contributor in setting the stage for the First World War. Germany, trying to expand its power and become the dominant power, wanted to obtain as much land as possible in Africa with the Berlin Conference while trying to undermine Britain. Instead, the Conference came out in Belgium's favor and just created tension between the countries. As years passed, German aggression began to develop as Wilhelm's foreign policy was enacted. Germany sought out ways to make Britain look weak by showing their support to the Boers and splitting the French alliance with the Moroccan crises. Germany's intentions only managed to fail and made the country look weak. A few years after the Moroccan

[25] Ibid, 356

crises, Germany would take its turn and descend into war with the British Empire.

AMERICAN HISTORY

The Blackstone Rangers and the Civil Rights and Black Power Movement in Chicago

Sam Keiser

When you think of the Civil Rights Movement in the states north of the Mason-Dixon Line, the last people thought of would be gang members. In our minds, Martin Luther King, James Bevel, Jesse Jackson, and Stokely Carmichael are the people credited with spreading the Movement to the North. Because of this view, the roles local organizations and gangs played in the Civil Rights and Black Power Movements is often glossed over. Nowhere is this more apparent than in Chicago in the late ‘60s during the Chicago Freedom Movement of 1966 and the subsequent rise of the Black Power Movement of 1968. This marked a period when gang involvement in the Civil Rights Movement would not only grow; it would actively be sought after. In the ‘60s, Chicago based gangs became more numerous and more organized than the previous iterations. Their involvement in the Civil Rights and Black Power Movements enabled them to become players not only locally, but on the national stage as well.

"The Blackstone Rangers," who would also be known as the "Black P. Stones" and "El Rukn," were co-opted into the Civil Rights Movement in Chicago. They were able to extend their influence beyond the Civil Rights Movement and into the Black Power Movement, as well. The Rangers and their leader Jeff Fort became the most notorious gang in Chicago. Their rise to prominence and community activism made them a unique force in the '60s. The relationships they formed with prominent Civil Rights and Black Power leaders such as, Martin Luther King Jr., Jesse Jackson, and Fred Hampton showed their willingness to fight the inequalities in Woodlawn neighborhood. To understand the Blackstone Rangers and how they became such a prominent gang in Chicago, their beginnings must be considered. The man most associated with the Rangers who came to be the eventual leader of the Blackstone Rangers was Jeff Fort. He was born on February 20, 1947, in Aberdeen, Mississippi, he and his family would later take up residence in Chicago's "South Side" in the mid-fifties. At a young age, Jeff Fort had a penchant for getting in trouble with the law. He began popping in and out of juvenile detention centers and it was here that he met Eugene "Bull" Hairston, who would eventually become the leader of the Blackstone

Rangers. They took the name Blackstone from Blackstone Avenue, the street they lived on. The exact year that the gang was formed varies from source to source, but the gang was officially formed sometime in the late '50s to early '60s. However, the most likely year of the gang's formation occurred in 1959. Originally, Eugene Hairston assumed leadership of the gang with Jeff Fort as his second in command. This gang, like many others, was formed to protect their neighborhood from rival gangs like the Devil's Disciples, Imperials, Conservatives, FBIs, Drexel Casanovas, and the Gangsters.[1] During the gang's early years, they adhered to their original goals, protecting their neighborhood from the encroachment of these gangs on their territory.[2]

Beginning with their inception in1959, the Blackstone Rangers were engaged in street battles with rival gangs, mainly the Devil's Disciples. However, things began to change in 1965. The Rangers shifted their focus away from the street violence and began working on organization. The shift that occurred was mainly due to the arrival of Reverend John Fry in Woodlawn. Through the outreach efforts of

---

[1] Natalie Moore, and Lance Williams. *The Almighty Black P Stone Nation: The* Rise, Fall, *and Resurgence of an American Gang* (Chicago, Ill: Lawrence Hill Books, 2011), 32.

[2] Tom Brune, and James Ylisela JR, "The Making of Jeff Fort." *Chicago magazine*, November 1998. http://www.chicagomag.com/Chicago-Magazine/November-1988/The-Making-of-Jeff-Fort/.

Chuck LaPagila, who was a member of the church, Fry began to engage with the Rangers. Reverend Fry wanted to help shape the Rangers into a political youth organization. It was Fry, before anyone else, who recognized the Rangers' potential to be a political organization if they directed their energies in a more positive direction. In an effort to foster better relations between the church and the Rangers, Fry began to allow the Rangers to make use of the First Presbyterian church as a space for them to gather as a group. However, trying to form a relationship between the church and the Rangers had its share of difficulties. In Reverend Fry's book, *Fire and Blackstone*, Reverend Fry described the community's reaction to the church working with the Rangers by saying, "Please understand. The Blackstone Rangers had a terrible reputation. Almost without exception Woodlawn residents hated and feared them. The organization was known to be armed and quick to use firearms and other instruments of violence. Woodlawn residents thus believed the Church must at least be sanctioning and even participating in these activities."[3] Despite the community's uneasiness over the situation

[3] John Fry, *Fire and Blackstone,* 1st ed (Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1969), 8.

with the Rangers, it does seem as though Reverend Fry was able to steer the Rangers towards a more positive direction.

Eventually, the church became the *de facto* headquarters of the Blackstone Rangers. It was here under the tutelage of the Reverend John Fry that the Blackstone Rangers began to organize their gang into one of the most influential organizations on Chicago's "South Side." In this respect, the Blackstone Rangers were unique. Unlike many other gangs, the Blackstone Rangers had a strong central chain of command that allowed them to act in concert. They achieved this organization by incorporating the smaller gangs that had joined up with them directly into the overall Ranger command structure.

This led to the creation of what the Rangers called the "Main 21." The Main 21 was essentially the governing body of the Blackstone Rangers. It included all of the gang leaders who had joined up with the Rangers in the early sixties and it was presided over by Eugene Hairston and Jeff Fort. The Main 21 had two very distinct roles that helped organize the Rangers into one of the most organized gangs of its time. The first role of the Main 21 was to make decisions for the gang as a whole. The second role of the Main 21 was that the gang leaders who joined the Rangers still had control of their gang's

day-to-day operations.[4] By 1966, they became what John Hall Fish described as, "a supergang."[5] Unlike many Black gangs, the Rangers had risen in numbers while still maintaining their command structure. Shortly after the formation of the Main 21 the Blackstone Rangers renamed themselves as the Black P. Stones. Their rise from a lowly neighborhood street gang made up of only a few members to an organized gang of three thousand members brought them a lot of attention from both the local and national level.

One of the most telling signs of the Rangers' potential to be a powerful force for not only the community, but for Blacks across the nation occurred when noted Civil Rights activist James Bevel came to Woodlawn meet with them in 1966. Bevel was a prominent member of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC) that was led by Martin Luther King Jr. This was an attempt by the SCLC to organize the gangs in Chicago and redirect their efforts into helping what would soon become officially known as the "Chicago Freedom Movement". To this end, Bevel pleaded with the Rangers to give up violence as a means to increase their influence in the streets. He even showed them

[4] Moore and Williams, *The Almighty Black P Stone Nation,* 34-35.
[5] John Fish, *Black power/white control; the struggle of the Woodlawn Organization in Chicago,* (Princeton, N.J: Princeton University Press, 1973), 118.

a film that detailed the events of the Watts Riots.[6] The Watts Riots occurred in 1965 in Watts, California. The riot was sparked by ongoing police brutality, unemployment and housing. The Rangers showed a large amount of indifference to Bevel's presentation. While this is certainly not what Bevel or the SCLC had hoped for, it did not mean that they could not use the Stones during the Chicago Freedom Movement.

The Chicago Freedom Movement was very different from what is now viewed as the traditional Civil Rights Movement in the South. The movement was largely inspired in the wake of the riots that broke out in Watts in 1965. The Watts Riots forced Civil Rights leaders to shift from the needs of Blacks in the South to the needs of those in the Chicago. One of the main differences between the Chicago Freedom Movement and the Civil Rights Movement of the South was that Civil Rights leaders were now trying to fight against poverty, *de facto* segregation, unfair housing, and unequal employment. This was a far cry from fighting de jure segregation in the South. The biggest problem facing Blacks in the North was the use of *de facto* segregation. *De facto segregation* is an informal form of segregation

[6] Fry. *Fire and Blackstone,* 5.

that is not placed into law. Instead it was an unspoken practice that is mostly driven by the attitudes of the white majority. Essentially, Blacks and whites would be segregated as a matter of fact and not law. *De facto* segregation was also employed in the job market resulting in a lower number of Blacks being hired by numerous businesses. Both unfair housing practices along with discrimination in the job market contributed heavily to Black poverty. This segregation occurred even though there were no laws in place that barred Blacks from housing or employment. These factors would present a noticeably different challenge for a movement that had largely fought against legal discrimination in the South.

King announced the start of the Chicago Freedom Movement in 1966. It quickly became apparent that he wanted to harness the Black youth to help with his campaign. After King moved into the Lawndale area in 1966, he began meeting with some of the local gang leaders in the Lawndale area after a three-day riot between the police and citizens of Lawndale. In the wake of this riot, King set up a meeting between the SCLC and local gangs in Lawndale. Among the gangs that King reached out to were the “Vice Lords”, “Roman

Saints," and the "Cobras."[7] These meetings had a dual purpose; on one hand, King did want to end the violence caused by gang members. On the other hand, King understood the value that these gangs could bring to his movement. David Lewis, author of *King: A Biography*, described the meeting between King and the gang leaders: "Martin listened patiently to a four-hour outpouring of anti-white, anti-city hall vituperation, allowed that he understood their indignation, and persuaded the youth leaders to agree to try non-violence experimentally. It was to be an experiment of brief duration."[8] This tactic of meeting with the gang leaders and members seemed to work for King. King used the same approach when trying to steer the Blackstone Rangers towards non-violence. For all intents and purposes, this approach seemed to work. Many of the larger and more visible gangs would refrain from violence and become active participants in the Chicago Freedom Movement.

So how do the Blackstone Rangers fit into the narrative of the Chicago Freedom Movement? The easy answer would be to just say that they showed up to a few marches. However, that would diminish some of their most influential works during the Chicago Freedom

[7] David Lewis. *King: A Biography* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1978), 336.
[8] Ibid 336.

Movement. According to several sources, the Rangers were first sighted at King's rally at Soldier Field in 1966. While they were not in support of non-violence, they did add numbers to the march on city hall. It is also important to note that according to these sources that they were actively chanting "Black Power"[9]. This should be unsurprising as "Black Nationalism" fit with their values more than the non-violence of the Civil Rights Movement. After making it known that some of their number intended to be a force for the Chicago Freedom Movement, their involvement only increased. In addition to taking part in the rally at Soldier Field, the Rangers took part in various marches throughout the city. One of the more prominent marches they were involved in was the infamous march on Marquette Park. Reportedly the Blackstone Rangers acted as bodyguards for King after he was struck by a brick.[10] The Rangers showed their capacity for restraint by not lashing out in the wake of this attack. Gang members also featured prominently in the "Open Housing" marches in 1966. Dr. King recalled, "I remember walking with the Blackstone Rangers [one of the Woodlawn areas most notorious

[9] Liam Ford, *Soldier Field a Stadium and its City* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2009), 210; Moore, and Williams, *The Almighty Black P Stone Nation,* 41.
[10] John Hagedorn, "Race Not Space: A Revisionist History of Gangs in Chicago" *Journal of African American History* 91, no. 2 (2006): 202.

gangs] while bottles were flying from the sidelines, and I saw their noses being broken and blood flowing from their wounds; and I saw them continue and not retaliate, not one of them, with violence."[11]

The common theme of the Chicago Freedom Movement is that the Rangers were a major part of "Operation Breadbasket". Operation Breadbasket was another movement in Chicago that was headed up by Reverend Jesse Jackson. The goal of the operation was to target businesses that did not employ or underemployed Blacks. The goal was to get the company either to negotiate with the protestors or to stage a boycott of the store or company until they were forced to come to the bargaining table. According to several sources such as, *Up Against The Wall* and *Shakedown: exposing the real Jesse Jackson,* the Black P Stones supported this movement in two extremely different ways. The first way they supported the movement was through participating in the boycotts and the picket lines. Some sources alleged they even worked with other large gangs such as the Vice Lords and the Black Disciples to picket and boycott businesses.[12] According to

[11] Poverty and Race Research Action Council, ""Launching the National Fair Housing Debate: A Closer Look at the 1966 Chicago Freedom Movement." prrac.com.
[12] Curtis Austin, *Up against the wall: violence in the making and unmaking of the Black Panther Party* (Fayetteville: University of Arkansas Press, 2006), 200;

John Hagedorn, who wrote a journal article on the subject, “The three major gangs—"Lords, Stones, and Disciples" or "LSD"—formed a coalition to "take Chicago on a trip" and fight for jobs and civil rights. C. T. Vivian, Jesse Jackson, land other civil rights leaders worked with the gangs in their campaign for jobs in the construction industry, though the alliance was tenuous at best.”[13] This coalition was formed in 1969 and was instrumental in helping Jackson make Operation Breadbasket successful. Some of their most notable efforts included: halting construction work at the Woodlawn YWCA, Woodlawn Gardens, Madden Park Homes, and the new Dr. Martin Luther King High School. Members of the Stones staged a sit-in inside of the Building Trades Unions Council. The Stones also halted construction work at the University of Illinois.[14] Because of the large numbers of protestors, many of the businesses had no choice but to come to the bargaining table. The influence of the street gangs involved in the boycotts helped make it possible to bring enough pressure on the companies targeted by Operation Breadbasket.

Kenneth Timmerman, *Shakedown: exposing the real Jesse Jackson*. (Washington, D.C.: Regnery Pub 2002), 27.
[13] Hagedorn, “Race Not Space”, 202.
[14] Angeliki Panagopoulos, "LSD: gangs and UIC" April 8, 2014, <http://gangresearch.net/ChicagoGangs/lsd/lsd.htm>.

So did the Rangers and by extension any other street gangs make an impact on the Chicago Freedom Movement? Well, the answer is both yes and no. First off, the Rangers and other large gangs, such as the Black Disciples, made an impact due to the ability to bring in large number of members to marches and rallies. It also seemed that there ability to bring in large numbers of Black youth served them well when they participated in boycotts. Whether or not they engaged in underhanded tactic such as extortion, intimidation, or threats of violence against any of the businesses during Operation Breadbasket is not as clear. However, it needs to be understood that while projects such, as Operation Breadbasket were a success. The Chicago Freedom movement as a whole did little to make lasting changes. Mayor Daley and the bigoted sentiment that pervaded the white neighborhoods of Chicago proved too much for the leaders of the Chicago Freedom Movement to handle. King and other Civil Rights leaders called a summit with Mayor Daley on August 26, 1966. However, the agreement that came out of the summit meeting failed to quickly implement the proposed changes. The lack of a deadline for the changes as well as there being little to no evidence that city officials would actually implement these changes led many to believe that this

was a failed movement. While this failure cannot be blamed on any one individual person or group, it does not diminish the influence and power of gangs during the Chicago Freedom Movement.

While the Chicago Freedom Movement may have not been a success, it did open the door for the Black Panther Party to take center stage in Chicago in the late sixties. The perceived failure of the Chicago Freedom Movement contributed to many turning towards Black power movements to offer a solution to northern inequality. The Vietnam War also contributed to the rise of Black Nationalism in cities such as Chicago. The man who would become the symbol of the Black Power Movement was Fred Hampton. Fred Hampton is the key to understanding the impact that the gangs of Chicago had on the Black Power Movement. However, this impact may not have been the kind that people expected. To understand the impact of gangs like the Black P. Stones on the Black power movement, it is necessary to talk about J. Edgar Hoover's FBI.

The FBI played a direct role in the Civil Rights Movement of Chicago. The causes of this aggression stemmed from both the Fred Hampton and the Chicago based Black Panther Party and their desire to form a coalition with the large numbers of gangs that controlled the

streets. Because of this attempted coalition the FBI got involved and effectively ended the Black Power Movement in Chicago. What is very important to note is that the Stones influence on the Black Power Movement is defined more by the efforts of the FBI and police attempting to take down their organization than by the actual cooperation between the two organizations.[15]

The first thing to address when talking about the role of gangs such as the Blacks P. Stones on the Black Power movement is the rise of Fred Hampton to a leadership role in the Chicago chapter of the Black Panthers. Fred Hampton was born on August 30 1948, in the southwest area of Chicago. Many prominent Black leaders such as Marcus Garvey, Malcolm X, and W.E.B Dubois inspired Hampton.[16] Even at a young age his abilities to speak, mobilize and organize and would serve to help him become an activist as early as his high school years.

Among some of the various examples of Hampton's activist leanings involved campaigning for the inclusion of more Black teachers in the school system, a student organized boycott due to the

[15] Austin, *Up Against the Wall*, 200.
[16]Jeffrey Haas, *The Assassination of Fred Hampton how the FBI and the Chicago police murdered a Black Panther* (Chicago, Ill.: Lawrence Hill Books/Chicago Review Press, 2010), 18.

fact that only white girls were nominated for homecoming queen, and a seat on a student council that dealt with racial issues. Charles Anderson, a former dean at Hampton's high school, had this to say about his efforts, "Fred was the reason I was hired at Proviso East High School as dean in charge of attendance," he said, "Until that time, I had been applying for six years and never had been given an interview."[17] Hampton was so well regarded that the teachers relied on him to help calm tensions between the Black and white students of the school. Eventually, Fred's actions and leadership both at school and his community earned the attention of the NAACP who offered him a job. This would officially mark the beginning of his career as an activist.

However, Hampton's time with the NAACP would eventually come to an end due to the Vietnam War. Unlike many in the mainstream organizations, Hampton was fervently opposed to the war. Hampton would then go on to say that, "he was not just for "Peace in Vietnam," but "Victory in Vietnam" for the Vietnamese."[18] This attitude would lead Hampton on his journey into the growing Black Power Movement. Hampton was recruited to join the newly formed

[17]Ibid, 19.
[18]Ibid., 27.

Chicago chapter of the Black Panther Party in 1968. From there he quickly rose through the ranks to become its leader. Hampton began organizing many outreach programs for the community. Probably the most prominent program was a free breakfast program for school aged kids. This program would eventually expand to several different areas across the city.

Hampton developed "Rainbow Coalition"; his plan was to incorporate all of the street gangs of Chicago, regardless of race, into the Black Panther Party. This was a first for the Panther's organization, as none of the other branches of Panthers went out to recruit entire gangs into their ranks. On the surface, this seemed like a very well thought out idea. For one, if he were to be successful in convincing the gangs to join him he would drastically increase the number of Panthers in Chicago.

This was not the only advantage to reaching out to the gangs. Gangs also offered the opportunity for Black Panthers to move freely through gang-controlled territory. It was also no secret the Black youth in Chicago were becoming more and more influenced by the Black Power Movement, especially in the face of the Vietnam War. Hampton wasted no time trying to make peace with various gang

leaders around the city, and in 1969, Hampton was able to secure peace with the Black Disciples, the main rivals of the Black P. Stones. This was a favorable outcome for Hampton and the Panthers as they had managed to add one of the largest gangs in Chicago to their movement.

Hampton showed a particular interest in trying to form a coalition with the Stones. For one, the Stones were heavily involved with local community projects through the Woodlawn Organization. They also were the largest and most organized gang in Chicago at the time. There was one reason in particular that drove Hampton to actively court the Stones. If the Black P. Stones were incorporated into the Black Panther Party, Hampton would be able to consolidate all of the other gangs in Chicago. However, Hampton's plan to add the Stones into his coalition did not go as smoothly as he might have imagined. These negotiations between the two groups almost led to all-out open warfare between the Panthers and the Rangers.

It is important to note the many similarities between the Stones and the Panthers. The Black P. Stones shared with both the Disciples and Panthers a strong sense of Black Nationalism. The fact that Black nationalism influenced Stones is evident in their colors of red, green,

and, Black, which are reminiscent of the colors of Marcus Garvey's movement, which was the first major movement in America that centered on Black nationalism. In McPherson's article "Chicago's Blackstone Rangers," he described the Rangers' take on Black power by saying, "If they believe in any form of Black power at all, it's the physical energy which they are attempting to harness in the Black community and the economic power which, they believe, will come through constructive uses of that energy."[19] The Stones and the Panthers both distrusted the police. Both groups felt that the authorities had unfairly targeted them since their inception. All of these factors would lead point to an alliance between the Panthers and the Rangers. This would not be the case. In fact, an alliance between the Rangers and the Panthers had many difficulties. One of the main problems between these two groups revolved around each side wanting the other to join them. Both sides valued the other's numbers and organization and wanted to add those strengths to their own. Because of this, these meetings usually devolved into a show of force by either side. Haas described the scene, "One face to face meeting took place at the Rangers headquarters in Chicago's Woodlawn neighborhood. Fred and

[19] James McPherson, "Chicago's Blackstone Rangers" *The Atlantic*, June 1969, 96.

several other armed Panthers went to the meeting but were quickly surrounded by many better armed Rangers including Jeff Fort, their leader and other representatives of the Main 21."[20] The meeting came very close to erupting into an open conflict between the two groups. However, Hampton managed to talk his way out of the situation without resorting to violence. Both groups went their separate ways without starting an all-out war. Above all, the tension between the two groups never faded.

The reason for these tensions stemmed from none other than the FBI. When Fred Hampton began actively courting the Black P. Stones to join forces with their organization, the FBI took notice. According to an agent in Chicago, the FBI's main fear was that, "This large Negro youth gang [might] develop Black Nationalism and align themselves [sic] with the extremist BPP."[21] To the FBI, a merger between the Panthers and the Stones could lead to a revolutionary group bent on overthrowing America within its own borders. Much of this fear was influenced by the growing discontent in the Black community over the conflict in Vietnam. Fearing an armed uprising

[20] Haas, *The Assassination of Fred Hampton*, 43-44.
[21] Kenneth O'Reilly, *Racial matters: the FBI's secret file on Black America, 1960-1972* (New York: Free Press, 1989), 303.

led by the Panthers and the Stones, the FBI closely monitored the talks between the Stones and the Panthers. As it turns out J Edgar Hoover himself had a vested interest in monitoring the Stones. This becomes evident in one of his letters written to his men stationed in Chicago.

> The youth gang problem in your area is acute. It is difficult to say whether youth gangs such as the Blackstone Rangers or Disciples are interested in racial militancy or merely exploiting the racial situation for the impetus it gives their programs for extortion in the ghettos. The Bureau feels that this area of your work needs further in-depth probing to determine the youth gangs' involvement in racial matters. Accordingly, if you have not already done so, you should open cases on youth gangs in your area such as those mentioned above as well as their leaders to resolve the extent that these gangs and their leaders may be involved in racial militancy. These investigations should receive your prompt attention and the results should be submitted in form suitable for dissemination.[22]

This letter only served to show the fear of what a large and highly organized gang could do if they turned to Black Power Movement.

At first, it did not seem like there was much to fear from either side joining the other. The talks between the Stones and the Panthers

[22] Moore and Williams, *The Almighty Black P Stone Nation*, 92.

had broken down into trying to intimidate the other through a show of force. The continued meetings failed to bring about any meaningful cooperation between the two groups. The FBI then decided to get involved to try and sow seeds of discontent between the Stones and the Panthers. In order to drive the two groups apart, the FBI began sending letters to the respective leaders of the groups in order to spread mistrust among the organizations.

> Brother Jeff
> I've spent some time with some Panther friends on the west side lately and I know what's been going on. The brothers that run the Panthers blame you for blocking their thing and there's supposed to be a hit out for you. I'm not a Panther, or a Ranger, just black. From what I see, these Panthers are out for themselves not black people. I think you ought to know what they're up to. I know what I would do if I was you. You might hear from me again.[23]

This is just one example of the types of letters that the FBI sent to the leaders of the Stones and the Panthers in order to bring them into conflict. Admittedly, these letters would not have the desired effect. However, letters were not the only weapon available to sow distrust between the Panthers and the Stones.

[23] Austin, *Up Against the Wall*, 205; O'Reilly, *Racial matters*, 304-305.

The FBI further tried to fuel the violence between the Stones and their longtime rivals, the Black Disciples. If they succeeded in this attempt to cause open warfare between the gangs, it would guarantee that Hampton's proposed merger would fail. In order to achieve this goal, the FBI wrote letters to the Stones and Disciples much like the ones that they had sent out to the Stones and the Panthers in an effort to increase tensions between the three groups. The FBI also used its considerable resources to keep the Stones under heavy surveillance. In order to keep tabs on the Stones, the FBI recruited Stones as informants.

For all of the initial animosity between the Stones, Panthers, and Disciples none of them wanted to go to war with each other. The Stones, while still a powerful organization, had to deal with an internal crisis after its leader Eugene Hairston was sentenced to prison on charge of soliciting a murder. This led to Jeff Fort taking over as the official head of the gang.. Then in May of 1969 the worst-case scenario occurred for the FBI.[24] The Stones along with the Black Disciples and the Panthers announced a truce between the three groups. The truce essentially ended the possibility of a street war

[24] Austin, *Up Against the Wall*, 206.

between the Panthers and Stones. Though, none were officially affiliated with the other. The truce allowed the Panthers to sell their newspapers in Stone territory however, the Panthers decided against this. This truce was the high point of the Stones involvement with the Panthers. While it was not an outright alliance between both groups, it did signal future collaboration between the two sides. Understandably the FBI and governmental agencies were very alarmed by this sudden turn of events. Due to the truce between the three most powerful Black organizations in Chicago, the FBI decided to increase their efforts to destroy the Panthers and their new allies.

After failing to start a gang war between the Stones and Panthers, the FBI began using informants to infiltrate the ranks of the Black Panthers nationwide. One of the most prominent informants for the FBI was William O'Neal. O'Neal was coerced into becoming an FBI informant after he and a friend stole a car. It would not be long before he was contacted by an FBI agent by the name of Roy Mitchell and asked to join the Panthers with the sole purpose of finding incriminating evidence against them. O'Neal described his role as an informant and his relationship with agent Mitchell in an interview:

> Well, I think Mitchell, the relationship between I and Mitchell concentrated on the local activities. We talked very, very little about what was going on nationally early on in the game. Later on, when Bobby Seale and the guys would come to town, it took on a national scope, but right then and there we were concentrated on the local chapter. And later on I understood that his thinking, in that regard. He wanted me to build up some credibility within the Black Panther Party, so he gave me a lot of room, a lot of leash at that point. He let me become a Panther before I became an FBI informant.[25]

In addition to acting as a spy for the FBI, O'Neal was also encouraged to do everything possible to influence the Black Panthers to engage in criminal acts. He was also asked by his handlers to sabotage many of the Panthers community outreach programs. However, O'Neal did not become such a well-known informant merely by spying on the day-to-day activity of the Panthers. O'Neal' is mostly known for his role in the deaths of both Fred Hampton and Mark Clark. In the days before the deaths of Hampton and Clark, it

[25] "Interview with William O'Neal", conducted by Blackside, Inc. on April 13, 1989, for Eyes on the Prize II: America at the Racial Crossroads 1965 to 1985, Washington University Libraries, Film and Media Archive, Henry Hampton Collection, http://digital.wustl.edu/cgi/t/text/text-idx?c=eop;cc=eop;rgn=main;view=text;idno=one5427.1047.125/.

was found out that O'Neal had stolen the floor plans to Hampton's apartment a day before the apartment was raided. After he gave the plans to the FBI, a special police task force conducted a raid on the apartment the next day. After allegedly being shot at, the police unit opened fire on the apartment door. Over ninety shots were fired into the apartment leaving Fred Hampton and Mark Clark dead. Over twenty panthers that were also present in the apartment that night were arrested.[26]

The death of Fred Hampton and Mark Clark sparked community outrage against the police forces. Many prominent members of the community came forward to condemn what they viewed was cold-blooded murder. This public outcry would lead to a trial of the police officers that were involved in the raid as well as the State Attorney Edward Hanrahan. The officers involved and the State Attorney General were indicted by a federal jury on the charges of

[26] Hanrahan's Indictment For Bad Lying" *The Black Panther*, September 16, 1971, http://www.itsabouttimebpp.com/BPP_Newspapers/pdf/Vol7_No4_1971_Part1.pdf; , http://articles.chicagotribune.com/1990-01-18/news/9001050412_1_fbi-agents-medical-examiner-death; O'Reilly, *Racial matters*, 311-312

obstruction of justice. However, very little was done to secure real justice for Mark Clark and Fred Hampton.[27]

The deaths of Hampton and Clark were a huge setback for the Black Power movement in Chicago. Hampton's death effectively ended the truce between the Stones and the Panthers. Without Hampton, the hopes to eventually politicize the gang and bring them into the fold of the Black Panther Party failed. Fort would eventually go to jail on fraud charges. After he was let out of jail in 1976, the Black P. Stones would not have the same influence that they had once enjoyed on Chicago's South Side. After Fort's eventual release from prison, he would go on to turn the Black P. Stones towards the Islamic faith. He would eventually rename the gang the El Rukns and change his name to Chief Malik. The gang would once again reach prominence after it was discovered that they had conspired with Libyan President Muammar Gaddafi to sneak a missile into the United States for a terrorist attack. This marked the end of Jeff Fort as he was sentenced to a maximum-security prison.[28]

---

[27]"Hanrahan's Indictment For Bad Lying" *The Black Panther*, September 16, 1971, http://www.itsabouttimebpp.com/BPP_Newspapers/pdf/Vol7_No4_1971_Part1.pdf
[28] Biography.com Editors, "Jeff Fort Biography" *The Biography.com,* http://www.biography.com/people/jeff-fort-578620

The role and influence of the Stones on both the Civil Rights and Black Power Movements of the mid to late ‘60s cannot be discounted. The Stones and their various other counterparts were able to play a positive role during the Chicago Freedom movement. Instead of using violence, the Stones participated in rallies, marches, and picket lines. They, along with other gangs, were able to secure better opportunities for jobs for the urban Black population of the city. In order to achieve this they were able to put aside old rivalries and cooperate not only with the various Civil Rights Organizations but other gangs as well. Although they were able to positively influence what would widely be known as a failed movement, they did make their mark on history. The Stones went on to influence the Black Power movement in Chicago. However, the true extent of their influence will never be known due to the machinations of the FBI in conjunction with local police forces. The fact that a truce had been called between the Stones and the Panthers was what mobilized the FBI to bring down the Panthers only shows how much people in power feared them. It is unclear whether or not they would have eventually been a positive force for the Black power movement; however, there is no question that they influenced it. Had Hampton not been killed there

was a chance that he would have been able to bring about a powerful movement dedicated to Black Power. With the increase in numbers that would have been brought about by the merger, Hampton may have well been able to affect serious change, not just in Chicago, but also across the rest of the country.

An Affluent Anomaly: The Cultures and Economies of the Pre-Columbian Northwest

Jacob Grandstaff

The Indians that lived in what is today the northwestern United States represent three distinct cultures based on their geography. The arid, mountainous region of present-day Utah, Nevada, and southern Wyoming make up what archeologists refer to as the Great Basin. The tribes to the north in western Montana, Idaho, eastern Oregon, and eastern Washington are recognized as the Plateau culture. And those who lived along the Pacific coast from northern California to southeastern Alaska are referred to as the Northwest Coast culture. These regions were marked by drastic contrasts in lifestyle and wealth. Most of these differences were primarily the result of culture, but physical geography played a role in shaping each culture. According to Gallup, Sachs, and Mellinger, location and climate have large effects on income growth, through their effects on transportation costs, disease, and agricultural productivity, among other reasons.[1] It is the purpose of this paper to focus on the Northwest Pacific Coast and the

[1]. John Luke Gallup, Jeffrey Sachs, with Andrew Mellinger, "Geography and Economic Development," Center for International Development at Harvard Universtiy Working Paper No. 1, 1999, 2, 5.

material prosperity the tribes in that region achieved in contrast to other Native Americans and how their cultures facilitated that prosperity.

The Great Basin

The Great Basin was never densely populated by Native Americans. When the Spanish first explored the area known as the Great Basin, they found the area sparsely populated except for small tribes who hunted and gathered for a living whose location often depended on the season and food source availability.[2] At that time, the area was populated by five main groups known as the Shoshone, Paiute, Ute, Bannock, and Washoe. The Paiute and Shoshone were further scattered into several different tribes that were later identified by Europeans by their location. Linguistic uniformity was a unique feature of the Great Basin Indians. With the exception of the Washoe in the Lake Tahoe area who like the Chumash in California spoke a Hokan language, all of the Great Basin tribes spoke one of six languages in the Numic branch of the Uto-Aztecan family.[3]

---

[2]. "The Native People of North America: Great Basin Culture," Cabrillo College, March 9, 2000, accessed February 22, 2014, http://cabrillo.edu/~crsmith/noamer_basin.html.
[3]. Ibid.

Because of the arid territory, the tribes of the Great Basin lived mostly a life of subsistence from seeds, nuts, berries, and roots which were dug up with a digging stick.[4] As in most Native American cultures, hunting also played a major role in the Great Basin diet. The Southern Paiute located in present-day, southern Utah and Nevada did grow beans, maize, and squash, but this was mostly limited to the stream banks which were few and far between.[5] Hides and furs were used and sometimes combined with plants to provide clothing.[6] Communal hunts for rabbits were common, similar to communal antelope hunts to the north. But, compared with neighboring regions, the Indian tribes of the Great Basin lived primitive lives which included widespread hunger throughout much of the year.[7]

Organization on a scale larger than the village was only temporary.[8] The Great Basin Indians lived in tipis much smaller and less advanced than those popularized by the Great Plains Indians. The walls were usually covered by thatch or brush, although hide and bark

---

[4]. James A. Maxwell, *America's Fascinating Indian Heritage*, (New York: Reader's Digest, 1990), 251-255.
[5]. Alice Beck Kehoe, *North American Indians: A Comprehensive Account*, (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1981), 341-346.
[6]. Harold E. Driver, *Indians of North America*, (1961: The University of Chicago Press, Chicago), 148.
[7]. Ibid, 30.
[8]. Driver, 328.

were sometimes used as well. The high level of mobility of the tribes in this area caused many of these tipis to be built and taken down hastily.[9]

An example of the culture of poverty that dominated the tribes of The Great Plains is how they reacted to the horse. When the horse spread north in the wake of the Spanish invasion to the south, the animal transformed the lifestyle of the Plains Indians and improved their standard of living by making hunting and defense easier. However, the Shoshone and Paiutes to the west ate any horses they found because the horses competed for the herbs and plants that those tribes themselves ate.[10] Much of their poverty however, can be attributed to the fact that they were landlocked and while geography is not the determining factor of prosperity or poverty, it can and does play a role in providing advantages and disadvantages.[11] The Indians of the Great Basin were among the poorest in North America and the infertile land, sparse hunting, and lack of access to major waterways no doubt contributed to this by putting them at a disadvantage that their neighbors to the northwest did not have.

---

[9]. Ibid., 118.
[10]. Kehoe, 355.
[11] Gallup, Sachs, and Mellinger, 2, 5.

The Plateau

The Plateau is bordered by the Rockies to the east and Cascade Mountains to the West. It stretches about midway through Idaho and Oregon to the south and into Canada to the north. The people of the Plateau were divided into two linguistic families, the Saphatin of the Penutian family to the south and the Salish to the north.[12] The governments of these tribes were loose and tied to the local village with hunting and fishing territory being shared among villages and even among tribes with little or no objection. This was in stark contrast to Eastern tribes who often banned speakers of foreign languages from their territory.[13] When the Blackfeet moved into the region from the East, the Nez Perce and the Salishian Coeur d'Alenes took up a much more structured form of government in which private property was taken more seriously and territorial boundaries were guarded more closely.

The people of the Plateau typically lived in pit houses that tended to be a little more elaborate than those of the primitive Southwest. In some ways, they were a cross between the wigwam, pit

[12] Alice Beck Kehoe, *North American Indians: A Comprehensive Account*, (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1981). 359.
[13] Harold E. Driver, *Indians of North America*, (1961: The University of Chicago Press, Chicago), 335.

house, and tipi. They consisted of a pit four to five feet deep, with thatched roofs covered with earth from the pit for insulation, with numerous poles supporting the structure. A ladder led up through the smoke hole which was how they entered and exited the dwelling. Sometimes several families could live in one of these dwellings. During warm weather, the Plateau Indians slept outdoors.[14]

The Plateau Indians were mostly peaceful, lacking both the war culture of the nomadic Plains Indians and the fierce territorialism of the Northwest Coast natives.[15] Although, their artwork was not as sophisticated as the Northwest Coast cultures, coiled baskets and soft woven bags produced by the people of the Plateau region show that they were capable of expert craftsmanship, but were likely prevented from fully developing their talents by the harsh environment in which they lived.[16] Fishing was the mainstay of those living in the western Plateau; while those living to the east and north hunted big game such as moose, elk, and deer like their sub-Arctic and Plains neighbors, with wild plants also making up an important part of their diet.[17]

---

[14] Kehoe, 357-360.
[15] Driver, 15.
[16] Phillip Drucker, Cultures of the North Pacific Coast, (1965: Chandler Publishing Company, San Francisco, CA), 109.
[17] Driver, 27.

Trade flourished in the Plateau because of the Columbia River and its tributaries that connected the Plateau Indians with the tribes on the Northwest Coast, which also put them in a strategic position to be middlemen for the slave and horse trade between the Plains and Northwest Coast tribes once the horse was introduced. The horse was introduced into this region in the eighteenth century and some tribes such as the Yakimas and Nez Perces became expert breeders. The buckskin, skin-covered tepees, and feathered headdresses spread to the Plateau Indians beginning in the eighteenth century, but especially in the nineteenth century as the horse made cross-country travel and trade more accessible. The isolation that many of the Indian peoples had experienced for millennia faded with the introduction of the horse culture.[18]

Northwest Coast

If a European had traveled from the Atlantic Coast of Western Europe eastward, the further he travelled, the less sophisticated the societies he encountered would have become. He would see pockets of cultural gems here and there, but once he entered Eastern Europe, he would encounter societies little changed for thousands of years. As he

[18] Kehoe, 357-360.

crossed the Asian steppes, he would find splintered, nomadic tribes. But, upon reaching China, Korea, and Japan, he would be as shocked as Marco Polo at the level of civilization - a level in some aspects superior to that of Europe. The same would have held true in North America. Had he traversed the entire breadth of the North American continent at the time of Columbus' landing at San Salvador in 1492, he would have seen a scaled-down version of Eurasia in North America's pattern of cultural advancement. The Indian tribes east of the Mississippi enjoyed plentiful agriculture and for their continent, fairly advanced societies. But, upon reaching the Prairie and Plains, the tribes became smaller, simpler, and more spread out. Upon arriving in the Plateau and Great Basin, the traveler would probably have been so depressed at the level of underdevelopment he would doubtless have assumed that only natives suffering from cold and hunger could be found on the West Coast. However, this was very far from the reality of the coastal tribes.[19]

In comparison to the Eastern, Plains, and Southwest Indians, little is known among the modern, general population of the Indians of the Northwest Coast in what is now northern California, Oregon,

[19] Kehoe, 402.

Washington, British Columbia, Vancouver, and the Aleutian Islands. But, it was here that the most advanced form of Native American culture existed in the future United States of America and Canada at the time of European discovery.

The Northwest Coast is extremely mountainous with the peaks along the mainland coast as well as on the islands reaching well over four thousand feet. The treacherous mountain ranges would make one assume that this area has most likely been sparsely populated throughout history, but Indian populations were extremely dense in this region before European exploration. One reason for this is that a warm current pushes in below the Aleutian Islands, producing a moderate climate and intense rainfall. This fair weather and heavy watering combines to produce rich vegetation which was beneficial to hunter-gatherer societies such as those on the Northwest Coast.[20] Forest and aquatic game were available in abundance, but because of the rugged terrain, hunting was not as easy or as profitable as fishing. Successful fishing required the development of technological knowledge, something in which the northwestern, coastal tribes proved amply rich at the time of European discovery. The environment of the

[20] Ibid, 1-2.

Northwest Coast remained fairly constant from the modern San Francisco Bay area all along the southern Alaskan coast. Yet, the technologically and culturally-advanced, area discussed here did not extend that length, soundly refuting the environmental determinist theory that cultures' advancement or simplicity is solely the result of adaptation to their surroundings. North of the Yakutat Bay in southeastern Alaska, the Indian cultures became less advanced and the same was true with cultures south of Cape Mendicino, California which is well north of San Francisco. For this reason, historical, cultural, and ethnic differences must be taken into account when one searches for an explanation for the difference in technology among the northwestern tribes.[21]

To the far northern section of this region lived the Tlingit and Haida tribes who were a part of the Athabascan family along the southern Alaskan coast and on Queen Charlotte Islands. These were the most advanced of Northwest Coast societies. The posts supporting their wood houses were carved with different forms of art and eventually evolved into the free standing totem poles for which the tribes of the Northwest coast are so well known. The Tsimshian were a

[21] Ibid, 7-8.

part of the Penutian family who lived just south of the Athabascans in northern British Columbia. The central region, which is today Vancouver Island and British Columbia were inhabited by the Kwakiutl people who spoke a Wakashan language, the Chinook, Nootkans, and to a lesser extent, the Bella Coola who were a Salishian tribe. These coastal Salish were related to Indians on the Plateau further east and are believed to be late arrivals along the coast who misplaced former inhabitants because they are related to the people further inland rather than the other coastal peoples.[22] The southern groups were the Wakashan and Salish-speaking tribes in today's Washington and Oregon.[23]

Diet

Agriculture has traditionally been considered a necessary component of advanced cultures, but the northwestern tribes produced affluent cultures without it, relying mainly on fishing, hunting, and limited gathering for food. According to Harold Driver, "no other area of equal size without agriculture anywhere in the world enjoyed as much material prosperity as did the North west Coast."[24] The only

[22] Drucker, 107.
[23] Kehoe, 402-403.
[24] Driver, 529.

crop raised among the tribes of northern California was tobacco. This was "used in rituals and for its psychotropic effect." In fact, the Northwest Coast was the only region of North America where tobacco was grown, but not smoked. These tribes only chewed it with lime.[25]

It is possible that the Indians of California never developed agriculture because the amount of time irrigation, planting, and harvesting would have taken would have been much more than the time taken to collect and process acorns. Furthermore, acorns could be collected and processed by the women, freeing the men to hunt and fish. Acorns did not grow in abundance in this region the way they did among the tribes in the central and southern part of California, but berries were abundant throughout the entire Northwest Coast. A lack of starchy foods in the flora was made up for by whale oil and fat. Grilling, boiling, and steaming in pit ovens using wooden bowls and certain types of cooking baskets were the means that these tribes used to cook their food and they almost never ate their food raw.[26]

It was the abundance of fish that allowed central California to grow the densest population in all of North America.[27] Because of the

[25] Ibid, 90.
[26] Ibid, 20.
[27] Kehoe, 377-378.

abundance of edible fauna and the rich flora, the Northwest Coastal tribes developed the most advanced hunter-gatherer society the world has ever known. They practiced every form of hunting and trapping that was practiced elsewhere in North America, but because of the abundance of seafood, hunting was given less attention, although this varied depending on how far inland a tribe was. From May to September, they stored enough food to feed themselves and trade for an entire year and the rest of the year they devoted to pleasure and other tasks. The result was the development of a complex, social, class structure in which wealth was highly regarded and caused a person to gain considerable influence in the community.[28,29]

Manufacturing and Architecture

The northwestern tribes were excellent woodworkers, attaining an advancement in in this craft that surpassed all other native peoples of North America. The red cedar of the coastal region was soft and pliable, making woodworking much easier for these tribes than for others. Hardwoods were used for small items such as crafts that demanded toughness and durability. Natives possessed iron knives and ornaments of copper and knew how to work both. Copper came from

[28] Ibid, 290.
[29] Drucker, 15.

deep within the Alaskan mainland, but it is unknown whether the iron was traded from Asia by the Eskimos who are known to have traded with eastern Asian tribes as early as 1,000 A.D., found from shipwrecked Asian ships, or meteoritic.[30] Using stone and bone drills, axes, chisels, and knives, they were able to fell and carve the red and yellow cedars found in their region. They were especially skilled canoe builders. Most of their canoes were dugouts which they carved from one log. They came in many different shapes and sizes, depending on the purpose of the boat.[31] They used these canoes to fish, travel, and fight. A fishing canoe could be only big enough for two men to fit in, while a war canoe or their version of a war ship could fit fifty and be up to sixty-five feet in length. These larger canoes were also used to ferry important nobility to feasts, or potlatches as they were called. They also sculpted large, troughs from which they ate, large storage boxes, basket, and hats.[32] Other wood implements made by these tribes were cradles, drums, sea hunter's quivers, and chamber pots.[33]

---

[30] Kehoe, 427.
[31] Maxwell, 298.
[32] Ibid.
[33] Ibid, 31

The most advanced architectural feat of the Northwest Coast tribes was their multi-family houses. These houses were supported by log posts which were filled in with planks, stretching horizontally or vertically. The logs remained in place, but the planks used for walls and roofs were transported to other locations when a village moved. Some houses were built with a one-pitch, shed-like roof and it is believed these were how the plank houses began and were then added on to.[34] Along the Oregon coast, rectangular houses of cedar planks between post fames with sloping roofs were built. These tribes also built thatched storehouses or barns.[35] Their houses ranged in size from thirty by forty-five feet to as large as one thousand feet long in which an entire village would live.[36]

A description of a Kwakiutl village in 1792 revealed a village of about three hundred fifty people that contained twelve houses of split log planks in each of which several families were housed. About ninety dug-out canoes were drawn up to the houses or were being used

[34] Driver, 109-110.
[35] Kehoe, 417.
[36] Ibid, 301.

in the water.[37] The Nootkas' built their houses in such a way that dismantling them before winter, leaving only the stakes and moving on with the planks was no difficult task.[38] The possession of whale oil on the upper storage shelves was a source of pride for individuals whose families had took part in the whale slaying.[39]

A typical Chinook house was about sixty by forty feet and housed four families. Two sets of shelves ran along the walls, the upper for storage and the lower for bunks. Each family had its own hearth in the center of the house and closeable smoke holes were built into the roofs. Most villages had one extremely long house, usually up to three hundred feet in length for potlatches and other ceremonies. Sometimes the village chief and his family would live in it. Most villages were fortified.[40] The tribes who lived more towards the interior tended to build their houses underground with only the roof and gable with a window above ground. This was most likely influenced from the Plateau and Basin pit house cultures.[41]

---

[37] Andrey Zlobin, "Car Market of Russia," *Forbes*, June 20, 2012, http://www.forbes.ru/sobytiya/rynki/83283-avtorynok-rossii-kogda-sokratitsya-otstavanie-ot-ssha.
[38] Drucker, 144-145.
[39] Ibid, 149.
[40] Ibid, 420.
[41] Ibid, 26-27.

In addition to being excellent wood workers, the Northwest Coast natives were also expert weavers. Mountain goat wool, tree bark, and bird down were the main tools in this industry. Matting was the primary textile of most of these tribes. Their mats were made for furniture, sails, wallets, mattresses, and tablecloths.[42]

Art

The Northwest Coast has been identified by one recognizable art style. Pictures of animals, monsters, and humans were carved and painted on houses, canoes, boxes, and especially totem pole which were set up in front of houses and graveyards as memorials to the dead.[43] All carving and works of art were painted red and black. The images painted were representations of supernatural beings which had supposedly made themselves known to the ancestors of the artists doing the painting. The art of the northern tribes such as the Tlingit, Haida, and Tsimshian were distinctive for their emphasis on the object's face and stylization, whereas, the Kwakiutl, Nootka, and Salish were more natural and realistic.[44]

[42] Ibid, 34-37.
[43] Drucker, 22.
[44] Driver, 189-191.

Unlike the Wakashan-speaking tribes to the south who buried their dead in boxes in caves, the Tsimshian mostly cremated their dead. Poles and sometimes new houses were built as memorials for the important, upper class deceased, with all expenses paid by the family. The Tsimshian were especially renowned for their creative art which they painted on necessary objects such as utensils, house posts, and storage boxes. These images usually included animals, supernatural beings, or monsters.[45]

Division of Labor

Ninety-five percent of the labor was performed exclusively by men, which was the most intense division of labor by gender anywhere on the continent. In Northwest Coast societies, ownership of property such as houses or fishing holes was different from the modern concept of private property and mainly meant the right to oversee the use of it.[46] Slaves made up an estimated ten to twenty per cent of the Northwest Coast and were generally treated poorly by their owners.[47] Part of the value set on slaves involved what kind of labor skills they had. Wealth such as lands and houses was the collective property of a family or

[45] Ibid, 126-131.
[46] Ibid, 531-533.
[47] Ibid.

clan even though it was spoken of often as belonging to the individual who acquired them. Wealth was accumulated to provoke envy in outsiders and pride in members of one's own family and clan or allies. The ability to dispose of or destroy wealth was considered a luxury of which one was proud. This resulted in many slaves being murdered as masters wished to show off to others that they were wealthy enough to throw away the life of a slave.[48] Slavery was highly shameful for those captured and their people and if they belonged to a nearby tribe, that tribe usually offered vast amounts of wealth to buy them back.[49]

Potlatch

Potlatches were huge feasts, often celebrating the bequeathing of a title onto someone or as an announcement of one's claim to a title or rank. In it, the host would give lavish gifts to his guests to prove his worth through his wealth. Guests would extol the abilities of the subject of the celebration and both the subject, who was often the host and the guests would brag on their ancestors and admonish the young men to emulate their virtues. Dances and performances were common features of these feasts.[50] Wrestling, tug-of-war, weightlifting, and foot

[48] Drucker, 50-52.
[49] Ibid.
[50] Kehoe, 410.

races were common forms of competition among the men, while gambling and mythtelling were forms of amusement participated in by both men and women.[51] After the potlatch, his neighbors would give him the respect due his new title or position. Many of these celebrations were attended by hundreds of people, some of them travelling for days to get to them.[52] The more titles a tribe had, the more potlatches its people attended. For instance, among the thirteen divisions of the Kwakiutl, there were six hundred fifty-eight titles, some of which were "creating trouble all around," throwing away property," "about whose property people talk," and even "getting too great."[53]

Government and Marriage

The people of the northwestern coast formed a very class-conscious society. Lineages were highly respected and arranged marriages were performed among the aristocracy from which the chiefs came so as not to pollute noble blood.[54] In most Northwest Coast nations, governance was based on wealth, making the richest man in a tribe or village its ruler. The exception to this was the tribes

[51] Drucker, 67-68.
[52] Maxwell, 290.
[53] Driver, 226.
[54] Kehoe, 408-409.

living further to the south in the region covered in this paper: the Yurok, Karok, Hupa, Klamoth, and Madoc. These tribes lived in virtual anarchy. They developed a much more organized and observed pattern of solving crimes like their northern neighbors with blood money, only because they spent a good deal of their time in feuds. Private property was jealously guarded and adultery was a serious offense because it was viewed as a serious violation of property rights. Although, their wealth paled in comparison to their coastal neighbors farther north, they were extremely obsessed with riches and spent much of their leisure time thinking about and praying for riches.[55]

Brides were paid dearly for and it was common for girls to be confined in separate rooms for long periods of time before marriage so that their fair skin would attract a higher price and a marriage with a higher-ranking young man on the social ladder.[56] The more possessions the family of a man gave to his future bride's family as a price for her, the more his family could expect to receive from her relatives at a later potlatch.[57]

[55] Drucker, 177-179.
[56] Driver, 267.
[57] Ibid, 530.

Clothing

In clothing, the Northwest Coast tribes made extensive use of furs and pelts and had an abundance of rain clothes, particularly protective hats and waterproof ponchos of plant materials. During warm weather, men usually went naked except for ornaments and hats while women always at least wore skirts except in rare ceremonial circumstances. Tattooing, body piercing, and the wearing of ornaments were common among both genders [58] Most of the coastal tribes were aware of buckskin and moccasins and owned them through trade, but these were mainly used by the more northern tribes in cold weather.[59]

The proximity of the northwestern, coastal tribes to Asia and the islands of the Pacific produced an obvious, shared culture. There have been many examples of shipwrecked Asian ships off the Northwest coast. Although the major Asian powers are not known to have established any regular trade, certain cultural similarities have been found in tattooing, hat styles, wooden armor, and the Indians familiarity with iron.[60]

[58] Driver, 138.
[59] Drucker, 41.
[60] Ibid, 428.

Government, Law, & Warfare

Among all the Northwest Coast tribes, ruling was based on wealth and heredity. It was common for one family to own an entire village, but this only meant that they and more specifically, whoever the head of that family was at the time were the overseers of that village. The larger the village, the more power and influence that family and that family's head had in the tribe. Multiple villages were united in tribelets and the size of these tribelets affected the power and influence of its main family among that people group.[61]

Except for brief, military alliances, local clans or families were governed internally and autonomously, dispensed its own justice. If a member of one clan murdered someone of another, the offended clan would demand the life of someone of equal social standing in order to restore peace. This arrangement was accepted willingly sometimes, but other times, inter-tribal warfare or the payment of blood money had to solve the issue. Warfare was usually fought over land rights. In fact, shortly before the arrival of Europeans, an Eskimo group on an island in the Gulf of Alaska was exterminated by various other tribes in the area. Extermination or total enslavement were generally the goals in

[61] Driver, 333.

warfare since leaving part of the enemy alive and free could mean having to fight the same tribe again in the future.[62] Northern tribes wore wooden helmets and weapons were those used in close combat. When an enemy had been slaughtered, their homes were looted and burned and their heads displayed on poles as trophies in front of the attackers' village.[63]

Although most of these tribes possessed large war canoes, they were mostly for transportation, pursuit, and retreat and rarely did engagements happen at sea. If a tribe could not defend itself through conventional warfare, it would split into various groups, head for the forest and form a subsistence lifestyle mixed with guerilla warfare. The Xaihais were one such tribe that was nearly exterminated and forced to hide in remote areas and eat raw meat for fear of revealing their location through fires. They would likely have been exterminated by neighboring tribes after their hunting and fishing land if it had not been for the Pax Britannica that put an end to tribal warfare.[64] In later prehistoric times, some Tlingit groups joined the Tsimshian who gave them tracts of land to live in. These Tlingit adopted the language of

[62] Drucker, 70-76.
[63] Ibid, 79.
[64] Ibid, 80-82.

their new neighbors and together extinguished an Athabascan-speaking Tahltan tribe through annihilation and slavery.[65]

Trade

Trade with groups from other geographic regions was fairly limited unless a tribe had access to a river that led beyond the mountains. The location that served as the trade hub for these tribes was The Dalles, a location along the Columbia River of a boiling falls and rapids that was not a vertical drop, but a slow series of rapids that made it difficult for fish, particularly salmon to travel, forcing them into shallow pools near the banks. This made for great fishing and tribes from hundreds of miles to the east would make the trip to barter for dried salmon. It was mainly the result of this trade that Lewis and Clark on their expedition used a Shoshone woman as an interpreter on their quest to find the river that they had heard emptied into the Pacific.[66] The Chinook were the dominant tribe along the Oregon-Washington coast, mainly because they controlled the mouth of the Columbia River where most of the trade flowed outward. As a result, their language became the basis of the common language of the region.

[65] Ibid, 105.
[66] Drucker, 169.

This came to be known as Chinook Jargon and eventually borrowed aspects of Nootka, English, and French.[67]

The Nootkans produced dentalium shells, which was the monetary unit of the Northwest Coast. The only other tribe known to gather the shells was the Southern Kwakiutl and they frequently intermarried with the Nootka.[68] The gathering of dentalium shells and their processing was a slow, tedious process which ensured it a stable value.[69] The Nootkans' superb boat-building and their near monopoly on the production of currency caused their language to influence the Chinook jargon. They were also among the most numerous of the Northwestern tribes, numbering around ten thousand at the end of the eighteenth century.[70]

The Klamoth and Madoc tribes were on the border region between the Northwest and Plateau cultures. They lived in Earth-covered pithouses in winter and wigwams in summer like the Plateau tribes.[71] Although these tribes were not as affluent as the Northwest Coast tribes, they put more emphasis on the accumulation of wealth

[67] Kehoe, 419.
[68] Drucker, 151.
[69] Kehoe, 425.
[70] Drucker, 144-145.
[71] Kehoe, 416.

than did the Plateau tribes and it was among the wealthy that their leaders came. The Klamoth and Madoc frequently raided a neighboring tribe for slaves, keeping however many they needed and selling others at the Dalles. This continued until 1869. As in most slave societies, the captives were denigrated and given much poorer quarters than the masters, furthermore, female captives were regularly treated as concubines.[72]

Conclusion

The Northwestern Indian tribes differed greatly from the tribes throughout the rest of North America. In fact the cultures of the Plateau and Great Basin when compared to the cultures of the Northwest Coast were so different from one another they could have been on separate continents. The Great Basin tribes mostly acquired their food by hunting small game like rabbits, picking berries when and where they could find them, and digging for roots. The tribes of the Great Basin were slightly better off as far as game was concerned and adopted many of architectural techniques of their neighbors to the east and west as contact with other tribes increased. These tribes benefitted from trade with the Northwest Coast, but did not have much

[72] Ibid.

tribal organization and tended to be somewhat nomadic like the Basin and Plains cultures.

The Northwest Coast however, was nothing in comparison to the primitiveness of the Rocky Mountain and Plateau Indians. These tribes did not live in tipis, wigwams, or pits, but rather took full advantage of the abundance of natural resources that they had access to unlike their distant neighbors to the east and built large, comfortable houses of wood planks, canoes, totem poles, and elaborate crafts. The wealth, prosperity, and leisure experienced by these people, isolated from the eastern part of the continent by the Great Divide made their advanced existence all the more intriguing. But, perhaps the greatest anomaly of the Northwest Coast Indians is the fact they reached this level of wealth as a hunter-gatherer society, something that in the annals of history and discoveries of archeology has never been recorded.[73]

[73] Driver, 529.

Imagining George Washington: A Historiography of George Washington in Historical Memory

Amanda Knox

George Washington. This single name elicits memories of who the man behind it is. The first president of the United States. The important Revolutionary War general. The farmer. The slave owner. Whatever memory is triggered by these four syllables is likely dependent upon the person and their connection to the man. However, it is interesting to consider how George Washington has been manipulated through historical writing to invoke such responses. For example, of the two biographies examined in this essay both attempt to make Washington more human and less of a godly legend. The first does this by focusing on his private life while the second does so while highlighting his military career. Furthermore, there has been research conducted into the ways that Washington's image has been used in popular culture and sociologists have weighed in on the conversation with considerations on why these memories are created in the first place. Most recently, emerging scholarship has been centering on the ways that national memory is being developed through places of

commemoration, such as Washington's birthplace. By tying together these seemingly unrelated works of scholarship on the topic, this essay seeks to answer the question of how the memory of George Washington has been used and discussed by academics who have written about him in diverse ways over a period of approximately one hundred years.

A few highlights of George Washington's public life may serve well for maintaining a temporal setting and general context of the figure. First, he was born in February 1732 in Virginia. At the age of twenty one, Washington joined the military, and began participating in the French and Indian War in various ways. He was given command of the Virginia militia which he relinquished in 1758 when the war concluded.[74] He served as General of the Continental Army from 1775 to 1783 and later as President of the United States from 1789 to 1797.[75] Washington passed away in 1799 at Mount Vernon, Virginia, at the age of sixty seven.[76]

[74] "Biography," Mount Vernon, accessed November 11, 2015, http://www.mountvernon.org/george-washington/biography/.
[75] "Key Facts about George Washington," Mount Vernon, accessed November 11, 2015, http://www.mountvernon.org/george-washington/key-facts/.
[76] Ibid.

Equally valuable to this examination is the knowledge of how historical writing has developed over time. John Arnold, professor of medieval history, best details this transformation in his 2000 book *History: A Very Short Introduction*. In short, historical writing initiated with a political or religious focus in order for one population to prove supremacy over another and this type of writing continued through the 1800s.[77] By the twentieth century, he argues, historians began to focus more on social history, or the story of the common person in their socioeconomic setting.[78] Recently historians have been producing cultural history, analyses of how "things" make history. This progression of history writing is especially clear with a topic such as George Washington.

The first piece of scholarship considered in this examination of Washington's historical memory is the earliest accessible work and it appeared out of the 1890s, a time when financial panic in the United States was coupled with the beginning of an industrial boom and a World's Fair. Historian Paul Leicester Ford authored the biography *The True George Washington* in 1896 almost one hundred years after

[77] John A. Arnold, *History: A Very Short Introduction* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), 82.
[78] Ibid. 84

the death of George Washington. Ford, the great-grandson of the famous lexicographer Noah Webster, printed his first book in 1876 when he was fourteen years old and continued to write and edit works on such men as Thomas Jefferson, Alexander Hamilton, and George Washington.[79] In *The True George Washington*, Ford eloquently explains that "by a slow evolution we have well-neigh discarded from the lives of our greatest men of the past all human faults and feelings; have enclosed their greatness in glass of the clearest crystal, and hung up a sign, 'Do not touch.'"[80] Never more has this been the case than with Washington. Ford seeks to overturn this interpretation of Washington and to "humanize" him.[81] Because of this, Ford spends little time dissecting Washington's political career and works to reveal his private life with the primary use of Washington's own writings. Ford unveils such topics as Washington's family relations, physique, education, "relations with the fair sex," farming and slaveholding duties, social life, friends, and enemies.[82] The biography closes with two chapters devoted to Washington the soldier and Washington the

[79] "Paul Leicester Ford Papers," New York Public Library, accessed November 13, 2015, http://archives.nypl.org/mss/1043.
[80] Paul Leicester Ford, *The True George Washington* (Philadelphia: J.B Lippincott Company, 1896), 5.
[81] Ibid.
[82] Ibid., 9.

citizen and office holder. This would indicate that despite the cornerstone of Ford's work being Washington's private life, he believed the culminating points of Washington's life to be those involving his military and political careers.

One of the leading themes throughout these topics is Washington's honesty. In terms of his agricultural career Ford says that "it is to be questioned if a fortune was ever more honestly acquired or more thoroughly deserved."[83] He also concludes his work with a quote from Tench Tilghman who claimed that Washington was "the honestest man that I believe ever adorned human nature."[84] Each chapter is completed by a quote, either from Washington or one of his contemporaries, which denotes his enviable character. The most striking of these finishes a segment explaining Washington's lack of biological children and reads: "God left him childless that he might be the father of his country."[85]

In this biography, Washington is remembered as a man with desirable moral qualities and as the father of his country. That it is "his" country is likely not a mistake. Once the United States of

[83] Ibid., 137.
[84] Ibid., 310.
[85] Ibid., 37.

America becomes Washington's there is a more compelling reason for the common person to uphold the foundations which the country is presumed to be founded upon. Interestingly, the publisher of *The True George Washington*, J. B. Lippincott, began as a publisher of bibles and trade books which would indicate that the published works were intended for the general public.[86] This being the case, it is perhaps more clear that Ford was writing with the popular intent of his time described by Arnold, the intent to create nationalism among his readers, particularly when this work is placed within the context of the events of the 1890s, a time when the common man was becoming more powerful in society.

Almost one hundred years later in 1984, John Alden, Professor Emeritus of history at Duke University, produced *George Washington: A Biography* which is fascinatingly not wholly unlike the one written by Ford. This biography is a quasi-social history in that Alden also seeks to remove the "gilding upon a wooden hero" and "contribute a lucid and balanced account of Washington as military commander and to assess correctly his role as defender of the American nation during

[86] The Historical Society of Pennsylvania, "J.B Lippincott Company Records," accessed November 13, 2015, http://hsp.org/sites/default/files/legacy_files/migrated/3104lippincottinventory.pdf.

his presidency."[87] Alden uses sources that aim to illuminate Washington's "personality, problems, and decisions," which work to emphasize the human qualities Washington possessed while achieving almost superhuman feats.[88] The author thoroughly examines Washington's life from his early boyhood years and private life, to his role in the French and Indian War, and through Washington as a Revolutionary War general to his funeral. The memory this work creates is nothing short of a heroic one. Beginning with his early military career Alden claims "the extraordinary young Colonel Washington continued to be extraordinary."[89] Alden says that later, in 1775, despite the "ample supply of political and philosophical talent and genius" in the First Continental Congress the intellectually modest Washington who disliked oratory still "came to the fore."[90] While Alden still attempts to say that Washington "was quite human" because "he had a sense of humor. He enjoyed a racy anecdote, and he perceived the ironies of men and things," his previous statements of Washington's military and political career, as only a couple examples

[87] John R Alden, *George Washington: A Biography* (Baton Rouge and Louisiana: Louisiana State University Press, 1984), xi.
[88] Ibid., 307.
[89] Ibid., 47.
[90] Ibid., 103.

of the many, clearly still put forth the image of Washington not as a common man but as a man who made many sacrifices for the sake of his freedom and his country.

This work was published by the Louisiana State University Press and is clearly intended for a scholarly audience. This is particularly intriguing when the work is examined in light of the culture of the United States in the 1980s. Just as Ford's work constructs Washington to fit his times, so too does Alden's. By the 1980s, the United States is facing the Cold War, the threat of communism, and political ideological shifts towards conservatism. Ignoring Alden's dogmas, it would be unwise for a university to propagate any type of liberal stance during this time particularly when it comes to a Founding Father so it makes sense that Washington's astounding military and political careers are the highlights of this biography.

Conversely, Karal Ann Marling, professor of art history and American studies at the University of Minnesota, uses completely different sources and methods to ask a question that many previous scholars had not queried about Washington. Instead of studying Washington's life she directly considers how the memory that has

already been created of Washington is promulgated in everyday life. The result is her 1988 book *George Washington Slept Here: Colonial Revivals and American Culture, 1876-1986*, a comprehensive cultural history of Washington. The context of this work arguably has less to do with the cultural climate of the United States and more relevance within the context of historical writing. Again, as Arnold outlined, the late twentieth century for history writers saw a shift towards cultural questions. This book is a perfect example of this shift because it examines "Washington imagery in the popular culture" from 1876 to the 1980s in order to better understand his significance within the culture.[91] She examines all ranges of objects from paintings to stamps, and dinner plates to party invitations. One of the most interesting examples in this study is Marling's survey of the ways that the prayer at Valley Forge was used in popular culture.

The prayer at Valley Forge was a depiction of Washington alone with his horse in dark snowy woods in his General's uniform with bowed head and on one knee praying for protection over the Continental Army. This scenario is a work of fiction but that has meant little to anyone. Marling explains that this image was painted in

[91] Karal Ann Marling, *George Washington Slept Here: Colonial Revivals and American Culture, 1876-1986* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1988), vii.

1854 by Lambert Sachs and again by John McRae in 1866.[92] In 1928 the United States Postal Service chose to use this image as the commemorative Valley Forge sesquicentennial stamp and again in 1977 as the Christmas stamp.[93] The Saturday Evening Post also used this image on the cover of the 1935 issue published on Washington's birthday.[94] Marling elaborates that before the Civil War this image was viewed as parable, however as the country moved towards civil war it was increasingly used as a symbol of unity and propaganda "arguing first for the preservation and then for the restoration of the United States of America that George Washington and God had called into being in the cold, white-clad woods of Valley Forge."[95] It could have been this image that Ford had in mind when he described Washington as an untouchable hero. This example, and more broadly Marling's book, epitomizes the fact that public memory is largely influenced by the story that is emphasized in popular culture whether it is verity or not.

Barry Schwartz, professor of sociology, researched that last notion more thoroughly in his 1991 article "Social Change and

[92] Ibid., 3-4.
[93] Ibid., 2-3.
[94] Ibid., 2.
[95] Ibid., 4-5.

Collective Memory: The Democratization of George Washington." While it may seem out of place to include a sociologist in this examination it actually lends itself well as an amalgamation of social and cultural histories pertinent to the topic. Instead of historically examining the life of George Washington or the use of his likeness, as previous sources have done, Schwartz considers the social reasons why these memories of Washington are developed. Schwartz claims that collective memory is the result of seeing "the past as a social construction shaped by the concerns and needs of the present."[96] This point has been made clear as it relates to previously mentioned sources. He explains, "Between 1800 and 1865, Americans remembered George Washington as a man of remoteness, gentility, and flawless virtue; after 1865 they began to remember him as an ordinary, imperfect man with whom common people could identify."[97] Not surprisingly, between 1865 and 1920, an era of reform and a time when the United States became a world superpower, Washington became the common man and during the 1920s, a height of prosperity in many ways for the United States, Washington became a

[96] Ibid.
[97] Barry Schwartz, "Social Change and Collective Memory: The Democratization of George Washington," *American Sociological Review* 56 (1991): 221.

"businessman and captain of industry" and so the evolution continues.[98] More specifically, Schwartz considers the number and types of biographies written about Washington before and after the Civil War.

Before the Civil War an average of sixty three biographies were written or reprinted on Washington and as the threat of civil war drew nearer the number of biographies rose to approximately eighty six.[99] Many of these biographies, like Ford's, discussed Washington's success in his private life and set him above the rest when it came to his public dealings.[100] They valued his character, revered his social status, and lauded him for being the father of our country, or his as the case may be. Before war was imminent it was not necessary to incite deep patriotism or military interest among citizens. Morality would be one of the primary concerns. Once Civil War took over the nation, Washington was being bandied between the North and South, each using him to validate their positions by claiming his support.[101] If anyone could garner support they likely believed it would be Washington. By the 1860s, however, only forty seven biographies

[98] Ibid.
[99] Ibid., 223.
[100] Ibid.
[101] Ibid., 224.

were published and the number declined to thirty four in the 1870s and 1880s.[102] It must be understood that prior to the Civil War, the Revolutionary War was the only conflict of any kind in United States memory. The Civil War saw an unprecedented amount of death and political and civil strife which met a climax with the assassination of Abraham Lincoln who eventually became the new hero. Schwartz puts into words what Marling depicted with images and that is the fact that the memory of a past event is essentially constructed out of necessity in the present.

Finally, Seth Bruggeman, professor of history and American studies at Temple University, grapples with these similar issues concerning George Washington and memory in his 2008 book *Here George Washington Was Born: Memory, Material Culture, and the Public History of a National Monument*. Bruggeman incorporates social and cultural history writing into what began as an agency history for the National Park Service. His analysis of "how and what we choose to remember and why those choices change over time," is

[102] Ibid.

specifically applied to Washington's birthplace.[103] In short, Washington's birthplace was not significant to him. It was Washington's grandson who placed a marker at the site in 1815 that eventually awarded it national attention.[104] In 1923 a wealthy Virginian woman commissioned a replica of Washington's birthplace to be made on the site of its exact location. The director of the National Park Service loved the idea so much a deal was made to hand over the building to the Park Service once it was built.[105] The house was completed in 1930 and became known as Memorial House. Unfortunately, it was built in the wrong location and looked nothing like Washington's actual birthplace.[106] It eventually came out that no evidence of what the house looked like or what was contained within it existed.[107] What followed was much contest over how to interpret this place and its meaning. Women wanted to have their stories told, there was a call to have racial injustices depicted, the need to fight communism, and other similar instances throughout the development of this place that effected the changes made to it. Today there is still

[103] Seth C. Bruggeman, *Here George Washington Was Born: Memory, Material Culture, and the Public History if a National Monument* (Athens and London: The University of Georgia Press, 2008), 9.
[104] Ibid., 10.
[105] Ibid.
[106] Ibid., 11.
[107] Ibid., 92.

no answer to how to properly interpret George Washington in this place, a place historians have no photographic evidence of. Recently, Bruggeman says, it has been suggested that the Park Service use Memorial House to depict the history of the Park Service or to depict the history of commemoration in the United States instead of used as a place to memorialize George Washington.[108] No decision has been made concerning those proposals but what this situation exemplifies is how difficult it is to find the truth behind a man stifled by assumptions, myth, and the story of what people need him to be.

As aforementioned, these sources may superficially seem quite disparate but when they are all considered in the larger scope of how historical writings developed from strictly seeking political gain, to social histories of the everyday person, and to cultural considerations of things, it can be seen how these writings change the memory of George Washington and so fit nicely together. This essay could have examined only biographies, only material culture, only public spaces, but the value of exploring these different groups together is that it becomes clearer how history writing on the topic changed over time and that all of these genres contribute to the image of Washington. The

[108] Ibid., 203.

two biographies used here by Ford and Alden propagate the idealized heroic George Washington, as much as they also want to emphasize him as a common man. Ford's work is a great example of a social history of Washington because it examines his daily life and his life outside of politics. Alden's book is more of a quasi-social history because its focus is in telling Washington's life in the military. Both of these biographies, though, are products of their historical context and are similar to how other historians of the time were writing. The same goes for Marling's cultural history. The 1980s saw a cultural turn in the ways history was written and considered and Marling produced a work that did exactly that. The imagery of the prayer at Valley Forge specifically demonstrates how culture connected with a mythical interpretation of Washington and chose to remember him in that way. Schwartz contributed to social and cultural history as well. His sociological consideration displayed how the idea of Washington was manipulated within contemporary culture. Finally, Bruggeman also encompassed both the social and cultural history of Washington by navigating and making available the history of Washington's reconstructed and reinterpreted birthplace. An amalgamation of all of these sources may revel who the "real" George Washington is or

perhaps they could just be manipulated into what we need George Washington to be in this moment.

PUBLIC HISTORY

Collections Care at Pond Spring in Courtland, Alabama

Ashley Pentecost

Pond Spring is unique among house museums in the scale of its collection. Many house museums, such as Belle Mont, simply consist of the structure and collections must be acquisitioned. However, when Pond Spring was donated to the state by the descendants of General Wheeler, they also donated the majority of the personal possessions of the Wheeler family. During my tenure at Pond Spring, I have undertaken many roles including tour guide, docent, housekeeper, and cashier to name only a few; however, my main job has always been working on the collection. So far there have been around six-thousand items accessioned and there could easily be double that amount waiting to be accessioned. In this article, I will discuss the process of accessioning objects, archival material, and books using examples of some of my work.

Unfortunately, budgetary restrictions impact which conservation measures can be taken and being owned by the state of Alabama, Pond Spring is no different. While the practices used at

Pond Spring are considered "best practices," they are determined by the budgetary restrictions placed upon the site. In other words, while the practices mentioned below are safe for the artifacts, they may not be the same practices used by larger institutions with larger budgets.

At Pond Spring, the first step to cataloging an artifact is to conserve the object. The objective is to stunt any form of degradation as much as possible. There are numerous agents of degradation and conservation efforts depend on accurately recognizing the agent. Agents include light, humidity, temperature, pollutants, pests (rodent and/or insect), and/or mold.[1]

Exposure to light can cause irreversible damage to artifacts. Fading and discoloration, can occur, while heat generated from exposure to light can cause warping as well as weakening of fibers and organic material. To combat these effects, artifacts need to not only be kept out of direct sunlight, but also protected from high levels of artificial light. At Pond Spring, UV filtering film has been adhered to all of the windows in addition to shades being drawn. In order to protect artifacts in exhibit areas safe from artificial lights, great care is taken not to keep lamps on for extended periods of time, as well as,

[1] Buck, Rebecca A. MRM5: Museum Registration Methods. 5th ed. Washington, DC: American Association of Museums, 2010. 287-291.

keeping close eye on the artifacts themselves to ensure that they remain undamaged by their brief exposure to light.

As briefly mentioned, extremes in temperature is also a major agent of deterioration. Likewise, humidity, either excess or lack of, can cause deterioration to a collection.[2] To combat fluctuations in temperature and relative humidity at Pond Spring, they have installed five HVAC systems in the restored house. In a mixed collection, it is necessary to find a middle ground when determining humidity and temperature settings. At Pond Spring, the temperature is typically kept between 60 and 70 degrees Fahrenheit, while the relative humidity is kept around 50 percent (+/- 5 percent). Regulation of the relative humidity and temperature, can also prevent the presence of a major deteriorate – mold.

There are numerous contaminants that can damage the collection. While the number of contaminants is great, the solution is fairly simple – the goal is to keep artifacts away from all kinds of contaminants. Contaminants can be gases, liquids, and solids and they can damaged objects through disintegration, discoloration, and

[2] Ibid., 288.

corrosion.[3] Gaseous pollutants create chemical reactions and can come from the artifacts themselves. Off-gassing is a reaction in which pollutants from one artifact damage another. Other pollutants include pollen and dust as well as fibers and so it can come from outdoors through the ventilation or clothing. These pollutants are abrasive and damage artifacts such as wooden furniture via mechanical abrasion. In addition, moisture and oils from human hands can damage organic materials, discolor archival material and textiles as well as corrode metals. As previously mentioned, the solution for preventing this kind of damage to the collection, as well as the materials needed, is simple. Mylar, cotton gloves, and frequent housekeeping can keep this kind of damage from occurring. Mylar is used to prevent off-gassing from one artifact to another. Any artifacts such as ceramics glass, etc. should be separated from the furniture on which it sits by a layer of mylar. Cotton gloves will prevent any form of moisture or oils from transferring to and damaging artifacts. Effective HVAC systems, as well as, frequent housekeeping in the form of dusting (with the cloth,

[3] Ibid, 290.

not a feather duster) will prevent most of the damage incurred through the contact of particles such as pollen and dust.[4]

Pests such as insects and rodents can severely damage a collection. The most effective way of preventing this kind of damage is by preventing future infestation. Infestations can be prevented by frequent monitoring of the collection for insect and rodent activity, removing any kind of pest attractants and creating an inhospitable environment for pests. If damage has already been incurred, there are ways to minimize further damage to the artifact. At Pond Spring, we we first remove all evidence whether that is the pest themselves, or the damage done to the artifact (for example, newspaper remnants destroyed by rodents). This is done most effectively by using a vacuum. In the case of artifacts which would not be damaged by freezing temperatures, we seal the artifacts in nonreactive plastic bags and freeze it for between six to ten days. Then we once again vacuum the artifact for any remaining evidence of past damage, usually this consists of insect carcasses. Note that for delicate artifacts vacuuming through a fine mesh screen is necessary.

[4] Ibid., 291.

Accessioning is a multi step process and at Pond Spring specifically, a very exact process. We use a master log of all accession numbers and before any kind of cataloging can occur, an accession number must be assigned to the artifact and designated in the numeric order in the master log (for example 1993.1.5678, 1993.1.5679, 1993.1.5680 and so on). Let me take a moment and explain how accession numbers were created at Pond Spring. The home was donated to the state in 1993 and therefore the first set of numbers is the year in which the artifact was received by the state of Alabama. If an artifact was donated or loaned to Pond Spring in another year, the first set of numbers would designate that year instead. The second number is the donor number, so since most of the collection was donated in the same year and by the same donor the majority of the collection is designated as 1993.1.XXXX. After the number has been entered into the master log, it needs to be fixed somehow to the artifact itself, the goal is to designate the artifact with the number in semi-permanence in a location that is not easily seen but that is easily found. This means that, if necessary, the number can be changed or removed. If the artifact is archival such as paper or books then the accession number is affixed to the artifact using a number two pencil on either the first

page of the book in the top right corner or on the back of a sheet of paper on the bottom right side. The graphite is non-reactive and can be a removed, if necessary. For ceramics or glass, the accession number is printed on acid-free paper and "glued" to the artifact. The adhesive used is non-reactive and water-soluble, therefore it can be removed with ease. Some artifacts cannot have an accession number affixed to them (for instance metal or oddly shaped artifacts). In these cases, it is necessary to place the number on an acid-free tag that can be tied to the artifact. While necessary, this method can be somewhat ineffective as tags can accidentally be removed. In the case of textiles, tags are written on twill tape using acid-free ink and then sewn using an open stitch onto the artifact. The open stitch prevents damage to the artifact as well as allowing the tag to be removed if necessary. At Pond Spring, we typically attach the twill tape tag in the same place that a tag would be affixed on a modern garment.

After accessioning an artifact, the artifact is catalogued using a catalog sheet which includes necessary and important details about the artifact. The catalog sheet is dated and the initials of the cataloguer is placed on the sheet. There is a description section on the sheet where important details about the artifact are listed. For instance, the

description section of a newspaper article should include the title of the publication, the location of the publication, the date of the publication and a brief description of the subject matter. In the case of a newspaper clipping, one should also include information about other sections outside of the main article. These can include ads, comics, or other articles. It is also necessary to measure the artifact including at the very least it's height and width; however, the more detailed an artifact is the more measurements that should be included. For instance, a blouse should have measurements of the bust, waist, neck, yolk, and sleeve length, as well as, the length from the neck to the bottom hem. The location that the article was found with in the home should also be included on the catalog sheet. This helps determine who the original owner of the artifact was. Next, is the condition section. Any tears, discolorations, creases, or other pertinent information regarding the condition of the artifact need to be included in the section. If there is any information regarding the temporary storage location of the artifact, for example the box number, folder number or room, it is important to include this information on the catalog sheet.

Before an artifact can be housed in temporary storage, it needs to be wrapped in something non-reactive. In the case of archival

material, this means being separated from other artifacts using acid-free paper and then placed within acid-free folder. For most other artifacts, with the exception of oversized artifacts, this means being wrapped in acid-free tissue paper. These barriers help prevent further damage to artifacts through either mechanical, biological, or chemical degradation. For example, a blouse would need to have tissue paper fed through the sleeves and have the bust and neck area padded with paper. Using tissue paper retains the original shape of the garment. Once this has been accomplished, tissue paper is wrapped around the garment to protect it from any other artifacts that maybe housed in the same box. Not only are the artifacts housed in either acid-free tissue or paper, but the boxes are also non-reactive. When boxes are being placed in the storage area it is important to know the contents of the box in order to ensure that lighter boxes are placed on top of heavier boxes. In order to accomplish this, the accession numbers of the artifacts housed within the box are written on the label, along with the box number, and affixed to the outside of the box. Space is at a premium in house museums. To allow for temperature and humidity controlled storage area at Pond Spring, the attic was converted to a

storage area during the renovation and numbered shelving units are used to house storage boxes.

Once an artifact is accessioned, cataloged, and housed the final step is to input the data from the catalog sheet into a database. At Pond Spring, like most house museums, Pastperfect is used to collate all the data regarding the collection, making it easily accessible as well as past perfect is used to collate all the data regarding the collection, making it easily accessible to museum administrators. Before any data can be input into the database, one must log in under their ID number in order to track who makes changes to in artifacts data. Then, one must choose between four categories: objects, books, archives, and photographs. Once the category has been selected, one must select the "add" icon. From there a lexicon is searched and the general name of the artifact is selected (for instance, a newspaper clipping would be selected as simply "newspaper"). This ensures that the artifact is easily searchable by type. Then, the exception number is added to the artifact name. A data sheet will be created in which all other data can be input. This data includes original location within the home, temporary storage location, the initials of the cataloguer and the date catalogued, a description of the artifact (to include dimensions and any other

pertinent information), and the condition of the artifact as well as the date that this condition was determined.

The Ins and Outs of Textiles

Claire Eagle

Textiles are not only one of the most common items found in a museum, but also some of the most fragile. In ensuring that these items remain in the best condition, it is important to know exactly how to handle, identify, and care for them. First and foremost, one must determine exactly what a textile is as the term itself has a very broad meaning in the museum world. According to the National Park Service there are seven categories under the term textiles. These include bed coverings including quilts, clothing, tapestries and wall hangings, upholstery, embroidered samplers and household decorations, baskets and mats, and rugs.[1] These items under the term "textile" not only require certain care and handling, but also have certain pests and agents of deterioration detrimental to their material, and require certain numbering practices different to other museum objects. When all of these practices are followed and pests are properly dealt with a textile object can have a long life in any museum.

[1]Sara J. Wolf, Appendix K: Curatorial Care of Textile Objects (Harpers Ferry Press, 2002), 1.

Proper care and handling of a textile begins as soon as it is brought into the museum. When any object becomes part of a museum collection, it is important to complete a condition report. This condition report, which should be updated periodically, serves as a guide in the care and handling of this object. There are three specific terms used when describing the condition of a textile. The first term is 'crocking.' Crocking is the loss of color in the material. The dyestuff is gone, but the fiber is still there. 'Fraying' occurs when the separation of threads leads to a raveled or worn spot on the textile. The final term is 'tendering.' This term is most commonly used in the description of silk. A deterioration of threads usually occurs because of a combination of light, heat, or perspiration exposure, and the use of salt mordants.[2]

In addition to reporting on the condition of the material, measurements should be taken. Two dimensional textile objects, such as rugs and tapestries, should be measured along the warp and the weft. The warp is the stationary element, while the weft is the moving element.[3] It is also important to determine whether to include any

[2] Rebecca Buck and Jean Allman Gilmore, eds., Museum Registration Methods, 5th ed. (Washington DC: American Association of Museums Press, 2010), 229.
[3] Ibid., 220.

fringe or tassels with the overall measurement. *Museum Registration Methods* notes that whether they are included or not the measurements of any fringe, tassels, or borders should also be recorded and noted separately.[4] Measuring three-dimensional textiles, like clothing, is a little different than other textiles. Overall measurements are taken just as a rug or tapestry is measured, but tailoring measurements are also taken. This includes the length of the inseam and waistband.[5]

During this process an accession number is also given to the textile. This number is how the object is identified in the museum. Due to this fact it is often required that the textile is labeled with the number. To ensure that the textile is not harmed special care needs to be taken within this process. Hand sewing a hand-written label into a textile is the most practiced method. This method is recommended for all textiles except those that are disintegrating and in very poor condition. *Museum Registration Methods* suggests using unbleached fabric tape or non-woven polyester.[6] After the choosing of the material the book outlines a step-by-step process that should be followed to complete the labeling of a textile without harming it. Step one consists

[4] Ibid., 220.
[5] Ibid., 221.
[6] Rebecca Buck and Jean Allman Gilmore, eds., 244.

of writing the number on the twill tape, leaving about ¼ inch on each side of the number for adhering to the textile. The second step requires the ironing of the label to set the ink then washing the label in a container using distilled or de-ionized water and Orvus detergent. It is essential the label be then rinsed several times in clear, distilled or de-ionized water. After the labeled has dried, it has to be determined where it will be placed. Before attaching it turn under the cut ends of the label, then sew label in place using needle and thread. It is important that you sew between the threads of the textile and not through the textile weave.[7]

Care should be taken to place the labels in a place that would not be seen if the textile was displayed. When labeling clothing, the label should most often be placed where a modern clothes label exists. Rugs, quilts, tapestries, etc. should be labeled on the reverse corners so the label is easily found.[8] Finally, if the textile is too fragile because of its deteriorating state, no label should be placed on the object. Instead, the identifying number should be placed on the container the textile is in, any wrapping it may have, and any supports it may have.

[7] Ibid., 244.
[8] Ibid., 261.

After the textile has had a condition report completed and it is labeled it must be stored. Properly storing a textile directly affects the life of the object, effectively controlling the agents of deterioration. The storage areas used to house textiles need to be kept clean, remain dark, and have the temperature and humidity levels within recommended ranges.[9] Mary Fahey, the chief conservator at the Henry Ford Museum suggests temperature for storage areas in the winter to be kept at seventy degrees Fahrenheit with a thirty to thirty-five percent relative humidity level. While in summer the temperature should be kept a little higher at seventy-five degrees Fahrenheit and the relative humidity level should be between fifty and fifty-five percent.[10] Keeping storage areas at these temperatures and relative humidity levels is important. Higher temperatures can leave the textiles brittle. Brittle textiles in high relative humidity can easily be overcome with biological activity further damaging the object.[11]

Light is another agent of deterioration plaguing textiles. Damage done by light is irreversible. Both ultraviolet and visible light

[9] Mary M. Fahey, "The Care and Preservation of Antique Textiles and Costumes," *Henry Ford Museum and Greenfield Village,* https://www.thehenryford.org/research/caring/textiles.aspx (accessed October 13, 2015)
[10] Ibid.
[11] Wolf, 10.

can cause bleaching of dyed textiles and darkening of undyed textiles.[12] This can also lead to the weakening of the fabric causing it to deteriorate faster. However, preventing light damage is easily done. It is best to store textiles in rooms without windows. If that cannot be achieved filter the ultraviolet light coming in through the window with filters and/or Plexiglas.[13] Storage areas that do not have doors that open directly to the outside can also prevent light damage to textiles. When light is necessary, especially in display, it is recommended to have visible light no higher than fifty lux.[14]

Pollution is not just the hazy smog visible in big city skylines. There are many pollutants that can cause deterioration of a textile. Chemical pollutants like acid rain and ozone can degrade the fibers of any textile.[15] Others like cigarette smoke, aerosol sprays, and other cleaning agents can leave oily deposits on fibers causing staining.[16] Like damage from light, damage from pollutants can easily be prevented. HVAC systems in both storage and display areas filter the air so that these pollutants cannot come in contact with the textiles.

---

[12] Ibid.
[13] Fahey
[14] Wolf, 10.
[15] Fahey
[16] Wolf, 11.

Sealing the cases that these textiles will be stored in serves as extra protection. Chemical pollutants are not the only ones that cause harm to textiles. Dust and dirt is very harmful to textiles as well. These pollutants can dull and stain the textile. Silica, which is found in high amounts in dust and first can cause cuts and abrasion in textile fibers with its sharp surface.[17] Limiting access by window and door to areas where textiles are can keep the pollutants away. Proper storage and regular cleaning of storage areas can keep textiles from being dramatically affected.

There is no one-way to store any textile. As previously stated, the term textile is very broad, encompassing many different types of objects. The type of textile the object is determines how it should be stored. There are three main types of textile storage. The first, flat storage, is the most ideal. Flat storage is the best for smaller textiles, like samplers, linens, and fragments. It is also the best option for fragile items as it offers the most support.[18] The Upper Midwest Conservation Association cite two main categories of flat storage: Box storage and shelf/drawer storage in cabinets.[19] Box storage should not

[17] Ibid.
[18] Ibid., 15
[19] "Instructions for Storing Textiles in Flat Storage" Upper Midwest Conservation

be done in wood base cardboard boxes. Wood and uncoated metal shelves should also not be used. When stored in boxes the textile should first be wrapped in acid free tissue paper or put into acid free boxes.[20] Ideally, textiles are put into the largest box available. Where space is an issue and textiles must be folded to be stored periodic refolding is useful in keeping the fibers from weakening and breaking along the fold. Folds should also be padded with crumpled acid free tissue paper to reduce the severity.[21] Finally, textiles should not be stacked. The stacking of textiles not only puts extra weight on the fibers but can also lead to problems when accessing each textile.[22] This can cause even more stress on fragile fibers.

While flat storage is ideal there are some textiles, like rugs and large linens that are more easily stored when rolled. These textiles are rolled onto acid free tubes that are available in many different sizes. The National Park Service suggests that each tube be six inches longer than the width of the rolled textile.[23] In cases of large fragile textiles extra care should be taken. When rolling the textile acid free tissue

---

Association, (preserveart.org, 1999).
[20] Fahey
[21] "Instructions For Storing Textiles in Flat Storage"
[22] Ibid.
[23] Wolf, 16.

paper should be layered in between. This process involves layering tissue on the front facing side of the textile and rolling the textile onto the tube with tissue still in place.[24] After each textile is rolled onto their acid free tube each tube needs to be stored. Suspension is the best choice. A dowel rod is inserted in the hollow tube and the dowel is suspended from some kind of rack. Most common and economical is a simple dowel rack. A frame is constructed with notched that fit the dowel previously inserted into each tube.[25] Each textile is suspended horizontally for even weight distribution.

Finally, there is hanging storage. This way of storing is primarily used for clothing. Textiles such as dresses, coats, and bodices in good condition are easily stored hanging in a wardrobe. However, these textiles cannot be put on any kind of hanger. To reduce the amount of tension put on the shoulders and neck of the garment heavily padded hangers should be used.[26] Even with padding surrounding the hanger, wood and metal hangers should be avoided. Plastics hanger are the least hazardous to the textile and are the best

[24] Fahey
[25] "Instructions For Rolling Textiles," Upper Midwest Conservation Association, (preserveart.org, 1999).
[26] "Storage Techniques for Hanging Garments: Padded Hangers," National Park Service, 1994, 1.

choice.[27] Additional support may be needed with heavier garments. The National Parks Service uses twill tape to support the lower part of the garment, their instructions read: "Using a needle and thread, securely stitch length of one inch wide cotton twill tape to seam allowances or strong areas of the waistband on the garment. Tie the tapes to the hanger's wire neck, adjusting the lengths of the tape so they provide adequate support."[28] This method gives extra support to the waist of the garment so that the entire weight is not on the shoulder and neck in the hanger. If space permits extra support can be added by stuffing crumpled acid free tissue paper under the collar and into the sleeves of the garment.[29]

Last in the storage of hanging textiles is the importance of dust covers. These dust covers act as a barrier between garments. They can prevent the transfer of dyes as well as the tearing of other garments cause by buttons and other attachments.[30] While hanging can be space effective it is important to remember that the more fragile textiles cannot handle the stress put on the fibers.

---

[27] Fahey
[28] "Storage Techniques for Hanging Garments: Padded Hangers"
[29] Ibid.
[30] Wolf, 19.

Whether textiles are in storage or on display pests are always an issue. Textiles are the targets of three main types of pests, carpet beetles, clothing moths, and firebrats and silverfish. The majority of the damage to textiles are done by carpet beetles and clothing moths. Immature carpet beetles feed on protein materials. This includes wool, silk, hair, fur and feather.[31] These pests make their presence known by leaving frass--a colored, powder excrement--around infested textiles.[32] These pests leave chewed holes in their wake. Clothes moths feed on protein materials as well. The larvae feed on soiled woolens, which are usually in abundance in museums. These moths leave behind silky white cocoons in their wake. These cocoons are often the first sign of infestation and can help identify the problem.[33] The final pests are not as common when it comes to textiles. Silverfish and Firebrats are usually found around books. However, any garment that has sizing or starchy glue becomes their target. These insects are small and are identifiable by their scaly appearance and pinchers on their tails.[34]

Pest prevention is always better than treating after the fact. In museums the key to prevention is good housekeeping. Keeping the

[31] "Integrated Pest Management Manual: Museum Pests"
[32] Fahey
[33] Ibid.
[34] Ibid.

museum clean of plant and food material, as well as a water supply can deter pests from infesting your museum. However, pests cannot always be deterred. In the event that textiles are infested, there are ways of getting rid of harmful insects. Chemicals are never a good idea as they can cause more damage to the textile than the pest. Many museums have started using a freezing process to rid textiles of their infestation. As soon as the infestation is seen the textile, and all others that could also be contaminated, should be sealed in individual plastic bags and all excess air vacuumed out.[35] The bag should then be placed into a freeze; an inexpensive household freezer works fine, at a temperature below negative five degrees Fahrenheit. The National Parks service cites six to ten days as a sufficient time for freezing.[36] This process might need to be repeated as many pests have the ability to adjust their body temperature according to their environment. To help with this problem the freezing process should also be carried out in warmer times of the year so that the temperature changes are fast and extreme.[37] This process should only be used if an infestation is

[35] Fahey
[36] "An Insect Pest Control Procedure: The Freezing Process," National Park Service, 1.
[37] Fahey

confirmed. Freezing rapidly and often can cause damage to some materials.

Many would not classify mold and mildew as a pest but in museums they can be a real problem and potentially ruin textiles just as insects do. Just as the environment affects other agents of deterioration changes in the environment a textile is stored or displayed in can cause the textile to become a carrier of mold. Microorganisms are more likely to grow in natural fibers, however all fibers will support microorganism growth. Drastic changes in temperature and relative humidity can cause textile fibers to dry out and absorb moisture quickly causing swelling and cracking.[38] The presence of mold and mildew will usually be smelled with a musty odor, but if not caught in time it can cause permanent staining from the growth.[39] Staining from mold is almost impossible to remove. The best way to prevent the growth is to keep textiles away from water, and ensure that the museums HVAC system is properly controlling the temperature and the relative humidity.

[38] "Causes, Detection, and Prevention of Mold and Mildew on Textiles," National Park Service, 2.
[39] Fahey

When textiles are not in storage and on display many of the same rules of storage still need to be followed. However, a few other guidelines should be kept in mind when displaying. Smaller textiles such as embroidered samples and flags should be kept behind UV protected glass.[40] This ensures that the textile is protected from harmful light as well as pests. Separating textiles from potentially harmful materials can ensure that the textile will not be harmed while on display. Sara Wolf of the National Park Service suggests separating textiles from those other harmful materials, such as polished wood, by placing a thin Mylar sheet between the textile and other object.[41] Finally, it is important that no matter how impressive or cool the textile is it should not be displayed if it is in too fragile of a state.

Textiles are an important part of any collection. This broad term encompasses everything from rugs to dresses. Each textile requires special care and handling to ensure it remains in good condition. Whether your collection consists of wool uniforms or Native American woven blankets, it is important that you know the ins and outs of textiles before storing or displaying any textile.

---

[40] Fahey
[41] Wolf, 28.

BOOK REVIEWS

Review of:

Elizabeth R. Varon, *Disunion! The Coming of the American Civil War, 1789-1859*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2008.

Elizabeth R. Varon's book, *Disunion! The Coming of the American Civil War, 1789-1859,* discusses the issues and events that caused discord in the nation from the signing of the Constitution until the eve of the Civil War. According to Varon, "This book offers a new perspective on Civil War causality by arguing that disunion was a far more pervasive concept than secession in antebellum politics, that debates over the meaning of disunion permeated the political cultures of both North and South and embittered each section against the other, and that those debates reached back to the very founding of the republic." (p. 15) In addition, Varon's book "aims to provide a narrative synthesis of the best recent studies on antebellum America" and analyze "what the participant said, what they believed, and how they expressed their own passions, and agonies, as they set the Union on the road to war." (p. 2, 4) Varon argues that the terms "disunion" and "secession" should be considered separately because secession had a specific definition while disunion was an "adaptable concept."

"Disunion," according to Varon, "was invoked by Americans, across the political spectrum, in five registers: as a *prophecy* of national ruin, a *threat* of withdrawal from the federal compact, an *accusation* of treasonous plotting, a *process* of sectional alienation, and a *program* for regional independence." (p. 5) The word disunion embodied Americans' "fears of extreme political factionalism, tyranny, regionalism, economic decline, foreign intervention, class conflict, gender disorder, racial strife, widespread violence and anarchy, and civil war, all of which could be interpreted as God's retribution for America's moral failings." (p. 1)

The concept of disunion was considered "a nightmare, a tragic cataclysm" by many residents of the North and South. However, politicians, abolitionists, and pro-slavery advocates on both sides of

the Mason-Dixon Line did not hesitate to invoke disunion to further their objectives. As early as the Constitutional Convention, South Carolinian delegates John Rutledge and Charles Pinckney threatened that their state would not join the Union unless the African slave trade was allowed to continue. Moreover, the Northern fear of disunion allowed the South to insert three pro-slavery provisions in the Constitution: The Three-Fifths Compromise, the Fugitive Slave Clause, and the continuance of the international slave trade for twenty years. The threat of disunion was used successfully by advocates of slavery during the drafting of the Constitution, and would be used repeatedly in the following years by pro-slavery Southerners to gain concessions from the North.

Accusations as well as threats of disunion were common in antebellum politics. Thomas Jefferson's Democratic-Republican Party emerged in the late 1700s and gained ground in 1800. Democratic-Republicans used repeated accusations of disunion against the Federalists to further their chances in the election of 1800. When the War of 1812 came, Federalists protested the war and threatened Republicans with separation from the Union. Disunion rhetoric was tied to the discussion of admitting new states as free or slave. During the Missouri Crisis of 1819-21, disunion was used as a tool to push for compromise. In 1832-33, the Nullification Crisis brought political tensions as John C. Calhoun and other anti-tariff politicians threatened disunion. Although he refused to consider nullification, Jackson agreed to a gradual lowering of the tariff in an effort to quiet the cry of opposition.

Disunion as a prophecy was embodied in the slave rebellions and other violent incidents. Denmark Vesey's Rebellion in 1822 was used by advocates of slavery as an illustration of the terror that abolition would bring to America. Abolitionists, meanwhile, used the incident to illustrate their prophecy of how God was going to punish America for allowing the sin of slavery. Garrison considered Nat Turner's Rebellion on August 22, 1831, to illustrate the truth of this

prophecy. Further evidence of disunion as a prophecy was found in the Sectional Crisis of 1835, when forty-six pro-slavery riots and fifteen race riots occurred in America.

Disunion rhetoric increased between 1830 and 1850 as sectional tensions became chronic. In the late 1830s, some abolitionists, particularly William Lloyd Garrison, embraced the concept of disunion as a way of separating the pro-slavery South from the free North. This would have been considered using disunion as a process of sectional alienation. The discussion of the annexation of Texas caused further disunion rhetoric. As the issue was debated, Southerners such as Robert Barnwell Rhett decried anti-annexationists as being disunionists. When the Mexican War broke out, abolitionists were opposed to the war and were openly called disunionists by the war's supporters. While senate members had always denied such accusations in the past, the Crisis of 1850 saw Southerners Robert Toombs and Alexander Stephens proclaim themselves disunionists on the Senate floor. That same year, the Nashville Conventions passed "measures asserting the constitutional right of secession." (p. 227) The Kansas-Nebraska Act of 1854, pro-slavery clashes in Kansas from 1855 to 1856, the caning of Charles Sumner on the Senate floor in 1856, and John Brown's raids in 1856 and 1859 all illustrated that abolitionist and pro-slavery tensions were rising to a dangerous level. The election of Republican Abraham Lincoln in 1860 proved to be the final breaking point for the Union.

Disunion! The Coming of the American Civil War, 1789-1859, is a thorough history of how disunion rhetoric was ingrained into the turmoil that led to the Civil War. Although Varon's book is clearly meant for a scholarly audience it is well-written and clearly argued, making it a great choice for students of the Civil War, abolitionism, or sectionalism.

Kayla Scott

Review of:

Roberts, Blain. *Pageants, Parlors, and Pretty Women: Race and Beauty in the Twentieth Century South*. Chapel Hill, North Carolina: University of North Carolina Press, 2014.

A women's beauty can affect her life in more ways than it should. This is more than true in the South. Arguably, the South puts more emphasis in a women's beauty than any other place in the United States. The 'southern belle' possesses absolute beauty and grace, hair and nail appointments are a weekly tradition, and that southern drawl can be heard even when they are whispering secrets to their friends. Most importantly, southern belles were white. Not only does the definition of beauty change when one looks more closely at race, but we see how important it was to culture and the racial divides that dominated the South in the twentieth century.

Raised in a small town in Louisiana, Blain Roberts saw how important beauty was in the South. However, it wasn't until she attended college in New Jersey that she saw how differently her southern female classmates presented themselves in comparison to those from other parts of the United States. She later returned to the South to earn her masters and doctorate degrees at UNC, Chapel Hill. Roberts examines everything from pageants and parlors to beauty products and clothing and the roles these things played in both sides of the racial divide. Female beauty was a lot more than just vanity; it had the ability to both strengthen and undermine the racial, class, and gender assumptions during the Jim Crow era (12).

The perfect stereotypical Southern woman always had her hair and makeup done. In the late nineteenth century, where Roberts starts her work, the South was rural. Beauty products and parlors were not easily accessible. Companies started marketing them as the perfect way to maintain one's elite white racial identity (18). In her first chapter, she begins by examining the beginning of the immense emphasis put on beauty in a purely racial way. Many early products

women used on their faces were often dangerous. Whitening enamel, which was lead-based, is only one example of the lengths taken to make sure that their skin remained untouched from the sun due to their worry that it would become darker.

The cosmetics industry skyrocketed in the Unites States with the beginning of the twentieth century, but that did not mean that the rural women of the South were buying them. In urban areas, like Birmingham and Atlanta, young elite women tracked the ads and bought products whenever they could. Roberts gives a short history as to how the cosmetics industry got its start as well as how the southern woman began playing into the idea of beauty. However, towards the end of this chapter she contradicts the notion she has made that elite women were the main users of cosmetics. She tells of women who were criticized for their use of makeup to 'paint their faces.' It is here she claims that the social elite put an emphasis on natural beauty. Roberts found an article from the *Baltimore Sun* that read, "No woman, in her natural desire to be beautiful, should seek outside aid when true beauty can be obtained through right living and right thinking, by observing the laws of nature and health, by living a useful, helpful life, and being content with that state of life into which it shall please God to call her" (33). Not only does this confuse readers, she perhaps misses a great opportunity to strengthen her work. It is at this point that she could have examined why the use of cosmetics gained such popularity when social elites supposedly believed natural beauty was more important.

It is not until the second chapter that Roberts examines beauty on the other side of the racial divide. Roberts claims that, "black southern women forged a more intimate and more active relationship with the burgeoning world of beauty than did white southern women" (59). This is proved by the popularity of the beauty parlor. A beauty parlor was considered a safe haven where African American women could really talk about the racial issues of the twentieth century. Furthering the importance was the emphasis that African American

leaders put on beauty, "by paying attention to physical appearance and health, poor southern blacks not only challenged stereotypes they also internalized the moral social virtues necessary for climbing the socioeconomic ladder" (65). Continuing in this chapter Roberts proves why beauty deepened the racial divide. The problem with African American leaders emphasizing beauty was that it further emphasized white beauty. The biggest and most common practice was that of straightening black women's hair. While this is an important aspect of what many would say was a way of trying to control the African American population with beauty, Roberts puts too much importance on this one practice. Bleaching of the skin was not only dangerous, but unfortunately common and was also important in the case of African American women who attempted to strive for what was considered beautiful; white skin.

Chapters three and four examine the public rituals of beauty contests for white southern women and black southern women, respectively. In the seventies a pattern was noticed in the previously crowned Miss Americas; during the previous fifteen pageants over a third of the winners had been from the South. These pageants gained popularity because of their development in the rural areas of the South. In fact, it became tradition in many families for girls to start in baby pageants. Beauty queens were literally grown. Roberts shows here how the idea of southern beauty, at least for white women, became renowned and coveted in the modern era. For African American women however, these contests were more about race pride. These beauty contests were used to change the world's views of the southern black woman. Assumptions were made all over the U.S. that these women were just "frazzled maids," "overweight mid-wives" or "unkempt domestics" (150). It was efforts like these contests that helped to make the ideas of beauty that African American leaders wanted for women come to exist. Roberts could have tied in this chapter more closely with chapter two on the ideas of beauty these women had. More importantly she should have examined how these

contests paved the way for black women to be considered beautiful in their own right.

In the final chapter, "Bodies Politic: Beauty and Racial Crisis in the Civil Rights Era," Roberts shines in her analysis of beauty in the racial divide and how it affected the Civil Rights movement. She sheds new light into the role African American women played in the fight for equal rights. The biggest focus is on that of college homecoming courts and pageants. First these students had their own contests and weeks to focus on black women. Then they took it to the rest of the campus. In the seventies black women essentially waged a war to prove their beauty. The focus of their campaigns was to get recognition of Afrocentric beauty standards (247). Many of the African American contestants won, too. Colleges like South Carolina and Alabama elected their first black homecoming queens in the late seventies.

Starting with the standards of beauty for white southern women in the late nineteenth century and chronicling throughout the twentieth century, *Pageants, Parlors, and Pretty Women: Race and Beauty in the Twentieth Century South* greatly examines the ideas of beauty. Unlike many southern women's history books, Roberts gives equal attention to both races, successfully intertwining the standards of beauty with the politics and race war of the time. It is obvious that Blain Roberts is highly educated in this field and did extensive research for this work. While clearly written for academic purposes, this book exceeds those expectations. In fact, the way Roberts brings together her anecdotes, research, and analysis in an easily understood way, any amateur historian who is interested in this subject of beauty standards should put this book at the top of their reading list.

Claire Eagle

Review of:

Slavery and Public History: The Tough Stuff of American Memory. Edited by James Oliver Horton and Lois E. Horton. Chapel Hill, North Carolina: University of North Carolina Press, 2006 [paperback edition, 2009]. Pp. xiv + 272, introduction, illustrations, notes, contributors, index. $19.95, paper.

Slavery and Public History is a compilation of journal articles detailing the uncomfortable nature of the "peculiar institution" of slavery in the history of America. The target audience of this book is primarily academic due to the various journal articles that comprise the book. This book is not intended for the layperson because of the nature of academic writing within the several articles in the book. In addition, the over-arching subject matter of the book is the issue of slavery and its discussion about the historical issue of slavery on the national and state level in museums and parks. What the book reflects is the perceived problem that exists in how America can have an open and intellectual discussion about the most awkward institution in American history. That needed conversation is what the collective articles each remind the reader to critically think about.

Overall, there is one main point in this book, how do we as a country approach the dilemma of slavery in American history? Ira Berlin stated succinctly that "American history cannot be understood without slavery" (p. 2). He is correct, and the rest of the articles within the book follow from this main theme presented by Berlin. Whether it is David Blight recalling what Civil Rights leader Fred Shuttlesworth said about telling it like it was (p. 33), or a young man in Kentucky by the name of Eric Browning trying to incorporate the influence of slavery at Federal Hill in Kentucky to the people who tour the plantation home (p. 116). Different people want the same thing, and that is the truth of slavery recognized as it is in the history of America. Slavery is a dilemma in American historiography and this

book tries to explain how to approach the sensitive subject of slavery in American history.

The goal of the book was to show how public historians deal with the contradictory nature of a free nation who still held on to the institution of slavery after 1776 (p. vii). That is exactly what the articles did in this book. Whether it was a discussion on the Liberty Bell or the controversy in Richmond, Virginia over Abraham Lincoln, the individual authors of the articles each broached the sensitive subject of slavery in their own ways to show the incongruities of supporting both slavery and freedom in the antebellum and postbellum.

In transitioning from goals, the chance for inventive research within the book comes from the side of the people who believe the alternative theory known as the "Lost Cause." Each author discounts and immediately marginalizes that philosophy as incorrect, and rightfully so, but it would be interesting for a scholarly article to explain how believers in the Lost Cause would explain how slavery should be discussed in national and state ran museums.

There was a deficiency in the collection of journal articles: the editors of the book left out articles from the Southern perspective. Not a perspective that is condoning or perpetuating or even sympathetic to the Lost Cause or its philosophical variances, but just an academic or two that has lived and taught within the South to give a more broad and multiregional perspective on the issue of slavery and its representation in history. That was both a weakness and something the editors left out of their compilation of articles.

To transition, *Slavery and Public History* brings to mind a book by the name of *Whitewashing America: Material Culture and Race in the Antebellum Imagination* by Bridget T. Heneghan, in which the issue of slavery and the place of slavery within the material culture of America is a difficult point in history. *Slavery and Public History* wonders whether the history of slavery has a place in the American

past; whereas, *Whitewashing America* made aware whether slaves or former slaves actually had a rightful place in American material culture. The reason why they are similar is the two books wonder where the rightful place is of the African-American in American history in a culture that was dominated by white culture and white historians. Both *Slavery and Public History* and *Whitewashing America* raise important questions of how to deal with minority history and culture in an American society that wishes to avoid "the tough stuff of American history" so to speak.

Finally, the weakness of *Slavery and Public History* is the lack of critical academic writing from professors in the South. Most of the academics writing the articles were located in Washington, D.C., a few from the West Coast, and one spent time in Richmond, the second capitol of the Confederacy (pp. 253-56). That was not enough to create a balanced book based on regional points of view. Now, of course, the book was not concerned about regional balance or anything of that nature; its focus was on slavery and how to discuss the sensitive issue in the academic world. However, it would be interesting to have Southern professors contribute to an article compilation such as *Slavery and Public History*.

In conclusion, what *Slavery and Public History* teaches the reader is slavery is still a sensitive issue in America and a taboo subject. Eventually, open and intellectual dialogues need to be held between academic and layperson to explain the peculiar institution of slavery. In the end, public history can serve as the intermediary between the tough stuff of American history and giving the general public an informed, educated, and insightful explanation of slavery in American history, while maintaining a sensitivity to the painful nature of the peculiar institution. That is what *Slavery and Public History* is about.

Matthew C. Fesmire

Review of:

Johnson, Walter. *River of Dark Dreams: Slavery and Empire in the Cotton Kingdom*. Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2013.

In *River of Dark Dreams: Slavery and Empire in the Cotton Kingdom*, Walter Johnson explores the impact of slavery, capitalism, and imperialism on the Mississippi Valley. After acquiring the Louisiana Territory, Thomas Jefferson anticipated the Mississippi Valley's "abundance of land would produce a harvest of self-sufficient, noncommercial white households headed by the yeomen patriarchs whom he associated with republican virtue … an 'empire for liberty'" (3). However, "'disloyal' whites, Native Americans, Africans, and African Americans" inhabited the region; and, to develop the empire, the United States had to "prevent alliances linking invading armies from Europe … with the indigenous and enslaved populations of the Mississippi Valley" (25). Once the cotton boom and the extension of slavery reached the region, Jefferson's "empire for liberty" became the Cotton Kingdom. Johnson uses Madison County, Mississippi as an example to illustrate "a furious transformation from a frontier exchange economy to a boom time cotton economy" at the same time the number of slaves doubled (47).

The steamboat, which allowed shipments to go up the Mississippi River instead of having to rely on downriver flow, was an important economic aspect of the Mississippi Valley. In addition, the levee in New Orleans provided further commercial potential. Produce and products—as well as slaves—travelled the Mississippi, moved through the levee, and became destined for the metropolitan cities of the Atlantic. Because of this, Louisiana "regulated banking more strictly than almost any other state in the union," and by 1840 "was the most urbanized state in the United States" (85). According to Johnson, steamboats became the third biggest investment in the Mississippi Valley behind land and slavery. In addition, steamboats carried "the nineteenth century's emergent strategy of social management:

segregation" (129). Johnson explains that steamboats were part of a "white-supremacist ritual" that circulated "ideas about slavery and master up and down the river" (136).

Johnson explores how slaves were tortured and how they responded through the slave community. The way that planters laid out their fields—rectangular and rows—allowed the field overseer to easily witness the progress of the slaves. If they were not working fast enough, the slaveholders "produced theatricals of discipline and punishment that concretized their authority … in the public form of a wounded slave" (171). Further, slaveholders used various other methods to oppress their slaves. Johnson uses food as an example of how planters controlled their slaves. Also, slaveholders were involved in the reproduction of their slaves, and as Johnson argues "extended their dominion to spaces inside the bodies of the women they owned" (195). Much of the work the slaves did was cooperative—even some of the individual tasks—that historians referred to as slave community. Johnson argues that slaves acted in solidarity "because they recognized their fellow slaves not as 'agents,' but as family members, lovers, Christians, African, blacks, workers, fellow travelers, women, men, co-conspirators, [and] competitors" (217).

Johnson attempts to show whether planters were capitalists or not. He explains that one group of historians argues slavery was not capitalist, and another faction of historians claims slavery was capitalist. Johnson contends that a materialist and historical analysis "begins from the premise that in actual historical fact there was no nineteenth-century capitalism without slavery" (254). However, he wants to "set aside prefabricated questions and threadbare tautologies" to examine the importance of cotton on capitalism (254). Cotton had provided the Mississippi Valley with "one of the richest agricultural societies in human history" (151). The region had entered the global economy by shipping their product to locations across the Atlantic, especially in England. Soon, planters began experimenting with cotton to make it easier to pick. Slaveholders began planting cotton by how

much could be picked by hand, and started judging slaves by their hands. According to Johnson, healthy men and women were "full hand," pregnant women were "half-hands," first-year children were "quarter-hands," and those who had mutilated or unsatisfactory hands were threatened and tortured (153-4).

In the latter third of the book, Johnson explores the imperialism of the Mississippi Valley by surveying how the region became interested in Cuba, Nicaragua, and the reopening of the Atlantic slave trade. According to the author, the Mississippi Valley's interest in Cuba was "a product of a specific moment in time and a particular combination of economic, political, and technological circumstances" (307). Trade and commerce in the early 1850s was moving east to New York City because of the railroads. However, by expanding to Cuba, the South could reclaim its position to "assert dominion over the commerce of the West and revitalize the Mississippi [River] as a north-to-south axis of trade and prosperity" (320). Yet, Johnson states that the Neutrality Act of 1818 "made it illegal to raise a private army in New Orleans … [and] asserted that diplomacy was the arena where nations, rather than ethnic groups or religions or classes confront one another" (323). After various plots to invade Cuba failed, the Mississippi Valley shifted to another nation further south.

William Walker proposed an opportunity for the Mississippi Valley to expand to Nicaragua. According to Johnson, Walker's project worked for slaveholders because "controlling the isthmus would deliver the trade of the Pacific to the port of New Orleans; and reestablishing slavery in Central America would provide the South with a bulwark against the progress of hemispheric abolition" (371-2). Walker, who had conquered Nicaragua as a soldier of fortune and proclaimed president in 1856, returned to the nation, and greeted Louisiana Senator Pierre Soulé. Upon his arrival, Soulé delivered Walker a $500,000 bond exactly one month before Nicaragua legalized slavery and reopened the slave trade (390). In addition, Walker appealed to the Mississippi Valley's non-slaveholding white

men. Yet, many slaveholders soon began to question the loyalty of these men. Journalist Edward Pollard believed these whites had two ways to "forestall social disorder": the first was to support William Walker and the second "consisted of reopening the Atlantic slave trade to the United States" (381).

According to Johnson, there were many arguments in favor of reopening the Atlantic slave trade. As he explains, if Walker represented imperialists' quest for new territory, the slave trade intended to make sure "that territory would be transformed in the image of the plantation social order of the Deep South" (395). Also, many in the Mississippi Valley were unhappy with the Kansas-Nebraska Act, particularly with popular sovereignty. Johnson explains that by "controlling the terms of economic growth—the growth of 'slave' or 'free' states—one could control the inflow of pro- or anti-slavery whites," and thus could control whether a political economy was free or slave (400). Further, the Deep South was in need of so many slaves that they were afraid they would deplete the slave population in the Upper South. Therefore, the Atlantic slave trade needed to reopen to avoid a slave drain. However, not all in the Mississippi Valley were supporters of reopening. Senator Albert Gallatin Brown believed reopening would "augment the power of the planter class to push poor white people off their land," and Senator Henry Foote saw the idea of importing 200,000 slaves was "simply terrifying" (417).

Johnson concludes the work by explaining how the invasion of Nicaragua and the reopening of the slave trade failed. He explains that both "represented an imperial vision of the future of slavery, patriarchy, and white supremacy. Each in its own way proposed a reorientation of space through a global projection of 'the South,' and characterized its vision as one of white male regeneration" (418). In addition, Johnson argues that the supporters of the slave trade devastated the Democratic Party, and guaranteed Abraham Lincoln's election. Overall, Johnson presents an excellent work of scholarship.

He employs a large number of primary and secondary sources. However, the work does have one minor fault. Johnson abruptly ends the work following the discussion on reopening the slave trade, and does not provide an epilogue or concluding chapter. Regardless of this, Johnson delivers an outstanding monograph on both African American and Southern history.

David Justice

INSTITUTIONAL/PROFESSIONAL CONTRIBUTIONS

Public History at UNA

Carolyn Barske, Ph.D.
University of North Alabama

What is public history? Simply put, public history is history practically applied. Public history takes history outside of the classroom, into museums, archives, libraries, historic sites and homes, to your television, and out into the ever-growing digital world. Public historians are trained as collaborators and as facilitators, as well as historians. They work with communities to develop projects that expand the historical narrative of our world well outside of a typical textbook. They help to give voices to the stories of ordinary (and not so ordinary) people, they help to develop museum exhibits, they work to preserve historic downtowns, they help to archive our written past, and they conduct archeological digs to piece together our material past.

While people have been practicing public history in many different venues stretching back into the eighteenth century, it was not until the 1970s that universities began developing programs to specifically train public historians. The term "public history" was coined by Robert Kelley in 1975. The next year Kelley and others at UC Santa Barbara launched the first public history program in the country. The program helped historians apply the skills they learned in graduate school to a variety of fields outside

academia, which was suffering from a severe job crisis in the 1970s.[1] Other programs soon followed. Today, there are over 100 graduate programs in public history across the country.

In the fall of 2012, the department of history at the University of North Alabama began offering a concentration in public history within its master's degree program. The concentration option required students to take four courses in public history, including an introduction to public history course. Students could complete additional public history projects for their directed research and study courses if they went down the comprehensive exam path, or could complete a public history related thesis or thesis project to give them additional experience.

Between 2012 and 2015 the department also developed an undergraduate minor and certificate option in public history and a graduate certificate in public history. The department also secured funding for four graduate assistantships. The UNA Public History Center, currently housed within the Muscle Shoals National Heritage Area, hosts two of the graduate assistants and focuses on working on projects to benefit community and state history organizations. Graduate assistants also work with the Muscle Shoals National Heritage Area and the Collier Library Archives and Special Collections.

---

[1] Denise Meringolo, *Museums, Monuments and National Parks: Toward a New Genealogy of Public History.* (Amherst: The University of Massachusetts Press, 2012), xiv.

During the 2014-2015 academic year, the department of history developed a proposal for a stand-alone master's degree in public history to replace the graduate concentration in public history. The new program, launched in the fall of 2015, allows students to specialize in two areas of public history: historical administration and historic preservation. The administration track is geared towards students who have an interest in working for archives, museums, heritage areas, or other non-profit institutions. Students in the preservation track take coursework designed to prepare them for careers with cultural resource management firms, state historic preservation offices (SHPOs), city planning departments, and the National Park Service. Both tracks require an internship and also require one course within the College of Business. When speaking with prospective employers during the development phase, many expressed an interest in seeing students prepared to think not just as historians but also in having practical skillsets developed in management courses. The undergraduate minor and certificate programs developed in 2013-2014 also give the students the option to take business courses to prepare them for the many hats public historians wear out in the real world. As with the traditional degree in history, students have the option to complete either a thesis or to complete two smaller research projects and take comprehensive exams. The Masters in Public History at UNA is the second program of its kind in the southeastern United States.

At the root of the public history program at UNA is a firm belief that the best public history programs are those that work to connect students to their community with projects that give students practical, hands on experience. Completed in public history courses, as assistantship projects, as internships, as thesis projects, and as directed research and study projects, these projects have taken many forms since 2012. Students have developed educational programs for local museums. They have contributed to the Alabama Cultural Resource Survey, a state-wide initiative for the Alabama Bicentennial celebration. Students have helped to develop exhibit panels for Sacred Way Sanctuary, a Native American horse sanctuary in Florence. They have worked on National Register of Historic Places nominations, developed entries for the Encyclopedia of Alabama, conducted oral history interviews, and developed short documentary films. Students have developed strategic plans for local sites, conducted historic site assessments for the Muscle Shoals National Heritage Area, created finding aids for collections housed in the university archives, digitized journals, completed a battlefield preservation project funded through the American Battlefield Protection Program, and have written docent manuals for local museums. All of these projects, and many more, have given students invaluable skills that they can take with them when they leave UNA and have helped local institutions immensely. Public history students have worked with many organizations, including the Florence Historical Board, the Tennessee Valley Historical

Society, the Alabama Bicentennial Commission, Alabama Chanin, Fort Morgan, the Florence City Museum system, the Muscle Shoals National Heritage Area, Heritage Preservation Inc., Florence Main Street, the Florence-Lauderdale Public Library, Pond Springs: The General Joe Wheeler Home, the Berry Library, Belle Mont, the Limestone County Archives, the Morgan County Archives, and Sacred Way Sanctuary. Connections made with these organizations benefit students as they move through their graduate course work and into their professional careers.

Graduates from the UNA Public History program have gone on to successful careers in the field. Students are currently working for the Alabama Department of Archives and History, the Alabama Historical Commission, the Alabama Bicentennial Commission, the Des Plaines Public Library, and the University of Alabama Center for Economic Development.

With many more public history projects in the works and new opportunities like a study abroad trip to Scotland planned for 2017, it is safe to say that studying public history at UNA gives our growing number of students a well-rounded, thorough, and exciting education. You never know what will happen next!

Six Word Memoirs Project

Matthew Barlow, Ph.D.
University of North Alabama

In my undergraduate Public History survey course in the fall 2015 semester, we read Allison Bechdel's graphic novel autobiography, *Fun Home: A Family Tragicomic*. In her acknowledgements to *Fun Home*, Bechdel writes: "Thanks to Helen, Christian and John Bechdel for not trying to stop me from writing this book." In class, we discussed what this means. After some discussion, we came to the conclusion that Bechdel was thanking her mother and siblings for not challenging her story of the events that led to her father's death, or of her childhood experiences with her father. This, of course, reveals the fact that perhaps her narrative of the events is not entirely reliable. Perhaps her conclusions about her father are inaccurate? Perhaps she is not a reliable narrator, after all? Perhaps her siblings would tell a different story? And her mother an entirely different one again? This led to a discussion about the nature of memory and autobiography.

In our memories, we are the stars of our own movies. The stories we tell ourselves feature us, in the centre of the narrative. This

is not surprising, of course, as we experience the world from one particular point-of-view: our own. Think of an event you shared with someone: your memories of it will differ, in some cases in minor details, but in others, in major details. Blame or credit will shift. Even the sequence of events may differ between the two of you. But our memories are also carefully curated. We reconstruct and revise our memories all the time. In some cases, this is entirely unconscious, we are not aware of this revision, but it happens as new data emerges, and new experiences happen. In other cases, we carefully revise and reconstruct our memories to make ourselves look better, or even to make ourselves the victim of a sequence of events.

Autobiographies emerge from memory. And not surprisingly, autobiographies are carefully curated stories wherein the author reconstitutes his or her experiences. Or omits some. Or edits out details from an event or memory.

With this in mind, we approached our major project, the Six Word Memoirs. The idea of the Six Word Memoirs comes from *Smith Magazine* in New York City. The idea is based on the first known six word memoir, by Ernest Hemingway: "For sale. Baby shoes. Never used." From Hemingway's very sad memoir, the people at *Smith*

realized that a lot can be said in six words. Six word memoirs can be profound and sad like Hemingway's. Or they can be pithy and fun. Or anything in between.

We created a website for our project. And we fanned out to collect the six word memoirs of the community of the University of North Alabama. We approached my colleagues in various departments for permission to come into their classes to collect memoirs. We approached the deans and senior administration of UNA, up to President Kitts. And we asked support staff and the police to participate. We set up a table in the GUC to collect memoirs in exchange for cookies. People contributed their memoirs on paper in these situations, or they went to our website and left them there. One of my students collected memoirs on YikYak.

In about three weeks, we collected some 600 or so memoirs. We then faced curatorial decisions: What do we do with memoirs that are obscene? Or ones that contain cuss words? Or references to drink and drugs? And so on. What about ones that aren't six words long? We decided, in the end, memoirs that weren't six words were automatically excluded. We decided to leave in cuss words and reference to drinking, at least to an extent. We did not include obvious

references to drugs. Then we had to decide how to and where to display them. Our original ideas for outdoor, multi-locational exhibits had to be reigned in, in part because we could not get permission to use certain parts of campus, but also because the weather turned cold and wet for a few weeks. So, we re-grouped and created one outdoor exhibit outside the new Science and Technology Building on campus. The other was mounted in the Library Commons.

We opened the exhibit right after Thanksgiving as we all limped towards the end of a long semester. Jennifer Edwards of the Florence *Times-Daily* came to see our exhibit and we ended up in the newspaper. This project was a wonderful eye-opener for all of us. We were amazed and overwhelmed by the response from the UNA community. But we were equally overwhelmed by the honesty of our respondents, by what they said in six words. Some were funny. Some were pithy. But many of them were deep and heavy. My students and I were reminded that everyone has their own story, and we are not in a position to judge others. We don't know their stories. We don't know why they're happy or sad. Or why they're rude or polite. We need to respect others.

I was hoping we would learn something about autobiography and memory in the process. Memory, at both the societal and individual level, is what fascinates me as a scholar. I was also hoping that we could perform a service for the campus community. University is hard, especially for freshmen. I still remember my first year of university and the alienation and confusion that came with it. I can see my freshman students get overwhelmed at negotiating an entirely new system. I understand how students at all levels of university can get alienated and feel lost. I hoped that by collecting these memoirs and exhibiting them, we could show those who felt a little lost or alienated that they were not alone, that others felt that way. And maybe that would be enough to help them begin to see the light at the end of the tunnel.

I think I speak for my students that this was a transformational experience for us all. We learned a lot about memory and autobiography, which were my pedagogical goals, of course. But, perhaps more importantly, we learned a lot about human nature and about the people we share the UNA community with.

HGSA would like to extend special thanks to Dr. Barlow for the workshops, time, and assistance he has given our members. Thank You!

Politicizing of History: The Role of Public History in an Ever-Changing Political Landscape

John J. Gurner, M.A, MScR
Cultural Resources Specialist
Fort Morgan State Historic Site

In honor of the University of North Alabama's newly created Public History Masters program, it seems appropriate to write about some of the issues that affect the vital role public historians have in society. With an ever-changing political climate, anything can be instantly commented on through social media to add fire to a controversy. Incorrect information and bad history seem ubiquitous these days. If the wrong thing is said or done that appears to contradict one's personal view of the past, people are likely to follow the sway of a mob charging after the proverbial monster and demand change of what is deemed as "offensive" history. Public historians have a unique job that brings us in direct contact with people. While many are engaged in research for various organizations or are in classrooms preparing the new generation for their future jobs, it is the ones who work at historic sites and engage with the public everyday that hold an

important, yet often precarious, position. The public historian who acts as a historical interpreter has a chance to impart knowledge or a new way of looking at a historical issue that a person may have previously believed they understood perfectly. This often means donning period costume and portraying a character. In certain settings, visitors may become fully engaged in an interpretive moment, such as visiting a British camp for a Revolutionary War event and watching an elegantly dressed British officer, bearing a look of indignant disregard for all, riding past on a horse, or watching a Civil War artillery demonstration for the first time and feeling the blast as the cannon belches its fire at an imaginary enemy charge. Such experiences can change a person's view of history entirely. In this capacity, the professional interpreter can have a rewarding experience, perhaps telling a more up-to-date version of a well-known story, taking the time to show visitors what a soldier carried in his knapsack, or getting children to assist a laundress in the less than glorious task of washing a soldier's moldy shirt-definitely an unforgettable experience! Yet, the interpreter can also be the one who takes the brunt of visitors' anger for an affront to their views of a particular heritage, real or imagined.

In the months since the tragic deaths of nine people during a service at a South Carolina church by an avowed white supremacist and Confederate sympathizer, there has been a spin-off issue: the use and meaning of the Confederate flag as a historical and cultural symbol. This quickly brought many historical sites that display Confederate symbols under scrutiny. As a historical interpreter, the controversy brought to home an issue I have been pondering for nearly two decades: how should historical objects that have developed a controversial place in the public sphere be used in public history? What follows is an examination of the issues that many historical sites are currently dealing with in terms of placing their site's history in the proper interpretive context despite any modern distaste for a particular, perhaps uncomfortable, aspect of history. As a secondary theme, I will offer some guidance for historical interpreters who work with the public and suggest how best to endure a heavily politicized controversy and still educate visitors about complex historical issues without offending sensibilities.

Before examining the issues surrounding the controversy, I must first give a background story to the events as I experienced them

in a professional capacity. As a historical interpreter working at Fort Morgan State Historic Site, my job is to plan interpretive programs for the summer tours and weekly night Civil War tours. Fort Morgan is known for its role as a Confederate stronghold, but the site was used for more than just the Civil War. The problem for the staff is that many visitors only see one side to the site's history. With that in mind, our guided tours attempt to quickly highlight the other periods of the fort's use by the U.S. military. For the summer programs, the historical interpreters portray Confederate soldiers for the tours and school groups, so we focus on interpreting the soldiers' daily routine during the period of January 1861 to August 1864. For the summer of 2015, however, we continued the Civil War Sesquicentennial timeline and developed the program to portray the Union Garrison of 1865. This provided better interpretation of the last phase of the war and Fort Morgan's role as a staging area for the Federal operations against Mobile as well as the end of Third System Fortifications as seacoast defense platforms. At first, the events in Charleston seemed too far away to influence work at our site on the Gulf coast. Within two days all of that changed when pictures began emerging of the suspect posing with the Confederate battle flag. As I suspected, attention was

immediately drawn to the flag that has become the most recognized symbol of racial hatred, and with that it seemed likely that all manner of attention would be directed at historic sites once connected to the Confederacy. Many people in South Carolina quickly began calling for the removal of the Confederate flag from the state capitol. An editorial from the Charleston *Post and Courier* stated: "there is no appropriate place for the flag at the Statehouse."[1] On June 23, while the legislature met to vote on issues for the upcoming special session, a rally was held where protesters of the flag hoisted their signs high. Likewise, South Carolina state senator Vincent Sheheen of Camden introduced a bill that would bring the flag down.[2] As the events unfolded, the Fort Morgan staff prepared for the likely rush of reporters, arriving like a horde of locusts hungry for a story. My first task was to instruct my seasonal interpreter to avoid discussion with visitors concerning the events in Charleston and the issue of the battle flag. The next day on June 24, Governor Robert Bentley surreptitiously had the Confederate

[1] Editorial, "Time to furl the Confederate flag," Charleston *Post and Courier*, June 22, 2015, http://www.postandcourier.com/article/20150622/PC1002/150629774 (accessed December 4, 2015).

[2] Cynthia Roldan, "South Carolina lawmakers agree to discuss removing Confederate flag," Charleston *Post and Courier*, June 23, 2015, http://www.postandcourier.com/article/20150623/PC1603/150629759 (accessed December 4, 2015).

battle flag removed from the Capitol building, and when asked why he had it removed he said, "This is the right thing to do. We are facing some major issues in this state regarding the budget and other matters we need to deal with."[3] Indeed, it was a bold move. By that afternoon a reporter from a Mobile news channel arrived and quickly began looking for *the* flag. Fort Morgan normally flies five flags to represent the nations that have controlled Mobile Point and the Gulf coast. We have a sixth flag that was the unit standard of the Montgomery Rifles--one of the first units to garrison the fort during the Secession Crisis and later became a part of Confederate Army of Alabama. For the reporter, her attempt to find a story, or create one if need be, was thwarted by the rains of the early morning so that all of the flags were not flying that day. It did not, however, stop the reporter from delivering a story entitled, "Fort Morgan Still Flies Confederate Flag." Thankfully, I was dressed as a Federal artillery sergeant for the next tour, which probably further hindered any planned stirring of the proverbial pot. Nevertheless, the story was weak and only managed to get some opinions from the visitors concerning the issue of the

[3] Charles Dean, "Alabama Gov. Bentley removes Confederate flags from Capitol grounds," 24 June 2015 http://ww.al.com/news/index.ssf/2015/06/confederate_flag_removed_from.html, (accessed November 16, 2015).

Confederate flag; interestingly, most of the people interviewed said it was acceptable for the flag to be displayed at a historic site.[4] The quick media attention concerning the Confederate battle flag, combined with the fervor of the protesters calling for its removal from the public sphere, shows that Governor Bentley's action, which South Carolina's governor would later follow, resurrected an old issue for historians to yet again consider: when and where can a controversial and highly politicized historical symbol be displayed?

Before a suitable answer can be given, two aspects or the subject must be addressed: symbolism and history education. To understand the Confederate battle flag as a symbol, one must first understand why the flag was created, how it was initially used, and how it is used in a modern context. As an item that is part of a region's or nation's material culture, flags occupy a unique place. National flags are considered important symbols portraying who they are and something of the nation's heritage. The first flags were mostly for military purposes and evolved into family emblems; much later flags were developed for powerful houses (essentially a collection of related

[4] Debbie Williams, "Fort Morgan Still Flying Confederate Flag," June 24, 2015, http://wkrg.com/2015/06/24/fort-morgan-still-flying-confederate-flag/ (accessed November 22, 2015).

sub-families), i.e. the warlords who claimed power for particular regions, thus becoming the first nobles. Dynastic flags formed the basis for the first national flags because of the efforts of ambitious kings or powerful dukes to impose their will upon larger areas of land. The process was not easy, but over many centuries the dynasty gains more territory, and adds more minor lords to the list of allies, the nation starts to take shape. The likely symbol to represent the new collection of provinces that make up a nation has tended to come from the ruling house. In Western Europe, the rise of the Bourbon dynasty and the making of the kingdom of France is one example of the general scenario just given. The symbol or sigil of the Bourbon kings became not only the motif of the national flag, but was also the form used for the colonial flag that flew in the far-flung French territories around the globe- the white flag emblazoned with three gold or yellow *fleur-de-lis.* Out of the need for warring factions and knights to identify each other on the battlefield, heraldry was developed to organize the colors and motifs adopted by powerful leaders.[5] Consequently, it is a complicated system where even the smallest change of a family's standard gave specific meaning as the families

[5] H. W. Koch, *Medieval Warfare,* (London: Bison Books, 1978), 115.

intermarried or old braches died off. In the modern era, as warfare evolved into larger events with numerous types of units engaged across battlefields that could span miles, the flag designs had to be simple and distinctive enough so commanders knew where the units were located along the battlefield. During the first phase of the Secession Crisis, many units in the Confederate States had designed their own battle flags. When these units were re-organized into the Confederate States Army, such flags carried by companies- some having less than a hundred men- were required to be sent home once full regiments were raised.

For organizational purposes, flags were essential and a considerable amount of ceremony was given when presenting the regimental flag to the men. Such ceremonies often included what Bell Wiley colorfully described as "platitudinous" oration typical of modern high school valedictorian speeches and was given by "some beauteous, behooped patriot."[6] The solemnity of the occasion ensured that Civil War soldiers learned to revere the unit banner, as it instilled *esprit de corps* and confirmed the individual soldier's commitment to

[6] Bell I. Wiley, *The Life of Johnny Reb* (New York: Bobbs-Merrill, 1943; repr., New York: Book-of-the-Month Club, 1994), 21.

fight for his people. Men revered the battle flag and most would do anything to save the colors from falling into enemy hands. The history of the British Army during the Napoleonic War provides many useful examples of how soldiers developed attachments to their flags. Likewise for the French Army, soldiers prided their attachment to certain regiments and the loss of their Eagles, solid cast bronze statuettes mounted on a long blue shaft, caused just as much shame as their British counterparts would have felt if such symbols of soldiery were lost during battle. During the American Civil War similar issues with the loss of the colors occurred. Indeed, numerous courthouses and museums in the North would be lacking if they did not have the battle flags of captured Confederate units to showcase the gallantry of their homegrown citizen-soldiers. In essence, the colors or battle flags represented the soldiers of the units, so displaying them in a non-military/historical context is improper. The issue for the general public is why some people insist on flying or displaying a flag that should not have any modern significance.

The problem with producing a good answer comes from the long and twisted history of the development of the politicized Confederate flag. This is not a soldier's flag, or at least not one that is

relevant to any historical regiment. Indeed, this symbol is a later construction that has developed a different and more forceful presence in several political and pseudo-ethnic ideologies- namely the Confederate cause as the foundation of the "Southern nation." The symbol of that nation has, for some at least, become the now ubiquitous Confederate flag; it just happens to be the wrong flag. As mentioned above, there were numerous flags used by the Confederate army, but the reason why *one* type prevailed as the all-encompassing banner has caused much discussion. One can easily blame the Virginians for this, or at least the veterans of the Army of Northern Virginia, for the first phase of the adoption of a particular flag for post-war causes. The problem, however, is one of misuse and the twisting of a military banner into something else has only recently been called into question by scholars. In 1993, Dr. Robert D. England penned an interesting newspaper opinion where he poignantly observed, "Whoa boys! We've got the wrong flag. There was never anything called "the" Confederate battle flag." His article was in response to another Confederate flag controversy after the newly-elected governor of Alabama Jim Folsom brought down the Confederate flag. As England

points out, "Never mind that it never had flown over the dome in its new condition. Gov. Folsom hoped to end the controversy which consumed a forest of trees, hacked for sawdust for legal briefs and newsprint."[7]

A decade later, John Coski examined the development of the Confederate battle flag in both the design process for the flags used by the secessionists and Confederates as well as the use of these symbols in the modern era. Coski's work provides a great look at how emerging nations create symbols that set themselves apart from their progenitors. For the Confederates, as Americans who no longer aligned with the United States yet still clung to the symbols of the old order, this meant adopting a national flag that still had the same colors people thought represented them, but in a style different from their mother country. This process also consumed the American patriots during 1775 through 1776 while adopting flags which initially exemplified their resistance to a tyrannically tax-hungry parliament. Many flags emerged from this period; in essence, these reflected the ideology of the separately emerging states which would coalesce into a unified resistance. The Gadsden Flag, a rectangular yellow field

[7] Dr. Robert D. England, "Whoa Boys! We've got the Wrong Flag," Muscle Shoals *Times Daily*, May 16, 1993.

featuring a coiled rattler and the words "Don't Tread On Me" inscribed below, is just one example of numerous types used during the first phase of resistance. The Grand Union flag (field of thirteen horizontal stripes, alternating red and white, with the British Union Jack in the canton) symbolized the Britishness of colonial resistance,[8] but once the goals of the conflict changed less than a year later, so too must the flags change to show a nation fighting for its survival from the supposed tyranny of Mother Britannia. The first attempt at creating a unique Confederate flag, a living symbol of the nation itself, was a flag that was very similar to the U.S. colors but with three alternating stripes of red, white, and red, and a blue canton which contained seven pentagonal stars arranged in a circle- later one for each state of the Confederacy. This is often referred to as the "Stars & Bars," and for the time was a well-designed flag that allowed for easy production while containing the three colors that many southerners still regarded as integral in their identity. Not everyone, of course, was pleased with

[8] It has been long regarded that the adoption of the Grand Union Flag occurred on I January 1776. General George Washington was conducting an inspection of the troops still assembled at Prospect Hill near Cambridge, MA., and officially adopted the flag for the Continental army. Research by Byron DeLear, of the North American Vexillological Association, has confirmed this as a "solid" story. Edgar B. Herwick III "Somerville Still Raises the Grand Union Flag 238 Years Later," January 2, 2014, http://wgbhnews.org/post/somerville-still-raises-grand-union-flag-238-years-later (accessed December 05, 2015).

the design. The Chair of the Flag and Seal of the Provisional Congress, William Porcher Miles, believed it too closely resembled the U.S. flag, but his objections were not taken into consideration until the next year.[9] The Confederacy had many units that went to the first battle of the war at Manassas Junction in July 1861 with the First National as battle flags. The battle quickly showed the problem of using flags that looked too much like the enemy's colors, because once the fog of war set in men had to be able to recognize their standards during the confusion of the fight. Manassas proved that the similarity of the Federal and Confederate army flags was a liability and a change had to be made for the benefit of the army. For the civilians, the objections to the Stars & Bars were that it 'failed to satisfy…' and was essentially a 'hybrid bunting in use during our transitional period from attempted to confirmed independence of the country of whose flag it is a plagiary.'[10] In a strange twist of irony, the First National caused problems for northerners as reported in the Chattanooga *Daily Rebel:*

> "On the night of the 3rd of July[1862] the secessionists of Middletown, Delaware, hoisted a Confederate flag on a pole which had been erected by Unionists, and that early on the

[9] John M. Coski. *The Confederate Battle Flag: American's Most Embattled Emblem*, (Cambridge, Mass: Belknap Press, 2006), 4-5.
[10] Robert Bonner, "Flag Culture and the Consolidation of Confederate Nationalism," *Journal of Southern History* 68 no.2 (May, 2002): 313.

> morning of the 4th the "Stars and Bars" were supported by forty rounds by supporters of the Abolition Government. When they discovered their mistake they were so enraged that they immediately hauled down the flag and tore it to shreds, and vigorously applied themselves to washing the pole with soap and water to cleanse the polluting effects of the Confederate banner." [11]

Fortunately for the Confederate Army, General Pierre Gustave Toutant Beauregard, the commander of the Confederate forces at Manassas, quickly contacted his former aide, William Miles, to develop a new army flag. Beauregard had seen first-hand the confusion in battle from the similarity of battle flags and pressed upon Miles the need for a change. Miles, yet again, proposed using his original flag design which the Flag committee had rejected- a diagonal blue cross emblazoned with stars for each state in the Confederacy, on a red field. The committee rejected the proposal to change the national flag, so Beauregard, in a bold attempt to outmaneuver the civilians, went to his superior, General Joseph E. Johnston, about creating distinctive army flags separate from the 'peace' flag.[12] After more discussion, it was decided to use the "Miles" flag as the new army

---

[11] Chattanooga *Daily Rebel* 08/09/1862, http://chroniclingamerica.loc.gov/lccn/sn82015209/1862-08-09/ed-2/seq-3/ (accessed 12/10/2015).

[12] Coski, *Confederate Battle Flag*, 8.

battle flag. Miles had spent much time developing this design. At one point he changed the design from his original motif that used a cross of St. George (Latin cross) that was part of an early secession flag of South Carolina, and replaced it with a saltire or diagonal cross that was used in heraldry. Miles was very conscious of the use of heraldic symbols and made his changes to the design because a Jewish citizen of South Carolina had written to him asking for the change so the flag would not appear to have ties to one particular faith.[13] With the saltire, Miles succeeded in creating a visually striking flag that incorporated the colors many southerners regarded as part of their heritage as Americans, whose ancestors had participated in the first war of independence. More importantly, the Confederate States Army had a distinctive battle flag that was separate from the national flag. This battle flag was a square field of red, bordered in white, emblazoned with a blue diagonal cross, bordered in white, and twelve stars within the cross, and was adopted by the Army of the Potomac (later renamed the Army of Northern Virginia). I shall henceforth refer to the aforementioned flag as the Southern Cross. The problem with using the saltire, as Coski points out, is that while it is a standard heraldic

[13] Ibid., *5.*

device it can easily be misconstrued as St. Andrew's cross and by extension impart a strong Christian connotation. Indeed, many denominations of Christianity use particular crosses to represent their churches, but despite the attempt by Miles to lessen the implied religiosity of the flag by using the 'more *Heraldic [sic]* than *Ecclesiastical*' saltire, the flag would acquire layer upon layer of extra meaning in terms of heritage, culture, and by extension, defense of slavery.[14] Confederates quickly inferred their own religious views into the meaning of the diagonal heraldic cross, once described by one flag committee member as resembling a pair of 'blue suspenders.'[15] The editor of the *Countryman* revealed his religious interpretation when he stated that by adopting the St. Andrew's Cross emblem, 'the southern people recognize Christ and him crucified, and his precious teachings…'[16] What was important for commanders was the implementation of uniform battle standards and ordering new flags to replace the old ones being used. This was not to be an easy task. Many units of the various departments were strewn across a vast geographical area and had already developed their own standards,

[14]Coski, 5, 27.
[15] Ibid., 7
[16] Bonner, "Flag Culture," *JSH* 68, 315.

fought under them, and were very much attached to these fighting colors. After the Army of the Potomac adopted the Southern Cross as its battle flag, General Beauregard urged flag conformity. Later, transferred to the west, he continued his crusade, which was taken up by General Joseph Johnston as commander of the Army of Tennessee. John Bell Hood tried the same thing, despite his understanding of 'the pride many regiments of the corps feel in other flags which they have gloriously borne in battle but interests of the service are imperative.'[17] Although many regimental commanders resisted the order, most units were forced to change the colors to the Southern Cross design, but with a slight deviation. Instead of a complete adoption of the Virginian flag, the flags were made rectangular and with no border. Some units from Alabama retained their original banners, and these relics show the problem with people of today who ascribe one type of flag for all the units that fought for the Confederacy.[18]

---

[17] General Orders no. 39, March 11, 1864 in Coski, *Confederate Battle Flag*, 13.

[18] In an interview with Robert Bradley of the Alabama Department of Archives and History, he explained that a large majority of Alabama units of the Army of Tennessee were called the "d--n blue flag boys" due to their 'non-regulation' flags. Since these units became part of General Patrick Cleburne's division they were exempted from Johnston's order. A quick look at the ADAH online photograph collection shows the variety of unit flags, particularly the 16th and 33rd who were issued Hardee/Cleburne flags after losing the originals at Franklin, http://digital.archives.alabama.gov/cdm/search/searchterm/civil%20war%20flags/mode/all/order/date/page/1.

For the average public historian acting as tour guide or historical interpreter, the opportunity to relate even a brief outline of an artifact or historical symbol's history, such as the account of the Confederate battle flag given above, is normally not possible during most encounters. So how do we educate people regarding the accuracy of their personal views regarding a historical issue? First, perhaps obliviously, that starts in the classroom. Secondary education teachers who teach history have more opportunities than ever before to obtain the correct information either from their former professors or from digital archives. While most schools are governed by state and local standards of instruction, teachers still have the power to remove the old and outdated views of sensitive historical periods and insert modern interpretations, i.e. use the national flags of both the combatants of the Civil War instead of the contentious battle flag. Given the modern era development of the Ku Klux Klan as a racist institution that propagates hate and fear, removing the popular version of the Confederate flag is one way to lessen the discomfort for some, yet maintain historical accuracy detached from any possible controversy. Despite attempts from well-known Civil War groups such

as the United Daughters of the Confederacy and Sons of Confederate Veterans to persuade fringe groups to cease using the rectangular battle flag for their political agendas,[19] the flag's use in the public sphere will likely never stop. However, as historians, we can use such a symbol to educate people about what the imagery means and explain how perceptions become distorted overtime. A colleague of mine once said, "The worst place to learn about the Civil War is at your grandmother's knee." He has a point and one that is hard to fight, especially if a visitor asks a question that requires one to answer in a way that contradicts what someone was taught at home, saying that the sainted grandma- preserver of family lore and epitome of sagacity- was wrong!

Returning now to problems with politicized history, often used by conflicting sides to further their cause; how can public historians do their jobs during what often turns into a public relations crisis? As mentioned earlier, the emergence of a distracting controversy with a historic site flying a Confederate flag never emerged, and Fort Morgan

[19] Coski, *Confederate Battle Flag*, 106; The SVC produced a new flag resolution where it stated, "the use of the Confederate Battle Flag by extremist political groups and individuals who seek to clothe themselves in respectability by misappropriating the banner under which our southern ancestors fought for a Just Cause which is as noble as much latter day is ignoble," *New Flag Resolution*, http://www. scv.org (accessed December 17, 2015).

was spared, this time. The potential was there, and is likely to re-emerge if attention is again brought back to the issue of the battle flag. After a day or two of fretting over how to deal with the issue, I decided the best way to handle any questions about the flag, beyond the usual question of why the site does not fly *the* flag, was to tackle it head-on. Shying away from answering any question concerning an artifact's meaning and use, or a historic site's history, only portrays an unprofessional attitude and possibly one's own personal bias. Having grown up in the Mid-South- from northern Mississippi to northern Alabama- my own preconceived notions of the South's less than perfect history had to be assessed and pushed out of mind when writing or talking to people about the region's history. While the taint of rebellion still hovers across the reconstructed states, what happened is not the fault of anyone living today; some of us just happened to be descendants of those rebels. When wearing a Confederate uniform for an event, my role is that of historical interpreter, but the role of historian will quickly emerge when a visitor asks a question regarding anything that happened at the site beyond "the War," or when linking issues together to present a larger historical landscape. Speaking

candidly, with regard for propriety, and with evidence behind those words, such as quoting from a letter or diary of a person involved, does more to make any moment into an interpretive one, which a person can take with them and hopefully share with others. If there is one good thing that the controversy of the Confederate battle flag has done, it is to elicit discussion regarding the propriety of its use and promote more accurate use of historical images. Baldwin County, Alabama, is a good example of how the controversy produced a proper change when the county Department of Archives and History decided to change the flags on the county seal.[20] Not only was the old Confederate battle flag removed and replaced with the Confederate First National flag, other changes were made to better reflect the county's colonial heritage. For the longest time the British flag used on the seal was the blue flag with a red cross of St. George, bordered in white, overlaid on a white cross of St. Andrew, but it also contained a smaller red saltire emblazoned on the edges of the white cross. This happens to be the current flag of the United Kingdom, known as the

[20] John Sharp, "Baldwin County votes to remove four flags from its seal including Confederate battle flag," October 6, 2015, http://www.al.com/news/mobile/index.ssf/2015/10/baldwin_county votes_to_remove.html (accessed December 10, 2015).

Union Flag, which became the official British flag in 1801[21] after Ireland was incorporated into the United Kingdom.[22] The red saltire, then referred to as the cross of St Patrick,[23] was added to represent Ireland, so the Union flag was not used by the short-lived British colony of West Florida (1763-1781). Now the proper colonial flag, the King's Colour, has its rightful place. Likewise, the Spanish and French flags were corrected to the proper colonial banners. This shows that despite any politicized moment, no matter how it was generated, small but important changes can be made for an accurate portrayal of cultural heritage. In the long-term, actions such as those taken by the BCDAH indicate that when a populace allows historians to add a new

[21] http://www.flaginstitute.org/wp/flag-registry/?flagtype=National+Flag (accessed December 30, 2015).

[22] R. F. Foster has described the "Union with Westminster" as a "radical act of reform" and largely part of a security measure due the 1798 rebellion, *Oxford Illustrated History of Ireland*, ed. R.F. Foster,(Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989), 183.

[23] The addition of the red saltire to the British flag has a strange history due to its dubious historical authenticity. The cross may have originated from misconceptions of unit banners first used by the Earls of Kildare as early as 1467, who later participated in many battles to remove the English presence from Ireland. Alternatively, flags bearing the Cross of Burgundy (red, rough-shaped cross on a white field) were used for various units of Irishmen in the service of Spain. These units fought against Anglo-Irish and English soldiers in Ireland at different times, so the symbol may have become associated with Ireland through them. The red saltire, as far as can be ascertained, was not an original symbol of old Eire, despite modern assertions to the contrary, like those of David Kerr writing for the ulsternation.org, http://www.ulsternation.org.uk/cross_of_st_patrick.htm (accessed December 28, 2015).

layer of accuracy to the perception of local history, everyone benefits. Nevertheless, there are sure to be more controversies in the future. Consequently, usurpation of the Gadsden Flag by the Tea Party and other groups may cause Revolutionary War sites to come under scrutiny if found flying it, even when displayed in the context of representing the first phase of colonial resistance. In responding to a politicized moment of historical importance, should historians use a crisis as an educational moment? Yes, but it has to be done carefully. A recent college graduate working as a tour guide may not have the ability to deal with a media spawned PR nightmare, but professional historians can act as a united front to thwart the distortion of historical facts. Perhaps historians should push for the removal of secessionist symbols from official seals, flags, and other displays, but it is not our place. Moreover, in dealing with politicized moments of corrupted history, if public historians stand firm with the facts and carefully constructed theories, we may yet dispel the myths, slay all shibboleths, and accomplish our mission to educate the people.