
THE ALEXANDRIAN

Troy University Department of History

& Phi Alpha Theta-Iota Mu

In Remembrance of Professor Nathan Alexander

Co-Editors

Karen Ross

Nichole Woodburn

Student Assistant Editors

Connor McCreery

Peyton A. Paradiso

Daniel W. Throckmorton

Colby Turberville

Nichole Woodburn

Faculty Associate Editors

David Carlson

Margaret Gnoinska

Allen Jones

Marty Olliff

Andrew Reeves

Kristine Stilwell

Technological Editor

Timothy W. Winters

Selection Board

Scout Blum

Timothy Buckner

David Carlson

Margaret Gnoinska

Allen Jones

Marty Olliff

Dan Puckett

Andrew Reeves

Karen Ross

Nichole Woodburn

Alexandrian Submission Guidelines

The Alexandrian accepts manuscripts pertaining to the subjects of history and philosophy. Accepted forms include book reviews, historiographical articles, articles, and essays.

Format: All submissions should be in Microsoft Word. They should adhere to the *Chicago Manual of Style*. Please include footnotes instead of endnotes and refrain from using headers.

Abstract: Any article submission must include an abstract of no more than 200 words. This is not necessary for submissions of book reviews or essays.

Author biography: A short biography of any relevant information should be included for the contributors' page of the journal. Such information includes your major and class designation, graduation date, research interests, plans after college, hometown, any academic honors or affiliations you deem relevant, etc. Author biographies should be no more than 100 words. Please be sure your name is written as you would like it to appear in the journal.

Please send all submissions to alexandrian@troy.edu.

Cover art: "Portrait of Charlemagne, whom the Song of Solomon names the King with the Grizzly Beard. – Fac-simile of an Engraving of the End of the Sixteenth Century." Figure 9, from Paul Lacroix, *Manners, Custom and Dress During the Middle Ages and During the Renaissance Period*, London, Chapman and Hall, 1874.

THE ALEXANDRIAN

Table of Contents

Introduction and Dedication, Nichole Woodburn.....	4
Contributors' Biographies.....	6
Articles	
Traditions of Paganism and the Christian Church, Morgan Jackson.....	8
The United States' Various Responses to the Armenian Genocide, Rebecca Johnson.....	24
Military Objectives and Political Policy, Patrick Jones.....	34
Accepting the End of my Existence: Why the Tutsis Did Not Respond More Forcefully during the Rwandan Genocide, Theo M. Moore	44
From Emperor to Holy Crusader: A Historiography of the Charlemagne Legend, Colby Turberville.....	58
Trying For a Better Society: A Look at British Socialism Post World War II, Clarence C. Walker	74
Faculty Essay	
Research Update, Dr. Jennifer Ann Newman Treviño	93
Department News.....	102
Troy University Master's Program Announcement.....	103
Gratitude.....	104
Professor Nathan Alexander Remembered.....	105
Phi Alpha Theta Inductees.....	107

Introduction and Dedication

After the inaugural issue of *The Alexandrian* last year, the history department became showcased on a university level for providing a forum for student research. This tiny publication aided two students when applying for masters programs in history and gave the writers a chance to present their material in front of students, faculty, and supportive administration. In short, our first issue accomplished all we hoped it would and set a precedent for history and philosophy students who also wished to submit their work.

Our first issue discussed Dr. Nathan Alexander, the impetus for a student-run history publication at Troy University. All the work presented in these pages is done in his memory.

With the publication of our second issue, we have accomplished another great feat. This is the first issue since the very first *Alexandrian*. This is no small accomplishment, as we believe the essays spanning from Charlemagne to the Armenian genocide are just as exciting as those published in our first issue. We have also expanded the contents of this journal to include a faculty essay by Dr. Jennifer Ann Newman Treviño. This journal is the accomplishment of so many contributors' hard work, and this is why the achievement of finishing our second issue and officially creating a serialized journal is so meaningful.

To Doug Allen, who was the first student editor and the former Phi Alpha Theta president who came back from a conference one day with the statement, "We have to make a history journal," congratulations, because your inspiration is our legacy. To Dr. Ross who has held this idea through "generations" of Phi Alpha Theta members as they are initiated and graduate, thank you for the hard work you have not only already done, but are planning to do as this journal continues. With big dreams for what this journal is to become, I know that even as I graduate this spring semester, at least one part of my hard work will be shared with others.

Another special legacy that I hope will continue with this journal, is a dedication of each issue as *The Alexandrian* is passed from student to student. So, our second issue of *The Alexandrian* is dedicated to Dr. William Welch who is retiring from Troy University this year. Dr. Welch was my first professor in the history department and was my reason for declaring a history minor, and otherwise has been a favorite professor of his students. He leaves the history department in order to travel, but we thank him for his time at Troy and wish to

recognize him here because of his importance to several contributors of this journal.

It is my hope that the Iota-Mu chapter of *Phi Alpha Theta* will continue to find and reward excellent student research. I am so happy to have been a part of this issue of *The Alexandrian* and I sincerely wish for you to enjoy the essays.

Thank you,

Nichole Woodburn

Phi Alpha Theta president and co-editor

Contributors' Biographies

Morgan A. Jackson

Morgan A. Jackson is an academic advisor for the College of Arts and Sciences at Troy University. She obtained her Bachelor of Science in History and Political Science at Troy University. In July 2013, Morgan will receive her Masters in Post-Secondary Education with a Concentration in History. Morgan's areas of research include colonial society and politics, popular culture, history of paranormal and superstitious beliefs, and wartime propaganda.

Rebecca Johnson

Rebecca Johnson graduated Magna Cum Laude from Troy University, Dothan campus, in 2011 with Bachelor of Science degrees in European History and Psychology. She received the Outstanding Undergraduate Student in History award and is a member of Phi Alpha Theta. She is currently working on her Master's degree in Postsecondary Education – History. Her research focus is on the American Gilded Age and Progressive Era. Eventually she wants to be a university professor and to research topics from new perspectives.

Patrick Jones

Patrick Jones is a senior History-Education major planning to graduate in May 2013 with a concentration in American/Latin American History. He is a resident of Dothan, Alabama, and hopes to find a teaching position at a high school near the Dothan area in the fall. He plans to start taking classes towards a Master's degree in History. Jones was a Senator the last two years in the Student Government Association and a Phi Alpha Theta member over the last year. The source of the research of his paper, Patrick Cleburne, is who he is named after which sparked his interest in writing this paper.

Theo Moore

Theo Moore graduated from Troy University with a bachelor's degree in history. While in attendance at Troy, he served as the treasurer, secretary, and was later promoted to president of the Troy University chapter of Omega Psi Phi Inc. He also was a contributing member to other social groups on Troy University campus such as 101 Elite Men and the African American Alliance. Theo currently teaches at Admiral Moorer Middle School in Eufaula, Alabama. Most

importantly, he is a second semester graduate student pursuing a master's degree in history. Theo's main focus in history is U.S. History and World History. He eventually aspires to become a historian, author, and university professor.

Colby Turberville

Colby Turberville will graduate with honors from Troy University with a Bachelor's degree in History this May. While at Troy he was Secretary of Phi Alpha Theta and a student editor for the Alexandrian History/Philosophy Journal. He plans to attend graduate school this fall at the University of Florida or Troy University. His areas of interest include Carolingian Europe, late ancient law and order, and late Roman Empire. His eventual plans include becoming a university professor and published historian.

Clarence C. Walker

Clarence Walker graduated from Troy University in the fall of 2012 with a major in history and minor in political science. A native of Dale County, Clarence currently resides and works in Birmingham, and in the future Clarence plans to attend graduate school in history, with a particular interest in political history.

Traditions of Paganism and the Christian Church

Morgan Jackson

Abstract: The late antique period witnessed the overlap of Christian teaching with pagan practices. The rise of the Christian Church marked a change in the way pagan practices termed magic were viewed, tolerated, and altered. Historian Valerie Flint addresses these changes in *The Rise of Magic in Early Medieval Europe* by examining how magic was defined during the second to sixth centuries and how the Church responded to magical practices in a pagan world. However, more recently scholarship concerning late antique pagan practices and Church authority disputes Flint's claims.

Magic in the Late Roman Empire was not looked upon favorably. Although the definition of magic as well as the tolerance from the Church, other authorities, and society changed during Late Antiquity, the use of magic did not decline. The rise of the Christian Church marked a change in the way magic was viewed and tolerated. Historian and author Valerie Flint addresses the rise of power and influence of the Christian Church as well as its relationship and involvement with magic and paganism in *The Rise of Magic in Early Medieval Europe*. Flint examines how magic was defined during the second to sixth century and how the Church responded to magical practices in a pagan world. She also explores the differences in Church sanctioned customs and traditional pagan practices. The purpose of this paper is to evaluate Flint's thesis and supporting arguments by discussing the manner in which the Church defined magic, the pagan traditions that were adopted, the pagan traditions that were forbidden, the people who were involved in the use of magic, and the different views concerning magic and Christianity by Church Fathers.

The definition of what constituted magic was not easily definable in Late Antiquity, and it is no easier to do so now, especially considering the age of the term magic and the various transitions it has faced in various societies throughout history.¹ Valerie Flint provides two different definitions for the term magic (or *magia*) in the introduction of *The Rise of Magic in Medieval Europe* as well as additions to, or inexact variations of the term in different articles and books. According to Flint, at least in this instance as she provides several definitions in her writing, magic can be defined as the "preternatural control over nature by

¹ Jan Bremmer, Jan Veenstra, *Metamorphosis of Magic from Late Antiquity to the Early Modern Period* (New York: Peeters Publishers, 2002), Chapter 1.

human beings, with the assistance of forces more powerful than they,” with the definition of “...a type of wonder or delight.”² Flint acknowledges that her use of the term magic will cover several acceptable definitions of the word.³ With Flint’s definition, the realm of what can be considered magical practice is unlimited, leaving any action open for question about its affiliation with magic.

On the other hand, historian Fritz Graf defines magic as communication with higher powers in order to procure a desire or need.⁴ This could include asking for a cure to an illness, the inheritance of money, or the demand to place a love spell on another person. His definition restricts the realm of magic, though it does not leave room for fields that have traditionally been associated with magic. The difficulty historians have in defining magic reflects the difficulty that the Church and society had in the late antique period. In fact, historian Scott B. Noegel writes, “Many historians of religions have regarded magic simply as a type of religious practice.”⁵

Flint states that traditional portrayals of magic and the Church in Late Antiquity show a weak Church forced to integrate practices. She also provides several reasons as to why the Church would decide to integrate pagan rituals. Flint describes the rural pagan population as being an overwhelming majority over Christians. She also asserts that the Church was unable to view pagan practices in the manner in which they were intended, often times benign, making pagan magical use that much more threatening to the Church.

Despite the vastly different opinions of magic and the Church during Late Antiquity, Flint asserts that the Early Christian Church consciously integrated pagan practices into the Church in order to maintain a peaceful relationship with a large and influential pagan population.⁶ Flint’s take on magic and the Church places the Church in a more powerful and wiser role. Her early Church consisted of leaders who wanted to grow in influence and power while

² Valerie I. J. Flint, *The Rise of Magic in Early Medieval Europe* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991), 3.

³ *Ibid.* 5.

⁴ Fritz Graf, “Theories of Magic in Antiquity,” *Magic and Ritual in the Ancient World (Religions in the Graeco-Roman World)*, ed. P. Meyer & P. Mirecki, (New York: Brill Academic Publishers, 2002).

⁵ Scott B. Noegel, *Prayer, Magic, and the Stars in the Ancient and Late Antique World* (Philadelphia: The Pennsylvania University Press, 2003), 9.

⁶ Valerie Flint, *The Rise of Magic in Early Medieval Europe*.

also appealing large groups of pagans. Most importantly, her depiction of the Church shows a history of magical practices.

The early Christian Church faced many difficulties in regards to pagan magical practices. Part of the problem with magic was the inability to provide a concrete definition. In some instances, magic could be defined as citing a spell or incantation. At other times, it might be mixing a potion. These purposes that called for incantations or potions varied, sometimes being to cure illness and other times, to harm others. Magic has also been affiliated with fortune telling and other practices that fall into the realm of divination. The nature of magic caused it to be indefinable, yet the Christian Church saw a need to address magical use. This too would cause a problem because the Church was unable to provide sufficient guidelines to differentiate between acceptable and unacceptable magical practices.⁷

Approved magical use had to be positive in nature, had to be realistic and useful in daily life, or it had to have some sort of Biblical foundation in order to be acceptable.⁸ At the same time, late antique laws helped restrict non-authorized magical use. However, these laws were designed to protect people from wrongful accusations or harm. This type of danger included poison and love potions.⁹ The practicality of this type of law prevented poisons from widely circulating as potions designed to combat illness, bad luck, or assorted vanity issues like baldness and impotence. Magic and medicine tended to overlap in this area.

The relationship between Christianity and pagan magic is complicated because the Church often lacked consensus on what practices were permissible. Flint uses the writings and teachings of Church fathers and authorities, like Gregory of Tours and Augustine of Hippo, to defend her points.¹⁰ Flint briefly discusses Gregory of Tours' use of tokens and relics in the healing of others as a magical practice. Instead of referring to it as magic, Gregory suggests that his abilities are gifts from the Christian God for his faith and duty. Although many of his practices seemed similar to magic as discussed so far, he was not accused of witchcraft.

⁷ Allen E. Jones, *Social Mobility in Late Antique Gaul: Strategies and Opportunities for the Non-Elite* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 300.

⁸ Flint, *The Rise of Magic in Early Medieval Europe*, 51.

⁹ Jones, *Social Mobility in Late Antique Gaul*, Chapter 8.

¹⁰ Flint, *The Rise of Magic in Early Medieval Europe*, 112, 404.

Similarly, Augustine defends the Eucharist, a Christian practice involving ritualistic cannibalism and magic, in *The City of God, Confessions*, and in his various sermons by discussing how the idea of the Eucharist is practiced. Augustine believes that while what is seen when partaking in the ritual appears to be one thing, the Christian faith demands that the Eucharist be seen as the body of Christ, and that the Church becomes the body of Christ in participating in this and many other rituals.¹¹ Flint compares acts like this with pagan practices, and suggests that Augustine made these claims in order to ease the transition from paganism to Christianity. However, Flint goes on to say that Augustine was not a supporter of pagan tradition, despite temptations to engage in magic from time to time.

Medical practices have historically been linked with magic. Among the reasons for this association was that medicine primarily required someone of special knowledge to administer medical procedures, and many of the methods used to cure illness were inconsistent. Cures also relied on the use of incantations, potions, and amulets. Such methods were used during Late Antiquity. The nature of medicine insinuated not only magic, but possibly magic conducted by witches. The problem of potential witchcraft accusations was exacerbated by the fact that many potion makers were women or others of lower rank in society. Although the accusation of witchcraft could be met with severe financial penalties if proven wrong, those who were thought to be guilty could face physical and spiritual punishment on behalf of the Church.¹² By the Late Antique period, medicine was practiced among different groups of people, and the allowance of magical practice depended upon the group.

Late Antiquity often separated the physician, an educated or elite member of society, from the folk healer who frequently utilized medical techniques often affiliated with magic. Prior to the Late Antique period, physicians were lower ranked, and therefore, more susceptible to any negative ramifications resulting in death or botched procedures from the ones they healed. They were also often less likely to receive patronage from wealthier individuals. However, physicians in the Late Antique period prospered far more and were held in higher esteem.

¹¹ Augustine of Hippo, *Sermon 272*, Last accessed April 12, 2012. http://www.earlychurchtexts.com/public/augustine_sermon_272_eucharist.htm (April 15, 2012).

¹² Jones, *Social Mobility in Late Antique Gaul*, Chapter 7-8; Edward Peters, *The Magician, the Witch, and the Law (The Middle Ages Series)* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1978), 20.

Physicians were given the task of preserving older medical texts but also had to add their own knowledge to those practices.¹³ There was also opportunity for physicians to work for more prestigious people and earn better educational and social opportunities when they embraced Church teachings. Historian Allen E. Jones states that Augustine of Hippo congratulated physicians who embraced the Christian Church. Physicians tended to utilize practices that were ordained by the Church, even if those practices were different in name only. This included calling upon God, angels, and saints, or using religious items to heal the wounded and the sick.

Folk healers were more likely to work with less wealthy patients, often serving a much larger group of people than physicians, while earning a fraction of the money. Their practices involved offering incantations, which called upon good beings or spirits, and expelled bad spirits or demons. These methods also often included home remedies and the use of amulets to encourage healing. These were the individuals who would more often find themselves accused of witchcraft. Some folk healers might have believed that they were practicing actual magic by calling upon higher powers or using the stars and potions to fulfill their desires.¹⁴ Others were aware of their limitations or that they were simply frauds trying to earn money from those in need. Individuals like these more often than not sold items like love potions and told fortunes in addition to healing. Still others were able to utilize the methods they learned to cure or reduce illness and disease.

Folk healers were more likely to be accused of witchcraft or of causing some sort of damage that clerics commonly produced. There are several documented accounts of nuns and other church officials who had to correct the work of folk healers. For example, Saint Monegundis healed a young man who had been poisoned by a folk healer.¹⁵ A story like this would promote the Church and the decrees made in terms of magic and medicine by making the work of the folk healer seem foolish at best and murderous at worst. Spreading such stories in a practical sense suggests that the Church had managed to remove the unsafe practices in magic and healing while retaining the ideas that obviously worked. Any failures on the part of the Church's ordained healing practices was not a failure of the cleric's interpretation, but instead a decision on the part of God. In

¹³ Ibid, 256.

¹⁴ D. A. Russell, "Criticisms of Late Antiquity," *Rhetorical Exercises from Late Antiquity*. (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009).

¹⁵ Jones, *Social Mobility in Late Antique Gaul*, 298.

a spiritual sense, the Church could claim that it was not God's will for a person to heal or live, and so nothing could have been done to prevent death.

By being able to claim that failures in Church-ordained practices were decisions of God, the Church was not demonstrating an integration of paganism and Christianity with the goal of appeasing pagans, but adopting techniques that typically produced positive results and using them to assert dominance. In addition, both physicians and folk-healers worked towards the same goals, often utilizing different techniques with similar features. The difference between what the Church authorized and what folk healers practiced only existed in name.

Whereas a physician or cleric might use a religious token or relic from a saint and say a prayer to bring about healing, a folk healer might use a stone and recite a spell. The relic and the stone might possess similar healing properties, and the prayer and the spell might ask for the same things—only the deity, spirit, or other higher being responsible for providing the request would be different. Flint suggests that these differences were decided upon by the Church, allowing some pagan traditions in, but not all. It provided for the mistrust and dislike of magic without completely eliminating it, while it also allowed for the Church to assume more authority. The use of tokens, amulets, and relics in Late Antiquity provides another example of Christian and pagan integration, though not in the manner that Flint argues.

Amulets played a major role in pagan rituals, healing, and other magical practices. Amulets could be made of several different types of material or be of one solid material. In fact, they were often made from materials found in holy places or from materials that were considered to have good luck or positive energy. Those qualities would or should, in turn, attract positive results. Folk healers would place the amulets on the body of a sick person in order to draw out evil spirits or encourage healing. Folk healers might tell patients to wear the amulet on a certain part of the body for a specified period of time.¹⁶ Flint states that Christian tokens replaced amulets but maintained similar uses. The tokens could be, and often were, constructed out of similar materials that pagan amulets had been, including certain wood, stones, hair, or anything that had been attributed with magical or positive properties. In many cases, tokens were often no different than amulets except for name and affiliation, although there are a few additions. Crosses decorated with flowers, fabrics, and other fine materials began replacing

¹⁶ Marvin Meyer and Paul Mirecki, *Magic and Ritual in the Ancient World* (New York: Brill Academic Publishers, 2002), 12-39.

sacred and decorated trees (although these trees would become part of the Christian celebration of Christmas). Similarly, angels fighting demons replaced good spirits tackling bad ones over health, good fortune, and other important aspect of the human condition.¹⁷

Unlike the numerous differences between Church-approved physicians and pagan folk healers, there are minimal differences between the physical composition and the use of amulets and tokens. The use of amulets in healing, especially by folk healers, certainly have a magical connotation. Referring to an items as tokens instead of amulets removes the magical connotation from the practice and replaces it with divine intervention. Again, this is not an example of the Church and pagan integration. Instead it represents the Church's way of placing itself in a position of authority.

The differences in prayer and spell casting became an important question in determining those practices allowed by the Church and those that were not.¹⁸ Chanting was an important aspect in many rituals. Exorcisms and healing used chanting to call upon the assistance of a deity. The Church referred to this chanting as prayer, whereas chanting outside of Church guidelines could be referred to as spell casting or incantations. Flint describes prayer as a practice by a religious person who submits to a deity to gain their assistance. Spell casting involves a magician or other person who seeks to compel the deity to do as the spell caster wants.¹⁹ These definitions certainly support her argument, showing a Church that wants to exclude dangerous and selfish magic, but allow other types with positive outcomes as a means to appease the pagan population. It also insists that a majority of miraculous and seemingly magical work be done through the Christian God rather than through various demons, higher beings, or demi-Gods.

¹⁷ Valerie Flint, "The Demonisation of Magic and Sorcery in Late Antiquity: Christian Redefinitions of Pagan Religions," *Witchcraft and Magic in Europe: Ancient Greece and Rome*, ed. Bengt Ankarloo and Stuart Clark, (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1999).

¹⁸ Scott B. Noegel, *Prayer, Magic, and the Stars in the Ancient and Late Antique World*, 9. Emile Durkheim differentiates between magic and religion or prayers by arguing that magic is an individual event while religions tends to be more social. However, his definitions lacks explanations of the exact actions that are performed in each. For this reasons, his definition has not been included in the main text with Flint and Graf.

¹⁹ Valerie Flint, "The Demonisation of Magic and Sorcery in Late Antiquity."

Historian Fritz Graf does not agree with Flint's definition. "[A] magus is someone who, through the community of speech with the immortal gods, possesses an incredible power of spells for everything he wishes to do."²⁰ He follows this by suggesting that magic was/is based on the ability to converse with gods or other higher beings, making prayer another form of magic. Historians Jan Bremmer and Jan Veenstra defend Graf's definition of magic and prayer. They define magic as a term "...commonly used to designate a whole range of religious beliefs and ritual practices, whereby man seeks to gain control of his fate and fortune by supernatural means."²¹

Flint's definitions of prayer and magic share common elements with Bremmer and Veenstra's. Unlike Graf, however, Flint includes further criteria, including the intent of the chanter. However, Graf's definition seems to be more universal. Graf's definition allows for no difference between prayer and spell casting, contradicting part of Flint's argument. The difference in a pagan and a Christian exorcism or healing chant would be the deity called upon, just like the difference between an amulet and a token was often times just the name.

Despite Flint's claim, there were not standardized ways to differentiate between prayers and spells or tokens and amulets, and the rituals in and outside of the Church reflected these things. Consider, for example, an article by Roy Kotansky that discusses a cure for headaches in the form of a token and prayer. The token was to be worn in a capsule on the head or around the neck, and the person suffering had to recite a prayer. "Turn away, O Jesus, the Grim-Faced One, and on behalf of your maidservant, her headache, to (the) glory of your name."²² Kotansky provides an example of Church sanctioned healing in that the Deity spoken to is part of the Trinity and linked to the Christian God. Additionally, the person speaking submits himself to Jesus. This ritual includes prayer based on Flint's definition, or magic and a prayer based on Graf's definition. Kotansky points out a similarity to earlier headache cures which call for the same actions with very slight alterations to the chant. Not only does a change of this nature indicate the minimal differences between tokens and amulets and prayer and spell casting, it also shows the ease in which folk healers could adopt Christian teachings into already established remedies and traditions.

²⁰ Fritz Graf, "Theories of Magic in Antiquity."

²¹ Jan N. Bremmer, Jan R. Veenstra, ix..

²² Roy Kotansky, "An Early Christian gold Lamella for Headache," *Magic and Ritual in the Ancient World (Religions in the Graeco-Roman World)*, ed. P. Meyer & P. Mirecki, (New York: Brill Academic Publishers, 2002).

Another discussed spell is a pagan hymn designed to praise “light bearing deities.” The hymn reflects the complexity of determining the differences between both Flint and Graf’s definitions of prayer and spell casting. The hymn was not intact when discovered, and therefore lacks the hymn’s purpose outside of deity praise, but it does provide enough information to indicate that it could be considered a prayer. The hymn calls upon the constellation of Draco. It does not ask for benefits from the constellation Draco, and instead, offers praise.²³ While the Christian God is not the subject of this hymn, it does reflect reverence if not complete worship, so it meets both Flint and Graf’s standards for prayer. However, because Graf equates prayer to magic, it can also be considered magical.

Another spell created to assist during an exorcism includes pagan spell casting combined with a Christian demon.²⁴ This older version of this practice recalls pagan practices that can be considered magic and is quite similar to the newer exorcism. A different exorcism shows an incantation that combines Christian and Pagan deities. The Christian God and the Greek god, Hermes, are two of those mentioned. “[I am] Hermes sent to bring daemon out.”²⁵ The person performing the exorcism is to begin by stating this phrase. The purpose behind this claim is to make the demon wary of those performing the exorcism and the possibly of intervention by a more powerful Deity. Later passages in the exorcism include, “I adjure you by the god of the Hebrews.”²⁶ This line demonstrates that the Jewish and Christian God is being asked to intercede by someone claiming to be a Greek God, thereby, combining the Christian and a pagan belief system. The exorcism also calls for a mixture of oil and other herbs, a practice used both in Church sanctioned healings and in pagan practices. Unlike previous healing and protection practices, this exorcism indicates that pagan practices were adopting Christian ideologies into their own practices.

Most of the spells/prayers/incantations reviewed in this paper lack a thorough discussion of love spells in terms of any changes that took places as a result of Church influence. Generally, love potions and spells were frowned upon by the Church, either because of the possibility that a potion might end up

²³ Roy Kotansky and William Brashear, “A New Magical Formulary,” *Magic and Ritual in the Ancient World (Religions in the Graeco-Roman World)*, ed. P. Meyer & P. Mirecki, (New York: Brill Academic Publishers, 2002).

²⁴ *Ibid.* 12.

²⁵ A. Deissmann, *Light from the Ancient East*, Last accessed April, 17, 2012. http://www.tertullian.org/fathers/pagan_exorcism.htm

²⁶ *Ibid.*

poisoning the drinker or because the Church was interested in preserving the chastity of the target.²⁷

Despite that, a Coptic spell from the Late Antique period that calls for an intense love to form in the heart and loins of one young man for another man seems to differ from the types of spells that were, according to this research, typically Church approved. In fact, Flint and others indicate that love spells and potions were considered dangerous. “By your powers and your amulets... that just as I take you and put you at the door and the pathway of Phello,... you must take his heart and his mind; you must dominate his entire body.”²⁸ This spell, created by Christians, calls upon the Christian God through his monks and utilizes amulets to complete the task. This spell does not show signs of a spell enchanter submitting to God, as Flint would suggest prayer should do, but demanding that God provide him with what he wants, as magicians do.

Flint’s argues for the incorporation of pagan traditions into developing Church customs to appease a large pagan community. Tokens replacing amulets, and prayer replacing spells demonstrates some of the ways in which this happened. Flint even credits Gregory the Great as being responsible for suggesting that Christian holidays should be celebrated during pagan festivals.²⁹ However, the relationship between Christianity and paganism is much more complex than Flint alludes to. Instead of merely imagining that the Church alone made the choice to adopt pagan customs, one should envision that both the Church and pagans adopted one another’s customs as indicated by the spells, prayers, and exorcisms discussed earlier. These particular spells also demonstrated a usefulness that the Church recognized, and therefore allowed within Church ritual.

Flint also argued that the Church allowed certain pagan practices while forbidding others. As long as the practice was ordained by the Church, there were no repercussions. Other practices could bring about severe punishment including removal from the Church.³⁰ Flint even argues that authority figures could use magic accusations to bring about death sentence to their enemies.³¹ Even though laws concerning magic in Late Antiquity varied from virtually non-existent to

²⁷ Jones, *Social Mobility in Late Antique Gaul*, Chapter 8.

²⁸ *Coptic Love Spell to Obtain a Male Lover*, Last accessed April 17, 2012. <http://www.fordham.edu/halsall/pwh/copticspell.asp>.

²⁹ Flint, *The Rise of Magic in Early Medieval Europe*, 91.

³⁰ Jones, *Social Mobility in Late Antique Gaul*, 308.

³¹ Flint, “The Demonisation of Magic and Sorcery in Late Antiquity.”

death sentences, those practicing medicine or trying to cure other ailments were at risk in the event that they failed in their attempts.³² Those who failed could face legal or spiritual repercussions, and such problems extended to more than just folk healers and recognizable magicians.

Historian Matthew Dickie discusses a case tried before the Court of Areopagus, an Athenian court of appeal, involving the death of a man who ingested a love potion. The woman responsible had not intentionally caused the death and was acquitted, but Dickie points out that love potions often contained deadly hemlock, and not all trials ended in a similar manner.³³ Dickie questions what the outcome might have been had the case not been contingent on the intent of the woman. He also questions the outcome in cases where death had not occurred, but an individual received or perceived a form of harm. Dickie concludes that an individual could pursue a private suit of damage against an accused magician.³⁴ Given Dickie's findings, it is clear that the Church had the authority to punish those who broke the law or caused sufficient harm to others.

There were several problems with the manner in which the Church chose what to allow and what to forbid given that the standard of preventing harm was not always the deciding factor. Divination, or the ability to predict the future, was often frowned upon by the Church. Isidore of Seville, a Church father, suggested that divination had no natural purpose, and was instead used to bring about luck, or fortune to the individuals able to do it.³⁵ The ability to predict the future was also an ability associated with higher or more powerful beings, including demons, gods, and the Christian God.³⁶

Divination was thought to occur while a person slept, making it difficult for an individual to control what they saw while asleep. Dreams that told the future were thought to have come from a higher power.³⁷ This methodology of seeing the future, while unapproved by the Church, has foundations in the Old Testament, specifically references to Joseph, son of Jacob, who not only had prophetic dreams, but interpreted the dreams of others.³⁸ There were also church affiliated individuals, such as Genevieve of Paris, a fifth century nun, who

³² Jones 29; Ibid, 303.

³³ Matthew Dickie, *Magic and Magicians in the Greco-Roman World* (New York: Routledge, 2001), 55.

³⁴ Ibid, 56.

³⁵ Flint, *The Rise of Magic in Early Medieval Europe*, 50.

³⁶ Valerie Flint, "The Demonisation of Magic and Sorcery in Late Antiquity."

³⁷ Noegel, *Prayer, Magic, and the Stars in the Ancient and Late Antique World*, 132.

³⁸ Genesis 37-39.

practiced divination and mind reading while also working to both heal and curse those who came to her in need. Genevieve also was credited with using her abilities to save Paris from attack.³⁹ Both Biblical narratives of divination and the writings about Genevieve technically defy the Church's view on that particular magical practice. However, Joseph and Genevieve's abilities could be viewed or taught as the work of the Christian God through holy individuals. Joseph and Genevieve served God's purpose by providing valuable insight to others, ultimately protecting their lives and way of existence, which ultimately protected and promoted the purpose and power of the Church.

Useful magic, such as parts of astrology tended to be approved by the Church, but like the exceptions of divination allowed in Church doctrine, the field astrology included several inconsistencies that should not have been approved by the Church. Isidore of Seville, who was against the use of divination, was a supporter of the natural aspects of the craft whereas Augustine of Hippo denounced it entirely.⁴⁰ The provided justification for astrology was that it was an branch of magic that served a useful and non-harmful purpose.⁴¹ Astrology and astronomy, though in different fields of modern study, were often linked together during the Late Antique period.⁴² While areas of astrology did focus on navigation, determining the seasons, and other scientific fields, other areas related to magical practices including medicine and divination.⁴³

The fields of medicine and divination had inconsistent rules in regards to Church opinion, and the association with astrology causes further question as to Flint's assessment that the Church was actively adopting certain pagan practices to appease the pagan population. With the examples of divination and astrology, Flint declares that religiously based practices involving divination and astrology is acceptable because of its uses in daily life, while the use of these practices for any other reason is forbidden because of its association with evil. She fails to discuss the overlap of either practice, but this is due to the passing nature in which she mentions them. Flint is correct in that the Church did select certain practices and forbid others, offering justifications for their decisions.

³⁹ Jones, *Social Mobility in Late Antique Gaul*, 297-298.

⁴⁰ Flint, *The Rise of Magic in Early Medieval Europe*, 50.

⁴¹ *Ibid*, 50.

⁴² Glen Warren Bowersock, Peter Robert Lamont Brown, Oleg Grabar, *Late Antiquity: A Guide to the Postclassical World* (Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1999), 319.

⁴³ Bowersock, *Late Antiquity: A Guide to the Postclassical World*, 319.

The Church also used Christian writings and doctrine as justification for the stances it took on magic. The story of Joseph, son of Jacob, found in Genesis is just one example of the Church referring to magic (divination, healing, and other acts) used by God through individuals. Had Joseph used divination and dream interpretation as a way to benefit himself, or called upon a deity other than God to perform those acts, the Church would have, according to Flint, disapproved of that magic. Other stories in the Bible reflect circumstances in which magic is used but ultimately presents punishments to the person responsible.

The story of Ham also provides another example of Biblically endorsed magic. Ham "saw the nakedness of his father (Noah)" drunk and on the floor of his tent. Ham told his brothers about this incident, and then shielded their eyes from Noah as they covered his nakedness. When the situation was made known to Noah, it prompted him to curse Ham's son (and not Ham), Canaan for the indiscretion.⁴⁴ In this story, a follower of God curses another for displeasing him, breaking away from the guidelines of helpful or positive magic that had been set by the Church.

Flint, Jones, and other historians of Late Antique magic often refer to the Biblical battle between Simon Peter and Simon Magus.⁴⁵ Simon Magus, referred to as just Simon, was demonstrating his magical talents in Samaria. As a result, the locals began referring to Simon as God. Simon Peter and John arrived in Samaria and began baptizing the locals. Simon Magus asked Simon Peter how much he must pay in order to acquire the ability to spread the Holy spirit. Simon Peter declared that a man cannot buy his way into Heaven and turns away from Simon Magus.⁴⁶

The moral of the story of Simon and Peter is that magic is not to be used. Only God can perform miracles and magical acts, not an individual. It also indicates that those who use magic for themselves do not serve God, but seek glory and worship for themselves. Magic performed in order to bring glory to oneself, or performed with the assistance of another deity, cannot be tolerated. Stories like this provided the Church with justification and authority for any anti-magic sentiment or laws because they demonstrate that magic not associated with God was dangerous or blasphemous. Additionally, non-sanctioned magic was

⁴⁴ Genesis 9:20-27.

⁴⁵ Magus is derived from the word *mageuon* found in early recordings of the Book of Acts. It was assigned to Simon as a way to emphasize his use of magic or to refer to him as a magician.

⁴⁶ Acts 8:9-24.

associated with harming others, or allowing evil spirits, demons, or deities to have control. The magic or miracles allowed by God and the Church were supposedly more positive.

As complex as the Church stance on the use of magic was, or even what magic consisted of, Flint argues that the efforts made by the Church were more about the institutionalization of Christianity in daily lives, and this led to the distrust of anything with magical affiliation.⁴⁷ Magic, however loosely defined, was found in all aspects of life from medical practices, to love potions, to spells that cured impotence. What Flint really argued that by introducing Christianity into pagan societies, Christianity had to embrace certain aspects of paganism to survive, spread, and thrive. Her thesis also assumes that the pagan population was larger than the Christian population, and that the larger pagan population would react violently, or at least negatively, to the introduction of Christianity.

Sources from Late Antiquity do show an integration of pagan and Christian practices as shown through spells, prayers, laws, and in the field of medicine. What Flint fails to emphasize is the tremendous power of the Christian Church as well as the spread of Christianity throughout the Roman Empire and Europe. Pagans began experiencing persecution as early as the fourth century under Emperor Constantine I who was behind the destruction of several pagan temples.⁴⁸ The late fourth century saw pagan persecution and anti-pagan laws with severe punishments for those who chose not to adhere to the laws under Theodosius I.⁴⁹

By the year 529, Emperor Justinian I, a strict Christian, initiated the banishment of paganism throughout various parts of the Roman empire. His efforts included the enforcement of anti-pagan laws, and sending missionaries.⁵⁰ The Late Antique period also witnesses several instances of vandalism meted on pagan temples and statues. Pagan land was taken, and Christian churches and symbols replaced pagan temples and symbols. Roman emperors, as seen through the efforts of Constantine I, Theodosius I, and Justinian I, and many others, demonstrated the ability of the Roman Empire and the Church to abolish much of pagan practices. The Church had no need to adopt pagan traditions for its survival, despite Flint's claim.

⁴⁷ Flint, "The Demonisation of Magic and Sorcery in Late Antiquity", 270.

⁴⁸ W. H. C. Frend, *The Rise of Christianity* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984), Chapter 14.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.* Chapter 20.

⁵⁰ W. H. C. Frend, *The Rise of Christianity*, Chapter 23.

The Late Antique society never completely abandoned magic, though magic was limited in its use, either by law, or because the practices not outlawed so often fell under the guise of religious ritual. Spells became prayers, amulets became tokens, and the scientific aspects of astrology were embraced and recommended by Church fathers. The Church could defend its endorsement and banishment of certain kinds of magic by citing chapters of the Bible or by providing extensive texts of philosophy which examined and explained Christian faith. Additionally, the Church provided guidelines for the use of magic, allowing the useful and the positive to become part of the Church. Flint was correct in arguing that the Church had adopted some pagan practices, and that doing so actively encouraged pagans to embrace Christianity. However, the population of pagans in rural areas was smaller than she imagined, and they were certainly no threat to the power of the Church.

Bibliography

- Bowersock, Glen Warren, Peter Robert Lamont Brown, and Oleg Grabar. *Late Antiquity: A Guide to the Postclassical World*. Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard Univ. Press, 1999. 319.
- Bremmer, Jane, Jan Veenstra. *The Metamorphosis of Magic from Late Antiquity to the Early Modern Period*. New York: Peeters Publishers, 2002. Chapter 1.
- Matthew Dickie. *Magic and Magicians in the Greco-Roman World*. New York: Routledge. 2001. 55.
- Flint, Valerie I. J. *The Rise of Magic in Early Medieval Europe*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991. 3.
- Flint, Valerie I. J. "The Demonisation of Magic and Sorcery in Late Antiquity: Christian Redefinitions of Pagan Religions," *Witchcraft and Magic in Europe: Ancient Greece and Rome*, ed. Bengt Ankarloo and Stuart Clark, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1999.
- Frend, W. H. C. *The Rise of Christianity*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984. Chapter 14.
- Graf, Fritz. "Theories of Magic in Antiquity," *Magic and Ritual in the Ancient World (Religions in the Graeco-Roman World)*. ed. P. Meyer & P. Mirecki. New York: Brill Academic Publishers, 2002.
- Jones, Allen E. *Social Mobility in Late Antique Gaul: Strategies and Opportunities for the Non-Elite*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009. 300.

- Kotansky, Roy. "An Early Christian gold Lamella for Headache," *Magic and Ritual in the Ancient World (Religions in the Graeco-Roman World)*, ed. P. Meyer & P. Mirecki. New York: Brill Academic Publishers, 2002.
- Kotansky, Roy, William Brashear. "A New Magical Formulary," *Magic and Ritual in the Ancient World (Religions in the Graeco-Roman World)*, ed. P. Meyer & P. Mirecki. New York: Brill Academic Publishers, 2002.
- Meyer, Marvin, Paul Mirecki. *Magic and Ritual in the Ancient World*. New York: Brill Academic Publishers, 2002. 12-39.
- Noegel, Scott B. *Prayer, Magic, and the Stars in the Ancient and Late Antique World*. Philadelphia: The Pennsylvania University Press, 2003. 9.
- Peters, Edward. *The Magician, the Witch, and the Law (The Middle Ages Series)*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1978. 20.
- Russell, D. A. "Criticisms of Late Antiquity," *Rhetorical Exercises from Late Antiquity*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- Augustine of Hippo, *Sermon 272*, Last accessed April 12, 2012.
http://www.earlychurchtexts.com/public/augustine_sermon_272_eucharist.htm.
- Coptic Love Spell to Obtain a Male Lover*, Last accessed April 17, 2012.
<http://www.fordham.edu/halsall/pwh/copticspell.asp>.
- Deissmann, A. *Light from the Ancient East*, Last accessed April, 17, 2012.
http://www.tertullian.org/fathers/pagan_exorcism.htm.

The United States' Various Responses to the Armenian Genocide

Rebecca Johnson

Abstract: In 1915 during the First World War, the Turks of the Ottoman Empire killed a significant number of Christian Armenians. The Turkish leaders targeted the Armenian people for allying with Turkey's traditional enemy, Russia. The Turks deported most Armenians to camps and murdered them, but also killed others in their homes and communities where U.S. missionaries and diplomats witnessed it. The Americans then reported these atrocities to the U.S. asking for intervention. These reports brought about awareness of the killings and prompted various responses from the United States. An immediate popular response came from the American Committee for Armenian and Syrian Relief (ACASR). ACASR successfully raised millions of dollars for Armenian relief through its self-directed efforts to hold fundraisers and rallies throughout the country. The government responded informally through the American Committee for the Independence of Armenia (ACIA), designed to help Armenia gain independence. This long-range response failed in gaining independence for Armenia because the committee had to persuade another entity, the federal government, to act in a particular way over which the committee had no control. This paper examines the differences between the American's nongovernmental and governmental response; in particular it maintains that the private committee, the ACASR, was more successful than the quasi-governmental ACIA because ACASR's goals were more immediate and achievable through its own efforts.

In 1915 during the First World War, the Turks of the Ottoman Empire killed a significant number of Christian Armenians. The Armenia area was located in the Caucasus region of the Ottoman Empire, which made it vulnerable to Turkish attacks. There had also been religious tension between the Christian minorities, including the Armenians, and the Muslim Turks. In 1908, the sultanate of the Ottoman Empire was overthrown during the Young Turk revolution and the extremist faction took over. This faction was led by the dictatorial triumvirate of Talaat Pasha, Enver Pasha, and Jemal Pasha. By 1915, they accused the Armenians of allying with Turkey's traditional enemy, Russia, in the early stages of WWI and the Turks began what many consider genocide against them with a massacre in Constantinople on April 24. Between 1915 and 1918, the Turks killed or deported to camps over 500,000 Armenians.¹

The United States responded to the massacres in various ways; including the immediate, popular response from the American Committee for Armenian and Syrian Relief (ACASR) in raising relief for the Armenians. In addition, the U.S. government responded informally through the privately-operated American

¹ Adam Jones, *Genocide: a Comprehensive Introduction* (New York: Routledge, 2006), 105.

Committee for the Independence of Armenia (ACIA), to help Armenia become an independent state.

There is significant literature on the Armenian genocide itself, but recently new research has focused on America's response to the genocide. The most noted research comes from Peter Balakian, a Professor of Humanities at Colgate University, and it details the failures of the U.S. government to aid and protect the Armenians.² Another scholar of genocide, Mark Malkasian, explores these failures analyzing the disorganization within the government sponsored committees, such as ACIA. Balakian and Malkasian mostly focus on the government's responses.³ However, analysis of this governmental response should be developed further, along with other responses within the country. In this paper I examine the differences between America's nongovernmental and governmental response; in particular I maintain that the private committee, ACASR, was more successful in providing relief to Armenians than the quasi-governmental ACIA was in gaining independence for an Armenian state because ACASR's goals were more immediate and achievable through its own efforts. ACIA had to persuade another entity, the federal government, to act in a particular way over which the committee had no control.

The key elements in bringing the Armenian massacres to the United States' attention were Christian missionaries and U.S. diplomats. Missionaries from the U.S., mostly Protestants, had been in the Ottoman Empire since the early nineteenth century. They first attempted to convert Turks to Christianity, but then shifted to helping the Christian minorities flourish, including establishing universities "instilling their students with a sense of national identity and pride."⁴

The missionaries witnessed the first stage of the genocide in 1915, when intellectuals at the missionary schools and other Armenian men were imprisoned and murdered. The Turks then rounded up the remaining Armenians and deported them to concentration camps. William Shedd, a Presbyterian missionary, described the Turkish governor, Jevdet Bey, and Turkish soldiers killing "800 villagers."⁵ The missionaries began writing home to their families and the State

² Peter Balakian, *The Burning Tigris: The Armenian Genocide and America's Response* (New York: Harper Collins Publishers Inc., 2003).

³ Mark Malkasian, "The Disintegration of the Armenian Cause in the United States, 1918-1927," *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 16, no. 3 (August 1984): 349-365.

⁴Michael B. Oren, *Power, Faith, and Fantasy: America in the Middle East, 1776 to the Present* (New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 2007), 13.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 330.

Department. In one instance, missionaries Dr. Clarence and Elizabeth Ussher cared for wounded Armenians in their clinic. They wrote to the State Department that “many Armenian and American lives were in danger.”⁶ The American missionaries asked for aid, money, and manpower; along with requests for the government to intervene to end the killings.

U.S. diplomats in the Ottoman Empire also responded. The most important of these was Henry Morgenthau. He was appointed U.S. Ambassador in Constantinople by Woodrow Wilson, and stationed there during the deportations and killings. He was made aware of the situation by U.S. consuls Leslie Davis in Harput and Jesse Jackson in Aleppo, both central locations of the events occurring to the Armenians. Beginning in April 1915, Morgenthau sent monthly telegrams to Secretary of State Robert Lansing reporting on the unfolding events. On July 10, he indicated that the systematic repression had escalated, stating, “reports indicate a systematic attempt to uproot peaceful Armenian populations and through arbitrary arrests, terrible tortures, wholesale expulsions and deportations...to bring destruction and destitution on them.”⁷ He asked for aid and advice on how to handle the situation. On July 12 and July 13 he sent more telegrams repeating his request for aid from the U.S. government. Lansing responded July 16 stating, “The Department can offer no additional suggestions relative to this most difficult situation other than that you continue to act as in the past.”⁸ This evidence reveals that as the Armenian situation escalated, official United States policy was to do nothing. Indeed, until it entered the war in 1917, U.S. foreign policy was to remain neutral. This explains why Lansing did not intervene; doing so would have opposed the Ottoman Empire, one of the Central Powers, and broken neutrality. Morgenthau persisted, though, by constantly sending reports to Lansing. Other American missionaries and state officials informed the U.S. of the mass killings in hopes that they could help the Armenian people.⁹

Such reports prompted various responses from the United States. Newspapers reported many times a month on the worsening condition of the Armenians within the Ottoman Empire. The *New York Times* published a total of

⁶ Ibid. 331.

⁷ Henry Morgenthau to Robert Lansing, Washington, July 10, 1915, in Ara Sarafian, ed., *United States Official Records on the Armenian Genocide, 1915-1917* (London: Taderon Press, 2004), 51.

⁸ Robert Lansing to Henry Morgenthau, Constantinople, July 16, 1915, in Sarafian, *United States Official Records on the Armenian Genocide*, 53.

⁹ Balakian, *The Burning Tigris*, 279.

145 articles in 1915 alone.¹⁰ There are not many studies analyzing articles published about the Armenian genocide, but elements of these articles show how reporters responded to the killings. The *Times* used Henry Morgenthau, familiar to Americans because of his Ambassadorship, and specific details reported back from Armenia in titles and within articles. Towards the beginning of 1915, articles often mentioned Ambassador Morgenthau, describing his efforts to negotiate with the Turks on the Armenians' behalf. Two articles in April 1915 focused mainly on him, "Appeal to Turkey to Stop Massacres"¹¹ and "Morgenthau Intercedes."¹² Another aspect of the newspaper articles was the frequent use of numbers in headlines and articles. The *Times* used such numbers in headlines to display the severity of the situation and grab the reader's attention. One article, entitled "Burn 1,000 Armenians," states, "1,000 men, women and children are reported to have been locked in a wooden building and burned to death. In another large village thirty six persons, it is said, escaped massacres."¹³ Other article titles are "6,000 Armenians Killed,"¹⁴ and "1,500,000 Armenians Starve."¹⁵ These articles urged people to help, acting as a form of propaganda.

This agitation helped elicit a quick, popular response in the form of the American Committee for Armenian and Syrian Relief (ACASR). After Morgenthau sent his July telegrams asking for aid, the Department of State asked the American Board of Commissioners of Foreign Missions to find a way to secure funds. The people in charge were James L. Barton, once a missionary in the region, and Cleveland Dodge, a philanthropist who set up schools overseas. Members of ACASR, described as "businessmen-philanthropists," donated \$100,000 in their first meeting.¹⁶ They sponsored rallies and fundraisers and sent that money to the U.S. diplomats in Armenia. ACASR researched what exactly was occurring in the Ottoman Empire and published the findings through the

¹⁰ Ibid. 282.

¹¹ "Appeal to Turkey to Stop Massacres," *New York Times*, April 28, 1915, in Armeniapedia: The Armenian Encyclopedia, http://www.armeniapedia.org/index.php?title=Appeal_To_Turkey_to_Stop_Massacres_-nyt19150428 (accessed November 15, 2009).

¹² "Morgenthau Intercedes," *New York Times*, April 29, 1915, in Armeniapedia: The Armenian Encyclopedia, http://www.armeniapedia.org/index.php?title=Morgenthau_Intercedes_-nyt19150429 (accessed November 15, 2009).

¹³ "Burn 1,000 Armenians," *New York Times*, April 20, 1915, in Armeniapedia: The Armenian Encyclopedia, http://www.armeniapedia.org/index.php?title=Burn_1,000_Armenians-nyt19150820 (accessed November 15, 2009).

¹⁴ "Armenian Genocide Contemporary Articles," Armeniapedia: The Armenian Encyclopedia, http://www.armeniapedia.org/index.php?title=Armenian_Genocide_Contemporary_Articles (accessed November 15, 2009).

¹⁵ Ibid.

¹⁶ Balakian, *The Burning Tigris*, 281.

press, which inspired more help. President Wilson called ACASR “the true spirit of our country,” after it raised \$20 million by 1916.¹⁷ When the U.S. entered World War I in 1917, ACASR operations slowed, but Congress incorporated it in 1919, renaming it the Near East Relief and leaving Barton in charge. The committee continued to raise funds through smaller events until it disbanded in 1929. The total amount it raised during its existence was \$116,000,000.¹⁸

ACASR’s events, ranging from mass rallies to small fundraisers throughout the country, helped unify the organization and the country to support relief. Rallies were held in places like Detroit, New York’s Amsterdam Opera House and the Philadelphia Stadium. The rally at the New York Hippodrome raised \$76,000. Other fundraisers occurred, such as the 1916 Harvard-Yale football game from which all proceeds went towards Armenian relief. ACASR also enticed wealthy American families to donate to the cause. The Rockefeller Foundation had given \$610,000 by 1917, and the Guggenheim Fund donated \$30,000. Additionally, ACASR asked local clubs to hold fundraisers. Lions, Kiwanis, and Rotary clubs across the country collected money from their members and held events.¹⁹

ACASR even solicited help from children. Before the Armenian crisis, adults did not make children purposely aware of other countries’ suffering. During it, parents and teachers used the phrase “starving Armenians,” with children, which was coined by missionary Clara Barton and promoted by ACASR.²⁰ Parents often told their children not to waste food and to clear their plates because of the “starving Armenians” overseas. Children contributed to the Armenian cause through weekly Sunday school fundraisers. They participated in bake sales and helped with lemonade stands during the summer. Children raising money for the Armenians show ACASR’s cause even reached a local level in American society.

In addition, films and documentaries on the Armenian genocide helped raise money and awareness. One prominent film was *Ravished Armenia* which is about Armenian survivor, Aurora Mardiganian. Upon her arrival in America, publishers made her survival story public through newspaper articles and by turning it into a novel. This caught the attention of Hollywood which produced a film version of Mardiganian’s story. ACASR used the film to raise \$100 million, in part because it allowed the general population to contribute just by buying a

¹⁷ Ibid., 67.

¹⁸ Ibid., 280.

¹⁹ Ibid., 289-290.

²⁰ Ibid., 291.

movie ticket.²¹ ASCAR successfully raised millions of dollars for Armenian relief through its self-directed efforts to hold fundraisers and rallies throughout the country.

The American Committee for the Independence of Armenia (ACIA) suffered a different fate. After WWI, the Ottoman Empire collapsed and the allied world powers had to determine what to do with it. Even though the Armenian killings had ended, concern for the Armenians continued into 1919 because of the instability that attended the Ottoman collapse. The U.S. government responded informally to this concern through the ACIA, formed in 1919 to help Armenia gain independence and become a nation unto itself. Vahan Cardashian, an Armenian lawyer who immigrated to New York in 1902, created the ACIA. The 1915 mass killings in Armenia affected him because his immediate family members were victims. He quit his law practice to advocate for Armenian independence. Cardashian sent letters to prominent political, business, and church figures that then pushed the United States government to formally recognize an Armenian Republic and to provide the Armenians with any assistance they needed.²²

The ACIA was unsteady from its start. Committee members united in the same goal to help Armenia support itself through independence, but once they began to determine how to accomplish nationhood, members disagreed over the level of autonomy Armenia should have. James L. Barton, of the ACASR, was a key member of the ACIA since he already had experience with the Armenian conflict. He supported partial independence because full independence might adversely affect missionary operations in the Ottoman Empire. He wanted to protect the century's worth of investment and resources missionaries had put into the region. In this case, Barton's self-interests motivated his opposition towards the main goals of the ACIA. Barton constantly debated Cardashian over Armenian nationhood, affecting the group's unity and effectiveness.²³

Many important government officials originally supported the ACIA's goals. Former President Theodore Roosevelt believed President Wilson had done too little to aid the Armenians and should have declared war on Turkey. He blamed Wilsonian diplomacy in a letter to Cleveland Dodge stating, "The Armenian horror is an accomplished fact. Its occurrence was largely due to the

²¹ Leshu Torchin, "'Ravished Armenia': Visual Media, Humanitarian Advocacy, and the Formation of Witnessing Publics," *American Anthropologist* 108, no. 1 (March 2006), 214-220.

²² Malkasian, "The Disintegration of the Armenian Cause," 351-352.

²³ Balakian, *The Burning Tigris*, 308.

policy of pacifism this nation has followed...the presence of our missionaries, and our failure to go to war, did not prevent the Turks from massacring a million Armenians.”²⁴ Roosevelt, though his bellicose persona and opposition to Wilson diminished the value of his opinion, was not alone. Others also wanted to use military intervention. Cardashian proposed this and even Ambassador Morgenthau mentioned troops were needed to stop the killings in one of his July 1915 telegrams to Lansing.

No matter the support, the U.S. did not want to get involved in the Turkish War of Independence against the Allies’ occupation following WWI. Senator Henry Cabot Lodge—Theodore Roosevelt’s closest friend—opposed the ACIA’s March 1919 request for the U.S. to send in 50,000 troops. Lodge’s resistance was entangled in his isolationist opposition towards the U.S. entrance into the League of Nations. He did not want the U.S. obligated to other countries’ conflicts. The senator’s concerns influenced President Wilson who denied ACIA’s request.²⁵

Hope came to the ACIA in 1920 when the Ottoman Empire and Allies signed the Sévres Treaty, one of the terms of which called for the creation of the Democratic Republic of Armenia and recognition of independence. This was short lived because a conflict arose among Turkey, Armenia, and Russia. For protection from the Turks, Armenia signed an agreement with Russia to be annexed as Soviet Armenia.²⁶ After this, the ACIA cause was finished. The committee did not succeed in part because of internal disorganization. Factions within, one side led by James Barton, disagreed over the level of independence Armenia should be granted. External factors, however, played a much bigger role. Lodge’s opposition to military intervention, and Wilson’s refusal to send troops was one, the Turkish-Armenian-Russian contretemps was another, and the solution to both—Armenia’s annexation to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics—was the final impediment to the ACIA’s goal of an independent Armenian state.

Examination of two U.S. responses to the Armenian genocide indicates that the goals each committee sought were key factors in effectiveness. The American Committee for Armenian and Syrian Relief (ACASR) responded quickly, holding its first meeting in September 1915 just months after

²⁴ Theodore Roosevelt to Cleveland Hoadley Dodge, Oyster Bay, May 11, 1918, in *Armenian National Institute*, <http://www.armenian-genocide.org/roosevelt.html>

²⁵ Malkasian, “The Disintegration of the Armenian Cause,” 353.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, 355.

Morgenthau's requests for American humanitarian aid.²⁷ The next step it took was holding rallies, which brought together members to organize. ACASR campaigns, such as *Ravished Armenia*, encouraging children to help, and the rallies allowed success because it was achieved through its own efforts. ACASR did not have to rely on another entity to achieve its goals. Supplies and funds that came from the relief organization helped Armenians survive. During this time there were no humanitarian relief organizations other than the Red Cross, which was still very young. ACASR began without a model to follow for large-scale relief. ACASR was able to organize itself and raise resources on its own despite not having a previous example as a guideline.

In contrast, the quasi-governmental American Committee for the Independence of Armenia (AICA) was unsuccessful. The internal disorganization partly contributed to ACIA's Armenian aid. Its original unity disintegrated when factions formed over the level of independence Armenia should have and the question of using the U.S. army to impose Armenian independence. Debate over how to gain independence for Armenia slowed the committee's efforts and left Armenia vulnerable to annexation into the Soviet Union. A major factor in their failure to make Armenia independent was having to persuade another entity, the United States government, help to establish this. ACIA had no control over the government's final decision on military involvement or allowing Armenian annexation.

No matter how much of a failure the ACIA's efforts were, the more immediate response of the ACASR was beneficial and appreciated by the Armenians. The funds and supplies helped Armenians who had escaped the concentration camps survive. The Americans who went to Armenia were able to treat wounds and counsel them. Appreciation from the Armenian people is seen in a letter sent to Morgenthau from the Archbishop of Armenia:

We are grateful that at this time when such a large portion of the civilized world is engaged in a deplorable and disastrous war, the United States of America turn their benevolent attention to the suffering of Armenians and most generously render their moral and material help for their much needed relief.²⁸

²⁷ Balakian, *Burning Tigris*, 279.

²⁸ Arch. Zaven Der Eghiayan to Henry Morgenthau, Constantinople, December 24, 1915, in Sarafian, *United States Official Records on the Armenian Genocide*, 423.

From the outside world, the aid given to the Armenians could have been better, but the people directly in the situation greatly appreciated what help they received. Examining the differences between the nongovernmental and governmental responses shows the ACASR was more successful than the government sponsored ACIA because the ACASR accomplished a smaller magnitude of goals and did not answer to another entity. This uncommon viewpoint on Armenian aid points out different aspects and gives a better understanding of the genocide and America's involvement. Official records, newspaper archives, and telegrams are important in advancing research in the United States response to the genocide.

Bibliography

- “Armenian Genocide Contemporary Articles.” Armeniopedia: The Armenian Encyclopedia.
http://www.armeniopedia.org/index.php?title=Armenian_Genocide_Contemporary_Articles (accessed September 27, 2008).
- Armenian National Institute. “Theodore Roosevelt, President of the United States (1901-09).” Armenian National Institute. <http://www.armenian-genocide.org/roosevelt.html> (accessed November 19, 2009).
- Balakian, Peter. *The Burning Tigris: The Armenian Genocide and America's Response*. New York: Harper Collins Publishers Inc., 2003.
- Jones, Adam. *Genocide: a Comprehensive Introduction*. New York: Routledge, 2006.
- Malkasian, Mark. “The Disintegration of the Armenian Cause in the United States, 1918-1927.” *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 16, no. 3 (August 1984): 349-365.
<http://www.jstor.org.libproxy.troy.edu/stable/163045?&Search=yes&term=cause&term=armenian&term=disintegration&list=hide&searchUri=%2Faction%2FdoBasicSearch%3FQuery%3Ddisintegration%2Bof%2Bthe%2Barmenian%2Bcause%26gw%3Djtx%26prq%3Damerican%2Bcommittee%2Bfor%2Bthe%2Bindependence%2Bof%2Barmenia%26hp%3D25%26wc%3Don&item=1&ttl=364&returnArticleService=showArticle> (accessed October 01, 2009).
- Oren, Michael B. *Power, Faith, and Fantasy: America in the Middle East, 1776 to the Present*. New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 2007.
- Sarafian, Ara, ed. *United States Official Records on the Armenian Genocide, 1915-1917*. London: Taderon Press, 2004.

Torchin, Leshu. “‘Ravished Armenia’: Visual Media, Humanitarian Advocacy, and the Formation of Witnessing Publics.” *American Anthropologist* 108, no. 1 (March 2006): 224-230.

Military Objectives and Political Policy

Patrick Jones

The question of whether or not to free and arm slaves for the Confederate Army during the American Civil War is one that has brought suspicion and discussion about our nation's most terrifying time. In times of war, leaders are needed to step up and make difficult decisions and propose controversial issues in the face of internal dangers. This paper will examine one of the central conflicts within the South during this critical era. The argument centers on Confederate General Patrick Cleburne's 1864 proposal to arm and free slaves to the Confederate Army in the face of an opposing culture and government. Many historians feel that the proposal Cleburne made to arm and free slaves in January 1864 failed at the time because of his mistaken belief that the South's military goals outweighed its political foundations. The resources collected for this paper will focus on the debate to arm slaves for the Confederacy initiated seriously by Cleburne against his government's values. Did the benefits of enlisting slaves to fight for the Confederacy outweigh the setback of betraying Confederate government ideals?

On the night of January 2, 1864, Patrick Cleburne stood in front of his fellow officers of the Army of Tennessee and delivered his proposal to arm and free slaves to fight for the Confederacy, an army in desperate need of men. The Army of Tennessee commanders present in the room on the night were split on how they felt about Cleburne's plan for victory. Word of Cleburne's proposal went to President Jefferson Davis where he immediately forbade any discussion of it to avoid further controversy. The document failed at the time to attain Southern recognition and stopped Cleburne's further promotion in the military.¹

The debate after the war began with Nathaniel Stephenson's article "The Question of Arming the Slaves", the pioneering work on the subject done in 1913 in the *American Historical Review*. Stephenson's primary focus is on the prospect of arming slaves for the Confederacy's cause for liberty, which was Cleburne's focus. Stephenson forms many questions challenging the foundations of the South's government and said discussion of it further hurt the Confederacy's chances. He is confused on the impact President Davis actually had as a leader of

¹ Craig L. Symonds, *Stonewall of the West: Patrick Cleburne & the Civil War*. (Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas, 1997), 9-44, 184-187; Howell and Elizabeth Purdue, *Pat Cleburne: Confederate General*. (Hillsboro, TX: Hills Jr. College Press, 1973), 2-49, 268-274.

the confederate system. Although he later advocated for slaves being used in his army, he did so at a time when the South was virtually out of options, not even considering any action until November 1864 in the war's final stages.²

Charles Wesley's 1919 article "The Employment of Negroes as Soldiers in the Confederate Army", claims both armies would benefit from African American assistance. The result of the war depended on which side was willing to utilize them more. The early historiography reveals scholars showed confusion about emancipation and its meaning for the South. So there was a debate over emancipating slaves during the war, and after the war the reasons behind that emancipation came into question among scholars. Thomas Robson Hay's article "The South and the Arming of Slaves", examines the comprehensive discussion of the controversy during the war years. Cleburne made his proposal to strengthen the army and to give new life to the failing military goals of the Confederacy. He formed his plan not to end slavery but to vindicate his position on state rights and the South's cause to win their war for independence. Wesley and Hay agree on Cleburne's motives and the position of power the African Americans in the South held during the war.³

Recent writings on Cleburne and his proposal have interpreted the document as strictly military-based to win a war or something that questioned one's loyalty and patriotism to the South. The first definitive biography to be done on Cleburne would not be released until the 1970's. Professors Howell and Elizabeth Purdue wrote the book in 1973 entitled, *Pat Cleburne: Confederate General*. One chapter of the work is devoted to Cleburne's proposal to arm slaves, arguing that it sought to make an increasingly weak army stronger. Cleburne wanted something done immediately for the Confederacy, not for the issue to be addressed when all other options had failed.⁴

² Nathaniel W. Stephenson, "The Question of Arming the Slaves", (*American Historical Review*, XVIII: January 1913), 295-308 in Robert F. Durden, *The Gray and the Black: The Confederate Debate on Emancipation*, (Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana State University Press, 1972), 291-292; Charles H. Wesley, "The Employment of Negroes as Soldiers in the Confederate Army", (*Journal of Negro History*, IV: July 1919), 239-253 in Durden, *The Gray and the Black*, 292-293.

³ Charles H. Wesley, "The Employment of Negroes as Soldiers in the Confederate Army", (*Journal of Negro History*, IV: July 1919), 239-253 in Durden, *The Gray and the Black*, 292-293; Thomas Robson Hay, "The South and the Arming of Slaves", (*The Mississippi Historical Review*, 6:1: June 1919), 34-73.

⁴ Howell and Elizabeth Purdue, *Pat Cleburne: Confederate General*. (Hillsboro, TX: Hills Jr. College Press, 1973), 268-274.

The South and the Politics of Slavery, 1826-1856, written by William J. Cooper Jr., addresses the political issue of arming slaves for the South's military means. Slavery was embedded in Southern society, but proposals had come early in the war for its abolishment. Cooper uses this political subject to describe the secession crisis and the struggle between the slave and free societies. The South had become a society torn apart by different values and beliefs with Jefferson Davis trying to fight a war where the South was vastly outnumbered and underfunded. He needed a united front instead of one where the motives and consequences of war had become blurred. Military affairs have been linked with the politics of the times, and that was never truer than for the Confederacy during the American Civil War. Howard and Elizabeth Purdue contend that Cleburne truly felt that Southern politics would take a backseat to any military objectives while Cooper believes the military issue of the proposal was prohibited by the political issue of arming slaves. In *After Secession: Jefferson Davis and the Failure of Confederate Nationalism*, historian Paul Escott examines this intersection by focusing on the reasons for Confederate defeat and the political ramifications behind it. At the outset of the secession controversy was a divide between American and Southern nationalism, with slavery right in the middle. Secession became a way to vindicate what the South had been saying for so many years. The Confederate government allowed for slavery in part to help the Southern workers who would profit from the higher wages.⁵

During the war, a more contemporary philosophy was formed to abolish slavery for the greater good of achieving Southern independence. Escott states, "Despite the fundamental importance of slavery to the economic and social system, this new philosophy had to overcome religious and political values which were deeply rooted in Southern culture."⁶ President Davis said having slaves was a constitutional right, but Davis was one of the first to advocate emancipating slaves to fight for the South in 1865. In regards to Cleburne's proposal, Escott believes what happened was a result of the election year of 1864, not in the Confederacy but the United States. If African Americans were used in the Confederacy, it would strengthen the chance that Lincoln would be re-elected in the North as an indication his new policies for African Americans were being used

⁵ William J. Cooper Jr., *The South and the Politics of Slavery, 1826-1856* (Baton Rouge, La: Louisiana State University Press, 1978); Paul Escott, *After Secession: Jefferson Davis and the Failure of Confederate Nationalism*, (Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana State University Press, 1978), ix, 24, 25, 28, 32 .

⁶ Paul Escott, *After Secession: Jefferson Davis and the Failure of Confederate Nationalism*, (Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana State University Press, 1978), 229.

even by the enemy. So Cleburne's proposal never stood a chance in early 1864 in the South because of the fear of Lincoln coming back to power.⁷

In *The Gray and the Black: The Confederate Debate on Emancipation*, Robert Durden sees Cleburne's proposal as the freest debate on arming and enlisting slaves. The proposal could have, if taken seriously in January 1864, turned the tide of the war immediately in the South's favor. His book *The Self-Inflicted Wound: Southern Politics in the Nineteenth Century*, looks at the 1800's as a whole and the problems the South brought onto themselves during the century. It looks specifically at the Confederacy and its failures during the American Civil War. It was a "self-inflicted wound: the gradual surrender of the Southern white majority beginning in the 1820's to the pride, fears, and hates of racism", that led to the South's ultimate defeat. Durden considers Cleburne "one who did not ignore the nascent controversy and the realities that lay behind it."⁸ Despite the praise for Cleburne, Durden additionally feels there is a distinct weakness in Patrick Cleburne's proposal. The Constitution of the Confederacy mentions that slavery and the abolishing of it was the responsibility of the individual states. So in effect, Jefferson Davis did not have the authority to emancipate the slaves and arm them and as Durden states it "might just as well have advised the sun not to rise or the tides of the oceans to cease."⁹ Durden continues with the debate initiated by Southern newspapers during the four years of war, which is covered more in his previous work *The Gray and the Black*. Durden and Escott both believe that Cleburne's proposal and resulting controversy is one that had a much larger political accusation on the South than any further military action.

Historian James McPherson in *Battle Cry of Freedom: The Civil War Era* also provides an interesting interpretation regarding the political events around the Confederacy during the Civil War. McPherson claims Cleburne felt slavery would have ended soon after the war and the South should have been willing to lose it over their independence from the Union. He states "Cleburne cut to the heart of a fundamental ambiguity in the Confederacy's *raison d'etre*. Had secession been a means to the end of preserving slavery? Or was slavery one of the means for preserving the Confederacy, to be sacrificed if it no longer served

⁷ *Ibid.*, xii, 19, 24-25, 28, 32, 180-181, 228, 235, 242-254.

⁸ Durden, *The Gray and the Black*, 291-293; *The Self-Inflicted Wound: Southern Politics in the Nineteenth Century*, (Lexington, KY: The University Press of Kentucky, 1985), ix, 98.

⁹ *Ibid.*, 99.

that purpose?”¹⁰ Because Davis respected Cleburne, he did not dismiss the general but did withhold promotion, implying that Cleburne received the minimum punishment for his actions.¹¹

Stonewall of the West: Patrick Cleburne & the Civil War by Craig L. Symonds is another extensive biography done on Cleburne with a descriptive chapter regarding his proposal. Symonds agrees with Howard and Elizabeth Purdue’s previous interpretations but he adds that Cleburne may have failed to recognize that many Southerners saw that owning slaves came with their liberties and freedom rights in the South. The South seceded with liberty and slavery being two constant interchangeable parts of the southern way of life. Cleburne knew the dangers of the proposal but the potential good of winning the war was itself grounds for emancipation. His ultimate objective was for the Confederacy to achieve self-government. Symonds agrees with Durden in his interpretations of liberty in the South and how some in the South viewed liberty at home as the right to own slaves. Cleburne, however, firmly believed that Southerners would give up this liberty in order to keep the greater premise of that liberty. Losing the war would take away that liberty anyway. Patrick Cleburne had only been in the south since 1850, and even then his time was in Arkansas, a state that was southern but was not a dominant slave state. Although Cleburne may have believed the South would give up one liberty for the chance at a greater one, modern scholars Symonds and McPherson approach the subject from two different angles but arrive at the same conclusion that the military man, Cleburne, spoke his heart while shielding his eyes and mind to the greater political picture.¹²

Mark Hull’s essay, “Concerning the Emancipation of the Slaves” in *A Meteor Shining Brightly: Essays on Maj. Gen. Patrick R. Cleburne* by Mauriel Phillips Joslyn also takes this stance, despite being part of a larger biographical work. Cleburne did not foresee the potential problems among his own officers and the strong reaction from his fellow commanders. His central arguments of choosing independence over slavery may have been doomed from the beginning. Cleburne’s own peers that he fought bravely with had a strong rebuttal to his statements which made Cleburne fear that President Davis might remove him from command. In short, the opposition to arming slaves made it impossible for

¹⁰ James McPherson, *Battle Cry of Freedom: The Civil War Era*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988), 832.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, 833, 865-867.

¹² Symonds, *Stonewall of the West*, 184-188, 191.

any legislation to pass through the Confederate Congress to arm and emancipate slaves until the war was nearly over.¹³

Bruce Levine's work *Confederate Emancipation: Southern Plans to Free and Arm Slaves During the American Civil War* devotes the introduction to Cleburne's proposal and the debate that ensued during the war. Levine sees Cleburne's proposal and the denial of it by Davis and the South "not surprising" given the immediate outcry that would happen later on in 1864 when Davis himself began advocating arming African Americans. The questions posed from the proposal include the motives behind secession and slaves fighting willingly on the Confederacy's behalf. Levine poses "Had this plan succeeded in rescuing the Confederacy from defeat, what would it have meant for the future structure and functioning of the South's economy?"¹⁴ Other views held by previous historians are also interpreted. The opposition's argument to Cleburne's proposal to emancipate and arming slaves was "If the Southern states had left the old Union to preserve gracious slavery-and if they had warred since 1861 for the same purpose- why would they agree in 1865 to sacrifice their central war aim for the sake of military success? Wasn't this illogical- indeed, irrational?"¹⁵ Supporters argued over the state rights issue and how independence and a new government structure was what Southerners fought for. Since slavery was subordinate to the military objectives of those leaders, they were prepared to sacrifice slavery for independence. Devine states that "southern army officers and political leaders began to contemplate the use of black troops only because (and only when) they recognized the depth of the crisis into which these southern difficulties had plunged the southern war effort."¹⁶

Paul Escott re-evaluated his previous stance from the book he wrote a generation earlier when he added to the scholarship with a short article in 2010, called "We Must Make Free Men of Them", claims "no one developed as thorough an argument for arming and freeing the slaves as Cleburne."¹⁷ One can see the difference in Escott's two interpretations written twenty years apart and the further knowledge Escott developed during this time. In *After Secession*, he

¹³ Mark Hull, "A Proposal to Arm the Slaves", in Joslyn, *A Meteor Shining Brightly*, 150-157, 160, 165.

¹⁴ Bruce Levine, *Confederate Emancipation: Southern Plans to Free and Arm the Slaves During the American Civil War*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 2-15, (6).

¹⁵ Levine, *Confederate Emancipation*, 9.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 15.

¹⁷ Paul Escott, "We Must Make Free Men of Them, (*Civil War Times*. June 2010:Vol. 49, Iss.3, 44-51 (44). <http://web.ebscohost.com.libproxy.troy.edu/ehost/> (Accessed February 8, 2012).

clearly believed Jefferson Davis was the first to advocate arming slaves and did so to the best of his ability. But here in this article, he talks about Cleburne's proposal and Davis's early refusal in January 1864. Davis, in fact, made a severe error by waiting nearly an entire year to bring the issue back to light. Cleburne failed to see the whole picture in making his proposal to soldiers, but Davis failed to act knowing the dangers of not acting as the leader of the Confederate government.¹⁸ Bruce Stewart Jr.'s recent biography of Cleburne, entitled *Invisible Hero*, describes Cleburne's stance further. Cleburne believed slavery would end one way or the other. With African Americans being used as soldiers, it could take away the prejudices they had towards white Southern men. But he failed to see his government for what it was. Stewart explains "Cleburne looked at the Confederacy as one entity. He did not grasp the fact that the focus of the secession movement had never been on the creation of a new Federal government, but rather on the independence of each individual state."¹⁹ Since the Southern government was in fact a Confederacy, Cleburne did not have to just convince the officers and Jefferson Davis of his plan but all the governors of the Confederate States, each with their unique say on how their states would respond. Stewart calls the whole thing "wishful thinking at best."²⁰ Stewart's work is interesting because it incorporates both of Escott's previous works, one an extensive book on Southern politics and the other a short article on the proposal to arm and free slaves. Stewart understands both perspectives from years of research. Patrick Cleburne was a valiant military man, but when it came to the political world he lived in, he fell short even to the point of being naive. The time period demanded an immediate change that could realistically never occur. The controversy of allowing slaves in the army intersected with the South's struggle to keep away from a centralized government they felt would further suppress their rights and liberties. The government they fought to hold onto cost them at the most crucial time of the war.

21

There have been several correlations between interpretations over the years from the authors' unique perspectives and focus. The Cleburne biographers, particularly Purdue and Stewart, cast Cleburne as a heroic military figure; others see Cleburne from his proposal, regarding that as his most courageous act or most traitorous. But each of the biographers cannot argue any case for or against arming

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 44-51.

¹⁹ Bruce H. Stewart Jr., *Invisible Hero: Patrick R. Cleburne*, (Macon Georgia; Mercer University Press), 2010, 217.

²⁰ *Ibid.*

²¹ *Ibid.*, 216-220.

slaves without first mentioning the proposal, which because of the renewed interest, has received further research and scrutiny from scholars. Escott's writings clearly reflect the changes that have taken place within a generation to change certain misinterpretations. He now sees Cleburne in much the same way as the biographers do: as a military man that risked his position for the fate of his country at a time when others around him failed to do so. McPherson and Durden approach the subject from a distance, not focusing so much on Cleburne's proposal, but the politics of war in the South during the 1860's with a glancing look at the proposal and its impact. Bruce Levine produced his larger work as the same type of context as previous article writers Hay and Wesley. Their works focus solely on the debate of emancipation in exchange for freedom and what the Confederate government stood for and came to represent through words and lack of action.

The question of arming and freeing the slaves during the American Civil War is one that has sparked plenty of research and debate. History writers continue to theorize what could have happened if Cleburne's idea of immediate action had taken place. Cleburne spoke to his men in January 1864, believing his proposal to be the best option for the South to win their ultimate struggle for independence. Because the war ended the way it did, the research and scholarship to this question garnered more and more attention and additional findings. Although the effort to win the war for the South would have prolonged the struggle further, the South would most likely still be defeated. Cleburne's plan seems the best remaining option, but it was also a best-case scenario in which all the obstacles standing in the way of Confederate victory would fall with one signing of a bill by Confederate President Davis. This was never to be the case no matter how quickly Davis could have acted. Cleburne made an action that needed to additionally be made in unison by a Confederacy. It was a fundamental fallacy that Cleburne hoped in vain could be overlooked.

Bibliography

- Beringer, Richard E, Herman Hattaway, Archer Jones, and William N. Still Jr. *Why the South Lost the Civil War*. Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 1986.
- Cooper Jr., William J. *The South and the Politics of Slavery*, (Baton Rouge, La: Louisiana State University Press, 1978.

- Durden, Robert F. *The Gray and the Black: The Confederate Debate on Emancipation*. Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana State University Press, 1972.
- . *The Self-Inflicted Wound: Southern Politics in the Nineteenth Century*. Lexington, KY: The University Press of Kentucky, 1985.
- Escott, Paul. *After Secession: Jefferson Davis and the Failure of Confederate Nationalism*, Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana State University Press, 1978.
- . "We Must Make Free Men of Them." *Civil War Times* 49, no.3; (June 2010): 44-51. <http://web.ebscohost.com.libproxy.troy.edu/ehost/> (Accessed February 8, 2012).
- Hay, Thomas Robson. "The South and the Arming of Slaves." *The Mississippi Historical Review* 6, no.1; (June 1919): 1 34-73 (48). <http://www.libproxy.dothan.troy.edu.jstor.org/stable/1886652> (accessed March 17, 2012).
- Hull, Mark. "Concerning the Emancipation of the Slaves", (143-178) in Mauriel Phillips Joslyn's *A Meteor Shining Brightly: Essays on Maj. Gen. Patrick R. Cleburne*. Milledgeville, GA: Terrell House Publishing, 1997.
- Joslyn, Mauriel Phillips. *A Meteor Shining Brightly: Essays on Maj. Gen. Patrick R. Cleburne*. Milledgeville, GA: Terrell House Publishing, 1997.
- Levine, Bruce. *Confederate Emancipation: Southern Plans to Free and Arm the Slaves*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- McPherson, James. *Battle Cry of Freedom: The Civil War Era*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988.
- Purdue, Howell and Elizabeth. *Pat Cleburne: Confederate General*. Hillsboro, TX: Hills Jr. College Press, 1973.
- Stephenson, Nathaniel L. "The Question of Arming the Slaves", (*American Historical Review*, XVIII: January 1919), in Robert F. Durden, *The Gray and the Black: The Confederate Debate on Emancipation*, Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana State University Press, 1972.

Symonds, Craig L. *Stonewall of the West: Patrick Cleburne & the Civil War*.
Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas, 1997.

Wesley, Charles H. "The Employment of Negroes as Soldiers in the
Confederate Army", (*Journal of Negro History*, IV: July 1919), 239-
253 in Durden, Robert F. *The Gray and the Black: The Confederate
Debate on Emancipation*. Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana State University
Press, 1972.

Accepting the End of my Existence: Why the Tutsis Did Not Respond More Forcefully during the Rwandan Genocide

Theo M. Moore

Abstract: On April 6, 1994 in Rwanda, One of the most horrific events in human history took place, known as the Rwandan Genocide. This act of violence was planned and carried out by Hutu extremist with an objective to exterminate all Tutsis. The Hutu motives behind this act of violence dates back to the nineteenth century when the Tutsis ruled over Rwanda. Under Tutsi rule, the Hutu claimed to have been mistreated by the Tutsi. The conflict between the two ethnic groups would escalate when Europeans began colonizing countries in Africa. In 1916, under Belgium occupation of Rwanda, the Belgians supported the Tutsis until they began pursuing an attempt to become independent. In result, the Belgians began supporting the Hutu to assist them in overthrowing Tutsi rule. In the early 1960s, The Hutus came to power and used drastic measures to sustain their power. Throughout the Hutu reign, they displayed ominous signs of a possible genocide against the Tutsi. However, the Tutsi gave a minimum effort of resistance toward the Hutus. This paper questions why there was a limited effort of response from the Tutsi in the Rwandan Genocide in 1994. The goal is to answer the question with evidence to support reasons why the Tutsis did not respond effectively.

Genocide is an effort to directly kill a group of people or indirectly by creating conditions such as starvation and rape.¹ The majority of genocides consist of destroying national, ethnic, or religious groups. This definition of genocide exemplifies the brutal attacks that Tutsi people endured during the genocide of Rwanda in 1994. The genocide in Rwanda rapidly took the lives of nearly 800,000 Rwandans, mainly within the Tutsi population.² This event was the culmination to a long history of conflict between two ethnic groups, the Hutu and Tutsi, which spiraled out of control as the years passed. This contentious issue dates back centuries ago when Europeans were colonizing Africa. Europe enforcements of their cultural attributes upon Africans caused separation between the Tutsi and the Hutu.

Since the 1960's, the Tutsi people had been experiencing signs of a possible genocide, but did not respond effectively. The signs that the Tutsi were experiencing were actual threats from the Hutu that consisted mainly of verbal

¹ Ervin Staub, "Genocide and Mass Killing: Origins, Prevention, Healing and Reconciliation Genocide and Mass Killing: Origins, Prevention, Healing and Reconciliation," *Political Psychology* 21(2000): 367-382.

² Stephanie Nolan, "Don't Talk to Me about Justice," *Globe and Mail*, April 3, 2004, last modified April 8, 2009, <http://www.theglobeandmail.com/news/world/dont-talk-to-me-about-justice/article1135480/?page=all>.

and physical attacks toward the Tutsi. There were some ethnically-motivated murders as well, but this was nothing compared to the number of murders during the 1990s. There were multiple reasons why the Tutsis did not respond to the early signs of genocide. Ever since the early attacks to the genocide itself, Tutsis were slowly but surely being deprived of responding to the threat that the Hutus posed. Between 1960 and 1994, the Tutsis were brutally attacked, raped, and even killed. These were ominous signs that should have triggered in their minds that the destruction of their ethnic group was possible. The experience from signs of genocide preconditioned them into accepting authority and violence. In result, this made the Tutsi more submissive and less likely to retaliate in the face of extreme violence. These ominous signs were commenced by Rwandan churches, government, and media.

There were also other signs that should have alarmed the Tutsis that destruction was near such as verbal threats, killings, and rapes which later caused sexually transmitted diseases (STDs) amongst Tutsi women. The Tutsi only had their Christian beliefs to rely on which Hutu extremist would later take advantage of by churchmen brainwashing the Tutsi from the altar. So when the genocide finally arrived in 1994; the Tutsis were halfway defeated physically and mentally, which limited their ability to respond.

This article will briefly describe Rwandan history to understand the Hutus' motives. Further, it will discuss the early warnings of genocide and how it slowly deprived the Tutsis of a fighting chance to respond when the genocide had taken place. There were signs of unequal education, the involvements of the government, Church, and media that were responsible for the Tutsi not responding effectively. This answers the question of why the Tutsis did not forcefully respond.

The population of Rwanda consisted of three ethnic groups; Tutsi, Hutu, and the Twa. The Twa comprised three percent of the population and mainly reside outside the cities. The Tutsi were approximately fourteen percent and the Hutu were majority with the percentage of eighty-three. Before colonialism, Tutsis ruled Rwanda with the royalty guidance of King Kigeri Rwaburgiri which was the first king to come into contact with the Europeans. During Rwaburgiri rule, Rwanda was divided into a standardized structure of provinces and districts that was administered by a hierarchy of chiefs predominantly controlled by Tutsi at the higher levels. Under Tutsi control, the Hutu were peasants that claimed to

have been brutally mistreated under Tutsi power which became a driving force and motive for the Hutus during the genocide in 1994.

The genocide began with the death of the Rwandan President Juvenal Habyarimana.³ President Habyarimana was of Hutu ethnicity whose plane was shot down above Kigali airport on April 6, 1994.⁴ That day the Hutus began slaughtering the Tutsis in Kigali, Rwanda, then spreading west killing every Tutsi in sight, which resulted in thousands of Tutsis dying. Lasting one hundred days, the Rwanda genocide left approximately 800,000 Tutsi and Hutu sympathizers' dead. The Tutsi was blamed for this incident and denied the allegations. The Tutsi believed that they were set up by Hutu extremist to get enough motive and support to carry out a genocide attack on them.⁵ Even though President Habyarimana death sparked the beginning of genocide, there has been conflict between the Hutu and the Tutsi for many decades prior to April 6, 1994.

The Hutu and Tutsi relationship was quite civil during the fifteenth century. During their reign, the Tutsi created a political system known as the Mwami. This political system structured a social status according to wealth. Hutus that were wealthy enough could join the ranks of the Tutsi Mwami. As for the poorer Hutu, they were providing with tax dues which could have been portrayed as a cause for revenge in 1994.⁶ Overall, this period of the Tutsi and Hutu relationship was non-aggressive. It was not until the nineteenth century when conflict entered into the relationship. There was one definite cause of conflict between the Hutu and the Tutsi and that was European colonialism.⁷

During the nineteenth century, Europeans occupied Africa and forced colonialism upon the countries in Africa. Germany ruled Rwanda until World War I and then the Belgians took over colonial rule in 1916. During Belgium rule, the Belgians quickly supported the Tutsi. They assumed that the Tutsis were more educated and civilized than Hutus due to their physical appearance.⁸ The Tutsis'

³ Anver, Versi, "Obituary: Juvenal Habyarimana," *The Independent*, Apr 08, 1994.
<http://search.proquest.com/docview/313048972?accountid=38769>.

⁴ "Slaughter in Rwanda." *Maclean's* 107, no. 16 (Apr 18, 1994): 39.
<http://search.proquest.com/docview/218442901?accountid=38769>.

⁵ BBC, "African News: Rwanda: How the Genocide Happened," accessed February 9, 2013,
<http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-africa-13431486>.

⁶ Peter Urvin, "Prejudice, Crisis, and Genocide in Rwanda," *African Studies Review* 40 (1997): 93.

⁷ Modern History Project, "The Rwandan Genocide," accessed February 9, 2013,
<http://modernhistoryproject2012.wordpress.com/history-of-hutu-tutsi-relations/>.

⁸ Linda Melvern, *A People Betrayed: The Role of the West in Rwanda's Genocide* (New York: Zed/St. Martin's Press, 2000), 4-8.

slender face structure reminded the Belgian's of their physical attributes. As a result of this, Europeans came to believe that Tutsis had Caucasian ancestry, and were thus "superior" to Hutus.

In 1933, the Belgians introduced ethnic identity cards that determined Rwandans ethnic identity so that they could make sure jobs and education were granted to the Tutsis. The acts of violence between the Hutu and Tutsi in Rwanda genocide were initiated by such "divide and rule" policies of the Belgians. Unfortunately, during the beginning of the genocide 1994, the same identity cards later played a drastic role when determining whether a Rwandan lived or died. During the genocide, identification cards became a symbol of death by giving the killers a sense of direction to quickly determine who was a Tutsi.⁹ Those who refused to show their ID's at roadblocks were presumed to be Tutsi unless they could quickly prove otherwise. If Rwandans could not prove that they were not a Tutsi, they were murdered immediately, including some Hutus. So it is safe to say that the Belgians promoted ethnic separation that helped sow the seeds of violence between the Hutu and the Tutsi.

After WWII, many African countries declared independence from their colonial power. In 1962, Rwanda, under Tutsi rule, claimed its independence from the Belgium. The decolonization of Rwanda triggered more killings between Tutsis and Hutus. The Belgians favored the Tutsi ruling until the Tutsi began to pursue an independent Rwanda. In response, Belgium aided the Hutu militarily and politically to overturn the position of leadership to the Hutu. So in this way the Belgians helped ignite the conflict between the two ethnic groups.¹⁰

After the Hutu overthrew Tutsi ruling, they were afraid of the Tutsis regaining power, which would redirect them back to the bottom of the ethnic groups in Rwanda. This fear gave the Hutu a sense of urgency to sustain power. With this desperate ambition to keep control, the extremist Hutus began killing Tutsis and forced them to flee into surrounding countries.¹¹ Many Tutsis fled to Burundi where Tutsi were still in power. In Burundi, a lot of Hutu were being

⁹ Janine Di Giovanni, "The Daily Seyahatname: How One Woman Survived the Rwandan Genocide and Changed Legal History," (blog) accessed February 9, 2013, <http://bloggingbalkanistan.wordpress.com/2010/07/24/how-one-woman-survived-the-rwandan-genocide-testified-against-her-tormentor-and-changed-legal-history-part-ii/>

¹⁰ Phillip Verwimp, "Death and Survival during the 1994 Genocide in Rwanda," *Population Studies* 58, no. 2 (2004): 233-245.

¹¹ Richard Dowden, "The Graves of the Tutsi are Only Half Full - We Must Complete the Task." *The Independent*, May 24, 1994. <http://search.proquest.com/docview/313068665?accountid=38769>.

killed by Tutsi, which resulted in the Hutu fleeing to Rwanda where Hutus just became power. Even though many Tutsi fled after Hutu came into power, many stayed and experienced the progression towards genocide.

The Hutus' motives for their brutal attacks derived from a sense of fear and revenge. The Hutu felt that they were forced into extreme action because of the threat of the Tutsis. The threats of the Tutsi were imagined by the Hutu, but it was nonetheless real in the mind of the perpetrators.¹² The Hutu believed that unless the Tutsi were eliminated, then they would face extermination themselves. The other Hutu motive for the genocide was revenge. The Hutu had long memories of when the Tutsi ruled over Rwanda. Stories were passed down for generations about real or imagined humiliations and defeats. This resulted in the Hutu seeking revenge by exercising genocidal actions.

From 1960 to 1990, the Tutsis were witnessing the escalation of early attacks that posed as ominous signs that genocide was possible. Tutsis were underprivileged citizens when the Hutu came to power. Many of them were forced out of schools and banned from local Hutu-owned food markets. Odette Nyiramilimo, a Tutsi survivor who later became a physician and a senator in Rwanda explained how she was forced out of school because she was a Tutsi. To stay in school, her father gave her a false identification card that declared her as a Hutu. That identity card saved her life more than once and even gave her the opportunity to have access to an education.¹³

In some areas, Tutsis were allowed to attend school but they experienced discrimination from their Hutu teachers and students. A Tutsi survivor by the name of J.J. explained how being a minority Tutsi in a school overwhelmingly populated by Hutu meant that there were no pleasant days. Her Hutu classmates would bully her along with teachers blaming poor test scores and attention spans on her Tutsi identity as well. It was nearly impossible to receive an education in a school under those conditions. The Tutsi tolerated discrimination to pursue a fair education. However, many of the Hutus simply made it impossible for any peace if one was thought to be a Tutsi. Yet, the Tutsis had faith in peace when faced with the opposition. Although the Tutsis had strong faith, it was slowly

¹² Paul J. Magnarella, "The Background and Causes of the Genocide in Rwanda," *Journal of International Criminal Justice* 4 (2005): 801-822, <http://jicj.oxfordjournals.org/content/3/4/801.full.pdf+html>.

¹³ Lisette Bonilla, "Q & A: Interview with Odette Nyiramilimo, accessed February 2, 2013, <http://www.newrepublic.com/article/politics/q-odette-nyiramilimo#>.

decreasing from the effects of violence and hatred emotions so vile that it would lead some Hutus to commit genocidal murder in the future. So what were the reasons for the Tutsi lack of acknowledgement to the ominous signs of genocide?

The Tutsi had respect and were obedient to three significant social powers: the church, government, and the media. These three social powers that the Tutsi respected were the same that would later want them dead. Timothy Longman, historian and author, believed that religion played an important role in this question. Longman believes that the churches taught Rwandans to respect superior and authority, which is assumed to be a reason for Tutsis not retaliating with violence. Longman mentions how Churchmen used Christian beliefs to teach obedience and respect for authority to numb the Tutsi from any type of resistance:

After independence, the churches stood as important centers of social, economic, and political power, but rather than using their power to support the rights of the population, the churches were integrated into wider structures of power that allowed wealth and privilege to become concentrated in the hands of a select few. The churches as institutions worked with the state to preserve existing configurations of power in the face of increased public pressure for reform, ultimately culminating in the strategy of genocide. While never publicly endorsing genocide, the churches nevertheless are complicit because they helped to create and maintain the authoritarian and divided society that made genocide possible and because the entanglement of the churches with the state made the churches partners in state policy.¹⁴

Longman explains how the church helped the government maintain authority by making political statements from the altar. These political laws divided the church that mainly struck hate and fear into the hearts of the Hutu. Many churches in Rwanda were responsible for provoking Hutus in believing that their destructive actions were in God's will. Instead of fighting for the rights of the Tutsis, the leadership in some churches decided to assist Hutu extremist. The Rwandan Genocide would not have been possible without the support of some churches that were involved. Keep in mind that it was not all churches in Rwanda were involved. It was mainly church officials that had personal interest in the

¹⁴ Timothy Longman, "Christian Churches and Genocide in Rwanda," revision of a paper originally prepared for the Conference on the Genocide, Religion, and Modernity, United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, May 11-13, 1997, accessed February 9, 2013, <http://faculty.vassar.edu/tilongma/Church&Genocide.html>.

government. Many church leaders displayed interest in the government to gain popularity and social status within certain Rwandan communities.

Churchmen and politicians had an interesting relationship that was substantially beneficial. Without the church, politicians could not have been influential to the Rwandan citizens' directly. Many political figures could not get effective support from poor and middle class families compared to churchmen who are spiritually motivational, and influential in the community. However, in the politicians' favor, the church could not have received so much social and economic status without the government. So in result, the church and government had a symbolic relationship in supporting genocide against the Tutsi ethnicity.

The church and government were the driving force behind the genocide. Many of the churches gained the trust and faith of the Tutsis, and then when needed for spiritual uplift, most churches deceived them. During the genocide in Rwanda in 1994, the Tutsis hid for days searching for a safety ground until help arrived. The only safe ground that made since to them was their local Church. So many Tutsis sought sanctuary for physical, spiritual, and mental uplift. The Tutsis had faith that their local church leaders would aid them in their time of need. With the Church and government embracing genocide, the Tutsis had no fighting chance of responding effectively. The Church did not only take advantage of their innocents, they also took their lives. Statistics illustrate that more people were killed in church buildings and approximately seventeen thousand were discovered outside churches.¹⁵ When the Tutsi fled to the churches during the genocide was a powerful indication of their belief that their religion would literally save them. Even Though the role of the church and government had a major effect on the cause of genocide, the media played a tremendous role as well in early warnings leading up to genocide.

Prior to the genocide, the media played a role similar to the church by informing their peers that the toleration of Tutsis must come to an end. Westerners do not understand how significant the radio station was to the Rwandan people. It was their main source of local information. An historian by the name of Mary Kimani said, "The radio became a voice of God."¹⁶ The radio was very important

¹⁵ Gail M. Gerhart, review of *Arming Rwanda: The Arms Trade and Human Rights Abuses in Rwandan War*, by African Rights, New York, June 1994, Capsule Reviews, <http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/49874/gail-m-gerhart/arming-rwanda-the-arms-trade-and-human-rights-abuses-in-the-rwan>.

¹⁶ Dina Temple-Raston, "Journalism and Genocide," *Columbia Journalism Review* 41, no. 3 (Sept./Oct. 2002): 18.

to all Rwandan citizens of all ages. In Rwanda, the ratio was one radio per thirteen people. The media, especially through the radio airwaves, used propaganda to foment the fears of the Hutus and to persuade them that the extermination of Tutsis was necessary.

There was a popular radio station in Rwanda called RTLM, which twisted the truth to provoke genocide. They initiated prejudicial remarks towards the Tutsis that conducted vulgar language. This radio station gave birth to the term “cockroach” by playing Zairian music which encouraged discrimination and threats to the Tutsi people. Many critics gave the RTLM station the nickname “the hate station.”¹⁷ The radio broadcasts entered the homes of Rwandans instructing and provoking violence toward Tutsis. The RTLM would broadcast bylaws of the Hutu Ten Commandments to assure that genocide will come soon.¹⁸

The Hutu Ten Commandments really strengthened the motives and beliefs of Hutus carrying out a genocidal plan.¹⁹ This propaganda provoked Hutus into the realization that they should cease promptly any interactions with a Tutsi. If not, they would be considered to be a traitor, which could result in brutal consequences. As for the Tutsi, they were hopeful for the situation to improve.

The Hutu Ten Commandments were published in 1990 in the edition of Kangura, an anti-Tutsi, “Hutu Power” Kinyarwanda-language newspaper in Kigali, Rwanda. The Hutu Ten Commandments are a prime example of anti-Tutsi propaganda that was promoted by Hutu extremists in Rwanda. The commandments stated that Tutsis should work within their ethnic group. Any Hutu that socialized with a Tutsi woman was considered a traitor. The commandments also stated that all Tutsis were dishonest in business. Furthermore, any Hutu doing business with a Tutsi would be a traitor as well. Tutsis were not allowed to hold any positions within the government and they were not allowed in the military. The last three commandments consisted of a provocation to Hutu citizens to attack Tutsis and have no mercy while in the act of violence. In my opinion, this triggered the Hutu mindset that their violent behavior

¹⁷“Hate Radio: Rwanda Archives,” accessed February 9, 2013, http://web.archive.org/web/*/http://www.radionetherlands.nl/features/media/dossiers/rwanda-h.html

¹⁸ Temple-Raston, “Journalism and Genocide,” 18; Cassandra Cotton, “Where Radio is King: Rwanda’s Hate Radio and the Lessons Learned,” accessed February 14, 2013, <http://atlismta.org/online-journals/0607-journal-gender-environment-and-human-rights/where-radio-is-king/>.

¹⁹ Ibid.

was acceptable. This was one of the major reasons Tutsis could not emigrate or fight back. They had no recourse to even begin to respond due to the laws that were enforced that limited the opportunity to respond. However, Tutsis did not want to leave or be insubordinate because they respected authority.

As the radio and Hutu press were encouraging violence, what was the Tutsi response to the verbal abuse from the radio and the propaganda in print? The Tutsi response was not effective due to the suppression of the involved churches and government. So the Tutsi had limited options for a chance to respond. What options could the Tutsi possibly explore? Everything the Tutsi believed in wanted them to be exterminated, which resulted in a minimum chance to respond.

Even though the radio played an important role in the genocide, there were other warnings. In October 1992, Professor Filip Reyntjens held a press conference in the Belgian state senate. In the conference, he revealed in great detail how the Hutus were planning genocide. He also gave names of the leaders, including Colonel Théoneste Bagasora, who was one of the masterminds behind the genocide.²⁰

The Tutsis were physically unable to protect themselves from brutal violence. However, there were incidents where Tutsis defended themselves with violent force they were mostly armed with stick and stones which was no match compared to Hutus heavy artillery. Even though Tutsis tried to fight back, they were physically unable to do so due to starvation, malnutrition, and diseases. Before the genocide in 1994, many Tutsis starved while hiding for months in secluded jungles and fields. Many were afraid they would be captured by the Hutus if they were to search for food. The Tutsi began to get weaker and defenseless against the Hutu. Due to their obedience to the deceitfulness of the church, government, and media, some Tutsis became so weak to the point of submission and acceptance of genocide. Further, from a physical standpoint, due to the starvation, malnutrition, and incurable diseases, the Tutsi was not able to display any type of resistance. More than five million died from the conflict and the aftermath due to starvation.²¹

²⁰ Melvern, *A People Betrayed*, 49.

²¹ BBC, "African News, Rwanda: How the Genocide Happened," last modified Dec. 18, 2008, <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/1288230.stm>.

There were cases where the Tutsi aggressively tried to persuade Hutus to spare them and their family lives, however. Documents show how some Tutsis took desperate actions into paying Hutus to protect them by offering money and sexual services. The women used their bodies to purchase another day of survival for themselves and their families. The Hutu usually did not bargain with a Tutsi for sexual favors since they were raping Tutsi women as a murder tactic. There were countless of Tutsi women that were raped, some more than once.²²

Tutsi women died during brutal rapes and some survived but later died from AIDS. Ten years after genocide, loads of women and young girls were living with HIV/AIDS after being raped during the Rwandan Genocide. There was one case in particular where a 35-year-old Tutsi woman, by the name of Athanasie Mukarwego, was raped. She mentions how the Hutu militia told her, “You will be killed with rape. Did you know that kills too?” Ten years after the genocide, she was still living in constant dread.²³ There were various accounts of Hutu extremists that used rape as an actual genocidal plan.²⁴ They forced Tutsi women to parade naked or perform various humiliating acts at the bidding of extremist soldiers and militia. Thousands of children were victims as well. Over 100,000 children were raped during the genocide in 1994, majority was orphans. So how could the Tutsi fight back when they were mentally brainwashed from the three social powers and physically being starved, attacked, and raped?

After the Hutus took power, the Tutsi endured thirty years of mental abuse from the church, government, and media that left them hopeless. They also struggled physically from starvation, malnutrition, and AIDS. So when the genocide actually took place, in a sense, there was no one to kill because the Tutsis were left with minimum options to resist, causing a submissive state of mind. The church, government and media, convinced the Hutu population that killing a Tutsi was a civic duty. So in acceptance, the Tutsis could not respond effectively.

The Tutsis did not resign themselves to death entirely. A group of Tutsi pastors wrote a letter to Elizaphan Ntakirutimana, who was a Hutu pastor of the Seventh Day Adventist Church in Rwanda. The Tutsi pastors wrote asking

²² Alison L. Des Forges, “*Leave None to Tell the Story: Genocide in Rwanda* (New York: Human Rights Watch, 1999), 214-215.

²³ John Carlin, “Aids [*sic*] Still Haunts Survivors of Rwandan Genocide,” *The Independent*, December 2, 2003, retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/310627560?accountid=38769>.

²⁴ Erin K. Baines, “Body Politics and the Rwandan Crisis,” *Third World Quarterly* 24, no. 3 (2003): 481.

Ntakirutimana to help them and their families by negotiating with the mayor to save them. They asked for Ntakirutimana help because he was of Hutu ethnicity and he was well known in Rwanda. The letter states, “We wish to inform you that tomorrow we will be killed with our families, we therefore request you to intervene on our behalf and talk with the mayor.”²⁵ The Tutsi pastors accepted the very real possibility of death before even asking for help in this letter. Unfortunately, Ntakirutimana was a Hutu extremist that was intimately involved in killing Tutsi refugees. He was known for gaining the trust of Tutsis and then would set them up for Hutu extremist to come in and kill them. Without the aid of Hutu sympathizers, the legal and law enforcement communities, support from non-governmental agencies, and allies in the West, the Tutsis lacked the means to save themselves. After years of demoralizing abuse and ill treatment, they lacked the will to resist their Hutu oppressors. There was no possible way to retaliate or escape when Tutsis had been violently attack, raped, and dehumanized for thirty years prior to the genocide itself.

There were previous Hutu attacks that posed ominous signs of a possible genocide. The Tutsis had no fighting chance of survival when the church, government, and radio stations were against their existence. This trapped Tutsis into the mindset of acceptance mentally, physically, and spiritually. The ominous signs weakened, deprived, and gradually killed them as the years progressed into the genocide in 1994. It was heart wrenching to discover that the Tutsis had limited options to respond to a horrific act of violence. A numerous signs of early attacks should have alarmed the Tutsis to leave or plan an uprising. The early signs demoralized them into accepting authority wishes, which resulted in horrific events beginning on April 6, 1994—when 800,000 Tutsis were killed within three months. This tragic event in human history is known as the Rwandan Genocide.

Bibliography

Books

Des Forges, Alison L. *“Leave None to Tell the Story:” Genocide in Rwanda*. New York: Human Rights Watch, 1999.

²⁵ Philip Gourevitch, *We Wish to Inform You that Tomorrow We will Be Killed with Our Families* (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1998), 130.

Gourevitch, Philip. *We Wish to Inform You that Tomorrow We will Be Killed with Our Families*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1998.

Melvorn, Linda. *A People Betrayed: The Role of the West in Rwanda's Genocide*. New York: Zed Books/St. Martin's Press, 2000.

Periodicals

Baines, Erin K. "Body Politics and the Rwandan Crisis." *Third World Quarterly* 24, no. 3 (June 2003): 479-493.

Carlin, John. "Aids [*sic*] Still Haunts Survivors of Rwandan Genocide." *The Independent*, December 2, 2003, retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/310627560?accountid=38769>.

Dowden, Richard. "The Graves of the Tutsi are Only Half Full - We Must Complete the Task." *The Independent*, May 24, 1994. <http://search.proquest.com/docview/313068665?accountid=38769>.

Magnarella, Paul J. "The Background and Causes of the Genocide in Rwanda." *Journal of International Criminal Justice* 4 (2005): 801-822. <http://jicj.oxfordjournals.org/content/3/4/801.full.pdf+html>.

Nolen, Stephanie. "Don't Talk to Me about Justice." *The Globe and Mail*, April 3, 2004. Last modified April 8, 2009. <http://www.theglobeandmail.com/news/world/dont-talk-to-me-about-justice/article1135480/?page=all>.

"Slaughter in Rwanda." *Maclean's* 107, no. 16 (Apr 18, 1994): 39. <http://search.proquest.com/docview/218442901?accountid=38769>.

Staub, Ervin. "Genocide and Mass Killing: Origins, Prevention, Healing and Reconciliation." *Political Psychology* 21(2000): 367-382.

Temple-Raston, Dina. "Journalism and Genocide." *Columbia Journalism Review* 41, no. 4 (2002): 18.

Urvin, Peter. "Prejudice, Crisis, and Genocide in Rwanda," *African Studies Review* 40 (1997): 91-115.

Versi, Anver. "Obituary: Juvenal Habyarimana." *The Independent*, Apr 08, 1994. <http://search.proquest.com/docview/313048972?accountid=38769>.

Verwimp, Phillip. "Death and Survival during the 1994 Genocide in Rwanda," *Population Studies* 58, no. 2 (2004): 233-245.

Web Sites

BBC. "African News: Rwanda: How the Genocide Happened." Last modified December 18, 2008. <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/1288230.stm>.

Bonilla, Lisette. "Q & A: Interview with Odette Nyiramilimo." Last modified July 19, 2006. <http://www.newrepublic.com/article/politics/q-odette-nyiramilimo#>.

Cotton, Cassandra. "Where Radio is King: Rwanda's Hate Radio and the Lessons Learned." Accessed February 14, 2013. <http://atlismta.org/online-journals/0607-journal-gender-environment-and-human-rights/where-radio-is-king/>.

Di Giovanni, Janine. "The Daily Seyahatname: How One Woman Survived the Rwandan Genocide and Changed Legal History." (Blog). Accessed February 9, 2013. <http://bloggingbalkanistan.wordpress.com/2010/07/24/how-one-woman-survived-the-rwandan-genocide-testified-against-her-tormentor-and-changed-legal-history-part-ii/>.

Gerhart, Gail M. Review of *Arming Rwanda: The Arms Trade and Human Rights Abuses in Rwandan War*, by African Rights, New York, June 1994, Capsule Reviews, <http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/49874/gail-m-gerhart/arming-rwanda-the-arms-trade-and-human-rights-abuses-in-the-rwan>.

Human Rights Watch. "Leave None to Tell the Story: Genocide in Rwanda." March 1, 1999. #1711. <http://www.unhcr.org/refworld/docid/45d425512.html>.

Longman, Timothy. "Christian Churches and Genocide in Rwanda." Revision of a paper originally prepared for the Conference on the Genocide, Religion, and Modernity United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, May 11-13, 1997. Last accessed February 14, 2013. <http://faculty.vassar.edu/tilongma/Church&Genocide.html>.

Modern History Project. "The Rwandan Genocide." Last accessed February 9, 2013. <http://modernhistoryproject2012.wordpress.com/history-of-hutu-tutsi-relations/>.

From Emperor to Holy Crusader: A Historiography of the Charlemagne Legend

Colby Turberville

Abstract: This article is a historiography of Charlemagne's legend. It roughly covers between the late eighth century to the twelfth century. It focuses on various contributors to Charlemagne's legend such as his contemporary courtiers, especially Einhard. It also pays close attention to the clerical backlash against Charlemagne during the reign of his son, Louis the Pious. This article shows how the diversification of Europe changed the legend of Charlemagne, and thus preserved it. Finally, this article ends by showing the power that Charlemagne's image had accumulated as evidenced by its strong influence during the First Crusade. This article is in short an attempt to follow the developing image and legend of one of the most influential figures in European history, and show that image's influence on and connection with that history.

Introduction

The year 800 was a difficult time for the papacy. The constant threat from the Lombards to the north, the struggle for religious authority with the patriarch of Constantinople, and the political turmoil in the city of Rome itself were chief among the papacy's concerns. Political events in Rome culminated in November with Pope Leo III being beaten by political rivals. Badly injured, Leo escaped north into Frankish lands. Leo had escaped into Francia for obvious reasons. Charlemagne ruled there, and he was Leo's best political ally. Charlemagne was widely known as a successful warlord. He had conquered the ferocious Saxons, subdued the threatening Lombards, and taken on the Muslim threat in Spain. Now, Charlemagne was the savior of the pope, and soon would come into the exceptional position of being the pope's judge as well.

In Rome, Charlemagne would oversee the pope's trial. Although no one would bring allegations against Leo, he was eventually forced to "invoke the name of the Holy Trinity and purge himself by oath of the charges alleged against him."¹ These recording of these events conveyed a message that even the Apostolic See could answer to Charlemagne. An even more emphatic message was sent three weeks later with the crowning of Charlemagne emperor on Christmas Day by the pope. The Royal Frankish Annals record the event in a glorious manner:

On that very same most sacred day of the Lord's birth, when the king, at mass, rose from prayer before the *confessio* of the blessed apostle Peter, pope Leo

¹P.D. King, "Annals of the kingdom of the Franks" in *Charlemagne: Translated Sources* (Lancaster, UK: University of Lancaster Press, 1987), 93.

placed a crown upon his head, and from the entire people of the Romans came the acclamation: 'To Charles, Augustus, crowned by God, great and pacific emperor of the Romans, life and victory!' And after the acclamations he was adored by the *apostolicus* in the way emperors of old were and, the name of patrician having been laid aside, was called emperor and Augustus.²

Clearly the events of Charlemagne's coronation in 800 reveal that he was already seen through a legendary lens a decade before his death. This image was largely the result of his courtiers who heaped continual praises on him. Charlemagne's image was reminiscent of the images of Roman emperors, removed and unapproachable. Following Charlemagne's death in 814, his son, Louis would seek to neutralize this image. Thus, a new genre of writing arose. These writings often depicted Charlemagne in a type of purgatory making penance for his past sins. The new image of Charlemagne focused on his moral shortcomings rather than his military career, which was impeccable. Unfortunately for Louis, his own military career was disastrous – constantly plagued by political infighting and failing campaigns. It was in this atmosphere that Einhard wrote his *Vita Karoli*. Einhard's representation made Charlemagne more knowable and friendly. This greatly differed from the removed and unapproachable image portrayed by Charlemagne's other courtiers. Einhard's *Vita Karoli* was successful in saving the memory of Charlemagne. It is Einhard's representation that would be the basis for subsequent *vitas* and *gestas*.

The military turmoil during the ninth and tenth centuries eventually led to the disintegration of the Carolingian Empire. This disintegration created new kingdoms within the boundaries laid out by the Treaty of Verdun (843). These kingdoms developed their own culture and pursued their own agendas. It is out of these agendas and cultures that Charlemagne's image diversified. Representations of Charlemagne began to take on the unique qualities of the regions they were developed in. This period initiates the transformation of Charlemagne's image from a Frankish ideal to a more universal, European one. By the eleventh and twelfth centuries, with the rise of the Crusades, Charlemagne had become the perfect avatar for the Christian warrior. Charlemagne was no longer remembered as a great Frankish king, but as the epitome of Christian piety, a holy crusader. The legend of Charlemagne was born in the Aachen court, revived by Einhard in the mid-ninth century, and eventually transformed into a universal ideal of crusading, medieval Europe.

²Ibid.

Charlemagne's Court

Charlemagne had an "insatiable curiosity" throughout his entire life.³ During the 780s and 790s, he began gathering educated men from all over the European continent. These men not only educated Charles himself, but also others at court. Alcuin describes the court setting as an academy, although according to Alessandro Barbero, this "might imply a degree of organization and permanence that in reality did not exist."⁴ Nevertheless, those whom Charlemagne brought to his court were diverse and highly educated. The court would have included the Lombards Peter of Pisa and Paul the Deacon, the Englishman Alcuin of York, the Spanish-born Theodulf of Orleans and Agobard of Lyons, and the Italian Paulinus of Aquileia. These men would have been influential in the teaching of Latin grammar, the *trivium*, and the *quadrivium*.⁵ These men were also the driving force behind the Carolingian Renaissance.

Three important results of the Carolingian Renaissance were a revival of the classical arts in Gaul⁶, a uniformity of writing, and a greater circulation of texts. Alessandro Barbero states that "the majority of men of letters (courtiers) were not Franks, which demonstrates the sorry state of Frankish culture at the time."⁷ The teachings of these "men of letters" would eventually produce learned Frankish scholars such as Angilbert and Einhard for future Frankish generations. Out of the desire to circulate knowledge came a need for the writing style to be uniform and useful. Carolingian miniscule provided this in that it was a more practical and less convoluted style of letters. Perhaps the greatest aspect of the Carolingian Renaissance, not just in general, but also as pertained to the development of Charlemagne's legend, was the increase in textual circulation. Immediately following his accession, Charlemagne issued a circular calling for all available books to be donated or copied for the newly built library in his palace at Aachen. Libraries and monasteries throughout Gaul began sharing books and copies of books, both secular and religious. The effects of this widespread circulation can be seen in that 7,000 manuscripts have survived from the ninth

³Alessandro Barbero, *Charlemagne: Father of a Continent* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London: University of California Press, 2004), 214.

⁴*Ibid.*, 215.

⁵*Ibid.*, 214.

⁶David Ganz, "Einhard and the Characterisation of Greatness," in Joanna Story, ed., *Charlemagne: Empire and Society* (Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 2005), 39-40.

Alcuin's use of Ciceronian and Seutonian rhetoric techniques shows this revival, especially when considering ancients were being downplayed by other Christian scholars and that Alcuin taught much of the next generation's Frankish scholars.

⁷Barbero, *Father of a Continent*, 215

century compared to 1,800 of the first centuries CE.⁸ This circulation of knowledge also ensured that more documents pertaining to Charlemagne would survive for later generations, including Einhard's depiction, which was vitally important to Charlemagne's literary survival.

Charlemagne's most important teacher and adviser was Alcuin of York. Alcuin was highly influential at court, having taught most of the future generation's scholars. He was also influential, however, in advising Charles on many political and religious matters, coordinated the *Admonitio generalis* and the *Epistola de litteris colendis*. In many of Alcuin's letters to Charles, one can already see the workings of Charlemagne's developing legend. Several of Alcuin's salutations depict Charlemagne as the Israelite King David: "To the most virtuous, excellent and honorable King David," "To the most religious and excellent lord, King David," and "To his lovingly respected and respectfully loved lord, King David."⁹ This demonstrates a continuing Roman custom that legitimacy lay within the male past, and also shows that Charlemagne was seen as a great Christian king, but not just any king. Alcuin compared Charlemagne with David, the epitome of godly kingship. Alcuin's letter of June 799 to Charles reveals the almost legendary lenses through which Charlemagne was already being viewed:

There is the Royal Dignity, in which the dispensation of our Lord Jesus Christ has established you as ruler of the Christian people; in power a ruler more excellent than the aforementioned ones, in wisdom more radiant, and in grandeur more sublime. Behold, now in you alone lies the salvation of the churches of Christ. You are the avenger of crimes, the guide of those who err, the consoler of the afflicted, the uplifter of the righteous.¹⁰

Charlemagne was also represented as a "New Constantine", an image that would feature heavily in his taking of the imperial title. The various recordings of the episode of Charlemagne's imperial coronation at Rome in 800 show the masterful work of his courtiers in presenting him as a humble servant-king, reluctantly willing to do what was needed. The Lorsch Annals recorded Charles's acceptance of the title thusly:

⁸Ibid, 234.

⁹Paul E. Dutton, ed., *Carolingian Civilization* (New York and Toronto: Broadview Press, 2004), 120-127.

¹⁰Pierre Riché, *The Carolingians: A Family Who Forged Europe*, ed. Michael I. Allen (Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1993), 120.

King Charles was himself unwilling to deny this request of theirs and, having submitted with all humility to God and the petition of the *sacerdotes* and the entire Christian people, received the name of emperor, with the consecration of the lord pope Leo, on the very day of the nativity of our Lord Jesus Christ.¹¹

Einhard famously would later claim that had Charlemagne known about the intentions of that day, he would have never entered the church.¹² However, all of the annals record that the church clergy, Pope Leo, and the entire Christian population saw the event as necessary. Alcuin and many of Charlemagne's other courtiers were also expecting some sort of climatic event. It is, therefore, ludicrous to think Charlemagne had no former knowledge or inclination of the intentions of the Mass that day. The annals also record Charlemagne as arbiter of the proceedings concerning Pope Leo's alleged torture and blinding. The *Frankish Annals* represent Charlemagne as more powerful than the pope. According to the *Annals*, as Charlemagne began passing judgment on the perpetrators of the crimes against the pope, the latter "compassionately" interceded with Charlemagne on their behalf. The annals also record that Charles forced Pope Leo to purge himself prior to the proceedings. These images of Charlemagne convey the same one that Alcuin's letter of June 799 did: "... in power a ruler more excellent, in wisdom more radiant, and in grandeur more sublime."¹³ The use of Constantinian-style architecture¹⁴ further highlighted Charlemagne's association with Constantine. According to Linda Seidel, this gave "visual expression to this idea of the Carolingian as the Early Christian's successor."¹⁵

The court of Charlemagne proved vitally important to his legend's birth. The educated men Charlemagne brought to his court were extremely influential in the success of the Carolingian Renaissance, which was the catalyst for increased intellectual activity and textual circulation. This improved circulation

¹¹P.D. King, "Lorsch Annals" in *Charlemagne: Translated Sources* (Lancaster, UK: University of Lancaster Press, 1987), 144.

¹²Einhard *Life of Charlemagne* (Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 1960), 56-57.

¹³Riché, *The Carolingians*, 120.

¹⁴Use of a palace *aula* at Aachen, modeled on the roman imperial style, as referenced in Rosamond McKitterick, 'Charlemagne's Palaces and the Status of Aachen' in *Charlemagne: The Formation of European Identity*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 2008), 162-163, is one example of this architecture. The presence of *aulas* at other palaces indicates that this imperial image was widespread and reiterated at Charlemagne's major stopping points on his royal itinerary. For a more detailed account of Aachen and great contrasting views of it as Charlemagne's capital see R. McKitterick's *Charlemagne: The Formation of European Identity* and Janet Nelson's 'Aachen as a Place of Power' in *Topographies of Power in the Early Middle Ages*.

¹⁵Linda Seidel, "Constantine 'and' Charlemagne", in JSTOR, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/766771> (accessed January 25, 2012).

would ensure the continuation of the depictions of Charlemagne. These depictions were of power, humility, and piety. Charlemagne was seen as the "New David" ready to lead the Franks, the "new Israelites", to their destiny as the chosen people. This image is clearly seen in the writings of Alcuin, one of the most influential men of Charlemagne's court. The recordings of the events of the imperial coronation of 800 in the various contemporary annals, as well as the use of Constantinian-style architecture, show Charlemagne as the "new Constantine". All of these depictions would provide the resources that would be used by later generations in the construction of his legend. However, the greatest provision of Charlemagne's court to the birth of his legend was the image that Charlemagne was unapproachable. "Had subsequent generations possessed the king's direct deliberations, his religious and philosophical thought, his little jokes and outbursts of anger, these might have made him seem smaller and more knowable."¹⁶

Charlemagne's Death

Charlemagne's death was met with overwhelming mourning. A minority would have, however, anticipated the opportunities for power and advancement. However, given the praise heaped upon Charlemagne by his courtiers, who were very influential as bishops and abbots, the image of Charlemagne would have been quite favorable in 814. The following excerpts from the *Planctus de obitu Karoli*, written by an anonymous monk of Bobbio shortly after Charlemagne's death, gives good insight into what would have been the emotional atmosphere after his death.

From [eastern] lands where the sun rises to western shores,
 People are [now] crying and wailing
 Alas for miserable me.
 The Franks, the Romans, all Christians,
 Are stung with mourning and great worry.
 Alas for miserable me.
 Francia has endured awful wounds [before],
 But never has suffered such great sorrow as now,
 Alas for miserable me.¹⁷

Louis the Pious's Reign

¹⁶Dutton, "Karolvs Magnvs", 26.

¹⁷Dutton, *Carolingian Civilization*, 157-159.

Charlemagne had attempted to divide his kingdom equally among his three sons. He hoped to ensure that no internal strife would result in the destruction of his and his ancestors' accomplishments. Reality, however, would not work in Charlemagne's favor. Shortly after his *Divisio regnorum* in 806, two of his sons, Pepin and Charles died in 810 and 811, respectively. Thus, by the time of his death in 814, Charlemagne had one legitimate heir to pass his Frankish and imperial crown to, Louis.

Louis, known as the Good-Natured or Pious, immediately set out to establish his own authority. He rid the court of his father's courtiers. (Although, he did retain Einhard.) Thus, Louis established a court loyal to himself. He also made in-house changes by sending his sisters to monasteries to rid the palace of perceived moral laxity. Charlemagne's palace and court had allegedly become morally deficient during his old age when aspiring underlings were left to follow their personal ambitions. Louis would also recognize papal authority over documented papal territories, an act which would weigh heavily against him later in his reign. Nevertheless, when Louis had taken his father's throne, he faced the problem of distinguishing himself from Charlemagne. Louis would have had no chance of denying Charlemagne's military success. However, the allegations of moral depravity towards the end of Charlemagne's reign provided Louis' court with the ammunition needed to launch a literary reappraisal against the great emperor's idealized image.

The *Visio Wettini*, written by Heito, bishop of Basel (803-823), recounts the visions of the monk Wetti. In the *Visio*, Wetti sees a certain prince (Charlemagne) having his genitals gnawed on by an unspecified animal. This stark contrast with the literature produced during Charlemagne's reign is quite representative of the results of Louis' initiative against his father. Similarly, the *Vision of the Poor Woman of Laon* of the 820s displayed a new genre of literature geared at morally criticizing Charlemagne. In the *Vision*, the woman sees Charlemagne being tortured, but is assured that his punishment will pass if Louis "provides for seven memorial services on his behalf."¹⁸ One can see that the author placed the power of the situation completely in the hands of Louis.

Despite Louis's moral reappraisal of Charlemagne, the latter was still seen as a great king. In every account of Charlemagne's punishment, he is eventually released to heaven. Nevertheless, with the moral attacks on Charlemagne's image and the new praises being thrust upon him, Louis began to

¹⁸*Ibid.*, 203-204.

distinguish himself from his father. Walahfrid Strabo's *De imagine Tetrici* shows this distinction.

You [Louis] rule a people called to the beauties of paradise
 Over temples built upon sacred stones, great king.
 Your famous father at one time enhanced their importance.
 His golden effigies sport at the top of columns,
 To his genius I do not apply the teaching of Plato

Later, Walahfrid explains this reference to Plato:

Only then does a prosperous republic arise,
 When kings are sufficiently wise and wise men are kings.¹⁹

Reality, however, would not allow for Charlemagne's memory to lapse. Louis faced many disastrous military campaigns and internal disorders, which in turn led to an even greater idealization of the "old days" of the mighty Charlemagne. Nithard characterizes this time of internal strife as growing "worse from day to day, since all were driven by greed and sought only their own advantage."²⁰

In 817, Louis dispensed his *Ordinatio imperii*. This document divided up his kingdom between his sons, Pippin of Aquitaine and Louis of Bavaria, and crowned Lothar co-emperor. After the death of his first wife, Ermengard, Louis married Judith, the daughter of Welf, count of lands in Bavaria and Alemmania. Judith was a strong-willed woman intent on gaining political control for Louis' and her son, Charles. Simply put, Lothar recognized the potential political hazards from Judith's manipulating. Lothar immediately began garnering support, lay and ecclesiastical. According to Pierre Riché, "As an advocate of peace and stability, Lothar would find many supporters among the episcopacy."²¹ Defending the dispensation of the *Ordinatio imperii*, Lothar, along with both his brothers, Pippin and Louis, moved to take control and rid his father of Judith and Bernard of Septimania.²² The negotiations, however, between Louis and his younger sons

¹⁹Walahfrid Strabo's *De Imagine Tetrici* quoted in Thomas F.X. Noble, "Greatness Contested and Confirmed: The Raw Materials of the Charlemagne Legend," in Matthew Gabrielle and Jace Stuckey, eds., *The Legend of Charlemagne in the Middle Ages: Power, Faith, and Crusade* (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2008), 7.

²⁰Dutton, *Carolingian Civilization*, 299.

²¹Riché, *The Carolingians*, 151.

²²Ibid. Bernard of Septimania was Charlemagne's godson and distant cousin of Louis the Pious. He began as Count of Barcelona before receiving high accolades and the title of Duke of Septimania as a result of his military prowess in northern Spain. He eventually became counselor to Louis and Judith's protector.

stopped the rebellion of 830. The loss of support from his brothers soon forced Lothar to comply as well, and resulted in a new partition of lands. According to Riché, this partition "failed to address the underlying reasons for the crisis that wracked the empire."²³ Thus, in 833, Lothar and Louis' other sons revolted again. Although the second rebellion met with defeat, it resulted in what is called the "Field of Lies." The "Field of Lies" was a meeting between Louis and his sons, Pope Gregory I, and some of the Frankish clergy. With what constituted Louis' whole world against him, he had no choice but to comply with their demands. Louis debased himself before all present and did penance, admitting to all manner of sins. This completely humiliating act would forever tarnish Louis' memory. Even after the reversal of the "Field of Lies", Louis never regained the prominence he had had at the beginning of his reign.

In the beginning, Louis had a fresh start. The Frankish kingdom was his, as well as the imperial title. He immediately sought to create a stark, yet favorable, contrast between his reign and that of his father. Louis created a court loyal to him, while dispelling the air of immorality. Thus court scholars wrote favorably of Louis, ever so slightly discounting the reign of Charlemagne. Charlemagne was a great military leader, but his moral shortcomings and his "barbaric" ways were stressed. Louis sought to be remembered not only as a great king, like his father, but also as a godly one. Texts such as the *Visio Wettini* and the *Vision of the Poor Woman of Laon* show the moral backlash against Charlemagne.²⁴ However due to military failures and political debacles, Louis lost credibility as king and was forced to debase himself at the "Field of Lies". Near 828²⁵, with the events of Louis' reign looking bleaker and bleaker, Einhard saw the chance to set the record straight for his former king and friend.

Einhard: Charlemagne's Savior

Einhard's *Vita Karoli* is without a doubt a result of the decline of the political environment during Louis the Pious' reign. However, its construction was

²³Ibid, 154.

²⁴This moral backlash is evident in the written sources. Since the clergy were the authors of these written sources, therefore, this was most assuredly a clerical backlash. The common people, who were mostly illiterate, probably did not hold the same views held in the sources. Nevertheless, Louis' literary reappraisal of Charlemagne was not aimed at commoners anyway. The support of the Church and Frankish elite was what mattered, and those were the groups focused on by Louis.

²⁵Noble, "Greatness Contested" in Gabrielle and Stuckey, eds., *Legend of Charlemagne*, 9. Dates for the writing of the *Vita Karoli* range from 817 to 833. However, Lupus of Ferrières's letter to Einhard, 829-830, references the *Vita*. Also by 830, criticism of Charlemagne is almost non-existent. Thus, 828 is a logical conclusion, if one acknowledges that after two years of circulation, the *Vita* would have been influential in changing the literary atmosphere.

not the simply result of Einhard's surroundings. Einhard wrote his *Vita Karoli* of his own volition during a time when no contemporary praises of Charlemagne were being written. Thomas Noble claims that "had nothing more been written about Charlemagne, his legacy might have appeared different to us."²⁶ Although there was a lessening of the moral attacks against Charlemagne, criticism still "had a free hand."²⁷ Einhard's *Vita Karoli* would change the literary atmosphere concerning Charlemagne.

Einhard's *Vita Karoli*, according to David Ganz, was a *vita et conversatio*, combining life with deeds; instead of merely deeds (*gesta*).²⁸ This writing of *vita et conversatio* was limited to saints' lives during the Middle Ages. Ganz claims that Einhard was thus making a profound statement that Charlemagne was among the saints.²⁹ Einhard's *Vita Karoli* circulated all over Europe, influencing several scholars. The *Vita Karoli's* influence is evidenced by the fact that 134 manuscripts of various dates still exist today.³⁰

Evidence for the direct influence of Einhard's work on literature is found in comparing Walahfrid Strabo's *Visio Wettini* and his *De Imagine Tetrici*. The *De Imagine Tetrici* is much more sedate compared to the *Visio Wettini* concerning criticisms on Charlemagne. Einhard's *vita* was written between these two documents, and Strabo certainly had access to it. A decade after the *Vita Karoli* one can see the total impact it had on Charlemagne's image. Einhard's contemporaries praised his *vita* and subsequent generations used it as a model. Charlemagne's image was thus rehabilitated through the *Vita Karoli's* success. The last criticism of Charlemagne can be found in 839. Wandalbert of Prüm's *Vita et Miracula sancti Goaris* "mildly rebukes Charlemagne for failing to keep a promise to visit Goar's monastery."³¹ This slight rebuke contrasts considerably with the criticisms of Charlemagne during the 820s. Charlemagne was no longer being criticized as morally decrepit and "barbarous".

Einhard's depiction of Charlemagne reminded the failing Frankish world of Louis the Pious' last years about the "days of old". Einhard skirted the issues with Charlemagne's morality, perhaps giving credence to them, since Einhard

²⁶Ibid., 8.

²⁷Ibid.

²⁸David Ganz, "Einhard and the Characterisation of Greatness," in Joanna Story, ed., *Charlemagne: Empire and Society* (Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 2005), 41.

²⁹Ibid, 50.

³⁰Dutton, "Karolvs Magnvs," in Gabrielle and Stuckey, eds., *Legend of Charlemagne*, 29.

³¹Noble, "Greatness Contested," in Gabrielle and Stuckey, eds., *Legend of Charlemagne*, 11.

refused to even acknowledge their importance. Nevertheless, Einhard reinvigorated the idealized image of Charlemagne. Einhard, however, also created a new image of Charlemagne. Through writing on his personal life, Einhard made Charlemagne more knowable. Einhard showed Charlemagne as a good, respectable man. One particular excerpt that depicts this characterization concerns Charlemagne and friendship. "For he showed a very fine disposition in his friendships: he embraced them readily and maintained them faithfully, and he treated with the utmost respect all who he had admitted into the circle of his friends."³² Einhard saved Charlemagne from the brink of oblivion, and it is his depiction that would be used in subsequent generations. Whether Einhard can be trusted is a matter of debate.³³ However, it can undoubtedly be said that without Einhard, the legend of Charlemagne would appear much different, if it survived at all.

Verdun to Charles the Fat: Dispersion of the Charlemagne Legend

After Louis the Pious' reign, Charlemagne was once more idealized as the epitome of godly kingship. The success of Einhard's *Vita Karoli* had ensured that Charlemagne's image would never be attacked again. Thus, later Frankish successors would use the image of Charlemagne to galvanize support. However, the image of Charlemagne would not remain a Frankish concept alone. Eventually, after the breakup of Carolingian Europe, the Charlemagne legend would take on different roles for the resulting new kingdoms. Immediately following Louis the Pious' death, the Frankish kingdom was divided into three separate kingdoms. It was at this point, the Treaty of Verdun in 843, that the transformation and dispersion of the Charlemagne legend began.

Lothar, Louis' heir, began seeking to take the kingdom for himself. His bid proved unsuccessful, however, and after two years of fighting, Louis the German and Charles the Bald seized Aachen, and Lothar was eventually forced to surrender. The result was the Treaty of Verdun. Verdun successfully divided the Frankish lands into three separate kingdoms. Louis received everything north of the Alps and east of the Rhine. Charles was given lands west of the Rhine. Finally, Lothar was given the middle ground stretching from the North Sea to Italy. The Treaty of Verdun would represent a transformation of the European political

³²Einhard and the Monk of St. Gall, *Two Lives of Charlemagne*, ed., A.J. Grant (n.p.: Digireads.com, 2010), 27.

³³Einhard's style was heavily influenced by Suetonius. Suetonius is much known as a gossip. Although both author's do have facts in their accounts, this style should be taken into account when judging either one's validity.

landscape for centuries to come. Each of the new kingdoms at the time was still largely culturally Frankish. Each kingdom, however, began following its own political, cultural, and ideological path. Essentially, this division would lead to a new Europe; no longer Frankish, but quite diversified. This diversification created changes in accounts of Charlemagne across Europe. For example, changes in the Charlemagne legend can already be seen in the *Vision of Charlemagne*, a text from the court of Louis the German, in that it is written in Old High German instead of Latin like many texts from the court of Charlemagne. Louis the German, as well as Charles the Bald, would also commission copies of Einhard's *Vita Karoli*. However, the word *magni* was added, and in Louis the German's edition a sword "sent by God" is given to a sleepy Charlemagne by an apparition. Interestingly, on this sword are words written in German. These minor changes wrought on the memory of Charlemagne were specific to the kingdom producing them. By the time of Charles the Fat in the late ninth century, Charlemagne was quickly becoming the ideal for every people. In his fifth book, the Saxon Poet depicts Charlemagne leading the Saxons instead of the Franks. The Saxon Poet praises Charlemagne for conquering his people and causing them "to know the light of faith and cast off the darkness of perfidy."³⁴ Charles the Fat was the last legitimate heir of Charlemagne. Although there would continue to be Carolingian rulers on the thrones of Europe, the fact remains that after Charles the Fat, Europe's political makeup and culture quickly began changing. It was no longer Frankish, but a world of various kingdoms and cultures. However, because medieval Europe was created out of the dissolution of the Frankish world that Charlemagne ideally represented, Charlemagne would come ideally to represent medieval Europe as well.

Eleventh and Twelfth-century Europe: The Crusading Ideal

The actions of Pope Urban II at the Council of Clermont in 1095 set off centuries of religious warfare that would not only engulf Palestine but parts of Europe as well. Crusading quickly became a religious ideal for medieval Europe. Various rewards, such as forgiveness of sins, were given to the participants, and crusaders were considered most pious and obedient servants of God. Representations of Charlemagne during this period would depict him as a holy crusader: obedient, pious, and humble. Charlemagne's image was invoked

³⁴Ibid., 535.

because no one would better represent the ideal of Europe, than the “man” of Europe.

Texts such as the *Descriptio qualiter* and the *Chanson de Roland* show the complete transformation of Charlemagne's identity. Charlemagne now represented Europe, and his Frankish heritage was only a footnote if noted at all. In the *Descriptio qualiter* Charlemagne had been asked to come to the aid of the emperor at Constantinople who was under Muslim attack. After warding off the Muslim force, Charlemagne refused to take any gifts home, but reluctantly took relics with him as evidence of God's mercy and provision. Another text showing Charlemagne as the ideal crusader is the famous, *Chanson de Roland*. The *Chanson de Roland* was an attempt to show that the crusading ideal dated back to the days of Charlemagne. These words of *Roland* represent the image of Charlemagne as a great defender of Christendom.

The emperor is happy and joyful
 He has taken Cordoba and shattered its walls,
 And demolished its towers with catapults;
 His knights have captured great booty,
 Gold, silver, and costly arms.
 No pagan was left within the city
 Who was not slain or made a Christian.³⁵

Interestingly, Charlemagne never ventured to Jerusalem or Constantinople. Therefore, "memory was adjusting history."³⁶ The extent of Charlemagne's memory was far-reaching, and its power to invoke legitimacy made it unique. Jay Rubenstein shows this power. It is Godfrey of Bullion's Carolingian heritage that showed him as the legitimate ruler of the Latin Kingdom. As a descendant of Charlemagne, Godfrey was seen as quite possibly the Last Emperor, an "ever-vigilant military guard against a demonic enemy."³⁷

Conclusion

³⁵*Chanson de Roland* as quoted in Jace Stuckey, "Charlemagne as Crusader? Memory, Propaganda, and the Many Uses of Charlemagne's Legendary Expedition to Spain," in Matthew Gabriele and Jace Stuckey, eds., *The Legend of Charlemagne in the Middle Ages: Power, Faith, and Crusade* (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2008), 141.

³⁶Noble, "Greatness Contested," in Gabriele and Stuckey, eds., *Legend of Charlemagne*, 13.

³⁷Jay Rubenstein, "Godfrey of Bouillon Versus Raymond of Saint-Gilles: How Carolingian Kingship Trumped Millenarianism at the End of the First Crusade," in Matthew Gabriele and Jace Stuckey, eds., *The Legend of Charlemagne in the Middle Ages: Power, Faith, and Crusade* (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2008), 70.

Charlemagne's legend is definitely the result of fortune. Although its beginnings were the result of his own courtiers and the Carolingian Renaissance, its preservation was not. Charlemagne's memory was preserved by the disastrous reign of Louis the Pious and more importantly by the success of Einhard's *Vita Karoli*. Einhard's *Vita Karoli* would influence later generations' views on Charlemagne. It would be the basis for subsequent biographies, such as Notker's *Gesta Karoli Magni*. Nevertheless, by the end of Louis the Pious' reign, Charlemagne was the embodiment of Frankish ideals. After the Treaty of Verdun in 843, subsequent kingdoms would transform the legend of Charlemagne to create support and legitimacy for their rules. It is this slow transformation that would continually preserve Charlemagne. Charlemagne no longer represented the Frankish world, but rather medieval Europe. Finally, the culmination of the development of the legend of Charlemagne came in the eleventh and twelfth centuries when images of Charlemagne showed him as a humble pilgrim, a holy crusader, and a predecessor of the Last Emperor. It was these images that were thought to carry enough power and influence to invoke legitimacy for the ruler of Jerusalem, the center of the Christian world.

Bibliography

- Barbero, Alessandro. *Charlemagne: Father of a Continent*. Translated by Allan Cameron. Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London: University of California Press, 2004.
- Dutton, Paul Edward. *Carolingian Civilization: A Reader*. New York & Toronto: Broadview Press, 2004.
- . "KAROLVS MAGNVS or KAROLVS FELIX: The Making of Charlemagne's Reputation and Legend" in Matthew Gabriele and Jace Stuckey, eds. *The Legend of Charlemagne in the Middle Ages: Power, Faith, and Crusade*. New York & London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008.
- Einhard. *The Life of Charlemagne*. Foreword by Sidney Painter. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 2010.
- Einhard and the Monk of St. Gall. *Two Lives of Charlemagne*. Edited by A.J. Grant. n.p.: Digireads.com, 2010.
- King, P.D. *Charlemagne: Translated Sources*. Lancaster, UK: University of Lancaster Press, 1987.
- Latowsky, Anne. "Charlemagne as Pilgrim? Requests for Relics in the *Descriptio qualiter* and the *Voyage of Charlemagne*" in Matthew

Gabriele and Jace Stuckey, eds. *The Legend of Charlemagne in the Middle Ages: Power, Faith, and Crusade*. New York & London: Palgrave MacMillan, 2008.

McKitterick, Rosamond. *Charlemagne: The Formation of European Identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University, 2008.

Nicholson, Helen. *Palgrave Advances in the Crusades*. New York & London: Palgrave MacMillan, 2005.

Noble, Thomas F.X. "Greatness Contested and Confirmed: The Raw Materials of the Charlemagne Legend" in Matthew Gabriele and Jace Stuckey, eds. *The Legend of Charlemagne in the Middle Ages: Power, Faith, and Crusade*. New York & London: Palgrave MacMillan, 2008.

Riché, Pierre. *The Carolingians: A Family Who Forged Europe*. Translated by Michael Idomir Allen. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1993.

Rubenstein, Jay. "Godfrey of Bouillon versus Raymond of Saint-Gilles: How Carolingian Kingship Trumped Millenarianism at the End of the First Crusade" in Matthew Gabriele and Jace Stuckey, eds. *The Legend of Charlemagne in the Middle Ages: Power, Faith, and Crusade*. New York & London: Palgrave MacMillan, 2008.

Stuckey, Jace. "Charlemagne as Crusader? Memory, Propoganda, and the Many Uses of Charlemagne's Legendary Expedition to Spain" in Matthew Gabriele and Jace Stuckey, eds. *The Legend of Charlemagne in the Middle Ages: Power, Faith, and Crusade*. New York & London: Palgrave MacMillan, 2008.

Runciman, Steven. "Charlemagne and Palestine." *The English Historical Review* 50, no. 200 (October 1935). <http://www.jstor.org/stable/553491> (accessed March 27, 2012).

Seidel, Linda. "Constantine 'and' Charlemagne." *Gesta* 15, no.1/2 (1976). <http://www.jstor.org/stable/766771> (accessed January 25, 2012).

Story, Joanna, eds. *Charlemagne: Empire and Society*. Manchester & New York: University of Manchester Press & Palgrave, 2005.

Williams, Hywell. *Emperor of the West: Charlemagne and the Carolingian Empire*. London: Quercus, 2011.

Trying For a Better Society: A Look at British Socialism Post

World War II

Clarence C. Walker

Abstract: In the years between 1939 and 1945, Great Britain was left near economic turmoil and the population of the country desired a better system to live under. It is from this experience that the Labour Party was able to install social reforms during the postwar years of 1945 to 1951, guided in part by the Beveridge Report that laid out reform for Britain's health insurance sectors. When World War II was over the Labour Party, under the leadership of Clement Attlee, was able to implement some of the social reforms that could not have been done during the war years or prior. Author George Orwell believed the Beveridge Report neither contained enough socialist ideology nor empowered the government. Orwell's writing about the dangers of a corrupted communist political system was considered to be on the fringes of the Left within Britain. With the political shifts happening within Europe during the first half of the twentieth century, the years of 1939 to 1945 and 1945 to 1951 were important for the culmination of policies bringing socialist policies to Britain. Since the Labour Party government of 1945-51 was unable to keep popular support in the years to come, they were unable to implement what some hoped would be a fully socialist agenda. Without the high level of nationalism that Britain experienced due to the victory of World War II, the Labour Party would not have been able to take Britain from being a predominately capitalist to a socialist society.

The early twentieth century was a time of political shifts all across the globe and this includes Britain's shift to socialism. This was due to many issues but mostly revolved around Britain's part in World War II and how the nation was brought together as a result of the war. During the early twentieth century in Britain there were those who supported socialist social policies, but due to the conservative party in power and Britain's capitalist economy it was hard for these social policies to be implemented. In order for socialist reforms to be put into place something was needed to act as a catalyst to bring popular support for socialist reforms to the forefront. This catalyst would be World War II. The war effort would require better accountability of how the government would be able to take care of the suffering population. Part of this would be laid out by Sir William Beveridge in the Beveridge Report, which was aimed primarily at health insurance, but also addressed other reforms that Beveridge viewed as necessary. The end of the war brought with it the elections of 1945 in which the Labour Party won a surprising victory. The Labour Party had only held a majority in Parliament for three out of the previous forty-five years and conservative Winston Churchill, who was viewed as being the Prime Minister who rallied the British and won the war, was expected to carry on in rebuilding Britain after the war. Nationalism

was a powerful factor in this election in that it acted as a binding agent in which the country was united by the desire for a new direction for how the country was operated. Having won the election, the Labour Party went to work implementing social reforms and its socialist agenda of nationalization. Clement Attlee was to be the leader who tried to find the balance between those within the Labour party who wanted a fully socialist agenda and those who wanted a minimum of socialist policies. As men returned from service and women returned home from the wartime industries jobs, now was the time for the socialist system to work. However, due to the economic restraints put on the system it is evident that this was a system that was not yet strong enough to support itself.

While not being a member of the Labour Party, the writer George Orwell was a politically charged writer who often wrote about the dangers of corrupt capitalist *and* communist political systems. His writings are often misunderstood as being *against* socialism, but Orwell was a staunch socialist who truly believed that socialism was the best of systems. During the war Orwell wrote about patriotism and how England was a great country but it could be better through implementing socialism. Beveridge, Attlee, and Orwell all three played a part in bringing socialism, at least partially, to Britain, but it was the war that gave socialism the support from the British population it needed to be implemented. The type of control that the war time coalition government had was one geared towards controlling the population and in this way it supported the population in ways as never before. Moreover, it was this type of control that the Labour Party would continue to use after the war in implementing the social reform and socialist policies.

The Labour Party and the Implementation of Socialist Policy

As with the rest of Europe, Britain lay in economic turmoil at the end of the Second World War. Even in victory the British political future was a toss-up, as evident by the then surprising victory of the Labour Party in the election of 1945. Throughout the war a coalition government ran the country under the wartime mentality of control, in which the government was geared towards the war effort and civilian social welfare. The Labour Party would, through popular support, continue this type of control during the postwar period in an attempt to implement social reforms aimed towards the goal of making Britain a socialist state. Under this type of governance the Labour Party was able to continue

policies such as free meals in schools¹ but also expand other policies like those geared towards health care. The Labour Party also used this time to implement policies towards nationalization of private industry. These two together would form the basis of the socialist reforms from which the socialist push would come. Starting with the Bank of England in 1946, industries were starting to be put under government control in order to implement austerity measures or to enforce the ones already in place². Twenty percent of productive industry would end up being nationalized and these included mining and railways as well as the health care industry which under governmental control would be reorganized as the National Health Service (NHS). This system was to be the tool in which any British citizen would receive health care at no charge to the patient with the doctor to be reimbursed by the government³. In *The Future That Doesn't Work* (1977) several authors put forth their ideas regarding British socialism. As far as British medicine the author points to issues that have come to plague the NHS since its creation⁴. One of the problems presented is that of the compensation of the general practitioners. Due to protest from within the medical field, compromises were made to be able to both work under the NHS as well as to continue seeing private patients, which could be viewed as one of the first socialist ideological failures of the NHS. Under the 9/11 agreement, reached between interests in the Labour Party and the Tories, a medical consultant would be allowed to receive 9/11th of a full time consultant's pay in order to be able to see private patients. Other evidence of ideological failure of the system came in 1951 when the NHS started charging for eyeglasses and false teeth with the goal of saving an estimated £23 million⁵. This act also caused the resignation of Aneurin Bevan who ideologically was a socialist and who was the MP who helped guild NHS legislation through Parliament as well as helped organize and operate it until his resignation. In true socialist form Aneurin Bevan said "we ought to take pride in the fact that despite our financial and economic anxieties, we are still able to do the most civilized thing in the world—put the welfare of the sick in front of every other consideration."⁶

¹ James Hinton, *Labour and Socialism*. (Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press, 1983), p171.

² Hinton, *Labour and Socialism*, p171.

³ Harry Schwartz, "The Infirmary of British Medicine" in *The Future That Doesn't Work*, ed. R. Emmett Tyrrell, Jr. (New York: Doubleday 1977), p34.

⁴ Ibid.

⁵ Ibid, p 27.

⁶ Schwartz, "The Infirmary of British Medicine" in *The Future That Doesn't Work*, ed. by R. Emmett Tyrrell, Jr., p24-5.

A 1942 government report titled “Social Insurance and Allied Services,” later known after its author Sir William Beveridge, put forth an idea on the reforming of the insurance system within Britain in which the old system was deemed ineffective and a new system should take its place. This report was meant as an informative guide for the government. What the report called for is a system of state run compulsory insurance schemes. According to Beveridge, as one of the “Three Guiding Principles of Recommendations” in the report, that the future proposals should learn from the past system by these “sectional interests” should not have any bearings on those future proposals⁷. It is his second guiding principle that shows more of the ideological nature of what Beveridge is trying to accomplish. In it he writes about the “five giants on the road to reconstruction.”⁸ These five giants are “disease, ignorance, squalor, idleness, and want.”⁹ It is these five things that he believes will be attacked by not only his new organization of social insurance but other areas of social reform for this report is only, or should be only, but one step in an overall policy of “social progress,” which has the noblest of aspirations. And it is clear by the third of the Guiding Principles that what Beveridge intends to include is the idea that while the system is between the individual and the state there should be room for the individual to better his standing economically and doing so voluntarily. At the same time, Beveridge states that “the state should offer security for service and contribution, addressing how the state should not “stifle incentive, opportunity, responsibility.”¹⁰ Ideologically, it seems as this system is a socialist system aimed at relieving society’s ills. The issue of want is the biggest “ill” in Beveridge’s idea of the then current system. This want stems from “an interruption or loss of earning power.”¹¹ In his explanation of such he describes this as being derived from the inequalities of the flawed system of capitalism. That is why he reasons that to prevent this interruption or loss from occurring three things must happen:

1. A widening of current coverings.
2. To cover those presently (1942) excluded.
3. Raising the rates of the benefits.¹²

⁷ Sir William Beveridge, *Social Insurance and Allied Services*, (New York: Macmillan company, 1942).

⁸ Ibid.

⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰ Beveridge, *Social Insurance and Allied Services*.

¹¹ Ibid.

¹² Ibid.

But relieving the interruption or loss situation is only the first issue in the abolition of want. The second widens the scope a bit to accept “family needs” in this “interruption and loss” period. It sets forth to accept the idea of income adjustments based on the needs in the form of children’s allowances but these are to be given not only in times of unemployment but in times of employment as well. The reason is that without fulltime allowances the lower paid workers with large families will still have that “want” during times of employment, and secondly in a time of employment the foresaid large family’s income will be larger than in time of unemployment.

Throughout the report, Beveridge states that the aim of the report is reform of the insurance system. However, he also dives off into issues affected by the system as well as society’s influence on the system. Throughout the report Beveridge lays out the reforms needed as well as those needing it. He states that the plan as being “all-embracing” but it is still “classified in application.”¹³ This is in relation to the different make up of an individuals, i.e. recipients, position, be it the gainfully employed, the housewife, or those below or above the working age. This is how he makes a system that recognizes a person’s position within that society. In the plan itself he details how these groups would be covered by the various social reforms implemented, such as unemployment benefits, pensions, and medical treatment. At the same time, he addresses the need to fund a society as such, and that it is society which should fund it no matter what the individuals draw from it. This is where the plan comes to insurance, and a compulsory power of the state over society. In doing so the report lays out the need for the individual to participate, but the report makes a statement in recognizing the British citizen’s desire in not wanting “free allowances,” but “benefits in return for contributions.”¹⁴ The significance of this statement is that Beveridge already noted that the reason for giving full allowances even in times of employment is to keep the larger families income larger than that during unemployment and to keep the “want” out. The Beveridge Report laid the ideological groundwork for the then future of the British state. It would set up a system of social reforms in which the state would take over the different areas in which it felt were beneficial to ease society’s ills, desire, and wants, in essence becoming the modern welfare state.

While never having been put into practice, the Beveridge Report did act as a guide in forming postwar Labour Party doctrine in which the state of Britain

¹³ Beveridge, *Social Insurance and Allied Services*.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*

was to become, some could argue, a socialist state. The report had a good deal of support from the British people when it was released in 1942. One reason was that in times of a raging war Britons were taking care of Britons, thereby bonding a country's population into a cohesive society fixed on similar goals amidst the times of tragedy and eventual victory. As stated in the Beveridge report, during this time of war a "revolutionary moment in the world's history is a time for revolutions, not for patching"¹⁵ in referring to the need of a new system.

Sir William Beveridge's Other Works

The Beveridge Report is often linked to socialist reforms of post-World War II. Beveridge, being a socialist, strove to bring about other socialist reforms. Having been educated at Oxford University in the early years of the twentieth century he gained interest in social reform.¹⁶ It is shortly thereafter that Beveridge came to work in the East End of London for several years seeing firsthand the issues of the poor and, more important to his work, the issue of unemployment. During the First World War Beveridge worked within the government and shortly after the war was knighted. Because Beveridge had what some might call an inflated sense of self he often times rubbed people the wrong way and therefore alienated himself from having more support from within the government. The issue of the nature of the so called committee set up to examine the state of insurance in Britain can be looked at as a prime example. In the section on Beveridge in the book *Fifty Key Figures in Twentieth-Century British Politics* the author explains how due to his nature it was only in 1940 that Beveridge was asked to join the government but even then in a "relatively insignificant Ministry of Labour manpower survey."¹⁷ From here he was then permitted to become chairman of the inquiry. It was only that due to the controversial nature of the report that it was decided between the powers that be, Arthur Greenwood namely, that Beveridge would sign the report himself and that the others, being civil servants, would be regarded as his advisers."¹⁸ For a person like Beveridge, the popular support shown to the report could only bolster his desire for the social reforms.

Beveridge's past political writing revolved around the issue of unemployment, and he would continue to write about the need for those type of

¹⁵ Beveridge, *Social Insurance and Allied Services*.

¹⁶ Keith Laybourn, *Fifty Key Figures in Twentieth-Century British Politics*, (London: Routledge, 2002).

¹⁷ Ibid.

¹⁸ Laybourn, *Fifty Key Figures in Twentieth-Century British Politics*, p 34.

reforms after his report's publication, even tying them together in his report *Full Employment in a Free Society*. Published in 1944, the report lays out that its aim is at "freedom from idleness and sets out a policy for full employment to achieve that aim".¹⁹ While the idea of 100% employment may seem ambitious, Beveridge actually sets his standard for full employment around 97%²⁰, pointing out that there would always be someone who could not work at some point. It is through a certain passage titled "Preservation of Essential Liberties" that the liberation side of Beveridge appears when he talks about how civil liberties such as "freedom of worship, speech, writing, study and teaching", and even "free assembly" whose goal could be "peaceful change of governing authority" and included in the idea around this work of unemployment in a "free society."²¹ For without this freedom Beveridge realized the system would be one of totalitarianism, as Orwell probably would agree, and therefore unequal in this sense. However, Beveridge states that these "essential liberties... do not include liberty of a private citizen to own means of production and to employ other citizens in operating them at a wage."²² He states that while the goal is full employment not through the abolition of property, i.e. the means of production, but if it is required then "abolition would have to be undertaken."²³ This attitude seemed to be prevalent throughout Britain not only during the war but after the war and it seems this reasoning could be what leads the Labour Party to implementing some of its policies on nationalization.

Ideal Socialism and Reality

The socialist attitude held by Beveridge, and set forth by his report, and those held by others such as Attlee, A. Bevan, and Orwell, while being of a pure socialist ideology, could be the downfall for the Labour Party in Britain. Or it could be the very reason that it thrived while it did because Britain was more united in the few years after the war than before. Due to the war, Britain had reformed its society to that of a wartime society in which the economy was controlled heavily by the central government and revolved around the manufacture of wartime goods. By 1945, Britain had only one-third of its prewar export industry of 1939. Along with the loss of lend-lease aid from the United States, that same year Britain was in a tough economic spot. Austerity was a

¹⁹ Sir William Beveridge, *Full Employment in a Free Society*, (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1960).

²⁰ Ibid.

²¹ Ibid.

²² Ibid.

²³ Ibid.

necessity for Britain during the war and it would help in the postwar wartime governmental controlled plan of implementing the Labour Party's socialism. It would only be through another loan from America that would allow the country, under the new socialist policies, to continue to run. But even still it was under these conditions that the Labour Party moved forward with its social reforms in 1946.²⁴ Under certain political ideology, like communism and according to Karl Marx, in order to be able to reach ideal socialism the capitalist system must not only come first but must flourish in order to show the injustices that the bourgeois class causes the proletarian class²⁵. It is this capitalist system, with its massive infrastructure of industries that will provide the means to be able to create an equal society through the evolution of the working classes moving their way to an area where they actually control the power, or what is equated with power, and that being the means of production. When the need for capital ceases due to the circle of production then the socialist system can flourish. This is the way, the road if you will, to socialism but the desire for the equality that comes from deep within the lower classes may stem from being within a system that promotes the idea of liberalism. This is shown in the theory put forth in the *Three Instances of Hegemony in the History of the Capitalist World Economy*. The author states that Britain having been one of the three Hegemonic powers, 1815-73, "tended to be advocates of Global Liberalism."²⁶ It was this sense of liberalism focusing on not only the betterment of self but also betterment of fellow men that can lead to the whole range of what are civil liberties. Under this hegemonic time is when more freedoms, per se, were given not only in the area of not only civil liberties but also to the area of "flow of the factors of production,"²⁷ the "Free market." Where this idea may differ from socialism could be better explained by Sir Winston Churchill: "Liberalism has its own history and its own tradition. Socialism has its formulas and aims. Socialism seeks to pull down the wealth; Liberalism seeks to raise up poverty.... Socialism exalts the rule; Liberalism exalts the man. Socialism attacks capital; Liberalism attacks monopoly."²⁸ While being a political opponent of socialism through his conservative politics, these words do sum up some of Churchill's feelings and ideas about socialism. Since the Labour Party government of 1945-51 was unable to keep popular support in the years to

²⁴ Hinton, *Labour and Socialism*, p169.

²⁵ Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, *The Communist Manifesto*. (London: Penguin Classics, 2002).

²⁶ Immanuel Wallerstein "Hegemonic Power and Stability" in *Theoretical Evolution of International Political Economy*, ed. George T. Crane and Abba Amawi (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997).

²⁷ Ibid.

²⁸ Viscount Simon, "Churchill as a Liberal" in *Churchill: By His Contemporaries*, ed. By Charles Eade (London: Morrison and Gibb, 1955), P60.

come they were unable to implement what some hoped would be a fully socialist agenda. The NHS continues today but due to the liberal ideas even within the conservative party it was an ideological and political win when first introduced with even Churchill saying the Beveridge Report was an ideal plan.²⁹ But due to the conservative party's restraints on politics during the war, the Beveridge Report and the Labour Party's resolution to support and implement the report was defeated in February of 1943.³⁰ But this was also a time of unity in which all Britons were suffering the effects of war, which has its ways of connecting a population. This might be the reason that the Labour Party had a more decisive, as well as surprising, victory in the General Election of 1945. It was during the war in which there was a replacement of the old school meal system as a means to free up time to allow the housewives and mothers to enter the work force. The Blitz created and fed the need for emergency housing and health care³¹ and all to be provided by the government. Both of these last two issues are ones that would continue past the war within the socialist agenda of the Labour Party. But government was unable to fulfill the housing needs appropriately due to not only the economics of rebuilding a country after a war but also providing for the new wartime families and the baby boom that accompanied it.

The Labour Party would not be able to fully implement a socialist system because the Labour Party lost its majority hold on Parliament during the elections of 1951. The attitudes had changed between 1945 and 1951. No longer was everyone an equal in Britain, the hard times were over, or were supposed to be at least. As men returned from service and women returned home from the wartime industries jobs, now was the time for the socialist system to work. But due to the economic restraints put on the system it is evident that this was a system that was not yet strong enough to support itself. In a book titled *Government Failure and Over Government* and in the section titled "Beveridge's Error" the author states that "It is that the main services of what became 'the welfare state' suffered from three crucial defects in disregarding the changing conditions of the people:

1. They were introduced too soon by false argument and before the private mechanisms could show their superiority.

²⁹ Schwartz, "The Infirmity of British Medicine" in *The Future That Doesn't Work*, ed. by R. Emmett Tyrell, jr.

³⁰ Laybourn, *Fifty Key Figures in Twentieth-Century British Politics*.

³¹ Schwartz, "The Infirmity of British Medicine" in *The Future That Doesn't Work*, ed. by R. Emmett Tyrell, Jr.

2. They were maintained too large in forms that did not respond to or reflect individual private wishes.
3. And they were continued far too long when they had become superfluous because the people could provide them privately with better regard for individual preferences.”³²

It was a return to the normalcy of prewar capitalist desire almost, if there could be a normalcy at this point that doomed the Labour Party in the 1951 elections. But in 1945 it was the desire for a better society that allowed the Labour Party to come to power. Even in 1947 the Labour Party was having political problems within its ranks, primarily focusing around the argument of the steel industry and whether it should be nationalized. Part of the theory of nationalizing Britain at the time was that the government would only target loss-making industries as a means to redirect private capital into other, still private, sectors.³³ Also problems arose over coal shortages, the value of borrowed dollars, and the government’s “repression of socialist possibilities in liberated Europe.”³⁴ These situations led to political turmoil in Britain early in the phase of the implementing socialist reforms during the Labour Party’s rule, and in part ensuring the downfall of the Labour Party which guaranteed that a full socialist program would not be able to be put into effect. The policies that were put into place, however, were carried out under the guidance of Clement Attlee. It was Attlee who acted as the balance within the Labour Party between those who wanted a full socialist agenda and those who wanted a more selective set of socialist social reforms.

Clement Attlee

The question could quite often be asked if it is the man who makes the moment or is it the moment that makes the man. In the case of Clement Attlee the two-sided question posed carries weight on both sides. Born in 1883, Attlee was a member of parliament from 1922-55 representing the Labour Party. It was Attlee who led the Labour Party not only as a part of the wartime coalition government but also as Prime Minister of Parliament following the war in the years of 1945-51. It was under his guidance and leadership that the social reforms of Britain were put into place in the post war era. Throughout his life Attlee saw the need for social reforms. From the time he was a social worker in London’s East

³² Arthur Seldon, *The Collected Works of Arthur Seldon: Government Failure and Over-Government*, ed. Colin Robinson (Indianapolis: Liberty Fund, 2005), p169.

³³ Hinton, *Labor and Socialism*, p172.

³⁴ *Ibid*, p173.

End in 1908³⁵ to the wartime coalition government, Attlee would work towards a goal of a socialist Britain. After having control of Parliament for a short period of time in 1924 and then again from 1929-31,³⁶ within the Labour Party there seemed to be in the early 1930s a need for a new leader. The so-called old guard could not keep up with policies and demand for the type of socialism that was coming about. This is why along with his input in policy-making of the Labour Party, Attlee became party leader in 1935 after having made a somewhat surprising rise to power in the Labour Party.³⁷ When the subject of socialism came up, however, in modern conversations one must be careful to keep a neutral bias to a post-Cold War idea of what socialism is and must try to envision it as in the political realm of the charged political climate of early twentieth century European context. "Attlee's fundamental political concept was that socialism should be achieved through democratic means. Attlee's socialism was not doctrinaire; rather, it was his response to the human circumstances and contemporary conditions which he knew in London's East End and during the depression."³⁸ It seems that while the point of socialism is that the governmental control is for the good of the public, the protection of the collective; Attlee knew that the need for the betterment of the people needed to be the driving force behind socialism. Some of Attlee's early political policy writings had more to do with political reform, i.e. cabinet reform, and nationalization than society's ills. This could be that Attlee knew that the public need was there already but now the governmental system needed to catch up to that public need. His chance would not come in a time of peace but instead in a time of war. In 1940, after the election of the conservative Sir Winston Churchill as Prime Minister, Churchill offered to form a coalition government with the Labour Party. This set the stage for a Labour Party influence on British political policy that they had not had before. In 1942 Attlee was Deputy Prime Minister under Churchill and throughout the war remained in the war cabinet.³⁹ While the two did not always see eye to eye on political issues they were able to act as a check and balance system upon each other's political views as was demonstrated, for example, during their discussion over the publication of the Beveridge Report. While the checks did not allow for passage of the Beveridge Report, there was some support from Churchill after the initial resistance; he saw the good that could come about by further bringing the

³⁵Kenneth O. Morgan, *Labour in Power: 1945-1951*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1984), p45-51.

³⁶ *Ibid.*

³⁷ Robert Pearce, *Profiles in Power: Attlee*, (London: Longman, 1997).

³⁸ Jerry H Brookshire. "Attlee and Cabinet Reform, 1930-1945", *The Historical Journal*, Vol. 24, No. 1 (Mar., 1981) pp175-188. P 178.

³⁹ Pearce, *Profiles in Power: Attlee*, 95.

county together. However, the issue of Attlee's involvement in the wartime coalition government allowed for the Labour Party policies to be put into place in certain situations. Policies of nationalization were used as means to help the war effort. Food rationing was first introduced in Britain at the beginning of the war, and it would not be the only thing rationed. Clothes and different forms of fuel were rationed as well.⁴⁰ Some issues that the wartime coalition government would have effect on are that of unemployment, health care, and housing. While all these issues were affected by the war it was under Attlee's leadership during the post-war that these policies continued.

The British people seemed to be at a tipping point in 1945, and this was Attlee's chance of putting forth socialism through democratic means. Attlee, as well as other Labour leaders, who have had the needed experience of what governmental control is capable of, continued this ideologically socialist agenda during the postwar period. The Labour controlled government pushed through no less than seventy-five measures in the "first year of socialist rule."⁴¹ While Attlee was a socialist, one could ask to what degree was he a socialist and to what degree was he a politician? Through the 1920s and 1930s, he wrote about nationalization of industry as well as governmental control, but once Prime Minister it seems that he acted as a center balance from within the Labour Party between the left and right factions of the party. Left-wingers, such as Aneurin Bevan, wanted full nationalization due to the principle idea that private ownership led to "exploration of workers in the interests of the wealthy few."⁴² There were also influences in Britain that made the issue of nationalization moot. It would come once again to those in which the system serves. The very people who are being uplifted by the act of nationalization felt that the industries did not belong to them.⁴³ This is what was dangerous to Attlee the politician. He knew that to achieve the welfare state it had to be reached by conscience.⁴⁴ This conscience brought him to power in 1945 and the lack of it is what took him from power in 1951.

The Union Jack, British Nationalism

British nationalism had a great deal of input in implementing the postwar socialist social reforms. The issue of nationalism was somewhat new to the world through the world wars. Before the nineteenth and twentieth centuries most

⁴⁰ Philip Warner, *World War Two: The Untold Story*, (London: Cassell & Co, 1988), p 59.

⁴¹ Morgan, *Labour in Power: 1945-1951*, p99.

⁴² Pearce, *Profiles in Power: Attlee*, p147.

⁴³ *Ibid*, p147.

⁴⁴ Pearce, *Profiles in Power: Attlee*, p152.

counties, nations, populations, cultures, or whatever political term given, were more tied to their monarch than to their actual nation-states. It was during the First World War when countries fought for the “preservation or restoration of their nation-states.”⁴⁵ According to Michael Howard, it was an “enhanced sense of national pride and achievement” that stemmed from the Battle of Britain in 1940, as well as the victory at the battle of El Alamein that led to Britain thinking higher of its actual position as not only as a great nation-state but also a super power.⁴⁶ It could quite possibly be this thinking, along with other theories presented, that led to such a strong sense of self in which the British felt connected to each other in ways never before. By having this feeling, it opens up, along with other factors, the door for the Labour Party in winning its surprising victory in the General Election of 1945. It seems that at a time when nationalist sentiments were high, as in 1940, 1942, and 1945, the desire for a population to care for itself, i.e., as a collective through socialist measures, would follow and be just as high. Even though nationalism is usually an exclusive idea in that it keeps groups out of a certain classification, i.e. a country, sometimes nationalism presents an idea, or quite possibly an illusion that everybody is equal, being that all have suffered through the same tragic event.

The Idea of a Pure Idea

The author George Orwell may be considered one of the twentieth century’s greatest political writers. His views were in favor of a socialist system. His status as an ideologically pure socialist was sometimes debated, and he never wrote a complete socialist program. It would seem that such an ideologically driven man like Orwell would have done so, but Orwell decided to write instead against the injustices of a capitalist society in early writings and against totalitarianism in his later writings. Examples of such are his writing about the plight of the miners in Wigan in *The Road to Wigan Pier* (1937)⁴⁷ as an early writing and later examples in *Animal Farm* (1945),⁴⁸ as well as *1984* (1934).⁴⁹ For the sake of this article the author will try to diverge from any literary critique but use the works more as a guide to who George Orwell was ideologically and politically. Orwell was born to a lower middle class family who, due to class

⁴⁵ Michael Howard, “War and the Nation-State”, *Daedalus*, Vol. 108, No. 4, (Fall, 1979), pp. 101-110. p104.

⁴⁶ *Ibid*, p 101-110.

⁴⁷ J.R. Hammond, *A George Orwell Companion*, (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1982). Publishing dates pulled from respective section from within Hammond’s book.

⁴⁸ *Ibid*.

⁴⁹ *Ibid*.

implications at the time, were somewhat obligated to serve as civil servants. This is what brought Orwell to India to serve as a police officer for several years and from which his work titled *Burmese Days* (1934) is based. It is this time in which Orwell sees that under an empirical system injustices can occur, whereas before in his early writing not only was he unaware but quite possibly he was unaware that he could be unaware. In Zwerdling's *Orwell and the Left* he states that Orwell could have been a "writer who neither understands why things are as they are in his society nor can imagine the possibility of a really different world."⁵⁰ But it seems that maybe Orwell found his imagination as he grew as a writer and a person. It seems that by following Orwell's chronologically ordered works one could follow the evolution of Orwell's forming ideology. From *Burmese Days* his eyes were opened to injustices. In *The Road to Wigan Pier*, he champions the working class, in the *Homage to Catalonia* (1938), based on his involvement during the Spanish Civil War, he established the socialist idea as a workable one, and in *Animal Farm* he warned against the corruption that is possible to the communist system. Having noted earlier that Orwell never penned a complete socialist program, he did at least once lay out a simplified program in the section of his work *The Lion and The Unicorn* (1941) in which he lays out his suggestion for what the people should want during this time of war and it is a six-point program, of which three points are focused on domestic issues while the other three are foreign policy related. In this program, he lays out what Britain needs at this time to become socialist.⁵¹ In doing this he has firmly stated, and with popular support at the time of publishing has shown, that the want for Britons to have a socialist society was present indeed.

Many of Orwell's published works promoted socialism. He believed in the system to which he belonged in England to be an outdated and corrupt one as demonstrated in the section of his work titled *The Lion and the Unicorn*. In this work, he makes reference to England being comprised of multiple nations when examined economically. The real issue of this writing, however, is that it is a piece of work that actually promotes patriotism. If this is the case then why attack the system while trying to raise it up? Several reasons for this could exist: Orwell saw the system as wrong in some areas but he also discusses how through the advancement of the middle, and especially the advancement of the working class the system, wages and general quality of life have risen over the previous 100 years. To analyze *The Lion and the Unicorn* further one must note the difference

⁵⁰ Alex Zwerdling, *Orwell and the left*, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1974).

⁵¹ George Orwell, *The Lion and The Unicorn*. Last accessed April 24, 2012 through URL <http://orwell.ru/library/essays/lion/english/>

between nationalism and patriotism as laid out in Orwell's *Notes on Nationalism*.⁵² On the surface the two items at hand may seem similar but from Orwell's view they were on separate ends all together. Nationalism was seen by Orwell as a tool of corruption to rule over a population whereas patriotism was a population's tool to rule over its nation. *The Lion and the Unicorn* was written and released early in the war and was received well by most of the British population. This work could be categorized as being propaganda, and for its very nature it was. Within the first section Orwell lays out an idealistic idea of what England was, i.e. better beer be it "bitterer"⁵³ and the view of the "grass is greener" imagery. It seems that while the so-called nationalist movement was strong within Britain during the war, Orwell's idea of patriotism was a force behind that nationalism.

The goal that Orwell was trying to accomplish was to appeal to every citizen in the attempt to be that they were the ones who controlled their destiny through their patriotism. Even though Orwell critiques certain groups with this work he still supports a strong idea of tying oneself to one's country and to one's countrymen, as exemplified by how the English would refuse to use a foreign language even overseas. One of the groups which Orwell attacked was the "left-wing intelligentsia."⁵⁴ He viewed it not as the solution of the problem but a problem in their own right, stating that they "lack at all times ... any constructive suggestion".⁵⁵ The point that Orwell seemed to be trying to make was that at that moment in time they should be Englishmen first and class members second. In building up to what is a nation, a population and its doings must be taken into account for this is where a liberation, socialist included, type of power is going to come from. In part three of *The Lion and the Unicorn*, which Orwell titled "The English Revolution," he talks about some issues with the socialism of 1940. He stated that if the changes were to come, then initiatives were to come from below. He made it clear that since this never happened in England before, must happen now: "a Socialist movement that actually has the mass of the people behind it."⁵⁶ This is the very thing that leads to the implementation of social reforms during and postwar, the mass of the people.

⁵² George Orwell *Notes on Socialism*. Last accessed April 24, 2012 through URL http://orwell.ru/library/essays/nationalism/english/e_nat

⁵³ Orwell, *The Lion and The Unicorn*.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*

The Difference between 1945 and 1951

Britain was already in a hard spot in 1939 when the war started and what most of the British people had in common was the desire for a better life and a better system to give them that life. The early part of the twentieth century was an active time in the scope of world politics with old forms of government being replaced with untested, ideological types of rule. Britain has had its fair share of class distinction and class warfare but due to the hard times before and the war itself, the population was drawn together to declare that a better way was needed. This was to be shown through the 1945 election of Attlee. The bonding effect that the war had, be it Orwell's idea of patriotism, the general nature of nationalization, or through military victories, would only be the means to implement socialist policy in Britain. The actual strength would come from the people who by 1951 no longer had the bonds they did just after the victory over Nazi Germany in 1945. The Labour Party's ways of implementing socialism were ideologically socialist, but due to economic constraints on an already economically hurting country, could the system support itself? The Labour Party was to do this by becoming the Welfare State in which the government had a responsibility to care for its citizens. To accomplish this it would require the changing of an economic system that was geared to making wealth to one geared to redistributing that wealth. But in this system there was a sense that the almost broke nation of Britain had a better society in mind. In the short term it was harder on the country, which recovered more slowly than other countries during the postwar period. However, this was the burden that Britain decided to bear in its attempt to create that better society.

In conclusion, with nationalism at a high point, the Labour Party was able to win the 1945 election. With this win, the Labour Party was able to continue certain social reform policies that began during the war and to implement some socialist social policies during the postwar period that would have been impossible to do prior to the war due to the lack of nationalist sentiment. The Beveridge Report, while never gaining full support during the war, acted as a guide to the social reforms that would come postwar. There would need to be a leader who was able to act as a center point of the socialist social reforms. This leader was Clement Attlee who was able to be a voice for social reform within the coalition government during the war and the voice for a balanced socialist driven agenda after the war. The level of nationalism that Britain had in 1945 was driven by the victory during the war. But George Orwell saw the difference between nationalism and patriotism, and he believed the socialist system could work but

would have to be backed by the right conditions. Orwell wanted a Britain that was ruled as a socialist system and he realized that the events of the war, the uniting of the country, could act as a way to bring Britain together as never before. Although in the early twentieth century, political shifts towards socialism were taking place within Britain, it was the Second World War that led to the implementation of socialist reforms in Britain, such as the creation of the NHS and the nationalization of different industries. Without the high level of nationalism that Britain experienced due to the victory of World War II, nationalism that was also brought about by tragedies and suffering, the Labour Party would not have been able to take Britain from being a predominately capitalist country to one of a socialist type society.

Bibliography

- Beveridge, Sir William. *Social Insurance and Allied Services*. New York: Macmillan company 1942.
- Beveridge, Sir William. *Full Employment in a Free Society*. London: George Allen & Unwin, 1960.
- Brookshire, Jerry H. "Attlee and Cabinet Reform, 1930-1945", *The Historical Journal*, Vol. 24, No. 1 (Mar., 1981) pp175-188.
- Colbert, Stephen. *I Am America: And So Can You*. New York: Grand Central Publishing, 2007.
- Hammond, J.R. *A George Orwell Companion*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1982.
- Hinton, James. *Labour and Socialism*. Great Britain: University of Massachusetts Press, 1983.
- Howard, Michael. "War and the Nation-State", *Daedalus*, Vol. 108, No. 4, (Fall, 1979), pp 101-110.
- Laybourn, Keith. *Fifty Key Figures in Twentieth-Century British Politics*. London: Routledge, 2002.
- Marx, Karl and Friedrich Engels, *Communist Manifesto*. London: Penguin Classics, 2002.
- Morgan, Kenneth, O. *Labour in Power: 1945-1951*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1984.

- Orwell, George. *Notes on Socialism*. Last accessed April 24, 2012 through URL http://orwell.ru/library/essays/nationalism/english/e_nat
- Orwell, George. *The Lion and The Unicorn*. Last accessed April 24, 2012 through URL <http://orwell.ru/library/essays/lion/english/>
- Pearce, Robert. *Profiles in Power: Attlee*. London: Longman, 1997.
- Seldon, Arthur. *The Collected Works of Arthur Seldon: Government Failure and Over-Government*, ed. Colin Robinson. Indianapolis: Liberty Fund, 2005.
- Simon, Viscount. "Churchill as a Liberal" in *Churchill: By His Contemporaries*, ed. by Charles Eade. London: Morrison and Gibb, 1955.
- Schwartz, Harry. "The Infirmary of British Medicine" in *The Future That Doesn't Work*, ed. by R. Emmett Tyrell, Jr. New York: Doubleday, 1977.
- Wallerstein, Immanuel. "Hegemonic Power and Stability" in *Theoretical Evolution of International Political Economy*, ed. George T. Crane and Abba Amawi, 244-252. New York: Oxford University Press, 1997.
- Warner, Philip. *World War Two: The Untold Story*. London: Cassell & Co, 1988.
- Zwerdling, Alex. *Orwell and the Left*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1974.

Faculty Essay

A Research Update from Dr. Jennifer Ann Newman Treviño

Each year we plan to ask Troy faculty members to provide an update on their research, as well as the story of how their research or career in history has evolved. Dr. Treviño, our first volunteer, is a Civil War historian who teaches on the Montgomery campus. She received her PhD in history from Auburn University in 2009. Below she discusses the origins and major arguments of her book project, now nearing completion, and provides extensive historiographical footnotes for interested students and scholars.

Throughout my life my passion for history has led me to devote a great deal of time to reading, research, and writing. I am currently revising and editing my manuscript tentatively titled, *Alabama Women, Self-Identity, and Religion During the Civil War*. This research project has a long history dating back to a paper I wrote as an undergraduate. I have always been in love with the Civil War and fascinated with the southern women's personal experiences during the conflict. This interest was what led to the term paper from which my dissertation and now book manuscript eventually emerged. As I continued my education I knew that I wanted to write my dissertation for my Ph.D. on southern women during the Civil War, but I needed to narrow it down to a feasible original research project.

The Civil War's popularity among historians as well as the general public made my task extremely difficult; over 50,000 books, articles, pamphlets, and other documents about the Civil War had been published when I started my project.¹ By this point I had read hundreds of books on different aspects of the Civil War, so I located and read every secondary source I could find that dealt with women, especially southern women, during the war. I also continued looking for wartime writings of southern women. As I did so I noticed the trend that had caught my attention in my undergraduate research paper; faith and religious beliefs permeated almost every source I examined. Armed with a preliminary bibliography, primary sources, notes, and a general thesis that religion was central to southern women's self-identity and experiences during the war, I met with my advisor. He thought that my proposed project had

¹ For an estimate on the number of works published on the Civil War see, Internet Public Library Special Collections, <<http://www.ipl.org/div/pf/entry/48451>> (accessed on March 4, 2013).

potential, but was concerned about its broad scope because I originally planned to examine the wartime writings of every southern woman I could find so that my research would be comprehensive and encompass the entire Confederacy. After further discussion, my advisor looked at me in all seriousness and asked, “Jennifer, do you ever want to finish your dissertation?” I was initially confused, because of course I did! He then told me what all historians are told or realize at some point during their career – I needed to *further* narrow down and focus my topic. That made perfect sense and I set off to see where my sources would lead.

I spent the next several months searching for southern women’s Civil War writings in archives across the South and found so many personal writings from women living in Alabama that I decided to conduct a case study based on their personal wartime writings. I wanted to give them a voice and let them tell the story of how they experienced the war. Although many works explore various aspects of the Confederacy, including southern women, some of whom lived in Alabama during the war, none focuses specifically on Alabamian women’s religious beliefs and their construction of Confederate identity. I had found my topic!

The only criterion I used to select women to include in this study was that they left a written record of their lives. This meant that my study would naturally have limitations: I could only look at the lives of women who were literate (around fifty percent of white Alabama women were literate in 1850), recorded their thoughts and experiences on paper, and whose writings had survived the war.² Interestingly enough, I found writings from women that

² Historian George Rable has also pointed out, when constructing the lives of women in the Civil War South, even for those whom ample evidence is available, there are still many missing pieces. Despite these limitations, however, for those women who did leave a record of their wartime experiences a fairly accurate picture of their lives can be constructed. See George Rable, *Civil Wars: Women and the Crisis of Southern Nationalism* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1989), 3; Susanna Delfino and Michele Gillespie eds., *Neither Lady Nor Slave: Working Women of the Old South* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2002), 1. Published accounts of women during the war abound. For example see, Earl Schenck Miers, ed. *When the World Ended: The Diary of Emma LeConte*, Forward by Anne Firor Scott (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 1987); Parthenia Antoinette Hague, *A Blockaded Family: Life in Southern Alabama During the Civil War*. Introduction by Elizabeth Fox-Genovese (1888; repr., Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 1991); Charles G. Waugh and Martin H. Greenberg, *The Women’s War in the South: Recollections and Reflections of the American Civil War* (Nashville: Cumberland House, 1999); Cary, *Refugitta of Richmond: The Wartime Recollections, Grave and Gay, of Constance Cary Harrison*. Eds. Nathaniel Cheairs Hughes, Jr. and S. Kittrell Rushing (Knoxville, TN: The University of Tennessee Press, 2011); David Mathews, *Why Public Schools? Whose Public Schools? What Early Communities Have to Tell Us* (Montgomery: New South Books, 2003), 19. During the antebellum era the number of white Alabamians who received some form of formal education through the use of private tutors, public or private schools, academies, seminaries, and colleges grew and became more important,

represented a wide variety of the Alabama population; they range from single girls in their early teens to married women in their sixties; women from wealthy slaveholding families (one woman's family had as many as eighty slaves) and from families who appear to have owned no slaves; they lived across the entire state of Alabama, from Huntsville to Mobile. In the end, however, all of the women in the study ended up being middle and upper-class, literate, white, Protestant women.³

The Civil War profoundly impacted the lives of these women and brought cataclysmic changes to their lives; none escaped being affected by the conflict. Many struggled to come to grips with the turmoil it caused and attempted to cope with its horrors. Writing gave many Alabama women a way to sort through their thoughts and feelings and—despite its limitations—this study gives these women a voice by offering insight into the way that one group of Alabama women experienced the war. It also demonstrates that the impact of the war on individuals was far more than historians initially recognized or acknowledged.⁴ Ultimately, despite the fact that they missed and worried about

especially to the middle and upper classes. Historian J. Mills Thornton estimated that in 1860 around 46 percent of “whites between the ages of five and twenty” attended school. The number of public and private schools rose from around 750 in 1840 to 2,100 by 1860. J. Mills III Thornton, *Politics and Power in a Slave Society: Alabama, 1800- 1860* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1978), 293.

³ See the 1850 and 1860 U.S. Census records found at www.ancestry.com (accessed on December 1, 2008). See also Ann Douglas, *The Feminization of American Culture* (New York: Knopf, 1977), 8; Barbara Welter, *Dimity Convictions: The American Woman in the Nineteenth Century* (Athens: Ohio University Press, 1976), 21; and Zillah Haynie Brandon Diary, January 1, 1861, SPR262, Alabama Department of Archives and History (hereafter cited as ADAH). Although all were white Protestants, their denominational preferences ranged from Baptist to Methodist to Episcopalian, but they all shared the common belief in the omnipotence, omnificence, and omnipresence; God controlled everything and had a plan for the life of each individual. I also supplemented women's writings with personal letters, public writing (such as newspapers and advice manuals), and state and church documents. Historians agree on the importance of expanding the scholarly examination of the Civil War beyond the traditional focus on battles and leaders, but much work remains to be done if we are to fully understand the magnitude of the Civil War's effect on the lives of individuals. While historians have recently begun recognizing the significance of religion and women in the war, few examine the juncture of the two. Thus, this study is intended ultimately as an examination of women, and religion in Civil War Alabama.

⁴ These general statements held true for the majority of Americans, but, of course, there were exceptions to the norms. There were, for example, some women who disguised themselves as men and fought as soldiers. See De Anne Blanton and Lauren M. Cook, *They Fought Like Demons: Women Soldiers in the American Civil War* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2002). For a discussion of traditional gender norms please see, Eugene Genovese, “Toward a Kinder and Gentler America: The Southern Lady in the Greening of the Politics of the Old South,” in *In Joy and In Sorry: Women, Family, and Marriage in the Victorian South, 1830-1900*, edited by Carol Bleser (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991), 127. See also David B. Chesebrough, *Clergy Dissent in the Old South, 1830-1865* (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1996), 1, 24; Drew Gilpin Faust, ed., *The Ideology of Slavery: Proslavery Thought in the Antebellum South, 1830-1869* (Baton

their loved ones, endured great physical and emotional hardships, became discouraged at times, and mourned the loss of loved ones, religion helped these Alabama women cope with the war, defined their wartime experiences, became the core of their Confederate identity, and continued to serve as the basis of their belief in the righteousness of the Confederacy long after its demise in 1865.⁵

Antebellum gender norms naturally carried over into the post-war South and influenced the way the history of the war was written. For years Americans romanticized the conflict, debated the military decisions of significant leaders, and emphasized the heroism of the soldiers, both North and South. When writers included the story of women in the war they portrayed an image of heroism, valor, sacrifice, and undying support for the war. Women in these works did not question what was taking place around them, but humbly submitted to their fate and never faltered in their support for the Confederacy. According to historians such as Drew Gilpin Faust, such interpretations had a paternalistic aspect; it was important for men and women to craft an “exemplary narrative about the Confederate woman’s Civil War... designed to ensure her loyalty and service” both during the war and after.⁶

Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1981), 10; John Patrick Daly, *When Slavery was Called Freedom: Evangelicalism, Proslavery, and the Causes of the Civil War* (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 2002), 136; Stephen V. Ash, *When the Yankees Came: Conflict and Chaos in the Occupied South, 1861-1865* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1995); Emory M. Thomas, *The Confederate Nation: 1861-1865* (New York: Harper and Row, 1979), 16; “Church, Honor, and Disunionism” in Bertram Wyatt-Brown, *The Shaping of Southern Culture: Honor, Grace, and War, 1760s-1880s* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2001); Bertram Wyatt-Brown, *Honor and Violence in the Old South* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986); “Honor and Secession” in Bertram Wyatt-Brown, *Yankee Saints and Southern Sinners* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1985), 183-213; Wayne Flynt, *Alabama Baptists: Southern Baptists in the Heart of Dixie* (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1998), 122.

⁵ For an example of a few of the primary sources used in this project see Brandon Diary, SPR262, ADAH; Sarah Lowe Davis Diary, SPR113, ADAH; Cobb and Hunter Family Papers #1745, Southern Historical Collection, Wilson Library, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, North Carolina (hereafter cited as SHC-UNC); Nathaniel Henry Rhodes Dawson Papers, #210, SHC-UNC; Benson-Thompson Family Papers, Rare Book, Manuscripts and Special Collections, Nicholas Perkins Library, Duke University (hereafter cited as Duke); E. W. Treadwell Papers, Duke; US Federal Census, 1850, 1860, and 1870 found at ancestry.com; “A Few Words in Behalf of the Loyal Women of the United States by one of themselves,” Loyal Publication Society, No., 10 (New York: Wm. C. Bryant and Co., Printers, 1863), Manuscript at the British Library, London England; “The Bayonet! The Needle! The Plow!” *The Southwestern Baptist Alabama*, March 19, 1863; “The Ladies of Alabama Your Services are Wanted,” *The Democratic Watchtower*, March 1, 1865; “To the Ladies of Alabama,” Executive Department, Montgomery, Ala., July 20th, *Claiborne Southerner*, July 31, 1861; *Confederate Imprints 1861–1865*, “Proclamation by the Governor of Alabama,” (microfilm) reel 32, no. 1473. For examples of some of the secondary sources consulted see the other notes.

⁶ When examining the position of women in the Old South, two major interpretations exist. In Catherine Clinton’s overstated view, women were nothing more than victims of a tragic social

An article published on December 12, 1862 in the *Montgomery Daily Mail*, titled, “Woman’s Heroism,” succinctly captured not only the ideal image imposed upon women, but also an ideal that women imposed upon themselves (and indeed, this is an idea that some still view as valid to the present day). “The attitude of woman is sublime,” the article began. “Bearing all the sacrifices... she is moreover called upon to suffer in her affections, to be wounded and smitten where she feels deepest and most enduringly... Man goes to the battlefield, but woman sends him there, even though her heart strings tremble while she gives the farewell kiss and the farewell blessing.” While men were driven by the “excitement of action, by the hope of honor, by the glory of conquest” women

structure. The oppressive nature of southern society made the southern woman nothing more than a “slave of slaves” as the entire structure of southern society was biased against white plantation mistresses. The southern plantation mistress “became a prisoner of circumstance” as planters, in fear of losing their authority, tightened controls on both slaves and women throughout the antebellum era. Clinton, *Plantation Mistress*, 6-35, 109, 179, 221, quotation from 198. Elizabeth Fox-Genovese and many others have disagreed with Clinton. Fox-Genovese argued that women did not oppose slavery, or advocate women’s rights, but rather accepted their role in society. While some might have complained about the hardships of slavery they rarely opposed the system “that guaranteed their privileged position as ladies.” Even the noted Mary Chestnut, whom some historians have claimed opposed slavery, “took slavery for granted as the foundation of her world.” Fox-Genovese, *Within the Plantation Household*, 30-31, 48, 201, 236, 334, 359. See also Stephen Berry, *All That Makes a Man: Love and Ambition in the Civil War South* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003). The diaries and letters of the Alabama women examined here suggest that Clinton overemphasized the victimization of women and simultaneously removed their autonomy. See also Drew Gilpin Faust, “Altars of Sacrifice: Confederate Women and the Narratives of War,” in *Divided Houses: Gender and the Civil War*, edited by Catherine Clinton and Nina Silber (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992): 171-199, 172; Drew Gilpin Faust, *This Republic of Suffering: Death and the American Civil War* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2008), 209; Drew Gilpin Faust, *Mothers of Invention: Women of the Slaveholding South in the American Civil War* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1996); Maris A. Vinovskis, “Have Social Historians Lost the Civil War? Some preliminary Demographic Speculations” *Journal of American History* vol. 76, no. 1 (June 1989): 34-58; Catherine Clinton ed., *Half Sisters of History: Southern Women and the American Past* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1994); David W. Blight, *Race and Reunion: The Civil War in American Memory* (Cambridge: Belknap Press, 2001); George Rable, “‘Missing in Action’: Women of the Confederacy,” in Catherine Clinton and Nina Silber eds., *Divided Houses: Gender and the Civil War* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992); Walter Fleming, *Civil War and Reconstruction in Alabama* (Cleveland: Macmillan Company, 1911); H. E. Sterkx, *Partners in Rebellion: Alabama Women in the Civil War* (Madison: Fairleigh Dickenson University Press, 1970); Katharine M. Jones, *Heroines of Dixie: Confederate Women Tell their Stories of the War* (New York: Bobbs-Merrill, 1955); Walter Sullivan, ed., *The War the Women Lived: Female Voices from the Confederate South* (Nashville: J.S. Sanders & Company, 1995); Frank McSherry, Jr., Charles G. Waugh, and Martin Greenberg, *Civil War Women: The Civil War Seen Through Women’s Eyes in Stories by Louisa May Alcott, Kate Chopin, Eudora Welty, and Other Great Women Writers* (New York: Torchstone, 1988); Malcom C. McMillan, *The Alabama Confederate Reader* (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1963); Bell Irvin Wiley, *Confederate Women* (London: Greenwood Press, 1975); J. L. Underwood, *The Women of the Confederacy: In Which is Presented the Heroism of the Women of the Confederacy With Accounts of Their Trials During the War and the Period of Reconstruction, With Their Ultimate Triumph Over Adversity. Their Motives and Their Achievements As Told By Writers and Orators Now Preserved in Permanent Form* (New York: Neal Publishing Company, 1906).

were forced to remain at home “to suffer, to bear the cruel torture of suspense, to tremble when the battle has been fought... to know that defeat will cover her with dishonor and her little ones with ruin.” She was left to worry about her loved ones and mourn upon hearing that the “husband she doted upon, the son whom she cherished in her bosom and upon whom she never let the wind blow too rudely, the brother with whom she sported through all her happy days of childhood, the lover to whom her early vows were plighted,” had “died upon some distant battle-field and lies there a mangled corpse, unknown and uncared for, never to be seen again even in death!” But, the article concluded, “she bears it all and bows submissive to the stroke. – He died for the cause. He perished for his country.”⁷

This socially constructed image of the woman willing to endure untold suffering as she sacrificed for the Confederate cause permeated newspapers and popular culture both during the Civil War and in the years that followed its conclusion. In reality, women’s experiences and reactions were far more complex than this newspaper article and early historians of Civil War women portrayed. Indeed, the complexities of secession, the creation of the Confederacy, the outbreak of war, and men and women’s reactions to it in Alabama cannot be overstated. Historian Margaret Storey argues that ten to fifteen percent of Alabamians were Unionists who never supported the Confederacy, but even taking this into account, the majority of Alabamians supported secession and the creation of the Confederacy. Although many works explore the creation of the Confederacy, none focuses specifically on Alabamian women’s religious beliefs and their construction of Confederate identity.⁸

⁷ “Honor to Whom Honor is Due: Extracts from a sermon delivered at Christ Church, Savannah, on Thursday, September 18, 1862, being Thanksgiving day by the Right Rev. Stephen Elliot, Bishop of Georgia: Woman’s Heroism,” *Montgomery Daily Mail*, December 12, 1862.

⁸ Margaret Storey argues that Alabama Unionists remained loyal to the Union for a variety of reasons, including economics, family ties, conceptions of southern honor and southern values. Storey points out that individuals remained Unionists not just out of opposition to the Confederacy but “also out of a deep desire to cleave to something, to consolidate and preserve what they valued in their families, neighborhoods, section, and nation.” She further notes that “When these men and women gave their allegiance to the Union in 1860-61, they frequently did so as a matter of obligation. To honor and protect, and not betray, a host of social ties was crucial to their understanding of themselves and their role in their communities.” See Margaret M. Storey, *Loyalty and Loss: Alabama’s Unionists in the Civil War and Reconstruction* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2004), 1-17, quotes in note on pp. 4, 5, and Storey, “Civil War Unionists and the Political Culture of Loyalty in Alabama, 1860-1861,” *Journal of Southern History* 69, no. 1 (February 2003): 71-106. See also Daniel W. Crofts, *Reluctant Confederates: Upper South Unionists in the Secession Crisis* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1989).

Recent scholarship has demonstrated that as women across the South struggled with the trials of the war many also strove to live up to an ideal image, which was perpetuated not only by society, but also by the women themselves. This ultimately created an unachievable goal.⁹ For example, in addition to many other things, social norms dictated that women were expected to be pure, virtuous, moral, patient, and submissive. Many women did not merely outwardly conform to these socially “imposed” standards, but also relied on their religious beliefs to internally hold themselves to an even higher standard; they reproached themselves for what they referred to as their “wicked emotions” or “silly thoughts.”¹⁰ The Civil War only added to their internal conflict. The same religious beliefs that caused women to reproach themselves for “wicked” thoughts or emotions also offered them a source of comfort and security. Surrounded by a whirlwind of change, many Alabama women turned to the one constant in their lives: their faith. As the turmoil of the war raged around her, one woman succinctly summarized the feelings of many when she wrote, in “God alone we put our trust and humbly pray.” As she worried, another mother

⁹ By the 1960s, with the rise of social history, scholars began to question the traditional narrative and tried to include previously overlooked groups and aspects of the conflict, including gender and religion. Historians such as Faust and George Rable were among the first to provide broad overviews of southern women during the war. Others such as Victoria Ott, Laura Edwards, Anya Jabour, and LeeAnn Whites, to name a few, have focused on various aspects of southern women’s experiences during the war. An emphasis on gender and women has shed new light on our understanding of the Civil War and demonstrated that gender construction shaped the events leading up to the war, the war and its aftermath, and the memory of women’s role in the conflict. See, Faust, *Mothers of Invention*; Rable, *Civil Wars*; Victoria Ott, *Confederate Daughters: Coming of Age During the Civil War* (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University, 2008); LeeAnn Whites, *Gender Matters: Civil War, Reconstruction, and the Making of the New South* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005), 1, 5-6, 21; Anya Jabour, *Scarlett’s Sisters: Young Women in the Old South* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2007); Rable, “Missing in Action,” 134, 146; Nina Silber, “Intemperate Men, Spiteful Women, and Jefferson Davis,” in *Divided Houses: Gender and the Civil War*, edited by Catherine Clinton and Nina Silber (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992): 283-305, 283-84; Mary Elizabeth Massey, *Refugee Life in the Confederacy* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1964); Frank Moore, *Women of the War: Their Heroism and Self-Sacrifice* (Hartford, CT: S. S. Scranton and Co., 1868); Catherine Clinton, *Tara Revisited: Women, War, and the Plantation Legend* (London: Abbeville Press, 1995); Thomas P. Lowry, *Confederate Heroines: 120 Southern Women Convicted by Union Military Justice* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2006); Richard Hall, *Patriots in Disguise: Women Warriors of the Civil War* (New York: Paragon House, 1993); Mary Elizabeth Massey, *Bonnet Brigades* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1966); Laura Edwards, *Scarlett Doesn’t Live Here Anymore: Southern Women in the Civil War Era* (IL: University of Illinois Press, 2000).

¹⁰ Rebecca Vasser Diary, September 24, 1856, Rare Book, Duke See also Sarah Lowe Davis Diary, January 30, 1861, SPR113, ADAH.

turned to her faith for assurance and wrote, "I trust an overarching Providence is guiding us."¹¹

My project goes into great detail examining how the group of Alabama women in my study had their faith put to the test time and time again. Their initial enthusiasm for the Confederacy waxed and waned over the course of the war. At the same time, the more they sacrificed the more vested interest they had in the success of the Confederacy. If they turned their backs on the Confederacy they believed that they were negating the sacrifice of their loved ones. Many wrote letters to their loved ones expressing how much they were missed, but at the same time, several of these women pressured men to serve in the Confederate army and at least one woman went so far as to tell her fiancé that she would not have considered marrying him if he had shirked his duty. Another mother told her son that if he desired to win the heart of an attractive girl, he must be a good and faithful soldier, because no honorable woman would consider a man who had not proved his devotion to his country. She added that the young men who remained at home were ashamed to even go out in public because they were not doing their duty to the country.¹²

Throughout the antebellum era women had consistently relied on their religious beliefs to sort through their personal identity and to cope with complex or vexing circumstances. It was only natural that women would continue to turn to their belief that God controlled everything and had a plan for their lives as the antebellum world they knew crumbled around them. Throughout the war women continued to put their faith in God as they wrote things such as "I feel confident" that "with the help of Him who ruleth all things Our Cause must triumph."¹³ As women sought to situate themselves within the newly created Confederacy and cope with the conflict and loss caused by the Civil War, they naturally relied on the one thing in their lives that remained stable and a constant. Thus, for many

¹¹ Zillah Haynie Brandon Diary, December 21, 1860, April 25, 1861, May 8, 1862 January 15, 1863, January 21, 1863, SPR262, ADAH; M. E. Thompson to her sons, Marion, September 23, 1861, Benson-Thompson Family Papers. See also Mark S. Schantz, *Awaiting the Heavenly Country: The Civil War and America's Culture of Death* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2008), 209, and Stephanie McCurry, "'The Soldier's Wife': White Women, the State, and the Politics of Protection in the Confederacy," in *Women and the Unstable State in Nineteenth-Century America*, ed. Alison M. Parker and Stephanie Cole (Arlington: Texas A&M University Press, 2000), 15-16, 22-31.

¹² M. E. Thompson to her son, Marion, September 2, 1861, Benson-Thompson Family Papers; Elodie to Dawson, Selma, December 22, 1861, Dawson Papers.

¹³ Sarah Lowe Davis Diary, February 26, 1862, SPR113, Alabama Department of Archives and History.

women, faith would become the center of the Confederate identity as secession and war transformed them into Confederate women.¹⁴

¹⁴ Although, historians who examine religion often mention women, and scholars of women such as Faust and Rable include a discussion of the centrality of religion to the lives of southern women, none provide an in depth examination women's wartime experiences in light of their religious beliefs. As Catherine Brekus pointed out, "more than thirty years after the rise of women's history alongside the feminist movement, it is still difficult to 'find' women in many books and articles about American religious history." Yet even her book completely overlooked the American Civil War. Catherine A Brekus, ed., Introduction to *The Religious History of American Women: Reimagining the Past* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2007), 1. See also Eugene D. Genovese, *A Consuming Fire: The Fall of the Confederacy in the Mind of the White Christian South* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1998); Mitchell Snay, *Gospel of Disunion: Religious Separatism in the Antebellum South* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993); Faust, *Mothers of Invention*; Rable, *Civil Wars*; Miller, Stout, and Wilson eds., *Religion and the American Civil War*; Harry S. Stout, *Upon the Altar of the Nation: A Moral History of the Civil War* (New York: Penguin Books, 2006). Although several authors have focused on the role of religion in the soldiers' lives and a few war journals have been published, generally speaking, women in relation to religion have been neglected. For examples of recent work on religion in the Civil War see Kenneth W. Noe, "The Fighting Chaplain of Shiloh: Isaac Tichenor's Civil War and the Roles of Confederate Ministers," in *Politics and Culture of the Civil War Era: Essays in Honor of Robert W. Johannsen*, edited by Kenneth W. Noe and Daniel J. McDonough (Seligs Grove, Pa., 2006): 240-64; Bruce Gourley, "'These Days are Fraught with Many Blessings': The Clashing Worlds of Julia A. Stanford, Georgian Baptist, 1861" (Unpublished, 2004); Bruce Gourley, "Responses to Confederate Nationalism Among Baptists in Middle Georgia, 1861-1865" (Unpublished, 2004); Jennifer Newman, "God is on Our Side: The Religious Views of a Civil War Woman" (Unpublished, 2003); Jennifer Newman Treviño, "Elizabeth Rhodes: An Alabama Woman's Religious Beliefs During the Civil War," *Alabama Review* (October, 2009); Sidney J. Romero, *Religion in the Rebel Ranks* (New York: University Press of America, 1983); Joseph T. Durkin, ed., *Confederate Chaplain: A War Journal of Rev. James B. Sheeran, c.ss.r. 14th Louisiana, C.S.A.* (Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Company, 1960); Charles Reagan Wilson, *Baptized in Blood: The Religion of the Lost Cause 1865-1920* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1980); Walter Sullivan, ed., *The War the Women Lived: Female Voices from the Confederate South* (Nashville: J.S.Sanders & Company, 1995); Mark A. Noll, *The Civil War as a Theological Crisis* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2006). Scholars such as Catherine Clinton, Drew Gilpin Faust, Elizabeth Fox-Genovese, George Rable, and Sally McMillen related the centrality of religion in the everyday lives of women in the antebellum and Civil War South. Catherine Clinton, *The Plantation Mistress: Woman's World in the Old South* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1982), 95; Drew Gilpin Faust, *The Creation of Confederate Nationalism: Ideology and Identity in the Civil War South* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1988); Faust, *Mothers of Invention*; Elizabeth Fox-Genovese, *Within the Plantation Household: Black and White Women of the Old South* (North Carolina: University of North Carolina Press, 1988); Rable, *Civil Wars*; Sally G. McMillen, *Motherhood in the Old South: Pregnancy, Childbirth, and Infant Rearing* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1990); Laura F. Edwards, *Scarlet Doesn't Live Here Anymore: Southern Women in the Civil War Era* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2000), 1, 5; Kimberly Harrison, ed., *A Maryland Bride in the Deep South* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2006), 20; Kathryn Carlisle Schwartz, *Baptist Faith in Action: The Private Writings of Maria Baker Taylor, 1813-1895* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2003).

Department News for 2011

Robert Kruckeberg was hired this past year on the Troy campus – welcome Rob!

Jennifer Ann Newman Treviño has a chapter entitled, “‘The Aggressions of the North Can Be Borne No Longer’: White Alabama Women during the Secession Crisis and Outbreak of the War,” in a forthcoming book, *The Yellowhammer War: The Civil War and Reconstruction in Alabama*.

William Welch has an article coming out soon in *El Combatiente a lo Largo de la Historia: Imaginario, Percepcion, Representacion* entitled “The British Soldier as Artist during World War One.”

Scott Merriman’s chapter “The ‘real’ Right Turn: The Reagan Supreme Court,” was published in *In the 1980s: A Critical and Transitional Decade*, edited by Kimberly R. Moffitt and Duncan A. Campbell. (2012).

David Carlson was named book review editor for H-South this past year, and his article, “‘Remember thy Pledge!’: Religious and Reformist Influences on Joseph E. Brown’s Opposition to Confederate Conscription,” is coming out in the *Georgia Historical Quarterly*, late 2013.

Andrew Reeves had an article published in *Church History and Religious Culture* (2012), “English Secular Clergy in the Early Dominican Schools: Evidence from Three Manuscripts” and an upcoming article in *Religion Compass* entitled “‘The Cure of Souls is the Art of Arts.’ Preaching, Confession, and Catechesis in the Middle Ages.” And finally, Andrew’s book chapter, “Teaching Confession in Thirteenth-Century England: Priests and Laity,” will appear in *Priesthood and Holy Orders in the Middle Ages*, edited by Greg Peters (Leiden: Brill, forthcoming).

This summer we bid farewell to William “Buddy” Welch and Fred Beatty who will be retiring. We will miss you!

Troy University Master's Program Announcement

One of the key goals of the History Department at Troy University for the past several years has been the development of a master's program in history. This project has been driven by faculty and the demands of our students. The department recently completed a survey of our history and history education majors and alumni, and 91.5% of those who responded indicated that they would be interested in a history master's degree if Troy offered one.

In November of last year, the university approved our plans and curriculum for a Master of Arts (MA) in History. We have one more step to go – approval by the state agency (the Alabama Commission of Higher Education) - before the degree will be finalized. We'll go before the state to present our case, answer any questions, and hear the vote on September 13, 2013. Assuming the state approves the degree in September, the department intends to begin the Master of Arts in History in the spring of 2014.

The master's program (the first MA to be offered at Troy University) will be a 36-hour program, with a choice of two tracks for students – either the Thesis Track or Non-Thesis Track. The Thesis Track is intended as the degree for students who wish to continue their graduate studies with a Ph.D., and will include the completion of a significant, original research paper. The Non-Thesis Track is considered a “terminal” degree for students who don't want to go beyond the master's degree. With either track, students must select a primary and secondary field (American or European history). Students will take a variety of readings and research classes in each field to complete their studies.

Assuming state approval of the program, graduate application packets will probably be due around mid-November, 2013, with our first class expected to begin officially in the spring of 2014. However, for those of you who would like to get a “head start” on classwork, we will be offering the core classes for the degree online for the first time in the fall of 2013.

If you have any questions, or would like to discuss the program more, please contact Dr. Scout Blum (sblum@troy.edu or 334-670-5663).

Gratitude

Co-editors Nichole Woodburn and Karen Ross would like to extend their appreciation to the many, many people who worked hard to make this second volume possible. We especially would like to thank the faculty who spent their time reading and reviewing the many submissions we received this year, and then went on to help the authors who were selected to revise their work. This required many hours of reading, editing, re-reading, and more editing. Thank you for giving you time and talents.

And to our authors, students as well as faculty, thank you for your efforts. Just when you thought your research papers and historiographies were done, you entered into the laborious process of revising for publication. Congratulations on a job well done!

And finally, we would like to express our deep gratitude to the Alexander family, Sandra, Steve, Rachel, Andrew, Sarah, and Elisa. After learning of the new journal, Steve and Sandra Alexander offered their support, both financial and in spirit, to ensure that it would continue long into the future. You have been tremendously generous, and we look forward to many more years of the *Alexandrian*. Thank you.

Professor Nathan Alexander Remembered

The following story was contributed by Dr. Nathan Alexander's high school social studies teacher, Lane C. Dowell. Nathan's dedication to his students and his enthusiasm for history were the inspiration for this journal. We continue to remember him as a beloved colleague, professor, mentor, and friend. He is still very much a presence in our lives and his legacy will benefit students yet to come.

As an aging, retired teacher, who had the privilege of hosting thousands of students over decades, I am often asked, "Do you remember me?" Pondering why I might recall some and not others remains an enigma. What I do know is that a handful are imprinted in my mind and often some stimulus will bring forth a very vivid event, which causes this crusty, old Irishman to smile as he savors a pleasant gift from the past. I will NEVER forget Nathan, who each day entered my classroom with a smile and a tremendous thirst for knowledge. He loved learning.

He challenged me to be a better mentor. Yes, Nathan was truly the student that politely pressured his teachers to "stay one page ahead of the class." Perhaps his most attractive characteristic was the courtesy and respect he paid his fellow man. I am sure he never featured himself a role model, but he definitely was and in so many arenas.

I can still see his face etched with that familiar smile, as he peered around the corner of my door after the bell tolled the day's end. "Have you got a few minutes, Mr. Dowell?" What would tonight's topic be ... politics, sports, which he dearly loved, or something he had read. I guess our 5th quarter discussions gave me the opportunity to know Nathan better than most. He never complained. I only learned of his affliction, with the dread disease that eventually claimed his life, when we had a chance meeting at a bookstore (in the history section, of course) only days before he would be confined to Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center. His final words to me were, "Mr. Dowell (I tried to get him to call me by my first name, but...) let's get together soon for a Scotch and have a good talk." I still toast his memory.

His passion for learning and giving back to his students, so they might walk in his shoes, is so admirable. I am a better person for knowing Nathan Alexander.

Nathan, you are one in a million. Thanks for the memories, being such a phenomenal young man and a dear friend. You are truly a gentleman and a scholar that is admired, respected and loved.

Lane C. Dowell
Social Studies Department, Retired
Bremerton High School

Phi Alpha Theta Inductees, Fall & Spring 2012-13



William Charles Alexander

Jackie O. Barnett

Toria M. Grimm

Ernest M. Holmes

Benjamin W. Keenan

Peyton Alexandra Paradiso

Daniel W. Throckmorton