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"Deliverance of our Church and Nation" The Bond between The Book of Common Prayer and English Nationalism

Meghan Bigley

A personal identity unto itself is a complicated thing. People struggle for entire lifetimes to understand the uncertain depths of elements that join together to create a unique and special individual. Yet these struggles to navigate the workings of a human being are no different when used to analyze the evolution of a nation’s identity. Overwhelming factors throughout history combine and fuse to create a shared collective distinctiveness; which in turn is digested and processed by countries whose citizens are tied together with common history, enemies, practices, and faith. In England, faith and the bond of Protestantism overwhelmingly played a leading role in defining the national identity. The sacred invocations that reside in The Book of Common Prayer stand as tangible examples of what their identity came to be. Not only do the prayers and religious articles residing within this sacred text stand as paradigms for the English belief that they are a chosen people under providence, it also stands as a physical artifact that evolved overtime, as the national identity of England changed alongside it. That is why if the national identity of England has any chance of being analyzed and navigated, it is imperative that the sacred texts that the English cling to, like The Book of Common Prayer, be used as a guide.

This is not to say that The Book of Common Prayer is a work of nationalism. It is merely a piece of the puzzle; one element amongst a thousand that helped to create a distinct English national identity. The book alone, seen from a strictly religious perspective, holds no more nationalistic prose than the Holy Bible. However, the religious principles and the liturgy that are components of the prayer book, define its power as a source for nationalism. This power existed because there was a desire for religious unification, for a separation between the Godly and the “other,” and for a return to the Golden Age of England.

The 1662 version of The Book of Common Prayer, which is the primary source of this analysis, was authorized by Charles II after the restoration of his monarchy, following the death of Oliver Cromwell. The “improvement” was undertaken during the Savoy Conference of 1661, in which Presbyterians, partially led by the minister John Baxter, attempted to appeal to the bishops and ministers appointed by Charles II.¹ The appeal of the Presbyterians required revision of the old Book

of Common Prayer written in 1559, by approving their compiled list of exceptions to Anglican doctrine and its liturgy.\(^2\) However, the Savoy Conference ultimately ignored and even affronted the Presbyterians and their exceptions. Already in December of 1661, the Corporation Act had “destroyed Presbyterian influence in the large towns, [and] centres of [England’s] power.”\(^3\) The Savoy Conference, in turn, followed the progression of refusal to Presbyterian and “nonconformist” ideology, especially as it pertained to The Book of Common Prayer. This was made evident by Charles II himself, when he addressed the House of Commons in January of 1661:

> I must tell you, I have the worst luck in the World, if, after all the Reproaches of being a Papist, while I was abroad, I am suspected of being a Presbyterian, now I am come home. I know you will not take it unkindly, if I tell you I am as zealous for the Church of England, as any of you can be, and am enough acquainted with the Enemies of it on all sides: That I am as much in love with the Book of Common-prayer, as you can wish, and have prejudice enough to those who do not love it, who, I hope, in time will be better inform’d, and change their minds; and you may be confident, I do as much desire to see an Uniformity settled, as any amongst you. I pray trust me in that Affair…\(^4\)

In this address, Charles is drawing a clear line in the sand. Either you stand with Parliament and the Church of England, by supporting the newly revised prayer book, or you represent the extremes, the nonconformists or Catholics whose ideas are an affront to English Protestantism. There is no other reason why Charles II, the supreme monarch of England, would attempt to prove to the House of Commons that they have nothing to fear. Their sacred Anglican ideologies, liturgy, and prayer book, according to Charles, are safe from the evils of popery and Presbyterianism. This is evident by looking at the preface of the prayer book where these two groups are represented as “men of factious, peevish, and perverse spirits,” and therefore have no business inflicting their “mischevious purposes” on a Godly nation.\(^5\) The desires of England's king, and the fears of its parliament, are reflected in the wording of its prayer book.

However, the monarchy at this time was not just concerned with rejecting nonconformist ideas. There was also a desire to present a prayer book that symbolically represented a unified England; something that through “Publick Liturgy” could “keep the mean between two

---

\(^2\) Ibid.


\(^4\) Charles II, The Second Parliament of Charles II: Second Session - begins 20/11/1661, part of vol. 1 of The History and Proceedings of the House of Commons, published 1742, pp. 46-60. This quote is taken directly from Charles II speech to the House of Commons. In this record of the house proceedings, it can be found under the heading, “The King's particular Speech to the Commons alone.”

\(^5\) The Book of Common Prayer, final paragraph “Of Ceremonies”, published by John Baskerville, 1762. This version of the prayer book is actually the 1662 version. However the publication available is the 1662 version printed by the English publisher John Baskerville later in 1762.
extremes…” 6 The Book of Common Prayer makes this clear in its section “Concerning the Service of the Church” when it states, “whereas heretofore there hath been great diversity in saying and singing in Churches within this realm; some follow Salisbury Use, some Hereford Use, and some the Use of Bangor, some York, some of Lincoln; now from henceforth all the whole Realm shall have but one Use.” 7 As is clear from the prayer book’s intentions in regards to “saying and singing,” we can see that the revisionists who participated in the Savoy Conference decided that The Book of Common Prayer was about unification, even if meant forced amalgamation. This uniformity is also seen in the prayer book’s preface when it is written:

Our general aim therefore in this undertaking was, not to gratify this or that party in any of their unreasonable demands; but to do that, which to the best understandings we conceive might most tend to the preservation of Peace and Unity in the Church; the procuring of Reverence, and exciting of Piety and Devotion in the public Worship of God; and the cutting off occasion from them that seek occasion of cavil or quarrel against the Liturgy of the Church. 8

This “preservation of Peace and Unity in the Church” would be achieved by systematic separation of Presbyterians and Catholics from public office, from corporate rank, and from any position of power under the new laws of Charles II, especially the Act of Uniformity in 1662. 9 Within the laws articulation, the prayer book’s importance as a source for English identity is evident:

And to the end that Uniformity in the Publiq Worshipp (sic.) of God (which is so much desired) may be speedily effected be it further enacted by the Authority aforesaid That every Parson Vicar or other Minister whatsoever who now hath and enjoyeth any Ecclesiasticall Benefice or Promotion within this Realme of England or places aforesaid shall in the Church Chappell or place of Publiq[ue] Worshipp …openly publiquely and solemnly read the Morneing and Evening Prayer appointed to be read by and according to the said Booke of Co[m]on Prayer att the times thereby appointed and after such reading thereof shall openly and publiquely before the Congregation there assembled declare his unfeigned assent & consent to the use of all things in the said Booke contained and prescribed in these words and no other… 10

In this act, Charles is forcing England’s hand. It can no longer represent a realm where diverse religions compete to hold the imagination of the people. There must be separation of the wheat from the chaff. In the eyes of Anglican Protestants, sacred texts like The Book of Common

---

6 The Book of Common Prayer, 1st paragraph of “Preface.”
7 Ibid., 5th paragraph “Concerning the Service of the CHURCH.”
8 The Book of Common Prayer, 4th paragraph of “Preface.”
Prayer could not be weakened by ecumenicalism. Nonconformist factions that sought to re-envision the Church and its holy liturgy in England were seen as tarnish on those that represented God. It was made clear through the Act of Uniformity, that to be true to “God’s Honour and Glory, and to the reducing of the people to a most perfect and godly living, without Error or Superstition,” preachers, parsons and vicars all had to read the Morning and Evening Prayer according to the set script of the prayer book. Without this display of loyalty to their country’s chosen sacred texts, they could not represent England.11

This notion of separating the wheat from the chaff is key to understanding England’s identity, especially as it pertains to the role of *The Book of Common Prayer*. Throughout history people have united together in collaboration of defeating a familiar enemy. Often this enemy is merely seen as the “other” or a group that doesn’t belong. For England there was a feeling that Presbyterians and Catholics represented a dangerous “other” that could corrupt moral society. This feeling of unity against a common enemy knit itself into the verbal fabric of sacred texts and eventually the national identity. The historian Colin Kidd, in his interesting examination “Protestantism, Constitutionalism & British Identity under the later Stuarts,” argues that England had long feared Catholic and Presbyterian influences, and had vigorously argued against them in a mainly “theological current.”12 However, during the time of *The Book of Common Prayer’s* revision, the “exegesis of millenialist prophecy in England” and the “condemnations of ’popery and arbitrary rule,’” found themselves “couched in a temporal rhetoric of political liberty….!”13 This rhetoric would “resonate throughout the British Protestant nation…offering at a very basic level a common identity – if only in opposition to a Catholic ‘other.’”14

However, the fear of a common enemy was only one element that helped to define English nationalism. Another sense of shared community that served as a source for unification was the ritual or liturgy that surrounded *The Book of Common Prayer*. In the sections on “The Order how the Psalter is appointed to be read,” and “The Order how the rest of holy Scripture is appointed to be read,” we see a Protestant calendar stating how often and at what times prayers are read and received. This calendar establishes a “devotional framework for the passage of the seasons, firmly centered on commemoration of the life of Christ, with a severe reduction in the number of holy

---

11 *The Book of Common Prayer*, 6th paragraph of “Ceremonies.”


13 Ibid.

14 Ibid.
days.”\textsuperscript{15} However, new holidays and reasons for prayer were created, and though many of them were “founded on Christianity, purged of the excesses of late-medieval Catholicism, the guiding landmarks were taken from recent incidents in English history.”\textsuperscript{16} One clear example is the 29\textsuperscript{th} of May. This is the day of Charles II restoration and ascendancy. This day became a holiday, and throughout England its commemoration signaled the “firing of bonfires, ringing of bells, and the wearing of sprigs of oak.”\textsuperscript{17} However, perhaps most importantly, the saying of a special prayer from \emph{The Book of Common Prayer} marked this day. This prayer is found in its own section of the prayer book under the “Form of Prayer for the 29\textsuperscript{th} Day of May.”\textsuperscript{18} In this prayer we see the clear blending of a secular holiday with religious liturgy when it is written:

\begin{quote}
A Form of PRAYER with THANKSGIVING to Almighty God, For having put an end to the great Rebellion, by the Restitution of the King and Royal Family, and the Restoration of the Government after many Years interruption; which unspeakable Mercies were wonderfully completed upon the Twenty-ninth of May, in the Year 1660. And in Memory thereof, that Day in every Year is, by act of Parliament appointed to be for ever kept holy.\textsuperscript{19}
\end{quote}

This is simply the celebration of a monarch’s ascension. However, by residing in special reverence in \emph{The Book of Common Prayer}, an endowment of holiness envelops the holiday. This causes a fusion between a secular festival and religious liturgy.

Another striking addition to the 1662 version was that of “Prayers and Thanksgivings upon Several Occasions.”\textsuperscript{20} In this section, an entire prayer assemblage was put together for Englishman to say at certain times. There is a prayer for rain, for fair weather, for times of “war and tumult,” and even a prayer “For the High Court of Parliament, to be read during their Session.”\textsuperscript{21} This last prayer is of particular interest when linking the prayer book to the development of a national identity. It is in this prayer that again, the blending of religious characteristics with a developing secular nationalism began to occur. This prayer reads:

---


\textsuperscript{16} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{17} Ibid., p. 64.

\textsuperscript{18} \emph{The Book of Common Prayer}, “Form of Prayer for the 29\textsuperscript{th} Day of May”

\textsuperscript{19} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{20} \emph{The Book of Common Prayer}, “Prayers and Thanksgivings upon Several Occasions.”

\textsuperscript{21} Ibid.
Most gracious God, we humbly beseech thee, as for this Kingdom in general, so especially for the High Court of Parliament, under our most religious and gracious King at this time assembled: That though wouldest be pleased to direct and prosper all their Consultations, to the advancement of thy glory, the good of thy Church, the safety, honour, and welfare of our Sovereign and his Kingdoms; that all things may be so ordered and settled by their, upon the best and surest foundations, that peace and happiness, truth and justice, religion and piety, may be established among us for all generations. These and all other necessaries, for them, for us, and thy whole Church, we humbly beg in the Name and Mediation of Jesus Christ, our most blessed Lord and Saviour. Amen.22

Here we can see that Parliament has found a place “among the evident expressions of God’s favor.”23 This is a fascinating addition because The Book of Common Prayer evolved to exhibit the important role Parliament had come to play by the seventeenth century in England. Its role as a purveyor of nationalistic sentiment through festivals and the fusion of religion with secular holidays, made Parliament the subliminal voice of the people.

By approving this addition, Charles II fully acknowledged that Parliament, not the monarchy, had come to represent an authority to the people of England. This gives an entirely new dimension to the prayer book. Its writing represented a sense of history on the part of its revisers. And they stamped the book with obvious additions that reflected the changing attitudes of the nation following the end of the rump parliament and the rise of the restoration monarchy.

For the prayer book to truly represent a source of nationalism, however, this fusion of secular festivals with religious liturgy had to represent a transition in the conscience of the nation. Symbolically, this representation of the “nationalization of the masses” signifies an organic process, whereby, from the bottom-up, the ideals represented in The Book of Common Prayer became intrinsically linked to the identity of England through ritual and ceremony.24 And although the concept of an organic transition is probably unrealistic, all that really mattered was that the masses believed in its existence. This belief, whether unfounded or not would be bonded with English heritage and myth, and their certainty of being a chosen people under providence.

This feeling that the grace of God saturated their entire existence was a major component of The Book of Common Prayer’s fundamental involvement in everyday English life. The millenialist ideas

22 Ibid.
that the apocalypse was near, combined with the importance of covenant, became a natural belief for England. In regards to covenant, England connected itself to the Jews of the Old Testament, and their belief in “ethnic election,” whereby the chosen and God join together in covenant with each other.\(^{25}\) In particular, covenant is often interpreted through the survival of a great journey, or the success or triumph of a battle. In *Exodus 3:8,* King James Bible, it is written, “I am come down to deliver them out of the hand of the Egyptians, and to bring them up out of that land unto a good land and a large, unto a land flowing with milk and honey.”\(^{26}\) In this passage, the Jews connect deliverance to the preservation of the covenant, which represents their key to salvation. In *The Birthpangs of Protestant England: Religious and Cultural Change in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries,* historian Patrick Collinson argues that empires of the time used the idea of the Old Testament story to link themselves as God’s chosen people.\(^{27}\) Apparently, the first Pope at Avignon, Clement V, utilized the story when he said the French nation was “like the people of Israel.”\(^ {28}\) This would later be adopted by an English Chancellor in the fourteenth century when he said, “Israel is understood to be the heritage of God, as is England.”\(^ {29}\)

The essential role of covenant and providence in the development of England’s nationalism is also seen in *The Book of Common Prayer,* especially in the “Form of Prayer for the 5th Day of November, for the 30th Day of January, the 29th Day of May, and the Form of Prayer for the 25th day of October.”\(^ {30}\) All of these prayers represent important historical events in England’s history. November 5\(^{th}\) is Guy Fawkes Day, January 30\(^{th}\) is the death of Charles I, May 29\(^{th}\) is the restoration of Charles II, and October 25\(^{th}\) is the accession of King George III. The prayer dedicated to the death of Charles I is a perfect example of history, being molded to suit the temperaments of the time, when it reads:

> A FORM of PRAYER with FASTING, to be used yearly upon the Thirtieth Day of January, being the DAY of the Martyrdom of the Blessed King CHARLES the First; to implore the Mercy of God, that neither the Guilt of that sacred and innocent Blood, nor those other fins, by which God was provoked to deliver up both us and our King into the

\(^{25}\) Anthony D. Smith, *Chosen Peoples: Sacred Sources of National Identity* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2003), p. 81. In this section, Smith examines what he calls, “the peoples of the covenant.” And he specifically defines “ethnic election” and its connection to covenant.

\(^{26}\) Old Testament, Exodus 3:8 (King James Bible).


\(^{28}\) Ibid.

\(^{29}\) Ibid., p. 7.

\(^{30}\) *The Book of Common Prayer,* “Form of Prayer for the 5th Day of November,” “Form of Prayer for the 30th Day of January,” “Form of Prayer for the 29th Day of May,” and “The Form of Prayer for the 25th day of October.”
hands of cruel and unreasonable men, may at any time hereafter be visited upon us, or our posterity.31

Charles I had previously been seen as a tyrant. Several times he had dissolved Parliament because they would not do his bidding, and when it suited his needs he would re-instate it for purposes of gaining taxes.32 However, over the course of history, Charles’ death became the act of a martyr. And through the collective history of English Protestants, his martyrdom served as a holy observance requiring special attention in The Book of Common Prayer. This would happen to another historical event, only one with a different temperament.

Guy Fawkes Day commemorates the demise of a Catholic plot to blow up Parliament. The prayer dedicated to that day reveals the symbolic holiness of Parliament, the commemoration of defeating the terrible “other” in the Catholic Guy Fawkes, and a historical event that has been manipulated to serve Protestant England’s belief in ethnic election. The prayer reads:

A Form of PRAYER with THANKSGIVING to be used yearly upon the Fifth Day of November, for the happy Deliverance of King JAMES I, and the Three Estates of ENGLAND, from the most traitorous and bloody-intended Massacre by Gunpowder: And also for the happy Arrival of His Majesty King WILLIAM on this Day, for the Deliverance of our Church and Nation.33

This is important, because at the very end of this prayer the line reads “Deliverance of our Church and Nation.” The Book of Common Prayer has taken the final step necessary to merge both religious identity and English nationalism, to create something new that became “embedded in the English culture and could no longer be rooted out.”34

These holidays symbolize England’s role as God’s chosen people. Each one either demonstrates the English overcoming adversity, or playing the role beautifully of the glorious victim. This “ethnohistory” creates a collective reflection on English heritage, and it is utilized in The Book of Common Prayer as a tool to link English Protestantism with ethnic election and covenant.35

---

31 The Book of Common Prayer, “Form of Prayer for the 30th Day of January.”
33 The Book of Common Prayer, “Form of Prayer for the 5th Day of November.”
34 Greenfeld, Nationalism: Five Roads to Modernity, 65.
35 Smith, Chosen People, 166-189. This chapter deals with what Smith terms “ethnohistory,” or the collection of myth, history and heritage by a group of people.
Numerous examples exist throughout history, where the Old Testament story of salvation served as a backbone for a supposed relationship with God as His chosen people. Eventually, England’s proof of divine providence was established through the events of their collective history. It’s the combination of covenant, divine providence, and deliverance that becomes essential for the growth and development of the collective history of the Protestant English nation, and they would use sacred texts to support their place as a chosen people, like The Book of Common Prayer.

The collective memory utilized by the prayer book, is also linked to the idea of “Peace and Unity.” After surviving the English Civil War, the execution of their monarch, the rise of Parliament, and the demise of Oliver Cromwell, England was ready to return to a time when “harmony and unity between the Crown and the nation …allowed the national consciousness to mature and become a widely shared, legitimate way to look at the world.” The 1662 Book of Common Prayer utilizes this desire for peace and unity, by stating that the prayer book is the tool in which this can be achieved.

It is possible to argue, that The Book of Common Prayer isn’t really a source for English nationalism. That the “development of [an] English national identity” was ultimately an emerging “religious, Protestant” identity, “rather than [a] national” identity. This is a valid argument. However, within the prayer book, there is too much that connects both England’s collective memory, and their sense of covenant with God for it to serve a universal Protestant movement. A French Huguenot would have no interest or reason to say prayers for Guy Fawkes Day or for Parliament. Just as Catholics and Presbyterians, would find no reason to support the liturgy of the Anglican Church. The nationalism that was fundamentally connected to The Book of Common Prayer wasn’t a Protestant nationalism. It may not have even been English, as we know it today. But it represented the fusion between Protestantism and England’s collective history. Sociologist Liah Greenfeld argues that England was a “Protestant nation… But it is essential to realize that it is the noun and not the adjective which makes all the difference…” Whether they were “Protestant or not, England was a nation,” and it was defined “in terms of religious and political values which converged” together to create something that became ingrained in the minds of its citizens.

The Book of Common Prayer is the embodiment of the convergence of values and the growing sentiment of the English nation, because it served as a source for nationalism by fusing secular ideas,

---

36 Ibid.
37 Ibid., p. 65
38 Greenfeld, Nationalism: Five Roads to Modernity, 65.
39 Ibid., p. 66.
historical events, and public sentiment with prayers and liturgy that could be practiced everyday. Through routine and ritual, the ideas presented in the prayer book would help to fasten the bonds of nationalism even tighter. The manipulation of religious liturgy to include prayers commemorating historical events like the execution of Charles I, Guy Fawkes Day and the uncovering of the Gunpowder plot, or the restoration of Charles II, created a perceived shared history. The 1662 *Book of Common Prayer* and its impact on England’s national identity represented what the future had in store for other nations. Countries like France and Germany would both attempt unification by applying liturgical practices to secularized concepts. This attests to the power of *The Book of Common Prayer* as a source for nationalism. If the prayer book merely represented religious nationalism, its influence could never stand the test of time in the growing secular environment of the post-modern era. And although the religious liturgy that defines the prayer book represents more tradition than intrinsic necessity, its popularity proves that it embodied the spirit of English nationalism, and played a fundamental role its development.
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On April 28, 1965, U.S. Marines landed in the Dominican Republic. Known as the “five glorious days,” this military operation closed a brief period in Dominican history, which had “pitted Dominican ‘rebels’ against their ‘loyalist’ enemies.” Ignoring President Franklin D. Roosevelt’s Good Neighbor policy, these were the first operational U.S. combat troops to land in Latin America in nearly forty years. Siding with the “loyalists,” President Lyndon B. Johnson issued a statement declaring intervention necessary “to protect American lives.” On May 2, 1965, in a radio and television report, Johnson further elaborated on the justification for intervention to the American public, depicting Communist conspirators as taking over what had begun as a democratic revolution. Considering military actions warranted the United States occupied the island nation until September 3, 1965, at which time a new interim government assumed power.

Historians have written volumes on the U.S. intervention in the Dominican Republic in 1965. However, few have devoted adequate attention to the origins of intervention. This paper will identify the 1963 overthrow of democratically elected president Juan Bosch as the origin of U.S. intervention in the Dominican Republic in 1965. The coup, which ousted Bosch and his constitutional government after only seven months in power, led to domestic unrest, civil war, and the landing of over five thousand U.S. Marines. Targeting Bosch’s overthrow as the catalyst for U.S. intervention raises a simple question. What prevented the United States from intervening during the military coup that removed Bosch as president of the Dominican Republic? Surely, given the Communist takeover in Cuba in 1959, the United States would welcome a leader in the Caribbean who had been democratically elected, was dedicated to a constitutional form of government, and seemed committed to ridding the government and military of corruption.

The United States failed to aid Bosch for two reasons. First, U.S. leaders considered Bosch to be soft on communism. He refused to deport individuals for their leftist convictions or to suppress their right to promote political ideals. In the throes of the Cold War, this inaction made the United States uncomfortable. Furthermore, members of the U.S. government believed Bosch owed favors, linked to the election, to certain Communists. Second, and more important, Bosch wanted a truly sovereign nation and promoted the Dominican Republic as an independent state capable of making decisions free of U.S. tutelage. The refusal to accept a new challenge to U.S. hegemony in the Caribbean, be it democratic or Communist, prevented the United States from fully
supporting the presidency of Juan Bosch. These two factors, as the following pages will
demonstrate, explain why the United States did not support Bosch in the same way it previously had
supported provisional Dominican governments.

Examining the effect of Bosch’s overthrow on U.S. intervention requires first to describe
U.S. relations with Rafael Leónidas Trujillo Molina. Furthermore, it is important to understand how
Trujillo’s death changed both U.S.-Dominican relations and the political makeup of the Dominican
Republic. Trujillo came to power in 1930 and served as dictator until his death in 1961. Enjoying
good diplomatic and economic relations with the United States for the majority of its rule, the
Trujillo regime began to collapse in 1955. Although the U.S. maintained diplomatic relations with
the Dominican Republic, debt from the 1955 World’s Fair, Trujillo’s acquisition of sixty-three
percent of Dominican sugar production, and the kidnap and murder of dissenter Jesús de Gálindez
caused President Dwight D. Eisenhower and his administration to become cautious in its support of
Trujillo. The United States had long been aware of Trujillo’s use of terror to subdue the Dominican
people. Yet because he was staunchly anti-Communist and historically had been cooperative with
U.S. economic policy, his record of corruption, torture, murder, and theft did not end U.S.
patronage of the Dominican Republic. Reportedly, when asked about Trujillo, President Roosevelt
had this cynical reply: “He may be an S.O.B., but he is our S.O.B.”

Relations with the Dominican Republic became increasingly problematic on January 1, 1959.
This day marked completion of the Communist victory in Cuba. U.S. support for Trujillo, given his
“flagrant and widespread violations of human rights,” ignited anti-American sentiment in Latin
American. The Cuban movement, on the other hand, attracted popular support throughout the
hemisphere. Support for the dictator made condemnation of the new Communist nation difficult.
It would be viewed as hypocritical to criticize the evils of communism while at the same time
supporting Trujillo. The dictator, who felt increasingly detached from Washington and witnessed
popular movements against dictatorship throughout Latin American, had become a pariah.

As frustration mounted, Trujillo ordered the assassination of one of his perceived enemies,
Venezuelan President Rómulo Betancourt. Although the attempt failed, the incident gave the
United States the opportunity for a complete break with the Trujillo regime. This split, for both the
United States and other Latin American nations, came in August 1960, as the Organization of
American States (OAS) declared it would call on members to impose sanctions against the
Dominican Republic. It consisted of ending:

- diplomatic relations between all the member states and the Dominican Republic [and] . . .
- partial interruption of economic relations between all the member states and the
Dominican Republic, beginning with an immediate embargo on all arms shipments and war material of any kind. 7

Historically, the OAS never had recommended sanctions against a member state. However, the result of this OAS decision placed the Dominican Republic in economic crisis. Both the lower class *infelices*, or those born to endure hardship, and the upper class were suffering due to its neighbors’ compliance with the call for imposing sanctions. 8

With domestic opposition mounting against the Trujillo regime, the United States began contemplating possible reactions to an overthrow. A Memorandum from the Cuban Task Force of the National Security Council dated May 15, 1961 reported the following:

The economic position of the country has weakened seriously. Opposition to the regime is expanding and becoming more determined, and recent reports indicate Trujillo’s removal may be imminent. 9

Fifteen days later, on May 30, 1961, a band of Dominicans once subservient to Trujillo assassinated him while he was riding in his limousine. The end of Trujillo’s thirty year reign of terror in the Dominican Republic began events leading to intervention. 10

Following the assassination, President John F. Kennedy “examined the situations realistically,” Arthur M. Schlesinger Jr. recalls. “There are three possibilities,’ he said, ‘in descending order of preference: a decent democratic regime, a continuation of the Trujillo regime or a Castro regime. We ought to aim for the first,” Kennedy continued, “but we really can’t renounce the second until we are sure that we can avoid the third.” 11 The reaction of the Dominican public fell short of open revolt. With the conspirators behind the assassination unprepared to take power, Ramfis Trujillo, oldest son of the slain dictator, quickly replaced his father. Joaquín Balaguer served as puppet president, while Ramfis commanded the armed forces, the real power in the Dominican Republic. However, the pampered playboy proved ill equipped to overcome the challenges his nation faced. OAS sanctions remained intact and Ramfis’s efforts to champion “democracy” meant he could no longer use brutal force to quell insurrections. On November 14, 1961, with domestic demands that all members of the Trujillo family leave the country, Ramfis announced his intention to resign as head of the joint chief of staff. Leaving on the family yacht with ninety million dollars and his father’s body, Ramfis sailed to Paris on November 17. 12

The departure of Ramfis coincided with increased U.S. involvement in Dominican affairs. Prior to resigning his post, Ramfis contacted his exiled uncles Héctor and José Arismendi Trujillo to retain family control of the Dominican Republic. The “Wicked Uncles,” as they were known in the Dominican Republic, arrived on November 15, alarming both the Dominican people and the United
States. U.S. Secretary of State Dean Rusk wasted no time in making clear that continuation of the Trujillo regime would be unacceptable. Stating that the OAS would postpone consideration on “withdrawing the suspension of trade with the Dominican Republic,” his November 18 statement added:

It appears that they [Héctor and José Arismendi] may be planning an attempt to reassert dictatorial domination of the political and economic life of that country, threatening the recent gains of the Dominican Government and people towards democratization.

Moreover, the statement warned that “the United States is considering the further measures that unpredictable events might warrant.” The next morning U.S. warships containing eighteen hundred U.S. Marines were in clear view from Santo Domingo as U.S. planes made visible passes along the shore line. Emboldened Dominican forces demanded the departure of Héctor and José Arismendi, resulting in the two fleeing just before November 20.

The U.S. public commitment to Dominican “democracy” through the threat of armed intervention was significant. Washington continually referenced the perceived strides towards democracy the Dominican Republic made after the death of Trujillo. At a news conference on November 29, 1961, President Kennedy predicted that, “as a result of the conversation in the Dominican Republic . . . we can make progress towards achieving the kind of government which will permit the Dominican people to control their own destiny.”

Broad generalizations and references to democracy in the Dominican Republic from Washington were novel at best. While it did desire free elections for the Dominican people, the United States assumed cívicos would fill the Dominican government. The cívicos, or upper class, had served silently under Trujillo and were able to maintain their wealth throughout his rule. Serving as window dressing, the United States could conduct normal relations with this Dominican “democracy,” despite the fact that the cívicos had no intention of pursuing social reform. The potential for U.S. intervention in 1961 shows U.S. commitment to democracy in name only. Moreover, this reveals Washington’s commitment to a friendly government it could claim was a democracy, whether or not that government was willing to partake in democratic practices. It is clear that U.S. support for “democracy” was actually support for the elite class.

Ousting of the “Wicked Uncles” provided the United States with the chance to push the Dominican Republic toward the appearance of “democracy.” Balaguer still retained power, but the Dominican people, particularly the cívicos, had no intention of allowing someone who had been aligned so closely with the Trujillo regime to govern. The United States made clear its stance on the
subject in a memorandum to John Calvin Hill, Consul General in Santo Domingo, providing talking points for a conversation Hill was to have with Balaguer:

The United States is prepared to lend its support in the OAS and bilaterally to a government consisting of a) A president. b) A Council of State composed of distinguished citizens mutually acceptable to the opposition and to the government including the armed forces. c) A cabinet divided among nominees of the present government and the opposition and d) The armed forces, responsible under the constitution solely to the president and responsible under him for their own self-administration without political interference.\(^{16}\)

Without strong U.S. backing, Balaguer had no choice but to comply. On January 1, 1962, the Council of State took power. The OAS called for lifting sanctions three days later.\(^{17}\)

The Council was committed to holding democratic elections. Its members were comprised almost entirely of *cívicos*. Furthermore, the Council’s main domestic support came from the Unión Civica Nacional (UCN), the political party representing the elites. In January 1962, the UCN was dominant in Dominican politics and the Council had full U.S. support. President Kennedy continually praised the Dominican Republic for its transition from dictatorship towards democracy. Moreover, Kennedy’s statement on January 22, 1962 declared that the United States would make available twenty-five million dollars in emergency credit.\(^{18}\) Not praised solely for its steps towards democracy under the Council, the Dominican Republic also gained U.S. approval for its staunch anti-communism. However, the new government proved corrupt. Doing little to promote social reform or reverse unemployment, most Dominicans continued to live in abject poverty. The *cívicos* had no intention of implementing positive change; instead the new government used positions of power to enlarge their wealth.\(^{19}\)

The *cívicos* were confident that the UCN would achieve victory at the polls. Crusading on the principles of anti-Trujilloism and anti-communism, candidate Viriato Fiallo’s campaign proved ineffective. Moving behind the scenes, the Partido Progresista Dominicano (PRD) began gaining the support of the people. The UCN, which never could evade its reputation as the party of the elite, spent its time squabbling in urban centers. Lacking the funding of the UCN, the PRD and its candidate Juan Bosch took their campaign to rural areas in search of peasant votes. The methods the PRD used were effective in generating popular support for Bosch. With backing from the United States and OAS, elections occurred on December 20, 1962. Bosch received almost sixty percent of the vote, while the UCN received just over thirty percent.\(^{20}\)

On February 27, 1963, Juan Bosch took the oath of office as president of the Dominican Republic. Born in 1909 in the town of La Vega, Bosch’s mother was Puerto Rican and his father
was a Spanish immigrant who found work first as a bricklayer and later as a small merchant. As a teenager, Bosch’s family moved to Santo Domingo. While a student there, Bosch joined the political opposition to Trujillo. After a brief stint in jail, he fled the country in 1936. In 1939, with other exiled members of the Dominican Republic, Bosch helped to form the PRD. During his time in exile, Bosch gained recognition for his literary skills. Bosch spent twenty-five years in exile, returning to the Dominican Republic after Trujillo’s death. Leading a band of exiles, this intellectual turned politician achieved the impossible, winning the election in landslide fashion. Much of Bosch’s appeal derived from the fact that he came from modest means and attempted to reach out with sympathy for their plight to the electorate. His commitment to democracy was strong and his dedication to Dominican independence stronger, the latter of which led to waning U.S. support for his presidency.²¹

From the onset, Bosch faced immeasurable economic and political challenges. Stated clearly in an airgram from John Bartlow Martin, ambassador to the Dominican Republic, to the Department of State, was U.S. recognition of Bosch’s obstacles:

There was almost nothing but wreckage and ruble to build on—a stagnate economy a looted treasury, vast unemployment, no free voluntary institutions, no democratic tradition, few experienced people in government, [and] an ignorant submerged populace . . ..²²

Bosch immediately focused on fixing the Dominican economy. Martin praised Bosch’s economic practices in his memoirs: “I am convinced that in its lifetime the Bosch government was one of the most dollar-honest governments in the Republic’s history, and would compare favorable with many Latin American and United States governments.”²³ Clearly, Martin recognized Bosch’s commitment to an honest government.

Bosch attacked the public payroll, cutting ministers wages, the chief justice of the Supreme Court’s monthly salary from $2,000 to $1,000, as well as his own monthly salary from $2,400 to $1,500. Furthermore, he eliminated “soft jobs” in the government. His policy of attacking luxurious salaries extended to the military. Bosch expected those serving in uniform to live off their salaries alone. High ranking officers would no longer be able to use the military budget for self aggrandizement, instead that money would be allocated for social and economic programs. The result of his top down economic policy soon saved the Dominican Republic $2,658,600 a year, a significant amount for this poverty-stricken nation.²⁴

Given his fiscal policies, Bosch did not enjoy support from the cívicos or the military. Prior to elections Martin predicted that “what the Republic will need on December 21 will not be a good winner but several good losers . . ..”²⁵ Clearly, Martin was referring to the cívicos and military. If
Bosch lost, he would not have the economic means or powerful relationships necessary to disrupt the elected government. However, for the cívicos and the military, not intervening in Bosch’s presidency was not an option. To remove power from the two and redistribute their wealth to the infelices was not only unimaginable but ridiculous. So began a barrage of Communist accusations against Bosch. Furthermore, his programs of social reform lacked the necessary funding for implementation and the population began to become disillusioned. These two factors combined to create a hostile environment for Bosch domestically.

Perhaps more important, Bosch’s commitment to democracy and the Dominican constitution caused Washington to view his administration negatively. Especially annoying for the United States was that Bosch would not commit to identifying and deporting Communists for their political convictions. He operated “under the pretext that ‘a democratic government cannot be democratic for some and dictatorial for others . . . .’” Martin later admitted that Washington did not think Bosch was a Communist. However, it did believe that his lackadaisical approach towards communism could allow infiltration, causing the Dominican government to lean towards the Communist inspired left, thus becoming anti-American. “I believe . . . that during the campaign, before he was sure of victory,” Martin concluded, “Bosch had reached an understanding with certain Communists.” This was because Bosch “lived quite literally in terror that one or another of the Castro/Communist would kill him if he double crossed them.” Bosch’s policies resulted in isolation from the cívicos, the military, and Washington, the three most important groups to a functional Dominican government.

U.S. distaste for Bosch did not derive solely from his stance on communism. His clear intent to pursue a nationalistic course also challenged U.S. hegemony in the Caribbean in numerous ways. In a gesture of public support, the United States sent Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson to Bosch’s inauguration. Refusing to cater to U.S. wishes, Bosch invited anti-American Juan José Arévalo, former president of Guatemala, to the ceremony as well. Furthermore, Bosch voiced only lukewarm praise for the Alliance for Progress, President Kennedy, and U.S. generosity. One U.S. congressman “said Bosch’s nationalism was acceptable but he should throw in a sop of gratitude to the United States.” More troubling for Washington, Bosch sought aid from other foreign countries, negotiating a $150,000,000 line of credit from a European lending institution, while openly criticizing contracts Balaguer and the Council of State made with American sugar firms.

Moreover, Bosch’s nationalism and unwillingness to act as a puppet affected the OAS. The United States could no longer count on the Dominican vote, which proved particularly troublesome
when Bosch endorsed principles of nonintervention regarding resolutions favoring drastic measures against Communist Cuba. All of these actions combined to further isolate the Bosch government from Washington. This proved fatal to democracy in the Dominican Republic.²⁹

On September 25, 1963, the military removed Bosch from power after only seven months in office. Martin had cabled warning of a coup to Washington the day before. Unwilling to do anything to save Bosch, “the Department refused to intervene militarily unless a communist takeover were threatened.”³⁰ The Kennedy administration’s claim of unconditional support for democracy in the hemisphere proved hollow. The United States did not aid Bosch for two reasons. First, he was soft on communism. Second, his nationalism precluded full U.S. support for his presidency. Perhaps more important, the United States was complicit in staging the coup. First, the Kennedy administration neither reformed the military after Trujillo’s death nor monitored it closely thereafter. Second, the United States provided little funding for social reform programs under the Bosch presidency. However, for many Dominicans, Bosch represented the democratic process, and a return to a government of the elite for the elite would be unacceptable. It is on these grounds that civil revolt took place. Had the Kennedy administration lived up to its claim of being a protector of democracy, President Johnson could have avoided military intervention in 1965.

U.S. fear of communism in the Dominican Republic had intensified since the Communist overthrow of Cuba. Because Bosch refused to deport alleged Communists and allowed freedom of speech and political ideas, the United States viewed his presidency as a threat to hemispheric security. Kennedy made clear the U.S. stance on communism in Latin America when he spoke of using “every resource at our command to prevent the establishment of another Cuba . . ..”³¹ However, the U.S. knew Bosch was not a Communist. Nevertheless, U.S. dissatisfaction with Bosch’s nationalism motivated a desire for his removal. Bosch speaks of the United States and communism in his *The Unfinished Experiment*:

The United States [created] a systematic propagation of the fear of Communism without an explanation of just what Communism is. An artificial fear has been created, so diffuse and vague that people can identify it with anything that displeases them or conflicts with their desires. Communism can be anything, and anything can be Communist—a government, a book, a song, a political party, and sometimes a democratic regime rightly established under the law.³²

U.S. claims that Bosch was soft on communism provided the public justification for inaction when the Bosch administration faced opposition. Maintaining U.S. hegemony in the hemisphere, however, was the real motivation.
Bosch’s nationalism explains Kennedy’s refusal to act on the president’s behalf. Cuba already had deserted the United States and maintaining friendly governments was an American priority. Moreover, U.S. dedication to democracy throughout Latin America was superficial. Those “democracies” still had to operate within certain U.S.-defined parameters, consisting first and foremost of blind acceptance of U.S. leadership in the hemisphere. Evidence of this existed in the nearly three decades of U.S. support for Trujillo. Trujillo, who dominated the Dominican people through terror, despised communism and was counted on in Washington as a U.S. ally in the Caribbean, regardless of his international practices and policies. The Council of State also enjoyed U.S. patronage. Although credited with moving the Dominican Republic towards democracy, the Council’s members, comprised almost entirely of cívicos, believed their party would win the election and had no intention of answering to the Dominican people. However, they too were anti-Communist and pro-American. Bosch did not promote communism nor was he anti-American. Bosch answered to the people and the Dominican constitution before the United States. Washington found this unacceptable because it dictated Bosch’s refusal to act in accordance with the United States regardless of circumstance.

Two specific U.S. policies towards the Dominican Republic doomed Bosch’s presidency. The first was President Kennedy’s Dominican military policy. The Dominican military, under Trujillo and following his death, remained the most powerful political force on the island. The military had become a center of corruption, but its reputation for anti-communism led Kennedy to keep its principal components intact. Both Bosch and the United States were aware that prevention of a coup was dependent on how closely the United States monitored the Dominican military. In a conversation with Bosch prior to his inauguration, Kennedy inquired about the republic’s military needs. Among other requests, Bosch “insisted that the U.S. military mission could and should play a vital role in stressing to their Dominican counterparts the need to support democracy.” The United States had threatened intervention to prevent a return to Trujilloism and on an unmentioned occasion deterred a military coup against the Council. However, for Bosch, the United States would not commit to intervention “unless a communist takeover were threatened.” The lack of U.S. action was a consequence of American aversion to Bosch’s nationalism.

Economics was a second factor in U.S. policy affecting Bosch’s removal as president. Bosch’s platform had promoted new programs of social and agrarian reform. However, Bosch inherited an economically bankrupt country. In the previously mentioned conversation, Kennedy and Bosch talked finance as well. Kennedy asked whether the forty million pesos the United States
had granted to the Dominican Republic through the Council was sufficient. While Bosch acknowledged the loan, he declared:

that most of it was devoted to long-term projects. Two million pesos . . . had been devoted to small loans to farmers but more money would be needed to satisfy the farmers’ need for credit.\footnote{35}

His inability to carry out necessary reform severely hurt his popularity among the Dominican people. “What had happened to the revolution,” Ambassador Martin then reluctantly asked Bosch:

I was not in a very good position to ask it— we [the United States] were not being much help . . .. What it all came down to was this: Bosch had no cash . . .. And to a considerable extent it was our fault. We were being far less generous and helpful to Bosch than we had been to the Consejo [Council of State].\footnote{36}

The United States knew Bosch’s economic policies hurt the cívicos and military. If he were to succeed as president, popular support from the Dominican people was indispensible. Moreover, Washington’s unwillingness to help Bosch’s “revolution” financially led to declining support and eventually to his overthrow. Clearly, the United States required more than just cordial relations for its support.

Following the military coup, the Kennedy administration briefly broke off diplomatic relations with the Dominican Republic. Stating his opposition to military coups, Kennedy also acknowledged that “dictatorships are the seedbeds from which communism ultimately springs up.”\footnote{37} However, instead of withholding restoration of formal diplomatic ties until the Dominican Republic reinstated the democratically elected government, Washington extended recognition to a three-man triumvirate and restored diplomatic relations on December 14, 1963.\footnote{*} In return for recognition, the Triumvirate agreed to hold elections in 1965. Within a short time, Donald Reid Cabral, a member of one of the most powerful families in the Dominican Republic, established control over the Triumvirate. Reid Cabral enjoyed good relations with the United States and Dominican military, and would rule the Dominican Republic until U.S. intervention two years later.\footnote{38}

However, despite his support from the United States and Dominican military, Reid Cabral found himself facing an economic crisis. In December 1963, prices for sugar plummeted—the Dominican Republic’s major export. As a result, Reid Cabral began to cut public work projects, and social services, causing unemployment to increase. Moreover, Dominicans began seeing Reid Cabral as a puppet of the United States, further damaging his popularity. To combat his growing

\footnote{* President Kennedy was assassinated on November 22, 1963. President Lyndon B. Johnson restored diplomatic relations with the Dominican Republic.}
opposition, Reid Cabral resorted to terror tactics reminiscent of the Trujillo regime. The triumvirate banned left-wing newspapers, jailed trade union leaders, and left corpses in public places as a warning to others. Disillusioned and isolated from everyone except the United States and portions of the Dominican military, Reid Cabral nevertheless believed he had complete control of the Dominican Republic.\(^{39}\)

On April 24, 1965, corruption and economic incompetence led to the pro-Bosch constitutionalist revolt. Fighting to return Bosch to the presidency, a military faction that supported the former president staged a coup against Reid Cabral. With the eventual addition of thousands of citizens, it appeared the “rebels” had dealt the “loyalists” a fatal blow on April 27 at the Battle of Duarte Bridge. However, the next day, U.S. troops intervened, ending Dominican hope for Bosch’s return to power. The Johnson administration initially claimed the intervention was necessary to protect American lives. Days later, Washington admitted the military action was a response to the threat of a Communist takeover in Santo Domingo. Furthermore, Washington released an error-filled list of fifty-eight alleged Communists accused of taking part in the revolt. The accused included individuals who were ill, out of the country, or in jail. On September 3, a provisional government assumed power, again with the task of holding elections. On June 1, 1966, an interim government staged the second election in just over three years. Balaguer, running for the Reformist Party, won with 57 percent of the vote.\(^{40}\)

The death of Trujillo resulted in the United States substantially increasing involvement in the Dominican Republic. Thereafter, the overthrow of President Juan Bosch was the catalyst for U.S. military intervention in 1965, marking the height of U.S. involvement. Despised in the Kennedy administration for his stance on communism and his nationalistic agenda, lack of support reflected Washington’s distaste for Bosch. Inadequate U.S. financial aid and military backing provided the Dominican upper class and military with the ability to attack Bosch and eventually remove him from the presidency. The culmination of these events led to revolt and intervention. Many historians view Johnson’s decision as a blunder. However, Johnson was a victim of a poor Dominican policy inherited from the Kennedy administration.

Piero Gleijeses states in *The Dominican Crisis* that in 1963 the Kennedy administration could not have saved Bosch. This is simply untrue. If the United States provided the same financial aid it had for previous governments, monitored the Dominican military more closely, and committed itself to intervention as it had before, it could have guaranteed a full term for Bosch. However, within the Kennedy administration, the term “democracy” actual meant hegemony. In this context,
it is clear that regardless of Bosch’s devotion to democracy, his assertive nationalism would prevent full support from Washington. This was the legacy Johnson would confront following Kennedy’s death. The origins of intervention were rooted in Bosch’s overthrow, an event U.S. leaders mismanaged during Kennedy’s presidency. Johnson’s continuation of Kennedy’s Dominican policy created another negative episode in what historians widely recognize as a failed foreign policy. U.S. tolerance of the overthrow of Juan Bosch and subsequent military intervention in the Dominican Republic in 1965 constitute another sad chapter in the regrettable history of U.S. relations with Latin American in the twentieth century.41
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Charles Faulkner: The Life of a Butte County Immigrant and Banker, 1844-1897
Michael McNeil

The life of Butte County banker, Charles Faulkner, witnessed two epic events of nineteenth century European and mining history. Events such as the potato blight, which ravaged rural villages in Ireland during the 1840s, and James Marshall’s renowned discovery of California gold in 1848, which opened the floodgates for prospectors all over the world seeking a fortune of their own. These historical proceedings differ immensely yet the repercussions are arguably similar. The similarities can be seen in the demographics of the United States today. It is clear that events that took place during the nineteenth century pushed many different individuals and families from their country of origin into a new one, the United States of America. Hopefuls of all kinds wished to escape the horrors of famine or to strike it rich in the goldfields of California. Although the migration push factors may have differed between immigrants the major pull factor of the United States stood clear: economic opportunity.

The birth of Charles Faulkner occurred on December 5, 1844, in Monoghan County, Ireland on the eve of the “great hunger.”¹ The following year witnessed the beginnings of a famine that would eventually cause a population drop of more than fifty percent in Ireland. The people of Ireland subsisted mostly on potatoes, which became a problem when the food supply began to deplete.² A fungus destroyed more and more potato crops each year, and providing food for families became increasingly difficult for the rural Irishman. Typically, an Irish family had many mouths to feed and, being the youngest of ten children, Charles Faulkner’s family did not stand apart from the majority.

The Irish starved during these years and did not have many options. Few public work programs existed to assist the people and the ones that did were not successful in effectively aiding them. Many of these people immigrated to the United States seeking better economic fortunes.

---

¹ George C. Mansfield, *History of Butte County, California: with Biographical Sketches of the Leading Men and Women of the County Who Have been Identified with its Growth and Development from the Early Days to the Present* (Los Angeles: Historic Record Company), 573. There is some confusion to when Charles Faulkner was actually born due to the biographical sketch pinning the year at 1846 and his headstone at Chico Cemetery Section 8, Block B, Lot 90, has the year of birth at 1844. ² S.H. Cousens, “Regional Death Rates in Ireland During the Great Famine, from 1846-1851,” *Population Studies* 14, no. 1 (July 1960) : 55.
outside of Ireland. Naturally, the largest Irish immigration wave to the United States occurred during the famine years with seven million Irish people emigrating.  

When the potato blight began destroying the crop in the province of Ulster, where the Faulkner family resided, it posed a huge problem. Fifty percent of the Ulster population relied heavily on potatoes and with the crop being wiped out the province had an annual average decrease of twenty percent in population during the famine years. These conditions pushed many Irish men and women out of their homeland as emigration proved necessary for survival. It is unclear where most of Charles’ siblings dispersed to, but two of his brothers, George and Thomas, headed for California where they lived and mined in Oroville, Butte County, during the 1850s.  

The birth of Oroville occurred almost overnight following the discovery of gold on the Feather River in 1849, when miners began staking claims along the stream at a place known as Orphir. The settlers who first made their way to Orphir in 1849 – 1850 utilized simple methods for mining such as the shovel and pan technique. During this time advanced mining technology did not prove necessary due to the abundance of easily accessible placer gold in the rivers of California. Orphir continued to grow due to mining. In 1855 the town of Orphir was forced to change its name to Oroville. Since the county of Placer already hosted a post office by the name of Orphir. During the same year significant infrastructure developed in Oroville with the creation of the Feather River and Orphir Water Company. The emergence of the company created many construction jobs on new water projects. New jobs meant an increased population in Oroville and more opportunity for different industries to succeed. A fourteen-mile-long ditch that went from Oroville to a town known as Enterprise holds that title of being the first water project done by the company. The town of Oroville continued to grow and saw its first bank, McWilliams &

---

5 Butte County, Recorder, Deeds, Book A, 1850-1871, 218. The deed is corroboration of the Faulkner brothers’ existence in Butte County as early as 1857.  
7 Mansfield, *History of Butte County*, 77.  
8 Wells and Chambers, *History of Butte County*, 232.  
9 Ibid.  
10 Ibid., 235  
11 Ibid.  
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Tymeson, in 1855.\textsuperscript{12} Plenty of exciting events continued to take place during the 1850s. The town of Oroville boasted being the largest mining town in California and it ranked fifth in population.\textsuperscript{13}

With growth in Oroville came change. The town remained a mining town but the methods employed changed drastically. The use of flumes for large-scale hydraulic mining began in 1854 but the new technology of flume mining did not really prove successful in Oroville until 1856.\textsuperscript{14} Later George, Thomas, and Charles Faulkner would employ these techniques to mine their claim with a man named George Dyer.\textsuperscript{15}

After the brothers of Charles Faulkner had settled in Oroville, Charles left Ireland for the United States to join his brothers in their success.\textsuperscript{16} It is most likely that Charles Faulkner left Ireland in 1860 since the first evidence of his residency in California occurred in 1861.\textsuperscript{17} During this time period the median age of an average male emigrant from Ireland stood at 22.5.\textsuperscript{18} Faulkner did not fit into this cohort since he arrived in California at the age of seventeen. Between the years of 1860 and 1870 8.4 percent of males between the ages of 15-19 left their homeland compared to a 33.4 percent immigration rate among men ages 20-24.\textsuperscript{19}

After arriving in California, Charles Faulkner began mining alongside his brothers with much success. The Faulkner’s emerged as some of the most successful miners in Butte County. Their claim would prove lucrative until 1861, when a flood caused extensive damage that proved too costly to clean up.\textsuperscript{20} Contemporaneous with their mining venture, the Faulkner brothers began their banking business with the purchase of the bank firm of McWilliams and Tymeson in 1860.\textsuperscript{21}

Banking in California did not have a significant start until 1848. During this year the Miner’s Bank opened in San Francisco and its name sent a clear message that welcomed gold prospectors to do business.\textsuperscript{22} Wright and Company established the bank and held the title of being the first banking firm in San Francisco, but it would be less than a year before San Francisco would be home

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{12} Ira Cross, \textit{Financing an Empire: History of Banking in California}, Vol. 4,\textsuperscript{1}\ (Chicago: The S.J. Clark Publishing Co., 1927), 99.
\textsuperscript{13} Mansfield, \textit{History of Butte County}, 119.
\textsuperscript{14} Ibid., 80.
\textsuperscript{15} Ibid., 86.
\textsuperscript{16} Ibid., 573.
\textsuperscript{17} Butte County, Recorder, Deeds, Book F, 1850-1871, 397 –399.
\textsuperscript{18} Kerby Miller, \textit{Emigration and Exiles}, 581.
\textsuperscript{19} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{20} Ibid., 86.
\textsuperscript{21} Ira Cross, \textit{Financing an Empire}, 98-99.
\end{flushright}
to six other banking firms. The growth of San Francisco and its banks would continue during the gold rush years. Sacramento would be the site for California’s first bank outside San Francisco. The spread of banks beyond San Francisco provided a clear sign that miners and businessmen coming to California did not plan on leaving until they struck it rich, even if it meant moving to a different part of the state. After Sacramento, the next town to see a bank would be Marysville, where Norman Rideout and William Smith opened N.D. Rideout, Smith and Company in the early 1850s. This banking firm would later buy out the Faulkner brothers Oroville firm and employ Charles Faulkner to start the first bank in Chico. The rise of banking in California occurred simultaneously with all other sorts of developments that transformed California after the discovery of gold at Coloma.

During the next few years Charles Faulkner continued to work as a banker, but at the same time he began buying small pieces of real estate as well. These transactions would prove to be a modest start for a man who would later be a regular purchaser and seller of real estate. In 1866, the Faulkner brothers agreed to sell their banking firm to N.D. Rideout, Smith and Company. The Marysville company continued to employ Charles Faulkner as a cashier.

Shortly after the Faulkner brothers sold their bank another significant event took place in the life of Charles Faulkner. On August 10, 1867, Charles Faulkner underwent a personal transformation of great magnitude when he became a citizen of the United States. The aforementioned event gives one an idea of Charles Faulkner’s intentions. It is clear that he had quickly gained success in the United States and had no desire to return to his homeland where economic opportunity did not prevail. Acquiring a United States citizenship conveys that Charles Faulkner identified with the American dream and ideals of personal advancement and opportunity. It is no surprise to find out that Faulkner decided to continue his life in the United States since the return rate of Irish immigrants reigned among the lowest, although not as low as the return rate among the Jewish people (one out of every twelve Irish went back home).
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In 1871 the newest branch of the N.D. Rideout, Smith, and Company bank opened its doors in the emerging agricultural town of Chico on Second Street near Broadway. ND Rideout acquired the site for his bank from a man named John Kempf. Charles Faulkner thus began a distinguished banking career in Chico as cashier of the new bank. The bank building contained offices that hosted other companies such as the Western Union Telegraph Company and Wells Fargo & Co. Housing such important commercial tenants would prove significant for Charles Faulkner since among those employed locally by Wells Fargo was a man named John R. Robinson who, in later years, would become one of Faulkner’s most important business partners.

John Robinson traveled to California from Lexington, Missouri with his father and mother where they settled at Hansonville in 1852. When Robinson grew older he moved to San Francisco to attend college. After college, Robinson worked for Crew and Conley until 1871 when he moved to Chico where he worked for Wells Fargo. Shortly after settling into the Butte County Bank building, Robinson began joining Charles Faulkner in business ventures beginning with the purchase of a lot in Chico on May 8, 1872. Later these two individuals engaged in agricultural proceedings and established the Faulkner and Robinson orchards. These men embraced technology and used their intuitive skills to foster advancement in Chico.

In June 1872 Charles Faulkner married Mary MacDonald Tilden, thus beginning a new chapter in his life. Alongside this event Faulkner emerged as an important community figure when elected to the office of City Treasurer in January 1872. Charles Faulkner continued working as cashier at the bank and in January 1873, after only two years of operation, the Chico branch of ND Rideout, Smith and Co. changed its name to the Bank of Butte County. Concurrently, the bank became a joint stock company, named George C. Perkins president, and named a board of trustees that included ND Rideout, William Smith, George C. Perkins, Harmon Bay, and Charles Faulkner. These men on the board of trustees stood out as some of Butte County’s most prominent residents.
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notably George C. Perkins who later became governor of California and served as a senator.⁴² Perkins remained president until January of 1875 when Harmon Bay, a Chico farmer and businessman, replaced him. Bay held the position of until 1879 when ND Rideout succeeded him as president. Rideout continued to serve as president of the bank for many years and continued to manage the post until his death in 1907.⁴³ The bank boasted clients such as John Bidwell who Charles Faulkner knew as a customer when Bidwell banked at the Faulkner brothers banking house.⁴⁴ It becomes clear that the associates of Faulkner, and Faulkner himself, had influence among the community. The newly established Bank of Butte County would witness prosperous times in Chico due to the town’s agricultural economy. In previous times the California banker catered to miners, but the changing dynamics of the economy provided evidence that the farmer would become the next important client.⁴⁵

During the late 1860s the bonanza wheat era emerged in California and by the 1870s the California economy transformed with the agricultural movement. The California Mediterranean climate proved as a viable condition for dry farming wheat and farmers of California began to have a surplus of grains due to favorable weather conditions.⁴⁶ Fortunately for California agriculture, a new client base began to form in Europe due to bad crop years, therefore providing an outlet for the
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wheat surplus. Liverpool began importing an increasing amount of wheat from California in the 1870s. By the end of the 1875-1876 crop year the United Kingdom imported 48 percent of its wheat. Just one year later that number would be 64.7 percent.\textsuperscript{47} Not only did the bonanza wheat era boost the economy of California but also the techniques employed for growing wheat changed due to increasing technology.\textsuperscript{48}

After the bank’s name change in 1873, Faulkner became a father with the birth of Isabel Tilden Faulkner on February 27. Sadly for Charles and Mary Faulkner their first child died March 30, 1874.\textsuperscript{49} August 10, 1874 witnessed the birth of Charles Faulkner’s second child, Louis Glass Faulkner. Louis Glass Faulkner attended school in Chico but moved to Oakland for high school and college where he earned a law degree. Eventually, Louis Faulkner would move back to Chico and establish himself as a successful lawyer and contributing member to the community until his death on March 13, 1927.\textsuperscript{50} The Faulkner family would make its last addition with the birth of Ethel Tilden Faulkner on August 25, 1878.\textsuperscript{51} Ethel Faulkner later married a man named EB Copeland, a Stanford graduate and later dean of the College of Agriculture in Los Banos, the two would settle in Butte County where they would command a rice-growing operation.\textsuperscript{52}

Only two months after the birth of Faulkner’s first child, tragedy struck the bank of Butte County on April 2, 1873 when a fire engulfed the building.\textsuperscript{53} Although the fire destroyed the building, the bank’s vault served its purpose by protecting the assets of the bank.\textsuperscript{54} Afterwards the bank occupied the rose building directly across the street from the destroyed institution. Meanwhile, ND Rideout, owner and president of the bank, scurried to secure a new building in which to do business in. In previous years, ND Rideout secured the deed to the lot on the S E corner of Second Street and Broadway, where Jamba Juice conducts business today, and decided to build the new bank on this site. Swain and Hudson received the contract to construct the new building, which would be finished and open for business on November 12, 1875.\textsuperscript{55} The new bank building cost $28,000 to construct and residents considered it to be one of the most impressive buildings in
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The building stood out as an extraordinary addition to the community, and boasted a large entrance that consisted of a door made of walnut and plate glass, beautiful marble steps leading to the entrance of the bank, and Corinthian columns resting on the fore mentioned steps. The Bank of Butte County bounced back from misfortune and within the next few years would be established as the premier banking institution in Butte County.

The year of 1873 proved tragic for Charles Faulkner, but he continued his duties as Chico City Treasurer and as cashier of the Bank of Butte County. His political endeavor proved successful and in 1875 Charles Faulkner sought reelection as City Treasurer and won. Faulkner’s successful reelection serves as corroboration of competence demonstrated in the office and he would be reelected again in 1877. Coinciding with his success as cashier and treasurer, Faulkner demonstrated superior businessman qualities by hastily gathering properties with his partner John Robinson. By August 31, 1876 Faulkner and Robinson procured eight properties together. 1876 proved to be a significant year for the partnership of Faulkner and Robinson when Robinson resigned as Butte County Clerk and accepted the position of assistant cashier at the Bank of Butte County. Upon his resignation, Robinson appointed the local Methodist reverend, Jesse Wood, as County Clerk.

By the end of 1876 the business activities of Charles Faulkner became dormant. Although Faulkner had been purchasing and selling real estate consistently until this time, when a year and a half passed without any evidence of his activity in the real estate market, it became clear that Faulkner’s other activities occupied most of his time. Irish immigrants, such as Faulkner, rarely returned home during this time period. Conditions in Ireland did not provide for economic opportunity resulting in a low return rate among Irish immigrants. Despite this fact Charles Faulkner left Chico and traveled to Ireland for a visit. It is unclear when exactly Faulkner left Chico, but one can assume the trip would have taken place in late 1876 due to the lack of business activities by Faulkner at this time. On May 31, 1877, Faulkner returned to the United States on the ship
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Abyssinia.\textsuperscript{63} Abyssinia ported in Manhattan and Charles Faulkner went through customs at Castle Garden. Before Ellis Island, Castle Garden reigned as the premiere spot for processing immigrants, receiving some 73 million immigrants between the years 1855-1890.\textsuperscript{64}

By February of 1878 it is evident that Charles Faulkner returned to Chico and began actively pursuing business interests. On the 15\textsuperscript{th} of February, Robinson and Faulkner purchased land from Charles Crocker.\textsuperscript{65} Given Faulkner’s prominent position in Chico, and in the banking industry, it is safe to assume that the Charles Crocker Faulkner conducted business with was that of the “Big Four”. To further confirm this notion is evidence of Faulkner conducting business with the Central Pacific Railroad Company.\textsuperscript{66}

The Big Four consisted of Lehlend Stanford, Charles Crocker, Collis P. Huntington and Mark Hopkins.\textsuperscript{67} These men helped foster advancement in California by bringing railroads to towns all over the state. The railroad emerged as an important transportation medium, especially in Chico where wheat needed to be shipped to the nearest port, and on July 4\textsuperscript{th} 1870 the first train rolled into Chico.\textsuperscript{68} The introduction of the train into the community brought about a sense of advancement and the knowledge that the archaic methods of shipping could be phased out. The railroad created competition for shipping ports on the Sacramento River, which previously had been the exclusive shipping method for Butte County wheat farmers. The shipping practice consisted of loading wheat onto many horse drawn wagons that would then be taken to the nearest port on the Sacramento River. Upon arriving the wheat would be loaded onto steam ships and sent to the ports of the San Francisco Bay area.\textsuperscript{69} From San Francisco the wheat embarked on a 100 day, 14,000 nautical mile journey to Liverpool.\textsuperscript{70} Medium clippers, the vessels used for shipping wheat, became the last commercial use of wooden sailing ships.\textsuperscript{71} Economics reigned as the primary factor resulting in the use of the medium clipper because other shipping methods would not suffice due to cost. The non-perishable characteristic of wheat allowed for a longer, yet more cost effective, means of transportation. To meet the financial challenges that farming entailed, farmers turned to local banks for assistance via loans.

\textsuperscript{64} http://www.castlegarden.org/index.html.
\textsuperscript{65} Butte County, Recorder, Deeds, Book Q, 1877-1887, 795.
\textsuperscript{66} Butte County, Recorder, Deeds, Book Z, 1877-1887, 435.
\textsuperscript{67} Rice, \textit{The Elusive Eden}, 258.
\textsuperscript{68} John Waterland, no. 2, 44:2.
\textsuperscript{71} Ibid.
The closing of the 1870s witnessed the emergence of the Bank of Butte County as the strongest financial institution in Chico. The Bank of Chico generated the chief competition for the Bank of Butte County and in 1879 the Bank of Chico would be displaced as the banking leader and never again would it reemerge to its previous position. Along with the success of the bank came success for Charles Faulkner. Besides owner and president ND Rideout, Charles Faulkner owned more stocks of the Bank of Butte County than anyone else with 425 shares in contrast to that of Rideout at 625. The 1870s hosted many significant life events for Charles Faulkner that included, marriage, children, and financial success.

The 1880s surfaced as a decade that witnessed aggressive business undertakings and success by Faulkner and Robinson. The 1880 census reveals that Faulkner employed a domestic servant from England named Katie Brown, which provides evidence of Faulkner’s wealth. By the year 1882 Faulkner became the Bank of Butte County’s largest stockholder with 425 stocks with California Governor, George Perkins, holding the second largest amount with 400 shares. Along with success came more community respect and responsibility. The community’s deference for Charles Faulkner can be seen in his appointment to the Chico State Normal School Board of Trustees. The responsibilities given to the governing board remained simple, to pass the bill that would allow the school to be built and secure a proper location for the school. Eventually, General John Bidwell donated eight acres of land, harboring a lucrative cherry orchard and next to the Presbyterian Church, which became the site for the school.

The decade proved to be one full of activity for the business partnership of Faulkner and Robinson, which saw 33 joint business transactions by the duo. The most notable year of undertakings came in 1889 with a business venture that became a community development property. On June 6th, 1889 Faulkner and Robinson purchased a large piece of land from a man named George Miller for $7,497. George Miller had been assigned the task of taking care of the former estate of William Northgraves who recently passed away. Northgraves, one of the original Chico
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pioneers, journeyed to California with the Bidwell party and became a mining partner of the General.\textsuperscript{82} Once Faulkner and Robinson acquired the land, they wasted no time dividing it into smaller lots. They began advertising the new property with an advertisement running in the Chico Record on June 14, 1889, only eight days after Faulkner and Robinson procured their investment.\textsuperscript{83} The “Northgraves Addition,” as it became formally known with proper survey being done on June 20, 1889, sat one-fourth of a mile from town.\textsuperscript{84}

![Northgraves Addition to Chico.](image)

Photo courtesy of Chico Record June 14, 1887.

The two-acre lots ranged in price from $425 dollars to $600 dollars depending on the location. Lot sixteen, which can be seen in the above photo, carried the most value with an asking price of $600 dollars. Faulkner and Robinson also offered a 5\% discount to customers with cash and an 8\% interest would be applied to those with deferred payments.\textsuperscript{85} Amazingly, on October 2, 1889, Faulkner and Robinson sold their last lot of the Northgraves Addition.\textsuperscript{86} The combined asking price of the lots stood at $10,100, $2,603 more than the purchased price. The undertaking of
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this business venture conveys that Faulkner and Robinson worked efficiently, hastily, and possibly even aggressively together.

Alongside Faulkner’s personal success came good fortune for the Bank of Butte County. The institution continued to dominate Chico’s banking industry in the 1880s and the prosperity continued throughout the duration of Faulkner’s life.\footnote{Butte County, Recorder, Bank Assessment Roll.} In fact the bank did well enough that president of the bank, ND Rideout, built 100 miles of telephone line in 1885.\footnote{John Waterland, “Built 1st telephone lines, 1885,” no. 2, 107:1.} The telephone lines connected the towns of Marysville, Willows, Moore Station, Oroville, and Chico where the telephone line office were stationed at Rideout banks or offices.\footnote{Ibid.} It becomes evident that ND Rideout knew the importance of the telephone and embraced the new technology.

During the Faulkner’s last years he continued to be active in the real estate and banking business. His life can be characterized with him having strong ambitions, strong business ideals, and community activism. Throughout his life, Faulkner remained a man of good business ethics who helped those who he deemed honest and trustworthy.\footnote{Chico Enterprise Record, August 6, 1897.} As a result, Faulkner’s ambitious wheeling and dealing left a mark in the community and many respected him for his kindness and well-tempered personality.\footnote{Ibid} Faulkner became sick in 1897 and left for San Francisco to seek professional medical help. Unfortunately, Faulkner never recovered and past away at Dr. Lane hospital on July 30, 1897.\footnote{Chico Cemetery Section 8, Block B, Lot 90. Visited by Author.} Upon Faulkner’s death John Robinson assumed the responsibility of cashier at the Bank of Butte County.\footnote{Ira Cross, Financing an Empire, 99.}

In closing, the life of Charles Faulkner represents the American dream. Faulkner immigrated to the United States in search of economic opportunity and a better life. With no hesitation Faulkner chased his dream and became one of Chico’s best citizens. He witnessed and participated in the era of large-scale flume mining and his banking ventures catered to bonanza wheat farmers, who helped transform the California economic landscape. Charles Faulkner’s hard work and perseverance displays a true American.
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“Great Anticipations! Fearful Reality!”: Why Men Chose to Volunteer to Fight for the Confederacy

Dillon Carroll

“It is interesting, sometimes, to the old veterans, to go back, in retrospect, to the days of 1861,” John S. Robson, who volunteered at sixteen, mused after the war, “when soldier-life was gilded with the glory that was to be…in a war which we were taught to think would be a very short one-ninety days at most, but which tried our faith, nerve, and patience, for four of the longest years that are ever crowded into the lifetime of a generation.”¹ What convinced men like John S. Robson to embrace secession and join the war effort? Specifically, how were men living in the Upper South, which was not as economically tied to slavery as the Lower South, convinced to join the war? The decision to welcome secession remained a complex, emotional decision that often took the form of a religious conversion.²

Southern men faced a perilous decision in the spring of 1861. By February of that year, South Carolina, Mississippi, Florida, Alabama, Georgia, Louisiana, and Texas had all left the Union.³ Men in the Upper South had to decide whether they turn away from the Union and risk war against the nation that had given them everything? Or would they stay loyal to the Union and risk war against their homeland? During the early months of 1861 a generational divide arose between southern men regarding the decision to secede from the Union. Young men overwhelmingly supported secession, while elder men remained conservative, hoping that the fissure among the states would heal on its own before they were forced to choose sides.⁴

Colleges became breeding grounds for the secession movement among the Upper South states. Young college students became infatuated with joining their southern brethren in disunion. Is it a surprise that so many southern youth were so initially enthusiastic about secession and the possibility of war? Historian Stephen Berry certainly did not think so “for any still curious as to why young men fought in the Civil War, they need look no farther than this—they fought because they

were young."5 Youth was certainly a driving force in the loving embrace secession felt among young men in the South. But the reasons ran far deeper than just youth. Young men attending the southern universities were the sons of planters and politicians. They came to these universities to receive more than an intellectual education; they came to receive an education in gentility. Personal independence and individuality were important to the parents of collegiate youth and were emphasized by them. Embracing secession and possible civil war allowed southern youth to fully realize their education in independence. Defying parental and academic authority was the ultimate form of independence.6 “Resolved, That being deeply impressed with sentiments of patriotism for the honor of our beloved state,” fifteen Louisiana students at the University of North Carolina claimed in a resolution signed after Louisiana adopted an ordinance of secession, “we are ready to forsake the peaceful duties of a college life, and take up the sword, in defence of that sacred Liberty, we have been taught to cherish from our earliest childhood.”7 Additionally, as the sons of planters, they believed their future rested on the institution of slavery. They felt slavery was under attack, and therefore their future livelihood was under attack as well, “and in defence of that Institution, at once our pride, and the source of all our health and prosperity.”8

An analysis of masculinity in the nineteenth century American South reveals that manhood was not simply achieved by age. Young adults were not considered men, they were considered youths. They lacked all the indicators of southern manhood: property ownership, slave ownership, successful career, successful marriage, self-control, dependence upon no one but self. But by embracing disunion and later volunteering for the war effort, young men had found a shortcut into established manhood. Secession then, served as a rite of passage for young southerners.9

Rebel flags were raised at several universities, including the University of Virginia, before the state had seceded. Flag raising ceremonies served several symbolic functions. They demonstrated an obvious shift of loyalty from the United States to the southern Confederacy. They also
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demonstrated a shift from adult authority to youth solidarity. They were a visible statement that young men wanted to lead in secession and war.\textsuperscript{10}

There were, however, exceptions to the monopoly of secessionist thought among young adults. Several young men were aghast at the prominence disunion held among college youth. “I have seen Lincoln’s inaugural,” Tennessean John W. Halliburton wrote his fiancée from Chapel Hill. “Still it does not make me a secessionist only an anti-Lincoln man…I can hate him and still love the Union.”\textsuperscript{11} Halliburton was an island of unionism awash in a tumultuous sea of disunion, and he knew it. “I verily believe that I am the only union man in College,” he confided in his fiancée in the same letter. “I have a hard time here about politics. I am assailed and attacked by all the boys that I meet…Daily am I engaged in a wordy war with some two or three and I just slash right and left.”\textsuperscript{12} Life must have been tough for young Halliburton on the campus of Chapel Hill; southern youth had no patience for dissent. They would have demanded solidarity from him or demanded he leave and join the old men. He may have found better company among his elders.

In the early months of 1861 older men in the Upper South were not as warm to secession as the younger generation was. They were apprehensive, even disdainful of the disunion movement. While many of these men despised President-elect Lincoln, they still maintained a fierce loyalty towards both the Union and the Constitution of the United States. Even Robert E. Lee, who later became one of the most revered American Generals behind George Washington, and the most famous Confederate soldier, scorned the secession movement. “The framers of our Constitution never exhausted so much labor, wisdom, and forbearance in its formation and surrounded it with so many guards and securities if it was intended to be broken up by every member of the Confederacy at will,” Lee argued in January of 1861. “It is idle to talk of secession.”\textsuperscript{13}

In the same month, T.N. Crumpler delivered a speech in the North Carolina House of Commons, in which he affirmed his rabid loyalty to the Union, and attempted to dissuade the state from entertaining secession. “I have been influenced from early manhood to this moment by love of country; and I shall ever continue to be a patriot and a true friend of the Constitution and the
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Union...The Union must be preserved. It shall be preserved.”

Speeches like this were common among men in the Upper South during the early months of 1861. It spoke to their reaction against both the agitators of the secession crisis, and the radical youth who embraced disunion.

Voters in both Tennessee and North Carolina were given the choice of voting for or against the holding of a state convention to consider the question of secession. “I have considered a Convention part of the disunion machinery which is necessary to force a State from her accustomed orbit, and drive her into another system,” T.N. Crumpler stated in North Carolina. “It is the door through which we are to walk out. It is the bridge upon which we are to cross the Rubicon...we cannot dissolve the Union.” Voters in both Tennessee and North Carolina agreed, and voted against even holding a convention. In Tennessee, for example, only twenty-three percent of the voters favored secession in February of 1861.

Virginia, Arkansas, and Missouri, however, did hold conventions to consider secession from the Union. Missouri and Arkansas both rejected secession in March, while Virginia continued to deliberate through February. The Virginia convention allowed commissioners from the Lower South to speak, like John S. Preston, who was a Virginian by birth, but a resident of South Carolina. He pleaded for Virginia to join the Confederacy, “believing the rights violated and the interests involved are identical with the rights and interests of the people of Virginia,” Preston argued, “and remembering their ancient amity and their common glory, the people of South Carolina have instructed me to ask, earnestly and respectfully, that the people of Virginia will join them in the protection of their rights and interests.” Virginia did not believe their rights and interests were identical to South Carolina’s, and they voted against secession in early April.

For older men, refusing to leave the Union held a dual repudiation. It was obviously a dismissal of their Lower South brethren; essentially proclaiming a separate interest that did not lie with disunion. But much more than that, spurning secession was also an insult upon the younger generation of southern men who had so enthusiastically embraced it. It was a refusal to recognize the masculinity of the younger generation. Older southerners regarded the younger generations’
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acceptance of disunion as immature and irresponsible, both of which were clear indicators of youth, not manhood.\textsuperscript{19}

Clearly the Confederacy was hoping for allies on the basis of geography, desperately trying to stimulate men from the Upper South into vigorous action. But the regions did not have identical interests; there remained a fissure among the South concerning the prominence of slavery. Slaves constituted forty-seven percent of the population in the Confederate states, while only twenty-four percent of the population in the Upper South. Thirty-seven percent of white families in the Confederate states owned slaves, compared with twenty percent of the families in the Upper South. Men in the Upper South were less invested in slavery than families in the Confederate states. Simply put, not all southerners were initially willing to risk war over the potential limitation of slavery.\textsuperscript{20}

However, this fissure was healed during the month of April 1861 when fighting at Fort Sumter erupted on April 12, 1861. Lincoln sent a message to the Governor of South Carolina, informing him that an attempt to supply the Fort would be made with provisions only. Lincoln had put the ball into the Confederacy’s court, and they wasted no time in allowing violence to commence. At 4:30 am on April 12, Pierre Gustave Toutant Beauregard opened fire from Charleston Harbor upon the miniscule fort enveloped in darkness. After thirty-three hours of bombardment, the tiny garrison inside the Fort surrendered. Immediately following the attack, President Lincoln issued a proclamation calling for 75,000 volunteers to put down the rebellion.\textsuperscript{21}

The fighting at Fort Sumter and the subsequent proclamation had a galvanizing effect upon the Upper South, serving as the catalyst for the acceptance of radical secessionist thought. In a letter to his father, twenty-year-old Edward H. Armstrong revealed why the Upper South had suddenly embraced radicalism. “Further bloodshed could be avoided, by every man in the South shouldering his musket,” Armstrong claimed while reiterating a speech he heard at Chapel Hill. “Lincoln would then see our strength and would know that it would be useless to attempt to coerce us.”\textsuperscript{22} Coercion implies persuading an unwilling person to do something usually by threats or force. When someone is forced to do something against their will, they could potentially be relegated to a state of
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dependence. Submission to Lincoln’s supposed “coercion” would have equated with a state of
dependence in the minds of many southerners, who had unique fears of dependence.23

Regardless of the fact that Confederate forces had fired the first shot from Charleston
Harbor on Fort Sumter, southerners regarded Lincoln’s proclamation as an act of war, and a threat
of invasion. “We know, my Sister and Mother,” Georgian Edwin Bass wrote his sister, “that our
country is threatened [with] destruction by an inveterate enemy that is willing to show no regard for
humanity nor the rights of our section and people.”24 Certainly, the threat of invasion weighed
heavily upon the minds of southerners in the spring of 1861. Many men capitalized on the fear of
invasion to help fill the enlistment of local regiments. “Men of the Potomac border,” a leaflet
calling for Virginia recruits proclaimed. “Your Country calls you to her defence, already you have in
spirit responded. You await but the order to march, to rendezvous, to organize, to defend your
State, your liberties, and your homes!”25

The shame of submission, and the dependence and emasculation that submission carried
with it, certainly weighed upon their minds as well. Submission did not signify masculinity, but
resistance certainly did. “Think of what an unjust people are endeavoring to do to us, threatening
not only our liberties but our lives,” William Butt wrote to his wife. “What would you think of the
Southern people if they quietly give up and submitted? What would you really think of me were I
too craven-hearted to resist our great enemy?”26 Honor certainly played a lead role in convincing
men to enlist in the conflict. The sinews of southern honor comprised the ability to defend family
and home. If a man could not or would not defend his family, he was considered dishonorable,
cowardly, and feminine. In such a case, many southerners charged women with inspiring men to go
to war. “Women of Virginia, cast from your arms all cowards; and breathe the pure and holy, the
high and glowing inspirations of your nature, into the hearts and souls of lover, husband, brother,
father!”27

War fever spread across the South like a raging wildfire. War was everywhere, and the young
generation of southerners who had warmly embraced secession, were now ecstatic to become
soldiers in the conflict. “There is a great excitement here. Everybody talks, thinks and dreams of
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war. The students are leaving daily,” Lavender Ray wrote his sister from Chapel Hill in April 1861.
“I desire very much to join them and will do so, if Pa and Ma are willing. I shall await their answer
with impatience, hoping it will be in the affirmative.” Ray would join Company A of the 1st
Georgia Volunteer Infantry as a private, on July 6, 1861. After the elder generation of southern
men embraced secession and confirmed the authenticity of separation, the young generation
returned to their traditional role within the social hierarchy. They still considered themselves worthy
men for being early proponents of disunion, and for being eager participants in the war. But instead
of defying the elder generation, they again looked to them for guidance and permission. “I beg you
to let me be one to proceed to Federal Point,” Edward H. Armstrong requested from his father,
“and frighten Lincoln out of his wits… I should be happy to bear a part, humble though it be, in
defense of my country.”

Contributing to the torrent of war that had spread across the South after the firefight at Fort
Sumter was the widespread belief among southern men that the war would be quick. Most men did
not believe they were signing up to fight in a war that would last four years, and cost the lives of
thousands of men, not to mention the collapse of their society and culture. Some even denied that
there would be any violence. “The chances are decidedly against war,” Thomas R.R. Cobb wrote to
his wife, “there may be a little collision and much confusion, but no bloody or extensive war.” A
young Georgian shared Cobb’s confidence that secession would occur without any violence, “What
will the Europeans think when they find out that one of the greatest revolutions that has ever taken
place was begun and ended without bloodshed? It is truly a revolution guided by reason and carried
through without the aid of brute force.” Inexperience contributed to the widespread belief that
secession would be carried through peacefully, or with minimal conflict. Most of these men were
not professional soldiers, or had limited experience with soldiering.

A widespread sense of adventure convinced many men to enlist and become soldiers. Many
volunteers believed that the war would be filled with distinction and excitement. Combined with the
predominant feeling that the war would be quick made the early southern volunteers a very eager
bunch. “Those of us who had enlisted felt that we were great heroes and were going forth to
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participate in a kind of holiday excursion, soon to return crowned with victorious laurels,” Alabamian William Robert Houghton, who enlisted at eighteen, remembered. “I had but limited education and knew very little of the ways of the world, but felt my importance as a prospective soldier of the Confederacy.”33 The romance and adventure that battle seemed to promise to southern volunteers breached the generations and tugged at the hearts of older men. Men who had never ventured from the farm, or who spent their day working at an urban craft shop, or who spent all their time on the plantation; were very easily lured to volunteer by the prospect of fame and excitement.34

Many volunteers certainly joined the war effort not out of patriotism or a strong sense of duty, but because enlisting was popular. Peer pressure has always played a part, and will always play a part, in convincing men to go to war. That proved especially true in 1861 when regiments were raised locally, often in the same neighborhoods. Men who grew up together, went to school together, worked together, all joined a regiment together. Peer pressure must have been particularly strong.35 “I never would come if it had not been that all the boys was going off,” Lavender Ray wrote his brother in 1861, as a private in the 1st Georgia Volunteer Infantry. “And if I was you, I would leave right straight for home, and there I would stay until peace is made.”36 Very few men could resist the pressure to enlist and risk looking feminine in the eyes of their friends and family.

Apart from actual service in warfare, southerners’ knowledge of soldering would have been limited to two experiences. Militia service would have been an experience in which a select few participated. While the militia rarely saw actual service, it would have given men a background in marching, weaponry, and the hierarchy of the military, which complemented the social hierarchy of the South.37 Another experience, which proved to be tactically limited, but a greater number of southerners participated in, would have been slave patrols. Most slaveholding communities organized a muster annually to terrorize slaves. Following the escape of a slave, or a slave insurrection, slaveholding whites organized a slave patrol to police the area. Harriet Jacobs
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described one such patrol in North Carolina: “At night, they [whites] formed themselves into patrol bands, and went wherever they chose among the colored people, acting out their brutal will.”

Men who did have extensive experience in warfare were understandably hesitant about the conflict. They were also critical of the popular belief that the war would be short and perhaps bloodless. Many professional soldiers had a sense of foreboding, because they knew the war would be extensive and violent. Robert E. Lee was plagued with a fearful apprehension even after Virginia had left the Union: “Whatever may be the result of the contest, I foresee that the country will have to pass through a terrible ordeal.” The popular notion that the war would be brief permeated the minds of men and lead to a sense of invincibility that irritated the professional soldiers. Those who had experience wanted to instill their sense of trepidation into the southern people. Twenty-seven-year-old North Carolinian William Dorsey Pender was one of these men. “We shall never be able to do anything until our Southern troops get two or three sound whippings,” Pender wrote his wife Fanny. “I firmly believe it would be the best thing for the South.”

The widespread sense of invincibility that pervaded the mind of southern men, and perplexed the professional soldiers, certainly was influenced by the military tradition of the South. The most successful and popular American generals were southerners including George Washington, Andrew Jackson, Winfield Scott, Zachary Taylor, and Albert Sidney Johnston. Additionally, American armies had a history of success against superior odds. Washington fought against superior numbers in the American Revolution. Jackson fought against a superior British force at the Battle of New Orleans. During the war with Mexico, General Scott and Taylor continually fought outnumbered against Mexican forces. Southern men influenced by this tradition, had no reason to believe they could not soundly defeat a numerically superior northern army in a relatively short time.

This was the maelstrom in which southern men were immersed; the pressure to enlist in the conflict was so great. None felt that pressure more than a North Carolinian named Walter Lenoir. Walter was born in 1823 and was the son of Thomas Lenoir, and the great grandson of William
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Lenoir, a revolutionary hero. The Lenoirs were one of the leading families who lived in East North Carolina, and like all prominent southern families, they were planters and slaveholders.43

Walter was the third son of Thomas Lenoir and Selina Louise Lenoir, and his experience was typical of planter society. He attended the University of North Carolina, from which graduated in 1843. After graduation, Walter began a five-month tour of the northern states with his brother Tom. The signs of progress and improvement, which seemed breathtaking when juxtaposed to rural North Carolina, particularly surprised him. In 1846, Walter became licensed to practice law in North Carolina, a common profession for the sons of planters who had no land of their own. In 1856, Walter proposed to a Virginia cousin, Cornelia Christian, and they were married in the summer of that year. The couple was blessed with the birth of a daughter in 1857, but like thousands of children in the nineteenth century she fell ill and succumbed to disease. Tragedy soon struck again as Cornelia lost a prolonged battle with illness in February of 1859. While coping with his massive grief, Walter made a trip North in search of a new home and a fresh start, which he thought he had found in Minnesota.44

He returned to North Carolina in November of 1860, and became a witness to the unraveling of national unity during the secession crisis. When secession came to fruition, Walter joined his elders in scorning the rash decision made by the Lower South states. He was thirty-eight years old, and this reaction was typical of men his age living in North Carolina.45 After the fighting at Fort Sumter erupted and Lincoln made his famous proclamation, Walter was swept up in the war fever that raged through the hearts of southern men. In a letter to his little brother Rufus, who remained on the homefront during the war, Walter revealed why he enlisted. “I have on two occasions during the war found it necessary to reflect very seriously upon what course it might be my duty to take,” Walter related to Rufus in 1863. “The first time was when I first became certain that the war was actually upon us. For ten or fifteen minutes I studied perhaps harder than I ever did in my life. I remember that large drops of sweat stood on my forehead…I reflected that, under God, I owed my life, my ease, my enjoyment, my property, to the laws and institutions of my country.”46
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Walter had a literal conversion experience after Fort Sumter that electrified him from an ambivalent Unionist, to a hardened Confederate. He had never been very religious, but the war gave him the religious experience he had always craved.\textsuperscript{47} Adding to his conversion experience, a heavy feeling of duty convinced Walter, and many southerners, to enlist. Duty to country, as Walter and many other men understood it, was a reciprocal obligation to home and country. They were duty bound to protect the country, and the family, that had for so long protected them.\textsuperscript{48} Additionally, the war presented a second chance for older men like Walter to fulfill their manly dreams. Like many thirty-something men, Walter was not completely satisfied with the life he was leading. He was a widower, he did not own substantial property, and his litigation career was mundane and dull. In his mind, the war offered him a chance to participate in a manly crusade against an agitating enemy, to reconnect with a youthful masculinity that was previously long lost.\textsuperscript{49}

Thomas Lenoir, Walter’s older brother, raised a volunteer company in Haywood, North Carolina, that became known as the Haywood Highlanders. They were mustered into state service as Company F of the 25\textsuperscript{th} Regiment of North Carolina Infantry.\textsuperscript{50} In 1860, ordinary men raised volunteer regiments locally. Much like the militia, social and economic superiors often funded the regiment; in return the men would elect them captain. By the end of April 1860, 60,000 southern men had volunteered in local companies to fight in the impending war.\textsuperscript{51}

While Rufus refused to enlist, Walter joined Thomas and the Haywood Highlanders in January 1862 in South Carolina. Shortly thereafter, Union forces gained dual victories in February 1862. The first was in eastern North Carolina, at the same time, Union strikes in the west led by General Ulysses S. Grant seized Forts Henry and Donelson. After these setbacks, Rufus’ view of the war began to darken considerably. Walter began a series of letters hoping to boost the morale of his sulking brother. Among these letters, Walter shared his reasons for volunteering.\textsuperscript{52}

Walter, like many southern men, became convinced that Lincoln’s proclamation amounted to coercion, and that southern men could never submit to such an insult. Submission was equal to dependence, which emasculated and dishonored men. “I could never submit to Yankee rule,” Walter wrote Rufus in 1863. “Liable to be elbowed out of the road by them or to see my mother or
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my sisters insulted by their wenches who would flaunt the highways with them. I would rather lose all my property, loathe in a dungeon, die.”53 This was the world Walter imagined would materialize if men like himself allowed the South to submit to the North. In this imaginative world, men like Walter could be pushed around, deprived of all independence, forced to watch the degradation of their women. The terrifying future Walter imagined was based on the world that black slaves inhabited. Simply put, Walter believed that submission would turn southern men into slaves that were dependent and feminine.

Walter wanted to reconnect with a brilliant past; the war offered him a chance to do so. He wanted to prove himself worthy as an heir of the Revolution, a faithful custodian of liberty. “Remember that your grandfather fought through an eight years war,” he wrote Rufus in 1862, “a few infant colonies struggling against the richest and most powerful and war like nation on earth, exposed to constant dangers, but that he survived it all.”54 Walter did not have to look that far back for inspiration from previous generations, he could look to his father as well. “Your father once buckled on his sword in the fearful task of making war upon the same mighty nation, but he too survived it and lived to ripe old age.”55 Looking back to previous generations provided guidance to Walter, it made him feel worthy of his patriarchs. But it could also provide counsel, because his father and grandfather had waged war and survived to tell about it. Reconnecting with his predecessors provided Walter with a store of confidence.56

Walter’s confidence was also buoyed by the belief that he was enlisting to fight in a just and righteous cause. He believed, like so many other southern men, that the South was being invaded and they were simply protecting their liberty and homes. “Ours is now the righteous side of this controversy while that of our adversaries is unholy,” Walter wrote his mother in 1862.57 If the cause of the South was just, consequently the cause of the North was unjust. Walter considered the invading enemy as evil, and therefore they would not be allowed to win. God would not allow it.

Religion was a prominent feature in Walter’s decision to enlist and go off to war. His conversion experience had left him with a fervent belief in Christianity. Walter’s belief in God, and his belief that the cause of the South was righteous complemented each other. In his mind, God would not allow an unjust enemy of a righteous people to succeed in subjugating them. “You read
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the Bible and you know that God rules the world,” he wrote Rufus in 1863. “He is just and merciful, and he can’t be on the side of the wicked. He is always on the side of the just…it is our duty to hope, that it will be apparent to human observation in the ordinary way that he will favor us.” Walter ardently believed that God favored the South and would not allow the North to win. This belief invigorated his courage, and uplifted his confidence.

Walter was fortified with boundless optimism, buoyed by his conversion experience that hardened him into a ceaseless Confederate soldier. Prior to the war he was not a conventional southerner; he had spent considerable time in the northern states and admired them for their industrialization, so much so that he had planned on moving to Minnesota prior to the war. Walter was ambivalent towards slavery, he had considered owning slaves to be evil and eventually vowed to never own a slave himself. This may seem strange considering that Walter was the heir to a planter family, but he most likely never dealt with the evils of slavery personally. He was the master’s son, so he rarely was witness to the heinous acts of disciplining irate slaves. He was also a resident of the Upper South, where slaveowners were more in the business of selling slaves to fund economic diversification. But all of these conflicting emotions were consolidated into radical southern pride when Walter felt that North Carolina was threatened with an invasion and subjugation.

Walter’s confidence was lifted by the support and cheer of his family. He believed that he was fighting for his country, and for his family. His nightmares of the submission of the South involved his mother and sisters being abused by Yankee invaders. He, like so many other southern men, needed the absolute support of his family to remain confident of the final results of the war. He wrote his despondent brother Rufus in an attempt to lift his spirits and convince him of the righteousness of their cause. But his attempt to lift the spirits of Rufus must be viewed as an attempt to lift his own spirits and boost his own confidence. His lawyer-like arguments for Rufus to be more optimistic were likely similar to the case he had laid out in his own mind to remain confident.

Because of this fact, Rufus’ consistent pessimism agitated him. “I have been perhaps too much exercised about my dear brother Rufus, whom I regard as a sort of prisoner chained at home,
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by the softest of fetters,” Walter wrote his Mother in 1862. “His last letter to me was a little of the bluest.”63 Walter believed Rufus was manacled at home by his feminine fears, unwilling to enlist in the war or even remain confident of the Confederate cause. But Rufus’ despondency was curable; Walter encouraged him to enlist. “I do not think the contingency will come upon you; but if it should come be ready for it…Make the choice now, and if you make it in accordance with your convictions of duty you will soon I hope find your self a much more cheerful and hopeful man.”64 According to Walter, enlisting would make a man out of Rufus, and would help to cure his incessant sulking.

Walter made this particular recommendation out of his own experience. In the wake of the death of his family, Walter’s conversion to a Confederate soldier suddenly gave him a purpose in life. He felt he was fighting a just and righteous cause, he felt that God was with him, he felt like a man. But he also had begun to hear rumors that local citizens had begun to question Rufus’ loyalty to the Confederate cause. In the back of his mind, Walter most likely despaired about Rufus’ loyalty as well.65 He maneuvered to kindle Rufus’ masculinity and sense of duty. “I feel my determination increasing as the prospect darkens,” Walter wrote Rufus in 1862. “When I remember that adversity only serves to develop the better qualities both of men and nations I can not but believe that your manly and loyal nature will be aroused by the calamites of our country.”66

Rufus Lenoir never enlisted to fight in the Civil War, despite the advice from his brother. Walter however, went off to fight along with thousands of eager southern men who were determined to take part in the action before it was over. “A Southern soldier’s ambition consists in the fervent hope that he be afforded the earliest practicable chance of crossing bayonets with the mercenaries of a despotic tyrant.” A young Georgian wrote a friend in 1861.67 Walter, and other southern men like him, enlisted believing that the war would not significantly damage their personal independence and individuality. For common men, individuality and independence were prized possessions not to be bartered away. As Confederate General John B. Gordon marched his men through Atlanta to a camp on the outskirts of town, he could not help but admire their individuality. “The march, or rather straggle…was a sight marvellous to behold and never to be forgotten,” Gordon remembered. “Totally undisciplined and undrilled, no two of these men marched abreast;
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no two kept the same step; no two wore the same colored coats or trousers. The only pretence at uniformity was the rough fur caps made of raccoon skins.\textsuperscript{68} These men expected to maintain their individuality and independence throughout the conflict.

Men enlisted with the belief that they would continue to control their own destiny through the conflict. They held a fervent conviction that their fate rested on their inner qualities. As long as they responded to challenges with courage and honor, the markings of masculinity, they would continue to control their own fortune. Many men even believed that the courageous man would be spared in battle.\textsuperscript{69} The Civil War would test these men in ways they could never have imagined. It would challenge everything that constructed their world, even the foundations of masculinity itself.

In April 1861, sixteen-year-old David E. Johnston joined the 7\textsuperscript{th} Virginia regiment and became a soldier like thousands of fellow Virginians.\textsuperscript{70} In one sentence Johnston brilliantly expressed his decision to become a soldier juxtaposed with the sad reality, “Great anticipations! Fearful reality!”\textsuperscript{71} Indeed, the war would become a “fearful reality” for most of these men.
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Brief Encounter: Sino-Soviet Relations 1945-1960
James Morey

On February 14, 1950 the People’s Republic of China and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics signed a historic Treaty of Friendship, Alliance and Mutual Assistance. This agreement initiated a decade of close cooperation between the two great Communist states. Western politicians looked on in horror and expressed apprehension about the monolithic nature of the Communist alliance. Chairman Mao Tse-Tung and Joseph Stalin warmly endorsed the alliance between two great states. But, before two decades passed the alliance died and Chinese and Soviet troops clashed over border issues dating from the 18th century. The pact could not survive the death of Stalin. The alliance, forged upon the pragmatism of Stalin, foundered when left in the hands of Mao Tse-tung and Nikita Khrushchev.

Russian interest in Asia can be traced back to a “land grant made by Ivan the Terrible to the Strogonov brothers in 1574.” The Stroganovs represented the leading edge of generations of Russian explorers that traveled east in search of land, freedom, and opportunity. Although the land granted by the Tsar did not, technically, belong to Russia, this did not stop the steady eastward migration of “freebooting Cossacks…in search of furs and precious metals.” In fact “it was primarily the fur trade which led the Russians to cross Siberia.”

Exploration of Asia fell to private interests who “built … forts at strategic points from which they ruled the natives, forced them to swear allegiance to the Tsar and collected tribute of furs and provisions.” However, Russian traders lacked significant military or logistical support and avoided conflict when possible. Despite this policy of avoidance, a clash of interests proved inevitable. During the following century conflict erupted in the Amur River region. The fighting continued throughout the 1680s until both parties signed the Treaty of Nerchinsk. This treaty, signed on August 27, 1689, “the first between China and a European state,” acknowledged Chinese control of the Amur River region. The Treaty of Nerchinsk remained unchanged for nearly two centuries.
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By the middle of the nineteenth century, the Russian empire sought a strong and enduring presence in the Far East. Russian progress during this period is largely due to the efforts of Nikolai Muraviev, the “Governor General of Eastern Siberia.”

Muraviev initiated a long-term plan to expand the Russian border. The Qing Dynasty, beset by growing European military pressure and the concerted diplomatic efforts of Britain, France, and the United States, had little chance of outmaneuvering the Russians.

Under the skilled direction of Muraviev, Russia managed to negotiate a new treaty. This treaty, the Treaty of Aigun, signed on May 28, 1858, nullified the Nerchinsk document and “yielded to Russia most of the territory north of the Amur between the Aigun and the Pacific.” However, another section stated that “between the Ussuri River and the sea, as they are presently, be commonly owned by the Chinese Empire and the Russian Empire until the boundary between the two States is settled.” (Italics added.) Two years later, on November 14, 1860, this area also came under Russian control with the Treaty of Peking when “the Sino-Russian border was definitively drawn along the Amur and Ussuri rivers, giving the Russians complete control of the region between the Ussuri and the Pacific.”

The Amur River became the definitive border for the Russians. The lengthy boundary required an inconvenient long rail line to the port of Vladivostok and led to renewed Russian interest in Manchuria. Cutting across Manchuria would save vast amounts of capital, time, and labor. The defense of Vladivostok also led to continued Russian interest in control of the neighboring state of Korea. Both Manchuria and Korea dominated Sino-Russian relations for many decades to come.

Sergei Witte, the next person to significantly advance the Russian cause, did so in several stages. The first important development involved construction of the Trans-Siberian Railway. This original route of this transcontinental line, planned to link Vladivostok and the Pacific regions with the rest of the empire, went around Manchuria along the northern shore of the Amur River. However, in September 1896, Witte, managed to convince the Chinese to form an alliance with Russia against Japanese aggression. This partnership “rested on a bargain: the right to extend
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Russia’s Trans-Siberian Railroad across China’s northeast in return for Russian military support.”  

The new section of rail, built on Chinese land allowed for an “extra-territorial corridor slicing through three north Manchurian provinces … linking Vladivostok with the Trans-Siberian Railway.” Critics complained that this rail corridor, called the Chinese Eastern Railway, “would be militarily indefensible.” Nonetheless, construction continued and eventually the Chinese Eastern Railway “became a major instrument of Russian penetration into Manchuria.”

Problems in Mongolia strained relations throughout this period. Mongolians, unwilling to tithe their horses to the Qing military, frequently fled across the Russian border. Failure to expel these nomads, proved a source of contention for several centuries. Russian interests ultimately triumphed however, after the Qing dynasty fell and the Russians “created a de facto Russian protectorate in Outer Mongolia” Shortly after this coup the Romanov dynasty also came to an end, nonetheless control of Mongolia continued under Soviet rule.

The victory of the Bolsheviks in the Russian Civil War ended overt Russian imperialism in Asia. The newly formed Soviet Union, led by Vladimir Lenin, concerned itself with recovery, and spared few resources for the east. Lenin, in fact bemoaned the fate of “semi-colonial countries like … China.” He advocated a new policy at the Second Party Congress advising that “infant Communist parties, as they arose, should ally with the bourgeois nationalist parties of their countries” in order to counter the threat of invasion by imperialist powers. After the death of Lenin, Joseph Stalin, the new leader of the Soviet Union, continued to encourage the cooperation between the small Chinese Communist Party and the Nationalist forces led by President Sun Yat-Sen. In later years this policy solidified into the United Front, However the death of Nationalist leader Sun Yat-Sen signaled the end of the first United Front.

The new leader of the Nationalist forces, Chiang Kai-Shek, had deep connections with a “notorious underworld organization … the Green gang” located in the industrialized city of Shanghai. Socialist ideology opposed many of the Gang’s corrupt business practices. In turn, the Green Gang resented the Communist presence in Shanghai. In April of 1927 “Green Gang
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members and forces loyal to Chiang”\textsuperscript{20} launched a brutal surprise attack on Communist forces in Shanghai.

The attacks in Shanghai left the Chinese Communists battered, reeling, and deeply suspicious of advice from outsiders. The treachery of the Nationalists discredited the policies of the United Front and, by implication, the Soviet Union. Years later, “bitter recollections of earlier betrayals”\textsuperscript{21} marred initial attempts at alliances. Eventually Chinese Communists finally regained enough strength to challenge the Nationalists and again turned to the Soviet Union for assistance. At first, Stalin had little use for the Communists, and favored the Nationalist cause. This strange behavior is understandable when viewed as part of Stalin's foreign policy.

Throughout the Chinese Civil War, Stalin pursued a highly pragmatic foreign policy. Stalin, “a master practitioner of \textit{Realpolitik},”\textsuperscript{22} showed little ideological concern about making diplomatic agreements with capitalists. Examination of Soviet agreements with Republican Spain, Nazi Germany, and Nationalist China all demonstrate this tendency to prioritize territorial and material gains.

In Spain, Soviet assistance during the Spanish Civil War came at the cost of “more than two-thirds of the Spanish gold reserve.”\textsuperscript{23} The Republican forces, out-gunned by the Spanish fascists, turned to the Soviet Union for aid. Early in 1937 a desperate cable from the Spanish Air Ministry begged the Soviet ambassador for assistance, admitting “only Russia can put us on an equal footing . . . with the fascists.”\textsuperscript{24} However, arms and assistance came at a high cost, adding up to “510 tons of Spanish gold … liquidated through Soviet accounts by April 1938.”\textsuperscript{25} Despite Soviet assistance the Republican government fell to the fascists; the gold stayed in Moscow.

A year after the last of the Spanish gold cleared Soviet accounts; Stalin approved a non-aggression pact with the fascist government of Nazi Germany. This arrangement came with an even higher price: Soviet occupation of Eastern Poland and the Baltic Republics of Latvia, and Estonia, and Lithuania. Stalin, addressing the country after the German invasion of the Soviet Union, defended this action as a “pact of peace.”\textsuperscript{26} The speech does not mention East Poland or the Baltic
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States. In subsequent negotiations with the Allied powers Stalin requested acknowledgement of these territorial gains and “in the end, Churchill and Roosevelt accepted Russia’s 1941 borders.”

This ideologically questionable arrangement preceded a similar bargain with Japan. With the Russo-Japanese Neutrality Pact, announced on April 13 1941, Japan recognized the Republic of Outer Mongolia in exchange for Soviet Russia’s recognition of ‘Manchukuo.’ This agreement, viewed by Chiang Kai-Shek as a “flagrant violation of the Sino-Soviet Agreement 1924 and the Sino-Soviet non-aggression Pact of 1937,” provided another point of discord between the two states. The pact lasted until August of 1945 when the Soviet Union declared war on Japan and quickly occupied Manchuria. This in turn led to the wholesale “looting of factories and mines.”

Manchuria led Stalin to continue diplomatic negotiations with Chiang Kai Shek, leader of the Chinese Nationalist forces. This decision showed a clear intention to prioritize strategic and economic gains over ideological concerns. Stalin sought a treaty recognizing Soviet rights in Manchuria. This required dealing with the Nationalists since “only they, as the recognized government of China, were in a position to deliver the Manchurian booty contractually.”

During the Chinese Civil War, Stalin continued negotiations with Chiang. Only at the point that the Communist leader Mao Zedong seemed destined to win does Stalin provide the Chinese Communists with captured Japanese weaponry and other military equipment. In 1949, after the Communists win the war, Soviet Union proved to be the “first state to establish diplomatic relations” with the new government. However, this recognition “failed to send even a congratulatory message to the Chinese leaders.” This deliberate lack of acknowledgement implied that the leadership was unimportant. Despite this insult, relations between the two states gradually improved and the following year Chairman Mao visited Moscow.

According to Stalin’s successor, Nikita Khrushchev, “[Stalin] had no confidence in Mao Zedong,” As leader of the other great Communist land power, Mao’s very existence challenged Stalin’s position as supreme leader of all Socialism. Mao, however, was careful to appear subservient to Stalin and the Soviet Union. Mao’s public statements consistently acknowledged Stalin as the titular head of the communist world. However, government statements within China carefully
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nurtured an image of Mao as the leader of China and Maoism as distinctly different from Marxism, Leninism or Stalinism.

Moreover, Mao and Stalin held vastly different strategic goals for Asia. Stalin prioritized support of the Soviet-backed government of North Korea. Mao felt that Korea, while important to Chinese border security, paled in comparison to the Nationalist presence on Taiwan. Mao favored the immediate invasion of Taiwan; in fact even as the possibility of conflict arose in Korea, Mao increased his buildup of potential invasion forces.³⁴

Stalin encouraged the Chinese to fight on the side of the North Koreans. North Korea held great promise as a means of diverting attention from Eastern Europe. Chinese involvement in the Korean conflict proved to be the decisive factor in building an alliance between the two states.

Mao, in desperate need of Soviet military and industrial assistance agreed to support the North Korean invasion of South Korea, “in return for substantial military aid.”³⁵ This led a decade of cooperation. On February 14, 1950 the two states signed the Sino-Soviet Treaty of Friendship, Alliance and Mutual Assistance. Additional agreements signed that day included the extension of Soviet credit equaling “U.S. $300, 000,000”³⁶ China eventually received enough Soviet military equipment to equip “64 infantry divisions and 22 air divisions.”³⁷ Chinese involvement in the Korean conflict proved to be decisive and led to an armed truce that continues to this day.

The death of Stalin brought new leadership to the Kremlin. The change in the Soviet regime exposed the fragile nature of the new alliance. On February 25, 1956, the new Soviet leader, Nikita Khrushchev, faced with rising dissent and a questionable past, legitimized his rule by denouncing Stalin. Khrushchev condemned Stalin’s purges, absolute control over the Soviet system and Stalin’s “cult of the individual.”³⁸ However, in the process, Khrushchev threatened the legitimacy of Mao. Mao built his leadership on the Stalinist model. Two years previously, after the death of Stalin, Mao telegraphed the Soviet Union with the statement the “immortal beacon of Comrade Stalin will forever illuminate the path on which the Chinese people march forward.”³⁹ The following day Mao decreed a national “period of mourning [during which] all factories, mines, enterprises, units of

³⁴ Goncharov, 148.
³⁵ Ibid., 190.
³⁶ Agreement Between the Central People’s Government of the People’s Republic of China and the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the Granting of Credit to the People’s Republic of China in Goncharov, 263.
³⁷ Ibid., 201.
armed forces, government organs, schools, and people’s organizations” must refrain from all public celebrations. Three days after this Mao declared that Stalin represented the “central figure in the world Communist movement.”

Therefore Khrushchev’s denunciation of Stalin led to questions about Mao’s judgment. Accordingly, when Khrushchev declared that the “cult of the individual is alien to Marxism-Leninism,” Mao responded with:

The question at hand is not whether there should be a cult of individual, but whether or not the individual concerned represents the truth. If he does, then he should be revered. If truth is not present then even collective leadership will be no good.

China, dependent on the Soviet Union for technical and military assistance, did little to provoke conflict with Khrushchev. Indeed, there seemed little reason to do so as “Soviet assistance grew a hundredfold,” during the early years of Khrushchev’s reign. As a result China’s first Five-Year Plan benefited from the presence of “thousands of Soviet engineers and technical advisers.”

Another significant distinction between Mao and Khrushchev lay in Mao’s incredible statements on the subject of nuclear war. Mao famously denounced the nuclear threat as an “atomic hoax.” Mao went on, stating China had “a population of 600 million, and a territory of 9.6 million square kilometers. That little bit of atomic weaponry cannot annihilate the Chinese people.”

Khrushchev, however, admitted that the Soviet Union “feared a nuclear exchange.” Faced with the possibility of nuclear annihilation Khrushchev abandoned the idea of a violent revolution and embraced a new policy of détente. For Mao détente undermined his position as a revolutionary leader. Détente conflicted directly with the idea of worldwide revolution. Détente acknowledged the status quo. The status quo in China included 600 million poor and hungry peasants. Mao rejected détente and “by the late 1950s Mao was the strongest advocate of the Cold War in the Communist camp.”
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Additionally, nationalist concerns began to affect the relations between the two states as border questions grew tense. Chinese diplomacy attempted to renegotiate several points along the Manchurian border. This astonished Khrushchev, who later claimed that the Chinese “out of nowhere … dragged up the question of whether the Soviet Union had supposedly reincorporated territories that … had been part of the Russian empire.”\(^{50}\) Despite his surprise at Chinese concerns, Khrushchev held similar beliefs about historic Russian borders, stating for example, “after the defeat of Japan we regained what tsarist Russia had lost.”\(^{51}\) In addition, he insisted that the Soviet border “existed long before the victory of the Chinese revolution in 1949.”\(^{52}\) This continuing disagreement over border issues contributed to the growing hostility between the two states.

Mao, aware that industrialization might have to proceed without Soviet assistance, prepared the people for a radical departure declaring that China “not follow the old paths of technical development”\(^{53}\) Mao went even further in distancing China from Soviet policies declaring that “in learning from the Soviet Union we must not mechanically copy everything in the Soviet Union in a doctrinaire way.”\(^{54}\) Mao then asked the farmers to dramatically increase steel production through the use of backyard furnaces; this essentially, is the heart of the Great Leap Forward, a desperate attempt by Mao to industrialize China without Soviet aid. The peasantry enthusiastically melted all of their farm and kitchen equipment into worthless scrap iron, in the process burning all the available fuel. The results were tragic. Plummeting industrial and agricultural production, unreported by local officials, led to famine and death on a massive scale. The failures of the Great Leap seriously undermined Mao’s credibility with Khrushchev who later criticized these policies at the Twenty-First Congress. This critique is another factor that led to a “cooling”\(^{55}\) of Sino-Soviet relations.

Another significant contribution to the growing tensions between the two states occurred on August 23 1958, when Chinese Communist military forces began shelling Nationalist forces on the island of Quemoy. This attack occurred despite the fact that Taiwan and the United States had “signed a mutual defense treaty.” To the surprise of the Communist forces the United States honored its commitments, defending the area with the US Seventh Fleet. Mao conceded the point and gradually pulled back from the artillery offensive.
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This debacle proved the last straw for an increasingly apprehensive Khrushchev. Mao’s failure with the Great Leap Forward, his willingness to engage the United States, and apparent lack of concern about a nuclear exchange led to Khrushchev’s decision to deny China access to atomic weapon technology. On August 20, 1959 the Kremlin “informed the PRC leadership that they would not provide them with a prototype of the Bomb.”

Sino-Soviet relations included the escalating stress between China and India. Initial border tensions between the two states focused on “the westerly route [to Tibet] via Aksai Chin.” Possession of this route, “essential to Chinese control of western Tibet,” conflicted directly with Indian claims to this territory. This situation deteriorated even further when India provided sanctuary for exiled Tibetan leader, the Dalai Lama. The Soviet Union, hoping to stay neutral, stayed quiet about the conflict. Khrushchev later recalled, “We did not share their point of view and our press maintained restraint.” The Soviet Union not only failed to condemn India in September of 1959 they granted India “$375 million” aid in the form of “tractors, combines…and other agricultural machinery” for India’s first Five-Year Plan. In fact, under Khrushchev’s leadership, the Soviet Union offered “India far larger loans than had ever been given to China.”

The following month Khrushchev traveled to China to recognize and celebrate the tenth anniversary of the establishment of the Republic of China. The reception committee welcomed Khrushchev with “coldness in their speeches.” This marked Khrushchev last personal visit to Beijing and in July of the following year he “decided to withdraw all specialists from China.”

Sino-Soviet Relations would never recover. The “indestructible friendship” lay in ruins. Over the next decade rhetoric between the two states grew sharper and sharper. Ten years after the death of Stalin, vitriolic declarations from China accused Soviet leadership of a “complete betrayal of … proletarian internationalism.” Also in 1967 an editorial in Pravda condemned the “nationalistic, great power policy of the present Chinese leadership.” The column went on stating,
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“The cult of personality of Mao Tse-tung has reached absurd lengths.”\textsuperscript{68} Later that same year Soviet and Chinese forces engaged along the Amur River. Armed hostility remained the norm between the two states for the next several decades.

The two estranged states abandoned each other. The following decade Communist China established diplomatic relations with the United States and eventually replaced Taiwan in the United Nations. Trade between the United States and China flourished. The Soviet Union, isolated and financially exhausted, did not survive the twentieth century.

\textsuperscript{68} Ibid.,
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The Role of the Euro in European Unification and the Development of Collective Nationalism
Kenneth J. Knirck

Introduction

Conflicting and complementary theories of nationalism and nation-building have shown that people who share a common land, economy, language, religion, and/or political enemy have used these commonalities to help define nationhood. This paper will focus on the influence that membership in the European Union and the European Monetary Union has had on state-level nation identity and European nationalism, with respect to the use of a common currency. This paper will also compare and contrast the existing historical scholarship on nationalism, and the effort by the European Union and the E.M.U. to create a sense of European nationalism among member countries. Additionally, the use, interpretation, and public reaction to the symbols depicted on the euro, and the psychological affect that these symbols have on the European community and national identity will also be examined.

Collective versus State-Level Nationalism

Individual E.U. member nationalism versus collective E.U. nationalism is not a zero-sum game. In other words, the development of E.U. collective nationalism does not necessarily negate or significantly reduce the national self identity of the citizens of E.U. member countries. In fact, the converse may actually be more relevant, in that membership and participation in the European Monetary Union (E.M.U.) enhances some of the nationalist traits that have been evident in the development of national self identity in sixteenth to nineteenth century European and North American countries.

Historians and political scientists agree that on a very basic level, groups of people come together to be with people who have similar characteristics to utilize their collective resources to survive and thrive. This convergence of homogeneous people into societies, and eventually into sovereign nations, can be a natural and gradual occurrence, or in the case of 18th century France, according to David A. Bell, nationalism can be an intentional and scripted construct.¹

Similarly, European unification is a concerted effort to bring together, primarily for financial and military reasons, a variety of nations and nation-states that have common goals of prosperity.

and security. In the wake of the destruction of World War II, Sir Winston Churchill expressed his hopes that a unified Europe, both economically and culturally, would hasten the rebuilding process and avert future conflicts. Even though Churchill envisioned a united Europe in the near future that was “championed and sponsored” by Soviet Russia, the United States, and the Commonwealth of Great Britain, he did not believe that Great Britain should be a part of the union. He was non-specific on the reasons for this stance. Churchill articulated this idea of a “United States of Europe” in his 1946 speech in Zurich:

> The structure of the United States of Europe, if well and truly built, will be such as to make the material strength of a single state less important. Small nations will count as much as large ones and gain their honor by their contribution to the common cause. The ancient states and principalities of Germany, freely joined together for mutual convenience in a federal system, might take their individual places among the United States of Europe. I shall not try to make a detailed programme for hundreds of millions of people who want to be happy and free, prosperous and safe, who wish to enjoy the four freedoms of which the great President Roosevelt spoke, and live in accordance with the principles embodied in the Atlantic Charter. If this is their wish, if this is the wish of the Europeans in so many lands, they have only to say so, and means can certainly be found, and machinery erected, to carry that wish to full fruition.²

From its inception to the present time, there has been a concern that the act of confederating individual nations, each with their own traditions and feelings of nationalism, would undermine the nationalistic qualities of the member states. Would the political and economic consolidation of these nations destroy the fabric of their nationalism by attempting to homogenize them into a single Europe? Will the use of a common currency erode the nationalistic qualities of the individual member nations of the E.U.? Or is the euro a constructive agent that will facilitate the bridging of the member nations together, thus producing European nationalism?

There is concern that the Maastricht Treaty and the construction of the E.U. and E.M.U. have created a new interest in state-level nationalism. Feelings of insecurity have been seen as a reaction to the political, economic, and social internationalism associated with European unification. Further unification will mean the loss of national identities and cultures. This phenomenon could also bring about the blurring of internal borders within Europe, and may produce a reemphasis on local and regional cultures. Although opinion polls have shown that there is widespread support for
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the E.U., a large majority of Europeans do not yet feel a strong attachment or deep loyalty for a unified Europe.³

**The Economic Rationality of Nationalism**

In the last twenty years, attitudes regarding individual nationalism, as opposed to European nationalism, have changed. Europeans have adopted an ethos of economic rationality which has come to affect their attitudes regarding personal identity, national identity, and the loyalty they feel toward their respective countries. According to Eurobarometer survey data, nearly half of all Europeans (E.U. members and non-E.U. members) feel that their local towns offer a greater fulfillment of their need for “roots” than their country.⁴ Only about one third of all respondents said that their primary attachment is to their country, and about half of the people do not care about their compatriots. The majority of Europeans surveyed felt that membership in the E.U. would be personally beneficial financially. Additionally, when asked about their vote on the referenda on the Draft European Constitution in 2005, only 25% of those polled voted “no” because they felt that it would threaten their national identity. Most of these anti-constitutional respondents were more worried about bread-and-butter issues such as the potential loss of blue-collar jobs and competitive wages. These results indicate that most Europeans have adopted a unitarian rather than a patriotic attitude regarding nationalism and national loyalties.⁵

**Imagined Economic Communities**

Benedict Anderson used the phrase “imagined communities” to illustrate the somewhat nebulous connection between people of a nation who have in some way bonded with thousands of people whom they will never actually meet or know. Their collective self image allows them to perceive of themselves as a nation.⁶ Banking and monetary systems are also imagined communities that require faith and trust in the government or the bank to back up and guarantee the value of a currency that is not equal in value to a hard commodity such as a precious metal. The basis of
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⁴ Eurobarometer No. 51.0, March-April, 1999.
currency is trust, and all who participate in the use of that currency must take a leap of faith in the institutions that back that faith.7

Expanding the Nationalist Sphere

The unification as a European community is an intentional construct that was born out of a need for collective security. This deliberate and coordinated effort to construct nationalism is somewhat analogous to the planned development of French national unity around 1700, as noted by David A. Bell,8 who further contends that the process of national construction is a decidedly modern phenomenon, beyond the level of thought that existed in Europe before the eighteenth century age of revolutions.9 Fast-forward 300 years and we can see the intellectual, economic, and technical modernity of the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries that has made collective European nationalism not only possible, but arguably imperative for the continued growth, competition, and global relevance of Europe. E. J. Hobsbawm agrees with Bell that nationalism is a relatively new construct, and the “national question…is situated at the point of intersection of politics, technology, and social transformation.”10 Hobsbawm pushes his starting point for modernist nationalism forward from Bell’s to the late eighteenth century, when the French and American revolutions helped produce an atmosphere of collective sovereignty, brotherhood, and national sentiment in these countries.11 Following this line of progression and logic, the capability and probability of contemporary Europe successfully developing collective nationalism is high.

Several important factors have historically contributed to the development of nationalism. These include common beliefs, needs, goals, and fears that exist within a population of a territory or region. Many of these traits are present and contribute to the necessity and feasibility of a unified Europe. A. D. Smith’s definition of a nation is, “…a named human population sharing an historic territory, common myths and historic memories, a mass public culture, a common economy and common legal rights and duties for all people.”12 By expanding this definition outward from the micro to the macro level, it can be reapplied from the individual nation level to the broader pan-European level. Geographically, the acceptance of a broadening of the nationalistic borders is

9 Bell, The Cult of the Nation of France, p. 5.
11 Hobsbawm, Nations and Nationalism Since 1780, p. 19.
theoretically possible, given that the region of Western Europe is roughly the same size as the United States. The successful federation of American states is similar to the concept of a united Europe. Although, a great difference does exist in the fact that the European component countries each come to the table with centuries of history, which they have used to create their foundation of nationalism. This history was used to build a sense of national identity that many citizens may be reticent to set aside. Although European unification may tend to degrade state-level nationalism, it conversely tends to build broader political, economic, and cultural affiliations. But the trade offs between state-level nationalism and a larger sense of nationalism is not entirely subtractive. A.D. Smith notes that most Europeans are very comfortable with multi-faceted self identification. Considering one’s self to be both a member of a smaller nation as well as a member of a collective European community is quite common and acceptable.\(^{13}\)

**Hybrid Monetary System/ Hybrid Nationalism**

Matthias Kaelberer argues that, “The relationship between money and collective identity is reciprocal. On the one hand, money is a purposeful political tool in the construction of identities. On the other hand, in order to function properly, money requires some degree of collective identity among its users.” He continues his belief in the euro as the prime factor in European integrations by stating, “While the European Union has arguably taken on some elements of statehood – with the euro a leading example of that process – the primary allegiance of citizens still rests with their nation states. Currently, and most likely for the foreseeable future, national identities are stronger than a European identity. On the other hand, the euro is certainly the most important symbol of European integration and identity beyond the individual EU member states to date.”\(^{14}\) By using a common currency, the members of the E.M.U. are, and will continue to be, more receptive and comfortable with the idea of multiple citizenship or hybrid nationalism.

While many citizens feel an attachment and loyalty to their national currency, the pragmatic spirit of many Europeans is evident in their enthusiasm to embrace the euro in exchange for their own national currency when their own currency is devalued or unstable. For example, the French were more than happy to drop the franc in favor of the euro in 2002, as were the Italians and their


lira. Neither country showed much loyalty or identification with their respective currencies in light of the tenuous monetary value and stability of these currencies.\textsuperscript{15}

The reasons that Europeans have chosen to accept the euro are primarily rational and practical. Because this acceptance is not based on loyalty or patriotism, the level of emotional connectivity between the E.M.U. members and the euro is relatively low, but this low intensity connectivity is sufficient to produce the acceptance necessary to produce faith and trust in the system. As Kaelberer states,

> The EU is certainly not a natural or organic association. It lacks the immediacy of kinship ties. Emotional or affective relationships within the European Union are quite minimal. As the former President of the EU Commission, Jacques Delors, observed: ‘Europeans will not fall in love with a Common Market’. European identity, therefore, is conceivable – for the most part – only as a civic identity.\textsuperscript{16}

The E.M.U. and the European Central Bank (E.C.B.) are cognizant of the nationalist issues that are attached to the unified economy. They seek to create an inclusive economic system that does not alienate its member countries by minimizing or ignoring their sovereignty, self identity, history, or national symbols. These have been important considerations in the development and design of the euro. By depicting nonexistent architectural images on the euro notes, the E.C.B. has successfully avoided the prospect of prioritizing the historical symbols of the member countries. And continuing the spirit of non-favoritism, they have allowed each member to incorporate their own national symbols on the reverse side of their nation’s euro coins. By utilizing generic euro symbols\textsuperscript{17} on the obverse side of these national/euro coins, the E.C.B. has made their coins a graphic and symbolic representation of the hybrid nationalism that is being encouraged by the E.M.U.\textsuperscript{18}

As a historical note, the use of international currencies such as the euro is not a novel idea. In fact the deterritorialization of currency has been the trend for the last two centuries. Through much of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, the use of multiple local and regional currencies was the norm in many parts of the world, including Europe and the United States. Fragmented banking system were problematic in that there were issues regarding rates of exchange, consistency

\textsuperscript{15} Kaelberer, “The Euro and European Identity”, p. 164.
\textsuperscript{16} Kaelberer, “The Euro and European Identity”, p. 168.
\textsuperscript{17} The standard euro “e” was inspired by the Greek letter epsilon. This is an example of the use of references that and symbols that are somewhat universally European. The “e” also represents the first letter in Europe, and the two parallel lines in the center of the “e” represent stability. (See: Kaelberer, “The Euro and European Identity,” pp. 166.
of measurements (coin weight), and the viability of coinage and bank notes that were issued by both private and national banks. In fact, it wasn’t until 1797 that the United States issued their own standard currency to avoid the widespread use of Spanish and Mexican coins. When Italy was politically unified in 1861, they wasted little time in producing their own coinage a year later, based on the Sardinian lira. Similarly, the formation of the German Reich in 1871 was followed a year later with the establishment of the Reichsmark as the official standard currency. With economic globalization, the use of international currencies and monetary standards grew. The British pound was accepted as the benchmark for currency exchange, and certain commodities were bought and sold using an accepted common currency.

Monetary unification has more to offer than consistency and stability. National currencies are an important symbol of sovereignty, and a source of national identity. Twentieth century bank notes displayed symbols that reflected national pride and the image of strength. Common symbols were the portraits of monarchs, shields, swords, lions, armor, monuments, buildings, allegorical figures, and historical figures. The strength and viability of a nation’s banks and its currency has played an important role in reinforcing national identity. But this perception of economic stability is based on trust. All monetary systems are based in large part on a faith. The establishment of this monetary belief system opened the door to the international use of credit as a legitimate form of money between 1910 and 1920. This in turn led to the acceptability and practicality of international currencies as a safe form of exchange.
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19 Various commodities such as metals, furs, and tobacco competed with currency as modes of trade, and numerous private and local institutions issued their own currencies. It is estimated that at the time of the American Civil War, more than 7000 types of banknotes were in circulation within the borders of the United States. (See: Eric Helleiner, ‘Historicizing Territorial Currencies: Monetary Space and the Nation-State in North America’, Political Geography, 18 (1999): p. 320.


22 In the twentieth century when petroleum became an internationally universal commodity, the U.S. dollar was established as the accepted trading currency, primarily because the U.S. was the prime exporter of oil.

23 Great Britain did not incorporate the portrait of the Queen on their bank notes until 1960. See Wolters, “The Euro,” pp.8-12.

The Role of Cohesion and Competition in the Development of National Identity

Many important parallels exist between nation-building theories, and the contemporary attributes of the European community. Although some of the common traits of nationalism are not identical, the resulting development of identity building is consistent with the economic cohesion that is the goal of the E.M.U. As Hobsbawm and Bell have shown, the invention of nations, much like the invention of the European Union and the E.M.U., is possible and has occurred. For example, Great Britain was “invented” by means of the Act of Union in 1707 that linked England, Scotland, and Wales. This legislation, commonalities of interests, beliefs, and enemies, brought these three entities together under a single flag. Although regional differences in class and political beliefs still existed, the Union Act promoted trade among the English, Scots, and Welsh by removing many internal trade barriers and customs duties.\(^\text{25}\) As Linda Colley states, “This was a union of policy…and not of affection.”\(^\text{26}\) Many of these differences, some of which were created by geographic circumstances, created a rich diversity that was advantageous to Britons as a collective nation. Because a variety of soils, terrain, and climate produced regional abundances of certain goods, Britons were brought together by the necessity to trade. This commercial interdependence was mutually beneficial for those involved, and this interaction created economic and social networks that further enhanced British cohesion.\(^\text{27}\) Such is the spirit and function of the Maastricht Treaty, and the goal of the E.M.U. to soften trade barriers among the member nations and take advantage of the economic diversity and collective strength of its partners.

Another apt comparison between eighteenth and nineteenth century European nationalism and the progress of the European community, is the use of a common enemy or “other” as a means of identity creation and unity. The eras of nation building studied by Colley and Hobsbawm included xenophobic tendencies toward Catholics and the French. Notes Hobsbawm, “There is no more effective way of bonding together the disparate sections of restless peoples than to unite them against outsiders.”\(^\text{28}\) In *Money and the Nation State*, Kevin Dowd notes that the concept of “Fortress Europe” has been associated with animosity toward the financial powers of the United States and Japan as the basis for artificial European nationalism. This synthetic nationalism is then used to intensify the internal cohesion of the European economic bloc, which is hoped will be the catalyst for the transformation of Europe into an economic superpower on par with the established


\(^{26}\) Colley, *Britons*, p. 11.

\(^{27}\) Colley, *Britons*, pp. 16-17; 41-42.

\(^{28}\) Hobsbawm, *Nations and Nationalism*, p. 91.
economic giants.29 Declining world trade in the 1980s was seen as an opportunity for a unified European economy to step up and grasp the role of a stable economic superpower. Notes Dowd, A certain school of thought in the EC establishment in Brussels has always wanted to make the EC into a federal superstate and has therefore sought conflict with other countries, the United States especially, to create the pressures within Europe that would lead to unification. The deterioration of the climate of world trade since the early 1980s gave them the opportunity they sought, and a vicious circle developed in which trade problems led to more lobbying and increasingly confrontational trade negotiations; they in turn created further disputes and a worsened climate of world trade. This process in the meantime created the external "enemies" the Brussels establishment wanted, and the latter could then use the threats posed by these enemies to promote the internal policies they really desired.30

In a purely fiscal sense, members of the E.M.U. see the United States and its vast economic might as the outsider, the object of competition, and a unifying device for developing a European economic community. When the euro came into existence on January 4, 1999 as a virtual currency, the goal was to fix the exchange rate between the member counties in hopes of establishing a stable monetary system that could compete against the U.S. dollar in the ever-expanding post-Soviet world market, and to standardize of the price of goods and labor throughout Europe. With the United States as the sole remaining military and economic superpower, it was immediately seen as a natural rival to the E.M.U. When the euro was introduced in 1999, it traded at 82.25 cents. By July of 2002, the euro edged the dollar and was worth $1.0005. The euro is currently worth $1.293. The strength of the euro on the international monetary market was not only a vindication of the E.M.U., but was a great economic boost to the collective members, and by extension helped to heighten the sense of pride that the members had in their system. Although the euro was proving to be a strong contender in the global marketplace, its strength against the dollar was in large part due to a precipitous drop in the value and confidence in the dollar and the U.S. economy in the wake of financial scandals involving Enron and Worldcom. Oscar-Erich Kuntze, an international economist at the IFO Institute in Munich stressed the importance of economic stability and competitiveness on the national psyche by stating, “As a German I know how important psychology is in politics and economics. The strong German mark had such a strong effect on our psychology and this case [the burgeoning euro] may be similar.” Charles Grant, the director of the Center for European Reform

in London added that a stronger euro could help to convince important non-E.M.U. members like Great Britain to embrace the euro by saying, “It will put a bit of spring into the stride of the bedraggled pro-Europeans in this country.”

According to Leah Greenfeld, “National identity is, fundamentally, a matter of dignity.” Economic accomplishments have long been a measure of the quality and glory of a nation. And the drive for prestige and image fuel a country’s desire for foreign economic ties that will maximize their wealth and positive identity. International economic policies also facilitate the two-way flow of culture between nations and regions who engage in cross-border trade. This tends to increase the economic strength and stability of each nation through diversity.

The enthusiast manner in which Europeans embrace the euro was evident on New Years Day, 2002, when the actual currency went into circulation. Although the transition, for the most part, went smoothly, cash machines were quickly emptied. Europeans were so enthusiastic and curious about how the currency would work, many restaurants and shops were inundated by people who were anxious to try out the new money.

**Currency Iconology and Nationalistic Symbolism**

The imagery that is used on the Euro coins and paper currency is distinctively and purposefully designed to invoke a sense of common European history, as opposed to the pre-euro currency of the member nations that often depicted nationalistic icons such as political leaders, scientists, artists, or national monuments. In contrast, the euro coins and bills utilize images of non-existent buildings, bridges, and arches that utilize the various architectural styles and the common history of Europe, with an emphasis on “building” and “bridging” the European community. The use of the terms “constructive,” and “bridging” are not arbitrary. The modernization of Europe and the theme of building toward the future is also seen in the sequence of architectural and artistic styles that are used on the bills. This is seen in the progression of styles from ancient to modern in
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smaller denomination bills to higher denomination bills respectively. The official interpretation of these symbols, as stated by the European Central Bank, confirms their bonding symbolism:

On the front of the banknotes, windows and gateways symbolize the European spirit of openness and co-operation. The 12 stars of the European Union represent the dynamism and harmony between European nations. To complement these designs, the reverse of each banknote features a bridge. The bridges symbolize the close co-operation and communication between Europe and the rest of the world.

The use of symbolism to promote national identity and pride is not a novel concept. Nazi and Italian fascist governments used symbolism extensively to promote nationalism. These regimes utilized strong, powerful images and architecture to instill a sense of confidence. The use of symmetry and geometric shapes added to the psychological development of uniformity, collectivity, and order. A similar strategy is utilized by the European Central Bank in its depiction of enduring images and geometric shapes to reinforce a feeling of security and confidence in the euro and the E.M.U.

Many historians who specialize in the study of nationalism like Linda Colley, George Mosse, and David Bell agree that an essential facet of national identity is a shared history of struggle. Clearly the individual nations of Europe have seen their fair share of adversity, which has been shown to be an asset in the development of nationalism. But the European Central Bank and the E.M.U. took a decidedly holistic approach to the symbolism that would be incorporated into their currency. Putting the shared sacrifice of the individual member countries aside, collectively Europe has a long history of shared misfortune, most notably the devastation and destruction of two world wars. This shared history is symbolized on the euro as “building” on the past and “bridging” the past with a positive and stable future.

35 The 5 euro note features a classical Roman arch and aqueduct; the 10 euro note features a Romanesque church bridge and door; a Gothic church window and bridge are seen on the 20 euro bill; the architectural style featured on the 50 euro bill is the Renaissance; imagery on the 100 euro bill is of Baroque and Rococo styles; the 200 euro bill depicts iron and glass architecture; and the 500 euro bill features modern 20th century architecture. In depictions of doors, windows, and gates (Brandenburg), they are shown in the open position to signify openness and a welcoming spirit. While using images that represent positive European history, the E.M.U. uses selective memory in forgetting the uncomfortable or regrettable eras of European history such as war and imperialism. (See: Kaelberer, “The Euro and European Identity,” pp. 166-167).


Conclusion

European unification has been successful in producing “hybrid nationalism” that allows the individual member counties to retain and nurture the cultural components that are important to their national identity, while assimilating into the collective of a unified Europe that is necessary for stability in a post Soviet Union political world market. Many of the historical precedents and trends that have been present in nation building and identity formation are evident in the current project of European economic unification, including: creating and nurturing national identity through shard a history of struggle; patriotism and a positive self image through competition with a perceived enemy; and the use of strong and positive imagery to promote the goals of the nationalist movement. By applying these historical attributes of nationalism on the macro level of a European community, as opposed to the micro level of the individual nation, the European Monetary Union and the European Union have, in a relatively short span of this economic and social experiment, succeeded in developing pan-European nationalism without drastically undermining the state-level identity. With the euro as a common bond between nations, the effort by the E.U. and the E.M.U. to unify Europe to the point where they can maintain a high level of global competitiveness and economic strength appears to have a bright future. And the acceptance of bi-level, hybrid nationalism (at least in the European community) seems to be a workable formula. Matthias Kaelberer succinctly summarizes European unification, with the euro as the centerpiece, by saying:

The cultural tradition of antiquity, feudalism and the uniformity of the medieval period, the experience of the reformation, renaissance, enlightenment, nation state formation and the Industrial Revolution are all common experiences of Western Europe beyond individual nation states. The introduction of the euro is merely another part of this construction of a common European identity. It makes European identity more tangible and provides a concrete European symbol that engraves another element of ‘Europeanness’ into the daily lives of individuals.39
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Patriarchy, Power, and Property: Rape in Early Modern English Society

Bryce Havens

During the early modern period, England was a patriarchal society where men used their political and social power to protect their property in the forms of land, real estate, and more importantly, women. Husbands and fathers owned and controlled their respective wives and daughters. In this social order, however, it was not a woman’s body, mind, or soul that men sought to possess, but her chastity. The primacy placed on female chastity as a type of male property created what is today known as the “double standard.” This standard asserted that female chastity and reputation were of paramount importance, while male honor was much less stringently controlled. By exploring cases of rape from the Old Bailey, as well as the rich secondary source material, this paper will seek to reaffirm that the double standard was the prevailing social standard regarding sexual behavior for men and women.

While the focus of this paper will be the double standard between conceptions of male and female honor, there are a number of important elements that must be discussed first. In order to better understand the nature of the double standard, it is necessary to elaborate on three subjects: the history of rape as defined in English law, the role of gender in early modern English society, and conceptions of male and female sexuality. Such background information will be crucial when interpreting the trial records that will be discussed later.

The crime of rape in the English legal system dates back to the Middle Ages. The 1275 Statute of Westminster, for instance, “prohibiteth that none do ravish, nor take away by force, any Maiden within age, neither by her own consent, nor without; nor any Wife or Maiden of full age, nor any other Woman, against her Will.”¹ This association of rape with abduction has lead many feminist scholars to argue that the statute was designed to protect men’s property from theft, not to expressly deal with the crime of rape. The 1285 Statute of Westminster specifically addressed the issues of “Punishment of Rape: of a married Woman eloping with an Adulterer; [and] for carrying off a Nun.”² Here the notions of property are even more palpable; a married woman was the
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property of her husband, and a nun was the property of the church. According to Nazife Bashar, “All three issues revolved around property, its theft and its recovery.”

Other statutes, such as those of 1382 and 1487, further emphasized the notion that rape laws were designed to protect male property. The 1382 statute stated that women who “‘consented’ after ‘rape’ were to lose all claim to their husband’s property,” thus making a woman’s consent “irrelevant.”

The 1487 statute further equated rape with abduction: “Women, as well as Maidens, as Widows and Wives having Substances, some in Goods moveable and some in lands and Tenements…been oftentimes taken by Misdoers.” Bashar concludes that all of these statutes were “directed at the protection of the property of the wealthy” because “Family land and wealth was increased by carefully placed marriage alliances” and rape threatened these alliances.

Although it would appear that medieval rape laws were heavily unfavorable as they related to women, the crime itself was taken very seriously. The statute of 1285 made rape an offence punishable by death. A statute written in 1576 equated rape and murder as equally serious in nature. It also removed the benefit of clergy, leaving death as the only form of punishment. Lawyers and other legal minds during the time believed that a woman could justifiably kill a man who had raped her. Justifiable homicide was even permitted in cases of attempted rape, which was classified as a misdemeanor rather than a felony. Thus, in the eyes of the court and many legal scholars, by the “end of the sixteenth century” it was believed that “rape should and would be punished.”

While written laws governed the crime of rape, popular opinion and traditional views governed what was considered proper male and female decorum. Men and women in early modern England were believed to have specific and unique gender characteristics. Such ideas were “fundamentally based on two premises: the biblical story of…creation…and medical understandings of the biological differences between men and women.”

The biblical view held that men were superior to women because God created Adam first and made Eve from one of his ribs and parts of the New Testament, also, specifically describe women as subordinates to their husbands. Biological understandings of the sexes in use during the early modern period dated back to the humoral
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sciences of Aristotle and Galen, which stated that the human body was composed of four unique fluids. As with the biblical view of the two sexes, such “humoral theories” believed men to be “more perfect and more completely formed because they were hotter and drier than women.” Although many of these medical views changed over time due to advancements in science and understanding of human anatomy, the belief in male superiority never waned.

The biblical notion of male dominance, as well as the anatomical differences between men and women, led many writers of the time (almost entirely male of course) to espouse gender specific virtues to the sexes. Female virtues included “chastity and purity; modesty, meekness, and patience; tenderness and charity; and piety and devotion” while male virtues were “[astuteness], courage, boldness, discretion, honesty, and sobriety.” Such virtues also required gender specific faults. Women were softer, weaker, and more emotional (thus less intelligent) than men, who, in turn, were more likely to be prideful, violent, and bombastic. Men and women were, thus, defined by their distinct gender roles. Any deviation from their specific role, or misbehavior, especially sexual, was a serious social offense.

The final way that men and women were separated into their specific gender roles was by sexuality. Although many of the views that sought to explain male and female sexuality changed over time, during the early modern period two generally accepted views are worth noting: male promiscuity and female passivity. The sexual desire for both pleasure and procreation were seen as the natural “biological urge” of men who needed to spread their seed. Many contemporaries even noted that “male lust as a fact of life” was apparent in the “permissive attitudes towards male promiscuity evident in the prevailing double standard” and the many “hypocritical, ‘artful’, and deceptive methods men used to get virtuous women into bed.” This desire to bed “virtuous” women during the eighteenth century led to the “demand for virginity in the brothels of England [and] culminated in a mania of defloration…without parallel in Europe.”

Women, on the other hand, were the passive objects of male desire. This view partly grew out of the increase in knowledge of the female reproductive cycle. Before female reproduction was understood, it was believed that a woman had to achieve an orgasm during intercourse in order to conceive. This view, consequently, led to the belief that a woman “could not have been raped if
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sexual intercourse led to pregnancy.”17 Once this view was rejected, “women’s conscious participation in intercourse was de-emphasized...and increasingly women were viewed as sexually passive, even passionless.”18 The very language used to describe sex (and rape), also connoted female passivity. Men solicited, occupied, beget, and used women, while women, subsequently, submitted to, were occupied by, and suffered “men to have intercourse with them.”19

The scholar responsible for first broaching the subject of the double standard in the academic community was Keith Thomas. In his 1959 article “The Double Standard” Thomas stalwartly argues that the double standard as a social idea “has been deeply rooted in England for many centuries and which by effect upon law and institutions as well as upon opinion has done much to govern the relations of men and women with each other.”20 Thomas’s examination of primary evidence such as conduct books, divorce laws, political debates, and personal correspondences, lead him to conclude that the “English insistence on female chastity” can only be explained by “the desire of men [to have] absolute property in women, a desire which cannot be satisfied if the...woman has once been possessed by another man...”21

Confirmation that the double standard was the prevailing social norm in England during the early modern period is uniquely evident in trial records of rape cases. Such cases help to clarify the second-class status of women within the English legal system specifically, and within English society as a whole. Evidence of the double standard can be seen in three ways: the negative treatment of the woman’s character, the lack of concern with regards to the man’s character, and the primacy of virginity as evidence of rape.

Practically all women who brought allegations of rape before the court faced scrutiny of their character. The 1747 case of Anne Lucy is a pristine example of such examination. Lucy, a spinster in the service of John and Anne Fisher, alleged that Daniel Bright raped her after dining with the Fishers at the “George and Vulture” (a hotel or inn of some sort). During the cross-examination of a man named Potter, who was present at the dinner, Potter testified that Lucy “bears the Character of a very loose debaucht Girl, in the Town.”22 Anne Fisher testified that Lucy was of a “very

17 Shoemaker, Gender in English Society, 62.
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21 Ibid., 216.
indifferent Character, [and] we did not intend to keep her.”23 Mr. Cooper, another man present at the dinner, said Lucy “has a bad Character in our Neighbourhood, I had [heard] it from my Father and her own Mother.”24 A man named Jacques declared, “this Girl has had a bad Character from 11 or 12 Years of Age.”25 Even John Archer asserted, “She is a bad disorderly Person, that’s her general Character; I have an Apprentice that has kept her company for a considerable Time.”26 All of these people testified to Lucy’s “bad” or “indifferent” character, all the while she proclaimed that she was a virgin before the rape. Daniel Bright was acquitted.

Although the testimony against Anne Lucy was primarily about her character (though she did state that Bright called her a “common Whore, and [Bitch] twenty Times” before he raped her27), other cases focused much more on the woman’s sexual honor. Jacob Wykes and John Johnson were acquitted of raping twenty-seven year old Ann Cooper in 1718, “Wife of Michael Cooper,” after two “Officers of the Court” testified that she was both “the oldest Bite and oldest Whore we have” and “she has been a Common Woman of the Town for some Years.”28 It is interesting to note that although Wykes and Johnson did not know Ann Cooper prior to this rape, it was they who “called Persons to [speak] to her Character.”29 If Wykes and Johnson did not know Ann Cooper before the rape, as the transcript suggests, then how could they have readily produced “Mr. Jennings,” “Mr. Butler,” “Daniel Singleton,” “Joseph Short,” and the two court officers to testify to Ann Cooper's bawdy character? It is safe to assume that the accusations leveled by these men were outright fabrications. Ann Cooper asserted to the end that she was “Innocent of all as an Angel in Heaven.”30

Such attacks on the sexual honor of women are rife throughout cases of rape. Susannah Gilman, a woman “20 Years of Age and a Virgin,” was described as an “impudent Slut.”31 Sarah Matts was depicted as a “Street-Walker,” a “Whore” and a “Thief.”32 Elizabeth Stone was a “whore,
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and bitch.”33 Because the accused men in all of the above cases were acquitted, it is obvious that if there was any question in the all male jury’s mind regarding the accusing woman’s character or sexual honor, an acquittal was the likely verdict.

The use of slanderous words such as these, especially the word “whore,” gives credence to Laura Gowing’s argument that “the idiom of slander holds women entirely responsible it [illicit sexual behavior], contains no words to condemn male sexual misconduct, and judges men and women by two sets of incommensurable values.”34 Although Gowning’s article is about defamation cases, where women sued those who called them malicious words such as “whore” in an attempt to preserve their honor from being publicly shamed, her argument concerning the use and purpose of such words can clearly be used when interpreting examples such as those above from cases involving rape.

While the character and honor of many women were viciously scrutinized, the records show a lack of concern for the same vigorous scrutinization of the man’s character. In most of the cases examined so far, there is a heavy imbalance in the ratio of the accusing woman’s testimony to the accused man’s testimony. In the cases that actually contain testimony, the women are usually questioned by their attorney, the defense attorney, and occasionally the “court” as a whole (whether that is the judge or the jury is not specified). The “prisoner,” as the accused man is usually referred to as, if he speaks at all, does not undergo nearly as much questioning. The prosecuting attorney usually does not question him, nor are the questions directed at him as repetitive or mentally demanding as those directed at the woman. The case of Anne Lucy, again, is a good example. Lucy’s testimony is approximately half of the court record, including questions from both her attorney and the attorney for Daniel Bright. The rest of the transcript is eyewitness testimony of the people who were present at the dinner party. Daniel Bright, conveniently, only spoke once to say, “I am absolutely innocent of what I am charged with; I had rather be excused [from] speaking if your Lordship pleases.”35

When the nature of a man’s character is questioned, it is seemingly always positive. Thomas Norris, accused of raping ten-year old Elizabeth Coy in 1741, was described as a “downright honest Man.” One witness even testified that he “believe’d him to be as sober and honest a Man as any in

35 OBP, July 1747, Anne Lucy (t17470715-26).
In a 1735 case against Edward Jones, who was accused of raping Sarah Evans, the trial record says this: “Several gave the Prisoner the Character of a sober modest honest Man, and not inclinable to Women.” Again, in the case against George Haggis, accused of raping Sarah Main with the aid of his friends Richard Keeble, and Thomas Gibbons, the transcript says:

Thomas Godding, Nathaniel Harris, Patrick Edwards, Elizabeth Gofton, George Dean, Ellen Newport, Robert Hill, Robert Kisby, Samuel Gibbons, Thomas Sullivan, Sarah Pomfret Thomas Barnet, Mary Smith, Hannah Hare William Dean, and Henry Teat, appeared for the Prisoners, and gave them good Characters; some of those who appeared for Gibbons, declared they never heard his Character impeached, but on Account of being a Thief Taker, and that he lived agreeably with his Wife, and was fond of his Children. Those for Haggis declared, they took him to be an honest Man. Several of these Witnesses gave Pogey [a witness for Sarah Main], and the Girl [Sarah Main] an ill Character. All Acquitted.

Evidence such as this clearly shows the importance of honor and reputation, and the role of both in the double standard.

The final, and most revealing, aspect of the court records in support of the double standard is the desire for proof of virginity to prove that a rape had indeed occurred. The desire for this proof (by having a surgeon or midwife testify to the condition of the victims hymen or any other genital injuries) appears in less than one percent of the available cases, though where it does appear, it is extraordinarily telling of the prevailing social conception of female sexual honor.

Three conditions were needed to legally prove that a rape had occurred: penile penetration of the vagina, that the act was non-consensual (unless the victim was under ten years of age, which was the legal age of consent), and corroborating evidence. If the victim was ten years of age or older, and if the issue of consent was not clear (which was often the case), then the best evidence to prove rape was the testimony of someone with medical training concerning any injuries to the victims’ genitals, specifically injuries to the hymen. This is further supported by the fact that the

59 Of the 387 available rape cases in the Old Bailey archive, only 12 contain testimony where the word “hymen” is used.
majority of guilty verdicts involved cases where the victim was not old enough to consent\textsuperscript{41} (and thus presumed to be a virgin), or cases that had testimony about injury to the hymen.\textsuperscript{42}

In the 1796 case against David Scott, who was found guilty of raping eleven-year-old Mary Homewood and sentenced to death, surgeon Richard Munn testified, “upon opening the labia and the vagina, I found it proceeded therefrom, the hymen had evidently been ruptured, and the internal parts were in a general state of inflammation.”\textsuperscript{43} In a case from 1690, George Hutton was sentenced to death for raping Elizabeth Marriot, a “Virgin under the Age of Ten Years.” Her mother, a “Midwife and Chirurgeon,” stated, “upon Oath, that she [Elizabeth] was in a very bad Condition and much hurt, and that they concluded it to be the force of some Man that had violently penetrated her Body.”\textsuperscript{44} Cases without direct testimony of a surgeon or midwife still often resulted in a guilty verdict if the victim was less than ten years of age. In 1686, Thomas Broughton was sentenced to death for raping Catherine Phrasier, a “Virgin under the age of ten years.”\textsuperscript{45}

Having the testimony of surgeon or midwife, however, often backfired if he or she testified to a lack of genital injury. James Larwill was acquitted of raping Jane East in 1778 when Mr. Kennedy, a surgeon, stated, “I examined the hymen, and found it quite perfect; there was no sort of laceration.”\textsuperscript{46} Charles Earle was acquitted of raping Mary Matthews in 1770 because James Purdue testified, “I examined the child… in the presence of Mr. Howard, Mr. Gloster, and the house surgeon of the Infirmary….[T]he hymen, which is the test of virginity, was almost entire; the passage was very straight.”\textsuperscript{47} Such evidence affirms that there was a general rule in rape cases, and that rule was best described by the court in the 1787 case against John Ince: “Court to Jury. Gentlemen, you see the hymen not being broke, there could be no rape. NOT GUILTY. Tried by the first Middlesex Jury before Mr. Justice HEATH.”\textsuperscript{48}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{41} Walker, \textit{Crime, Gender and Social Order}, 56.
\item \textsuperscript{42} This supports Nazife Bashar’s statement that “Rape of an adult woman was generally considered by the [courts] to be a case not suitable for trial. The courts were far more willing to prosecute for rape where virginity was involved…” Bashar, “Rape in England Between 1550 and 1700,” 38.
\item \textsuperscript{43} Old Bailey Proceedings Online, September 1796, trial of Mary Homewood (t17960914-12), www.oldbaileyonline.org, (accessed 2 April 2008).
\item \textsuperscript{44} Old Bailey Proceedings Online, December 1690, trial of Elizabeth Marriot (t16901210-5), www.oldbaileyonline.org, (accessed 2 April 2008).
\item \textsuperscript{45} Old Bailey Proceedings Online, January 1686, trial of Catherine Phrasier (t16860114-16), www.oldbaileyonline.org, (accessed 2 April 2008).
\item \textsuperscript{46} Old Bailey Proceedings Online, September 1778, trial of Jane East (t17780916-12), www.oldbaileyonline.org, (accessed 2 April 2008).
\item \textsuperscript{47} Old Bailey Proceedings Online, December 1770, trial of Mary Matthews (t17701205-39), www.oldbaileyonline.org, (accessed 2 April 2008).
\item \textsuperscript{48} Old Bailey Proceedings Online, October 1787, trial of Cornelia Winter (t17871024-78), www.oldbaileyonline.org, (accessed 8 April 2008).
\end{itemize}
Another interesting aspect of these cases that deserves further elaboration is the intense questioning and scrutiny that women underwent during a trial. As mentioned earlier, women were questioned by both attorneys and the court, and were also questioned much longer than the accused man. An example of this can be seen in the case of Mary Homewood:

Court. Q. What part of your body did he put it to? - A. Into my private parts.
Court. Q. Was it a part of his own body? - A. Yes.
Court. Q. Did what he did give you any pain? - A. Yes; it hurt me a great deal.
Court. Q. How far do you think he went into your body? - A. I cannot tell; he hurt me a great deal.
Court. Q. Did you feel him in your body? - A. Yes, sir.
Court. Q. How long did he stay there? - A. It looked to be a long time; I thought it was a quarter of an hour; but I don’t think it was so long.
Court. Q. Did you feel any thing come from him? - A. O yes, a good deal; about the evening it came from me very fast.
Court. Q. Did you feel any thing come from his body into your’s? - A. Not before I was going to bed; it was all over my shift.
Court. Q. You felt him in your body? - A. Yes.
Court. Q. Did you feel him far in? - A. Yes.49

While such repetitive questioning can be seen as an attempt by the court to gain accurate information that will ultimately decide the fate of a man’s life, it can also be construed as an attempt to confuse the woman being questioned. Were a woman to slip up and accidentally contradict herself while undergoing such severe scrutiny, she would likely be judged as a liar and the defendant acquitted. This style of examination also implies an inherent distrust of women. Garthine Walker explains such innate mistrust of women as, “[The] construction of sexual violence as all or nothing was reflected in juridical discourse that devalued women’s accusations…[J]udges, justices, and jurors were explicitly warned to distrust women’s allegations.”50 Thus, men were inherently honest, and women inherently dishonest. Although this is not necessarily evidence of the double standard in regards to sexual honor, it reveals a great deal concerning the social placement of women in English society during the early modern period.

Keith Thomas’s interpretation of the double standard stood as the dominant academic construal for many years. In 1999, however, Bernard Capp, in his article The Double Standard Revisited: Plebian Women and Male Sexual Reputation in Early Modern England, sought to “refine [the]
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traditional model of gendered morality.”51 By examining sources such as court cases and personal correspondences, Capp asserts that male sexual honor was just as important as female sexual honor. “Fear of exposure or defamation” he states, “could render respectable men vulnerable to wronged or calculating women and, while the sexes were never equally matched in the politics of sexual relations and reputation, it is wrong to see women as no more than passive and helpless victims.”52 Capp cites cases of pregnant women who sued the father of their unborn child in order to force a marriage, of women who formed “semi-professional sexual extortion” gangs to extort money from innocent men, and of men who raped women and then offered to pay them for their silence.53 While Capp does show a concern among men as to the nature of their sexual reputation, he fails to account for the “insistence on chastity” and the “desire of men for absolute property in women” that was central to Thomas’s argument for the double standard.54

The evidence presented in this paper clearly supports Thomas’s view of the double standard. The importance placed on female character and reputation, the ostensible lack of concern for male character and reputation, and the paramount value to be found in female virginity, all sustain the notion that the double standard of sexual behavior was the established social order in early modern English society. By controlling the legal and social standards that defined female honor, men were subsequently able to define their property in women’s chastity.

52 Ibid., 74.
53 Ibid., 74, 84, 94.
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Government of Contradictions: How the Cuban Revolution Treated Homosexuals

Samantha Luger

From the first spark of revolutionary ideas in Cuba during the 1950s, it became obvious that the revolution would not be for everyone. With dreams to unite the people, conquer poverty, eliminate racism and bring equality to the sexes, the revolution promised hope to an impoverished people. Despite these dreams, Cubans who had fought the hardest for the revolution would not reap the benefits. The revolutionary government promised freedom, but persecuted all political dissidents who did not follow its ideological agenda, including homosexuals. The conflicting message from the Cuban government frustrated minority groups and made it impossible for homosexuals in Cuba to achieve their revolutionary goals.

The influences of Soviet ideology on homosexuality and the desire to break away from American manipulation drove the Cuban government to pursue unrealistic goals for societal norms. The contradiction is that even with all the benefits the revolution brought to Cuba, including advancements in education and public services, Cuban homosexuals were denied the promise of sexual and emotional freedom from government control. Both men and women who had supported the revolution soon realized that they would be denied its benefits due to their sexual orientation. Those who admitted their homosexuality became ostracized, often losing their jobs, their families and their personal freedom.

Rich with culture, color and sexuality, but lacking in the basic necessities, Cuba during the 1950s desperately needed change. Sixty percent of Cuba’s rural families lived in dwellings with earth floors, roofs made of palm tree leaves and houses that did not have water or latrines. Only one in four families had access to electricity. ¹ The commercialization of sex and widespread control of major cities by organized crime left Cuba weak to American manipulation. Before the Cuban Revolution, Havana was a “playground for large numbers of American tourists who came in search of the unbeatable combination of money, sin and sex.” ² In the 1950s, Havana was a “whoredom run by gangsters” where Cubans had to “beg and whore themselves to tourists.” ³ Many Cubans resented their economic dependency on American products and tourism.

³ Ibid. 15.
Cubans were predominantly bitter and upset by the American support of Cuban leader Fulgencio Batista’s harsh regime, as he continued a Cuban tradition of manipulating the poor workers for upper class profit. As part of an American theory of ‘hemispheric defense’ against Soviet communism, the US government began providing Batista with bombs, war planes, bullets and guns in 1933, which he used against his own people. Impoverished Cubans blamed the Batista government and American tourist exploitation for their misery, which left them vulnerable to the ideas of revolutionary change.

Many homosexuals had to depend on underground illegal activities and American tourists to survive in pre-revolutionary Cuba. In 1933, the Cuban government enacted the Public Ostentation Laws, which criminalized anyone who “scandalously dedicates himself to practicing homosexual acts or makes public ostentation of this conduct or importunes others with the requirements of this nature.” These laws encouraged Cubans to harass homosexuals until they exposed their sexual orientation, which put parents against their children and neighbor against neighbor. Families disowned their homosexual children, which for some Cubans meant poverty and starvation because “the family was typically the most important institution in pre-revolutionary Cuba.” Belonging to a family unit became critical to survival in a country “where more than a quarter of the population was frequently out of work and where there was no social security.”

Much of the Cuban rural population misunderstood homosexuality and saw being gay as deviating from the norm. Homosexuals who remained with their families in the villages were “often ostracized or cast in the role as village queer – the homosexual version of the village idiot.” Once rejected by their family and village unit, homosexuals had few options; join the militia or look for work in more populated and sexually open cities, specifically, cities which supported American tourism and underground activities that would provide homosexuals with jobs. Consequently, unemployed homosexual Cubans flooded the cities from rural areas and “Havana became a center
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for gay men and lesbians seeking employment and hoping for greater freedom to lead their own lives.”

During the 1950s, organized crime groups ran most of the businesses in Cuban cities. Havana had 270 brothels, 700 bars and tens of thousands of slot machines, all of which fed money into the Batista regime and US corporations. The city was widely viewed as ‘Sin City’, “a tourist paradise of gambling, sexual license and prostitution of both sexes.” This widespread corruption left many of the major cities in Cuba unrestrained by law enforcement, making them generally an accepting place for homosexuals and all other illegal activities. Before the revolution, the Batista government could not effectively “regulate personal behavior” in the major cities, therefore the organized crime groups ruled.

Pre-revolutionary Cuba did not provide many legitimate and legal job opportunities for open homosexuals. Those who wished to live a homosexual lifestyle had to involve themselves in the illegal, underground crime sectors of Cuban cities. Some homosexuals kept quiet about their sexual orientation, which caused anxiety and fear, often forcing them to lie about their personal lives. Lesbian women in particular had to hide their attraction to women in order to keep their jobs. To protect themselves from sexual harassment at work, lesbians often had to pretend to have boyfriends and even get men to come to their work to protect them.

Despite the poverty throughout the rest of the country, Cuba’s private sectors of illegal activities flourished during the 1950s. Most homosexuals profited from working in underground organized crime businesses, such as in casinos, bars, or working as prostitutes. The guilt they felt, however, prevented homosexuals from creating a ‘gay community’ or ‘gay pride’ before the revolution. For many of them, homosexuality made life a “shameful and guilt-ridden experience,” as most of them saw homosexuality as a “profitable commodification of sexual fantasies.” To this sexual minority, a revolution would mean the opportunity to live and love the way they wanted, acceptance from their families, and a lifestyle without American exploitation or government control. A Cuban revolution would mean that lesbians would not have to live in fear at their workplaces and homes. Those are the benefits that homosexuals fought for and supported during the revolution.
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The Cuban Revolution did not come from a communist or Marxist background. It came from an anti-American hatred and determination for independence, which is important in understanding how the revolution affected certain minority groups in Cuba. Castro led the 26th of July Movement not in search of a government based on communism, but instead, in search of a government no longer dependent on American capitalism. Castro focused on creating a “social justice and a new kind of socialism for his country.”  

Cleansing the major cities of the corruption and decadence that controlled all life and business during the Batista regime became an important goal of the Cuban Revolution. This meant the government needed to reeducate the sex workers, male and female, that “characterized the worst of capitalistic bourgeois decadence.” Education soon became the antidote to Batista’s corruption, along with restructuring the health care system, with an emphasis on better nutrition, proper hygiene and higher health standards in poorer regions. Castro began a new national priority for free health care in Cuba and a progressive social security system.

These efforts to improve schools, housing and health clinics undoubtedly benefited Cubans, yet some of the consequences of Castro’s revolution alarmed Cubans. The new government strictly controlled the press, militarized the educational systems and limited “functioning democratic institutions for free speech.” Restrictions on civil rights seemed an easy trade for Cubans compared to the Batista government, but those who wanted more from the revolution detected a lack of sympathy for some minority groups. Although the Cuban Revolution represented a symbolic declaration of independence from American manipulation, the underlying homophobic tone of the cleansing of the country did not go unnoticed by many gay Cubans.

The main theme of the revolution was anti-American and nothing was more anti-American during the 1950s than communism. As the revolution gained power, the American government shunned Castro and many worried that “American hostility could push Cuba towards subservience to the Soviets.” From this hostility, and from the basic necessity for a plan of action, Castro gradually began implementing communist and Marxist ideology into his vision of revolutionizing Cuba. Castro did not at first “profess adherence to any particular ideology but soon came to
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embrace communism.” 22 Communist ideology had a “puritanism and social rigidity” that attracted
Castro as he cleaned up the streets of Cuba from prostitutes, drug dealers and gangsters. 23 To
Castro, the revolution in Cuba was not just about making the lives better for Cubans, but revitalizing
the Cuban image. Castro needed a political platform to revolutionize his country and the ideology of
communism aligned with his previous beliefs. Turning to Soviet ideology also meant examining how
they had handled counter-revolutionaries and those believed to be without morals in their society.
Cuban leaders introduced Soviet methods into their new governmental policies in order to
implement progress.

Mobilizing public support on moral issues and regaining the national dignity lost during the
Batista regime became more important to Castro than improving the country or discovering
communism. 24 To Castro, this meant strengthening the traditional family unit and promoting the
evolution of the ‘new socialist man’. This new Cuban male stereotype would be a “healthy individual
with a new attitude toward work.” 25 Castro’s revolutionary contemporary, Che Guevara, stated that
he envisioned the ‘new socialist man’ as “motivated not by material considerations of any kind but
rather by moral values directed toward what is necessary to create a better life for all people.” 26
Castro thought of himself as the ideal ‘new socialist man’ and said that the revolution “needed
strong men to fight wars, sportsmen, men who had no psychological weaknesses.” 27 According to
conventional Cuban ideals, homosexual men did not fit into this stereotype. The idea of
homosexuals acting as leaders in the revolutionary movement concerned Castro and he said,
“…homosexuals should not be allowed in positions where they are able to exert influence upon
young people.” 28 Revolutionary leaders such as Castro and Guevara could not understand how
these men could be considered intellectuals or contribute positively to Cuba’s revolutionary
transformation. 29 In a 1961 interview, Castro stated,

“Nothing prevents a homosexual from professing revolutionary ideology and, consequently,
exhibiting a correct political position. In this case, he should not be considered politically negative.
And yet we would never come to believe that a homosexual could embody the conditions and
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requirements of conduct that would enable us to consider him a true revolutionary, a true Communist militant.”  

The idea that homosexuals were without morals, weak and therefore poor candidates for revolutionaries came from a long history of homophobia in Cuba and from Castro’s most recent turn to Soviet ideology. Much like other Latin American countries, Spain controlled Cuba as a colony before Cuba’s independence in 1902 and the experience influenced Cubans socially and culturally. Spanish values manipulated how many Cubans thought of the roles of men and women in the family and society. Cuba’s experience as a Spanish colony influenced their feelings towards homosexuality. The Spanish Catholic Church, the African slave traditions, the Moorish (Islamic) ideas on male roles and the Western ideology of the role of men as protectors of women all became incorporated into general distain for homosexuality in Cuba as immoral and insubstantial. From the time of Spanish colonial rule to the incorporation of Soviet ideology, Cuban nationalism focused on male strength, not weakness (homosexuality). Paranoid about capitalist decadence corrupting the country, Castro took Cuba’s homophobia to an extreme once he came to power. In 1934, the Soviet Union re-criminalized homosexuality under the leadership of Joseph Stalin in an effort to promote heterosexuality and the traditiona family roles or “ideals of the new Soviet citizenry.” The Soviets did not accept homosexuality as part of their communist ideals. Stalin demonstrated his personal feelings towards homosexuals in this quote, “these scoundrels must receive exemplary punishment and a corresponding guiding decree must be introduced in our legislation.” The Soviets saw homosexuality as a crime against both “masculinity and the state” but recognized homosexuals as victims of capitalism who needed to be rehabilitated.  

Before turning to communism, the policies of the Cuban revolutionary government had been “largely open minded and humanistic, dictated as much by the determination to transform radically the structure of Cuban society and free its economy from American domination” more than any type of commitment to a communist outline or philosophy. Cubans welcomed communist homophobia because it fit in with their already held beliefs and “many of the new Cuban
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converts to socialism accepted Soviet claims at face value.” 37 This is the ideology that Castro embraced when he turned to communism in 1961 as he anxiously held his volatile revolution together.

Instability characterized the revolution from the very beginning. Revolutionaries desperately sought to keep it together long enough to achieve their dreams of cleaning up Cuba and creating the ‘new socialist man’. The US invasion at the Bay of Pigs in 1961, the terrorist actions of the counter-revolutionaries and CIA sponsored attacks on Castro created general paranoia and feelings of mistrust in Cuba. 38 The invasion led to an “increase in militarization, surveillance, and concern over national security” which meant that “anyone who was ‘different’ fell under suspicion.” 39 This anxiety led to individual persecution of those that the Cuban government believed did not follow the communist ideology and specifically, a plan created in 1965 to “rehabilitate individuals whose attitudes and behaviors were perceived as being nonconformist, self-indulgent and unproductive.” 40 This plan called for an organized repression of political dissidents, such as militant Catholics, Jehovah’s Witnesses, the unemployed, the ‘politically suspect’ and homosexuals, in the form of rehabilitation work camps known as the Military Units to Aid Production (UMAP). 41 Due to traditional paradigms of machismo, the Cuban government did not recognize lesbianism and considered only males as ‘homosexuals’.

Designed to create a better Cuban citizen through hard work in the sugar cane fields, the camps focused on “specifically ‘correcting’ homosexual behavior, which, in the revolutionary policy makers’ eyes, threatened the creation of a true revolutionary consciousness among the Cuban people.” 42 Due to personal homophobia, those running the camps often ignored the main purpose of rehabilitating the political dissidents and early UMAP draftees were “treated so inhumanely that the officers responsible were court-martialed and replaced with leaders assigned to bring order to the camps.” 43 Officers abused their power by exploiting homosexuals in the camps in two ways; guards could “use the prisoners as handy objects of verbal and physical abuse” or “use them for sex as they
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wish, as long as they are not public about it.” 44 After the camps closed down, the Cuban
government exposed these violent officers and convicted them of crimes of torture. 45 In a 1984
interview with Juan Escalona, Cuban minister of justice, he spoke of homosexuals as being ‘disabled’
and they could never contribute to society while having this “fundamental personality flaw”. 46 He
explained that the Cuban government did not initially single out homosexuals, but designed UMAP
camps to deal with unproductive citizens. 47

The Cuban government had many different ways to target these dissidents and those whom
they deemed unproductive to society. Although they did not outlaw homosexuality outright, they
made laws that targeted homosexual behavior in a vague enough way to make it possible for
homosexuals to be arrested and put in these labor camps. Laws against ‘disturbing the peace’, which
could be considered as displaying homosexual mannerisms, or the law against ‘dangerousness’,
which was a vague term for antisocial behavior, or the law against ‘loafing’, which simply outlawed
anyone from loitering on the streets with no particular purpose, all targeted homosexual men. 48
Enforcement of these laws meant a ‘trial of visibility’ and “these sets of laws and their enforcement
criminalized looking gay.” 49 The Cuban government did not focus on private homosexuality, but
considered public homosexuality as constituting criminality.

The Cuban government set up different mass organizations to enforce these laws, such as
the Committees for the Defense of the Revolution (CDR). Interns at the UMAP camps had charges
placed on them for mostly victimless crimes, like breaking laws against ‘dangerousness’ or ‘loafing’.
The government realized that enforcement of these laws would be difficult without consistent
surveillance, so they entrusted the CDR and other groups with “reporting antisocial behavior” which
became the only way the police could arrest people for placement in the camps. 50

Organized communist groups, such as the CDR, tracked down homosexuals in their
workplace, homes and universities settings to expose them. The groups called this targeting ‘moral
purges’ and often brought the men in front of their assembly for public humiliation by asking them
personal questions, such as favorite sexual positions, and then sent them to the police for UMAP
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People became paranoid as the Cuban government enacted laws that made it illegal not to report homosexuals to the police. The Cuban government targeted homosexuals and publicly humiliated them to show that they could not be worthy of the benefits of their revolution, demonstrating that Cuban leaders did not design their revolution to include homosexuals.

Historically, the UMAP camps became “permanent symbols of Cuban homophobia,” from the personal memoirs and documentaries that have developed since the institution of those camps from 1965-1967. One documentary, Improper Conduct, directed by Nestor Almendros and Orlando Jimenez Leal, contains interviews with Cuban refugees that experienced persecution under the Cuban government. One man in the film describes how the police brought him to a room and told him to walk around. From his walk, the police determined his effeminacy, and therefore homosexuality, and sent him to the UMAP camps for rehabilitation.

Their paranoia caused Cuban leaders to become obsessed with appearances and behaviors. The Cuban government focused on public displays of homosexuality in order to create the ‘new socialist man’. Private homosexuality did not concern the government as a main target of persecution; they only wanted to rehabilitate men to become productive to society. The government designed the UMAP camps to refashion the outward appearance of the homosexual male, to provide him with the best ‘new socialist man’ qualities and “a deep voice, a controlled gait, and a firm handshake were seen and felt as proof of manliness.”

The obsession with appearances only served to highlight how the UMAP camps acted superficially with the purpose to rehabilitate. The inability of Cuban leaders to recognize the reality of homosexuality haunted the impressions of gay Cubans under the revolution. In Improper Conduct, one of the interviewees, Susan Sontag, says that “the militarization of revolutionary society seems inseparable from the devaluation and suspicion of any and all ideas of weakness, including, of course, femininity and feminine-fashioned homosexuality.” Being viewed as a weakness in the revolution and as something that needed to be ‘corrected’ left homosexuals feeling invisible and deprived of the revolution they had dreamed and hoped for.
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These camps also demonstrated that the Cuban government still blamed American imperialism for homosexuality and for them gay Cubans represented a sexual colonization of Cuba from the US tourists. Castro noted that many of those arrested and forced into the UMAP camps “bore official designations of victim’s of an imported ‘disease’ of effeminate male behavior… of a condition inconsistent with the model of Cuba’s new socialist man.” 57 The contempt and disgust of homosexuality and its connection to the decadent and capitalistic lifestyle of pre-revolutionary Cuba followed the policy of Cuban leaders who initiated the UMAP camps to rehabilitate the ‘weak’.

There are many different interpretations as to the significance and purpose of the UMAP camps. Many Cubans debate whether the degree of violence and persecution within the camps targeted homosexuals specifically. These camps served the purpose of cheap hard labor needed in rural areas of Cuba and solved the problem of what to do with homosexuals thought as lazy and unproductive to Cuban society. The success of the sugar harvest depended on this labor and became “crucial to Cuba’s economic survival.” 58 This does not excuse the barbaric treatment of the workers: “conditions were so severe that some people committed suicide.” 59

The hard labor and terrible conditions of the camps did not symbolize the worst parts of the imprisonment to the gay interns. The fact that the “persecution of homosexuals and other minorities in Cuba completely contradicted the humanist and liberating values that had motivated the revolution” is what really damaged the homosexual support to the revolution. 60 This proved to homosexuals that despite their support of the revolution and their efforts to improve Cuba, Cuban government did not intend for the revolution to include them. In a 1965 interview about his trip to Cuba, Allen Ginsberg, an American gay activist and poet, said:

“What was the ideology they were proposing? A police bureaucracy that persecutes fairies? I mean, they’re wasting enormous energies on that. Some of those ‘fairies’ were the best revolutionaries – people that fought at the Bay of Pigs.” 61

Cuban leaders had turned their backs on homosexuals and ignored the fact that gays in Cuba supported the revolution and wanted to help clean up Cuba from American exploitation. Homosexuals had been abandoned by their families due to their sexual orientation and forced to work in illegal businesses sponsored by American underground groups. Some homosexuals fought
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in the revolution side by side with heterosexuals and they had the same dreams of freedom and self-determination as other revolutionary Cubans tired of being exploited by American corporations. The gays in Cuba undoubtedly supported independence and the revolutionaries acknowledged their sacrifices by rejecting them.

In 1959, Fidel Castro fascinated Americans as a ‘rebel with a cause’ with his romantic idealism of the Cuban Revolution. This fascination soon turned dark once stories of concentration camps for homosexuals and other political dissidents during the mid 1960s leaked out of communist Cuba. Americans and Cubans began recognizing the contradictory message of the Cuban government as a “regime which speaks much of progress, but which has halted the fluency and growth of its people in many ways.” Now that the government ‘cleaned up’ Havana, those homosexuals disowned by their rural families had no where to go and the amount of Cuban immigrants to the US via another country increased in numbers. As a result, more information about the Cuban Revolution became available to Americans.

Despite recommendations from homophobic military officials, Castro admitted that the “treatment of the UMAP draftees was scandalous” and conceded to international pressure. The Cuban government discontinued the UMAP camps in 1967, halting the institutionalization of homophobia. The government allowed the Cuban military to maintain their authority for recruiting and training new soldiers, or ‘revolutionaries’, “but its ‘rehabilitative’ and truly repressive mission was thereafter sharply curtailed”. Despite closing the camps, the image of a true communist and the ideology of Cuban ‘machismoism’ dictated the Cuban definition of the ‘new socialist man’. This philosophy dominated the cultural identity of Cuba and prevented them from accepting tolerance for homosexuals.

Coming to terms with the changing times and views of homosexuality, the Cuban government gradually began considering a different approach and for the first time, they officially referred to homosexuality in “medical and psychological terms rather than criminality.” Even though the “closing of the camps initiated a much less oppressive environment for gay people in Cuba,” the discrimination against homosexuals by Cuban leaders, employers and law enforcement
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continued. 68 The government stopped openly persecuting homosexuals, but the issue remained that the Cuban Revolution sent contradictory messages to the people. Cubans began to understand the reality that the “Castro government is oppressive, militaristic and undemocratic and that its economic and social advantages are much overrated.” 69 People began to realize that the revolution promised to them needed work.

The Cuban government sent contradictory messages to Cuban homosexuals by promising to ‘clean up’ Cuba for everyone. By persecuting homosexuals and other political dissidents, the government demonstrated they had designed a limited revolution. Most gay men in Cuba did not have families that supported them and resented the fact that they had to depend on American exploitation for survival. Homosexuals fought the hardest for revolutionizing Cuba and breaking away from American economic dependency, yet the new revolutionary government denied them recognition for their efforts. Traditional paradigms of masculinity prevented Castro and other Cuban leaders from allowing homosexuals to enjoy the freedom they promised with the revolution.

Years of being under the Spanish empire as a colony and then becoming dependent on American capitalism made Castro’s government paranoid and anxious to prove their masculinity, which they believed homosexuality contradicted. American hostility towards the new Cuban government forced Castro to rely on the Soviet Union for economic support and protection. Soviet homophobia influenced Castro’s quick turn on homosexuals and dramatic manifestation of anti-homosexuality with the UMAP camps. The message sent to homosexuals became very clear with the advent of ‘moral purges’ and groups like the CDR. Castro revolutionized Cuba by cleaning up the cities and designing the ‘new socialist man’, but the aggressive intolerance of homosexuality did not go unnoticed. The Cuban Revolution of the late 1950s sent a contradictory message to sexual minority groups by promising sexual and emotional freedom, yet in actuality they betrayed homosexuals by denying them the benefits of the revolution. Castro did not design his revolution for everyone and homosexuals felt the consequences of that betrayal.
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“On, On, You Noblest English”: Language, Religion and Nationalism in England

Sean Painter

“Most students today will agree that standard national languages, spoken or written, cannot emerge as such before printing, mass literacy and hence, mass schooling.” ~ Eric J. Hobsbawm

“Long before the advent of mass primary education vernacular culture and established authority had thus come together again as seed-bed of the nation-state.” ~ Adrian Hastings

The two opinions quoted above represent two distinct philosophies regarding the importance of language in the development of nationalism. However, what is nationalism exactly? In 1887, Walter Bagehot observed, “we know what it is when you do not ask us, but we cannot very quickly explain or define it.” In the twelve decades since Bagehot’s observation, many scholars have offered countless explanations to this complicated question with numerous theories and opinions on the factors that contribute to the creation of nationalism. Among these many factors are the labels ethnicity, shared history or territory, identity crises, religion and language. Today our initial question results in a considerable array of contradictory opinions, each with a differing definition of nationalism and different interpretation of when the phenomenon of nationalism began. In the sea of confusing rhetoric, two apparent philosophies emerge, allowing grouping into the very appropriate labels of modernists and medievalist. Of these labels, language and religion are the most interesting. This paper will examine how each respective side views the importance of language and religion and their functions in the development of nationalism in England.

Best illustrating the philosophical difference between modernists and medievalists are the opinions of Eric Hobsbawm and Adrian Hastings. Hobsbawm and Hastings refer to the key words of “ethnicity,” “territory,” “history,” “culture,” and “language” in their own definitions of nationalism as characteristics that are essential “landmarks” used to “explain why certain groups have become ‘nations’ and other not.” The opinions on the importance of language differ vastly from arguments that assert language being primarily important to the rise of nationalism to the arguments that relegate it to categories of lesser importance. Hobsbawm’s equation that “nation=state=people” is fundamentally a top to bottom approach to nationalism; the nation is formed by modernity, likely after
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industrialization creates a state that its people form allegiances to.\textsuperscript{5} Modernists therefore can ignore the importance of cultural landmarks like language because the use of language and other cultural traits, ethnicity, territory, history “are themselves fuzzy…ambiguous, and…useless,” and only serve purposes for propagandists who have nationalistic agendas.\textsuperscript{6}

Hobsbawm asserts that language, “had nothing to do in principle” with nationality. Citing the example of the American Revolution, Hobsbawm asserts “what distinguished the American colonists from King George…was neither language nor ethnicity.”\textsuperscript{7} This fails to acknowledge the present perception that English is the de facto official language of the United States, spoken by the majority of the populace, and a major factor in every citizen’s American identity. Hobsbawm does not dismiss language entirely. He recognizes that language is “the very essence of what distinguishes one people from another,” but reduces its impact on nationalism because only a select few languages obtain a status that transcends the oral threshold to become a language that is also written. The resulting creation of “linguistic barriers” and communities speaking “mutually incomprehensible languages” creates “separate entities” that do not create nations but “merely groups which happen to have trouble in understandings each other’s words.”\textsuperscript{8} If one of these “mutually incomprehensible languages” did evolve into a genuine national language, and elevate itself “to the status of ‘languages-of-power,’”\textsuperscript{9} Hobsbawm would argue that this could only happen after a system of general education was implemented. Prior to this, the language would be spoken only by the ruling elites and literate, and thus the “language could hardly be a criterion of nationhood” because these national languages are “semi-artificial constructs and…virtually invented,” and not representative of the entire population.\textsuperscript{10}

For modernists, this theory changes when states introduce mass education because it is through this outlet that mass “knowledge of the official language” is brought into most homes.\textsuperscript{11} Related to mass education is the printing press, which cements the foundations of national languages by forcing the speakers of the numerous “mutually incomprehensible languages” to speak one dialect. The advent of the printing press “made it possible for rapidly growing numbers of people to relate themselves to others, in profoundly new ways,”\textsuperscript{12} making it possible for these people “who might find it…impossible to understand one another” before “capable of comprehending one another,” thus
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forming the basis in which a nation could form. For modernists, it is fair to assess that language plays a supporting role to other factors, it is one among many proto-nationalistic categories that indicate human groupings, but “contrary to nationalist myth, a people’s language is not the basis of national consciousness but … a ‘cultural artifact’” that cannot be used to define nations.

Medievalists find importance in the “fuzzy, ambiguous and useless.” Hastings considers language and the “vernacular literature” to be “by far the most important and widely present factor….for the development of nationhood.” Of the afore mentioned “landmarks” that are used in determining whether a group is a nation, language, is the least “fuzzy” because it is through the various forms of language (both spoken and written) that the majority of people find commonality, which is essential in the building of a nation. The importance of language stems from the unifying factor it creates. As the number of speakers increases, the “bond between the written language...with the oral language…used by everyone, can ensure that a linguistically based nationalism quickly gains support even in largely non-literate communities.” At this stage, these communities are still primarily loosely associated ethnicities. For Hastings, the definition of nation is dependent on ethnicity, in which language is critical. By his definition, ethnicities are groups who share cultural identities, including language, while a nation forms from multiple ethnicities, with its own identifiable literature, and identity. Under this definition, it is not difficult to see that most nations will include groups of people who do not feel part of the nation’s “core culture,” but benefit from being part of the nation. The nation forms when the language begins to develop literature “with popular impact” that “pushes its speakers from the category of an ethnicity towards that of a nation.” However, when does this “push” begin? Modernists contend that 1789 is roughly the starting date for the study of nationalism, while medievalists would argue earlier dates ranging from the tenth to seventeenth century. Hasting summarizes this conflict accurately when he writes “Hobsbawm wrote a history of nineteenth-and twentieth century nationalism, but not a history of nationalism.” The date, at which each particular academic asserts that the rise of nationalism occurs is important, not only in differentiating between modernist and medievalist, but also primarily because it allows better understanding to the importance
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placed on language. A major argument in the study of nationalism when focused on language is the connotation of the words associated with nations through the centuries.

The word “nation” itself has gone through numerous changes in meaning. Today we look at the modern connotation and superimpose that definition onto historical examples. In examining the importance of language, it is important to look at the evolution of the word, as this allows context on how words and language have helped define nations. Liah Greenfeld gives an exhaustive examination of this process. Beginning with Ancient Rome, “nation” originally had a derogatory connotation, “reserved for groups of foreigners…whose status…was below that of the Roman citizens.” From this definition, it moved to a more academic setting and the University of Paris used it to describe the many communities of students in attendance. Here, the word nation “lost its derogatory connotation…and…acquired an additional meaning” that “referred…to the community of opinion and purpose.” This new definition was then applied to an “ecclesiastical republic” (the clergy) where it acquired additional connotations, “that of representatives of cultural and political authority, or a political, cultural…social elite.” In analyzing this “zigzag pattern of semantic change,” Greenfeld demonstrates the importance of language in determining nationality. While nowhere near today’s present day meaning, the ancient form of the word nation alludes to the future connotation of division by nationality. This new connotation would not last long, as the meaning changed once again in the early sixteenth century when “‘nation’ in its conciliar meaning of ‘an elite’ was applied to the population…and made synonymous with the word ‘people.’”

This semantic transformation occurred in sixteenth century England, making “the birth of the English nation” not just “the birth of a nation” but “the birth of the nations, the birth of nationalism.” This makes the evolved connotation of the word nation in sixteenth century England a signal to not only “the emergence of the first nation in the world” but also to the present modern connotation of how the “word is understood today.” The meaning of “nation” did not remain solely associated with England for very long. Shortly after taking the connotation of referring to an English people, “the word ‘nation’ meaning ‘sovereign people’” began to be “applied to other populations and countries” where it obtained new significance and came to “signify a ‘unique sovereign people.’” The changing history of the word illustrates how it has evolved and been applied to different groups but not necessarily its definition, which we must look at contemporary dictionaries for.
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Both Hobsbawm and Hastings analyze contemporary dictionaries for their uses of nationalistic key words that describe states to determine how close these words were to their present definitions. The purpose is not to determine if these words were used because they are, but to determine whether they have the same meaning associated with them today. Modernists argue that the mere existence of these words do not constitute the existence of nations, while for medievalists usage of these words seemingly always leads to the conclusion that nations do exist. Hobsbawm chooses to reference the Dictionary of the Royal Spanish Academy, and focuses on “lengua nacional,” “nacion,” “gobierno,” “patria,” and “tierra.” None of these words had definitions now associated with them today until 1884; at least in Spain. Hastings is critical of this choice: “if we are seeking to assess the age of a modern word…then it seems most sensible to seek for where it is likely to have been most long-lived, not where it could be expected to have a shorter history.” Spain is not viable for Hastings because nationalism there began to “flower” at a much later date than in England. Hastings uses Johnson’s Dictionary of 1755, “which defines ‘nation’ as ‘a people distinguished from another people, generally by their language, origin, or government.’” This definition fully fits into his medievalist criteria and further argues that the meaning of the word “nation” in 1755 has similar meaning to present day definitions. Hastings further supports the assertion that “nation” was in use well before modernity by citing examples of the word used in a present day context by John Milton, Adam Smith, William Pitt the Younger, and Edmund Burke. “Nation,” and similar words, went through significant changes in its “sentiment and meaning,” with the word developing a grander scope that demonstrated the populace developing greater allegiance to greater entities like England rather than local communities; “country was defined as ‘nation;’” ‘nation’ was defined as country.”

In addition to the usages in dictionaries, these words appear in popular literature. Shakespeare makes frequent use of nationalistic words. In *Henry IV, Part I*, the character Falstaff laments that “It was alway yet the trick of our English nation,” and in *Julius Caesar*, Shakespeare writes “Who is here is vile that will not love his country?” William Shakespeare’s history plays dealing with the Hundred Year’s War (the first and second tetralogies) are blatantly nationalistic propaganda meant to inspire unity among the English populace. More importantly, these works of literature serve as examples of how language is paramount in developing nationalism. Numerous other examples exist and this usage:
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in contemporary literature solidifies the existence of nationalism for medievalists, and “strongly suggest[s]...Englishmen felt themselves to be a nation;” with language being a contributing factor in that belief.29 It is apparent that the word had evolved into something grand, invoking patriotism, the nation and nationalism.

The language and literature of England became paramount to nationalism. Greenfeld points out that this “cultural creativity...was quite unprecedented and sudden.”30 These men “were the founders of the national culture,” and laureates like Richard Hakluyt in 1589 boasted that the English “have excelled all the nations and peoples of the earth.” A cult grew around English literature, particularly Geoffrey Chaucer who was lauded with such praise as “our father Chaucer,” “our worthy Chaucer,” “Noble Chaucer,” and described as “the English equivalent of the great masters of antiquity by Francis Meres in 1598.31 The praise for English language and literature by sixteenth-century writers was not limited to Chaucer and other fourteenth-century writers, but to the many contemporary writers who received equal if not greater praise than Chaucer. As a whole, English language and literature was “an object of passionate devotion...loved as 'our mother tongue,' [and] 'our best glory.'”32 Additionally, an example of how language can come to the forthright of nationalism agendas, the proponents of English lauded it as the most superior of all the languages; “it was equal in everything to the other ‘famous and chief languages,’ namely Hebrew, Greek, Latin, Syriac, Arabic, Italian, Spanish, and French.”33 While Hobsbawm and modernists would dismiss language, religion and culture as precursors to nationalism, it is evident that medievalists believe that language have significance. Greenfeld asserts that language offered a vehicle “through which national sentiment could express itself.”34 This sentiment can be seen in the prologue to the Canterbury Tales, where aspects of the English “industrial, agricultural, bureaucratic, and academic” classes being represented demonstrates a “portrait of the nation,” that existed “from every shire of ende of Engelond,” proving the statement that “the age of Chaucer...represents...the high points of national consciousness.”35 In this English golden age of literature, “a whole new class of people emerged whose main preoccupation was to do research and write-chronicles, treatises, poems, novels, and plays-in English about England,”
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with “everything English” becoming “an object of attention and…national pride.”36 The example of the English language in England and its relation to nationalism is well established and “led to the firm entrenchment of modern, full-fledged, mature nationalism.”37 Popular literature in England illustrates the importance of language in developing nationalism; however, for all the praise lauded upon the great writers, the importance of language is best represented by religious literature and texts.

By the sixteenth century, the English “saw themselves as standing under the sign of God.”38 The foundations of this religious nationalism were laid much earlier, beginning in the tenth century with the educational reform instituted by Alfred the Great. This is the period in which the perception of an English nation-state begins to form.39 Alfred instituted many reforms, and among other policies and projects, he translated many works from the Latin into Old English, helping to establish the vernacular language that would produce such epics as Beowulf. Alfred’s inspiration came from Bede, and his Ecclesiastical History of English People, was one of the first works translated by Alfred into Anglo-Saxon. It is filled with religious imagery and that the idea that “England was imagined in biblical terms, as an island ‘nation’ under God, in the manner of ancient Israel.”40 These early foundations were strong enough that they would not only endure several centuries of French dominance after the Norman Conquest in 1066 but also would reemerge in the fourteenth century and support later nationalism developments in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries.41 Beginning in the fourteenth century, “English national sentiment made itself felt, in the series of wars conducted,…in the rise of an English literature in the age of Chaucer, and the use of English in administration and the courts.”42 It was also visible in propaganda; examples include letters to Parliament that suggested the King of France was planning an invasion of England with the intent of wiping out the English language.43 Early English literature shows the foundations of nationalism; however, it is in Elizabethan literature, that languages affect on nationalism reaches its zenith.

Shakespeare’s Henry V, whose titular character “is based, in part, on the models of both Moses and King David,” again reinforces the idea of England being the Chosen People, and “the true successor of the ancient Israelite Kingdom.”44 Many Protestants in the sixteenth century began to
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believe the religious nationalism being printed and distributed. John Aylmer wrote in 1559 in *A Harborowe of True and Faithful Subjects*...that “God is English,” and thankful to them that they were “not Italians, Frenchmen, or German.” England was a new Israel, “the land of plenty, abounding” in all the necessities of life like beef, beer, and eggs. God’s grace was not solely domestic, as God also would bless them in foreign conflicts and war” because “God and his angels fought on her side against foreign foes.” 45 Smith uses this as an example of “rising national sentiment [taking] a religious form.” 46 The English have entered what Smith describes as the “Divine Covenant.” 47 Heavily religious in tone, it is also an excellent example of how the English were coming to believe through their literature that God was not only gracious and would offer them this “land of plenty” but would also grace them by being scornful to their Catholic enemies or European contemporaries. Modernists view nations and nationalism as a “recent and novel phenomena,” with no place for religion. 48 However, the impact of religion on nationalism is hard to ignore; Hastings states that the Bible “provided...the original model of the nation,” and without it, nations and nationalism never would have evolved. 49 The printing of the English Bible is an excellent example of this, and the Bible would have profound implications on the development of English nationalism. 50

The most “obvious literary instrument” for nationalism is the English Bible. It is not difficult to imagine that the Bible in England was paramount in daily life; over one hundred editions were published between 1560 and 1611. In addition, mandatory church attendance, where parishioners heard the Bible and the *Book of Common Prayer*, further and instilled “English Protestantism.” 51 Hastings examines the importance of the Bible, citing two biblical verses in which the word “nation” is used; “Isaiah’s ‘nation shall not lift up sword against nation’ (Isaiah 2.4)” and “Matthew’s ‘nation shall rise against nation, and kingdom against kingdom’ (Mt. 24.7).” These are just two of “a vast multitude of texts” that use the word “nation” in the King James Bible. 52 Notable other editions with the translations of the word nation include the Genevan edition (1560), which had over seventy editions from 1560 to 1611, and “nation” even appeared in the late fourteenth century Wycliffe Bible. 53
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The relationship between English nationalism and Protestantism is apparent. They worked beneficially together, but this does not correlate to an assumption that Protestantism itself is a nationalizing factor. On the European continent, Protestantism had nowhere near the affect that it did on Great Britain, but this was due to a series of fortunate events that magnified forces that made the unity achieved under Protestantism more nationalistic. These events included the excommunication of the Virgin Queen in and publication of Foxe’s *Book of Martyrs* in 1570; the defeat of the Catholic Spanish Armada in 1588, which gave credence to the idea that God was on their side because of the “Protestant Winds” that “he blew with…and…scattered” 54 the Spanish fleet; and Guy Fawkes’ Gunpowder Plot in 1605. These events “combined to heat up English nationalism” under a banner of Protestantism.55 Of these events, the *Books of Martyrs* is as important as the Bible. All churches in England had copies of the *Book of Martyrs* along with a copy of the Bible, and it was also printed numerous times in affordable installments. Different versions of the opening dedication compare Queen Elizabeth to both Emperor Constantine and Jesus Christ and the content of the *Book of Martyrs* were the “ordinary people,” who had been persecuted by the Catholic regime of Queen Mary, further creating a sense of unity behind religion. “England was in covenant with God,” and because England had been overtly diligent in its commitment to Protestantism, they were God’s new chosen people with “the strength and glory of England was the interest of His Church; and the triumph of Protestantism was a national triumph.”56 While the English “were but barely literate,” the Bible and the *Book of Martyrs* were the few pieces of literature that every Englishman read or had read to them, and this only added to the “consciousness of belonging to the English nation” that had been developing since Alfred the Great.

An examination of England’s nationalism would not be complete without briefly looking at the other ethnicities that share their island, and state simply because the impact of English on Scotland, Wales, and Ireland shaped their own brands of nationalism and conversely reshaped English nationalism. States can “exist…easily with a multiplicity of ethnicities within it. They do this by “employing different languages,…systems of local government and customary law” but as the state modernizes “this becomes impossible” and the language of the federal government “inevitably comes
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to impinge upon countless people” who before had no need to learn it and had spoken their local dialect. This is not to say that local languages and ethnicities are doomed to disappear completely. They do survive but with “clear…limited borders.” 57 Examples can be seen throughout the world in any nation; in the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Welsh, Scottish, Irish and Cornish survive within the boundaries of those regions, with the first three being “official languages” in those regions. 58 Their existence is paramount because they too are examples of nationalism supported by language. These languages survive only when efforts are made to keep them relevant, mainly accomplished by educational means like providing instruction in a language in addition to the nation’s dominant language or in some cases, like Wales, instead of. 59 The teaching of a dominated religion is not a product of modernity, a fourteenth century example of an effort for English language promoters to reduce the influence of French in England is demonstrated by John Tevisa’s comment in 1385 that “in all the grammar schools of England children leave French and construe and learn English.” 60 Additionally languages avoid extinction by fortunate circumstance. Again, using Wales as an example, the English language was spoken by so few Welsh that any attempt to convert the Welsh with an English language Bible would have been a dismal failure that Parliament made the decision in 1563 to provide Wales with Welsh versions of both the Bible and Book of Common Prayer. This decision prevented the disappearance of the language, conversely, the same decision in Cornwall not to translate these works into Cornish resulted in the “very rapid decline in the use of” that language and eventual temporary extinction until a twentieth century revival. 61 Inadvertently, the proponents of these languages overcompensate for the subservient status of their language. In Wales, “the Welsh language enthusiasts,” devised Welsh place names for locations that never had them, “not having been settled by Welsh speakers,” or locations where there is no need, like foreign cities and landmarks in Africa. 62 These languages continue to exist, prompting these regions like Wales, Ireland, Scotland, and Cornwall opportunities to exhibit their own “nationalistic” enthusiasm while remaining part of a greater unity, currently the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. Each of these nation’s individual nationalisms remain strong and in no other European country does the interplay between language, religion, and nationalism exist as apparently as it does in Ireland.
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It is appropriate to end with the conundrum of Ireland because the “Irish, who have no neighbors other than Protestants, are exclusively defined by their religion,” and the “blending of religion and nationalism” still exists today. Irish nationalism has been present since the sixteenth century; however, its zenith occurred in the modern age, making the significance of language considerably more opportunistic for nationalists. The Irish nationalism that grew from the sixteenth century, today associated with Catholicism, and its conflict with Protestantism, was not solely Catholic to begin with. Originally, many Protestant Irish, who themselves were mostly immigrants from the island of Britain and considered “‘English by blood, English to the Irish…Irish to the English,’” were contributing forces in Irish nationalism. This dynamic began to change, as Irish became to mean “Irish Catholics, and nobody else.”

When the Act of Union was implemented in 1800, Conor Cruise O’Brien asserts that a critical mistake was made. If “the Union had been immediately accompanied by the completion of Catholic Emancipation, it is possible that Ireland would have come…to accept its participation in the United Kingdom in the way that Scotland accepts it.” Emancipation did not occur, and there would be no Irish “rumblings of nationalist uneasiness,” and the “fatal flaw” of the Act of Union “eventually transformed the Catholic question into the Irish Question,” further cementing Catholicism and Irish nationalism together. The divide between Irish nationalism and Protestantism was completed with the “Divorce Court Crisis of 1890,” in which the Protestant leader of Irish nationalism, Charles Parnell, and the Irish Catholic Church came into conflict. Since this crisis, “there has been no Protestant leader of Irish nationalism, nor has any Protestant…been admitted to the inner circles of Irish nationalism.” The crisis initially strained relations between Catholicism and Irish nationalism, had the “longer-term effect [of] bind[ing] them together more closely than ever.” This fervent blend of religion and nationalism can be demonstrated through the literature of the period, especially in the editorials of the highly pro-Catholic Irish newspaper The Leader and the works of playwright William Yeats.

Perhaps the greatest promoter of Irish nationalism and hatred of things Protestant was journalist DP Moran, who was both “intensely Catholic and…nationalist” and the editor of The Leader.
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“the journalist flagship of Irish Ireland.”70 Moran’s mission was to “subvert what remained of Protestantism” in Ireland “by putting the fear of God”71 into them. While heavily biased, and racist, the editorials of The Leader “constitute the only sustained explicit exposition of Catholic nationalism” in the media during this period.72 The Leader was not an official party paper. It supported the Parliamentary Party, but was not its voice. It was “militantly catholic,” but stayed away from sounding like an “official organ of either Church or Party.”73 By doing this, neither the Parliamentary Party nor the Catholic Church was at fault for its content, and did not have to worry about giving “offense to English people or Protestants.” Moran and The Leader were their own voice, spewing out propaganda, speaking for all whom they supported, and saying “out loud what other Catholic nationalists had been bottling up…for many generations.”74 More importantly, The Leader changed the dynamic that had formally separated the Catholic religion and the politics of nationalism, bringing them closer together, demonstrating the power of literature and language in forming Nationalism.75

The importance of The Leader can also be demonstrated with an analysis of its treatment of another standard-bearer in Irish Nationalism, William Yeats. Moran and Yeats came into conflict because Yeats, a Protestant, “claimed to be a nationalist but The Leader…challenge[d] the validity of that claim, with the potent counter-claim that Irish nationalism had to be Catholic, and Yeats…did not qualify.”76 Nevertheless, Yeats, despite Moran’s “campaign” against him made substantial contributions to Irish Nationalism through language and literature through his plays, poetry and by leading the Irish Literary Movement. Yeats’ play Cathleen ni Houlihan “is both the most nationalist and the most propagandist work the Yeats ever wrote” and is “probably the most powerful piece of nationalist propaganda that has ever been composed.”77 The play drew on the personification of Ireland as a “poor old woman.” Yeats was not inventing anything new. The theme of Ireland widowed, abandoned, and without hope” is prominent in Irish literature. It is most prominently used by seventeenth century writer Geoffrey Keating who harkened Ireland as a “tragic widow…violated by foreign oppression.”78 The use by Yeats connected Irish nationalism to all Irish and had great “influence
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on the development of Irish nationalism.”79 The play also can be seen as Yeats attempt to prove that even though he is a Protestant, he is a nationalist. He does this without comprising his own beliefs because in the play, those that are martyred, “have no need of prayers, because, in what Anthony Smith describes as the “celebration of national heroes,”80 these young Irishmen “sacrificed their lives for Ireland” for a “higher cause,”81 demonstrating the importance of language in shaping religion, because Yeats places the nationalism over religion.

Despite his differences with Moran and The Leader, “Yeats…welcomed The Leader on general cultural-nationalist grounds, especially for its commitment to…the revival of the Irish Language.82 For the majority of Irish nationalists, Moran’s “Irish Irelanders,” the revival of Gaelic, the Irish Language was “a paramount necessity,” and Moran and The Leader, after losing significance after its attacks on Yeats, undertook this task “as its mission,”83 at which it arguably failed miserably. The “metamorphosis of Ireland from an almost-entirely-English speaking country…to an Irish-speaking one would…take time,” and its transformation was not guaranteed or even likely. The Leader, itself only made a symbolic attempt at revival, by publishing only one article in Irish weekly. O'Brien succinctly states the failure of the Irish revival “most Irish Irelanders were content to express their detestation of everything English in the only language which they actually knew…English.”84 This failure does not moderate the importance of language in nationalism. The desire for the movement existed, but it was impractical to implement.

An answer that would satisfy Bagehot's 1887 observation about nationalism that “we know what it is when you do not ask us, but we cannot very quickly explain or define it” is not forthcoming anytime soon. The debate on what defines a nation will exist as long as nations exist. What is certain is that languages continue to play an important role in this discussion. Where no other unifying traits are present, or where these traits present obstacles to forming a nation, language can bond these peoples together. Whether language is an element of proto-nationalism, having “nothing to do in principle” with nations, which the modernists believe, or is the “central element in the definition of the nation,” an opinion expressed by medievalist Anthony Smith, the role of language in developing nations does exist. This debate can be expressed using certain criteria, is language a more modern invention?

Modernists would believe so, believing that language shapes nations only after the invention of
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industrialization and the advent of mass education. Modernists would content that languages shape nations when they bound them together by speaking a common language. This debate will continue precisely because there is no right or wrong answer, and any answer given is highly subjected to personal opinion and agendas. However, what we can see, with an objective eye, is the progress of language, and its vocabulary. Liah Greenfeld’s research demonstrates a definite “zigzag pattern of semantic change,” which shows the word “nation,” being used in different contexts, from a meaning in Ancient Rome that has total opposite of today’s definition to the sixteenth century examples in England that are recognizable today as having identical meaning. The effects of language and religion merging together to form a successful brand of nationalism are surely visible in Protestant England.

During the sixteenth century were daily sermons from the English Bible and other religious texts expressed not only the idea of England as a nation, but which also “laid the foundations of the modern English culture.” The importance of religion can also been demonstrated outside of England. In Wales, the translation of religious texts into Welsh saved Welsh from extinction, and in Ireland, religion and language still play extraordinary roles in daily life. In populations were a symbiotic merger between religion and language has occurred, references to the nation become defined to these concepts. It is easy to determine that language has become a “central element” in defining a nation.86
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National identity is a product of a country’s collective memory. In Ireland, patriotism influences both commemorations and historical scholarship. This is evident in the passionate divide between “revisionist” and “traditionalist” approaches to Irish history. The eye-catching statues that adorn Dublin demonstrate the deep love and concern the Irish have for their past. A modern tourist attempting to navigate the capital will encounter streets commemorating such figures as Parnell, O’Connell, and Pearse. In the midst of this living history, the Easter Rising stands out as one of the great moments in the formation of modern Irish identity.

2006 marked the ninetieth anniversary of the Easter Rising, which, “every major political party in Ireland claims a connection to.”¹ The care and caution that the Republic placed in planning the 1916 day of memorial revealed the importance of history in modern Irish politics and society. The Easter Rising’s ninetieth anniversary was in the traditionalistic fashion; however, the event attempted to honor all modern Irish political traditions, including unionist. Though the event was politically inclusive, the divide between traditionalism and revisionism remained evident.

Commemorations and historical fact make “uneasy companions, if not outright enemies.”² By their very nature, memorials dedicated to nationalist leaders or to past battles, such as the Easter Rising, create an “us versus them” mindset, whereby the past is used to define, and create, differences between peoples. The Rising is understood to be both a key watershed event, and a rallying cry for terror acts perpetrated by the Provisional IRA in the 1970s. The politics of historical understanding stem from the selective nature of memory.

A nation’s memory is similar to that of an individual’s own recollection of the past; they are both flawed and biased. Politicians and traditionalist historians were, ironically, the first “revisionists” when it came to the idea of failure. How else could the disaster of 1916 be transformed into an event of national pride and unity, other than by “the powerful and perplexing interplay between history and memory?”³ This is not however the first example of Irish national
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identity being sculpted from failure. Both the military failure of the United Irishmen in 1798, and the perennial crop failures that caused the Great Famine, a half-century later, have become part of the Irish identity. These three failures had an uneven affect on the island’s population. They primarily affected poor Catholics, and as a result, created a distinct sense of “Irishness” not shared by the whole of the island. This has, in part, led to a modern gulf between memory and history.

Historical interpretation is a controversial topic in Ireland. Traditionalists tend to place country before other obligations, including historical neutrality, whereas revisionists work to dispel the romanticized past. Traditionalists often exploit the past in order to define “Irishness,” as being Gaelic in culture, Catholic in religion, and Anglophobic in principal. Thus traditionalist historians turn Irish identity into an exclusionary one, whereas revisionism works to broaden the definition of Irish. The revisionist historian Roy Foster wrote Modern Ireland with the goal of creating a “more relaxed and inclusive definition of Irishness.” Foster’s objective appears pure and logical, but many traditionalists are extremely hostile to his treatment of twentieth-century Ireland.

The ongoing debate between revisionism and traditionalism has often become a hostile matter. Nancy J. Curtin believes that “revisionists are bad historians, who intrude too much on popular consciousness by their alignment with the media and political establishment. They are turning Clio into a prostitute.” Traditionalists see revisionism as anachronistic, with the purpose of appeasing modern socio-political ideals by adapting history to neutralize ancient animosities.

The appearance of revisionist works coincided with the height of the Modern Troubles. The historian Ruth Dudley Edwards released her infamous book Patrick Pearse: The Triumph of Failure in 1977, only a few years after Bloody Sunday (1972). Historians, such as Edwards, labor to dispel antagonistic perceptions of the past by reexamining Ireland’s history, including her martyrs like Pearse. Brendan Bradshaw argues that “even at the theoretical level, the notion of a revisionist enterprise conducted in the name of “value-freeness” suggests a contradiction” and that the only difference between traditional and revisionist interpretations are “the forms in which distortion has manifested itself.”

2006 was the first national commemoration of 1916 since it was canceled in 1972. As a result of the Troubles, national military commemoration became associated with ongoing violence in the
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north. In an effort to make the 2006 commemoration as inclusive as possible, the Irish government reached out to every major political party, and offered rival parties, such as Sinn Fein and the Ulster Unionist Party, an opportunity to participate in the official parade and wreath laying ceremony at the General Post Office. This was an important move, on the part of the government, especially if we examine Ireland’s fascination with commemoration.

Commemoration has served as Ireland’s tool to build a unique identity. The centennial commemoration of the United Irishmen’s 1798 rebellion was planned years in advance. Henceforth, the celebration was remembered as a “year-long indulgence in patriotism and Anglophobia.” Commemorations, such as the one in tribute to 1798, demonstrate Ireland’s developing sense of purpose and identity. Foster argues that these “communal acts of remembering and celebration” have become obligatory in Ireland as a means of creating a modern and artificial sense of purpose.

After the death of Parnell, Ireland’s intellectuals filled the void left by her politicians. During the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, W.B. Yeats, and James Joyce were establishing themselves in the world of print; Yeats in particular would later be instrumental in Ireland’s national movement. Two other contemporary intellectuals, Patrick Pearse, and James Connolly were beginning the road that would lead them to martyrdom in 1916, and in the men in modern Irish memory. Connolly was a man devoted to international socialism, and entered the realm of politics in 1896 as the founder of the Irish Socialist Republican Party. Pearse, on the other hand, remained out of politics until 1913 when he joined the Irish Republican Brotherhood, only three years before the Rising.

The leaders of the Easter Rising have remained an extremely delicate, and in certain instances taboo, topic. Traditionalists have painted Patrick Pearse, named commander and chief immediately before the Rising, as a heroic and selfless individual who sacrificed himself for the good of Ireland. Reinterpretation of Pearse is highly controversial, and stirs, not only scholarly debate, but also emotions. This was the case with Ruth Dudley Edwards’s biography of Pearse. The work of
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Edwards and other revisionists has been as warmly received by traditionalists, as depictions of Muhammad were in Danish cartoons.\(^\text{15}\)

For traditionalists, the notion of questioning Pearse’s sexuality is seen as character assassination.\(^\text{16}\) In addition to Pearse’s personal life, the martyr’s commitment to politics has been fiercely debated. As Edwards points out, Pearse was not always an Irish revolutionary. For the majority of his professional life, Pearse dedicated himself to the advancement of Celtic culture, and to the preservation and growth of the Irish language. Until his political radicalization, Pearse viewed the Gaelic language as “not merely more important than the political movement but it is on a different and altogether higher plane.”\(^\text{17}\) Towards the end of his life, Pearse made a sudden switch into the realm of politics. His short-lived life in the nationalist movement became the source of much debate between both traditionalist and revisionist historians. As Foster argues, no one believed Pearse to be a great man until after he had been shot.\(^\text{18}\)

Edwards dedicated a considerable amount of her book to the issue of Pearse’s late political writings. When viewed through a certain light, his eventual martyrdom appears to be the product of a self-fulfilling prophecy. Or, as Edwards would say, it was the result of “his mystical yearnings for martyrdom.”\(^\text{19}\) Pearse made many radical and controversial statements, the zenith of which was written in response to the unprecedented level of bloodshed happening on the continent in 1915: “it is good for the world that such things should be done. The old heart of the earth needed to be warmed with the red wine of the battlefields. Such august homage was never before offered to God as this, the homage of millions of lives given gladly for love of country.”\(^\text{20}\) Fellow nationalist, James Connolly, was quick to criticize Pearse’s recklessly belligerent rhetoric. Revisionists, such as Foster, have called Pearse’s political writings “sinister gibberish.”\(^\text{21}\)

The Easter Rising began on April 24\(^{th}\), 1916. Events went on as planned, despite suffering major setbacks in arms shipments and disputes within the IRB leadership. Both modern traditionalist and revisionist historians agree on the details of the rising, but differ greatly on the meaning. For Edwards, the man who commanded Ireland’s insurrection was a “heavy, balding
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schoolmaster with a sword he could not use." As discussed earlier, Pearse’s entry into radical politics came only a few years prior to the Rising; however the traditionalist Tim Pat Coogan, in complete disregard for the past, distorted the facts to make Pearse appear as though he had been a revolutionary from birth.

The Rising was a failure. Pearse, Connolly, and the other leaders overestimated the average citizen’s commitment to the cause of independence, and the insurrection ultimately cost every leader, excluding De Valera, his life. However, the memory of 1916 was used to achieve strategic victory during the Anglo-Irish War. Writers, such as Yeats, played upon the emotions of 1916 in order to incite the Fenian spirit during the war. Today, traditionalist memory of 1916 is largely framed by the romanticism that occurred during the Anglo-Irish war. Foster has criticized the traditionalist memory of 1916, pointing out that it was Ulster, not England, that prevented the Home Rule bill in 1912. This is a powerful modern revisionist criticism regarding the legitimacy of the Rising.

In the years since the Rising, the Irish have seen tremendous change and growth come to their island. After the Anglo-Irish war, Ireland was split into Northern Ireland, and into what eventually became, the Republic of Ireland. Today the Republic is a member of the European Union, and has the second highest per capita GDP in the Union. Though now on equal footing with other European states, the question of how to commemorate the past remains a heated one. This was evident when the Republic chose to have a military parade to honor the ninety-year anniversary of Rising.

The official government ceremony was both traditionalistic, and at the same time, inclusive. However, the Ulster Unionist and the Democratic Unionist parties of Northern Ireland declined to participate in the commemoration. Modern unionists have chosen to remember 1916 as a betrayal to the Irish serving in the British Army, during World War One. Both Taoiseach Bertie Ahern, and President Mary McAleese participated in the military procession. By using the Irish Defense Forces to remember the Rising, the government legitimizd the actions of the martyrs of 1916 in a fashion
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that complemented national memory, though this came with criticism from the Social Democratic and Labour Party (SDLP) of Northern Ireland.  

Politics were foremost on the Irish peoples’ minds during the commemoration. Fianna Fáil, the largest political party in the Republic, worried that the event would be used to score a major victory for Sinn Fein, in next year’s election. To avoid political fallout, the ruling party organized the Easter Rising’s commemoration in a way that honored national memory; however, the ceremony included a minute of silence that honored all who died, not just Irish nationals. Bertie Ahern’s speech honored the Rising’s leaders as visionaries, who saw the nationalist cause before the masses. Ahern connected 1916 with the Good Friday agreement of 1998 by arguing that the Easter Rising started Ireland on the road to freedom, and that freedom produced the ability for the Irish people to seek out long lasting peace.

Traditional and revisionist history clashed once again, in 2006, over the memory of both the Easter Rising, and the greater conflict with Great Britain. In June of that year, director Ken Loach released his film *The Wind That Shakes The Barley*, which approached the Anglo-Irish war, and subsequent civil war, from the traditionalist prospective. Loach’s film plays out old paradigms; the British are despots while the Irish are freedom fighters.

Revisionist historian Ruth Dudley Edwards had a simple question about the film’s director: “Why does Ken Loach loathe his country so much?” Edwards described Loach as a “Marxist propagandist” who “seems incapable of making a film that is not, at bottom, old-fashioned propaganda.” It is hard not to appreciate the irony of a revisionist historian calling a traditionalist filmmaker unpatriotic. To Edwards, *The Wind That Shakes the Barley* misrepresents history in order to promote Irish socialism. Clearly, hostility and history make much better bedfellows, in Ireland, than history and memory.

Despite being a small island-nation, Ireland has many fierce divides. There remain two separate governments, and multiple understandings of the term “Irish.” For more than thirty years now, the Irish historical community has disputed the traditionalist approach to history. the Easter

---
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Rising remains central to this continuing debate. Separating history from national memory remains a difficult procedure. Professional historians with traditionalist agendas make this worse by focusing their work around promoting national memory, at the expense of historical neutrality. The ninetieth commemoration of 1916 demonstrated how both emotion, and politics, still surround the Easter Rising, and will certainly be the case again when Dublin hosts the centennial celebration of the Rising, in 2016.
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Hardihood and the Strenuous Life: Concerning the Changing and Endangered Nature of Manhood in America
Michael Antongiovanni

Theodore Roosevelt and William James through their words and deeds shaped, in powerful ways, the society within which we live today. Although James, born in 1842, was sixteen years Roosevelt’s senior, both men came of age during Reconstruction and rose to the height of public life during the first decade of the 20th century. They were clear and compelling thinkers who vigorously expressed themselves on numerous topics; not the least of which, the changing and endangered nature of manhood in America. James outlined his ideas on manliness in a brief essay entitled “The Moral Equivalent of War” delivered in 1906 at Stanford University. Roosevelt expressed his thoughts on several occasions not the least of which in the spring of 1899 when he addressed Chicago’s Hamilton Club with a speech that eventually became the title work of a collection of essays called “The Strenuous Life”. Recognition by both men of the decline of certain essential elements of male character indicates a broad social anxiety about the faltering of manly virtues in the rapidly changing society of turn of the century America. They agree that the loss of these virtues is a disease from which society must be cured. However, they recommend different prescriptions for recovery. The source of these differences is one of perspective and emphasis. Roosevelt attempts to conserve tradition, while James recommends an admittedly utopian approach. Both men want to convince their audiences that their solution is best. Roosevelt through a return to behaviors that are in the process of being lost, and James through new behaviors yet to be tried.

In the following pages we will discover the details of both men’s ideas of manliness and then deploy James’ philosophical tool Pragmatism as a method to reconcile these competing theories. Pragmatism is useful for this purpose because it serves as a neutral arbiter between competing theories; attempting to identify what is true by deferring always and finally to real world experience. For Pragmatism (and I would offer for James and Roosevelt as well) real world experience trumps theory every time. What works best in the real world is what is best—and what is best is what is true. However, what works best changes over time in response to fluctuating priorities and perspectives, so what is true changes over time. What was true in one context can become less true as conditions change. I think both men would welcome the opportunity to have their ideas evaluated by such a process, and I believe it is a process that can be usefully employed in our ever changing and pluralistic world.
James signified his concept of manliness with the term “hardihood.” Through the brief essay he uses this term to represent a host of virtues that includes, “intrepidity, contempt of softness, surrender of private interest, and obedience to command.” The term essentially equates to military character. The essay lays out the arguments for and against war, and in it James admits that war serves the essential creative function of cultivating military character in young men. War generates hardihood, which serves as the “rock upon which states are built.” Manliness is foundational to society and James gave an explicit nod to Roosevelt when he stated:

*The duty is incumbent on mankind, of keeping military character in stock -- if keeping them, if not for use, then as ends in themselves and as pure pieces of perfection, -- so that Roosevelt's weaklings and mollycaddles may not end by making everything else disappear from the face of nature.*

James had ideas other than war for how to produce manliness, nevertheless, hardihood is essential and mankind would weaken and falter if lost.

Roosevelt had a more expansive concept of manliness he called, “The Strenuous Life,” which he considered from many different perspectives in a number of his writings. The term is used as the title of a collection of essays originally published in various periodicals. The essays characterize Roosevelt’s conceptions of manliness represented under titles such as “Expansion and Peace” in which he justified America’s imperial ambitions; “The Best and the Good” where he outlined his ideas with regard to political realities and necessities; and “The American Boy” which described how the strenuous life provides a means to inculcate proper virtues in American youth. In each case, the essays featured manliness as the central theme. Like James, he used a long list of adjectives to define his idea. The best example comes in his essay entitled “Character and Success” where Roosevelt laid out the desirable features of a man’s character:

*He must not steal, he must not be intemperate, he must not be vicious in any way; he must not be mean or brutal; he must not bully the weak. In fact, he must refrain from whatever is evil. But besides refraining from evil, he must do good. He must be brave and energetic; he must be resolute and persevering.*

Like James, Roosevelt found these virtues foundational to our society, and their degradation of the utmost concern. In the final paragraph of Roosevelt’s essay “The Strenuous Life”, he outlined the consequences of the loss of such virtues in the game of life that we must win. Roosevelt believes

---
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the stakes could not be higher when he states, “The twentieth century looms before us big with the fate of many nations.” If America does not rise to meet the challenge, by “exercising manliness”, he warns, “the bolder and stronger peoples will pass us by, and will win for themselves the domination of the world.” This is an essential concern, and he recommended a specific course of action to ensure it does not come to pass:

Let us therefore boldly face the life of strife, resolute to do our duty well and manfully; resolute to uphold righteousness by deed and by word; resolute to be both honest and brave, to serve high ideals, yet to use practical methods. Above all, let us shrink from no strife, moral or physical, within or without the nation, provided we are certain that the strife is justified, for it is only through strife, through hard and dangerous endeavor, that we shall ultimately win the goal of true national greatness.

Roosevelt and James agreed promoting manliness is essential to preserve the nation and the American way of life; the same way of life, that gave both men every advantage in education and opportunity. Richard Hofstadter, in his chapter on Roosevelt in *The American Political Tradition* addresses this way of life in the years subsequent to the Civil War. He writes that the middle class, well-to-do and aristocratic young men “found themselves unable to participate with any heart in the greedy turmoil of business or to accept without protest boss ridden politics.” Hofstadter mentions James by name as having “immersed himself in academic life” as a means to cope with this social reality. Roosevelt however recognized his calling to public life as a young man, while James suffered from a malaise and came to his career in academia only after several false starts; initially as a painter, a chemistry student, and finally a medical doctor. Hofstadter’s describes Roosevelt autobiography wherein he recounted the horror that his friends expressed when he first unequivocally stated his intention to enter politics. But Roosevelt was adamant and in an article written for the *Century* when he was only twenty eight years old, distinguished himself from other rich Americans by expressing his disgust for the wealthy upper classes as “timid, short sighted and selfish.” And likely to “regard everything merely from the standpoint of does it pay?” Roosevelt also criticized academics as of the general tendency to “neglect and even look down upon the rougher and manlier virtues, so that an advanced state of intellectual development is too often associated with a certain effeminacy of character.” This quote stresses the point that manliness is an essential trait that if lost, subjects one
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to indictment as a potentially worthless person and if not worthless than certainly suspect and in need of repair; a point with which James, as an academic, probably took issue.

Roosevelt’s definitive articulation of his views on the properly manly virtues set out a style of behavior that he recommended to everyone as nothing more than a common sense view of what “every self-respecting American demands from himself.” And by extension, what we as citizens of the United States should expect from our country. 9 Roosevelt speech was passionate and eloquent and in it he described the features of the Strenuous Life as “not the doctrine of ignoble ease” but rather the life of “toil and effort, of labor and strife.” It is for one who “does not shrink from danger, from hardship, or from bitter toil.”10 Roosevelt personally embraced these ideals from childhood in an effort to overcome chronic illness, including asthma, which sometimes prevented him from participating in vigorous outdoor activity. Through the encouragement or insistence of his father he built up his physic to become a robust specimen.11 As such, he embodied the ideal result of the strenuous life and could be forgiven for promoting its virtues after achieving such remarkable personal success. As he states in his essay “who out of these wins the splendid ultimate triumph.” He continued to practice every aspect of his ideals of the strenuous life. He embodied them and deserves admiration for his diligent work and striving to achieve real and meaningful goals. As he states:

\[
\text{We do not admire the man of timid peace. We admire the man who embodies victorious effort; the man who never wrongs his neighbor, who is prompt to help a friend, but who has those virile qualities necessary to win in the stern strife of actual life. It is hard to fail, but it is worse never to have tried to succeed.}^{12}
\]

Roosevelt prescribed a similar course of action for the nation as a whole: “As it is with the individual so it is with the Nation.” He goes on to refute conventional wisdom that a nation with a peaceful history is a happy nation but rather “Thrice happy is the nation that has a glorious history.” It is better to “dare mighty things” and risk defeat than to “live in the grey twilight” of having never tried. He offered the Civil War as evidence of a glorious history; a war that not only freed the slaves but once more restored the Republic as the “helmeted queen among nations.” The costs in lives, money and “heartbreak” were for Roosevelt an acceptable cost.13 James agrees and in his essay he
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comments on the same phenomenon, admitting that “probably hardly a handful of eccentrics” would reject it but as he says:

*Ask all our millions, north and south, whether they would vote now (were such a thing possible) to have our war for the Union expunged from history, and the record of a peaceful transition to the present time substituted for that of its marches and battles, and probably hardly a handful of eccentrics would say yes. Those ancestors, those efforts, those memories and legends, are the most ideal part of what we now own together, a sacred spiritual possession worth more than all the blood poured out.*

War provides the means for a nation to take its proper place among the great and good in the history of man. Roosevelt exhorted the nation to take action in the wider world “If we are to be a really great people, we must strive in good faith to play a great part in the world. We cannot avoid meeting great issues. All that we can determine for ourselves is whether we shall meet them well or ill.”

In the essay *Expansion and Peace* published in the “Independent” December 21 1899, Roosevelt continued to extol the unmitigated virtues of war as a necessary precursor to the propagation of civilized society into barbarian lands. As he states, “…unrighteous and cowardly peace may be worse than any war; and …it can often be obtained only at the cost of war.” It is only through civilized culture’s imperialistic actions throughout the world that moral righteousness triumphs over evil. This seems a very reasonable view when considered from Roosevelt’s perspective as an American at the beginning of the twentieth century. The untrammeled expansion over the American continent was astonishing in any terms Europeans would have recognized. Manifest Destiny appeared to be just that—both obvious and certain. Now with the closing of the Western Frontier as announced by Frederick Jackson Turner, in his Frontier Thesis, Roosevelt thought it was only natural to redirect this war engine for the promotion and defense of democracy throughout the world at the next logical beneficiary, the Pacific Rim, and specifically the Philippines.

Roosevelt believed expansion was our whole national history. From the founding of the nation the push was Westward to the Mississippi; and then the Columbia; South into Florida; and into Texas and California. Roosevelt explains, “While we had a frontier the chief feature of frontier
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life was the endless war between the settlers and the red men.” He states that both white men and Indians were at fault for the violence, but the ultimate cause was simply that “we were in contact with a country held by savages.” Roosevelt made it clear that the border with Canada is in no danger of war, or the settled regions of Mexico however, “elsewhere war had to continue until we expanded over the country. Then it was succeeded at once by a peace which has remained unbroken to the present day.” Roosevelt clarified his position when he summarized, “Fundamentally the cause of expansion is the cause of peace.”

This expansion in the name of peace concerned Roosevelt. With civilized neighbors engaged chiefly with commerce, future generations of young men will not benefit from the manly developmental benefits of war. The potential of American Society “growing weak from easy repose” was a real threat. The fires in which the martial virtues are forged must be relocated to provide the next generation with the formative opportunity to fight. War will provide the corrective remedy and restore the manly virtues. As Roosevelt noted in his closing sentence war will simultaneously allow “the mighty civilized races which have not lost the fighting instinct, [to] gradually bringing peace into the red wastes where the barbarian peoples of the world hold sway.”

Roosevelt and James identified different aspects of the same phenomenon. Roosevelt emphasized evidence suggesting the civilizing influence western imperial expansion exerted over barbarian lands. James noticed that man behaves in his own best interest when conditions are favorable for commerce and other social interactions. In both cases these men were concerned with the potential atrophy of the characteristics of manliness. These characteristics are identical as signified for James and Roosevelt by “Hardihood,” and the “Fighting Instinct” respectively. For a society, finding itself without these key attributes is of critical concern. Civilized man deserves admiration and pity as both cultured and emasculated. It is these countervailing aspects of civilization’s moderating effects on the barbarian virtues that create a paradox from which Roosevelt and James hoped to successfully emerge. Matthew Jacobson addresses these concerns in Barbarian Virtues when he writes, “on the one hand, the civilization embodied by the United States and Western Europe was plainly the state to which the world’s people ought rightly to aspire” but simultaneously “on the other hand the primitive traits of vigor manliness and audacity, had given way to effete over civilization among the once hearty Anglo-Saxon race.”
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hardihood and fighting spirit—in short the barbarian virtues, were a principal concern; To speak in Darwinian terms, an organism that turns up to the interminable battle for survival unprepared would find itself ill-equipped to survive and in mortal peril.

The decades following the publication of Darwin’s On the Origin of Species (published in 1859) found his theory of natural selection widely adopted and oftentimes incorrectly applied across a wide range of fields. James’ early education was broad and included much scientific training, first as a student of chemistry and finally as a medical doctor. These studies include a healthy dose of Darwinism most notably expressed in his yearlong field research expedition to the jungles of Brazil where his primary assignment was to collect fish specimens, ironically, to provide the expedition’s leader, the famous paleontologist Louis Agassiz, with evidence to reject the ideas of evolution. On this expedition he certainly had many hours to contemplate Darwin’s ideas. Fortunately, James did not enjoy collecting specimens in the jungle and he moved on to pursue other interests upon his return to America, but retained his scientific training and his appreciation of Darwin. James was a devoted evolutionist, who published his first article on the subject in 1865. However, while he agreed that natural selection did serve as a neutral arbiter of merit. He did not agree that the doctrine of the “survival of the fittest” should invest the process of evolution with human values, or that public policy and individual behavior are understood as adaptive, consistent with survival characteristics and justified as natural. He worried such attitudes led to an endorsement of almost any coercive behavior including war. In a society that had just been through a civil war these ideas were clearly appealing but were rejected by James. He was a proponent of Darwin, but unlike many of his fellow evolutionists, did not see Darwinism as the exclusive truth, and this pluralism was central to his broader pragmatic theories.

James, therefore, provided a sophisticated and well informed interpretation of Darwin. He outlined the implications that civilizing influences may have on the future of humanity and took seriously the real concern of maintaining the martial virtues that “the race should never cease to breed.” James recognized that the martial virtues were naturally selected over untold generations and he made the point simply enough when he stated “Dead men tell no tales, and if there were any tribes of other type than this [warlike] they have left no survivors.” Roosevelt expressed the
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identical sentiment when he agrees, “If Russia had acted upon Tolstoy’s philosophy, all its people
would long ago have disappeared from the face of the earth, and the country would now be
occupied by wandering tribes of Tartar barbarians.” 25 It is clear that evolution has selected almost
exclusively for pugnacity, not because it is an end in itself, but rather in the real world, the one both
Roosevelt and James are concerned with, it worked.

Investing Darwin’s ideas on evolution with powers extending beyond science is tempting
even today. Assigning motives and meaning to natural phenomenon is comforting. The appearance
of progressive teleological ends, however, is not real. James speaks of Darwinian inheritance of the
fighting spirit when he states, “Our ancestors have bred pugnacity into our bone and marrow, and
thousands of years of peace won't breed it out of us.” The fighting spirit is humankind’s natural
inclination: “The military instincts and ideals are as strong as ever” 26 Natural Selection has done its
job through the crucible of existence with its daily trials. But drawing parallels between natural
phenomenon and other analogous applications concerning groups, social institutions and society at
large should be resisted. If Thomas Hobbs had it even somewhat correct when he states life is
“solitary, poor, nasty, brutish, and short,” 27 then James must concede, as he does, that war can
appear to be a “permanent human obligation.” and that many “regard war as a biological or
sociological necessity, uncontrolled by ordinary psychological checks or motives.” 28 As such, society
should be ever vigilant in guarding against the instinctual bias towards a desire to indulge this
biological desire. The fighting spirit embedded in our nature assumes war even when reason may
find that death on the battle field does not serve any practical purpose.

In a Darwinian sense the field of battle is unnecessary for honing inherited skills. While
battle may seem to cultivate desirable traits, in fact it only results in death denying these young men
the ability to pass on to the next generations the inherited martial virtues so much admired and
which they already possess. Roosevelt’s phrase, when deconstructed makes the point; one should
live a strenuous life, but not too strenuous for while toil, effort, labor and strife are commendable,
rushing onto the field of battle may achieve only death. An example illustrating the limits of the
strenuous life comes from Roosevelt’s own experience when in the fall of 1902 he suffered injuries
in a trolley car accident which he characterized as “trivial” and refused treatment. However three
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weeks later he developed an abscess on his left shin which required him to not move his leg for several weeks. 29 While fortunately there were no long-term consequences of this incident, it illustrates how fragile life can be, and while stoic perseverance is commendable, Roosevelt’s life may have been cut short by otherwise avoidable circumstances. Nietzsche may be right, “Whatever does not kill you makes you stronger” 30 but there is a limit, and that limit is death—something to be avoided if the goal is survival.

In this light, the martial virtues are not exercised and strengthened then passed to the next generation in enhanced form. Inherited traits are not earned but received, and if found useful, the court of natural selection rewards the lucky organism with survival and a chance to propagate to subsequent generations. An example may help illustrate this distinction. Consider the giraffe, with its extraordinarily long neck, so useful for reaching the high branches of trees. It is intuitive to imagine that after years of straining to reach leaves on ever-higher branches the animal succeeds in changing its anatomy to increase marginally the length of its neck. This process over many generations would produce ever-longer necks resulting in the remarkable creatures we see today. It is appealing to declare this striving as the essential element that propels the breed forward to ever-greater success in the interminable battle for survival. It is comforting to believe that these efforts will transmit to the next generation and thus improve the breed. However, we know each generation of giraffes begins life with the same neck genetically inherited from his parents. Counterintuitively no progress transmits from generation to generation. The striving of the preceding generation does not transfer to succeeding generations. Rather, it was the ancient giraffe naturally gifted with an intrinsically long neck; whose traits were selected and passed on to subsequent generations. It was the gift of natural ability that bested all earnestly striving, but unfortunate, short necked giraffe. The ability to reach high branches with ease proved the greater advantage. It is this intrinsically better way that James hoped to find.

James proposed to find a substitute for war providing a better means to exercise the martial virtues while not exposing young men to the risk of death in battle. James, like Roosevelt, was critical of the “antimilitarists” who “propose no substitute for war’s disciplinary functions, no moral equivalent of war” he wanted to “preserve some of the old elements of army discipline.” James hoped to find a replacement for war that would allow humankind to gently lift the weight of war from the balance of life and replace it with something new. He strove not to change the motivations

that drive man to war but redirect them towards a new endeavor. In his essay he asks rhetorically, “Patriotic pride and ambition in their military form are, after all, only specifications of a more general competitive passion. They are its first form, but that is no reason for supposing them to be its last form.” Roosevelt considers a similar idea in his essay “The American Boy,” where in it he discussed fox hunting, which he considers a “first class sport,” but found it absurd to hear with what hyperbole “certain excellent fox-hunters, speak of this admirable but not over-important pastime.” He did however note the chief serious use of fox-hunting is to “encourage manliness and vigor, and to keep men hardy” so that they can show themselves fit to take part in work or strife for their native land. Roosevelt more generally stated for instance, “athletic sport has beyond all question had an excellent effect in increased manliness.” So, while fox hunting is probably not war’s moral equivalent, there are means other than war to hone manliness.

For James to remove war from this world required something be set in its place. But, he asked what will satisfy man’s inherited pugnacity and foster manliness? James strove to preserve the military character which “everyone feels the race should never cease to breed,” while at the same time remove war and replace it with a more useful and productive successor. An alternative to war that produces even better results with less destruction and, as such, pragmatically serves a greater good.

The moral equivalent of war that James proposed was, “the immemorial human warfare against nature,” military conscription of the youthful population into an “army enlisted against Nature.” While the military metaphor of “battling nature” falls harshly on our environmentally conscious ears, the point remains, through hard work and service towards a collective good James believed we could, “get toughness without callousness, authority with as little criminal cruelty as possible and painful work done cheerily.” Roosevelt as a conservationist understood the importance of nature as a place where men go to test themselves, to do battle as it were against the elements. And above all, men go outdoors into nature to hunt. It appears both James and Roosevelt agree that Nature could serve as a fruitful training ground for cultivating the manly virtues.

In James’ collected Lowell Lectures entitled “Pragmatism: A New Name for some Old ways of Thinking,” he set out a method for “settling metaphysical disputes that might otherwise be
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interminable.”35 I believe Roosevelt and James would welcome pragmatism as a means of evaluating their ideas, because the method does not require allegiance to any a priori point of view. One does not have to subscribe to a certain metaphysical system or believe in for example free-will or quantum physics to enlist the pragmatic method as arbiter of an otherwise interminable disagreement. It is an agnostic method that as James stated in his first lecture rejects “abstractions and insufficiency, closed systems and pretend absolutes and origins.” In his description of the idea James seemed to channel Roosevelt when he described pragmatism’s desire to “turn towards concreteness and adequacy, towards facts, towards action and towards power.”36

On pragmatic grounds of concrete fact Roosevelt’s actions hold up very well. His “strenuous” policies helped insure that America entered the twentieth century as a preeminent nation-state capable of projecting its power around the world. His policies appear successful based on real outcomes. The national trajectory directed by Roosevelt during this period set the foundation for United States political, economic, and cultural hegemony. Considered from this point of view Roosevelt’s “strenuous life” produced many useful results and much good in an otherwise imperfect world. However, these good and useful outcomes are not unassailable. They remain open to interpretation and reevaluation based on new information, more subtle interpretation, and renewed analysis. A change in perspective even moment-to-moment warrants a reevaluation of previously held beliefs and the benefits they provide. Pragmatism allows for an ever changing stream of consciousness with new higher truths grafted on to the old collection of earlier belief. As James states, “New truth is always a go-between a smoother-over of transitions. It marries old opinion to new fact so as ever to show a minimum of jolt, a maximum of continuity.”37

In his essay The Best and the Good published in the Churchman Roosevelt expressed this pragmatic sensibility when we recounted comments made by Archbishop Benson. regarding a particular piece of legislation that while not perfect, was the best possible option for now.

"The bill does not, of course, represent my ideal, but it is a careful collection of points which could be claimed, which it would be indecent to refuse, and which would make a considerable difference about our powers of dealing rightly with cases. Gain that platform, and it would be a footing for more ideal measures. I do not want the best to be any more the deadly enemy of the good. We climb through degrees of comparison.”38
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Pragmatism embraces an appreciation for the evolving nature of life, the layering of good then better and finally best over time. The language of gaining a footing for more ideal measures and “climbing through degrees” connects these ideas as aspects of the same Darwinian theme. Roosevelt went on to reinforce this point in his own words when he recognized the importance of achieving “the best possible when the perfect best is not attainable, and in this life the perfect best rarely is attainable.” Roosevelt appreciated the “plastic” nature of progress and the necessity to make some progress when it can be achieved, in hopes of furthering the progress at a later date. In his closing remark of the essay he captured this essence well, “we do only harm if, by intemperate championship of the impossible good, we cut ourselves off from the opportunity to work a real abatement of existing and menacing evil.” This emphasis on meaningful outcomes and real ends is identical to the sentiment that James emphasizes in his Pragmatic Method when he states:

“If [certain] ideas prove to have a value for concrete life they will be true, for pragmatism, in the sense of being good for so much. For how much more they are true, will depend entirely on their relations to the other truths that also have to be acknowledged.”

It is this “cash value” James stated that classes an idea as true, but not in the base sense of mere moment to moment material benefit, not “does it pay” but rather the “best possible” with a real ability to “abate menacing evil”. Roosevelt made a compelling argument that the pursuit of the strenuous life by both individuals and society does provide the highest possible benefit. United States history appeared as an almost unbroken string of successes from the founding of the country throughout the nineteenth century, culminating in the American culture of progress.

This vision of America at the end of the nineteenth century addresses one aspect of society, but there were countervailing forces that took many forms. Maureen Flanagan illustrates these forces throughout America Reformed: Progressives and progressivisms 1890s – 1920s; sometimes they manifest as a generalized sense of unease, as in the Public Forums Movement, which hoped to achieve, “a truer democracy where ordinary people could gather together and discuss the problems of society.” In other cases, such as the crusades for safe milk for children, action was much more acute, specific, and urgent. In every case, a segment of society felt an acute sense that the social contract has failed. Society was no longer able to deliver; a decent home, employment and
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education, a clean safe physical environment, and a level of confidence in the police force, civil servants and other government officials. These social-justice progressive reform movements call into question the prudence of America’s social trajectory—in the language of modern public opinion polls, for many, the United States was no longer heading in the right direction but was rather off on the wrong track. These contrary opinions with strongly negative valence, exposed American society’s benefits as less timeless, and rather more closely tied to merely momentary advantage.

James sensed these limitations and while he largely agreed that manliness was productive, useful, and a force for good in this world. He did not believe war was the best, most useful—and, therefore most true—path to achieving the manly martial virtues. There is another better, more productive, more useful—and therefore, truer option. This other option is War’s “Moral Equivalent” How much better to redirect those energies and the benefits to be gained by energetic effort to an even higher good with even more utility for our society; not rejecting the strenuous life, not faulting its violent history, only layering a new truth a go-between, a smother-over a transition. Something the mind can grasp and recognize as a subtle additional truth with even greater utility. James encouraged humanity to bridge over this interval. He optimistically hoped this shift was possible for as he stated in his closing remarks of his essay, the shift has been made before.

\[\text{The amount of alteration in public opinion which my utopia postulates is vastly less than the difference between the mentality of those black warriors who pursued Stanley's party on the Congo with their cannibal war-cry of "Meat! Meat!" and that of the "general-staff" of any civilized nation. History has seen the latter interval bridged over; the former one can be bridged over much more easily.}^{45}\]

The belief that man will find a better way is our opportunity. We can choose to embrace new aspects of our nature to overcome the pugnacity bred over untold generations into our very marrow. It is an optimistic hope, but thankfully, optimism is also a significant aspect of the American character. Let us hope our optimism is strong enough to prevail.

---
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Fidel Castro’s Game: Baseball and Cuban Nationalism

David Wysocki

One day, when the Yankees accept peaceful co-existence with our own country, we shall beat them at baseball too and the advantages of revolutionary over capitalist sport will be shown. ~ Fidel Castro, c. 1974

After hundreds of years of tactical divide-and-conquer racism and colonial systems of slavery, the Caribbean island country of Cuba was composed of a detached and marginalized mixed-race people. An identity began to spring out of the rhetoric of Cuba Libre leader and nationalist writer José Martí in the late 19th century. Fidel Castro, a 20th century Cuban caudillo and ardent nationalist, cited the populist Martí in his speeches in attempts to adhere the varied and split social classes. Castro also knew rising parallel to Martí was the rural American game of baseball. After his revolutionary forces seized Havana in January of 1959, baseball became not just the island’s favored game, but a symbolic moral example and ideal of the Cuban Revolution. Most importantly, baseball became a tool to Castro for facilitating nationalism at home while showing off the successes of the Revolution’s social reforms through direct competition abroad.

Cuban-born Latin American historian Roberto González Echevarría said that there has never been a case where a state has been as involved and dedicated to its nation’s favorite sport as Castro has been with baseball. It may seem ironic that Castro, with such a pugnacious anti-United States agenda, would adopt an American game as the symbolic face of his Revolution. However, for most Cubans baseball goes back further than the American version and an examination of the game’s past and the Cuban people’s relationship to it is necessary.

During Spanish colonial rule, Cubans felt an apprehensive bond to the United States due to economic interdependence and geographic proximity. By the time of the Spanish American War in 1898, the United States was purchasing nearly eighty-seven percent of Cuba’s exports, representing nearly ten percent of all U.S. imports at the time. The exportation of the game was a result of this relationship when it was brought to the island by Nemesio Guilló in 1864, a Cuban student studying in the U.S. However, when anti-U.S. resentment built early in the 20th century, after legislation like the Platt Amendment, Cuba would do what it could to distance itself from its northern neighbor and
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1 Cuba Libre was a Cuban independence movement in the 1890s when Cuba was a sugar colony under Spain. See John Charles Chasteen, Born in Blood and Fire: A Concise History of Latin America 2nd ed. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2006), 208.
2 A caudillo is a military strong man prevalent in 19th and 20th century Latin America. For more see Ibid., 125-130.
4 Stephen E. Lewis, lecture, California State University, Chico, March 6, 2008.
modify the game into an autonomous Cuban vestige. In a response to the augmenting hemispheric hegemon and the inner cry for historical belonging, stories emerged, before the Spanish instituted a process of extermination of native culture and life in the 16th century, that the indigenous Siboney Taíno of the island played a game called *batos* which involved two teams, a stick, a ball, and stone bases. The suggestion that the Cuban model had preceded the modern American version, whether true or not, was a clear sign that Cuba was severing the entrails linked to expanding American culture of the time.

There was significant historical precedent of Cubans using baseball for resistance. During colonial times, baseball was used as a rebellion to the “crass Spaniard” who played soccer and went to bullfights, representing everything backward in a modern world. In December of 1895, Spanish officials discovered that professional baseball revenues on the island were financing Martí’s movement for independence. As a result baseball was banned by the Spanish colonial government and labeled taboo. Indeed, baseball games were used as meeting places for rebels and a recruitment center for players involved in the conflict. Even Emilio Sabourín, one of the founders of Cuban baseball, spent significant time in a Spanish prison at Cueta (in northern Africa) for his role in the independence fight in the late 19th century. More than fifty years after independence from Spain, Martín Dihigo, one of the island’s greatest players, met revolutionary Ernesto “Che” Guevara in Mexico City and gave financial support for the *Granma* landing of 1956. Baseball had provided a powerful link between the two revolutionary movements and also cleared an accessible path for Castro to latch onto Martí’s coattails.
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5 The Platt Amendment was legislation that essentially made Cuba a colony of the United States, granting full sovereignty only when the island was deemed “stable.” Realistically this meant when American investments on the island were safe. Cuba had now gone from being a colony, to a neo-colonial puppet. For more see Nancy Stepan, “Imperialism and Sanitation,” *Cuba Reader* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2003), 150.


10 The *Granma* was a small yacht purchased by Castro used to return to Cuba with his guerrilla band in 1956. Martin Dihigo returned to the island as an instructor after the Revolution. Dihigo met Guevara in the early 1950s. Gilberto Dihigo, interview with Milton H. Jamail. See Ibid.
The political history of the island was opaque to el pueblo (the Cuban people) and political ignorance was a “hand-down”—an unfortunate side effect of its colonial legacy.\(^\text{11}\) Cuba was, in fact, the last Spanish colony to gain independence in Latin America in 1898. When the July 26th Movement marched into Havana in 1959, with a handful of guerillas, very few knew of Castro’s political ideology as much as they heard of his bravery in the attack at Moncada in 1953.\(^\text{12}\) While el pueblo may not have known the name of their first president, they likely knew their favorite team’s first baseman. The people who had been left out of politics found baseball, which came originally to the rural city of Matanzas and not the elitist capital of Havana, accessible and understandable.\(^\text{13}\) Through cheering, jeering, and purchasing a ticket the fan could feel like they are somehow influencing or controlling the action on the field of play, providing a sense of democracy rarely experienced by the masses. Historian Joseph L. Arbena argued that sports in Latin America are often a source of self-respect and a type of rebellion among people who have seen much of their culture destroyed after colonialism and the wave of “modernism.”\(^\text{14}\) Cuban writer Jose Sixto de Sola went further declaring that “Athletic sport was one of the factors that made Cubans feel free and obtain their liberty.”\(^\text{15}\)

Creating a nation from the long divided el pueblo would have likely seemed a daunting task for any eminence in 1959, no matter his or her popular appeal. After nearly four centuries of slavery, ending in 1886, and the importation of Jim Crowe laws by the U.S. after 1898, Afro-Cubans were marginalized in public and private life. An account of a young female instructor from Castro’s Literacy Campaign rudely exposes the depth of racial discrimination on the island in 1961. She was warned by a rural creole family that blacks “practiced bestiality” and would attempt to molest her if she went to give them lessons.\(^\text{16}\) Similar kinds of prejudice were visible for women and the poor.

\(^{11}\) Wagner, “Sport in Revolutionary Societies,” 113-120.
\(^{12}\) The July 26th Movement was Castro’s guerilla forces fighting Fulgencio Batista’s U.S. supplied armies. Its name stems from the attack on the Moncada military barracks on July 26th, 1953. To read more on the July 26th movement or the Moncada attacks see Samuel Farber, *The Origins of the Cuban Revolution Reconsidered* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2006), 49-50.
\(^{13}\) Wagner, “Sport in Revolutionary Societies,” 113-120.
\(^{14}\) “Modernism” is roughly the idea that Latin American governments have socially repressed their people in the name of progress. See Joseph L. Arbena, “Sport and the Study of Latin American Society: An Overview,” *Sport and Society in Latin America: Diffusion, Dependency, and the Rise of Mass Culture* (London: Greenwood Press, 1988), 4-6. Also, it was clear after 1898 with legislation like the Platt Amendment (which virtually transformed Cuba into a U.S. protectorate) that the U.S. didn’t share the visions of the populist Cuba Libre leaders. See “Platt Amendment,” ca. 1903, *Our Documents*, (http://www.ourdocuments.gov/doc.php?flash=true&doc=55).
\(^{15}\) Jose Sixto de Sola was a Cuban scholar and wrote this in 1914. See Louis A. Perez, Jr., “Between Baseball and Bullfighting: The Quest for Nationality in Cuba, 1868-1898,” *The Journal of American History* 81, no. 2 (Sept. 1994), 494.
\(^{16}\) The Literacy Campaign was an effort to educate all Cubans seemingly without social barriers. See Richard R. Fagen, “1961: The Year of Education,” *Cuba Reader* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2003), 386-388. Also Oscar Lewis,
Baseball became a key impetus of Castro’s social reform and in 1959 he nationalized sporting facilities across the island that had previously been available only to wealthy creoles. He also abolished racial and gender restrictions in an effort to erode the long divisions between the large Afro-Cuban and creole populations and encourage mass participation in sports. Since 1900, the Cuban League was one of the few places blacks participated as it was the first baseball league to be racially integrated. Adopting baseball allowed Castro to hijack this pocketed legacy of equality. Just twenty-three years later, exiled Black Panther Assata Shakur described the Afro-Cuban population as culturally closer to Africa. She even said that conditions in Cuba were better than for blacks in the U.S. in 1984, evidence of dramatic social changes brought by the Revolution.

While mass sports participation worked hand in hand with the nationalizing Family Code and Literacy Campaign, minorities still were not wholly equal. There has always been a ceiling to the advancement of not just blacks, but also women, as neither have held significant positions in the Revolutionary government. Despite some clear discrepancies, the human rights effort brought significant change and promoting mass participation of all classes became the cornerstone to Revolutionary sport’s success.

A new program soon emerged called Dirección General de Deportes (hereafter DGD) which was renamed National Institute for Sports, Physical Education, and Recreation (hereafter INDER). The programs focused on medicine, physical education, and overall health in addition to creating a population ready to physically and mentally defend the country in the always worrying possibility of insurrection or armed invasion. More specifically, sport for Castro displayed four basic constants in the effort to force international recognition and a sort of cohesion or blending of domestic society. Sports were to teach collective work, be open to all social classes (meaning income, sex, age, and race), promote health and welfare, and produce champions. Possibly the most attractive aspect of sport, was that there was already strong leadership existing and the country already had


18 The Family Code was a law passed which pushed women out of the house and into schools, workplace, and even the military. See Margaret Randall, “The Family Code,” The Cuba Reader (Durham: Duke University Press, 2003), 399-405. Women also


20 Pettavino and Pye, Sport in Cuba, 69-70.

21 Fidel Castro was well aware of U.S. assassination plots and was always prepared for a Bay of Pigs Part II. See González Echevarría, Pride of Havana, 364-368.

distinguished, world-class athletes (mostly in boxing and baseball). Because of the nature of the socialist movement in Cuba, which appealed to the masses, Castro was again able to cling to the game which was already the passion of the same demographic. Unlike most sports, in Cuba, baseball didn’t spread from the top down. It was born from the poor countryside and spread up. 

By 1962, professional sport, including the Cuban League, had been banned and by 1967 all sporting events on the island became free to the public to increase involvement as a part of the reforms. The Revolutionary government considered professional sports as exploitation of man by other men. For socialism, pro athletes were sold and exchanged like product. Before the Revolution, 135 Cubans had broken into Major League Baseball and many Cubans by this time had put together very successful careers.

The effort to get children into the sporting arena became a key component of mass participation programs because at a young age people tend to learn their lifelong habits. It was hoped that children would grow up and use these learned attributes (morality, structure, selflessness, and hard work) in other realms later in their lives, preferably in factories and the military, if not on the field. To ensure a good product, a “pyramid of success” was created through a system of schools and academies. Of course, in reality, the top of the pyramid had little room for individual athletes as there could be only one “epic hero” of the Revolution. The individual and the team were cached in the shadow of the “Maximum Leader,” and to take a picture with, or be mentioned by, Castro personally was the greatest honor.

José de la Caridad Mendez, Martín Dihigo and Roberto Ortiz were greater in the minds of fans than the politicians of their time. But no athlete can equal Fidel Castro, who is treated by his votaries as if he were the living embodiment of the Cuban nation.

While the academies force one to compare Cuba with the Soviet Union, the nature of baseball seemed to force some disassociation with the mechanic Soviet sports specimen. While sport overall in Cuba would work for a goal of peak physical health, baseball, the island’s bloodline,
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23 Cuban baseball was already known for its world class baseball talent. See Cubanball.com, “International Games,” (http://www.cubanball.com/intlcomp.html).
25 The Cuban League was Cuba’s largest professional baseball league and existed between 1878 and 1961 and usually only fielded three to five teams. In 1947 the Cuban League entered in an agreement with Major League Baseball to use the league for player development.
26 Jamail, Full Count, 11.
28 González Echevarría, Pride of Havana, 364-368.
29 Ibid.
required less conditioning and more focus on the artisan skills of hitting, pitching, and strategy. The Soviet model also didn’t match up with the Cuban demographics. Older Cubans came to mock Soviet-trained coaches and academy instructors by calling them el laboratorio, or by saying it appeared they were manufactured in a laboratory. The Soviet system was characterized by “science, routine, and no-nonsense regimentation” while the Cuban system allowed more freedom and innovation as it was still developing and continues to redefine itself to this day. Sports in the Soviet Union weren’t developed to catapult the country into a position of dominance, but to simply back up their already glowing status as a world power. Baseball in Cuba was to be the instrument that thrust the small nation onto the international stage.

When professional sports were abolished in 1961 the four-team Cuban League was leveled and new amateur leagues like the National Series arose to take its place near the apex of the pyramid. The National Series included sixteen teams, giving a team to every province on the island, providing more opportunities for community involvement with the game and allowing a new regional pride to emerge that had never existed. Teams took nicknames of regional business sectors nationalized by the Revolution like Industriales (Industrials), Citricultores (Citrus Producers), Salineros (Salt Producers), and Cafetaleros (Coffee Growers). Castro also began pooling plenteous resources into the building of state of the art baseball facilities, even in places traditionally ignored by Havana like Isla de la Juventad, an island off Cuba’s southern coast. In 1959 there were 1,893 sports installations, but by 1990 the total had increased to 11,122. Municipal parks were also built at incredible rates that helped solidify “mass socialization” through mass participation. Proof of the success of the program is illustrated in the fact that in 1962 there were 60,887 players at some level of organized baseball. By 1977 the number had climbed to an astounding 493,000, an enormous figure considering Cuba has roughly eleven million inhabitants. Raudol Ruiz, a professor at INDER said,
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30 Ibid.
34 González Echevarría, Pride of Havana, 368-376.
35 Pettavino and Pye, Sport in Cuba, 89.
36 González Echevarría, Pride of Havana, 361-363
“In a way we wanted everyone to have the conditions of life that the children of the ruling class had.”\(^{38}\)

In fact, baseball emerged as more than just a sport and test tube for nationalist experimentation. While President Fulgencio Batista’s Cuba lost its minimal contribution to communal sports, baseball has actually become an essential source of income for Castro.\(^{39}\)

According to a Ministry of Finance document, the Cuban government, between 1957 and 1958, spent just 1.75 million pesos on sports facilities and programs out of a 365 million peso budget.\(^{40}\) By 1994, Castro was investing $120 million a year in these types of programs. Because of success in tournaments abroad, Revolutionary sports not only paid for themselves but even provided a profit. Even though all of the tournaments of which they participated were considered “amateur,” most competitions offered and provided winnings based on finish.\(^{41}\)

Also emerging from the ashes of the professional game and from the U.S. trade embargo was Batos, a sports equipment manufacturing plant. In 1959, Castro had scrambled to meet the steep state quota of 1,478 state-owned sporting facilities as the U.S. blockade handcuffed Cuba in lieu of sporting equipment. Little help could be found overseas simply because baseball was not widely played in Europe. By chance, in 1959, the Zarabozo brothers, using broken parts of cash registers and jukeboxes, fashioned a machine that accidentally produced a baseball.\(^{42}\) By 1961, the Industria Deportiva was in business and by 1994 nearly seventy percent of Cuba’s sporting equipment was produced domestically and available for free to the people. The industry brought jobs and evoked national pride because it wasn’t an industry nationalized, but was pieced together from scratch by the Revolution. In an interview, Guillermo de la Cuesta, director of Industria Deportiva, used the Cuban baseball fan’s willingness to return foul balls as evidence of Cuba’s pride of the industry and respect for the game. Every returned foul ball, to de la Cuesta, was helping to break the U.S. blockade.\(^{43}\) In 1971, the Batos produced baseball was accepted as the official baseball for the World Series Amateur Championships, showing the world how far the disadvantaged domestic industry
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\(^{39}\) Fulgencio Batista was president of Cuba twice between 1940-1944 and 1952-1959.


\(^{41}\) Pettavino and Pye, Sport in Cuba, 8.

\(^{42}\) Ibid., 89-92.

\(^{43}\) Guillermo de la Cuesta, interview with Paula Pettavino. See Ibid., 92.
had advanced. As propagandistic posters exorbitantly plastered around the country stated, “Revolution is to Build!”

As a watershed, entities like the State Committee on Science and Technology emerged to help deal specifically with top-level athletes and sports. Ruiz even gained international recognition for his research. In 1976 he gained heroic status when he became the first Latin American to win the Philip Noel Baker award for scientific investigation given by the International Council for Sport Science and Physical Education. Although Cuba still frequently relied on borrowed technology and trade with Japan and Europe (when it could) and governmental claims of large scale economic growth were often false, the sports industry increased production 179 percent between 1978 and 1984 and exports rose twenty-five times before stagnation in 1982. Jorge Garcia Bango, former president of INDER, in an article in *Granma Weekly Review*, claimed the new industry “combats individualism, egoism, and everything that opposes the rights of the great majority.”

With the praises of the Revolution being sung from top officials of the Cuban government, it is also important to point out that by 1975 demand was already outstripping supply. Largely due to the bantam size of the island, only fifty percent of equipment was able to be made with Cuban raw materials, capping the potential industrialization on a large scale. Cuba, increasingly due to its decision to exercise comparative advantage in sugar markets, has become a strict net importing nation, even of food. In 1975 two percent of the sports manufacturing budget of 7.8 million pesos wasn’t even spent. Further, by 1987, INDER released a report that described its 9,000, or so, factories and distribution centers as “poorly maintained and inefficient.” According to the report, sixty percent of these facilities were classified as “bad or average.” The entire industry was like
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44 Ibid., 89.
49 Stubbs, *Cuba: The Test of Time*, 60.
50 To read more on social and economic constraints on nationalism see Dudley Seers, *The Political Economy of Nationalism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983).
51 Ibid., 92.
much of the Revolution due to the U.S. blockade. Revolutionary Cuba was given the permanent challenge of *resolviendo*, a word Cubans use to describe turning adversity into advantage.\(^{52}\)

Between 1961 to the present, Cuban amateur baseball has not disappointed Castro or the Cuban people on the field. Coincidentally, one month after announcing plans to create a national amateur championship in March of 1961, the Amateur World Series was to take place in Costa Rica. Manuel González Guerra, the new Olympic Committee leader in Cuba, held massive tryouts in a last minute attempt to field a team for the tournament. Surprisingly, at the same time as CIA-trained Cuban exiles raided the island in the Bay of Pigs Invasion on Cuba’s northern coast, the Cuban baseball team crushed its opponents in San José, Costa Rica on route to an easy victory.\(^{53}\) According to González Echevarría, the connection between both triumphs wasn’t lost for Castro and “the bond between baseball and defense of the motherland was strengthened.”\(^{54}\)

In international competition since 1961, the pyramid has produced amazing results as Cuba has unquestionably dominated every tournament it has participated. Between 1965 and 2007 Cuba won seventeen of twenty-two Baseball World Cups while the United States in the same period won just three times in 1973, 1974, and 2007. Between 1963 and 2007, Cuba nearly swept the Pan-American games by winning eleven tournaments out of a possible twelve with the U.S. winning just once in 1967. Beginning in 1992, Cuba won three gold medals and one silver medal in four separate Olympic Games. In International Cup play, the Cuban team has brought home ten championships out of sixteen including winning seven consecutive between 1983 and 1995. In the Central American and Caribbean Games, Cuba again impressed by winning nine of twelve between 1962 and 2006. Cuba even added sixteen titles at the Junior World Championships (AAA) and Youth World Championships (AA) between 1981 and 2006. They’ve placed in Haarlem Baseball Week all five times from 1972 to 1996 and won the only Americas Cup in 2002 at Monterrey, Mexico.\(^{55}\)

Fresh after beating the Major League Baltimore Orioles in an exhibition game, the paternal Castro was waiting to give his praise to the team. According to González Echevarría, Omar Linares met Castro outside the plane and said, “Dear commander—in-chief, the mission you gave us has been completed...*Socialismo o muerte!* (Socialism or death!). *Patria o muerte!* (Homeland or death!) *Venceremos!* (We will triumph!)”\(^{56}\) The actions of Linares, and from those like Dihigo, seem to suggest

\(^{52}\) Ibid., 9.

\(^{53}\) Cuba successfully pushed back the U.S.-funded invasion with a mixed race civilian army. See González Echevarría, *Pride of Havana*, 355.

\(^{54}\) Ibid.

\(^{55}\) Cubanball.com, (http://www.cubanball.com/intlcomp.html)

that González Echevarría’s claim that Cuban baseball players had no room for socialist dogma to be somewhat questionable, or at least not a strict rule.\(^{57}\) What is even more impressive of the victory was that star players such as Kindelán, Pacheco and Mesa weren’t able to play because of commitments to competition in the National Series. The *Cuba Free Press Project* skeptically described Cuban national baseball commissioner Carlos Rodríguez’s decision to hold out the talented players as a way to have an excuse to fall back on in case of a loss.\(^{58}\)

Linares’ words sound familiar to testaments of a soldier after military conquest. The exportation of the Cuban Revolution was to be accomplished in this way, through action and success on the field against its foes. Castro was the figurative general of *equipo Cuba*, an army that couldn’t be stopped. He would sit with and lecture players and managers, first about baseball strategy and then about the visions of the Revolution, in the outfield grass after games.\(^{59}\) He was the patriarch and lifeblood of an imperfect and increasingly repressive Revolution, but one that has brought significant social change and relative stability to an island long devastated from colonial and neo-colonial headaches.

The Cuban nation-building successes through sport didn’t go unnoticed in the international arena. In 1977, Cuba began exporting sports aid and programs abroad, especially to countries with similar colonial histories, mostly in Africa. Cuba now was able to use sport as a tool for international cooperation, and building nations wished to emulate their new benefactor with surprising enthusiasm.\(^{60}\)

Despite the success of baseball, recent economic hardship has surely had an impact on nationalization efforts and it is clear that baseball has taken a hit at home. Discontent since 1991, with the imposition of the “special period” following Soviet collapse, grew and living conditions began to relatively crash with it.\(^{61}\) Despite copious efforts to display their sovereignty from world super-powers, the Soviet Union had long been subsidizing the Revolution by providing Castro with below-market crude oil and agreed to buy Cuban sugar at above market prices.\(^{62}\) Without Soviet aid, Cuba has been slowly crumbling and the average Cuban salary in 1999 had dropped to $10 a
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\(^{57}\) Ibid., 368.

\(^{58}\) The *Cuba Free Press* is an online anti-Revolutionary news organization. See Garcia, “Excuses Available.”


\(^{60}\) Countries and regions receiving sports aid or having involvement in Cuban sports programs included Algeria, Angola, Benin, Congo, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Malagasy Republic, Mali, Mozambique, Nigeria, Tanzania, Iraq, South Yemen, Vietnam, Nicaragua, Panama, Peru, Brazil, and Venezuela. See Pettavino and Pye, “Revolutionary Sport,” 479.

\(^{61}\) Pettavino and Pye, “Revolutionary Sport,” 475.

month. Rewards for high achievement also dropped and traveling abroad built up resentment among Cuban players as it was easy to see how far the Revolution was falling in comparison to even minor league players of other countries. Timothy Dwyer of the Philadelphia Inquirer described conditions on the road for Cuban players:

They live in the bowels of the stadiums...The rooms, crammed with bunk beds, look more like prison cells than bedrooms...The never leave the stadium. On a typical day, the players practice in the morning, eat lunch and then sleep in their tidy dungeons until its time for batting practice.64

In 1991, pitcher Rene Arocha became the first player from equipo Cuba to defect to the United States. This event gave the casual push that figuratively broke the seal. Defections began ravaging the island’s best talent, undoubtedly attracted by the lure of ever-rising Major League salaries that had neared a $3 million a year average with a $250 thousand minimum wage by 2007.65 The attraction of the U.S., or detraction from Cuba, became so irresistible that players like Lázaro González and Euclides Rojas, in 1993 and 1995 respectively, attempted to sail to Florida on makeshift rafts. Rojas initially didn’t make it and witnessed the drowning of an old woman who attempted to swim to land she hallucinated.66 While both eventually made it to the U.S., neither player found success. Defection was once common because it was near impossible to break onto equipo Cuba, the highest competition for a Cuban, but now the island’s most heralded players were leaving because the daily problems of Cubans had become “lunch and dinner.”67

Suspicion began getting the best of the government and to prevent future defections INDER began forcefully retiring players who became too good, simply substituting them for players who looked less desirable to scouts.68 The constant re-stocking of equipo Cuba seemed to drive authorities into madness. Agents like Joe Cubas and Gus Dominguez, who have arranged defections for multiple players, kept authorities on constant watch and if there was suspicion of a scout nearby, practices were often cancelled and players hidden away.69 German Mesa, arguably Cuba’s best shortstops, and others, were suspended indefinitely for speaking to someone accused of being an
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64 Timothy Dwyer quote found in: González Echevarría, Pride of Havana, 387.
66 Rojas was eventually smuggled out Cuba. Ibid, 388-389.
68 Ibid., 386.
69 Ibid.
agent. These repressive measures predictably led to even more defections. The official response from Granma was one of finger pointing. The Revolutionary propaganda suggested the players were somehow tricked by U.S.-based, mafia-linked, agents. Defectors like Liván Hernández, 1997 World Series MVP in the major leagues, were said to have “betrayed the Cuban people.”

This frame of mind may not fully be propagandistic in nature. Heavy pressure was put on the Cuban teams not just by Castro, but the people as well. Howard W. French of the New York Times quoted a Cuban sportswriter in 1992 that said about Cuban baseball players,

It is almost unfair the burden they are carrying. They are the best in the world and are not expected to lose to anyone, but they know that a loss against the United States would be more than a sports defeat. It would be a national betrayal.

According to historian Milton H. Jamail, there are some logical reasons for the Cuban government’s unwillingness to part with amateur baseball and the pyramid. First, athletes still represented all that was good left in the Revolution. Athletes were still mythically driven by high morals and were to be role models for all Cubans. Of course, secondly, Cuban baseball was incredibly successful even after taking major hits from defection and the questionable strangling tactics later by the government to restrict it. Cuban baseball put the nation in a rare position of dominance, forcing other nations to bow beneath their glowing medals and national colors. After the economic collapse, the game was one of the few things the government could cling to for national pride. Lastly, and arguably most crucial, was that Castro didn’t want his best players playing in the heart of the enemy, the U.S., for entertainment. Reducing his peloteros (ballplayers) to la pelota esclava (slave baseball) was unacceptable.

The defections of Orlando and Liván Hernández jolted us into the reality of many Cuban defectors of the 1990s. Orlando was seen as a prideful child of the Revolution. His notable loyalty even convinced scouts that he would never defect, and many stopped trying, seeing it as a waste of time. He once said, “I know the prettiest word in the world is money. But I believe words like loyalty and patriotism are very beautiful as well.” After he was forced into retirement, a tormenting ennui pushed him hesitantly to the U.S. in December of 1997. His younger brother, Liván, had defected in
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70 Ibid, 393.
72 Ibid., 133-137.
73 Slave baseball was what many in the Revolutionary government called professional baseball. For more information see Ibid., 134.
74 Emphasis is in the original. Fainaru and Sánchez, “Emigration in the Special Period,” 638.
1995 when he escaped from his dorm room in Mexico. He “stumbled through his tears into (Joe) Cubas’ waiting rental car.”

Jamail shows off the class-leveling of the Cuban Revolution in baseball that has made the game “romantic.” Before a 7:30 game, he sat outside of Estadio Latinoamérica at 6:00 to watch a pick-up game. In the parking lot, men between the ages of eighteen and thirty-five played without lines and used cardboard bases. He noticed sitting across the diamond were the Industriales players, dressed in uniform before the game. Despite the activity around them, none of the players were being bothered by requests for autographs or taking pictures with el pueblo. Everyone simply sat watching the game “intently” together. The game’s recent and powerful emphasis on the star player and commercialism elsewhere was replaced by communualism and humility in Cuba. To Jamail, “it was baseball at its best, harking back images of the game long past in the United States.”

Arguably, nothing so consistently defined the Cuban or pulled together the nation under the Revolution as did baseball under Castro. His cunning ability to transform a point of pride into a Revolutionary and militaristic satellite without social borders allowed the success of the program to materialize. Through all of the Revolution’s imperfections, social conditions for the masses are a far cry from their pre-Revolutionary state, even prompting a French activist in 2008 to claim “I wish I had been born in Cuba.” Cuba now ranks forty-first in the world in infant mortality rates at 5.93, two ahead of the U.S., and boasts literacy rates of 99.8%, among the top five in the world. Alberto Juantorena summed up the search for the Cuban identity when he said, “Americans live in a country; we Cubans are building a country.” Cuban identity has been carefully constructed by Castro and is now identifiable to all living on the island. The Cuban is now rarely defined by the color of his skin, but of his or her strength, morality, and sacrifice to the betterment of all Cubans in Revolutionary terms. Peloteros have been one of the key go-betweens and communicators of the Revolution and remain “the purest pride and joy of the entire Cuban people.”
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