

THE CHICO HISTORIAN

Volume 29
2019

The Journal
of the
CSU, Chico
History
Department



“I know of no time in human history where ignorance was better than knowledge.”

-Neil deGrasse Tyson

Cover Art & Design

Illustration of Trinity Hall, 2018. Constructed in 1933, today it is the home of the CSU, Chico History Department. (Used with permission: “Trinity Hall,” Ricardo Vega, 2018).

History Department
California State University, Chico
400 West First Street
Trinity Hall Room 223
Chico, California, 95929-0735
(530) 898-5366

The Chico Historian is an annual publication of the Alpha Delta Omicron Chapter of the Phi Alpha Theta National History Honor Society and the California State University, Chico (CSUC) Department of History. It aims to provide students the opportunity to publish historical works, and to train editorial staff members in producing an academic journal. Issues are published at the end of each academic year. All opinions or statements of fact are the sole responsibility of the authors and may not reflect the views of the editorial staff. The authors retain rights to individual essays.

Phi Alpha Theta's mission is to promote the study of history through the encouragement of research, good teaching, publication, and the exchange of learning and ideas among historians. The organization seeks to bring students, teachers, and writers of history together for intellectual and social exchanges, which promote and assist historical research and publication by our members in a variety of ways.

**We dedicate this volume to
John Boyle**

Retired CSUC professor of Asian history John Boyle, a scholar in the area of pre- and post-war Japan, taught courses in east Asian history at Chico State from 1968 until his retirement in 1997. He is the author of *Modern Japan: The American Nexus*. His generous support of *The Chico Historian* has made the publication of this and many other issues possible, a fact much appreciated by everyone involved with this journal.



The Chico Historian

Volume 29: 2019

The Annual Publication of the
Alpha Delta Omicron Chapter of Phi Alpha Theta
and the Department of History
California State University, Chico

Chief Editors

Jordan Cottrell and Juan Vega Ramirez

Editorial Board

Jason Bohnert
Joshua Furtado
Eric Jopson
Maria Kogler

Advising Faculty

Dr. Stephen E. Lewis, Phi Alpha Theta

Contents

Introduction & Acknowledgments	vii
Editor and Contributor Biographies	xi

Articles

<i>The Agrarian Economy of Ancient Rome: Practices, Institutions, and Labor</i> MARIA KOGLER	2
<i>Taming of the Senate: the Machinations of Rehabilitation</i> JEREMY WEISS	15
<i>Jacobitism and the Fight For Religious and Political Authority in Britain, 1688-1715</i> EMILY AHLERS	25
<i>The Tongue of Mexico: Finding Identity in Malintzin and La Llorona</i> SEBASTIAN LOZA	33
<i>The Memory of Mata Hari</i> MARINA SANCHEZ	46
<i>Investigating Russian Gender and Class Norms Through World War I Nurses</i> MOLLY HAMILTON	58
<i>The Historiography of the Easter Rising</i> JORDAN COTTRELL	71
<i>Accessory to Assassination: U.S. Policy Toward the Congo Crisis, 1960-1961</i> JASON BOHNERT	91

The Key to Heaven's Gate: The Pervasiveness of Cults in America

HOLLY SANBECK 106

Book Reviews 120

Appendix

Phi Alpha Theta 2019 Initiates 125

Introduction & Acknowledgements

The Chico Historian offers an opportunity to share some of the recent work of the undergraduate and graduate students at California State University, Chico. This year's theme is diversity. In this volume, we celebrate the eclectic historical interests that our students and faculty exude. Our contributors covered a sweeping array of different time periods, locations, themes, and styles of history. We have papers that range from Ancient Rome to the twenty-first century. Writers looked at the histories of the United States, Latin America, Europe, and Africa. They employed the tactics of political history, gender history, art history, cultural history, social history, and intellectual history.

Since the diversity of the offerings in this edition of *The Chico Historian* makes thematic categorization difficult, we will briefly discuss the papers in chronological order. Two of our contributors looked at Ancient Roman history. Maria Kogler explores Roman agriculture in her paper, "The Agrarian Economy of Ancient Rome: Practices, Institutions and Labor." Jeremy Weiss studies Roman political history in his "Taming of the Senate: The Machinations of Rehabilitation." Emily Ahlers looks at early modern British history and explores the relationship between religion and politics in "Jacobitism and the Fight for Religious and Political Authority in Britain, 1688-1715."

Sebastian Loza's paper spans from the sixteenth century into the twentieth century and beyond and he brings readers to a new continent and exposes them to art in, "The Tongue of Mexico: Finding Identity in Malintzin and La Llorona. We have three papers that deal with World War One and the changing opportunities and roles for previously marginalized groups that emerged due to that conflict. Molly Hamilton looks at the way that the war affected Russian women in her paper, "Investigating Russian Gender and Class Norms Through World War I Nurses." Marina Sanchez explores the legacy of a famous accused female spy in "The Memory of Mata Hari." Jordan Cottrell writes about the ways historians study the 1916 Irish rebellion that took place as Britain fought in her paper, "The Historiography of the Easter Rising."

Finally, two of our contributors submitted papers that focus on the post-World War II era. Jason Bohnert looks at Cold War foreign relations and African history, as well as American, in his paper, "Accessory to Assassination: U.S. Policy Toward the Congo Crisis, 1960-1961." Holly Sanbeck returns to religious history in "The Key to Heaven's Gate: The Pervasiveness of Cults" in America.

This year we also included a book review section in *The Chico Historian*. This section contains reviews of four books about modern American history. Eric Jopson reviews writer Malcolm Cowley's post-World War I classic about the Lost Generation, *Exile's Return*, and journalist and popular historian Jonathan Eig's *The Birth of the Pill: How Four Crusaders Reinvented Sex and Launched a Revolution*. Juan Vega reviews historian Ruth Rosen's landmark history, *The World Split Open: How the Modern Women's Movement Changed America*, and historian David R. Roediger's *Working Toward Whiteness: How America's Immigrants Became White: The Strange Journey from Ellis Island to the Suburbs*. We hope that this will become an enduring feature of the journal and offer a different type of content for readers and writers alike.

We would like to express our sincere gratitude and appreciation for a number of people who made this year's publication of *The Chico Historian* possible. To begin, we are deeply grateful for Professor John Boyle's continuing support of *The Chico Historian*. His generosity enables our publication and our appreciation should not be understated. We also thank Professor Steve Lewis, who served as the faculty advisor for the journal and for the History Club and Phi Alpha Theta and as our wonderfully supportive department chair. We would also like to thank Professor Robert Cottrell for teaching us invaluable writing skills and helping us sharpen our book reviewing abilities. In addition, we wish to extend our gratitude to all of the faculty who advised and mentored students, helped shape their papers, and encouraged them to submit. We thank members of the History Club who participated in our workshop. We are also grateful for our contributors, who wrote and submitted the papers that fill our journal and who worked with the editorial team to refine their work. Lastly, the chief editors would like to thank the members of our editorial board, who volunteered their time to encourage submissions and edit papers, enabling us to present this issue.

The Chico Historian Editorial Board

Editor and Contributor Biographies

Editors

Jason Bohnert is a graduate student in the History MA program at CSU, Chico. He is working toward graduating in the Spring of 2020. His paper was written for Dr. James Matray's Historical Research course in the spring of 2015 when he was an undergraduate. Jason is a sports enthusiast, specifically for teams from his home town of Seattle, WA.

Jordan Cottrell is a graduate student at CSU, Chico. Her interests include British history, intellectual history, and women's history. She intends to seek a PhD and pursue a career as a History professor. She wrote her paper for HIST 690, the graduate seminar in historiography, during the fall of 2017.

Joshua Furtado is studying both Mathematics and History. He enjoys combining his two passions by studying how mathematics has shaped history and how historical cultures have shaped mathematical advancements. He is pursuing a career in teaching, and hopes to pass on his passion for both his areas of interest.

Eric Jopson is currently in his first year of graduate studies at CSU, Chico and is working toward earning a M.A. in History. He enjoys many aspects of history but is most interested in racial relations of religious organizations. He intends to pursue a thesis in studying the Mormon Church's relations with its black members in the twenty-first century. After graduation, Eric intends to pursue a career as an archivist.

Maria Kogler is a first-year graduate student in history. She double majored in History and Agriculture as an undergrad and plans to pursue a teaching credential after earning her M.A. in order to teach both history and agriculture classes at the high school level. In addition to attending classes, Maria spends time on campus working as a Supplemental Instruction Leader for introductory U.S. History classes. In her free time, Maria enjoys record shopping, relaxing with her cats, and adventures in Bidwell Park. She originally wrote her paper for Dr. Dallas DeForest's Decline and Fall of Rome course in the fall of 2018.

Juan Vega Ramirez is a graduate student in the CSU, Chico History MA program. He double majored in History and Latin American Studies

as an undergrad and hopes to continue bridging these fields for the remainder of his academic career. After graduation, Juan wishes to teach history at the high school or community college level before pursuing a PhD in History. Juan enjoys hiking, bicycling, and spending time with friends.

Contributors

Emily Ahlers is an undergraduate student at CSU, Chico. Emily is pursuing a BA in History with a minor in European studies. After graduation, Emily will be continuing her education as a graduate student at the University of York in England. Her interest in Early Modern European history was founded in Dr. Jason Nice's Tudor/Stuart Britain class in the Fall of 2017. It was for this class that she wrote her paper on the Jacobites and the Glorious Revolution. Emily hopes to earn a PhD with a focus on what is now the United Kingdom during the Early Modern era. Outside of academics, Emily enjoys working, traveling, and rooting loudly for the San Francisco Giants.

Molly Hamilton is an undergraduate student who will be graduating in Spring 2019 with her Bachelor of Arts in History and minors in Italian, European Studies and Food Studies. Having spent her junior year in Florence, Italy, Molly is passionate about travel and European history. She wrote this paper last semester for Dr. Kate Transchel's HIST 490 class which focused on World War I in Europe. When she is not writing history papers, Molly enjoys watching The Great British Baking Show, eating Italian food and listening to Fleetwood Mac.

Sebastian Loza is an undergraduate senior pursuing a B.A. in History, General Option, and a B.A. in Art History. He is planning to continue his education in graduate school in order to work in libraries or museums. He is not opposed to teaching in a college setting either. His main area of interest is Mexican nineteenth and twentieth-century politics of nation building and identity. Sebastian originally wrote his paper for Dr. Asa Mittman's Art History 400: Monsters and the Monstrous.

Holly Sanbeck is a 1st year post-graduate Student Teacher at California State University, Chico. She obtained her BA in History in 2018 and is currently teaching history to 7th graders in Oroville, Calif. Though native to Nevada, she lives in Chico with her husband and their cat, Hercules. Her hobbies include camping, board games that take more than three hours, and studying cults, witchcraft, and proto-sciences, such as alchemy and Hermeticism. Though the study of religion, cults, and Hermeticism are among her favorite things she also enjoys studying

Monarchs from the Middle Ages and Early Modern Europe. This paper was written as her final undergraduate paper for Professor Livingston's History 490.

Marina Sanchez is an undergraduate student pursuing a Bachelor of Arts in the Social Science, Pre-Credential option. She is a senior, expecting to graduate in May 2019. Her goal is to teach high school history after completing the credential program at Chico State University. Her interests in history include ancient Egypt and medieval Europe. Outside of school, Marina enjoys reading, painting, and spending time with her family. This paper was originally written for the history capstone course HIST 490. The topic of the class was social and political aspects of World War One.

Jeremy Weiss is an undergraduate at California State University, Chico, on track to graduate in the fall of 2019 with his Bachelor of Arts degree in History. After a seventeen-year gap, Jeremy returned as a reinstated student in the fall of 2017, earning recognition on the Dean's List his first three semesters back at Chico State. He attributes this to a clear desire to pursue an M.A. in History, with an eye on a career in teaching at the university level, as well as publishing for a popular history audience. His academic passion lies with the events surrounding the decline of the Roman Republic and the rise of Imperial Rome, as evidenced by his paper written for Professor Dallas DeForest's Historical Methodology course focused. During his time spent away from school he enjoys reading, music (especially attending concerts), and traveling with Nina, his wife of fifteen years.

Articles

The Agrarian Economy of Ancient Rome



The ruins of the North Leigh Roman Villa in modern-day Oxfordshire, England
(Image Source: "North Leigh Roman Villa," English Heritage
<https://www.english-heritage.org.uk/visit/places/north-leigh-roman-villa/>)

THE AGRARIAN ECONOMY OF ANCIENT ROME: PRACTICES, INSTITUTIONS AND LABOR

| Maria Kogler

The assimilation of newly-conquered lands into the Roman Empire had many consequences for both the environments and the peoples involved. A complex structure of laws, agricultural developments, and migratory events created an evolving agricultural society in the Roman provinces that centered around the Roman villa. Throughout the fifth century A.D., this new social structure resulted in physical, economic, and cultural transformations to agrarian conditions in Britain, Gaul, northern Africa, Spain, and the Mediterranean. Roman farmers borrowed agricultural techniques from other cultures and further developed them to help provide food and other goods to the Empire's large population. Through farm tenancy on villas located across the empire's holdings, Romans transformed the labor system that accompanied these agricultural developments, which resulted in an efficient system of production. These cooperating factors framed a complex, efficient system of agriculture, vital to the expansion of the Roman Empire. Without an effective, stable source of food and other agricultural goods, the Empire's military would have been less powerful, the state administration could not have performed to its full ability, and the structure of the Empire itself would have taken a different form, likely less widespread and ultimately less dominant in the region.

Agricultural techniques developed quickly during the archaic period. Although the types of crops produced within the Roman Empire changed very little over the course of the first six-hundred years of the common era, the varieties of these crops and their methods of production changed dramatically. Romans continued to grow grains such as wheat, barley, and millet throughout the provinces. However, innovative crop rotation techniques became increasingly popular throughout the Empire. First, the development of the fallowing technique created a multifunctional system that intertwined plant husbandry and animal breeding. Fallow fields were left bare for a season in order to replenish the soil nutrients and increase water retention. While the field sat empty, domesticated oxen were used to plow the field and then allowed to graze on it to remove any weeds that started to grow.¹

Despite its improvements to the soil, fallowing as an agricultural technique has a limited production capacity, because the

¹ K.D. White, *Roman Farming* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1970), 113-114.

field sits empty for a period of time and therefore is not productive.² Legume-based crop rotation methods quickly followed the fallowing technique, after farmers discovered that growing legumes such as alfalfa, beans, and peas could help the soil regain nutrients at a faster rate than leaving the field fallow.³ In addition to the benefits offered to the soil, legumes crops directly benefited farmers by providing necessary nutrients to both humans and livestock in the event of a food shortage. This system of crop production developed into modern crop rotation patterns as Roman techniques matured and eventually allowed farmers to grow multiple crops in the same field.

Another notable example of Roman transformations of agricultural production in imperial holdings is seen in a settlement located in modern-day Spain. Between the first and fourth centuries, Roman farmers produced several different olive tree species to participate in the Baetican oil trade.⁴ Researchers found that the oil produced during the Roman period in Las Delicias within the lower valley of the river Guadalquivir during the Roman period came from a diverse selection of olive varieties. The researchers determined that the Roman farmers developed these varieties between the second and fourth centuries. This diversity indicates the pragmatic nature of Roman olive producers.⁵ A wide range of crop species, though all were olives, would lower the risks of destruction due to pests, disease, and dramatic changes in climate. Additionally, farmers in the region used artificial selection and other crop breeding practices to create a genetically superior olive plant that would produce the highest volume of olive oil. Because olive trees are not an annual crop, farmers had extended periods of time to experiment and determine the best combinations of tree species to produce their olive oil.

Though these ancient breeding practices were significantly more rudimentary than modern practices, advancements in agricultural production through intermixing wild olives and cultivated olives helped Romans participate in trade. These limited trade processes between provinces eventually grew into the necessary markets that allowed rural

² Marcel Mazoyer and Laurence Roudart, *A History of World Agriculture*, trans. James H. Membréz (New York: Monthly Review Press, 2006), 244-245.

³ Norman Scott Brien Gras, *A History of Agriculture in Europe and America* (New York: F.S. Crofts & Co. Publishers, 1925), 34-35.

⁴ Oriane Bourgeon et al., "Olive tree varieties cultivated for the great Baetican oil trade between the 1st and 4th centuries A.D.," *Vegetation History and Archaeobotany* 27 (2018): 465.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 468.

farmers on villas to obtain tools and materials.⁶ Other indicators of the cultivation of new species are found in the archaeological evidence of exotic plants introduced in Britain during the Roman period. The ability to trade in order to procure new species of plants and breeds of livestock animals made the British villa system appear as a collection of mixed farmsteads.⁷

Monte Mozinho, a Roman settlement located in northern Portugal, provides more evidence of settlers revising the land to fit the transforming agricultural system. Decades of excavations have led researchers to assume that multiple phases of village communities existed at Mozinho. The site became a Roman settlement prior to the first century A.D., although major migration continued until the second century A.D.⁸ As Mozinho developed as a community, its inhabitants developed agricultural strategies and methods to sustain its population. Crop residues found in what appeared to be storage facilities at the site revealed that its inhabitants grew multiple types of grain at Mozinho, including wheat, rye, and millet. These plant remains were likely deposited in the storage facility as a result of fallowing, harvesting, and processing practices. Researchers also recovered additional remains from pasturelands.⁹ Although crop residues found at archaeological sites indicate which crops were grown for food at different periods of Roman settlement, the remains alone do not clearly indicate which crops were used for what purposes. Adding to the confusion, species often associated with pasturelands in modern times can also be found growing naturally as weeds.¹⁰

Rural agricultural communities utilized both plant and animal by-products in order to avoid wasting potentially useful materials. Roman farmers often used crop residues to fertilize fields in preparation for harvest or as animal feed. Any residues remaining in storage were most likely saved with the intention of utilizing them as animal feed, which was needed year-round, especially during times of low crop production, such as drought or pest infestations. This implies that much of the residue found during archaeological digs were the remains of

⁶ D. P. S. Peacock and D. F. Williams, *Amphorae and the Roman Economy: An Introductory Guide* (London: Longman, 1986), 57.

⁷ Richard Hingley and David Miles, "The human impact on the landscape: agriculture, settlement, industry, infrastructure," in *The Roman Era*, ed. Peter Salway (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 170-71.

⁸ Joao Pedro Tereso, et al., "Crops and fodder: evidence for storage and processing activities in a functional area at the Roman settlement of Monte Mozinho," *Vegetation History and Archaeobotany* 22 (2013): 480.

⁹ *Ibid.*, 485.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*

fodder crops rather than subsistence crops. Additionally, the specific crops found at Mozinho indicated the use of crop rotation strategies where complementary crops could be planted in the same field during different seasons.¹¹ Monte Mozinho also provides historical evidence of varying harvest methods based on different agricultural strategies. These harvest methods varied depending upon the future use of the crop being harvested.

Agricultural developments outside of Rome often influenced these changes in production methods. Greek farmers, prior to the Roman period, began experimenting with crop rotation cycles to provide greater food output for the Greek population.¹² Romans copied and then improved upon these methods, as the ability to feed a large population became increasingly important. The increased variety of crops seen in locations such as the Spanish colonies demonstrated that the Romans understood that more diverse crops would have a higher rate of production.¹³ Irrigation trenches and canals dug in Egypt during Roman rule borrowed techniques from other cultures and appear to have been designed for flood prevention as well as irrigation purposes.¹⁴ Conquered people also provided the example for labor specialization, or the development of a labor force dedicated to farming across the provinces.¹⁵ While the Romans were attempting to dominate these conquered groups, they also were willing to adapt and appropriate techniques when necessary.

Along with innovations in agricultural techniques, the Roman Empire saw the development of a new form of settlement in rural areas, the villa. The Roman villa represented an entirely new method of generating agricultural products. Historian John Percival defines the villa as “a place in the country, normally... associated with farming... and in most cases a single house.”¹⁶ Percival continues his definition by explaining that the Roman villa was more than a single, defined structure; the villa was an agricultural development itself.¹⁷ Villas as a fixture of the agrarian economy of the empire were not invented, but

¹¹ *Ibid.*, 489.

¹² Tadashi Ito, “Irrigation Holes in Ancient Greek Agriculture”, *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* no. 56 (2016): 27.

¹³ W. E. Heitland, *Agricola* (Westport: Greenwood Press, Publishers, 1921), 203-5.

¹⁴ Jean-Paul Bravard, et al., “Rise and Fall of an Egyptian Oasis: Artesian Flow, Irrigation Soils, and Historical Agricultural Development in El-Deir, Kharga Depression, Western Desert of Egypt,” *Geoarchaeology: An International Journal* 31 (2016): 467-486.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*

¹⁶ John Percival, *The Roman Villa* (Berkeley; University of California Press, 1976), 13.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 15.

were developed by the social and financial processes at work within the Roman Empire.¹⁸ Each villa included multiple resources, arable land, storage facilities, and the villa house.¹⁹ Neighboring homes likely belonged to peasant farmers or slaves of the villa owners.²⁰ The villa enabled wealthy landowners to produce more than one crop and sell the surplus rather than relying on the subsistence farming method of the past. This system allowed Roman cities to continue growing, as villas in rural areas produced crops and raised livestock to provide food and other goods for city residents. The combination of productive villa farms and thriving city centers had been successful in Rome since the first century, and was imitated in Britain and other imperial territories into the third and fourth centuries A.D.

Roman settlement often meant the reorganization of a region. In Britain, for example, the population slowly increased as war captives, relocated from the frontier, settled in the interior. Retired soldiers also chose to make their homes where there was available land and potential income from farming.²¹ Capital investment from Rome encouraged the spread and development of the villa system across Britain during the first and second centuries.²² This investment was likely intended to assist with the transformation of somewhat marginal land into effective agricultural fields, a process both time-consuming and costly.²³ Although the villa system, and its productive grain crops, appeared to be a profitable venture, the monocropping structure of the province's agricultural system was the opposite. The steadily increasing population in Britain required more than just grain to sustain itself. Despite the high costs of both importing and transporting items, other goods and products had to be imported into the island from other Roman provinces.²⁴

In Gaul, Roman villa settlements began appearing in the first century B.C.E., although these settlements were few and far between. The rise of the villa was prominent in the first century A.D., especially in regions such as Trier, where the soil conditions were extremely productive.²⁵ The expansion of the villa network in Gaul continued until

¹⁸ Ibid.

¹⁹ Tereso, et al., "Crops and fodder," 481.

²⁰ Hingley and Miles, "The human impact on the landscape," 170-71.

²¹ Michael Fulford, "A second start: from the defeat of Boudicca to the third century," in *The Roman Era*, ed. Peter Salway (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 61.

²² Ibid.

²³ Ibid., 62.

²⁴ A. L. F. Rivet, *The Roman Villa in Britain* (New York: Frederick A. Praeger, Publishers, 1969), 189.

²⁵ Percival, *The Roman Villa*, 81-83.

approximately 250 A.D., when barbarian invasions and military battles made living in Trier and surrounding areas both dangerous and economically unproductive.²⁶ Villas in the Rhineland of modern-day Germany were subject to raids by the region's barbarian tribes and were therefore structured in the interest of security and function, in contrast to the more luxurious villas of Britain and Gaul.²⁷

Meanwhile, Roman holdings in Africa reaped the benefits of imperial funds, as investors in Italy and Africa financially boosted the agricultural production of the region. Improved techniques, such as crop rotation and fallowing, and property expansion in the second and third centuries resulted in significant improvements to African olive farms.²⁸ Etruria, on the Italian coast, where a network of villas and farms developed, demonstrated another example of agricultural reorganization during the period. In the first and second centuries, this settlement decreased in both size and population, which resulted in a few villas owned by wealthy landowners.²⁹ These landowners increased the production of their villas and focused on grains and livestock in order to increase their financial gains. While the conditions and locations of Roman villas varied throughout the imperial holdings, the general functions were the same. For centuries, until the decline of the empire, these villas specialized in certain crops, of which a portion of the products were then collected by the state and redistributed across the empire.

Evidence of large-scale shipping of corn grown in Britain to supply populations in Germany along the Rhine supports the assertion that surplus goods produced in one region were intended to be transported to elsewhere in the Roman empire.³⁰ Similarly, grain grown in Spain was transported to various provinces within the empire.³¹ Archaeological evidence found in a Sicilian villa indicates that although Sicily had been a source of grain during the second century, as the Roman Empire expanded, other provinces became the standard source

²⁶ Ibid.

²⁷ Ibid., 84.

²⁸ Ibid., 62-63.

²⁹ Gaetano Di Pasquale, et al., "Human-derived landscape changes on the northern Etruria coast (western Italy) between Roman times and the late Middle Ages," *The Holocene* 24, no. 11 (2014): 1491-1502.

³⁰ Ammianus Marcellinus, *Roman History, Volume I, Books 14-19*, trans. John C. Rolfe (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1950), 32.

³¹ Percival, *The Roman Villa*, 59-60.

of imported crops.³² The movement of crops and animals from producer regions to other locations kept cities and towns with restricted access to arable land supplied with food and other necessary items. The existence of these places directly implies that the agricultural production of the villas allowed a large enough surplus to feed a town's population.³³ However, the system had its flaws. For example, impairing the flow of these necessary items could have drastic impacts.

Most cities had storage granaries, though large cities such as Rome and Constantinople would have difficulty distributing, let alone storing, enough food to supply their entire populations.³⁴ In an attempt to avoid this, Roman emperor Diocletian signed the "edict of the maximum" in 301, putting price ceilings on hundreds of items. His attempt failed, as a black market for goods appeared in Rome.³⁵ As a result, food prices increased dramatically; in the fifty years between 294 and 354, the price of wheat increased by 6000%.³⁶ Another attempt under Emperor Julian resulted in the same outcome. Price stability became a constant source of conflict between producers and consumers.³⁷ Roman orator Q. Aurelius Symmachus wrote letters concerning the risk of famine in Rome as early as 345, an era where Egyptian grain was being imported into Constantinople and African corn to Rome.³⁸ Barbarian invaders were willing and able to use this weakness to their advantage. By cutting the city off from Portus and therefore removing African grain imports from Rome's food supply as he did in 408 A.D., Visigoth invader Alaric leveraged control of the city due to the lack of food available for its large population.³⁹ These, and other instances, demonstrated the fragility of the agrarian situation in the Roman Empire. Greed, conflict, and military or civil unrest could easily upset the balance of production, import-export patterns, and prices that Rome relied on for its supply of food.

Another problem arose in the agricultural sector as the availability of labor began to decrease. Upper-class landowners could own multiple parcels of land in various locations; it would be impossible

³² Giuseppe Castallana and Brian E. McConnell, "A Rural Settlement of Imperial Roman and Byzantine Date in Contrada Saraceno near Agrigento, Sicily," *American Journal of Archaeology* 94, no. 1 (Jan. 1990), 25-44.

³³ Percival, *The Roman Villa*, 145.

³⁴ Peacock and Williams, *Amphorae and the Roman Economy*, 22.

³⁵ Mazoyer and Roudart, *A History of World Agriculture*, 255.

³⁶ *Ibid.*

³⁷ *Ibid.*

³⁸ Heitland, *Agricola*, 409.

³⁹ Marcellinus, *Roman History*, 35.

to maintain these properties without laborers of some kind.⁴⁰ The relationships between laborer and landowner had several transitions. During the colonization process in Spain, the conquered peoples of newly-Roman provinces were conscripted into a “necessary slavery,” to speed the Romanization process.⁴¹ This practice was used in other provinces as well, even though these farming slaves did not produce the required agricultural output to support the growing population. In addition, as the rate of expansion of the empire began to slow, the number of available slaves decreased.⁴² Roman peasants were not interested in working the land without the opportunity to profit because they associated agricultural labor with slaves’ work.⁴³ In order to increase the rate of production, land tenancy arrangements were introduced as an alternative option, becoming increasingly popular during the first and second centuries. This system reduced the risk for the landowner while ensuring his access to the crops produced on his land.⁴⁴ Moreover, while slaves could not be trusted because they might damage the crop or ignore their duties, tenant farmers had to tend to the land to the best of their abilities since the land was also their source of income.⁴⁵

The arrangement appeared equally advantageous for the tenant. Tenant farmers paid cash for their rent, as well as a tax on a percentage of their yield, but the surplus crops could be sold or traded. They could reap the benefits of both a steady income and access to the trade markets of the province. The more surplus crop a tenant farmer produced, the more potential income he could gain. Landowners could not simply impose conditions on a tenant farmer; the lack of available laborers allowed tenants to bargain and negotiate the terms of the lease agreement.⁴⁶ In addition, long-term agreements between landowner and tenant became increasingly valuable. Tenant farmers could invest in making improvements to their share of the villa while the landowners profited from these investments. Viticulture (wine-making) allowed tenant farmers to request returns on their labor and time if they were to leave a villa through the imperial court system.⁴⁷

⁴⁰ Dennis P. Kehoe, *Investment, Tenancy, and Profit* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1997), 145.

⁴¹ Mazoyer and Roudart, *A History of World Agriculture*, 247-48.

⁴² Heitland, *Agricola*, 454-56.

⁴³ *Ibid.*

⁴⁴ Kehoe, *Investment, Tenancy, and Profit*, 154-55.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 157.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, 239.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, 217.

While the intention was the development of a symbiotic relationship between tenant and landowner, this did not always occur. The *Digest*, a collection of Roman laws and policies produced in 533 A.D., outlined various legal processes, such as those regarding tenancy in Rome and its provinces.⁴⁸ These legal processes developed over time as the Roman court systems saw cases regarding tenancy agreements in contention.⁴⁹ Elite landowners challenged the tenant farmers they had employed on their lands for different reasons, including late rent payments. The jurists on these cases had to consider the repercussions of their decisions because they were members of the landed upper-class themselves.⁵⁰ While the majority of these cases were documented in the third century A.D., Columella, a prominent agricultural writer, offered advice to landowners regarding the treatment of tenants as early as the first century A.D. He suggested that the system of tenant farming existed alongside the “necessary slavery” of the first century.⁵¹ Columella also advised against renting villa properties to “city tenants,” who “preferred to manage the leased property through a slave bailiff,” or farm manager, who might also let the farm perform at a rate below its capacity.⁵²

As the Roman Empire’s power began to decline in the third and fourth centuries, the tenant farming system changed and became like the serfdom model that would later be seen in the medieval period. This serfdom, appearing only advantageous for the landowner, was a system “enacted from both above and below.”⁵³ A steady decrease in the Roman population became worrisome to its officials, as the army continued to wage wars with invaders and kingdoms outside its frontiers. In 332 A.D., Constantine issued a law “binding tenants to the soil,” and in doing so attempted to lessen the impact of the shrinking population on agricultural production.⁵⁴ Tenant farmers could no longer easily break their contracts and were legally bound to both the land and the landowner.⁵⁵

Simultaneously, villas began transforming into self-sufficient entities in order to preserve their independence in the face of barbarian invasions. Landed elites used binding contracts with peasants in order to

⁴⁸ *The Digest of Justinian*, trans. Charles Henry Monroe (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1904), 301-2.

⁴⁹ Kehoe, *Investment, Tenancy, and Profit*, 154.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*

⁵¹ Columella, *On Agriculture: Books 1 – 4*, trans. Harrison Boyd Ash (Harvard University Press, 1941), 36.

⁵² *Ibid.*, 37.

⁵³ Gras, *A History of Agriculture*, 66.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, 67.

⁵⁵ Mazoyer and Roudart, 256.

keep power, while the peasants themselves agreed to the terms in order to gain the protection that working in a villa provided.⁵⁶ Men willingly sacrificed their independence for the promise of subsistence and status.⁵⁷ Instead of operating as a collective, agricultural producers began to focus on self-sufficiency in order to protect their own interests. Archaeological evidence found in Sicily supports this argument, indicating that multiple Sicilian villas were reorganized into independent country residences with dedicated laborers instead of a series of tenant farming arrangements.⁵⁸ Villages closed off from city connections, villas attempted to become independent, and agriculture returned to a subsistence-based system rather than commercial enterprise.⁵⁹

The irony of this situation is that the once-superior Roman Empire was increasingly reverting to the agricultural and societal patterns in place before the Empire; subsistence farming and independent properties became the dominant lifestyle, while cities and towns decayed. This reversion came from a mixture of the decline of the empire, a loss of trade abilities, and the instinct of the members of the landed elite to protect their individual interests in the face of the unknown. One example of this is seen in the decline of the coinage system, which led to the breakdown of the economy in Romanized Britain. The coinage system was necessary for the villa system to operate. Thus as the coinage dried up, the villa system ceased to operate effectively.⁶⁰ Although many agricultural systems appeared to continue operating, the Romanized nature of the villas and other institutions slowly disappeared.⁶¹ As the landed elite began to reorganize the agricultural system, 500 A.D. saw the decline of the villa and the rise of the manor system in previously Roman provinces as the Roman Empire of the West began to lose its hold and fracture apart.

Agricultural innovations, in conjunction with the development of the Roman villas throughout the provinces, allowed for increased productivity and efficiency. As the number of villas increased and the availability of laborers decreased, Roman landowners found various methods to recruit peasant farmers into a tenant farming system, which in turn created economic benefits for both classes. The import-export economy of the Roman Empire was a system designed to produce large

⁵⁶ Gras, *A History of Agriculture*, 67.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, 69.

⁵⁸ Castellana and McConnell, "A Rural Settlement of Imperial Roman and Byzantine Date," 44.

⁵⁹ Gras, *A History of Agriculture*, 72.

⁶⁰ Hingley and Miles, "The human impact on the landscape," 169.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, 171

amounts of crops in areas where they were easily and productively grown, and then sent to cities and other regions lacking arable land.

However, this rate of success was not sustainable. Unfortunately, the strength of the Roman agricultural economy was also its downfall. An increasing reliance on imported food for cities created increased price competition, black markets, and the ability for interference from outside sources. Although productive, the increasingly complex agricultural system allowed opportunities for mistakes and obstruction, leading to increased instances of civil unrest and other issues. Inversely, civil or military unrest contributed to disruptions of the food system throughout the empire, regardless of the original location of the conflict.

While not always reliable, the agricultural processes developed in the Roman Empire beginning in the first century A.D. demonstrate the collection of knowledge and resources available on the European continent. By integrating the techniques of conquered peoples, such as the Greeks and Egyptians, and combining these with the arable land found in conquered regions, the Roman Empire created a complicated process of food production. In conjunction with an evolving, dedicated labor force, these techniques and lands enabled the Roman Empire to sustain its wide reach for centuries.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

- Ammianus Marcellinus. *Roman History, Volume I, Books 14-19*. Translated by John C. Rolfe. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1950.
- Columella. *On Agriculture: Books 1 - 4*. Translated by Harrison Boyd Ash. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1941.
- The Digest of Justinian*. Translated by Charles Henry Monroe. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1904.

Secondary Sources

- Bravard, Jean-Paul, Ashraf Mostafa, Romain Garcier, Gaelle Tallet, and Pascale Ballet. "Rise and Fall of An Egyptian Oasis: Artesian Flow, Irrigation Soils, and Historical Agricultural Development in El-Deir, Kharga Depression, Western Desert of Egypt." *Geoarchaeology: An International Journal* 31 (2016): 467-486.
- Bourgeon, Oriane, Clemence Pagnoux, Stephane Maune, Enrique Garcia Vargas, Sarah Ivorra, Vincent Bonhomme, Mohammed Ater, Abdelmajid Moukhli, and Jean-Frederic Terral. "Olive tree varieties cultivated for the great Baetican oil trade between the 1st and 4th centuries A.D., *Vegetation History and Archaeobotany* 27 (2018): 463-476.
- Castellena, Giuseppe and Brian E. McConnell. "A Rural Settlement of Imperial Roman and Byzantine Date in Contrada Saraceno near Agrigento, Sicily." *American Journal of Archaeology* 94 no. 1 (January, 1990): 25-44.
- Fulford, Michael. "A second start: from the defeat of Boudicca to the third century." In *The Roman Era*. Edited by Peter Salway. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- Gras, Norman Scott Brien. *A History of Agriculture in Europe and America*. New York: F.S. Crofts & Co. Publishers, 1925.
- Heitland, W.E. *Agricola*. Westport: Greenwood Press, Publishers, 1921.
- Hingley, Richard and David Miles. "The human impact on the landscape: agriculture, settlement, industry, infrastructure." In *The Roman Era*, edited by Peter Salway. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- Tadashi Ito, "Irrigation Holes in Ancient Greek Agriculture." *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 56 (2016): 25-40.
- Kehoe, Dennis P. *Investments, Profits and Tenancy: The Jurists and the Roman Agrarian Economy*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1997.
- Mazover, Marcel and Laurence Roudart. *A History of World Agriculture*. Translated by James H. Membrez. New York: Monthly Review Press, 2006.
- Peacock, D. P. S. and D. F. Williams. *Amphorae and the Roman Economy: An Introductory Guide*. London: Longman, 1986.
- Percival, John. *The Roman Villa: An Historical Introduction*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1976.
- Rivet, A. L. F., ed. *The Roman Villa in Britain*. New York: Fredrick A. Praeger, Publishers, 1969.
- Tereso, Joao Pedro, Pablor Ramil-Rego, Teresa Pires De Carvalho, Rubim Almeida-da-Silva, Filipe Costa Vaz. "Crops and fodder: evidence for storage and processing activities in a functional area at the Roman settlement of Monte Mozinho." *Vegetation History and Archaeobotany* 22 (2013): 479-492.
- White, K.D. *Roman Farming*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1970.

The Taming of the Senate



Augustus of Prima Porta (Photo Attribution: Vatican Museums)

TAMING OF THE SENATE: THE MACHINATIONS OF REHABILITATION

| Jeremy Weiss

Who was the *princeps* Augustus? For no less than two millennia there has been considerable debate regarding that question. One argument suggests he was a terrible autocrat bent on domination, another leans toward his being a benevolent patriarch to his country. Or, was he something in between the two? Octavian/Augustus rehabilitated his image, using the magistracies, the development of alternative military honors, and a newly fashioned imperial court. These reforms seduced the Senatorial aristocracy, which held hope for a return to the government as it existed under the Republic, into accepting, and ultimately adopting, the Principate as the dominant form of governance for Rome. The dealings that Octavian/Augustus had with the Senate in January 27 BCE were in essence theatrical, orchestrated by a determinedly ambitious man, meant to give a facile image of shared power between the Senate and the *princeps*. It was a fiction that the senatorial aristocracy of the day appeared only too happy to comply with due to the potential for inclusion in the newly emergent ‘inner circle’ of imperial courtiers, the creation of which was a result of Augustus’ restructuring of the traditional military honors afforded prominent men.

Much has been written regarding Octavian/Augustus’ relationship with the senatorial aristocracy. Foremost among the modern scholars would have to be Ronald Syme. In *The Roman Revolution*, Syme argues that through an examination of how the various noble families were manipulated, either by proscription or elevation, a clearer picture emerges of how important Octavian’s ability to rally the Caesarian party was to the success of the principate. For it is these relationships, having taken on the traditional form of patronage, coupled with the Pax Romana brought about under Augustus’ rule, which Syme saw as crucial to the acceptance and survival of the *Principate*. In his article, “Octavian in the Senate, January 27 BC”, W. K. Lacey argues three main points: first, Octavian gave up no power when he returned control of the *res publica* to the Senate; next, by giving the Senate control over the public provinces’ governance and the treasury, he *appeared* to restore the Senate’s ‘constitutional prerogatives’ in managing the *res publica*, while also restoring SPQR’s ability to pass law through the traditional Republican method of *senatus consultum* and People’s Assembly; and finally, the Senate, for what it was worth to members’ political careers and family fortunes (societally and financially), played

along and kept up its end of the charade by granting ‘unprecedented’ honors and *provincia* to Augustus.¹

Regarding the restriction and restructuring of the traditional military honors, there has been more recent scholarship, such as that of the authors Frances Hickson and Geoffrey Sumi, each of whom examined the use of offices that carried senatorial rank, both traditional and newly created, as a means by which the *novi homines* and *optimates* were seduced by Augustus into compliance. Frances Hickson, in her article “Augustus ‘Triumphator’: Manipulation of the Triumphal Theme in the Political Program of Augustus” argued that when Augustus restricted the ability of ambitious men to participate in a triumphal procession through Rome, not only did he remove and replace one of the most ancient roles available to them with which to wrap themselves in personal glory, namely that of *triumphator*, but that this was ‘a deliberate and unified political program.’² By instituting the *ornamenta triumphalia*, Augustus showed he did not oppose recognition of military achievement, but rather, the aim of this program was to limit public acclaim for potential rivals³, and thus sought to reserve the public opinion swaying ceremony for Augustus’ own successors. For Geoffrey Sumi, it was the emergence of an imperial court, populated by members of the imperial family as well as members of the senatorial aristocracy, which resulted in the establishment of a hierarchy of acquiescence. This hierarchy was based upon, among other factors, the position one held, often due to the favor of Augustus, which conferred direct access to the *princeps*.⁴

It is through these lenses that the Principate, with its falsely modest refusals of honors and renewable terms of office, was in fact deadly serious, melodramatic theater, meant to foster the illusion that it was something other than the monarchy it really was. Following a period of bloody force, heavy handed politics, and civil war, it was through this deliberate and unified political program that Augustus was able to achieve his Pax Romana, and thereby, the rehabilitation of his reputation from bloodthirsty *triumvir* to benevolent and salubrious *pater patriae*.

The year was 29 BCE, almost fifteen years since the Second *Triumvirate* had formed. It had been nearly as long since the Second

¹ W. K. Lacey, “Octavian in the Senate, January 27 B.C.” *The Journal of Roman Studies* (Vol. 64, 1974): 184.

² Frances V. Hickson, “Augustus “Triumphator”: Manipulation of the Triumphal Theme in the Political Program of Augustus.” *Latomus* 50, no. 1 (1991): 124.

³ *Ibid.*, 131.

⁴ Geoffrey Sumi, “Ceremony and the Emergence of Court Society in the Augustan Principate.” *The American Journal of Philology* 132, no. 1 (2011): 81.

Triumvirs "decided to root out their opponents all at once," in the largest rounds of proscriptions Rome would see.⁵ Included in these proscriptions were the remnants of those noble families that, under the *Res Publica*, had stood in opposition to the Caesarian party. Though ancient sources vary in their numeric breakdown, approximately 2300 senators and knights were sentenced to death, foremost among them, the venerable Marcus Tullius Cicero, unwitting participant in the downfall of the Republic.⁶ Through these proscriptions, many families of noble standing were diminished in clout, number, and fortune. The largest number of names, we are told by Suetonius, came from Octavian, as, "he for some time opposed his colleagues in their design of a proscription; but after it was begun, he prosecuted it with more determined rigour than either of [Marcus Antonius and Marcus Lepidus]."⁷ Though Hickson was more specifically referring to Augustus' policy of restricting the role of *triumphator*, the 'pitiless' and 'logical' method about which Octavian, in particular, approached the proscriptions was in fact part and parcel of this "deliberate and unified political program."⁸ By eliminating his opposition in such a ruthless manner, Octavian instilled in the surviving senatorial and equestrian orders the knowledge that he was willing to do whatever was necessary to achieve his ends; an unspoken threat that served his cause well in future years when coupled with the velvet glove of social and/or political elevation.

Speaking of political elevation, let us briefly return to Cicero's unwitting part in bringing down the Republic. Beset by civil strife, if not outright civil war just yet, beginning in September 44 BCE Marcus Tullius Cicero, leading voice of the Senate, delivered his series of speeches against Marcus Antonius, *The Philippics*. In several of these speeches, while praising the young Caius Caesar for defending Rome against the menace Marcus Antonius, Cicero repeatedly referred to Octavian as "godlike," or, wise beyond his years.⁹ In calling for Octavian to be granted authority, i.e. *imperium*, to legally defend Rome, it was with no sense of irony that Cicero stated, "If we go to sleep over this opportunity we shall have to endure a tyranny which will be not only cruel and haughty, but also ignominious and flagitious." For how could

⁵ Ronald Syme, *The Roman Revolution*, 2nd ed. New York: Oxford University Press, 1951: 190.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 191.

⁷ Caius Suetonius Tranquillus, *The Lives of the Twelve Caesars*, Vol. 2. Ed. Thomas Forester. Trans. Alexander Thomson. Ebook: Project Gutenberg, 2004: 27.1.

⁸ Hickson, Augustus "*Triumphator*", 124.

⁹ Marcus Tullius Cicero, "The Orations of Marcus Tullius Cicero, Volume 4." Translated by C.D. Yonge. Ebook: Project Gutenberg, 2004: 88.

Cicero have known at that time what Octavian had in store for the Senate and *res publica*? On 1 January 43 BCE, Cicero sealed the fate of the Republic when he suggested, "Caius Caesar... shall be a senator, and shall deliver his opinions from the bench occupied by men of praetorian rank, and that, on occasion of his offering himself for any magistracy, he shall be considered of the same legal standing and qualification as if he had been quaestor the preceding year."¹⁰ This move gave Octavian his entrance into the Senate with the right to stand for *consul*, despite not having held all the prerequisite offices of the traditional *cursus honorum*.

In 29 BCE, the Senatorial ranks, previously depleted by two civil wars and proscriptions, had swollen to 1000, "overflowing with creatures of the *Triumvirs*."¹¹ With the end of the Second Triumvirate, something had to be done, and so Octavian reduced their number through two "scrutinies." In the first of these purges, the senators were left to decide who should be cast out after Octavian urged "them to become their own judges out of the consciousness of their family and their life," a not so veiled reference to the proscriptions of the *Triumviral* Period.¹³ We may speculate that these were those senators who achieved their status through bribery or were loyal to his fellow *triumvirs*.¹⁴ Octavian, along with Marcus Agrippa, his consular colleague for the year, personally handled the second of these "scrutinies." The two *consuls* were attended by ten strongmen, with Octavian wearing both armor under his toga and a sword at his side.¹⁵ The worst of the remaining senators, inclusive of many anti-Caesarians, were ousted, either under threat or through persuasion.¹⁶ Rome was thus left with a Senate stocked with older Caesarian partisans and young men whose fortunes had changed through the largess of the newly self-styled *princeps senatus*. Showing his mastery of stage direction, Octavian achieved three goals with one action: first, he restored *dignitate* to the Senate; second, he lessened the number of voices that could be heard voicing (potentially dissenting) opinions; and third, Octavian ensured the majority of those left in the Senate owed their position to him personally, making them

¹⁰ Cicero. *Orations*, 138

¹¹ Cassius Dio *Rome History*, Vols. 3-4. Trans. Herbert Baldwin Foster. Ebook: Project Gutenberg, 2004: 42.4.

¹² Syme, *The Roman Revolution*, 196; Suetonius. *The Lives of the Twelve Caesars*, Vol. 2, 35.1.

¹³ Dio *Histories*, vol 3-4, 42.3.

¹⁴ Suetonius, *The Lives of the Twelve Caesars*, Vol. 2, 35.1.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 35.3.

¹⁶ Syme *The Roman Revolution*, 306.

much more apt to acquiesce to his wishes.¹⁷ In this way, as Meyer Reinhold summed it, “(t)his controlling force was removed from the center of power and transformed by Augustus into a semi-hereditary new form of aristocracy, a fusion of the older nobility with many ‘new men’ from less prestigious families that had supported the *princeps* in his rise to power.”¹⁸ But, as P. A. Brunt pointed out, this self-serving orchestration should not be taken to mean that Octavian did not value the appearance of having the support of the Senate.¹⁹ The *appearance* that the Senate was still valuable to Octavian for anything other than doing exactly as the *princeps* desired, or as Dio put it, “everything is conducted and administered entirely as the one in power desires,” is precisely what the Settlement of January 27 BCE was intended to give.²⁰ For it can be surmised that these men were no longer the great statesmen who had once populated the Senate. These were inexperienced men, Republican-era career backbenchers, incapable of grand expansionist or even progressive designs for the state, let alone effective running of the state.

On 13 January 27 BCE, Octavian summoned the Senate to meet, having broken with the tradition of giving the senators some notice, if only a single day’s, regarding the topic which they were summoned to discuss.²¹ To briefly summarize the results of Octavian’s unrecorded speech: he laid down his consulship and returned the running of the State to the Senate. At this point, Dio stated, “As for praising him, some did not have the courage and others were unwilling... The senators begged that a monarchy be established, and directed all their remarks to that end until (naturally) they forced him to assume the reins of government... Then he began to show a real interest in setting up a monarchy.”²² Octavian agreed to assume *proconsular* power over a large portion of the *provincia*, namely, the most troublesome. Otherwise, the “Senate, People, and magistrates were to resume the rightful exercise of all their functions.”²³

¹⁷ Walter Eder, “Augustus and the Power of Tradition: The Augustan Principate as Binding Link between Republic and Empire,” in *Between Republic and Empire*, ed. Kurt A. Raaflaub and Mark Toher (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990): 71-122, 103.

¹⁸ Meyer Reinhold, *The Golden Age of Augustus*. (Sarasota: Samuel Stevens & Co., 1978) 27.

¹⁹ P. A. Brunt, “The Role of the Senate in the Augustan Regime,” in *The Classical Quarterly*, Vol. 34, No. 2 (1984), 423-444, 442.

²⁰ Dio, Cassius *History of Rome* Book 53, 17.6.

²¹ Lacey, *Octavian in the Senate, January 27 B.C.*, 176.

²² Dio, Cassius *History of Rome* Book 53, 11.10-14.

²³ Syme, *The Roman Revolution*, 313.

But this was far from reality. As noted by Lacey, despite holding powers of multiple offices for fixed but renewable terms, Octavian ceded no power when he returned control of the *res publica* to the Senate. By giving the Senate control over the “public provinces” governance and the treasury, he appeared to restore the Senate’s “constitutional prerogatives in the *res publica*,” while also restoring SPQR’s ability to pass law through the traditional Republican method of *senatus consultum* and People’s Assembly. The Senate, for what it was worth, played along and kept up its end of the charade by granting “unprecedented” honors, such as the bestowal of the honorific *Augustus* and the largest *provincia*, which held the greatest potential for future honors.²⁴ But here even, the consulars assigned to the Imperial provinces were *legati Augusti*, serving under Augustus’ “order and *auspices*.”²⁵ Further, those provinces that fell under the Senate’s purview were assigned by the Senate to men chosen from a list provided by Augustus himself.²⁶

As Mark Toher stated, one hallmark of Roman society had always been the “aristocratic struggle for honor and status in the community,”²⁷ an assertion that Mary Beard concurred with, having stated, “(m)ilitary success had been one foundation of political power as far back in Roman history as it was possible to go.”²⁸ From this flowed concepts of *dignitas*, *auctoritas*, *virtus*. The greatest source of public ‘honor and status’ was the role of *triumphator*. Traditionally granted by decree of the Senate under the Republic, the *triumph* was a highly sought-after ceremony, a chance for a man to publicly show what he had done for the glory of Rome, and receive, very publicly, adulation and gratitude from the *Senatus PopulusQue Romanus*. It was the greatest means by which ‘to get one’s name out there,’ so to speak. For with public notoriety came the *auctoritas* necessary to sway men in the Senate, and by extension public policy. In 29 BCE, Octavian held his triple *triumph*, the last one he would celebrate. But even this was part of Octavian’s grand plan, for as Hickson had noted, “Augustus placed himself firmly within the republican tradition by refusing to accept further triumphs... only three men had exceeded that number; all were

²⁴ Lacey, *Octavian in the Senate, January 27 B.C.*, 184.

²⁵ Sumi, *Ceremony*. 85; Augustus, *Res Gestae*, 26.5.

²⁶ Sumi, *Ceremony*. 86.

²⁷ Mark Toher, “Augustus and Roman Historiography” in *Between Republic and Empire: Interpretations of Augustus and his Principate*, eds. Raaflaub, Kurt A. and Mark Toher, (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993), 139-154, 147.

²⁸ Mary Beard, *S.P.Q.R.* (New York: Liveright Publishing Corporation, a Division of W.W. Norton & Company, 2015), 364.

dictators.” Octavian was extremely mindful of avoiding such connotations. It was this role of *triumphator* that Augustus restricted moving forward from 27 BCE. By restricting the *triumph*, with its public military parade through Rome, “(t)he general was thus deprived of the opportunity to attract the adulation of the people as he rode in splendour through the streets of Rome.”²⁹

After that year, the *triumph*, the greatest of public ceremonies available to Romans, was restricted to the imperial family. Instead, Augustus fostered a new sort of Imperial Court. Once it became clear that for men of ambition things were no longer as they had been under the republic with respect to the paths for glory and political sway, Augustus was wise enough to realize that he needed a suitable substitute to keep the senatorial aristocracy content. For this, Augustus developed an imperial court, or ‘inner circle,’ composed of the current and former upper magistrates. The purpose of this imperial court, along with the revised military honors, according to Sumi was to grant direct access to the emperor himself in place of the actual, political sway that these men would have otherwise held in the Senate, *ceteris paribus*, prior to the Principate.³⁰ Augustus sought to replace the triumphal procession, with its uncontrollable public adulation, with the conferring of the *ornamenta triumphalia*, or ‘triumphal ornaments’ (the gold coronet laurel crown [*corona triumphalis*], palm-leaf embroidered tunic [*tunica palmata*], purple with gold toga [*toga picta*], ivory baton, and *curule* chair, and the right to wear them in public) along with admission to his inner circle. In this light, “It is possible to view court ceremony in the early Principate as a dramatic and symbolic mediation of political relations between senatorial aristocracy and the *princeps*.”³¹ Augustus had bought the senatorial aristocracy’s support by replacing their sway in the Senate House with personal audiences with the *princeps*. Again, here was the illusion, willingly participated in by a grateful and compliant Senate. Individuals may have a voice with the *princeps*, but, the Senate had become nothing more than an extension of Augustus’ will; a means by which to give constitutional legality to a monarch’s wishes.

Octavian/Augustus, through a unified political program cultivated among the senatorial aristocracy a level of compliant subservience that had never been enjoyed by any leading man. It was a program that included the purging and reduction of the Senate, the elevation to patrician status of former equestrians who supported him,

²⁹ Valerie A. Maxfield, *The Military Decorations of the Roman Army*. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1981), 105.

³⁰ Sumi, *Ceremony*, 81.

³¹ *Ibid.*, 81.

the restriction of military honors, the creation of an imperial court, and the superficial restoration of the Senate's powers. By allowing those who unquestioningly supported him to thrive and gain his ear, Augustus was able to bring the Senate around to a favorable view of the newly emerging *Principate*. Perhaps the Senate truly believed that at some point, given the inclusion of term limits and the staunch refusal of titles such as 'dictator for life,' Augustus might follow the lead of Lucius Cornelius Sulla and lay down his supreme power. But it is more likely that that perception was precisely what Augustus was aiming for with the Settlement of 27 BCE between himself and the Senate. In this manner — by allowing the senatorial aristocracy to feel as if they had some chance for political clout and a meaningful political career — Augustus completed his transformation from ruthless *triumvir* to benevolent patron of the Roman people, as displayed by the *tribunicia potestas* granted Augustus in 23 BCE, the bestowal of the title *pater patriae* in 2 BCE, and finally, in his Senate sanctioned deification upon his death in 14 CE.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

- Augustus. *Res Gestae*. Translated by Thomas Bushnell, 1998.
- Cicero, Marcus Tullius. *The Orations of Marcus Tullius Cicero, Vol. 4*. Translated by C.D. Yonge, M.A. Ebook: Project Gutenberg, 2004.
- Dio, Cassius. *Rome History, Vols. 3-4*. Translated by Herbert Baldwin Foster. Ebook: Project Gutenberg, 2004.
- Tranquillus, Caius Suetonius. *The Lives of the Twelve Caesars, Vol. 2*. Edited by Thomas Forester. Translated by Alexander Thomson. Ebook: Project Gutenberg, 2004.

Secondary Sources

- Beard, Mary. *S.P.Q.R.* New York: Liveright Publishing Corporation, a Division of W.W. Norton & Company, 2015.
- Brunt, P. A. "The Role of the Senate in the Augustan Regime," *The Classical Quarterly*, Vol. 34, No. 2 (1984), 423-444.
- Eder, W. "Augustus and the Power of Tradition: The Augustan Principate as Binding Link between Republic and Empire," in *Between Republic and Empire*, ed. Kurt A. Raaflaub and Mark Toher, 71-122. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990.
- Hickson, Frances V. "Augustus "Triumphator" : Manipulation of the Triumphal Theme in the Political Program of Augustus." *Latomus* 50, no. 1 (1991): 124-38.
- Lacey, W. K. "Octavian in the Senate, January 27 B.C." *The Journal of Roman Studies* Vol. 64, 1974, pp. 176-184.
- Maxfield, Valerie A. *The Military Decorations of the Roman Army*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1981.
- Reinhold, Meyer. *The Golden Age of Augustus*. Sarasota: Samuel Stevens & Co., 1978.
- Sumi, Geoffrey. "Ceremony and the Emergence of Court Society in the Augustan Principate." *The American Journal of Philology* 132, no. 1 (2011): 81-102.
- Syme, Ronald. *The Roman Revolution*, 2nd ed. New York: Oxford University Press, 1951.
- Toher, Mark. "Augustus and Roman Historiography" in *Between Republic and Empire: Interpretations of Augustus and his Principate*, eds. Raaflaub, Kurt A. and Mark Toher, 139-154. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993.



Portrait of King William III by Thomas Murray c. 1691. (Image Source: National Portrait Gallery)

JACOBITISM AND THE FIGHT FOR RELIGIOUS AND POLITICAL AUTHORITY IN BRITAIN, 1688-1715

| Emily Ahlers

The Glorious Revolution of 1688 can be studied as both a political and a religious movement. The Jacobite cause was deeply rooted in religion, but the Jacobites' religion also influenced their political agenda. The rebellion began when the Jacobites declared their support for the exiled King James II, a Catholic, who had been dethroned by the Protestant William of Orange. The English idea of a "hereditary monarch" was thus breached when William took the throne, disrupting the hereditary line of the Stuart family.¹ The Jacobites believed James II to be God's representative on earth and the one true king under Him. Their religious values would inspire and motivate the political rebellion that began in 1688, and continued beyond the death of James II, until the British ultimately defeated the Jacobites in 1745.

Daniel Szechi, a professor at the University of Manchester, is a leading figure of research into the Jacobite Rebellion. Throughout his career he has published a series of books and articles on the Jacobite causes for rebellion. In his article, "The Jacobite Revolution Settlement, 1689-1696," Szechi argues that the Jacobite movement exploded because of "the profound religious tension that lay at the heart of the Jacobite cause."² This religious tension stemmed from the mostly-Catholic Jacobites, who remained loyal to the similarly-Catholic King James II after his exile from England. Those Scottish and English people who remained loyal to the Stuart family and who rejected the Protestant Parliament formed the basis of Jacobitism.³ Szechi argues in his article, "A Blueprint for Tyranny: Sir Edward Hales and the Catholic Jacobite Response to the Revolution of 1688," that Jacobites working underground throughout England attempting to restore the rightful king added to the crisis and uncertainty of this time.⁴ Political instability, coupled with religious tensions, continued for years after the initial

¹ Robert Bucholz and Newton Key, *Early Modern England, 1485-1714: A Narrative History* (Hoboken: Wiley-Blackwell Publishing, 2009).

² Daniel Szechi, "The Jacobite Revolution Settlement, 1689-1696," *The English Historical Review* 108, no. 428 (July 1993): 611.

³ Bucholz and Key, *Early Modern England*, 319.

⁴ Szechi, "A Blueprint for Tyranny? Sir Edward Hales and the Catholic Jacobite Response to the Revolution of 1688," *The English Historical Review* 116, no. 466 (April 2001): 343.

rebellion, and would not be resolved until the British defeat the Jacobites in 1745.

In contrast, rather than focusing on religion, historian Eveline Cruickshanks states that “the common aim of the exiled court and the British Jacobites was a restoration of the Stuarts.”⁵ The belief that James, king of England, Scotland, and Ireland, was the one true king under God helped to unite the Jacobites in their attempts to restore him to the throne. While in exile from 1688 to 1715, the Stuart court sought to gain support from foreign powers, namely France, in order to build the court’s army. Cruickshanks outlines the attempts made by the French to aid the Jacobite cause. Although attempts at restoration ultimately ended in disaster, the Revolution of 1688-89 served as the starting point of a seventy-five-year struggle for Stuart authority. In an article entitled “The Idea of Conquest in Controversies Over the 1688 Revolution,” author M. P. Thomas states that many Protestant men believed “the Revolution meant breaking faith with his lawful sovereign, the violation of sacred oaths, and nothing short of a national apostasy from the doctrines of passive obedience and non-resistance.”⁶ This politically-minded argument was made towards the end of the Glorious Revolution in 1689, while James was still in exile in France, and after the Protestants had gained control of England under King William III. It served as a challenge to those Protestants in Parliament who questioned the king’s authority, asking for proof that the king had conspired against Protestants and the entire kingdom. In fact, the Protestants who opposed King James were the ones who conspired against the kingdom when they asked a foreign ruler to invade their country.

Throughout the Jacobite Rebellion, loyalty to religion versus loyalty to country was a point of conflict for many of King James’ supporters. William Sherlock, an English clergyman who supported the Williamite Revolution against the Jacobites, wrote that “he [James] wanted nothing but power to make himself absolute, and to make us all Papists.”⁷ A dedicated Williamite, Sherlock wrote that King James used “methods he afterwards used to advance Popery, which were so seasonably defeated by the happy arrival of our present Sovereign,

⁵ Eveline Cruickshanks and Edward T. Corp, *The Stuart Court in Exile and the Jacobites* (London: Hambledon Press, 1995).

⁶ M. P. Thomas, “The Idea of Conquest in Controversies Over the 1688 Revolution,” *Journal of the History of Ideas* 38, no. 1 (1977): 34.

⁷ Bucholz and Key, *Sources and Debates in English History 1485-1714* (Hoboken: Wiley-Blackwell, 2009).

whom God long preserve.”⁸ Sherlock wrote this “letter to a friend” in 1692, while James was seeking asylum in France and attempting to rally the Catholic French into supporting his claim to the throne. The “friend” whom Sherlock is addressing in the letter is not simply one friend, but instead all of his fellow supporters of King William. These friends likely shared Sherlock’s fear of encroaching popery, the fear that if James were to be king, the Catholic Pope would be the one ruling England through James. The letter served as a warning that if James succeeded in returning to England with the support of the French, the French crown would then be the figure of authority in England. This would result in trouble for the Protestants in England, as the French were predominately a Catholic people.

In their attempts to regain both religious and political authority in Britain, the Stuarts were supported not only by their fellow Catholics, but also by Protestants who hailed King James as the rightful sovereign under law. Despite their fears of encroaching popery, Protestants who supported James declared they would not “acknowledge any other King, than James the Second, who is our lawful sovereign while he lives.”⁹ In a publication entitled *Remonstrance and Protestation*, loyal Protestants supporting the rightful king argued that the king’s crimes and sins were against himself and not the nation, and that he has the freedom to do as he wished due to his prince’s right.¹⁰ The Protestants in support of James meant to support the king, as they “[could] find neither truth or justice in the reason given for laying his majesty aside.”¹¹ James was their ruler by right who had been crowned under the law, and who served as God’s representative on earth so long as he lived, despite the fact that he was a Catholic.

Historian Ted Vallance states that recent revisionist scholars have highlighted the idea that “William’s mercy mission to England in November 1688 could easily be viewed as a Dutch Invasion.”¹² William and his followers arrived in England to “preserve English liberties,” but with the growing power of Louis XIV in France, Dutch control of England ensured a greater power backing England against the French

⁸ William Sherlock, *A Letter to a Friend, Concerning a French Invasion, To Restore the Late King James to his Throne* (London: 1692).

⁹ *A remonstrance and protestation of all the good protestants of this kingdom, against deposing their lawful sovereign King James II* (London: 1689).

¹⁰ *Ibid.*

¹¹ *Ibid.*

¹² Ted Vallance, “The unrevolutionary revolution? Interpreting the Revolution of 1688,” *Teaching History* no. 151 (June 2013): 18.

military and French Catholic supporters of King James.¹³ The idea of a military alliance with the English against France placed a lot of power into the hands of the Dutch and gave William a greater sphere of military control. English Protestants who accepted William as their king supported the union of the two countries, as it would unite the two great Protestant powers against the exiled King James and the Catholics in France. This move both advanced William politically, and gave him the opportunity to smother Catholicism throughout England. It also secured Protestantism as the established religion of the Church of England.

In an attempt to discredit James and convince the British people that he was a threat to both Parliament and Protestantism, King William and his government also managed to commit themselves to a war with France. When William broke the divine right of kings concept by taking the crown from James, who was the rightful hereditary ruler, King Louis XIV of France took action to restore order across the continent. He offered protection to James during his time in exile and allied himself with the Jacobite cause, believing that no ruler, given such an elevated position by God himself, should be challenged. An alliance with the Jacobites was also beneficial to France, allowing the French to take up arms against the Dutch, who had hoped to prevent England from turning Catholic and allying with France.¹⁴ This alliance with France gave the Jacobites some political leverage and gave them the power and motivation to fight the growing rebellion to put their Catholic king back on the throne. Although the potential for a Franco-Jacobite invasion of the British Isles from continental Europe first existed in 1692, the Jacobites and the French were twice defeated in their attempt to invade.¹⁵ These attempts, coupled with the fear of an increasing spread of Catholicism through the Stuart royal line, served as the main fighting point for many of King William's followers.

In response to William's own invasion of the British Isles in 1688, the Jacobites began to release propaganda accusing William of being a tyrannical ruler. They declared that "support for the expedition was treason and stressed that such rebellion was against both divine and national law."¹⁶ This meant that not only was the deposition of the Catholic King James by William and the Protestants an act against the law, but also an act of defiance towards God. William challenged the theory of divine right when he took the throne away from James, who

¹³ Ibid.

¹⁴ Ibid., 306.

¹⁵ Szechi, "Blueprint for Tyranny," 343.

¹⁶ Tony Claydon, "William III's Declaration of Reasons and the Glorious Revolution," *The Historical Journal* 39, no. 1 (March 1996): 93.

had ascended to the throne through the will of God. Many clerics under William's jurisdiction doubted his religious and political authority but were reassured by followers of the new king that God's favor had passed from the former King James II to the present King William III.¹⁷ This so-called passing of God's favor offered a religious justification to the overthrow of James. In his continued attempts to secure power, King William, in his manifesto entitled "Declaration of Reasons," claimed that religious liberties were in danger under the existing Catholic regime.¹⁸ Jacobites, through their use of anti-Williamite propaganda, responded by claiming that William was simply "making moves to secure power and authority."¹⁹ So long as God's favor was thought to be on the side of the Protestant king, the papist King James and his Jacobites continued to pose a threat to stability in Britain.

Throughout his campaign to suppress the Jacobites and their ongoing rebellion, William used the Protestants' fears of encroaching popery throughout the nation to his advantage. Protestants shared the fear that the Catholics in power would ultimately "reduce or destroy the interest of the Church of England."²⁰ Titus Oates, a Protestant in England at the time of Prince William of Orange's invasion, wrote a proposal to the prince expressing his concern about "the encroachment and growth of popery and slavery."²¹ In this proposal, Oates thanked William for accepting the invitation to invade the country, believing that the danger of encroaching popery had subsided upon the arrival of the Protestant prince. However, at the time Oates' letter was written in 1688, the Jacobites were just beginning to take action to put their king back on the throne. Jacobite leaders were worked actively "for the restoration of the old order, while the majority of the party remained aloof from the government and engaged in plots for the return of James or his heirs."²² Oates' fears of encroaching popery and the political crisis between James and William continued to be a concern for the next fifty-seven years, until the British ultimately defeated the Jacobites at the Battle of Culloden in 1745.

The Jacobites, in their crusade for religious liberty, did not see a Catholic monarch on the throne again in their lifetime. The religious

¹⁷ James R. Hertzler, "Who Dubbed It 'The Glorious Revolution?'," *Albion: A Quarterly Journal Concerned with British Studies* 19, no. 4 (1987): 582.

¹⁸ Claydon, "William III's Declaration," 87.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*

²⁰ Titus Oates, *Proposals humbly offered* (1688).

²¹ *Ibid.*

²² George Cherry, "The Legal and Philosophical Position of the Jacobites, 1688-1689," *The Journal of Modern History* 22, no. 4 (December 1950): 310.

values which had motivated the Jacobites throughout the Revolution ultimately were not enough to restore their monarch to the throne, and any political authority the Jacobites once had died out after their final defeat by the British in 1745. Jacobites who remained in Britain after the Glorious Revolution continued to fight for their king, mounting several rebellions against King William and the Protestants over the next fifty-seven years. After their defeat in 1745, the threat of spreading Catholicism through the hereditary line of the Stuart family diminished, and Protestantism was thus secured as the dominant religion in Britain. The Jacobites' appeal to the divine right of kings concept, which had dominated Britain since the early modern period, was destroyed and the idea itself would lose traction after the Revolution. With the hope of a restoration of the House of Stuart defeated in 1689, Jacobites at home and abroad began building another campaign to put the Catholic Stuarts back on the throne. The Glorious Revolution of 1688-89 therefore served as the starting point for the Jacobite religious civil war that would continue throughout Britain for the next fifty-seven years.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

A remonstrance and protestation of all the good protestants of this kingdom, against deposing their lawful sovereign King James II. London, 1689.

Oates, Titus. *Proposals humbly offered.* 1688.

Sherlock, William. *A Letter to a Friend, Concerning a French Invasion, To Restore the Late King James to his Throne.* London, 1692.

Secondary Sources

Bucholz, Robert, and Newton Key. *Early Modern England, 1485-1714: A Narrative History.* Hoboken: Wiley-Blackwell Publishing, 2009.

Bucholz, Robert, and Newton Key. *Sources and Debates in English History 1485-1714.* Hoboken: Wiley-Blackwell Publishing, 2009.

Cherry, George. "The Legal and Philosophical Position of the Jacobites, 1688-1689." *The Journal of Modern History* 22, no. 4 (December 1950): 309-321.

Claydon, Tony. "William III's Declaration of Reasons and the Glorious Revolution." *The Historical Journal* 39, no. 1 (March 1996): 87-108.

Cruikshanks, Eveline, and Edward T. Corp. *The Stuart Court in Exile and the Jacobites.* London: Hambledon Press, 1995.

Hertzler, James R. "Who Dubbed it 'The Glorious Revolution?'" *Albion: A Quarterly Journal Concerned with British Studies* 19, no. 4 (1987): 579-585.

Szechi, Daniel. "The Jacobite Revolution Settlement, 1689-1696." *The English Historical Review* 108, no. 428 (July 1993): 610-628.

Szechi, Daniel. "A Blueprint for Tyranny? Sir Edward Hales and the Catholic Jacobite Response to the Revolution of 1688." *The English Historical Review* 116, no. 466 (April 2001): 342-367.

Thomas, M. P. "The Idea of Conquest in Controversies Over the 1688 Revolution." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 38, no. 1 (1977): 33-46.

Vallance, Ted. "The unrevolutionary revolution? Interpreting the Revolution of 1688." *Teaching History* no. 151 (June 2013): 18-19.



Cihuateotl (Image Source: Mesoamerican Gallery, The Metropolitan Museum of Art)

THE TONGUE OF MEXICO: FINDING IDENTITY IN MALINTZIN AND LA LLORONA

| Sebastian Loza

Legend has it that a young attractive woman in tears haunts the ill-lit streets of Mexico at night. She is usually said to be near a river and through her tears she asks about her deceased children. She is known as La Llorona or the Weeping Woman, for the uninitiated. Although her legend is not a particularly unique concept, in Mexico this phenomenon has perhaps the most nuance. This complexity stems from La Llorona's inherent connection with Malinalli, also known as Malintzin, Doña Marina, or La Malinche. This historical female figure of the sixteenth-century Spanish Conquest was later used by Mexican politicians of the nineteenth century as a symbol of ultimate betrayal to one's country. In the mid-twentieth century, Chicanos interpreted Malinalli as an abused mother of Mexican mestizo culture. Contemporary feminist Chicanas contextualize Malinalli as a representation of modern concerns over female agency and male control over it. Exploring the relationship between the controversial Malinalli and the monstrous Llorona will shed light on the underlying reasons they are connected while also showcasing the people who are negatively affected by this dangerous union.

To discuss La Llorona is to tackle a trans-Latin American ghost. She is present in one form or another throughout Latin America and anywhere there is a critical mass of Latino immigrants, such as in the large Latino communities within the United States. This paper chooses to keep the discussion of La Llorona within the rich (yet incredibly mobile) Mexican culture. This is due to the complicated and direct relationship between Malinalli and the Mexican populace that resulted in her aggressive and pervasive transformation into La Llorona. It would also be pertinent to say that my ill-spent childhood in Mexico consisted partly in dark playgrounds, alleys, and generally decrepit buildings with friends telling ghost stories in which La Llorona made frequent appearances. These formative experiences influenced me and my decision to research the connection between this popular myth and La Malinche.

In order to prevent future confusion, a short detour is required on Malinalli's many names. According to Pilar Godayol, La Malinche was born between 1502 and 1509 as Malinalli, the name of the twelfth

day in the Aztec Calendar.¹ She was baptized by the Spanish during their invasion and was renamed Marina, but the Spaniards would later refer to her as Doña Marina.² Due to the lack of the letter “r” in Nahuatl, the natives call her Malina and later Malintzin, since the “-tzin” was a suffix added as a form of respect.³ The Nahuatl referred to Cortés as “Malintzin-e.” Spanish soldiers replaced “zin-e” with “nche,” thus Cortés was known as Malinche.⁴ The Spanish soldiers then began to call Malintzin as La Malinche, which was used in context as “the wife of the captain.”⁵ Throughout this essay I will use her multiple names interchangeably except while discussing the importance of each name in context.

Now that we have a firm understanding of Malinalli’s many identities, allow me to introduce La Llorona as understood in Mexican popular culture. In Mexican folklore, La Llorona has many different recountings, but they all hit the same main story beats. La Malinche, who is invariably described as beautiful, murders her own kids, drowning them in a river as a way to punish Hernan Cortés for marrying or having an affair with another woman. After she realizes her mistake, she drowns herself in the river and her spirit is cursed to wander the night, seeking her children. La Llorona is usually depicted as in need of children to replace her own. In Mexican folklore, La Llorona usually appears once the sun sets. Any children out and about after dark are in mortal danger if they hear her sorrowful cries. She is often described as wailing for her kids, saying something along the lines of “My children, my children, where are you? Where are my children?” To be sure, La Llorona has infinite origins and retellings depending on the agenda of the storyteller. Some legends are devoid of any references to La Malinche or Cortés but La Llorona always shares similar physical and culturally labelled attributes of La Malinche.

After her death, Malinalli unwillingly served for many disparate movements. In order to examine this phenomenon, it is important to discuss her changing nature and contrast it with her most extreme and violent version, La Llorona. Before she was a monster, Malinalli was a Mayan slave who was given as a gift to Hernan Cortés during the conquest of Mexico. She became his mistress and was made to work as his translator, which explains why she is also known as *la*

¹ Pilar Godayol, “Malintzin/La Malinche/Doña Marina: re-reading the myth of the treacherous translator,” *Journal Of Iberian & Latin American Studies* 18, no. 1 (2012): 65.

² *Ibid.*

³ *Ibid.*

⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵ *Ibid.*

lengua, “the tongue.” Her linguistic prowess is legendary; she apparently learned Spanish in a few weeks.⁶ Nevertheless, not much else is known because reconstructing Mallinalli’s past is difficult due to several factors. The most important reason her story eludes historians, as Camilla Townsend exasperatedly wrote, is that “The woman left us no diaries or letters, not a single page.”⁷ Despite these obstacles, Mexican emergent identity took her and used her malleable image in order to fit the ever changing wants and needs of male Mexican culture.

When referring to Malintzin, feminist author Pilar Godayol remarks, “Alternating praise and calumny, the patriarchal system of the last five centuries has not ignored her.”⁸ Godayol notes the frequent invocation of Malintzin’s name and perceived character throughout Mexican folklore and political discourse. During Spanish Conquest, some natives revered Malinalli, while the conquistadors viewed Doña Marina as an indispensable asset.⁹ As mentioned before, some of the indigenous respect came from her quick mastering of Spanish language. Another source of her admiration within native circles was her affiliation with the Spanish. Indigenous communities perhaps initially thought of the European force as the culmination of several divine omens and Malintzin’s association with them extended certain qualities of the celestial.¹⁰ In letters to the Spanish Crown, Cortés describes her as important to the cause but (as expected) rarely called her by her many names, preferring instead to refer to her as “la lengua que yo tengo, que es una India de esta tierra”¹¹ [the tongue that I have, who is an Indian of these lands]. Cortés not only avoids writing Marina’s name, he directly views her as an extension of himself. He valued her translating abilities and appropriated these skills as his own. This disregard for Malintzin’s name and identity is typical of the time. The power dynamic present between those conquering and those being conquered did not lend itself to mutual respect. Despite the context of the Conquest, the Spanish invaders gave her the honorific title, “Doña,” meaning “Lady.” This title points to her importance to the Spanish and according to Ann McBride, it also demonstrates how the Spanish considered the conquest a chivalric

⁶ Ann McBryde-Limaye, “Metamorphoses of La Malinche and Mexican Cultural Identity”, *Comparative Civilizations Review* Vol. 19, Fall 1988, (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press), 9.

⁷ Camilla Townsend, *Malintzin’s Choices: An Indian Woman in the Conquest of Mexico* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2006), 5.

⁸ Pilar Godayol, “Malintzin/La Malinche/Doña Marina: 62.

⁹ Ann McBryde-Limaye, “Metamorphoses of La Malinche”, 2.

¹⁰ Miguel León-Portilla, *The Broken Spears* (Boston: Beacon Press, 2006), 8.

¹¹ *Cartas y Relaciones de Hernán Cortés al Emperador Carlos V*, Collected and illustrated by Don Pascual de Gayangos (Paris: A Chaix y C, 1866), 72-74.

affair.¹² Clearly, in life Malinalli was important to both sides of the conquest.

After her death, assumed to be around 1531, her identity underwent several drastic changes in post-conquest Mexico.¹³ After the thorough destruction of indigenous religion, Malintzin became a conduit for the vestiges of ancient Aztec beliefs. The surviving nahua speaking natives correlated Malintzin with several goddesses including Coatlicue, goddess of motherhood and death and Tonantzin, goddess of maize, among others.¹⁴ They also connected her to Cihuateteos which were originally the spirits of women who died in childbirth and would help the sun set in the West.¹⁵ Once the sun set, the Cihuateteos would traverse the night weeping while abducting and killing children, seemingly out of the negative experience with childbirth that resulted in their deaths.¹⁶ The Cihuateteos are depicted in statues throughout the Aztec empire as ghoulish, sitting on their knees ready to pounce with clawed hands (See fig. 1).

The origin of La Llorona in popular Mexican culture has her roots in the fearsome Mesoamerican Cihuateteo, as is evident in the similarities they share. For example, both the Cihuateteos and the modern La Llorona are mothers. They both they seek children at night as they weep. Thus, La Malinche is posthumously correlated with the Cihuateteo. This relationship changes as she is used to encapsulates the emotions of a nascent nation going through an identity crisis. La Malinche is envisioned, not as a fanged creature but, as the folkloric singular woman who weeps for her race (her children), after the devastation of Spanish Conquest.¹⁷ This association with Cihuateteos is perhaps the first time Malintzin is directly associated with La Llorona.

The Aztec roots of La Llorona become more apparent with an analysis of *The General History of the things of New Spain: The Florentine Codex*. The *Codex* is one of the few written sources available to historians when researching Aztec culture during the pre-conquest and conquest era. It includes accounts of Aztec social customs, hierarchies, farming practices, warfare, and religion. Within the pages of *The Florentine Codex* are writings of a phenomenon that is eerily

¹² Ann McBryde-Limaye, "Metamorphoses of La Malinche" 9.

¹³ *Ibid.*, 7.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 11.

¹⁵ Jones, Lindsay, Mircea Eliade, and Charles J. Adams, *Encyclopedia of Religion* (Detroit: Macmillan Reference, 2005), 5905.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*

¹⁷ Ann McBryde-Limaye, "Metamorphoses of La Malinche", 11.

similar to that La Llorona.¹⁸ Ten years before the Spanish arrived, the Aztecs observed several bad omens that foretold the return of Quetzalcoatl. Among these omens lay one that is identical to one of the modus operandi of the modern Llorona. The sixth bad omen is described as follows: "Often was heard a woman, who went weeping and crying out at night. She cried out loudly; she went about saying: 'O my beloved sons, now we are at the point of going! 'Sometimes she said: 'My children, where shall I take you?'"¹⁹ A woman wailing about her children in the middle of the night in Tenochtitlan illustrates that La Llorona (or some version of her) may have been ingrained into indigenous culture before the arrival of the Spanish. Furthermore, Tenochtitlan was famously built atop a lake that could explain why La Llorona interacts with bodies of water, drowning herself and later drowning her victims.

However, this connection must be made timidly because the *Florentine Codex* is not an infallible document. The Spanish friar Bernardino de Sahagún did not begin the *Codex* until 1545, which is well after the presumed death of Malintzin. To compile the *Codex* Sahagún used Nahuatl speaking natives as informants and asked them to explain Aztec beliefs before conquest and during the conquest. Despite his anthropological approach, the metamorphosis of La Malinche into a Cihuateteo and La Llorona undoubtedly influenced the native perspective when discussing the pre-conquest omens they described. Regardless of the origins of the omen, La Llorona and her attributes represented some of the fears that pre-conquest and post-conquest natives had. Cihuateteo represented the dread of the former group while the conflagration of Malintzin and Cihuateteo personified the dismay of the latter. The endurance of La Llorona and her distinctive personality also speaks of the anxieties modern Mexicans still have. The legend of La Llorona has retained a permanent space in the Mexican cultural mindscape for 500 years. This itself is not particularly rare for monsters, however between the sixteenth century and twenty-first century Mexico went through several cultural shifts as it moved from the colonial period, the (partial) industrial revolution, and the modern era, which culminated in contemporary popular culture. La Llorona's legend survived and even flourishes during the Mexican Revolution. This atypical behavior is important to underscore the idea that La

¹⁸ Bernardino De Sahagún, *General History of the Things of New Spain: Florentine Codex*, Translated by Anderson, Arthur J. O., Charles E. Dibble, and Jay I., Monographs of the School of American Research ; No. 14, Pt. 8. (Santa Fe: School of American Research, 1950), 18.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*

Llorona, alongside La Malinche, helped establish and direct Mexican identity.

La Malinche's domain quickly expanded from La Llorona, the one who cries for her country's fate, to a negative counterpart and scapegoat to rising Catholic sentiments. La Malinche becomes juxtaposed to *La Virgen de Guadalupe* by Catholic institutions and politicians seeking to unite Mexico. The name *Virgen de Guadalupe* stems from a now sanctified story in which a young man by the name of Juan Diego meets the Virgin Mary in the outskirts of Mexico City in 1531. She encourages Juan Diego to build her a church on the hillside where they met. Juan Diego goes to his local priest who demands evidence that she is indeed The Virgin Mary. Upon his return to the hill, she complies in several manners. First, she heals Juan Diego's uncle and then has her image display on a blanket where Juan Diego carried roses. According to Norma Alarcón, Guadalupe serves as an example of a woman who is willing to take on her roles as a mother and can promise deliverance to believers.²⁰ At the same time, Malintzin's image is appropriated to become the opposite of what *La Virgen the Guadalupe* represents. These female figures clash in Mexican discourse and as Alarcón states:

Malintzin represents feminine subversion and treacherous victimization of her people because she was a translator for Cortés's army. Guadalupe and Malintzin become functions of each other... Quite often one or the other figure is recalled as being present at the origins of the Mexican community, thereby emphasizing its divine and sacred constitution or, alternately, its damned secular fall.²¹

Mexican identity effectively forms around expelling Malintzin and embracing *La Virgen de Guadalupe*. This binary self-imposed idea within the culture expresses itself by continuously reminding the masses that *La Virgen* saved their nation from its painful fall from grace. The imposed Catholic religion, once finding a champion in Guadalupe, attributed the conquest, the most painful and shameful moment in the Mexican mind, to La Malinche. This effectively shifted the blame of the

²⁰ Alarcón, Norma. "Traduttora, Traditora: A Paradigmatic Figure of Chicana Feminism." *Cultural Critique*, no. 13 (1989): 57-87.

²¹ *Ibid.*, 67.

conquest to those who were conquered and turns La Malinche into the “monstrous double” of *La Virgen de Guadalupe*.²²

Religion was not the only institution that appropriated La Malinche however. Politicians gravitated toward La Malinche’s perceived betrayal and further cannibalized her image. Once Mexico gained its independence from Spain in 1821, politicians used La Malinche for their state-building needs to unify a divided nation. On September 15th of 1861, celebrating the relatively recent independence of Mexico, politician Ignacio Ramirez recalled that Mexico was initially subdued due to “Malintzin-Cortés’ whore.”²³ Ramirez was attempting to consolidate Mexican identity by attributing a bitter moment in Mexican history to a native woman who translated for the invading force. By calling her “Cortés’ whore,” he is adding agency to Malintzin’s sexual relationship with the Conquistador, which is a hasty and damaging portrayal of this female figure. This is in direct contrast to the previous iteration of Malintzin as La Llorona, the one who weeps as her nation is subjugated. However, it does follow the similar trend of La Malinche being the monstrous double to *La Virgen*.

After this, the term “Malinchista” comes to the forefront of Mexican language that is still in used today. The term refers to someone servile to a foreign power or someone who adopts foreign customs and cultures while leaving behind their Mexican culture. This term is unfair to use as Malintzin was a slave in her own culture and did not have the same context of nationalism that nineteenth-century Mexicans sought. Mexican politicians found it easy to disparage a native female. A lack of personal written material and centuries of myths built around Malintzin left her memory at the mercy of the Mexican state and Mexican culture. The perceived idea that she complied with Spanish invaders was used to its fullest extent in their case against Malintzin and, thus, La Malinche (and the identity built for her) became the perfect target for belligerent claims.

Toward the beginning of the twentieth century La Llorona and La Malinche begin to be examined under a different light by the warring factions of the Mexican Revolution. The song *La Llorona* first appeared during the tumultuous Mexican Revolution. Between 1910 and 1921, the Mexican folklore song became popular amongst rebel soldiers. *La Llorona* is usually not sung to completion and has had several lines added to it throughout its long life. Several of these lines point to 500-year-old understanding of La Llorona, such as “Hermoso huipil

²² *Ibid*, 66.

²³ *Ibid*, 58.

llevabas, Llorona/ Que la Virgen te creí.”²⁴ [Beautiful dress you wore, Llorona/ that I thought you were the Virgin.] This serves as a reminder that La Llorona and the Virgin were still considered mirrored counterparts. Their beauty was so entrancing that even the viewer could mistake one for the other.

The song seems to be from the perspective of a man meeting, falling in love, and then potentially feeling trapped in a relationship with La Llorona. There are subtle references to his feelings toward La Llorona: “Ayer lloraba por verte, Llorona y hoy lloro porque te vi.” [Yesterday I cried to see you, now I cry because I saw you]. The man in the story, who in most cases can be interpreted as the person singing the song, has regrets about meeting her. In another part of the song, a mermaid visits the man and gives him a note saying, “Who has love (also) has pain.” The message functions as a way for the protagonist to acknowledge that love is painful; however, the fact that the messenger is a mermaid is also worth noting. When discussing the monstrous bodies of mermaids, Dana Oswald argues that mermaids represent a transitional body.²⁵ The monstrosity of a mermaid stems from their ambiguity. The liminal body of mermaids connects to male fears and sexual frustrations with their inability to sleep with the half-beautiful half-monster mermaid. This dichotomy in turn is placed on La Llorona as well. She is a beautiful woman (as beautiful as the Virgin Mary) who courts the singer/male protagonist but once he has fallen in love with her, their relationship turns sour. This is similar to mermaids who call out for sailors with sweet songs only to kill them once they are seduced. Toward the end of the song the singer asks La Llorona to drown him in a river so he can escape this pain. La Llorona now also has a role parallel to that of mermaids; she is a sexualized woman who ultimately and violently breaks her lovers’ hearts.

During the twentieth century, La Llorona/La Malinche was not only sexualized in Mexican folk songs but also in Chicano literature. Famous Mexican poets and writers begin referring to La Malinche as *La Chingada* [The screwed one]. Octavio Paz explored this new moniker in an essay titled “The Sons of La Malinche.” He argues that *La Chingada* is the perfect example of what La Malinche represents to the Mexican people. Paz eloquently muses on the terminology of “Chingada” and states “What is the Chingada? The Chingada is the Mother forcibly opened, violated or deceived. The *hijo de la Chingada*

²⁴ The author is unknown; however the song is generally attributed to Andres Henestrosa, a famous Mexican Renaissance man who fully fleshed out the song in the 1940’s.

²⁵ Oswald, Dana, “Monstrous Gender: Geographies of Ambiguity,” *The Ashgate Research Companion* edited by Mittman, Asa, and Peter Dendle, (New York: Routledge, 2016), 362.

is the offspring of violation, abduction or deceit.”²⁶ Through his writing, Paz is attempting to tackle the reason for Mexico’s cynicism and lays the blame on what was done to La Malinche by the Spaniards. This romanticized idea helped Mexicans justify their perceived social stagnation.

In doing so, Paz was effectively refuting José Vasconcelos’ ideas of *La Raza Cosmica* (The Cosmic Race). Written in 1925, Vasconcelos sought to predict the future of races but mainly interested in mestizos. The author imagines the mestizo race as an exceptional one because it is the union of Iberian peoples and Mesoamerican/Andean natives.²⁷ This junction of races, in Vasconcelos’ opinion, is what will create a utopian “Cosmic Race.” Octavio Paz disagrees with these positivist sentiments and instead sees this mixture of the Old World and the New as inherently disruptive. Furthermore, he blames *La Chingada* and her abuser Hernan Cortés as the progenitors of mestizos. This catastrophic and violent conception can only give birth to lost children, according to Paz. In turn this explains Mexican disillusionment and discontent with mid-twentieth century affairs.²⁸

Although Octavio Paz and other Chicano writers of the twentieth century tried to reclaim La Malinche, they did so in a way that decisively took away Malintzin’s agency while also trying to change the predominant ideas around her. Nevertheless, by painting her as an abused mother of an exploited race, Paz forced Mexicans to come face to face with the past and recognize that La Malinche is perhaps worthy of sympathy. Despite this, as *La Chingada* she became an object for a male audience to associate their desires and fears. She became not a malicious traitor but a sexual victim. In this sense, La Malinche is equal to the biblical Eve; an unwitting perpetrator of the first sin, damning her children to a life of suffering. This version of Malinche, along with every other interpretation of her before the rise of Chicana feminism in the 1970s, forged the bruised egos of Mexican men.

Upset with the traitor/helpless woman dichotomy Chicanas reexamined La Malinche and La Llorona. Norma Alarcón strongly pushed against Chicano notions of La Malinche, stating that these

²⁶ Paz, Octavio, “The Sons of La Malinche,” *The Mexico Reader: History, Culture, Politics*, edited by Joseph, Gilbert, and Timothy Henderson, (Durham: Duke University Press, 2003), 22.

²⁷ Vasconcelos, José, “The Cosmic Race,” *The Mexico Reader: History, Culture, Politics*, edited by Joseph, Gilbert, and Timothy Henderson, (Durham: Duke University Press, 2003), 16.

²⁸ Mexico still suffers from rampant cynicism. This in part stems from several regimes rising and toppling between 1910 and 1920 which was followed by a seventy-year political domination by one particularly corrupt party (the PRI).

representations painted her as foolish, overtly erotic, and lacking any real purpose other than to satisfy the needs of the patriarchy.²⁹ La Malinche served as a way to police women and their behaviors, especially when comparing her to her virtuous double to *La Virgen de Guadalupe*. The latter is a pious mother who only speaks for her children and the former is a woman who only spoke for herself and in doing so betrayed her own people. La Malinche and, by extension, La Llorona, are a precautionary tale on what a woman's roles should be in life. Progressive movements eventually challenged these machista ideals.

The first step in reclaiming La Malinche for Chicanas was to clearly state that Chicanas are in some ways La Malinche. They find themselves torn between two cultures. They speak two languages and translate for both foreigners and family leaving them open to criticism of "Americanizing" similar to the "Hispanicizing" critique levied against Malintzin.³⁰ So despite being in between two cultures, neither fully accepts them. Chicanas point out machismo and speak out against the patriarchy, abandoning any rules established for them by an unfriendly system. This feminist advocacy creates a sense of mutual understanding between La Malinche and Chicanas.

Once finding themselves in La Malinche, Chicanas then refute 500 years of claims that disparage La Malinche. This is imperative to them because leaving Malintzin in the hands of men inherently takes away any chance for women to define themselves. In order to humanize her brutalized, image, Chicanas describe Malintzin as an "...agent, choice-maker, and producer of history."³¹ The main issue critics point to regarding this perception of Malintzin is that modern feminist place a present understanding of female agency on a native woman who died over 500 years ago. Recognizing that 500 years ago these same notions of feminine identity did not exist is significant; on the other hand, reclaiming La Malinche is more important for women in the present. Although this reexamination might be anachronistic and teleological, by describing her as a "producer of history" Chicanas are attempting to counter the male dominated ideas surrounding Malintzin and by extension seeking to define themselves.

In today's popular culture, La Llorona and La Malinche are mostly divorced from each other. La Llorona has become a story to tell children in order to keep them from going outside after dark. Hardly any knowledge of her connection with Malintzin remains. Today's Llorona

²⁹ Norma Alarcón, "Traddutora, Traditora," 71.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, 73.

³¹ *Ibid.*, 75.

is the vestiges of La Malinche's most repulsive (and exaggerated) action to the collective Mexican mind: a woman who worked for the Spanish forces and led to their subjugation and humiliation. Mexican men never forgave her for this neo-fantastical inception of Mexico and thus forced themselves to relieve their own painful origins by setting boundaries for women's behavior. For them, La Llorona is a monstrous Malinche, an evil spirit roaming the land and drowning children.

These male fantasies that helped create a Mexican identity were built around patrolling what women could and could not be. It is an important and monumental task for women to reclaim La Malinche. To have Chicanas able to define themselves on their own terms against the patriarchy is a huge step in dispelling machista folklore that inherently damages women. Ironically, however, *la lengua* will always be spoken for by others. Authors ascribe feelings and actions on to a female figure in order to fit their own needs. Malinalli has been categorized as a: translator, traitor, wailing banshee, selfish mother, abused mother, and a Chicana feminist icon. These categories help the perpetrators identify themselves. The more recent attempts to redefine La Malinche are positive ones, allowing for more freedom and power among women. In the end, La Malinche silently stands guard on the border of what Mexicans are and who they do not want to be, regardless of who Malinalli truly wanted to be.

Bibliography

- Alarcón, Norma. "Traddutora, Traditora: A Paradigmatic Figure of Chicana Feminism." *Cultural Critique*, no. 13 (1989): 57-87.
- Bernardino De Sahagún. *General History of the Things of New Spain: Florentine Codex*. Translated by Anderson, Arthur J. O., Charles E. Dibble and Jay I. Monographs of the School of American Research; No. 14, Pt. 8. Santa Fe: School of American Research, 1950.
- Cartas y Relaciones de Hernán Cortés al Emperador Carlos V*. Collected and illustrated by Don Pascual de Gayangos. Paris: A Chaix y C, 1866.
- Godayol, Pilar. "Malintzin/La Malinche/Doña Marina: re-reading the myth of the treacherous translator." *Journal Of Iberian & Latin American Studies* 18, no. 1 (2012): 61-76.
- León-Portilla, Miguel. *The Broken Spears*. Boston: Beacon Press, 2006.
- Lindsay, Jones, Mircea Eliade, and Charles J. Adams. *Encyclopedia of Religion*. Detroit: Macmillan Reference, 2005.
- McBryde-Limaye, Ann. "Metamorphoses of La Malinche and Mexican Cultural Identity." *Comparative Civilizations Review* Vol. 19, Fall 1988. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Oswald, Dana. "Monstrous Gender: Geographies of Ambiguity." *The Ashgate Research Companion* edited by Mittman, Asa, and Dendle, Peter. New York: Routledge, 2016.
- Paz, Octavio. "The Sons of La Malinche." *The Mexico Reader: History, Culture, Politics*. Edited by Joseph, Gilbert, and Timothy Henderson. Durham: Duke University Press, 2003.
- Townsend, Camila. *Malintzin's Choices: An Indian Woman in the Conquest of Mexico*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2006.
- Vasconcelos, José. "The Cosmic Race." *The Mexico Reader: History, Culture, Politics*. Edited by Joseph, Gilbert, and Timothy Henderson. Durham: Duke University Press, 2003.

The Memory of Mata Hari



Image of Mata Hari c. 1915 (Image Source: Bain News Service, Publisher. Mata Hari Lady Macleod Photograph. <https://www.loc.gov/item/2014705666/>.)

THE MEMORY OF MATA HARI

| Marina Sanchez

Mata Hari's memory, often cloaked in fantasy and legend, continues to capture the imagination and attention of people as it has since her rise to fame in pre-World War I France. Her name conjures images of scandalous espionage, seduction, romance, fame, and splendor. Her tragic story continues to captivate popular culture through literature, film, and oral histories. Mata Hari's role as a spy baffles historians who argue that she was "the worst spy in history."¹ The legend of the notorious femme fatale conflicts with evidence of her apparent incompetence and failure to be an effective spy. The memory of Mata Hari is entangled with sensationalized fantasy, reflecting our obsession with sexualized and powerful women.

The memory of Mata Hari is lasting despite her horrendous failings as a spy during WWI and is a testament to how people are fascinated with highly sexualized women in history. Mata Hari transformed the role of the female spy from the humble role of the informant to the femme fatale that is so popular in fiction.² Her story is a cautionary tale of the way the public perceives women to be dangerous to society. Mata Hari is the inspiration for several films including one in 1931 starring Greta Garbo, as well as plays, fictional novels, memoirs, and histories.³ The legend of her betrayal of France by spying for the Germans continues to imply that trusting women in war is a grave mistake.⁴ Hence, French propagandists utilized her story to force women into a subservient position after the war.

Behind the fame and glamorous exterior lies a woman with a troubled past. Who was Mata Hari? Mata Hari's real name was Margaretha Zelle. She was Dutch and came from the town Leeuwarden in the Netherlands.⁵ Her father called himself the "baron" of the town due to his wealth from a successful hat business and stock investments. The fact that her father was well off may be one of the reasons why Mata Hari was not able to live without luxury later in her life.⁶

For instance, one of her teachers stated, "Papa Zelle gave her an exquisite four-seater carriage, drawn by two beautifully horned

¹ Margaret Darrow, *French Women and the First World War* (New York: Oxford, 2000), 272.

² *Ibid.*

³ *Ibid.*, 6.

⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵ Sam Waagenaar, *Mata Hari*, (New York: Appleton-Century, 1965), 4.

⁶ Waagenaar, *Mata Hari*, 6.

goats. The gift was Margaretha's pride and joy...She was enabled to be admired at age six, which was already important to her."⁷ She was the only girl in town who came to school in a red dress, which she whirled in front of her classmates, who were greatly impressed by her.⁸ Young girls in Dutch society did not usually wear red dresses, as this was a color that represented flamboyant behavior. Even from a young age Mata Hari thirsted for attention from her peers and she thrived on the admiration of others. Her looks were exceedingly important to her self-esteem and later on were essential to her success as an exotic dancer. Mata Hari met her husband Rudolph Macleod through the classified advertisements in a newspaper. He was twenty years her senior and an officer in the Dutch Colonial Army.⁹ Mata Hari maintained that Macleod was a brutal bully. She claimed that the reason she never exposed her breasts was because Macleod in a jealous rage tore her nipples off with his teeth.¹⁰

They returned to Amsterdam in 1901 and Mata Hari sued for divorce in 1904. She left for Paris to make a new life for herself as the exotic dancer Mata Hari, meaning "the eye of dawn."¹¹ She lived an extravagant, flamboyant lifestyle financed by various rich and powerful lovers. She reinvented herself as something exotic and performed her utterly novel dances in transparent costumes with a jeweled bra and extraordinary headpieces.¹²

Her act was an Oriental striptease. She shed colorful veils while enacting Hindu temple dances, which she learned while living in the Dutch East Indies. She ended her performances only wearing her breast plates, prostrate on the floor before a Hindu idol.¹³ In her diary, she described her love for her art and wrote:

I also believed that I had no choice but to dance, and it was then that I discovered the demon within me, my Art, forcing me to- even today I cannot fully understand it. Right under the eyes of God! - to deviate from the sacred rhythms, and to rare try some steps, profane ones, which I had not learned from the priests.

⁷ Ibid.

⁸ Ibid., 9.

⁹ Waagenaar, *Mata Hari*, 11.

¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹ Darrow, *French Women*, 286.

¹² Pat Shipman, "Why Mata Hari Wasn't a Cunning Spy After All," *National Geographic*, October 14, 2017, 1.

¹³ Darrow, *French Women*, 286.

I will never forget how I prostrated myself into the dust, waiting for lightning to strike me, as I was sure it would all sinners.¹⁴

Mata Hari was a popular and critical success. In 1905, she danced more than thirty times in Parisian salons and several times in Paris' most extravagant theaters.¹⁵ She later traveled around Europe performing before gentry and royalty. The public marveled at her radical success and worshipped her image. She captured the hearts and fantasies of men and women in Europe.

However, by the summer of 1914, both her career as a dancer and as courtesan declined. She was thirty-eight, overweight, and her dancing had been taken over by younger and more talented performers. She lived solely off the generosity of her many lovers, but her income fell rapidly. She was forced to sell her clothes and jewelry to pay her debts since she maintained her extravagant lifestyle.¹⁶ She met a handsome young Russian soldier named Vladimir Masloff and fell in love. They desired to marry, but Mata Hari needed funds to support them after Masloff lost his eyesight early in the war. Mata Hari agreed to spy for the French in order to support herself and her husband. She struck a deal with Georges Ladoux, who was the head of the newly re-activated Deuxieme Bureau of the Ministry of War. Ladoux sent Mata Hari to spy on the Germans for the French intelligence agency and allowed her to visit her lover if she performed effectively.¹⁷

Mata Hari's involvement in the war as a spy proved to be useful for Ladoux in boosting French morale, which had fallen exponentially as the war dragged on. As the French army suffered terrible loses on the battlefield, French troops became so demoralized that some refused to fight. Mutinies spread across the French army and on the home front. Industrialized workers participated in strikes. Reasons for such widespread discontent included war weariness and poor leadership but did not explain why the French army experienced disaster on the battlefield.¹⁸

Ladoux felt that the arrest of a prominent spy could raise French spirits and revitalize the war effort, but he also had his own interests in mind as he sought to frame Mata Hari for his own espionage

¹⁴ Mata Hari, *The Diary of Mata Hari*, (New York: Carroll & Graf Publishers, 1984), 6.

¹⁵ Darrow, *French Women*, 287.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 287.

¹⁷ Shipman, *Cunning Spy*, 1.

¹⁸ Darrow, *French Women*, 284.

crimes.¹⁹ Ladoux ordered his agents to shadow Mata Hari as she made her way around restaurants, parks, shops, boutiques, and nightclubs. The agents opened her mail and eavesdropped on her phone conversations, keeping a log of her daily activities. They did not find evidence of her gathering or passing important information to the Germans.²⁰

Nonetheless, Mata Hari was arrested for treason against France. The French government released a 1,295-page dossier filled with interviews, letters and reports compiled by investigators. Scholars who viewed these documents state that the evidence against her was thin and loaded with innuendo.²¹ The prosecutors openly stated that she was deceitful and accustomed to toying with men.²² Her trial was wrought with sexist and misogynistic biases. The court ruled that her role as a double agent caused the deaths of 50,000 French lives and sentenced her to death by firing squad.²³ Some historians say she was targeted because of her gender and openly sexual lifestyle.²⁴ Historian Pat Shipman states, “If she had been a modest, demure woman or a man, what she was doing would not have been in the least suspicious.”

Western culture sees war as exclusively a masculine affair and its relationship to women remains highly problematic.²⁵ Society tends to conclude that women have nothing to do with war and “women and war” is a false connector.²⁶ However, during World War I women engaged directly in the war effort. They were nurses, ambulance drivers, and factory workers. Women took on jobs originally dominated by men and excelled in the workforce.

Despite her failings as a spy, Mata Hari contributed to the war effort through her dancing and espionage. However, historians conclude that as a spy Mata Hari had little impact on battles, despite the insistence of her enemies. Therefore, Mata Hari’s image as an influential femme fatale is largely fictional.

Nonetheless, a French firing squad commanded by Ladoux executed Mata Hari on October 15, 1917. She was led to her death by

¹⁹ Shipman, *Cunning Spy*.

²⁰ *Ibid.*

²¹ “Mata Hari alias MCLEOD Margaretha Geertruida: executed by the French in 1917 for accusations of spying for Germany, *The National Archives*, Reference KC 2/1 (Crown, 1914-1925), 1-88.

²² Meilan Solly, “The Sultry Spy and the Coverup,” *Smithsonian* 48, no.5 (2017): 19.

²³ Solly, *Sultry Spy*, 19.

²⁴ Meilan Solly, *Sultry Spy*, 19.

²⁵ Darrow, *French Women*, 6.

²⁶ *Ibid.*

two nuns, a priest, two doctors, and several journalists. She refused the customary blindfold and would not allow her wrists to be tied. She waved to the nuns and blew kisses to the priest and her lawyer just as the squad took aim.²⁷ They fired, and the legendary figure Mata Hari dropped, lifeless, to the ground.

Following her death, Mata Hari became a sensation and the public thrived off the fantasy of her powerful sexual aura. She is memorialized in literature, film, and oral history. She is portrayed as a powerful sexual being with the ability to manipulate men into doing as she wished. However, evidence shows that Mata Hari was not necessarily the deceitful mastermind that Hollywood loves to portray her as. It is more likely that Mata Hari was a pawn used by the French and Germans.

Nonetheless, the most widely held view of Mata Hari is that of a villain who betrayed France and caused the deaths of thousands of men by passing along confidential battle information to the Germans. These images began in 1915 and 1916, when the French public experienced backlash against female spies. The patriarchal French society viewed women as inferior to men and did not trust their ability to spy.²⁸ The French also feared foreigners because they were at war with Germany. The French public began to suspect all foreigners as possible spies leaking secret information to the Germans.

Consequently, in the summer of 1917, France succumbed to a spy scare and the government expelled over one thousand foreigners and charged 500 people with espionage, including Mata Hari.²⁹ Due to her Dutch background, supposed Indian story, and her openly sexual personality, Mata Hari was a perfect scapegoat for the French to blame.

Pre-war spy fantasies predisposed the French public to believe in Mata Hari's guilt, but the immense potential of her story engrained itself into the public memory.³⁰ Her drama is one of the most remembered stories of WWI. In the British newspaper *The Times*, in 1917, Mata Hari's reputation as a traitor to France was released to the public.³¹ It is questionable whether Mata Hari's dancing alone would have been enough to make her a household name in the English language. Additionally, it is undoubtedly only the combination of

²⁷ Amy Sargeant, "The Return of Mata Hari," *Historical Journal of Film, Radio & Television* 3 no. 1 (2010): 37-54.

²⁸ Darrow, *French Women*, 285.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, 285.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, 284.

³¹ "Woman Spy Shot," *The Times*, 16, October 1917, The Times Digital Archive.

dancing and spying that prompted the popularity of the phrase, “she’s a real Mata Hari.”³²

Mata Hari is vilified in French spy fiction and popular culture.³³ Sensationalized stories emerged about female spy stories. Emile Massard, one of the earliest propagators of Mata Hari story claimed she passed herself off as a volunteer nurse to extract information from wounded soldiers. This accusation drew from wartime stories of nurses who turned out to be spies and saboteurs.³⁴ The association of her name with the leakage of confidential information reveals how the public saw her as sinister. It helps to show why a female spy incurs hatred among even men who did not fear death at the hands of the enemy. However, they shuddered in fear of an invisible enemy, the spy, who could cause them even greater harm.³⁵

On the other hand, Mata Hari is also remembered as a useful villain cast as the seductive female spy. Another article in *The Times* (1926) warns the public about the evils of women through a trial of one of her lovers accused of espionage.³⁶ Her role explained what was otherwise inexplicable; why French masculinity failed for four long bloody years in the war. Great courage and sacrifice led to no decisive victory for French troops in the trenches. The longevity of the female spy image validates how important Mata Hari’s story was to the French understanding of their experience in war.³⁷ Her bibliography rivals that of Joan of Arc in the massive numbers of plays, films, fictions, memoirs, and histories devoted to her memory.³⁸ However, it is unclear whether Mata Hari can be considered a saint or a devil. She is by no means guilty of being a double agent, but her imperfect life decisions make it difficult to characterize her as a saint.

Furthermore, French accounts of Mata Hari compare her with Miss Cavell, a British nurse executed by German forces. Cavell was accused of using her position as a nurse to spy for the British and French. The Allied forces saw her as a saint and compared her angelic sacrifice to Mata Hari’s treacherous misdeeds. However, these comparisons are usually unsuccessful because what made Cavell a saint and martyr was her innocence in the charges brought against her. Cavell’s advocates

³² Waagenaar, *Mata Hari*, 3.

³³ Darrow, *French Women*, 286.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, 273.

³⁵ Thomas Coulson, *Mata Hari: Courtesan and Spy* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1930), 1.

³⁶ “The Letters to Mata Hari,” *The Times*, 21, April 1926, *The Times Digital Archive*.

³⁷ Darrow, *French Women*, 270.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, 270.

desperately insisted that she was not a spy.³⁹ However, most people believed Mata Hari was guilty of her crimes and even her lover Masloff testified against her in order to save himself.

While some accounts call Mata Hari the worst spy in history, others state she was “perhaps the greatest woman spy of the century.”⁴⁰ These sentiments attest to why her memory is so lasting because she sparks our imagination and fantasies. In the film *A Woman Redeemed*, the director is careful to capture the settings, costuming, and locations as indicators of Mata Hari’s character.⁴¹ The fictionalized film reworks the legend of Mata Hari and references memoirs from WWI to recreate her glorious life. Additionally, *Mata Hari* (1931), starring Greta Garbo, portrayed Mata Hari as a beautiful femme fatale who manipulates men to further her career in espionage. Garbo plays the infamous lady with a deep, sultry voice smoking with a long cigarette holder and wearing revealing dresses.

Garbo as Mata Hari entices men with her voice and her body, but behind the striking facade lies a dangerous spy. The film begins with an execution scene that foreshadows the end of Mata Hari’s life. The narrator during the execution scene warns, “The war dealt similarly with traitors and spies.”⁴² This scene in the movie is evidence that in 1931, Mata Hari was continually viewed as a villain and remembered as an enemy to France. She had bewitched all of Paris with her exotic dancing, but many authorities hated her because her sexuality was too brazen. The officer seeking to arrest Mata Hari in the film states, “Some dance and some die and some will do both.”⁴³

This film shows that Mata Hari was a spy and a villain. She is working as a powerful spy and even murders a high ranking general for her Russian lover. She is a seductress of men and uses officers to extract important war information. Through this film, it is evident the directors want to teach a lesson that women are not to be trusted because they have self-serving motivations. The film is a statement about Mata Hari and women as a whole. It calls for men to control and limit women’s actions before they can exact irreversible damage. Mata Hari is blamed for the deaths of thousands of men. If she were a male spy, her actions would not be viewed in such a negative way. Instead, her actions would be admired as clever and live on through action-packed spy films.

³⁹ Ibid., 270.

⁴⁰ Amy Sargeant, *The Return of Mata Hari*, 1.

⁴¹ Ibid.

⁴² *Mata Hari*, produced and directed by George Fitzmaurice, 85 minutes, Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer, 1931, film.

⁴³ Fitzmaurice, *Mata Hari*, 1931.

In the film *Notorious* (1946), directed by Alfred Hitchcock, the plot is modeled after Mata Hari's memory as a seductive femme fatale who ensnares men into her espionage schemes.⁴⁴ Alicia Huberman played by Ingrid Bergman represents Mata Hari and is used by her country to extract information. She is forced to navigate a web of romance, seduction, and duty to her country. This film is further evidence of how powerful women are viewed by society. They are portrayed as deceitful through cinematography.

Similarly, the film *By the Light of the Silvery Moon* (1953), starring Doris Day, takes place in 1918 and contains aspects of mistrust in mysterious women.⁴⁵ A French actress is cast as the spy "Dangerous Dora" and the family within the film believed she seduced their father. Dangerous Dora is meant to represent Mata Hari and the entire towns turns on her because of her sexual aura and mystery.

These films illustrate how Hollywood and subsequently society view the memory of Mata Hari. Her story as a sexualized woman is consistently portrayed as negative. The femme fatale of Hollywood modeled after Mata Hari is usually a villain and her story is created for the purpose of warning viewers of how an unchecked woman can affect their community and country. These ideas are dangerous to the feminist movement if women with drive and power are constantly being labelled as seductresses and villains.

Furthermore, another aspect attributed to female sexuality is Mata Hari's hypnotic and sexual nature. She is said to have hypnotized men and bent them to her will in order to betray them.⁴⁶ Her exotic dancing and ever-changing biography played upon Parisian fantasies of the erotic East. The French intelligence officer Ladoux who employed Mata Hari described her hypnotic eyes and husky voice as tools used to seduce men.⁴⁷

Mata Hari's sexuality threatened those around her and continues to shock people today. Not only did she have many love affairs with various officers, she had lovers from several countries who were high ranking men as well. She claimed to have captured the heart of the crown prince of Germany which affected her image in France during WWI.⁴⁸ Mata Hari also conjured images of lesbianism, she performed at the salon of Natalie Barney, a woman known for her

⁴⁴ *Notorious*, directed by Alfred Hitchcock, 102 minutes, RKO Radio Pictures, 1946, film.

⁴⁵ *By the Light of the Silvery Moon*, directed by David Butler, 101 mins, Warner Bros, 1953, film.

⁴⁶ Darrow, *French Women*, 287.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*

⁴⁸ Mata Hari, "Mata Hari 1879-1917: A Jean," *Litoral*, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/43400831>.

openly lesbian lifestyle.⁴⁹ According to Mata Hari's diary, she had a relationship, both sexually and emotionally, with Barney.⁵⁰

While the vilified versions of Mata Hari's life are fantastical and fascinating, evidence points to her innocence. Historian Sam Waagenaar investigated Mata Hari and found that she was innocent, entrapped in the cruel environment of World War I. He argues the previous memories of Mata Hari are based on hearsay and facts are not rare, but nonexistent. He insists that rumors were mostly used as the truth in the vilification of Mata Hari.⁵¹ Waagenaar contacted Mata Hari's maid and close companion Anna Lintjens, who claimed that Mata Hari was never a spy.⁵² Lintjens had in her possession Mata Hari's scrapbooks, in which Mata Hari stored every letter, document, photograph and bit of paper that was written about her.⁵³ The scrapbooks held no indication that Mata Hari was a spy, only a woman obsessively concerned about self-image. This was the first positive declaration of Mata Hari's innocence.

There is a noticeable shift in Mata Hari's memory starting in the 1960's from vilification to innocence. Based on historical evidence, it is more likely that Mata Hari was not a double agent. She was not intelligence spy mastermind that Hollywood likes to portray her as. In fact, evidence suggests that Mata Hari was not a clever individual and could not possibly orchestrate being a double agent. In Michelle Moran's historical fiction novel, *Mata Hari's Last Dance*, Mata Hari is portrayed as a largely innocent woman entrapped in a snare of espionage that she did not understand.⁵⁴ In this novel, Mata Hari is motivated by love and survival to spy for France, and never agreed to spy for Germany. She is used as a scapegoat, which contrasts with her historical portrayal as a master spy.

In the last few years, historians debunked the legend of her role as an evil double agent. Modern memories of Mata Hari are less incriminating than historical examples. Today, her memory is that of an exotic dancer who evokes sexuality and the exotic. She is heightened to the level of sexualized celebrities of today such as Kim Kardashian or Jennifer Lopez. Women are continually objectified in a sexual nature as possessions of men.

⁴⁹ Ibid.

⁵⁰ Hari, *The Diary*, 198.

⁵¹ Waagenaar, *Mata Hari*, Vii.

⁵² Ibid., Vii-ix.

⁵³ Ibid., xi.

⁵⁴ Michelle Moran, *Mata Hari's Last Dance* (New York: Touchstone, 2016), 1-207.

Mata Hari's memory as deceitful and sexually promiscuous plays into male fears of female sexuality. It is certain that her memory is largely explained by this phenomenon. Her images in film, novels, and plays as a mysterious femme fatale has become the stereotypical female spy that no one should trust. It paints a picture of how patriarchal societies exploit the images and memories of powerful women for their own purpose of placing women into an inferior and subservient position compared to men.

Furthermore, Mata Hari is remembered for her sexuality and ultimately for her mistakes in life. Women who do everything right are not remembered. People are fascinated by sex and mystery. This is why Mata Hari remains infamous and ingrained within the history of WWI. Her story is a true example of how powerful and sexual women are viewed by society today. The public remembers female figures for their carnal desires rather than their achievements. Women are labelled as "Jezebels" or "tramps" for doing the same actions as men. Mata Hari's story is a lesson for society today about how our views of women are largely negative. It is time to shift away from oppression of women's power and sexuality to empowerment in order to encourage young women rather than repressing their full potential.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

- By the Light of the Silvery Moon*. Directed by David Butler. 101 mins. Warner Bros, 1953. Film.
- Hari, Mata. *The Diary of Mata Hari*. New York: Carroll & Graf Publishers, 1984.
- Hari, Mata. "Mata Hari 1879-1917: A Jean." *Litoral*, no. 248 (2009): 164.
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/43400831>
- Mata Hari*. Directed by Curtis Harrington. 1hr 48min. Cannon Group, 1985. Film.
- Mata Hari*. Produced and directed by George Fitzmaurice. 1hr 25min. Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer, 1931. Film.
- 'Mata Hari' alias MCLEOD Margaretha Geertruida (Marguerite Gertrude): executed by the French in 1917 for accusations of spying for Germany. *The National Archives*. Reference KC 2/1. Crown, 1914-1924, 1-88.
- Notorious*. Directed by Alfred Hitchcock. 102 mins. RKO Radio Pictures, 1946. Film.
- The Times* (London, England), Tuesday, Oct 16, 1917; pg. 6; Issue 41610.
- The Times* (London, England), Wednesday, Apr 21, 1926 p. 13, Issue 44251.

Secondary Sources

- Coulson, Thomas. *Mata Hari: Courtesan and Spy*. New York and London: Harper & Brothers, 1930.
- Darrow, Margaret. *French Women and the First World War: War Stories of the Home Front*. New York: Oxford, 2000.
- Gilbert, Nora. "She Makes Love for the Papers': Love, Sex, and Exploitation in Hitchcock's Mata Hari Films." *Film & History: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Film and Television*, vol. 41, no. 2, 2011, pp. 6–18.
- Howe, Russell Warren. *Mata Hari, the True Story*. New York: Dodd, Mead, 1986.
- Keay, Julia. *The Spy Who Never Was: The Life and Loves of Mata Hari*. London: Michael Joseph, 1987.
- Lahaie, Olivier. 2017. "Mata Hari, Ou Le Badinage Fatal." *Revue Historique Des Armées*, no. 288 (July): 66–79.
<http://mantis.csuchico.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=hia&AN=126175027&site=ehost-live>.
- "Le Mirage Mata Hari." *Historia* (00182281), no. 855 (March 2018): 39.
<http://mantis.csuchico.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=hia&AN=131138817&site=ehost-live>.
- Lethier, Pierre, and Clara Laurent. 2009. "Marthe Richard vs. Mata Hari: The (De)Mythologizing of a French Spy." *Studies in French Cinema* 9 (1): 63–73.
- Sargeant, Amy. 2010. "The Return of Mata Hari: A Woman Redeemed (Sinclair Hill, 1927)." *Historical Journal of Film, Radio & Television* 30 (1): 37–54.
- Siegal, Nina. "Swaddled in the Mysteries of Mata Hari." *The New York Times* (Oct. 14, 2017): Proquest Global Newsstream. <https://search-proquest-om.mantis.csuchico.edu/docview/1950583969/F9898EF11E294A77PQ/1?acountid=10346>
- Waagenaar, Sam. *Mata Hari*. New York: Appleton-Century, 1965.



Nursing Personale of the Anglo Russian Hospital, 1916. Accessed from Library Canada and Archives.

INVESTIGATING RUSSIAN GENDER AND CLASS NORMS THROUGH WORLD WAR I NURSES

| Molly Hamilton

In 1915, at the height of World War I, Russian nurse Lidiia Zakharova remarked that a German trench battle along the Eastern Front was “a city of the dead, its inhabitants frozen in the most unlikely positions.”¹ She went on to describe a pair of soldiers, one German and one Russian, lying “in each other’s arms, recent enemies reconciled by the majesty of death.”² Never before had Zakharova seen such horrors like the ones she witnessed in World War I. Like most other European nations, Russia relied heavily on female involvement during the war. Millions of women across the nation participated in the war, taking on new roles as nurses, doctors, teachers, factory workers, farmers, trench diggers and even soldiers. While British, French and American nurses in World War I have been the subjects of copious amounts of historical study of the Western Front, there is significantly less work published on Russian nurses like Lidiia Zakharova. This is intriguing considering the nature of both fronts. While the Western Front was made famous by often stagnant trench warfare, the Eastern Front was notorious for a highly mobile and dynamic war. Thus, the Russian nurses were forced to deal with a fast-paced, always-moving war which was different from the experiences of their Western counterparts. In studying Russian nurses during World War I, it is apparent that the war allowed Russian women to partake in new wartime activities and interact with women outside of their own station, which helped change both gender and class norms in Russia.

Prior to World War I, nursing in Russia was a rather unestablished profession, largely viewed as a hobby that only women of the upper class engaged in. The creation of the Russian nursing career can be credited to women of the royal family as opposed to the state. It was a dowager empress, Maria Feodorovna (mother of Tsars Alexander I and Nicholas I), who was pivotal in the development of the profession. She constructed homes for widowed women and helped care for the ill. These women became known as Compassionate Widows of the Empress and it was the first charitable organization that helped the sick.³ The first true nursing *obshchina*, or community, in Russia was created

¹ Susan R. Grayzel, *The First World War: A Brief History with Documents*, (Boston, Massachusetts: Bedford/ St. Martin’s, 2013), 79.

² *Ibid.*, 80.

³ Laurie Stoff, *Russia’s Sisters of Mercy and the Great War: More Than Binding Men’s Wounds*, (Lawrence, Kansas: University Press of Kansas, 2015), 19.

by Grand Duchess Alexandra Nikolaeva (daughter of Tsar Nicholas I) and Princess Teresa Old'enburgskaia in 1844. It was called the Order of the Holy Trinity and it required its members to be unmarried women.⁴

While these two organizations helped forge Russian nursing as a pastime, it was the Crimean War (1854-1856) that created a true need for Russian nurses. The well-known Dr. Nikolai Pirogov and Grand Duchess Elena Pavlovna (sister-in-law to Tsar Nicholas I) formed the Order of the Exaltation of the Cross in 1854. They sent twenty-eight trained nurses, the Sisters of Mercy, to Crimea in order to help wounded soldiers.⁵ In the early years of wartime nursing, many men opposed female involvement because it granted them authority that was unprecedented for women at the time. In fact, some doctors, although understaffed, insisted that nurses in hospitals were unnecessary.⁶ These men believed that women should be exempt from seeing the horrors of war, which in their opinion, was a uniquely male experience. The creation of the Order of the Exaltation of the Cross gave way to the establishment of the Russian Red Cross, who after the Crimean and Russo-Turkish War (1877-18878) created more communities for Sisters of Mercy throughout Russia.⁷

The sudden outbreak of World War I in 1914 caused a scramble for military mobilization all throughout Europe. In Russia, it became painfully obvious that nurses were understaffed. Although nursing was a popular profession for women in Britain and France, Russians still thought of it as a hobby rather than a career. In 1914, there were only about 4,000 Sisters of Mercy, while the state wanted 10,000.⁸ Preceding the war, the typical Russian Sister of Mercy trained for over a year in extensive medical courses before she was awarded the coveted title. Yet due to the dire circumstances, training for wartime nurses went from a year to two months.⁹ By the end of 1914, the Russian Red Cross had successfully been able to construct 150 nursing communities that trained upwards of 10,000 women. In 1916, there were over 25,000 Sisters of Mercy.¹⁰ In only half a century, a profession that had been deemed inappropriate for women became noble and prestigious work.

⁴ Ibid.

⁵ Ibid., 21.

⁶ Ibid., 27.

⁷ Ibid., 28.

⁸ ---, "Sisters of Mercy in Russia's Great War," *Russia's Great War and Revolution*, 2014, 1.

⁹ ---, "The 'Myth of the War Experience' and Russian Wartime Nursing during World War I," *Aspasia* 6, (2012): 100.

¹⁰ ---, "Sisters of Mercy," 1.

Russians started to perceive nursing as an activity that embraced the nurturing and docile demeanor of women.¹¹ The increased number of nurses catapulted Russian women into the male sphere for the first time during World War I.

Most of the primary sources from Russian nurses during World War I come from aristocratic women. The participation of Russian nurses in World War I was deeply rooted in the nineteenth-century ideas about the role of upperclass women partaking in philanthropic endeavors—an idea supported by the Orthodox Church.¹² Thus, many Sisters of Mercy came from the nobility. The most famous wartime nurses were Empress Alexandra and her eldest daughters Ol'ga and Tat'iana.¹³ Newspapers commonly printed the names of grand duchesses, princesses, baronesses, and countesses who had joined the Sisters of Mercy. This was supposed to encourage other women to enlist and reaffirm to the public that nursing was a noble cause.¹⁴ Poet Nadezhda Iakusheva claimed that in educated families “where the daughters did not have to work for a living, the girls volunteered in the hospitals.”¹⁵

One example was Tat'iana Varnek, a young socialite in Saint Petersburg who joined a nursing community at her friend's insistence in 1912. She studied at the most distinguished nursing community, the Kaufman Obshchina.¹⁶ After completing her training, she worked at the impoverished Obukhovskii City Hospital for only a month before quitting because of her lack of time for social engagements.¹⁷ She was surprised, however, when World War I broke out and reentered nursing due to a sense of patriotic duty.¹⁸ Another reason for the prevalence of elite women in the Sisters of Mercy, was because only they could receive the intensive schooling that the initial nursing courses required. Women from the lower class with little education had virtually no chance of passing the exams. In fact, even amongst the most highly educated women, half of the women were unable to pass the tests. Varnek recalls fewer than 200 of the original 400 students at the

¹¹ ---, *Russia's Sisters of Mercy*, 40.

¹² Nancy Wingfield and Maria Bucur, *Gender and War in Twentieth-Century Eastern Europe*, (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 2006), 12.

¹³ Stoff, “Myth of the War,” 101.

¹⁴ ---, *Russia's Sisters of Mercy*, 78.

¹⁵ ---, “Myth of the War,” 101.

¹⁶ ---, *Russia's Sisters of Mercy*, 15.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 16.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 38.

Kaufman Obschina passing.¹⁹ With the shortened wartime training, World War I allowed a more diverse group of women into the nursing profession.

While the most notable Sisters of Mercy came from the nobility, a vast number of Sisters and volunteers came from the middle class. In fact, nurse Tat'iana Aleksinskaia described her fellow Sisters as mostly middle-class "Russian intellectuals."²⁰ These intellectuals included members of the Russian intelligentsia and professionals, along with doctors and teachers who all enlisted in nurse training or involved themselves in civilian organizations to aid the wounded.²¹ During the war, nursing also became open to Jewish women, not only Orthodox ones as had been the case previously. A young nurse, N. Chelakova remarked, "all of us, doctors, nurses, and orderlies, gathered from different ends of the country and from different environments, as if to create colorful pattern of national customs and foundation... soon we became like one big, friendly family."²² One of the most notable middle class nurses was the youngest sister of Bolshevik leader Vladimir Lenin. Despite her anti-Tsarist beliefs, Maria Ul'ianova served as a Sister of Mercy in an ambulance train throughout the course of the war.²³ Actresses and singers joined the Sisters of Mercy, as well as the ballerinas A.M. Bakashova and A.P. Domenshchikova.²⁴

Information about the peasant nurses is harder to come by considering they were less likely to write in journals or publish their work than the upper-class nurses. However, these women did exist. Tat'iana Varnek described one of her nursing colleagues as *baba*, meaning peasant. There is even a record of peasant Sister M.E. Nikolaeva receiving a medal by the Red Cross in 1915 for her extraordinary work in wartime nursing.²⁵ Many doctors and nurses believed that some of the most dedicated nurses were the peasants who had no other choice but to work, unlike a lot of their comrades.²⁶ For possibly the first time in Russian history, women from the royal family were interacting with women from the peasantry. In a now famous quote, Grand Duchess Maria Pavlovna recalled, "almost no one knew me. The nurse's uniform brought me close to those who wore khaki; we

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 16.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 77.

²¹ ---, "Myth of the War," 101.

²² ---, *Russia's Sisters of Mercy*, 173.

²³ ---, "Myth of War," 102.

²⁴ ---, *Russia's Sisters of Mercy*, 78.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, 81.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, 17.

all lived the same life and had the same interests.”²⁷ While it is doubtful that the Grand Duchess had the same interests as peasant or even middle class nurses, the quote demonstrates how the war created social mingling that was not acceptable before 1914.

Some Russian women saw World War I as an opportunity to further women’s rights and elevate the place of women in Russian society. One of the most outspoken feminists of the time was Dr. Poliksena Shishkina-Iavein, leader of the League for Women’s Equality. She urged her fellow women to enlist as wartime nurses. Shiskina-Iavein stated that participation in the war “is our obligation to the fatherland, and this will give us the right to participate as the equals of men in the new life of victorious Russia.”²⁸ Another supporter of female involvement in the war was Tat’iana Aleksinskaia, a socialist doctor. She recalled working in a “feminist train” and was proud to be working with all women doctors and nurses in her unit.²⁹

There were two competing images of the Sisters of Mercy. The first, and most common depiction, was the Sister of Mercy as a pious and feminine figure. In fact, Canadian nurse Dorothy Cotton observed how nun-like the Sisters of Mercy seemed in comparison to the militaristic uniforms worn by Canadian and Western European nurses.³⁰ The all-white uniforms covered the nurse almost from head to toe. The uniform was meant to cover any part of the woman that seemed feminine. The curves of a woman: the hips, chest, and buttocks, were concealed by the shapeless dress. The sleeves were long and the collars high. Long hair was covered by a veil and it was forbidden for nurses to wear cosmetics.³¹ The overall effect of the uniform was a woman who appeared to be pious, virginal, and extremely non-threatening to the patriarchy (see image preceding this section). For soldiers, these young women seemed untouchable in their nun-like appearance which was meant to reduce sexual liaisons between the soldiers and nurses.

This portrayal of the Sisters of Mercy was immortalized on postcards. Postcards were relatively new in Russia, having only been introduced in 1872 by Austrians and Prussians.³² To raise money for the war, the Ladies’ Circle of the Petrograd School of Army Medics

²⁷ *Ibid.*, 105.

²⁸ ---, “Myth of the War,” 100.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, 102.

³⁰ Christine Hallett, *Veiled Warriors: Allied Nurses of the First World War*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), 112.

³¹ Stoff, “Myth of the War,” 107.

³² Hubertus Jahn, *Patriotic Culture in Russia during World War I*, (New York: Cornell Press University, 1995), 39.

published a variety of postcards depicting the Sisters.³³ This new type of propaganda “depicted these heroines as caring mothers, hand-holding lovers, and untouchable beauties. They were shown at work in the hospital, at the front, [and] even in portraits.”³⁴ These prints helped to instill patriotism into the Russian public. The image of the innocent Sister of Mercy was supposed to represent someone worth fighting for.

The competing image to the pious and feminine Sister of Mercy, was the tough and gender-bending nurse that was common on the Eastern Front. The Sisters who belonged to the dangerous *letuchka*, or ‘flying columns’, redefined the image of the nurse. Because the war at the Eastern Front was very mobile and most of the fighting took place far away from hospitals, flying columns were invented.³⁵ Flying columns were mobile hospital units that followed the troops. These hospital units were not extravagant and were often limited to a horse drawn cart or wagon.³⁶ The nurses who belonged to the flying columns often times moved just as rapidly as the troops. Furthermore, nurses who were a part of flying columns faced much more danger than nurses serving in hospitals. According to Laurie Stoff, front-line “Sisters of Mercy experienced extreme cold, constant fatigue, vermin infestations, contagious diseases, deadly artillery fire, and aerial bombardment.”³⁷ Medical personnel also faced gas attacks by Allied enemies and risked second hand gas exposure from the clothing of wounded soldiers.³⁸ Mental illness was also a common side-effect of the war. Nurses frequently suffered from manic depression and hysteria after seeing war atrocities.³⁹ For these reasons, the Sisters of Mercy on the front were some of the toughest and most focused nurses of the war. Flying column nurses often wore breeches, heavy jackets, boots and they sometimes rode horses in order to manage the rough terrain.⁴⁰ For example, Sister Lidiia Zakharova wore a man’s leather jacket and riding boots on the front. She remarked that, “With God’s help my transformation went well, the feminine in me decreased more and more, and I did not know whether to be glad or sad about this.”⁴¹ The circumstances of war

³³ *Ibid.*, 40.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, 42.

³⁵ Hallett, *Veiled Warriors*, 105.

³⁶ Stoff, “‘Myth of the War,’” 104.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, 98.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, 104.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, 106.

⁴⁰ Hallett, *Veiled Warriors*, 108.

⁴¹ Barbara Alpern Engel, *Women in Russia, 1700-2000*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 128.

demanding that these women challenged the conventional notions of Russian femininity through their manly dress and tough exterior.

Nurses on the front were also given more responsibility and power. The lack of medical personnel made it possible for women to hold positions of power. Instead of having male superiors, many women headed the flying columns. This was a very new concept to Russian women who had previously always followed male instruction. This was especially distressing to Grand Duchess Maria Pavlovna who was granted the position of head nurse of a rear hospital in Pskov in 1914.⁴² She had a hard time adjusting to the position because she had never given orders before. Following the traditional gender roles prevalent in Russian culture, she “since childhood been taught submission and obedience. It was easy and perfectly natural for [her] to carry out orders; but [she] could not, did not know how to, give any.”⁴³ Women could also be found leading ambulance train cars in addition to flying columns. These new opportunities for women helped to alter the typical gender roles in Russia.

Not only did World War I allow Russian women to interact across a multitude of classes, but it also allowed them to interact with women from other European nations. Florence Farmborough was an English woman living in Moscow when the war broke out (See Fig. 2). Her love for Russian language and culture compelled her to volunteer in Russia instead of her home country of Britain. She completed a six-month nursing course and became a surgical nurse on the front. She romanticized her time in Russia and looked back on the experience with fondness. However, like her fellow nurses, she was shocked and appalled by the death and destruction of war. In her memoir she remarked, “I loved Russia the most because she taught me the meaning of the word suffering.”⁴⁴

Violetta Thurstan was another English nurse who served in a flying column on the Eastern Front. She, like Farmborough, found both beauty and sorrow in the Russian landscape and people. She opted to serve on the front where the fighting was most intense, as opposed to a hospital. She survived many life-threatening incidents and saw unspeakable horrors. After a particularly gruesome battle she recalled “one man had practically his whole face blown off, another had his

⁴² Stoff, *Russia's Sisters of Mercy*, 135.

⁴³ *Ibid.*

⁴⁴ Christine Hallett, *Nurse Writers of the Great War*, (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2016), 217.

clothes and the flesh of his back all torn away.”⁴⁵ What Farmborough, Thurstan and the other flying column nurses experienced were brutal acts of violence that threw them into the male sphere. Other European nations viewed women as too fragile to see the atrocities of war and subsequently placed them far away from the fighting. However, nurses on the Eastern Front witnessed the war first-hand.

Very different from the flying columns were the wartime hospitals. Most of these hospitals were located far away from the fighting. Many of the Sisters of Mercy hailing from elite families were able to choose where they were stationed due to their connections.⁴⁶ As expected, most chose to work in these safer environments. For example, the Empress Alexandra and her daughters worked at the very comfortable hospital on the grounds of the palace at Tsarkoe Selo, which was far away from the fighting.⁴⁷ Another lavish hospital was the Anglo-Russian Hospital in Petrograd. Housed at the former Dmitri Palace, “the walls and ceilings [were] very elaborate...there [were] about eight huge gold chandeliers.”⁴⁸ (See Fig. 3) The hospital was a cross-cultural collaboration between the English and Russians. The hospital opened on February 12, 1916 under Lady Muriel Paget and Lady Sybil Grey, with support from the Tsar’s aunt, dowager queen Alexandra.⁴⁹ Canadian nurse Dorothy Cotton served at the Anglo-Russian Hospital with both English and Russian nurses. A far cry from the harsh conditions on the front, Cotton attended parties at the English Club and danced with men in uniform in her free time.⁵⁰ She went to the Winter Palace everyday where she assembled supplies and socialized with English and French speaking Russian aristocrats. In a letter to her sister, she recalled how polished and well-kept the Russian ladies’ fingernails were.⁵¹ While most of wartime hospitals were not this extravagant, serving in a hospital was still much safer than serving in a flying column.

⁴⁵ Violetta Thurstan, *Field Hospital and Flying Column: Being the Journal of an English Nursing Sister in Belgium and Russia*, (London: G.P Putnam’s Sons, 1916), 162.

⁴⁶ Stoff, “Sisters of Mercy,” 2.

⁴⁷ ---, *Russia’s Sisters of Mercy*, 78.

⁴⁸ Dorothy Cotton, Letter to her Mother, 25 January 1916, accessed from *Library and Archives Canada*.

⁴⁹ Hallett, *Veiled Warriors*, 108.

⁵⁰ Dorothy Cotton, Letter to her Mother, Petrograd, 25 December 1915, accessed from *Library and Archives Canada*, 1-6.

⁵¹ ---, Letter to Elsie [Cotton], 8 December 1915, accessed from *Library and Archives Canada*, 1-8.

One aspect that set Sisters of Mercy apart from Western nurses was the unique way in which they treated their patients. Russian nurses were famous for the ceremonial and quasi-religious way they redressed wounds.⁵² This remarkable practice took place in the private ‘dressing rooms’ of the hospital where patients were moved to when their wounds needed to be redressed. This spiritual practice was uniquely Russian and foreign nurses serving in Russian hospitals were awed by it. English nurse, Violetta Thurstan, recalled how adept Sisters of Mercy were at aseptic dressing techniques. While they focused intently on the injuries and wounds, she criticized the Russians for being rather unconcerned with the patient as a whole.⁵³

For many Sisters of Mercy, the February Revolution and the abdication of Tsar Nicholas II in 1917 came as a shock. Amidst the domestic turmoil, attention shifted from the war to the political upheaval at home. At the Anglo-Russian Hospital, the Imperial flag was traded for the red flag of the Revolution and “men fixed with bayonets” ordered the hospital personnel to remove the imperial insignia from the door.⁵⁴ As most of the Sisters came from the elite, they were undoubtedly Tsarists and deeply upset with the news of his abdication. Florence Farmborough “shared the grief of her fellow nurses that their Tsar had been humiliated.”⁵⁵

At the outbreak of the October Revolution in 1917, Anglo-Russian nurse Mary Britnieva became terrified (See Fig. 4). Hailing from a family belonging to the Russian intelligentsia, she was worried her family would be persecuted by the Bolsheviks. She also felt her dual-British citizenship made her family a threat to the ‘new’ Russia. However, she stayed in Russia with her husband who was ordered to stay by Bolsheviks.⁵⁶ Almost all of the English and Canadian nurses serving in Russia left after the abdication of the Tsar. In 1918, English nurse Florence Farmborough fled Russia and returned to England via Siberia and the Pacific.

During the Russian Civil War, many Sisters of Mercy who were still loyal to the Tsar either joined the White Army as nurses or fled Russia altogether. In contrast, some Sisters from the peasantry joined the Bolshevik led Red Army and became ‘Red Sisters.’⁵⁷ In only

⁵² Hallett, *Veiled Warriors*, 112.

⁵³ Thurstan, *Field Hospital and Flying Column*, 116.

⁵⁴ Hallett, *Veiled Warriors*, 209.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, 210.

⁵⁶ ---, *Nurse Writers*, 223.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*

a few months, these former colleagues, who had worked together and grown to close during the war, became enemies.

The Bolshevik takeover marked the end of the Sisters of Mercy. Seen as part of the bourgeoisie, Sisters were met with harassment and abuse from revolutionaries.⁵⁸ They represented the elite class that most of the Russian population detested. It immediately became clear that there was no place for this semi-religious order in the new Russian socialist state. The Sisters of Mercy gave way to a new “All-Union Congress of Sisters of Mercy” but it too was disbanded in 1919 by the Bolsheviks.⁵⁹

Recognizing women’s new entrance into mainstream Russian society, the Bolsheviks exerted a tremendous amount of effort to win the support of working class women.⁶⁰ They revived a former publication, *Rabotnista*, or “Working Women” and promised to end the war and lower prices.⁶¹ Upon the Russian exit of World War I, one woman exclaimed while waiting in a bread line, “I congratulate you, citizeness, we Russian women are going to receive [our] rights.”⁶² While women did receive the right to vote under the Bolsheviks, it was only a symbolic power and they had little say in the government. Under the Bolsheviks, the ‘male sphere’ and ‘female sphere’ fell away and left behind only the ‘working sphere’ that both women and men were expected to occupy. The progress that Russian nurses had made in World War I, specifically overcoming gender and class barriers, were thwarted by the Russian Revolution.

Historian Peter Gatrell summarizes the involvement of Russian women in military nursing the best by stating that, “the war also demonstrated female capacity to enter directly the military terrain in ways that both liberated women and disturbed current convention.”⁶³ For the first time in Russian history, women from various social classes and backgrounds were able to come together and work toward a common goal. Furthermore, women who served on the Eastern Front did not adhere to the traditional Russian notions of femininity and

⁵⁸ Elizabeth Murray, “Russian Nurses: From the Tsarist Sister of Mercy to the Soviet Comrade Nurse: A Case Study of Absence of Migration of Nursing Knowledge and Skills,” *Nursing Inquiry* 11, no. 3 (2004): 133.

⁵⁹ Hallett, *Veiled Warriors*, 106.

⁶⁰ Engels, *Women in Russia*, 138.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*

⁶² *Ibid.*, 135.

⁶³ Peter Gatrell, “The Epic and the Domestic: Women and War in Russia, 1914-1918” in Gail Braybon, ed. *Evidence, History and the Great War: Historians and the Impact of 1914-1918*, (New York: Berghann, 2003), 202.

redefined the image of a nurse. They entered the male sphere of war and proved themselves capable of handling even the worst types of violence. These Sisters of Mercy, for a short time, altered gender and class norms in Russia before the Bolsheviks took power and further toppled the class system and traditional gender roles—stunting the progress of women by placing them under a regime with little political voice and rights.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

- Britnieva, Mary. *One Woman's Story*. (London: Arthur Baker, 1934).
- Cotton, Dorothy. Letter to Elsie [Cotton], 4 March 1917. Accessed from *Library and Archives Canada*, 1-4.
- . Letter to Elsie [Cotton], 8 December 1915. Accessed from *Library and Archives Canada*, 1-8.
- . Letter to her Mother, Petrograd, 25 December 1915. Accessed from *Library and Archives Canada*, 1-6.
- . Letter to her Mother, 25 January 1916. Accessed from *Library and Archives Canada*.
- . "Nursing Sister Dorothy Cotton's ward A in the Anglo Russian Hospital at the Dmitri Palace. Formerly a ballroom," 1916. Accessed from *Library and Archives Canada*.
- . "Nursing Personale of the Anglo Russian Hospital, 1916." Accessed from *Library Canada and Archives*.
- Farmborough, Florence. "The Red Cross on the Eastern Front, 1914-1917." *Imperial War Museum*.
- . *With the Armies of the Tsar: A Nurse at the Russian Front in War in Revolution, 1914-1918*. (New York: Cooper Square Press, 2000).
- Thurstan, Violetta. *Field Hospital and Flying Column: Being the Journal of an English Nursing Sister in Belgium and Russia*. (London: G.P Putnam's Sons, 1916).

Secondary Sources

- Bisha, Robin, Jehanne M. Gheith, Christine Holden, and William Wagner, eds. *Russian Women, 1698-1917: Experience and Expression, an Anthology of Sources*. (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 2002).
- Engel, Barbara Alpern. *Women in Russia, 1700-2000*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004).
- Gatrell, Peter. "The Epic and the Domestic: Women and War in Russia, 1914-1918" in Gail Braybon, ed. *Evidence, History and the Great War: Historians and the Impact of 1914-1918*. (New York: Berghann, 2003).
- Goldman, Wendy Z. *Women at the Gates: Gender and Industry in Stalin's Russia*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002).
- Grayzel, Susan R. *The First World War: A Brief History with Documents*. (Boston, Massachusetts: Bedford/ St. Martin's, 2013).
- Hallett, Christine. *Nurse Writers of the Great War*. (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2016).
- . *Veiled Warriors: Allied Nurses of the First World War*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014).
- Jahn, Hubertus. *Patriotic Culture in Russia during World War I*. (New York: Cornell Press University, 1995).
- Murray, Elizabeth. "Russian Nurses: From the Tsarist Sister of Mercy to the Soviet Comrade Nurse: A Case Study of Absence of Migration of Nursing Knowledge and Skills," *Nursing Inquiry* 11, no. 3 (2004): 130-137.

Stoff, Laurie. "The 'Myth of the War Experience' and Russian Wartime Nursing during World War I." *Aspasia* 6, (2012): 96-116.

---. *Russia's Sisters of Mercy and the Great War: More Than Binding Men's Wounds*. (Lawrence, Kansas: University Press of Kansas, 2015).

---. "Sisters of Mercy in Russia's Great War." *Russia's Great War and Revolution*, 2014.

Thompson, John M. *Russia and the Soviet Union*. (Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press, 2013).

Wingfield, Nancy and Maria Bucur (ed.). *Gender and War in Twentieth-Century Eastern*

Europe. (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 2006).

The Historiography of the Easter Rising



An image of Sackville Street, Dublin after the Easter Rising in 1916. (Image source: *The People's War Book and Pictorial Atlas of the World*, 1920, via *Wikimedia Commons*, November 17, 2017)

THE HISTORIOGRAPHY OF THE EASTER RISING

| Jordan Cottrell

From the beginning, the Easter Rising of 1916 left a complicated legacy. An armed insurrection, planned by a small and determined group, began the Monday after Easter. Would-be revolutionaries took over Dublin and proclaimed an Irish Republic, only to end in surrender six days later after fighting with British soldiers and police destroyed much of the city and resulted in almost 500 deaths, almost half of them civilians. Initially, most Irish people did not support the rebellion, objecting to its violence, its suddenness, and the threat it posed to the gradual move toward relative-independence in the form of home rule, particularly given that the United Kingdom was mired in the midst of World War I at the time of the Rising. In fact, immediately before the Rising, leader Eoin MacNeill of the Irish Volunteers, one of the largest nationalist paramilitary organizations, publicly issued an order countermanding the planned Rising, which resulted in considerable confusion and decreased participation. However, public opinion rapidly shifted in the wake of a further sixteen deaths: those of the executed “leaders.” All members of the small Military Council who planned the Rising and signatories of the Proclamation of the Republic were executed, but so were some who did not participate in the planning or hold high ranks in any of the groups involved like the Volunteers, the Irish Republican Brotherhood (IRB), the Irish Citizen Army (ICA), or Cumann na mBan. One such man, Willie Pearse, was likely targeted primarily because he was the younger brother of poet, schoolteacher, revolutionary leader, and declared President of the Republic Patrick Pearse. The executions took place over several days, raising further ire with each one. While the British authorities caught on to this change of sentiment, and commuted hundreds of other death sentences, they created martyrs with those sixteen executions. The fierce British crackdown shored up support for the nationalist cause, and led to the escalation of the Irish revolutionary era into a War of Independence. The war ended with the creation of the Irish Free State, later the Republic of Ireland, albeit without the heavily protestant counties of the north. However, even in the country’s earliest days, the legacy of the Easter Rising proved complex. The country quickly entered a civil war where opponents of the provisional government decried the Anglo-Irish Treaty, which established independence, a betrayal of the Proclamation of the Easter Rising.

From those early days to the commemorations and re-evaluations spurred by the centenary in 2016, Irish political and cultural developments shaped how people viewed the Rising. Popular and

academic historians continually found ample material for exploration and debate in the history of the Easter Rising. The rich historiography on the subject continued to grow and each year new books and articles about the Rising came out. However, these works reflected a diverse range of opinions on any number of aspects of the events of 1916. The debates evoked by the Rising also reflected ongoing developments in Ireland, including the often violent political and religious divides that plagued the island throughout the twentieth century. Unusually, the historiographical trends and debates played out throughout Irish society: in newspapers, political debates, public commemorations, popular histories, and in academia.¹

The Easter Rising long enthralled journalists and other writers of popular histories, charged politicians' rhetoric, and served as a meaningful touchstone of Irish identity for many. In the first fifty years following 1916, people knew, and cared, more about the Rising more than one might normally expect for such a small, short, and "unsuccessful" attempt at revolution. They also celebrated it. Revolutionary credentials garnered from participation in the Rising proved invaluable, virtually a pre-requisite for holding political office, as demonstrated by the success of the only garrison leader to survive the Rising, Eamon de Valera. He led anti-Treaty forces to victory in the Civil War and served as the head of Ireland's government for decades. However, in many ways this popular admiration was at odds with the views percolating among academic historians, including those at both the heavily Catholic University College, Dublin, and the traditionally Protestant bastion Trinity College, Dublin. "Revisionist" approaches to the Rising, questioned the violence brought forward by a small number of would-be revolutionaries at a considerable cost to the rest of the city and country, existed for several decades before historian Roy Foster famously declared, "We Are All Revisionists Now," in 1986. Nevertheless, a distinct increase in the number, depth, and prominence of revisionist histories of the Rising and Irish history emerged in the 1970s and 1980s.² With the publication of Foster's landmark survey of

¹ Allison Martin, "Easter Rising Commemorations in the Early Irish State," *History Ireland* 24, no. 2 (March/April 2016): 42-22; J. J. Lee, "1916 as Virtual History," *History Ireland* 14, no. 2 (March/April 2006): 5-6; Richard S. Grayson and Fearghal McGarry, "Introduction," in *Remembering 1916: The Easter Rising, the Somme and Politics of Memory in Ireland*, eds. Richard S. Grayson and Fearghal McGarry (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016): 1; Dominic Bryanm "Ritual, Identity and Nation: When the Historian Becomes the High Priest of Commemoration," in *Remembering 1916*, 24.

² Charles Townshend, *Easter 1916: The Irish Rebellion* (Chicago: Ivan R. Dee, 2005): 348; Labhras Joye and Brenda Malone, "The Roll of Honour of 1916," *History Ireland* 14, no. 2 (March/April 2006): 10-11; Roy Foster, "We Are All Revisionists Now," *The*

modern Irish history, *Modern Ireland, 1600-1972*, which became a runaway bestseller, some of these ideas escaped the ivory tower and entered the public consciousness. An explosive debate played out in the popular press, as nationalistic popular historians reacted to the questioning of a core component of the foundation of Ireland's independence. Critics often inaccurately portrayed the revisionists as Unionists and highlighted the Protestantism of some prominent revisionists such as Foster and Paul Bew, despite the popularity of revisionism among Catholic academics such as those at University College.³

This debate took place under the same shadow that spurred a generation of young historians to question the Rising and that led to a dramatically muted 75th anniversary. The lavish events of the 50th anniversary celebrated the events of 1916 as a glorious revolution that culminated in the creation of the modern, independent state led by the revolutionary hero de Valera. Popular histories emerged, most notably Max Caulfield's celebrated *The Easter Rebellion*, though these histories reflected little of the revisionist tendencies of the Dublin universities. The 75th anniversary, however, saw far fewer celebrations, with official ceremonies reduced to a small, quiet commemoration at one of the sites most associated with the Rising. By this point, the Troubles were in full swing terrorist groups battled over Northern Ireland's continued status as part of the United Kingdom. The government neither wished to do anything to encourage further violence in Northern Ireland nor to celebrate a history of violence in the south. Throughout the century since the Rising, anniversaries, particularly landmark anniversaries, both reflected Ireland's changing relationship with its past and created natural opportunities and spurs for historians and public intellectuals to reflect on the legacy of one of the seminal events in the creation of modern Ireland.⁴

Irish Review, no. 1 (1986): 1-5; Ciaran Brady, ed., *Interpreting Irish History: The Debate on Historical Revisionism 1938-1994* (Dublin: Irish Academic Press, 1994); Evi Gkotszardis, "Irish Revisionism and Continental Theory: An Intellectual Kinship," in "A Post-Christian Ireland?" Special Issue, *The Irish Review* no. 27 (Summer, 2001): 121-139.

³ John M. Regan, "Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde: 'the two histories,'" *History Ireland* 20, no. 1 (January/February 2012): 10-13; Ian McBride, "The Shadow of the Gunman: Irish Historians and the IRA," in "At the Crossroads of Past and Present – 'Contemporary' History and the Historical Discipline," *Journal of Contemporary History* 46, no. 3 (July 2011): 686-710.

⁴ Brian Hanley, "Who Fears to Speak of 1916?" *History Ireland* 23, no. 2 (March/April 2015): 10-11; Max Caulfield, *The Easter Rebellion* (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1963); "'The Irish Republic Was Proclaimed by Poster': The Politics of Commemorating the Easter Rising," in *Remembering 1916*, eds. Richard S. Grayson and Fearghal McGarry: 43-61; Margaret O'Callaghan, "Reframing 1916 after 1969: Irish

Historians debated fiercely how much continued exultation of the Rising, through public events such as the anniversary celebrations and through general cultural sources including school history lessons, fueled extremist sentiment.⁵ Reportedly, books about the revolutionary period and ensuing civil war by the prominent journalist and popular historian Tim Pat Coogan became the reading material of choice for members of the Provisional Irish Republican Army in detention. One should note that Coogan himself, while fiercely Republican, did not endorse terrorist activities. Despite concerns about the potentially harmful effects of popular commemorations, revisionist historians published more and more on the subject of the revolutionary period and the Rising. However, they often framed it as part of a debate about a theory that the Rising actually hurt Ireland's democratic progress toward national liberation, independence, and unity. Proponents of this "democratic theory" argued that by interrupting Ireland's journey toward home rule – a situation of devolved power within the British Empire, promised by the British government and delayed due to World War I – the Easter Rising actually set Ireland back as it spent years mired in revolutionary and civil wars and lost the northern counties of Ulster.⁶

The democratic theory debate formed one component of a longer conversation about the nature of the Rising. Even the terminology used to describe the week after Easter in 1916 reflected the uncertain, and often uncomfortable, ways that revisionist historians looked at 1916. Plenty eschewed classifying it as a revolution, and while many settled for more ambiguous terms like "rebellion," "insurrection," or the most common "rising," others took this further. Some historians argued that because a small number of militarized leaders drove the violent attempt to overthrow the government, the Easter Rising was actually more of an attempted coup d'état or a putsch than a revolution. During the height of the Troubles, historians effectively distanced themselves from support of the pursuit of Irish independence by a small number of committed radicals willing to use violence at a time when such distance had relevance far beyond the ivory tower. One could not defend support for the Provisional IRA by means of moral equivocation with the Easter Rising if one rejected the morality of the Rising in the

Governments, a National Day of Reconciliation, and the Politics of Commemoration in the 1970s," in *Remembering 1916*, 207-223.

⁵ Regan, "Southern Irish Nationalism as a Historical Problem," *The Historical Journal* 50, no. 1 (March 2007): 197-223; Dennis Kennedy, "Casting a Cold Eye on 1916 (and 1966)," *History Ireland* 23, no. 5 (September/October 2015):10-11; Paul Bew, "'Why Did Jimmie Die?'" *History Ireland* 14, no. 2 (March/April 2006): 37-39.

⁶ Ciaran Brady, ed., *Interpreting Irish History*; Paul Bew, "The Easter Rising: Lost Leaders and Lost Opportunities," *The Irish Review* no. 11 (Winter, 1991/1992): 9-13; Ian McBride, "The Shadow of the Gunman," 686-710.

first place.⁷ Even Coogan, republican journalist and popular historian par excellence, came to adopt much of this perspective in the wake of the Troubles and concerns about the fragility of the peace process of the 1990s. He concluded in 2001 that “the 1916 Rising was both profoundly important and profoundly unnecessary” and “the message of 1916...is that those who do not learn from history really can be doomed to relive it.”⁸

These considerations challenged histories of the Rising that emanated from outside of Ireland as well. The Rising served as inspiration and example for other foreign uprisings and foreign, often politically charged, histories of the Rising abounded. Other nationalist movements that sought to overthrow their imperial masters cited the Irish example. Even outside of these ex-colonial countries, historians in the United States and Western Europe sometimes portrayed the Easter Rising as the first anti-colonial revolution and continued to do so even when such a view was at odds with the revisionist trends among many historians who specialized in Irish history.⁹

With such a fraught political environment, Irish history of the revolutionary period continued to focus heavily on traditional political, military, and intellectual history. This contrasted markedly with historiographical trends in the rest of the world as histories of the Easter Rising focused less on areas such as social, cultural, gender, and quantitative history that were fashionable elsewhere in the world in the 1970s and 1980s. Following the Good Friday Agreement in 1998 and the dissipation of the Troubles, a wealth of new approaches to the Easter Rising emerged.¹⁰ Historians looked at previously understudied areas

⁷ Charles Townshend, *Easter 1916: The Irish Rebellion* (Chicago: Ivan R. Dee, 2005): xvi; Hanley, “Who Fears to Speak of 1916?”: 10-11.

⁸ Tim Pat Coogan, *1916: The Easter Rising* (London: Phoenix, 2001): 1, 4.

⁹ Maurice J. Casey, “Historiography: ‘Red Easter,’” *History Ireland* 24, no. 5 (September/October 2016) 40-42; Mansour Bonakdarian, “The Easter Rising as a Milestone in Iranian Nationalist Appraisals of the Irish Question,” *American Journal of Irish Studies* no. 14 (2017): 51-81; Tom Garvin, “The Anatomy of a Nationalist Revolution: Ireland, 1858-1928,” *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 28, no. 3 (July, 19186): 468-501; Thomas J. Rowland, “The American Catholic Press and the Easter Rebellion,” *The Catholic Historical Review* 81, no. 1 (January, 1995): 67-83; Mustafa Shakir, “Revision and Revival: A Postcolonial Approach to Irish Cultural Nationalism,” *New Hibernia Review/Iris Éireannach Nua* 2, no. 3 (Autumn 2016): 13-16; Keith Jeffery, *1916: A Global History* (New York: Bloomsbury, 2016); Sinisa Malesevic, “Irishness and Nationalism,” in *Are the Irish Different?* ed. Tom Inglis (Manchester: Manchester University Press): 10-21; Gkotzardis, “Irish Revisionism and Continental Theory,” 121-139.

¹⁰ Guy Beiner and Joep Leerssen, “Why Irish History Starved: A Virtual Historiography,” *Field Day Review* 3 (2007): 66-81; Linda Connolly, “A New Vision of Irish Studies,” in *Are the Irish Different?* ed. Tom Inglis (Manchester: Manchester

such as the experience of children during the revolt, Irish soldiers in the British Army, archaeological remains of the Rising, cultural representations, and the education of participants.¹¹ Historians looked at the daily life of those in Dublin, including quotidian aspects such as the limited food supply that affected those on all sides – or none – of the Rising. Even areas as basic as class garnered attention in a way they largely failed to do before. Historians and the general public alike found interest in subjects once taboo in a conservative Catholic country, such as sex and homosexuality.¹²

One of the most egregiously obscured areas of inquiry was the considerable role played by women. For much of the time since the Rising, few women merited attention beyond the prominent Constance, Countess Markiewicz, a daughter of the Anglo-Irish Ascendancy who co-founded and led the women's group Cumann na mBan, served as a commander in the ICA, and was the only woman to receive a death sentence, albeit one commuted on account of her sex. With the

University Press, 2014): 230-240; Sighle Bhreathnach-Lynch, "Revisionism, the Rising, and Representation," *New Hibernia Review/Iris Éireannach Nua* 3, no. 1 (Spring, 1999) 82-96; Mary E. Daly, "Forty Shades of Grey? Irish Historiography and the Challenges of Multidisciplinarity," in *Ireland Beyond Boundaries: Mapping Irish Studies in the Twenty-First Century*, eds. Liam Harte and Yvonne Whelan (London: Pluto Press, 2007): 92-110.

¹¹ Joe Duffy, *Children of the Rising: The Untold Story of the Young Lives Lost During Easter 1916* (Dublin: Hachette Books Ireland, 2015); Tom Burke, "The Other Women of 1916," *History Ireland* 24, no. 5 (September-October, 2006): 8-9; Neil Richardson, *According to Their Lights: Stories of Irishmen in the British Army, Easter 1916* (Doughcloyne, Wilston, Cork: The Collins Press, 2015); Bhreathnach-Lynch, "The Easter Rising 1916: Constructing a Canon in Art & Artefacts," *History Ireland* 5, no. 1 (Spring, 1997): 37-42; Nicholas Allen, "Cultural Representations of 1916," in *Remembering 1916: The Easter Rising, the Somme, and the Politics of Memory in Ireland*, eds. Richard S. Grayson and Fearghal McGarry (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016): 168-180; James Moran, *Staging the Easter Rising: 1916 As Theatre* (Cork: Cork University Press, 2005); Franc Myles, "The Archaeology of 1916," *Archaeology Ireland* 30, no. 3 (Autumn, 2016): 13-16; Foster, *Vivid Faces: The Revolutionary Generation in Ireland, 1890-1923* (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 2014): 31-74; Gal Gerson, "Cultural Subversion and the Backgroun of the Irish 'Easter Poets,'" *Journal of Contemporary History* 30, no. 2 (April 1995): 333-347.

¹² Mick O'Farrell, *1916: What the People Saw* (Cork: Mercier Press, 2013); Townshend, *Easter 1916*; Fergus Campbell, "The Social Dynamics of Nationalist Politics in the West of Ireland 1898-1918," *Past & Present* no. 182 (February 2004): 175-209; Gavin Foster, "Class Dismissed? The Debate Over a Social Basis to the Treaty Split and Irish Civil War," *Saothar* 33 (2008): 73-86; Peter Hart, "The Social Structure of the Irish Republican Army, 1916-1923," *The Historical Journal* 42, no. 1 (March 1999): 307-317; John M. Regan, "Strangers in Our Midst: Middling People, Revolution and Counter-Revolution in Twentieth-Century Ireland," *Radharc* no. 2 (November 2001): 25-50; Matthew Schultz, "Ancient Warriors, Modern Sexualities: Easter 1916 and the Advent of Post-Catholic Ireland," in *Haunted Historiographies: The Rhetoric of Ideology in Postcolonial Irish Fiction* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2014): 97-128; Foster, *Vivid Faces*: 115-143.

exception of Markiewicz and Dr. Kathleen Lynn, the chief medical officer of the Rising, those who received any attention were largely relatives of the executed leaders, celebrated more as representatives of the martyrs than in their own right: Kathleen Clarke, widow of IRB and Military Council leader Tom Clarke; Grace Gifford Plunkett, who married her fiancé Joseph Plunkett in a prison chapel mere hours before his execution, endearing her to generations of republicans; and various female relatives of Patrick Pearse.

Even these women often only merited attention as figureheads, rather than as active and important participants. History remembered Clarke as the grieving widow, rather than as an individual more involved in the planning of the Rising than most of those executed in its wake, who inherited control of the Military Council's funds and names as part of the survival plan of the IRB and Military Council to ensure their work continued. Similarly, history remembered Markiewicz for her admittedly flamboyant self-designed uniform and her "exotic" title, rather than her role as a leading officer, occasional comments about her aristocratic good skill as a "cracking shot" aside. De Valera even went so far as to substitute more compliant female relatives of those killed for less agreeable ones when he needed their political backing at commemorations. Also ignored was the Rising's significant connection to feminist movements of the day, including suffrage movements. The proclamation took a radical view of gender relations, promising universal suffrage and equality to all citizens, but this largely unfulfilled promise of the revolutionary gender equality fit poorly in the conservative, Catholic Ireland that emerged after the Civil War. Ignorance about the role of women persisted despite the significant, and often very public, ways that women participated in the Rising at all levels.

Margaret Ward, the first major historian to tackle this gaping hole, published *Unmanageable Revolutionaries: Women and Irish Nationalism* in 1989. Her excellent work stood largely alone despite the increased attention paid to women's history and gender history in other parts of the world. More women's histories eventually reached the mainstream of the historical literature, but the process proved slow. Ward cited a thesis by the then-graduate student Ann Mathews; Mathews eventually released a book based on the first half of this thesis, *Renegades: Irish Republican Women 1900-1922*, but only in 2010. In line with the overall expanded examinations of the history of women in the Easter Rising, women's historians quickly sought to incorporate the experiences of more "ordinary" women, moving beyond the well-connected, and typically middle-to-upper class, women who garnered biographical attention. Lucy McDiarmid's *At Home in the*

Revolution looked at the lives of women caught in a city under siege. Cal McCarthy's book on Cumann na mBan examined the women's paramilitary organization that played a considerable role in the Rising.¹³

General historians of the Rising varied in their incorporation of women into general histories of the Rising in recent years. Foster's generational biography *Vivid Faces* notably paid extensive attention to the women involved in the Rising and demonstrated the role women played in forming part of an intellectual culture ripe for a struggle for independence. Other historians incorporated the considerable roles that women played as messengers, medics, and cooks even where they did not directly bear arms. However, some continued to write histories where women hardly showed up. Even 21st Century accounts of the Easter Rising frequently describe de Valera as the only leader or only senior officer to survive the Rising. Such a depiction particularly ignores the roles of Markiewicz and Kathleen Lynn while arguably overstating de Valera's role. In his otherwise excellent book about the Rising, distinguished historian Charles Townshend frequently approached the female rebels with a distinctly dismissive air. Townshend cited man who observed Markiewicz and offered that "the Countess took unfair advantage of her sex." Townshend followed this with his own brief commentary, "Not, perhaps, for the last time." Similarly, Coogan wrote a new history of the Rising in 2001 that added an incredibly valuable reappraisal of 1916 to the popular literature on the subject but barely mentioned even the most famous women.¹⁴

Revisionist historians differed tremendously in how they responded to the proliferation of studies of new aspects of the Rising and new historiographical approaches. The leading revisionist historian, Roy Foster, called on a great deal of social, cultural, and gender history in his book *Vivid Faces: The Revolutionary Generation in Ireland*. Its aims reflected this new approach, since it provided a generational biography. Chapters on "Learning," "Playing," and "Loving" stood beside "Arming" and Fighting." Other historians continued to write military and political histories of the Rising, though even those expanded their ideas of what belonged in such histories. Townshend's *Easter 1916* exemplified this as it incorporated details of daily life and the experiences of ordinary belligerents and bystanders in its

¹³ Margaret Ward, *Unmanageable Revolutionaries: Women and Irish Nationalism*. (London: Pluto Press, 1989); Anne Matthews, *Renegades: Irish Republican Women 1900-1922* (Cork: Mercier Press, 2010); Lucy McDiarmid, *At Home in the Revolution: What Women Said and Did in 1916* (Dublin: Royal Irish Academy, 2015); Cal McCarthy, *Cumann na mBan and the Irish Revolution*, rev. ed. (Doughcloyne, Wilton, Cork: The Collins Press, 2014).

¹⁴ Foster, *Vivid Faces*; Townshend, *Easter 1916*, 167; Coogan, *1916*.

explorations of the battles that raged during Easter week. Clair Wills' *Dublin 1916: The Siege of the GPO* looked at political and military developments as a means to understand the symbolism of these events during the Rising and after. Other historians looked at the interplays between the events of 1916 and the British government or American supporters of Irish independence from new, post-revisionist perspectives.¹⁵

One contributing factor to the expansion of areas of study came from a greater wealth of sources. Some of this derived from historians' increased willingness to consider the kind of sources that drove social and cultural historians elsewhere in the world decades earlier. Both social changes in the wake of decreased tensions in Northern Ireland and government policies in the Republic also made certain sources more readily available from the mid-1990s forward. Most notable among these included the declassification of the records from the Bureau of Military History's investigations. From 1947 to 1957, the Irish government collected numerous accounts of the Rising from belligerents on both sides and bystanders. In 1959, the government classified the results of this project, and historians only gained access in 2003. However, the nature of the materials collected in this archive meant that some historians greeted this arrival with trepidation. A large portion of declassified material consisted of oral histories. Oral histories proved as controversial in Irish historiography as they did elsewhere in the world. Historians often regard such witness statements, particularly when rendered decades after the events, questionable. The conditions surrounding these oral histories amplified such concerns, as those issuing them often had incentives to portray their participation in a certain light. Some sought military pensions for their participation while others risked exposing the extent of their violent actions. Notably, despite leading the government that ordered the project, de Valera refused to participate. Additionally, the investigators frequently edited the statements for clarity, though the witnesses did review and sign approval for the final statements. Nevertheless, historians such as Charles Townshend, Cal McCarthy, Lucy McDiarmid, and Gene Kerrigan made excellent use of the records to enhance their histories and shed light on

¹⁵ Foster, *Vivid Faces*; Townshend, *Easter 1916*; Clair Wills, *Dublin 1916: The Siege of the GPO* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2009); McCarthy, *Cumann Na mBan and the Irish Revolution*; Ronan Fanning, *Fatal Path: British Government and Irish Revolution 1910-1922* (London: Faber & Faber, 2013); Geoffrey Bell, "Easter 1916," in *Hesitant Comrades: The Irish Revolution and the British Labour Movement* (London: Pluto Press, 2016): 1-22; Robert Schmuhl, *Ireland's Exiled Children: America and the Easter Rising* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2016); Thomas J. Rowland, "The American Catholic Press and the Easter Rebellion," *The Catholic Historical Review* 81, no. 1 (January, 1995): 67-83.

the experiences of ordinary participants and witnesses in the events of Easter week and Diarmaid Ferriter also called on even more recently opened archives related to applications for pensions. Historian Fearghal McGarry centered his 2010 book, *The Rising*, on these records in order to study the “mentalities” of those who lived through the Rising, looking the possible distortions in how people remembered and presented their stories.¹⁶

Additionally, despite the popularity of the debate between revisionist historians and popular writers and journalists, many ordinary Irish men and women found the Rising difficult to discuss in a land mired in violent conflicts involving the Republicanism. Historian Sinéad McCoole pointed out that families often discarded or destroyed potential sources such as diaries, letters, newspaper clipping, and photographs and felt uncomfortable discussing the role their ancestors played in Ireland’s struggle for independence. In conducting research for her 2003 book, *No Ordinary Women*, she found it easier to discuss such matters and obtain sources held by individuals and families after the first IRA ceasefires in the mid-1990s altered the political climate.¹⁷ Along with the formal declassification of sources, decreased political tensions and more distance from the events made ordinary people more comfortable looking into, and sharing, family histories.

However, one should note that the end of the Troubles did not lead to the end of the complicated national, political, and religious divisions surrounding Northern Ireland and the Republic of Ireland and it did not lead to an easy dismissal of the concerns raised earlier by revisionists or any kind of consensus about the history of the Easter Rising. New areas for historical study meant new areas for historical debate, such as the discussions about memory, commemoration, new archives, oral history, and gender showed. Older debates continued as well, including the perpetual argument about the “blood sacrifice theory” – how many of the rebels expected to serve as martyrs whose sacrificial deaths at the hands of the enemy would inspire their countrymen to rise en masse, as opposed to expecting the Rising to succeed. Even more fundamental and older differences still influenced

¹⁶ Conor McNamara, “Conflict in Ireland, 1916-1977: The British Cabinet Papers On-Line,” *History Ireland* 20, no. 2 (March/April 2016):46-49; Charles Townshend, *Easter 1916: The Irish Rebellion* (Chicago: Ivan R. Dee, 2006); Cal McCarthy, *Cumann Na Mban and the Irish Revolution*, rev. ed. (Doughcloyne, Wilton, Cork: The Collins Press, 2015); Lucy McDiarmid, *At Home in the Revolution: What Women Said and Did in 1916* (Dublin: Royal Irish Academy, 2015); Gene Kerrigan, *The Scrap: A True Story from the 1916 Risings* (Dublin: Doubleday Ireland, 2015); Diarmaid Ferriter, *A Nation and Not a Rabble: The Irish Revolution 1913-1923* (London: Profile Books, 2015); Fearghal McGarry, *The Rising: Ireland Easter 1916* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010).

¹⁷ McCoole, *No Ordinary Women*, 19.

historians as well. Many of the leading revisionists, who completed their graduate work in the 1970s and 1980s, continued to publish and teach and, despite embracing new methods and areas of study, remained uncomfortable with the violence of the Rising. Old questions about nationalism and religion continued to occupy historians and their students.¹⁸ Moreover, others criticized them on familiar grounds. They complained that Paul Bew came from Northern Ireland, Roy Foster belonged to the Church of Ireland and received a Quaker education, and Charles Townshend and Foster held professorships at English universities. This time, however, more criticism came from inside the academy. Despite the end of the Troubles, this demonstrated less consensus than in 1986, when Foster sweepingly declared all historians revisionists, as a new generation of academic anti-revisionist historians came up through the ranks in the post-Good Friday era. Perhaps none exemplified this development better than historian John Regan, who argued that revisionist historians, in an effort to counter terrorism, behaved like paranoid schizophrenics and “let the Provisionals into our profession...began speaking untruths, writing falsehoods and teaching these to their students, all while slapping each other’s backs. And how the Provos laughed.”¹⁹

Outside of academic history, those writing for a popular audience also continued to search for the legacies of 1916. A theme prominent in the lead up to the centenary involved reflection on the failure to achieve the radical aims of the Rising’s leaders, which extended beyond nationalism and independence. Tim Coogan, Trotskyist sociologist Kieran Allen, and amateur historians James Heartfield and Kevin Rooney all used the Easter Rising and its legacies to frame histories of the last century.²⁰ All came from left-wing perspectives and focused on the unfulfilled promises of the Rising.

¹⁸ James Heaney, “Chesterton, Pearse, and the Blood Sacrifice Theory of the 1916 Rising,” in “Religious Freedom in the 21st Century,” *An Irish Quarterly Review* 103, no. 411 (Autumn 2014): 307-317; Patrick Maume, “Fr Francis Shaw and the Historiography of Easter 1916,” in “The Jesuits in Ireland: Before and After the Suppression,” *Studies: An Irish Quarterly* 103, no. 412 (Winter 2014/2015): 530-551; Richard English, “History and Irish Nationalism,” *Irish Historical Studies* 37, no. 147 (May 2011): 447-460; Connolly, “A New Vision of Irish Studies,” 230-240;

¹⁹ Regan, “Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde,” 10-13; David Fitzpatrick, “Dr Regan and Mr Snide,” *History Ireland* 20, no. 3 (May/June 2012): 12-13; Regan, “Dr Regan/Mr Snide Replies,” *History Ireland* 20, no. 4 (July/August 2012): 12-13. “Provisionals” and “Provos” both refer to members of the terrorist organization the Provisional Irish Republican Army.

²⁰ Coogan, *1916: One Hundred Years of Irish Independence From the Easter Rising to the Present* (New York: Thomas Dunne Books, 2015); Kieran Allen, *1916: Ireland’s Revolutionary Tradition* (London: Pluto Press, 2016); James Heartfield and Kevin Rooney, *Who’s Afraid of the Easter Rising? 1916-2016* (Winchester: Zero Books, 2015).

James Connolly, who joined the Military Council planning the Rising and brought the trade-unionist ICA with him, was a dedicated socialist and syndicalist. While Connolly was lauded as a martyr – as a signer of the proclamation and military commander he was executed despite deadly injuries necessitating a stretcher to hold him before the firing squad – the Irish Labour Party Connolly helped found failed to achieve electoral success. Despite Labour serving as Ireland’s main center-left party, it never controlled the government; unusually for a Western democracy, both of Ireland’s main parties belonged to the center right. In addition to Connolly’s explicitly socialist aims, historians and journalists questioned the radical promises enshrined in the proclamation of the Republic and the radical visions other leaders of the Rising. Pearse’s utopian vision of Ireland, found both in the proclamation he penned and in his other work, promised a different Ireland than the one that emerged after years of revolution and civil war and after numerous revolutionaries died. For example, a good number of participants in and leaders of the Rising came from the Gaelic revival movement, but despite efforts throughout century following the Rising, fewer people speak Gaelic at home in 2017 than they did in 1916.²¹

A number of historians looked to Connolly’s left-wing politics in more detail, particularly in light of the economic challenges Ireland faced in recent years and the government’s austerity measures. Like the atmosphere fueled by the Troubles, this too reflected broader developments in Irish political life. The 2011 and 2016 elections in the Republic of Ireland saw Sinn Fein, the left-wing party historically linked to the Provisionals, garner the largest numbers of seats in the assembly since 1923 and become the third-largest political party in the country.²² One should exhibit caution when examining the apparently leftward shift in histories of the Rising. Historians, both academic and popular, long tended to be more left wing than average. Still, the increased support for Sinn Fein reflected a broader dimension to these trends. The aftermath of the Easter Rising effectively created Sinn Fein as propaganda incorrectly ascribed the rebellion to Sinn Fein, thus drawing support to a previously marginal group when Irish support for the Rising increased in light of British opposition. Sinn Fein’s recent resurgence could represent a new aspect of the legacy of 1916.

²¹ Bryan Fanning, *Irish Adventures in Nation-Building* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2016); Shane Nagle, “Eoin MacNeill: The Mind Behind the Easter Rising?” *History Ireland* 22, no. 1 (January/February 2014): 36-39; Geoffrey Bell, “Easter 1916,” in *Hesitant Comrades: The Irish Revolution and the British Labour Movement* (Dublin: Pluto Press, 2016): 1-22.

²² Heartfield and Rooney, *Who’s Afraid of the Easter Rising?*; Allen, 1916.

Memory fascinated historians from the late 1990s, reflecting both a general trend in historiography throughout the world and a society that attempted to recover from its violent past. While historians long compared the Rising to nationalist and anti-colonial revolutions throughout the world, a new generation of historians sought instead to compare the events of Dublin in 1916 with their neighbor to the north. They looked at how the Battle of the Somme in World War I, where large numbers of Northern Irish soldiers perished, shaped Northern Ireland in public memory in a fashion akin to how the Rising shaped the Republic. Memory and trauma also provided perspectives for historians looking at how divisive history of the Easter Rising often proved. They situated the Rising as part of a founding mythology of Ireland dear to many and also as something too mired in violence for many of its witnesses to comfortably address. As McCool pointed out, many in Ireland were reluctant to remember their roles, or those of their family members, in such a divisive conflict. These studies helped explain both why revisionists found celebration of the Rising so troubling and why a segment of the general population reacted negatively to historians questioning the Rising. The twinned subjects of memory and trauma yielded a considerable amount of attention as historians expanded the ways that they looked at 1916 and its complicated legacy.²³

In many ways, the centenary commemoration of the Rising in 2016 reflected the current state of the historiography of the Rising. The planning of the commemoration itself, unsurprisingly, stirred historians to consider the ways that they looked at the events of 1916.²⁴ The result was, much like the historiography, mixed. The commemorations mimicked neither the glorification of the 50th nor the avoidance of the 75th. Plenty of events took place, but not all had a celebratory tone. The Easter Rising's centenary was set as a part of a "decade of centenaries" that sought to commemorate the many significant events that took place throughout the revolutionary period, including the ones associated with the attempts at home rule, yet so far the 1916 commemorations garnered

²³ Richard S. Grayson and Fearghal McGarry, eds. *Remembering 1916: The Easter Rising, the Somme, and the Politics of Memory in Ireland* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016); Hanley, "Who Fears to Speak of Easter Week?"; Bew, "Why Did Jimmie Die?"; 37-39; Robert Ballagh, "What Anniversaries Tell Us," *History Ireland* 24, no. 2 (March/April 2016): 10-11; John Bruton, "Why We Should Commemorate the Centenary of Home Rule," in "Religious Freedom in the 21st Century," *Studies: An Irish Quarterly Review* 103, no. 411 (Autumn 2014): 287-295; Guy Beiner, "Between Trauma and Triumphalism: The Easter Rising, the Somme, and the Crux of Deep Memory in Modern Ireland," *Journal of British Studies* 46, no. 2 (April 2007): 366-389;

²⁴ Fearghal McGarry, "'Imagining the Past to Remember the Future?': Easter 1916 in 2016," *History Ireland* 24, no. 2 (March/April 2016): 46-49;

more interest and attention. As a number of historians urged, the events surrounding the anniversary of the Easter Rising sought to include various aspects once overlooked and previously taboo areas such as sexuality and gender attracted popular interest. Interest in Northern Ireland's experience of 1916 increased. Moreover, these broadened considerations took place on both popular and academic levels and the centenary fueled discussion as Irish men and women considered their country's past. From the beginning, historiography of the Easter Rising, both shaped and reflected Ireland's politics and culture. Current historiographical trends, as shown in the histories sparked by the recent centenary, suggest that broadening of approaches that emerged as the Troubles dissipated is likely to continue. The Easter Rising remains relevant and both the Irish public and historians who study Ireland will continue to explore and question the events of 1916 in years to come.

Bibliography

- Allen, Kieran. 1916: Ireland's Revolutionary Tradition. London: Pluto Press, 2016.
- Anderson, Anne. "1916 to 2016 Reflections." *American Journal of Irish Studies* 14 (2017): 165-176.
- Ballagh, Robert. "What Anniversaries Tell Us." *History Ireland* 24, no. 2 (March/April 2016): 10-11.
- Beiner, Guy. "Between Trauma and Triumphalism: The Easter Rising, the Somme, and the Crux of Deep Memory in Modern Ireland." *Journal of British Studies* 46, no. 2 (April 2007): 366-389.
- Beiner, Guy and Joep Leerssen. "Why Irish History Starved: A Virtual Historiography." *Field Day Review* 3 (2007): 66-81.
- Bell, Geoffrey. "Easter 1916." In *Hesitant Comrades: The Irish Revolution and the British Labour Movement, 1-22*. London: Pluto Press, 2016.
- Bender, Abby. "Anti-Exodus: Patrick Pearse's 'New Testament of Irish Nationality.'" In *Israelites in Erin: Exodus, Revolution, and the Irish Revival, 93-129*. Syracuse, New York: Syracuse University Press, 2015.
- Bew, Paul. "Moderate Nationalism and the Irish Revolution, 1916-1923." *The Historical Journal* 42, no. 3 (September, 1999): 729-749.
- "The Easter Rising: Lost Leaders and Lost Opportunities." *The Irish Review*, no. 11 (Winter, 1991/1992): 9-13.
- "Why Did Jimmie Die?" In "1916: 90th Anniversary Issue." *Special Issue History Ireland* 14, no. 2 (March-April, 2006): 37-39.
- Bhreathnach-Lynch, Sighle. "The Easter Rising 1916: Constructing a Canon in Art & Artefacts." *History Ireland* 5, no. 1 (Spring, 1997): 37-42.
- "Revisionism, the Rising, and Representation." *New Hibernia Review/Iris Éireannach Nua* 3 no. 1 (Spring, 1999): 82-96.
- Bonakdarian, Mansour. "The Easter Rising as a Milestone in Iranian Nationalist Appraisals of the Irish Question." *American Journal of Irish Studies* no. 14 (2017): 51-81.
- Bourke, Thomas. "Nationalism and the Royal Irish Academy, 1916-1923." *An Irish Quarterly Review* 75, no. 298 (Summer, 1986): 196-208.
- Boyce, D. G. *The Irish Question and British Politics, 1868-1996*. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire: MacMillan Press, 1996.
- Bruton, John. "Why We Should Commemorate the Centenary of Home Rule." In "'Religious Freedom' in the 21st Century." *Special Issue, An Irish Quarterly Review* 103, no. 411 (Autumn 2014): 287-295.
- Buckley, Maureen. "Irish Easter Rising of 1916." *Social Science* 31, no. 1 (January, 1956): 49-55.
- Bunbury, Turtle. *The 1916 Rising: The Photographic Record*. Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield, 2015.
- Burke, Tom. "The Other Women of 1916". *History Ireland* 14, no. 5 (September-October, 2006): 8-9.
- Campbell, Fergus. "The Easter Rising in Galway." In "1916: 90th Anniversary Issue." *Special Issue, History Ireland* 14, no. 2 (March – April, 2006): 22-5.
- "The Social Dynamics of Nationalist Politics in the West of Ireland 1898-1918." *Past & Present*, no. 182 (February, 2004): 175-209.
- Casey, Maurice J. "Historiography: 'Red Easter.'" *History Ireland* 24, no. 5 (September/October 2016): 40-42.
- Caulfield, Max. *The Easter Rebellion*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1963.
- Connell, Joe and Joseph E. A. Connell Jr. "Countdown to 2016: Larnie Gunrunning." In "Special Issue: Brian Boru." *Special Issue, History Ireland* 22, no. 2 (March/April, 2014): 66.

The Historiography of the Easter Rising

- Connolly, Linda. "A New Vision of Irish Studies." In *Are the Irish Different?*, edited by Tom Inglis, 230-240. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2014.
- Coogan, Tim Pat. 1916: One Hundred Years of Irish Independence From the Easter Rising to the Rising. New York: Thomas Dunne Books, 2015.
- 1916: The Easter Rising. London: Phoenix, 2001.
- The IRA: Fully Revised and Updated. New York: Palgrave, 2002.
- Cullen, Emily. "Summoning Her Children to Which Flag?" *History Ireland* 24, no. 6 (November-December 2016): 32-34.
- Daly, Mary E. "Forty Shades of Grey?: Irish Historiography and the Challenges of Multidisciplinarity." In *Ireland Beyond Boundaries: Mapping Irish Studies in the Twenty-First Century*, edited by Liam Harte and Whelan, 92-110. London: Pluto Press, 2007.
- De Rosa, Peter. *Rebels: The Irish Rising of 1916*. New York: Fawcett Columbine, 1990.
- Delaney, Enda. "Our Island Story? Towards a Transnational History of Late Modern Ireland." *Irish Historical Studies* 37, no. 148 (November 2011): 599-621.
- Duffy, Joe. *Children of the Rising: The Untold Story of the Young Lives Lost During Easter 1916*. Dublin: Hachette Books Ireland, 2015.
- English, Richard. "History and Irish Nationalism." *Irish Historical Studies* 37, no. 147 (May 2011): 447-460.
- Enright, Sean. *The Easter Rising 1916: The Trials*. Dublin: Merrion Press, 2013.
- Fanning, Bryan. *Irish Adventures in Nation-Building*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2016.
- Fanning, Ronan. *Fatal Path: British Government and Irish Revolution 1910-1922*. London: Faber & Faber, 2013.
- Fennell, Desmond. "On Telling the Irish Revolution as It Really Was." *History Ireland* 20, no. 5 (September/October 2012): 10-11.
- Ferriter, Diarmaid. *A Nation and Not a Rabble: The Irish Revolution 1913-1923*. London: Profile Books, 2015.
- Fitzpatrick, David. "Dr Regan and Mr Snide." *History Ireland* 20, no. 3 (May/June 2012): 12-13.
- Foster, Gavin. "Class Dismissed? The Debate Over a Social Basis to the Treaty Split and Irish Civil War." *Saothar* 33 (2008): 73-86.
- "In the Shadow of the Split: Writing the Irish Civil War." *Field Day Review* 2 (2006): 294-303.
- Foster, R.F. *The Irish Story: Telling Tales and Making It Up in Ireland*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- Modern Ireland, 1600-1972*. London: Penguin Books, 1988.
- Vivid Faces: The Revolutionary Generation in Ireland, 1890-1923*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 2014.
- "We Are All Revisionists Now." *The Irish Review*, no. 1 (1986): 1-5.
- "Yeats at War: Poetic Strategies and Political Reconstruction from the Easter Rising to the Free State: The Prothero Lecture." *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 11 (2001): 125-145.
- Foy, Michael and Brian Barton. *The Easter Rising*. Thrupp, Stroud, Gloucestershire: Sutton Publishing, 1999.
- Garvin, Tom. "The Anatomy of a Nationalist Revolution: Ireland, 1858-1928." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 28, no. 3 (July, 1986): 468-501.
- Gerson, Gal. "Cultural Subversion and the Background of the Irish 'Easter Poets.'" *Journal of Contemporary History* 30, no. 2 (April, 1995): 333-347.
- Gkotzaridis, Evi. "Irish Revisionism and Continental Theory: An Intellectual Kinship." In "A Post-Christian Ireland?" Special Issue, *The Irish Review*, no. 27 (Summer, 2001): 121-139.

- Grayson, Richard S. and Fearghal McGarry, eds. *Remembering 1916: The Easter Rising, the Somme, and the Politics of Memory in Ireland*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016.
- Hanley, Brian. "Who Fears to Speak of 1916?" *History Ireland* 23, no. 2 (March/April 2015): 10-11.
- Hart, Peter. "The Social Structure of the Irish Republican Army, 1916-1923." *The Historical Journal* 42, no. 1 (March, 1999): 207-231.
- Heaney, James. "Chesteron, Pearse, and the Blood Sacrifice Theory of the 1916 Rising." In "RELIGIOUS FREEDOM in the 21st Century." *Special Issue, Studies: An Irish Quarterly Review* 103, no. 411 (Autumn 2014), 307-317.
- Hearne, Dana. "The Irish Citizen 1914-1916: Nationalism, Feminism, and Militarism." In "Women and Irish Politics." *Special Issue, The Canadian Journal of Irish Studies* 81, no. 1 (July, 1992): 1-14.
- Heartfield, James and Kevin Rooney. *Who's Afraid of the Easter Rising? 1916-2016*. Winchester: Zero Books, 2015.
- Jeffery, Keith. *1916: A Global History*. New York: Bloomsbury, 2016.
- Joye, Labhras and Brenda Malone. "The Roll of Honour of 1916." In "1916: 90th Anniversary Issue." *Special Issue, History Ireland* 14, no. 2 (March-April: 2006): 10-11.
- Kee, Robert. *The Green Flag: A History of Irish Nationalism*. London: Penguin Books, 1972.
- Kennedy, Dennis. "Casting a Cold Eye on 1916 (and 1966)." *History Ireland* 23, no. 5 (September/October 2015): 10-11.
- Keogh, Dáire. "Patrick Pearse, 'Studies' and the Birth of Revisionism." In "A Century of Studies." *Special Issue, An Irish Quarterly Review* 100 no. 400 (Winter 2011): 421-432.
- Kerrigan, Gene. *The Scrap: A True Story from the 1916 Rising*. Dublin: Doubleday Ireland, 2015.
- Kostick, Conor and Lorcan Collins. *The Easter Rising: A Guide to Dublin in 1916*. Dublin: The O'Brien Press, 2000.
- Krause, Peter. "The Irish National Movement: Where You Stand Depends on Where You Sit." In *Rebel Power: Why National Movements Compete, Fight, and Win*, 131-172. Cornell, New York: Cornell University Press, 2017.
- Lee, J. J. "1916 as Virtual History." *History Ireland* 14, no. 2 (Mar. - Apr., 2006): 5-6.
- Lucey, Donnacha Seán. "The Poor Law and the Irish Revolution: the Case of the Cork Workhouse." In *The End of The Irish Poor Law? Welfare and Healthcare Reform in Revolutionary and Independent Ireland*, 13-40. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2015.
- MacNeill, Eoin and Shane Nagle. "Eoin MacNeill: The Mind Behind the Easter Rising?" *History Ireland* 22, no. 1 (January/February 2014): 36-39.
- Martin, Allison. "Easter Rising Commemorations in the Early Irish State." *History Ireland* 24, no. 2 (March/April 2016): 42-44.
- Matthews, Ann. *Renegades: Irish Republican Women 1900-1922*. Cork: Mercier Press, 2010.
- Maume, Patrick. "Fr Francis Shaw and the Historiography of Easter 1916." In "The Jesuits in Ireland: Before and After the Suppression." *Special Issue, Studies: An Irish Quarterly Review* 103, no. 412 (Winter 2014/2015): 530-551.
- Mcbride, Ian. "The Shadow of the Gunman: Irish Historians and the IRA." In "At the Crossroads of Past and Present – 'Contemporary' History and the Historical Discipline." In *Journal of Contemporary History*, 46, no. 3 (July 2011): 686-710.
- McCarthy, Cal. *Cumann Na Mban and the Irish Revolution*, rev. ed. Doughcloyne, Wilton, Cork: The Collins Press, 2014.

The Historiography of the Easter Rising

- McDiarmid, Lucy. *At Home in the Revolution: What Women Said and Did in 1916*. Dublin: Royal Irish Academy, 2015.
- McGarry, Fearghal. "'Imagining the Past to Remember the Future?': Easter 1916 in 2016." *History Ireland* 24, no. 2 (March/April 2016): 46-49.
- The Rising: Ireland Easter 1916*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- McNamara, Conor. "Conflict in Ireland, 1916-1977: The British Cabinet Papers On-Line." *History Ireland* 20, no. 2 (March/April 2012): 40-41.
- McCoole, Sinéad. *No Ordinary Women: Irish Female Activists in the Revolutionary Years 1900-1923*. Dublin: The O'Brien Press, 2003.
- Moran, James. *Staging the Easter Rising: 1916 as Theatre*. Cork: Cork University Press, 2005.
- Mustafa, Shakir. "Revision and Revival: A Postcolonial Approach to Irish Cultural Nationalism." *New Hibernia Review/Iris Éireannach Nua* 2, no. 3 (Autumn, 1998): 36-53.
- Myles, Franc. "The Archaeology of 1916." *Archaeology Ireland* 30, no. 3 (Autumn 2016): 13-16.
- O'Farrell, Mick. *1916: What the People Saw*. Cork: Mercier Press, 2013.
- O'Halpin, Eunan. "Historical Revision XX: H. E. Duke and the Irish Administration, 1916-18." *Irish Historical Studies* 22, no. 88 (September: 1981): 362-376.
- O'Leary, Philip. "Reasoning Why after Fifty Years: The Easter Rising in Eoghan Ó Tuairisc's *Dé Luain* (1966)." *Proceedings of the Harvard Celtic Colloquium* 31 (2011): 253-281.
- Quinn, James and Lawrence W. White. "1916 Rising." *Books Ireland*, no. 363 (September/October 2015): 18-20.
- Regan, John M. "Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde: 'The Two Histories.'" *History Ireland* 20, no. 1 (January/February 2012): 10-13.
- "Dr Regan/Mr Snide Replies." *History Ireland* 20, no. 4 (July/August 2012): 12-13.
- "Irish Public Histories as an Historiographical Problem." *Irish Historical Studies* 37, no. 146 (November 2010): 265-292.
- "Southern Irish Nationalism as a Historical Problem." *The Historical Journal* 50, no. 1 (March 2007): 197-223.
- "Strangers in Our Midst: Middling People, Revolution and Counter-Revolution in Twentieth-Century Ireland." *Radharc* no. 2 (November, 2001): 35-50.
- Richardson, Neil. *According to Their Lights: Stories of Irishmen in the British Army, Easter 1916*. Doughcloyne, Wilton, Cork: The Collins Press, 2015.
- Rowland, Thomas J. "The American Catholic Press and the Easter Rebellion." *The Catholic Historical Review* 81, no. 1 (January: 1995): 67-83.
- Schmuhl, Robert. *Ireland's Exiled Children: America and the Easter Rising*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2016.
- Schultz, Matthew. "Ancient Warriors, Modern Sexualities: Easter 1916 and the Advent of Post-Catholic Ireland." In *Haunted Historiographies: The Rhetoric of Ideology in Postcolonial Irish Fiction*, 97-128. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2014.
- Townshend, Charles. *Easter 1916: The Irish Rebellion*. Chicago: Ivan R. Dee, 2006.
- "Making Sense of Easter 1916." In "1916: 90th Anniversary Issue." *Special Issue, History Ireland* 14, no. 2 (March-April: 2006): 40-45.
- Tuathaigh, Gearóid Ó. "A Tangled Legacy: The Irish 'Inheritance' of British Labour." In *The British Labour Party and Twentieth-Century Ireland: The Cause of Ireland, the Cause of Labour*, edited by Laurence Marley. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2016.
- Tucker, David M. "Some American Responses to the Easter Rebellion, 1916." *The Historian* 29, no. 4 (August: 1967): 605-618.
- Walsh, Maurice. *Bitter Freedom: Ireland in a Revolutionary World 1918-1923*. London: Faber & Faber, 2015.

- Ward, Alan J. *The Easter Rising: Revolution and Irish Nationalism*, 2nd ed. Wheeling, IL: Harlan Davidson, 2003.
- Ward, Margaret. *Unmanageable Revolutionaries: Women and Irish Nationalism*. London: Pluto Press, 1989.
- White, Lawrence William and James Quinn, ed. *1916 Portraits and Lives*. Dublin: Royal Irish Academy, 2015.
- Williams, Martin. "Ancient Mythology and Revolutionary Ideology in Ireland, 1878-1916." *The Historical Journal* 26, no. 2 (June: 1983): 307-328.
- Wills, Clair. *Dublin 1916: The Siege of the GPO*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2009.



Patrice Lumumba speaking with supporters in his effort to regain office, Leopoldville, Congo. (Image source: Library of Congress, October, 1960.)

ACCESSORY TO ASSASSINATION: U.S. POLICY TOWARD THE CONGO CRISIS, 1960-1961

| Jason Bohnert

A DC-4 landed on an airstrip in Congo's Elizabethville, Katanga Province on 17 January 1961. Belgian mercenaries kicked three beaten and blindfolded men, Patrice Lumumba, the first prime minister of Congo out of the plane to the concrete below. The mercenaries dragged Lumumba and the two others to a truck and drove them away where execution awaited. Rival Congolese politicians Moïse Tshombe and Godefroid Munongo, along with Belgian mercenary Colonel Carlos Huyghe, among others, were ready to eliminate Lumumba, their biggest enemy. According to a UN Commission inquiry Huyghe shot Lumumba in the chest and he bled out until the fatal shot was delivered to Lumumba's head.¹

US foreign policy toward Congo from the middle of 1960 through early 1961 constituted a critical chapter of the Cold War. President Dwight D. Eisenhower and other U.S. politicians viewed Lumumba as a threat because he desired to establish an all-African ruled Congo, free of Belgian influence.² The valuable minerals in Congo made the African country a Western interest. An Eisenhower aide reportedly heard the President suggest assassinating Lumumba, but Ike did not do so explicitly. The Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) ordered an assassination attempt on Lumumba but it failed. In response, the Soviet Union quickly offered aid to Lumumba, while criticizing the United States and Belgium for their imperialism. This subsequently led to Lumumba's capture and his eventual death. Belgian mercenaries killed Lumumba with indirect involvement from the CIA.

Eisenhower and US foreign policy makers used their understanding of the Cold War to see third world countries. This viewpoint coupled with their self-serving objectives resulted in a foreign policy that valued imperialism over humanity. Lumumba and his followers were anti-colonial. Nonetheless, Eisenhower viewed colonialism as an easy solution to stop the spread of Soviet influence into the poor, uneducated, and colored countries that he believed were inferior. Third World nations considered U.S. actions toward Lumumba unjust, motivated by imperialism, and racist to a certain degree.

Lumumba was born on 2 July 1925 in Onalua of the Belgian

¹ G. Heinz and H. Donnay, *Lumumba: The Last Fifty Days*, trans. Jane Clark Seitz (New York, 1969), 141.

² Rene Lemarchand, "Patrice Lumumba," in *African Political Thought: Lumumba, Nkrumah, and Toure*, ed. W.A.E. Shurnik (Denver, CO, 1968), 29-30.

Congo into a poor Catholic farming family. He learned manual skills until his teachers recognized his intellectual potential, loaned him books, and encouraged him to educate himself. Lumumba moved to Stanleyville in 1944 and became a postal clerk; it was there he developed political aspirations. Lumumba helped form the first nationwide political party in Congo, known, historian Robert K. Flatley wrote, as “the Congolese National Movement (Mouvement National Congolais, or MNC).”³ Lumumba was elected prime minister of Congo in 1960 after Belgium granted the colony independence. The United States and its allies saw him almost immediately as a threat to Western interests. This led to Lumumba’s death as his rivals murdered him with indirect CIA involvement.

Lumumba’s long-term political ideology for Congo called for creating a unified national Congo that incorporated every tribe and attained full independence from Belgium. His short-term goal was self-government that promoted Congolese nationality.⁴ Lumumba became increasingly impatient with Belgian authorities still within Congo. This caused increased distrust of Belgium, the United States and the United Nations. Nikita Khrushchev, premier of the Soviet Union, had been in contact with Lumumba since 1959; the two were on friendly terms and historian Allesandro Iandolo claimed Lumumba wanted to “exchange diplomatic representatives with the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.”⁵ Lumumba was a radical leftist, but not a communist. Regardless, friendly relationship with Khrushchev made Lumumba a threat to United States interests.

Congo’s first nationwide voting happened in May 1960. This resulted in the election of Joseph Kasavubu as president, Lumumba as prime minister, and Tshombe as governor of Katanga Province.⁶ Lumumba promised pay raises to all government employees except military personnel. The Congolese military were angered because they gained no financial benefits from the new government. Furthermore, Belgian military superiors still treated the Congolese military inferiorly

³ Robert K. Flatley, "Patrice Lumumba." Salem Press Biographical Encyclopedia Research Starters. <http://ehis.ebscohost.com/mantis.csuchico.edu/eds/detail/detail?sid=66b38f19-cab1-43ca-9f36-f8e14ebbf0aa%40sessionmgr4001&vid=1&hid=4113&bddata=JnNpdGU9ZWRzLWxpdmU%3d#db=ers&AN=88802075> (accessed 10 April 2014).

⁴ Lemarchand, “Patrice Lumumba,” p. 29.

⁵ Allesandro Iandolo, “Imbalance of Power: The Soviet Union and the Congo Crisis, 1960-1961,” *Journal of Cold War Studies* 16, no. 2 (Spring 2014): 37.

⁶ Stephen E. Ambrose, *Eisenhower: The President* (New York, 1984), 586.

— just as they had before independence.⁷

The Congolese army at Thysville, near Leopoldville, mutinied, dismissed their Belgian commanders, terrorized the Europeans still in the region, and allowed chaos to ensue. Belgian paratroopers landed to provide safety for citizens of European decent, while simultaneously trying to stop rebellion. On 11 July 1960, Tshombe and the mineral rich Katanga seceded and allied themselves with Belgium and Western powers to preserve independence. Lumumba and Kasavubu, learning about the problem in Katanga, requested UN aid and deployment of UN troops to end secession in Congo. The United Nations sent troops into Congo under orders so vague it became unclear whether UN soldiers had authority to use force against the rebels.⁸ Western nations wished for Lumumba's ouster from power and favored this ambiguity. The United States saw Congo was in turmoil. Washington now faced a choice; it could implement policy consistent with Congolese interests or follow a neo-colonialist course of intervention to advance Cold War objectives.

The United States knew Lumumba would ask Khrushchev for help. The Eisenhower administration therefore wanted to reach a settlement with Lumumba quickly before the Congo Crisis deteriorated further. The U.S. government sent a cable to Lumumba that invited him to Washington for negotiations in July 1960. According to biographer Jim Newton, Lumumba's trip was a disaster:

Lumumba arrived . . . woefully unprepared to discuss his nation's future. He had no agenda for the talks; he forgot even to bring money. American officials feigned respect for him but in fact regarded him as an oddity. Ralph Bunche, the great American diplomat and civil rights leader and winner of the 1950 Nobel Peace Prize, considered Lumumba "crazy."⁹

Lumumba's horrible impression on U.S. representatives was conveyed to Eisenhower. This led to increased distrust of Lumumba. Fear was palpable that he would ally Congo with the Soviet Union. An urgent thought took hold that the best way to secure Congo for Western interests was for the United States to engineer the removal of Lumumba.

Western members of the United Nations distrusted Lumumba.

⁷ Larry Devlin, *Chief of Station, Congo* (New York, 1969), 8.

⁸ Iandolo, *Imbalance of Power*, p. 40.

⁹ Jim Newton, *Eisenhower the White House Years* (New York, 2011), 326.

Other UN members were concerned with what Lumumba's rule over Congo would mean for UN prestige. Lumumba saw the lack of UN interference against Belgian troops in Congo as unjust. He viewed the United Nations Operation in the Congo (UNOC) as inefficient and believed it endorsed imperialistic policies. UN representatives alleged that if Lumumba was in power, he would to damage the reputation the UNOC, which would cast the United Nations in a negative light.¹⁰

The United States desired control over Congo because the US wanted to stop the spread of communism and sought dominant influence in Katanga, one of the richest mineral lands in Africa. One U.S. newspaper had noted in May 1950 how Congo was home to "half or more of the earth's known high-grade uranium ore," along with substantial amounts of copper, cobalt, tin, zinc, silver, gold, and diamonds.¹¹ The United States had been importing uranium from the Katanga region of Congo since World War II and used it in the Manhattan Project. Eisenhower was not going to let uranium rich land fall into the hands of the Soviets during the Cold War. Strategic concerns eclipsed interest in advancing popular desires and the well-being of Congolese.

Historians debate the veracity of claims that Ike ordered Lumumba's assassination. According to National Security Council (NSC) member Robert H. Johnson, Eisenhower implied order for Lumumba's murder:

At some time during that discussion, President Eisenhower said something-I can no longer remember his words-that came across to me as an order for the assassination of Lumumba who was then at the center of political conflict and controversy in the Congo. There was no discussion; the meeting simply moved on.¹²

If true, Eisenhower would have ordered the assassination for many reasons. One had its origins with Lumumba's trip to the White House in the summer of 1960. Eisenhower's aides, primarily Under Secretary

¹⁰ Telegram from the Embassy in the Congo to the Department of State, 3 December 1960, *Foreign Relations of the United States* [hereafter *FRUS*, with appropriate year], 1958-1960, *Africa* (Washington, DC, 1992), 14: 612-13.

¹¹ "Uranium Ore, Copper Pacing Congo's Output American Capitol To Have Part Soon In Katanga Projects" *The News-Herald*, (Franklin, PA, 18 May 1950), p. 2.

¹² U.S. Congress Select Committee to Study Governmental Operations with Respect to Intelligence Activities United States Senate, *Alleged Assassination Plots Involving Foreign Leaders*, Report prepared by Frank Church, 94th Cong., 1st Sess., 1975, 55.

of State C. Douglas Dillon, were disgusted with Lumumba's visit and gave Eisenhower the impression, historian Stephen E. Ambrose reports, that Lumumba was "'an individual whom it was impossible to deal with.'" ¹³ The President saw Lumumba equally threatening as Communist leader Fidel Castro. Allen Dulles, director of the CIA, was under the impression that it was permissible to assassinate Lumumba to remove him from the African political scene.¹⁴

In September 1960, Khrushchev invoked his right to attend a UN meeting "as head of the Russian delegation."¹⁵ He wanted to defend Congo and expose injustice within the country on an international forum. That action agitated Eisenhower and confirmed his view of Lumumba as a Soviet ally. The President asked for deployment of UN peacekeepers in Congo at the outset of the session. Khrushchev immediately advocated for the opposite of Eisenhower's proposal. Ambrose described how Khrushchev condemned "Western colonialism in the Congo, charging both the U.N. and the United States were trying to maintain Belgian control of Katanga."¹⁶ At the same UN session, Lumumba asked in his speech for help to return Katanga to Congo and secure the withdrawal of Belgian troops from his nation.

Khrushchev sent Lumumba a congratulatory telegram the day prior to Congo's independence from Belgium. It indicated that the Soviet leader was excited to begin diplomatic relations with Congo. On 7 July 1960, Khrushchev's dream of establishing diplomatic relations with Congo became reality when a Soviet delegation met with Lumumba and the two sides agreed to become allies.¹⁷ Soviet actions displayed support for Congolese self-rule. However, for Eisenhower this confirmed his belief that Lumumba, now aligned with the Soviets, represented a serious threat to the United States. Lumumba's resistance to Western influence and tendency to request Soviet aid made eliminating the prime minister a risk worth taking.

During August and September 1960, the CIA attempted and failed to assassinate Lumumba. CIA Station Chief in Congo Larry Devlin received a cable from CIA Deputy Director for Plans Richard Bissell in Washington that carried the code word PROP. The top-secret message informed Devlin that on 27 September 1960, a senior CIA officer would meet him, "identify himself as 'Joe from Paris,'"¹⁸ and

¹³ Ambrose, *Eisenhower: The President*, p. 586.

¹⁴ *Alleged Assassination Plots Involving Foreign Leaders*, p. 52.

¹⁵ Ambrose, *Eisenhower: The President*, p. 589.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 590.

¹⁷ Iandolo, *Imbalance of Power*, p. 39.

¹⁸ Devlin, *Chief of Station*, p. 94.

give him instructions on his mission. On that day a senior CIA officer and chemist walked to Devlin's car, stepped inside the vehicle and told Devlin he was "Joe from Paris."

Devlin and Joe drove to a CIA safe house to discuss the mission privately. Joe told Devlin that he came "to the Congo carrying deadly poisons to assassinate Lumumba," and Devlin was to carry out the task. The mission shocked Devlin; he asked Joe who authorized it. Joe informed Devlin that Eisenhower had wanted the assassination. He "wasn't there when he approved it, but Dick Bissell said that Eisenhower wanted Lumumba removed."¹⁹ Devlin was to complete the task alone and leave no evidence suggesting US involvement. Devlin received multiple poisons from Joe, including a fatal tube of toothpaste that would make it appear that Lumumba died from polio.

Devlin disagreed with the plan to assassinate Lumumba but could not let Joe or any of the other men involved in the PROP mission know his objections. The CIA would remove Devlin if he refused the mission. Another CIA officer who was willing to carry out the job would replace Devlin, and the CIA would end his career. He viewed the mission as "morally wrong."²⁰ This was not because he thought that Lumumba was the right leader for Congo, but because Devlin knew the Congolese would take care of their "Lumumba issue" themselves. Devlin's thoughts on the PROP mission reflected US ignorance toward the Congolese desire of self-rule.

Devlin knew he could not simply ignore the PROP mission. Accordingly, he reported on his progress, or lack thereof, to Washington every week and requested items like "a rifle with a telescopic site" to delay CIA scrutiny. Devlin asked his main informant in Lumumba's entourage if there was any way to gain access to his personal bathroom and plant the poisonous toothpaste. The informant, to Devlin's pleasure, told him that it would be nearly impossible. His plan was to procrastinate until "Lumumba would either fade away politically as a potential danger, or that the Congolese would succeed in taking him prisoner." Devlin knew that the CIA did not need to assassinate Lumumba because the Congolese would remove him. This would achieve the US goal while avoiding the taint of neo-colonial interference to advance self-serving American objectives.

Meanwhile, Soviet reaction to the Congo Crisis displayed Moscow's support for Lumumba. According to Iandolo, Lumumba requested Khrushchev's aid and he ordered transport trucks from the Kremlin, originally intended for the UN, to be given directly to

¹⁹ Ibid.

²⁰ Ibid., p. 96

Lumumba.²¹ Khrushchev completely backed Lumumba — gave him money and equipment, assigned one of the top Soviet diplomats as “Soviet Ambassador to the Congo,” and accused the United Nations and Western powers of supporting imperialistic forces within Congo. Iandolo quoted Khrushchev by stating:

If any country’s troops sent to Congo in agreement with the Security Council resolution will not for any reason be able to guarantee the withdrawal of the troops that intervened [the Belgians] from the territory of the independent Congolese state, then [it is necessary] to send to the Republic of Congo troops that from those countries who will be ready to take part in the realization of this rightful act.²²

Khrushchev’s objection was that the ambiguity of the resolution made UN troops in Congo effectively useless. He viewed this as Western imperialistic forces seeking material gain that could give them an advantage in the Cold War. Ignoring how Khrushchev’s message allowed him to pose as a champion of Congolese sovereignty, Washington considered Khrushchev’s threat confirmation of the necessity to remove Lumumba from power. Lumumba was fraternizing with the biggest enemy of the United States. Too much was at stake to let the Congo come under command of the Soviets.

Western powers did nothing as tensions between Lumumba and Kasavubu increased over the next few months. On 5 September 1960, the relationship became so fractious that Kasavubu, on national radio, dismissed Lumumba as prime minister and replaced him with a Western oriented politician. Lumumba protested Kasavubu’s announcement; he called it illegal and unjust. Lumumba became convinced that a Belgian-French plot was underway to remove him because Kasavubu’s aides were from those countries. Moreover, he was certain the United Nations was complicit in the removal scheme.²³

Both men turned for help to the Army chief of Staff Mobutu Sese Seko.²⁴ Mobutu knew this was the perfect opportunity to gain power. When Devlin met with Mobutu, Devlin received a startling message. Mobutu told Devlin that Lumumba and Kasavubu had

²¹ Iandolo, *Imbalance of Power*, 45.

²² *Ibid.*

²³ *Ibid.*

²⁴ Newton, *Eisenhower: The White House Years*, p. 328.

dismissed each other, leaving Congo in a state of political turmoil. The two discussed the potential problems that could arise because of Soviets arriving in Congo. Mobutu advised Lumumba to remove the Soviets from advising the army, prior to his removal as prime minister. Lumumba said he would but did not. Mobutu asked Lumumba again, and Lumumba told Mobutu to mind his own business. The Soviets, Lumumba declared, were a political matter that did not pertain to Mobutu. Lumumba was untrue to his word, which was unacceptable to Mobutu. He knew the United States would immediately want a new Congolese leader and wanted to be that man.

Devlin began to understand the meaning of Mobutu's words before he presented his request. Mobutu confirmed with his commanders that they were displeased with Soviet attempts to infiltrate the army. Mobutu stated:

“Here is the situation: the army is prepared to overthrow Lumumba. But only on the condition that the United States will recognize the government that would replace Lumumba's. The government that we would establish would be temporary and would stay in power only so long as necessary to get the Soviets out of the Congo and to create a democratic regime.”²⁵

Mobutu knew this was his golden opportunity to take power in Congo but needed reassurance that his new government would have US backing. He also made it clear he would remove Lumumba and Kasavubu. Devlin had to make a critical and difficult decision. CIA Chief Dulles authorized Devlin in the PROP cable to remove Lumumba, with or without force. Devlin knew he was not authorized to pledge US support for a coup but was in a time-sensitive situation with seemingly everything on the line. Nonetheless Mobutu's plan did hold the potential to rid Congo of both Lumumba and Soviet influence, regardless of the wishes of Congolese people.

Mobutu told Devlin that he had to return to the army and tell them whether to execute the plan. Devlin decided he had no choice but to guarantee that the United States would recognize Mobutu's temporary government. Mobutu's response was emotionless. He informed Devlin the coup would happen within a week. Devlin acted outside of his power again and promised Mobutu money to finance the

²⁵ Devlin, *Chief of Station*, p. 78.

coup.²⁶ Devlin made the United States complicit in the overthrow of Lumumba when he made these promises to Mobutu. Washington did not object to Devlin's actions because they removed Lumumba from power, neutralized Soviets within Congo, and brought the United States out of the Congo Crisis. Mobutu took control of Congo and surprisingly retained Kasavubu as a political aide.

On 6 September 1960, Minister of Justice Joseph Ileo signed an arrest warrant for Lumumba, citing his radio time after dismissal as prime minister as treasonous and the reason why Congo was in chaos. On 11 September 1960, Congolese soldiers arrested Lumumba at his residence. Fifty soldiers, still loyal to Lumumba, freed him after he arrived at prison. Freedom was short-lived as Mobutu's soldiers arrested Lumumba again five days later. But Lumumba was able to escape again after two days and returned home.²⁷

Lumumba received UN protection. He enjoyed relative autonomy under UN watch until 10 October 1960 when he could no longer avoid harassment without staying home under constant UN supervision. Mobutu threatened force against UN aid to Lumumba if Mobutu could not arrest his rival once and for all. However, Mobutu and UN representatives came to a compromise. Lumumba would not undergo arrest but relocation to a secluded area of Congo where he would have no political power. Mobutu made clear that if Lumumba left his new residence, he would face arrest immediately.²⁸ Mobutu wanted to eliminate the threat of Lumumba and avoid disapproval the United.

On 27 November 1960, Lumumba escaped with the assistance of loyalists and armed escorts. Lumumba and his entourage stopped the next morning to buy supplies where locals recognized him. The locals supported the former prime minister with such enthusiasm that he believed he had no choice but to give a speech.²⁹ Lumumba's enemies knew where he was after that exposure, which helped them capture him before any damage was done. The desire of Congolese people for Lumumba's leadership was ignored by the CIA when he gave these speeches. The information was used to locate Lumumba instead. On 1 December 1960 Lumumba was crossing a river with his entourage via canoe. Mobutu's troops knew of Lumumba's location and were waiting for him on the other side. Congolese soldiers beat Lumumba and took him and his followers prisoner.³⁰

²⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 79.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 25-25.

²⁸ *Ibid.*

²⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 34.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 40.

Mobutu's troops continued to beat Lumumba and his allies savagely as they transported them to the prison at Camp Hardy in Thysville. The United Nations protested the violence inflicted on Lumumba during his arrest. UN Secretary General Dag Hammarskjöld considered Lumumba's arrest illegal. Rajeshwar Dayal, UN diplomat from India in charge of the UNOC, wanted to dispatch the Red Cross to ensure humane treatment of Lumumba. However, Mobutu and his army ignored these requests and continued to beat Lumumba. Kasavubu wrote to Hammarskjöld a few days later informing him that two doctors would examine the former prime minister to confirm humane treatment. Kasavubu chose not to mention that the two doctors were Belgian, with one being Mobutu's personal physician. The doctors did not give their reports to the public, but Kasavubu told the United Nations reports indicated the prisoners were in acceptable condition.³¹

On 12 January 1961 Camp Sonakulu in Thysville mutinied over unfair wages and the uprising soon spread to Camp Hardy where Lumumba was in prison. The mutinous soldiers jailed the Congolese officers and raped their wives.³² Concern arose as to what extent Lumumba played a role in igniting the mutiny. Devlin had reports from his informants that the mutinous troops set Lumumba free. The events over the next few days led to the murder of Lumumba, regardless of his involvement in the mutiny.

The following day Mobutu, Kasavubu, Foreign Minister of Congo Justin Bomboko, and others rushed to Thysville to end the mutiny. Earlier that morning, Devlin met with Mobutu and Bomboko about the uprising. Mobutu informed Devlin of plans to travel to Camp Hardy and come to an agreement with the mutinous soldiers. Devlin objected to this plan because it put all of Congo's top politicians in a dangerous place at the same time. Mobutu replied, "Halfway measures won't do, Larry. Everything is lost if we don't stop this right now . . . It's an all or nothing situation. All or nothing."³³ Mobutu, Bomboko, Kasavubu, and their associates saw this as their top priority. They needed to end the mutiny and transfer Lumumba to a prison that could supervise him.

Tshombe knew that he could keep Lumumba imprisoned in Katanga. The two were bitter enemies and it was in Tshombe's best interest to have Lumumba under his watch. Belgian advisers thought it best if Lumumba was in Katanga too because his life was at risk at

³¹ *Ibid.*, p. 53.

³² *Ibid.*, p. 72.

³³ *Ibid.*, p. 128.

Camp Hardy.³⁴ On 17 January 1961 Lumumba and his two companions were transferred from Thysville to Katanga. Director of Security of Congo Victor Nendaka and Defense Commissioner Ferdinand Kazadi, both men Lumumba trusted, drove to Thysville and told Lumumba that a coup had occurred in Leopoldville, which resulted in the imprisonment of Kasavubu, Mobutu, Bomboko, and Ileo. Lumumba, they said, needed to return to Leopoldville at once to reclaim his position as prime minister. Lumumba was convinced that this was true and left with the men.³⁵

Nendaka and Kazadi betrayed Lumumba. Their true plan was to arrest Lumumba and his two companions then transfer them to Katanga. There they would place them in the hands of their enemies for execution. Belgian mercenaries severely beat the three prisoners again during their transfer to Katanga. The violence against Lumumba and his companions was so barbarous it made the plane crew nauseous and caused the radio operator to vomit.³⁶ Lumumba pleaded for the plane to land anywhere but Elizabethville because he knew his fate if his captors delivered him to Tshombe and Munongo.

Munongo and Lumumba had been enemies for years and events during 1960 made the relationship worse. Munongo had gone so far as to instruct his police to prevent Lumumba from entering Elizabethville. That evening, Lumumba and his companions arrived as prisoners in Elizabethville. Belgian mercenaries threw the beaten prisoners out of the plane to the ground below then dragged them to a truck, abused every step of the way. The mercenaries drove Lumumba and his companions away from the airport to a villa for their execution. Tshombe, Munongo, and Belgian mercenaries were waiting for the prisoners when they arrived. Lumumba's enemies did not listen to his pleas for humanity. The bullet retrieved from Lumumba's head was from a 9mm pistol, a gun Katangese police are not issued.³⁷ That bullet showed the mercenaries likely pulled the trigger, not the Congolese.

Halfway around the world Eisenhower was delivering his farewell speech at the moment of Lumumba's murder. John F. Kennedy became President three days later.³⁸ In his memoirs, Devlin claimed he and the CIA had no knowledge of the plan to assassinate Lumumba. After Mobutu and Bomboko told him of their intention to travel to Thysville to end the munity, Devlin received a phone call from Mobutu

³⁴ Heinz and Donnay, *Lumumba*, p. 77.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 86.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 93.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 144-45.

³⁸ Newton, *Eisenhower: The White House Years*, p. 347.

assuring him that Mobutu's supporters had taken control of the situation and Lumumba was back in prison. However, shortly after Lumumba's arrival, Devlin received this cable from the CIA officer in Elizabethville: "THANKS FOR PATRICE. HAD WE KNOWD HE WAS COMIN WE'D A BAKED A SNAKE."³⁹ Devlin's testimony during a Senate committee study of the assassination was controversial as it implied indirect U.S. involvement in the murder of Lumumba and his two companions. Devlin's testimony was incriminating:

They knew of no CIA involvement in Lumumba's death. The Congo Station had advance knowledge of the central government's plan to transport Lumumba into the hands of his bitterest enemies, where he was likely to be killed.⁴⁰

Devlin said that he did not know how Mobutu, Tshombe, Munongo, and others planned to eliminate Lumumba. He confessed knowledge of only the impending transfer to the people mentioned above where they probably were going to murder Lumumba.

The CIA's indifference to Lumumba's fate kept it from pulling the trigger. However, with the information the CIA had it could have acted to prevent Lumumba's death; it simply chose not to do so. Removing Lumumba had been a U.S. top priority for months and Devlin knew the Congolese would solve this problem for him. Historian Piers Brendon summarized perfectly what transpired in his biography of Eisenhower:

"The CIA did not murder Lumumba, but it assisted in his capture by the new military ruler, General Joseph Mobutu, who did execute him."⁴¹

Knowing of Lumumba's delivery to his enemies for execution and doing nothing to stop it substantiated indirect involvement of the CIA in the assassination of Lumumba. The CIA's failure to act displayed Washington's Cold War prism that ignored Congolese self-rule and focused on self-serving American objectives.

In January 1961, Mobutu assumed the rank of General. The temporary government he established with US backing failed to produce its goal of permanence. There were power struggles between

³⁹ Devlin, *Chief of Station*, p. 130.

⁴⁰ Quoted in *Alleged Assassination Plots Involving Foreign Leaders*, p. 48.

⁴¹ Piers Brendon, *Ike: His Times and Life* (New York, 1986), 396.

Tshombe and Kasavubu after Lumumba's death until Mobutu, with financial support from the United States, seized power as dictator and maintained his control until 7 September 1997 when he died. He terrorized the country during his reign, winning a reputation as one of the most loathsome dictators of the twentieth century.⁴²

Lumumba's willingness to side with the Soviets scared Western powers, but he was likely the only man who could have united Congo. People within the boundaries of his nation did not view themselves as Congolese, but rather as members of their individual and unique tribe. It was often tribal divisions that Belgians exploited to maintain their dominance of Congo. Lumumba saw this division. He knew that the only way to unite Congo and end their oppression was to suppress these differences. He stressed that all the tribes could have their own voice and could coexist within a new Congolese government. Lumumba's assassination was the end of hopes for a unified Congo.⁴³ Mobutu, Howard W. French observed, even changed "the name from Congo to Zaire in 1971 in a bid to overcome Lumumba's enduring legacy."⁴⁴ Lumumba's positive impact on Congo was immeasurable. Regardless, his assassination came with indirect involvement from the CIA. This showed Washington's lack of understanding Congolese desires.

US policy makers did not like that Lumumba was murdered but were happy he was no longer a threat. Washington could now run foreign policy toward Congo as it desired. The CIA put Mobutu and his regime in power. The intelligence agency supported American policy, shut down nationalism, and dismissed Soviet influence. Tshombe's role in Katanga and good relations with the West guaranteed Western use of precious minerals from the region.⁴⁵ The United States installed neo-colonialism in Congo. This allowed corrupt politicians to gain power, oppressing the Congolese.

Some members of Kennedy's administration, known as Africanists, wanted to reverse the secession of Katanga, which Kennedy favored as well. The new president worried, however, about the backlash that direct action would cause. In September 1961, the United Nations went into Katanga to end secession. This failed, as the Katangan military was far better equipped than the UN forces. The United States

⁴² Jeanne M. Haskin, *Tragic Congo: From Decolonization to Dictatorship* (New York, 2005), 39.

⁴³ Lemarchand, "Patrice Lumumba," p. 47.

⁴⁴ Howard W. French, *A Continent for the Taking: The Tragedy and Hope of Africa* (New York, 2004), 230.

⁴⁵ William Minter *King Solomon's Mines Revisited: Western Interests and the Burdened History of Southern Africa* (New York, 1986), 147.

did not offer any military assistance to the UN, but the CIA provided the Katangan army with a plan that helped it humiliate UN forces.

These actions reflected a US policy toward the Congo after the assassination of Lumumba. Installation of Mobutu as leader was only the first step. Despite claims to the contrary, Kennedy followed the same policy Eisenhower had in Africa with similar results. US policy toward the Congo Crisis was seen through the lens of the Cold War, which ignored the desire for self-rule from the Congolese and pushed self-serving American objectives.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

- Devlin, Larry. *Chief of Station, Congo*. New York: Perseus Book Group, 2007.
- Heinz, G. and H. Donnay. *Lumumba The Last Fifty Days*. Translated by Jane Clark Seitz. New York: Grove Press Inc., 1969.
- “Uranium Ore, Copper Pacing Congo’s Output American Capitol To Have Part Soon In Katanga Projects.” *The News Herald*, 18 May 1950, 2.
- U.S. Congress. Senate. Select Committee to Study Governmental Operations. *Alleged Assassination Plots Involving Foreign Leaders*. 94th Cong., 1st Sess., 1975.
- U.S. Department of State. *Foreign Relations of the United States, 1958-1960*. Vol. XIV: *Africa*, Washington, DC: United States Government Printing Office, 1992.

Secondary Sources

- Ambrose, Stephen E. *Eisenhower: The President*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1984.
- Brendon, Piers. *Ike: His Life and Times*. New York: Harper & Row, 1986.
- French, Howard W. *A Continent for the Taking: The Tragedy and Hope of Africa*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2004.
- Haskin, Jeanne M. *Tragic Congo: From Decolonization to Dictatorship*. New York: Algora Publishing, 2005.
- Iandolo, Alessandro. “Imbalance of Power: The Soviet Union and the Congo Crisis, 1960-1961.” *Journal of Cold War Studies* 16, No. 2 (Spring 2014): 32-55.
- Lemarchand, Rene. “Patrice Lumumba.” In *African Political Thought: Lumumba, Nkrumah, and Toure*. Ed. W.A.E. Shurnik, 15-59. Denver, CO: University of Denver Press, 1968.
- Minter, William. *King Solomon’s Mines Revisited: Western Interests and the Burdened History of Southern Africa*. New York: Basic Books, 1986.
- Newton, Jim. *Eisenhower: The White House Years*. New York: Doubleday, 2011.
- Weissman, Stephan R. “What Really Happened in Congo: The CIA, the Murder of Lumumba, and the Rise of Mobutu.” *Foreign Affairs* 93, No. 4 (July/August 2014), <http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/141523/stephen-weissman/what-really-happened-in-congo> (accessed 10 March, 2015).



The banner image located on the homepage of Heaven's Gate website.
Image location: <http://www.heavensgate.com/>)

THE KEY TO HEAVEN'S GATE: THE Pervasiveness of Cults in America

| Holly Sanbeck

In the early Spring of 1997, thirty-nine people individually covered in a purple shroud were found dead in a residence outside San Diego, California. It did not take authorities long to recognize who the victims were, but the story of their deaths sparked controversy and a plethora of aghast reactions from people around the world. The thirty-nine individuals voluntarily took their own lives in the hopes of being taken to a higher level of living via an alien spaceship following the then-passing Hale-Bopp comet. The Heaven's Gate cult was a relatively small group of people who believed a great many things, most of which were denounced by the majority of Americans. Whether or not their beliefs held any truth holds no relevance for this paper, but the outcry from the American people who claimed that the cult members were "crazy," "abnormal," and "brainwashed" does. In fact, nothing about the existence of Heaven's Gate is irregular for American culture. American history has more than a few instances of cultish thinking and times when swaths of American people flocked to a religious leader regardless of his or her "extreme" beliefs. Heaven's Gate should not be viewed as abnormal in American thinking, but rather seen as an example of the recurring and long-standing American susceptibility to outrageous and intense beliefs. The following paper will define what a cult is, provide an examination of Heaven's Gate itself, conduct a brief review of cults throughout American history, and analyze why Americans are so prone to following outlandish ideals.

While often used as a pejorative label, the term "cult" can be explained in many ways. Unfortunately, there is not one, easy and simple, definition. Academics from various fields agree that a cult is religious at its base but from there they disagree. As scholar J. Gordon Melton explains, social scientists often divide religious groups into three categories: churches, sects, and cults.¹ Professor John J. Collins furthers this distinction by stating that the largest difference between churches, sects, and cults is that the first two generally agree with societal norms and tend to follow them. Cults, however, "involve innovation."² Cults differ from other religious movements, but it is important to remember that they fulfill the same needs that churches and

¹ J. Gordon Melton, *Encyclopedic Handbook of Cults in America* (New York: Routledge, 2013), 3.

² John J. Collins, *The Cult Experience: An Overview of Cults, Their Traditions and Why People Join Them* (Springfield: Charles C. Thomas, 1991), 10.

sects do. A key factor for why people follow a set of beliefs is the need to answer questions like “what’s the meaning of life?” Religion is a way of answering these questions for many people. The beliefs that each individual religious group follows are mere sets of ideals that followers believe efficiently answer these questions. The beliefs themselves will range from ‘outlandish’ to ‘undeniable’ depending on who is analyzing them. Belief sets by themselves cannot be easily categorized into whether or not they “real” or “acceptable.” Therefore, beliefs alone do not decide whether or not followers of cults are crazy or deviant. The beliefs that Heaven’s Gate members held were not unusual or unheard of.

Understanding, analyzing, and comparing the beliefs of cults require an exploration of who the cults members were and how the cult was established. Marshall Applewhite and Bonnie Lu Nettles founded Heaven’s Gate in the 1970s. Marshall Applewhite, known as both Do and Bo, was a professor at both the University of Alabama and St. Thomas University; Nettles, known as Ti and Peep, was a registered nurse who played an active role in the metaphysical circles near Houston, Texas.³ Nettles, with her connection to the metaphysical circles, was already entangled in New Age beliefs when she met Applewhite. At its inception they initially named their cult Human Individual Metamorphosis, and they began spreading the news that they were the “Two Witnesses” prophesized in Revelations, Chapter 2 from the Christian Bible. The cult later changed its name, to Heaven’s Gate, when its beliefs became more cultivated and sophisticated as Applewhite and Nettles analyzed its purpose and adopted more Christian ideologies and elements from science fiction. Adapting these influences allowed their philosophies and beliefs to develop further. The moniker Heaven’s Gate, and the “Away Team” as the members who committed suicide were called, referred to the cult’s belief that once the members were taken on the ship that they believed followed the Hale-Bopp comet they would enter Heaven’s Gate.

As Christopher Partridge, professor of religious studies, explains in his book, *UFO Religions*, The Two first made news headlines after a presentation they gave in 1975 in Waldport, Oregon, where they had an audience of 200 listeners and immediately gained quite a few members, including “a teacher of metaphysics named Clarence Klug and twenty-three of his students.”⁴ Though membership changed regularly between

³ Robert W. Balch and David Taylor “Making Sense of the Heaven’s Gate Suicides,” In *Cults, Religion & Violence*, ed. David G. Bromley and J Gordon Melton (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 210.

⁴ James R. Lewis, “Legitimizing Suicide: Heaven’s Gate and New Age Ideology” in *UFO Religions*, ed. Christopher Partridge (New York: Routledge, 2003), 111.

1975 and the early 1990s, at its peak membership of Heaven's Gate numbered as high as 200 individuals. At one point during this fifteen-year period, the cult was split into smaller groups to spread the word and gather more followers.⁵ Do and Ti were not simple-minded folk; both were well-educated, nor were they young. Age and status varied as members left and new members joined, at the time of the suicides members aged from 20-72 and that was generally the norm for this cult.⁶ Do and Ti did not attract young impressionable counterculture enthusiasts. James R. Lewis, a professor of religious studies explains, "The members of the fated community were not impressionable young people: in fact, only two members were in their twenties."⁷ The only thing that truly connected these people was their appreciation for Do and Ti and the values that the leaders outlined.

Members of the cult followed those values happily even though the cult limited and discouraged ties to their family, friends, and material possessions. The followers of Heaven's Gate believed in overcoming their human weaknesses. Doing so included a detailed and strict day-to-day regime, uniform clothing, and a practice called "Tomb Time" when members would go days without saying anything but "yes," "no," or "I don't know."⁸ None of the strict guidelines that Do and Ti set out were forced upon the members, despite how extreme they may have seemed. Do and Ti believed that part of overcoming human weakness included denying sexual urges, enough so that some members (including Do himself) underwent voluntary castration.⁹ Even so, members who did not want to follow these strict rules were encouraged to leave. Do and Ti were understanding and quite kind to those members; as J. Melton explains, "Ti and Do even bought bus or plane tickets for departing members and gave them money to help them get reestablished."¹⁰ While some members, or students as they were often called, would leave the "classroom", new students would start to attend. At no point in time was a member forced to stay in the cult, and if the

⁵ Balch, *Cults*, 213.

⁶ Stephanie Simon, Nick Anderson, and Tony Perry, "39 in Cult Left Recipes of Death: Believed Alien Ship Would Take Them to Heaven: Officials Describe Careful, Ritualistic Suicide. The Dead, Ages 20 to 72, Included 21 Women." *LA Times*, March 28, 1997. http://articles.latimes.com/1997-03-28/news/mn-43761_1_mass-suicide

⁷ James R. Lewis and Jesper Aa. Peterson eds., *Controversial New Religions* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), 350.

⁸ James R. Lewis, *The encyclopedia of cults, sects, and new religions* (Amherst: Prometheus Books, 1998), 265-271.

⁹ "Some Members of Suicide Cult Castrated," *CNN*, March 28, 1997. <http://www.cnn.com/US/9703/28/mass.suicide.pm/>

¹⁰ Balch, *Cults*, 216.

member became dissatisfied with the practices or beliefs, he or she was encouraged to say his or her goodbyes to fellow members.

In 1988, Do, in an update he called “‘88 UPDATE -- THE UFO TWO AND THEIR CREW,” outlined the basis of what Heaven’s Gate believed. “Likewise a human who seeks only to become a member of his next evolutionary kingdom may become a member of that kingdom if he completely overcomes all the aspects and influences of the human level providing he has found favor with a member of that next level who will direct him through his metamorphosis.”¹¹ Heaven’s Gate centered its beliefs on creating humans worthy of metamorphosis by relinquishing personal property and other worldly pleasures, ensuring that they were fit for picking when the time came.

One difficult task is attempting to understand what cult members expected “when the time came.” Unfortunately, there is little evidence to show exactly how the cult’s thoughts on death and members’ entrance to the Kingdom of Heaven changed, and there is controversy on how they felt about suicide. As sociology professors Robert Bach and David Taylor explain in a book, *Making Sense of the Heaven’s Gate Suicides*, in the early years of their endeavor in cult leading Do and Ti stated that suicide would void your ticket through Heaven’s Gate. Yet after Ti’s unexpected death from cancer in 1985 the story changed and Do concluded that time was running out and the members had to commit suicide.¹² Even in the face of suicide, members were happy to be in the cult. When the group collectively committed suicide they, as explained by an *Los Angeles Times* article written in the days following the suicide, “left behind mystical computer postings and matter-of-fact videos explaining that they were eager to graduate from their human shells and ascend into heaven on an alien spaceship.”¹³ After Ti’s death, the members of Heaven’s Gate further developed their beliefs to claim that it was not one’s human body that would be taken to the alien spaceship also known as the Kingdom of God or the Kingdom of Heaven, but that one’s soul would be incarnated into its next level physical body. They compared this action to the changing of one’s clothes, a rather mundane and inconsequential action.

The ideology and belief system of Heaven’s Gate relied heavily on earthly metaphors; throughout members’ interviews, written philosophies, and videoed speeches, are mentions of an insect-like chrysalis of humans and Earth as a “garden.” If the garden referred to

¹¹ Marshall Applewhite, ‘88 Update – *The UFO Two and Their Crew*, Oct. 18, 1988. <http://www.heavensgate.com/book/3-3.htm>.

¹² Balch and Taylor “Making Sense of the Heaven’s Gate Suicides,” 216-17.

¹³ Simon, “39 in Cult.”

Earth, plants referred to the people of Earth. Do and Ti based their core beliefs on the idea that the Kingdom of Heaven sent members to the garden so that they would nurture plants and help them evolve them to be used as soul deposits for other members. As Do explains on their website, 2000 years ago a member of the Kingdom of Heaven was sent into a body at the behest of his father. This member went into the twenty-nine- or thirty-year-old body of Jesus and his sole purpose in the Garden of Earth was to “offer the way leading to membership into the Kingdom of Heaven to those who recognized Him for who He was and chose to follow Him.”¹⁴ Only those who have developed enough to be potential soul deposits would be receptive to his teachings and “they could get to His Father only through total reliance upon Him.”¹⁵ Heaven’s Gate members believed in a literal, physical Heaven that was “certainly not among humans on Earth,” and that entering that physical heaven required leaving Earth along with leaving “family, sensuality, selfish desires, your human mind, and even your human body if it be required of you- all mammalian ways, thinking, and behavior.”¹⁶ As with Jesus, all incarnations of Next Level members happened after birth, sometime in adulthood. For Do and Ti, their incarnation happened just a few short years before they started spreading knowledge about the Next Level. Both the UFO Two and their students believed that Do was “in the same position to today’s society as was the One that was in Jesus then” and that his sole purpose was to “offer the discipline and ‘grating’ required of this transition into membership in My Father’s House.”¹⁷ For Heaven’s Gate, that transition meant that thirty-nine members committed suicide.

Why they committed suicide can be explained through their beliefs and how they viewed the world. First, Heaven’s Gate members did not believe good deeds or faithful lives equated to entrance into Heaven. As Do stated in his final exit statement, “No one can enter that Kingdom [of Heaven] by trying to live a good life in this world.”¹⁸ For members of Heaven’s Gate, the only way that entrance was granted was through the guidance of an incarnated member of the Kingdom who had entered human vessel. The members of the Kingdom of Heaven who came to Earth would help humans to “discover their minds” and get their souls to enter their human bodies and reunite themselves with their

¹⁴ Marshall Applewhite, *Do’s Into- Purpose – Belief: What Our Purpose Is - The Simple “Bottom Line.”* <http://www.heavensgate.com/misc/intro.htm>

¹⁵ Ibid.

¹⁶ Ibid.

¹⁷ Ibid.

¹⁸ Applewhite, *Do’s Final Exit.*

Kingdom of Heaven counterparts. It was then up to senior members, those who initially helped humans discover themselves, to guide individuals into leaving their human bodies and entering their Kingdom of Heaven bodies, which were tangible beings and not metaphorical.

Just before the suicides, it was very important for the members of Heaven's Gate to express was that they were not "committing suicide." They explained what would look like a thirty-nine-member mass suicide to the media and public was more a reclaiming of their true identities. What they did over the course of a few days was merely move from one evolutionary level to the next. Do and his students believed that committing suicide was "separating from the Kingdom of God when the Kingdom of God has reached out and offered life to you."¹⁹ Whether or not the group was committing suicide, they still needed to prepare.

As the group geared up for their exit, members conducted interviews and made exit statements with each other. The purpose of those activities was to explain their thoughts and decisions to anyone that would listen, as well as to counter the media backlash they expected once their bodies were discovered. They did not want their beliefs, decisions, or leaders to be falsely tarnished and denounced. Srrody, a twenty-one-year veteran of Heaven's Gate, explained in his exit statement, "Trust your own feeling rather than what you hear from someone else."²⁰ In the same video thirty-seven other members express their pure joy and elation at the prospect of what they planned to do in a matter of days. These members ranged from three to twenty-two years of membership in Heaven's Gate; some had joined and then left and came back many years later. Every individual interviewed expressed nothing but joy for their actions and love for their leader, and nearly each one actively denounced the idea of brainwashing or force. One member called what was ahead of them "the happiest day of my life," while another claimed, "I am the happiest person in the world." Dstody, a twenty-two-year veteran, stated "I don't know what I did to deserve to be here. I am embarrassed that I can't express, without getting emotional, how good I feel about what I am doing."²¹ Not a single interviewee seemed apprehensive about his or her upcoming actions.

Yet, after the suicides, Americans still claimed that surely these people were brainwashed. This argument arises again and again

¹⁹ Marshall Applewhite, *Do's Final Exit*, March 19, 1997.

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=wdGXDQ_8bSA

²⁰ *Student Exit Statements*, date unknown.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=wHz9it70TdI>

²¹ *Ibid.*

when cults and their followers are brought up in academia and beyond. However, this argument is invalid. Heaven's Gate is categorized as a "suicide cult," accompanying them is Jonestown, the Order of the Solar Temple (OTS), the Branch Davidians, and Aum Shinrikyo. Though these five cults differ quite a bit, there are aspects where they can be compared. Nearly all cults have a religious background; many stem from Christianity while others take inspiration from Eastern religions. To deny cults their relevance and prominence in society is to deny any religious movement, for at that level they are all the same. More importantly, despite what many anti-cultists claim membership to a cult does not necessitate anti-social or abnormal behavior. As described by James Lewis, many members of these cults, especially of OTS, "were generally well integrated into society, well connected politically and socially, and affluent."²² While Heaven's Gate members land further on the spectrum of being removed from society, they still have elements of "regular" Americans. In his book *The Oxford Handbook of New Religious Movements*, James R. Lewis denounces claims of cultic brainwashing by posing the question: "How does one distinguish cultic brainwashing from other forms of social influence, such as advertising, military training, or even normal socialization routines of public schools?"²³ Anti-cult enthusiasts quickly jump onto the brainwashing wagon or join other Americans in claiming that those individuals who join cults are unlike ordinary people. However, neither of these accusations are accurate or honest. Heaven's Gate existed in a time when the Internet was just becoming popular, and in order to spread their beliefs, they incorporated technology into their practices by creating a website. Lewis agrees with Hugh Urban, also a religious studies professor, when he claims that the age of the Internet enables cults. The internet, according to Urban, helped create "the perfect environment for the inception, incubation, and evolution of new religious movements."²⁴ But it was not just the Internet that helped facilitate cults like Heaven's Gate or shaped their world view.

Just days before their exit from this level, three students wrote statements titled "Why We Must Leave at This Time" to explain what caused them to leave their human vessels behind and enter into the Next Level. While each statement varies in a few ways one underlying cause is present. The members of Heaven's Gate felt that the world was not conducive to their goals and purposes of living on "this level." Freedom

²² Lewis, *Controversial New Religions*, 299.

²³ James R. Lewis ed., *The Oxford Handbook of New Religious Movements* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 5.

²⁴ *Ibid*, 123.

to move, speak, and preach, whenever they needed or wanted to, was imperative for them because they believed the only reason they were here was to help more humans connect with the Next Level and become ready for evolution. However, these individuals felt like those freedoms were being stripped away; “to us, the most obvious infringement is upon the freedoms of the individual by the governments of the world.”²⁵ Moreover, they believed that governments, particularly the United States, had instituted laws and regulations that, purposefully or inadvertently, inhibited them from having nomadic and free lives. Members of Heaven’s Gate also blamed, the complacency and acceptance of social norms by the general public, writing, “They have become complacent to the gradual, and to us, alarming changes that increasingly infringe upon the real freedom to grow as an acceptable servant to the KINGDOM OF HEAVEN.”²⁶

The world in which Heaven’s Gate existed helped form and develop its beliefs as well as influence its actions, but the greater American past also helped develop this group. Religion sits at the very core of the American value system. Beyond democracy, structure, or economic tendencies, what sets America apart from many other countries in the West and in the East is the wild religious freedoms that Americans exercise. In *Cults in Context*, Lorne L. Dawson explains that the formation of cults is just another way of exercising that freedom. He argues, “The rise of NRMs (New Religious Movements) reflects an extension of religious individualism and volunteerism.”²⁷ Beyond religious freedom, Christianity plays a large role in American history and formation of values. Though there is no *recognized* state religion, Christian denominations have played the largest role in formation of American values as John Collins, a professor and critic of the Old Testament, says, “biblical religion is the oldest influence on American values and ways of thinking”²⁸ and sociology professor Edward M. Levine claims “Religious cults are also said to be a welcome sign evidencing the persistence of religious faith.”²⁹ If anti-cultists claim that cults have no place in American society they are being historically inaccurate and denying cults their rightful place among the identification of what it is to be an American.

²⁵ Chkody, *Earth Exit Statement: Why We Must Leave at This Time*, March 22, 1997. <http://www.heavensgate.com/misc/exitchk.htm>.

²⁶ *Ibid.*

²⁷ Lorne L. Dawson, *Cults in Context: Readings in the Study of New Religious Movements* (New Brunswick: Transaction, 1998), 398.

²⁸ Collins, *Cult Experience*, 105.

²⁹ Edward M. Levine, “Religious Cults: Their Implications for Society and the Democratic Process,” *Political Psychology* 3, No. ¾ (1981), 35.

Historically, cults have been in America since its inception. As far back as 1799, Americans joined cults based on Native American beliefs. Though the American following of Native American beliefs dissipated in the early nineteenth century, it rose again in 1860, and once more in 1870. Finally, in 1918, the various Native American cults, with their American followers, merged together.³⁰ If the definition of cults includes a break from the standard churches and sects and the innovation of new practices and beliefs, then it can be argued that America was founded on the basis of a cult. The study of cults both in America and throughout the world is directly connected to some of the most religiously movements. The Reformation gave way to religious freedom and movement, and the Great Awakening allowed for an American acceptance of religious enthusiasm and individuality. The path that these two movements paved encouraged both religious openness and conflict as stated by James R. Lewis in his book, *Cults in America*, The Second Great Awakening created “new conflicts within the major Protestant denominations.”³¹ By the time of The Second Great Awakening, Protestantism was an established and *accepted* religion. However, when Protestantism began it was viewed by and large on the same terms as people view cults now. The cycle continued, as more denominations split from larger Christian sects. Now, other Christian denominations fall into the category of cult, too. Seventh-Day Adventists, Mormons, and Jehovah’s Witnesses have all been classified as dangerous cults by the German Enquiry Commission, a group created to assess and identify religious groups who posed violent dangers to the state.³²

Cults got their inspiration from other aspects of American culture as well. The counterculture movement of the 1960s and 1970s increased the facilitation of groups like Heaven’s Gate and the Branch Davidians. As academic author Irving Hexham and historian Karla Poewe explain, during the counterculture movement “we slid into the permissive society.”³³ Cults, in and of themselves, are not new or recent in American history. This is also true about the basic tenets of belief system of Heaven’s Gate.

³⁰ Collins, *Cult Experience*, 73-75.

³¹ James R. Lewis, *Cults in America: A Reference Handbook* (Santa Barbara: ABC-CLIO, 1998), 47.

³² Stuart A. Wright, “Public Agency Involvement in Government-Religious Movement Confrontations,” in *Cults, Religion & Violence*, ed. David G. Bromley and J Gordon Melton (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 113-115.

³³ Irving Hexham and Karla Poewe, *Understanding Cults and New Religions* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1986), 111.

Heaven's Gate relied heavily on Christian influences, but its beliefs were peppered with other aspects. The cult's belief in Unidentified Flying Objects (UFOs) and science fiction-related ideals is often accused of being crazy and wrong, but this is still not a unique belief for Heaven's Gate. UFOs had been a source of religious beliefs and identification since at least the 1880s, when Helena Petrovna Blavatsky codified it within theosophy.³⁴ Many cults have taken inspiration from UFOs, especially since the 1940s and 1950s. Social anthropology professor Christopher Helland details four of these groups as particularly high profile: Aetherius Society, the Adamski group, the Unarius Academy of Science, and the Ministry of Universal Wisdom.³⁵ But even as some cults share inspiration and aspects with other cults broad generalizations lead to inaccurate claims, like the ones that call Heaven's Gate "strange" and "bizarre."

Just as it would be historically inaccurate to deny cults the seat they deserve in American history, it is also wrong to lump every cult together. Religion is formative to human cultural, societal, and individual values. These values are undeniably going to vary between people, groups, and nations, as they very well should. Diversity in beliefs stimulates conversation, thought, and understanding. While the vast majority of elements involved in Heaven's Gate can be explained in context of other things that have existed in the past or concurrently, it is wrong to attempt to deny Heaven's Gate their own form of innovation, beliefs, and values. The problem only arises when cults are denounced or disregarded for those beliefs and branded as being strange, unusual, and wrong. As professor and theologian Mark W. Muesse explains, "We judge things as bizarre according to how much they diverge from our own way of seeing things, which we usually privilege as being closer to the truth than all others."³⁶ If cults are a natural evolution of religious beliefs, what do they become when concurrent with America's notion of truth and reality?

American notions of truth have been a struggle since the early stages of the nation. This inability to accept the truth is part of what makes Americans so unique and susceptible to joining cults. Cults often use the ideology of "primal experiences" to vindicate and validate their beliefs. In fact, these experiences are used in many religions but are used

³⁴ Lewis, *Legitimizing Suicide*, 107.

³⁵ Christopher Helland, "From Extraterrestrials to Ultraterrestrials: The Evolution of the Concept of Ashtar" in *UFO Religions*, ed. by Christopher Hugh Partridge (New York: Routledge, 2003), 162.

³⁶ Mark W. Muesse, "Religious Studies and "Heaven's Gate": Making the Strange Familiar and the Familiar Strange" in *Heaven's Gate: Postmodernity and Popular Culture in a Suicide Group*, ed. George D. Chryssides (Surrey: Ashgate, 2011), 54.

often in cult dogmas. Primal experiences are surprise encounters with some higher being and identified as “not normal.” While this may, to a rational thinker, discredit belief systems based on Primal Experiences, according to Hexham and Poewe, a survey of Americans showed that over thirty percent of individuals “responded positively to questions about primal experiences.”³⁷ Still, in other ways Americans identify on base levels with ‘crazy’ thinking.

In his work, *Fantasyland: How America Went Haywire: A 500-year History*, journalist Kurt Andersen investigates why Americans are so prone to believing outlandish things. Americans pride themselves on being *exceptional*. They honor and desire religious freedom, and denounce other political systems that do not incorporate that freedom into their structure. Andersen claims that American Exceptionalism is *religious freedom*. He states that “because we’ve had such a religious marketplace for so long, religion naturally ‘wants’ to be more primitive, miraculous, and amazing.”³⁸ Marshall Applewhite himself gave support for Andersen’s then unpublished argument, which contended that Americans truly feel that their beliefs and feelings trump other, proven or not, facts. In *Do’s Final Exit*, Do states clearly, “Whatever we believe to be true *is* true for us,” and he claims that the truth of members of the next level have an even different truth from humans, arguing that “the level above human’s truth is that the only purpose for the human kingdom at all is a temporary training ground.”³⁹

Yet, the continuity of cults within America can still be explained without recognizing the tendency of Americans to disregard truths for their own feelings. Religious studies professor Mary Farrell Bednarowski described the continuity of American cults by explaining that “contemporary New Age thought is both a continuation and an expansion of the many theological and philosophical concepts Theosophy began offering American culture” and that cults are a direct response to “the dyadic thinking which is so ingrained both in Western theological thinking and in American culture.”⁴⁰ Ultimately there remain many problems with lumping cults together, denouncing their rightful influences on American culture, and jumping to common anti-cultist stereotypes. Viewing Heaven’s Gate as an individual group shows commonalities with established religions as well as minority cult.

³⁷ Hexham, *Understanding Cults*, 61.

³⁸ Kurt Andersen, *Fantasyland: How America Went Haywire: A 500-year History* (New York: Random House, 2017), 291.

³⁹ Applewhite, *Do’s Final Exit*.

⁴⁰ Mary Farrell Bednarowski, *New Religions and The Theological Imagination in America* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1989), 18.

It exhibits continuity between fears, beliefs, and American inability to accept truth. However, it is still imperative to assess why it is unacceptable to lump cults together in a pejorative manner as well as claim, as each cult pops up, that these groups are new, unusual, and completely out of the ordinary. Lewis claims that “according to spokespersons for cult watchdog groups, our society is populated by hundreds – perhaps even thousands—of cult groups.”⁴¹ While cults in America have been in existence since the country won its freedom from England, there has been a spike in the number of these groups since the early 1900s. Lewis explains that while over 100 New Religions existed in 1900 over 800 existed by 1990. The prevalence of cults is so large that in some areas of the United States there are 5.7 new religions per million residents, and in other areas it drops only as low as 1.2 per million residents.⁴² With this kind of evidence, credit cannot be given to the claim that any cult has popped up out of nowhere, even if their beliefs lead them to take their own lives.

There is little evidence that Heaven's Gate was aberrational in the history of American thought. Instead, there are heavy indications that the cult exemplified how prone Americans have been to outrageous and intense beliefs. Because Americans have been offered such freedoms of thought, religion, and practice, their morals and values have changed over-time. As the world transformed into a materialistic and consumerist society, cults like Heaven's Gate assisted in individual understanding and removal from the concurrent world. UFO sightings and followings have been present in America for nearly a century. Suicide has been a form of personal agency for longer than America has been a country, and it has played no small part in the practices of many religions around the world. Americans have had a recurring tendency to disregard the established truth in favor of beliefs that feel truer to them. Finally, Heaven's Gate failed to brainwash or coerce members into joining and staying; more often than not cult attendance is verifiably voluntary. The study of Heaven's Gate becomes less an investigation into why thirty-nine people killed themselves, and more an attempt at understanding how personal agency, religious freedom, and fantastic beliefs in America change.

⁴¹ Lewis, *Cults in America*, 5.

⁴² Lewis, *Cults in America*, 182-183.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

- Applewhite, Marshall. '88 Update – The UFO Two and Their Crew. October 18, 1988. <http://www.heavensgate.com/book/3-3.htm>.
- Applewhite, Marshall. *Do's Final Exit*, March 19, 1997. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=wdGXDQ_8bSA
- Applewhite, Marshall. *Do's Into- Purpose – Belief: What Our Purpose Is - The Simple "Bottom Line"*. <http://www.heavensgate.com/misc/intro.htm>
- Applewhite, Marshall. *Last Change to Evacuate Planet Earth (Before it is Recycled)*. September 29, 1996. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=m74KOFZYOWM>.
- Balch, Robert W. and David Taylor "Making Sense of the Heaven's Gate Suicides." In *Cults, Religion, and Violence*, edited by David G. Bromley and J Gordon Melton, 209-223. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Chkody. *Earth Exit Statement: Why We Must Leave at This Time*. March 22, 1997. <http://www.heavensgate.com/misc/exitchk.htm>.
- Heaven's Gate. *Student Exit Statements*. date unknown. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=wHz9it70TdI>
- Hettena, Seth. "Returning to Earth from Heaven's Gate." LA Times, April 07, 2002. <http://articles.latimes.com/2002/apr/07/local/me-36643>.
- Simon, Stephanie, Nick Anderson, and Tony Perry. "39 in Cult Left Recipes of Death: Believed Alien Ship Would Take Them to Heaven: Officials Describe Careful, Ritualistic Suicide. The Dead, Ages 20 to 72, Included 21 Women." LA Times, March 28, 1997. http://articles.latimes.com/1997-03-28/news/mn-43761_1_mass-suicide.
- "Some Members of Suicide Cult Castrated." CNN, March 28, 1997. <http://www.cnn.com/US/9703/28/mass.suicide.pm/>.

Secondary Sources

- Andersen, Kurt. *Fantasyland: How America Went Haywire: A 500-year History*. New York: Random House, 2017.
- Bednarowski, Mary Farrell. *New Religions and The Theological Imagination in America*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1989.
- Collins, John J. *The Cult Experience: An Overview of Cults, Their Traditions, and Why People Join Them*. Springfield: Charles C. Thomas: 1991.
- Dawson, Lorne L., ed. *Cults in Context: Readings in the Study of New Religious Movements*. New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers, 1998.
- Helland, Christopher. "From Extraterrestrials to Ultraterrestrials: The Evolution of the concept of Ashtar." In *UFO Religions*, edited by Christopher Hugh Partridge, 169-72. Routledge: New York, 2003.
- Hexham, Irving and Karla Poewe. *Understanding Cults and New Religions*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eersmans Publishing, 1986.
- Melton, J. Gordon. *Encyclopedic Handbook of Cults in America*. Routledge: New York, 1992.
- Muesse, Mark W. "Religious Studies and 'Heaven's Gate': Making the Strange Familiar and the Familiar Strange." In *Heaven's Gate: Postmodernity and Popular Culture in a Suicide Group*, edited by George D. Chrystides, 53-57. Farnham: Ashgate Publishing Company, 2011.
- Levine, Edward M. "Religious Cults: Their Implications for Society and the Democratic Process." *Political Psychology* 3, No. ¾ (1981): 34-49.
- Lewis, James R. *Cults in America: A Reference Handbook*. Santa Barbara: ABC-CLIO, 1998.

The Key to Heaven's Gate

- Lewis, James R. *The Encyclopedia of Cults, Sects, and New Religions*. Amherst: Prometheus Books, 1998.
- Lewis, James R. "Legitimizing Suicide: Heaven's Gate and New Age Ideology." In *UFO Religions*, edited by Christopher Hugh Partridge, 103-129. London: Routledge, 2003.
- Lewis, James R., ed. *The Oxford Handbook of New Religious Movements*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Lewis, James R. and Jesper Aa. Peterson, eds. *Controversial New Religions*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.
- Partridge, Christopher, ed. *UFO Religions*. London: Routledge, 2003.
- Wright, Stuart A. "Public Agency Involvement in Government-Religious Movement Confrontations." In *Cults, Religion & Violence*, edited by David G. Bromley and J Gordon Melton, 102-22. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Book Reviews

EXILE'S RETURN: A LITERARY ODYSSEY OF THE NINETEENTWENTIES. by Malcolm Cowley. *The Viking Press, 1951. 322 pp.*

Malcolm Cowley is a renowned literary critic and social historian who is widely respected for his literary works on the "Lost Generation" and the Great Depression. In *Exile's Return*, Cowley provides a thought-provoking account of the experiences of the "Lost Generation" writers and the sense of exile that arose among intellectuals. His observations and experiences with the Dadaists in Paris were particularly fascinating. It was interesting to read about Cowley's experiences with this little-known group. The discussion on the Dadaists tied well into Cowley's theme of social and intellectual exile due to the group's nihilism and unconventional views on art. The idea of social exile is mirrored in Cowley's observations on how the "Lost Generation" felt unsettled in a society increasingly focused on Capitalism. In addition to Dadaism, Cowley also extends this theme globally through his discussion on Russian intellectuals in the mid-nineteenth century. By taking a comparative look at the actions of Russian intellectuals, Cowley allows the reader to see the importance of the "Lost Generation" in a broader context. This shows that the mentality of exile from a social and intellectual standpoint was a global phenomenon, rather than an exclusively American one.

Overall, Cowley's chronicle of the "Lost Generation" is an enlightening story of the intellectuals of the 1920s; however, he occasionally allows his personal attachment to the period interfere with the narrative. Personal experiences and passion can be valuable in a story, as seen by Cowley's interactions with Dadaists in Paris and his literary struggles in New York. However, at various points in the narrative his emotions interfere which led to questionable decisions and observations on certain topics. For example, Cowley mentions in the prologue that "I had written at length about the life of Harry Crosby, whom I scarcely knew, in order to avoid discussing the more recent death of Hart Crane, who I knew so well that I still couldn't bear to write about him." While the story of Crosby fit well into Cowley's narrative, he relied on interpreting Crosby's obscure diary entries rather than using more familiar material. One might wonder if Cowley's arguments would have been better supported with a story his reader, and himself, was more acquainted with. Nevertheless, Cowley provides a fascinating look at the social and intellectual struggles the "Lost Generation" writers experienced in the 1920s.

Eric Jopson

WORKING TOWARD WHITENESS: HOW AMERICA'S IMMIGRANTS BECAME WHITE. by David R. Roediger. *Basic Books: Perseus, 2005. 336 pp.*

David Roediger's *Working Toward Whiteness* provides an extremely detailed account of the "new immigrant" experience in the United States during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Using a plethora of sources, Roediger persuasively argues against historians who attempt to portray the assimilation of European immigrants into U.S. society as easy or smooth.

Roediger contends that the process of assimilation was uneven and messy because of the racist literature, attitudes, and practices that existed in the United States. To elaborate on this argument Roediger divides the text into three parts: the first details the variety of ways U.S. citizens thought about race and ethnicity, as well as the social hierarchy that emerged from this understanding. The middle part of the book deals with the “inbetweenness” of immigrant groups as they encountered racism and nativist opposition in the public sphere. The final part explains the process of assimilation, first through the lens of new immigrants and then from the viewpoint of the national government. This organizational framework coupled with Roediger’s diverse sources and immense attention to detail allows the author to determine how immigrant groups became “White”.

Although Roediger describes the Americanization process as messy, uneven, and inconsistent, he also highlights a few trends that aided immigrant groups as they struggled to be perceived as white. Immigrants quickly learned the racial hierarchy of the United States; they participated in the communal hatred of African Americans, Asians, and sometimes other European immigrant groups that were not considered white. Furthermore, immigrant laborers increasingly joined unions alongside native whites to secure labor demands for everyone that met the union’s racist or ethnocentric criteria. Roediger also shows how the U.S. government facilitated the Americanization of these immigrant groups. Two of the many examples he presents are the immigration restriction laws of the 1920s that allowed for “good” Europeans to continue migrating en masse while simultaneously easing fears that “bad” Europeans were reducing U.S. “stock” and FDR’s New Deal reforms that indiscriminately benefitted anyone who wasn’t black, Asian, or Latino.

Working Toward Whiteness is a memorable work that incorporates intellectual history as well as social history to examine how European immigrant groups became “white.” Even though Roediger’s extensive use of examples may render some sections hard to read, his nuanced portrayal of the new immigrant experience in the United States is fundamental for understanding U.S. politics and race relations since the turn of the twentieth century.

Juan Vega Ramirez

THE BIRTH OF THE PILL: HOW FOUR CRUSADERS REINVENTED SEX AND LAUNCHED A REVOLUTION. *by Jonathan Eig. W.W. Norton & Compan, 2014. 388 pp.*

Jonathan Eig is an American journalist who has authored five books, including *Ali: A Life* (2017) and *Get Capone: The Secret Plot that Captured America’s Most Wanted* (2010). In *The Birth of the Pill: How Four Crusaders Reinvented Sex and Launched a Revolution*, Eig provides an intriguing biographical history of the birth control pill and the four key people involved in its creation. More specifically, Eig’s account of Gregory Pincus’ and John Rock’s research provided an enlightening view on the origins of birth control. It is easy to associate this topic with just women’s efforts for birth control; however, Eig helps the reader understand that men also played a role in promoting new methods of contraception. He also provides an interesting

discussion on the influence of eugenic ideology on birth control. Eugenacists were interested in the concept of controlled birth rates, which connected well with the book's theme of class struggle. Eig mentions that better methods of contraception would help the lower class have less children. Eugenacists widely supported this belief because they wanted to weed out "inferior" people like immigrants and the lower class. This showcases how controversial birth control was since it could easily be stigmatized by radical intellectuals and politicians.

Overall, Eig's account of both men and eugenacists in the support of birth control is intriguing; however, his description of Margaret Sanger's adherence to eugenics is flawed. Eig argues that Sanger appealed to the ideology mainly for social and political support for her ideas on birth control. Yet, he also mentions that Sanger fully supported "weeding" out inferior people through sterilization, which seems to contradict his original argument that Sanger appealed to eugenacists strictly for support. Eig also takes a defensive approach to Sanger's ties to eugenics by not properly criticizing her, despite the stigma of that ideology. Eig also seems too focused on the Catholic Church as providing the only religious resistance to contraception. At one point he says, "Only Congress...and the Roman Catholic Church held fast" during his discussion on resistance to legal birth control. Eig fails to mention that other religious groups, like the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, resisted the legalization of contraception. Nevertheless, Eig provides a readable look at the development and growth of birth control in the 1900s.

Eric Jopson

THE WORLD SPLIT OPEN: HOW THE MODERN WOMEN'S MOVEMENT CHANGED AMERICA. by *Ruth Rosen*. *The Viking Press*, 2000. 446 pp.

Ruth Rosen's *The World Split Open* presents a detailed history of the American women's movement from the early 1960s to the late 1990s. The large chronological scope of the book allows the author to produce a comprehensive study of second-wave feminism and the dramatic cultural changes it produced. In four parts broken up into ten chapters, Rosen highlights the gendered cultural norms of Cold War-America, documents some of the movement's important members and significant events, surveys the revolutionary changes second-wave feminists achieved during the second half of the twentieth century, and discusses the widespread political and religious backlash to the incomplete feminist revolution.

The book begins by demonstrating how that the politics of communist containment set the stage for the rebirth of feminism during the Cold War. Political leaders promoted traditional gender roles in the public and private sphere, restricted women's political and economic activity, and ultimately gave women the tools to organize themselves. Moreover, Rosen argues that second-wave feminism emerged as a direct challenge to the gender specific cultural norms that limited women's autonomy as described in Betty Friedan's *The Feminine Mystique* (1963). Rosen highlights the year 1963 as a watershed moment because of the sudden quickening of feminist activity. She describes two

parallel streams of feminist activism that quickly gained political visibility; one was composed of women of the Old Left, such as Friedan, and the other was made up of baby boomers who held socialist views and were generally more radical, such as Dolores Huerta. The former group pressed for equal rights through political cooperatives such as NOW. The latter group increasingly believed that “the personal is political” and thus worked to disrupt the status quo through participation in consciousness-raising groups and direct-action protests. Rosen argues that this generational gap coupled with the emerging variety of diverse feminist ideologies resulted in a movement that could not be pinned down ideologically. By the 1970s, radical activists advocated for reproductive rights and sexual liberation while liberal feminists condemned them for doing so. Nonetheless, women held the autonomy to redefine the meaning of feminism and use their definition to generate radical change.

Ruth Rosen’s primary objective in *The World Split Open* was to educate new generations on “the remarkable passion and accomplishments” of the American women’s movement, especially since many people take for granted the wide-ranging and transformative changes it brought about. Rosen is undoubtedly successful at completing this task.

Juan Vega Ramirez

Phi Alpha Theta 2019 Initiates

It is with great pride and enthusiasm that the Editorial Board of *The Chico Historian* welcomes into the fold this year's new members of the Alpha Delta Omicron Chapter of Phi Alpha Theta:

Ryan Cady

Gregory Cannon

Jordan Cottrell

Michael Dursteler

Molly Hamilton

Kiara Harry

Vivian Hernandez

Emma Kirchhoff

Maria Kogler

Jessica Lewis

Benjamin Robertson

Harrison Ross

Jillian Willis

