

intentionally left blank

inside front cover flyleaf



ON THE COVER:

Untitled. Pencil drawing by Bill Peglar.

Bill's story:

"I was born in Panama Canal Zone, Panama in 1947—grew up in the 'atomic city' of Oak Ridge, Tennessee, and after a few unsuccessful stabs at college, I

wound up being a Vietnam era veteran on a long and twisted road. It seemed that the positive and stable things about my life were that I always had an obsession about building things and working with my hands. Consequently, I have spent my life being a welder, blacksmith, jeweler, silversmith, and goldsmith. I've also done a lot of lapidary work, cut and polished precious stones, and learned some things about diamonds and colored gems.

So, after approximately twenty-five years of working as a jeweler-sculptor, I've been drawing and learning watercolors for the past ten or so. I absolutely love to draw and paint. I do a wide range of pencil drawings and watercolors, and some pen & ink drawings and oil paintings. Many of these deal with landscapes, wildlife and the natural world. Every time I explore the woods around North Central Florida I discover natural altars—spiritual forms that are portals to another world. They can be anything from awe inspiring sculptures to palaces to meditate on. Carlos Casteneda once said that 'seeing' is seeing the spaces between the leaves. That is also my credo. I don't have any formal training, but I study a lot on my own—and I'm not afraid to ask questions. I also teach art lessons occasionally (mostly on a volunteer basis). My students have turned out to be some of my best teachers."

This account was condensed from an interview with Bill on May 25, 2012 and the description of his artwork he wrote on his business card.

ALPATA is the Seminole-Muscogee word for alligator.

ALPATA

a journal of history

VOLUME IX, SPRING 2012

A Publication of the University of Florida
PHI ALPHA THETA *gamma eta chapter*

graduate managing editor **Eleanor Deumens**

undergraduate managing editor **Sarah Kleinman**

book review editors **Christopher B. Crenshaw**
Christopher Woolley

editors **Michael Falcone**
Josh Krusell
Elizabeth McNeill
Katalin Rac
Peter Sanders

faculty advisor **Dr. Jack E. Davis,**
Professor of History

underwriting partner **Kelley Fund for History**

sponsors **University of Florida**
Department of History
Dr. Ida Altman, Chair

designer **Eleanor Deumens**

cover artist **Bill Peglar**

CONTENTS

Special Section

Academic Freedom at the University of Florida.....1
*Christopher Crenshaw, Michael Falcone, Sarah Kleinman,
Josh Krusell, Elizabeth McNeill, and Peter Sanders*

Featured Articles

“Culture Areas” in British Florida: Indians, Africans and Europeans.....22
Christopher B. Crenshaw

Bartram’s Paradoxical Perspective on Indians.....33
Caitlin Nelson

Battles with Battles: Harnessing the Power of the Revolutionary Landscape in
the New South.....48
Jessica Taylor

Black Blooded: The Alliance of the African Blood Brotherhood and American
Communism.....78
Kimberly Burroughs

The May 1972 Crisis.....95
Michael Steven Thomas

Book Reviews

Andrew S. Curran. *The Anatomy of Blackness: Science and Slavery in an Age of
Enlightenment*. Baltimore, M: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2011.....110
Reviewed by Sarah Goodwin

Veronika Fuechtner. *Berlin Psychoanalytic: Psychoanalysis and Culture in
Weimar Republic Germany and Beyond*. Berkeley: University of California
Press, 2011.....113
Reviewed by Anthony Sabatini

| | |
|--|------------|
| Katherine L. Jansen and Miri Rubin, eds. <i>Charisma and Religious Authority: Jewish, Christian, and Muslim Preaching 1200-1500</i> . Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols Publishers, 2010..... | 116 |
| <i>Reviewed by Sean Hill</i> | |
| Tim Johnston. <i>Being Soviet: Identity, Rumour, and Everyday Life under Stalin, 1939-1953</i> . New York: Oxford University Press, 2011..... | 119 |
| <i>Reviewed by Wesley White</i> | |
| Stephanie Leitch. <i>Mapping Ethnography in Early Modern Germany: New Worlds in Print Culture</i> . New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010..... | 122 |
| <i>Reviewed by Matt Mingus</i> | |
| Kate Ramsey. <i>The Spirits and the Law: Vodou and Power in Haiti</i> . Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2011..... | 125 |
| <i>Reviewed by Erin Zavitz</i> | |
| Bruce. E. Stewart. <i>Moonshiners and Prohibitionists: The Battle over Alcohol in Southern Appalachia</i> . Lexington, Ky.: The University Press of Kentucky, 2011..... | 128 |
| <i>Reviewed by Jennifer A. Lyon</i> | |
| Katie Sutton. <i>The Masculine Woman in Weimar Germany</i> . New York: Berghahn Books, 2011..... | 131 |
| <i>Reviewed by Chelsea Jimenez</i> | |
| John Thorn. <i>Baseball in the Garden of Eden: the Secret History of the Early Game</i> . New York: Simon & Schuster, 2011. | 134 |
| <i>Reviewed by Sarah Calise</i> | |
| Submission Guidelines..... | 137 |

SPECIAL SECTION

ACADEMIC FREEDOM AT THE UNIVERSITY OF
FLORIDA

*Christopher Crenshaw, Michael Falcone, Sarah Kleinman,
Josh Krusell, Elizabeth McNeill,
Peter Sanders*

The University of Florida has been serving the state and the nation as an important center of higher education even prior to the opening of its present-day campus in Gainesville in 1906. Looking back onto the history of the institution reminds us that the university had its share of problems and controversies, especially over the issue of academic freedom. Stories of those who have suffered academic injustice at the hands of their peers, the university administration, and/or the Florida legislature, tell us that the university has not always been acceptant of views on the margin, nor has it always been independent from outside political influences. In this section the study of the early history of the

university is both a goal and a tool. The authors intend not to criticize the past actions of the University of Florida, but rather to underscore the fact that what the university did or failed to do was a product of the times and to illustrate that the university is an interesting figure of study, representing several national historical trends of the twentieth century.

The first controversy attaining national attention involved University of Florida history and economics professor Enoch M. Banks. It evolved around the disputed uses, abuses, and interpretation of Southern history; in other words, how history should be taught to white students (all male) in the conservative South and the university's role in mitigating threats to its faculty's scholarly views. In early 1911, Professor Banks submitted a short essay to *The Independent*, an academic magazine published in New York City, commemorating the fiftieth anniversary of the inauguration of Lincoln and the secessionist movement that led to the American Civil War. "It seems fitting," he wrote, "for a Southerner who belongs to an entirely new generation... to estimate in the calm light of history the wisdom of secession and the meaning of the great conflict which its trial precipitated." Confident that a "new spirit of liberality toward opposing views... is perhaps the greatest incipient triumph of the twentieth-century South," he discussed the wisdom of State sovereignty and slavery from an academic perspective. He asked, "Was the attitude of the South in relation to these two questions right—in the highest and best sense of the term right?"

Ultimately, he felt that “the North was relatively in the right, while the South was relatively in the wrong.”¹

Banks was careful to acknowledge both sides of the argument in his paper. While he argued that slavery was unsustainable and the secessionist movement could not be justified, he was also careful to concede that “most intelligent Southerners... would entirely agree... that the right of secession was then inherent in the nature of our Union.” The question revolved around a higher level of right and wrong, and Lincoln was right in aligning himself with “the forces working for the best interests of an advancing civilization.”²

Shortly after his piece was published in February, Banks discovered that some vocal leaders of Southern “patriotic” organizations felt that the South *was* on the right side of the issues that led to secession, and that he was terribly and indefensibly wrong. These leaders used the press to shape public opinion against Banks and, by extension, other progressive academics in the South. Opponents of the piece seized on this extra-legal justification of the Federal cause to build their case against Banks. Former Florida state senator John S. Beard took the offensive from his home in Virginia. He fumed in a long editorial reprinted by the *Tampa Morning Tribune* on February 26, “this article is an outrage upon truth and upon decency, and is an insult to every Confederate veteran, every son of a veteran, and every daughter of the Confederacy.” Thus calling on the three key groups that would oppose Banks’s view and lobby for his dismissal—the United Confederate

¹ Enoch Marvin Banks, “A Semi-Centennial View of Secession,” in *The Independent*: volume 70 (January-June 1911): 299. <http://books.google.com/> (accessed January 6, 2012).

² *Ibid.*, 303.

Veterans, the sons of Confederate Veterans, and the United Daughters of the Confederacy—Beard played to his audience: “If one who holds the perverted views of Mr. Banks is to fill the chair of History and Economics at the principal institution of learning in the State, then these patriotic organizations are worse than useless in the State of Florida and might as well dissolve.” He then issued a clear call to action, stating “[these groups] should enter a loud and emphatic protest against the retention of Mr. Banks, by the Board of Control, in his present condition.”³ The lines were drawn, but the battle was already nearly over. Banks “wilted” in the face of criticism and turned in his resignation to University of Florida president Albert A. Murphree on March 9. However, the press debate continued after his departure.

The *Atlanta Constitution* took Banks’s side in a March 13 editorial that challenged the “Mental Gag-Law” advocated by Beard and the Confederate veterans’ associations. “It may be he is right, wrong—partially both,” the editor wrote, “but *The Constitution* is principally concerned with pleading for and insisting upon tolerance as the basis of the South of the twentieth century.”⁴ While Banks’s opposition labeled his ideas as “anachronistic,” the *Constitution’s* editors argued that censuring his ideas was even more of an anachronism. Noting that “tolerance is the Southern keynote today,” they urged readers to keep an open mind.⁵

The next shot in the press offensive was fired by Willis M. Ball, editor of the Jacksonville *Florida Times-Union* on Thursday, March 16. The ideas in Banks’s original *Independent* article were dangerous, Ball

³ “Mr. Beard Aroused,” *Tampa Morning Tribune*, February 26, 1911: 21.

⁴ “The Day Past For Mental Gag-Law,” *The Atlanta Constitution*, March 13, 1911: 4

⁵ *Ibid.*

contended, because they justified Lincoln's actions in light of an extralegal duty. If this were acceptable, "the country ceases to be a republic, the constitution loses its authority and conscience becomes our guide instead of law." Ball was further troubled by the implications of the rule of conscience. "Whose conscience?" he asked, answering, "that of the man possessed of the power to enforce the rule of his conscience on the rest of us." The following Monday, Ball took up the theme again. Banks's tribute to Lincoln "would subvert government itself making the conscience of the anarchist a court of appeal." For students attending the University of Florida, Ball felt that this line of reasoning was especially threatening. Ball wrote, "To have a generation of young men and women grow up in this country imbued with the idea that the conscience of one man is above the national or state law... is to grow anarchists by wholesale."⁶ In preparing this March 20 editorial for the *Florida Times-Union*, Ball either did not see or chose not to mention a letter from Banks to the *Atlanta Constitution* published on Saturday, March 18.

In a long explanation of his actions, Banks wrote that the *Constitution's* "Mental Gag-Law" piece "did his soul a world of good," and that he was motivated to help struggling Southern educational institutions catch up with those in the North. "Perhaps I should say that in order to protect the University of Florida from further criticism I have tendered my resignation," he continued.⁷ Asking the reader to pardon the length of his letter, Banks expressed his "unbounded enthusiasm for

⁶ Willis M. Ball, "A Florida Tribute," *The FloridaTimes-Union*, March 16, 1911: 6, "The Teacher and the School," *The Florida Times-Union*, March 20, 1911: 4.

⁷ "More About Mental Gag-Law," *The Atlanta Constitution*, March 18th, 1911: 6.

an awakened and progressive South.”⁸ He worked toward that goal until his death eight months later.

Though Murphree expressed his agreement with the editors of the *Constitution* in defending academic freedom—“the soul of the University,” in his words⁹—he was unable to retain Banks. Fear of the political backlash by Confederate veterans’ organizations, backlash that he felt threatened the university’s future, silenced Banks and forced him to submit to the political will of the popular groups. The Banks incident at the University of Florida illustrates how these popular political organizations utilized the press to shape public opinion, and political pressure to enforce it. By attacking academia, these organizations fundamentally altered the ways in which the Southern past could be constructed and discussed.

The history of academic freedom at the University of Florida is also intertwined with the history of the Klu Klux Klan in Gainesville. The story of Father John Conoley is a striking example of the Klan’s influence on the University, as well as on social and civic life in Gainesville. Conoley attended his freshman year at the University of Florida, when it was still Florida Agricultural and Mechanical College, in 1903. Ordained as a Catholic priest in 1915, he returned to Gainesville after serving in World War I to establish a ministry for Catholic students, then only a very small number, at the university in 1919. He later built a Catholic chapel and student dormitory.¹⁰ Conoley also organized a

⁸ Ibid.

⁹ Bailey, 15.

¹⁰ Stephen R. Prescott, “White Robes and Crosses: Father John Conoley, the Klu Klux Klan, and the University of Florida,” *The Florida Historical Quarterly*, Vol. 71, No. 1 (Jul., 1992), 18-40, 27. The dormitory was located on University Avenue where St. Augustine Church stands today.

drama club, The Masqueraders, on campus in 1921.¹¹ He was widely liked among students and a prominent figure on campus. “As it was,” writes historian Stephen R. Prescott, “Conoley’s abilities and efforts on behalf of the University of Florida attracted the attention of the Klan.”¹²

The early twentieth century, specifically from about 1923 to 1924, was the height of the Klan’s influence in Gainesville. Nearly one hundred hooded Klan members marched in a parade down University Avenue in January 1923.¹³ Anti-Catholic sentiment was rife in Gainesville at this time, owing to a larger anti-Catholic movement in Florida and the South as a whole. Anti-Catholic politicians, organizations and newspapers characterized Catholics as subversives, deviants, and beholden to the Pope. The Klan objected to a Catholic priest serving the students of a public university.

In 1923, Conoley gave a speech at the Gainesville Kiwanis Club, urging community leaders to provide jobs for students who could not afford their educational expenses. According to Prescott, this seemingly “innocuous” incident brought Conoley to the Klan’s attention, as three local newspapers praised Conoley’s speech and the ideas behind it.¹⁴ The Klan published a leaflet railing against Conoley and what they deemed his “undue” influence over students. The Klan accused Conoley of attempting to seduce male students in his Catholic dormitory, both through religious conversion and sexual predation. The persecution of Conoley was very clearly connected to the Klan’s wider agenda to

¹¹ The Masqueraders were the precursor to the Florida Players student drama group.

¹² Prescott, “White Robes and Crosses,” 40.

¹³ *Ibid.*, 19.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 30.

promote fear of Catholics and Catholic proselytizing in the community and among university students.

University officials' initial reaction and subsequent lack of action to protect Conoley from the Klan reflected its influence on the university. President Murphree initially supported Conoley, writing in a private correspondence that "officials of the University of Florida will not appear in print in answer to a cowardly group who operate in the dark - I refer, of course, to the little coterie purporting to represent the Alachua Klan."¹⁵ However, after petition letters from members of the community and pressure from Klan leaders, Murphree began to drift from Conoley, saying publicly that Conoley had been appointed "preacher," not a "chaplain," and therefore he had no right to officiate at Catholic mass.¹⁶ Murphree eventually removed Conoley from his post as head of The Masqueraders and his position at the Catholic Ministry.

Over a weekend in February 1924, three Klansmen kidnapped Father Conoley from St. Patrick's rectory in Gainesville. Conoley would later identify two of his kidnappers to his friends and family, alleging that one had been Mayor George Seldon Waldo and another Police Chief Lewis Washington Fennell.¹⁷ The Klan members left Conoley severely beaten and reportedly castrated on the steps of a Catholic Church in Palatka. Conoley suffered physical and mental complications from the attack and it took him nearly a year to convalesce. He left Gainesville and did not return.

There was a vacuum of silence in both the press and on campus surrounding Conoley's beating and disappearance from Gainesville,

¹⁵ Prescott, "White Robes and Crosses," 35.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 36.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 37.

attesting to the influence of the Klan at that time. Father Conoley was caught on the wrong side of the Klan, and university officials could not or would not defend him or come to his aid.

Of course, Catholics were not the only targets of such discrimination, especially in the South where Jim Crow laws limited African Americans' access to education at universities. During the middle of the twentieth century, the civil rights movement slowly broke down the Jim Crow system, and a significant battle for desegregation was fought at the University of Florida. In pursuit of his entitlement to a quality education as a native Floridian, Virgil Hawkins, a black public relations official for Bethune-Cookman College, applied to the University of Florida College of Law in April 1949. At the time Hawkins submitted his application, Jim Crow laws defined the South's segregationist practices. Lawyer Stephen J. Riegel writes: "The federal courts from the Reconstruction onward consistently and frequently decreed Jim Crow segregation to be constitutional and consistent with the laws of the land."¹⁸ In accordance with racial trends, "the Florida constitution had mandated the separation of races in all walks of life, both public and private."¹⁹

The Florida Board of Control (later re-named the Board of Regents) denied Hawkins admissions to the University of Florida based on his race. Hawkins took his case to the Florida Supreme Court, which found that he possessed "all of the scholastic, moral and other

¹⁸ Stephen J. Riegel, "The Persistent Career of Jim Crow: Lower Federal Courts and the 'Separate but Equal' Doctrine, 1865-1896," *The American Journal of Legal History* 28, no. 1 (January 1984): 20.

¹⁹ Whittington B. Johnson, "The Virgil Hawkins Case: A Near Decade of Evading the Inevitable, the Demise of Jim Crow Higher Education in Florida," *Southern University Law Review* 16, no. 1 (1989): 56.

qualifications except as to race and color.”²⁰ The court supported its decision using the Equal Protection Clause within the Fourteenth Amendment of the United States Constitution: “No state shall... deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.”²¹ Hence, the Florida Supreme Court dictated that Hawkins could either attend law school in another state at Florida’s expense or attend Florida’s forthcoming black law school at Florida A & M University (FAMU). Furthermore, while the FAMU College of Law was under construction, Hawkins had the right to take law classes at UF.²² However, Hawkins accepted neither option. He argued that attending the FAMU College of Law, which then only existed on paper, did not provide him equal protection under the law.²³ Unsatisfied with the court’s ruling, Hawkins and his attorneys appeared before the Florida Supreme Court for the third time on August 1, 1952.

While Hawkins’s third appeal failed in court, the subsequent years brought an upsurge in legislation favoring educational equality. Following the ruling in *Brown v. Board of Education* in 1954, the United States Supreme Court declared segregation in public schools illegal. The Supreme Court’s companion ruling required the University of Florida to admit Hawkins to its law school. However, UF still denied him access to its legal education. The US Supreme Court again ordered his admittance, but the Florida Supreme Court did not comply, arguing

²⁰ Lawrence A. Dubin, "Virgil Hawkins: A One-Man Civil Rights Movement," *Florida Law Review* 51, no. 5 (December 1999): 923.

²¹ U.S. Const. amend XIV, §1.

²² Dubin, 923.

²³ Darryl Paulson and Paul Hawkes, "Desegregating the University of Florida Law School: Virgil Hawkins V. the Florida Board of Control," *Florida State University Law Review* 12, no. 1 (1984): 59-60.

erroneously that state law superseded federal law.²⁴ Judge DeVane, the judge who presided over Hawkins's June 16, 1958, hearing, conditioned the desegregation of UF graduate and professional schools upon Hawkins's voluntary withdrawal of his 1949 application. If Hawkins had not complied, "the litigation concerning his qualification to enter law school would have gone on for years."²⁵

At the age of fifty eight, Hawkins finally enrolled in the New England School of Law. In 1976, twenty seven years after he first applied to law school, Hawkins returned to Florida with a J.D. degree.²⁶ When he appeared before the Florida Bar, his request to take the state bar examination. After appealing this decision and passing the exam, Hawkins became a member of the Florida Bar by a special waiver. He then spent his short law career as a public defender in Lake County, Florida. Although Virgil Hawkins was never admitted to the University of Florida College of Law, his persistence opened the doors for other African Americans to obtain law degrees from University of Florida. The same year that Hawkins rescinded his application from University of Florida, George Starke was admitted as the first African American law student at the University of Florida. In 1962, W. George Allen became the first African American graduate of the University of Florida College of Law.²⁷ Furthermore, Hawkins's impact on the history of racial equality in education has not gone unnoticed. In 2001, UF recognized his contributions by awarding the university's first-ever posthumous

²⁴ "The Virgil Hawkins Story," University of Florida Levin College of Law: Centers and Clinics, accessed January 30, 2012, <http://www2.law.ufl.edu/centers/hawkins/virgil.shtml>.

²⁵ Dubin, 941.

²⁶ "The Virgil Hawkins Story," <http://www2.law.ufl.edu/centers/hawkins/virgil.shtml>.

²⁷ Ibid.

degree. This honor not only bestows recognition upon a man who fought against the oppressive Jim Crow segregation of the South, it memorializes Hawkins's fight to win freedom of education for African Americans at Florida's state universities. It also demonstrates that the university is engaged in the education of its past and acknowledging its part in the history of segregation.

During the Cold War, the United States entered into a period of heightened fear over potential societal subversion and state infiltration by purported communist agents and sympathizers. Florida was not immune to this nationwide shared sentiment and was swept up in efforts to root out allegedly disloyal and subversive elements throughout all levels of society. Falling under this category, homosexuals were targeted by many who considered them to be "morally weak and psychologically disturbed."²⁸ Such ideological fervor, which collectively became known as McCarthyism, resulted in the Florida state senate appointing its very own investigative committee in 1956 under the chairmanship of State Senator Charley Johns with the goal to "investigate organizations or individuals threatening the safety of Florida's residents by violating state laws."²⁹ Known as the Florida Legislative Investigation Committee, or more informally the Johns Committee, the Committee began investigating the Florida public education system in 1958 in an attempt to purge public universities, students and members of faculty equally, of

²⁸ "Historian David K. Johnson: Exposes the U.S. Government's Anti-Gay Crusades," *GayToday*, available from <http://gaytoday.com/interview/010104in.asp>; accessed January 17, 2012.

²⁹ Bonnie Stark, "McCarthyism in Florida: Charley Johns and the Florida legislative investigation committee" (M.A. diss. University of South Florida, 1985).

homosexuality, which it deemed a threat both to the state and Floridian society.

Among the most prominent universities targeted was that of the University of Florida. Under the leadership of President J. Wayne Reitz, the university cooperated fully with the investigation despite the fact that the Johns Committee lacked the legal authority to investigate homosexuals within the university.³⁰ Nevertheless, under the direction of chief investigator R.J. Strickland and with the help of University of Florida campus police, the investigation of the University of Florida resulted in the dismissal of at least 20 faculty members and 50 students on grounds of suspected homosexual behavior. Strickland and other investigators subjected scores of individuals to interrogation, often in motel rooms for several hours at a time. In one case, the chairman of the Department of Geography, Sigmund Diettrich, attempted suicide after being questioned by Strickland and forced to resign by Reitz. Throughout the entire ordeal, few challenged the legal authority of the Johns Committee. As a result, the American Association of University Professors attempted to inform the faculty of their legal rights especially in respect to the interrogations carried out by Strickland upon persons of interest. In the case of the University of Florida administration, Reitz hesitated to oppose the Johns Commission out of fear of losing state funding.

In all, the Johns Committee represents the dark legacy of McCarthyism and contributed to the stifling of academic freedom by targeting academics based upon their sexuality under the auspice of protecting the greater society from the “degenerative moral condition of

³⁰ Ibid.

homosexuality.” The committee members justified the witch-hunt with unsubstantiated causal relationships between homosexuality and political subversion, thereby transforming “communism and homosexuality into diseases that had infected American Institutions.”³¹ In 1964, following the controversial publication of an anti-homosexual report commonly referred to as the Purple Pamphlet, with the termination of the funding of the Florida Legislative Investigation Committee the persecution ended. However, the challenges surrounding academic freedom within the University of Florida, particularly regarding Florida state government intervention in university affairs, were far from over.

The 1960s were marked by several notable struggles over tenure and academic freedom at the university. Unlike previous decades, however, these clashes became widely publicized and highly controversial, a development indicative of both the challenges to traditional power structures in higher education nationwide, and of an increasing public engagement with academic matters.

The first of these battles concerned University of Florida journalism instructor Ed Richer. Richer was an early sponsor of the University of Florida Student Group for Equal Rights, and took part in local demonstrations for civil rights and free speech. Among these was his support for the Freedom Party, a renegade student group that challenged the decades-old single-party stranglehold on the university’s student government. More alarmingly to the university administration, Richer was an outspoken political leftist, penning a nationally circulated column called “Radically Speaking” railing against what he perceived to

³¹ James A. Schnur, “Closet Crusaders: The Johns Committee and Homophobia, 1956-1965,” in *Carryin’ on in the Lesbian and Gay South*, ed. John Howard (New York: New York University Press, 1997), 155.

be the impotence of half-hearted campus rebellions. He believed that “the academic rights movement is full of people whose personal and intellectual slovenliness can be in part accounted for because they haven’t the primal political character necessary for the choice” between rebellion and revolution.³²

Richer soon fell victim to the very shortcomings in academic freedom that had been his central cause: in 1965, the university administration terminated Richer’s year-to-year contract, citing his lack of academic qualification. Richer suspected this was a pretext to remove a politically active instructor, and requested a hearing before the tenure committee. The hearing was granted, but university lawyers refused to take part, effectively denying Richer due process and consequently ending his career.³³

Perhaps more radical than Richer was UF psychology professor Marshall Jones, another early participant in both the civil rights movement and the New Left. Jones served as the faculty sponsor for both the University of Florida chapter of Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) and the Student Peace Movement.³⁴ In June 1967, Jones was unilaterally dismissed by outgoing President J. Wayne Reitz, despite the College of Medicine’s approval of tenure. The controversy surrounding this decision fittingly inaugurated the rocky presidency of Reitz’s successor, Stephen C. O’Connell, who received Jones’s appeal

³² Ed Richer, “Radically Speaking,” *Free Student*, No. 5, 1965, 3.

³³ Jeffrey A. Turner, *Sitting In and Speaking Out: Student Movements in the American South, 1960-1970* (Athens, Ga.: University of Georgia Press, 2010), 159.

³⁴ Transcript, Austin Creel. Oral history interview with Stuart Landers, August 27, 1992, p. 35, Samuel Proctor Oral History Program Collection, P.K. Yonge Library of Florida History, University of Florida.

and whose actions pushed the incident into a national spotlight.³⁵ A series of tumultuous appeal hearings in the spring of 1968 publicly highlighted issues of academic freedom, and drew nationwide attention to the ideological struggle underway in Gainesville. The *New York Times* reprinted “McCarthyesque statements from Reitz,” including his belief that Jones was “one of the cleverest leaders of rebellion in United States academia,” a “fomenter of rebellion,” and an “emotional and dangerous manipulator of students and faculty,” which served only to undermine additional administration actions against Jones.³⁶ Perhaps most galling to students, O’Connell and his deputy, Dean of Student Affairs Lester L. Hale, censored an editorial in the campus newspaper *The Florida Alligator* regarding the Jones debacle. O’Connell personally threatened the piece’s author, Steve Hull, and Hale installed an administration-friendly student journalist in the post of “Special Editor.”³⁷ Despite the tumult, university officials eventually prevailed, and Jones was ousted. It was to be the first of numerous controversies during the O’Connell era.

Yet times were changing, and official intervention in academic affairs was becoming decreasingly viable. Just a year after the Marshall Jones hearings, O’Connell found himself caught between an increasingly agitated body of faculty and the Florida state government, which had called for the dismissal of philosophy professor Kenneth A. Megill.

³⁵ Interview with Marshall B. Jones, October 1967. Unidentified interviewer. University Archive, Special Collections, University of Florida (Gainesville, Fla.)

³⁶ Anthony Ripley, “Black Power Unit Stirs Florida City,” *New York Times*, April 21, 1968; and “Professors Censure 6 Colleges,” *Washington Post*, April 18, 1971.

³⁷ Scott DeGarmo, “Student Revolt: Where Next?” *The University Report 2* (Gainesville, Fla.) no. 21, February 6, 1969.

Another outspoken instructor, Megill was nevertheless professionally respected and academically prosperous. Nevertheless, the Florida Senate demanded his removal, which O'Connell initially resisted, fearing both diminished political autonomy for the university and the wrath of the American Association of University Professors.³⁸ O'Connell wrote that "the academic community is beset by fear when dismissal proceedings happen, hindering the 'spirit of inquiry.'"³⁹ His administration's rejection of the recommendation of the Department of Philosophy to promote Megill for tenure in 1971 further underlined the irony of O'Connell's words. A year later, O'Connell unilaterally dismissed Megill from the university, citing "unprofessional behavior." This action was something of a watershed in the ongoing struggle for academic freedom. Megill's academic career was a distinguished one—he was named Outstanding Professor of 1969 by the College of Arts and Sciences, and was the university's first-ever nominee for a National Foundation of the Humanities fellowship. His published works included *The New Democratic Theory* and *The Community as a Democratic Principle in Marx's Philosophy*, and his department chair considered Megill "without question one of the ablest, most thoughtful and interestingly dedicated young men within the faculty of this university, and in terms of personal probity, sobriety, and human generosity he is one of the finest men I have ever encountered in the teaching profession."⁴⁰ That such a prestigious colleague could be

³⁸ Ripley, "Black Power Unit Stirs Florida City," *New York Times*, April 21, 1968; "Professors Censure 6 Colleges."

³⁹ DeGarmo, "Student Revolt: Where Next?"

⁴⁰ Letter from Thomas Hanna, Chairman, Department of Philosophy, to Dean Harry H. Sisler, College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, February 18, 1969. Special and Area Studies Collections, George A. Smathers Libraries, University of Florida (Gainesville, Fla.).

unceremoniously dismissed at the whims of administrators unnerved many faculty members.

The legacy of the challenges to academic freedom in the 1960s and 70s cascaded down to future years. Jones went on to document University of Florida radicalism in a dissertation titled “Berkeley of the South.” O’Connell’s censorship of the *Alligator* led to its declaring financial and editorial independence from the university in 1971, while the ongoing battles over academic freedom of expression—and the Jones hearings in particular—led the American Association of University Professors to direct its microscope on Gainesville. After an analysis, the organization officially censured the University of Florida in December 1970, citing conditions “not conducive to the protection of academic freedom for non-tenured faculty members or as indicated by recent developments, for faculty in general.”⁴¹ The decision brought national attention to the administration’s actions, not only from scholars but also from the national press (most notably the *Wall Street Journal*).⁴²

The American Association of University Professors’s action, the dismissal of Megill, and the subsequent increase of outside scrutiny on the university’s policies regarding academic rights were instrumental factors in the creation of a union named the United Faculty of Florida, which became a key force in matters of academic rights in the decades to follow. Dismissals now required negotiation with the union, and the university began to take steps toward the restoration of its image. Several of the terminated professors received financial compensation,

⁴¹ Academic Freedom and Tenure: University of Florida” *AAUP Bulletin* 56 no. 4, December 1970.

⁴² Richard Martin, “Uneasy Profs: Tenure for Teachers Is Beginning to Crumble as Critics Push Drive” *Wall Street Journal*, April 16, 1971.

while the Jones case was settled when the university donated \$6,000 worth of literature on academic freedom to the library. The American Association of University Professors finally lifted its censure in 1975.⁴³

From a present day perspective, it is easy to take academic freedom for granted, especially within the public university system. Through the lens of academic freedom, the history of the university can be seen to exemplify several trends of the twentieth century. These included the controversy over the “correct” interpretation of Southern history, the rise of the Klu Klux Klan, the civil rights movement, paranoia over Communist infiltration and the Vietnam anti-war campaigns of the 1970s. The history of academic freedom itself is neither static nor stagnant, and requires active participation by students, teachers and the administration to maintain an environment cohesive to the open intellectual process that is the hallmark of educational institutions within the United States.

⁴³ Linda Wisniewski, “Professors Recommend UF Censure Removed” *Independent Florida Alligator*, June 2, 1975.

FEATURED ARTICLES

“CULTURE AREAS” IN BRITISH FLORIDA: INDIANS, AFRICANS AND EUROPEANS

Christopher B. Crenshaw

In one of the first communications between the Lower Creeks in East Florida and incoming British officials, Chief Chehayache assured Indian agent¹ John Stuart in September 1764, “The Spaniards are gone, and you are now on the ground which we lent them: we approve of it, and will always hold you fast as brethren.”² Instead of a one-sided exchange characterized by “dispossession” of Indian lands, trade goods, and lives

Jacksonville native Christopher Crenshaw is a fourth-year history student at UF and member of Phi Alpha Theta. He is currently developing further research on culture areas in British East Florida in preparation for an honors thesis. Christopher also contributed as a book review editor in this issue of *Alpata*.

¹ Responsible for maintaining diplomacy and trade with Indian nations in all of the Southern colonies.

² Chehayaché to John Stuart, Apalachee, 27 September 1764. “The Indian Frontier in British East Florida; Letters to Governor James Grant from British Soldiers and Indian Traders,” *Florida History Online*. <<http://www.unf.edu/floridahistoryonline/Projects/Grant/letters.html>> (accessed October 31, 2011.) This resource will be henceforward abbreviated as **UNF**.

by Europeans,³ this and other documents indicate that British-Indian relations in colonial Florida followed a different pattern. Archaeologist Alice Beck Kehoe describes “culture areas” in which neighboring cultures share ideas, languages, goods, and values.⁴ Lower Creeks and Seminoles in Florida played a significant role in a unique culture area with their European neighbors. They often occupied a position of power in negotiations on land policy, trade, international rivalries, and slavery. The power they held in these negotiations and the positions they took—especially those dealing with slavery—offer interesting insights into the social and political interaction between Indians, Africans, and Europeans in colonial Florida.

English colonists first came into contact with the Creek Indian Confederacy when they founded Charles Town on the Carolina coast in 1670. After European diseases had taken an initial toll on Indian populations in the wake of the expeditions of Hernando de Soto, Lucas Vázquez de Ayllón, and other European explorers, the loose network of Muscogulge towns that formed the Creek Confederacy, as it was known by Europeans, had grown into an important regional power. Creek towns operated an extensive trade system that controlled the flow of goods and people down the many rivers streaming from the vast forests of the hinterland down to the Carolina tidewater.⁵ From the first contact in 1670, Creek diplomats established a pattern that defined Creek-British

³ As in James H. O'Donnell III, “The Florida Revolutionary Indian Frontier: Abode of the Blessed or Field of Battle?” *Eighteenth-Century Florida: Life on the Frontier*, Samuel Proctor ed. (Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 1976): 63.

⁴ Alice Beck Kehoe, *America Before the European Invasions* (London: Longman, 2002): 29.

⁵ Kathryn E. Holland Braund, *Deerskins & Duffels : The Creek Indian Trade With Anglo-America, 1685-1815* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1993): 27. *eBook Collection (EBSCOhost)*, EBSCOhost (accessed November 3, 2011).

relations for more than a century.

For the Creeks, the most important aspect of this interaction was trade. After 1685, an exclusive trade relationship with their English neighbors became an increasingly dominant factor in Creek life. Indian merchants exchanged deerskins, furs, food, and captured enemies for muskets, metal tools, horses, textiles, and other European products. This arrangement was equally beneficial for both parties. John Stuart wrote to the Board of Trade—aware of the value of Indian products—in 1764, “The Original great tye between the Indians and Europeans was Mutual conveniency. An ax, a knife, a gun were... deemed inestimable acquisitions [by the Indians].”⁶ In an earlier report to the Board, Charleston merchant Edmund Atkin explained in 1755 that Creek policy was “Simple and Plain... confined to the securing of their personal safety, a supply of their wants, and fair usage.”⁷ Far from occupying a subordinate position in an imposed commercial relationship, Creek towns engaged in highly profitable trade that was motivated by the town’s interests. An Upper Creek diplomat in 1777 described the impact that this commerce had on the Creek way of life, for better or for worse. “We have been used for so long,” he wrote, “to wrap our children up as soon as they are born in goods procured by the white people that we cannot do without.”⁸ Unlike the imperial policy of Spain, based on both the ideological *and* economic conquest of indigenous peoples, Britain counted on trade alone as the basis of agreements with Indian partners in

⁶ *Ibid.*, 26.

⁷ Patricia R. Wickman, *The Tree That Bends: Discourse, Power, and the Survival of the Maskókí People* (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1999): 178. <<http://site.ebrary.com/id/10408800>> (accessed November 4, 2011).

⁸ O'Donnell III, 64.

the Southeast.⁹ This policy was carried out in East and West Florida between 1763 and 1784.

Before trade in Florida could be commenced, however, Creeks and Seminoles¹⁰ sought to extend their own power over the territory with British assistance. Observing the inability of the Spanish administration in Florida to protect their mission communities in Apalachee territory, the Creek Confederacy and British soldiers pacified Spanish and Apalachee interests there. This opened the territory to Creek settlers. Carolinians welcomed the pacification of Spanish Florida, which they viewed as a military threat and a harbor for runaway slaves.¹¹ Through a series of devastating raids beginning in Queen Anne's War, Creek and Carolina raiders pushed Spanish missionaries and soldiers out of mission communities in Apalachee country and back behind the walls of St. Augustine. For the Creeks, this was part of a larger power strategy that enlisted British support to defeat and enslave their rivals. Warrior and chief Sempoyaffe recalled in a 1768 meeting, “I am now an old man, and give publick testimony that the English have always been our best friends.” He continued, “with them many years ago, we made old fields of the Apalachee settlements.”¹² Creek raiders seized and enslaved Apalachee enemies and sold them to British traders before moving into the new territories the raids opened. By 1764, they founded seven towns

⁹ Wickman, 181.

¹⁰ The term “Seminoles” was increasingly used to describe the Creeks who inhabited East Florida, after Agent Stuart referred to them by that name in a 1771 letter. The meaning of the name is disputed, but some believe it means “wild people.” As Creek experience in Florida matured, those inhabiting the eastern portions of the territory considered themselves separate from the “National” Creeks inhabiting the rest of the Southeast.

¹¹ Jane Landers, *Black Society in Spanish Florida* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1999.): 26.

¹² John Stuart to James Grant, Charles Town, 16 December 1768. UNF.

in former Apalachee territory and at least six more across the Florida frontier.¹³ When Florida was ceded to Great Britain in 1763, Creeks and Seminoles used this numerical and strategic superiority to influence the patterns of trade and settlement in the new colonies.

“You cannot conceive the trouble I have with my Copper Neighbours,” the frustrated commander of the garrison encamped at Apalachee, George Swettenham, wrote to East Florida governor James Grant in 1766. “Nothing will satisfie them, neither will they give thanks for anything but rum and provisions.”¹⁴ Trade in both directions shaped the economy of both East and West Florida. For the struggling British, Indians were a source of food and, at times, a vital lifeline to other Europeans. “The Indian that carries this dispatch is promised by me that on his safe delivery of it he shall be given two blankets at St. Augustine,” Garrison Commander James Pampellone wrote in a letter to Governor Grant in the winter of 1764, “He is likewise at his return to have two Guns and one cag of Rum.” In the winter of 1765, Pampellone's replacement, Swettenham, was entirely dependent on Indians for the survival of the garrison. Explaining that his rations would not last beyond three weeks, he lamented the difficulties of trade with powerful Creeks in the area. “The Indians will not come in as we have nothing to give them in exchange for their Venison. . . . If I had a little rum, present[s], and baubels I could bring them about the Fort & then we could get meat, but we are at present . . . [really] miserable.”¹⁵ Indian traders were unwilling to assist the British without a material enticement.

¹³ James Pampillone, Names of the Indian Towns, Number of Gun Men, and the Miles Distant from St Mark's Fort Apalachee, 21 January 1765. UNF.

¹⁴ George Swettenham to James Grant, Apalachee, 31 January 1766. UNF.

¹⁵ George Swettenham to James Grant, December 1765, Apalachee. UNF.

In addition to the material weakness of the British military in the province, Swettenham's letter indicates a larger pattern of trade and settlement on Creek and Seminole terms. A British trader in the Apalachicola region reported Indian resistance to English encroachment, while planting fences and clearing land he thought had been rightfully claimed from the Creeks. He found instead that “they will allow no such thing but are joynd in one Talk from their [neighboring] nations to part with no more land than was [given] at the Congress at agustar [Augusta, Georgia.]”¹⁶ British officials were aware of the power the Indians held over the interior. In a 1764 letter to Pampellone, Governor Grant instructed him to tell the Indians that white settlers coming to the area “have only come there to look at the Country. . . . They need not be under any apprehension of their settling there without their consent being first obtained.” Mindful of the types of arguments that would persuade the Creeks to grant inland territory, he continued, “inform them that I have brought a great many things from the Great King, to supply their wants.”¹⁷ Settlers violating agreements with the Indians could also face direct intimidation. James Spalding, a merchant granted a trade monopoly in northeast Florida, wrote Grant of a fearful occurrence in the area around the source of the Ocklawaha River. Moving south to sell horses and other wares, he encountered a band of Seminoles who “took my goods, tore open the packs, and had proposed making a division,” before the chief arrived and ordered them to stop. The chief, who had agreed by treaty that no trader should intrude on Creek¹⁸ hunting

¹⁶ A Trader at Apalachicola, Ed Haynes to Commander, 22 March 176[5?]. UNF.

¹⁷ James Grant to James Pampellone, or Officer commanding at Apalaché, 14 September 1764, St Augustine. UNF.

¹⁸ This Chief's disregard for Creek treaties may be a sign of the East Florida transition

grounds, “ordered my horses to return or that he himself next day would take the Goods.”¹⁹ In East Florida, the British government was virtually helpless to defend itself against the power of Indians in the area. “The Indians can with great ease stop the Settlement of this Province,” James Grant wrote to John Stuart in 1766, “and as we can do no harm to those same Indians. . . . If we live in Peace with our neighbours this Province will soon 'tis to be hoped, become a usefull Country.”²⁰ Despite overtures to Indian concerns through treaties and gifts, powerful Creek and Seminole towns in East Florida limited British settlement to the coast. In West Florida, they completely controlled the trade in skins and furs by forcefully expelling or, occasionally, killing Europeans that violated trade agreements.²¹ Intermarriage integrated white settlers and merchants into West Florida Creek towns, further consolidating their dominance of the valuable markets in the territory.

A significant part of the Indian power base in Florida, especially among the Seminoles in East Florida, was made up of runaway slaves and their descendants. As early as 1603, when a group of slaves established a Maroon community with a group of Ays on the Atlantic Coast,²² Florida Indians offered powerful enticements to enslaved Africans fleeing European masters. In Indian towns, Africans could gain freedom from the oppressive forms of bondage practiced in the British

from Creek to Seminole identities.

¹⁹ James Spalding to James Grant, St John's River, 17 June 1766. UNF.

²⁰ James Grant to John Stuart, St Augustine, 15 December 1766. UNF.

²¹ Andrew K. Frank, “Taking the State Out: Seminoles and Creeks in Late Eighteenth-Century Florida,” *The Florida Historical Quarterly*, Vol. 84, No. 1 (2005): 22. <<http://www.jstor.org/stable/30150914>> (accessed November 1, 2011).

²² Terrance Weik, “The Role of Ethnogenesis and Organization in the Development of African-Native American Settlements: an African Seminole Model,” *International Journal Of Historical Archaeology* 13, no. 2 (June 2009): 213. <<https://search-ebSCOhost-com.lp.hscl.ufl.edu/>> (accessed November 4, 2011).

colonies.²³ These enticements were strengthened by Spanish policies that granted freedom and asylum to runaways from British colonies to the North, beginning in 1693.²⁴ While some scholars take a critical view of the Spanish policy of asylum,²⁵ it led to a free Black settlement north of St. Augustine that played an important part in wars in the Southeast until Spain evacuated the Floridas in 1763, and set the precedent for a pattern of cooperation between enslaved persons and Indians that continued until the middle of the nineteenth century.

Southeastern Indians took a different view of slaves than their European neighbors. While domestic slavery had long been a part of Indian life, slaves were incorporated over time into Creek society through intermarriage and gradually earned membership in the clans that formed the center of Creek social and political life.²⁶ Other Indians in the Southeast shared similar forms of servitude. Comparing Indian slavery with European, a Cherokee diplomat told the British in 1730, “This small rope we shew you is all we have to bind our slaves with, and may be broken, but you have iron chains for yours.”²⁷ Enslaved Africans that escaped into Indian country were often taken into domestic servitude by

²³ Indian slavery is a complex topic. Different cultures held different views on slaves within Indian society, but in most cases, runaways acted as serfs. After rendering a portion of their produce to the parent Indian town, they were allowed a degree of autonomy that was impossible to attain in plantation colonies.

²⁴ Landers, 25.

²⁵ Tolagbe M. Ogunleye, “Àrokò, Mmomomme Twe, Nsibidi, Ogede, and Tusona: Africanisms in Florida’s Self-Emancipated Africans’ Resistance to Enslavement and War Stratagems,” *Journal of Black Studies*, Vol. 36, No. 3 (Jan., 2006): 398. <<http://www.jstor.org/stable/40035017>> (accessed November 1, 2011).

²⁶ Kathryn E. Holland Braund, “The Creek Indians, Blacks, and Slavery,” *The Journal of Southern History*, Vol. 57, No. 4 (Nov 1991): 603. <<http://www.jstor.org/stable/2210598>> (accessed November 1, 2011).

²⁷ Claudio Saunt, “‘The English Has Now a Mind to Make Slaves of Them All’: Creeks, Seminoles, and the Problem of Slavery,” *American Indian Quarterly*, Vol. 22, No. ½ (1998): 159. <<http://www.jstor.org/stable/1185115>> (accessed November 1, 2011).

the Creeks or allowed to settle and farm in Maroon communities in a state of vassalage. British officials attempted to stem the tide of runaways by appealing to Creek material desires. In Georgia and South Carolina, they offered Creek hunters guns and blankets for the return of slaves, dead or alive.²⁸ The increasing presence of slaves in Carolina and Georgia, however, signaled a transition in the economy away from Indian products like fur and skins to cash crops produced on plantations.²⁹ As Creeks became more dependent upon the Carolina economy for their own power relative to the English and other Indian rivals, by the 1740s many towns adopted European attitudes toward slavery.³⁰ This precipitated a break in the Creek Confederacy, as some towns chose to continue traditional slave practices and a more autonomous way of life. Some of these towns broke away from the Confederacy and move into the vast, vacant territory around Payne's Prairie and the St. Johns River in Florida.

At the Picolata Congress of 1765, East Florida governor James Grant and Indian agent John Stuart agreed to a line of separation between British lands and those held by Creeks in the area around Apalachee or Seminoles in the area around the St. Johns River. Creek Representative Tallechea, calling himself a “Slave of the Tongue for my people, being always employed to talk for them,” warned the British of the strict Indian interpretation of the line. “You will consider that the presents which are now to be given us may last for a year... but the land which we now give will last forever,” he warned, “and... should any people or cattle stray beyond the line and die or be lost... the red people may not be blamed for

²⁸ Braund, “The Creek Indians, Blacks, and Slavery,” 611.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, 164.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, 607.

it.”³¹ With the British confined to the eastern side of the St. Johns River, Seminoles behind the line offered refuge to runaway slaves. While they were not offered full freedom from bondage, enslaved Africans who chose to live among the Seminoles were adopted into a state of vassalage that allowed them to form their own settlements and live in relative freedom.³² These Black Seminole towns made important contributions to Seminole power. African Kikongo and Yoruba words like *Wahu* (“to trill the voice”), *Alafia* (“peace, health, or wealth”), and *Suwani* (“my house, my home”) gave names to settlements that persist on maps of Florida today.³³

It is difficult to determine how many Africans and their descendants lived alongside Seminoles and Creeks and Florida. As few as 430 may have lived in Indian towns by 1776,³⁴ but Creek racial policies suggest that there were many more. Seminoles were even more open to Africans than their “national” Creek counterparts. In later Seminole towns like Apilshopko and Apilchapoocha, Africans or descendants of Africans made up 40 to 60 percent of the population. Other settlements, like Angola, were made up completely of Africans. The geographical and social Indian borderlands were porous, and by 1783 approximately 42 percent of the 4,745 Blacks imported into British

³¹ Writers’ Program (Fla.). *Transcriptions of the British Colonial Office Records. Copied From the Library of Congress Collections for the Files of Florida Writers’ Project, Work Projects Administration.* (Gainesville, Fla.: 1939): 585.; James W. Covington, ed., *The British Meet the Seminoles: Negotiations Between British Authorities in East Florida and the Indians, 1763-68* (Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 1961): 28.

³² John K. Mahon, *History of the Second Seminole War, 1835-1842* (Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 1967): 20.

³³ Ogunleye, 399.

³⁴ Patrick Riordan, “Finding Freedom in Florida: Native Peoples, African Americans, and Colonists, 1670-1816,” *The Florida Historical Quarterly*, Vol. 75, No. 1 (1996): 35. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/30142151> (accessed November 1, 2011).

East Florida were unaccounted for.³⁵ Africans in Florida, formerly enslaved, served as warriors, interpreters, diplomats, and leaders in Indian communities.

The relative power of Indians and Africans in colonial Florida in comparison with European colonists has been largely overlooked in current interpretations of the past. Many historians have characterized the history of interaction between Europeans and Indians in the colonial Southeast as one of “dispossession,” in which powerful Europeans dominated indigenous peoples and took their land, food, trade goods, and lives. Letters and other documents left behind by colonial officials indicate a more balanced relationship between British settlers and Creek/Seminole Indians in Florida. The history of British-Creek relations since 1670 sheds further light on the complex interaction of trade, international rivalries, and race that contributed to a unique “culture area” in Florida, where neighboring Europeans, Africans, and Indians worked out their living arrangements in common.

³⁵ Weik, 212; Riordan, 37.

BARTRAM'S PARADOXICAL PERSPECTIVE ON INDIANS

Caitlin Nelson

“I had now passed the utmost frontier of the white settlements,” wrote William Bartram after traveling through St. Mary’s, Georgia—the border between Indian and colonial-European civilization.¹ He observed the environment of coastal Georgia as “enchantingly varied and beautiful,” covered in vibrant subtropical plants and serenely quiet until a rustle in the bushes startled him.² Between the trees, he spied a Seminole man, armed with a rifle. “I never before this was afraid at the sight of an Indian,” Bartram said of this moment, frozen in the woods under the power of another. As he approached the Seminole, he mustered the strength to extend a friendly hand. “A look of malice, rage, and disdain”

Caitlin Nelson is a recent graduate of the history program. She was president of UF's Phi Alpha Theta and a student in the History Honors Program. She joined Teach for America and will be teaching secondary social studies in Philadelphia.

¹ William Bartram, *The Travels of William*, Mark Van Doren ed. (New York: Dover, 1955), 45.

² *Ibid.*

shot across the Seminole's face, but gradually disappeared upon examining the confident, kindly Bartram.³ He took Bartram's hand, and in the "silent language of his soul" communicated his reasons for sparing him:

White man, thou art my enemy and thou and thy brethren may have killed mine; yet it may not be so, and even were that the case, thou art now alone, and in my power. Live; the Great Spirit forbids me to touch thy life; go to thy brethren, tell them thou sawest an Indian in the forests, who knew how to be humane and compassionate.⁴

Lacking a shared language, Bartram imagined this dialogue. Yet it acknowledged the different sentiments that defined Anglo-Indian relations during the late eighteenth century: bitterness over land disputes, violence, and white ignorance of (and assumptions about) Indian temperament. Bartram imagined that the Seminole's motivation behind sparing him was to change Europeans' perceptions of Indians, to demonstrate that they were benevolent, not beastly. This supposition (which he details very early in the published account of his journey, popularly known as *Travels*) reveals less about the Seminole's mercy and more about Bartram's goal, secondary to observing various flora and fauna: to discount typical opinions, stereotypes, and assumptions about Indians held by whites. His views about Indians were atypical of his time. A combination of Quakerism, Enlightenment philosophies, deep empathy, and romantic tendencies supported and formed Bartram's

³ Ibid.

⁴ Ibid.

philosophies. He claimed to believe in the equality of all men and the importance of cultural preservation. Although Bartram considered the Indians brethren to Europeans and admired their basic way of life, he appeared incapable of fully departing from late eighteenth century perspectives on Indians. When tribes or individuals fell from Bartram's angelic image into contemporary stereotypical activities, like binge drinking or licentiousness, he could not help but express his disdain by not only including these thoughts in *Travels* (when he had the option not to), but also by reverting to synchronic racist language in his descriptions. In this way, Bartram maintained and asserted principles of white supremacy, despite his sensitivity, respect, and compassion for Indian culture.

Born outside of Philadelphia to one of British North America's leading botanists, John Bartram, in 1739, William Bartram matured in an academic atmosphere, meeting prominent Americans like Benjamin Franklin and Benjamin Rush. In 1765, King George III appointed John Bartram royal botanist and sent him to explore Britain's new territory—Florida. Embarking in 1765, William joined his father on this southern journey, sketching wildlife along the way. His father called him “his little botanist,” as William already demonstrated an affinity for drawing and observation.⁵ A sentiment William did not inherit from his father was his respect for Indians, as John's father had been murdered by Indians. John avoided them at all costs, considering them barbarous, untrustworthy animals, likening them to monkeys.⁶ John and William

⁵ Thomas P. Slaughter, *The Natures of John and William Bartram* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1996), 112.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 23.

differed in their natures, too. John was firm, practical, and realistic—traits that prevented him from embracing Quakerism. William, by contrast, was emotional, creative, and flighty, a believer in God and equality. John worried about William's professional future due to his mercurial character.⁷ After unsuccessfully dabbling in the shipping trades and running a plantation along the St. Johns River, William received funding from Dr. John Fothergill, a London physician and fellow Quaker, to observe and collect plants and animals with the hope of discovering useful species. Although Fothergill did not request accounts of Indian culture,⁸ Bartram wrote of his numerous encounters in a manner similar to that of his descriptions of flora and fauna.

In this analysis of Bartram's paradoxical views on Indians, two of his writings are particularly useful. The first and most widely known is *Travels*, published in 1791—thirteen years after his return from this adventure. In *Travels*, Bartram recounts his 1773-1777 journey through the South as he gathered exotic plants and documented unusual animals, like the white ibis and primeval alligator.⁹ Although “vegetable productions” were his primary concern, descriptions of Indian encounters fill the pages of *Travels*, with Part IV consisting solely of ethnographic information on the Creeks, Cherokees, Seminoles, and Choctaws.¹⁰ While *Travels* serves as an informational and exciting example of early nature writing, there appears to be an underlying political goal in regards to Indian relations, although Bartram was—and is—considered a

⁷ Ibid., 120-124.

⁸ N. Bryllion Fagin, *William Bartram, Interpreter of the American Landscape* (Baltimore, Md: Johns Hopkins Press, 1933), 80.

⁹ The actual date of Bartram's return is unknown.

¹⁰ Bartram, 19.

relatively apolitical figure.¹¹ In the introduction, he alluded to incorporating Indians into American society.

The second of Bartram's writings used in this analysis is extremely political in nature as Bartram explicitly expressed his support for the Indian civilization program—the introduction of white civilization to Indians in the hope of acculturation. “Some Hints and Observations, Concerning the Civilization, of the Indians, or Aborigines of America” is an unpublished piece of mysterious origins¹² found with the papers of Henry Knox.¹³ In this piece, Bartram explained that the Europeans would have failed to settle the New World were it not the help of their Indian brethren, and he speculated why Indians would side with the British during the Revolutionary War.¹⁴ He asserted that “all the nations & Tribes of Men, are Brethren & the offspring of one Family,” emphasizing the equality of all peoples.¹⁵ However, Bartram's political support for the civilization program expressed here directly contrasts with his supposed respect and admiration for Indian culture. This support of acculturation “Some Observations,” along with the tone Bartram employed to describe certain “uncivilized” actions among the Indians in *Travels*, form Bartram's philosophical paradox of simultaneously

¹¹ Douglas Anderson, “Bartram's Travels and the Politics of Nature” *Early American Literature* vol. 25, no. 1 (March 1990), 4.

¹² When “Some Observations” was written is unknown, but some have speculated that it was produced in the late 1780s or early 1790s.

¹³ Henry Knox, American Secretary of War (1785-1795) was one of the men who formulated the Indian civilization project. Waselkov and Braund (see below) propose that Knox requested Bartram to report his feelings on Indian civilization and possible integration.

¹⁴ Some Americans used this alliance to justify overtaking Indian lands.

¹⁵ Gregory A., Waselkov and Kathryn E. Holland Braund, *William Bartram on the Southeastern Indians* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1995), 195.

believing in equality among all men *and* the unquestionable superiority of European culture.

The idea of the “noble savage” undoubtedly affected travelers of North America. Even before their arrival, Europeans imagined primitive lands, as historian Michael Kammen points out, populated “with noble savages of superior insight and wisdom.”¹⁶ Historian Harry Liebersohn identifies that as the accounts of travelers and armchair adventurers trickled into Europe and the northeastern United States, two contrasting images of Indians developed: the “noble savage,” a follower of an “innate moral principle,” and the “ignoble savage,” the cannibal and bloodthirsty warrior.¹⁷ The possibility of uncivilized yet harmonious communities reflected a European insecurity: did civilization benefit society?¹⁸ For romantics like Bartram, those who questioned reason and longed for nature, this was an important question. But as European settlements firmly established themselves in the Americas, encounters with Indians only reaffirmed in white minds the benefits of civilization. This creation of the “other,” perpetuated by travelers, politicians, and writers made the Indian the inferior, the diametrical opposite of European civilization.¹⁹ According to literary scholar Roy Harvey Pearce, those who continued to believe in the idea of the “noble savage”

¹⁶ Michael G. Kammen, *People of Paradox: An Inquiry Concerning the Origins of American Civilization* (New York: Knopf, 1972), 141.

¹⁷ Harry Liebersohn, “Discovering Indigenous Nobility: Tocqueville, Chamisso, and Romantic Travel Writing” *The American Historical Review*, vol. 99, no. 3 (June, 1994), pp. 746-766 (University of Chicago Press), 748-749.

¹⁸ Roy Harvey Pearce, *Savagism and Civilization: A Study of the Indian and the American Mind* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988), 136.

¹⁹ Eve Kornfeld, “Encountering ‘The Other’: American Intellectuals and Indians in the 1790s” *William & Mary Quarterly* vol. 52, no. 2 (April 1995), 290-291.

were considered “isolated radicals.”²⁰ Bartram’s perspective on Indians resulted from his continued “radical” belief in the “noble savage” and the negative images asserted by his predecessors and contemporaries. Bartram’s feelings about Indians flipped from extreme to extreme, from the “noble savage” image to that of the inferior, uncivilized man, with few descriptions falling in-between these two poles.

In America, Indians presented both benefits and challenges to settlers: a source of practical knowledge, crucial to their survival, and a hurdle to eventually overcome. While most New World settlements initially appreciated the hospitality and knowledge of the Indians, they outgrew their dependency on them, employing indigenous skills learned to create independent white civilizations.²¹ Their success in agriculture, and thus their growth in population, led to the conquest of new lands, which meant encroaching on Indian territory. In “Some Observations,” Bartram acknowledged this process. He even praised the Indians for their defense of the English against the Spanish in the early days of the South. However, beyond this support, Bartram still wished for the “introduction of our [whites’] Language, System of Legislation, Religion, Manners Arts & Sciences” to the “neighbouring [*sic*], uncivilized nations.”²² In *Travels*, he stated in the introduction that the fledgling United States government would undertake the civilization efforts.²³ Bartram, all at once, recognized American settlers’ great debt to the Indian nations *and* the superiority of European culture. By asserting the supremacy of

²⁰ Pearce, 136.

²¹ Richard Slotkin, *Regeneration Through Violence: The Mythology of the American Frontier, 1600-1860* (Middletown, Conn.: Wesleyan University Press, 1974), 5.

²² Waselkov, 195.

²³ Bartram, 26.

English, democracy, Christianity, and white civilization, Bartram subordinated the legitimacy of Indian culture. An egalitarian civilization among Indians and whites was his goal, though the path to achieving this was extremely unequal.

It would be unrepresentative, though, to ignore Bartram's appreciation of Indian culture. In *Travels*, he wrote of Indians' genuine, innate friendliness—a trait not usually associated by other whites with Native Americans. “O divine simplicity and truth, friendship without fallacy or guile, hospitality disinterested, nature, undefiled, unmodified by artificial requirements,” wrote Bartram, seemingly refreshed by the honesty and earnestness of Indian hospitality.²⁴ Even while within the boundaries of white civilization, he never wrote so passionately about the South's hospitality. While traveling in Indian country, Bartram never once spoke of feeling unwelcome.²⁵ In some Indian towns, like Cuscowilla and Talahasochte in East Florida, he enjoyed grand feasts and entertainment. At Talahasochte, the chief even deemed Bartram “of his own children or people, and should be protected accordingly.”²⁶ These experiences were typical in Bartram's *Travels*—not the bloody scenes of cannibalism and war that his contemporaries might have expected.

Although he generally viewed Indians in a positive way, he also considered them a basic people who varied little from animals. In a passage not included in the published version of *Travels*, Bartram wrote that there was of Indians “but little difference between their manners and

²⁴ *Ibid.*, 284.

²⁵ The only instance Bartram felt unwelcome in *Travels* was during an encounter with a rogue band of African slaves in Florida—not Indians (*Travels*, 373).

²⁶ Bartram, 200.

the animal creation in general.”²⁷ Coming from a man who had a deep respect for all God’s creatures, this is not entirely an insult. Instead, historian Larry R. Clarke argues that Bartram considered “primitive man as more virtuous than civilized” (Bartram used the word “virtuous” to describe plants, animals *and* Indians). But Bartram did not consider Indians as part of the environment as N. Bryllion Fagin—a leading historian of the Bartram family—argued in 1933.²⁸ While Bartram described Indians in similar language as he did with species of flora and fauna, he did not consider Indians as an economic asset as he did the environment. Though he sought the “useful productions of nature,” Indians were not included in this.²⁹ He treated the Indians as if they were in an intermediate position, between animals and humankind. Bartram often expressed ambivalence in his presentations of Indians, reflecting the tension between images of noble and ignoble savages. This ambivalence resulted in either his praise or censure of Indian behavior. Despite Bartram’s copious praise, his own sensibilities and Quaker religiosity deemed some behaviors beyond reprehensible and inspired his support for introducing white civilization to his Indian brethren.

Indians’ supposed penchant for European goods, especially alcohol, reinforced their image among whites as barbaric, uncivilized, and without restraint. In St. Augustine, Bartram witnessed a scene of binge drinking that matched the contemporary image of an “ignoble savage.” He encountered about forty Seminole warriors on their way to battle the Choctaws of West Florida. Over a period of ten days, the

²⁷ Fagin, 46.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, 53.

²⁹ Bartram, 29.

warriors consumed about twenty kegs (five gallons each) of rum. Bartram described the scene using the most extreme language he ever employed in *Travels*. The “sons of Mars,” referring to the Indians’ warlike and overly masculine nature, “exhibited one of the most ludicrous bacchanalian scenes that is possible to be conceived.”³⁰ Singing crude songs, endless dancing, and mad flirtations filled the ten days. The “dejected lifeless sots” drank until they fell ill and still continued to pursue another mouthful of rum, trading anything for just a drop more. The interactions between men and women, though, upset Bartram the most. The “jovial, amorous toppers” took “such liberties with each other, and act[ed] without constraint or shame,” further validating contemporary stereotypes. In situations concerning the practice of sex in Indian society, Bartram praised Indians for their modesty. While at a camp with a newlywed Indian couple, he noted the use of a private nuptial chamber.³¹ When discussing fornication in general, Bartram postulated that Indians acted on their urges “in no greater excess than other nations of men.”³² This made alcohol—“their beloved nectar”—the true culprit of an Indian’s untamed actions.³³ In all of *Travels*, Bartram never appeared so distanced from the Indians, so separated by civilization and whiteness as he did in retelling the scene at St. Augustine. Witnessing such unadulterated indulgence probably contributed to his reasons for publicly producing *Travels*, a work that he

³⁰ Bartram, 214.

³¹ *Ibid.*, 355.

³² *Ibid.*, 183.

³³ *Ibid.*, 214.

hoped “might assist the legislature of the United States to form, and offer to [Indians] a judicious plan for their civilization and union with us.”³⁴

Although Bartram attempted to untangle myths about Indian cultures along his southern journey, his ethnocentrism periodically becomes evident in his texts. At times, he praises Indian culture in its similarity to European cultures or the greater humankind, elevating Indians to the same or similar superiority level as whites.³⁵ Bartram named Indians fundamental interests as “the security of person and property, the two great concerns on mankind.”³⁶ This assertion made Indians relatable. Regarding war, Bartram discounted the image of the ignoble, bloodthirsty savage by not only emphasizing Indians’ generous hospitality and friendliness, but also by comparing their motivations for war to those of Europeans. Their reasons for war “spring from the same erroneous source as they do in all nations of mankind,” said Bartram.³⁷ The Indians’ fought for the same things as white civilization, as “the renowned Greeks and Romans,” and for the same reasons, “not for the ferocious, capricious desire of shedding human blood as carnivorous savages.”³⁸ Here, Bartram tried to defeat stereotypical notions of Indians as impulsive and cruel. He also respected and revered their monuments as he would those of a white or ancient civilization, equating them to the religious monuments of Palestine and Judea.³⁹

³⁴ *Ibid.*, 26.

³⁵ This further refutes Fagin’s argument that Bartram considered Indians animals or features of the southern landscape.

³⁶ Bartram, 182.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, 183.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, 315.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, 297.

In his consideration of Indian culture through “white eyes,” Bartram also identified the source of Indians’ problems: “the encroachments of white people.”⁴⁰ The demands of European traders induced the overhunting of game, while Indians overhunted to obtain the “foreign superfluities” that they traded hides for.⁴¹ The introduction of European goods tainted Indians desires, and yet Bartram advocated for the introduction of white culture—capitalism included. He also assumed that Indians already knew the rhythms of white culture. While visiting an Indian village, all the Indians remained in their homes on Sunday; he presumed they were respecting the Sabbath.⁴² Although Bartram acknowledged the threat of his own European culture, he ultimately assumed its superiority.

In his descriptions of male Indians, Bartram often resorted to contemporary stereotypes to describe them. He often showed respect for Indian hierarchy when depicting chiefs, but faltered when recounting the actions of male warriors. For example, Bartram described a Seminole chief with the most flattering language, recalling his stature as “the most perfect human figure I ever saw.”⁴³ He praised his “amiable engaging countenance” and “becoming grace and dignity.”⁴⁴ Of other male Indians, though, Bartram’s characterization matched the derogatory image of the hollering Indian, the energetic, beastly indigenous warrior. “The brow ferocious, and the eye active, piercing or fiery, as an eagle” were “truly characteristic of the red men,” claimed Bartram, painting the

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 182.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 184.

⁴² *Ibid.*, 362.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, 206.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*.

Indian as a constant predator.⁴⁵ In a dreamlike sequence, Bartram related the story of a Seminole hunting a deer, bounding through a meadow like a gazelle, a “painted, fearless, uncontrolled” warrior.⁴⁶ Referring to a group of young boys, he noted their “whooping and hallowing” before a hunt.⁴⁷ The language Bartram used to describe Indian men always likened them to animals or basic humans, surveying the landscape for prey and traveling in packs. In a less obvious fashion, Bartram also felt the need to assert Indians good qualities in questionable circumstances. For instance, when he encountered an Indian man married to a white woman—an occurrence feared by frontier white men—he immediately noted the Indian’s good character: “he seemed an active, civil, and sensible man.”⁴⁸ Although this is a positive evaluation, it perhaps served to assure white readers of the white woman’s safety. During these events, Bartram resigned his usual defense of his Indian brethren and surrendered to contemporary racist myths of the savage Indian, with his howling war cries and an affinity for white women.

The myth of the Indian woman, too, tainted Bartram’s image of Indians. Since 1575, the stereotype of the Indian woman consisted of two identities: the princess and the squaw.⁴⁹ In *Travels*, Bartram capitulated and solidified this dichotomy. He spoke mainly of “the princess” Indian, of the “power of beauty in a savage.”⁵⁰ He praised Indian women for their modesty, veiling their brown faces from white strangers and their

⁴⁵ Ibid., 286.

⁴⁶ Ibid., 165.

⁴⁷ Ibid., 170.

⁴⁸ Ibid., 47.

⁴⁹ Rayna Green, “The Pocahontas Perplex: The Image of Indian Women in American Culture” *The Massachusetts Review*, vol. 16, no. 4 (Autumn, 1975), pp. 698-714;

⁵⁰ Bartram, 111.

“becoming grace and decency” during raucous festivities. Among these glowing assessments of Indian “princesses,” Bartram also criticized Indian women for their treachery and selfishness, typical of the squaw character. While the Indian men partook in the drinking extravaganza at St. Augustine, the women, instead of drinking, collected the rum offered to them by their male tribesmen and deposited it into a vessel hidden beneath their dresses, only to sell back to the men once the kegs ran dry. In his description, Bartram used the word “wench” to describe the women—a word that appears nowhere else in *Travels*.⁵¹ While referring to an Indian woman who distributed her white husband’s property among her relatives, Bartram juxtaposed her “innocence, modesty and love” with her seductive, beguiling, and distracting movements, calling her a “little charmer.”⁵² This combination of beauty and self-interest was characteristic of “the squaw.” In his assessment of Indian women, Bartram saw no middle ground; she was either a modest, respectable Indian woman, capable of assimilation, or the squaw—the savage, dishonest charmer of the white man.

Such is the virtue of these untutored savages; but I am afraid this is a common-phrase epithet, having no meaning, or at least improperly applied; for these people are both well-tutored and civil; and it is apparent to an impartial observer, who resides but a little time amongst them, that it is from the most delicate sense of the honour and reputation of their tribes and families that their laws and customs receive their force

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, 214.

⁵² *Ibid.*, 110.

and energy. This is the divine principle which influences their moral conduct.”⁵³

Despite these praises, Bartram’s belief in natural law or “divine principle” had its limits. He chose to include images of Indians in *Travels* that reaffirmed and endorsed negative racial stereotypes. Indians’ absence of public modesty and predilection for European goods made Bartram’s Indians innately inferior and in need of a different kind of white interaction; he thought they needed instruction. Although he refuted the moniker “untutored savages,” Bartram wished to tutor them, as he expressed in “Some Observations.” Indians required an education in English, Christianity, democracy, and manners before they could be elevated from their intermediate position between white men and animals. This is Bartram’s paradox: a combination of deep human respect for the Indian and the belief in the supremacy of white culture, a mixture of kinship, pity, and transcendence with the most innocent of intentions.

⁵³ Bartram, 111.

BATTLES WITH BATTLES: HARNESSING THE
POWER OF THE REVOLUTIONARY LANDSCAPE
IN THE NEW SOUTH

Jessica Taylor

In 1781, American general Nathanael Greene and British strategic master Lord Cornwallis fought the largest battle in the Southern theater of the Revolutionary War on over a thousand acres of present-day Guilford County, North Carolina. Makeshift mass graves and individual burials, debris, and shelled-out buildings marked the landscape for upwards of fifty years.¹ One hundred years after the Battle of Guilford Courthouse, physical remainders of Revolutionary deeds and dead dotted the field as North Carolinians sought to commemorate the militiaman's generation,

Jessica Taylor is a PhD student in history at the University of Florida and a park ranger at Guilford Courthouse National Military Park. She received her B.A. in Anthropology and History and her M.A. in Comparative History at the College of William and Mary in Williamsburg, Virginia.

¹ Benjamin J. Lossing, 1849. Quoted in: John Hiatt, *Guilford Courthouse National Military Park Cultural Landscape Report* (Atlanta: National Park Service Southeast Region, 2003), 30.

using their Southern and American values as a starting point. On July 4, 1901, recently elected governor Charles B. Aycock unveiled a monument on the site of the conflict to militia captain James Morehead: a large granite triangle financed in part by a famous descendent and Confederate veteran, Major Joseph M. Morehead. Aycock's remark as keynote speaker was brief: "May their example of honoring a revolutionary kinsman be followed by others."²

Between 1886 and 1917, a generation of Greensboro businessmen invested in the Guilford Battleground Company (GBC), purchased land, erected monuments, and held ceremonies for Revolutionary War heroes. Against the backdrop of Greensboro's urban growth, the move to memorialize the Battle of Guilford Courthouse emerged from a combination of pride in nation, state, family, and race. The ambitions of former Confederate officers and a nostalgic, antimodern impulse further bolstered claims to this distant past.

However, these ambitions were realized unevenly and sporadically. Initially under the guidance of careful antiquarian Judge David Schenck, the park transitioned from commemorating a masculine military feat to disseminating the fast and loose "historical" narratives crafted by Southern elites like Joseph Morehead. Schenck and Morehead both yearned for the Revolutionary era, but with remarkably disparate motives. Ultimately, as Greensboro's businessmen cultivated cultural and political import with the help of the park, the elites' claims to patriotism and Revolutionary history found competition from the claims of the federal government. With an eye on the significance of the Battle

² R.F. Beasley, "Addresses of Hon. Chas. B. Aycock and R. F. Beasley, Esq.," (Greensboro, N.C.: Guilford Battleground Company, 1901), 7.

of Guilford Courthouse to the nation rather than to Greensboro and the South, the United States War Department's purchase of the park extirpated the very tie between history and community that had initially caught its attention.

Few historical works link collective memory and memorialization of the Revolutionary War to the post-Civil War South; those that explore this link study the transforming images of the Founding Fathers. In her study of the Mount Vernon Ladies Association, Jean B. Lee examines antebellum imaginings of America's Revolutionary generation as "a distilled, didactic narrative of heroism and self-sacrifice, dedication to ideals of liberty, and the conviction that America's founding experience had altered the course of human history."³ Respectable Southern women became the key advocates for preservation of the estate. Similarly, Barry Schwartz asserts that the Civil War is a pivot point for the collective memory of the Revolutionary generation, contending that both the antebellum idea of George Washington as a Virginian aristocrat and the postbellum conception of Washington as a flawed and ordinary man existed side-by-side. American historical memory validated the paradox: "society continued to embrace aspects of its aristocratic past (gentility without privilege) while it rejected aspects of its present democratic culture (privilege without gentility). Washington's changing and enduring images thereby legitimated and sustained one another."⁴

³ Jean B. Lee, "Historical Memory, Sectional Strife, and the American Mecca: Mount Vernon, 1783-1853," *The Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* 109:3 (2001), 355.

⁴ Barry Schwartz, "Social Change and Collective Memory: The Democratization of George Washington," *American Sociological Review* 56: 2 (1991), 234.

The creative meditation on memory and methodology in Gretchen Adams's *The Specter of Salem* also proves to be relevant outside of its subject matter. Adams reflects on the usefulness of common American symbols, such as the national fascination with the witch trials to explain that "collective memory in the United States, like the studies of it, tends to coalesce around symbols designed for emulation."⁵ From moments in which white Southerners condemned Northerners as fanatical and abolitionist Puritans to Arthur Miller's indictment of McCarthyism, "Salem has endured as a metaphor because of its flexibility in expressing cultural anxieties and warning against extreme behaviors or beliefs."⁶ Might one say the same about the Revolutionary War and its potential in the nation-building project? If the venerated Washington persists in memory only in transformed and divided identities, what explains the resurrection of a battle from the inglorious and messy Southern campaign?⁷

This article explores the creation, evolution, and demolition of the war story of Guilford Courthouse. David Blight and recent scholars have demonstrated that collective memories simultaneously served to build nationalism and cast a blow against oppressed counternarratives.⁸ Rather than study the strength of dominant collective memories as a

⁵ Gretchen A. Adams, *The Specter of Salem: Remembering the Witch Trials in Nineteenth-Century America* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2008.) 3-4.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 9.

⁷ The Southern theater of the American Revolution began in 1778 when the British captured Savannah. The British seized Charleston in 1780, scattering insurgents to the west. Banastre Tarleton pursued the fleeing Southern Continental Army north through the backcountry Piedmont, where the Battle of Guilford Courthouse took place six months before Yorktown in 1781.

⁸ David Blight, *Race and Reunion* (Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press of Harvard University, 2001). *See also*: William Blair, *Cities of the Dead: Contesting the Memory of Civil War in the South* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2004), 12.

depersonalized or even normative force, historians should attend to the men and women who wielded this unnatural power.

Development and maintenance of the former battleground has shuffled between such men and women who wedded civic, business, and bureaucratic leadership and who hailed from the GBC, the United States War Department, and finally the National Park Service. This study focuses on the GBC's preservation efforts and ends with Company president Paul Schenck's effort to cede the park to federal control. The internal correspondence of the GBC, its records of the commemorations and speeches at monument dedications, and the society sections of Greensboro's newspapers recreate time spent at the park. Together, the War Department and the Company slated the Guilford Battlefield for the dual purposes of commemoration and recreation, where white national identity was reified and reassured.

The present city of Greensboro, North Carolina arose from the decayed hamlet of Guilford Courthouse. Greensboro tied itself to the rest of the South via the railroad: the North Carolina Railroad connected Charlotte to Greensboro in 1856, the Confederacy built the Piedmont Railroad from Danville to Richmond during the war, and the Cape Fear and Yadkin Valley line moved through Greensboro by 1888.⁹ Transportation improvements brought northern industrialists like Moses and Caesar Cone to Greensboro as textile investors, typifying "the rapid growth of numerous new small- and medium-sized inland cities in the

⁹ Cape Fear and Yadkin Valley Railway Co., *Cape Fear and Yadkin Valley Railway: Its Origins, Constructions, and Extensions* (Philadelphia, Penn.: Allen, Lane, and Scott Printers, 1889), 98.

New South period.”¹⁰ Greensboro businessmen eagerly embraced their city’s modern, evolving identity. At the turn of the twentieth century, Greensboro’s newspapers appropriated for their masthead the moniker “Gate City,” a reference to the sixty trains that moved through the downtown station each day.¹¹ Coinciding with the completion of the Cape Fear and Yadkin Valley Line, the population of Greensboro tripled between 1890 and 1900 to over ten thousand residents; Guilford County’s population increased to almost forty thousand persons.¹²

Greensboro’s economic importance to the state underscored its political importance: the state Republican convention was held in Greensboro in 1900, the Democratic convention in 1902, and both in the same city in 1904. Additionally, the annual meeting of the United Confederate Veterans took place in Greensboro in 1902, and local railroad and business leaders entertained the participants lavishly: “The Greensboro reunion was the best conducted, and the attendance the largest ever held in the state. That the city did itself proud by its...attention to the ‘old vets,’ and all in attendance will never cease to speak well of their treatment.”¹³ The engineers of these events mixed hospitality with the power of Greensboro’s new reputation as a political and cultural center for modern North Carolina.

¹⁰ Samuel Kipp, “Old Notables and Newcomers: The Economic and Political Elite of Greensboro, North Carolina, 1880-1920,” *The Journal of Southern History* 42: 4 (1977), 374.

¹¹ “The Gate City,” *Greensboro Special Souvenir Number* (Greensboro: Daily Record Press, 1910).

¹² U.S. Census, Historical Census Browser, University of Virginia. Stable URL: <http://mapserver.lib.virginia.edu/php/county.php> Last accessed: 9 December 2011.

¹³ James W. Albright, *Greensboro, 1808-1904: Facts, Figures, Traditions, and Reminiscences* (Greensboro, N.C.: Jos. J. Stone and Company, 1904), 74.

These businessmen, in turn, created a new “civic activism” culture that integrated local political power, new industry, and cultural capital into one pleasing package.¹⁴ Samuel Kipp argues that with modernization came political elitism. Between 1880 and 1910, Greensboro’s lawyers and railroad leaders consolidated over 85 percent of all city positions; as a result, 93 residents shared 253 civic jobs. A few white-collar workers hoarding many government positions left little room for lower-level professionals, storeowners, and artisans.¹⁵ Similarly, upper-level white-collar workers also dominated the “civic sphere,” which included social clubs, social welfare organizations, and business associations. Newcomers found these community organizations increasingly useful in ingratiating themselves with the locals, granting outside elites an instant role as “symbolic custodians of community values and public morals.”¹⁶ Consolidating both business and bureaucratic roles in the city allowed new citizens in Greensboro to combine the “civic sphere” with business and government functions. Business organizations claimed control over the community’s traditional moral interests and their modern economic interests, just as citizens of Greensboro perceived a transition from the former to the latter.

Incorporated at the height of this transition in 1887, the GBC allied the modern and the moral. Its charter membership is a laundry list of Greensboro’s leading lawyers and professionals. Treasurer J.W. Scott served as an alderman and founder of J.W. Scott & Co., “the largest dealers of dry goods and notions in the state.”¹⁷ Julius A. Gray was the

¹⁴ Kipp, 373.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 380-382.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 383.

¹⁷ Albright, 88.

second president of the National Bank of Greensboro and is credited with building the Cape Fear and Yadkin Valley Railroad that gave Greensboro its “Gate City” title. Company secretary Thomas Keogh was a fellow at the bar with the GBC’s founder and visionary, Judge David Schenck.¹⁸

If Greensboro citizens were at work constructing new titles and identities for themselves, David Schenck fit right in. Although a newcomer to Greensboro in 1882, Schenck was nevertheless immersed in the South’s economic changes and continuities. He made his career before the war as a lawyer, entered the Confederate Army as an officer, and practiced politics during Reconstruction as a leader in the Lincoln County Klan and a prominent member of the state Democratic Party.¹⁹ He soon renounced the Klan, stating that its members comprised “the lower orders of life.”²⁰ Gathering allies who shared his understanding of the importance of elite moral guidance, Schenck envisioned that a group of gentlemen might restore order to Greensboro by reshaping its perimeters.

At the city’s edge stood the last structure, a single chimney, of the original hamlet of Guilford Courthouse. As one Park Service historian later recounts, “One cool October evening, while trudging through the [battle]fields, a sudden thought occurred to him: he would

¹⁸ David Schenck, *North Carolina, 1780-’81*. (Raleigh, N.C.: Edwards and Broughton Publishers, 1887), 448.

¹⁹ Allen W. Trelease, *White Terror: The Ku Klux Klan Conspiracy and Southern Reconstruction* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1995), 198.

²⁰ Deposition of T.A. Hope, read into testimony of David Schenck, Report of the Joint Select Committee to Inquire into the Condition of Affairs in the Late Insurrectionary States, 42d Congress, 2d Sess., House. Rept. 22., Vol. 1484-1496 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1872). In Bradley David Proctor, “The Reconstruction of White Supremacy: The Ku Klux Klan in Piedmont North Carolina, 1868 to 1872,” MA thesis (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina, 2009).

buy some of this historic land. He approached the owner and began to bargain. Within one hour, he had purchased thirty acres of ground.”²¹ Within one year, Schenck garnered interested elite friends and support for a charter from the state assembly (and he also became a general counsel for the Cape Fear and Yadkin Valley Railroad).²² Schenck conceived of the GBC as an organization fighting to “redeem the battlefield from oblivion” and to commemorate the battle for visitors.²³ Schenck had discovered a resource with the untapped potential to narrate an inherited North Carolinian past, patriotism, and pre-modern morals.

The landscape remained unshaped, lacking a story to captivate even a visitor from the city. The Company simply needed financial backing to create a structured landscape that provided recreation, entertainment, and solemn reflection on the past. What should the Company memorialize—the battle, Americans, patriotism, the South, North Carolinians? How should it carry out the process of memorializing?

David Blight argues that “all future discussions of the meaning and memory of this fundamental turning point...had to either confront or deflect” the transformations enacted by the federal government in 1863.²⁴ For Southern businessmen partially dependent on Northern investment, Revolutionary War memory represented both a tightrope walk and an opportunity to restore order to ambiguous sectional relationships. The first monument set the stage for the glorification of patriotism, North

²¹ Walter T. Bruce, “History of the Alamance Monument,” (unpublished: internal correspondence, Guilford Courthouse National Military Park, 1964), 1.

²² Hiatt, 41.

²³ Schenck, 13.

²⁴ Blight, 18.

Carolina history, and American victimhood. A large cut granite piece, erected on the initial purchase of land in 1887 immediately adjacent to carriage thoroughfare on New Garden Road, was dedicated to North Carolina militiaman and martyr Captain Arthur Forbis. Local legend recounts his demise without the moment of death itself, but with the discovery of Forbis “twenty-eight hours [after the battle] with two bullets in his body and a saber thrust through his leg, the last wound inflicted by a Tory of whom he had asked for a drink of water.”²⁵ With the exception of a monument erected for the Delaware and Maryland Regulars, the monuments that followed in the next five years were all dedicated to North Carolina individuals. Judge Schenck, the lobbyist and fundraiser behind most of these monuments, erred on the side of caution in memorializing only army men with direct ties to the location at which the monument was erected; for example, the Maryland monument was erected at the exact location that the bodies of Maryland troops were discovered in the mid-nineteenth century.

Meanwhile, the Company focused on acquiring adjacent tracts of land and grooming the landscape for a recreational escape outside of the city. Between 1887 and 1900, Schenck deforested most of the Company’s holdings, ordered the building of a lake, two hot-spring houses, stone and metal arches straddling New Garden Road for carriages to pass under, and a “Schenck Museum” to exhibit “many relics of the great struggle for liberty.”²⁶ Fittingly, the Cape Fear and Yadkin

²⁵ Addie Donnell Van Noppen, *The Battle Field of Guilford Court House* (Privately Published, 1923), 3. Interestingly, Forbis is as alive and a prisoner of the British on March 17, 1781. Prisoner List, March 17, 1781, *Cornwallis Papers*, Public Record Office, London.

²⁶ Albright, 113.

Valley Railroad bisected the park and ran perpendicular to New Garden Road, which brought city carriages into the park for picnicking, hunting, fishing, and bathing.

The dedication ceremonies at the park reified patriotism and educated patriots and picnickers alike. The Company, and particularly Schenck, seriously questioned who might best memorialize the Revolutionary War and, in turn, it sought living men with ancestral ties to the Revolutionary War, to North Carolina, and with direct ties to the Confederate cause. In a few cases, the Company sought the actual ancestors, relocating what was left of North Carolinian Declaration of Independence signers William Hooper and John Penn to the base of a new monument celebrating American independence.²⁷ Similarly, the body of Major Joseph Winston, for whom Winston-Salem is named, was relocated to a new resting place, next to one of the most extravagant monuments of the early Company period. Donated by Governor Holt in 1893, the Winston monument features a life-size bronze statue of Winston in military dress and stands adjacent to both the train tracks and the new Holt Avenue.²⁸ Although Winston's accomplishments differ from Hooper's and Penn's, these three leaders secured the state's Revolutionary history in their shared identities as North Carolinian, masculine, and white. Governor Holt, a speaker at the dedication of the Winston monument, said it best: "Stand my boy, for the right; stand for North Carolina."²⁹

²⁷ Hiatt, 77.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, 40.

²⁹ Thomas M. Holt, "Speech of Ex-Gov, Thomas M. Holt," *Annual Celebration of 1895* (Greensboro: Reece and Elam, Printers, 1895).

The process of reimagining characters from a forgotten war story parallels the Company's search for a narrator. Overwhelmingly, keynote speakers during this nascent period were present at July Fourth commemorations, GBC anniversaries, and monument dedications, and, like Schenck, were state-level politicians in the Democratic Party. Most notably, Governors Zebulon Vance, Thomas Holt, and state Supreme Court Justice Walter Clark delivered orations to crowds at the new park. The transcripts of Vance's and Clark's speeches, delivered in 1889 and 1892, respectively, were published immediately after the commemoration ceremonies and included the moments during the speeches at which the crowd applauded. The front covers of both publications, similarly titled "Address...at Guilford Battle Ground," did not mention the audience from Greensboro, privileging the historical significance of the site over Greensboro's contemporary industrial power.³⁰

Parades held at the site further underscored a historical emphasis. The men of the Company agreed to form a military unit, with David Schenck as head of the "Continental," who "with knee breeches, cocked hats and flint and steel muskets...raised to parade."³¹ On the surface, at least, the economic and historic-cultural legacies of Greensboro remained separate.

Vance's speech brings this implicit separation into question. During one of the very first commemoration ceremonies since the

³⁰Zebulon Vance, "Address at the Battle Ground, May 4, 1889" (Greensboro, N.C.: Reece and Elam Printers, 1889).

Walter Clark, "An Address upon the Life and Services of General William R. Davie" (Greensboro: Reece and Elam Printers, 1892).

³¹David Schenck, "Meeting of the Board of Directors: October 23rd, 1888," *Greensboro Record*, Unknown Date.

Company's incorporation in 1887, Vance's 1889 speech alluded to his personal reputation, his own Revolutionary heritage, and the simple courage of the North Carolina militia, all ideas that also comment on his Civil War role as both a Confederate officer and governor. The former governor declared, "I have never yet failed to respond when called on by the people of North Carolina."³² Leaving his personal connection to the GBC and the battlefield unsaid, Vance considered his presence at Guilford Courthouse an extension of his career as the self-professed politician of "the people of North Carolina."³³ The applause that followed no doubt demonstrated the audience's agreement.³⁴

Vance delved into a romantic soliloquy for the home-grown militia, thereby glorifying "the courage, audacity, and war-like skill which enabled untrained militia, without artillery, without bayonets, without even discipline, with simply hunting rifles and inadequate ammunition, to assault fortified mountain heights...and carry them by storm."³⁵ This, of course, was anachronistic: at the battle, Greene lay in wait for Cornwallis to funnel his troops down thin New Garden Road and into the line of fire. Rather, the symbolism of indomitable spirit in the face of overwhelming odds may tie in with the Lost Cause truism that the South faced the overwhelming industry and resources of the North. In either case, the romanticization of soldierly courage certainly derives from the rhetoric of reconciliation; the honor of fighting belongs to both sides.

³² Vance, 2.

³³ *Ibid.*, 2.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, 2.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, 2.

Next, much like he tied his political career into North Carolina's current historical needs, Vance attached himself to this national militia tradition through his own well-known military service and his common-man ancestry:

I know that it is not perhaps in good taste for citizens of a Democratic country to boast of the blood which is in their veins, but I am sure I will be pardoned for indulging in a strain of filial pride by glorifying the fact that my grandfather was one of those who amidst smoke and fire ascended those heights on that day.³⁶

Here, Vance wrote from a place of privilege: as a member of a democracy, as a descendent of a militiaman, and implicitly, as a white descendent of a white militiaman. After making this statement, Vance then argued that blood and courage are intertwined in explicitly racialized terms that also underline North Carolina's victimhood at the hands of history: "The day when the foot of the first Anglo-Saxon was placed on American soil is known historically, but the spot where the colony of the great and splendid Raleigh landed is unmarked by a single memento."³⁷ Vance spoke of North Carolina as the Arthur Forbis of American history: ignored and silenced, but braver than the rest.

North Carolina's exceptionalism lies implicitly in the history of its white residents, and the vague and romantic perspective on this history flattens compelling, contemporary issues. New South businessmen managed the byproducts of increasing class inequality, the disfranchisements of blacks, and the unrecognizable urban environment.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, 3.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, 6.

Schenck's impulse to move his site of memorialization to the margins of the city and the city's problems reflects this management. His efforts to memorialize an event that, by blood, had the ability to reduce differences between economically stratified whites and allay their cultural anxieties made the park a preeminent destination for city dwellers.

Simultaneously, he sought to enable easy access to a pleasure park, and he lobbied "the Board of Commissioners of Guilford County to order that the road machine be applied to the present road from Greensboro to the Battleground and that said road be placed in passable condition."³⁸

Through his political and bureaucratic connections and efforts inside of the city, Schenck emphasized that his park was for Greensboro's contemporary patriots.

The commemoration of several new monuments between 1895 and 1904, however, displayed a broadening of Schenck's original vision at the hands of his successor, John C. Morehead. Greensboro's citizens witnessed the rise of larger and more expensive sculptural monuments, increasing coverage of Company meetings and events in Greensboro's newspapers, and the curiously self-serving dedication of monuments to the Company's own ancestry. Unfortunately, the accuracy of these new dedications deviated without the meticulous historic research of Schenck; not only were new monuments often thematically unattached to the battlefield, North Carolina, or even the Revolutionary War, they were often divorced from basis in military, cultural, or political context. In sidestepping politics, the Company's new leadership used the landscape

³⁸ David Schenck, "Meeting of the Directors of the Battle Ground Company Friday, May 13th, 1898," *Greensboro Record*, Unknown Date.

and the park's prominent position as a social space to make reconciliationist statements in patriotic guise.

Erected in 1903, the monument to Judge Schenck marked the beginning of new, different ties to the recent and distant past. Planned as a copy of the A.P. Hill Monument of Richmond—a prominent bronze sculpture commemorating one of Stonewall Jackson's lieutenant generals of the Civil War—the monument, perhaps like Schenck's vision, remains unfinished even into the twenty-first century.³⁹ The inscription might also be considered an incomplete account of Schenck's Greensboro career, noting only, "DAVID SCHENCK/THE PROJECTOR OF THIS BATTLE FIELD'S RECLAMATION AND THE ORGANIZER AND FIRST PRESIDENT OF THE GUILFORD BATTLEGROUND COMPANY, 1835-1902."⁴⁰ Morehead hoped to commission a bronze statue of Clio, the muse of history, to sit atop the monument, a dual portrayal of Schenck's love for the subject and an allusion to Schenck's civic virtue.⁴¹ The description of Schenck's contribution to the Company serves this exact purpose. Morehead simplified Schenck's vision by historicizing his career simply as the beginning, calling forth classical symbolism that fastened the first GBC president's memory to a timeless and pre-modern history. Simultaneously, he accessed Schenck's honored Confederate background through the grandiose Hill monument, thereby pushing his predecessor further into the nineteenth century. During his

³⁹ William G. Gray, *The Monument s of Guilford Courthouse National Military Park*, internal correspondence, National Park Service, 1967. 75.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 77.

⁴¹ Clio was not unveiled until 1909, and stood for a little over three decades until she was taken for scrap metal during World War II. *Ibid.*, 10.

presidency, Joseph Morehead repeatedly used these same tactics to venerate or neutralize the past.

Typifying Morehead's turn is the mystifying "No North—No South" monument, which was dedicated in 1902 and stands alongside New Garden Road by Schenck's stone arches. In simple block lettering on all four sides of this granite rectangle, it reads "NO NORTH/WASHINGTON/ NO SOUTH/GREENE."⁴² Because General Nathanael Greene was a Rhode Islander who led the Southern campaign, and General George Washington was a Virginian who led the Northern campaign, the monument refers to their friendship and effective partnership that culminated in achievement at Yorktown. The text does not refer to the battlefield; rather, the monument might have found a home in any city on the east coast. Indeed, Morehead reconciled what he (but neither Greene nor Washington) saw as oppositional forces that work in unison toward the birth of a nation. Nation-making, as described in Vance's narrative about his militia ancestor, is accomplished only through the guidance of white manhood.

White manhood is omnipresent in the dedication of the first Guilford Courthouse monument to a woman. The matronly statue of Marylander Kerenhappuch Turner, erected by the GBC in 1902 during Morehead's first year as president, retells the vaguely true story of a mother who rode with a baby in her saddlebag to Guilford Courthouse. She reached the side of her wounded son days after the battle, intending to nurse him back to health. She is also purportedly the ancestor, through that son, of two GBC members. Her legendary status is underscored by

⁴² Charles G. Hartman, "Guilford Courthouse National Military Park: Composition of Monuments and Markers" (Internal Correspondence, National Park Service and War Department, 1932), 1.

the image of the beautiful white woman standing on a white pedestal with a towel and teacup in hand. As local Greensboro curator Ellen Kennedy writes, Turner is the “Betsy Ross” of Guilford Courthouse; indeed, both women were “memorialized for taking a traditional role to the extreme.”⁴³

Although the Turner monument is located only a few hundred feet away from the Arthur Forbis monument, commemoration of the matron and militiaman could not be more at odds. Forbis’s martyrdom venerated the common man and the Carolinian soldier, but Turner’s story reflected her living descendants and the current gender order. The Morehead line, which included the late former governor John Motley Morehead, New York City industrialist James Turner Morehead, a different James Turner Morehead of Greensboro, and GBC President Joseph M. Morehead, descended from Turner. The latter two Moreheads, longtime GBC members, are mentioned in the dedication speech given in 1902 as Turner’s surviving relatives, and are specifically listed as “James T. Morehead, one of the leading and most distinguished members of the Greensboro bar, who...is devoted to his profession, preferring it to political honors, and Major Joseph M. Morehead [who] conceived of erecting the beautiful monument we dedicate and unveil today.”⁴⁴ Keynote speaker O. S. Bradshaw, another member of the Greensboro bar, went beyond mentioning the family connection. Instead, he used the

⁴³ Ellen Kennedy, “Memories on the Ground: Layers of Meaning in the Battlefield Landscape” (unpublished, 2010), 11.

⁴⁴ O.S. Bradshaw, Esq. “On the Occasion of the Unveiling of a Monument to Her Memory, at The Guilford Battle Ground: July 4th, 1902” (Privately Printed: Guilford Battleground Company, 1902), 3. Another monument, to Captain James Morehead, ancestor of Joseph Morehead, was erected less than two years earlier a dozen feet away from the Kerenhappuch Turner monument. (Hiatt, 30)

commemoration as a platform to reassert the Moreheads' character as civic leaders. The image of these Greensboro elites as men without ambitions beyond those tied to community-spirited service—dignified diffidence is itself a civic virtue—created a smokescreen for their state- and national-level connections as railroad investors and as fundraisers for the GBC.

Kerenhappuch's effigy also ties Revolutionary sacrifice to the Moreheads' twentieth-century claims to public spirit. Bradshaw contended that the Moreheads' "patriotic kinsman, Major J. Turner Morehead, of New York City, who, with enthusiasm as well as with purse and brain...set an example worthy of imitation, which it is to be hoped will stimulate others to like manifestations of patriotic and filial piety."⁴⁵ The industrialist Major James Turner Morehead, of Wilson Aluminum Company, contributed funds toward the monument alongside his cousin Joseph Morehead, thereby making the commemoration a truly "filial" affair. Their "filial piety" was acceptable on two levels: first, as a gesture toward American history, but perhaps more importantly, as "an example" of correctly using their white-collar clout. While Greensboro's social and economic inequalities deepened and Battleground narratives revolved around Greensboro rather than the state, the monument to the Morehead family was an invitation to other elites to mark their territory on hallowed ground. In fact, Joseph Morehead extended more than an invitation by publishing the names of businessmen with shares in the Company, and the amount donated, in the pages of the *Greensboro*

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 3.

Patriot.⁴⁶ Ever since Schenck's death in 1902, the balance had clearly shifted in favor of the GBC, and the new monuments thus generated new community prestige and power.

But the Company had competition for that prestige. Indeed, the Moreheads' monument opened the door for claims to the battle's history from groups, like the Sons and Daughters of the American Revolution (SAR and DAR), which require proof of Revolutionary ancestry for membership. While the Company raised monuments commemorating specific troop movements or key moments in the battle, the "truth" of proven, individual genealogies, rather than Schenck's value-laden narrative of the battle itself, allowed multiple chapters of the DAR to descend upon the battlefield. These groups established less grandiose monuments to men and women from their chapter districts, like Martha McFarland Gee McBell (1921) and General Edward Stevens (1931), among others. Significantly, a few of the chapters, and the individuals they hoped to commemorate, came from beyond North Carolina. For example, the monument to Edward Stevens, who "ON THIS SPOT...WAS WOUNDED WHILE MAKING A GALLANT STAND WITH HIS VIRGINIA TROOPS" was sponsored by the DAR of Culpeper, Virginia. And pointedly, it honored the wounding of a Virginia soldier at the wrong "spot" on the field.⁴⁷

On one level, access to the landscape of the battleground had rapidly democratized, no longer exclusive to Judge Schenck, Greensboro elites, the Company, or the voice of North Carolinians. Instead, the crop of new monuments represented continuities and changes in the visions of

⁴⁶ Joseph M. Morehead, "Letter to the Editor," *Greensboro Patriot*, February 13, 1901, 7.

⁴⁷ Hiatt, 61.

the Company. While Schenck used the Company to find friends and allies in his new hometown and to make the Company a viable social club, Morehead used the Company to increase the community power of its members. This reversal in the GBC's social meaning meant that the individual members found the Company not only a financial and civic responsibility, but also a political tool. However, the monuments of Arthur Forbis and Edward Stevens still have much in common with the other granite cuts: these monuments continued to uphold the connection between nationalism, sacrifice, and whiteness. Morehead's modification to this tradition empowers living individuals to affix their own identities on an ancestral, pure whiteness and patriotism. Far from revealing their tendency toward self-aggrandizement, Bradshaw and the Moreheads crafted a creative, passionate ethic from a violation of both historic accuracy and accepted Company tradition.

Furthermore, Kerenhappuch Turner's storied, picturesque feminine presence on the battlefield points to traditional gender relationships in respectable white society. She alters Schenck's vision of an antimodern landscape by adding antimodern, fictional characters to the Guilford Courthouse story. The GBC expanded the traditional image of war beyond the battlefield to the home front, exalting female sacrifice as an extension of military history. However, Bradshaw described women's work in terms of acceptable social roles as they existed during the Civil War and not the Revolutionary War, during which most doctors and nurses were male. In his version of history, women "went to the battlefield to moisten the parched tongues, to bind the ghastly wounds,

and to soothe the parting agonies alike of friend and foe, and to catch the last whispered message of love from dying lips.”⁴⁸

Women took no part in the battle itself, but instead met soldiers in its wake to administer care. The “last whispered message of love” is repeated in the aftermath of the Civil War rather than the aftermath of the Battle of Guilford Courthouse; after the Civil War, Victorian Americans sought to incorporate “the Good Death” as a final sacred, personal moment, in which dying soldiers received familial love and final spiritual contentment.⁴⁹ The postbellum emphasis on domestic and meaningful death often retrospectively placed women on the battlefield and in homes where dying men lay; consequently, the mythic and romantic character of Turner’s feats suggests that her story was exaggerated to fit contemporary tropes. The further that the Company and the narrative of Guilford Courthouse migrated from military history, the further they fell into common images and contrivances of post-bellum myths and sentiments.

Turner’s saintly journey seems less so without the antimodern setting of the colonial landscape. Separating the domestic sphere from “the exciting and exulting rush of battle,” Bradshaw’s 1902 speech dedicating the Turner monument cites the special hardships of “the women, by their lonely hearthstone surrounded by helpless children, in the pre-medieval forests, without mail or telegraph [to ease] their suspense, their anxiety, their agony—their death born without a

⁴⁸ Bradshaw, 2. For the role of women in the health of the army, see Ann M. Becker, “Smallpox in Washington’s Army: Strategic Implications of the Disease during the American Revolutionary War,” *The Journal of Military History* 68: 2 (2004), 395.

⁴⁹ Drew Gilpin Faust, *This Republic of Suffering* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf Press, 2008).

murmur.”⁵⁰ Crucially, Bradshaw did not place Turner’s or any woman’s “lonely hearthstone” in pioneer hamlets, the state, or the South. Rather, he chose to flatten the female experience and deny the earlier historical specificities of speeches by Holt and Vance. Bradshaw referred to wives and daughters collectively as the “grand reserve army” that “in village, hamlet, town, and city, from ocean to ocean” remained “angels of pity.”⁵¹ Reducing Turner’s identity to one among many of these women simplifies the meaning of her respectability. In Bradshaw’s words: “She loved her children with the devotion of a true mother, but she loved her country also.”⁵²

Acceptable nineteenth-century nursing practices validated Turner’s feminine respectability, but her mythical context—the pre-medieval forest and the colonial hamlet—made her selfless acts harrowing and dangerous, different from the circumstances of the average Victorian woman. Turner begs a contrast between the past and the present, but that contrast is essentialized not with disparate individual or cultural characteristics, but with the difference between the modern and the premodern white woman. The use of anachronistic understandings of “the Good Death” and the female role in war present in Turner’s mythology demonstrates a desire for continuity and connection with an American past. Turner’s story made the link between war and womanhood as meaningful and sacred as the Civil War had become. This connection, of course, was the tie of blood between the Moreheads and their ancestral claims to Guilford Courthouse’s past and Greensboro’s present.

⁵⁰ Bradshaw, 2.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, 2.

⁵² *Ibid.*, 2.

Bradshaw's speech also indicated the early murmurs of the next trend in Company history. In his introduction, which detailed the progress that the GBC made under new President Morehead, he boasted: "through the vigilance and diligence of President Morehead, and our Representatives of all parties in Congress, the favoring eye and the fostering hand of the National Government have been attracted as never before."⁵³ Bradshaw then revealed the next modification to the park: the enormous and intricate Davidson and Nash arches, positioned to frame carriages as they rolled down picturesque Holt Avenue.⁵⁴ Government recognition and funding, which through Morehead's presidency was limited largely to the State Assembly and the cooperation of North Carolinian public figures, skyrocketed as Company members lobbied for help with progressively larger projects. Indeed, federal involvement culminated in the unveiling of the largest monument yet on July 3, 1915: the monument to Greensboro's namesake, General Nathanael Greene. The celebration took place fewer than two years before the War Department appropriated stewardship of the property for the purpose of preserving the battlefield "for professional and military study."⁵⁵

The dream of a lavish commemoration of Nathanael Greene actually began before the Civil War. In 1857, "The Association for erecting a Monument to the memory of General Nathaniel (sic) Greene," under none other than Governor John M. Morehead, accepted contributions of one dollar from "Charter Members" until the Civil War broke out. However, unlike the eerily similar future GBC, the

⁵³ *Ibid.*, 1.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, 1.

⁵⁵ *National Military Park, National Park, Battlefield Site and National Monument Regulations* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1931), 62-63.

Association was doomed to failure even before the financial strain of the war proved unbearable. *The Greensborough Patriot* sarcastically reported, “The first, and apparently only, meeting of the Association was held at Greensborough’s Methodist Episcopal Church on March 15, 1858, with a ‘large crowd of ladies in attendance’ and ‘(hopefully) larger amounts [of money] will be contributed by our citizens whose means will justify such liberality.’”⁵⁶ Although the “Charter Member” list brimmed with names of future railroad tycoons and city leaders, it was not yet their time. Lacking the political prowess of later years, these early businessmen had to wait for the Gate City economic boom.

The Gate City boomers of the Company were, in turn, forced to wait for the War Department, which in 1911 began planning in earnest for the monument’s erection. The Congress approved the expenditure of \$30,000 in 1911 for a monument to Greene and the services of the Continental Army.⁵⁷ After the death of Joseph Morehead in 1913 and the election of David Schenck’s son Paul Schenck as president of the GBC, the War Department absorbed the “pleasure ground” into a growing conglomerate of East Coast battlefields—mostly from the Civil War—now titled “military parks.” Publishing a “Programme of Competition for the Memorial Monument” in August, the U.S. Engineer Office under the War Department regulated and limited the size, expense, materials, and deadlines of the project. The prize money for the design and the commission to sculpt the model from bronze both went to New York men, Albert M. Ross and F. H. Packer, respectively. In order to maintain

⁵⁶ *The Greensborough Patriot*, Friday March 19, 1858; Friday, March 5, 1858.

⁵⁷ Charles M. Stedman, “Address of Acceptance of the Greene Memorial Monument on Behalf of the Guilford Battle Ground Company, July 3rd, 1915,” unpublished, Historical Files, National Park Service, Greensboro, N.C.

custodianship, the War Department took away the Company's control of both the Greene Monument project and the landscape itself, authorizing other state governments to add their own military monuments to the battlefield. The Department placed Schenck as head of a three-person governing commission with few administrative powers; the other two spots of the commission were never filled.⁵⁸ The commission remained "an impractical bureaucratic courtesy," while the War Department made few of its own changes to the preexisting landscape. But for the first time, the door for commemoration remained open to ancestor-based organizations instead of the Company. Also for the first time, members of the Company, now effectively civil servants, could fall victim to political overturn and party change; for example, Democrat Paul Schenck was ousted from the commission at the beginning of the Republican Harding administration. For the first time, the new ethic of historic preservation replaced the codified utility of historic memory.⁵⁹ Governor Morehead's dream was realized, but the vision of civic leadership attached to his dream eroded.

The unveiling of the Greene monument mirrors these changes. Instead of a showcase of North Carolinian Democrats, the War Department sent a Regimental Band to lead the parade while politicians from Rhode Island and Delaware joined speakers from North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Virginia, and Maryland at the podium. Interestingly, these politicians delivered academic lectures rather than commemoration speeches, alluding to "Nathanael Greene as a Citizen of Georgia" or "'Light Horse Harry' Lee and William Washington,

⁵⁸ Hiatt, 46.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, 45.

Virginia's Cavalry Leaders in the Revolution," and codifying the turn toward "professional and military study" of the field.⁶⁰ Mentions of North Carolina in the speeches and lectures were few in comparison to allusions to contemporary national politics and American exceptionalism, which were then validated by the academic format. In his address, Charles Stedman concluded: "May the recurring seasons be propitious for...gatherings and may...hours spent together be full of joy...and redound to the benefit of our common country."⁶¹ In his speech, South Carolina's lieutenant-governor Andrew Jackson Bethea pointedly alluded to World War I and increasing national patriotism: "let us...follow the lead of Woodrow Wilson in his propaganda of peace and human justice."⁶² In between speakers, the band played "The Old North State," "Maryland, My Maryland," "Columbia, the Gem of the Ocean," and "America" back-to-back for a crowd of 10,000. The celebration of North Carolina's neighbors further symbolized the meeting of state histories under the larger canopy of a national narrative.

Yet, several traditions continued past this celebration of the end of the era. Morehead's genealogical politics were overturned when the Greene Monument was "unveiled by Mrs. Anna Clarke Meader...and Mr. George Washington Greene Carpenter of Boston, Mass., the nearest lineal descendants of General Nathanael Greene."⁶³ Men and women

⁶⁰ Paul Schenck, "Programme of the Twenty-sixth Annual Celebration of Guilford Court House Battlefield, July 3rd, 1915," (Greensboro: Guilford Battleground Company, 1915).

⁶¹ Stedman, 6.

⁶² Andrew Jackson Bethea, "South Carolina and North Carolina in the Campaign of 1780-'81," July 3, 1915, 7, unpublished, Historical Files, National Park Service, Greensboro, N.C.

⁶³ "Programme," 2. "Unveiling a Fine Monument," *Greensboro Daily Record*, Saturday July 3, 1915.

with other claims to Revolutionary ancestry descended on the park on July 3, 1915, but all of the participants and speakers, as well as most of the spectators, were white. While no mention of race, and very few mentions of the Civil War, found a place in the lectures, Schenck's and Morehead's pride as Confederate officers and as historians lived on through the increasing importance of ancestry as a claim to heroes of the past. As Company members and North Carolinians lost hegemony over the civic meaning of the battlefield to Greensboro's and North Carolina's current residents, they simultaneously hitched onto the national significance of their ancestors. People of color were denied the opportunity to claim descent from patriots of either the battlefield or the nation and they were thereby denied inheritance of the Wilson era's emphasis on "peace and human justice." But if memory of the Revolutionary War faded away, might the memory and meaning behind white genealogy and ancestry also fade?

In 1948, acting superintendent of Guilford Courthouse National Military Park Raleigh S. Taylor fought on the well-trodden battlefield, but in a different Southern campaign. As he catalogued damages done by vandals, Taylor hoped the Department of the Interior would resupply him with extra money, sheet metal, and granite to restore monuments now half a century old. Taylor's list of damages reads like a list of battle wounds:

The [General Joseph] Winston statue has a cut through the back, one foot is loose...the sword is missing, and there are a few cracks...around the feet. The [Declaration of Independence signer William] Hooper statue was once knocked from its pedestal, mashing the back of the

head and one cheek, and detaching the right arm.” Most interestingly, “The statue of [mythical matron Karenhappuch] Turner has a bullet-hole through the face, and another through the skirt.⁶⁴

Raleigh Taylor discovered the monuments’ irrelevance to Greensboro’s younger generations the hard way. Neither Morehead nor Schenck anticipated an audience unappreciative of their efforts, and they failed to recognize the transient nature of civic service as an avenue to political and social privilege. In front of the backdrop of Greensboro’s sudden urban growth, the move to memorialize the Battle of Guilford Courthouse emerged from national, North Carolinian, and family pride, which were all inseparable from, yet in conflict with, one another. The ambitions of former Confederate officers found legitimacy through the powerful image of the Revolution, but the Company men never decided whether that Revolution belonged to the past of North Carolina militiamen or to new Reconstructed Victorian businessmen. Joseph Morehead’s nostalgic, antimodern impulse for a simpler time, an effort to resolve these reconciliationist, Southern, racial, and very modern tensions, was ultimately incompatible with but reliant on national historical legitimacy. The ceremonial tendency toward antimodernism did not immediately rise to its full strength in response to Greensboro’s industrialism, but in a precise and personal moment in which this single individual saw its advantage. Moreover, these impulses rose in tandem with more muted understandings of whiteness, which were still integral to the individual’s relationship to national history and the current state.

⁶⁴ Correspondence, Raleigh C. Taylor to Mullins Manufacturing Corporation, April 14, 1948, 1, Historical Files, National Park Service, Greensboro, N.C.

Although devoid of Lost Cause rhetoric and openly racist pontification, the commemorations and monuments at Guilford Courthouse ultimately reflect sentiments of reconciliation that privilege white supremacy and Southern “history” alongside nationalism. But once the national government agreed to fund similar reconciliationist agendas and let white Southerners tell their own histories, speakers and organizations tied the Southern campaign to national independence. While white supremacy remained silent but unchallenged inside this reconciliationist vision, the GBC lost its potency. Just like the musket balls and military buttons buried under manicured grass and cement, the Guilford Battleground Company’s markers and statues are simply another layer of artifacts and relics, superimposed on those that came before.

BLACK BLOODED: THE ALLIANCE OF THE
AFRICAN BLOOD BROTHERHOOD AND
AMERICAN COMMUNISM

Kimberly Burroughs

On the evening of May 31, 1921 African American Dick Rowland sat confined in a Tulsa courthouse for the rape of a white elevator operator. News of his alleged crime flew through the city of Tulsa, and a white mob began forming around Rowland's courthouse. By nine o'clock that night, rumors that the mob intended to lynch Rowland had spread among the residents of Tulsa's African American "black belt" neighborhood. One-hundred black men rushed to the courthouse to prevent the illegal lynching. The Tulsa police attempted to cordon off the courthouse to prevent violence. By eleven o'clock blacks and whites from across the city were flooding toward the courthouse. Drastically outnumbered, the police rapidly lost control of the situation as both white and black mob members frantically armed themselves with shovels, tennis racquets, and anything else that was readily available. The initial skirmish lasted a

mere two hours with both mobs dispersing near midnight.¹ Throughout the night of May 31st the city rang with an uneasy silence.

On the morning of June 1st conflict exploded once again as a small army of 500 white residents stormed the negro quarter. After fierce fighting the white mob assumed control of the railroad and freight yards, forcing black combatants into the interior of the quarter. By one o'clock in the afternoon the "white invaders" began setting fires that would, in only seven hours, decimate all thirty blocks of black housing. The infantile and elderly residents of the quarter, too helpless to flee the flames, burned in their beds. By the end of the rioting, nine whites and sixty-eight blacks were dead. The flames left nearly 10,000 black residents homeless.²

The Tulsa Riot of 1921, along with the riots of the Red Summer of 1919, functioned as the culmination of a sectarian racial tension that had swept across the United States following the end of World War I.³ Between the riots of 1919 and the Tulsa riot of 1921, black nationalist organizations emerged to promote the liberation of oppressed African

Kimberly recently graduated from UF with a degree in English and History (May 2012). She is from Fort Lauderdale, Florida, where she attended St. Thomas Aquinas High School and participated in a wide variety of athletic and academic activities. In the coming year, Kimberly will be working with AmeriCorps Vista at the University of Tampa to promote and organize student service opportunities.

¹ Special to The New York Times. "Series of Fierce Combats," *New York Times* (1857-1922), June 2, 1921, <http://www.proquest.com/> (accessed December 13, 2011). Cyril V. Briggs, "The Tulsa Riot" in *The Crusader: A Facsimile of the Periodical*, ed. Robert A. Hill (New York: Garland Publishing, Inc, 1987, 1173.

² James S. Hirsch. *Riot and Remembrance: The Tulsa Race War and its Legacy* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 2002).

³ Mark Solomon. *The Cry Was Unity: Communists and African Americans, 1917-1936* (Jackson, MS: University Press of Mississippi, 1998), 14-15. Robert A. Hill, "Introduction," in *The Crusader: A Facsimile of the Periodical*, ed. Robert A. Hill (New York: Garland Publishing, Inc, 1987), xxvii.

Americans and to combat rampant white violence. One such organization, the African Blood Brotherhood (A.B.B.), gained national notoriety when the *New York Times* accused it of fomenting unrest in Tulsa, launching the A.B.B. on a path toward radical, militarized black nationalism and Communism.

This paper examines how and why black journalist Cyril Briggs and the African Blood Brotherhood successfully “forged an ideological link among national, race, and class consciousness” as part of a strategy for black liberation.⁴ As the intellectual mastermind of both the African Blood Brotherhood and its companion publicity organ *The Crusader*, Briggs developed a philosophy of anti-imperialism and anti-capitalism. However, far from textbook Marxism, this philosophy was rooted in utilitarianism. Briggs was a “race man” above all else.⁵ His interactions with the Communist Party emerged purely from an interest to secure the liberation of the black race, not of the international proletariat.^{6,7} Briggs’s Communism stemmed only from his nationalist strategy to sever the link between Capitalists and Capital (labor), thereby liberating oppressed and colonized black peoples throughout the world.

Cyril V. Briggs was born in 1888 on Nevis Island, a small Caribbean island southeast of St. Kitts. Historically a profitable British colony and midway point for the Triangular Slave Trade, Nevis offered

⁴ Solomon, *The Cry Was Unity*, 8.

⁵ Briggs, “Editorial: Negro First!” in *The Crusader: A Facsimile of the Periodical*, ed. Robert A. Hill (New York: Garland Publishing, Inc, 1987), 477.

⁶ Briggs, *The Crusader*, 1135. Edward Johanningsmeier. “Communists and Black Freedom Movements in South Africa and the US: 1919-1950,” *Journal of Southern African Studies*, 30, no.1 (2004) : 164, accessed December 13, 2011.

⁷ William Maxwell, *New Negro, Old Left: African-American Writing and Communism between the Wars* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1996), 9. 4: Robert A. Hill, “Introduction,” in *The Crusader: A Facsimile of the Periodical*, ed. Robert A. Hill (New York: Garland Publishing, Inc, 1987), xiv, xxvi.

Briggs, a bastard son of a white overseer and a black woman, an “utterly colonial education.”⁸ After a childhood of segregation and colonial tension, Briggs emigrated to Harlem in 1905 at the age of seventeen. He lived among other West Indian immigrants in New York City, eventually securing a position writing for the local *Amsterdam News*. In these early years, Briggs, secure in a community of like-minded West Indian émigrés, formulated a nascent sense of race pride that set the stage for his reaction to the ‘Red Summer,’ his detestation of global imperialism, and the development of his passionate black nationalism.⁹

By 1917, the year of the Bolshevik Revolution and the establishment of the world’s first communist state, a global backlash against the “civilizing mission” of the European imperial project emerged in response to a half century of colonial abuses.¹⁰ Capitalizing on this global sentiment, Woodrow Wilson issued his Fourteen Points, which demanded the end of continental imperialism, the self-determination of European peoples, and a more humane management of colonial holdings.¹¹ Wilson’s ‘Fourteen Points’ resonated with Briggs, who had begun publishing and editing a journal entitled *The Crusader* that same year.¹² He believed Wilson’s leadership represented a new era

⁸ Solomon, 5.

⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰ The most notable events in turning the tide against rampant Western colonialism included the Irish potato famine (in which the British government’s embrace of laissez-faire liberal economics cost one-million Irish lives), and the Boer-Wars (in which the British government was the first to institute concentration camps to detain Boer guerillas). The Boer-Wars were particularly effective in instigating the wave of anti-imperialism because they coincided with the innovation of film technology, bringing the first footage of imperial atrocities to the metropole.

¹¹ Solomon, 6.

¹² Solomon, 6. Briggs, *The Crusader* 1, 149-159.

of decolonization. Early issues of *The Crusader* praised Wilson's Fourteen Points and condemned imperialism as a "contravention to all Christian, humane and democratic codes against the weaker peoples of Africa and Asia..."¹³ These articles emphasized not simply the liberation of Caribbean blacks or of African Americans, but of all colonized and oppressed people of color. Thus the very early philosophy of Cyril V. Briggs, as reflected in *The Crusader*, focused on anti-imperialism and the liberation of the global black race.

Despite Briggs's early approval of the "genius" of Wilson's 'Fourteen Points,' he eventually became disillusioned, determining that the League of Nations, or the "League of Thieves," "is designed...to suppress all revolutions upon the part of the oppressed" and secure the *status quo* of contemporary imperialism.¹⁴ Abandoning any hope of witnessing African liberation with the help of a major capitalist power like the United States, Briggs began searching for an alternate ally. In December of 1918, *The Crusader* was "The Official Organ of the Hamitic League of the World," an organization initiated to:

Pressure the Paris Peace Conference into ensuring that the full rights of citizenship be granted to all People of Color, that all discrimination because of color be made illegal, that self-determination be extended to all nations and tribes within the African continent and throughout the

¹³ Briggs, "The Blond Beast" in *The Crusader*, 53. Briggs, "Africa for the Africans," in *The Crusader*, 3.

¹⁴ Briggs, *The Crusader*, 149-150. Solomon, 7: Solomon refers to a March 1919 editorial in *The Amsterdam News* entitled "The League of Thieves." After this same editorial provokes "the wrath of postal authorities," Briggs was fired from his post.

world, and that the exploitation of Africa and other countries belonging to people of color herewith cease.¹⁵

Formed before the solidification of the Soviet State and the emergence of the American Communist Party in mid-1919, the alliance between Briggs and The Hamitic League of the World offered the most logical and clearly evident path toward the global liberation of African peoples.¹⁶ This strategic and practical alliance making would become a common theme of Briggs's political maneuvering.

Despite this practicality, Spring 1919 issues of the *Crusader* exhibited the first signs of Briggs's emerging understanding of class conflict. In the eighth issue of *The Crusader*, an article entitled "Deporting Aliens and Negroes" warned that "the mailed fists of capitalism [were] aimed at the worker," regardless of his or her race.¹⁷ Further, the editorial argued that "labor suffers by its race prejudice" when both blacks and whites ignore the plights of fellow workers due to racial boundaries.¹⁸ The editorial "High Rents and Bolshevism" in issue nine offered the first explicit call to unite workers across racial lines, asserting that "when the Negro seeks relief in the class war of the proletariat...and makes common cause with the Bolsheviki of the world..." then the race would achieve liberation.¹⁹ These early, labor-

¹⁵ Theodore Kornweibel, *Seeing Red: Federal Campaigns Against Black Militancy, 1919-1925* (Bloomington, Ind.: Indiana University Press, 1998) 133.

¹⁶ Edward Johanningsmeier. "Communists and Black Freedom Movements in South Africa and the US: 1919-1950," *Journal of Southern African Studies*, 30, no.1 (2004) : 156-157, accessed December 13, 2011. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4133862>.

¹⁷ Briggs, "Deporting Aliens and Negroes," in *The Crusader*, 264.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*

¹⁹ Briggs, "High Rents and Bolshevism" in *The Crusader*, 294.

sympathetic articles evidence Briggs's emerging tendency to contextualize racial oppression in terms of class conflict. It was this tendency that first drew the attention of the infantile United Communist Party to Briggs.²⁰

However, the violence of the "Red Summer" rattled Briggs's idea of black solidarity with white workers. The return of African American WWI veterans to a persistently discriminatory white America set the stage for brutal race riots in Chicago and Washington D.C. Briggs, who claimed that "the white man was plainly the aggressor," wrote a lengthy article in the September issue of *The Crusader* entitled "The Capital and Chicago Race Riots," which indiscriminately condemned the white race and admonished "the hypocrisy and the casuistry of the Caucasian."²¹ Briggs's indignation concerning white aggression undermined any inclinations toward genuine Communism. With the Communist Party still reeling from internal sectarian divisions and unable to reign in white labor violence, Briggs decided to establish his own organization.

Swept up in the radical nationalism and violence of the summer, Briggs established the African Blood Brotherhood to "draw together the themes of race patriotism, anti-capitalism, anti-colonialism and organized defense against racist assault" that had evolved in *The Crusader* over its first year of publication.²² The A.B.B. was initially an

²⁰ Other relevant articles include: "The Negro's Place with Labor," (333) and "Make Their Cause Your Own," (368).

²¹ Briggs, "The Capital and the Chicago Race Riots" in *The Crusader*, 437-440.

²² Solomon, 9-10. While Robert Hill argues that "the evidence points to the creation of the Brotherhood [ABB] as a black auxiliary of the nascent Communist party from its inception," (xxviii) I agree with Mark Solomon's assessment that the A.B.B. was initially unassociated with the Communist Party, and was merely a "poorly financed educational

assembly of black intellectuals who were “willing to go the limit” in order to secure the international liberation of all African peoples.²³ Briggs ultimately envisioned the A.B.B. as a secretive fraternal order designed to promote radical nationalist ideas, act as a militarized line of defense ready to fight white aggression, and carry out the “inevitable battle” against capitalist powers that would “necessitate bloodshed.”²⁴

While the tone of the A.B.B. rang more potently of black nationalism than of communism, Briggs’s access to a broader *Crusader* readership and his inclination toward preemptive military organizing drew the attention of the new American United Communist party, which had finally consolidated by early 1920 and engaged in a long overdue consideration of “the race question.”²⁵ The United Communist Party, unlike the sectarian factions of American Communism’s early inceptions, approached black labor as an integral part of the proletariat, marking a departure from earlier white-only strategies.²⁶ *The Crusader*’s association with The Hamitic League of the World vanished by 1920, indicating that Briggs had discovered a new potential ally in American Communism for his fight for global African liberation. However, persisting racism within the U.S. Communist Party and a preoccupation with the international Communist program would impede the efforts of

and propaganda organization built largely around disseminating the *Crusader* and promoting discussion of its views.” (14).

²³ Solomon, 9. Briggs, *The Crusader*, 495.

²⁴ Martin Schipper, “Letter from ‘800’ to Rouch,” *Federal Surveillance of Afro-Americans (1917-1925)*. Microfilm Collection, The University of Florida Smathers Library West, Florida, slides 343-355. Kornweibel, *Seeing Red*, 136.

²⁵ Johanningsmeier, 159. Solomon, 30-40.

²⁶ Johanningsmeier, 163.

Briggs and the A.B.B. to fully maximize this new alliance, weakening the relationship between the two organizations through 1922.²⁷

As the convenient courtship of the A.B.B. and the United Communist Party haltingly evolved from the spring of 1920 to mid-1921, the arena of black nationalist politics intensified. While Cyril Briggs focused his attention on global African liberation and radicalism, Marcus Garvey and his Universal Negro Improvement Association assembled a large following of both moderate, middle class African Americans and nonradical black workers. Like Briggs, Garvey promoted a black exodus to Africa, which he dubbed the “Back to Africa” movement.²⁸ By the beginning of the summer of 1920, the membership of the U.N.I.A. had reached unprecedented numbers, leading to a call for the centralization of the massively nebulous organization. In response, Garvey announced a convention, scheduled for August of that year, “for the purpose of electing ‘his Supreme Highness, the Potentate, His Highness, the Supreme Deputy, and other high officials, who will preside over the destiny of the Negro peoples of the world...’”²⁹

A disagreement over this initial conference between Briggs and Garvey initiated a mud-slinging conflict between the two nationalist leaders that would persist well past the end of *The Crusader*. Briggs, who also promoted a global program for African liberation, argued that if the conference elected a centralized body to represent the international black population, an open invitation must be sent to all black organizations to ensure a representative election.³⁰ Garvey, on the other hand, was

²⁷ Ibid.

²⁸ Hill, “Introduction,” in *The Crusader*, xli.

²⁹ Briggs, *The Crusader*, 635.

³⁰ Briggs, *The Crusader*, 635, 1920, 2910.

determined to keep the convention an internal, U.N.I.A. affair. While Garvey eventually acquiesced to Briggs's call of an open invitation, the August 1920 convention cemented Briggs's dislike for Marcus Garvey, setting the stage for future conflict.

In the midst of the mounting Briggs-Garvey feud, the Tulsa Riots broke out in Oklahoma in May and June of 1921.³¹ The skirmish lasted from May 31st to June 1st, leaving nearly 10,000 black residents homeless.³² The press covering the incident portrayed the violence as the result of unwarranted black aggression, with the *New York Times* condemning the African Blood Brotherhood for "hatching a conspiracy" against white residents.³³ The A.B.B. never assumed responsibility for the riots, esoterically announcing in *The Crusader* that they "neither deny nor affirm" the accusations.³⁴ Regardless, the publicity generated national notoriety for the A.B.B., dramatically enhancing recruitment numbers and establishing the organization as a legitimate force for black nationalism.³⁵ This newfound notoriety forced the A.B.B. into an above-ground status, leading the organization to adopt *The Crusader* as its official publication and allowing Cyril Briggs to assume a position as an executive of an organized black nationalist group.³⁶ This new legitimacy lent the A.B.B. considerable clout in its attacks against Marcus Garvey and further attracted the attention of the United Communist Party.

³¹ Solomon, 14-15. Hill, "Introduction" in *The Crusader*, xxxiv.

³² James S. Hirsch. *Riot and Remembrance: The Tulsa Race War and its Legacy* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 2002).

³³ Solomon, 15.

³⁴ Briggs, *The Crusader*, 1178-1179.

³⁵ Solomon, 15.

³⁶ *Ibid.*

By the second U.N.I.A. convention in August of 1921, the conflict between Briggs and Garvey had devolved into mudslinging and slander. Briggs accused Garvey of “lying,” “bourgeois sympathy,” fraud, and race treachery.³⁷ However, despite his personal dislike of Garvey, Briggs badly wished to unify with the powerful Universal Negro Improvement Association in an effort to create “a mighty federation [of the disparate global black nationalist organizations] to make race a world power.”³⁸ In fact, historian Robert Hill argues “the attempt by the A.B.B. to infiltrate the U.N.I.A. convention formed part of a much broader strategy to wrest control of the movement away from Garvey as preliminary to assuming the direction of the black struggle.”³⁹ While Hill’s wording implies a degree of power grabbing on the part of Briggs, the unification of all black nationalist organizations into a powerful and centralized front was vital to Briggs’s plans for global black liberation. If Briggs needed to “wrest control of the movement away from Garvey” to accomplish this goal, so be it. Adamant that no other solution existed, Briggs launched a full scale attack on Garvey, eventually uncovering evidence of fraud in Garvey’s transactions with the Black Star Line. Briggs’s discovery permanently marred Garvey’s credibility and ended his reign as the country’s most prominent black nationalist leader.⁴⁰

The feud with Garvey eradicated a major ideological competitor to Briggs’s plan for global liberation, leaving Briggs as one of the few

³⁷ Briggs, *The Crusader*, 1242.

³⁸ Schipper, 329.

³⁹ Hill, “Introduction,” in *The Crusader*, xlii. Schipper, *Surveillance*, 288-292. Hill goes on to argue that “the entire anti-Garvey exercise appears to have followed the directive of the United Communist Party of America, calling upon Negro communists to infiltrate existing black institutions and ‘to expose the reactionary leaders who, for the purpose of betraying their race, infest these institutions.’” (xlii).

⁴⁰ Briggs, *The Crusader*, 407, 698.

prominent leaders of the radical black community. American Communism, searching for a way to integrate black labor into its larger struggle for proletarian revolution, targeted Briggs as a possible link to the black community. In January of 1921 the United Communist Party of America “enjoined the party members to “break down the barrier of race prejudice...and to bind [all workers] into a union of revolutionary forces for the overthrow of their common enemy.”⁴¹ Following the Tulsa riot of 1921, the increasingly militaristic and anti-capitalist A.B.B. represented the best option for the creation of a “union of revolutionary forces” among black and white workers.⁴² Further, Briggs’s dual command over the A.B.B. and the wide-reaching *Crusader Magazine* made him the United Communist Party’s top choice for organizer of a black communist element. The party decided to redouble its efforts to recruit Briggs and his A.B.B. By the end of 1921, Briggs was an official member of the United Communist Party, and the A.B.B. was American Communism’s first black auxiliary.⁴³ *The Crusader* and the A.B.B. increasingly called on black workers to organize “into labor unions for the betterment of their economic condition and to act in close cooperation with the class-conscious white workers for the benefit of both.”⁴⁴ Further, the A.B.B. demanded an alliance with “The Third Internationale and its millions of followers in all countries of the world” and “the revolutionary element

⁴¹ Hill, “Introduction,” in *The Crusader*, xxxvii.

⁴² Solomon, 30-40. Johanningsmeier, Briggs, “Communists and Black Freedom Movements,” in *The Crusader* 163.

⁴³ Hill, “Introduction,” in *The Crusader*, xix.

⁴⁴ Briggs, “The Program of the A.B.B.” in *The Crusader*, 1251.

which is undermining the imperialist powers that oppress all black peoples.”⁴⁵

By 1922 *The Crusader*, faced with a severe lack of funding and Briggs’s mission to establish a weekly periodical, ceased publication.⁴⁶ Despite Briggs’s utilitarian alliance with Communism, he and the A.B.B. faced a Communist program that “merely assumed that the ‘Negro question’ was reducible to an economic or class question to be settled when the general rights of labour were established through revolution.”⁴⁷ Further, white racism permeated the ranks of the American Communist Party, who vividly remembered the havoc that black strikebreaking had wrought on their earlier organizational efforts.⁴⁸ Frustrated by the party’s lack of progress on the race issue, Claude McKay, a member of the executive council for the A.B.B., introduced the issue at the 1922 Comintern, finally deciding that he and the A.B.B. must surpass white leadership to affect any change within the party.⁴⁹ After a personal conversation with McKay on the issue, Vladimir Lenin, leader of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the International Comintern, demanded that the “world Negro movement” be incorporated into the Communist agenda.⁵⁰ McKay’s contributions to the 1922 Comintern resulted directly in the establishment of a “Negro Commission,” which

⁴⁵ Ibid.

⁴⁶ Solomon, 28.

⁴⁷ Johanningsmeier, 159.

⁴⁸ Ibid., 160.

⁴⁹ Ibid., 164. Cyril Briggs suffered from a congenital speech impediment that, along with preventing him from participating in political oration, prevented him from attending the 1922 Comintern on behalf of the A.B.B.

⁵⁰ Ibid., 163.

addressed racism within the Communist party and established the “Black Belt Thesis.”⁵¹

The efforts of the A.B.B., including Claude McKay’s trip to the 1922 Comintern, constituted “a full-scale protest of white communist leaderships’ failure to recognize black issues.”⁵² Despite A.B.B. efforts, American communist leadership was so entrenched in its racist policies the situation necessitated “outside intervention of the Comintern” to “finally [force] the American party to change direction on race.”⁵³ Working on behalf of the African Blood Brotherhood, Claude McKay prompted Comintern “outside intervention.” In other words, the A.B.B. single handedly reoriented the program of the American Communist party, shifting its perspective from a race-blind international class struggle and forcing the party to embrace the issue of black national liberation. Contrary to the arguments of select scholars who assert that black nationalists were simply absorbed and utilized by the American Communist Party, the African Blood Brotherhood “opened two-way channels between radical Harlem and Soviet Moscow,” allowing for the dynamic development of a black communist program that catered to both the black nationalist liberation effort and the communist proletarian revolution.⁵⁴

⁵¹ Solomon, 42.

⁵² Johanningsmeier, 166.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, 166.

⁵⁴ Solomon, 17. Maxwell, 1. A review of Maxwell’s book by Allison Blakely appearing in *The American Historical Review* (Vol. 105, No. 5, Dec. 2000, p 1763-1764) summarizes his argument concerning the A.B.B. succinctly: “The ‘nation within a nation’ thesis adopted in 1928 may have been a Soviet directive, but it was written under the theoretical tutelage of American radicals: McKay and his comrades in the African Blood Brotherhood.”

Despite deep connections with the American Communist Party, Briggs and the African Blood Brotherhood were, first and foremost, nationalists. Briggs “[addressed] the racial self interest of blacks rather than arguing for an alliance on purely philosophical grounds” by maintaining, throughout the publication of *The Crusader*, an emphasis on purely black, not proletarian, liberation.⁵⁵ While “the adoption of revolutionary socialism by the A.B.B. deeply affected and ultimately transformed the racial views of the emerging [American] Communist Movement,” the consistent, primary goal of the A.B.B. remained “a liberated race in the United States, Africa, and elsewhere.”⁵⁶ George Frederickson’s thesis in *Black Liberation: A Complete History of Black Ideologies in the United States and South Africa* aptly describes Briggs’s utilitarian approach to Communism. Frederickson proposes that, globally, “the Communist Party...adopted various strains of Marxist thought and praxis to fit particular social and political circumstances.”⁵⁷ Briggs assumed the same utilitarian mindset in his interactions with the Communist Party, constantly searching for methods to exploit its resources to promote global black liberation.

While *The Crusader* increasingly promoted a Communist program throughout 1920 and 1921, its nationalistic roots persisted. Briggs’s flagship philosophy “Africa for the Africans,” which called for the establishment of a strong African free-state to which oppressed blacks could migrate and pursue self-determination, appeared in *The Crusader* no less than five times from November 1919 to the end of

⁵⁵ Hill, “Introduction,” in *The Crusader*, xlv.

⁵⁶ Solomon, 17. Hill, “Introduction,” in *The Crusader*, l xvii.

⁵⁷ Johanningsmeier, 156.

publication.⁵⁸ Furthermore, the theory evolved into a complex analysis of the global position of Africans. While the first issue of *The Crusader*, which introduced the concept of “Africa for the Africans” in its very first article, simply called for the establishment of the African free-state, issue 35 of the publication (published in July of 1921) outlined a nuanced understanding of how to execute Briggs’s plan.⁵⁹ This plan called for the global liberation of labor, which would have disconnected capitalists from the means of production and ownership of capital. With capitalists’ source of capital eliminated, global imperialism would have ceased, resulting in the emancipation of colonized Africans everywhere and creating the conditions for a viable African free state.⁶⁰ This evolved iteration of Briggs’s “Africa for the Africans” philosophy demonstrates both his successful union of black nationalism and communism, and his commitment to a “race first” policy of ‘black over red.’⁶¹

Further, the constitution of the African Blood Brotherhood maintained its commitment to “a liberated race” through various iterations of its official programs.⁶² In both 1920 (preunion with the United Communist party) and 1922 (postunion with the United Communist party), the African Blood Brotherhood mandated “a liberated race,” “absolute race equality,” “the fostering of race pride,” and “organized and uncompromising opposition to the Ku Klux Klan.”⁶³ Even in its 1922 mandate for the unification of labor, the A.B.B.

⁵⁸ Briggs, *The Crusader*, 517, 870, 905-906, 1193-1194, 1242-1243.

⁵⁹ Briggs, *The Crusader*, 1173.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*

⁶¹ Briggs, *The Crusader*, 477.

⁶² Hill, “Appendix: A Comparison of the Programs of the African Blood Brotherhood 1920 and 1922,” in *The Crusader*, lxxvii.

⁶³ *Ibid.*

qualified this necessity with the argument that with “the abolition of capitalist states” following the revolution of unified labor, “capitalist-imperialist... exploitation of workers in the colonies” would cease, bringing about the liberation of all colonized peoples.⁶⁴ While the programs and writings of the African Blood Brotherhood and of Cyril Briggs increasingly embraced Communist rhetoric, they remained dedicated to Pan-African Liberation.

Cyril Briggs and the African Blood Brotherhood ultimately provide an example of how one political group can manipulate the platform and resources of another political group to its own ends. From its inception, the A.B.B. remained committed to Briggs’s original fight for global black liberation. Throughout 1920 and 1921, Briggs and the A.B.B. systematically eliminated the threat of Marcus Garvey, a major roadblock to nationalist unification, and secured a mutually beneficial alliance with a blossoming United Communist Party (an alliance designed to promote nationalist unification). In its pursuit of black liberation, the A.B.B. fundamentally altered the Communist Party’s outlook on the race question in America, prompting an embrace of a nation-specific, and not global proletarian, program. Briggs was the first black nationalist to fuse his idea with Communism, a relationship that would blossom in the black community throughout the twentieth century and culminate in the American Civil Rights Movement of the 1950s and 1960s. Briggs and the A.B.B. fundamentally changed the course of African American history by pioneering various tactics like radical publication, strategic alliance making, and broad-based union.

⁶⁴ Ibid.

THE MAY 1972 CRISIS

Michael Steven Thomas

Late one Tuesday night in 1972, over 1,500 students stood outside their school's administration building, halting all traffic on one of the busiest roads in the city. The students gathered over the course of the day in an attempt to protest President Nixon's escalation of the Vietnam War and their school's indirect support of the war effort. After it became apparent to city and police leaders that these protesters would not move, officers equipped with riot gear were ordered to break up the assembly. The chaos that followed resembled the violent civil rights demonstrations prevalently found in the Deep South a decade earlier. Police officers shot tear gas and pepper spray into the crowd while protesters fought back with beer bottles and rocks. The police then turned a fire hose on the demonstrators, but they still would not disperse. Officers (and angry civilians claiming to be officers) moved into the crowd, wildly swinging their clubs and arresting anyone within their grasp, forcing the protesters to run in all directions. This was only day one of a three-day protest, and

it did not occur in New York or California. It happened in the small Southern town of Gainesville, home to the University of Florida.

Academic historians have largely overlooked the anti-war movement in Gainesville, Florida. Even the most recent work on the 1960s continues to focus on the most well known cases, like that of Columbia University, University of California Berkeley, and Kent State University. From historians to journalists, most studies follow the tendency to focus on Northern, more traditionally liberal schools. In their emphasis on Northern protests, historians imply that these demonstrations are exclusive to the North, denying appropriate recognition to Southern schools that participated in violent protests. In his book *The Seventies; The Great Shift in American Culture, Society, and Politics*, historian Bruce Schulman, for example, delivers a meticulous analysis of the turbulent events of the 1970s. Despite its thorough coverage of American politics, Schulman's work fails to make any mention of Southern college protests; he merely cites the "hippies and student radicals" that protested in New York.¹ While the events that transpired at institutions like Berkeley and Kent State certainly influenced the anti-war movement, our understanding of the era's student demonstrations is incomplete without investigating the countless examples of anti-war riots and protests in the South that remain absent from any scholarly critique. Gainesville's demonstrations provide one

Michael Steven Thomas is a senior majoring in history. This summer he received the Daniel J. Koleos Undergraduate Research Award to continue thesis research on protest movements within the Southern United States. After graduation, he plans to attend law school with the eventual goal of becoming an educator.

¹ Bruce J. Schulman, *The Seventies; The Great Shift in American Culture, Society, and Politics* (Cambridge, Mass.: Da Capo Press, 2001), 39.

such example. The size of the anti-war movement in Gainesville, Florida, challenges the contemporary notion that major Vietnam War protests occurred primarily in Northern liberal schools, further adding to our understanding of the anti-war movement as a whole.

Though working toward a similar goal, Gainesville's anti-war movement was far different in composition than the movements of the North. In 1972, the University of Florida's student body was unquestionably "Southern." According to state enrollment records of the same year, 21,730 of the 23,570 students enrolled were Florida residents.² Also unlike Berkeley and other schools noted for their anti-war protests, there was almost no clear political consensus among the student body or the community surrounding the University of Florida. While the Vietnam War was at the forefront of American politics, not everyone took sides simply for or against the war. Many students opposed the war itself but also disagreed with the demonstrations, while others were entirely apathetic to the situation. Despite support from various faculty members and other leaders on campus, the anti-war movement also struggled to gain support off campus from the more conservative Alachua County residents. Editorials in the *Gainesville Sun* and the campus-based *Florida Alligator* condemned any sort of protest as the unpatriotic work of ungrateful hippies. This mixture of public support

² Office of the Board of Regents, "Florida and Non-Florida on-Campus Enrollment in Florida's Colleges and Universities," *Enrollment in Florida's Institutions of Higher Learning*, Tallahassee, 1972, pg. 18, P.K. Yonge Library of Florida History in the Department of Special Collections and Area Studies, George A. Smathers Libraries, University of Florida, <http://ufdc.ufl.edu/AM00000211/00016/26j?search=enrollment+%3dflorida%27s+%3dinstitutions+%3dhigher+%3dlearning> (Accessed June 6, 2012)

and dissent contributed to the overall chaos and disorganization of the May 1972 crisis.

The anti-war movement in Gainesville lacked any sort of cohesion before the 1970s. Like many schools across the nation, the movement gained new life after the National Guard opened fire upon demonstrators protesting at Kent State University in 1970. Led by Michael Gannon, Chaplain of the St. Augustine Catholic Student Center at Gainesville and history professor at the University of Florida, students marched peacefully through campus, stopping to protest in front of the Reserve Officer Training Corp (ROTC) building and on the lawn of the university president's house, eventually ending at Tigert Hall, the school's administration building.³ Protesters declared that 6,000 students attended, while police reports stated that only 3,000 did.⁴ At the time of the protest, the University of Florida had barely 22,000 students enrolled. Even if demonstrators exaggerated their numbers, it is clear that a substantial portion of the student body decided to get involved in what was previously a highly unpopular movement.⁵ This high level of involvement on campus served to legitimize the controversial movement. The "1970 Crisis," as university president Steven C. O'Connell's personal records name it, was the first large-scale protest that the university had ever seen; but by no means would it be the last.⁶

³ Steve Orlando, "A Man for All Seasons," *Florida*, February 24, 2011, available from <http://magazine.ufl.edu/2011/02/michael-gannon> (Accessed June 7, 2012)

⁴ Steve Strung, "3000 UF Students on Strike," *The Florida Alligator*, May 7, 1970, 1.

⁵ Richard Jones to Sam Taylor, letter, May 15, 1972, Records of the University of Florida Office of the Student Body President, Samuel Taylor Papers, Vol. III, Box 8, Special and Area Studies Collections, George A. Smathers Libraries, University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida.

⁶ Report on the May 1970 Crisis, May 1970, University of Florida Office of the Student Body President, Samuel Taylor Papers.

Students remained on the lawn of Tigert Hall demanding that their administration listen to their views. These demands included disarming University of Florida police officers and shutting down the school's ROTC program.⁷ The latter was a common plea from students across the nation, but despite numerous Florida universities reporting large-scale protests against their ROTC buildings, newspapers still focused only on Northern protests.⁸ A report by United Press International on the ROTC protests failed to mention even one school in the South.⁹

The University of Florida's ROTC program continued to be the main target of Gainesville's anti-war movement. After National Guardsmen gunned down demonstrators during a protest on May 4, 1970 at Kent State University, demonstrators made many feeble attempts to show their displeasure with the ROTC program, even going as far as cursing the dates of ROTC members at a protest outside the military ball.¹⁰ In a letter to the editor, student Susi Eckdahl attacked the military-ball protest for its lack of taste and purpose and conveyed her disgust at the foul language and derogatory comments of the protesters to the women attending the ball. She also criticized the leader of Gainesville's Vietnam Veterans Against the War (VVAW), Scott Camil, the individual seen as the leader of the Gainesville anti-war movement and the person who had organized the military-ball protest.¹¹ Camil had enrolled as a

⁷ Ron Sachs, "UF Students Protest Kent State Incident." *The Florida Alligator*, May 7, 1970, 1.

⁸ "FSU-USF Protests Reflect Concerns." *The Florida Alligator*, May 6, 1970, 3.

⁹ "Students Strike Nationally Against the Deaths," *United Press International*, May 6, 1970, 4.

¹⁰ Eli Moss, "War demonstrators asked to leave Reitz Union," *The Florida Alligator*, May 1, 1972, 1.

¹¹ Susi Eckdahl, "Military Ball," *The Florida Alligator*, May 4, 1972, 9.

student at the University of Florida after fighting in the Vietnam War in the 1960s and would go on to play a large role in orchestrating the protest in 1972.¹²

Eckdahl's letter to the editor illustrated a rising trend not just at the University of Florida, but across the nation. By 1972, the majority of Americans polled were against the war; however, many had also grown tired of the protesting. Despite the unpopularity of the anti-war movement and promises to end the war, Nixon announced on May 8, 1972 that the United States had begun mining North Vietnamese harbors.¹³ The backlash from college students across the nation was swift and explosive, even among those who previously harbored negative sentiments toward the movement. At Berkley, 500 students wreaked havoc upon their local park, while 600 at Columbia did the same on the streets of New York. In Ohio, 2,000 students at Miami University blocked off Main Street, while at the same time 1,500 students at the University of California in Santa Barbara obstructed U.S. 101. In its article covering the nationwide unrest, however, the Associated Press made no reference whatsoever to demonstrations in the South, despite the fact that University of Florida students also blocked off major streets and came out in numbers far exceeding those of Berkley and Columbia.¹⁴

In Gainesville, the morning after Nixon's announcement, students attended class as usual.¹⁵ What started out as just another small

¹² "Camil may avoid conviction due to statute technicality," *The Florida Alligator*, May 9, 1972, 2.

¹³ David Chalmers, *And the Crooked Places Made Straight: the Struggle for Social Change in the 1960's* (Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press, 1991), 126-127.

¹⁴ The Associated Press, "Scattered Campus Protests Follow Nixon's Vietnam Action," *The Gainesville Sun*, May 9, 1972, 2.

¹⁵ Skip Perez, Dave Reddick, and Stacey Bridges, "170 More Arrested UF, Riot Wagon Moves Crowd," *The Gainesville Sun*, May 11, 1972, 1-4.

peace rally in front of the main library on campus would turn into one of the nation's largest demonstrations against the new North Vietnam campaign. Sponsored by the Vietnam Veterans Against the War and the Student Mobilization Committee, around 150 students gathered in front of the school's main library to share their feelings about Nixon's recently unveiled plan. By 1:30P.M., they moved to the lawn of Tigert Hall, the school's administration building, to express their thoughts to University of Florida President Stephen C. O'Connell. O'Connell agreed to meet with four student representatives, who demanded that he publicly condemn Nixon's actions and immediately halt all military research at the university. O'Connell rejected both requests.¹⁶

Frustrated with the outcome of their discussion and influenced by the reports of Northern protests, students decided to halt traffic by moving their demonstration onto the nearby Thirteenth Street, the main road in front of the administration building. Within minutes, police arrived to direct traffic around the protest, while student government president Sam Taylor pleaded in vain for his student body to disperse. When this failed to make a difference, Police Chief Nolan Freeman demanded that the students vacate the streets, threatening severe consequences to anyone who remained behind. Instead, the crowd grew larger.¹⁷ With traffic piling up, Chief Nolan decided it was time to act. At 3:30P.M., he ordered firemen to spray the group of nearly 1,000 protesters with fire hoses. Still, the crowd continued to grow. Chief

¹⁶ "Summary of Disturbance on May 9-10, 1972," Administrative Policy Records of the University of Florida Office of the President, Stephen C. O'Connell papers, Special and Area Studies Collections, George A. Smathers Libraries, UF.

¹⁷ Bridges and Reddick, "200 Arrested here in Antiwar Protest." *The Gainesville Sun*, May 10, 1972, 1.

Nolan then ordered his men to fire tear gas into the demonstration, throwing Thirteenth Street even further into chaos.¹⁸

Determined to keep his city under control, Gainesville Mayor Richard Jones met with Taylor, Camil, and O'Connell. Mayor Jones agreed to allow the protesters to continue with demonstration, providing they would clear the streets by 6:30P.M. Unfortunately for Jones, his deal fell through as soon as word of the negotiations spread among the students. Feeling betrayed by Camil for the agreement he made, demonstrators began to move north toward the busy intersection of University Avenue and Thirteenth Street. For the next two hours, police and protesters fought up and down Thirteenth Street until the city of Gainesville decided to temporarily give up the street in front of Tigert.¹⁹ At 8P.M., however, Chief Freeman decided that it was time to clear the streets again. Allegedly for the safety of the protesters, Freeman declared the after-dark protest an unlawful assembly and demanded that everyone vacate the area. Protesters were given until 9P.M. to leave, but the students defiantly held their ground. The *Florida Alligator* reported that 150 police officers were present, while *The Gainesville Sun* reported sixty or so. At 9:05P.M., the police moved in and violently cleared the street, arresting as many as they could. In return, protesters did all they could to resist arrest, battling officers throughout the main streets of Gainesville.²⁰

¹⁸ "Summary of Disturbance on May 9-10, 1972," Administrative Policy Records.

¹⁹ Alligator Staff, "UF Hit by 2nd Night of Unrest," *The Florida Alligator*, May 11, 1972, 1.

²⁰ Bridges and Reddick, "200 Arrested here in Antiwar Protest," 2.

By now it was 10 p.m., and over 2,000 students had gathered onto the street.²¹ This time, police fired a stronger chemical, pepper fog, into the crowd. The battle raged on between the police and the protesters. Many threw bottles and rocks, some even used slingshots to hurl objects at the authorities. But by midnight, the streets appeared empty. Over 200 students were arrested, most for unlawful assembly or resisting arrest, and their bond was set at \$502 each. Many students did not have the money so they remained in jail that night.²²

Like many of the famous protesters before them at Berkeley and Columbia, University of Florida students continued their demonstrations into the next day. In the morning, fire broke out in one of the university classroom buildings, causing over \$7,500 in damage. Fearing further mayhem, Camil partnered up with Gannon to organize a peaceful march across campus, but only 200 students attended. Before long, students gathered onto the street in front of Tigert Hall just as they had the day before.²³ In an attempt to avoid another night of violence, police allowed students to hold their position and spent the entire afternoon diverting traffic around the protest. But their patience wore thin when protesters decided to move their assembly downtown. Anticipating another clash with the authorities, students created a barricade around themselves from stolen bike racks and park benches.²⁴

At 10P.M., the police struck with full force. The neighboring Marion County sheriff's office brought in its riot wagon to smash

²¹ Alligator Staff, "UF Hit by 2nd Night of Unrest," 1.

²² Jim Spinks, "Tuesday Night's Protest Nets 219 Arrests, 18 Injured," *TheFlorida Alligator*, May 11, 1972, 10.

²³ Alligator Staff, "UF Hit by 2nd Night of Unrest," 1.

²⁴ "Summary of Disturbance on May 9-10, 1972," Administrative Policy Records.

through the barricade. The wagon shot tear gas from a mounted turret on its roof and lobbed canisters of gas from all sides. Unlike the previous night, protesters scattered as soon as the police moved in. Angered by how many demonstrators had escaped the night before, Gainesville Police Department brought in a helicopter with search lights to illuminate those attempting to flee.²⁵ Police chased protesters through neighborhoods and across campus, arresting over 160.²⁶ The events that transpired on the first two nights of protest in Gainesville mirrored those across the nation in terms of number of participants and clashes with the law, further discrediting the notion of an inherently conservative, obedient student-body South.

Fortunately for the city, the third night of protests brought no violence. A crowd of over 450 sat on the sidewalk in front of Tigert Hall, banging cans on the ground and shouting at cars as they drove by. In complete contrast to the previous two nights, the third protest carried with it a festive air. Protesters joked with the police officers who were present. People passed guitars around singing protest songs. Supporters of the movement brought their friends beer and donuts from the local Krispie Kreme. The violence had finally come to an end in Gainesville, but the chaos was far from over. In the wake of the demonstration, hundreds of reports of police brutality and press censorship flooded the newspapers for weeks to come.²⁷

²⁵ Perez, Reddick, and Bridges, "170 More Arrested UF, Riot Wagon Moves Crowd," 1-4.

²⁶ Jeffrey White, "Place Apartments Stormed, Gassed," *The Florida Alligator*, May 11, 1972, 2.

²⁷ Wendy Snyder, "Peace Breaks Out Thursday Night," *The Florida Alligator*, May 12, 1972, 2.

Having been at the scene on the first night of protests, *Gainesville Sun* reporter Dave Reddick observed firsthand the severity of the demonstration. In his article in the following day's paper, titled "Don't Resist," Reddick detailed the violence directed at him by the city's police. Reddick claimed that he was hit by an officer while he observed another officer drag a protester by his hair onto the bus of arrested citizens.²⁸ Once inside the bus, Reddick witnessed a policeman drag a pregnant woman by her hair and throw her onto the bus with him. She told him that she fainted after being beaten by an officer that she observed striking a young student. After regaining consciousness, the officer allegedly asked her if "the first time wasn't enough" while another policeman grabbed her by the neck, and threw her down.²⁹ Corroborating the incident, a picture appeared the next day in *The Gainesville Sun* showing a pregnant woman being carried off by police. Police Chief Freeman argued in the next day's paper that he received reports of Reddick violently participating in the protest and resisting arrest. When asked where he got this information, the police chief claimed that he "didn't remember."³⁰

Altogether, five journalists were arrested.³¹ Several reporters, students, and even Father Gannon reported seeing men who claimed to be undercover police beat protesters and then leave them in the streets without even arresting them.³² One student complained of police

²⁸ Reddick, "Don't Resist," *The Gainesville Sun*, May 10, 1972, 1

²⁹ Ibid.

³⁰ Doris Grimage, "Police Chief Criticizes Reporter Arrest Story," *The Gainesville Sun*, May 12, 1972, 10A.

³¹ Perez, "Newsmen tell of being arrested," *The Gainesville Sun*, May 10, 1972.

³² White, "Students Report Beating by Non-uniformed Persons," *The Florida Alligator*, May 11, 1972, 6.

shooting tear gas into his apartment during a birthday party. Police saw lights on in his residence late at night and thought he had protesters hiding inside.³³ Another student in the same apartment complex was arrested outside his building when he stepped outside for a cigarette break after a long night of studying with his roommates.³⁴ The riots left Gainesville with over \$40,000 worth of damage.³⁵ For a month after the demonstrations, President O'Connell was bombarded with letters from angry parents expressing their outrage and concern regarding the violent events in Gainesville. Ever the politician, he wrote back to each parent sympathizing with their concerns and promising an official investigation of each complaint. The University of Florida has no record of any investigation taking place.³⁶ O'Connell, who was at the time accused of censoring *The Florida Alligator*, would go on to praise both the police's efforts and tactics in a private letter to Chief Freeman.³⁷

Throughout the month of May, in every Gainesville newspaper, article after article criticized the protest. It is here that one sees the opinions of those other than the doves and hawks: a third group of people supported the anti-war movement's goals but disagreed with its tactics.³⁸ News anchors and politicians chastised protesters for lacking a realistic set of goals and leadership, but despite their strong opposition of the anti-war movement, these anti-protesters were not entirely correct in their

³³ Spinks, "Tuesday Night's Protest Nets 219 Arrests, 18 Injured," 10.

³⁴ Brad Steen, "More Brutality," *The Florida Alligator*, May 11, 1972, 9.

³⁵ "Report on Expenses by the City During the Disturbances at the University of Florida," Administrative Policy Records.

³⁶ "Letter from Stephen C. O'Connell to Parents," Administrative Policy Records.

³⁷ "Letter to Police Chief Freeman from Stephen C. O'Connell," Administrative Policy Records.

³⁸ Comer Knight and Matt Grossberg, "Disillusioned," *The Florida Alligator*, May 12, 1972, 9.

accusations. The anti-war protesters did in fact have a clear goal and purpose for their protest, but they suffered from the same problem that plagued the entire anti-war movement across America: They did not focus on their outer appearance, and did a poor job conveying their message to the people they were trying to reach. Protesters claimed that the purpose of the protest was to inconvenience the citizens of Gainesville so they would think of all the people inconveniently losing their lives in the war.³⁹ Instead, they merely annoyed drivers who found themselves stuck in traffic detours around the demonstrations.

Despite such a strong antagonism toward the protesters and the sheer amount of violence and damage that these protests brought about in Gainesville, the riots received surprisingly little attention from scholars. The amount of damage, hysteria, police resistance and brutality that these protests caused proves that the anti-war movement in Gainesville was no less legitimate than those occurring in the North. Perhaps after nearly two decades of civil disobedience, albeit over different issues, the American public had largely grown tired of organized protests.⁴⁰ Additionally, over this period of twenty years, the South struggled with civil rights, earning the region a reputation for intolerance. Less than a decade before in the adjacent state of Alabama, African Americans had faced violence as they pursued equal treatment under the law.⁴¹ Even at the University of Florida, African Americans undergraduates were only

³⁹ Bridges and Reddick, "200 Arrested here in Antiwar Protest," 2A.

⁴⁰ Melvin Small, *Antiwarriors; The Vietnam War And The Battle For American's Hearts and Minds* (Willmington: Scholarly Resources Inc., 2002), 52-64.

⁴¹ U.S. Census of Population and Housing (1990). "Birmingham's Population, 1880-2000". Birmingham (Alabama) Public Library. Archived on January 21, 2008.

granted access to the institution ten years prior to the protests.⁴² Because American history teaches only this portion of Southern history in the 1950s and 60s, it is hard for to imagine large liberal factions existing in the South. Essentially, these events are missing from history because they do not fit with contemporary view of the region.

The events that occurred between May 9 and 11, 1972, in Gainesville set a precedent for the city and the university. Today, Gainesville is still one of the more liberal towns in the South, ripe with dissent in every decade following the Kent State Massacre. But no demonstration has ever been as large, or nearly as violent as the Vietnam protests. Perhaps the biggest impact that these events had lies in what they teach about the history of the South. The University of Florida was not a lone oasis of liberalism in the South, as all of Florida's major college towns experienced massive demonstrations as well. Florida simply was not as inherently conservative as history would lead one to believe, nor were its colleges purely liberal. The demonstrations at the University of Florida were a struggle between a multitude of different ideals, and only through a thorough understanding of these events may we better understand ourselves as a society.

⁴² "1948-1974: Post War Expansion," UF Timeline: 150 Years of History at UF, <http://www.ufl.edu/about-uf/history/1948-1974/>. Accessed June 7, 2012.

BOOK REVIEWS

ANDREW S. CURRAN. *THE ANATOMY OF BLACKNESS: SCIENCE AND SLAVERY IN AN AGE OF ENLIGHTENMENT*. BALTIMORE, M: JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY PRESS, 2011.

Reviewed by Sarah Goodwin

Reducing the eighteenth century to its barest thread, this period that straddles the early modern and the modern is synonymous with the Age of Enlightenment and the power of knowledge over superstition. *The Anatomy of Blackness*, by Andrew Curran, places the subject matter within the Scientific Revolution and its application during the Age of Exploration. For the sake of reason, the argument over “who is human” required more “scientific” evidence as the European worldview shifted dramatically to accommodate the black race. This study of racial ideas draws upon three main sources: travelogues (or early ethnographies), naturalists’ and anatomists’ papers, and the philosophical discussion of slavery. Curran’s three narratives correspond with each of these: first,

Curran addresses the early identification of the problem of blackness; next, the advantages of whiteness; and, finally, the fundamental shift from a justification of slavery based on ambiguous notions to later using researched “proof.”

Anatomy is better classified under European history instead of African, which could be expected at first glance. Curran does not give a voice to those in chattel slavery, nor does he go into topics such as the Haitian revolution. Specifically, he deconstructs the perspective of French Enlightenment travelers, consciously limiting himself to his area of expertise. His goal is to layer or “textualize” the emerging definition of blackness. As Europeans defined others, they crystallized their own identity.

The first chapter, which condenses roughly three hundred years of detailed travelogues, is notably successful. Rather than present a clear portrait, these essays describe an episodic and fragmented story of Africa, an evolving “mosaic” without any stereotype. This would come later, once these anecdotes became second-hand knowledge—an example of Enlightenment thinkers’ habit of exceeding their own empirical notions.

Often overlooked, the work of eighteenth-century anatomists led to the removal of religious rhetoric from the problems of “difference.” The departure from the myth of Ham, the account that one of Noah’s sons was literally darkened as a form of punishment, created a web of assumptions and subsequent justifications. As the stereotypes evolved, so did the theories. The concept of race was not firmly established until the mid-eighteenth century. Comte de Buffon, the pioneering French naturalist, is principally responsible for ejecting the Biblical explanations

from monogenetic theory. Logically, the next question scientists addressed resembles the nature vs. nurture debate. They dissected layers of skin, compared blood, brains, and semen. Following that, the issue was whether the original man was white or black. Lacking a concept of natural selection, Europeans naturally saw blackness as a degenerate feature, all the more prominent in warmer climates. This was part of a tier-like ranking created by Euro-centric scientists. To develop the points further, Curran examines how each of these answers affected the pro- and anti-slavery camps. As the last chapter in the narrative, this complex analysis comes off as muddled and tiring.

To add another note about the organization of *Anatomy*, the chapters are in chronological order, held together by loosely defined themes. This allows a certain amount of flexibility and continuity within the historical narrative. Nevertheless, with the chosen structure, before getting to the final chapter on the “Natural History of Slavery,” the main points are repetitious. Yes, the chronology is helpful, but when the zoological approach has already been examined, and the monogenetic/polygenetic argument has already been outlined, the new evidence that is presented quickly gets lost. For example, this happens with the *nègre blanc*--African albinos. This is one of the most intriguing topics in the entire book because it intersects with “what is monstrous.” This condition was interpreted for the underlying superiority of whiteness—humankind reverted to whiteness. Curran scatters this topic throughout the parts. Picking up a paragraph or section here and there leaves the argument disjointed. These cases would be better served with a chapter of their own.

Even with that said, Curran effectively demonstrates that each of these Enlightenment intellectuals held much more complicated ideas than what is remembered today. This is how the liberal ideology was able to accommodate slavery—the need to compartmentalize, coupled with natural history. In addition, he acknowledges the difference between anti-slavery and racism. Curran’s approach to intellectual history is an exciting one that transcends the oft-written biographies and other author-centered discussions. His focus on trends and his immersion in the writings of the time creates an accurate rather than anachronistic mindset, which is truly useful for historians.

Sarah Goodwin is an undergraduate student in history.

VERONIKA FUECHTNER. *BERLIN PSYCHOANALYTIC: PSYCHOANALYSIS AND CULTURE IN WEIMAR REPUBLIC GERMANY AND BEYOND*. BERKELEY: UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA PRESS, 2011.

Reviewed by Anthony Sabatini

The renowned Dada artist and psychoanalyst Richard Huelsenbeck barely escaped imprisonment in Germany at the hands of the Nazis in 1936 when the Gestapo did not realize that Huelsenbeck the “degenerate” Dada artist and Huelsenbeck the practicing physician were one and the same person. Huelsenbeck’s adventure is an interesting example Fuechtner uses in her book to discuss the cultural phenomenon she dubs the “Berlin Psychoanalytic.”

Much more than just a formal history of the Berlin Psychoanalytic Institute (BPI), Fuechtner's book is the first comprehensive treatment of an often overlooked early movement in the history of psychoanalysis, focusing on the broad inter-war culture in which it manifested. The analysts and artists that distinguished the institute from its conception in 1920 until its unfortunate transformation into the Nazi-sanctioned Göring Institute in 1936 have remained understudied as a unique and cohesive group until now. With the goal of framing the organization and placing it alongside more well-known modernist movements such as the London Bloomsbury group and the Paris surrealists, Fuechtner centers in on the aspect of the group that distinguishes it most from other early centers in psychoanalysis: its social and political intent.

While questioning the parameters of classical Freudian analysis, the eight highlighted thinkers were in endless dialogue with most of the literature and politics that define Weimar culture, and Fuechtner does a good job of giving insight into those lost conversations. Many of the most radical ideas concerning sexuality and politics were entertained by those associated with the Institute. Well known analysts such as Karen Horney, Georg Groddeck, and Ernst Simmel all contributed to the advent of Neo-Freudian thinking by exploring new issues concerning culture, religion, and gender in psychoanalysis and literature.

In addition to the historical research exploring the various dialogues between the analysts in Berlin and elsewhere, Fuechtner offers new readings of landmark modernist works of the period, such as Alfred Doblin's *Berlin Alexanderplatz* and Heinrich Mann's *The Subject*. It is fascinating to read about this rarely covered historical phenomenon and

the literature that emerged from it, which is full of unexplored ideas from a group of thinkers who seem to have been waiting to be discovered. Among these iconoclastic writers and analysts who were the first to transgress the distinctions between science, art, and literature, the novelist and analyst Alfred Doblin and the Dada artist and analyst Richard Huelsenbeck stand out as the most interesting historical characters. Doblin's original mixture of literature and psychoanalysis are explored in the first chapter. In his many novels and case analyses, such as *Two Girlfriends Commit Murder*, Doblin's model of "fictional psychology" blended the lines between science and literature. He struggled to define what could be meant by a "psychoanalytic novel," and believed that literature should be able to shape psychoanalysis. Huelsenbeck, in the chapter entitled "Berlin Dada and Psychoanalysis in New York," emerges as a pivotal figure in the history of the Berlin Dada. He appears in the text as the most historically neglected of the figures. His insights into the nature of the Dada movement and its affinity with psychoanalysis are instructive and contemporary in tone. His unique blends of Jungian and Existential versions of psychoanalysis were driven by his Dadaistic background.

A clear aim in the book is Fuechtner's plea to have psychoanalytic and literary texts read not as separate genres, but as texts similar in strategies and concerns. Through the implementation of the writings of these artist-analysts, she shows us how. She defines her subject of study as "a cultural practice" and seeks to show how that practice took shape over time. The first two chapters take place in the formative years of the institute in Germany, while the third and fourth deal with the Berlin Psychoanalytic's influence abroad. This book will

open up research into a little explored chapter in the cultural history of psychoanalysis and also the historical moments of World War I and Weimar Republic Berlin. The literary and political testaments of the Berlin Psychoanalytic offer revealing reading for anyone unfamiliar with the vast array of writings that have emerged from psychoanalysis in different contexts and essential reading for all those who seek to understand a crucial group in the history of modernism.

Anthony Sabatini is an undergraduate student in history.

KATHERINE L. JANSEN AND MIRI RUBIN, EDS. *CHARISMA AND RELIGIOUS AUTHORITY: JEWISH, CHRISTIAN, AND MUSLIM PREACHING 1200-1500*. TURNHOUT, BELGIUM: BREPOLS PUBLISHERS, 2010.

Reviewed by Sean Hill

Before this volume's release, most scholarship on medieval preaching had focused on Christianity. The relatively small amount of work on Judaism and Islam had done little in the way of comparing these three preaching traditions. *Charisma and Religious Authority* is most helpful in developing our understanding of medieval preaching (and medieval religion more broadly) beyond the segregated approach to the three religions, which were often in close contact with each other in medieval Europe. The editors frame the essays through Max Weber's concept of charisma as something that endows certain people "with supernatural, superhuman, or at least specifically exceptional powers or qualities" (4) and depends on the leader's relationship with his followers, disciples, or,

in this case, audience. Using this definition, the essays attempt to show how charisma is an essential component in understanding religious identity.

The twelve essays are organized into five sections: charismatic authority, polemics, performance, sacred space, and political change. Among the most critical is Linda Jones's contribution, which details the routinization of performance in Islam that allowed preachers to recall Muhammad's charismatic authority. For example, the preacher might begin an exhortation with 'Oh people (*ayyuha al-nass*)' or 'servants of God (*ubbad Allah*),' and ascend the *minbar* (gilded pulpit) right foot first with a sword or rod in his left hand. All were actions traced back to Muhammad. Imitating these sacred liturgical phrases and motions, while avoiding others, enabled preachers to reaffirm their position as religious leaders.

The useful section on polemics shows how charisma provided access to positions of authority not normally available to women and laypeople. Beverly Kienzle details how Hildegard of Bingen's denunciation of Catharism solidified her anomalous position as a woman with widely recognized religious authority and the sanctioned ability to preach publicly. Conversely, Marc Saperstein's analysis of Jewish sermons in France and Spain shows the breakdown of charismatic authority when audiences did not participate in the preacher's performance, but met him with skepticism and disapproval. The situation was similar in Islam, as Jonathan Berkey shows in his essay on popular preachers who usurped exegetical authority from the *ulama*, the generally accepted group of scholars who interpreted sacred texts. In both cases, the significant effect was that popular preachers had shown

how orthodoxy and heresy, categories problematically applied to medieval Christianity, are all the more inapplicable to Islam and Judaism. The contrast between Hildegard's success and popular preachers' failure emphasizes a unifying theme of these essays: the value of Weber's model in its emphasis on the audience as the central component of charisma.

In this vein, Nirit Debby documents how physical elements of the sermon's performance, such as pulpits located in the lower nave that placed preachers in the same space as the congregation, used the important and even intimate relationship between preacher and audience. Some preachers arranged for passion plays to be performed after the sermon or during the rites of Mass. As preachers made efforts to attract audiences in order to reinforce their charismatic authority, Italian hermits gained reputations for holiness that brought audiences, as George Ferzoco's contribution describes. In the words of Weber's definition, these thirteenth-century Italian hermits provided an escape from "ordinary worldly attachments" (163). Here, Ferzoco expands our definition of preaching since the hermits gained charismatic authority among lay followers largely through personal exhortations rather than official worship services.

The various means by which charisma enhanced religious authority provide a cogent thread for such a broad spread of time and subject material. By using Weber's framework for charisma, the essays illustrates how useful the field of sermon studies can be for theoretical approaches to medieval history. Perhaps the principle historiographic contribution is the integration of Muslim and Jewish sermons to show the numerous functions of religious authority in the Middle Ages. The main

point for improvement might be the incorporation of more scholarship on Judaism and Islam. While its editors describe the volume as unique in its comparative approach to Muslim, Jewish, and Christian preaching, only one essay studies the topic through Judaism and two through Islam.

However, this emphasis on Christianity principally reflects how more attention has been given to and more sources are available on Christian preaching, and is hardly a fault of the editors. In fact, the fruitful works in this volume show the promise that comparative sermon studies have for future scholarship.

Sean Hill is a Masters student in European history.

TIMOTHY JOHNSTON. *BEING SOVIET: IDENTITY, RUMOUR, AND EVERYDAY LIFE UNDER STALIN, 1939-1953*. NEW YORK: OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS, 2011.

Reviewed by Wesley White

In *Being Soviet: Identity, Rumour, and Everyday Life under Stalin, 1939-1953*, Timothy Johnston looks at the latter part of the Stalin era, from the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact of August 1939 until Stalin's death in March of 1953. His goal is to show that, rather than being defined as a collection of competing nationalisms, the peoples of the Soviet Union were actually bound together through what Johnston calls the "Official Soviet Identity," or OSI (xxv).

Through the evaluation of archival documents (internal memos and other bureaucratic miscellany), interviews conducted with Soviet citizens, and newspaper articles from the time, Johnston attempts two

different things: first, he tries to do away with the Foucauldian notion that Soviet citizens were either collaborators with or resisters to the Soviet government's oppression of its citizens. In doing this, Johnston also challenges Sheila Fitzpatrick's idea that engaging in the creation and dissemination of rumors was tantamount to subversion. Using a concept coined by Stephen Kotkin ("tactics of the habitat"), Johnston explores four different ways Soviet citizens related to the regime in their everyday lives: performance, or "speaking Bolshevik"; reappropriation, or "the process by which Soviet citizens rewrote the rhetoric contained within the OSI and used it in a manner not originally intended by the state"; bricolage, or the fusing of "material from both official and unofficial sources to create a composite product" (xxxii-xxxiii pp.); Johnston's final tactic is avoidance of the regime, manifested in activities such as feigning illness, changing jobs, or merely engaging in *blat*, the Soviet economy of favors (xi).

Johnston seeks to change the focus from competing nationalities and the rhetoric that accompanied them. While important in the post-1939 Soviet landscape, the government also "invested great efforts in formulating and promoting a version of Sovietness that was supposed to operate over and above national identities" (xviii), and it is this supranational identity around which Johnston refreshingly chooses to frame his work. How he does this, though, is problematic at times. While he conducts interviews with citizens who experienced the 1939-1953 period, he also draws heavily from the Harvard Interview Project on the Soviet Social System (HIP), a collection of over three hundred interviews conducted between 1949 and 1953 with émigrés from the Soviet Union. While this is an excellent resource, it is also extremely

problematic when trying to define “typical” Soviet attitudes or understanding of a domestic situation or program. The people interviewed by the HIP, while offering valuable insight into the Soviet system, are by their very nature atypical of the Soviet population (especially during this era). Using a group of people who renounced their citizenships to demonstrate how citizenship was understood in the period is a strange choice.

While many Soviet historians find themselves constrained by the binary of resistance and support, Johnston successfully embraces the gray area in which the every-day Soviet lived. However, Johnston simply trades one set of binaries for another. Rather than using his concept of OSI to demonstrate the gradient of acceptance of this new, Johnston chooses to divide them into two camps: those that functioned within this OSI paradigm and those that functioned without. This would be less problematic if Johnston could concretely show the construction and implementation of his OSI. Instead, he all too often seems to assume that either the reader believes in it or finds it unproblematic when he uses the term. Unlike many theories that get bandied about within the field of Soviet historiography (Zubok’s *Revolutionary Imperial Paradigm* comes distinctly to mind), Johnston’s OSI concept is well-taken—its formation and viability simply need to be demonstrated better throughout the text.

Every work has its problems, and there is no such thing as the perfect monograph. Overall, Johnston’s analysis is an excellent addition to Soviet historiography. *Being Soviet* is well researched, clear, and concise. His development of the idea of an overarching Sovietness is especially interesting, considering that he uses not only archival documents, newspapers, and interviews, but also films, plays, and

popular music to support his arguments. Far from simply a top-down history, *Being Soviet* makes its case from a variety of different angles, and would be a welcome addition to the library of anyone interested in the Soviet Union or identity formation.

Wesley White is an undergraduate student in history.

STEPHANIE LEITCH. *MAPPING ETHNOGRAPHY IN EARLY MODERN GERMANY: NEW WORLDS IN PRINT CULTURE*. NEW YORK: PALGRAVE MACMILLAN, 2010.

Reviewed by Matthew Mingus

As historical studies of “space” and “place” have grown more and more prevalent, so too has inquiry into the epistemological origins and development of such concepts. Discovering and studying those underlying cultural constructs that dictate how humanity determines its (various) orientation(s) has become fashionable within academia—and for good reason. Since Immanuel Kant first recognized his transcendental ego, most intellectuals have acknowledged the importance of spatial perception in the shaping of ideas and identity. All too often, however, the most blatantly literary tools through which space is articulated—maps, globes, travel logs, and cosmographies—are overlooked as visual ephemera, rather than as pedagogical and ontological expressions. Stephanie Leitch is deeply interested in reading these very expressions as they were particularly drawn in early modern Germany. To her, illustrations of space played an integral role in bolstering the empirical observations of sixteenth-century explorers. As an art

historian, Leitch is well equipped to deconstruct all manner of carto/cosmographically oriented texts and show how various illustrators worked to systematically organize racial difference, laying the groundwork for both anthropology and ethnography. Using folklore and novel visual techniques, Leitch's chosen artists utilized established cultural classifications to relativize difference and, subsequently, destabilize the social hierarchies and moral absolutism of their day (178-179).

Leitch approaches German visual culture through a series of case studies, each focused on one small piece of her larger argument. The author begins by exploring Hartmann Schedel's *Nuremberg Chronicle* (first published in 1493) as a seminal text in the re-orientation of spatial understanding. It not only depicted fairly accurate representations of thirty-two European cities (clearly emphasizing the humanist disciplines of topography and geography), but also served as one of the first cosmographies to remove Jerusalem from the world's center. Instead, it is Schedel's hometown of Nuremberg that becomes "the logical site from which observation could proceed" (35). A (literally) cartographic shift is consciously made from Jerusalem or, as Leitch puts it, "from pure Christian cosmography" to Nuremberg, "replacing revelation with historiography" (19).

Leitch moves from this point to the early (and awkward) attempts at ethnography. She focuses on an "inversion of civilized effects," namely how the Germans turned the Roman Hercules into Hermann the German and Charlemagne into the folkloric "wild man" (53). Effectively, argues Leitch, visual cues were used to nationalize Roman history (primarily by way of Tacitus's *Germania*). Such a move,

however, soon put Germans in a tricky situation: if they understood their past as one dominated by “wild men” and *ur*-Germans, how were they to react to depictions of freshly discovered races? Leitch answers this by studying the work of Hans Burgkmair, a German woodcut printmaker and painter who worked to categorize the races of the New World, diversifying what had been up to the early sixteenth century a broad field of monotonous and stereotypically represented Indian “Others.” It is Burgkmair, according to Leitch, who first tries to publish the locations of various “races”—who gives us history’s first “ethnographic map” (80). Moreover, it is Burgkmair who works to depict people from the New World within familiar visual tropes, such as triumphal processions, “establishing kinship of these peoples with western traditions” (99).

Leitch also discusses both the re-emergence of the eyewitness as a visual tool and the practice of cannibalism. “Eyewitness” observation having lost its credibility by the early sixteenth century, Jörg Breu began using it as a visual trope, implying “a mobile spectator” in his illustrations of the Islamic world rather than “a perfectly situated omniscient viewer” (112). Building on this implied visual subjectivity and working to encourage the audience to identify with those foreign Others, Breu regularly stresses similarity over difference in his depictions. Rather than draw cannibals as savage, blood-thirsty brutes, for example, Breu’s illustrations largely focus on the technical aspects of cannibalism and portray the practice as a “socially rationalized” form of euthanasia (140).

Leitch concludes by claiming that these constant points of cultural intersection and visual attempts to understand and communicate various New World rituals all had the effect of challenging the political

and religious status-quo of Germany, encouraging pluralism and tolerance. While its heavy use of academic terminology will most likely make it ill-suited for a popular audience, any scholars interested in German history and/or European visual culture will be impressed by not only Leitch's excellent writing, but also by the beautiful illustrations throughout her text. Perhaps the most problematic issue this reviewer had with the book was the absence of a "comprehensive" (as opposed to "selective") bibliography. But otherwise well researched, forceful, and articulate, *Mapping Ethnography in Early Modern Germany* is a wonderful addition to both the history and art history of northern Europe.

Matthew Mingus is a doctoral student in European history.

KATE RAMSEY. *THE SPIRITS AND THE LAW: VODOU AND POWER IN HAITI*. CHICAGO: UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS, 2011.

Reviewed by Erin Zavitz

In the wake of media coverage of the 2010 Haitian earthquake, the word "voodoo" circulated from the columns of the *New York Times* to evangelical talk shows. Voodoo, at minimum, could be blamed for Haiti's underdevelopment and poverty, and, at the extreme, a cause of the earthquake itself. Kate Ramsey's masterful study of the history of Haitian Vodou, or *le vaudoux*, provides a timely response to the misinformed views of American media. While Ramsey specifically examines the evolving meaning(s) of *le vaudoux* from colonial Saint Domingue to twentieth-century Haiti and the relationship between

Voudizan (Vodou practitioners) and the Haitian state, a general aim of the book is to deconstruct “images of Haitian popular religion that have long served as a pretext for denying the Haitian majority full civil capacity and agency” (23). In this social history of law, she successfully weaves together a detailed and well-researched narrative of the complex interaction between popular religion and the state in pre-and post-revolution Haiti.

Ramsey organizes the study around several central historical conjunctures in the development of *Vodou* and the Haitian penal code: the 1791 slave uprising, the Roman Catholic church’s 1896 anti-superstition campaign, the U.S. marine occupation of 1915-1934, and the church’s 1940-41 anti-superstition campaign. In chapter one, she builds to the 1791 uprising and discusses the motivating force of *Vodou* in the slave revolt and Haitian Revolution. She argues that colonial interdictions on popular religious practices under the French *Code Noir* set a precedent for post-revolutionary leaders. The period also introduced competing meanings of *le vaudou*. Ramsey explains, “fascinated commentators employed the term both to index particular sets of religious practices, types of organization, and/or identities, which may or may not have been popularly so designated, and also to gloss a range of practices that participants would likely not have objectified in such a way” (26). Ramsey continues to balance these two threads in later chapters on the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. She contends that penal law in post-revolutionary Haiti, specifically laws against *les sortilèges* (malicious spells/sorcery), became “both an index and force of civilization” (55). While the elite sought to use law to define Haiti as a civilized nation, the peasant majority learned to employ the new laws to

combat malicious magic and, thus, played an integral role in shaping their promulgation. The arrival of the U.S. marines in 1915 marked an increase in enforcement of sorcery prohibitions; however, *Voudizan* maintained resilience in face of the “waves of repression” (155). The final chapter explores conflicting state policies that promoted Haitian folklore as a form of national culture, yet also supported the church’s 1940-41 anti-superstition campaign. This created an opening for Haitians to employ folklore as a popular political tool and challenge the Church’s campaign and the penal code’s prohibitions.

A valuable contribution to the history of Haiti and *Vodou*, Ramsey illuminates the complex relations between law and popular religion and lawmakers and *Vodouizan*. Throughout Haiti’s post-revolutionary history, local Haitians played an integral role in the “promulgation and application” of such laws (249). Moreover, the laws themselves often affirmed the behavior they sought to ban, allowing popular religious practices to continue despite prohibitions. Ramsey’s focus on law provides a bottom-up and top-down view of nineteenth- and twentieth-century Haiti that advances our understanding of the country’s tumultuous development. More generally, her work advances scholarship on popular religion in the African Diaspora, specifically how those in power have denigrated practices to control certain segments of the population.

Erin Zavitz is a doctoral student in Latin American history.

BRUCE E. STEWART. *MOONSHINERS AND PROHIBITIONISTS: THE BATTLE OVER ALCOHOL IN SOUTHERN APPALACHIA*. LEXINGTON, KY.: THE UNIVERSITY PRESS OF KENTUCKY, 2011.
Reviewed by Jennifer A. Lyon

When considering the portrayals of Appalachian society in popular culture, it is no stretch to say that moonshining is a central feature. Be it documentaries featuring infamous characters like Marvin “Popcorn” Sutton, situation comedies like *The Beverly Hillbillies*, or the Discovery Channel’s popular reality series *Moonshiners*, the standard trope of the uneducated, thickly accented, and invariably barefoot distiller is not hard to find. Yet, as historian Bruce E. Stewart demonstrates in *Moonshiners and Prohibitionists*, these stereotypes were the highly contingent result of a prohibition battle waged over two centuries. In charting the evolution of this conflict, Stewart presents fresh insight into the role of moonshine in Appalachian society and the larger narrative of prohibition in the South.

Stewart begins by examining the origins of the “antidistiller movement” in Western North Carolina. Far from being notorious outlaws, alcohol manufacturers were considered respectable, legitimate entrepreneurs throughout the antebellum period. They provided society with a product that was readily consumed in daily diets, for medicinal purposes, at social gatherings, and even in place of water—which was deemed too “low class” to serve in polite company. While temperance organizations did exist, the majority of Appalachians endorsed distilling and saw government interference as both a violation of their

constitutional rights and a threat to local autonomy. These dynamics changed briefly during the Civil War as civilians protested the distilling of crops into liquor amid food shortages and astronomic inflation—indeed, the price of corn increased 3,000% in one mountain community—yet Confederate defeat saw a resurgence of support for moonshiners. As Stewart explains, the swelling of anti-federal government sentiment during Reconstruction created a “golden age” of moonshining in Appalachia. Mountain communities linked the issue of liquor taxation with those of larger Reconstruction policies, and in the process the moonshiner became a symbol of resistance in the face of oppressive government interference.

Yet, the end of Reconstruction also signaled the decline of socially sanctioned distilling. Middle-class Appalachians were eager to participate in the burgeoning market economy, but they saw alcohol production and consumption by poor, rural mountain whites as an obstacle to attracting the necessary industry, outside capital, and railroad expansion. This class-based conflict was further intensified by the negative depictions of the area in national media and writing. To the horror of townspeople, Stewart explains, “illicit distilling became virtually a requirement in descriptive pieces dealing with the mountain region” (155). As this outside scrutiny intensified, urban Appalachians worked to protect their own image by advocating prohibition and distancing themselves from their rural and moonshining counterparts. In doing so they actually helped entrench the “myth” of violent and backward distillers in Appalachia. In the end, this vilification of moonshiners, paired with the changing economy and increased support

for alcohol reform, helped pave the way for the passage of statewide prohibition in 1908.

Criticisms prove few with this text, as Stewart presents a rigorous assessment of the fight over alcohol in nineteenth- and twentieth-century Appalachia. He clearly outlines how the sentiment against distilling changed over time, and how that change related to outside forces including the Civil War, Emancipation, Reconstruction, and industrialization. The book could benefit, however, from a more thorough treatment of the moonshiners themselves. To be sure, Stewart's cast of characters is quite broad and includes reformers, businessmen, federal agents, and politicians among others. Yet one gets a better sense of the motivations and actions of anti-alcohol forces than local manufacturers. This undoubtedly speaks to a paucity of primary sources left by the average moonshiner, yet it would be interesting to hear more from illicit distillers—particularly after the tide of public opinion turned against them in the late-nineteenth century. This caveat aside, *Moonshiners and Prohibitionists* is a well-written and interesting read that would make an excellent addition to graduate seminars and upper-level undergraduate courses.

Jennifer Lyon is a doctoral student in American history.

KATIE SUTTON. *THE MASCULINE WOMAN IN WEIMAR GERMANY*. NEW YORK: BERGHAHN BOOKS, 2011.

Reviewed by Chelsea Jimenez

Disgraced by military defeat in World War I, surviving German soldiers came home to women who embraced a new set of ideals to aspire to in post-war Germany. In *The Masculine Woman in Weimar German*, Katie Sutton analyzes what these ideals were and how they simultaneously contributed to and condemned the increasingly masculine forms of gender expression that women adopted. Sutton scrutinizes the German media's reaction to the changing ideal of womanhood, referencing contemporary magazines, newspapers, and sociological articles. While the mainstream media is the primary focus, Sutton also utilizes subcultural media, such as magazines written by and for lesbians. Focusing on changing fashions, new theories on deviant sexual behavior, and the performative aspect of gender in everyday life as well as film and athletics, Sutton artfully investigates the implications surrounding the emerging female masculinity and what that meant for German gender roles.

For several decades prior to World War I, women had fought for gender equality and according to Sutton, the war itself also contributed to the changing concepts of masculine and feminine and what was attached to those terms. The high number of male war casualties resulted in greater social and financial independence for women. Traditionally masculinized traits, such as intelligence, ambition, and independence became the traits of the ideal woman as well. Sutton addresses the

connection between the idealization of women with masculine traits and the popularization of masculine clothing for women. Her analysis of these changing trends in women's fashion leads to a discussion of how the media encouraged women to aspire to be like men while it also discouraged them from upsetting the set gender hierarchy. Scrutinizing the masculine fashions popular in the 1920s—the tuxedo, the trousers, and the monocle as worn by women—Sutton posits that these had transformative power for women as symbolic representations of their desire for equality with men as well as visual signifiers of some women's same-sex attraction.

Careful not to ignore social context, Sutton frequently mentions the conflicting sociological theories that were developed during this era and the messages the mainstream public received about masculine women through the media. Articles in certain popular magazines condemned masculine women as a threat to the existing social order while others celebrated them for aspiring to be more like men. Sutton argues that while some lamented the masculine woman as being too progressive and subversive, others in the queer subculture feared that idolizing masculinity reinforced heteronormativity. Social theories also varied widely, with some saying that female masculinity was a deviance linked with criminality, and others saying that it was an expression of an inborn urge and therefore should not be demonized.

Analysis of the performative aspect of masculinity is taken further with a thorough examination of the women who performed in male roles on stage. These male roles, known as *Hosenrolle*, were written with the intent of being performed by women and generated little controversy. The public acceptance of and fascination with female-to-

male performers that existed alongside public revulsion of male-to-female performers is, Sutton argues, indicative of the belief that masculinity was something to aspire to while femininity was deemed inferior and demeaning for men. Sutton also presents the argument, though with less evidence, that cross-dressing performers gave the German public a controlled outlet for their anxieties about the changing roles of women.

Sutton ends her analysis by putting Berlin, the urban center on which her study is focused, in the wider German context, comparing female masculinity in an urban setting with how it existed in provincial areas. Sutton's main argument of this chapter, that urban magazines and publications aimed at masculine women provided provincial non-heterosexual women with a means of forming a sense of community and overcoming their isolation, is buried under references to novels and films and occasionally she loses sight of the humanity of the subjects she is studying. While this weakness is pervasive throughout the book, it is particularly pronounced in this chapter.

Sutton's work is strongest in the first three chapters, with solid evidence to support her theories as well as active engagement with her subject to assert its historical significance. She successfully synthesizes anthropological methods of analyzing gender with a historical approach to placing her subject within a specific time and place while analyzing its value to German women's history. *The Masculine Woman in Weimar Germany* is an excellent addition to historical scholarship offering a welcome perspective on an often overlooked subject.

Chelsea Jimenez is an undergraduate student in history.

JOHN THORN. *BASEBALL IN THE GARDEN OF EDEN: THE SECRET HISTORY OF THE EARLY GAME* NEW YORK: SIMON & SCHUSTER, 2011.

Reviewed by Sarah Calise

The Special Base Ball Commission, developed by sporting-goods tycoon Albert Spalding, affirmed in 1908 that the true origins of baseball lay in the “American ingenuity” of Abner Doubleday of Cooperstown, New York, in 1839. Others asserted that baseball originated with Alexander Cartwright of the Knickerbocker Base Ball Club in 1845. Still unsatisfied, some writers continued to believe that baseball was of English origin, similar to a game called rounders. In *Baseball in the Garden of Eden*, sports historian John Thorn reveals the truth behind the early history of one of America’s most beloved games. It is a history that has long been clouded by such creation myths. Thorn navigates tangled webs of evidence (letters, newspapers, diary entries, and documents) to argue that the origins of baseball cannot be attributed to one man, but, rather, that it evolved over centuries from bat-and-ball games played in England and the United States. Furthermore, Thorn offers a fascinating explanation of how the myths were originally created and why they persist in the memory of baseball.

The rise in popularity and organization of baseball in the years following the Civil War stirred a heated debate over its origins. In 1905, a published letter from Abner Graves to a newspaper claimed that Abner Doubleday invented baseball as a five-year-old Graves stood witness. Despite a lack of factual support, the claim appealed to Spalding and the

panel of the Special Base Ball Commission. Thorn theorizes that the commission concluded that Doubleday was the “father of baseball” for two reasons: first, it gave the sport an American birthplace, invoking patriotism; second, Doubleday was once the president of the Theosophical Society, a religious cult in which Spalding was also a member. In perhaps one of the more intriguing sections of the book, Thorn discusses how the self-interested Spalding concocted the Doubleday creation myth in order to “Americanize” the cult of theosophy and to demonstrate its prominence in the future of the country (xiv). Unfortunately for Spalding, the Theosophical Society diminished and the Doubleday myth was practically rejected at inception. Yet, the myth lives on with the help of the National Baseball Hall of Fame, which resides in Cooperstown and continues to be a place of pilgrimage for thousands of devoted fans.

If not Doubleday or Cartwright, then who invented baseball and where did it begin? According to Thorn, one of the earliest sources for “baseball” appears in transcripts from a town meeting in Pittsfield, Massachusetts, in 1791, which disproves both the Doubleday and Cartwright myths by decades. The game was not invented in Pittsfield, however, because the meeting called for a ban on baseball. “It was not a nuisance devised in that year,” Thorn writes, therefore the sport must have been “played for some time before” (56). Thorn suggests that baseball has multiple origins and that it evolved from games such as cricket, town ball, cat, and rounders. Thorn argues that “baseball appears to have sprung up everywhere, like dandelions, and we cannot expect to identify with certainty which of these hardy flowers was truly first.” (57).

Nonetheless, Thorn uncovered a trio of men who were far more influential to baseball's development than Doubleday or Cartwright, but remained largely unrecognized until now. "Alex Cartwright did not set the base paths at ninety feet, the sides at nine men, or the game at nine innings," despite what it is engraved on his Hall of Fame plaque (xv). Instead, William Wheaton codified one of the most decisive set of rules for the Gotham club in 1837, while Daniel Adams determined the base paths at ninety feet, and, in 1857, Louis Fenn Wadsworth decided the game should contain nine innings of play and nine men in the field. Because all of these rules and regulations were vital to the development of the modern game, Thorn focuses on representing these men as the true pioneers of baseball.

Using his nearly thirty years of research, Thorn writes a compelling and distinguished history of baseball's origins. He not only discusses the crucial role of gambling and the media in facilitating the growth of the sport's popularity in the nineteenth century, but he also reveals the crucial role that many African Americans and women played in shaping the game. This book is an essential read for all baseball fans and American history enthusiasts.

Sarah Calise is an undergraduate student in history.

SUBMISSION GUIDELINES

Become a published author in *Alpata*, the award-winning, student-run journal of Phi Alpha Theta History Honors Society's Gamma Eta chapter at the University of Florida. All University of Florida students are invited to submit. All historical papers will be considered.

| Submission | Length |
|----------------------|----------------------|
| Undergraduate Papers | 2,500—4,000 words |
| Graduate Papers | 5,000 words, minimum |
| Book Reviews | 500—750 words |

All submissions must follow the *Chicago Manual of Style* humanities documentation system.

Submit electronically to ufalpata@gmail.com or send three hard copies, each with a cover page containing your contact information, to

Department of History
025 Keene-Flint Hall
PO box 117320
Gainesville FL 32611

To ensure equality in the selection process, do not include your name or contact information anywhere within your submission other than on your contact page.

Visit www.history.ufl.edu/new/alpata.htm to read previous issues of *Alpata*.

intentionally left blank

(back cover)