

CRESCAT SCIENTIA

UTAH VALLEY STATE COLLEGE
JOURNAL OF HISTORY



VOLUME IV
2006

Mailed manuscripts should be sent to: Crescat Scientia c/o Dr. Keith Snedegar, Utah Valley State College Department of History and Political Science, 800 West University Parkway, Orem Utah 84058. Call (801) 863-8487, Fax (801) 863-7013.

Crescat Scientia is an annual publication of the UVSC Department of History and Political Science. Issues are available for distribution during the Spring semester of each academic year. To obtain subscription information or to obtain back copies of Crescat Scientia, please contact the History department.

© 2006 Utah Valley State College Department of History and Political Science. All rights reserved.

General Guidelines for Submission

For students interested in submitting a manuscript for review and possible publication, the following guidelines provide an overview of the requirements. For more specific information, please contact the UVSC History Department or visit the History Department's web page.

To submit a manuscript, provide a complete version of the manuscript with cover sheet. Please note that any desired alterations should be made prior to submission. Editors will check for spelling errors and layout problems, not for substantial revision opportunities. Submissions should be written in accordance with the Turabian style of citation. The cover sheet should have a running head, author's name, permanent street address, email address, and a phone number. The body of your manuscript must have no markers which may identify the author (IE: name, class, professor etc). Submit a hard copy as well as one copy of the paper on disk. The disk version of your paper must be in Microsoft Word®. On a separate sheet of paper, provide a brief biographical sketch of yourself including things such as the degree you are working toward, previous degrees received, future plans (graduate school, work), awards the paper has won, other areas of personal interest, etc.

Please deliver your paper, disk, and biographical information, sealed in a manilla envelope, to the History Department addressed to: "Editor-In-Chief, c/o History Department RE: Academic Journal Submission"

Works submitted must be thematically concentrated in the discipline of history. Length of submissions may be anywhere between five and fifty pages and must not have been previously published.

CRESCAT SCIENTIA

UVSC JOURNAL OF HISTORY

Editor-in-Chief

Tiffany L. Knoell

Assistant Editors

Christopher P. Davey

Rebecca Harris

Ted Memmott

Faculty Advisor

Dr. Keith Snedegar, History Department Chairman

Published annually for the Utah Valley State College Department of History
and Political Science

Office of the Editor-In-Chief

Utah Valley State College, Department of History and Political Science,
800 West University Parkway, MS 185, Orem, Utah 84057

Phone: (801) 863-8487. Fax: (801) 863-7013



Dear Reader,

Crescat Scientia exists to promote student engagement with history. The best way to appreciate history is to become involved with it, to interrogate its artifacts and primary documents, and to attempt an interpretation of its meaning. This journal gives an expressive space to students who have so wrestled with the past.

The fourth issue of Crescat may be a bit slimmer than last year's volume, but contained within it is some of the best student scholarship the UVSC History Program has yet produced. Tiffany Knoell, our Outstanding Student of the Year, has again served as the editor. She and her editorial staff have done a commendable job. Of course the authors deserve full credit for the effort and skill they put into their articles.

Communicating the meaning of the past can be challenging work. Join me in congratulating all who contributed to this journal for taking up this essential endeavor.

And may knowledge grow!

Keith Snedegar
Faculty Advisor



ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This journal is the work of many hands, but it is those behind the scenes who provide the encouragement and support necessary to see such a task come to fruition. The faculty and staff have been instrumental in soliciting the submissions required for the completion of this journal, although there are a few who stepped above and beyond the effort required of them. Special thanks go to Dr. Kathren Brown and Dr. Keith Snedegar. Without their support, this journal would be a much diminished publication.

Thanks also go to those students who stepped forward and submitted their works. Although it is impossible to publish all submissions received, those who make the effort are to be commended and encouraged to continue writing and supporting *Crescat Scientia*.

Finally, the editorial staff has done wonderful work in the reading, selection, and editing of submissions. This journal could not have been published without their support and hard work. They have my gratitude and, more importantly, my respect.

Thank you.



CRESCAT SCIENTIA

UVSC JOURNAL OF HISTORY

VOLUME 4

2006

CONTENTS

Editor's Note	Tiffany L. Knoell	1
The Paper Revolution of the Eastern Block: How Far Has Democracy Progressed?	Tamara Hammond	3
Ulysses S. Grant: The Fighting General	Scott A. Walker	23
The Fates of Lee and Davis	Marty Johnson	45
Humanism: Friend or Foe of the Reformation?	Cindy Brightenburg	61

BIOGRAPHICAL NOTES

Staff85
Authors87



In a time when the fascination with the new seems to supplant interest in the old, one could well ask "Why study history?" There are many well-worn adages about lessons not learned being repeated or about precedent supplying every foundation for the future, but, to me, history is more than either of those. History offers us the opportunities to not only accept what now resides in books and other media as fact, but to also actively participate in the writing of that history.

The selections in this year's journal allow the authors - and the readers - to participate in the creation of history. "The Paper Revolution" is written by a first-hand observer of the fall of Communism in Eastern Europe. "Ulysses S. Grant: The Fighting General" and "The Fates of Lee and Davis" allow views into both sides of the Civil War. "Humanism: Friend or Foe of the Reformation?" examines early Germany during a time of upheaval and looks into the various movements for harmony or discord. And where does the reader fit in? Read these selections and don't be afraid to do your own research. What you find may add to the rich tapestry of the history of our human family.

Tiffany L. Knoell
Editor-In-Chief



THE PAPER REVOLUTION OF THE EASTERN BLOCK: HOW FAR HAS DEMOCRACY PROGRESSED?

TAMARA HAMMOND

This paper will analyze the reasons for the failure of “post Soviet-style capitalism” and its attendant malfunction of democracy during the transition from Communism to free enterprise in Eastern Europe, and specifically in Russia and Bulgaria. The failure of the political and economic systems is evident in their lack of economic growth and inability to provide sufficient material goods for the populations, as well as in the deficiency of political and economic freedom and the presence of widespread corruption in all social strata. Based on the premise that the reproduction of pre-1990 political and economic elites¹ conveys anti-competitive attitudes remaining from the Communist period that obstruct democratization, this paper will argue that the political change in the post-Communist countries is superficial and denies the popularly accepted notion that the development of free enterprise guarantees the growth of democracy.

The fall of Communism occurred quite suddenly and surprisingly in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union, even for the populations of the countries where it took place. Following the fall of the Berlin Wall² in November 1989, the regimes in all European Communist countries collapsed, followed by the disintegration of the Soviet Union in December 1991. Historians and social scientists still try to fully understand the series of events, resulting in a myriad of theories attempting to explain the cause of this significant change. The process of de-Communization varied from country to country and was successful to a different degree in each of the twenty-nine countries that emerged from Communism. Before presenting

¹ The group or part of a group selected or regarded as not only the most powerful, but who also set the power structure by determining their successors in the economic and political arenas of their countries. For the intent of this paper the term refers to regional and national level government officials.

² The wall was built through Berlin in 1961 by Eastern Germans with the help of the Soviet Union as a physical and symbolic barrier between the Communist and capitalist part of Germany and between the Soviet bloc and the Western world.

an analysis of the effects of the political change from Communism to capitalism and democracy, this paper will discuss some of the reasons that led to the collapse of Communism.

One of the main reasons for the collapse of Communism throughout the various nations, was the failure of the socialist economies, all based on the original Soviet system, an ineffective “command economy of state Communism.”³ One of the common characteristics of the separate Communist economies was the lack of free market and therefore the lack of competition, excluding the gray and black markets. Since the government decided what kind of manufactures to provide for the populations, regardless of demand, the systems created significant paucities in production and quality.

While in a free market economy it is accepted that poor service and quality will inevitably run a company out of business; in a government-led Communist economy, low quality was promoted and protected by the government, because any quality different than poor dangerously reflected the “image of the enemy.”⁴ No incentives for good production existed because the rewards for quality work naturally provided by the free market were missing. Salaries were preposterously low and standardized; there was no distinction between a hard-working and a lazy person.⁵ Five-year economic plans, defined and directed by the governments, imposed crude quantitative requirements for production and furthermore led to poor-quality consumer goods. Pressure for achieving plans from the government, bonuses and promotions dependent upon achieving the plan created incentives for producers and supervising bureaucrats to construct false or otherwise misleading reports. As the government policy emphasis was on military products, every other industrial manufacture was notoriously obsolete, inefficient, and distastefully designed. Furthermore, incentives, determined by the great number of potential workers who made the desired quota, led to the hiring of large numbers of unneeded workers. As a result, this over-hiring produced ineffective employees.⁶

3 Martin Harris, “Distinguished Lecture: Anthropology and the Theoretical and Paradigmatic Significance of the Collapse of Soviet and East European Communism,” *American Anthropologist* 94 No. 2 (Jan., 1992): 299.

4 Before 1967 blue jeans were forbidden in Bulgaria (one of the closest satellite countries of the Soviet Union) because of the image association with American West. Even after 1967 the production of blue jeans was a mere caricature of American jeans. After 1976 original U.S. blue jeans were sold occasionally on the black market in Bulgaria. In reference to Western influence, Bulgaria was only slightly ahead of the Soviet Union. In this case, it wasn't until 1980s when the USSR started to see large numbers of imported blue jeans on the black market.

5 There was a popular saying in Bulgaria, “We are pretending to be working, and the government is pretending to be paying us.”

6 The economic loss of ineffective management of business was covered by the government; therefore the leaders or even the workers did not experience the immediate consequences of economic failure.

Despite the failure of the economy in the Communist bloc, government propaganda extolling the successes of the plans was so strong that many people were led to believe that their economies were thriving. The pictures presented by the government media were overly optimistic, as they were based on missing or misreported data. In contrast, the propaganda portrayed the capitalistic West⁷ as “rotten” and “decadent,” often unable to provide the basics for their populations. The only pieces of capitalist reality shown in the news were brutal acts of racial discrimination, poor people in ghettos, and horrific scenes of imperialistic wars.

Another widely spread Communist myth was that the Communists were a majority of people in the Communist countries. Contrary to this belief, statistics showed that Communist party members were only 3.6 percent of the entire population in the Soviet Union in 1956.⁸ This percentage did not go very much up even during the last stage of Communism, the Gorbachev period (1986-1991.) In the first year of Gorbachev’s rule, 1986, the number of persons admitted to candidate membership into the Communist party declined to 663,070 from 667,625 in 1982.⁹ In 1990 alone the Party lost 787,000 members as they were expelled, died, or stopped paying their membership dues.¹⁰ Therefore, by the end of Gorbachev’s term there were 18 million Communist members, versus 240 million non-members in Russia, or 6.9% of the population.¹¹

Western influence¹² penetrated the Iron curtain¹³ and contributed to the change.¹⁴ According to journalist Jolanta Pekacz, Communist authorities were usually ready to subordinate their official ideology to immediate profit by providing Western-style rock music at resorts visited by Western tourists, for example, in Bulgaria and Romania.¹⁵ According to the author, the decrease of repression in the name of state profit led to a hybrid culture and allowed the releasing of films, books and plays unavailable before.¹⁶ However, not everyone had access to the released sources, usually

7 The term is used as a concept of all capitalist countries in Western Europe, the U.S.A, and Japan.

8 Walter S. Hanchett, “Some Observation of Membership Figures of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union,” *The American Political Science Review* 2 No. 4 (Dec., 1958): 1125-1126.

9 Bogdan Harasimow, “The CPSU in Transition from Brezhnev to Gorbachev,” *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 21 No. 2 (Jan., 1988): 256.

10 A. Craig Copetas, *Bear Hunting With the Politburo*. (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1991), 20.

11 *Ibid.*, 20 and 24.

12 The term is used throughout the paper as capitalistic influence.

13 A barrier of secrecy and censorship regarded as isolating the Soviet Union and other countries in its sphere.

14 Jolanta Pekacz, “Did Rock Smash the Wall? The Role of Rock in Political Transition,” *Popular Music* 13 No. 1 (Jan., 1994): 47 - 48.

15 *Ibid.*, 44.

16 *Ibid.*, 45.

they were reserved for Communists positioned high in command.

The creation of a hybrid culture allowed the elites to learn about alternative life styles. Ultimately this led to a desire to abandon the stiff and rigid doctrine of Communism and explore, even embrace capitalism. The ruling oligarchy had money and power, but no goods to buy and no opportunity to play and enjoy its money. In order to achieve this, the oligarchy had to go to the “rotten” West and take advantage of their advanced consumer goods and various entertainments. Communist elites traveled more frequently in the 1980s, in contrast with the regular population, which was restricted from traveling abroad, excluding the Eastern Block countries.

American scholar and journalist A. Craig Copetas described the double standard of the Communist politicians and their repeated visits to the United States in his book *Bear Hunting with the Politburo*. Copetas’ book summarized his three year living and working experience in the Soviet Union during the 1980s that allowed his first hand observation of the transition: “These men and women were perestroika’s¹⁷ account executives, but although they were expert at talking about the results of Gorbachevian democracy, they never once brought with them anyone who was not a member of the Communist Party high command.”¹⁸ Even the less restrictive Soviet politics in the 1980s did not end the heavy and open discrimination against regular citizens. The elites had no intent to expand opportunities for non-elites. While promoting democracy during the Gorbachev rule, the elites were no democratic.

This secret acceptance of the Western life style, officially condemned by the Communist propaganda, created a double standard that is still applied even now, after sixteen years of transition. The present capitalists of Eastern Europe are reproductions of economic and political Communist elites who formerly persecuted anybody even distantly associated with capitalism; however, they had the freedom to destroy most of the evidence of their belonging to the notorious Communist parties. Even the Western democratic press failed to report the essential information about the Soviet elites being members of the Communist Party while promoting them during their visits in the United States. As Copetas put it, “They were all members of the Communist Party – a fact that the networks’ news readers never seemed to touch upon when they lined up the Soviets to speak glowingly of glasnost¹⁹ and perestroika on Sunday morning television.”²⁰

17 Perestroika-a policy of reconstruction, reform of the economic, political, and social system of the USSR, officially initiated by Gorbachev during his term (1986-1991.)

18 Copetas, 230.

19 In contrast with the information eclipse for the masses that dominated the system, glasnost promoted a new Soviet policy of the 1980s: the opportunity to be heard, and the policy of publicly acknowledgement the nation’s social and economic problems and of allowing open discussion of them.

20 Copetas, 230.

It is ironic that the U.S. media failed to grasp the simple fact that the Soviet leaders were endorsing a farce of cosmetic changes in order to gain profit and credibility.

Communist leaders imposed their hypocrisy on East European societies for so long that it became the norm. As Copetas' young Russian partner and entrepreneur Volodya Yakovlev noted, "They [the Soviet people] didn't know how to ask questions because they were never allowed to ask questions."²¹ This type of mentality, indifferent to morally wrong actions was unacceptable in developed democratic societies and obstructed the process of democratization in post-Communist countries. Having encountered Russian people's indifference toward corruption and double standards, which existed at every level of economics and politics, Copetas precisely described this phenomenon in his book. He noted, "I was told that I could never understand the duplicitous nature of a Communist politician, no matter the explanation, because I was an American and easily fooled otherwise."²²

According to the author, the reality of capitalism dictated that no matter how successful people were, if they ruined their reputation, they inevitably lost their economic and political power.²³ Inversely, post-Communist societies accepted passively the glorification of corrupt authorities because of their current status of wealth and power, without outrage and indignation. In post-Communist states with opposition institutions, there was a degree of outrage; however, none expressed the opposition found in traditional democracies. Therefore some young Russians with exceptional opinions like the one of Copetas' business partners, who voiced their opposition to the indifference and conformation of the average population, were impressive and admirable: "Even passively accepting the past was wrong, Yakovlev thought, and he was not going to tolerate the complicity of his generation in keeping the country's tormentors alive under a different name."²⁴ This expression epitomizes the elite reproduction theory and its eroding effect on democracy.

Contrary to the situation in the former Soviet Union, in the Baltic states –Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, as well as Czechoslovakia and Poland– the existence of strong leaders like Landsbergis, Havel, and WałZesa, contributed to the collapse of Communism. Opposition parties such as Solidarity in Poland and its strong hegemony as an opposition movement helped topple the systems. The Pope and the Roman Catholic Church in Poland were also strong enough to challenge the Communist system

21 Ibid., 77.

22 Ibid., 203.

23 Ibid., 268.

24 Copetas, 29.

effectively by offering an alternative spiritual lifestyle. However, even potent opposition did not guarantee democracy later in Poland, Czech Republic, and the Baltic states.

This different background determined the later more successful transition to democracy in these countries compared to the former Soviet republics and their satellite countries such as Bulgaria, Romania, and the former Yugoslavia. In the Soviet Union and its satellites, opposition institutions were very weak due to threats, punishments and the use of the KGB;²⁵ they all created an environment of repression. Therefore, in the USSR the collapse of Communism was initiated and performed by Soviet Communist elites who saw in the political change great opportunities for acquiring new heights of power and prestige for themselves. Thanks to the elites' attraction to the Western lifestyle, previously acquired through their visits to the capitalist West, high echelon Communists concluded that, having absolute political and economic power, they could easily transform their rank into a high level capitalist class through a transition from Communism to capitalism. The elites also took in the consideration the fact that their desire for change coincided with the desire of the regular populations to abandon the unpopular Communist ideology and therefore would not be violently opposed.

Since the change of the regimes in Eastern Europe was driven by the Communist elite, the switch from Communism to capitalism was voluntary for the ruling class.²⁶ Gorbachev initiated the first steps with his famous perestroika and glasnost in Russia.²⁷ A curious, little-known fact emerged from Gorbachev's rule. Despite changes made by the Soviet leader that many in the West and East considered revolutionary, such as agreeing to the reduction of existing nuclear weapons, Gorbachev continued the historical pattern of limiting induction to the Soviet Communist Party; his administration even set a record for expelling members.²⁸ In 1986, 126,000 Communists were expelled from the Party, a rate 1.5 times higher than in 1984.²⁹ This policy contradicted the progressive image of Gorbachev, but foreshadowed the future elite intentions of dividing government property among a decreasing number of high-level Communists. Therefore during the privatization of Russia after 1990, a smaller, more organized Communist oligarchy bought government property and federal

25 KGB - Komitet. gosudarstvenoi bezopasnosti, State Security Committee in the Soviet Union.

26 Anton Steen, "The Question of Legitimacy: Elites and Political Support in Russia," *Europe - Asia Studies* 53 No. 5 (July, 2001): 711.

27 Bohdan Harasymiw, "The CPSU in Transition from Brezhnev to Gorbachev", *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 21 No. 2, (June, 1988): 250.

28 *Ibid.*, 257.

29 Harasymiw, 257.

resources for ridiculously low prices and quickly became rich. As the *Moscow News* reported in 2005, the top ten richest men of Eastern Europe were Russians who owned between 3.2 and 15 billion dollars. Millionaires in Russia also comprised 55 of the top 100 richest Eastern Europeans.³⁰ On *Forbes Magazine's* list of the world's wealthiest people as of May 2005, Russians placed third in the number of billionaires in the world, with 27.³¹

Number one of the 27 Russian billionaires was Michail Khodorovsky, the richest man in Russia before his arrest in October 2003. A former activist in the Young Communist League (Komsomol) of the Soviet Union, Khodorovsky had gained many connections at high levels of government as a young League leader.³² Khodorovsky made his billion dollar fortune almost overnight as he used his connections with the Kremlin to buy a controlling stake in Yukos, then a collection of Soviet-era oil companies, at below market value.³³

Boris Berezovsky was one of Russia's top ten richest people, according to journalist Sabra Ayres, who based her data on the *Forbes Magazine's* list of the world's wealthiest people in May 2005.³⁴ Thanks to his connections in the Kremlin, Berezovsky bought together with Roman Abramovich in 1995, a government oil company, latter renamed Sibneft, for just \$100 million.³⁵ Ironically, in 1992, when the government allowed private citizens to buy state property and resources in Russia, even though the prices were relatively low, the only people capable of stepping forward and bidding at auctions, were individuals who held high leadership positions during Communism and their cronies. Berezovsky took advantage of his elite status.

Roman Abramovich is, at present, the richest person in Russia and number 21 on the *Forbes* list. He is also Vladimir Putin's business and political partner.³⁶ After legitimizing the privatizations of the mid 1990s by buying back Abramovich's stake in Sibneft for \$13 billion in 2005, the government obligated him, in return, to stay in office for another term as a governor of Chukotka.³⁷ Allegedly, Abramovich's family was persecuted by the

30 Dmitry Dokuchaev and Valery Masterov, "Russian Oligarchs Top the List of Eastern Europe's Richest People," *Moscow News*, Sept. 14, 2005.

31 *Ibid.*

32 Yuliya Latynina, "Unknown Pages of Khodorkovsky's Biography," *Sovershenno Sekretno*, August 1999.

33 Sylvia Pfeifer, "In Putin's Pocket? The Russian Oligarch is \$9bn Richer After Selling His Oil Company to the State," *Sunday Telegraph (London)*, 2 Oct., 2005.

34 Sabra Ayres, "A Snapshot of Russia's Richest," *Cox News Service*, 13 May, 2005.

35 Pfeifer, 2005.

36 *Ibid.*

37 Andrew Mueller, "The Guide: Russian Godfathers," *The Guardian (London)*, 3 Dec., 2005, 4-6.

Communist authorities for being wealthy and Jewish, and rose to prominence under suspicious circumstances.³⁸

Yuri Luzhkov, a mayor of Moscow for 13 years and a billionaire, restored the torn-down statue of KGB founder Felix Dzerzhinsky, in either an open attempt to curry favor with former Lubyanka employee Putin, or in an open gesture of admiration for the infamous institution.³⁹ Luzhkov won re-election three times and accumulated a personal fortune of billions during his terms as mayor of the Russian capital through abuse of his position of power. It is unthinkable that a mayor of any developed democratic capital could profit as immensely from his or her position without being held accountable by his or her constituency.⁴⁰

Vladimir Gusinsky, a former cab driver,⁴¹ was a media magnate with interests in television, radio, and print. At the peak of his power in 2000, Gusinsky was one of the most powerful men in Russia. According to his own words, his television station NTV was confiscated by the Kremlin for being too critical of Putin.⁴² Gusinsky is currently in political exile in Israel and the local police are still investigating his suspected money laundering at Israel's Hapoalim Bank.⁴³ While elite status helped build massive fortunes, ironically, it cannot protect a person from attacks from other elites.

The fates of Khodorovsky, Abramovich, Berezovsky, and Gushinsky contain some common facts: they became abruptly some of the richest people in history with the privatization of state-owned assets and resources of Russia in the 1990s with the help of their Kremlin friends. The second part of the deal was that they, along with other oligarchs, engineered the re-election of Boris Yeltsin in 1996, and the election of his successor, Vladimir Putin, in 2000.⁴⁴ Ironically, now they regard Putin as an "ungrateful protégé,"⁴⁵ because of his persecution of the "Russian Godfathers." Unlike the affable Yeltsin, who was more tolerant of public criticism, Putin realized two crucial facts about many of the oligarchs: they were potentially more powerful than he was, and were not popular among Russian people that were largely poor and resentful.⁴⁶ Some billionaires like Khodorkovsky,

38 David Jones, "Tortured Past of Britain's Richest Man," *Associated Newspapers, Daily Mail (London)*, 22 Oct., 2005.

39 Lubyanka -the location where the former KGB headquarters resided in Moscow. Mueller, 5.

40 Ibid.

41 Before 1989, the only existing mafia units in the Soviet Union comprised of cab drivers and night club bar tenders who openly broke the law, possessing U.S. dollars illegally, because they served foreigners and worked in rapport with KGB. Normally Soviet citizens were not allowed to hold foreign currency and could be arrested for that.

42 Ayres, *Cox News Service*, May, 2005.

43 Mueller, 5.

44 Ibid.

45 Ibid.

46 Ibid., 4.

Berezovsky, and Gusinsky, were Jewish in a significantly anti-Semitic culture, and, even worse, tried to be independent from the Kremlin and Putin. This disrespect provoked Putin's wrath and, as a result, the former KGB agent did what he was best at doing: spying, persecution, and pressing charges for crimes accepted perfectly well before Putin felt threatened.

The authorities arrested Gusinsky in 2000 on charges of embezzlement. Upon his release, the owner of Media-Most, the only independent media corporation in Russia, fled into exile in Israel.⁴⁷ In 2002, Putin pressed fraud charges against Berezovsky, who then fled the country. In 2003, Britain granted Berezovsky political refugee status and a new name - Platon Elenin.⁴⁸ Khodorovsky was the most unfortunate of the "Russian Godfathers": Putin's former KGB colleagues in the now renamed FSB⁴⁹ arrested the oil oligarch in October 2003 on charges of embezzlement and fraud. Khodorovsky is now in prison, facing a possible nine year sentence.⁵⁰

A further investigation into the fate of Soviet and other satellite countries' elites during the post-Communist era is necessary for this analysis. According to East European historians, there are two theories about the destiny of the elite.⁵¹ First is the elite circulation theory. It claims the economic transition resulted in structural changes at the top levels of government and the elites recruited new people for command positions.⁵² Second is the elite reproduction theory. The revolutionary changes did not affect the social composition of elites - the old nomenklatura⁵³ managed to survive and became a new propertied bourgeoisie.⁵⁴ According to journalist Jolanta Pekacz, before the process of privatization officially began, political leaders had abandoned the Communist ideology and were acting in terms of corporate interest, rather than Communist principles, hence new leaders came to power with new elites already formed.⁵⁵ Pekacz's observations confirmed the elite reproduction theory.

47 Mueller, 5.

48 Ibid.

49 FSB-Federal Security Bureau that replaced the infamous KGB after the disintegration of the Soviet Union.

50 Mueller, 5.

51 Ivan Szelenyi and Szonja Szelenyi, "Circulation and Reproduction of Elites during the Postcommunist Transformation of Eastern Europe: Introduction," *Theory and Society* 2 No. 5 (Oct., 1995): 616.

52 Ibid.

53 The ruling, bureaucratic elite of the former Soviet Union made of members of the Communist Party chosen by the party to hold positions of leadership and privilege in government and industry.

54 Pekacz, 44.

55 Ibid.

According to Ivan Szelenyi and Szonja Szelenyi, the dominant view of elites in Eastern Europe among scholars favored the reproduction theory.⁵⁶ The prediction made in 1989, by Hungarian scholar Elemer Hankiss, that the old nomenklatura would become the new capitalists with the marketization of the economy, was confirmed by a cross-national comparative study of elite recruitment in post-Communist Eastern Europe.⁵⁷ A large-scale survey was conducted by an international team of scholars from the U.S. and several Eastern European countries in 1993. The survey, *Social Stratification in Eastern Europe*, included Russia and five other post-Communist countries: Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland, and Slovakia.⁵⁸ The results of the study that showed a high percent of elite reproduction were discussed in an intensive workshop in Hungary in 1993, and published in *Theory and Society* in 1995. According to the authors, around the same time as the Hankiss prediction occurred, a Polish scholar, Jadwiga Staniszkis, began to write about the emergence of a new “political capitalism” that would occur when the former nomenklatura decided to use its political power to gain private wealth.⁵⁹

Hungarian scholar Erzebet Szalai also offered in 1989, an analysis of some Eastern European countries.⁶⁰ Szalai emphasized the theory that Eastern Europe will see the emergence of a new technocratic stratum, opposed the old elite. Szalai contended that younger, educated technocrats who lost faith in socialism were struggling against an old, uneducated post-war elite who gained power through their commitment to the Communist cause. The younger technocrats perceived the concept of a free society as superior because they appreciated the commercial technical achievements of the West. According to journalist A. Craig Copetas, “...unknown to the idealistic young Apple-computer-fed MBAs who filled the cooperative tent, Americans with cash and computers were rare delicacies in the Russian co-op crowd, a dish heretofore eaten only by ranking ministry officials.”⁶¹

Based on the three independent diagnoses of Hankiss, Staniszkis, and Szalai of Eastern Europe, the authors concluded in their article: “while the socioeconomic system changes radically, those at the top of the class structure remained (sic.) the same. In other words, the personnel do not change, only the principles by which they legitimate their authority, power, and privilege are altered.”⁶² The authors adduced a number of

56 Szelenyi and Szelenyi, 617.

57 Ibid.

58 Ibid., 616.

59 Ibid., 617.

60 Szelenyi and Szelenyi, 618.

61 Copetas, 106.

62 Szelenyi and Szelenyi, 617.

statistics to support their conclusion. For example, they compared the data for Russia, Poland and Hungary.

According to their survey, which included 2,000 interviews with political and economic elites and 5,000 randomly selected members of the non-elite population in each country, the ratio of the old economic elite still in power in Russia in 1993 was 94%. For Poland and Hungary, 70% and 48% of the elites respectively were recruited in 1993. Similar data showed the statistics for the reproduction of the political elite: 81.4% was replicated in Russia, 42% in Poland, and 45% of the political elite in Hungary remained active.⁶³

The authors explained the difference in elite reproduction in the three countries with the hypothesis of the existence of a counter-elite in Hungary, and even a larger and better organized counter-elite in Poland.⁶⁴ In Russia, the nomenklatura came from the intelligentsia;⁶⁵ therefore the elites were educated and more likely to be elected in free elections just because of their knowledge and access to the media.⁶⁶ In contrast, in Hungary and Poland a larger percent of the Communist elite came from the working class and peasants, therefore their intelligentsia created the opposition and were more likely to be elected in free elections. Subsequently, elite circulation occurred in Hungary in Poland to a higher degree than in Russia.⁶⁷

There were some other reasons for the prevailing reproduction over circulation of elites in Russia and other post-Communist countries, offered by other scholars such as Michael McFaul, an associate professor of political science at Stanford University. According to McFaul, in some countries such as Poland, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia, the political opposition facilitated the circulation of the Communist elite.⁶⁸ Even though McFaul contrasted the strong opposition of Poland and Hungary to Russia and its post-Communist republics, he still acknowledged the significance of elite-recruitment in Poland and Hungary. He claimed, "Even before the first vote in March 1990, the old Communist Party had already become the new Hungarian Socialist Party, a renaming that occurred in most post-Communist countries when ruling elites realized that their old methods of rule were no longer viable."⁶⁹

63 Szelenyi and Szelenyi, 627.

64 *Ibid.*, 629.

65 The people regarded as, or regarding themselves as the educated and enlightened class. This designation entitled them to a certain status in society and indicated prestige.

66 Szelenyi and Szelenyi, 630.

67 *Ibid.*, 632.

68 Michael McFaul, "The Fourth Wave of Democracy and Dictatorship: Noncooperative Transitions in the Postcommunist World," *World Politics* 54 No. 2 (2002): 219.

69 McFaul, 220.

In Poland, the Pope and a strong Roman Catholic Church challenged the Communist system by offering an alternative lifestyle. This allowed Poland to control reproduction of political elites and led to the lowest percentage of reproduction in 1993. McFaul pointed out that Hungary's last opposition uprising was in 1956, while the last one in Poland was more recent, in 1980-81.⁷⁰ Strong hegemony coming from an opposition party like Solidarity in Poland helped dissolve the system, but ultimately did not significantly contribute to the development of democracy because of the officially prevailing cronyism among the elites. In the first elections in 1989, 35% of the seats of the Sejm⁷¹ were reserved for the Communists and another 30% for their cronies.⁷² Normally not legal in established democracy, these methods were considered to be legitimate in Poland. The Polish elites justified their actions with the claim that they were not Communists anymore; their party had become the "Socialist Party." This manipulation of the truth was popular in most post-Communist countries because of the widespread hostility against Communists. The ruling oligarchy was too complacent and too confident to care what people would think about their renaming farce.

In Russia, there was a lack of organized opposition. This explained the higher percentage of economic elite reproduction in Russia, respectively 25.6% higher than Polish and 49% higher than Hungarian elite recruitment.⁷³ Szelenyi and Szelenyi explained the difference in political elite reproduction among Russia, Poland and Hungary with the specific situation in Russia. A strong church influence such as the Roman Catholic Church in Poland was absent in Russia, as well as democratic conditions before the fall of Communism such as those in Hungary.⁷⁴ Subsequently, the authors reported the highest political elite recruitment in Russia, 52% higher than Polish and 55% higher than Hungarian. According to Szelenyi and Szelenyi, a high degree of elite replication was more likely to occur in countries where the technocracy was co-opted by the nomenklatura, as well as in countries where there was no counter-elite.⁷⁵ Assimilating the technocrats was a common practice for the ruling class during the Communist era. Very often technocrats voluntarily joined the elites in the Party because of the opportunities for status. Post-Soviet Russia exemplified both characteristics, the assimilation of technocracy and lack of counter-elite.

70 Ibid.

71 The Polish Federal Legislature.

72 McFaul, 220.

73 Szelenyi and Szelenyi, 621.

74 Ibid., 629.

75 Ibid., 620.

The subsequent superficial political changes in Russia after 1991 were caused by an entrenched system of corruption, patronage and authoritarianism. The infant democracy that inherited these systems transferred them into the “new” political structure, education, and media still dominated by previous elite. Even with the privatization of the economy, the old elites were reluctant to implement democratic structures below the surface. One obvious reason for this resistance was the elite tradition of exercising unchecked power during their long years of dictatorship.⁷⁶ As Copetas put it, “Perestroika ... was just a temporary assignation the Party was having with the West - a blat⁷⁷ scam on a global scale that was bringing the Big Dogs all kinds of financial and high-tech treats in return for a promise to marry Miss Liberty.”⁷⁸

This phenomenon can be seen in Putin’s increasing power and control over the media that led to censorship and decline in non-government sponsored media.⁷⁹ The Russian president’s former performance in an autocratic organization like the KGB determined his antagonism toward democracy. Putin’s supporters’ current intention to amend the constitution so he can run for a third term is more proof of the survival of an authoritarian mentality.⁸⁰ In an article published in the *Baltimore Sun* in 2005, the author cited Yuliya Latynina, a political commentator, who noted, “I think President Putin will secure a third term simply because this is the authorities’ logic. Power in Russia is in essence authoritarian, and there are no other ways to hand over power.”⁸¹

According to London’s *Times*, in 2005, Russia was rated the fifth most dangerous country in the world in which to be a reporter, after the murder of Paul Klebnikov, a Russian-born U.S. citizen.⁸² The author suggested that the murder happened in response to Klebnikov’s challenging publications. One was a book, titled *Godfather of Kremlin: Boris Berezovsky and the Looting of Russia* and the other was an article in *Forbes Magazine* that contained the first list of Russia’s 100 richest people.⁸³ The death of Klebnikov, among others, demonstrated the failure of democracy in Russia. The elites,

76 In Russia the dictatorship sustained for 74 years, from 1917 to 1991; in Bulgaria for 45 years, from 1944 to 1989.

77 blat - the manipulation of an elaborate system based on bribes, blackmail, graft, and corruption to get things done. (Copetas, 15)

78 Copetas, 71.

79 Sarah Mendelson, “Russia: Moving away from Democracy” *Washington Post*, April 26, 2005.

80 Erika Niedowski, “Despite Legal Limit, Russia Weighs 3rd Term for Putin,” *The Baltimore Sun*, 12 Sept., 2005.

81 Niedowsky, 2005.

82 Jeremy Page, “Rebel Leader ‘Ordered the Murder of Forbes Editor,’” *The Times: London*, 17 June, 2005.

83 Ibid.

accustomed to operating without question, have no issue in violating one of the most fundamental of democratic rights, freedom of speech.

In January 2006, the Glasnost Defense Foundation (GDF) released its annual report on freedom of speech in Russia.⁸⁴ The GDF reported 1,322 press-related incidents in 2005, ranging from arrests of journalists to the cancellation of critical television programs.⁸⁵ These disturbing statistics showed an increase in freedom speech violations from 1,236 incident cases in 2004 and only 1,119 in 2003.⁸⁶ The same author reported a shocking story about Russian popular news anchor Olga Romanova who refused the station manager's order to cut two critical reports from her newscast. In response, Romanova was physically prevented from entering the studio.⁸⁷ According to freelance journalist Alexei Pankin, even worse was the rise of self-imposed censorship, because it was immeasurable.⁸⁸ Facts like these refuted Putin's claim that he had no intention of suppressing media independence and freedom of speech in particular.

The political infrastructure determined the flaws of neo-capitalism in Eastern Europe such as corruption, misinformation, waste of human energy and talent, bureaucracy, and life-threatening environmental hazards.⁸⁹ One of the most negative consequences of the change of the system in Russia was the criminal influence upon the federal government: the mafia controlled the economy, distorted the transition to a free market and ruined the international image of Russia.⁹⁰ Activities such as money laundering through big private businesses like oil and gas fields, banking, hotel chains, and night clubs were constantly practiced in Russia and many other post-Communist countries. Tax exemptions for the privileged class, and embezzlement of state funds made Russia's oligarchs extremely rich. President Putin commented in regard to the case of billionaire Mikhail Khodorovsky recently, "People who in five to six years earned a personal fortune of \$5 billion, \$6 billion, \$7 billion, can't do this without breaking the laws."⁹¹ Ironically, Khodorovsky was a former activist in the Young Communist League of the USSR.⁹² The fact that he wasn't accused of law

84 Alexei Pankin, "Cowering of Your Own Free Will," *Moscow Times*, 31 Jan., 2006.

85 Pankin, 2006.

86 Ibid.

87 Ibid.

88 Ibid.

89 Marvin Harris, "Distinguished Lecture: Anthropology and the theoretical and Paradigmatic Significance of the Collapse of Soviet and East European Communism," *American Anthropologist* 94 No. 2, (June, 1992): 301.

90 Graeme P. Herd, "Russia and the Politics of 'Putinism'," *Journal of Peace Research*, 38, No. 1 (Jan., 2001): 109.

91 Neil Buckley, Isabel Gorst and Arkady Ostrovsky, "Oligarch's Tilt at Politics Crossed Line Set by Putin," *The Irish Times*, 18 May, 2005.

92 Yuliya Latynina, "Unknown Pages of Khodorovsky's Biography," *Sovershenno Secretno*, August 1999.

breaking until he crossed Putin is a proof of the relation between Russian government and mafia.

Because small businesses were forcefully suffocated to ensure the domination of government sanctioned bigger businesses, free enterprise did not necessarily lead to free competition.⁹³ Quasi-legal “insurance companies” mushroomed in the 1990s. They were comprised of mafia members and were racketeering small business owners and even individual car owners.⁹⁴ No business could exist without paying preposterously high “insurances” that were collected by the uniform looking “fat necks”- criminals with baseball bats, known also as “wrestlers.” Their brutal acts became part of the folklore of Russia and Bulgaria and were widely spread through anecdotes, parables, and even on national TV comedy shows. Thousands of newborn businesses were forcefully liquidated in the first five to ten years and remain doomed to failure now.⁹⁵

Even the circulation of elites was not revolutionary; it occurred from the middle to the top; the elites who stepped out of political power, practically retained or even improved their positions.⁹⁶ For example, the first democratically elected Russian President, Boris Yeltsin, emerged from a regional to a national level of former Communist leaders. It was a common principle for the “glasnost” elites not to endorse very familiar faces in high government leadership positions, in order to lead the population to believe that the candidates were not associated with the unpopular Communist oligarchy. According to Szalai’s circulation theory, the bureaucratic fraction of the old Communist elite shifted from top power positions to early retirement or minor but decent jobs, while the ones who replaced them came from the level below, often regional, who would have been promoted in time, even without political change.⁹⁷

An important factor in the varieties of transition to free enterprise is found in the geographic position of the country; proximity to democracies appeared to influence the democratic and capitalist transformation of the population. Dependence of the different post-Communist countries on their geographic location was evident from the study of historians Jeffrey Kopstain and David Reilly.⁹⁸ Proximity from the border to the

93 Alexandra Zlatanova and Siana Sevova, “500 000 Small Businesses Face Bankruptcy,” *Standard*, (3 Oct., 2005); *Internet Available* at <<http://www.dir.bg>>; accessed on Oct. 10, 2005.

94 It was impossible for a random citizen to own and drive an expensive car in Bulgaria in the 1990s without mafia’s permission. If the person did not belong to the privileged nomenclature, he or she was forced to make high monthly payments, approximately 1/5 of the car price, to the “Insurance Company,” or to sign the title over to the racketeers.

95 Zlatanova and Sevova, 2005.

96 The Court of Sofia, Private Firms Section, Transfer of Enterprise Rights, 27 Sept., 2005.

97 Szelenyi and Szelenyi, 636.

98 Jeffrey Kopstain and David A. Reilly, “Geographic Diffusion and the Transition of the Postcommunist World,” *World Politics* 53 No. 1, (Oct., 2000): 27.

non-Communist world determined the level of economic and democratic achievement. The most successful East European countries were the closest to the Western world.⁹⁹

Historian Peter Murrell offered a similar theory in his article "How Far Has the Transition Progressed?" Murrell provided data that explained some of the political and economic outcomes in post-Communist countries in relation to their distance from Vienna, the closest capital of the Western democracies. Comparison between the highest GNP per capita with the two lowest among the post-Communist countries was presented in details in Murrell's article. For example, Slovenia, showing the highest GNP in 1994, 35 % of the of the U.S., and the Czech Republic, second highest, 30.4%, were respectively 177 and 156 miles away from Vienna. In contrast, Tajikistan and Georgia, reporting the lowest GNP, respectively 3.9% and 6.2%, had geographical positions of much more distance: Tajikistan was 2662 miles from Vienna and Georgia was 1450 miles away.¹⁰⁰ Consequently, proximity is important, because the close distance from democratic countries allowed tourism, trade, and more importantly, media saturation.

Murrell also researched the existing level of democratic rights¹⁰¹ and found out that they compared similarly: Slovenia, Czech Republic, and Hungary were graded 92 points out of 100; Bulgaria and Poland - 83 points; Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, and Uzbekistan - 0.¹⁰² The first three countries were immediate neighbors of Austria and West Germany, while the next two were not very distant from the same region. The last three countries were not only thousands of miles away from the Western democracies, but were also part of the Soviet Union before 1991.

Post-Communist countries were experiencing the worst malfunctions of capitalism such as "crime, poverty, drug abuse, commercialism, inequality, and insecurity."¹⁰³ People were frustrated that the glamorous image of the Western world, presented by Hollywood and through contacts with immigrants, was just not materializing. Furthermore, the vast majority of people suffered the losses of free health insurance, government-subsidized housing, and government jobs that required little or no qualifications. Since all the legitimate jobs during Communism were created by the government, a variety of "positions" were formed and awarded even to low

99 Ibid.

100 Peter Murrell, "How Far Has the Transition Progressed?" *The Journal of Economic Perspective* 10 no. 2 (Spring, 1996): 27.

101 According to Murrell, the term evaluates countries on two dimensions: political rights, or the ability of people to participate freely in the political process, and civil liberties, or the freedoms that individuals have to develop views and institutions separate from those of state.

102 Murrell, 27.

103 Tina Rosenberg and Pricila B. Hayner, "The Unfinished Revolution," *Foreign Policy*, No. 115 (summer, 1999): 92.

echelon Communist activists as a common practice. Having only title and salary, these positions were lacking job description and it was not clear what functions were expected from the entitled personnel.

University professors in Eastern Europe viewed changing the educational system as a high priority, as well as a source for cultural, social, and human capital in post-Communist transitions.¹⁰⁴ They suggested using a cultural approach that employed re-education and socialization as a means of changing the old mentality. Post-Communist societies faced the challenge of building new economic structures without establishing a change in the education, mentality and culture that normally occurred first in the developed countries. Therefore, some progressive university professors such as Boyan Biolchev from Sofia University considered changing the education system crucial, because the existing stereotypes led to regression into the old mode of the twentieth century.¹⁰⁵ Unfortunately, it was not popular or dominating view in post-Communist academic circles.

Finally, the Eastern European countries, and Russia specifically, were facing an increasing totalitarianism after 1991. It was not clear in the 1990s whether the post-Communist countries were moving toward Western-style capitalism or into the Third World.¹⁰⁶ A major switch shook up Eastern Europe: the economic structure changed, often abruptly, from centralized government ownership to privatization.¹⁰⁷ Painlessly for the elites and without a shot fired, the former political and economic elites distributed government property among themselves in the post-Communist countries.¹⁰⁸ Although there were conflicts in Romania, Lithuania, Tajikistan, and the former Yugoslavia, the transition in the majority of Communist countries was bloodless.¹⁰⁹ Also, with the exception of Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, and Uzbekistan, where the first secretaries of the Republic's Communist Parties became presidents and free elections never occurred, the rest of the post-Communist countries had more sophisticated and quasi-legal transitions in which Communist elites took efforts to rename their parties and to form and lead oppositions.¹¹⁰

104 Peter Robert, "More Speculations, Fewer Facts on East-Central Europe," *Contemporary Sociology*, 27, No. 4 (July, 1998): 330.

105 Boyan Biolchev, "We Can't Reach Harvard with a Pole Vault," Interview by Radostina Dragostinova, 3 Oct., 2005, *Standard, Sofia Bulgarija*; Internet. Available at <<http://www.dir.bg>>; accessed on Oct., 10, 2005.

106 Szelenyi and Szelenyi, 635.

107 Sofia City Council "Vasil Levski" Financial Department, Registration of Private Company, 1 Jan., 1992.

108 Sofia City Council, Department "Government Property," Contract of Ownership, 2 Feb., 1994.

109 Michael McFaul, 223.

110 *Ibid.*, 220-221.

Post-Communist societies were successfully led to believe that Communism was gone and if there were problems associated with the change, capitalism's imperfections were to blame. The recruited Communist elites justified their own corruption and held responsible the flaws of free enterprise for their failure to provide sufficient living for the population. Applying only the easiest aspects of free market economy that led to high trouble-free profit such as the use of narcotics, prostitution, and crimes, the "new capitalists" claimed that the only alternative was going back to Communism or at least authoritarianism. Naturally, it was not a popular choice, even though many individuals of the pre-war and WWII generation expressed nostalgia for the "old times." Ironically, in November 1994, during the second set of free elections in Bulgaria, the Communists won. Unfortunately, it was not clear whether this victory was due to a falsification of the elections or to people's desperation. In both cases the Communist victory in Bulgaria could be interpreted as elite recycling and fits in Szelenyi and Szelenyi's reproduction theory.

According to historian Anton Steen, in the West political and economic institutions have been adopted over time into the culture and values system.¹¹¹ In contrast, in the post-Communist countries they were imposed in a rather artificial way and to some extent copied from abroad, instead of being developed as a result of internal economic and political growth. Since the government abruptly endorsed the new institutions, the time necessary for any institution to be integrated into the values system of the population was deficient. Therefore, it was not clear whether the political and economic institutions could develop further, or if they would fail completely.

Based on Ronald Inglehart's study of 57 countries, Steen concluded that only the ability to provide economic growth and sufficient material goods gives legitimacy to a regime, regardless of political system.¹¹² Furthermore, Steen suggested that when an economy grows, authoritarian attitudes decline.¹¹³ The author pointed out that Russia demonstrated a high respect for authority and a low GNP per capita at the same time.¹¹⁴ The low income, registered in Russia¹¹⁵ and most post-Communist countries determined that a desperate stage of mind obstructed the development of a free economic and social spirit in society.

111 Anton Steen, "The Question of Legitimacy: Elites and Political Support in Russia," *Europe-Asia Studies*, 53, No. 5 (July, 2001): 714.

112 Ibid.

113 Steen, 714.

114 Ibid.

115 Ibid. Also in 2002 GNP per capita in Russia was estimated \$ 9,700; in Bulgaria- \$6,500. *The World Fact book*, 2004.

Unfortunately, more than seventy years of Communist dictatorship crushed the famous Russian free spirit, glorified by Russian classic poets and writers like Alexander Pushkin, Yuri Lermontov, Leo Tolstoy, and Fodor Dostoevsky, among others. In the 1800s Russian classics left a hallmark in world literature describing the depth of Russian soul and its proud and independent attitude toward life. During the following seventy-four years of Communist dictatorship, this very same famous spirit was defeated through constant human rights deprivation, information eclipse, and isolation. Sadly, the same nation that would rebel against the yoke of tsars, was conquered by the “people’s government.” Pushkin’s Russians, who were ready to die defending their honor, were reduced to disgraceful con-arts.

According to Copetas’ three year surveillance in 1980s post-Soviet Russia, “Dishonesty, in the Western sense, was common business in the Soviet Union. The Russians calculated the morality or immorality of a deal based entirely on what was in [it] for them.”¹¹⁶ The same author described even a more bleak transformation of Russian spirit: “Soviet leaders had shaped the Russians’ anxieties about life into a national, institutional melancholy obliging the people to keep faithful to the Communist Party.”¹¹⁷ Unfortunately, this observation applies to most Eastern European populations. The task of reforming the spirit and mentality, laying in front of the people of the post-Communist countries, is gigantic.

Even though the political changes experienced during the transition period from Communism to capitalism in Eastern Europe could be considered progressive given the fact that dictatorships were terminated, they only brought false hope to the populations of post-Communist countries. The new ersatz capitalist economic system proved unable to provide stability and freedoms, in terms of sufficient economic production as well as proper laws and institutions. Furthermore, the changes were not revolutionary because during the Communist elite/driven transition the elite reproduced itself to a high degree and conveyed corruption and antagonism toward freedom into the new system. Consequently, the economic transformation from government to private ownership did not produce democracy in Russia and other Eastern European countries, because authoritarian stereotypes still dominated in all spheres.

116 Copetas, 112.

117 Copetas, 65.



ULYSSES S. GRANT: THE FIGHTING GENERAL

SCOTT A. WALKER

Ulysses S. Grant was the stand-out junior officer and general for the Union during the Civil War. His victories in the west between 1861 and 1863 were some of the greatest military achievements of the entire war. Grant's capture of fortified Vicksburg, Missouri has been called the greatest campaign and turning point of the war by historians such as Jean Edward Smith.¹ The offensives against Fort Henry and Fort Donelson, planned and executed by Grant, were the first major victories for the Union in 1862. More importantly, they came at time when Union efforts in the east were marred by failure and delay. Grant achieved victory at Shiloh despite being caught off-guard by Confederate forces. These crucial battles in the west set the stage for the final push and ultimate defeat of the Confederacy, for which Ulysses S. Grant was primarily responsible. Grant was successful for two reasons: he fought and he won. He was, by nature, one of the most offensive-minded generals on either side in the Civil War.² Grant's success was a result of his determination, aggressiveness, and uncompromising strategy.

Not all historians have been strong advocates of Grant and his success. William S. McFeely and Clifford Dowdey, in particular, were less than complimentary of Grant's generalship in their respective works *Grant: A Biography* (1981) and *Lee's Last Campaign: The Story of Lee and His Men Against Grant* (1960). More recently, though, staunch defenders of Grant have emerged. For example, Edward H. Bonekemper III, author of *A Victor, Not A Butcher: Ulysses S. Grant's Overlooked Military Genius* (2004), stated that Grant's successes have been seriously slighted and that Grant was the "greatest general" of the Civil War.³ John E. Deppen, a

1 Jean Edward Smith, *Grant* (New York, NY: Simon & Schuster, 2001), 14.

2 William L. Shea and Terrence J. Winschel, *Vicksburg Is The Key* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2003), 33.

3 Edward H. Bonekemper III, *A Victor, Not A Butcher: Ulysses S. Grant's Overlooked Military Genius* (Washington DC: Regnery Publishing, Inc., 2004), xv.

member of the Susquehanna Civil War Round Table, reviewed Bonekemper's work in *The Civil War News* and challenged his claim that Grant's successes have gone overlooked. Deppen proclaimed Bonekemper to be Grant's number one defender, but agrees with his conclusion that Grant was indeed a military genius.⁴

Ulysses S. Grant was both talented and intelligent. He was a gifted organizer and administrator in addition to being an aggressive commander.⁵ Grant's hard line nature caused him, on more than one occasion, to be guilty of underestimating the strength of his opponent. However, his assertiveness was consistent with his military philosophy and the strategic aims of the Union.⁶ Grant clearly defined his strategy when he said, "The art of war is simple enough. Find out where your enemy is. Get at him as soon as you can. Strike him as hard as you can and as often as you can, and keep moving on."⁷ This offensive-minded approach was not shared by most other Union commanders of the time. According to historian James McPherson, Grant's determination and aggressiveness were by no means typical among other Civil War generals, and led to his reputation as the "fighting general" of the Civil War.⁸

Ulysses Simpson Grant was born in Hiram, Ohio, on April 27, 1822. His father, Jesse Root Grant, had high expectations for Ulysses and secured him an appointment to the United States Military Academy at West Point, New York when he was seventeen years old. Grant did not enjoy his four years at West Point. He struggled through most of his training, excelling only in mathematics and horsemanship. Grant summed up his experience at West Point when he said, "A military life had no charms for me, and I had not the faintest idea of staying in the army even if I should be graduated, which I did not expect."⁹ Grant graduated in 1843, and was soon assigned to the 4th Infantry under the command of General Zachary Taylor. As a newly commissioned second lieutenant, Grant made preparations for his first experience with combat during the Mexican-American War. His opportunity came in May of 1846, at the battle of Palo Alto. Taylor commanded a force of about three thousand men with a large number of volunteers

4 John E. Deppen, review of *A Victor, Not A Butcher: Ulysses S. Grant's Overlooked Military Genius*, by Edward Bonekemper III, *The Civil War News*; Internet. Available at <<http://www.civilwarnews.com/reviews/bookreviews.cfm?ID=604>>; accessed on January 9, 2006.

5 Spencer C. Tucker, *Unconditional Surrender: The Capture of Forts Henry and Donelson* (Abilene: McWhiney Foundation Press, 2001), 29.

6 Bonekemper III, xv.

7 Brooks D. Simpson, *Ulysses S. Grant: Triumph Over Adversity, 1822-1865* (New York: Houghton Mifflin, 2000), 458.

8 Bonekemper III, 272.

9 Ulysses S. Grant, *Personal Memoirs of U.S. Grant, vol. I* (New York: The Library of America, 1990), 31.

within the ranks. Mexican troops outnumbered the Americans by nearly four thousand men.¹⁰ As the battle approached, Grant recalled his own fear and concern over what Taylor was thinking. "What General Taylor's feelings were during this suspense I do not know; but for myself, a young second-lieutenant who had never heard a hostile gun before, I felt sorry I had enlisted."¹¹

Considerably outnumbered, Taylor wasted no time giving the order to attack the Mexican soldiers and their defenses. Taylor's infantry, supported by superb artillery fire, advanced on the enemy positions and relentlessly marched forward until the Mexicans began to give way. The following day the Americans renewed the attack until the entire Mexican garrison had either been captured or retreated. Thus, Grant's first exposure to warfare was a daring and successful offensive attack. During the Civil War, Grant followed Taylor's example and found success advancing while outnumbered.¹² The impression left by the experience is evident; Grant later said, "I believe we are bound to beat the Mexicans whenever and wherever we meet them, no matter how large their numbers."¹³ This belief of his own invincibility stayed with him during the Civil War as he engaged the Confederates – he was willing to take the fight to the enemy, putting into practice the tactics learned under Taylor's command.

By August of 1846, Taylor had marched his men to the outskirts of Monterrey, the major city in northeastern Mexico. Grant exhibited particular interest in how Taylor conducted battles.¹⁴ When the attack began on the city, he was not included in the assault as he was serving as a quartermaster. The order was given for the infantry to charge and his curiosity got the better of him. He mounted a horse and rode forward to observe the fighting.¹⁵ Grant was quickly swept into the midst of the battle and ended up taking command of a group of soldiers whose commander had been killed. His example of courage and initiative amidst the chaos of battle would later win him fame during the Civil War. The next day Grant volunteered to carry a message on horseback to General Taylor asking for ammunition to be sent to the front lines. Before leaving, he was well briefed on the danger of the assignment and potential for enemy fire. He readily accepted the assignment and made adjustments to his saddle so he could use the horse as a shield from enemy fire.¹⁶

10 Smith, 47.

11 Grant, 65.

12 At the outset of the campaign against Fort Donelson Grant was outnumbered by about 6,000 men.

13 Richard Bruce Winders, *Mr. Polk's Army: The American Military Experience in the Mexican War* (College Station, Texas A&M University Press, 1997), 186.

14 William S. McFeely, *Grant: A Biography* (New York: Norton & Company, 1981), 33.

15 Grant, 76.

16 *Ibid.*, 78.

Grant served faithfully and benefited from his observations of Taylor's successes. He paid careful attention to the way Taylor conducted himself and how he fought battles. Taylor was never overly concerned with being outnumbered at the outset of an engagement, nor was he concerned with how others would view his decisions. Grant explained, "Taylor saw for himself, and gave orders to meet the emergency without reference to how they would read in history."¹⁷ He saw the importance of courage and decisiveness and also saw that battles could be won or lost based largely on the effectiveness of a commanding officer. Grant proclaimed his admiration of Taylor's leadership style in his memoirs: "No soldier could face either danger or responsibility more calmly than he. These qualities are more rarely found than genius or physical courage."¹⁸ Given his experiences during the Civil War, the most important lesson Grant gleaned from Taylor may have been the approach of always taking the fight to the enemy at every possible occasion.

When the Civil War began in 1861, Grant was living in Illinois. Recognizing that his combat experience thirteen years earlier would be valuable to the Union cause, he applied to the War Department in Washington asking for a command. Receiving no reply from the Secretary of War, Grant was given the rank of colonel by Governor Richard Yates of Illinois. His assignment was to command the 21st Illinois Regiment of volunteers, an untrained, undisciplined group. He spent the following weeks establishing order within the ranks and readying his troops for combat. His efficiency and resolve to prepare his volunteers did not go unnoticed. In May of 1861, before Grant had ever fought a battle, Yates promoted him to brigadier-general of volunteers.

On November 7, 1861, he led his first campaign against a Confederate camp of 2,500 men stationed on the banks of the Mississippi River at Belmont, Missouri. He was ordered by Major General John C. Fremont, commander of the Western Theatre of operations, to drive the rebels in the area back to Arkansas. Grant interpreted his orders to mean the Confederate camp, with all its occupants, should be destroyed or captured. This rephrasing of his orders provides a classic example of Grant's war-long philosophy: conquer the enemy.¹⁹ Fremont later explained his reasons behind the selection of Grant for the assignment:

I believed him to be a man of great activity and promptness in obeying orders without question or hesitation. For that reason I gave General Grant this important command at this critical period. I did not consider him then a great general, for the qualities that led him

¹⁷ Ibid., 95.

¹⁸ Ibid., 69.

¹⁹ Smith, 125.

to success had not had the opportunity for their development. I selected him for qualities I could not then find combined in any other officer, for General Grant was a man of unassuming character, not given to self-elation, of dogged persistence, and of iron will.²⁰

With the aid of two Union gunboats, Grant's three thousand volunteers overran the Confederates causing them to retreat. The untested Union soldiers, surprised by their easy victory, were found pillaging and raiding the abandoned camp rather than giving chase to the Confederates. The driven rebels regrouped and offered a swift counter-attack that forced the Union troops to retreat to the river. Calm and collected, he organized the retreat of his men personally while on horseback. As he had during his experience at Monterey, Grant displayed a tranquil doggedness that saved the day for his regiment.²¹ The brief battle achieved little for the Union, but it gave him valuable combat experience. In his memoirs, Grant stated that the Battle of Belmont instilled a confidence in his troops that did not desert them for the remainder of the war.²²

While more prominent and distinguished Union generals such as George B. McClellan were focusing on Virginia and Robert E. Lee, Grant sensed the importance of gaining control of the western rivers running south into the Confederacy.²³ He had been assigned to the Cairo, Illinois district and, staying true to his developing philosophy of attacking the enemy whenever possible, began surveying the region for Confederate strongholds. Early in 1862, he set his sights on Fort Henry located on the Tennessee River.

Fort Henry had been seized by the rebels and was of great strategic importance. The Tennessee and Cumberland Rivers offered splendid avenues for invasion.²⁴ Grant was aware of this fact. He presented his plan of attack to General Henry W. Halleck for approval, but was rebuffed by Halleck, who considered the idea preposterous.²⁵ Halleck was not a fighting soldier. Long regarded among the Union ranks as a brilliant administrator, Halleck lacked vision and was reluctant to act for fear of failure.²⁶ Determined to see the campaign through and believing in its strategic importance, Grant called upon Flag Officer Andrew Foote of the Union Navy. Here again was another example of Grant's initiative and fortitude.

20 Ibid., 117.

21 Gene Smith, *Lee and Grant: A Dual Biography* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1984), 111.

22 Grant, 185.

23 McFeely, 91.

24 Tucker, 31.

25 J. F. C. Fuller, *The Generalship of Ulysses S. Grant* (London: J. Murray, 1929), 82.

26 James McPherson, *Battle Cry of Freedom* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988), 395.

Foote liked the idea and he and Grant wired Halleck again informing him of the importance of the campaign. Halleck reluctantly approved and the campaign went forward.²⁷

Grant's plan was aggressive. He ordered General C. F. Smith to march a brigade to the western bank of the Tennessee River and overtake the half-finished Fort Heiman. This order was given to prevent any reinforcement of Fort Henry, positioned opposite on the east bank of the river. On the night of February 5, 1862, Smith found the fort abandoned and was ordered by Grant on the 6th to out-flank Fort Henry. Grant then proceeded to accompany his 17,000 men down the river aboard Foote's flotilla of gunboats.²⁸ He intended on a simultaneous land and water attack to prevent the retreat of the Confederate garrison stationed at the fort.²⁹

On February 6, Foote's gunboats opened fire and began a frontal assault that damaged most of the Confederate guns. Under the direction of Grant, General John McClernand took a division of Union troops to the rear of the fort with orders to prevent reinforcements from Fort Donelson, just twelve miles to the east. Confederate Brigadier General Lloyd Tilghman, commanding officer of Fort Henry, sensed the hopelessness of trying to hold the fort and ordered his men to retreat to Fort Donelson. McClernand was alerted to the retreat and ordered his cavalry to give chase. However, wet roads slowed McClernand's progress and prevented his successful capture of the retreating Confederate garrison. By the time Grant arrived on the scene, Fort Henry was under Union control with U.S. colors hoisted on the pole.³⁰ Grant immediately ordered the ironclad *Carondelet*, to destroy the Memphis and Ohio Railroad bridges that crossed the Tennessee River.³¹

John Codman Ropes, one of the first 19th century Civil War historians, proclaimed the importance of the capture of Fort Henry:

The effect of the capture of Fort Henry on the people of the whole country, North and South, was electrical... It was accomplished, too, so suddenly and so unexpectedly that the spirits of the Northern people were elated beyond measure, while those of the people of the South were correspondingly depressed.³²

Grant was pleased with the victory, but did not rest on his laurels. "I informed the department commander of our success at Fort Henry and that on the 8th I would take Fort Donelson."³³ Grant did not have official

27 Grant, 190.

28 Fuller, 84.

29 Tucker, 55.

30 *Ibid.*, 59.

31 Grant, 195.

32 Fuller, 84-85.

33 Grant, 196.

orders to move on Fort Donelson. Understanding, however, the importance of momentum and wanting to continue his offensive success, Grant ordered his men to march east and prepare for another engagement.

Grant's plan to take Fort Donelson was delayed by muddy roads. On the February 14, Flag Officer Foote arrived with his flotilla of ironclads and timberclads by way of the Cumberland River. Grant had asked Foote to come within a reasonable range of the fort and soften its defenses. Meanwhile, he and his 15,000 troops took up positions surrounding the fort and prepared to engage 21,000 entrenched Confederates.³⁴ Although outnumbered by nearly 6,000 men, Grant was convinced that victory belonged to the aggressor.³⁵ Donelson's water batteries did what they were designed to do; Foote's flotilla received considerable damage from Confederate bombardment. Foote's own ship was damaged, his pilot killed in an explosion, and Foote himself received an injury. Grant was informed of the disaster and summoned by Foote to reevaluate the strategy. "When I left the National line to visit Flag-officer Foote I had no idea that there would be any engagement on land unless I brought it on myself."³⁶ Renowned Civil War historian James McPherson wrote that Grant always thought more about what he planned to do to his enemies than what his enemies might do to him. He further stated that this offensive-mindedness eventually won the war.³⁷

While Grant was conferring with Foote, Union forces came under attack. Fort Donelson's commanding officer, Confederate General John B. Floyd, conferred with his subordinates, Generals Pillow and Buckner, about their precarious position as Grant closed in. The three generals settled on an attempted break-out attack to open a path for escape. Buckner received the assignment to stay behind and assist the break-out. Pillow and Floyd led the charge by attacking McClernand's division on the right flank.³⁸ The plan worked initially, catching the Union right flank off-guard. Grant was summoned from his meeting with Foote and quickly reorganized his troops amidst the chaos:

I directed Colonel J[oseph].D. Webster to ride with me and call out to the men as we passed: 'Fill your cartridge-boxes, quick, and get into lines; the enemy is trying to escape and he must not be permitted to do so.' This acted like a charm. The men only wanted some one to give them a command.³⁹

34 Ibid., 198.

35 Bonekemper III, 30.

36 Grant, 204.

37 McPherson, 400.

38 Tucker, 88.

39 Grant, 205.

Savage fighting continued for some hours and Grant's right flank began to give way, allowing for the escape of Pillow and Floyd. Grant immediately ordered General Smith to attack the Confederate center with his entire division, based on his assessment of the the enemy's weakened defenses.⁴⁰ Grant, by this time, was both aggressive and confident in his abilities as a general. He told one of his aids, "The side that attacks first now will be victorious." He then added, "The enemy will have to be in a hurry to get ahead of me."⁴¹

The order worked. The following day, General Buckner of the Confederate States Army sent a letter addressed to Grant to General Smith, asking for terms of capitulation for his troops and the fort. Grant replied the same day, February 16, 1862, with one of his most famous responses of the entire war: "No terms except an unconditional and immediate surrender can be accepted. I propose to move immediately upon your works."⁴² Buckner was incensed by the letter, but replied that he would accept the terms. He realized, as Grant did, that he was incredibly outnumbered by Grant's forces, now reinforced to over 27,000 men.⁴³

The capture of Forts Henry and Donelson were the first great victories of the war for the Union. Grant's unwavering and forceful role in both campaigns cannot be underestimated. By capturing the forts and opening up the river systems leading into the South, Grant had put a dagger into the Confederate left flank.⁴⁴ The North was elated by the news of Grant's victories. Lack of movement and failure by the Army of the Potomac had cast a shadow of doubt on the Union that was diminished by Grant's victories in the west.⁴⁵ Grant was eager to continue his success, and informed General Halleck that unless he heard otherwise, he would march his forces and take Clarksville and Nashville.⁴⁶ He held the opinion that a victory should be immediately followed up with another campaign so as to give the enemy little time to regroup.⁴⁷ Grant followed his own advice during 1864-65 campaigns against Robert E. Lee. However, he was ordered by Halleck to abandon his plan of taking the two cities and wait for further orders. The delay gave the Confederacy time to reinforce its vulnerable positions, and in Grant's opinion, unavoidably prolonged the war.⁴⁸

Halleck's order to stop the offensive and wait for reinforcements revealed a pattern common among Union generals. General George B.

40 Tucker, 94.

41 *Ibid.*, 94.

42 Grant, 208.

43 Tucker, 88.

44 Bonekemper III, 35.

45 McPherson, 403.

46 Grant, 215.

47 *Ibid.*, 214.

48 *Ibid.*, 214.

McClellan, commander of the Army of the Potomac in 1861-62, frequently considered his forces inferior to the Confederates despite the reality of having the greater numbers on his side. During the 1862 Peninsula Campaign, McClellan commanded an army of 100,000 men and still called upon President Lincoln to send more troops before he would renew an offensive against General Robert E. Lee.⁴⁹ Lee's forces were considerably smaller at the time.⁵⁰

Grant was promoted to major-general of volunteers following his river campaign victories. A jealous Halleck sought to reduce the magnitude of Grant's efforts in order to make his own skills appear more developed. He even removed Grant from his command, placing General C. F. Smith above him. However, Smith was involved in a boat accident and Halleck grudgingly placed Grant back in command of the Army of the Tennessee; a decision that significantly affected the final outcome of the war.⁵¹ Grant was ordered to move against a crucial Confederate railroad station at Corinth, Mississippi. Confederate General Albert Sydney Johnston desired to beat Grant to the punch, thus setting the stage for the bloody conflict that came to be known as the Battle of Shiloh.

By March of 1862, Grant had established his camp at Pittsburg Landing, Tennessee, in preparation for his drive south to Corinth. Again he was convinced that the enemy would not attack first and was occupied with the planning of his next campaign.⁵² Grant was instructed by Halleck to construct defensive positions and wait to be reinforced by Don Carlos Buell's army. Meanwhile, General Albert Sydney Johnston had decided to march his 40,000 troops north from Corinth to attack Grant. On April 6, 1862, the attack came near Shiloh Church and caught the Union forces by surprise, still eating their breakfast.

Union Brigadier General William Tecumseh Sherman was in command of the right flank when Johnston's army launched its attack near the log church at Shiloh. The Union soldiers were forced to fall back. Savage fighting ensued and Grant's army spent the rest of the day in a desperate attempt to avoid being swept from the field. By late afternoon, Union troops had established a series of defensive positions with their flanks protected on either side by the surrounding creeks and the Tennessee River.⁵³ Grant was stationed approximately three miles back from the initial fighting, but hurried to the battlefield at the first sound of artillery fire. He

49 George B. McClellan, Letter to Abraham Lincoln on his evacuation from the Peninsula Campaign, July 7, 1862; Internet. Available at <<http://www.law.ou.edu/hist/mcclcl.html>>; accessed on September 13, 2005.

50 McPherson, 526.

51 Tucker, 111.

52 Grant, 223.

53 Bonekemper, 45.

took immediate action in the reorganization and redeployment of his troops. "During the whole of Sunday I was continuously engaged in the passing from one part of the field to another, giving directions to division commanders."⁵⁴ Grant's effectiveness as a military commander was displayed by his attempts to restore order to the field of battle despite being caught off guard. Renowned British general and scholar Sir James Marshall-Cornwall wrote of Grant's efforts at Shiloh: "That Grant succeeded in restoring confidence and the will to resist amid these scenes of panic and disorder is sufficient evidence of his powers of leadership. At no moment did he relax his efforts;"⁵⁵

As the sun set on the first day of battle, the Confederates were forced to stop their offensive. The South suffered the loss of General Albert Sydney Johnston as a result of a wound he received early in the day. Command of the attacking Confederate army fell upon the brash Pierre Gustave T. Beauregard. As night approached, several Confederate commanders considered one final assault on the Union lines. Beauregard refused to authorize the maneuver and the fighting ended. This was the breather Grant needed. Despite sustaining heavy casualties and being pushed back to defensive positions, Grant was eager to move to the offensive and retake the field of battle. Several of Grant's officers advised him to order a general retreat before the Confederates could regroup and attack again in the morning. Grant sternly replied, "Retreat? No. I propose to attack at daylight and whip them."⁵⁶

Lesser generals such as Halleck or Buell may very well have retreated. Historian Jean Edward Smith claimed that if any Union general other than Grant would have been in command that night, the Union army certainly would have retreated.⁵⁷ General Sherman recalled Grant's orders on the night April 6, 1862:

He ordered me to be ready to assume the offensive in the morning, saying that, as he observed at Fort Donelson at the crisis of the battle, both sides seemed defeated, and whoever assumed the offensive was sure to win. General Grant also explained to me that General Buell had reached the bank of the Tennessee River opposite Pittsburg Landing, and was in the act of ferrying his troops across at the time he was speaking to me.⁵⁸

⁵⁴ Grant, 231.

⁵⁵ Sir James Marshall-Cornwall, *Grant: as Military Commander* (New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold Company, 1970), 79.

⁵⁶ McPherson, 410.

⁵⁷ Jean Edward Smith, 204.

⁵⁸ William Tecumseh Sherman, *Memoirs of W.T. Sherman* (New York: The Library of America, 1990), 266.

Grant knew that he could field 25,000 fresh troops by morning with the arrival of Buell. He also understood the importance of moving to the offensive at the first available opportunity, which he now had.

So confident was I before firing had ceased on the 6th that the next day would bring victory to our arms if we could only take the initiative, that I visited each division commander in person before any reinforcements had reached the field. I directed them to throw out heavy lines of skirmishers in the morning as soon as they could see, and push them forward until they found the enemy, following with their entire divisions in supporting distance, and to engage the enemy as soon as found.⁵⁹

Grant's confidence, tenacity, and aggressiveness won the day for the Union. On April 7, the newly reinforced Nationals⁶⁰ pushed Beauregard back over the same ground he had taken and bloodied the previous day. By late afternoon of the second day, the Battle of Shiloh was essentially over; most Confederates were now retreating back to Corinth. Grant had snatched victory from the jaws of defeat.

Union casualties, 1,750, at the Battle of Shiloh exceeded those of any previous battle to this point in the war. However, the Confederate casualty rate was a staggering 50 percent higher.⁶¹ As the war continued, the South found it almost impossible to replenish its forces while sustaining such high casualty rates. This insistence displayed by Grant on the battlefield illustrated his war-time philosophy to find and destroy the enemy. President Abraham Lincoln agreed with Grant, and was quoted as saying, "I can't spare this man; he fights."⁶²

Ulysses S. Grant was the general Lincoln had been waiting for. On November 2, 1862, Lincoln received a letter from his wife, Mary Todd Lincoln, who was living in New York with their children. In the letter, she described some events of daily life in New York, but also mentioned to the president the Northern public's opinion of the war in the east. "Many say, they would almost worship you, if you would put a fighting General, in the place of [George B.] McClellan."⁶³ Grant was Lincoln's "fighting general."

In the fall of 1862, Halleck was summoned to Washington to assume the position of general-in-chief at the War Department. This left Grant in charge of operations in northern Mississippi. Always eager to resume the offensive, he was now making plans for a thrust south to clear out the

⁵⁹ Grant, 234.

⁶⁰ Grant often referred to his own men as Nationals in his memoirs.

⁶¹ Bonekemper III, 56.

⁶² Carl Sandburg, *Abraham Lincoln: The Prairie Years and the War Years, One Volume Edition* (San Diego: Harcourt Inc., 1982), 289.

⁶³ Mary Todd Lincoln, *Letter to Abraham Lincoln, 1862*; Internet. Available at <<http://www.americanpresidents.org/letters/16b.asp>>; accessed on February 23, 2006.

surrounding rebel strongholds at Holly Springs and Grenada. He then planned to move against Jackson, Mississippi, and then on to the Confederate stronghold at Vicksburg. On November 2, Grant informed the War Department that he was preparing the Army of the Tennessee to move. He was pleasantly surprised when General Halleck wired back informing him that reinforcements were on the way and that he fully supported the campaign.⁶⁴

Again Grant's initiative and foresight outshone that of the other Union generals of the time. While Grant was actively preparing to fight, McClellan and Buell displayed nothing but caution.⁶⁵ McClellan had failed to pursue Robert E. Lee following a crucial victory at Antietam. Arguably, a swift chase by McClellan could have drastically changed the war in the east. During this same time period, Buell was relieved of his command of the Army of the Ohio for failing to give chase to Confederate General Braxton Bragg in Kentucky. Grant was a man of action, and in the closing months of 1862 and into 1863, he changed the entire course of the war with his triumph at Vicksburg.

Historian Earl S. Miers proclaimed that few men ever faced such a great opportunity while facing such a great risk as Grant did at the outset of the Vicksburg offensive.⁶⁶ Although the capture of Vicksburg has been called the turning point of the Civil War⁶⁷ it did not come easy for Grant. Vicksburg was the last great Confederate stronghold that blocked Union control and passage on the Mississippi River. Grant himself said of Vicksburg, "So long as it was held by the enemy, the free navigation of the river was prevented."⁶⁸ The city also contained a crucial railroad junction that was used to disperse food and other resources to the eastern side of the Confederacy.⁶⁹ The capture of Vicksburg was essential for the Union to gain complete control of the Mississippi and ultimately the west.

Grant's initial plan was a simultaneous thrust southward, utilizing both the railroad and the river systems. The order was for Sherman to lead his division down the Mississippi while Grant led the Army of the Tennessee along the route of the Mississippi Central Railroad from Grand Junction. The plan was simple. Grant would follow the rail line to Jackson and cut off Vicksburg's supplies while Sherman harassed the northern defenses. Grant hoped that by capturing Jackson, the Confederates would be forced to abandon Vicksburg. Grant's overland march was also a diversionary

64 Jean Edward Smith, 221.

65 Ibid., 221.

66 Earl S. Miers, *The Web of Victory: Grant at Vicksburg* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1984), ix.

67 McPherson, 665.

68 Grant, 283.

69 Bonekemper III, 71.

tactic to allow Sherman more success from the north. If the Confederates chose not to abandon the city, Grant would head west and attack Vicksburg from the south.⁷⁰

The plan seemed simple to Grant, but there was no precedent for what he was attempting to do. Grant was the first commander in history to attempt a sustained offensive in enemy territory dependent entirely on a railroad for logistical support.⁷¹ Natural obstacles were of particular concern. The route south from Grand Junction to Jackson was essentially a wet marshland with several tributaries such as the Tallahatchie, Yazoo, and Yalobusha Rivers heading west to the Mississippi. Grant's army faced the possibility of isolation from communication and supplies. As the campaign commenced, the Confederates did their best to destroy bridges, rip up rail lines, and sever Union communications.

The overland wing of the campaign, for which Grant took personal command, started well. Following the Mississippi Central Railroad line south from Grand Junction, the Army of the Tennessee captured the Confederate-held rail depot at Holly Springs. Union soldiers did not face much opposition because Confederate General John C. Pemberton, commander of the Department of Mississippi, ordered the depot abandoned when he learned of Grant's movements. Pemberton ordered his men to fall back to the fortified works just below the Tallahatchie River. Grant used the abandoned Holly Springs as a supply depot and continued the advance south toward the Tallahatchie.⁷² Whatever kind of stand Pemberton's men thought they were going to make did not last long. Always the aggressor, Grant nimbly outflanked the Confederate army below the Tallahatchie with speed and pushed Pemberton back; the Union suffered limited casualties.⁷³

While Grant and his Army of the Tennessee were preparing for another march south, the Union rear was being decimated. Pemberton ordered a dual cavalry raid of the Union rear while the bulk of his army continued to retreat south. The first raid was led by Nathan Bedford Forrest, accompanied by a small group of cavalrymen. Forrest rode deep into Grant's rear and wrecked several stretches of railroad.⁷⁴ The second cavalry raid was led by Confederate General Earl Van Dorn. Van Dorn took 3,500 cavalry troopers, surrounded the Army of the Tennessee, and captured Grant's supply base at Holly Springs. Van Dorn's men helped themselves to whatever

70 Shea and Terrence, 35-36.

71 Ibid., 36.

72 James R. Arnold, *Grant Wins the War: Decision at Vicksburg* (New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1997), 28.

73 Ibid., 28.

74 Grant, 289.

supplies they could carry and set fire to the rest. These two attacks had a devastating effect on Grant's overland campaign. He was now in a precarious position. His store of supplies and ammunition was now destroyed and he had no way of replenishing them due to Forrest's destruction of the railroad.⁷⁵ Grant was cut off from all communication from the north for over a week; two weeks went by before Union rations were obtained for his army.⁷⁶ Grant later said, "This demonstrated the impossibility of maintaining so long a line of road over which to draw supplies for an army moving in an enemy's country."⁷⁷ Grant called off the advance and headed north to reclaim Holly Springs and rethink his strategy.

Historian William S. McFeely called Grant's leadership into question due to the unfavorable circumstance the Army of the Tennessee was in following the cavalry raids.⁷⁸ Grant admitted the difficulties of relying solely on the railroad for support while in hostile territory. However, he had the luxury of hindsight when he made that statement in his memoirs. At the outset of the campaign, orders were given by Grant to help support the success of the venture. When Holly Springs was taken by the Union, Grant left a 1,500 man garrison behind to guard the supply depot. The garrison commander, Colonel Robert Murphy, was informed of Van Dorn's movements, but failed to make preparations or inform his subordinates.⁷⁹ Grant dismissed Murphy for the gross display of negligence, but the damage had already been done.⁸⁰ Guards and engineers were also positioned at crucial points along the rail line to repair damaged railroad caused by the enemy.⁸¹ Repairing railroad track took time and Grant was isolated in enemy territory. The advance had to be called off.

Meanwhile, the second half of Grant's two-pronged attack continued as planned. General Sherman led 30,000 Union troops down the Mississippi River aboard a flotilla of Union gunboats under the command of Rear Admiral David Dixon Porter. Sherman's destination was the Confederate defenses at Chickasaw Bluffs near the mouth of the Yazoo River, just three miles north of Vicksburg. The defenses at Chickasaw Bluffs were maintained by a single Confederate garrison, but with Grant's retreat in the east, Pemberton ordered 20,000 troops from Vicksburg to reinforce the area. Sherman's men were floating into a trap. Sherman recalled, "The

75 Arnold, 31.

76 Grant, 289.

77 *Ibid.*, 289.

78 McFeely, 126.

79 Grant, 290.

80 Murphy, along with his senior officers, had been drinking the night before the raid.

Murphy completely disregarded Grant's warning that hostile cavalry were in the area of Holly Springs.

81 Shea and Terrence, 36.

rebels held high, commanding ground, and could see every movement of our men and boats, so that the only possible hope of success consisted in celerity and surprise, and General Grant's holding Pemberton's army hard pressed meantime."⁸²

Grant was well aware of the possibility that Sherman's men could not achieve their objective without both legs of the campaign functioning.⁸³ Grant wired the news of Holly Springs to Sherman, but Confederate raiders cut the telegraph lines and Sherman did not hear word until after he had launched his assault on December 28 and 29, 1862.⁸⁴ Sherman's assault was repulsed by the reinforced Confederates and he was forced to retreat.

By late January of 1863, Grant amassed his forces at Milliken's Bend, northwest of Vicksburg on the banks of the Mississippi. He arrived on January 29, and reorganized his command structure in preparation for another advance against Vicksburg. Sherman maintained command of his XV Corps and Grant placed his former engineering officer General James B. McPherson in command of the XVII Corps. Command of the third wing of Grant's army went to Major General John A. McClernand. Grant placed McClernand in charge of the XIII Corps, but incorporated himself and his own men⁸⁵ into the XIII, no doubt to keep an eye on McClernand, who Grant considered to be a "political general."⁸⁶ With a command structure in place, Grant began examining all possible approaches to Vicksburg. The tenacious general had proven that he was insistent, now he had to keep the offensive pressure on Pemberton's men.

The problem Grant faced was getting his men in a reasonable position on the east side of the Mississippi where an attack could be launched.⁸⁷ Pemberton had successfully turned Vicksburg into a fortress. The city occupied the only high ground in the region and heavy artillery batteries were placed on the bluffs surrounding the city to guard against enemy approach.⁸⁸ Earlier in 1862, Farragut's flotilla attempted to bombard Vicksburg's batteries from the south. This proved to be unsuccessful because the Union fleet could not elevate its guns enough to reach the rebel artillery. Grant had to find a way to bypass the Confederate batteries.

82 Sherman, 317.

83 Grant, 289.

84 Sherman, 317.

85 McClernand, a former Illinois congressman, went behind Grant's back and asked Lincoln for a separate command at the outset of the campaign. When Grant learned of this, he wired Halleck asking for clarification. Halleck informed Grant that he had all command over the Vicksburg campaign and everyone in his department.

86 Grant, 294.

87 *Ibid.*, 295.

88 *Ibid.*, 296-297.

Over the next three months, several attempts were made by the Army of the Tennessee to divert, dredge, dig, blow up, and flood the Mississippi and the surrounding waterways. The idea was to dig a series of canals that could accommodate Porter's fleet and bypass Vicksburg's batteries. General Sherman recalled, "The Mississippi River was very high and rising, and we began that system of canals on which we expended so much hard work fruitlessly: first, that canal at Young's plantation, opposite Vicksburg; second, that at Lake Providence; and third, at the Yazoo Pass, leading into the head-waters of the Yazoo River."⁸⁹ Grant continued, "I, myself, never felt great confidence that any of the experiments resorted to would prove to be successful. Nevertheless I was always prepared to take advantage of them in case they did."⁹⁰

The fact that Grant did not stand idle or complain to his superiors about his situation is evidence of his resolve and the quality of his generalship. Grant had his mind set upon a decisive victory from the moment he reached Milliken's Bend.⁹¹ Politically, he understood that he must continue to act, or at least present the appearance of offensiveness during the winter. The elections of 1862 had gone against Lincoln and the Republican Party and General McClellan was scheming in Washington against Grant.⁹² As spring approached, the ground began to dry and the canal projects were abandoned.

Sherman's men had already proven the hazards involved in attacking Vicksburg from the north. Grant determined that the city must be taken from the south. His plan was incredibly risky. Grant marched his men south along the west bank of the Mississippi, presenting no immediate danger. However, for an offensive to succeed, he needed supplies and ammunition. Grant called upon Admiral Porter's fleet to attempt a night running of Vicksburg batteries. If the fleet failed to break through, Grant would again be isolated in enemy territory. The gamble worked. On the night of April 16, three union transports full of supplies steamed down the Mississippi accompanied by eight Union gunboats. The Confederates had prepared for such a maneuver and lit fires on the banks of the river to create light for the batteries.⁹³ Amazingly, all eight gunboats made it through while only one transport was sunk.⁹⁴

The next part of the plan required the Army of the Tennessee to safely cross to the east side of the Mississippi. To divert Pemberton's men from

89 Sherman, 329.

90 Grant, 297.

91 *Ibid.*, 296.

92 Fuller, 132, 136.

93 Grant, 306.

94 McPherson, 627.

this crossing, Grant ordered Colonel Benjamin H. Grierson's cavalry to raid deep into the heart of Mississippi. The raid became one of the most successful Union raids of the entire war. Grierson's 1,700 man cavalry destroyed miles of railroad, captured and killed hundreds of Confederates, and lured Pemberton's attention away from Grant. Strategically, Grierson's raid played a vital role in the Vicksburg campaign.⁹⁵ As another diversionary tactic, Grant ordered Sherman's men to fake another infantry charge near Chickasaw Bluffs while Union artillery pounded Vicksburg's northern defenses. General Sherman described the success of the diversion and the genius behind Grant's order; "This diversion, made with so much pomp and display, therefore completely fulfilled its purpose, by leaving General Grant to contend with a minor force, on landing at Bruinsburg, and afterward at Port Gibson and Grand Gulf."⁹⁶

Grant now had his army on the east bank of the Mississippi, fully supplied, below Vicksburg, and relatively free to move where he pleased. His next goal was to isolate Vicksburg from all possible reinforcement. On May 7, 1863, the Army of the Tennessee began what one historian has described as Grant's "blitzkrieg" through Mississippi.⁹⁷ Grant, accompanied by all three of his corps commanders, raced through the Mississippi countryside and converged on Jackson. Confederate defenders numbered only about 12,000 men and were ultimately overrun by Grant's crushing force. By the afternoon of May 14, the flag of the Fifty-ninth Indiana flew atop the capitol building.⁹⁸ The next day Grant ordered his army to prepare to march back to Vicksburg. Sherman's corps was ordered to stay behind and destroy the railroad, factories, and Confederate property in and around Jackson.⁹⁹ Pemberton's fortress at Vicksburg was now isolated from reinforcement.

To Pemberton's credit he did not wait idly behind the defenses of Vicksburg while Grant was destroying the Mississippi countryside. When Confederate scouts informed Pemberton of Grant's movements, he gathered 23,000 men and marched west to meet the Union troops head on. On May 16, 1863, Grant's forces met up with Pemberton's men who had positioned themselves on a 70-foot mound named Champion's Hill. Grant described the position: "Champion's Hill, where Pemberton had chosen his position to receive us, whether taken by accident or design, was well selected. It is one of the highest points in that section, and commanded all the ground in range."¹⁰⁰ Union Major General A. J. Smith encountered the

95 *Ibid.*, 628.

96 Sherman, 345.

97 Arnold, 126.

98 *Ibid.*, 141.

99 Bonekemper III, 105.

100 Grant, 342.

first Confederate pickets and fighting began that morning. Always preferring to be in direct control of a battle, Grant rode to the front in earnest at the first sound of gunfire and took charge.¹⁰¹

Offensiveness was in Grant's nature, and Champion's Hill was no exception. Grant ordered General Alvin P. Hovey to storm straight up the hill with his two brigades. Hovey's men gallantly reached the top of the hill, causing the Confederate front line to give way. At the crest, Union brigades were met by Confederate artillery and a newly reinforced Confederate division from Vicksburg. Hovey's men were forced to fall back, but Pemberton's fortunes were short lived. Grant personally rallied his fleeing soldiers and ordered two brigades to fill the hole.¹⁰² The end came for Pemberton when McClernand's men slammed into the Confederate right flank, causing the worn Confederates to scramble. Pemberton ordered a general retreat, but confusion caused by scores of advancing Union soldiers aided in the capture of hundreds of Confederates.¹⁰³

Grant's casualties were 2,457 men killed, wounded, or missing at the battle of Champion's Hill. More devastating for Pemberton's Army of Vicksburg was his 4,300 casualties.¹⁰⁴ The whole of the Confederacy was stunned by the defeat at Champion's Hill.¹⁰⁵ Pemberton had held the high ground at the outset of the engagement, but Grant's aggressiveness and determination had won the day yet again. Grant wanted the Confederates pursued and an end brought to the war along the Mississippi.¹⁰⁶ Pemberton, however, hastened his retreat until his men were safely behind his defenses at Vicksburg.¹⁰⁷ Grant now faced the reality of a full frontal assault against the fortified city of Vicksburg.

On the 19th, Grant ordered a frontal assault. He believed that Pemberton's men were demoralized and would not put up much of a fight.¹⁰⁸ The Army of Vicksburg still possessed plenty of determination and the assault was repulsed.¹⁰⁹ That night, Grant called his corps commanders together and the four of them resolved on another all-out assault on May 22, 1863. Grant described the attack as a gallant, unified effort where his men succeeded in most areas to overtake Confederate entrenchments.¹¹⁰ Grant's men were still unable to penetrate Vicksburg's defenses and get

101 Ibid., 342.

102 Shea and Terrence, 135.

103 Ibid., 136.

104 Captain Frederick Phisterer, *Statistical Record of the Armies of the United States* (Carlisle: John Kallmann, Publishers, 1996), 215.

105 Shea and Terrence, 138.

106 Miers, 200.

107 Grant, 349.

108 Ibid., 354.

109 Miers, 204.

110 Grant, 355.

inside the city. The two frontal assaults were costly for the Union, but characteristic of the “fighting general’s” offensive style. Finally, after two failed attempts, Grant and his subordinates decided on a siege of the city.

Preferring to take the city by a show of force, Grant settled on a siege and recalled that the investment at Vicksburg was now complete.¹¹¹ Union gunboats held the rivers and blocked all access to the city by water. Railroads and communication had been severed and the Army of the Tennessee stood between Pemberton and any hope of reinforcement. Grant’s men went to work creating a horseshoe defensive line and used artillery to keep the pressure on Pemberton as well. Grant said, “As long as we could hold our position the enemy was limited in supplies of food, men and munitions of war to what they had on hand. These could not last always.”¹¹² Pemberton’s supplies diminished; by June his men were on the brink of starvation. Grant, meanwhile, had ordered the construction of defenses and fortifications to protect his men from possible attack from east.

Pemberton’s last chance for escape was reduced to the possibility of an attack on Grant’s rear by General Joseph E. Johnston. If Johnston could have drawn Grant away from the city, then Pemberton’s men might have escaped the siege. This was not to be as Johnston decided not to attack when he witnessed the Union fortifications. In Johnston’s narrative on the war he said:

Reconnaissances, to which the 2d, 3d, and 4th of July (sic) were devoted, convinced me that no attack upon the Federal position, north of the railroad, was practicable. They confirmed the previous reports of our scouts, that the besieging army was covered by a line of field-works, extending from the railroad-bridge to the Yazoo; that the roads leading to this line had all been obstructed with felled trees, and that strong bodies of Federal infantry and cavalry observed and guarded the river.¹¹³

Grant said that he was strong enough to take on Johnston, but was pleased when he decided not to attack preferring to continue the siege against Vicksburg.¹¹⁴ However, Grant was growing restless and considered storming the city again if the enemy did not give up by July 6.¹¹⁵ Grant ordered his men to plant mines all around the city in preparation for another assault. On July 1, the Confederates raised a white flag. Three days later, July 4, 1863, a grudging and impolite Pemberton surrendered

111 Ibid., 357.

112 Ibid., 357.

113 General Joseph E. Johnston, *Narrative of Military Operations during the Civil War* (New York: Da Capo Press, Inc., 1959), 203.

114 Ibid., 368.

115 Arnold, 293.

his 29,491 men to Grant and the Army of the Tennessee and ended the forty-seven day siege and the near eight-month campaign against Vicksburg.

Grant's doggedness, determination, and offensive-minded strategy cannot be underestimated in the Vicksburg campaign or in the previous western campaigns discussed. In an offensive campaign without precedent, Grant succeeded in inflicting over 47,000 casualties, while taking only 10,484 for the Union.¹¹⁶ He successfully opened up the Mississippi River to the Union and, more importantly, drove a wedge into the Confederacy. Sherman said it best when he said:

The value of the capture of Vicksburg, however, was not measured by the list of prisoners, guns, and small-arms, but by the fact that its possession secured the navigation of the great central river of the continent, bisected fatally the Southern Confederacy, and set the armies which had been used in its conquest free for other purposes...ours was [an] offensive in the highest acceptance of the term...¹¹⁷

Some historians such as William S. McFeely have underestimated Grant's success. McFeely called the Vicksburg campaign "long" and "clumsy."¹¹⁸ He remains in the minority, as most historians proclaim Grant's effort at Vicksburg to be an act of military genius and determination.¹¹⁹ Following Vicksburg, Lincoln was heard in Washington referring to Grant as his "fighting general." Indeed, Grant proved that he was. Grant had outshone his fellow Union generals with a determined and successful offensive campaign. Sherman later described the genius of Grant:

The campaign of Vicksburg, in its conception and execution, belonged exclusively to General Grant, not only in the great whole, but in the thousands of its details. I still retain many of his letters and notes, all in his own handwriting, prescribing the routes of march for divisions and detachments, specifying even the amount of food and tools to be carried along...for no commanding general of an army ever gave more of his personal attention to details, or wrote so many of his own orders, reports, and letters, as General Grant. His success at Vicksburg justly gave him great fame at home and abroad.¹²⁰

116 Phisterer, 215.

117 Sherman, 359.

118 McFeely, 131.

119 Grant's military genius has been proclaimed by many historians. Some notables are listed: James R. Arnold, J.F.C. Fuller, Sir James Marshall-Cornwall, James McPherson, Earl S. Miers, and Jean Edward Smith.

120 Sherman, 359.

Grant was given a promotion from a General in the volunteer army to Major General in the regular army and went on to command the entire Union Army, bringing an end to the war in April, 1865. His talent for strategy seldom failed him and helped to secure victory for the Union. He was, in every respect, the “fighting general” of the Civil War.



THE FATES OF LEE AND DAVIS

MARTY JOHNSON

After returning from an arduous prison sentence of nearly two years, a weary Jefferson Davis met with the always-elegant Robert E. Lee in Richmond, Virginia, for the first time since the end of the Civil War.¹ Davis awaited trial for treason, and Lee had been subpoenaed as a witness. No record exists of what was said between the two, but one can imagine that both former Confederate leaders reflected on the different paths their lives had taken since that April of 1865 and the end of the Civil War. Although General Robert E. Lee had his share of hardship, his nobility in defeat and his actions to restore the Union placed him on a path of inner peace and acceptance of the future. Confederate President Jefferson Davis, on the other hand, had traveled and would continue to travel a much different path. His defiant spirit, denial of the inevitable, and unwillingness to accept a changed South would allow him no rest and would only lead to a life destroyed.

Davis and Lee had been acquaintances since their time together at WestPoint in the 1820s. During the 1840s and 1850s, their relationship grew more amiable and set the stage for a long-term friendship. Davis supported the United States Government as a colonel in the Mexican War² and later served as the United States Secretary of War under President Franklin Pierce. During this time, Lee was an accomplished lieutenant who served as one of Winfield Scott's chief aids during the Mexican War, all the while remaining in contact with Davis.³ Thanks to the early foundations of their friendship, Davis's relationship with Lee during the years of the

1 Douglas Southall Freeman, *R.E. Lee: A Biography, Vol. IV* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1935), 333-336.

2 Jefferson Davis, *The Papers of Jefferson Davis* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press), 699.

3 Steven E. Woodworth, *Davis and Lee at War* (Lawrence, Kansas: University Press of Kansas, 1995) 14.

Confederacy did not suffer from the same friction as the relationships between Davis and many of his other generals.⁴

A Confederate Civil War veteran, identified only as Baynes, wrote a first-hand account of his time in the army and his own relationship with Davis. He claimed that his position as “an intermediary between the secretaries of war and treasury”⁵ allowed him to have a social relationship with Davis. Baynes described a war-time meeting he attended at Davis’s home at which Lee was present: “The discussion between the president [Davis] and General Lee was easy and kind, and the tone was of men having entire confidence in each other.”⁶ This first-hand account provides confirmation of the ease of relationship between Davis and Lee.

The correspondence between Davis and Lee throughout the war also demonstrated the great respect they had for one another.⁷ Lee was aware of the friction between many of the other generals and the president, as well as the constant bickering that punctuated most of the war years. However, Lee strove to do everything in his power to maintain a good relationship with him.⁸ When the war began, Lee served as an advisor to Davis before his service as a field-general. While working in this capacity, so close to Davis, he built upon previous experience to effectively interact with him. This allowed him an edge not available to the other generals. Unfortunately, one of the tactics Lee learned early was to withhold some information from the president, not revealing all of his opinions at once.⁹ While the relationship did not have much friction, this lack of honest communication hurt the Southern strategies throughout the war.

The two leaders had very different ideas as to what was needed for the South to achieve victory. Robert E. Lee steadfastly believed that a fast offensive campaign would be most effective against the Union and most advantageous for the Confederacy.¹⁰ He knew that his new nation would continue to grow weaker as the war prolonged, especially if he was not able to achieve inspiring battlefield victories. The South was already suffering from a great disadvantage in manpower and supplies compared to the North. In a letter to Davis in June of 1863, he tried to remind the

4 Gabor S. Boritt, ed., *Jefferson Davis’s Generals* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999) 35.

5 Baynes, *Autobiography of Baynes*, 1870. L. Tom Perry Special Collections. Brigham Young University. Accessed on 11-30-05, 22.

6 Ibid.

7 Robert E. Lee, *Lee’s Dispatches to Jefferson Davis 1862-1865* Edited by Douglas Southall Freeman (New York: G.P. Putnam’s Sons, 1957).

8 Boritt, 33-36.

9 Ibid., 35-36.

10 Robert E. Lee, *The War-time Papers of R.E. Lee* Edited by Dowdey and Manarin, (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1961), 179.

president of this, writing “We should not ... conceal from ourselves that our resources in men are constantly diminishing, and the disproportion in this respect between us and our enemies ... is still augmenting.”¹¹ Just before his surrender he remarked on his long-standing belief that a long war would be too much for the South, saying “I have never believed we could, against the gigantic combination for our subjugation, make good in the long run our independence.”¹² Lee’s beliefs held and were proven true as the war became too much for the South as the years wore on.

On the other hand, President Jefferson Davis remained firm in his belief that a longer fight would be to the nation’s advantage. After the succession from the North he predicted “a long and bloody war would surely follow the withdrawal from the Union.”¹³ He believed that a longer war would devastate the North. Davis thought that by prolonging the fighting, the Union might decide that the fight just was not worth it. They may not need to defeat the North but rather be willing to fight longer.¹⁴ He promoted this strategy throughout the next four years. When the Southern cause was looking bleaker than ever during the spring of 1865 and the war had already lasted longer than either side anticipated, Davis still wanted to continue the battles. He even wanted to initiate guerilla warfare in an attempt to extend the war.

Lee did not enlighten Davis regarding his drastic difference of opinion, recognizing the near impossibility of changing Davis’s mind. This ill-advised tactic left each pursuing their own strategies while leaving the other in the dark. Although they had a great amount of respect for each other, Baynes recalled Davis’s lack of assurance in Lee’s early strategy, saying, “I have great confidence in your ability to whip the Yankees, but I do not think we can deceive them.”¹⁵

On other occasions, Davis further demonstrated his lack of faith in Lee’s military abilities as he withheld troops and supplies. In May of 1863, Lee wrote to the Secretary of War, James A. Suddon, venting frustration after not receiving reinforcements from Davis prior to an important offensive attack. Lee wrote “As far as I can judge, there is nothing to be gained by this army remaining quietly on the defensive, which it must do unless it can be reinforced.”¹⁶ This would become an oft-repeated scene after Lee was assigned as a field-general. Despite Lee’s military achievements, Davis opted not to give Lee all that he desired.

11 *Ibid.*, 508.

12 Robert E. Lee Jr., *Recollections and Letters of General Robert E Lee* (Garden City, N.Y.: Garden City Publishing, 1924), 151.

13 Jefferson Davis, *The Essential Writings of Jefferson Davis* (New York: The Modern Library, 2003), 394.

14 *Ibid.*, 33.

15 Baynes, 22.

16 Lee, *Wartime Papers*, 505.

Davis's lack of logistical and moral support led Lee to keep his own council as opposed to communicating openly with the Confederate president. An example of this played out in September of 1862 when Lee sent a telegram to Davis asking for permission to enter Maryland with his troops. Rather than waiting for Davis's response, Lee and his entire force had crossed the Potomac River within two days of delivery of the telegram.¹⁷ Davis eventually admitted that Lee's decision was the right one, despite the fact that he was not truly consulted in the matter.¹⁸

This inability to communicate reached a crisis point in April of 1865 as the war neared its end. After being driven from Richmond and surrounded by the armies of General Ulysses Grant, Lee sensed that the end was near and did not want to shed more blood or begin guerilla warfare. Davis, however, believed that the war was just entering a "new phase."¹⁹ After Lee fled Richmond, Davis reluctantly addressed the Confederate people from Danville, Virginia, on April 4, 1865, for what would be the final time. During his speech, he tried to motivate his people by saying, "I will never consent to abandon to the enemy one foot of the soil of any one of the States of the Confederacy."²⁰ He suggested that since Lee's armies were driven from Richmond that they now start "a new phase of a struggle," what he later admitted amounted to guerilla warfare.²¹ While refusing to acknowledge the inevitable outcome, Davis tried to ignite any hope remaining in the Southern people. However, this time few were willing to follow Davis. By then, "the South had lost both the ability and the will to make war."²²

Despite Davis's optimism, Lee saw no possible way to victory. Just five days after Davis's address, Lee found himself trapped with fewer than 30,000 men, of which only 8,000 were armed.²³ He was nearly out of supplies and surrounded by General Grant's army of 150,000 men.²⁴ With nowhere else to turn, Lee made contact with Grant for terms of surrender. When asked by one of his colonels, Charles Venable, what history would think of his surrender he answered, "They will say hard things of us; they will not understand how we were overwhelmed by numbers; but that is not the question, Colonel; the question is, is it right to surrender this army? If it is right, then I will take all the responsibility."²⁵ He then left on horseback to meet with General Grant to do what he believed was right.

17 Borritt., 35-36.

18 Ibid.

19 Jefferson Davis, "Jefferson Davis's Last Message to the People of the Confederacy April 4, 1865," *Documents of American History*. Edited by Henry Steele Commager. (New York: Meredith Corporation, 1973), 1.

20 Ibid., 1.

21 Ibid., 1.

22 Charles Bracelen Flood, *Lee, The Last Years*, (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1981), 45.

23 Lee Jr., 148.

24 Ibid.

Grant and Lee met in Appomattox Courthouse, Virginia, to discuss the terms. Lee accepted defeat in a very dignified manner and conversed with Grant cordially. Grant had a great deal of respect for the fallen general and rewarded him with generous terms. He gave Lee and his officers the honor of keeping their side arms.²⁶ He also provided Lee with 25,000 rations for his men and allowed them to keep their horses. Lee wanted the best terms possible for his men and negotiated with Grant for those men who would need their horses to smooth over the transition to peace in the South.²⁷ He knew that the devastated South would be much worse off without these horses, as the spring planting season would allow the South to return to a reasonable living standard.

Even in defeat, Lee was given ample support by his men as returned from his meeting with Grant. Confederate General A.L. Long described the scene as the soldiers awaited his arrival.

As he rode slowly along the lines, hundreds of his devoted veterans pressed around the noble chief, trying to take his hand, touch his person, or even lay their hands upon his horse, thus exhibiting for him their great affection. The General then with head bare, and tears flowing freely down his manly cheeks, bade adieu to the army.²⁸

In his farewell to his troops, he addressed them saying, "You will take with you the satisfaction that proceeds from the consciousness of duty faithfully performed."²⁹ Performing one's duty well was as high of a complement as one could receive from Lee. Beneath his bust in the Hall of Fame of Great Americans is inscribed his famous quote, "Duty then is the sublimest word in our language. Do your duty in all things. You cannot do more. You should never wish to do less."³⁰ His troops returned even more admiration for him because of the way he "performed his duty." Although Lee was no longer their leader on the battlefield, they continued to look to him as an example of how to accept the future.

Soon after Lee's farewell, Grant demonstrated his respect for the general by visiting him one final time. Grant knew that Lee had an enormous influence with the Southern people and he wanted to make sure that that influence would benefit the peaceful restoration of the Union. Grant assured Lee that President Abraham Lincoln planned to be very generous

25 Ibid., 152.

26 Freeman, 139.

27 Ibid., 139.

28 Ibid., 153.

29 Robert E. Lee, *Lee's Farewell to His Army, 1865*. Hoboken, N.J.: BiblioBytes. Database online. Available from eBook, product id 2008524. <<http://www.netlibrary.com/Details.aspx>>, 1.

30 Robert E. Lee, "General Order Number Nine," *The Annals of America. Vol. 9*. (Chicago: Encyclopedia Britannica, INC., 1968), 572.

to the South, saying “His goal was a true Union, not a victorious North harshly punishing a vanquished and treasonous foe.”³¹ Lee responded as Grant had expected, pledging to devote “his whole efforts to pacifying the country and bringing the people back to the Union.”³² Lee had fought valiantly and surrendered with dignity. Believing that he had been defeated fairly, he now promised to focus his efforts on restoration.

The first person Lee needed to convince was his stubborn friend, President Davis, who still would not admit defeat. On April 12, Lee sent a letter to Davis explaining his reasons for the surrender. Among those reasons, Lee stated that he did not have sufficient supplies and that “the enemy was more than five times [their] numbers.”³³ It seems that Lee was trying to help Davis to see the realization that the end had come and a continued war was going to be useless.

After sending the letter, Lee arrived at his home in Richmond on April 15. He did not know how he would be received, but he had confidence in his convictions. His son, Robert E. Lee, Jr., claimed that he returned home to Richmond to become “what he always desired to be - a peaceful citizen in a peaceful land.”³⁴ Upon his arrival, “the people there soon recognized him; men, women and children crowded around him, cheering and waving hats and handkerchiefs. It was more like the welcome to a conqueror than to a defeated prisoner on parole.”³⁵ Although Lee desperately wanted to rest his aging body after the war, his son Robert Jr., remembers that he politely and graciously acknowledged and received the hundreds of people that wanted to see the legendary general after the war.³⁶

Less than a month after the surrender, Union General George Meade met with Lee to discuss his future. Meade was amazed at how well the general had commanded his army, based on the difficult circumstances, limited resources, and lack of manpower with which he was faced. He was astonished when Lee told him how small his army was at the war’s end; Meade thought that it was twice that size.³⁷ After Lee noted that Meade’s gray hair made him appear to be ageing quickly, Meade replied, “Ah, General Lee, it is not the work of years; you are responsible for my gray hairs.”³⁸ After the conversation, Meade replied that he felt “really sad to think of [Lee’s] position, his necessities, and the difficulties which

31 Jay Winik, *April 1865: The Month That Saved America* (New York: HarperCollins Publishers Inc., 2001), 195.

32 *Ibid.*, 195.

33 Lee, *The Wartime Papers of R. E. Lee*, 938.

34 Lee, Jr, 155.

35 *Ibid.*, 155.

36 *Ibid.*

37 *Ibid.*, 154.

38 *Ibid.*

surround him.”³⁹ As the largest icon of the South he carried a great responsibility for all of his actions. His post-war decisions would now be monitored by the Southern people and have a great influence on how they would accept the defeat.

One of the first things that Lee sought after the war was personal forgiveness from the government. He wanted to avoid a trial for treason if at all possible. In June of 1865, he sent letters requesting a pardon to President Andrew Johnson and General Grant. He did not receive this pardon until his indictments were finally dismissed in 1869, but he never faced a trial.⁴⁰ While he awaited the decision, he believed that no matter the verdict, “he should now set an example by going to work.”⁴¹ He committed himself to keeping his commitment to General Grant of helping the restoration process.

Lee now dedicated himself to helping encourage his fellow Southerners to restore the Union. Soon after his surrender, Confederate Edward Porter Alexander agreed with President Davis’s idea of guerilla warfare and tried to convince Lee that the South could win such a war. Lee knew that the war was over and responded, saying, “The men would have no rations and they would be under no discipline. They are already demoralized by four years of war. They would have to plunder and rob to procure subsistence.” He continued, saying that this would cause a “state of society...from which it would take the country years to recover.”⁴² He knew that such action would continue to destroy the South when it now needed to be rebuilt.

One of his more influential letters was sent soon after the war ended to Virginia’s governor, John Letcher. In this letter, he showed his intent to fulfill the promise he made to General Grant just months earlier that he would use his influence to “pacify the country.” Speaking of the people of Virginia, he said, “...The duty of its citizens, then, appears to me too plain to admit of doubt. All should unite in honest efforts to obliterate the effects of the war and to restore the blessings of peace.”⁴³ He advised the governor that Virginians should now submit to and even support the United States government. They needed to “qualify themselves to vote and elect to the State and general legislatures wise and patriotic men, who will devote their abilities to the interests of the country and the healing of all dissensions.”⁴⁴ Lee concluded his letter with a commitment to practice what he preached, saying, “I have invariably recommended this course

39 Freeman, 196.

40 Ibid., 381.

41 Ibid., 207.

42 Boritt, 33.

43 Lee Jr., 163.

44 Ibid.

since the cessation of hostilities, and have endeavoured (sic) to practice it myself.”⁴⁵

Lee followed his letter to the governor with a letter to Josiah Tattnall, a former Confederate Navy captain on September 7, 1865. Tattnall, like many other Southerners, looked to Lee for advice on what to do next. Lee answered, “I believe it to be the duty of everyone to unite in the restoration of the country and the re-establishment of peace and harmony.”⁴⁶ His example had a far-reaching effect on many people in the South. Thousands of men and officers of the Confederate Army followed Lee’s example and made no efforts to restart the war, regardless of their bitter feelings about the outcome of the war.

During the summer of 1865, Lee was offered several prestigious employment opportunities.⁴⁷ Lee chose to serve as president of the all-male Washington College in Lexington, Virginia so he could guide the next generation of Southern leaders toward the creation of a stronger Union. The college board was very interested in the political views the former Southern general would teach the youth just months after he was a leader in a bitter war against the national government. To this, he responded, “It is particularly incumbent upon those charged with the instruction of the young to set them an example of submission to authority.”⁴⁸ He believed that the youth were some of the most important people for him to reach as he worked toward a more united nation.

Washington College had been a strong institution, but the war and economic setbacks had brought the college its lowest point structurally and economically since its founding in 1749. “Its buildings, library, and apparatus had suffered from the sack and plunder of hostile soldiery,” leaving “[its] ultimate value was most uncertain.”⁴⁹ To keep his vow of doing everything in his power to improve and help unite the South, Lee served diligently in the position of president and looked beyond the mere structures to build value from within the tattered walls.

Lee had a great influence on the students and the college in general. He was admired by those who associated with the college because of his hard work and the care that he showed for the students.⁵⁰ Lee biographer Douglas S. Freeman wrote of Lee’s accomplishments at the college, saying, “During his brief presidency, Lee invited Judge John White Brockenbrough to bring to the College his Lexington Law School, which he had

45 Ibid.

46 Robert E. Lee, “The Restoration of the Union,” *The Annals of America*. Vol. 9. (Chicago: Encyclopedia Britannica, INC., 1968), 607.

47 Ibid., 179.

48 Flood, 84.

49 Lee, Jr., 180.

50 Freeman. 245-270.

established in 1849, encouraged development of the sciences and instituted programs in business instruction that led to the founding of the School of Commerce in 1906.⁵¹ Lee served for a total of five years, during which time the college entered a period of accelerated growth.

The students came to love their college president. When asked by new students what the rules were, Lee replied that there were no written rules, but that “everyone was expected to act like a gentlemen.”⁵² With his, at times, less formal way of running the college, he grew closer to the students in it. One unnamed student wrote of Lee that he showed, “remarkable illustration of ... kindness to and care for the boys entrusted to him.”⁵³ He served there until 1870, the year of his death. Both Northerners and Southerners so much admired his service at the school that, in honor of his achievements, the school placed his name next to the name of American’s greatest hero, rechristening the college as Washington and Lee University.⁵⁴

In November of 1867, Lee was in the process of preparing for his son’s wedding when he was subpoenaed as a witness for a trial of an old friend, Jefferson Davis, in Richmond, Virginia. Davis, who had lived the life of an aristocrat, now was recovering from diseases he caught while in prison, and was a devastated man. Lee said that the post-war Davis “had changed a great deal.”⁵⁵ He was no longer the same dignified man he once was. As they looked upon each other for the first time in over two years, it is likely that both contemplated on how Davis’ decisions that now molded a new, much-diminished life for him.

Davis took a very different course during the closing weeks of the war. After delivering his final address to the Confederate people in which to he tried to inspire them to continue the war effort, he was shocked to hear of Lee’s surrender. Robert E. Lee, Jr., who was with Davis when the telegram arrived, described the president’s reaction to the news: “After reading it, he handed it without comment to us; then, turning away, he silently wept bitter tears.”⁵⁶ Even with the news, Davis was only fazed for a moment before he returned to his stubborn refusal to concede, “clutching the wild hope that somehow they could start to win again.”⁵⁷ Davis could not admit to himself or those who followed him that the war was over.

51 “The Robert E. Lee Papers.” Washington and Lee University; Internet. Available at <<http://miley.wlu.edu/LeePapers/index.html>>; accessed on 11-11-05.

52 Flood, 142.

53 *Ibid.*, 143.

54 “The Robert E. Lee Papers.”

55 Lee Jr. 310.

56 Lee Jr. 157.

57 Flood, 45.

When asked if Lee's surrender meant an end to the war, Davis responded, "We'll fight it out to the Mississippi River."⁵⁸

While Davis was in denial, Lee still hoped to bring the president to his senses. On April 20, Lee sent another letter to Davis, hoping to persuade him to concede. In the letter, Lee said, "The country...is morally and physically unable to maintain the contest." As far as the possibility of guerilla warfare, Lee continued by saying that such a war "may be continued...causing individual suffering and the devastation of the country, but I see no prospect by that means of achieving a separate independence."⁵⁹ He later encouraged the president to follow his example, saying, "To save useless effusion of blood, I would recommend measures be taken for suspension of hostilities and the restoration of peace."⁶⁰

Lee's letters did nothing to dissuade Davis from his pursuit of continued conflict; he had no intention of stopping the fight. He believed that the South was even near victory. In a letter to his wife Varina, on April 23, 1865, he spoke of Lee's surrender of the Army of Northern Virginia saying, "Had [Lee's] army held together, I am now confident we could have successfully executed the plan which I sketched to you and would have been today on the high road to independence."⁶¹ His desperation and almost "heroic" efforts to hold the Confederacy together would bring his last years to ruin.

Davis spent the next thirty days trying to flee the Union Army. He traveled 400 miles, mostly on horseback, pledging not to leave Confederate soil as long as some men were still willing to fight.⁶² However, very few were still willing. He headed west, determined to re-establish the Confederacy. He was most likely on his way to meet with General Kirby Smith, in Texas, who still had an army that had not surrendered.⁶³

On May 10, near the Savannah River in Georgia, Jefferson Davis was speaking with his wife, Varina, when a friend advised him that Union soldiers were nearby following the flight of the Confederate president. In an attempt to hide his escape, Varina threw a shawl over her husband's shoulders and Davis fled. At first glance, the Union soldiers thought that the escaping Davis actually was just a simple woman. However, one Yankee noticed spurs on the boots of this "woman" and confronted Davis. Davis dropped the shawl and the soldiers made the arrest.⁶⁴

58 William C. Davis, *Jefferson Davis: The Man and His Hour*, (New York: Harper Collins Publishers, 1991), 611.

59 Lee, *The Wartime Papers of R.E. Lee*, 939.

60 Ibid.

61 Davis, *Essential Writings of Jefferson Davis*, 368

62 Winik, 333-334

63 Ibid., 322

64 Davis, William C., 637.

Davis's disappearance made him a suspect in the recent assassination of President Lincoln. Because of this and the shawl that made Davis look like a woman during his escape, "to Davis's face, the troops mocked him, like a common criminal, or a babbling, vulgar demagogue."⁶⁵ Following his arrest, Union forces sent him to Fortress Monroe, Virginia, where he served nearly two years in jail. Davis was imprisoned for these years without a trial.⁶⁶

Once he saw how terrible the prison conditions were, it was observed that "He had never held much hope for himself since entering Fortress Monroe."⁶⁷ When he entered the jail, he noticed "a malarial atmosphere in his cell."⁶⁸ The next morning, things got worse as three men, including a blacksmith, entered his cell. They were there to place heavy chains around his ankles that would force him to hobble around his cell. As Davis protested, "four soldiers held him down while the blacksmith and his assistant riveted and locked the shackles into place."⁶⁹

Davis developed a relationship with John Craven, the jail physician, while in Ft. Monroe. Craven insisted that the chains be removed after Davis had suffered in them for nearly a week.⁷⁰ After three months in jail, Craven believed that Davis's health was so bad that he needed to alert the major-general of the prisoner's condition. The physician reported that Davis was suffering from prostration,⁷¹ erysipelas,⁷² and "a low state of the vital forces."⁷³ While living under these miserable life conditions, Davis did not receive a fork or knife with his food because of fear that he might commit suicide with his utensils because of his hopelessness.⁷⁴ He did not attempt suicide, but his quality of life may have caused him to think seriously about it. Dr. Craven thought that Davis's prison treatment was so tragic that, in 1865, he wrote and published a book about Davis's prison experience.

The separation from his family became perhaps more painful than the physical privations. He was not allowed to write letters to them for the first three months because of national safety concerns. At one point, he felt so much anxiety for his family that he asked his physician write down

65 *Ibid.*, 335.

66 John J. Craven, *Prison Life of Jefferson Davis*, (New York: Carleton, 1866), 218.

67 *Ibid.*, 217.

68 *Ibid.*

69 Flood, 57.

70 *Ibid.*

71 Prostration is a condition marked by dizziness and nausea and weakness caused by depletion of body fluids and electrolytes.

72 Erysipelas is an acute disease of the skin and subcutaneous tissue caused by a hemolytic bacterium and marked by localized inflammation and fever.

73 Craven., 222.

74 *Ibid.*, 223.

his “dying words” to them.⁷⁵ Davis’s wife, Varina, wrote several letters to Craven during those first three months because she had not received any information. The only news that she had received about her husband’s health were press reports that told tales of atrocities to which he was being subjected. She pleaded with Craven to notify her of her husband’s condition.⁷⁶ When Davis was finally allowed to write to his family, the U.S. Attorney General proofread each letter and only allowed him to write on family matters.⁷⁷

After his release from prison in the spring of 1867, he left for Niagara, Canada, to recuperate until his November trial date.⁷⁸ Davis had much to think about as he recovered. He pondered how the war ended and what the future held for him. He read, took long walks, and worried about how his financial needs would be met, even as “he resented having to accept the charity of friends who helped pay for his family’s lodging.”⁷⁹ However, it became more painful for him to remain idle while waiting for his trial.

After finally being summoned to Richmond for the trial, Davis arrived and shared several cordial conversations with Lee. His trial, however, was postponed until the next spring because it was decided that, since Virginia was under martial law, it was not ready for a civil court case on treason.⁸⁰ It was also suspected, however, that President Johnson feared that “If Davis were tried and acquitted—a very real possibility with a Virginia jury—he (Johnson) would be impeached again and removed from office.”⁸¹

The trial was delayed until February 15, 1869, nearly four years after his arrest. While Davis needed to be punished in some degree for his role in the Civil War, the fact that proper legal measures were not taken is inexcusable. William C. Davis, a Civil War historian and author agrees: “trying and convicting Davis for treason might not be a travesty of justice, but letting him languish year after year certainly was.”⁸² Davis developed a sense of hopelessness during those years of waiting for his trial. In regards to his waiting Davis said, “I am still at a loss to the purpose of the U.S. Govt. in relation to myself.”⁸³ During the final court date in February, 1869, his indictment was dismissed and the government decided not to prosecute.

75 *Ibid.*, 226.

76 *Ibid.*, 142.

77 Davis, *The Essential Writings*, 370.

78 Davis, William C., 657.

79 *Ibid.*

80 Papers of Jefferson Davis, Rice University; Internet. Available at <<http://jeffersondavis.rice.edu/>>; accessed on 11-11-05.

81 *Ibid.*

82 Davis, William C., 655.

83 Davis, William C., 659.

While his treatment was not fair, it is very possible that he would have suffered much less had he not clung to his stubborn attitude at the war's end.

Davis harbored his bad feelings toward the government throughout the rest of his life. Instead of encouraging the South to try to unite with the rest of the nation, like Lee, "he counseled the South to recover its wasted resources and maintain its principles."⁸⁴ In May of 1873, he wrote a letter to A. F. Beresford Hope, a member of the British Parliament from his home in Memphis, Tennessee. In the letter, written more than eight years after the end of the Civil War, he continued to rail against the United States government. He wrote, "The political condition of this country grows worse. The true character of the government has been subverted."⁸⁵ Where Lee had used his influence to accept and even support the United States government after the war, Davis continued to tear it down.

Another profound difference between Lee and Davis were their attitudes on the treatment of blacks. Lee began freeing his slaves just one year into the war.⁸⁶ He even claimed that he "had always been in favour (sic)? of the emancipation of the Negroes."⁸⁷ Davis had great concerns after the war with the freedom and rights that the government wanted to give to Blacks. William C. Davis, biographer of Jefferson Davis, wrote "Few men of his age and place...retained a [more] fundamental distrust of the intellect, reliability, and humanity of the black man."⁸⁸ He especially opposed giving Blacks the right to vote. In his letter to Hope, he wrote that, "Universal suffrage has brought...endless evil."⁸⁹

Davis lived as a businessman, author, and public speaker. For the most part, however, Davis tried to stay out of the public eye. He continued to live a life of discontentment, unable to accept the future. In an 1878 letter to his lifelong friend and West Point classmate, Crafts F Wright, he wrote, "I can and will say nothing which will lead anyone who trusts me to suppose that I am content with the present or the future it forebodes."⁹⁰ He believed that the direction in which the federal government was moving was "fatal to the peace, and happiness and liberty of Posterity."⁹¹

On March 10, 1884, Davis was invited to speak at a meeting before the Mississippi State Legislature. To the suggestion that he apply for an official pardon from the government for his participation in the Civil War twenty

⁸⁴ Jefferson Davis Biography, Civilwarhome.com; Internet. Available at <<http://www.civilwarhome.com/jdavisbio.htm>>; accessed on 10-25-05.

⁸⁵ Davis, *Essential Writings*, 406-407.

⁸⁶ Lee, *War-time Papers*, 378-379.

⁸⁷ Lee, Jr., 231.

⁸⁸ Davis, William C., 690.

⁸⁹ Davis, *Essential Writings*, 407.

⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, 420-21

⁹¹ *Ibid.*

years earlier he exclaimed, “Repentance must precede the right of pardon, and I have not repented...If it were to do over again, I would again do just as I did in 1861.”⁹² He expressed similar sentiments before the North Carolina State Legislature on October 30, 1889, during its centennial celebration and less than one month before his death. With his final words to the American public, he urged them to remember that the Declaration of Independence, the Articles of Confederation, and the Constitution all legitimized succession. He also encouraged them to continue in their Southern beliefs.⁹³ He continued to claim no regret for any of his decisions, showing a determination and doggedness to maintain his principles to the end.

Curiously, he did gain a little more support from the people following Lee’s death. William C. Davis wrote, “They remembered him for his unyielding resolve, for his refusal to admit defeat, for his determination to fight on and on even after the cause was not only lost but crushed.”⁹⁴ This respect brought more than 200,000 people to his funeral. However, “the dwindling popularity of Jefferson Davis had been restored only by the severity of his treatment.”⁹⁵ The “unyielding resolve” that would be his calling card denied him a life of serenity. Although he was the official leader of the Confederate people, “during the war and afterward [the southern people] never loved Davis as they loved Lee.”⁹⁶

Davis did eventually admit that succession was no longer a possibility; however, “he remained to the last an unyielding opposer of power centralized in the Federal government.”⁹⁷ He was never truly able to accept the new way of living and because of that, lived a sad and discontent life. He called himself someone who was “bitterly hated” by society.⁹⁸ Historian William C. Davis believes that, “(Davis) never achieved the peace and retirement from worldly affairs that he so cherished until his last years and final rest.”⁹⁹

Although Lee faced the difficulty of defeat just like Davis, he took on the challenge very differently. Despite Lee’s belief that history would “not understand” and would “say hard things” about his surrender, it remembers him very differently. As he was able to accept the unknown and worked to make the transition from war to peace much smoother, he gained the respect of his own men, the South in general, much of the North, and the

92 Ibid., 428-429.

93 Ibid., 439-441.

94 Davis, William C., 705.

95 Flood, 93.

96 Davis, William C., 704.

97 Jefferson Davis, *Biography*, 1.

98 Davis, *Essential Writings*, 420.

99 Davis, William C., 706.

thousands who have studied his life since. Woodrow Wilson, a fellow Virginian, historian, and later United States President, said of Lee that he was

“...a leader of men in war and peace, a champion of principles, a humanitarian, a man who devoted his entire life to the benefit of others without regard to himself. Time after time, he was offered opportunities to gain fame and wealth, but neither factor influenced his decision to take a course of action he conscientiously believed to be right.”¹⁰⁰

During a time when the nation needed someone to help to unite and rebuild, both men had opportunities to help. Instead of using his efforts and influence to create a better country, as Lee did, Davis continued to promote discord and distrust of the federal government. He lived the remainder of his life defiant, restless, and the “symbol of the lost cause.”¹⁰¹

100 Thomas L. Connelley, *The Marble Man: Robert E. Lee and His Image in American Society*, (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1978), 162.

101 *Papers of Jefferson Davis*.



HUMANISM: FRIEND OR FOE OF THE REFORMATION?

CINDY BRIGHTENBURG

Prior to the Protestant Reformation in Germany beginning in 1517, the Humanist movement of the late 15th century grew remarkably through the universities and printing presses of Germany. The humanists and the reformers of Germany had interesting similarities. Both groups included similar segments of German society among their members and adopted a mutual cause: comprehensive reform in the Roman Catholic Church. Despite their seemingly shared beliefs and camaraderie, the Reformation created a division between the two groups. Following the 1517 posting of Martin Luther's theses and the subsequent Reformation, some German humanist leaders such as Willibald Pirckheimer, Mutianus Rufus and Desiderius Erasmus sought to distance themselves from and even reject the very cause they had aided.

Humanism, a secular and religious school of thought, originated in Florence, Italy, during the fourteenth century. Eventually, its scope covered much of Western Europe, with leaders such as Huldreich Zwingli in Switzerland, John Calvin in France, John Knox in Scotland, and Henry VIII in England. The Reformation also took on various causes, each with unique outcomes. This paper, however, will specifically follow the impact of humanism in Germany, the birthplace of the Reformation.

When the idea of humanism was born in Italy, it manifested as a love for antiquity, in particular the classical texts of the Greeks and Romans, and embraced rhetoric, poetry, eloquence, and culture. Alister McGrath described the humanism of this time as "essentially conceived as a cultural and educational programme, based upon written and spoken eloquence, to which men of any religious, political or philosophical persuasion may subscribe."¹ It never achieved a cohesive, concrete ideology, and evolved over time into various forms. The problem with humanist diversity is that "the historian will very shortly have to reckon with as many humanisms as

¹ Alister McGrath, *The Intellectual Origins of the European Reformation* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, Ltd, 1987), 33.

there have been French republics.”² When it began in the late fourteenth century, it was decidedly Christian, with devout men who declared their adoration for ancient times through the acquisition of all things antique. They sought out the writings of Cicero and Virgil. They collected ancient coins and styled buildings and artwork after the ancient Greeks and Romans. The age of Enlightenment brought a renewed interest in humanism in which its supporters believed in individual thought, freeing themselves from blindly following tradition, ceremony, or dogmas. In modernity it developed into a more secular, anti-authoritarian philosophy. For example, in 1901, the humanist philosopher Hector Hawton wrote against Christianity saying that “the Humanist... is not saddled with the impracticable, perfectionist ethics of the New Testament” and “Humanism has shown that that ‘right’ does not require the support of supernaturalism.”³ Thus, humanism is difficult to define and varies depending upon its time period, its geography, and its philosopher.

The story of Renaissance humanism can be traced back to the writings of the Italian poet Petrarch (1304-74), which demonstrated a decided break from the traditional, scholastic studies of medieval scholars. The scholastic method was primarily taught in medieval universities as teachers used unsolvable, dialectic puzzles and questions, which would teach the student to use logic and reason. The idea was that conclusions of truth would be reached from premises of truth. Scholasticism was “the habit of intellectuals to dispute and debate every point of contention”⁴ To humanists, such debates had no interest in the beauty of rhetoric or oration, only in facts. Petrarch veered away from his fellow scholars in his desire to understand the loveliness of nature, and express his ideas in the eloquent literary style of the ancients, such as Cicero and Virgil. He wrote of his love for antiquity, saying, “in order to forget my own times, I have continually striven to place myself in spirit in other ages and consequently I delighted in history.”⁵ The rise of the middle class begat a generation who wanted their sons to be educated in the universities just as humanism was beginning to find its feet as a mode of learning. When Petrarch’s writings became popular with university scholars in Italy, traveling teachers with humanist beliefs “journeyed from city to city, and spread the enthusiasm

2 Lewis Spitz, *The Religious Renaissance of the German Humanists* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1963), 354.

3 Hector Hawton, “Humanism versus Authoritarianism”, in *Humanist Anthology*, comp. Margaret Knight (New York: Barrie & Rockliff, 1961), 170.

4 John C. Scott, *The Influence of the Medieval University on the Latin Church and Secular Government Politics* (San Francisco: Mellen Research University Press, 1992), 96.

5 Francesco Petrarch, “To Posterity,” in *Petrarch: Letters*, trans. James Harvey Robinson and Henry Winchester Rolf (New York: Putnam’s Sons, 1909); Internet. Available at <<http://www.fordham.edu/halsall/source/petrarch1.html>>; accessed on November 8, 2005.

for antiquity to ever-widening circles.”⁶ While this revived literary style and cultural movement spread through the universities of Italy during the fifteenth century, students from all of Western Europe were flocking to Italian schools. Because of its focus on ancient times, Italy was known throughout Europe as the center of learning, and scholars who wanted the best education found it there. Many embraced the humanist teachings and in turn brought the tradition back to their homelands, “returning to assume influential teaching positions in northern universities.”⁷

One of these men was Rudolph Agricola. Known as the father of humanism for Germany, it was he, according to Erasmus, “who brought with him from Italy some gleam of a better literature.”⁸ Agricola (1444-1485) studied at the University of Louvain and developed a love for the prose of the ancients such as Cicero. He also became well known for his eloquent use of Latin in his writings and letters. Later in his life, he introduced his newfound interest in classical rhetoric to Germany when he lectured at Heidelberg University in the late 1470’s. In his own quiet way, Agricola was the first to significantly influence his students in the ways of humanism, many of whom became the next generation of German humanist leaders.

The increase of universities in Germany during the end of the fifteenth century was remarkable. In the early fifteenth century, Germany claimed seven universities, but by the end of the century it had seventeen.⁹ Admissions in German universities increased from 1,200 registered in the fourteenth century to about 4,200 at the beginning of the sixteenth century. Economic changes in Europe such as urbanization, expansion of trade and agricultural products created a rising, increasingly literate, and curious middle class with new wealth and power. Commercialism aided in the growth of the cities, then became powerful entities themselves. Late medieval schools were not isolated or hidden entities in the midst of cities. Students frequently interacted with the general population and teachers were known to engage in political discussions with city leaders. Universities were generally founded by city fathers through the patronage of a local noble after acquiring a charter from the Catholic Church.

The average German student came from all walks of life. Middle-class sons of patricians and artisans were welcomed as well as the poor who were given an education in exchange for working odd jobs at the school.

6 Ibid.

7 McGrath, 38.

8 Desiderius Erasmus, *The Epistles of Erasmus*, ed. Francis M. Nichols (New York, 1904), quoted in Lewis W. Spitz, *The Religious Renaissance of the German Humanists* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1963), 20.

9 Edward Maslin Hulme, *The Renaissance, The Protestant Revolution and The Catholic Reformation in Continental Europe* (New York: The Century Co., 1914), 210-211.

It was rare, however, to find sons of nobles in a university prior to the sixteenth century as they had no need to improve their social standing. This changed after the sixteenth century. As middle-class students of law filled government seats, aristocrats saw the need for their sons to attend the universities to “equip themselves for high state office by acquiring a more solid and specialized training.”¹⁰ The growth of universities in Germany in the sixteenth century displayed the need for learning “not the least for the princes” and “for anyone who had in any way to assume public office, learning was insisted upon: priests and laymen had an equal share in an educative, intellectualistic movement.”¹¹ These are the men who learned humanism in the universities and later took part in the Reformation. Humanism had a place in influencing the thoughts of many segments of German society.

Prior to the early sixteenth century, the majority of students trained for the clergy since theology was at the center of university teaching. Other vocations included becoming master of a trade with membership in a guild, doctor of law or medicine, or teaching. This was accomplished through the traditional use of the trivium of “grammar, dialectic, and rhetoric, with grammar (the study of Latin) being the most important subject”¹² and the quadrivium with arithmetic, geometry, music and astronomy, all using the old scholastic methods. Each teacher lectured to a large group of students from a text for a period of time, after which he analyzed the text using specific scholastic questions and disputations handed down for generations. The student, in turn, took dictation of the text and the interpretations given to them, sometimes with discussions. This teaching method was most disliked and eventually challenged by the up and coming humanist teachers who believed a text should be explored for its rhetoric, beauty and use of language and, most importantly, accuracy.¹³

German humanist teachers introduced the study of ancient texts in their original languages, free from pre-written interpretations of others in the margins. Whereas scholastics clung to the Vulgate (the Bible translated into Latin, sometimes with glosses and commentaries included), humanists read directly from the Greek or Hebrew biblical texts. As scholastics interpreted and explained the scriptures for their students, humanists

10 Maria Rosa di Simone, “Admission” in *A History of the University of Europe*, vol. 2, ed. Hilde De Ridder-Symoens. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 313.

11 Notker Hammerstein, “Relations with Authority” in *A History of the University of Europe*, vol. 2, ed. Hilde De Ridder-Symoens. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 116.

12 Scott, 65.

13 Lawrence Brockliss, “Curricula” in *A History of the University of Europe*, vol. 2, ed. Hilde De Ridder-Symoens. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 570-572.

instructed their pupils in the intricacies of Greek, Latin, and Hebrew, encouraging individual interpretation.¹⁴

During the Renaissance, intellectual activity blossomed in German universities. A new generation of teachers and roaming lecturers appeared fresh from the schools of Italian humanistic learning, and quickly spread new ideas throughout the country. For example, students of the humanist Agricola, based at the University of Heidelberg, later diffused his teachings to other institutions. When one of his disciples, Alexander Hegius (1433?-1498), founded a university in Deventer in 1481, he brought the new learning with him. One of Hegius' students, Mutianus Rufus (1471-1525), also passed along humanism. Better known as Mutian, he eventually became a popular teacher at the University of Erfurt in 1492 and a humanist leader. He did not stay long, preferring Italy to Germany, but while there he introduced a circle of students to poetry and classical learning as well as introducing humanist teaching to Erfurt. A German humanist scholar of several universities, Conrad Celtes (1459-1508), wandered through Germany, extolling the virtues of the new learning in many academies and organizing "humanistic societies like the Italian academies."¹⁵ Although humanism was not the dominant method of teaching, it was growing in popularity. The influence of humanism was soon infused into the next generation of German university students.

The late fifteenth century signaled the apex of humanism. It did not take long for the love of antiquity to develop in the German universities. Classical Greek texts were brought from Italy, creating an interest in the "lost" writings of Cicero and Virgil. Historian Lewis Spitz wrote that "by 1520 the new culture had made its way into all the larger universities of the Empire."¹⁶ Greek and Hebrew were taught along with Latin, the study of "Latin and Greek prose writers, dramatists, and poets were often made a basic constituent of the philosophy curriculum"¹⁷ and logic was taught equally with rhetoric.

Scholasticism was not replaced by, but rather co-existed with, humanism but in most universities. In the printed satirical letters of the humanist writer Rabelais, the fictional character Gargantua bemoaned the tide of change in his time exclaiming, "Now all the disciplines have been restored, languages revived: Greek without which it is shameful for a person to call

¹⁴ Mcgrath, 128; Hilde De Ridder-Symoens, ed., *A History of the University of Europe*, vol. 2, *Tradition and Innovation*, by Olaf Pedersen (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 461.

¹⁵ Hulme, 210.

¹⁶ Spitz, 135.

¹⁷ Joseph S. Freedman, *History of Universities*, vol. 5, *Philosophy Instruction Within the Institutional Framework of Central European Schools and Universities During the Reformation Era*. ed, Charles Schmitt. (Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1985), 124.

himself learned.”¹⁸ But humanism in Germany universities took a bit of a turn from more than just a love for the classics. A new concept of individual thought began to creep in and oppose those who followed the dogmas of the Church without question, eventually leading to a rise of voices for Church reform.

Italy was the heart of the Renaissance during the fifteenth century and the source of humanistic thought. The love of all things classical gained popularity through scholarly studies, architecture and art. But the humanists of Italy did not interpret this cultural movement as a means of social reform or religious ethics. An example of Italian humanism can be found in the Medici family. They personified the Renaissance during the late fifteenth century, and under their rule, humanism was practiced in the Greek ideas of beauty, poetry, and art. For example, Lorenzo de Medici did not equate humanism with religion. Although he had a “sincere love of beauty and philosophical speculation,” he could “at times, be guilty of fraud and violence.”¹⁹ The intrigue and vices that plagued the family certainly did not lend themselves to an interest in morals or Church reform. Niccolo Machiavelli saw this distinctness in his fellow Italians. In his book *The Discourses on Titus Livy*, he praised the respect for antiquity; “a great price is paid for some fragments of an antique statue, which we are anxious to possess to ornament our houses with, or give to artists who strive to imitate them.”²⁰ But he goes on to say that when studying history, little regard is given to the values of the ancients; “imitating the noble actions, deeming that not only difficult, but impossible” as though men “were different from what they were in ancient times.”²¹

Northern European humanistic thought differed from that of Italy. It did not center on culture or art, but developed into the idea of creating a better society. Renaissance historian Edward Hulme explained that German humanists “were interested in the welfare of society at large” and “it was for the enlightenment of their fellow men that they studied, translated, and wrote, and not solely for the perfection of the individual.”²² Conrad Celtis (1459-1508), like other humanist teachers, wanted to bring eloquence to his somewhat backward homeland of Germany, the eloquence that seemed only to reign in Italy. His frustration with German

18 Francois Rabelais, *Letter from Gargantua to His Son Pantagruel*, trans. Paul Briens; Internet. Available at <<http://www.iclnet.org/pub/resources/text/wittenberg/melan/lifec-01.txt>>; accessed on October 18, 2005.

19 James Cleugh, *The Medici: A Tale of Fifteen Generations*, (New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1975), 171.

20 Niccolo Machiavelli “The Discoursed on Titus Livy” , ed. Franklin Le Van Baumer, *Main Currents of Western Thought*, 4th ed. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1978), 141.

21 Machiavelli, 141.

22 Hulme, 202.

students and their old-fashioned ways was demonstrated in the way he berated them in class. In a letter to him from his students, they complained how he would “accuse us of madness and charge that we are stupid barbarians, and call wild beasts those whose fees support you.”²³ The practice of calling the ineloquent scholar a barbarian was typical of humanist leaders because they strove to improve the world through beautiful expression and classical learning.

But German humanism differed from that of Italy when it took on the cause of Church reform. The Germans had a greater interest in the languages of the Old and New Testaments than did their Italian counterparts. Italian humanists were enamored with Latin while German humanists became increasingly interested in Hebrew and Greek. German humanists were not only focused on the classics of Cicero and Virgil; they wanted to learn from the scriptural texts of the church Fathers as well. This focus led to a fresh look at theology and interpretation.²⁴

The uniquely German direction toward Church reform was not new to university scholars as it had been raised before. The University of Erfurt, established in 1392, was known for the “antipapal sentiment of its leaders.”²⁵ It was run by the city council, not the Church, and was founded during “the great schism and sought authorization from several popes in succession Clement VII, Urban VI, finally opening under Boniface IX.”²⁶ Church members were expected to be loyal to whoever became pope, but during this time, the rapid turnover in the papacy created increasing disrespect for the office. This did not put the papacy into favor with the rectors of Erfurt. The writing of a student at the University of Heidelberg in 1422 began with the following verses, also demonstrating anti-papal sentiment:

The curia wants marks; it empties purses and arks.
 If you have no marks, shun popes and patriarchs.
 If you have given marks and have filled up their arks,
 You will then be free, no matter how guilty;
 For the Roman stool seeks no sheep without wool.²⁷

23 “The Students of Ingolstadt to Conrad Celtes” in *University Records and Life in the Middle Ages* ed. Lynn Thorndike (New York: Columbia University Press, 1944), 366.

24 Edward Zilsel, “The Methods of Humanism” in *Social Origins of Modern Science*; Internet. Available at <<http://www.compilerperss.atfreeweb.com/Anno%20Zilse1%20Humanism.htm>> ; accessed on March 20, 2006.

25 Spitz, 132.

26 Spitz, 132.

27 Conrad Buitzruss, “Academic Itinerary, 1422-1427,” in *University Records and Life in the Middle Ages*, ed. Lynn Thorndike (New York: Columbia University Press, 1944), 299.

While it is not clear whether or not humanist teachers actively spoke out for Church reform in their lectures, their writings and letters clearly called for change. Mutian of the University of Erfurt condemned the ethics of the clergy, declared Rome to be the “hell of all crimes.”²⁸ In a letter to his friend Herbord, Mutian criticized the pope as a character to whom “Jesus of Galilee did not lend his authority” who was used only to “frighten the enemies, entice money, sanctify God...and do miracles, heavenly or criminal.”²⁹ Humanist scholar Jacob Wimpfeling (1450-1528) explained the university teaching philosophy of his mentor Hegius, saying “The better education of the young is the foundation of all true reform, ecclesiastical, rational, and domestic.”³⁰ Humanist teachers, such as Mutian, not only spread humanism through the university, they also organized private circles of scholars, or societies, where social reform was discussed.

The German universities had political and social influence in their communities. At times of political controversy, “university involvement was often invited by the authorities. Many individual masters of the universities were also highly influential in public affairs.”³¹ German students, whether pursuing civic office or clerical duties, were at some point influenced by the increasingly humanist opinions of their teachers.

When comparing the social background of the typical university student with that of humanist leaders and Reformation followers, similarities arise. Those who participated in and supported the Reformation came from the status of princes, city councilmen, merchants, the clergy, and even the peasants. University students also included nobles, merchants and middle class society. The schools included students from the poor or layman class who become later became clergy, teachers, scholars and city leaders. Historian Hajo Holborn explained the background of those who helped to spread the reformation in Germany. Many were academically trained clergy who “carried Luther’s ideas to every corner of society and gave the Lutheran cause a prestige in the eyes of the common people which it might not easily have gained otherwise.”³² University trained city leaders also came to the aid of Luther, using their political influence to sway city councils to adopt his reforms. The secretary of Nuremberg’s city council, Lazarus Spengler published *Pleas in Defense of Martin Luther* and 28 Spitz., 138.

29 Mutianus Rufus, “Letter 73”, ed. Carl Krause in *Der Briefwechsel des Mutianus Rufus* (Kassel, 1885), 79; quoted in Lewis W. Spitz, *The Religious Renaissance of the German Humanist* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1963), 138.

30 Jacob Wimpfeling quoted in Edward Maslin Hulme, *The Renaissance, The Protestant Revolution and The Catholic Reformation in Continental Europe* (New York: The Century Co., 1914), 211.

31 Scott, 153.

32 Hajo Holborn, *A History of Modern Germany: The Reformation* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1982), 138.

“made the basic ideas of Luther fully his own and was clearly directed by them in his political plans.”³³ In the city of Frankfurt am Main, “Lutheran ideas first spread here among humanist clergymen....the movement spilled out of patrician homes and monasteries into the churches and shops.”³⁴ Humanism also included leaders from different social standing. An example from the rich merchant class is Willibald Pirckheimer (1470-1530), a city leader of Nuremberg. His father’s wealth allowed him to study extensively in Italy where he embraced humanism, and, to eventually become the leader of the movement in Nuremberg. He frequently dined with scholars such as Celtis, Desiderius Erasmus, Martin Luther, and others.³⁵ His humanist love of original texts and proper translation “prepared him for the Reformation’s return to the Scriptures.”³⁶ Through political clout and his published writings, Pirckheimer spread the cause for Church reform and originally supported the teachings of Martin Luther. At one point, he was accused in a papal bull as “having exalted and spread abroad Luther’s doctrine,”³⁷ and was threatened with excommunication. Later he helped the city of Nuremberg become a Protestant city.

Another example of a humanist leader from the class of the nobles was Ulrich von Hutten (1488-1523), a Franconian knight and humanist scholar. One of Luther’s most outspoken supporters, he had been trained in the universities of Erfurt, Leipzig and Greifswald. He joined the German humanist circle and was known for his prolific writings and poetry. Hutten’s support of Luther was clearly shown when he criticized those who went against him, including his dearest humanist friend, Desiderius Erasmus. German universities were a conduit for the spread of humanism and its concept of Church reform to various classes of people in Germany, and created a mind-set which furthered the progress of the Reformation.

The invention and increased use of the printing press did wonders for the spread of humanism. In the mid-fifteenth century, the German city of Mainz was the center of the new technology, where printers were trained under Johann Guttenberg. From there, many printers moved to other cities in Germany and to other countries to set up their own presses. The number of printing houses, publishers, and booksellers grew quite rapidly in the following years. By 1500, the large cities of Germany boasted a total of 72 presses, Nuremberg leading the way with fourteen.³⁸ Within twenty short years, the number increased to 105 presses. Success of printing

33 Ibid.

34 Thomas Brady, Jr, "The Reformation of the Common Man" in *The German Reformation: The Essential Readings*, ed. C. Scott Dixon (New York: Blackwell Publishers, 1999), 105.

35 Spitz, 156.

36 Spitz, 175.

37 Spitz, 177.

38 Rudolf Hirsch, *Printing, Selling and Reading: 1450-1550* (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1967), 110.

presses at that time was due to the increased wealth, trade, and the growing intellectual activity in German cities. Historian Rudolf Hirsch explained that the Rhineland had “favorable technical and economic and social and intellectual conditions”³⁹ that nurtured this new business. The technology of printing did not come under the jurisdiction of any organized guild, leaving the printers free from regulations. The wealthy middle class had become increasingly literate and wanted libraries of their own. These favorable trade conditions helped booksellers to sell and send locally printed books all over Europe.

Interestingly, the increase in printing presses coincided with the rise of universities in the same time period. The demand for books also came from university students who wanted their own copies of writings that were previously only available through libraries or copied laboriously from lectures. Thus, many printing houses set up shop near the universities not only for an easy market, but also to employ the students and scholars as proof readers and editors. Most of the books printed for universities were theological, but also included law books and those of classical antiquity. Book printing also brought about a marked change in university education and the acquisition of knowledge. Previously, students learned aurally from their teachers, but now they could read from their own text, opening the way for individual thought and ideas.

Students did not create the only market for booksellers. Lawyers and patricians were eager to have access to law and statute books, and many printers opened businesses near parliamentary buildings and law courts to accommodate them. This group was not restricted to law books only; they also purchased works of literature and current affairs. Theologians started to use the new technology to their advantage and often commissioned the printing of religious books and the Bible, to provide them with easy to use copies for teaching in the schools and from the pulpit. The Church was so enthusiastic for printed books that German bishops were known to offer indulgences to printers and booksellers.⁴⁰ The bourgeoisie also bought books for their personal libraries and many were instrumental in financing publications. In Leipzig, the furriers and skinnners financed their local booksellers.⁴¹ The most unlikely people – drapers, weavers, grocers, locksmiths, and cheese mongers – acquired personal libraries. Although the majority of the laity were illiterate, the press affected them as well. Handbills and posters advertising current events were read aloud to the general, non-reading public and detailed illustrations were commonly used

39 Hirsch, 15.

40 Lucien Febvre and Henri-Jena Martin, *The Coming of the Book: The Impact of Printing 1450-1800*, trans. David Gerard (London: NLB, 1976), 171.

41 Febvre, 180.

to convey political messages. The printing press touched all members of German society.⁴²

Humanist leaders in Germany quickly saw the great capability of the new technology as a means to increase the love for classical antiquity. Ancient texts could now be translated and copied en masse, and humanist leaders could publish writings conveying their messages. By 1500, Germany became a center for humanist printing. The first part of the sixteenth century boasted “an unprecedented prosperity, an age of exceptional economic boom, and of literate humanism.”⁴³ Writings most in demand were those of classical antiquity, such as Virgil and Cicero. Students and scholars could now read and interpret from their own copies and had an almost insatiable desire for more. Printers scrambled to obtain old manuscripts to meet the demand. As a result, the humanist circle in Germany grew to include successful printers and publishers who were devoted to perfect editions of these classics. Johann Froben, a printer in Basle and humanist scholar and an expert in Latin and Greek, personally prepared texts for printing, meticulously comparing manuscripts for content. Aldus Manutius, a German scholar and humanist teacher, left university life at the age of forty to become a printer. His printing house was located in Venice and was the first to create a press with Greek letters. His Greek texts were then used by students throughout Europe to learn the intricacies of that language and experience its original eloquence.⁴⁴

The increased production of classical texts was pronounced at the beginning of the sixteenth century, the apex of humanism. During the late fifteenth century production of books in Strasbourg, more than 50 percent were religious and 10 percent were classics. By 1520, “33 percent were either Latin or Greek texts or works by contemporary humanists and only 27 percent were connected with religion.”⁴⁵ Classical works had come into their own, but humanist writers were not content. They then commenced to use the press to further their own agendas, which included Church reform.

In 1494, Sebastian Brant, a humanist teacher at Basle University and proof reader for Johann Froben, published his first book, *The Ship of Fools*. In this satire, Brant observed the societal ills and created various fools to portray them. One of those ills referred to men who become priests merely as a means of economic security. Believing the Church will take care of them, they entered the priesthood without any real religious feeling. Concerning this matter, he wrote:

42 Febvre, 263.

43 Ibid., 187.

44 Ibid., 265.

45 Ibid., 264.

Most enter monasteries blind,
 Not old enough to know their mind,
 They enter not by heaven's will
 And only hope to eat their fill;
 They pay no heed to priestly vow,
 They never make a reverent bow.⁴⁶

The Ship of Fools was first printed in German, but its popularity led to translation into other languages and sales throughout Europe, becoming the first book to be an international best seller. The simplicity of style demonstrated that it was not intended only for an intellectual reader, but for all segments of German society with the intent to enlighten it about the ills of German society.

Desiderius Erasmus (1466?-1536), stood out as one of the most prolific of humanist writers, and was instrumental in spreading the study of classics. Born in Rotterdam and educated in Germany, Erasmus had known monastic life and was at one time ordained a priest. But neither suited him so he traveled Europe, dependent upon the hospitality of friends and devoting his time to writing. He chose England as his permanent residence, but preferred to use the humanist printers Froben of Basel and Aldus Mantinus of Venice for his works. He loved the classical writings of Cicero and Plato, but he was also a deeply religious man. Erasmus was sincerely concerned with accurate translation of the scriptures, particularly the New Testament and worried that the Vulgate had lost its pureness and contained many errors in translation. He was known for his excellent understanding of Latin and his eloquent use of it in his writings. His observation of the practices and ceremonies of the Church also troubled him, believing that their true meanings had been lost. So he set out to express his concern to the people through his books.

Two of Erasmus' most popular works, *Enchiridion Militis Christiani* and *In Praise of Folly*, demonstrated his dislike for some of the common practices of the Church. Like Brandt's *The Ship of Fools*, his *In Praise of Folly*, published in 1511, was also a satire of society. Through the character of Folly, Erasmus decried the hypocrisy and vices of Church leaders. Folly explained the easy, pleasurable life of bishops, who existed far from the humble life of Christ and, "think they have done quite well by Christ if they play a bishop's role with...ceremonies, with titles like 'your Beatitude, Your Reverence, your Holiness,' believing that "to teach the people is burdensome; to interpret Holy Scripture, academic; to pray, otiose."⁴⁷

Enchiridion was published in Germany in 1503, as a guide, he believed, for true Christians to follow. Erasmus asked the reader to return

⁴⁶ Sebastian Brant, *The Ship of Fools*, trans. Edwin H. Zeydel (New York: Dover Publications, 1962), 245.

⁴⁷ Desiderius Erasmus, *The Praise of Folly*, trans. Clarence H. Miller (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1979), 111-113.

from an outward religion of ceremony and show to one of inwardness and introspection, always looking to scriptures as a center or source of instruction. He outlined twenty-two rules for Christian life such as “The Value of Temptation” and “Do Not Follow Popular Opinion But Only Christ.” The book began with advice for living a truly Christian life, but then took a decided turn to attack the immoral ways of the clergy and their practices. He denounced relic worshiping, saying, “You venerate the saints and delight in touching their relics, but you despise the best one they left behind, the example of a holy life.”⁴⁸ Erasmus showed his disdain for ceremonies and rites explaining that, “Perhaps you will not be a good man without these things, but they do not make you good.”⁴⁹ His view of the papacy and Church authority was expressed when he stated that Christ is the sole master and that, “Apostle, pastor, bishop are terms of service, not rule; pope and abbot are words of love, not dominion.”⁵⁰

The popularity of Erasmus’ works was enormous. However, the somewhat intolerant tone of *Folly* was met by disapproval from some. Martin Dorp, an acquaintance of Erasmus, wrote him, saying, that *Folly* “has excited a great disturbance even among those who were formerly your most devoted admirers,” and, “Wouldn’t even the best fable be foolish if no one could read it unhurt and most were exceedingly offended?”⁵¹

Nevertheless, the popularity of *Folly* was tremendous and it earned status as the book whose sales almost outpaced those of the Bible.⁵² *In Praise of Folly* was not Erasmus’ sole success, as many of his other books were also in high demand. A book order list from 1520, to printer Johann Froben is representative of the demand for not only Erasmus’ books but of other humanists. From a total of 498 books, the order requested 50 copies of Erasmus’ *Adagia*, 25 of *Folly*, twelve of *Enchiridion* and 54 other titles of his books. The list also included 97 copies of books from other humanist writers such as Glareanus, Reuchlin, and Francesco Della Mirandola.

While *Folly* and *Enchiridion* were written in Latin and intended for an intellectual audience, their simplicity of style and subsequent translations into the vernacular certainly broadened the readership to include all literate Germans. The message of these humanist books, denouncing immoral Church practices by some clergy, the worshipping of saints and relics, and the authority of the papacy, clearly expressed the growing concern for

48 Desiderus Erasmus, *The Enchiridion of Erasmus*, trans. Raymond Himelick (Gloucester: Peter Smith, 1970), 111.

49 Ibid, 123.

50 Ibid, 156.

51 Martin Dorp, “Epistle 304”, quoted in Genevieve Stenger, *The Praise of Folly and Its Parerga*, ed. Paul Maurice Clogan, no. 2, *Medievalia Et Humanistica* (Cleveland: The Press of Case Western Reserve University, 1971), 102.

52 John Clyde Oswald, *A History of Printing* (New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1928), 135.

church reform. Book buyers from all levels of German society, students, city leaders, merchants, were influenced by what they read. It was this new reader who “tipped the scale in religious and socio-political controversies of the XVIth century; he provided popular support,”⁵³ which would later be used in the Reformation.

Thus, through universities and printed writings, the seeds of reform had already been planted in the soil of Germany when, in 1517, Martin Luther displayed his theses in Wittenberg for all to see. Although the breadth of the Reformation spread over many years and took on different forms in various locations, this act of Luther marked its beginning. His complaints had a very familiar ring.

Luther’s studies at the German University of Erfurt introduced him to humanism, but not to a great extent. He had a humanist teacher, but left before Mutian began his society of poets there. He was taught the dialectic scholastic method, but did not always use it in his teachings at Wittenburg. He saw the importance of classical Greek and Hebrew texts in teaching, and he was familiar with humanist writings, but he viewed the movement as secular, not religious. Luther did not place “the dignity of man.....or the restoration of antique culture first in importance.”⁵⁴ Although he was not considered a humanist, some of his ideas definitely coincided with them. The comparisons of the writings of Luther, Erasmus, and other humanists yield interesting correlations.

The Catholic Church was rich with ceremonies and fasts, as well as practices of revering saints, relics, and pilgrimages. The Church taught that observation of these practices would put one on the road to salvation. But to Luther and Erasmus, these had become superfluous actions, with the real meanings either lost to time or simply lacking a Biblical basis. In his writing *Freedom of a Christian*, Luther expressed his concern by saying “I greatly fear that no colleges, monasteries, altars, and offices of the church are really Christian in our day –nor the special fasts and prayers on certain saints’ days...thinking that through them our sins are purged away.”⁵⁵ He also warned people to guard themselves from works “because these do not purge sins, but rather pollute, as are in our time ceremonies, prayers, little speeches, structures of the churches.”⁵⁶

Similarly, Erasmus had earlier written his thoughts on the subject in the *Enchiridion*; “You worship the saints, you like to touch their relics; do

53 Hirsch, 147.

54 Spitz, 239.

55 Martin Luther, “An Appeal to the Ruling Class,” in *Martin Luther: Selections from His writings*, ed. John Dillenberger (New York: Doubleday, 1961), 79.

56 Martin Luther, “Sermon on Threefold Righteousness,” trans. Glen Zweck; Internet. Available at <<http://www.iclnet.org/pub/resources/text/wittenberg/luther/web/3formsrt.html>>; accessed on November 11, 2005.

you want to earn Peter and Paul? Then copy the faith of the one and charity of the other.”⁵⁷ With conviction, he further wrote, “Do not tell me that charity consists of frequent church attendance or genuflection in front of the images of saints or burning candles or repeating a specified number of little prayers. God is not impressed by such routines.”⁵⁸ The *Enchiridion* also echoed his sentiment against monastic life with “do we not see the most exacting type of monks putting their chief emphasis in worship either upon ceremonies or upon a certain mode of psalmody or upon certain physical tasks? If one were to examine them closely and look into their spiritual condition, he would find very few who are not walking in the flesh.”⁵⁹ Brandt’s *Ship of Fools* proclaimed that ceremonies of irreverent priests are of no avail:

O God, so many priests say mass,
 ‘Twere better far did they refrain
 And graced the altar ne’er again.
 Your sacrifices will not win
 The Lord when done with sin in sin.⁶⁰

The letters of Mutian, which preceded Luther, reiterated these concerns. He believed that salvation through fasts were only for the ignorant, and heartily condemned the worshiping of relics.⁶¹

The selling of indulgences had become a huge problem in Germany. Cardinals and bishops of the Church in Rome, as well as the pope, were becoming rich by selling salvation (indulgences) from sins for a price. A popular German motto of the time said, “so soon as the money box jingles, the soul flies out (of purgatory),”⁶² Before the Reformation, humanist writings touched upon the issue such as Erasmus’s *In Praise of Folly*. He wrote about the folly of the man who “thinks all his acts of perjury, lust, drunkenness, quarreling, murder, deception, dishonest, betrayal are all paid off like a mortgage.”⁶³ But Martin Luther attacked the idea head on in his 95 theses with no apologies or humor. Thesis number 21 stated “Therefore

57 Johan Huizinga, *Erasmus and the Age of Reformation* (New York: Harper & Row, 1957), 52.

58 Desiderius Erasmus, *The Enchiridion*, trans. Raymond Himelick (Gloucester: Peter Smith, 1970), 122.

59 Ibid, 121.

60 Brandt, 244.

61 Spitz, 137-138.

62 Martin Luther, “Disputation of Doctor Martin Luther on the Power and Efficacy of Indulgences,” in *Works of Martin Luther*, trans. Adolph Spaeth, L. D. Reed, Henry Eyster Jacobs (Philadelphia: A.J. Holman Company, 1915); Internet. Available at <<http://www.iclnet.org/pub/resources/text/wittenberg/luther/web/ninetyfive.html>>; accessed on November 11, 2005.

63 Desiderius Erasmus, *The Praise of Folly*, trans. Clarence H. Miller (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1979), 65.

those preachers of indulgences are in error, who say that by the pope's indulgences a man is freed from every penalty, and saved."⁶⁴ The selling of indulgences was an example of a church practice lacking biblical basis - a point on which both humanists and Luther agreed.

Both Erasmus and Luther studied the Bible in the Vulgate form, but with the introduction of old texts, they found inconsistencies. As they used their own knowledge of Latin and Greek, they found that some passages of the Vulgate differed from the original texts, changing the meaning of the messages. Both agreed that the pope was not the only one allowed to interpret scripture, but that individuals should be free to do so. Luther wrote, "The Romanists profess to be the only interpreters of Scripture even though they never learn anything contained in it their lives long."⁶⁵ Many of Luther's objections emerged as he translated Pauline texts. In 1545, he wrote a detailed explanation of what he thought Paul was really saying in his Epistle to the Romans. Using his interpretation, Luther stated, " St. Paul proves...that a person cannot help himself by his works to get from sin to justice any more than he can prevent his own physical birth."⁶⁶ Luther's interest in translation of original texts led him to question the Church's stance on religious practices for salvation, or works.

Erasmus also spent much of his time in the translation of scripture with an eye toward accuracy. One of his greatest achievements was his publication of the New Testament in Greek, in 1516. This was then followed by a "Latin translation which differed considerably from the standard Vulgate Bible of St. Jerome."⁶⁷ It was met with some criticisms by scholars and members of the clergy who held the Vulgate to be infallible. He incited doubts about the Vulgate with the omission of some of its passages in his New Testament. In John 5:, his Greek texts "lacked verse

64 Luther, "Disputation of Doctor Martin Luther on the Power and Efficacy of Indulgences." in Works of Martin Luther, trans. Adolph Spaeth, L. D. Reed, Henry Eyester Jacobs (Philadelphia: A.J. Holman Company, 1915); Internet. Available at <<http://www.iclnet.org/pub/resources/text/wittenberg/luther/web/ninetyfive.html>>; accessed on November 11, 2005.

65 Martin Luther, "An Appeal to the Ruling Class," in in *Martin Luther: Selections from His writings*, ed. John Dillenberger (New York: Doubleday, 1961), 412.

66 Martin Luther, "Preface to the Letter of St. Paul to the Romans," trans. Bro. Andrew Thornton in *D. Martin Luther: Die Gantze Heilige Schrift Duedsch 1545 aufs new aurerict ed.* Hans Volz and Heinz Blank (Munich: Roger & Bernhard, 1972), 2254-2268; Internet. Available at <<http://www.iclnet.org/pub/resources/text/wittenberg/german.bible/rom-eng.txt>>; accessed on October 22, 2005.

67 Franklin Le Van Baumer, *Main Currents of Western Thought* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1978), 156.

seven” and gave verse eight a different form.⁶⁸ He published his version confident that his translations were the correct ones. Following the outrage of some clergy, he later “promised to restore the verse if it could be found in a single manuscript.”⁶⁹ The humanist interest in classical texts had been helped by German universities and presses as they made original texts available to any who wished to study them for themselves, thus further promoting the notion of self-interpretation.

Another similarity between the teachings of Luther and Erasmus was the view that salvation did not depend upon the dictates of the clergy, but upon the faith of the individual as a response to God’s grace. After the Reformation had begun and the pope excommunicated Martin Luther, he did not recognize any clergy as the sole authority for God. In his *Commentary on Galatians*, speaking out against popes and bishops, he wrote, “They have no care for the saving of men’s souls. They are interested only in maintaining their position.”⁷⁰ Luther’s *Treatise on Good Works* further expanded this idea: “Now every one can note and tell for himself what is good and what is not good; for if he finds his confident that it pleases God, the work is good.”⁷¹ He demonstrated his desire for people to make their own theological decisions when he translated the Bible into German for all segments of society to read and interpret for themselves.

The *Enchiridion* of Erasmus also expounded, “Many people are in the habit of counting up the number of masses they have attended each day and relying upon this practice as if it were of supreme importance.”⁷² In contrast to this, Erasmus asked the reader to look inward; “Let the death of your Lord - be experienced with in yourself. Examine yourself and, as the saying goes, look into your heart.”⁷³ Other humanists taught the importance of individual thought. The letters of Mutian were critical of institutionalized thought and “stressed individuality and personal responsibility,”⁷⁴ especially with regard to religious devotion. Individual will was “the desire to study and to know the world, to put aside the fetters of arbitrary authority and discolored prejudice,”⁷⁵ a concept which was at the very heart of the Renaissance.

68 Roland H. Bainton, *Erasmus of Christendom* (New York: The Crossroad Publishing Company, 1982), 136.

69 Ibid, 137.

70 Martin Luther “Commentary on Galatians” trans. Theodore Graebner (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1949.), 5; Available at <<http://www.ctsfw.edu/etext/luther/galatians/Gal1-04.txt>>; accessed on March 9, 2006.

71 Luther, “Treatise on Good Works”, 2.

72 Erasmus, 110.

73 Erasmus 110.

74 Spitz, 139.

75 Hulme, 71.

By the time Luther made his protests known, humanism had flooded the thoughts of the clergy, the reading bourgeoisie, city leaders, and the nobles of Germany. When he was called to come before the Diet of Worms in 1521 to defend his 95 theses, he was cheered along the way by well-wishers. One young humanist poet cried out to the crowd, "Rejoice, exalted Erfurt, crown thyself....for bold he comes who will free you from disgrace."⁷⁶ After his refusal to recant his objections, Charles the V, Emperor of the Holy Roman Empire, sent out the Edict of Worms. Among other things, it demanded that Luther's writings be banned in every German city or, better yet, submitted to bonfires. Even this decree did not quell his supporters. The works of Luther became so popular, humanist writer and editor Beatus Rhenanus explained that they were "less sold than torn out of the hands of the booksellers."⁷⁷

Some educators undertook his cause. The University of Wittenberg soon became a Protestant school with the help of supporters in the faculty, as well as with the young scholars. This new, younger generation of humanists was eager to follow Luther because "they had felt lacking a religious and ecclesiastical community which gave their work a new meaning in the service of God."⁷⁸

Support also came unexpectedly from the German nobility. When Charles V tried to enforce his Edict of Worms on the leaders of Germany, a division occurred as some princes supported Luther and others remained loyal to Charles V. Phillip of Hesse was one of these princes who ignored the Edict and allowed the Reformation to continue in Germany unhindered. He did not punish Protestant acts against the Catholic Church and permitted the distribution of Luther's books. The aforementioned Ulrich von Hutten was another aristocrat who was determined to rid Germany of the Romanists. In this cause, he saw Luther as a means to finally achieve the goal of a unified Germany. His support of Luther was clearly demonstrated when he gave up an old and dear friend in order to aid the cause. Over the years, von Hutten had developed a keen friendship with fellow humanist Erasmus. They had communicated through letters and shared publishers, but when Erasmus would not lend his support to Luther, "von Hutten charged Erasmus with greed for glory, fear, jealousy of Luther, and other outrages."⁷⁹ With the help of these nobles and city leaders such as these, cities around Germany soon were officially Protestant.

However, as the Reformation continued to grow in Germany, leading humanists were expected to take sides in the matter. They would either

⁷⁶ Spitz, 237.

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, 239.

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, 146.

⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, 119.

support the revolt and risk a charge of heresy from the Church, or follow Luther. This caused a schism to occur as some chose to support Luther while others turned away. Those counted as friends of the Reformation included von Hutten, and, at first, Willibald Pirckheimer. But as tensions rose and violence broke out, some friends turned to foes. The enthusiasm of Pirckheimer began to wane when his own sisters, who were nuns, were turned out into the streets after their abbeys were taken over by the Protestants. He tried to influence the Nuremberg city council to allow the nuns to remain, but to no avail. Pirckheimer, who was named in a papal bull as Luther's accomplice, later wrote against him. He could not abide the Luther's acceptance of second marriages for priests. He composed and distributed a tract against Luther's initiative in 1528, and was also prepared "a dialogue lampoon against 'that monk' Luther,"⁸⁰ which was never published. He reiterated his love for the Catholic Church in 1529 with his translation of thirty sermons on piety from the Greek Church father, Gregory Nazianzen. He then asked Erasmus to "dedicate them to the Duke George of Saxony, Luther's foe."⁸¹ Finally, at his death, the former dinner host and friend of Luther left behind several unpublished tracts speaking out against him.

Mutian, who had written out against fasts and unethical priests, let his devotion to the Church be known when the Reformation came. He wrote, "to reject the authority of the Church...is damaging and full of impiety, even if you perceive errors."⁸² He was concerned with the aggressive methods used by the reformers as well as how the Church would condemn him if he supported them. In a letter to his friend Lang he wrote, "Doors are broken, windows smashed, and one lives in open barbarity. I would be a fool to acknowledge the boisterous Lutherans openly. The holy fathers would murder me."⁸³ He turned away from Luther's movement and clung to the Church.

Perhaps the biggest blow to Luther came from the one man to whom all of the German humanists looked to as their most learned and wise leader, Desiderius Erasmus. At first he was curious about Luther, perhaps viewing him as just another heretical monk. He wrote a letter to Frederick the Wise in 1519, saying, "Luther is entirely unknown to me. I cannot pass on his opinions because I have barely leafed through his books."⁸⁴ In the beginning, it seemed as though Erasmus would side with Luther. In his book *The History of the Life and Acts of Luther*, humanist Philip

80 Ibid., 193.

81 Ibid., 167.

82 Rufus, 152.

83 Ibid 153.

84 Desiderius Erasmus, quoted in *Erasmus of Christendom*, Roland H. Bainton (New York: The Crossroad Publishing Company, 1982), 157.

Melanchthon, a close friend of Luther, explained how Erasmus first felt. When Erasmus was asked by Charles V what he thought of Luther, Melanchthon wrote, "Erasmus clearly said that he thought Luther was correct, but that he looked for mildness in the man."⁸⁵ But as time went on and the Reformation progressed, Erasmus became more familiar with Luther's movement and he started to distance himself from it.

On the other side of the coin, Luther knew Erasmus and his writings quite well, and was sure that Erasmus was a proponent of Church reform. Melanchthon wrote that Luther "approached the understanding of Latin and Greek, to which place the studies of his youth had already been invited by the writings of Erasmus."⁸⁶ In an attempt to gain his stamp of approval, Luther began to write letters to Erasmus, feeling him out and discussing theological issues. But because Erasmus would not wholeheartedly support the Reformation, Luther finally replied in 1520, "Well then, Erasmus, I shall not mention your name again,"⁸⁷ and the correspondence ended for a time.

Erasmus had always wanted reform to be generated from within the Church and at a gradual rate. He had hoped for change caused by the slow integration of humanistic ideas. He greatly disliked siding with people or stirring up controversy and hatred. During the Reformation, he had the "noble illusion that it might yet be possible to preserve the peace by moderation, insight and kindness."⁸⁸ The brashness and boldness of Luther placed further distance between the two. Kindliness and moderation were his motto, but in the Reformation he observed the opposite tactics being used. Erasmus grew concerned about the violent actions of the Protestants, as they threw clergy into the street, and burnt and stole from churches. He also disliked Luther's headstrong nature. In a letter to Luther in 1526, Erasmus called him a "man, as you write, of violent temperament, and you take pleasure in this remarkable argument" and further said, "with that arrogant, impudent, seditious temperament of yours you are shattering the whole globe in ruinous discord."⁸⁹ In 1521, Luther was hidden away for a time in the castle of Warburg. Humanist and artist Albrecht Durer recorded in his diary a plea to Erasmus to take up the cause in Luther's

85 Philip Melanchthon, *The History of the Life and Acts of Luther*, trans. T. Frazel; Internet. Available at <<http://www.iclnet.org/pub/resources/text/wittenberg/melan/lifec-01.txt>>; accessed on October 18, 2005.

86 Melanchthon, 5.

87 Martin Luther, quoted in, *Erasmus and the Age of Reformation*, Johan Huizinga (New York: Harper & Row, 1957), 162.

88 Huizinga, 143.

89 Desiderius Erasmus, "To Martin Luther," in *Erasmus and the Age of Reformation*, John Huizinga (New York: Harper & Row, 1957), 241.

absence, writing, "Luther is dead; who will fight....Oh Erasmus of Rotterdam, where art thou?...defend the truth, gain the martyr's crown."⁹⁰ But Erasmus stood his ground. As time went on, Erasmus even went so far as to actively hinder the progress of the Reformation by insisting that his old friend Froben should stop publishing Luther's books. Erasmus, the epitome of German humanism, ultimately decided to take another road and would not support a cause that he had, through his writings, helped to incite.

The prevalence of humanism in the late fifteenth century did not significantly impact the Reformation, neither did it influence Luther. His studies, beliefs, and the movement he founded were his own and were not dictated by humanist leaders. But humanism's influence was all around him. One may also consider that the support of the princes and people of Germany was not simply due to their deep desire for Church reform, but more for economic and political reasons. The papacy in Rome was taking a large amount of money out of Germany, mostly through the sale of indulgences. In an effort to raise the conscience of German leaders against this practice, Luther wrote in an angry letter, "Now that Italy is sucked dry, they (the cardinals) come into Germany and begin, oh, so gently."⁹¹ The economic drain must have incited outrage in the German people and gives another reason behind the success of the Reformation in Germany. Perhaps Luther was only a means to an end in which the princes could gain liberty from the financial and political bonds of Rome. But here too, humanism played a role as they looked to nationalism.

Through humanist leaders, Germany had developed national pride and a desire for independence from all-powerful Rome. Prior to the Reformation, nature-loving Celtis had extolled the early German fathers and their worship in groves in his work *Germania generalis*, infusing his knowledge of classical texts about pagans into German history. He explained how in those early days, no Roman priests had told the Germans how to worship and no one served the Italians.⁹² He shared his discovery of Tacitus' *Germania* with his fellow scholars hoping to stimulate the study of German history. Willibald Pirckheimer used his knowledge of Greek and Latin to translate classical writings into German. After translating the works of Ptolemy, he wrote the first geographical history of Germany,

90 Albrecht Durer, "Diary", quoted in Lewis W. Spitz, *The Religious Renaissance of the German Humanists* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1963), 236.

91 Martin Luther, "An Open Letter to the Christian Nobility," in *Works of Martin Luther*, trans. C.M. Jacobs (Philadelphia: A.J. Holman Company, 1915); Internet. Available at <<http://www.iclnet.org/pub/resources/text/wittenberg/luther/web/nblty-04.html>>; accessed on November 11, 2005.

92 Spitz, 99.

Germaniae explicatio, expressing his patriotism.⁹³ Ulrich von Hutten saw the Reformation as a way to escape the political influence of Rome and hoped it would finally allow Germans self-rule. His pamphlets and writings often contained nationalistic themes, especially when he later discarded his humanist training of Latin to write only in German:

For Latin penned I up to now,
Which everybody did not know,
Now cry I to the Fatherland,
The German nation in its tongue,
Vengeance to bring for every wrong.⁹⁴

During the Reformation, von Hutten published and distributed tracts with telling titles such as *A Remonstrance and a Warning against the Presumptuous, Unchristian Power of the Bishop of Rome* and the *Unspiritual Estate*, and his *Address to All the Estates of the German Nation* and further with *Invective against the Luther-chewing Priests*. Humanism had served its role in the spread of nationalism and pride to the reading public of Germany.

The rise of humanism in German universities and the press prior to the Reformation helped set the stage for the great historical change that was to occur. The segment of German society who embraced the Reformation – nobles, merchants and clergy – was the same segment that had been educated at humanist universities and bought humanist books. The similarities between humanist thought and Luther's ideas of Church reform were remarkable. The late fifteenth century humanist movement in Germany contained similar ideas, influenced similar segments of society and, in many ways, mirrored the agenda of the Reformation. But when Martin Luther entered the stage, humanism was faced with the challenge of choosing sides, with some leaders wavering, or turning away. Some friends were forced to become foes.

⁹³ Spitz, 164.

⁹⁴ Ulrich Von Hutten, "Letter", *Edva rdvs Bocking in Vlrichi Hvttteni Equvitis Germani Opera* (Leipzig, 1859-1864), quoted in Lewis W. Spitz, *The Religious Renaissance of the German Humanists* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1963), 124.



JOURNAL STAFF

Christopher P. Davey

I was born and raised in Sussex, England. In 2001 I served an LDS mission in Edmonton, Alberta. After working in England I came out to study at Utah Valley State in 2004, leaving my native island in search for a fresh start. I am a History Education major, with interests in Modern European and U.S. Revolutionary History. I plan on continuing my education to a doctorate level, aiming to teach at university level. I live with my wife, Karin, in Taylorsville, Utah. Together we enjoy reading, participating in local church duties, and the odd movie.

Rebecca Harris

Rebecca Harris, also known as Becky, was born in Grand Forks, North Dakota. She was the first girl born after five brothers. At the age of one she and her family moved to Colorado where she remained until she left for college. She received an AS from BYU Idaho. After receiving her AS degree she lived in Melbourne Australia for a year and a half. Currently she is pursuing a BA degree in History with emphases in Latin American, Europe and the U.S. She will graduate spring 2006. She hopes to continue her education by obtaining a Masters in Public History.

Tiffany L. Knoell

Tiffany Knoell is currently a junior at UVSC. Her academic plans took the proverbial "left turn at Albuquerque" when she changed emphasis from British medieval studies to popular culture studies, focusing on cartoons as reflections of social mores and historical events. Following graduation from UVSC in spring 2007, Tiffany will pursue advanced degrees in cultural anthropology with the ultimate goals of teaching and continuing her research in her chosen field. Tiffany is the mother of three children: Jonathan, Alexander, and Katherine. She is a fan of the Oxford comma and her husband, Michael.

Ted Memmott

Ted Memmott, from Spanish Fork, Utah, is a senior majoring in history. His areas of emphasis at UVSC have been American and American Constitutional history as well as European history from the Middle Ages to the present. He plans to apply to law schools following his graduation from UVSC in April 2006. Ted and his wife, Silvia, have been married since 1997; they enjoy hiking and studying Medieval European history together. They have two vivacious daughters, Elisabeth and Leslie, who love camping and going to baseball games with their dad.

MANUSCRIPT AUTHORS

Cindy Brightenburg

I consider myself a soccer mom who currently lives in Lehi with my husband, my 14-year-old daughter, and my seven-year-old son. I am graduating this spring with a Bachelor of History degree that has been six years in the making. I enjoy studying history (mostly the ancient genre), science, and really good literature. My future plans are to become an elementary school librarian while working on a Master of Library Science degree, and then work in an academic library when my children are older. I also like to garden and crochet, but my favorite thing to do in my spare time is to research historical topics in the BYU library late at night.

Tamara Hammond

I was born and raised in Sofia, Bulgaria. I came to the U.S. in December 1997 and married an American from Utah. The U. S. is among five countries in which I have lived and has become my adopted motherland. Besides my native Bulgaria, I have lived in Italy, Greece, and Cyprus and speak fluently Italian, Greek, Russian, and Bulgarian. My multicultural experience ignited my passion for studying human behavior and helped determine my choice to study history. I am finishing my Bachelor's degree in history at UVSC in April 2006 with high honors and have been admitted recently to the graduate history program at the University of Utah. While history is my primary interest, my hobby is art and currently I have three pieces displayed at Woodberry Gallery at the UVSC Annual Student Exhibition.

Marty Johnson

Marty Johnson is a senior at UVSC and is graduating in history in April of 2006. After graduation he plans to teach seminary for the LDS church and eventually go on to graduate school in some field of history. He graduated with honors with his associates degree in December of 2004. His hobbies include playing his trombone, singing, playing sports, and spending time with his wife.

Scott Walker

I was born in southern California and spent my adolescent years in Orem, Utah where I graduated from Mountain View High School. I am currently a student at Utah Valley State College. My field of study is history and I will graduate in April 2006 with a Bachelor of Arts Degree in History. My main area of study has been U.S. history with an emphasis on military history. I am currently employed as a part-time teacher for The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints teaching at a local high school released-time seminary. My hope is to continue this profession following graduation this spring. I have plans and aspirations to attend graduate school but the timing of this decision will be based on my future employment. My time at UVSC has been great and I would like to thank my wife, Cecily Britt Walker, for being my rock and inspiration during these three long years of higher education. Your love and patience will always be remembered. Also to my two boys, Lincoln and Lleyten: Daddy loves you.