

# CRESCAT SCIENTIA

---

JOURNAL OF HISTORY

UTAH VALLEY UNIVERSITY

2015



# CRESCAT SCIENTIA

---

UTAH VALLEY UNIVERSITY  
**JOURNAL OF HISTORY**

**Volume XII**  
**2015**

Crescat Scientia is an annual publication of Utah Valley University's Department of History and Political Science. Issues are available for distribution during the spring semester of each academic year. To obtain subscription information or back copies of Crescat Scientia, please contact the history department:

Utah Valley University  
Department of History and Political Science  
800 West University Parkway  
CB 203A  
Orem, Utah 84058  
Phone: (801) 863-8487  
Fax: (801) 863-7013

©2015 Utah Valley University, Department of History and Political Science. All rights revert to the authors upon publication.

We invite all current students to submit their manuscripts for review and possible publication. Works submitted must be thematically related to history and political science. To submit a manuscript, deliver a complete version of the manuscript with cover sheet to the UVU History Department Office (CB 203A). Submissions should be written in accordance with the notes and bibliography documentation style form the Chicago style of citation. Submissions should be written in accordance with the notes and bibliography documentation style from the Chicago style of citation. Submissions must be between five (5) and twenty-five (25) pages in length. The manuscript should also be provided in digital form via email or be dropped off to our main office. 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. All papers are chosen through a double blind selection process by student editors.

For more specific information, please contact the UVU History Department or visit the department's web page at [www.uvu.edu/hps/](http://www.uvu.edu/hps/).

# CRESCAT SCIENTIA

---

UVU JOURNAL OF HISTORY

**Editor-in-Chief**

Tiffanie Butcher

**Managing Editor**

Brandon Springer

**Assistant Editor**

Kristen Gunnerson

**Assistant Editor**

Shea Haskell

**Faculty Advisor**

Keith Snedegar

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

Utah Valley University, Department of History and Political Science  
800 West University Parkway, Orem, Utah 840057  
Phone: (801) 863-8487 Fax: (801) 863-7013



## FACULTY NOTES

Dear Reader,

Each year has its own hopeful developments for the history program at UVU. This year we have moved into a glistening new classroom building, a five-story edifice featuring sleek, modernist spaces designed for twenty-first century education. Some might take it as a brick, glass, and steel manifestation of the ferment of knowledge. Yet this admirable building should not be mistaken for the learning process itself. Assuming that you're holding a physical copy of this volume (quite an assumption these days), I'd say that you have in your hands a much more tangible symbol of Utah Valley learning. Rough-hewn it may be, but *Crescat Scientia* is alive with the quest for human understanding.

*Crescat* got a late start this year. I even began to wonder (me of little faith) if we'd have anything to publish. Then Tiffanie Butcher entered the picture. As editor-in-chief she performed a nearly miraculous feat in saving the day. She assembled her team, solicited quality papers, worked closely with authors on their revision, and stuck to deadlines. Meanwhile, Brandon Springer ably managed the technical aspects of formatting and printing the journal. Of course their editorial work serves to highlight the achievements of other students' learning. Our authors have tackled some challenging subjects, from Erasmus to Lin Zexu, from the Boston Massacre to the Battle of Algiers. It is rewarding to see the results.

As you leaf through this volume I hope you come to appreciate the subtle architecture of human experience being elaborated here. It lacks the elegant lines and the mountain vistas of our new classroom building, but is inspiring all the same.

May knowledge grow!

Keith Snedegar

Faculty Advisor

## DEDICATION



The editors would like to dedicate this edition of *Crescat Scientia* to Professor Mark Lentz and Professor Lyn Bennett. Both of these professors have helped me discover my writing style and passion for historical writing. Thank you Professor Bennett for helping me find confidence in my writing and for introducing the journal to me. Thank you Professor Lentz for believing in me and recommending me to be the editor of this edition of the journal. Without either of you, I would not have the passion for historical writing and inspiration that I do.



## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This year's edition of *Crescat Scientia* would not have been possible without the help of several dedicated people. The editors would like to acknowledge their contributions.

*Crescat Scientia* would first like to thank Dr. Keith Snedegar, the faculty advisor for *Crescat Scientia*. He had complete faith in our abilities to publish this edition of the journal and gave us all the opportunity to learn and grow through this experience.

The editors would also like to thank all of the history and political instructors at UVU who have helped promote *Crescat Scientia* and worked with students to prepare their submissions outside of class time.

Lastly, we would like to thank all of those who submitted their papers and their dedication to bringing new light to common subjects. Your knowledge and research helped to create the 2015 edition of *Crescat Scientia*. Thank you!



## CONTENTS

### **Pope Pius II and Desiderius Erasmus: The Turkish Threat and the Need for Unity**

Kristopher Willis ..... 1

### **Are the National Liberation Front (FLN) Terrorists or Heroes?**

Krista Mosbacker ..... 21

### **Legal Battles Preluding Civil War: Constitutional Arguments For and Against Southern Secession**

Kameron R. Gonzalez ..... 35

### **Commissioner Lin and Charles Elliot: The First Opium War**

Jay T. Cherry ..... 55

### **Stoughton's Empire: The Glorious Revolution and the Role of the Merchant Class in Shaping American Protestantism**

Morgan S. Hardy ..... 67

### **The Influence of the Netherlands in South Africa during the 19th Century**

Joshua Spencer ..... 87

### **To What Extent Do Circumstances Determine Human Behavior?**

Ben Aldana ..... 99

### **"The Bloody Massacre:" The Boston Massacre and the Hidden History of a Labor Dispute**

Joshua J. Eaton ..... 125

### **The Republic of Mali: Crisis in Northern Mali**

Marie Essiko Poudiougou ..... 143



## EDITOR'S NOTE

The challenge that comes with bringing a new topic to light or a new light to a common topic is one that many students studying history and political science have faced again and again. For this edition of *Crescat Scientia*, I have strived to find papers for this journal that would engage and interest readers with new perspectives of various topics in history and political science.

History and Political Science are subjects that allow students to explore a vast amount of topics, events, individuals and the mysteries of our world. The study of History and Political Science also allows students to explore new ideas, create and change their opinions, and to question everything in an academic way.

It is my hope that the readers of this journal will review these papers with an open mind and will discover new subjects and perspectives that they would not otherwise consider. It is also my hope that these talented writers will continue to educate society with fresh and new perspectives through research and more publications.

“The more that you read, the more things you will know. The more that you learn, the more places you’ll go.”

-Theodor Seuss Geisel (Dr. Seuss)

Tiffany Butcher  
Editor-in-chief



## POPE PIUS II AND DESIDERIUS ERASMUS: THE TURKISH THREAT AND THE NEED FOR UNITY

KRISTOPHER WILLIS

After seven weeks of besieging the ancient city of Constantinople, on May 29, 1453 Mehmed II and his Turkish army broke through the Theodosian Walls and entered the city. The Sultan had just conquered the last stronghold of the Byzantine Empire and claimed them as his own. In the subsequent years the Turks would go on to conquer more land in Europe, Africa, and even make an attempt to take Vienna in 1522. The reaction to the fall of Constantinople was one of fear, anger and sadness. Many people were afraid that the Ottoman Sultan would direct his army to Europe. Tales of the atrocities committed during the sacking came in with the refugees some were true others exaggerations from evacuees. With the exception of the citizens of Constantinople itself, no other group felt more outraged by the events than the humanists. To them, the true tragedy was more than just the loss of an ancient city: they perceived Mehmed II's quest to be a threat to the culture and learning of classical antiquity. In a letter to Pope Nicholas V, Lauro Quirini gives words to his fear at the impending loss, "the overthrow of an entire people has been accomplished-the name of the Greeks has been erased... Consequently, the language and literature of the Greeks, invented, augmented, and perfected over so long a period with such labor and industry, will certainly perish."<sup>1</sup> James Hankins

---

<sup>1</sup> Quoted in Bisaha, Nancy. *Creating East and West: Renaissance humanists and the Ottoman Turks*. (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004), 67.

suggests that the fall of Constantinople led the humanists to write “far more often and at far greater length about the Turkish menace and the need for crusade than they did about such better-known humanist themes as true nobility, liberal education, the dignity of man, or the immortality of the soul.”<sup>2</sup>

One reason for this abundance of writing was the divide being created by the European states’ indifference on the Turkish question. To this point, two figures in history stand out, the Tuscan writer and diplomat Aeneas Sylvius Piccolomini, later Pope Pius II, and the Dutch humanist Desiderius Erasmus. Each represents a differing view on the Turkish question. Pius II was calling for a crusade to retake Constantinople and Erasmus was utilizing his humanistic talents to convince kings, popes, and the commoners, that living the irenic ways of Christ would help convince the Turks to convert. Although the two differed on how to go about answering the question of the Turkish threat, they both sought the same goal. While it is true that Pius II was looking only at Christian unity as a tool to push the Turks out of Europe as well as reassert some of the old papal authority and Erasmus had more of an ecumenical vision which he hoped would bring about a more Christian world, it nevertheless stands that Christians needed to cease all hostilities against each other and unify as a single Christian entity order to face the Turks.

### VIEWS OF THE TURKS

Pius II argued strongly that the Turks were not the descendants of the Trojans, taking vengeance for their ancestors. He believed adamantly that they were barbaric Scythians. He depicted the Turks were morally bankrupt and culturally backwards in order to show how great their threat was to Christendom. The influence of the ancient writings can be seen whenever he is referencing or directly talking about the

<sup>2</sup> Hankins, James. “Humanism and the Origins of Modern Political Thought.” *The Cambridge Companion to Renaissance Humanism*. Edited by Jill Kraye. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 112.



Turks. A good example of this can be seen in his biographical treatises on Europe. In his descriptions of the sack of Constantinople he says, "Once again, the uninjured and the wounded, the half-dead and the dying were rolled together in a heap. Every manner of dying could be seen, and many an image of death."<sup>3</sup> Compare this to Virgil's *The Aeneid*, when he is describing the sack of Troy, "Bitter sorrow everywhere, everywhere terror and many the image of death."<sup>4</sup> It is clear that Pius II had learned from the ancient writers how to evoke powerful emotions.

Pius II, however, did not focus primarily on ancient Roman authors. According to historian Margaret Meserve, Pius II relied heavily on a Greek philosopher named Aethicus Ister. Unfortunately, in his eagerness to belittle the Turks and present them as barbarians, Pius II mistakenly thought that Aethicus was real.<sup>5</sup> Rather, he was a character in the book *The Cosmographia of Aethicus Ister*, which is believed to have been written around the eighth century at a Carolingian monastery or court. For Pius II though, it suited his needs. Aethicus had traced the Turks to a part of Scythia that was removed from the classical world, thus giving them an even more barbarous provenance.<sup>6</sup> Meserve speculates that Pius II used Aethicus' accounts of the Turks because it placed them in a subservient

---

<sup>3</sup> Piccolomini, Aeneas Silvius. *Europe (c. 1400-1458)*. Edited by Bisaha, Nancy. Translated by Brown, Robert D (Washington D.C.: Catholic University Press, 2013), 96

<sup>4</sup> Vergil. *Vergil's Aeneid, Books I-VI. Rev. ed.* Edited by Pharr, Clyde. Translated by Kristopher Willis (Wauconda, IL: Bolchazy-Carducci Publishers, 1998), 2.369

<sup>5</sup> Meserve points out that although Pius II could not have known the dubious origin of the text, he nonetheless should have, and may have, not believed *The Cosmographia* to be authentic. Meserve, Margaret. *Empires of Islam in Renaissance historical thought*. (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2008), 99-105.

<sup>6</sup> Meserve. *Empires of Islam in Renaissance historical thought*, 294-295, n.162

position to not only the Romans but the Greeks as well.<sup>7</sup> By indicating that they had been subservient to both the Romans and the Greeks, Pius II was able to display the Turks as weak and inferior to the west, whose culture was largely based on both civilizations. Pius II believed whole heartedly that the Turks truly were the descendants of the Scythians. At the court of Fredrick III, Pius II gave a report on his findings, saying, "They are a nation of Scythians, originating in the heart of Barbary... an unclean and disgusting race, fornicators indulging in every kind of depravity..."<sup>8</sup> Throughout all of his research on the Turks it is clear that Pius II did everything he could to create an image of the Turk that would repulse the sensitive Christian ear.

Erasmus on the other hand, did not believe that the Turks were Scythian or Trojan, rather, he believed them to be of a nomadic origin.<sup>9</sup> Rather than focusing on their origins, Erasmus focused on the threat they posed and how to best answer the Turkish question. By the time of Erasmus' birth in 1466, the Turks had fortified the city of Constantinople under the rule of Selim I, was waging a war against Venice, and taken Bosnia along with some Genoese islands in the Northern Aegean Sea. By the time he had reached adulthood, Constantinople had been fortified and the Turks had expanded their territory even further. Before the siege of Vienna in 1522, Erasmus was not as critical of the Turks and completely against war. After the siege and into his twilight year, he became less anti-war and more critical of the Turks. While the stability and expanding Ottoman Empire was an issue in Erasmus' life time, the instability of Europe first only politically then, after the Protestant Reformation, both religiously and politically. Thus it should come as no surprise that Erasmus would focus more

---

<sup>7</sup> Ibid, 100-102

<sup>8</sup> Quoted in: Meserve. *Empires of Islam*, 68.

<sup>9</sup> Bisaha. *Creating East and West: Renaissance humanists and the Ottoman Turks*, 90

on the Turks and Christian unity later in his life, than he did in his early adult years.

Like Pius II, Erasmus was concerned about the inaction and indifference of various Christian states. In his treatises *De Bello Turcico*, he explains his frustration using the metaphor, “When your neighbor’s wall is on fire, it becomes your business; in fact, it becomes the business of the whole city, whenever a single house catches fire.”<sup>10</sup> This shows that Erasmus was a pragmatic man who understood that turning the other cheek was not always the right solution. Erasmus may have been a man of peace, but by the time he wrote his treatises *De Bello Turcico* in 1530 the Turks had unsuccessfully laid siege to Vienna, taken swaths of Christian land and killed a vast number of Christians. This made him feel as though at least some armed defense was necessary and commented, “Of course not all wars against the Turks are legitimate and holy, yet there are times when failure to resist the Turks simply means the surrender of part of Christendom to these barbaric enemies, and abandonment of those of our brethren who are already enslaved beneath their foul yoke.”<sup>11</sup> Erasmus was by no means shy when it came to talking about the Turks in letters and speeches; they are often used in his literature as a *bête noire*. This can best be demonstrated in *Praise of Folly* when he calls the Turks, “That whole cesspool of true barbarians...”<sup>12</sup> This line may have been from a satire he wrote, but when even writing in jest he still had the ability to invoke a negative image of the Ottoman Turks.

Erasmus’ view on the Turks can be difficult to discern at times, because of how often they changed throughout his

---

<sup>10</sup> Erasmus, Desiderius. *The Erasmus Reader*. Edited by Erika Rummel. (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990), 316.

<sup>11</sup> Erasmus. *The Erasmus Reader*, 317

<sup>12</sup> Erasmus, Desiderius. *Praise of Folly ; And, Pope Julius Barred from Heaven*. Translated by Roger Clarke. (Richmond, U.K.: Oneworld Classics, 2008), 56.

lifetime. For example, in a letter to Pope Leo X, Erasmus is attempting to convince the Pope that a crusade against the Turks is unchristian and not to the benefit of anyone. He does this by flattering Leo X and debasing the Turks. In the letter he writes, “Thereby you are building a fine and safe path that will lead to subduing or crushing the impious Turks. Eventually those savage beasts will not endure the roaring of our Lion [Leo]....”<sup>13</sup> The reason for the debasing is twofold. First, Erasmus does consider the Turks to have a barbarous nature. Second, Erasmus needed to convince Leo X that conversion would be preferable to a crusade and thus had to make war against Turks seem costly. Even though Erasmus calls them “barbaric enemies” in *De Bello Turcico*, he stops short there and in the following paragraph he states, “...In the first place, the Turks are men, and what is more, half-Christian.”<sup>14</sup> This quote shows that Erasmus was a logical man, who did not have such an intense hatred that it blinded him. By calling the Turks “half-Christian” he is confirming that though they have a barbaric nature, they still believe in much the same things Christians do. Erasmus is humanizing them as well as pointing out that they could be converted, if only shown where they strayed.

The views of the Turks by Pius II and Erasmus are very dissimilar from one another. While both considered the Turks to have been a barbaric people, Erasmus tended to lean away from outright demonizing them in the way Pius II did. Some may argue that one reason for this is that Pius II lived through the sacking of Constantinople and Erasmus had not. However, the Turks were still actively expanding their territory and sacking cities during Erasmus’ lifetime, thus that cannot be the only reason. The level of Christian disunity has to be the answer. In Pius II’s time, the church had not yet reached the

---

<sup>13</sup> Erasmus, Desiderius, *Erasmus and His Age; Selected Letters of Desiderius Erasmus*. Translated by Marcus A. Haworth. (New York, Evanston, and London: Harper & Row, 1970), 83.

<sup>14</sup> Erasmus. *The Erasmus Reader*, 317.

level of disunity that it would in Erasmus' life. Thus Pius II saw the need to degrade the Turks to promote unity as the best option, while Erasmus saw that war was not the answer to the problem. Because Erasmus was a man of peace, he truly did not believe that war was what Christ would want. Even on what he could call just terms for war was not good enough. Talking about just war he quotes Cicero in a letter to Conrad Peutinger<sup>15</sup> saying that, "In my opinion, Cicero's words hold true in this case too: that 'peace even on unjust terms is preferable to a perfectly just war.'"<sup>16</sup> By Erasmus' time, he had seen too many states that had gone to war with each other and the Turks. Europe needed to be unified and a model Christian society. War needed to end and the best way to do that would be to convert the Turks to Christianity thus ending the need to go to war, at least religiously. He says as much in a letter to his friend Paul Volz, "The most efficacious was of overcoming the Turks would be if they beheld that which Christ taught and exemplified shining forth in our own lives... If the Rule of Christian Charity is at hand, everything else will easily conform to it."<sup>17</sup> The question then becomes how to achieve these goals.

### THE TURKISH QUESTION

Pope Pius II has been the focus of many modern historians thanks to both the quality and quantity of his writings. At the time of Constantinople's fall, Aeneas Sylvius Piccolomini was not yet a Pope. The news of Constantinople's fall came while he was writing a letter to Pope Nicholas V. After hearing about the fall of the great city, the topic of his letter immediately switched to one of anger, sorrow, and dismay. Pius II wrote, "But how terrible is the report that has just newly brought from Constantinople? . . . Alas, how many names of

<sup>15</sup> A friend of Erasmus, a Lawyer, and a humanist.

<sup>16</sup> Erasmus, *Erasmus and His Age*, 153.

<sup>17</sup> Erasmus, Desiderius, *Christian humanism and the Reformation; selected writings. With The life of Erasmus*, ed. John C. Olin. (New York: Harper & Row, 1975), 113-117

great men will be destroyed now? Such is the second death for Homer, the second death of Plato. Where will we find the talents of philosophers and poets?”<sup>18</sup> The grief and anger that Pius II shows in this initial response to the report, demonstrates how bitter his feelings were towards the Turks. As a humanist, the loss of a city that was regarded to be a primary seat of learning was nothing less than catastrophic. This feeling was seconded by another humanist named Lauro Quirini. As Lauro Quirini wrote, “For not only has a royal city been captured, temples devastated and holy places polluted, but an entire race has been overcome... Thus both the language and literature of the Greeks discovered, increased and perfected with so much time, labor, and effort, has perished, alas!”<sup>19</sup> Although there was cause to be angry at the loss of Constantinople, the passion with which they write shows a deeper level of shock and sadness. Because so little support was sent to Constantinople when the other states could have done more to aid the beleaguered city, Pius II turns his pen on the European states, individual leaders, and most importantly the feuding and splitting of the Christian Church, blaming them for the great city’s fall. In his commentaries, Pius II claims that, “Every disaster is blamed on the negligence of those who rule. ‘They could have helped the Greeks in their hour of need,’ people said, ‘They could have sent aid before the nation was enslaved. They didn’t care. They are not fit to rule.’”<sup>20</sup> Once Pius II became

---

<sup>18</sup> Piccolomini, Eneas Silvius. *Der Briefwechsel Des Eneas Silvius Piccolomini*. Edited by Rudolf Wolkan. In *Fontes Rerum Austriacarum*. (Bd. 68. Vienna: Alfred Holder, 1918), 199-200. Translation is my own.

“Sed quid illud horrible novum modo allatum de Constantinople?... Heu, quot nunc magnorum nomina virorum peribunt? Secunda mors ista Homero est, secundus Platoni obitus. Ubi nunc philosophorum aut poetarum ingenia requiremus?”

<sup>19</sup> As found in: Hankins. “Renaissance Crusaders: Humanist Crusade Literature in the Age of Mehmed II,” 122.

<sup>20</sup> Piccolomini, *Aeneas Silvius Commentaries*. Vol. 1, Meserve, Margaret and Marcello Simonetta. (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2003), 127.

Pope, he would try in vain to gather the European powers into a unified force for the retaking of Constantinople.

Pius II was by no means the first Pope to use crusading rhetoric in an attempt to unify Christianity. However, according to many historians such as Nancy Bisaha, he is considered to be the greatest crusading pope of his century.<sup>21</sup> What makes Pius II so important in this era is not so much that he called a crusade as this had been done many times before, but what tools he used that other Popes had not. As a humanist Pius II had studied past rhetoricians, such as Cicero and politicians like Julius Caesar. This knowledge would help him to become known as the greatest crusading pope of the fourteenth century. Thanks in part to the humanist writings, including Pius II's, of the alleged atrocities that occurred during the sack of the great city, it became a rallying point to which Pius II would often use, calling the Turks "Savage people, hostile of good morals and good books."<sup>22</sup> In short, the answer to the Turkish question in Pius II's mind was firstly, the unification of Christianity, and secondly, the assault and retaking of Constantinople.

When Pius II began to advocate for a new crusade, his greatest strength was his humanist education and he was able to bring to bear all of his oratory and writing abilities. His commanding knowledge of humanist rhetoric allowed him to articulate his argument in such a way as to make it powerful and unique to his papal legacy. Throughout his endeavors the influence of ancients such as Cicero, Tacitus, Virgil, Plato, and many others, can be recognized. For example, when Pius II tells of the fall of Constantinople in his manuscript *Europa*, it is clear that he is getting some of his dialect from Tacitus' *Histories*. "The victors, whose numbers were beyond count, showed their utter depravity in their lust and cruelty: Neither

---

<sup>21</sup> Bisaha, *Creating East and West*, 140.

<sup>22</sup> Piccolomini, *Der Briefwechsel Des Eneas Silvius Piccolomini*. 209.

Translated is my own. "Sevisorum hominum, bonorum morum atque litterarum hostium."

rank nor age nor sex protected anyone. Rape was mixed with butchery, and butchery with rape.”<sup>23</sup> There are also hints of Virgil’s *The Aeneid* within this quote. Whether he was addressing an audience, as he did in Mantua, or waxing philosophical, as he did in his letters to his contemporaries, his answer to the Turkish question was always couched in humanist terms and done so in humanist style.

It is evident that Pius II had the total unification of all Christian states in mind when he wrote his *Commentaries*. The way he writes the multi-book manuscript is in a similar fashion to Julius Caesar’s *Gallic War* and *Civil War*, like Caesar, Pius II writes for his audience. Commonly for the humanists, the writings were propagandistic and always in the third person. While Pius II does utilize some of his humanistic education to denounce and vilify the Turks, he spends most of his energy and rhetorical ability on shaming the other Christians for their constant bickering as well as their acquiescence to the Turks various seizure of Christian land. Using his humanist knowledge, he exclaims to the German delegation, which was threatening to wage war on another Christian nation, “In your anger and rage you cannot see how your feuds weaken the whole of Christendom. ‘Pope Pius has a clearer view of what is happening and he takes pity on the noble land of Germany. He cannot stand to see so many great warriors- so stout hearts, the core of the Christian army- drawing swords against each other.’”<sup>24</sup> When Pius II says that he is taking pity on the Germans, he is ridiculing them, for to take pity on someone is to infer that they are pitiable and lesser than one’s own self. Here when he speaks of “stout hearts” he is using his humanist rhetoric by quoting from the *Aeneid*.<sup>25</sup> It does not appear that the *Commentaries* were meant to be published during the

<sup>23</sup> Piccolomini, *Europe*, 98. Compare this quote to Tacitus Histories 3.33

<sup>24</sup> Piccolomini, *Aeneas Silvius Commentaries*. Vol. 2, 19

<sup>25</sup> For a Comparison see, Page, T. E. *The Aeneid of Virgil, Books VII-XII*. (London: Macmillan, 1924), 8.150.



life of Pius II or at least until the moment of his death. This is safely assumed because Pius II had left instructions with Giannantonio Campano to revise the work as needed.<sup>26</sup> This, then, explains why the rhetoric was aimed so heavily at shaming the Christians. It has also been suggested that he wanted to further shame the Christians by taking part in his crusade. Pius II had seen even from before the fall of Constantinople that the Christian community was divided and the chasm was ever growing.

One of Pius II's greatest works of humanistic propaganda was his treatises on Europe. In this manuscript Pius II describes both, where the Turks came from, and the blasphemies they committed along the way. Although the book is supposed to be describing the various European states, at least one third of the book has some mention of the Turks. It is clear that Pius II was attempting to use this book for his propaganda against the Turks. He is trying to show how pervasive the Turks had become. "Then after crossing Pontus and Capadocia, they gradually infiltrated the other adjoining populations and built up their strength through clandestine raids in the manner of brigands."<sup>27</sup> Although this quote is denoting an earlier time in the Ottoman Empire's history, it nevertheless shows how Pius II believed that the Turks were a threat that could not only be seen in the open, but also clandestinely. Those who were to read this book would then see how much of a threat the Turks had become.

In stark contrast to the militaristic Pius II was Erasmus the Irenic. The belief that Christians do not make war to convert or subdue their enemies was central to Erasmus' answer for the Turkish question. After Erasmus hears that Pope Leo X is campaigning to gather men for a crusade against the Turks, he pens a letter to the Pope hoping to convince him of a better course of action. In the letter Erasmus writes, "I tend to

<sup>26</sup> Piccolomini, *Commentaries*. Vol. 1, 379

<sup>27</sup> Piccolomini, *Europe*, 73

think that, just as Christ along with His apostles and martyrs subdued the whole world by kindness, patience, and holy teaching, so too can we more effectively subdue the Turks by piety of life than by armed force. Thus Christendom would be defended by the same methods by which it was once established.”<sup>28</sup> Here Erasmus is explaining to Leo X that the only course of action required to convert the Turks, is to be shown an example of good Christian behavior. His letter shows how he believed that there was always another answer to a war that would be costly in both human lives and their after lives. Erasmus even goes so far as calling them a punishment from god. In a letter to John Rinck<sup>29</sup>, written in 1530, Erasmus he as much states this, “During all these many years how many wars have we not witnesses? What shores does not bear the stain of our blood? How often have we felt the Turkish sword, which is avenging our violation of the covenant we made with God?”<sup>30</sup> Towards the waning years of his life, Erasmus became down trodden with Christianity, and from this quote it can be gathered that he no longer believed that Christianity could be unified. However, different the views of Pius II and Erasmus, they were, as the saying goes, two sides of the same coin. This is never more easily understood than in Pius II’s epistle to Mehmed II.<sup>31</sup>

Pius II begins his letter not with words of praise or offers of friendship, but by belittling Mehmed II’s achievements. Referring to Mehmed II’s victories over the Greeks he states, “These

<sup>28</sup> Erasmus, Desiderius, *Erasmus and His Age; Selected Letters of Desiderius Erasmus*.82.

<sup>29</sup> A law professor at the University of Cologne

<sup>30</sup> Erasmus, *Erasmus and his age*, 236.

<sup>31</sup> The origins surrounding this letter are as controversial as the letter itself. Although there is little to no doubt as to the authenticity of the letter, the question as to why Pius II would write such a letter while attempting to form an army to attack said letters recipient is especially confusing. This letter’s purpose is one of conversion, and on the whole it probably was meant for just that, but Pius II may have had other motives for writing the letter.

exploits seems great to you and we do not call them small. But when Julius Caesar celebrated a triumph for his Pontic victory he had these words inscribed on the chariot which he rode, 'I came, I saw, I conquered,' because he considered the people whom he conquered and whom you overcame this summer to be unwarlike and unimportant..."<sup>32</sup> In just the first section of the letter, Pius II is telling Mehmed II that he has not been truly challenged yet and should not be so eager to begin a war with Latin Europe, while at the same time instilling European superiority. It is doubtful Erasmus would not have felt as confident as Pius II seems to be in this part of the letter. By Erasmus' time the Turks had begun to make stronger incursions into central Europe, such as the Siege of Vienna and the attempt in Austria.

Where Pius II and Erasmus seem to combine is in the belief that Muslims and Christians have a common background which was then corrupted by the Prophet Mohammed. Pius II says of their common background, "The law of the Jew is, therefore, true in your judgment and ours. Moses, David, Solomon, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Daniel are true. All the prophets of the Lord are true. The faith of the Jews is true who preserved in the law before Christ. All peoples who worshipped idols are false. Before Christ, God was known only in Judaea. Up to this point we do not differ."<sup>33</sup> This statement is echoed by Erasmus in his political discourse, "On the War against the Turks". In it he states, "There is even more reason to hope for this from the Turks... none of whom, worships idols; on the contrary, their beliefs are half-Christian... Merely to clamor for war against the Turks, calling them inhuman monsters, traitors to the Church and a race tainted with all kinds of crime and villainy, is simply to betray the ignorant

---

<sup>32</sup> Piccolomini, Aeneas Silvius. *Epistola Ad Mahomatem II*. Edited by Baca, Albert. (American University Studies: Peter Lang, 1990), 13.

<sup>33</sup> Piccolomini. *Epistola Ad Mahomatem II*. 37

mob to the enemy.”<sup>34</sup> Both of these men are asserting that there is very little difference between the two religions and that there can be a common ground on which discussions of peace may be founded. Comparing Erasmus’ views with the humanist Pico della Mirandola (1463-94), there seems to be a general interest in determining how different Islam was from Christianity. Mirandola had little to no qualms about praising the achievements of the Muslims. He believed that there were truths to be found in all peoples throughout time and in any religion.<sup>35</sup> Erasmus did not go as far as that, but he did believe that Islam had at least half truths. Evidence for this can be seen when he refers to the Turks as half-Christian.

It is also interesting to note how Pius II and Erasmus spoke of idol worship and how it was viewed. This was something that both men knew Christianity, Judaism, and Islam had strong feelings about and so would appeal to Mehmed II the most. Erasmus talks about it for much the same reason, but instead of convincing the Turks of this, he is trying to convince his contemporaries that there is some common ground and that war must be a last option only. Either way, both men acknowledged that there is common ground that can be advantageously exploited.

## CONCLUSION

Neither Pope Pius II, nor Desiderius Erasmus, were men who thought and lived in black and white terms. Pius II more than Erasmus seems to have had a personality which led him to make mistakes in his campaign for a crusade. Pius II’s indecisiveness as to whether Mehmed II was a man to convert or just another barbarian of the Islamic faith hindered his crusading rhetoric. He was also living during the time in which the power of the papacy was fast waning and the popes no longer had as much power over their subjects as they did during

---

<sup>34</sup> Erasmus. *The Erasmus Reader*, 325.

<sup>35</sup> Bisaha, *Creating East and West*, 170-172

the crusades. No matter how hard Pius II campaigned, how many manuscripts, or how many letters he wrote, it would never be enough. His crusade never left Europe.

The answer to the Turkish question for Pius II and Erasmus was a difficult one. Pius II had believed that the way to defeat the Turks was to destroy them through the great power of Christian unity. Erasmus believed in the superiority of Christians, but they had to unite and become the example of Christianity in order to complete his goal. Both men had toyed with the idea that the fall of Constantinople and the subsequent attacks against Christians was a punishment from god for the sins of all Christendom. In a work written by Pius II, Jesus and Constantine, are talking about the fall of Constantinople, in which, Constantine is lamenting the loss of his city and those of the Christian faith. Jesus replies, "The Turks have brought deserved punishment upon false Christian kind."<sup>36</sup> Erasmus later said much the same thing, "Can we attribute these successes to the Turks' Piety? Of course not...They are a race softened by debauchery and fearsome only as brigands. What then is the answer? They owe their victories to our sins; we have opposed them but, as the results plainly show, God has been angered against us."<sup>37</sup> Christianity had become wicked and fought more with itself than it did against those who would bring it harm. For Pius II and Erasmus Christian disunity was the true plague of the day and the Turkish horde was merely a symptom of the greater disease.

---

<sup>36</sup> Found in: Hankins. "Renaissance Crusaders: Humanist Crusade Literature in the Age of Mehmed II", 134.

<sup>37</sup> Erasmus. *The Erasmus Reader*, 317

## PRIMARY SOURCES

- Bisticci, *Vespasiano de, Renaissance princes, popes, and prelates: the Vespasiano memoirs, lives of illustrious men of the XVth century*. Trans. Willia George and Emiliy Waters. Intro. by Myron P. Gilmore New York: Harper & Row, 1963
- Cicero, Marcus Tullius. *De Officiis*. Translated by Walter Miller. New York: Macmillan, 2014
- Cyriac of Acona, *Later Travels*. Edited by Edward W. Bodnar Cambridge (Mass.): Harvard University Press, 2003
- Erasmus, Desiderius, *Christian humanism and the Reformation; selected writings*. With *The life of Erasmus*, ed. John C. Olin. New York: Harper & Row, 1975.
- Erasmus, Desiderius. *Epistles of Erasmus, from His Earliest Letters to His Fifty-first Year, Arr. in Order of Time*. Vol. 3, Translated by and Francis Morgan Nichols New York: Russell & Russell, 1962.
- Erasmus, Desiderius, *Erasmus and His Age; Selected Letters of Desiderius Erasmus*. Translated by Marcus A. Haworth. New York, Evanston, and London: Harper & Row, 1970
- Erasmus, Desiderius. *Praise of Folly ; And, Pope Julius Barred from Heaven*. Translated by Roger Clarke. Richmond, U.K.: Oneworld Classics, 2008.
- Erasmus, Desiderius. *The Erasmus Reader*. Edited by Erika Rummel. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990.
- Filelfo, Francesco. *Odes*. Edited by Diana Maury Robin. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2009), 319.
- Kritovoulos, Michael. *History of Mehmed the Conqueror*. Edited by Charles T. Riggs. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1954
- Machiavelli, Niccolo. *The Letters of Machiavelli: A Selection*. Edited and Translated by Allan H. Gilbert. University of Chicago Press ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988.
- Machiavelli, Niccolo, and W. K. Marriott. *The Prince*. Edited by Rob McMahon. Waiheke Island: Floating Press, 2008.
- Piccolomini, Aeneus Silvius “Chrysis” *Humanist Comedies*. Edited by Grund, Gary R. Cambridge, Mass.: I Tatti Renaissance Library Harvard University Press, 2005.
- Piccolomini, Aeneus Silvius *Commentaries*. Vol. 1, Meserve, Margaret and Marcello Simonetta. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2003.
- Piccolomini, Aeneus Silvius *Commentaries*. Vol. 2, Meserve, Margaret and Marcello Simonetta. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2007.
- Piccolomini, Eneas Silvius. *Der Briefwechsel Des Eneas Silvius Piccolomini*.

- Edited by Rudolf Wolkan. In *Fontes Rerum Austriacarum*. Bd. 68. Vienna: Alfred Holder, 1918.
- Piccolomini, Aeneas Silvius. *Epistola Ad Mahomatem II*. Edited by Baca, Albert, Bern. Peter Lang, 1990.
- Piccolomini, Aeneas Silvius. *Europe* (c. 1400-1458). Edited by Bisaha, Nancy. Translated by Brown, Robert D Washington D.C.: Catholic University Press, 2013
- Piccolomini, Aeneas Silvius. *Reject Aeneas, Accept Pius Selected Letters of Aeneas Sylvius Piccolomini (Pope Pius II)*. Translated by Thomas M. Izbicki, Gerald Christiansen, and Philip Krey. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 2006
- Piccolomini, Aeneas Silvius. *Selected Letters of Aeneas Silvius Piccolomini*. Edited by Baca, Albert. Northridge, Calif.: San Fernando Valley State College, 1969
- Platina, Bartolomeo. *The Lives of the Popes: From the Accession of Gregory VII, to the Death of Paul II. Vol. 2* Edited by Benham, William. London: Griffith, Farran, Okeden & Welsh,
- Tafur, Pero. *Tafur Pero, Travels and Adventures: 1435-1439*. Edited by Malcolm Letts. Broadway House, Carter Lane, London: George Routledge and Sons, 1926.
- Vergil. *Vergil's Aeneid, Books I-VI. revised edition*. Edited by Pharr, Clyde. Wauconda, IL: Bolchazy-Carducci Publishers, 1998
- Vergil. *The Aeneid of Virgil, Books VII-XII*. Edited by Page, T. E. London: Macmillan, 1924.
- Vespasiano Da Bisticci. *Renaissance Princes, Popes, and Prelates: The Vespasiano Memoirs, Lives of Illustrious Men of the XVth Century*. Trans. by Waters, W. G., New York: Harper & Row, 1963

## SECONDARY SOURCES

- Artz, Frederick Binkerd. *Renaissance humanism, 1300-1550*. Kent, Ohio: Kent State University Press, 1966.
- Babinger, Franz. *Mehmed the Conqueror and His Time*. Edited by William Hickman. Translated by Ralph Manheim Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1978.
- Bisaha, Nancy. *Creating East and West: Renaissance humanists and the Ottoman Turks*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004.
- Bisaha, Nancy. "New Barbarian or Worthy Adversary?" *Western Views of Islam in Medieval and Early Modern Europe: Perception of Other*. Edited by, David Blanks and Michael Frassetto, New York: St. Martin's Press, 1999.

- Black, Robert. *Benedetto Accolti and the Florentine Renaissance*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985.
- Bushnell, Rebecca W. *A Culture of Teaching: Early Modern Humanism in Theory and Practice*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1996.
- Chambers, David. *Popes, Cardinals, and War: The Military Church in Renaissance and Early Modern Europe*. London: I. B. Tauris, 2006.
- Contadini, Anna, and Claire Norton, eds. *The Renaissance and the Ottoman World*. Farnham: Ashgate, 2013.
- Frazee, Charles A. *Catholics and Sultans: The Church and The Ottoman Empire, 1453-1923*. London: Cambridge University Press, 1983.
- Hamilton, Bernard. "A Necessary Evil? Erasmus, the Crusade, and War against the Turks" *The Crusades and Their Sources: Essays Presented to Bernard Hamilton*. Aldershot, Hampshire, Great Britain: Ashgate, 1998. 259-279
- Hankins, James. "Humanism and the Origins of Modern Political Thought." *The Cambridge Companion to Renaissance Humanism*. Edited by Jill Kraye. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Hankins, James. "Renaissance Crusaders: Humanist Crusade Literature in the Age of Mehmed II." *In Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, Vol. 49. 111-146. Washington, DC: Dumbarton Oaks Publications Office, 1995
- Harper, James G. *The Turk and Islam in the Western Eye, 1450-1750: Visual Imagery before Orientalism*. Farnham, Surrey, UK, England: Ashgate, 2011
- Hillerbrand, Hans Joachim. *The Protestant Reformation*. Rev. Ed., 1st Harper Perennial ed. New York: Harper Perennial, 2009.
- Hope, Charles and Elizabeth McGrath. "Artists and Humanists." *The Cambridge Companion to Renaissance Humanism*. ed. Jill Kraye Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Inalcik, Halil. *A Social and Economic History of the Ottoman Empire, 1300-1914*. Edited by Donald Quataert. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- Mack, Peter. "Humanist Rhetoric and Dialectic." *The Cambridge Companion to Renaissance Humanism*. ed. Jill Kraye Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Mann, Nicholas. "The Origins of Humanism." *The Cambridge Companion to Renaissance Humanism*. ed. Jill Kraye Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Mansfield, Bruce. *Erasmus in the Twentieth Century Interpretations C 1920-2000*. Toronto, Ont.: University of Toronto Press, 2003



- Meserve, Margaret. *Empires of Islam in Renaissance historical thought*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2008.
- Moudarres, Andrea. "Crusade and Conversion: Islam as Schism in Pius II and Nicholas of Cusa." *MLN* 128, no. 1 2013: 40-52.
- Musto, Ronald. "Just Wars and Evil Empires: Erasmus and the Turks" *Renaissance Society and Culture: Essays in Honor of Eugene F. Rice, Jr.* Edited by Eugene F. Rice. New York: Italica Press, 1991. 197-216
- Nirit Ben-Aryeh, Debby. "Crusade Propaganda in Word and Image in Early Modern Italy: Niccolò Guidalotto's Panorama of Constantinople (1662)." *Renaissance Quarterly* 67, no. 2 (2014): pp. 503-543.
- Pippidi, Andrei. *Visions of The Ottoman World in Renaissance Europe*. London: Hurst, 2012.
- Queller, Donald E., and Thomas F. Madden. *The Fourth Crusade: The Conquest of Constantinople, 1201-1204*. Philadelphia, Pa.: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2000.
- Rummel, Erika. *Erasmus*. London: Continuum, 2004.
- Schwoebel, Robert. *The Shadow of the Crescent; the Renaissance Image of the Turk, 1453-1517*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1967.
- Stantchev, Stefan. "Inevitable Conflict or Opportunity to Explore? The Mechanics of Venice's Embargo Against Mehmed II and the Problem of Western-Ottoman Trade After 1453." *Mediaevalia* 32, no. 1 (2011): 155-196.
- Wedel, Christine. *Erasmus of Rotterdam: Advocate of a New Christianity*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2013

## BIOGRAPHY

Kristopher is a History major at UVU. He received his Associate's Degree in Automotive Collision Repair but has decided to continue his education in history. His plans for the future are to continue onto graduate school and eventually earn his Doctorates Degree and teach history class at the university level. He is currently as full-time student as well as working full time. When he has free time he enjoys spending time with his wife and playing video games.



## **ARE THE NATIONAL LIBERATION FRONT (FLN) TERRORISTS OR HEROES?**

**KRISTA MOSBACKER**

**I**n 1830, under the pretense of a slight given to the French Consul by the Ottoman leader in Algiers, France invaded Algeria and quickly took Algiers and the rest of the coastal areas. From that time on the French colonists, or Colons as they come to be known as, were in control and the Algerian people were reduced to second class citizens in their own country. During World War II many Algerians fought for France under the promise that when the war was over they would have more freedoms and power in the colonial government. This promise was one of many that the French never kept. After the French Colons broke this promise at the end of the war the Algerian people were saying enough. Organizations such as the National Liberation Front began to take shape to fight for the freedom of the Algerian people.

When people look back on events in history there are always questions that are asked about these events. One of these possible questions is whether or not the National Liberation Front or FLN were terrorists or heroes during the Algerian Revolution. There is some debate on which side these men and women should be placed. But before that can be answered there is one question that needs to be answered first. What is terrorism? By answering this question the original can be answered as well. In an article called "The Concept of Revolutionary Terrorism" Martha Crenshaw Hutchinson states that revolutionary terrorism is made of four key elements. The four elements that define revolutionary terrorism are: an attempt to seize political power, commits acts of unacceptable

violence, creates a consistent pattern of victims, and produces psychological effects on specific groups. By using these four components of terrorism this paper will show readers that the FLN were terrorists.

The first element of revolutionary terrorism according to Hutchinson is “Terrorism is part of a revolutionary strategy—a method used by insurgents to seize political power from an existing government”.<sup>1</sup> After France invaded and colonized Algeria in 1830 they really put the Algerian people in the position “ripe and ready for revolution”,<sup>2</sup> Hutchinson was quoted saying in Craig Rosenbraugh’s book *The Logic of Political Violence: Lessons in Reform and Revolution*.

After 1871 Algeria was governed not in the interest of France or of the Muslim majority, but for the benefit of the European minority. The disastrous impact of the military conquest and of colonial rule on the social, cultural, linguistic, religious, and economic structures of Algeria was completely disregarded. The traditional life of Algeria was literally destroyed and replaced with an alien system from which Algerians were excluded. Lands, especially the most fertile coastal plains, were seized for European cultivation, leaving the Algerian peasants with sparse plots from which only a bare subsistence could be won. Partial famines were followed by serious epidemics of disease among the local populations in 1893, 1897, and 1920.<sup>3</sup>

Rosenbraugh goes on to talk about the Blum-Violette bill in 1936 that was introduced into the National Assembly that was to allow some categories of Muslims to gain French citizenship. However this bill was shot down by the Colons (the

---

<sup>1</sup> Martha Crenshaw Hutchinson, “The Concept of Revolutionary Terrorism,” in *The Journal of Conflict Resolution* (Sage Publications, 1972), 385.

<sup>2</sup> Craig Rosebraugh, *The Logic of Political Violence: Lessons in Reform and Revolution*, (Portland: Arissa Media Group, 2004), 146.

<sup>3</sup> Martha Crenshaw Hutchinson, *Revolutionary terrorism: The FLN in Algeria, 1954-1962*, (Stanford: Hoover Institution Press, 1978), 2, quoted in Craig Rosebraugh, *The Logic of Political Violence: Lessons in Reform and Revolution*, (Portland: Arissa Media Group, 2004), 146.

French colonists), who did not want to lose any amount of power they had in the country. “As a result, this failure created bitterness, anger, and disillusionment even among moderate Algerians toward the possibility of reform”.<sup>4</sup> James Gelvin gives insight into this.

French colonialism resembled other colonialisms inasmuch as the French justified their activities by claiming that they brought civilization to the benighted natives—what the French called their civilizing mission (*mission civilisatrice*). At the same time, however European settlers and their descendants had access to rights of citizenship that no Muslim Algerian could hope to attain...this made the emergence of Algerian nationalism possible.<sup>5</sup>

The Algerian people and the leaders of the FLN tried for many years before the start of the Algerian Revolution to get better rights and privileges for their people but nothing seemed to work politically. After the Algerian people helped fight in World War II, they hoped that the French would finally give them the freedoms they wanted, but it didn’t happen. Rosebraugh quotes Hutchinson further.

The Algerian masses, now numbering about nine million had no hope of attaining equality of freedom within the French political system as long as the European population maintained its dominant position. No political reforms were in sight, nor were there plans to develop Algeria, to relieve the poverty and ignorance of its peasants, or to promote social, cultural, economic, or educational advancement. The Algerian population was doomed to permanent inferiority...The creation of a new nationality organization determined to use violence was opportune.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>4</sup> Craig Rosebraugh, *The Logic of Political Violence: Lessons in Reform and Revolution*, (Portland: Arissa Media Group, 2004), 147-148.

<sup>5</sup> James L. Gelvin, *The Modern Middle East: A History*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), 89-90.

<sup>6</sup> Martha Crenshaw Hutchinson, *Revolutionary terrorism: The FLN in Algeria, 1954-1962*, (Stanford: Hoover Institution Press, 1978), 6, quoted in Craig Rosebraugh, *The Logic of Political Violence: Lessons in Reform and Revolution*, (Portland: Arissa Media Group, 2004), 150.

The revolution began November 1, 1954. Rosebraugh goes on to point out that nearly all the men involved with the revolution at this point were men who had worked in politics and had seen that nothing was going to happen if they continued to try and work within the French system of government.<sup>7</sup> Violence might have been their only option to gain their freedom, but there is a difference between a revolutionary war and revolutionary terrorism which the FLN turned to later in the conflict. France was not going to give up Algeria without a fight, and that is just what they got.

The second component to revolutionary terrorism is that: "Terrorism is manifested in acts of socially and politically unacceptable violence".<sup>8</sup> For two years the FLN and the Algerian people fought the French in the countryside, keeping the violence away from the cities. However, French forces that had numbered 80,000 in 1954 were now up to 400,000 in 1956 and the effectiveness of the FLN's revolution was diminishing.<sup>9</sup> In his book Rosebraugh points out the beginning of this socially and politically unacceptable violence that was used. "A group called the Zone Autonome d'Alger (ZAA) began a bombing campaign, inflicting massive casualties on European civilians, in addition to assassination of those supporting the French empire, both Algerian and European".<sup>10</sup> They not only killed French civilians, but also their own people if they suspected them of working with the French. Rosebraugh added the following: "One of the main focuses of the ZAA was to leave bombs in public places. In Algiers alone, an estimated several

---

<sup>7</sup> Craig Rosebraugh, *The Logic of Political Violence: Lessons in Reform and Revolution*, (Portland: Arissa Media Group, 2004), 151.

<sup>8</sup> Martha Crenshaw Hutchinson, "The Concept of Revolutionary Terrorism," in *The Journal of Conflict Resolution* (Sage Publications, 1972), 385.

<sup>9</sup> John Ruedy, *Modern Algeria: The Origins and Development of a Nation*, (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2005), 167.

<sup>10</sup> Craig Rosebraugh, *The Logic of Political Violence: Lessons in Reform and Revolution*, (Portland: Arissa Media Group, 2004), 154.

hundred bombs were set off between the fall of 1956 and the summer of 1957”.<sup>11</sup> In the video titled *In the Name of Liberation: Freedom by any Means* the numbers they gave were over three hundred bombs, and thousands of deaths.<sup>12</sup> This part of the Algerian Revolution was called the Battle of Algiers and John Ruedy talks about the start of this battle in his book.

The actual Battle of Algiers as a planned campaign was launched on Sunday evening, September 30, 1956, when three young middle-class women placed bombs in a student dance spot, the fashionable Milk Bar on the Place Bugeaud, and in the downtown terminal of Air France. Three Europeans were killed and scores were seriously wounded, including many children. Orchestrated by Saadi Yacef, commander of the Autonomous Region of Algiers from a hideout in the heart of the Casbah, bombings and other outrages specifically aimed at the most innocent of the city’s population succeeded each other month after bloody month into the winter and spring of 1957.<sup>13</sup>

In an interview in the video Yacef Saadi admits that it had been his idea to use terrorism in the city. He explains that he didn’t think the revolution was going to get anywhere unless they did this to get the attention of the outside world.<sup>14</sup> It appears that the quickest way to do that in this world is if innocent people start dying. Ruedy wrote the same thing in his book, that the FLN felt that they had to “carry the battle from the countryside, where the outside world scarcely noticed what was going on, into the colonial capital by means of urban terrorism”.<sup>15</sup> In his book, *Algeria 1830-2000: A Short History*, Benjamin Stora gives many examples of the violence that was used in Algiers. “On June 3<sup>rd</sup>, a bomb went off near a bus-stop;

---

<sup>11</sup> Ibid., 155.

<sup>12</sup> *In the Name of Liberation: Freedom by any Means*, electronic resource (video), (New York: Films Media Group, 2005).

<sup>13</sup> John Ruedy, *Modern Algeria: The Origins and Development of a Nation*, (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2005), 168.

<sup>14</sup> *In the Name of Liberation: Freedom by any Means*, electronic resource (video), (New York: Films Media Group, 2005).

<sup>15</sup> Ibid., 167-168.

on June 9<sup>th</sup>, the dance hall of a casino was targeted, causing 8 deaths and 92 injuries”.<sup>16</sup> There were many more examples of the violence used against innocent people near the end of the revolution, it may have been in the name of freedom but it was still killing innocents. These examples serve to show that the FLN fill the second element in Hutchinson’s definition of revolutionary terrorism.

The next component in Hutchinson’s definition of revolutionary terrorism is: “There is a consistent pattern of symbolic or representative selection of victims or objects of acts of terrorism”.<sup>17</sup> This component goes along with the last because those acts of violence were carefully chosen to do the most harm, and to send a certain message from the FLN. In Ruedy’s book one FLN man was quoted saying: “one corpse in a jacket is always worth more than twenty in uniform”.<sup>18</sup> They knew that the more innocent lives killed, the more attention their cause would receive. Hutchinson gives good examples of these carefully chosen targets in her article.

The individual victims of FLN terrorism were most often members of identifiable politically relevant groups: for example the European minority, Moslem local or tribal authorities, Moslem elected or nonelected officials in the French administration, Moslems who disobeyed FLN orders on a variety of subjects, policemen, French administrators, Moslems who cooperated socially, politically, or economically with the French, and French military officers responsible for dealing with Moslems...It is not possible to prove FLN intent in each individual act of terrorism. While it is logical that when the FLN chose Moslem municipal officials as victims, the subsequent large number of resignations of these officials was a deliberate aim, specific evidence may be

---

<sup>16</sup> Benjamin Stora, *Algeria 1830-2000: A Short History*, trans. Jane Marie Todd, (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2001), 50.

<sup>17</sup> Martha Crenshaw Hutchinson, “The Concept of Revolutionary Terrorism,” in *The Journal of Conflict Resolution* (Sage Publications, 1972), 385.

<sup>18</sup> John Ruedy, *Modern Algeria: The Origins and Development of a Nation*, (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2005), 168.



lacking. However enough data do exist to indicate that in general acts of terrorism were part of a calculated strategy. The FLN often issued warning tracts or left explanatory messages on the bodies of their victims.<sup>19</sup>

It would seem they would choose targets by what would get their message across the fastest, no matter what the cost would be. With these examples the FLN fulfilled the third element of Hutchinson's definition.

The last element of Hutchinson's definition is: "The revolutionary movement deliberately intends these actions to create a psychological effect on specific groups and thereby to change their political behavior and attitudes".<sup>20</sup> This is perhaps the most damaging yet effective part of revolutionary terrorism, and the reason why it works so well. Martha Hutchinson had a lot to say about this component in her article.

Terrorism's value to revolutionary movements is not proportional to its expense, but to its psychological effectiveness. The most extreme but not the only reaction to acts of terrorism is emotional terror. Psychologists commonly define the psychological condition of terror as extreme fear or anxiety...the reaction to the terrorist menace tends to be anxiety because the stimulus although real is vague, incomprehensible, and totally unexpected: the qualities of the anxiety-producing situation. Persons confronted with terrorism feel helpless, which contributes to their anxiety, but this feeling is usually based on actual impotence. Terrorism appears irrational to the threatened individual, who therefore cannot respond rationally.<sup>21</sup>

Fear does terrible things to a person's mind and makes it so they cannot think straight. By this happening the target audience plays right into the hands of the terrorist group.

<sup>19</sup> Martha Crenshaw Hutchinson, "The Concept of Revolutionary Terrorism," in *The Journal of Conflict Resolution* (Sage Publications, 1972), 386.

<sup>20</sup> Martha Crenshaw Hutchinson, "The Concept of Revolutionary Terrorism," in *The Journal of Conflict Resolution* (Sage Publications, 1972), 385.

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*, 387.

This component goes along really well with the last element in Hutchinson's definition in that the targets were chosen carefully on which would cause the most psychological damage to the masses. Hutchinson had the following to say about this. "The members of direct target groups (and perhaps indirect targets, if they feel some affinity with the direct target) feel vulnerable"...<sup>22</sup> According to Hutchinson however, it doesn't just affect the individual but a community as well.

Terrorism destroys the solidarity, cooperation, and interdependence on which social functioning is based, and substitutes insecurity and distrust... Since one no longer knows what sort of behavior to expect from other members of society, the system is disoriented. The formerly coherent community dissolves into a mass of anomic individuals, each concerned only with personal survival.<sup>23</sup>

A community cannot function if this happens, and with the fall of community a person's sense of well-being also dissolves. It is a vicious cycle which terrorists have learned to use to their advantage. The FLN's terrorist attacks against the French colonists, and even their own people had this effect. In the video Yecéf Saadi explains that the Battle of Algiers and the attacks that took place there was a success. Because of these attacks the French government allowed General Massu and his men *carte blanche* to deal with the FLN and its followers. Massu and his men turned to torture, and killing many innocent people to stop the attacks that were happening in the city and to find the FLN leaders to end the revolution. Their actions brought the eyes of the world on France and split the French government, which then led to the independence of Algeria.<sup>24</sup> From these examples it is clear that affecting people's psychological well-being was a very important part of the FLN's revolutionary tactics.

---

<sup>22</sup> Ibid.

<sup>23</sup> Ibid., 388.

<sup>24</sup> In the Name of Liberation: Freedom by any Means, electronic resource (video), (New York: Films Media Group, 2005).

However, the FLN was not the only side in this war that did terrible things. The French and their brutality were some of the reasons the revolution happened in the first place. Rosebraugh tells a story that illustrates this point nicely.

At the end of World War II, an event occurred on May 8, 1945 that would have a permanent impact on Algeria. Local Moslems in Setif had received permission to hold a “nonpolitical victory parade” under the PPA organization. While the parade was en route, Moslem marchers pulled out a green Algerian flag and displayed banners with PPA slogans. “LONG LIVE INDEPENDENT ALGERIA; DOWN WITH COLONIALISM” and “FREE MESSALI (Hadj),” the banners stated. When a police officer ordered the Moslems to put away the banners, they refused, and police began to struggle with the protestors. A first shot was fired by the police, and in return one band of PPA militants opened fire on the police, then poured through the streets of Setif, knifing and clubbing such settlers as they could find. By the middle of the day, news of the revolt had spread through the territory and Moslems in other areas began rioting. Nearly 100 people died that first day.<sup>25</sup>

After this incident martial law was declared by the French who responded with military force. Many Algerian villages were bombed and the death toll was outrageous. It was estimated that 40,000 Moslems were killed.<sup>26</sup> The French also used acts of torture, and killed innocents in an attempt to find the people responsible for the bombings in Algiers. Stora talked about this in his book.

Massu’s men made massive arrests, systematically took down names, and in the “transit and sorting centers” located on the periphery of the city, practiced torture. The leader of the FLN, Larbi Ben M’Hidi, was arrested on February 17, and subsequently was said to have “committed suicide.” The “very exhaustive” interrogations produced results.<sup>27</sup>

<sup>25</sup> Craig Rosebraugh, *The Logic of Political Violence: Lessons in Reform and Revolution*, (Portland: Arissa Media Group, 2004), 149.

<sup>26</sup> Craig Rosebraugh, *The Logic of Political Violence: Lessons in Reform and Revolution*, (Portland: Arissa Media Group, 2004), 149.

<sup>27</sup> Benjamin Stora, *Algeria 1830-2000: A Short History*, trans. Jane Marie

The video talked about this incident as well. General Paul Aussaresses was the man that was in charge of M'Hidi's interrogation, and said in an interview that he was the one that had executed M'Hidi and reported it as a suicide. When asked if he regretted his actions he said that at the time he did not, it was something he was ordered to do and felt it was necessary in stopping the violence happening in the city. Now, later in life however, he regrets his actions during this time.<sup>28</sup> In his book Ruedy suggests that hundreds to thousands were tortured for information on the FLN, their leaders, and their movements.<sup>29</sup> Captain Pierre Alban Thomas was another French officer who was interviewed in the video. He was involved with the torture of prisoners and believes that it was the sole reason they lost the war. "Torture wasn't the way to go because it only reinforced the rebellion and intensified the hatred towards France." In turn this fueled the FLN and their people because more and more Algerians and even some French citizens joined the cause.<sup>30</sup> These actions do not excuse what the FLN did, but perhaps it makes them a little more understandable. However, do the ends justify the means? This is usually the next question asked, and one that can be hard to answer.

The FLN did many terrible things in the name of freedom and independence from the colonial power of France. Why did they resort to the tactics that they did? Perhaps Martha Hutchinson has answers to that question.

The reason for the frequency of revolutionary terrorism is that it is an effective strategy; its benefits outweigh its costs. The revolutionary movement's decision to use terrorism should be

---

Todd, (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2001), 50.

<sup>28</sup> In the Name of Liberation: Freedom by any Means, electronic resource (video), (New York: Films Media Group, 2005).

<sup>29</sup> John Ruedy, *Modern Algeria: The Origins and Development of a Nation*, (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2005), 168.

<sup>30</sup> In the Name of Liberation: Freedom by any Means, electronic resource (video), (New York: Films Media Group, 2005).

considered as a choice among violent means, not between violence and nonviolence, because peaceful means of political protest are usually denied by the regime. An FLN leader explained, "Urban terrorism like guerrilla warfare is the only method of expression of a crushed people." But the cost of terrorism is much lower than the expense of forming, arming, and supplying guerrilla bands.<sup>31</sup>

Simply it is cheaper to do what they were doing than supply an army. In his book Rosebraugh quotes what Hutchinson said above and goes a little further to explain this. "From a standpoint of basic intelligence, it simply does not make sense to even expect that a regime that colonized a country by military force would willingly grant liberties to the colonized population simply because that population asked nicely".<sup>32</sup> This is understandable, but could they have chosen a different path by still keeping costs down? Hutchinson does say that they made a choice among violent choices. Were there other ways to go about it? Another aspect to this story is that the FLN did not have complete approval of what they were doing from their own people.

With regard to whether it strengthened or weakened the FLN's authority among Algerians, judgments are mixed. Many Muslims were appalled at their side's resort to terrorism against the innocent and at the price equally innocent Algerians were called upon to pay in the French reactions. Others, up to then on the sidelines, were driven into resistance by Massu's counter-terrorist excesses.<sup>33</sup>

Even some of their own people felt that they were terrorists. Hutchinson had something to say about this as well.

---

<sup>31</sup> Martha Crenshaw Hutchinson, "The Concept of Revolutionary Terrorism," in *The Journal of Conflict Resolution* (Sage Publications, 1972), 387.

<sup>32</sup> Craig Rosebraugh, *The Logic of Political Violence: Lessons in Reform and Revolution*, (Portland: Arissa Media Group, 2004), 158.

<sup>33</sup> John Ruedy, *Modern Algeria: The Origins and Development of a Nation*, (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2005), 168-169.

Although resistance to French authority even in the form of armed bandits attacking the French military was relatively normal and considered perfectly honorable in many areas, FLN terrorism was definitely extranormal. Primitive societies, which most of Algeria was, are commonly accustomed to much cruelty, but throat cutting, a frequent FLN method, was used only in animal sacrifices. The FLN also cut off victims' noses, the nose being regarded as a symbol of honor and dignity in Algerian society. Normal tribal violence in rural Algeria, particularly in the Berber regions, was highly ritualized, symbolic, strictly regulated by custom, and involved little bloodshed.<sup>34</sup>

It just was not something that these people did even amongst themselves. To some, the FLN had crossed lines that they should not have crossed and many people around the world would agree with them.

Were the FLN terrorists or heroes? One thing that needs to be remembered about history is that there are always two or more sides to every story told. There will always be people out there that will say that the FLN were in fact heroes and without them Algeria would have never gained their independence, which is probably true. Situations in history, and life in general, cannot always be black or white and fit nicely into a little box. Sometimes things are in fact gray and extremely complicated in nature. This is probably one of those times. Could they have accomplished the same thing by not killing innocent people? Possibly, but we'll never know for sure. However, if you look at Hutchinson's definition of revolutionary terrorism there is definitely the argument that they were in fact terrorists.

---

<sup>34</sup> Martha Crenshaw Hutchinson, "The Concept of Revolutionary Terrorism," in *The Journal of Conflict Resolution* (Sage Publications, 1972), 386-387.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Gelvin, James L. *The Modern Middle East: A History*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Hutchinson, Martha Crenshaw. "The Concept of Revolutionary Terrorism." *The Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 1972: 383-396.
- In The Name of Liberation: Freedom by any Means. 2005.
- Rosebraugh, Craig. *The Logic of Political Violence: Lessons in Reform and Revolution*. Portland: Arissa Media Group, 2004.
- Ruedy, John. *Modern Algeria: The Origins and Development of a Nation*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2005.
- Stora, Benjamin. *Algeria: 1830-2000 A Short History*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2001.

## BIOGRAPHY

Krista is studying History Education and is hoping to teach high school history after she graduates. She is a single mom and says about going back to school "It's tough but worth all the hassle that comes with it sometimes."





# **LEGAL BATTLES PRELUDING CIVIL WAR: CONSTITUTIONAL ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST SOUTHERN SECESSION**

**KAMERON R. GONZALEZ**

**H**istory reveals the remarkable yet unsettling story of the American Civil War—a time when brother fought against brother, neighbor against neighbor, and citizen against citizen in a bloody contest of will and survival that ultimately cost the relatively young and developing nation thousands of lives and years of recovery. The work of many historians has highlighted the chronological forthcoming and nature of the Civil War, often in an attempt to discover the reasons as to why such a war came to be. Whereas much has been published resolving questions concerning the nature of the war, a less frequent emphasis taken has been the legal war that occurred congruently with the proceedings of the actual war. Of unique significance in the political and legal realms are the constitutional arguments involving the right of a state to disband from the union with which it is associated.

The secession of the thirteen states prior to the American Civil War provides a unique case study in constitutional history—both in the history of constitutions, generally, and the case of the United States, specifically. Secession was only utilized with near success one time in United States' history, although the threat of secession has not been uncommon to political discourse since the ratification of the Constitution. However, the constitutionality of the southern secession during the Civil War remains a question of constitutional reasoning, as demonstrated by the recurring tendency in some

political realms to open the secession argument when issues of dual federalism arise between the states and the Union. Important to compare, wherefore, is the effectiveness of the constitutional arguments employed during the great secession era of American constitutional history.

This article thus analyzes the legal arguments that would justify or disqualify secession as a legal means of state separation from the Union, juxtaposing the two positions—North and South—in an effort to uphold or debunk its legal credibility. Ultimately, the justification of secession might have depended on perception of the Constitution and underlying principles, which leads to suggest that both the South and the North engaged sound constitutional arguments to vindicate secession as constitutionally legal or illegal, respectively.

The acting body that enlisted secession, referred to in this article as “the South” or “the southern states,” was the principle actor in the secession argument, having first invoked the means of withdrawal without testing its legality in the courts. The South’s legally founded action of secession was then met by a northern rhetorical reaction of arguably equal counterweight. Thus the South, in establishing strong initial arguments, was countered and questioned by the North. Following South Carolina’s lead, the South was momentarily able to successfully withdraw from the Union. However, the North did not stand to agree with basic southern assumptions over such a withdrawal—at least, in this case, on a legal basis—and would fight both legally and militarily to coerce its legal opinion on the South.

### **ORDINANCES OF SECESSION**

Before delving into a discussion about the legal arguments of secession, the first documents to explore are the actual declarations of the states to secede from the Union. Perhaps the most important to examine is the “Declaration of the Immediate Causes Which Induce and Justify the Secession of South

Carolina from the Federal Union.” South Carolina, the first state to secede, is seen as the leader of the secession movement not only chronologically, but also ideologically.<sup>1</sup> Therefore, this document is seen as the forerunner to all ensuing acts of secession.

The “Declaration of the Immediate Causes”<sup>2</sup> first argues two major points in justifying secession, both of which draw from the Declaration of Independence. Notable at once is the lack of legal binding of the Declaration of Independence upon the states under the Constitution. Notwithstanding, the South Carolina legislature used the words of the Declaration of Independence in connection with the Constitution to make its arguments.

The first argument makes use of the words “FREE AND INDEPENDENT STATES,” as stated in the Declaration of Independence (1776). The “Declaration of the Immediate Causes” deems this idea expressed as “the right of a State to govern itself.”<sup>3</sup> Furthering this argument with the second point, the document then reasons that the thirteen free and independent states “solemnly declared that whenever any ‘form of government becomes destructive of the ends for which it was established, it is the right of the people to alter or abolish it, and to institute a new government.’”<sup>4</sup> This idea is seen as “the right of a people to abolish a Government when it becomes destructive of the ends for which it was instituted.”<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Hudson Meadwell and Lawrence M. Anderson, “Sequence and Strategy in the Secession of the American South,” *Theory and Society* 37 no. 3 (June 2008): 200, accessed 2014, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40211035>.

<sup>2</sup> “Declaration of the Immediate Causes Which Induce and Justify the Secession of South Carolina from the Federal Union,” Yale Law School: Lillian Goldman Law Library, 2008, accessed 2014, [http://avalon.law.yale.edu/19th\\_century/csa\\_scarsec.asp](http://avalon.law.yale.edu/19th_century/csa_scarsec.asp).

<sup>3</sup> Ibid.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid.

These two rights, in combination, justified the overthrow of Great Britain's rule and subsequent establishment of the Articles of Confederation. From thence the states, acting as sovereigns, became parties to the Constitution, in a position to adopt or reject the Constitution (adoption being the result), which "thus established, by compact between the States, a Government with definite objects and powers, limited to the expressed words of the grant."<sup>6</sup>

The South Carolina special legislature, in order to advance the rhetorical argument, invoked the two rights provided by the Declaration of Independence exercised in the adoption of the Articles of Confederation and the Constitution as the means by which secession is made possible. Expounding upon the exercise of these rights in secession, the document goes on to explain the offenses in which the constitutional Union had become "destructive of the ends for which it was established," and introduced the first constitutional argument by stating that "among these offenses was the enforcement of legal and Constitutional obligations surrounding the institution of slavery."<sup>7</sup>

Article IV of the United States Constitution states that "No person held to Service or Labour in one State, under the Laws thereof, escaping into another, shall, in Consequence of any Law or Regulation therein, be discharged from such Service or Labour, but shall be delivered up, on claim of the Party to whom such Service or Labour may be due."<sup>8</sup> Southern states not only used this clause as evidence of constitutional endorsement of slavery, but also founded upon this clause the argument that the discharge of these obligations by the Northern states was in essence a breach of contract (the Constitution being the contract). Also, negligence of enforcement on the part of the federal government proved enough to claim that it had become destructive of its end by disregarding the rule of law—sufficient grounds

---

<sup>6</sup> "Declaration of Immediate Causes."

<sup>7</sup> Ibid.

<sup>8</sup> U.S. Constitution, art. 4, sec. 2.

for abolishment of the government by means of withdrawal from the contract of the Constitution.

Other state declarations mostly echoed the message of the first, but with fewer words and often intensified antagonism. The “Alabama Ordinance of Secession” avowed passionately that “many and dangerous infractions of the constitution of the United States by many of the States and people of the Northern section, is a political wrong of so insulting and manacing [sic.] a character as to justify the people of the State of Alabama in the adoption of prompt and decided measures for their future peace and security, therefore.”<sup>9</sup> North Carolina, in a different manner, boldly declared that “the union now subsisting between the State of North Carolina and the other States, under the title of the United States of America, is hereby dissolved, and that the State of North Carolina is in full possession and exercise of all those rights of sovereignty which belong and appertain to a free and independent State,”<sup>10</sup> again inciting the argument of free and independent states first expressed by its southern counterpart.

These states each employed the traditional American avenue of constitutional alteration—conventions. Each state called for at least a state convention to conduct the proceedings of secession, and some states even went so far as to call for a general convention of the southern states.<sup>11</sup> The latter never came to fruition, and as a result the states acted individually in rescinding state ratification of the Constitution.<sup>12</sup>

<sup>9</sup> “Alabama Ordinance of Secession,” *Constitution Society*, January 11, 1861, accessed 2014, [http://www.constitution.org/csa/ordinances\\_secession.htm](http://www.constitution.org/csa/ordinances_secession.htm).

<sup>10</sup> “North Carolina Ordinance of Secession,” *Constitution Society*, May 20, 1861, accessed 2014, [http://www.constitution.org/csa/ordinances\\_secession.htm](http://www.constitution.org/csa/ordinances_secession.htm)

<sup>11</sup> T. Conn Bryan, “The Secession of Georgia,” *The Georgia Historical Quarterly* 31 no. 2 (June 1947): 89-91, accessed 2014, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40577110>.

<sup>12</sup> Meadwell and Anderson, “Sequence and Strategy in the Secession,” 21.

Therefore, the several instruments—the sovereignty of the states, the right of the states to abolish a corrupt government, the political grievances unjustly rewarded by the North, the use of state conventions—were thus employed in the secession announcement to the effect of legalizing the separation of the southern states from the Union. Though well founded in legal reasoning, the reasoning would have to extend beyond that stated in this declaration—the North in reaction would demand greater rationalization than what was first heralded for such a radical act.

### **UNION RESPONSE TO ORDINANCES OF SECESSION**

The nature of the North's approach in response may well be understood by looking at any legal accusation, which is raised by a plaintiff or prosecutor against a defendant or respondent. Given tradition of American law, the burden of proof lies on the plaintiff to demonstrate the guilt of the defendant. The North, in its position, was consigned to respond to the pontification of the Southern states' accusation of constitutional breach, and, given the benefit of leaving the burden of proof to the accusers, the North quickly declared the secession illegal and declared a lack of real cause from that which was provided. The justification provided by the South was thus determined dissatisfactory and was speedily rejected.

The North took issue with all of the several arguments employed by the Southern states in their declarations. Some explanations for rejection of the arguments are traced to the express language of the Constitution, while others find root in theoretical arguments surrounding the Constitution. The immediate rejection of the hasty secession thus requires a deeper analysis beyond the surface plain language arguments. Why did the South feel it had legal cause great enough to secede? Why did the North feel the South did not? Venturing into the underlying legal tone of the preceding years perhaps provides an answer.

## CONTRACT THEORY AND COMPACT THEORY

Elementary methods of interpreting secession in America have been traced back to the compact theory of the states and the social contract theory, two similar but fundamentally variant doctrines. Though the doctrines were introduced long before the institution of the Constitution, the doctrines played a major role in the ultimate ratification by the states of the Constitution.

### SOCIAL CONTRACT THEORY

Social contract theory, though centuries old, was articulated only years prior by John Locke and was later utilized by the Second Continental Congress in its Declaration of Independence. The social contract theory asserts that governments are created at the “consent of the governed” to the effect of protecting certain rights of the individual. Should those rights be infringed or abridged by the government without consent, the governed could revoke the established government and replace it with a new government.

The key elements of the theory are consent and individuals. The idea of individuals giving consent developed into the concept of popular sovereignty, which was used by federalists during the composition of the Constitution to validate instituting a federal government. This federalist, or nationalist, approach effectually shifted the sovereignty from the states to the individuals within the states. Belz articulates this very theoretical framework:

The nationalist school held that the Union was a political association of individuals, and the federal government the supreme sovereign authority of the nation constituted by those individuals. Nationalists relied mainly on the text of the Constitution—in particular the language of the preamble referring to ‘We the people of the United States’—and on the form of federal government as a republican government authorized to make and enforce law upon individuals.<sup>13</sup>

<sup>13</sup> Herman Belz, “Secession, Revolution and Social Contract Theory in

The prescribed manner of dealing with unjust government, according to theory, is the rising up of the governed to abolish the government—or in other words, revolution. With this in mind, it is no wonder the North saw secession not as an act of one state exiting a contract with another, but a group of the governed stirring up in insurrection, attempting to abolish a government, without considering if every governed individual desired abolishment.

The newly instated President Abraham Lincoln purported this argument in his first inaugural address: “If the United States be not a government proper, but an association of States in the nature of contract merely, can it, as a contract, be peaceably unmade by less than all the parties who made it? One party to a contract may violate it? Break it, so to speak? But does it not require all to lawfully rescind it?”<sup>14</sup>

This statement alludes to the argument that the contract among the American people is an executed contract, and would require the consent of all parties involved for a party (i.e. state) to remove itself. The North articulated that the South by not requesting consent of all sections party to the contract was not withdrawing from a contract but rather breaching a contract, which would require justice to mend (and ultimately coercion to enforce).

### STATE COMPACT THEORY

The compact theory of the Union differs from the contract theory in that the compact theory emphasizes the role of the states in forming the Union. The forming of the Union, as the theory asserts, consisted of states coming together agreeing to form a league—to be a part of a greater association or body.

---

American Political Thought,” *The Good Society* 6 no. 3 (Fall 1996): 12, accessed 2014, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20710761>.

<sup>14</sup> qtd. in Veronica Burchard, “Lincoln’s Refutation of Secession,” *OAH Magazine of History* 21 no. 1 (January 2007): 31, accessed 2014, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25162097>.



The sovereign actors united under the umbrella of federal authority remained the states, while the federal government was delegated only specific powers to maintain effectively certain political matters. Anderson captures this notion:

The origins of secession are found in the doctrine of the compact theory of the union. Although not universally embraced, compact theory certainly held sway among those fighting perceived encroachments of the federal government. A challenge to the constitutionality of the Alien and Sedition Acts, the Kentucky and Virginia resolutions (passage of which was directed by Thomas Jefferson and James Madison) asserted that the union under the Constitution was a compact and that, because there was no common judge to determine infractions of the compact, states possessed the power to interpose their sovereignty between their citizens and the federal government, nullifying any law that the states found to be unconstitutional. As a grievance-amelioration strategy, secession was regularly entertained by aggrieved states.<sup>15</sup>

The south embraced the compact theory from the onset of the Union, making various political stands based on the theory (e.g. nullification in South Carolina). Southern “aggrieved states” turned again to the compact theory to advance their legal position, and did so quite poignantly.

The position held was that each state, having at one time ratified the Constitution, could simply repeal the ratification at any time with the provision of any relevant grievance. This the states did, each recalling the acts of the legislature that committed to the Union that state.

South Carolina had been a clear proponent of this doctrine. Senator John C. Calhoun had entreated the theory during the nullification crisis of 1832. South Carolina at that time was alienated politically and failed to rouse the remaining of the South to enlist the compact theory as justification of

<sup>15</sup> Lawrence M. Anderson, *The Institutional Basis of Secessionist Politics: Federalism and Secession in the United States*, Oxford University Press 34 no. 2 (Spring 2004): 12, accessed 2014, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3331204>.

aggressive state action.<sup>16</sup> However, the antebellum years provided a different political climate in the South than the nullification years.

Using the state compact theory as a means of justifying secession, the South would then solicit arguments from other Constitutional provisions—at the forefront slavery.

### SLAVERY AND THE CONSTITUTION: SOUTHERN PERSPECTIVES

Slavery was the foremost dividing factor that acted as a wedge both politically and constitutionally between the South and the North. Much of the legal and political debate of the time nationwide was the issue of slavery. Constitutional arguments, so argued the South, transcended the moral arguments of the North. The South from the beginning made it clear that slavery was to be handled as a constitutional issue, not a moral issue.

The constitutional argument of slavery dates as far back as the drafting of the Articles of Confederation (if not further). After ratification of the U.S. Constitution, however, major debate over the meaning of various clauses and their intended effects arose. The South was persistent in declaring the constitutionality of the institution of slavery, well reflected in the statement of John C. McGehee—president of the Florida constitutional convention—saying that “in the formation of the Government of our Fathers, the Constitution of 1787, the institution of domestic slavery is recognized, and the right of property in slaves is expressly guaranteed.”<sup>17</sup> Several clauses, as the South would assert, stood as obvious justifications for slavery.

---

<sup>16</sup> Alfred Hinsley Kelly, Winifred A. Harbison, and Herman Belz. *The American Constitution: Its Origins and Development* (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, Inc. 1991) 207-212.

<sup>17</sup> qtd. in Donald R. Hadd, “The Irony of Secession,” *The Florida Historical Quarterly* 41 no. 1 (July 1962): 24, accessed 2014, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/30139892>.

*Three fifths clause.* The first clause contained in the Constitution is the three fifths clause of Article 1, Section 2, which states that “Representatives and direct Taxes shall be apportioned among the several States...according to their respective Numbers, which shall be determined by adding to the whole Number of free Persons...and excluding...three fifths of all other Persons.”<sup>18</sup> Three fifths of all other persons is well understood to refer to slaves. Prior to secession, the South claimed this as Constitutional recognition of slavery.

*Fugitive slave clause.* The second clause, stated earlier, is the fugitive slave clause of Article 4, Section 2. In summary, this clause provides that slaves who have escaped into other states or territories must be returned to the original state for prosecution. This clause was the most striking clause the South used to justify its grievances with Northern states, considering that many states both north and west of the slave states had been disregarding this law as a means of entreating a moral attack against slavery. Frustration with the lack of state and federal enforcement of the fugitive slave law left the southern states with little else to do.

*Commerce clause.* An important third clause is the commerce clause of Article 1, Section 8, which gives Congress the power to “regulate commerce...among the several states.”<sup>19</sup> Slaves had traditionally been seen as property therefore a commercial enterprise. However, the commerce clause as a forum for the protection of the institution of slavery as an interstate commercial enterprise had proven itself a double-edged sword. The use of the commerce clause in the antebellum years saw incredible drifting between those who desired to use it as a means of protecting slavery and those who wanted to use it as a means of ending slavery. In order to avoid such a fate, supporters of slavery argued that the institution was a local institution, outside of the scope of federal power—a

<sup>18</sup> U.S. Constitution, art. 1, sec. 2.

<sup>19</sup> U.S. Constitution, art. 1, sec 8.

point confirmed by the Supreme Court under the leadership of Chief Justice Roger Taney.<sup>20</sup> Torodash (1971) explains that “during the later slavery controversy, some Northerners argued that the commerce clause was the weapon Congress could have utilized to regulate or forbid the interstate slave trade”.<sup>21</sup> Fear of this use of power was no doubt on the minds of many in the South during the period of secession. On the other hand, the South disapproved of Congressional inaction in creating and enforcing interstate slave laws—perhaps establishing a constitutional double standard.

Though not the constitutional base upon which secession was constructed, manifestations of slavery in the Constitution became an important element of the secessionist sentiment. The abuse of such manifestations were used as examples of the type of grievances that would make possible the displacement of the government by the governed. Because the North abused the slavery clauses and by implication stopped adhering to all the terms of the contract, the South saw a quick and easy argument for justifying its exit.

The North, as could be imagined, used these same clauses with different approaches to demonstrate that slavery was indeed not fully protected or endorsed under the Constitution, and thus not grounds for claims of grievance. Even amidst its lack of enforcement of generally known Constitutional obligations, the North could without much effort also cite constitutional misnomers of the South—the most salient at that point being the act of secession.

---

<sup>20</sup> Kelly, Harbison, and Belz, *The American Constitution*, 250-251.

<sup>21</sup> Martin Torodash, “Constitutional Aspects of Slavery,” *The Georgia Historical Quarterly* 55, no. 2 (Summer 1971): 238, accessed 2014, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40579276>.

## CONSTITUTIONAL CONSIDERATIONS: NORTHERN ARGUMENTS

Perhaps the greatest point that the North made during the time of secession was that no constitutional provision was made to accommodate the exit of any state. This fact was only strengthened by the North's contract theory approach, arguing that the Constitution was clearly meant to be a finalized and executed agreement. The North only saw justification by using the Declaration of Independence—which is not legally binding—as a smokescreen masking the lack of a real Constitutional argument. The North also utilized several other constitutional arguments to repel the secessionist doctrine.

*Absence of provision.* The Constitution provides expressly means of a state's entry into the Union, but remains completely silent about a state's exit. The lack of this provision, argued the North, shows that by contracting in Constitution, the states waived ability to secede. Lincoln also expressed in his inaugural address that “no government proper ever had a provision in its organic law for its own termination. Continue to execute all the express provisions of our National Constitution, and the Union will endure forever.”<sup>22</sup>

*Supremacy clause.* The supremacy clause of the Constitution also concreted the fact that the Union is a federation, and that states share powers with the federal government. The states had, by agreeing to the Constitution, agreed to the yielding of certain powers to the federal government—powers that could not simply be taken back.<sup>23</sup>

*Slavery.* The North had legitimate reason to insist that the Constitution had never actually guaranteed slavery, but rather left it open to be restricted—if not altogether abolished. The three fifths compromise was not an endorsement of slavery; the compromise opened the door for slavery to become the

<sup>22</sup> qtd. in Veronica Burchard, “Lincoln’s Refutation of Secession,” 31.

<sup>23</sup> Kelly, Harbison, and Belz, *The American Constitution*, 282.

subject of debate for the states and the Congress. Also, the provision that in effect left open the ending of the slave trade in Article 1, Section 9 of the Constitution was compelling evidence of congressional power to put a halt to the practice. This argument was not new by any means, having been expressed by some during the Constitutional Convention.<sup>24</sup> Even though the debate over slavery does not directly link to legality of secession, the fact that opposing views over slavery as a constitutional issue makes clear the fact that “grievances” announced by the South could have been more like complaints or a means of proscribing an agenda—as seen in the general attitude of the North concerning the secession.

*Declaration of Independence.* Again, the North had difficulty accepting the use of the Declaration of Independence (1776) as a means of legal justification. Moreover, the North saw the South as the greatest villain to the Declaration, considering that the institution of slavery was violating the provision that decrees that “all men are created equal” (1776). To witness the South use the Declaration in justifying its action was seen as hypocritical and illegitimate.<sup>25</sup>

*Revolution and social contract.* Seeing as the contract theory suggests that only individuals in revolution can dissolve a corrupt government, the Union asserted that Southern secession could not in the end be about procedural Constitutional dismemberment based on legal principles, but rather revolutionary measures based on political grievances. The Union insisted that the Southern states, by decrying legal remedy in secession, were in fact hiding the real reason behind the abandonment—revolution, or “insurrectionary” actions, as Lincoln expressed.<sup>26</sup> Both sides recognized this by the time secession had commenced:

---

<sup>24</sup> Martin Torodash, “Constitutional Aspects of Slavery,” 238.

<sup>25</sup> Kelly, Harbison, and Belz, *The American Constitution*, 282.

<sup>26</sup> Veronica Burchard, “Lincoln’s Refutation of Secession,” 31.

The actions of the Louisiana convention indicate...that the delegates no longer looked upon secession as a feat necessarily to be achieved by explicitly sanctioned constitutional procedures, or to be sustained by peaceful means. In other words, by the time the secession ordinance was adopted, the delegates (and doubtless their constituents) were aware they were engaged in revolution, and that the undertaking was likely to end in war.<sup>27</sup>

The North must have seen that revolution, or otherwise replacement of the existing regime, could not be reached by any one state's actions, but could only be reached by utter majority of the states (as was done with the replacement of the Articles of Confederation with the Federal Constitution). Thus, the South failed to comply with majority rule.<sup>28</sup>

*Unconstitutional state actions.* The North saw some actions of southern states prior to secession as grossly unconstitutional. Of principal note is the overtaking of federal military installations before secession was complete. Governor Brown of Georgia was instrumental in encouraging southern states to take this aggressive action, leading by example by taking Fort Pulaski in Georgia. "Although the possession of Fort Pulaski was a military necessity to the state, its seizure before Georgia had seceded was, to say the least, 'unconstitutional,' and must have been so considered even by a secessionist as ardent as the Governor."<sup>29</sup> This was one offense that the North saw as evidence that the South truly had little constitutional consideration during secession. It is no surprise, then, that the North matched this military hostility of the South with its own military power.

<sup>27</sup> Charles P. Roland, "Louisiana and Secession," *Louisiana History: The Journal of the Louisiana Historical Association* 19 no. 4 (Autumn 1978): 397-398, accessed 2014, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4231817>.

<sup>28</sup> Herman Belz, "Secession, Revolution and Social Contract Theory," 13.

<sup>29</sup> Louise Biles Hill, "Governor Brown and the Confederacy," *The Georgia Historical Quarterly* 21 no. 3 (September 1937): 247, accessed 2014, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40550171>.

## SETTLEMENT OF THE CONSTITUTIONALITY QUESTION

The North, outspokenly rejected most arguments that the South asserted. Those in power acted quickly to show that they did not buy most constitutional arguments proceeding from the various ordinances of secession. The ultimate settling of the constitutionality of secession was consequently decided by force during the Civil War, and was not able to be addressed through judicial-legal channels alone. The North, having secured victory over the South, had asserted not only military dominance, but also legal and jurisprudential dominance. The wayward states were reined in and contained, and the question of the Constitutionality of secession became permanent—secession is not constitutionally justified.

Curiosity holds, however, that if the South had indeed won the war with the Union, perhaps Constitutional history would be telling a different story—one that divulges that secession *is* Constitutionally justified, or at least can be successfully employed if a state is willing to exact its military resources. However, this curiosity begs the question that if secession must be justified by war, which is arguably illegal in its nationally internal form, then is secession actually legally justifiable or must it be a prize won by war? Further, if secession is a prize to be won by war, what other legal prizes can be won by the same means? Although these questions take on arguments of their own, they certainly leave the door open for discussion regarding the finality of legal secession. Also, regardless of the constitutional-legal soundness of secession, the North politically had strong reason to disallow the Confederacy from forming, which in any event may have overridden any legal soundness demonstrated in secession.

In the end, perception of secession would be essential in determining the legality of it. For the South, secession was perfectly justifiable. Continued ignorance of various constitu-



tional clauses by northern states gave the South enough motive to disband from the Union. For the North, secession was a stretch of the legal imagination and would not go uncontested. Both sides based arguments on prominent jurisprudential thought and constitutional principles contemporaneous to the antebellum period, as well as turning to express language within the Constitution to articulate arguments that, though strong, could not ultimately decide the question of secession's constitutionality by constitutional arguments alone. By the end of the ordeal, the North was able to secure its position in rejecting secession, which required more than constitutional contest in a legal battleground to accomplish.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- “Alabama Ordinance of Secession.” *Constitution Society*, January 11, 1861, accessed 2014, [http://www.constitution.org/csa/ordinances\\_secession.htm](http://www.constitution.org/csa/ordinances_secession.htm).
- Anderson, Lawrence M. *The Institutional Basis of Secessionist Politics: Federalism and Secession in the United States*. Oxford University Press 34 no. 2 (Spring 2004): 1-18, accessed 2014, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3331204>.
- Belz, Herman. “Secession, Revolution and Social Contract Theory in American Political Thought.” *The Good Society* 6 no. 3 (Fall 1996): 11-15, accessed 2014, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20710761>.
- Bryan, T. Conn. “The Secession of Georgia.” *The Georgia Historical Quarterly* 31 no. 2 (June 1947): 89-111, accessed 2014, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40577110>.
- Burchard, Veronica. “Lincoln’s Refutation of Secession.” *OAH Magazine of History* 21 no. 1 (January 2007): 29-32, accessed 2014, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25162097>.
- Declaration of the Immediate Causes Which Induce and Justify the Secession of South Carolina from the Federal Union*. Yale Law School: Lillian Goldman Law Library, 2008, accessed 2014, [http://avalon.law.yale.edu/19th\\_century/csa\\_scaresec.asp](http://avalon.law.yale.edu/19th_century/csa_scaresec.asp).
- Hadd, Donald R. “The Irony of Secession.” *The Florida Historical Quarterly* 41 no. 1 (July 1962): 22-28, accessed 2014, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/30139892>.
- Hill, Louise Biles. “Governor Brown and the Confederacy.” *The Georgia Historical Quarterly* 21 no. 3 (September 1937): 239-264, accessed 2014, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40550171>.
- Kelly, Alfred Hinsey, Winifred Audif Harbison, and Herman Belz. *The American Constitution: Its Origins and Development*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, Inc. 1991.
- Meadwell, Hudson and Lawrence M. Anderson. “Sequence and Strategy in the Secession of the American South.” *Theory and Society* 37 no. 3 (June 2008): 199-227, accessed 2014, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40211035>.
- “North Carolina Ordinance of Secession.” *Constitution Society*, May 20, 1861, accessed 2014, [http://www.constitution.org/csa/ordinances\\_secession.htm](http://www.constitution.org/csa/ordinances_secession.htm)
- Roland, Charles P. “Louisiana and Secession.” *Louisiana History: The*

*Journal of the Louisiana Historical Association* 19, no. 4 (Autumn 1978): 389-399, accessed 2014, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4231817>.

Torodash, Martin. "Constitutional Aspects of Slavery." *The Georgia Historical Quarterly* 55, no. 2 (Summer 1971): 234-247, accessed 2014, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40579276>.

## BIOGRAPHY

Kameron is from South Ogden, Utah and is studying Political Science at UVU with a Public Law/Political Philosophy Emphasis and a Minor in Business. He is expected to graduate Spring 2016 with his Bachelor's Degree. In the future he would like a career as a Lawyer, Higher Education Lecturer and/or a Policy Advisor. His extracurricular activities include: UVU Ambassador, UVU Center for the Advancement of Leadership, Orem Institute of Religion Student Council, and Woodbury School of Business Communications Tutor.



## COMMISSIONER LIN AND CHARLES ELLIOT: THE FIRST OPIUM WAR

JAY T. CHERRY

Commissioner Lin and Captain Charles Elliot led two empires into a war that would reshape one empire and mean very little to the other. Commissioner Lin Zexu was sent by the Emperor of the Qing Dynasty in 1839 to lead the Qing Empire's campaign against the illegal opium trade in Canton or Guangzhou, China. Commissioner Lin's powers were great when he was sent to Canton. The Emperor had basically given him a blank check to resolve the opium problem. However, Commissioner Lin did not realize or truly understand to what length the British would go to in protecting their trade interests. In 1836 Captain Charles Elliot was made Chief Superintendent of British Trade in China. When he was appointed his position held little real power. Because he couldn't force the British traders to do what he asked he could only advise them. It was nonetheless his job to protect British trade with China. This meant that he could call on the British navy if there was a crisis. These two men would lead their respective countries into war and shape the conflict in many ways.

The First Opium War had been building to a head for years before war finally broke out. This was a war about relations between Britain and China. When Britain started trading with China, neither country had much knowledge of the other. The British would push to have meetings with the emperor to establish trade relations, and the Chinese would avoid them or be dismissive because they did not think foreign trade was important. China needed nothing from foreign countries to sustain its economy, and Britain's economy was

based on trade with foreign powers. China would develop the Canton System to deal with foreign trade, and this would allow the Emperor to focus on the state.

The British found the Canton System less than ideal, and never fully understood it. The Westminster Review discusses how Lord Napier is a prime example of not understanding China in an article titled "China: its Early History, Literature, and Language; Mis-translation of Chinese Official Documents; Causes of the Present War." Lord Napier preceded Captain Elliot as Chief Superintendent of British Trade in China, but Napier managed to botch things by refusing to relay messages through the Cohong Merchants and demanding to speak with the province administrator. Lord Napier's messages was refused and he attempted to attack Canton, until sickness forced him to turn back. This sickness would ultimately take his life.<sup>1</sup> The Chinese denounced opium smoking for years before the war, and requested that the British cease trading in it. The British ignored this, bringing or trading more opium

<sup>1</sup> P.P.T., "China: its Early History, Literature, and Language; Mis-translation of Chinese Official Documents; Causes of the Present War," *The Westminster Review* 34 (1840): 281-83.

Statement of the Sales of Opium by the East India Company at Calcutta,  
from 1798-99 to 1837-38.

Seasons.	Total Chests.	Total annual sales in Sic. Rs.	Seasons.	Total Chests.	Total annual sales in Sic. Rs.
1798-99	4172	17,31,161	1818-19	3552	63,43,265
1799-1800	4054	31,42,591	1819-20	4006	82,55,603
1800-1	4570	31,43,085	1820-21	4244	1,05,63,891
1801-2	3947	37,19,748	1821-22	3293	1,31,76,313
1802-3	3292	45,55,728	1822-23	3918	1,08,29,496
1803-4	2840	39,44,595	1823-24	3360	65,08,610
1804-5	3159	62,03,805	1824-25	5690	74,01,553
1805-6	3836	58,94,919	1825-26	3810	88,80,225
1806-7	4126	40,77,948	1826-27	6570	83,30,025
1807-8	4538	68,54,157	1827-28	6650	1,12,28,416
1808-9	4208	51,05,760	1828-29	7709	1,06,35,134
1809-10	4561	80,70,955	1829-30	8778	1,12,55,767
1810-11	4968	80,88,390	1830-31	7548	1,18,07,008
1811-12	4891	79,96,870	1831-32	7938	1,17,70,875
1812-13	4966	62,76,705	1832-33	10638	1,24,59,572
1813-14	4769	88,71,475	1833-34	12223	1,16,31,890
1814-15	3672	89,14,290	1834-35	12977	1,32,15,464
1815-16	4230	90,93,980	1835-36	14745	1,87,93,355
1816-17	4618	90,79,972	1836-37	16916	2,53,95,300
1817-18	3692	80,43,197	1837-38	17244	2,27,89,865

every year. The Colonial Magazine and Commercial-Maritime Journal ran an article entitled “The Opium Trade, and True Cause of the Stoppage.” Which would show the increase in opium trade over forty years.<sup>2</sup>

This all happened so the British could purchase Chinese tea without using silver to pay for it. Jack Beeching, in his book *The Chinese Opium Wars*, wrote “Though China had nothing she wanted to buy abroad, she offered for export a commodity which in those days could be procured nowhere else – Tea. By 1785, the East India Trading Company was buying and selling fifteen million pounds’ weight of China tea per year.”<sup>3</sup> Chinese tea was in high demand in Europe, and the British had to have it.

The British used opium to replace silver for purchasing their tea. There is some debate if it was on purpose or just slowly happened. Beeching concludes in his book that it is impossible to know how the British’s use of opium in their trades with the Chinese came about because there is no document directly proving the action was intentional and no substantial evidence that it wasn’t.<sup>4</sup> What can be said for certain is that by the 1830’s, the Qing Emperor saw opium smoking as a real threat in his empire for a variety of reasons. So there was a debate over on legalization or taking real action to shut down the opium trade. Beeching dates the Emperor’s decision to shut down the opium trade to November of 1836,<sup>5</sup> and Johnathan Spence dates it in 1838<sup>6</sup> in his book *The Search for Modern China*. However, both of them agree that

---

<sup>2</sup> Robert Montgomery Martin, ed, “The Opium Trade, and True Cause of the Stoppage,” *The Colonial Magazine and Commercial-Maritime Journal* 1 (1840): 86.

<sup>3</sup> Jack Breeching, *The Chinese Opium Wars* (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1975), 19.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, 15-39.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, 67.

<sup>6</sup> Johnathan D. Spence, *The Search for Modern China* (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1990), 149.

Commissioner Lin Zexu arrived in Canton early in 1839 after an unprecedented 19 successive meetings with the Qing Emperor. Actions to stop opium trading started before Lin Zexu arrived in Canton.<sup>7</sup>

Enormous powers were given to Lin as a High Commissioner appointed by the Emperor. He was chosen to create China's new policy to end opium trading, and commanded to go to Canton to start his campaign. In order to understand why the Emperor chose Lin as his high commissioner, it is important to learn who Lin was, and how the Emperor came to know him. Of pre-war Commissioner Lin, Spence wrote:

On paper, the choice was a fine one. Lin was a *jinshi* degree holder of 1811 who had served in the Hanlin Academy—the prestigious government center for Confucian studies in Peking—and in a wide range of posts in Yunnan, Jiangsu, Shaanxi, and Shandong provinces. As a governor-general of Hubei and Hunan, he had launched vigorous campaigns against opium smokers. One of his confidants was the outspoken scholar Gong Zizhen, who wrote in a letter to Lin that he believed all smokers of opium should be strangled, while pushers and producers should be beheaded.<sup>8</sup>

This quote starts to paint a picture of who Lin was before he arrived in Canton. He was successful and well liked, having moved up through administrations until he became a governor-general. This, however, makes him sound like he was going to take a hard line against opium, possibly beheading foreigners as pushers of opium. Beeching takes a different stance in his book:

Of all the high officials with a Confucian training who in their different ways tried to resolve the problems inflicted on China by the arrival of the 'seaborne barbarians,' Lin is the most sympathetic. His father had been a poor teacher in Fukien—the tea growing province north of Canton, and a notorious market for the coastal trade. By now over 70 percent of the population in Fukien smoked opium... renowned then and since as a poet, and nicknamed, on

---

<sup>7</sup> Beeching, 72-75.

<sup>8</sup> Spence, 149.



account of his moral uprightness, Lin the Clear Sky... Lin was well known as the man who had once put down a peasant revolt single-handed and without bloodshed... He had been ever since the official Peking sent to cope with particularly difficult situations.<sup>9</sup>

Beeching describes Lin as more even handed, and understanding person, willing to compromise rather than use heavy-handed techniques. Lin has been seen by many as a kind but morally upright individual. Herbert Giles wrote in his article, “Confucianism in the Nineteenth Century” that:

The active opposition of Commissioner Lin (1785-1850) to the opium trade, which precipitated the war, was a direct outcome of his careful training in the Confucian school. The question of morality and the appeal to justice ... were both based upon the ethics of Confucius. He not only professed his firm adherence to Confucianism, but exhibited in his every-day life a lofty conception of its ideals. He is the one representative of China, during this reign, to whom all foreigners would ungrudgingly accord the title of an honest man and a true patriot.<sup>10</sup>

Beeching and Giles both paint a similar portrait of Lin, portraying him as a morally upright man who was honest and fair. This is not to say that Spence is alone in thinking that Lin would be heavy handed. Schlegel, in his article titled “The Word ‘Good Faith’ in Commissioner Lin’s Proclamation of 18th March 1839,” wrote:

The 18th March 1839 ... Lin Tseh-su issued a proclamation to the foreign merchants in Canton, enjoining them to deliver up all the opium then stored aboard of the foreign vessels to the Chinese government ... ‘I have heard that you foreigners always attach great importance to the word good faith ... will deliver up the entire amount already here, and assuredly prevent the introduction of that which has not arrived...’ But when Lin used this expression in his proclamation, he was not paying a compliment to the men of the West, but only repeated trite astrological philosophic notion...<sup>11</sup>

<sup>9</sup> Beeching, 74-75

<sup>10</sup> Herbert Allen Giles, “Confucianism in the Nineteenth Century,” *The North American Review* 171, no. 526 (1990): 361.

<sup>11</sup> G. Schlegel, “The Word ‘Good Faith’ ( ) in Commissioner Lin’s Procla-

Schlegel indicates in his article that Lin had no faith in the foreigners, but refused to be disrespectful. Schlegel felt Lin knew he would have to be heavy handed to get the foreigners to obey his commands. Lin gave the foreigners no time to respond to his request, demanding the British turn over a well-known opium dealer, Lancelot Dent, and sending soldiers to trap the British in the factories (foreign housing outside Canton). These actions proved Lin to be heavy handed in his dealings with the British.

Lin refused to negotiate when he started his campaign, and even as he was removed by the Emperor, his final recommendation was not to negotiate. He clearly felt he was acting from the moral high ground, and this seems to be why he was so much more forceful than he had been before. Despite his forceful methods of dealing with the British, Commissioner Lin was never cruel. After trapping the foreigners, his first move was to give them food and water for six weeks, during which time they refused to comply with his conditions regarding the opium trade. In the end Lin would lose to the British, but Lin would never lose his place in history, becoming a hero to many Chinese people, and spawning a movement that would continue to fight the opium trade for years to come. Joyce Madancy, in her book *The Troublesome Legacy of Commissioner Lin: The Opium Trade and Opium Suppression in Fujian Province, 1820s to 1920s* focuses on the long term legacy of Lin, writing that: "Lin Zexu became a potent symbol of nascent Chinese nationalism and moral superiority throughout the Empire and even among western reformers."<sup>12</sup> She continues on, supporting that statement with a variety of examples as she attempts to discuss his legacy in full. Lin did his best to stamp out the opium trade because he

---

mation of 18th March 1839," *T'oung Pao* 3, no. 1 (1892): 67-68.

<sup>12</sup> Joyce A. Madancy, *The troublesome legacy of Commissioner Lin: the opium trade and opium suppression in Fujian Province, 1820s to 1920s* (Cambridge: Harvard University Asia Center, 2003) 5.

believed it was best for the people of China, but in the end he failed.

His failure was not due to his own mistakes, but rather because he faced an opponent that was better equipped, and largely lacked or failed to follow his moral compass, always following orders regardless of the morality of their actions. Captain Charles Elliot was the man Lin would face in the opium war. Captain Elliot had the full support of the British Empire if he needed it, but knew that a war in China was not something the British Empire desired. Beeching describes Captain Elliot in his book, writing:

As a boy of 14, Elliot had volunteered for the Royal Navy. . . family connections . . . helped him along in a peacetime naval career when many veterans were on the beach. Great Britain had taken upon herself the unpopular role of the world's police. . . helping bombard Algiers in 1816, and free Christian prisoners there, young Elliot found himself putting down piracy in the Persian Gulf, and harassing slavers on the West African coast and Bahama Cays before retirement in 1828 with the rank of Captain. . . not long after found him a post in British Guiana . . . the title of Protector of Slaves. . . In 1833 a reforming government ordered him back to London. . . Then Lord Palmerston sent Captain Elliot out to Canton. . . Elliot's official title—Superintendent of Trade. . .<sup>13</sup>

There is little dispute about Charles Elliot. He was accustomed to following orders, gracefully took offenses, and was used to working his way up the ladder. He didn't make a scene upon his arrival in Canton like Lord Napier had, but followed the set-up channels and showed respect to the Chinese. They quickly came to see him as a friend and not foe, causing them to underestimate him in, and assuming that he was a submissive man. Elliot's orders were to keep trade going and avoid war. He did this the best he could, from his arrival until he fired on the Chinese war junks, signifying the start of hostilities. Beeching wrote that Captain Elliot went so far as to help the Chinese chase off some opium smugglers that took

<sup>13</sup> Beeching, 63-64.

to using cannons near Canton, and even wrote a letter to the governor of Macao, asking him to expel the smugglers and their leader after he fled Canton.<sup>14</sup> All in an effort to protect trade and keep tea shipping from China.

Captain Elliot's actions may have given Lin the impression that no matter what he did, Captain Elliot would submit in the end. But when Lin demanded Lancelot Dent be handed over so he could be tried, Elliot sailed ahead of his soldiers to secure Dent in person and ensure his safety. Elliot would eventually convince the British to turn over their opium with the promise of compensation from the Chinese. Elliot had feigned weakness for so long that when he showed strength it confused the Chinese. Elliot's final concession was turning over the opium. After that he refused to budge. Elliot recommended that the British traders not sign the trade agreement Lin was offering. Beeching explains that these agreements would give the Chinese the right to execute anyone for trading/smuggling opium.<sup>15</sup>

This led to the complete breakdown of trade and communication between British and Chinese. The British, led by Elliot, moved to Macao and then to what is today the Island of Hong Kong. There Captain Elliot would wait for military back-up while they refusing to sign Lin's agreements/bonds. The British found themselves unable to purchase food due to this breakdown, and Elliot took it upon himself to get provisions for the British. Perdue wrote about this in an essay, published on Massachusetts Institute of Technology's website. He wrote:

On November 3, 1839—still with no declaration of war having emanated from either side—the unresolved Kowloon incident coupled with other complications precipitated a dramatic military confrontation at Chuanbi on Canton Bay. On this occasion, two British frigates—the 28-gun *Volage* and 18-gun *Hyacinth*—

---

<sup>14</sup> Beeching, 68-73.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, 81-82

took on 29 Chinese vessels that were blockading the harbor (16 war junks and 13 “fire-boats,” craft packed with straw and brushwood, sometimes covering chests of gunpowder, that were set ablaze and floated toward the wooden ships of the enemy). One junk was blown to bits by a lucky shot to its magazine, several other junks were sunk or heavily damaged, and only one British sailor was wounded as opposed to at least 15 Chinese killed. Despite this humiliation, Commissioner Lin’s report to the throne gave no hint of defeat and the emperor was persuaded that the Chinese had won a great victory.<sup>16</sup>

This quote demonstrates Elliot’s abilities as a Captain, being so successful while outnumbered so badly, and his resolve to see this conflict through. It also brings into question Commissioner Lin’s morality. Despite being honored for his honesty, Lin continued to lie about his success—or lack thereof—against British troops, and his lying was a major factor in his downfall. Perdue is the only writer to bring up Lin’s lies. While most other scholars hail Lin as an example of Confucian morals, Perdue continually questions this idea. Perdue’s work indicates that Lin’s lies contributed to the Chinese losing the war.

It is difficult to know who the better man truly was, but before the war ended Lin was exiled in disgrace, and Elliot negotiated for the British in the treaty ending the war. Elliot sacrificed his own morals for king/queen and country in the end. He never liked the opium trade and thought that it was disgraceful for the British to participate in it, but he protected it for the British Empire. Elliot seems to be discussed less than Commissioner Lin Zexu, but because of him Hong Kong became a British port city and was controlled by the British for 150 years, creating a Chinese city completely autonomous, in many ways, from mainland China today. In the end these two men would shape different parts of China’s future, having started a war that began a series of conflicts leading to the rise of Communist China

---

<sup>16</sup> Peter C. Perdue, “The First Opium War: The Anglo-Chinese War of 1839-1842,” [http://ocw.mit.edu/ans7870/21f/21f.027/opium\\_wars\\_01/ow1\\_essay01.html](http://ocw.mit.edu/ans7870/21f/21f.027/opium_wars_01/ow1_essay01.html).

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Breeching, Jack. *The Chinese Opium Wars*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1975.
- Giles, Herbert Allen. "Confucianism in the Nineteenth Century." *The North American Review* 171, no. 526 (1990): 359-374.
- Martin, Robert Montgomery, ed. "The Opium Trade, and True Cause of the Stoppage." *The Colonial Magazine and Commercial-Maritime Journal* 1 (1840): 84-104.
- Madancy, Joyce A. *The troublesome legacy of Commissioner Lin: the opium trade and opium suppression in Fujian Province, 1820s to 1920s*. Cambridge: Harvard University Asia Center, 2003.
- Perdue, Peter C. "The First Opium War: The Anglo-Chinese War of 1839-1842." [http://ocw.mit.edu/ans7870/21f/21f.027/opium\\_wars\\_01/ow1\\_essay01.html](http://ocw.mit.edu/ans7870/21f/21f.027/opium_wars_01/ow1_essay01.html)
- Schlegel, G. "The Word 'Good Faith' in Commissioner Lin's Proclamation of 18th March 1839." *T'oung Pao* 3, no. 1 (1892): 67-73.
- Spence, Johnathan D. *The Search for Modern China*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1990.
- T., P.P. "China: its Early History, Literature, and Language; Mis-translation of Chinese Official Documents; Causes of the Present War." *The Westminster Review* 34 (1840): 261-287.

## BIOGRAPHY

Jay T. Cherry was born in 1988 in Orem, Utah. His life has taken him far and wide, visiting 43 of the 50 United States along with China. Jay was a diesel cross-country truck driver and because of that experience, realized he wanted to finish his college education. He now studies at UVU as a History Major and plans to graduate the summer of 2015. He hopes to one day obtain a PHD, but for now he studies China with World History and hopes to return to China to teach English as a second language, while learning Chinese.







# STOUGHTON'S EMPIRE: THE GLORIOUS REVOLUTION AND THE ROLE OF THE MERCHANT CLASS IN SHAPING AMERICAN PROTESTANTISM

MORGAN S. HARDY

On April 18, 1689 the streets of Boston erupted with protesters. The object of their protest was the royal governor Sir Edmund Andros, an authoritarian leader appointed by King James II to govern New York and the New England colonies under a single centralized government known as the Dominion of New England. The Bostonians seized Andros and paraded him down the streets of Boston as jeering's came from citizens in the streets and from their windows. William Stoughton, a member of Andros' magisterial council, aligned himself with the protest and was personally chosen to call Andros to surrender by stating "we judge it necessary that you forthwith surrender, and deliver up the Government."<sup>1</sup> The protestors imprisoned Andros along with his men and the Glorious Revolution had finally arrived in America. Subsequently, New York and Maryland followed suit and sprung their own unique rebellions against their colonial governments.<sup>2</sup>

After William of Orange, a Dutch Protestant prince, usurped the thrown from the Catholic King James II, a chainlike reaction rippled throughout American colonies with Massachusetts, New York, and Maryland overthrowing their governors and declaring their loyalty to the new sover-

---

<sup>1</sup> William Stoughton et al, "At the Townhouse in Boston," 1689.

<sup>2</sup> The author gratefully would like to acknowledge the assistance and guidance of Dr. Michael Goode, Utah Valley University, for the advice he gave for this article.

eign. In Massachusetts, a coalition of merchants and clergy overthrew Andros in the name of Protestant liberties and anti-popery. Within the rhetoric of the Glorious Revolution lie various competing visions of empire. Stoughton's vision of a Protestant empire was thoroughly commercial and he sought increased political authority by pursuing the governorship.

Through his career of economic and political ambitions, Stoughton's vision of empire emphasized commercialization and personal industry through trade. This was very different than that of the Protestant Mather family, abolitionist Judge Samuel Sewall, and even Governor William Phipps who resided as governor after the Glorious Revolution. Many idealistic interest groups, with very different visions of empire, used the Glorious Revolution as tool for their political agendas. However, behind the rhetoric of anti-popery, the merchant class, of which Stoughton belonged to, was the hidden driving force behind the Glorious Revolution in America.

At the turn of the eighteenth century, the English economy was at a very high level of opportunistic growth and commercial trade. The middle class was experiencing a dramatic growth in population that "by the middle of the eighteenth century they are '[b]y far the largest proportion of urban population.'"<sup>3</sup> After the success of the Glorious Revolution in 1689, independent traders in London had greater influence on Parliament that enabled the trade to be unrestricted. With the termination of the slave monopoly of the Royal African Company in 1696 by a reorganized charter, independent traders began to import and distribute slaves and other goods throughout the English Empire. "More Boston merchants that ever before entered the 'Guinea Trade,' which partly accounts for the increased number of slaves in town."<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> Carl Bridenbaugh, *Cities in the Wilderness: The First Century of Urban Life in America 1625-1742*, rev. Benjamin L. Carp, New York: Oxford University Press, 1938, 4.

<sup>4</sup> Mark A. Peterson, "The Selling of Joseph: Bostonians, Antislavery, and

Carl Bridenbaugh in his two books *Cities in the Wilderness: The First Century of Urban Life in America, 1652-1742* and *Cities in Revolt: Urban Life in America, 1743-1776* emphasizes a summary of five colonial cities as they grew economically, socially, and culturally. Bridenbaugh argues that major growth within the cities was done by taking advantage of trade opportunities that allowed them to compete one with one another economically. The merchants, Bridenbaugh argues, nurtured “intercolonial culture.”<sup>5</sup> In Gary Nash’s *Urban Crucible*, however, showcased a different atmosphere in colonial America, one prorated with class division. Through the use of archives, Nash took seemingly normal sources and discovered “crucial and previously unknown details of the lives of ordinary people.”<sup>6</sup> Nash described that port cities, engaged in trade, contributed to the American Revolution by progressing in “social and economic developments.”<sup>7</sup> Nash’s text takes Bridenbaugh’s thesis into a whole new category of in-depth, archival evidence.

With increased class division among the New England colonies, Alison Gilbert Olson in her work titled *Making the Empire Work: London and American Interest Groups, 1690-1790* argues that the English Empire severed ties with her colonies by dismantling “transatlantic interest groups” which fostered unrestricted trade and harmony within the colonies.<sup>8</sup> These “transatlantic interest groups” are apart of the class

---

the Protestant International, 1689-1733,” *Massachusetts Historical Review*, Vol. 4, Race & Slavery (2002), 3.

<sup>5</sup> Carl Bridenbaugh, *Cities in the Wilderness: The First Century of Urban Life in America 1625-1742*, rev. Benjamin L. Carp, New York: Oxford University Press, 1938, 5.

<sup>6</sup> Gary B. Nash, *The Urban Crucible: Social Change, Political Consciousness, and the Origins of the American Revolution*, rev. Shane White, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1979, 2.

<sup>7</sup> Ibid.

<sup>8</sup> Alison Gilbert Olson, *Making the Empire Work: London and American Interest Groups, 1690-1790*, rev. Patricia U. Bonomi, *The William and Mary Quarterly, Third Series*, Vol. 50, No. 3 (Jul., 1993), 621.

division described by Nash that served to increase the economic growth of individual and communal status. This plays into the fact that merchants did most of their business in large ports cities such as New York and Boston but they specialized in selling goods overseas to increase profits. “During the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the Dutch and English merchant classes were constructing innovative combinations of land, labor, and capital meant to accumulate profit for yet further investment and production.”<sup>9</sup> These men were typically of higher status and of economic wealth that mostly dealt with trading in the old and new worlds.

However, the merchant class brought more to the table than profits and goods. It allowed the commoner to get ahead of English nobility in wealth. Nonetheless, the English nobility could engage more forcefully in the political arena. The merchantman sought more power and once achieved, “leading men clung to their [colonial assembly] seats for many years.”<sup>10</sup> As these men of influence sought the seats of the Governors elite, they saw “these posts as sources of honor, influence, and income.”<sup>11</sup> Still, as these merchantmen increased in economic power, some sought for political power in the colonies and status within London. As anti-popish pressures increased in the early American colonies, the Glorious Revolution in America became a great avenue to gain political power.

Despite the thrive for political power and long before any colonists settled in New England, there was a war raging in Europe. It was not a war of swords, pistols, or gunpowder. It was a war of ideologies. The war was against “popery,” a Protestant fear that Catholicism would spread across the world. Susan Juster, in her work titled “Iconoclasm Without Icons? The Destruction of Sacred Objects in Colonial North

---

<sup>9</sup> Alan, Taylor, “Natives, 13,000 B.C. -A.D. 1492,” In *American Colonies*, 21, New York: Viking, 2001.

<sup>10</sup> Taylor, “Revolutions, 1685-1730,” 286.

<sup>11</sup> Ibid., 287.

America" states, "[Anti-popish attacks]... derived in part from a deep well of spiritual anxieties and animosities whose source lay in the bloody European past..."<sup>12</sup> Michael Graham penned it as "fears born first in England."<sup>13</sup> Even Owen Stanwood stated, "When New England's revolutionaries of 1689 reflected on the crisis that pushed them towards rebellion, they placed its origins over a decade earlier, in 1678."<sup>14</sup> Though the fears came from early European struggles against anti-Catholicism, those fears played in more prevalent and personal cases on the outskirts of Colonial America.

The King Philips War, between 1675 and 1676, was a series of Indian raids on colonial towns, which extended along the coast of New England. The attacks were short-lived only really engaging in the summer and fall of 1675. As the colonists gained more support by enslaving Christian Indians, killing many native warriors so they could not join the resistance, and allowing them to run out of supplies, did the colonists gain the advantage. After the war, many Indians were sold into slavery or were killed.<sup>15</sup> However, "some of the defeated Indians escaped northward to take refuge among the Abenaki in north New England and New France. The refugee's carried with them a bitter hatred of the New English."<sup>16</sup> Not only was their hatred of the New English very strong, their desire to enact revenge was almost absolute. "The refugees and their

---

<sup>12</sup> Susan Juster, "Iconoclasm Without Icons? The Destruction of Sacred Objects in Colonial North America," In *Empires of God: Religious Encounters in the Early Modern Atlantic*, 237, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2011.

<sup>13</sup> Michael Graham, "Popish plots: Protestant Fears in Early Colonial Maryland, 1676-1689," *Catholic Historical Review* 79, no. 2 (April 1993): 197. America: History & Life, EBSCOhost.

<sup>14</sup> Owen Stanwood, "The Protestant Moment: Antipopery, the Revolution of 1688-1689, and the Making of an Anglo-American Empire," *The Journal of British Studies*, 46, pp. 484. 2007.

<sup>15</sup> Alan Taylor, "Puritans and Indians, 1600-1700," In *American Colonies*, 202, New York: Viking, 2001.

<sup>16</sup> Ibid.

descendants guided French raids that repeatedly devastated the frontier settlements of New England.”<sup>17</sup> This was a common fear in New English territories and such raids were consistently feared among those who were attempting to settle on the frontier.

These sudden attacks were all along the borders of New England and even extended into colonial Maryland. Such attacks were documented in *The Impartial Protestant Mercury* no. 34, a Maryland newspaper pamphlet printed in 1681, only five years after the King Philip’s War. This article contains an excerpt that describes some Protestant fears from the French Catholics in Quebec.<sup>18</sup> In the newspaper article, Maryland Protestant planters feared for their lives, the lives of their family, and their livelihood due to native attacks upon their farms. These attacks were guided by the escapee’s that migrated into Northern France after the King Philip’s War. The Maryland planters were fearful, not only because of increasing Indians raids and lack of cooperation from them, but because of the hidden enemy behind the attacks which attempted to destroy their crop. The article reads, “Nor do they [Indians] plant any Corn this Year, which makes it to be believed that they are promised Supplies by Some Ill Neighbors, especially some that are Papists not far off...” The natives go to great lengths to “Kill the Cattle of the Protestant Planters before their faces, and threaten every day to fall upon their persons, whereas they offer no such outrages to any Plantations of the Papists.”<sup>19</sup> Interestingly enough, the Indians, due to their recent hatred of the New English, were guided by French Catholics to only attack Protestant farms. If it were not so, the Indians would have raided whomever they wanted as they did in the King Philip’s War.<sup>20</sup> Anti-popery is used not only for pro-Protestant

---

<sup>17</sup> Ibid.

<sup>18</sup> *The Impartial Protestant Mercury*, no. 34, 16-19. 1681.

<sup>19</sup> Ibid.

<sup>20</sup> Alan Taylor, “Puritans and Indians, 1600-1700,” In *American Colonies*, 200, New York: Viking, 2001.

propaganda but used also as a vision of empire for early colonial America. Even though the attacks were very prevalent on the outskirts of Colonial America and even played into the lives of Protestant planters, its root lay in early European anti-Catholicism fears.

This article was written by members of the Whig party, a pro-Protestant group with a fear of universal Catholicism. In 1688, a few Protestant bishops sought help from William III, the “continents foremost defender of Protestantism,” because they feared a continual English-Catholic monarchy under King James II.<sup>21</sup> James II was “more doctrinaire absolutist than Charles,” the previous monarch and James II sought to universalize the entire kingdom under the banner of Catholicism.<sup>22</sup> In April 1688, the queen gave birth to a male heir to the throne. The birth of James II’s son, his Declaration of Indulgence in 1687, and “by favoring his fellow Catholics” caused letters to be written, pleading with William to fight for the Protestant cause.<sup>23</sup> Then, in November 1688, William landed on the beaches of England and moved towards London. James II, fearful of the sudden events, fled to France. The Whigs, “Williams English Supporters, called this transfer of power a ‘Glorious Revolution.’”<sup>24</sup>

Popery, though a deep Protestant fear and used as a tool by the merchants, brought a deep well of Protestant spirituality to the surface. David Voorhees, describing the situation of Jacob Leisler, the rebellion leader of New York, described Leisler as someone who didn’t even want to hold government office, for Leisler stated “the role of those ‘in office both Civil and Military,’ he asserted in 1689, is ‘to defend to the utmost’ the

<sup>21</sup> Owen Stanwood, “The Protestant Moment: Antipopery, the Revolution of 1688-1689, and the Making of an Anglo-American Empire,” *The Journal of British Studies*, 46, pp. 501, 2007.

<sup>22</sup> Alan Taylor, “Revolutions, 1685-1730,” In *American Colonies*, 276, New York: Viking, 2001.

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid.*, 278.

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*

‘true Protestant Religion.’”<sup>25</sup> His spiritual Calvinistic upbringing reflected his hesitation to engage in public affairs. Protestants looked at civil office and their spiritual duty as gears in a clock, both working simultaneously for the betterment of their faith, their country, and their livelihood. In Leisler’s case, due to “the appearance of the functions of the Protestant Religion, [that] remain still affected to the Papist’-that Leisler, following Calvin’s injunction that the magistrate’s function is ‘to withstand the fierce licentiousness of kings in accordance with their duty,’ decided to act.”<sup>26</sup> There was no separation of civil duty versus spiritual duty. Both were interconnected which reflected Protestants civil, religious, and political fervor against the fear of the papist.

As Leisler moved through his career as governor, he found it more difficult to engage the public and to keep himself in office. His lack of political background experience and his zealous Calvinist views was detrimental to his career. Simply put, “Lesiler made too many enemies too easily.”<sup>27</sup> His governorship was at jeopardy for several of New York’s citizens sought his position because the Crown had not endorsed Leisler’s governorship.<sup>28</sup> As he moved through office, Leisler had to be more opportunistic than his religious upbringing promoted if he were to keep his position as governor. In 1690, Leisler sought to take French Canada in order to prove that he could govern New York and be somewhat of help to the kingdom. But this proved to be an utter disaster and again, public opinion of his governorship declined. Leisler was a wealthy Dutch merchantman that “wore a wig and carried a walking, accoutrements of elevated status.”<sup>29</sup> After working for the West India Company for

---

<sup>25</sup> David William Voorhees, “The “fervent Zeale” of Jacob Leisler,” *The William and Mary Quarterly*, 51, no. 3 (2014): 471.

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>27</sup> Alan Taylor, “Revolutions, 1685-1730,” *In American Colonies*, 286, New York: Viking, 2001.

<sup>28</sup> *Ibid.*, 280-281.

<sup>29</sup> *Ibid.*, 450.



two years, before his eventful reign as governor, Leisler became “an independently established merchant in the lucrative fur and tobacco trades.”<sup>30</sup> Leisler had very little background as to anything militaristic or anything politically because his knowledge was in the trade. The raid on French Canada was simply Leisler's militaristic opportunity that ended poorly.

However, though his successful career as a merchant was outstanding, he lacked general direction and again public opinion. Many were seeking an opportunity for the governorship and sought a way to make that goal a reality. Joseph J. Casino, author of “Anti-Popery In Colonial Pennsylvania,” proposed that anti-popery was used “by opportunists, or when social and political crises demanded a scapegoat,” but also served “to define the boundaries of national allegiance.”<sup>31</sup> Stoughton and Leisler's political goals used anti-popery as a scapegoat to ascend to the governorship by campaigning after political anti-popery crises such as the Glorious Revolution or participating in economic investments such as landownership.<sup>32</sup> We see this example, also, in the Maryland experience when the Protestant Associators took up arms against Deputy Governor Colonel Henry Darnell because of his lack of support to the new Protestant monarchs, William and Mary.<sup>33</sup> Eventually, as we saw in the New York example, opportunity lost his taste for Leisler and he was hung at the gallows.

As in the New York and Maryland experiences, Boston also saw its share of merchant opportunists. When Sir Edmund Andros was overthrown by the citizens of Boston,

---

<sup>30</sup> Ibid., 455.

<sup>31</sup> Joseph J. Casino, “Anti-Popery in Colonial Pennsylvania,” *Pennsylvania Magazine Of History & Biography* 105, no. 3 (July 1981): 280, America: History & Life, EBSCOhost.

<sup>32</sup> Mary Cowell Deed of Sale to William Stoughton 1697, *Suffolk Deeds Liber XIV*, sec. 3, Boston, 1906, 287.

<sup>33</sup> Michael Graham, “Popish plots: Protestant Fears in Early Colonial Maryland, 1676-1689,” *Catholic Historical Review* 79, no. 2 (April 1993): 197. America: History & Life, EBSCOhost.

William Stoughton, a wealthy merchant who served on Andros council, saw a political opportunity to become governor. After the rebellion, Stoughton's popularity was at stake, given his recent service with Governor Andros, that he called upon the influential Mather family to help gain his royal commission to become governor. It is important to note that Andros was a firm Catholic who made laws to restrict Protestantism. In the colony, Andros forced the citizens to allow a Protestant church to be used for Catholic services, imposed new taxes, and all the town's meetings were abolished except for one meeting annually.<sup>34</sup> The Mathers, who were the leaders for fighting against Andros governorship, were a prominent Protestant family and were incredibly influential in the courts in England.<sup>35</sup>

Cotton Mather saw a very different vision of what colonial America should be. In his *Magnalia Christi Americana*, the history of New England was but "the progress of the Desired Reformation" and that it propelled the "common cause" of Christianity.<sup>36</sup> Every sermon or political oration delivered by Mather was to promote spiritual salvation through Christ. In another text by Mather titled *The Negro Christianized* argues that "Christianity directs a Slave, upon his embracing the Law of Christianity; that allows of himself That he is the Lord's Free-man, tho' he continues a Slave." This doctrine of preaching Christianity to Slaves was new to the colonial era and yet we see that Mather is highly concerned with spiritual salvation rather than physical salvation. Merchants were fearful of this preaching because it would eventually hinder the trade and decrease their income.

---

<sup>34</sup> Taylor. "Revolutions, 1685-1730." 277.

<sup>35</sup> Howard C. Rice, "Cotton Mather Speaks to France American Propaganda in the Age of Louis XIV," *The New England Quarterly* 16, no. 2 (1943): 203. See also Samuel Sewall, *The Selling of Joseph. A Memorial*, Boston: 1700.

<sup>36</sup> *Ibid.*, 200.

Once the governorship was secured, Stoughton in 1691, wrote to the British monarch, describing the injustices of Andros reign as governor in Boston. Stoughton, and his fellow councilmen who were “several Gentlemen of great Integrity, who likewise had a particular knowledge of the things them related,” wrote in 1691, “A Narrative of The Proceedings of Sir Edmund Andros and his Complices, Who Acted by an Illegal and Arbitrary Commission from the Late K. James, during his Government in New England.” This document is a detailed outline of Andros “illegal commission” with judicial infractions. Though the laws that were violated are of extreme importance, one paragraph, however, promotes the injustice of his governorship.<sup>37</sup> The text describes Andros as creating the council and yet neglecting its use and acting on his own governorship. This means that acts and laws were passed without the consent of the council. This is an imbalance of power, for Colonial assemblies regulated the governor’s pay and if the governor disagreed with the assemblies, the colonists simply had to complain to the Crown because of their ineffective governor.

Stoughton, with several of his council, described it this way, “The Way and Manner used afterwards of proposing and passing all laws was very uncertain and unequal, not answerable to the Nature of so great a Power, nor to the largeness of the Territory that was obliged by them, or to the Number of the Concelors appointed therein, for after a little while there were no set times appointed or given notice of for the making of Laws...”<sup>38</sup> This narrative is important because it describes the “chief matters” of Andros infractions as governor and what the people, by way of Andros councilmen, thought of his service.<sup>39</sup>

---

<sup>37</sup> William Stoughton et al, *A Narrative of The Proceedings of Sir Edmond Androsse and his Complices, who Acted by an Illege and Arbitrary Commission from the late K. James, during his government in New England*, Boston, 1691: 6-7.

<sup>38</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>39</sup> *Ibid.*, 12.

What is most interesting about this source is its lack of anti-popish criticism. Not once did it mention anything about Andros hindering the Protestant faith. In fact, this article was not written to attack Andros's belief in Catholicism. Rather, Stoughton could've have written this piece of work to increase his own popularity within Boston and to make his subjects appeal to him because he appealed to the new Protestant monarchy. Stoughton was a very influential businessman, merchant, and preacher in Boston. He needed the support of the citizens and by appealing to the new monarchy was safe bet to install in the people his zeal for Protestantism. Other historians have neglected this detailed piece of work probably due to their negligence in looking beyond the years 1688-1689.

In 1692 Stoughton became lieutenant governor under the new governor, Sir William Phips. Williams Phips was a self made man whose ambition for greatness propelled him from carpenter's apprentice to ship captain. Through his excursions to sunken Spanish galleons, which recovered over £300,000 in sunken treasure, caused Phips to be knighted in 1687. Through James II, Phips became the provost marshal general under Sir Edmund Andros magistration. After a successful military career in 1690, Sir William Phips was appointed the First Royal Governor of Massachusetts. During the Salem Witch Trials of 1692, Sir Governor William Phips appointed William Stoughton to be judge of Court of Oyer and Terminer. With Stoughton's lack of judicial experience, the court became dysfunctional and allowed spectral evidence into the cases of the accused. Governor Phips was not happy with how the court was run, that he disbanded the court all together. In 1694, Sir Governor William Phips was called to England to answer for several crimes of misconduct "to answer charges drawn up in part by Stoughton."<sup>40</sup> William Stoughton, like his experience with Sir Edmund Andros, sought the

---

<sup>40</sup> William Pencak, *Historical Dictionary of Colonial America*, Lanham, Maryland: Scarecrow Press: 229-230, 2011.

administration and “quietly help[ed] to gather evidence for the charges of maladministration.”<sup>41</sup> After Phips was called, Stoughton was made governor from 1694 until the Earl of Bellomont was appointed. After two years, Stoughton was appointed governor once more until his death in 1701. Sir William Phips vision of empire was personal glory that attributed to his humble beginnings whereas Stoughton's vision was purely economic.

After the uprising in Boston on April 18 1689, the British Board of Trade compiled the news into an index that was later published as *The Calendar of State Papers Colonial, America and West Indies*, Volume 13 – 1689-1692. This is a detailed volume of early colonial documents that consisted of abridged papers, documents, or any other forms of news that eventually were compiled into one historical record. In one such account, dated April 29 1689, is a summarized account of the uprising in Boston against Sir Edmund Andros. The text explains that a letter was written from Bristol, New England to “Mr. Mather and others” but does not give the identity of the author. It is assumed that “Mr. Mather” was Increase Mather for he was in England at the time appealing to the magistrate due to his disgust of Andros governorship.<sup>42</sup> The account continues addressing the events of the day starting with a capture of a Navy captain, the seizure of the town by angry protestors, and eventually the capture of the fort coupled with the surrender of Andros.

No fight ensued and no deaths were reported but interestingly enough, the text appears to have Andros, or his men at least, preparing for a scrimmage. The text reads, “Information then came that a boat was sent from the frigate to the

---

<sup>41</sup> Richard R. Johnson, “William Stoughton,” American National Bibliography Online.

<sup>42</sup> Increase Mather, *A Narrative of the Miseries of New England*, London, 1688.

Governor with arms, but the boat was seized.”<sup>43</sup> Then, only a few days later, Andros attempted to escape the fort, “passed two of the guards, and then was stopped.”<sup>44</sup> Andros appears to be opportunistic and trying to seize every opportunity to regain control or to escape his imprisonment. He alone was not the only one imprisoned. The text describes at least his officers, the Navy captain, and four others who were also imprisoned. Still, despite his attempts, Sir Edmund Andros was unsuccessful and the Protestants won.

However, *The Calendar of State Papers Colonial, America and West Indies*, Volume 13, 1-12, 1689 tells another story to the Protestant upheaval.<sup>45</sup> On May 10, 1689 a colony-wide declaration came from Governor Sir Edmund Andros, “charging all officers civil and military to be vigilant and careful in their places, pursuant to King James’s orders on the prospect of a Dutch invasion.”<sup>46</sup> Then all goes quiet and no more orders are received. However, the next note is directed to the President of Jamaica stating, “The Prince of Orange...Announcing that he had taken on himself the administration of England.” Another letter comes through to the West Indies and the North American colonies stating, “The Prince of Orange to the Governors of Colonies. Ordering all officers in the Colonies to be continued for the present.” The colonists are unsure what is exactly happening in England and they don’t know exactly how to address the Prince of Orange. If the Prince of Orange had indeed invaded then the colonists understood that the invasion was illegal and William III was a traitor. However, they also understood that William III might have been successful and now was the new monarch. “Congratulations on late successes;” wrote Abraham Kick to the Prince of

---

<sup>43</sup> “April 1689,” *The Calendar of State Papers Colonial, America and West Indies*, April 29, 1689.

<sup>44</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>45</sup> “America and West Indies: January 1689.” *America and West Indies*, 1-13: January 1689.

<sup>46</sup> *Ibid.*

Orange, "I am confident that when they [colonists] hear of your happy success they will appeal to you for restoration of their liberties."<sup>47</sup> The colonists seem to be unsure of how to respond to William III but they are overly concerned over their economic and political privileges.

What strikes as significant is that Sir Edmund Andros was completely obeying the king's orders. He was simply waiting on hearing any news from England pertaining to the Dutch invasion. When news of the revolution started spreading throughout the Dominion of New England, Andros "arrested several newcomers for 'bringing Traiterous and Treasonable Libels and Papers of News.'"<sup>48</sup> The colonists, knowing that Andros was a firm catholic, thought that he would not side with the new Protestant monarchs and promptly overthrew the governor on April 18, 1689. When James II became king there was much rejoicing throughout the West Indies and within the Northern Colonies.<sup>49</sup> However, due to the uncertainty of the succession of power to William III, the colonists remained on the edge of their seats eager for news about the Dutch invasion. The colonists were completely opportunistic and engaged in a more forceful way to demonstrate to the Crown that they were on his side.

Not only was the Glorious Revolution in America a tool for gaining political power, it was also a tool for increasing one's economic status. As Andros was governing in Boston, the taxes increased to unbelievable heights and Andros's salary was at a stunning £1,200 annually, which was higher than any previous Massachusetts governor.<sup>50</sup> Andros enacted new Navigation laws to restrict trade within Boston because of increasing news of the Glorious Revolution. These laws

---

<sup>47</sup> Ibid.

<sup>48</sup> Alan Taylor, "Revolutions, 1685-1730," In *American Colonies*, 281, New York: Viking, 2001.

<sup>49</sup> Ibid., 276.

<sup>50</sup> Ibid., 277.

aggravated the merchants because they could not increase their profits and could not distribute their goods. After the revolution, the West Indies' sugar planters enjoyed a monopoly on goods and "asked William III for reduced Crown taxes, expanded slave imports, better military support, and full protection against foreign sugar competition."<sup>51</sup> "As for the North American colonists, they wanted a looser relationship with the Crown, with less political and economic dependency."<sup>52</sup> The colonists wanted, "widening opportunities for both elite and middling entrepreneurs."<sup>53</sup> In the North American Colonies, Richard Dunn argues that without the overthrow of James II, there would not have been an entrepreneurial innovation.<sup>54</sup>

The Glorious Revolution in America was motivated by religious fear and opportunistic moments with the real beneficiary of the revolution being the merchant class. Before the war began there were considerable amount of fears from early European monarchies and French Canada, which increased communal fears amongst Protestant citizens. As those pressures increased with Catholic governors and their laws to inhibit trade, the colonists seized the opportunity to overthrow their governors and proclaim their allegiance to the new English crown. Though the colonists acted because of popish fears and opportunistic moments, the Glorious Revolution provided merchants, like Stoughton, with increased opportunities for political and economic gain. These uprisings promoted a combination of religious and economic fervor that catapulted the colonists to overthrow their leaders in the 1688-1689 Glorious Revolution in America.

---

<sup>51</sup> Richard S. Dunn, "The Glorious Revolution in America," In *The Origins of Empire: British Overseas Enterprise to the Close of the Seventeenth Century*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 465, 2001.

<sup>52</sup> Ibid.

<sup>53</sup> Ibid.

<sup>54</sup> Ibid.



## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- "America and West Indies: January 1689." *America and West Indies*, 1-13: January 1689.
- "April 1689." The Calendar of State Papers Colonial, America and West Indies. April 29, 1689.
- Bridenbaugh, Carl. *Cities in the Wilderness: The First Century of Urban Life in America 1625-1742*, rev. Benjamin L. Carp. New York: Oxford University Press, 1938. 4-5.
- Casino, Joseph J. "Anti-Popery in Colonial Pennsylvania." *Pennsylvania Magazine Of History & Biography* 105, no. 3 (July 1981): 280. America: History & Life, EBSCOhost.
- Dunn, Richard S. "The Glorious Revolution in America." In *The Origins of Empire: British Overseas Enterprise to the Close of the Seventeenth Century*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 465. 2001.
- Graham, Michael. "Popish plots: Protestant Fears in Early Colonial Maryland, 1676-1689." *Catholic Historical Review* 79, no. 2 (April 1993): 197. America: History & Life, EBSCOhost.
- Johnson, Richard R. "William Stoughton." American National Bibliography Online.
- Juster, Susan. "Iconoclasm Without Icons? The Destruction of Sacred Objects in Colonial North America." In *Empires of God: Religious Encounters in the Early Modern Atlantic*, 237. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2011.
- Mary Cowell Deed of Sale to William Stoughton 1697. Suffolk Deeds Liber XIV, sec. 3. Boston: 1906. 287.
- Mather, Increase. *A Narrative of the Miseries of New England*. London, 1688.
- Nash, Gary B. *The Urban Crucible: Social Change, Political Consciousness, and the Origins of the American Revolution*, rev. Shane White. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1979.
- Olson, Alison Gilbert. *Making the Empire Work: London and American Interest Groups, 1690-1790*, rev. Patricia U. Bonomi. *The William and Mary Quarterly*, Third Series, Vol. 50, No. 3, July 1993.
- Pencak, William. *Historical Dictionary of Colonial America*. Lanham, Maryland: Scarecrow Press: 229-230. 2011.

- Peterson, Mark A. "The Selling of Joseph: Bostonians, Antislavery, and the Protestant International, 1689-1733." *Massachusetts Historical Review*, Vol. 4, Race & Slavery 2002. 3.
- Rice, Howard C. "Cotton Mather Speaks to France American Propaganda in the Age of Louis XIV." *The New England Quarterly* 16, no. 2 (1943): 203.
- Sewall, Samuel. *The Selling of Joseph. A Memorial*. Boston: 1700.
- Stanwood, Owen. "The Protestant Moment: Antipopery, the Revolution of 1688-1689, and the Making of an Anglo-American Empire." *The Journal of British Studies*, 46, pp. 484. 2007.
- Stoughton, William et al. *A Narrative of The Proceedings of Sir Edmond Androsse and his Complices, who Acted by an Illege and Arbitrary Commission from the late K. James, during his government in New England*. Boston, 1691: 6-7.
- Stoughton, William et al. "At The Townhouse in Boston." 1689.
- Taylor, Alan. "Natives, 13,000 B.C. -A.D. 1492." *American Colonies*, 21. New York: Viking. 2001.
- Taylor. "Revolutions, 1685-1730." 277-286.
- Taylor. "Puritans and Indians, 1600-1700." 202.
- The Impartial Protestant Mercury. No. 34, 16-19. 1681.
- Voorhees, David William. "The "fervent Zeale" of Jacob Leisler." *The William and Mary Quarterly*, 51, no. 3. 2014. 471.





# THE INFLUENCE OF THE NETHERLANDS IN SOUTH AFRICA DURING THE 19TH CENTURY

JOSHUA SPENCER

The history of South Africa is one that most people would think involves only the British and the British Empire. However, when one looks closer at the people and history of South Africa it is seen that the country's history is enveloped with influence from the Netherlands. Afrikaans, a dialect of Dutch, is now one of the National languages in South Africa and much of the population is of Dutch descent.<sup>1</sup> It seems that the historical connection between South Africa and the Netherlands is lost behind the history that was experienced as a colony and member of the British Commonwealth. Nevertheless, the Netherlands played a role within South Africa that although it was lost as a colony to the British the traditions of the Dutch survived in ways within the lives of the South African Boers. This paper will discuss the role and influence the Netherlands played within South Africa during the 19th century. There will be a brief discussion of how the Netherlands became involved in South Africa, how the Cape Colony was lost, the formation of the Boer republics, the influence within those republics and ending with Dutch involvement during the Anglo-Boer War.

The history of South Africa from the White European point of view began when the Portuguese sailed around the Cape of Good Hope, Africa's most southern tip, in order to establish a water route to the East Indies. Once the sea path had been established, the sea trade route around Africa allowed other European powers such as the British, French, and the

---

<sup>1</sup> "The Languages of South Africa," Brand South Africa. <http://www.southafrica.info/about/people/language.htm>

Dutch to establish their own trade routes and colonies on the other side of the world. The Netherlands desired to monopolize the trade in the East Indies for themselves and in 1602 formed the *Vereenigde Oostindische Compagnie* (VOC). This chartered organization defined itself as a power trader among the European powers grappling for power in the East Indies, specifically with the Portuguese and the routes it had established around Southern Africa.<sup>2</sup>

As trade developed during the sixteenth-century, routes that became profitable for the VOC also made it necessary to establish a way station between the Netherlands and the Dutch colonies in India and other possessions in East Asia. The directors of the VOC decreed that the best place for that way station was Table Bay in South Africa. In 1652 the Cape Colony was established by Jan van Riebeck<sup>3</sup> with a contingent of 90 men. The Cape Colony was given the mandate from the VOC directors in the Netherlands to govern and maintain the colony in order to provide needed supplies and rest for ships traveling back from the East Indies to the Netherlands.<sup>4</sup>

With strict regulations and corruption rampant within the VOC, burghers, Dutch farmers and citizens in South Africa, began to expand outward farther north and east into the interior of Southern Africa in order to rid themselves of the grip of the VOC.<sup>5</sup> Two events sparked the beginning of the removal of Dutch control in the Cape Colony. The first was the outbreak of the French Revolution (1789-1799) back in Europe and the second was the collapse of the VOC in 1798. The outbreak of the French Revolution and the ascension of Napoleon Bonaparte as Emperor of France sounded the death

<sup>2</sup> Hermann Giliomee and Bernard Mbenga, *New History of South Africa* (Cape Town: Tafelberg, 2007), 42.

<sup>3</sup> Vincent Kuitenbrouwer, *War of Words Dutch Pro-Boer Propaganda and the South African War (1899-1902)* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2012), 38.

<sup>4</sup> Giliomee and Mbenga, *New History*, 42.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid* 79.

knell that removed the Netherlands from the strategic sea route to the East Indies. Bonaparte annexed the Netherlands as a State of France, renaming the country the Batavian Republic. Fearing that France would soon stretch out her hands and occupy the rest of the holdings of the Netherlands, the exiled government pleaded with the British to occupy all holding of their country. British occupation of the Cape Colony began in September 1795. Three years later in 1798, the VOC collapsed because of debt. Their control over the Cape colony was lost and a provisional ruling authority was established. When the French Revolution ended, Britain and The Netherlands signed the Treaty of Amiens in 1803, returning the Cape Colony to the Dutch. However, the strategic point at the bottom of the world seemed too enticing for the British Empire to truly let go and in 1806 they reclaimed it and established for themselves a colony in South Africa.<sup>6</sup> Thusly, the direct control of the Netherlands to her colony was totally removed by the British, but as the nineteenth-century began, their influence would remain and support for their cousins in South Africa would ebb and flow as the century moved forward.

With the British Empire now in control of the Cape of Good Hope and the Cape Colony, they began to implement the British colonial system on the Boers within their jurisdiction. However, the Boers did not care for British rule and authority and thousands of Boers began treks further inland to seek freedom. The mid-eighteenth-century contained the formation of two Boer republics, the South African Republic in 1852 and the Orange Free State in 1854. These two republics, which contained over 30,000 Boers of Dutch and other European descent, established themselves as powers to compete with the British within South Africa.<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> Ibid 47.

<sup>7</sup> Ibid 150.

The relationship of the Netherlands to the two Boer republics during the eighteenth-century came more in support from individual Dutch citizens rather than from the Government itself. Though the Dutch were no longer in control of the Boers, they felt a kinship and connection to these people in South Africa that could be compared to the relationship between the peoples of Great Britain and those living in the young United States of America at this time. There were connections of blood, religion, government and language. This connection between the Netherlands and the Boer republics could be argued to be a form of cultural imperialism that resulted in the migration of several thousand of Dutch citizens to the South African Republic or known also as the Transvaal. These migrants contributed a development of the government and economy of the Transvaal.<sup>8</sup>

The largest support came from a group formed in the Netherlands of Liberal and Protestant leaders on May 12, 1881 called the *Nederlandsch Zuid-Afrikaansche Vereeniging* (NZAV).<sup>9</sup> This group united people across the Netherlands who felt the Boer republics shared a common history and culture and could not be left alone in world to suffer at the hands of the British. It is felt the propaganda and support given by the NZAV became one of the most bounteous sources, purely from its size and the quality of members of the society.<sup>10</sup> The members of the NZAV felt that connection to their cousins that is described as, what Vincent Kuitenbrouwer noted in his book, *War of Words Dutch Pro Boer Propaganda and the South African War (1899-1902)*, *stamverwantschap*.<sup>11</sup> Familial sentiments towards the Netherlands were not often shared by the Boers within the Transvaal and the Orange Free State. Dutch immigrants to their republics were referred to as *Hollanders*,

---

<sup>8</sup> Kuitenbrouwer, *War of Words*, 11.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid* 39.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid* 145.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid* 36.



thusly distinguishing these people as *uitlanders* (outsiders) to their society and there developed among some of the Boers what is termed as *Hollanderhaat*. The feeling of *stamverwantschap* was felt more closely within the Netherlands, but not as much among the majority of Boers who felt the *Hollanders* did not truly understand them. Despite the attitude of the Boers, Dutch immigrants found a niche within the Transvaal in business and government institutions where they were freer to have an influence within it.<sup>12</sup>

A major example of the influence of the Dutch within the Boer republics' business and economic fields came in the form of the *Nederlandsche Zuid-Afrikaansche Spoorweg Maatschappij* (NZASM). A railway company that sought to build a rail line to connect the landlocked Boer republics, especially the Transvaal, with the ocean, which was completed in 1895. This rail line meant that they would not have to rely on the British controlled Cape Colony for supplies and transportation.<sup>13</sup> The company, granted corporation through leaders in Amsterdam, created another flow of *Hollanders* to South Africa. The directors of the company and 1,700 other people employed by the NZASM had direct roots to the Netherlands.<sup>14</sup>

Aside from the NZASM, the *Hollanders* coming into South Africa, caught in the hype of Pro-Boer sentiment, saw the Boer republics as business opportunities in need of the European influence. Men like D.H. Schmüll and G.R. Ockerse immigrated to the Transvaal where they hoped to invest their time and money into quite lucrative projects. Both men went to South Africa with specific investments in mind, but due to their lack of experience with these new fields they instead turned to other, more successful, projects. Schmüll went to the Transvaal to start mines for copper and iron, but ended up with a monopoly in match production. Ockerse traveled

---

<sup>12</sup> Ibid 48.

<sup>13</sup> Ibid 42.

<sup>14</sup> Ibid 50.

south to invest with pottery and mining but rather developed an ingenious way to extract the oil from ground nuts.<sup>15</sup>

The inflow of Dutch business men and investors into the South African Republic and the Orange Free State was seen by some to be monopolies of various companies and products. This was seen as a hindrance to the practice of *laissez-faire* economics within the country. However, the formation of monopolies within the Transvaal was welcomed and encouraged by President Paul Kruger to encourage investment within his country. This was also a way to prevent *Uitlanders*, those not of Boer or Dutch descent, from gaining a strong foothold within the markets in the South African Republic.<sup>16</sup>

Business prospects were not the only area of influence for the immigrating *Hollanders*, they also had a hand in the politics, bureaucracies, and government offices of the Transvaal and Orange Free State. Paul Kruger, the President of the South African Republic from 1881-1900, welcomed the influence and help of the cousins from the north within his country. Government officials that were of European birth, specifically from the Netherlands as he did not trust those of English descent residing in his country, were preferred by Kruger. He came to the conclusion that due to the higher standards of education in the Netherlands, the men that he appointed were better suited for their positions rather than the Boers.<sup>17</sup>

Dutch support for the Boers, aided by the NZAV increased in varying degrees over time in response to the conflicts that arose between the Boer Republics and the British Empire. The annexation of the Transvaal in 1877 by Special Commissioner Theophilus Shepstone, under authority of the British government, was seen by some in the Netherlands as something that required their attention. Sentiment resided mainly with those regular citizens that had family or economic interests in

---

<sup>15</sup> Ibid 51.

<sup>16</sup> Ibid 51.

<sup>17</sup> Ibid 48.

South Africa, but the government of the Netherlands strove to remain neutral and impassive to what the British had done. K.H.D Haley in *The British and the Dutch Political and Cultural Relations through the Ages*, wrote, "The fact was that Dutch commerce and the Dutch East Indian possessions still depended on the British navy and its protection against intrusion of other powers in the Indonesian archipelago..."<sup>18</sup> That statement sums up the reason for the government's vehement stance on neutrality during the conflicts between the Boers and the British. They feared that any attempt by them, the Dutch, to interfere with British foreign policy and movements would deter British fleets and assistance, needed in maintaining their East Indian colonies, away. This did not however deter public sentiment from growing within the Netherlands among the more affluent citizens. The feeling of *stamverwantschap* was growing and efforts, funds, and other supplies were gathered to be sent to the fledgling republics. Some even had the thought in their mind that the "...revival of the old Dutch spirit...might even be a prelude to the reconquest of South Africa for the Dutch race and the redeeming of a missed opportunity in the Dutch past."<sup>19</sup>

Despite the neutrality of the government, there began a domino effect in the Netherlands, supported by the NZAV and other pro-Boer groups to help the struggling Boer republics. Dutch authors, some who had been to South Africa and others that had not, began to write pamphlets, articles, and books regarding the Boers and their republics. These writings established a major threshold for Boer supporters:

During the 1880s and 1890s, a vision of South African History emerged that served to lend legitimacy to the existence of an independent Dutch entity in that region and to oppose British expansion. The Boers were portrayed as heroic and gallant pioneers

---

<sup>18</sup> K.H.D Haley, *The British and the Dutch Political and Cultural Relations through the Ages* (London: George Philip, 1988), 229.

<sup>19</sup> Ibid 228.

who brought European 'civilisation' to the interior of the Africa... By contrast, the British were depicted as arrogant, selfish empire-builders, who cared nothing other than their own interests and who achieved their goals by whatever means necessary.<sup>20</sup>

From this statement it can be surmised that the Dutch writers and political activists were supportive of the Boer movements in South Africa. Also, they were adamant on their views of being anti-British, viewing the British Empire as nothing more than an imperialist movement persistent on getting anything they wanted no matter what the cost.

Aside from the annexation of the Transvaal by the British, stronger support from the Netherlands for the Boers came during the Anglo Boer War (1899-1902). The skirmish between the British and the Boers regarding the Transvaal ended in benign peace, but disgruntled Boers in the Transvaal and Orange Free State wanted their independence from Great Britain. The government of the Netherlands, fearing that the feelings and passions of their people would anger the British Government across the English Channel, issued a proclamation of neutrality. The proclamation, issued May 3, 1898, stated that the exportation of "...arms, ammunition or other war materials to the parties of war [to include] everything that is adaptable for immediate use in war." was prohibited.<sup>21</sup> This issuance of the proclamation marked that the government of the Netherlands did fear some form of retribution from the British if they joined the Boer cause. As previously stated, the Dutch possessions in the East Indies relied on the protection of the British naval fleets, and if they declared outrage officially against the British government that protection would be lost.<sup>22</sup>

Nevertheless, the South African War raged on and public opinion within the Netherlands became more polarized

---

<sup>20</sup> Kuitenbrouwer, *War of Words*, 100.

<sup>21</sup> Robert Granville Campbell, *Neutral Rights and Obligations in the Anglo-Boer War* (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1908), 36.

<sup>22</sup> Haley, *British and the Dutch*, .229.

toward the Boer cause. Regardless of the official neutrality of the Netherlands, there was support of the Boer republics within the government, with strong support from Queen Wilhelmina herself.<sup>23</sup> Despite their neutral stance the Netherlands felt no qualms with accepting and supporting refugees flowing into their countries via various ports around Europe. Since the public opinion of the Dutch was favorable to their African cousins they opened their arms to help them in their need. R.A.I. Snethlage, consul-general of the Transvaal in the Netherlands, was able to coordinate efforts to find shelter and needed essential for the Boer refugees.<sup>24</sup>

As the war continued in South Africa, the armies of the South African Republic and the Orange Free State began to lose their strong footing against the powerhouse of the British steam roller. Boer Generals felt that ending the war was essential in light of their losses, while President Kruger felt it was necessary to move forward to the end.<sup>25</sup> However, with the war not going in favor of the Boers, Kruger's government felt it was necessary to provide protection for its leaders and Kruger left into exile. During the closing the years of the war the neutrality of the Netherlands' government was strongly maintained; however, it was difficult to ignore the clamoring of the public opinion. The Dutch Parliament, under the direction of the Minister of Affairs, devised a plan to appease the growing masses calling out for support of the Boers. They sent their ship, the *Gelderland*, to pick up the exiled leader Kruger from Delgoa Bay in South Africa and bring him to Europe.<sup>26</sup>

Bringing Kruger to the Netherlands allowed the Parliament save face with both their citizens and the British. The first by bringing Kruger to a supportive country where he was welcomed as a hero, while to the British perspective the

---

<sup>23</sup> Kuitenbrouwer, *War of Words*, 116.

<sup>24</sup> Ibid. 111.

<sup>25</sup> Giliomee and Mbenga, *New History*, 218.

<sup>26</sup> Kuitenbrouwer, *War of Words*, 143.

exiled leader was brought to a country whose government was determined to remain neutral to the cause. There would have been no fear that the government of the Netherlands would use Kruger in any way that could be interpreted as the Netherlands reneging on their neutrality proclamation.

The influence of the Dutch people within South Africa is prevalent in their own history but also within the larger history of South Africa. There was a feeling of closeness and relation that has been termed as *stamverwantschap* that, although the Dutch had lost their colony to the British, allowed for relations to continue and increase due to cultural ties. The Netherlands would never gain back their colony created by the *Voor-trekkers*, but they were allowed to continue imperialistically through the extension of their culture and influence across the formed Boer republics. Although the help the Dutch provided was not received by all within the South African Republic and Orange Free State as welcome and wanted, the Boer leaders saw the help as opportunities for growth, expansion, and stabilization for their newborn countries. Nevertheless, the Dutch have played a large role within South Africa and its history either by providing a people that share their cultural habits or by involving themselves directly. The influence of the Netherlands in the last half of the nineteenth-century was seen as a form of informal imperialism that did not involve the expansion of land but of culture.<sup>27</sup>

---

<sup>27</sup> Ibid 11.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Brand South Africa, "The Languages of South Africa." <http://www.south-africa.info/about/people/language.html>
- Campbell, Robert Granville. *Neutral Rights and Obligations in the Anglo-Boer War*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1908.
- Giliomee, Hermann, and Bernard Mbenga. *New History of South Africa*. Cape Town: Tafelberg, 2007.
- Haley, K.H.D. *The British and the Dutch Political and Cultural Relations through the Ages*. London: George Philip, 1988.
- Kuitenbrouwer, Vincent. *War of Words Dutch Pro-Boer Propaganda and the South African War (1899-1902)*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2012.

## BIOGRAPHY

Joshua is a current UVU student studying History Education. After he graduates he would like to teach World Civilizations and later continue to research that field of history in graduate school. He also enjoys cooking, baking, reading, drawing, and painting.





# TO WHAT EXTENT DO CIRCUMSTANCES DETERMINE HUMAN BEHAVIOR?

BEN ALDANA

How the people of Hitler's Nazi Germany were able to commit many of the atrocities which are now known to have taken place shortly before and throughout the course of World War II (WWII) is a topic worthy of investigation. Few would argue that the now well-known actions taken by many of the people and by the government of Nazi Germany were not simple instances of injustice, but heinous atrocities which boggle the human mind. Strangely, many ordinary Germans were active supporters of Hitler and his extermination policies as well as willing participants in many of the atrocities committed by the Nazis.<sup>1</sup> How does nearly an entire population get to the point of being complicit in, and even supportive of such action?

## MORAL DISENGAGEMENT

Moral disengagement is the process by which immoral or injurious conduct is converted into righteous conduct.<sup>2</sup> In the case of Nazi Germany, moral disengagement occurred by way of justification, displacement of responsibility, attribution of blame, minimizing the harmful consequences of actions taken, and dehumanization of the enemy, which are all ways that people can morally disengage.<sup>3</sup> The main focus of this paper

---

<sup>1</sup> Goldenhagen. *Hitler's Willing Executioners: Ordinary Germans and the Holocaust*.

<sup>2</sup> Osofsky, Michael, Albert Bandura and Philip G. Zimbardo. "The Role of Moral Disengagement in the execution Process." *Law and Human Behavior* 29-4 (2005): 371-393.

<sup>3</sup> Bandura "Selective Moral Disengagement in the Exercise of Moral

will be dehumanization. According to Bandura, by the processes outlined above, “what was once morally condemnable becomes a source of self-valuation” to the individual or individuals committing the act[s].<sup>4</sup> Therefore, the Nazi leaders and German soldiers may very well have viewed themselves as national heroes and protectors of the homeland as they carried out Hitler’s will, rather than the killers they are now perceive to have been.

Also relevant to Bandura’s Moral Disengagement Theory is the obedience research of Stanley Milgram, in which he initially believed that a vast majority of the experimental subjects he was studying would cease to administer powerful electric shocks to another person, even if ordered to do so by an authority figure during the experiment. It was thought that the subjects’ refusal to shock another person would result from a personal, moral sense of right and wrong.<sup>5</sup>

Milgram found that if someone had been ordered to cause harm to another, they likely would do so if ordered to by an authority figure they perceived as legitimate, even if they were personally opposed to doing so.<sup>6</sup> Through the use of Milgram’s and Bandura’s research, it can be concluded that ordinary Germans and even Nazi soldiers may have been personally opposed to the actions they were being asked or ordered to participate in, but the sense of obligation they felt to their government could have been greater than any personal opposition they may have had to the behavior they were supporting or participating in.

Instead of viewing their behavior as wrong and hurtful, looking at the situation through the lens of Moral Disengagement Theory, the German people and Nazi soldiers

---

Agency.”

<sup>4</sup> Ibid 106.

<sup>5</sup> Milgram, Stanley. “Behavioral Study of Obedience.” *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 67-4 (1963): 371-378.

<sup>6</sup> Ibid.

conceivably could have viewed what they were doing as noble and preservative of their country and culture.<sup>7</sup> Even if they had not, through moral disengagement, they still could have rationalized or justified what they were doing in the name of obedience to authority. Additionally, the people and soldiers committing the acts may even have been ‘good and decent’ people. However, as Milgram’s research shows, even ‘good and decent’ people can be coerced into doing things they believe to be morally inappropriate.<sup>8</sup> This may be why there are so many accounts of brutality at the hands of Nazi soldiers, but then also to have had them on occasion become polite, civilized, and caring.

This bipolar-like behavior is exemplified through a vivid personal account in which Bunting recounts the experience of a young child during WWII in a Nazi-occupied territory. The individual recalls both himself and his younger sister witnessing a Nazi soldier brutally beat a slave worker to death who had been brought from Eastern Europe and was being forced to construct a German fortification. After the beating, the soldier realized the children had been watching him. The children were terrified at what the soldier might do upon realizing he had been observed committing such an act. Instead of him being upset at the children for observing his violent actions, or being embarrassed at such a display, he called the children over. When they complied, he retrieved his lunch and split it three ways to share with the children, all at a time when food in the area was quite scarce. They ate with the bloody, beaten body of the slave worker in plain view of their picnic.<sup>9</sup> This exemplifies moral disengagement through the dehumanization of those forced to perform slave labor for the Nazis during WWII.

---

<sup>7</sup> Bandura “Selective Moral Disengagement in the Exercise of Moral Agency.”

<sup>8</sup> Milgram, Stanley. “Behavioral Study of Obedience.”

<sup>9</sup> Bunting, Madeleine. *The Model Occupation: The Channel Islands Under German Rule 1940-1945*. 148-149.

Based on the beating, this soldier could have been considered barbaric. Judging him based upon the kind sharing of his lunch with the hungry children however, he could have been viewed as considerate and humane. Considering the way he treated the children, this soldier showed that he was capable of kindly caring for others. Such an incidence of violence only makes sense if the slave in this situation was viewed as less than human by the soldier.

### SETTING THE STAGE FOR WWII

Even before the beginning of World War I (WWI), the Jews in Germany were targets of ill feelings for a variety of reasons. During WWI for example, Jews were accused of avoiding military service in order to stay home, allowing them to exploit the black market created by circumstances surrounding the war, thereby enriching themselves at the expense of Germans who were suffering and contributing to the war effort.<sup>10</sup> Understandably, such beliefs among the German population caused high levels of public anger to be directed at Jews.

WWI was very costly to both sides; it resulted in the mobilization of 65 million soldiers to fight, a large percentage of whom were killed or wounded over the course of the four-year conflict. The total estimated monetary cost of WWI was \$186.3 billion.<sup>11</sup> When inflation is taken into account, WWI would have a total price tag of \$4.3 trillion in today's [2014] dollars.<sup>12</sup> At the conclusion of WWI, Britain and France viewed Germany and its territories as the "spoils of war".<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>10</sup> Goldenhagen. *Hitler's Willing Executioners: Ordinary Germans and the Holocaust* 81.

<sup>11</sup> Statistic Brain. "World War I Statistics." Retrieved February 18, 2014 (<http://www.statisticbrain.com/world-war-i-statistics/>).

<sup>12</sup> Dollar Times. "Inflation Calculator." Retrieved February 18, 2014 (<http://www.dollartimes.com/calculators/inflation.htm>).

<sup>13</sup> Fawcett, Louise. *International Relations of the Middle East*. 2nd Ed. (New York, Oxford University Press. 2009): 28.

Victory in WWI had come at a high cost, and the types of warfare engaged in during WWI made it all the more embittering. During WWI, trench and chemical warfare, as well as tanks, flame throwers, machine guns, and long-range artillery were deployed for the first time.<sup>14</sup> As a result of these weapons being used, over 2.2 million French and British soldiers were killed, 6.2 million were wounded, and close to 60 billion dollars were spent on war costs combined between the two countries.<sup>15</sup> By the end of hostilities both France and Britain had developed a deep resentment towards Germany, as well as a justified aversion to war.

According to Goldhagen, these hostile feelings led to the division of Germany's territory as well as large war reparations payments being imposed upon Germany by the Treaty of Versailles, all while Germany's remaining territory and economy were in shambles.<sup>16</sup> The governments of France and Britain both felt justified in creating so many obstacles to Germany's economic success because of the destruction caused throughout Europe at the hands of the German military.<sup>17</sup>

The burdens placed upon Germany had a crippling effect on Germany's government and economy, creating circumstances which may have contributed to the rise of a leader like Adolf Hitler.<sup>18</sup> The new generation of Germans grew up frightened and felt undeserving of the obstacles imposed upon them by foreign powers after WWI. Throughout the 1920s and 1930s, Jews were being publicly painted as one of the main causes of Germany's ills and an enemy which had to

---

<sup>14</sup> Flanders Field Music. "World War One – Statistics." Retrieved on November 29, 2013 (<http://www.flandersfieldsmusic.com/WWI-statistics.html>).

<sup>15</sup> Ibid.

<sup>16</sup> Goldenhagen. *Hitler's Willing Executioners: Ordinary Germans and the Holocaust*. 81.

<sup>17</sup> Fawcett, Louise. *International Relations of the Middle East*. 2nd Ed.

<sup>18</sup> Mitcham, Samuel W. Jr. *Why Hitler?: The Genesis of the Nazi Reich*. 1st Ed. (Westport, CT: Praeger. 1996)

be stopped before it could exact any more destruction on the Germans' way of life.<sup>19</sup>

Hitler capitalized on these feelings and effectively made the case to citizens of Germany that they needed to expand their territory and take back what had belonged to them prior to WWI, in order to ensure its survival and prosperity in a world that would otherwise supervise Germany's demise.<sup>20</sup> This course of events lead not only to Hitler's rise to power and the atrocities committed against the Jews by the Nazis, but also to other less publicized events which took place during WWII, such as the occupation of the Channel Islands, and specifically the Island of Guernsey, by German forces. Guernsey is an island located in the English Channel, territory that during World War II was considered to be under the protection of Great Britain, a fact that remains true to this day.

According to Bandura, people typically stop themselves from acting in morally reprehensible ways unless they can somehow justify their conduct with respect to a certain population of people, or under a particular set of circumstances. This justification is what seemingly allows them to willingly engage in the reprehensible behavior, often with unnecessarily high levels of zeal. It also seems to be what allows the perpetrators of such behavior to compartmentalize what they are doing, appearing civilized in some situations while remaining brutal or inhumane in others.<sup>21</sup>

### THE WWII GERMAN OCCUPATION OF GUERNSEY

Despite the amount of post-WWII research which has been done, an under-researched aspect of WWII is the fact that a small part of Great Britain was occupied by German

---

<sup>19</sup> Goldenhagen. *Hitler's Willing Executioners: Ordinary Germans and the Holocaust*. 81.

<sup>20</sup> Mitcham, Samuel W. Jr. *Why Hitler?: The Genesis of the Nazi Reich*.

<sup>21</sup> Bandura "Selective Moral Disengagement in the Exercise of Moral Agency."

forces during WWII. On June 28, 1940 the English Channel Island of Guernsey, although de-militarized at the time, was attacked by German warplanes with bombs and machine guns.<sup>22</sup> Being de-militarized, the population had no way of defending against such an assault, during which 34 civilians were killed. Eleven more were killed on the neighboring Island of Jersey, bringing the total June 28, 1940 civilian death toll on the Channel Islands up to 45 people.<sup>23</sup> Two days later German soldiers landed at the airport on Guernsey, effectively beginning the wartime occupation of the Island. The rest of the Channel Islands were soon after occupied by German forces as well.<sup>24</sup>

Unlike much of mainland Britain, Carr reports the June 28th attack as the single combat-related, violent instance on Guernsey during WWII, if such an attack can appropriately be called combat.<sup>25</sup> As a result, at the conclusion of WWII, the islands had suffered very little physical damage compared with the damage sustained on mainland Britain. Psychologically however, the occupation had been humiliating and embarrassing to the islanders and especially to the British government.<sup>26</sup> Interestingly, when one of McGunnigal-Smith's interviewees was asked how they felt about the British government, she reported:

They couldn't do anything about it really. It wouldn't have been right if we had guns and things like that because we would have been bombed out, wouldn't we, by the Germans?<sup>27</sup>

---

<sup>22</sup> Bunting, Madeleine. *The Model Occupation: The Channel Islands Under German Rule 1940-1945*. 37.

<sup>23</sup> Carr, Gilly. "Occupation Heritage, Commemoration and Memory in Guernsey and Jersey." *History & Memory* 24-1 (2012): 96-97.

<sup>24</sup> Bunting, Madeleine. *The Model Occupation: The Channel Islands Under German Rule 1940-1945*.

<sup>25</sup> Carr, Gilly. "Occupation Heritage, Commemoration and Memory in Guernsey and Jersey" 96.

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>27</sup> McGunnigal-Smith, Sandy. Interview #27, 2010.

The islanders knew there was nothing the British government could have done about the German invasion. If British armed forces had tried to repel the Germans, many of the islanders would have been killed by the fighting.

During the occupation, Guernsey's residents lived under the constant fear of displacement and deprivation often associated with military occupation. Resources such as food, shelter, fuel, and medicine became scarce, resulting in the emergence of black markets, as well as the occupiers requisitioning large portions of what the islanders were capable of producing to support the Nazi war effort.<sup>28</sup> According to another of McGunnigal-Smith's interview subjects, the Nazis would regularly take some of her father's garden yield:

The State (of Guernsey) sort of supervised and asked people to grow crops of food, to feed the popula... vegetables, as far as possible to feed the population. Of course, some of that had to be allocated to the Germans.<sup>29</sup>

Everything grown or produced on the islands was carefully tracked and accounted for by the Germans so they could ensure maximum exploitation of the island's resources.<sup>30</sup>

Because Guernsey was officially British-defended territory, Hitler seemed to have an obsession with ensuring its security from invasion by British forces. Germany poured labor and resources into building up the security of Guernsey, as well as the other Channel Islands which had been taken by German forces, from any potential invasion if one happened to come from Great Britain.<sup>31</sup> Under the terms of the Hague Convention, the inhabitants of occupied territories cannot be

<sup>28</sup> Bunting, Madeleine. *The Model Occupation: The Channel Islands Under German Rule 1940-1945*.

<sup>29</sup> McGunnigal-Smith, Sandy. Interview #16, 2010.

<sup>30</sup> Bunting, Madeleine. *The Model Occupation: The Channel Islands Under German Rule 1940-1945*.

<sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*



used to perform labor for an occupying force, so the Nazis brought slave laborers from Eastern Europe to perform the work they needed to have done. These men and boys were mainly young Russians and Ukrainians, who were forced to live in camps and perform slave labor for the Nazis on the islands.<sup>32</sup> This is interesting to consider, since it also seems to be a violation of the Hague Convention, just in a different geographical area of the conflict. The Germans seemed to be selectively abiding by the Convention when it suited their interests, and violated it when it did not. The Nazis did not seem to care what the Eastern Europeans thought of them, but they wanted the occupation of British territory to be a 'model one.' This is because Hitler wanted word to get back to England that the German soldiers and leaders were capable of exhibiting very respectful behavior, and that living under German rule was not bad at all.<sup>33</sup> This goal of a 'model occupation' helps to explain some of the strangely humanitarian displays of behavior exhibited by the Nazis. The instance mentioned earlier concerning the children having the picnic with the soldier took place on Guernsey during the German occupation.

In another of McGunnigal-Smith's interviews of an individual who lived through the Nazi occupation of Guernsey, the interviewee recounted the following about one of the German soldiers he had a great deal of personal contact with during the war, as the soldier was billeted in his home:

He'd (the soldier) say how much he hated being at war. He'd rather be home with his family and uh, very decent man.<sup>34</sup>

This statement refers to a man who hated being at war, and would rather have been at home with his family than occupying a territory taken over by his government. He likely was there as a result of the obligation he felt to his government.

---

<sup>32</sup> Ibid.

<sup>33</sup> Ibid.

<sup>34</sup> McGunnigal-Smith, Sandy. Interview #23, 2010.

Based on the assessment of him being a ‘decent man’ by the person who was interviewed, it can be inferred that he was not the stereotypical WWII German soldier. What was this soldier doing however, when he was not in the presence of the family that was billeting him? The Nazi soldiers had perceptions of what was morally correct and what was not. They treated some of the people with whom they came into contact with the respect and dignity most people believe other humans should be afforded. This is evidenced by the way in which they treated most of the Guernsey islanders during the occupation of Guernsey. The way they treated the slaves however, was another matter entirely.

A good explanation for the behavior of the Nazis is that they dehumanized the slaves, and may even have blamed them for their own plight. Because many of the slaves were from Russia and Ukraine, they therefore may have been perceived as ‘the enemy,’ even though they were incapable of putting up a fight and many of them were only teenagers.<sup>35</sup> Had their respective countries not been engaging in warfare with Germany, they may not have had the misfortune of becoming slaves. Because many of the islanders were well aware of what the Germans were doing to the slave laborers, yet still made statements such as the one above, declaring the German soldier a ‘decent guy,’ it is also quite possible that many of the natives of Guernsey viewed the slave laborers as less than human. How else could they believe the soldier, supporting the abuse of slaves, to be a ‘decent guy?’

For both the Germans and the islanders, this dehumanization of the slaves may have been viewed as necessary for survival purposes. The Germans would not have tolerated any of the islanders interfering with their treatment of the slaves, and Bunting reports that the German soldiers were afraid of being transferred from Guernsey to the Russian front of the

---

<sup>35</sup> Bunting, Madeleine. *The Model Occupation: The Channel Islands Under German Rule 1940-1945*.

War if it were reported that they were being too lenient in their treatment of the slaves.<sup>36</sup> This fact easily could have led the soldiers to justify their acts of brutality against the slaves. Such brutality by the Germans, and the apathy of the islanders, both may have been thought necessary to each parties' respective self-preservation. Because the islanders themselves necessarily may have begun to dehumanize the slave workers simply so they could tolerate the abuses they were witnessing and hearing about on a regular basis, it is no surprise that the Nazis may have viewed the slaves as subhuman as well.<sup>37</sup>

### **THE GUERNSEY ISLANDERS: MORALLY DISENGAGED?**

Other isolated instances of apparent moral disengagement were romantic relationships that developed amongst the women on the island and the German soldiers stationed there. Most of the military age men left Guernsey to contribute to the war effort against the Germans.<sup>38</sup> This resulted in a situation in which numerous, attractive, single, and married women were left on the island with a large number of young and attractive German soldiers. The island population essentially became one of a disproportionate number of captive women as well as a large number of young German soldiers. One of the occupation survivors interviewed by Dr. McGunnigal-Smith in 2010 reported the following:

Interviewer: "Some of the Guernsey girls did go out with the Germans didn't they?"

Subject: "Oh, there's one in particular ... my sister had the beauty, not me ... this one, officers, it had to be officers. All through the occupation. A lot of them. There was a lot of them like that. You'd see them with nylons on."

Interviewer: "They say they got more privileges because they did?"

---

<sup>36</sup> Ibid.

<sup>37</sup> Ibid. 150.

<sup>38</sup> Ibid.

Subject: "They were well looked after, let's put it like that. Oh, there was quite a few of them. Quite, quite a few of them."

Interviewer: "Did the other Guernsey people dislike them for that?"

Subject: "A lot of them did, yea. A lot of them did. Even me. Me, I used to think ... don't say it BLANK ... because they were getting stockings and chocolate. Oh well, they went short of nothing."

Interviewer: "Do you think they did that (date Germans) because of the things they got, stockings and chocolate?"

Subject: "No. I think its just that they took to the bloke. Just probably took to him. I mean, he's a man after all. A man is a man in any nation!"<sup>39</sup>

This scenario, and the unusual quid pro quo relationships that developed between some of the women on the islands and the German soldiers stationed there is what prompted comparison to a major, modern social problem currently existing in the United States; incarcerated women and the problems they face in prisons and jails, as well as what awaits them when they walk out of the prisons and jails and into the community. Some of the particular problems associated with incarcerated women, as well as a few potential solutions will be discussed in the next section of this paper.

Many of the women who engaged in this uncharacteristic behavior on Guernsey during WWII might not have done so under normal circumstances. A common theme from Bunting, and from the information obtained by McGunnigal-Smith through her interviews in 2010, was that the women who were using their bodies to gain favor with the Nazis were uncharacteristic of the typical female island resident. Stealing to survive was commonplace, and not viewed as something 'wrong.' These behaviors prior to the occupation would not have been condoned in the community. Once survival necessitated them however, what was once morally condemnable became morally

---

<sup>39</sup> McGunnigal-Smith, Sandy. Interview #5, 2010.

acceptable.<sup>40</sup> This is evidence of moral disengagement on the part of the women on Guernsey during the occupation.

On May 9, 1945, almost a year after the allied invasion of France, and five years after taking Guernsey, the Germans finally surrendered Guernsey and the rest of the Channel Islands to British Forces without a fight. This day is still celebrated annually on the Islands. It is called Liberation Day, and it consists of large celebrations and parades.<sup>41</sup>

### THE INSURRECTION OF SUBJUGATED KNOWLEDGES

French philosopher Michel Foucault advocated the importance of insurrecting subjugated knowledges. Medina assists in deciphering precisely what it is that Foucault defines as the insurrection of subjugated knowledges; subjugated knowledges are events or ideas that have been hidden, repressed or overlooked, intentionally or unintentionally, which result in the oppression or marginalization of a person or group. The insurrection of subjugated knowledges is the process by which subjugated knowledges are brought to the public's attention, and made visible for all to see.<sup>42</sup> The presence of knowledge creates power, and if subjugated knowledges are not insurrected in search of the truth, then current, common, and authoritative knowledges that have been promoted by those holding on to power will be what continues to provide authority to those presently wielding power and control over a certain area of knowledge.<sup>43</sup>

The insurrection of subjugated knowledges is the process by which those who have been marginalized or silenced are in

---

<sup>40</sup> Bunting, Madeleine. *The Model Occupation: The Channel Islands Under German Rule 1940-1945*.

<sup>41</sup> Carr, Gilly. "Occupation Heritage, Commemoration and Memory in Guernsey and Jersey".

<sup>42</sup> Medina, Jose. "Toward a Foucaultian Epistemology of Resistance: Counter-Memory, Epistemic Friction, and Guerrilla Pluralism." *Foucault Studies* 12 (2011).

<sup>43</sup> Ibid.

some way given a voice to make others understand the plights they are suffering. The women on Guernsey are having their subjugated stories insurrected through this research, and another, modern set of subjugated knowledges will be insurrected in the next section of this paper.

### MODERN MORAL DISENGAGEMENT

Prisoners, especially female prisoners, are a population to whom American society is egregiously morally disengaged.<sup>44</sup> Prisoners and former prisoners are viewed in a stigmatic and unpopular manner by mainstream society. This stigma often results in elected officials crafting and promulgating harsh laws to appease constituencies, rather than dealing with problems in a well thought out and constructive manner.<sup>45</sup> President Richard Nixon's "war on drugs," which began in the 1970s, has become a great example of elected officials reacting to a problem in a way to appease voters, without fully considering the social ramifications of their chosen strategy for dealing with it.<sup>46</sup>

Much of the debate in the U.S. Congress during the 1980s concerning the mandatory minimum laws it passed against crack cocaine centered on the damage this substance allegedly caused to a fetus if the mother was a user during her pregnancy. It was believed that the effects of crack cocaine were more detrimental than those of powder cocaine when it came to damaging an unborn baby, which therefore justified a more severe punishment. In 2002 this assertion was deemed to be inaccurate by experts; the damage done to a fetus by both substances

---

<sup>44</sup> Waks, Allison L. "Federal Incarceration by Contract in a Post-Minneci World: Legislation to Equalize the Constitutional Rights of Prisoners." *University of Michigan Journal of Law Reform* 46-3 (2013).

<sup>45</sup> Conyers, John Jr. "The Incarceration Explosion." *Yale Law & Policy Review* 31-2 (2013): 385.

<sup>46</sup> "Federal Incarceration by Contract in a Post-Minneci World: Legislation to Equalize the Constitutional Rights of Prisoners." 1068.

is the same.<sup>47</sup> This scenario results in an interesting question; If policymakers are so concerned about the welfare of unborn children, then why are they not concerned about the effects incarceration has, specifically the incarceration of mothers, on the children of those mothers, and ultimately on society?

When children are separated from their mothers through incarceration or by other means, the damage can be long-lasting and the children are more than twice as likely to become incarcerated in adulthood.<sup>48</sup> If those making criminal justice policy decisions truly cared for the children throughout American society, they would heed this research as policy is created.

Since 1980, incarceration rates for drug offenses have increased nearly ten-fold, and the average length of imprisonment has increased by 36 percent.<sup>49</sup> If social vengeance was the only goal of the 'corrections system' in the United States, then this would have been the result of a perfect policy. Ironically, the 'war on drugs' has not led to a reduction in the number of drug users, just to an enormous explosion in the population of those incarcerated in American prisons, a disproportionate amount of whom are women. The population of women in federal and state prisons in the United States has increased six-fold over the last 20 years, increasing at a far higher rate than the male prison population.<sup>50</sup>

Because of the stigma they face, many of the women who become incarcerated need re-entry resources as they transition from prison to community. Some of the problems faced by women coming from prison or jail are exacerbated as they

---

<sup>47</sup> Conyers, John Jr. "The Incarceration Explosion." 381-382.

<sup>48</sup> Murray, Joseph and Lynne Murray. "Parental Incarceration, Attachment and Child Psychopathology." *Attachment & Human Development* 12-4 (2010): 290.

<sup>49</sup> Conyers, John Jr. "The Incarceration Explosion." 378-379.

<sup>50</sup> Braithwaite, Ronald L., Henrie M. Treadwell, Kimberly R. J. Arriola. "Health Disparities and Incarcerated Women: A Population Ignored." *American Journal of Public Health* 95-10 (2005): 1679-1681.

are released and expected to function in society. Women in particular face specific problems associated with child reunification, obtaining adequate housing, finding employment, and getting the health care they need.<sup>51</sup> Women cannot be expected to effectively function in society or even participate in aftercare or substance abuse treatment, or any other required transitional programming, if their basic human needs are not being met as they try to live their lives.

Because many women are released from prison with unmet needs, they may be at a higher than necessary risk of being rearrested and returning to prison.<sup>52</sup> Prison populations could be reduced significantly if those being released from prison were offered opportunities as well as support to assist with the transition they are making.<sup>53</sup> In one study, housing support alone was shown to reduce recidivism by 83 percent.<sup>54</sup>

### **WOMEN AND MORAL DISENGAGEMENT IN PRISON**

Some might argue that the women who end up incarcerated are themselves morally disengaged, which is why they offended in the first place, and why they continue their antisocial behavior in prison and even sometimes upon release. One study to examine this was performed by Wiess, et al. in which they interviewed a small number of incarcerated women. A common theme found by these researchers among the women interviewed was that they had “redefined” their own personal boundaries of morally acceptable and unacceptable conduct, with their views leaning in an antisocial direction.<sup>55</sup> What was

---

<sup>51</sup> Kerman, Piper. “The Huge Challenge of Building a Life After Prison.” *AlterNet*, April 15. (2010)

<sup>52</sup> Wiess, Josie A., Hawkins, Joellen W., Despinos, C. “Redefining Boundaries: A Grounded Theory Study of Recidivism in Women.” *Health Care for Women International* 31 (2010).

<sup>53</sup> Conyers, John Jr. “The Incarceration Explosion.”

<sup>54</sup> Wiess, Josie A., Hawkins, Joellen W., Despinos, C. “Redefining Boundaries: A Grounded Theory Study of Recidivism in Women.” 260.

<sup>55</sup> *Ibid.* 263-268.



not clear however, was if the women had simply created these personal moral definitions because they were devious people, or if this modification of personal morals was more of a reaction to the environmental conditions faced by the women who were interviewed. Either way, should this be happening if the women are supposed to be being 'corrected?' The fact that society is often putting women in situations where they may feel the need to morally disengage is itself concerning, especially since there is strong social science evidence to show how the problem could be effectively dealt with.

This is where similarities and differences can be ascertained between the two groups of women. Some of the women who lived on Guernsey during the German occupation showed that an individual's sense of right and wrong can become different under conditions of confinement. Even women who would not otherwise engage in certain 'immoral' behaviors can become morally disengaged to the extent that they essentially become 'different.' There is evidence of this reported by Bunting, as well as in Dr. McGunnigal-Smith's interviews, which in an important point because some of the women on Guernsey during the occupation were participating in behaviors that they otherwise would not have participated in.<sup>56</sup> These likely were women who otherwise would not ever have ended up in prison. They had lives that were viewed as normal, and were pro-social members of their community, all the way up to the point of a drastic change in their environment; occupation by a foreign military force. They were not free to come and go from the island; they essentially were 'imprisoned' on the island. This is why comparing them to incarcerated women is an appropriate comparison to attempt.

Often before women end up in prison, they have lived lives far from what would be considered nurturing or conducive to realizing their full potential as human beings, which likely

---

<sup>56</sup> Bunting, Madeleine. *The Model Occupation: The Channel Islands Under German Rule 1940-1945*.

contributes to the tarnished moral compass mainstream society perceives them to have. Ajinkya estimates that between 85 and 90 percent of women who end up in prison have been victims of violence prior to their incarceration, including rape, sexual assault, domestic violence, abuse suffered as a child, or any combination of these. Approximately 80 percent of incarcerated women are drug addicts.<sup>57</sup> These figures result in a population of women with low self-esteem, who harbor deep feelings of guilt, anger, shame, and dependency, each of which contributes to a sense of powerlessness and isolation.<sup>58</sup> Treating these women for the problems they manifest, rather than paying to incarcerate them, as well as placing their children in alternative living arrangements such as foster care, would be far more practical, and far more humane.<sup>59</sup> If provided with adequate assistance, it is very possible that these women might become productive members of society, rather than the social burden created by incarcerating them. The risk factors posed to future generations, and subsequent incarceration rates might decrease as well.

### **SOCIETY'S MORALLY DISENGAGED VIEW OF WOMEN IN PRISON AND PRISONERS IN GENERAL**

Instead of helping incarcerated women recover from past trauma, successfully reenter society, and repair familial relationships, the system often separates them from their children through incarceration, which causes more trauma, not only to the mother but to the children as well. Many of the detrimental effects which result from separating children from their mothers have been discussed, and are well-publicized.

---

<sup>57</sup> Ajinkya, Julie. "Rethinking How to Address the Growing Female Prison Population." *Center for American Progress*, March, 8. (2013).

<sup>58</sup> Fortune, Darla, Julie Thompson, Alison Pedlar and FeliceYuen. "Social Justice and Women Leaving Prison: Beyond Punishment and Exclusion." *Contemporary Justice Review* 13-1 (2010).

<sup>59</sup> Ajinkya, Julie. "The Top 5 Facts About Women in Our Criminal Justice System." *Center for American Progress*, March, 7. (2012).

Prosecutors as well as many courts and prisons in the United States appear to give little consideration to the problems associated with separating women from their children through maternal incarceration.<sup>60</sup> The following scenario is an example of such a lack of consideration:

In July 2010, a Connecticut woman, Heather Bliss, pleaded guilty in U.S. District Court to a charge of wire fraud, which resulted in a sentence of 30 months in federal prison. Her husband, William Trudeau, Jr., also was indicted in the case but chose to have a trial, ultimately receiving a 16-year sentence when he was found guilty on 2 of the 9 counts he originally had been indicted for. The couple had 3 children at the time of this incident, and Ms. Bliss was eight months pregnant when she self-surrendered to the prison she was ordered to serve her time in. The couple's children, ages 9, 6, and 2, went to live with a family the couple knew from church, and Ms. Bliss gave birth to her baby while incarcerated. The family caring for Ms. Bliss' children already had 3 children of their own to care for, and adding 3 more to that number understandably made their lives much more complicated.<sup>61</sup>

Having a baby while incarcerated can be an ordeal, and of course the government must pay all medical expenses associated with the pregnancy and birth. Ms. Bliss had private health insurance before becoming incarcerated, which would have covered the medical expenses she incurred, had she not been incarcerated. In this situation, both for the sake of the children as well as the mother, critically examining the 'best thing to do' may have been something that was in order. Ms. Bliss was not a danger or a flight risk. This is apparent because Ms. Bliss was allowed by the judge to self-surrender to prison, instead of being taken to prison immediately after sentencing. Had she been a danger or a flight risk, she would not have

---

<sup>60</sup> Pavlo, Walter. "Yes, Moms Go To Prison: The Story Of Heather Bliss." *Forbes*, October 29, (2013)

<sup>61</sup> *Ibid.*

been allowed to show up at a scheduled time to the prison in which she would serve her time.<sup>62</sup>

Situations like this occur because of the way the federal criminal justice system is administered. Women are sent to prison without regard to their or the children's well-being. The children in the case of Ms. Bliss needed to 'adjust' to their 'new' family when their mother went to prison, and will need to 'readjust' to their mother when she is released from prison. This was a major disruption in the lives of all involved and might have been handled in a less heavy-handed manner. Had an alternative to incarceration, or a program which allowed for liberal contact with the children been used, it would have benefitted not only the children and the mother, but also society in general through the mitigation of damage done to the mother-child relationships present in this case, not to mention the alleviation of stress to the family that agreed to take Ms. Bliss' three children in for 30 months. The public would have benefited financially, because her private insurance would have paid the bill for Ms. Bliss' medical care rather than the government. Had Ms. Bliss been allowed to have her baby and then report to prison, or been punished in a way other than incarceration, rather than this situation playing out as it did, Ms. Bliss' story and the numerous untold other stories similar to it are some of the subjugated knowledges with regard to the incarceration system in the United States, and are examples of society's morally disengaged view of incarcerated women.

As the number of women incarcerated in the United States and subsequently separated from their children increases, it is logical to conclude that the number of children adversely affected by this type of criminal justice policy will increase, which could contribute to unnecessarily high incarceration rates of those children in the future. Reichel reports that the United States is one of the least likely nations in the world to allow a mother to keep her baby for any length of time while

---

<sup>62</sup> Ibid

she is incarcerated, so incarcerating mothers often leads to separation of a mother from her child in the United States.<sup>63</sup>

Society tends to dehumanize those in prison. Reality shows such as 'Lock Up Raw' (2005-Present) portray prisoners as vicious and devious people, seeking to prey on anyone they can. This portrayal contributes to a belief that prisoners may be less than 'human,' which therefore helps society form a morally disengaged view that it is appropriate to treat them in the ways described, as well as in other inhumane and degrading ways.

This phenomenon of social dehumanization is explained very well in an article written by Christopher Lenn, in which he recalls his first personal experience with prisoners while he was a graduate student. Lenn and some of his classmates had volunteered to participate in a class being held at a prison in Oregon, in which half of the class would be prisoners. On the first day of class, Lenn reports that he and his classmates walked into the prison terrified of what they were about to experience. To Lenn and his classmates' surprise, the prisoners they interacted with were, "whole beings, full of histories and stories, with no less value than us".<sup>64</sup> This is a perception that many people lack, and results in the dehumanization of prisoners.

In a Canadian program called Stride Circle, efforts are made to familiarize incarcerated women with members of the community before they are released.<sup>65</sup> The view of this program is that everyone is responsible for the success of the women, and efforts are made to humanize them through regular contact and activities with members of the community,

---

<sup>63</sup> Reichel, Philip L. 2012. *Comparative Criminal Justice Systems: A Topical Approach*. 6th Ed. (Boston: Pearson. 2012) 260.

<sup>64</sup> Lenn, Christopher M. 2011. "Applying Buber's I-Thou Principle to Incarceration." *Peace Review* 23-3 (2011). 346.

<sup>65</sup> Fortune, Darla, Julie Thompson, Alison Pedlar and FeliceYuen. "Social Justice and Women Leaving Prison: Beyond Punishment and Exclusion."

before the women are released, for the purpose of building relationships. This helps communities be more accepting of the women, and helps the women to feel more comfortable when they are released to their communities.<sup>66</sup>

## CONCLUSION

Just as the subjugated knowledges of the women on Guernsey during WWII need to be examined in order to understand their perspective on what took place during the occupation, so to do the subjugated knowledges of incarcerated women in the United States if the problem of societal moral disengagement concerning them is to be resolved. The humanization of incarcerated women and the collateral consequences associated with incarcerating women are not given the consideration they are due, and will not be until their stories are de-subjugated, and the public can understand the problem. This social ignorance results in insensitivity and creates a host of potentially preventable problems, not only for the incarcerated women and their children, but also for the future of society in general. Understanding and implementing more effective ways of dealing with non-violent crime, especially in the cases of women, is essential to dealing with the incarceration problem currently facing the United States.

---

<sup>66</sup> Ibid.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ajinkya, Julie. 2013. "Rethinking How to Address the Growing Female Prison Population." *Center for American Progress*, March, 8. Retrieved April 9, 2014 (<http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/women/news/2013/03/08/55787/rethinking-how-to-address-the-growing-female-prison-population/>).
- Ajinkya, Julie. 2012. "The Top 5 Facts About Women in Our Criminal Justice System." *Center for American Progress*, March, 7. Retrieved April 9, 2014 (<http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/women/news/2012/03/07/11219/the-top-5-facts-about-women-in-our-criminal-justice-system/>).
- Bandura, Albert. 2002. "Selective Moral Disengagement in the Exercise of Moral Agency." *Journal of Moral Education* 31(2): 101-119.
- Bunting, Madeleine. 2004. *The Model Occupation: The Channel Islands Under German Rule 1940-1945*. London: Pimlico.
- Braithwaite, Ronald L., Henrie M. Treadwell, Kimberly R. J. Arriola. 2005. "Health Disparities and Incarcerated Women: A Population Ignored." *American Journal of Public Health* 95(10): 1679-1681. Retrieved April 7, 2014 (<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC1449417/>).
- Carr, Gilly. 2012. "Occupation Heritage, Commemoration and Memory in Guernsey and Jersey." *History & Memory* 24(1): 87-117. doi:10.2979/history-memo.24.1.87.
- Conyers, John Jr. 2013. "The Incarceration Explosion." *Yale Law & Policy Review* 31(2): 377-387. Retrieved February 19, 2014 (<http://eds.b.ebscohost.com/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=f97e9814-70e5-49b2-92fd-a5843059798f%40sessionmgr111&vid=7&hid=106>).
- Dollar Times, n.d. "Inflation Calculator." Retrieved February 18, 2014 (<http://www.dollartimes.com/calculators/inflation.htm>).
- Fawcett, Louise. 2009. *International Relations of the Middle East. 2nd Ed.* New York: Oxford University Press.
- Flanders Field Music, n.d. "World War One—Statistics." Retrieved on November 29, 2013 (<http://www.flandersfieldsmusic.com/WWI-statistics.html>).
- Fortune, Darla, Julie Thompson, Alison Pedlar and Felice Yuen. 2010. "Social Justice and Women Leaving Prison: Beyond Punishment and Exclusion." *Contemporary Justice Review* 13(1): 19-33. doi:10.1080/10282580903549128
- Goldhagen, Jonah. 1997. *Hitler's Willing Executioners: Ordinary Germans and the Holocaust*. New York: Vintage Books.

- Kerman, Piper. 2010. "The Huge Challenge of Building a Life After Prison." *AlterNet*, April 15, Retrieved April 7, 2014 from ([http://www.alternet.org/story/146464/the\\_huge\\_challenges\\_of\\_building\\_a\\_life\\_after\\_prison](http://www.alternet.org/story/146464/the_huge_challenges_of_building_a_life_after_prison)).
- Lenn, Christopher M. 2011. "Applying Buber's I-Thou Principle to Incarceration." *Peace Review* 23(3): 342-347. doi:10.1080/10402659.2011.596068.
- Medina, Jose. 2011. "Toward a Foucaultian Epistemology of Resistance: Counter-Memory, Epistemic Friction, and Guerrilla Pluralism." *Foucault Studies* (12): 9-35.
- McGunnigal-Smith, Sandy. Interview #5, 2010.
- McGunnigal-Smith, Sandy. Interview #16, 2010.
- McGunnigal-Smith, Sandy. Interview #23, 2010.
- McGunnigal-Smith, Sandy. Interview #27, 2010.
- Milgram, Stanley. 1963. "Behavioral Study of Obedience." *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 67(4): 371-378. Retrieved December 5, 2013 (<http://www.columbia.edu/cu/psychology/terrace/w1001/readings/milgram.pdf>).
- Mitcham, Samuel W. Jr. 1996. *Why Hitler?: The Genesis of the Nazi Reich. 1st Ed.* Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Murray, Joseph and Lynne Murray. 2010. "Parental Incarceration, Attachment and Child Psychopathology." *Attachment & Human Development* 12(4): 289-309. doi: 10.1080/14751790903416889.
- Osofsky, Michael, Albert Bandura and Philip G. Zimbardo. 2005. "The Role of Moral Disengagement in the Execution Process." *Law and Human Behavior* 29(4): 371-393.
- Pavlo, Walter. 2013. "Yes, Moms Go To Prison: The Story Of Heather Bliss." *Forbes*, October 29, Retrieved April 19, 2014 from (<http://www.forbes.com/sites/walterpavlo/2013/10/29/yes-moms-go-to-prison-the-story-of-heather-bliss/>).
- Reichel, Philip L. 2012. *Comparative Criminal Justice Systems: A Topical Approach. 6th Ed.* Boston: Pearson.
- Statistic Brain. n.d. "World War I Statistics." Retrieved February 18, 2014 (<http://www.statisticbrain.com/world-war-i-statistics/>).
- Waks, Allison L. 2013. "Federal Incarceration by Contract in a Post-Minneci World: Legislation to Equalize the Constitutional Rights of Prisoners." *University of Michigan Journal of Law Reform* 46(3): 1065-1096. Retrieved February 19, 2014 ([http://prospectusmjlr.files.wordpress.com/2013/10/waks\\_mjlr46-3.pdf](http://prospectusmjlr.files.wordpress.com/2013/10/waks_mjlr46-3.pdf)).
- Wiess, Josie A., Hawkins, Joellen W., Despinos, C. 2010. "Redefining Boundaries: A Grounded Theory Study of Recidivism in Women." *Health Care for Women International* 31:258-273.



## BIOGRAPHY

Ben graduated from UVU in May 2014 with a degree in Behavioral Sciences with an emphasis in Psychology and a minor in Political Science. Ben will be attending law school this coming Fall semester (2015). He enjoys researching and writing about instances of injustice and enjoys educating others of these instances in hopes of improving society.



## **“THE BLOODY MASSACRE:” THE BOSTON MASSACRE AND THE HIDDEN HISTORY OF A LABOR DISPUTE**

**JOSHUA J. EATON**

The Boston Massacre is the pivotal point when citizens of Boston stopped their more peaceful protests, and resorted to more violent means of communicating their dissatisfaction with the British Empire. This is not to say that the citizens of Boston had not used violence means prior to the Boston Massacre, but violent protest would become significantly more common and frequent after the Boston Massacre. Several factors contribute to the events leading up to the Boston massacre that helped to create an atmosphere of anxiety among the citizens of Boston. The first factor contributing to the anxiety of the colonists is that they felt that their rights as Englishmen were being violated. The next factor is that colonists feared that their newfound wealth and status might revert back to that of the old feudal system. While it may be easy to see the colonists as revolutionaries wanting to gain their independence from a tyrannical Empire, that could not be further from the truth. At this point, the colonists were never more British, which presents the problem of royalization. Colonists were still extremely loyal to the British crown, and wanted what they saw as equal rights of all Englishmen. Although the colonists had at first tried peaceful protests, they ultimately failed, and the colonists soon resort to more violent protests to send a stronger political message.

The anxiety of the colonists started with the passing of the Declaratory Act. The Declaratory Act would completely repeal the Stamp Act, and simultaneously it would reinforce

the notion that the British Parliament could impose any taxes it wished upon the colonists. This statement is seen in the following passage: “that the said colonies and plantations in America have been, are, and ought to be, subordinate unto, and dependent upon the imperial crown and parliament of Great Britain.”<sup>1</sup> Parliament continues to assert its authority over the colonies by stating that parliament itself “had, hath, and of right ought to have, full power and authority to make laws and statutes of sufficient force and validity to bind the colonies and people of America, subjects of the crown of Great Britain, in all cases whatsoever.”<sup>2</sup> While Parliament believed it could impose taxes on the colonies, the colonists took a very different view the matter.

The colonists believe that only elected representatives from the colonies could impose taxes on the colonies. In the resolutions of the Stamp Act Congress, colonists argue “that the only representatives of the people of those colonies, are persons chosen therein by themselves, and that no taxes ever have been, or can be constitutionally imposed on them, but by their respective legislatures.”<sup>3</sup> The colonists are not refusing to pay taxes, but are insisting that their own legislature have a role in consenting to taxation and a voice in the political world. Colonists believe that they could not be properly represented in parliament because parliament did not know or understand the needs of the colonies.

It was because of being taxed without representation that colonists believed that they would lose the economy they had worked so hard to build. The American colonists had developed an economy where labor had become profitable. In Medieval Europe on the other hand, labor was seen as something

---

<sup>1</sup> “The Declaratory Act.” Declaratory Act (January 2, 2009): 1. History Reference Center

<sup>2</sup> Ibid.

<sup>3</sup> “Resolutions of the Stamp Act Congress.” Resolutions Of The Stamp Act Congress (January 2, 2009): 1. MasterFILE Premier

that was done by the peasant class. The lower classes would be forced to work the land for a lord. In his book, *The Radicalism of the American Revolution*, Wood argues, that because the poor did manual labor, “most people still associated it with slavery and servitude.”<sup>4</sup> Wood argues that the equality and prosperity that were unique to Colonial American society was the reason why many colonists believed that, if they could no longer prosper from their work, it would “slide them back into the traditional status of servants or slaves”<sup>5</sup> who did not prosper from their labor.

This fear of slipping back into a feudal system caused great anxiety for the colonists. As Gary Nash points out in his book, *The Unknown American Revolution*:

The general well-being and equality of the society set against the gross inequality and flagrant harshness of both white servitude and especially black slavery made people unusually sensitive to all the various dependencies and subordinations that still lurked everywhere in their lives.<sup>6</sup>

This can be directly related to the Declaratory Act, which declares that colonists should and ought to be subordinate subjects to the Empire, doing as they were told.

This economy characterized by social mobility was the result of several events in the colonies, such as the Great Awakening. Gordon Wood points out that the Great Awakening allowed people who were not from the traditional leadership of the clergy to become ecclesiastical leaders.<sup>7</sup> Wood then uses the example of preachers such as George Whitefield, who began to preach messages such as “the message of God did not operate through the elite corps of learned clergy and their aristocratic allies. Rather, God worked through the inner light given to every man and women regardless of their station in

---

<sup>4</sup> *The Radicalism of the American Revolution* pg. 171

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid*

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, 172

<sup>7</sup> *The Unknown American Revolution* pg. 8-9

life.”<sup>8</sup> This caused a problem for the clergy because the common people could now question the traditional leadership. Wood explains: “The Awakeners created a mass movement; they challenged upper-class assumptions about social order and the deference due to established figures.”<sup>9</sup> Colonists began to believe that they could think and act for themselves.

The Colonists became more actively involved in politics, as Wood’s arguments explain that colonists were becoming more self-sufficient and acting for themselves, especially in politics. In his essay, *The Preconditions of the American Revolution*, Jack P. Greene examines the classes and how they affected politics. Greene argues that:

One may divide the potential participants in the political process, that is, the free adult male population, into three categories: the elite, including the both colony wide and local officeholders; a broader “politically relevant strata or mobilized population” that participated with some regularity in the political process; and a passive underlying population that took little part in the political system.<sup>10</sup>

Greene then tells us that the elite were a political minority, making up as “much as 3 percent to 5 percent of the free adult males, while the second category may have included as many as 60 percent to 90 percent of the same group.”<sup>11</sup> This shows that the political system that had long been dominated by the elite class was now changing. Wood demonstrates this point as well, when he gives us the example of William Shirley, who was the “Governor of the Province of Massachusetts Bay (1741–1749 and 1753–1756).”<sup>12</sup> Shirley wrote that more common folk began to attend the town meetings and would then have the majority vote over those who traditionally held

---

<sup>8</sup> Ibid., 8

<sup>9</sup> The Unknown American Revolution, 10

<sup>10</sup> Greene, Jack “The Preconditions of the American Revolution”, 49

<sup>11</sup> Ibid.

<sup>12</sup> <http://www.spokeo.com/William+Shirley+1>

power.<sup>13</sup> The American colonists enjoyed a raise in status within the political system. The political majority in Britain would have been lords and those of the upper class, but in the colonies the average citizen was gaining more political clout, evidenced by the 60-90 percent of the middle class becoming active in politics.

This mobility within the class system was made possible by the increase of knowledge and goods that were rapidly becoming available to the colonists. As Greene argues, there was an “increasing availability of knowledge through a broad spectrum of educational, cultural, social, economic, and religious institutions and through a rising number of books, magazines, and newspapers of colonial, British, and European origin accessible to the colonists.”<sup>14</sup> The colonists also benefit from “the emergence of relatively large numbers of men with the technical skills, especially in law, trade, and finance.”<sup>15</sup> The American colonists were becoming more educated and had a variety of technical skills which allowed them to become more actively involved in their political system. When the question of taxation arose in the colonies, it was not that the colonies refused to pay taxes, but that they wanted to have their own representatives decide on the taxes.

Although colonists wanted to have their own representation, the colonists make it very apparent that they do not see themselves any different from any other subjects of the British Empire. This can be seen in a passage of the resolutions of the Stamp Act Congress, which states “that his Majesty’s subjects in these colonies, owe the same allegiance to the Crown of Great-Britain, that is owing from his subjects born within the realm, and all due subordination to that august body the Parliament of Great Britain.”<sup>16</sup> It is important to remember

---

<sup>13</sup> Paraphrased from *The Unknown American Revolution*, 18

<sup>14</sup> Greene, Jack “The Preconditions of the American Revolution”, 50

<sup>15</sup> Ibid.

<sup>16</sup> “Resolutions of the Stamp Act Congress.” *Resolutions Of The Stamp*

that colonists did not want a revolution against Britain at this time. Colonists simply wanted to be represented by their own representatives from the colonies, who understood the needs of the colonists. The colonists were loyal subjects and willing to be subordinate, but they wanted to know that they were represented within the government as British subjects. The colonists did not want to be subjects that were simply ruled over, as the Declaratory Act suggests, but rather they wanted to be equals like any other subject of the British Empire. This is where we see the paradox of the colonists finding their own common identity from the consumption of British goods.

This paradox that T. H. Breen argues in his essay, *Worlds of Goods in the Northern Colonies*, is that “the road to Americanization ran through Anglicization.”<sup>17</sup> The idea is that colonists were only able to find their “American” identity by first being subjects of the British Empire. Breen links the emergence of this American identity to the consumption of British goods. Breen argues that colonists are very similar to their counterparts in England; Breen’s example of this is how “wealthy American’s mimicked English Gentlemen.”<sup>18</sup> Breen also shows that colonial stores that would appear across the colonies “provided an important link between the common people of America and the mother country.”<sup>19</sup> These stores provided goods from England that were in high demand, included tea, tea cups, sugar, good china, as well as various clothes. This was what tied the colonists to England. Before the idea of revolution against England began to take hold, the American colonies were able to identify as Englishmen by the goods that were available to them. Breen’s main argument is that these stores with imported British goods provided a sense of belonging to the colonists, by providing a common link to England.

---

Act Congress (January 2, 2009): 1. MasterFILE Premier

<sup>17</sup> *Worlds of Goods in the Northern Colonies*, 99

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*, 96

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid.*, 97



Breen argues that colonists began to have more influence by having a competitive market, this provided colonists with a new economic power. Breen explains that, because of this economic power, “one could plausibly argue that, by exposing colonists to this world of consumer choice, the British reinforced the Americans’ already strong conviction of their own personal independence.”<sup>20</sup> It was because of the consumer revolution that colonists were able to start building their own common identity separate from the Empire. This in and of its self creates a paradox because consumption of British goods is what drew the colonists closer to the British Empire.

While the Stamp Act had created anxiety, the following acts and the Boston Massacre would create more tension and anxiety between the colonists and the Empire. One of the acts which caused a great amount of anxiety was the Quartering Act. This act would force the colonists to quarter or “provide billets”<sup>21</sup> (lodging for the soldiers). The colonists were not only to provide lodging for the soldiers, but food and any other substance which the soldiers would require. This can be seen in the following passage of the Quartering Act:

That the officers and soldiers so quartered and billeted as aforesaid (except such as shall be quartered in the barracks, and hired uninhabited houses, or other buildings as aforesaid) shall be received and furnished with diet, and small beer, cyder, or rum mixed with water, by the owners of the inns, livery stables, ale-houses, victualling-houses, and other houses in which they are allowed to be quartered and billeted by this act.<sup>22</sup>

The citizens of Boston saw the Quartering Act as a violation of their rights, as well as a burden to the town. The soldiers were seen as a burden, because they took jobs as laborers which created a labor dispute between citizens and British soldiers.

---

<sup>20</sup> *Worlds of Goods in the Northern Colonies*, 97

<sup>21</sup> “Quartering Act of 1765.” *Quartering Act of 1765* (January 2, 2009): 1. History Reference Center

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*

Being forced to provide quarters for the troops did not sit well with the citizens of Boston. Captain Thomas Preston, an officer in the British army notes that “it is [a] matter of too great notoriety to need any proofs that the arrival of his Majesty’s troops in Boston was extremely obnoxious to its inhabitants.”<sup>23</sup> In an anonymous account of the Boston massacre, which was printed by order of the town of Boston, and then sold by EDES and GILL, in Queen Street and T. & J. Fleet in Cornhill, illustrates this point again.

Eager to share their own version of events with the government in Britain, Boston selectmen appoint James Bowdoin, Samuel Pemberton, and Joseph Warren to prepare an account of the King Street affair. Their narrative -- together with an appendix containing ninety-six depositions -- is published as a pamphlet a few days later, and copies are sent to England to counter Dalrymple’s military depositions. Remaining copies are impounded. With the soldiers’ trial anticipated in Boston, patriot leaders choose to flaunt their neutrality.<sup>24</sup>

The anonymous account states “thus were we, in aggravation of our other embarrassments, embarrassed with troops, forced upon us contrary to our inclination-contrary to the spirit of Magna Carta-contrary to the very letter of the Bill of Rights.”<sup>25</sup> The colonists saw this as a great embarrassment and an infringement upon their rights as Englishmen.

The colonists felt that their rights were being violated because the British Bill of Rights specifically states that the “raising and keeping a standing army within this kingdom in time of peace, without consent of parliament, and quartering

---

<sup>23</sup> Preston, Thomas. “Captain Thomas Preston’s account of the Boston Massacre.” Captain Thomas Preston’s Account Of The Boston Massacre (January 2, 2009): 1. MasterFILE Premier

<sup>24</sup> [Anonymous], A Short Narrative of the Horrid Massacre in Boston (Boston, 1770), p. 7, accessed December 3, 2014, [http://www.masshist.org/revolution/image-viewer.php?img\\_step=7&item\\_id=337&mode=small&nmask=8&tpc=&pid=2](http://www.masshist.org/revolution/image-viewer.php?img_step=7&item_id=337&mode=small&nmask=8&tpc=&pid=2)

<sup>25</sup> Ibid

soldiers contrary to law.”<sup>26</sup> The people of Boston were outraged by the Quartering Act because it was a blatant violation of their rights as Englishmen. That colonists would argue that they would not have to quarter an army nor provide for its keeping, because the Boston House of Representatives did not consent to the Quartering Act. Yet the colonists found themselves having to provide quartering and food for the soldiers during a time of peace in the Empire against their will.

What made this Quartering Act much worse was the competition for laboring jobs. This competition would arise because soldiers would not make enough while in the colonies. In order to support themselves while serving in the colonies, the soldiers would take on some of the labor jobs, such as working at the docks. One of the shouts called out by colonists before the Boston Massacre would be: “you bloody backs, you lobster scoundrels, fire if you dare, G-d damn you, fire and be damned.”<sup>27</sup> “Lobster scoundrel” refers to them taking up laboring jobs that the colonists themselves could have taken. This shows another reason why the colonists were not content with the soldiers being quartered in Boston. First the citizens would have to feed and provide quarters for these soldiers, while simultaneously these soldiers would take up the laboring jobs. The soldiers requiring quarters and food from the citizens, as well as taking up laboring jobs would be adding insult to injury for the colonists.

Colonists began to feel like their cries for redress were falling on deaf ears, because they had the right as “subjects to petition the King,”<sup>28</sup> which was not being properly respected by

<sup>26</sup> “The English Bill of Rights.” English Bill Of Rights (October 1999): 1. MasterFILE Premier

<sup>27</sup> [Anonymous], A Short Narrative of the Horrid Massacre in Boston (Boston, 1770), p. 7, accessed December 3, 2014, [http://www.masshist.org/revolution/image-viewer.php?img\\_step=7&item\\_id=337&-mode=small&nmask=8&tpc=&pid=2](http://www.masshist.org/revolution/image-viewer.php?img_step=7&item_id=337&-mode=small&nmask=8&tpc=&pid=2)

<sup>28</sup> “The English Bill of Rights.” English Bill Of Rights (October 1999): 1. MasterFILE Premier

Parliament. The colonists had formed several petitions to the King, as well to Parliament, but were completely ignored, and then the colonists received more acts, such as the Declaratory Acts. When soldiers arrived to stop political unrest in 1768, it created an atmosphere of tension between the soldiers and the citizens of Boston. Boston's citizens did not take well to the British soldiers; they were seen as trouble makers, because they were stirring up trouble among the colonists. One such accusation was that the soldiers were "exciting the negroes of the town to take away their masters' lives and property."<sup>29</sup> One reason that soldiers could be seen as trouble makers is that wealthy slave owners were worried about the system being upset, or an uprising from their slaves.

The tension would finally come to a head between soldiers and colonists at Mr. Gray's ropewalk, where ropemakers and soldiers were involved in a physical altercation. The anonymous source gives the account: "the soldier challenged the ropemakers to a boxing match. The challenge was accepted by one of them, and the soldier worsted."<sup>30</sup> According to the anonymous account, the soldiers would leave and come back with other soldiers who would also be beaten in various boxing matches by the ropemakers. On the other hand, British Captain Thomas Preston's claim counters the anonymous account and shifts the blame to the colonists. Captain Preston's account states that "on the 2nd instant two of the 29th going through one Gray's ropewalk, the rope-makers insultingly asked them if they would empty a vault. This unfortunately had the desired effect by provoking the soldiers, and from words they went to blows. Both parties suffered in this affray, and finally the soldiers returned to their quarters."<sup>31</sup> Preston's

---

<sup>29</sup> [Anonymous], *A Short Narrative of the Horrid Massacre in Boston* (Boston, 1770), p. 7, accessed December 3, 2014, [http://www.masshist.org/revolution/image-viewer.php?img\\_step=7&item\\_id=337&mode=small&nmask=8&tpc=&pid=2](http://www.masshist.org/revolution/image-viewer.php?img_step=7&item_id=337&mode=small&nmask=8&tpc=&pid=2)

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>31</sup> Preston, Thomas. "Captain Thomas Preston's account of the Boston

account and the anonymous account contradict each other. The anonymous account states that soldiers came back multiple times and were beaten at boxing each time. Preston's account states that it was an argument that came to blows, after which the soldiers returned to their quarters. Either way, tensions were running very high between the Boston citizens and the soldiers who were being quartered in the city.

Soldiers from the 29th regiment then sought revenge for being beaten at boxing. Several members of the 29th regiment would try to take it out on the colonists; this is clearly seen in the anonymous account: "after assaulting and driving away the few they met they met there, they brandished their arms and cried out, 'where are the boogers! Where are the cowards!'"<sup>32</sup> According to the anonymous account, these soldiers would then pass by a sentry where the Boston massacre would take place. According to the anonymous account, some boys may have "mistook the sentry for one of the depositions."<sup>33</sup> After assuming the sentry was a part of the aforesaid party, the boys would throw snowballs at the sentry. More guards would arrive, and snowballs would then be thrown at them. According to Captain Thomas Preston, a mob of colonists would form upon which "a general attack was made on the men by a great number of heavy clubs and snowballs being thrown at them, by which all our lives were in imminent danger."<sup>34</sup> According to Captain Preston, the colonists would savagely attack him and his men.

---

Massacre." Captain Thomas Preston's Account of the Boston Massacre (January 2, 2009): 1. MasterFILE Premier

<sup>32</sup> [Anonymous], A Short Narrative of the Horrid Massacre in Boston (Boston, 1770), p. 7, accessed December 3, 2014, [http://www.masshist.org/revolution/image-viewer.php?img\\_step=7&item\\_id=337&-mode=small&nmask=8&tpc=&pid=2](http://www.masshist.org/revolution/image-viewer.php?img_step=7&item_id=337&-mode=small&nmask=8&tpc=&pid=2)

<sup>33</sup> Ibid.

<sup>34</sup> Preston, Thomas. "Captain Thomas Preston's account of the Boston Massacre." Captain Thomas Preston's Account of the Boston Massacre (January 2, 2009): 1. MasterFILE Premier

In his account of the Boston Massacre, John Tudor describes the post-Boston Massacre sentiments of the colonists. Tudor quotes from a meeting that showed the colonists' reaction to the Boston Massacre. Tudor states that "it is the unanimous opinion of this meeting, that the inhabitants and soldiery can no longer live together in safety; that nothing can rationally be expected to restore the peace of the town and prevent blood and carnage but the removal of the troops."<sup>35</sup> The sentiments of the citizens here are that the only way to prevent further blood from being spilt is the complete removal of the quartered soldiers in Boston. The soldiers were ordered out of the town by Colonel Dalrymple to appease the citizens of Boston.

The fact that the Boston Massacre was fundamentally a labor dispute is covered up and masked to give the People of Boston a scapegoat. In his account, John Tudor uses the phrase "the unhappy victims who fell in the bloody massacre."<sup>36</sup> This term "bloody massacre" is a loaded term designed to depict the British as the enemy. Paul Revere uses this same tactic in his representation of the Boston Massacre, which "is intended to bring audiences around to Revere's point of view."<sup>37</sup> Revere's image shows citizens of Boston pinned by British soldiers who are opening fire on them. This is blatantly portraying the events that transpired to turn the citizens against the British. The colonists were not backed into a corner; rather it was the British soldiers who had their backs against the wall as the Boston citizens taunted them on to fire. Tudor demonstrates how the post-massacre events are played up against the British. Tudor talks about the burial procession of those who were killed in the Boston Massacre, stating that "the sorrow [that] was visible in the countenances, together with the peculiar

---

<sup>35</sup> Tudor, John. "An eye-witness describes the Boston Massacre." (January 16, 2009): Points of View Reference Center

<sup>36</sup> Tudor, John. "An eye-witness describes the Boston Massacre." (January 16, 2009): Points of View Reference Center

<sup>37</sup> Massachusetts Historical Society; [http://www.masshist.org/revolution/doc-viewer.php?old=1&mode=nav&item\\_id=178](http://www.masshist.org/revolution/doc-viewer.php?old=1&mode=nav&item_id=178)

solemnity, surpasses description.”<sup>38</sup> The events of the Boston Massacre were seen less as a provocation of the people, and more as oppression by the British Crown.

The true events of the Boston Massacre have become skewed; an important point to be remembered is that Captain Preston was put on trial, “but the jury brought him in not guilty.”<sup>39</sup> Captain Preston was found not guilty, but it did not stop the infamy of the events that had transpired from bringing about a shift in protests becoming more violent, as well as occurring more frequently. Again, it should be remembered that these are not the first events during which violence was used, but it is when groups such as the Sons of Liberty would begin to use more violent means to achieve their political goals. The Boston Massacre simply provided the means to vilify the British Empire and its troops, making them the public enemy.

The events prior to the Boston Massacre form a combination of political unrest and emotions coming together to form the tension that would fill the town of Boston. The colonists did feel that their rights as Englishmen were being violated and feared an eventual slide back into a system that resembled the old feudal society of Europe. This fear of sliding back into a lower status was due largely to the language of the Declaratory Act. While having their rights violated by quartering soldiers, the colonists would lose laboring jobs to these soldiers for whom they must provide quarters and food. The Quartering Act essentially created a labor dispute in an already tense atmosphere. This is a turning point where the colonists in Boston are pushed to the breaking point and begin to use more violent protests.

Violent protests did not only occur after the Boston massacre: historians have identified numerous examples of

---

<sup>38</sup> Tudor, John. “An eye-witness describes the Boston Massacre.” (January 16, 2009): Points of View Reference Center

<sup>39</sup> Ibid.

|colonists tarring and feathering royal tax collectors, hanging representations of political persons, and throwing stones at houses. The Boston Massacre is a key focal point where more violent acts would be committed as a means to send a strong political message, which led to a decline in the non-violent protests. This is where we see the rise of groups such as the Sons of Liberty, who instigated violent protests such as the Boston Tea Party, in which citizens of Boston dressed as Indians and threw tea overboard into the harbor as a protest of the British goods.

These events and Acts of the British Parliament combine to create a perfect storm that would play off of the anxiety of the citizens of Boston. The language of the Declaratory Act was seen as something that would bind the colonists to the will of Parliament, and the colonists would not have a say in their own taxation or their own government. When enacting their right to petition the King, the colonists would receive what they saw as further insult to their rights, because they would be completely ignored and then be forced to quarter the army which was sent to quell the political unrest in Boston. When the friction between colonists and the British soldiers came to a head, violence would ensue on both sides. These events, and the labor dispute between the soldiers and citizens, set the course for further political violence that would be seen in protests such as the burning of the schooner *Gaspee* (1772) and the Boston Tea Party (1773).





Paul Revere's "The Bloody Massacre" used as an attempt to unite the citizens of Boston against the British.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### PRIMARY SOURCES:

- “Anonymous account of the Boston Massacre.” Anonymous Account of the Boston Massacre (January 2, 2009): 1. MasterFILE Premier
- [Anonymous], A Short Narrative of the Horrid Massacre in Boston (Boston, 1770), p. 7, accessed December 3, 2014, [http://www.masshist.org/revolution/image-viewer.php?img\\_step=7&item\\_id=337&mode=small&nmask=8&tpc=&pid=2](http://www.masshist.org/revolution/image-viewer.php?img_step=7&item_id=337&mode=small&nmask=8&tpc=&pid=2)
- “The English Bill of Rights.” English Bill Of Rights (October 1999): 1. MasterFILE Premier
- “The Declaratory Act.” Declaratory Act (January 2, 2009): 1. History Reference Center
- Preston, Thomas. “Captain Thomas Preston’s account of the Boston Massacre.” Captain Thomas Preston’s Account Of The Boston Massacre (January 2, 2009): 1. MasterFILE Premier,
- “Resolutions of the Stamp Act Congress.” Resolutions Of The Stamp Act Congress (January 2, 2009): 1. MasterFILE Premier
- Tudor, John. “An eye-witness describes the Boston Massacre.” Eye-witness Describes The Boston Massacre (January 16, 2009): 1. Points of view reference center
- “Quartering Act of 1765.” Quartering Act of 1765 (January 2, 2009): 1. MasterFILE Premier

### SECONDARY SOURCES:

- Breen, T. H. “Baubles of Britain”: The American Consumer Revolutions of the Eighteenth Century. “Past & Present no. 119 (May 1988): 73-104. America: History & Life
- Breen, T. H. “Worlds of Goods in the Northern Colonies”. Major Problems American Colonial History, Documents and Essays, New York University, third edition.
- Greene, Jack “The Preconditions of the American Revolution”. Major Problems in the Era of the American Revolution, 1760-1791. Documents and Essays, University of Connecticut, second edition.
- Nash, Gary B. The unknown American Revolution: the unruly birth of democracy and the struggle to create America / Gary B. Nash. n.p.: New York, N.Y : Viking, 2005., 2005. UVU Library Books and Media
- Wood, Gordon S. The radicalism of the American Revolution / Gordon

S. Wood. n.p.: New York: A.A. Knopf, 1992. UVU Library Books and Media <http://www.spokeo.com/William+Shirley+1>, Information on Governor William Shirley.

Massachusetts Historical Society “The Bloody Massacre perpetrated in King Street, Boston on March 5th 1770 by a party of the 29th Regiment”; [http://www.masshist.org/revolution/doc-viewer.php?old=1&-mode=nav&item\\_id=178](http://www.masshist.org/revolution/doc-viewer.php?old=1&-mode=nav&item_id=178)

### **SPECIAL THANKS TO:**

My parents Debra and Thomas Eaton and Hutch who have always supported and believed in me, as well as Dr. Lentz, Dr. Goode and Dr. Hunt.

### **BIOGRAPHY**

Joshua is from Clinton, Utah, attended Syracuse High School and graduated in 2009. He earned an Associates degree from Snow College and is working on earning his Bachelor’s degree from UVU in History. He is an officer in Phi Alpha Theta (History Honor Society) and plans to graduate in the spring of 2016. Afterwards he plans on attending graduate school and hopes to work for the LDS Church Archives.



## THE REPUBLIC OF MALI: CRISIS IN NORTHERN MALI

MARIE ESSIKO POUDIOUGOU

Previously known as the French Sudanese Republic, Mali and Senegal claimed independence of France in 1960 and became the Mali federation. A few months later, Senegal withdrew from the federation and what formerly constituted the Sudanese Republic was renamed Mali. Mali consists of eight regions, and its borders on the north reach deep into the middle of the Sahara, while the country's southern part, where the majority of inhabitants live, features the Niger and Senegal rivers. The country's economic structure centers on agriculture and fishing.

Two of Mali's prominent natural resources include gold, (Mali is the third largest producer of gold on the African continent), and salt. About half the population lives below the international poverty line of \$1.25 a day. With a population of 16,455,903 (July 2014 est.), Mali is among the 25 poorest countries in the world, and remains dependent on foreign aid. Like any other Sub Saharan African country, Mali is made of several ethnic groups. Bambara, Malinke, and Soninke constitute 50% of the population, 17% of the population is made of Peul, 12% of Voltaic, 6% of Songhai, 10% of Tuareg and Moor, and 5% other. French is the official language. Mali has 13 national languages in addition to French, 46.3% Malians speak Bambara,<sup>1</sup> 9.4% speak Peul (known as Foulfoulbe in some countries), 7.2% speak Dogon,<sup>2</sup> 6.4% speak Maraka or

---

<sup>1</sup> The most spoken language in Mali and some of its neighboring countries such as the Ivory Coast and Burkina Faso

<sup>2</sup> Dogon is my ethnic language.

Soninke, 5.6% speak Malinke, 5.6% speak Sonrhail or Djerma, 4.3% speak Minianka, 3.5% Tamacheq, 2.6% Senoufo, and 8.5% speak other languages.<sup>3</sup> Mali is a secular country; however 94.8% of its population is Muslim. Christians represent 2.4% of the population while Animists represent 2%.<sup>4</sup> Islam is the dominant religion in Mali. Mali, as opposed to Islamic countries such as Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Iran, Brunei, United Arab Emirates and Qatar, does not implement Islamic law or Sharia. However, a group of individuals called Tuareg want to change that. They want Sharia Law to be applied in Mali, especially in the northern regions (Kidal, Gao, Timbuktu, and Mopti). The Tuaregs have lived in northern Mali since around the fifth century, according to Herodotus. After establishing the city of Timbuktu in the 11th century, the Tuareg traded, traveled, and conquered throughout the Sahara desert over the next four centuries, eventually they converted to Islam around the 14th century, and were able to gain great wealth trading salt, gold, and black slaves.<sup>5</sup>

During my visit in Mali last summer, I went to my father's native Dogon village named Hamany. As my father was showing my brothers and me the town, he told us an amazing story about the Tuaregs. According to the Dogon,<sup>6</sup> cousins of the nomad tribe in the Desert, the Tuareg are the descendants of "Mourou," the Genius of the Bush. Met in the bush by a goat shepherd, he was invited to approach humans who gave him a wife. From the union of the woman with the Genius of the Bush was born a boy named "KANA." Since KANA was tall, they added to his name the adjective "GA" which means tall, he ended up with a new name "KANA-GA" or "Kana the tall." The name KANAGA was immortalized by the KANAGA

---

<sup>3</sup> "Mali" *World Fact Book: Central Intelligence Agency of the United States*.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid.

<sup>5</sup> Douglass-Bowers, Devon. "The Crisis in Mali: A Historical Background" *Foreign Policy Journal*. Published Online Feb. 3, 2013.

<sup>6</sup> Ethnic group in Mali of which I am a part, both of my parents are Dogon.

mask that has the same shape as the symbol of the Tuaregs' cross.<sup>7</sup> This myth shows that the nomadic and the sedentary have always lived together in harmony. Since ancient times, the nomadic people of the desert have traded with the sedentary farmers. They traded salt (from Taoudéni) for grain (millet) and handicrafts made from animal skins.<sup>8</sup> This harmony was deteriorated when the Arab world and Europe introduced the practice of taking slaves for hard tasks. During their grain search, nomadic merchant caravans began to steal children and adults. They hid them in big bags in the desert. These stolen people, some whom were sold, others kept as slaves in the desert, were given the toughest chores. Sedentary people eventually discovered the link between the disappearances and the nomadic caravans, but being very skilled in their arguments, the nomads were always able to avoid serious crises which could jeopardize their trades. It sometimes happened that after decades, a stolen child accompanied his or her master to pick grain, but the brainwashing ensured that the child could not return to where he or she had come from. These stolen children were called "Belahs" among the Tuareg and "Haratines" among the Moors, Arab-Berber.<sup>9</sup>

Desert nomads lived in harmony with southern black communities by accepting central government. It was the arrival of Arab Islam in nomadic areas which exacerbated the division between the white nomadic and sedentary black peoples. Having known blacks as slaves in Saudi, many of the white nomads quickly came to consider all blacks more or less as slaves or of a lower status. The slave trade and colonization have compounded the problem of division.

---

<sup>7</sup> A neckless worn by the Tuareg.

<sup>8</sup> Personal Interview: Gabriel Poudigou

<sup>9</sup> The Arab-Berber are North African Maghreb who are of mixed Arab and Berber origin and whose native language is a dialect of Arabic. They also have an Arabic ethnic identity. Gabriel Poudiougou, Personal Interview.

For the particular case of the Kidal Tuareg community, The French, knowing that the Arabic Marabout<sup>10</sup> had an influence on the other nomadic tribe, designated him in the presence of all as the leader. The Arabic Marabout came to teach Arabic Islam in Essouk located between Timbuktu and Bourem. He was hosted by the Taghatmalet and ended up becoming Tuareg by marrying the daughter of his landlord. His new tribe, the tribe Ifoghas dominated all other tribes and applied Sharia Law. The Ifoghas tribe, in which a noble does not work with his hands, took everything they needed from other nomadic tribes and from the sedentary populations where they conducted raids. Those of the vassal tribes who wanted to win the esteem of Ifoghas and goods for their own accounts were recruited as soldiers during the campaigns or raids. Nomadic society was constituted by hierarchical noble tribes, vassals, artisans, and slaves.<sup>11</sup>

The rebellion in northern Mali started many years ago (1963). The Tuaregs have always wanted independence, and have engaged in a number of rebellions. The first rebellion that took place from 1963 to 1964 involved only a few citizens of the Ifoghas. It started in Bouressa, a town in the north of Kidal, where the first designated head of a military security post, a survivor of the war in Indochina, had pointed his flashlight on the young Illadi Ag Alla whose father had been murdered by the French colony. When Illadi responded by asking the chief not to shine his flashlight on him, he heard in reply “You deserve them to do unto you the same as what the French did to your father”

Faced with this insult to his family, the young Illadi Ag Alla retired to prepare his revenge. He was followed by other young people of his Tribe. Together they returned at night to break into the security post, took the weapons and

---

<sup>10</sup> The marabout is often a scholar of the Qur'an, or religious teacher.

<sup>11</sup> Gabriel Poudiougou is not only my father but also the former head of the Malian army (June 2008 to March 2012).



ammunition, and retired to the mountains. The situation then degenerated into an armed rebellion against the Central Powers of Bamako (the capital).<sup>12</sup>

The situation was brought under control after fierce fighting between the young Malian Army and the rebels with Illadi Alla Ag. Peace had settled with the Ifoghas. Many small security posts have been installed throughout the Malian desert to secure the peaceful population. The staff assigned to these posts ensured the role of security forces, health workers, teachers for mobile schools, and coaches for youth. Because of the intensity of the climate and the fact that the local economy was based on the material and financial resources of the military, the army was central to the daily life of nomadic and semi-nomadic people. The great drought that hit the Sahel-Saharan from 1973-1974 was particularly deadly in the Malian desert. Livestock, the only wealth possessed by the nomads, was decimated. Many people lost their lives. Some populations migrated to the south of the country, others to the neighboring countries such as Algeria, Mauritania, Upper Volta (now Burkina Faso) and Libya. In Libya, not being used to manual work, most of the nomad immigrants engaged in the Islamic Legion to fight in the Arab countries of Lebanon, Syria, Afghanistan, Pakistan, and Chad.<sup>13</sup>

The second rebellion was started by “attacks on non-Tuareg Malians at the southernmost edge of the Tuareg regions, which led to skirmishes between the Malian army and Tuareg rebels”<sup>14</sup> The rebellion in 1990 was headed by Iyad Ag Ghali, nephew of the same Illadi Alla Ag of Boughessa Abeibara on which the 1963-1964 rebellion had broken out. Iyad Ag Ghali failed in the armed struggle against Mali. Removing the traditional leaders and rejecting the central authority of Bamako destroyed the Ifoghas’ supremacy over other tribes.

---

<sup>12</sup> Personal Interview: Gabriel Poudiougou

<sup>13</sup> Personal Interview: Gabriel Poudiougou

<sup>14</sup> Douglass Bowers, Devon.

Iyad Ag Ghali was very clever to send messengers to the Aguel'hoc chief of the security post, requesting that the Old Intalla Ag Attaher (the current Head of the Ifoghas), meet him in the Tigharghar. After their meeting, the Old Intalla Ag Attaher went directly to Bamako to see President Moussa Traore to sign a cease-fire that the rebels accepted unconditionally. The cease-fire, which took place in Tamanrasset in Algeria, was followed by other peace agreements. Meanwhile, the socio-political movements that had risen in Bamako, had relegated the issues in the north to a secondary concern for the President of the Republic. Lieutenant Colonel Amadou Toumani Toure, returning from the War College in Paris, took the opportunity to lead the coup that deposed President Moussa Traore.<sup>15</sup> The rebellion did not last long because major steps for peace were made in 1991 by the government in transition,<sup>16</sup> resulting in the Tamanrasset Accords which stated:

To re-establish and to maintain peace and security in all its national territory and particularly in the 6th and 7th regions have agreed on the following points:

**Clause 1:** An end will be put to military operations and to all armed action in the entire territory of Mali and principally in the 6th and 7th regions on the 6th of January 1991 at...o'clock.

**Clause 2:** The two parties commit themselves to the banning of all recourse to acts of both collective and individual violence. All clandestine action or action contrary to public order must come to an end as well as all infiltration of armed elements coming from outside.

**Clause 3:** The fighting forces of The Azaouad Popular Movement and the Islamic Arabic Front existing on the day of the ceasing of hostilities will be stabilized within the zones corresponding to their current places of billeting. All individual and collective movement of members of these forces outside these places of billeting must take place without arms.

---

<sup>15</sup> Personal Interview: Gabriel Poudiougou

<sup>16</sup> Amadou T. Toure, who conducted the Coup D'état, was the president in transition.

**Clause 4:** The Malian Armed Forces will conduct no activity susceptible of giving rise to encounters with the combatants. They will proceed to a progressive reduction of their devices in the 6th and the 7th regions.

**Clause 5:** Within the framework of this agreement, the Malian Armed Forces will disengage from the running of the civil administration and will proceed to the suppression of certain military posts. As to the cities (county towns of the regions and other administrative divisions) the barracks will progressively be transferred to other more appropriate centers.

**Clause 6:** The Malian Armed Forces will avoid zones of pasture land and densely populated zones in the current 6th and the 7th regions.

**Clause 7:** The Malian Armed Forces will be confined to their role of defence of the integrity of the territory at the frontiers.

**Clause 8:** The combatants may integrate the Malian Armed Forces under conditions defined by the two parties.

**Clause 9:** A Commission of ceasing of hostilities is created in charge of the application of the dispositions of the present agreement. This Commission is presided by the Algerian Popular and Democratic Republic as mediator.

**Clause 10:** Apart from the mediator, the Commission for the ceasing of hostilities is composed of an equal number of representatives from the two parties.

**Clause 11:** The head office of the Commission of ceasing of hostilities will be located in Gao. **Clause 12:** All prisoners, hostages or civil internees imprisoned by any of the parties will be set free within 30 days from the signing of the present agreement.

**Clause 13:** The present agreement will come into force at the date of its signing.<sup>17</sup>

This agreement was written in Tamanrasset, January 6, 1991. It was negotiated in Algeria by Lt. Colonel Amadou Toumani Touré (who had taken power in a coup on March 26, 1991) and the two major Tuareg Tribes, The Azawad Popular Movement and the Arabic Islamic Front of Azawad, on

---

<sup>17</sup> "Tamanrasset Accord: Agreement on Ceasing of Hostilities" [www.ucdp.uu.se/gpdbase/peace/mal19910106.pdf](http://www.ucdp.uu.se/gpdbase/peace/mal19910106.pdf)

January 6, 1991. Unfortunately, the accord did not eliminate the tension between the Tuareg and the Malian government. The government in transition attempted to negotiate with the Tuareg. This led to the April 1992 National Pact between the Malian government and several Tuareg Tributes. The National Pact allowed for “integration of Tuareg combatants into the Malian armed forces, demilitarization of the north, economic integration of northern populations, and a more detailed special administrative structure for the three northern regions.”<sup>18</sup>

The third rebellion was different from the previous two. It was an insurgency in which members of the Malian army were kidnapped and killed. The insurgency began in May 2006, when a group of Tuareg army deserters attacked military barracks in the Kidal region, seizing weapons and demanding greater autonomy and development assistance. General Amadou Toumani Toure (former 1st president in transition after the first coup d'état) had won the presidential election in 2002, and responded to the violence by working with a rebel coalition known as the Democratic Alliance for Change to establish a peace agreement that restated the Malian government's commitment to improve the economy in the northern areas where the rebels lived. However, many rebels such as Ibrahim Ag Bahanga, refused to abide by the peace treaty and continued to terrorize and disturb the Malian military until the government of Mali deployed a large offensive force to eliminate the insurgency.<sup>19</sup>

I still remember the day I learned that Bahanga was killed. I felt so relieved and thought that things were going to get better. I thought the rest of the Tuareg rebels would give up since one of their main leaders was killed. I thought my mother would get to see her husband often as would my four siblings.

---

<sup>18</sup> Douglass-Bowers, Devon.

<sup>19</sup> “Army Claims Victory in Clashes with Tuareg Rebels” *France 24: International News* Jan. 2, 2009. [www.france24.com/en/20090102-mali-army-clashes-tuareg-rebels-claims-victory/](http://www.france24.com/en/20090102-mali-army-clashes-tuareg-rebels-claims-victory/)

I was wrong. Things were not going to be different. Before coming to the United States, I rarely got to see my dad. He would leave home early in the morning to go to work, so by the time I woke up he was gone, and by the time he got home my siblings and I were already in bed. I don't know my dad very well because I didn't get to spend a lot of time with him. The Army was his entire life, he loved his job so much that he spent the entire day at work. I remember his friends calling me "Rebel" when I was a child, some of them still call me that. I was born on a day the rebels attacked the military base in the north. My dad was there, he was a captain at that time. He got the news of my birth at the battle field, which is why his friends call me Rebel. My family lived in northern Mali for many years. My Father served in most of the northern regions in Mali (Gao, Kidal, Tombouctou, Tasalite). There were many children and teenagers like me who believed that the death of Bahanga would put an end to the Tuareg rebellion. We were so wrong because we did not realize that the death of Bahanga did not put an end to the Tuareg's desire of creating their own independent state. The fight for Tuareg independence remained leading up to the current, ongoing conflict.

On February 2012, Tuareg rebels launched a major offensive against Mali's military forces in order to seize the northern town of Kidal. Some Tuareg who consider themselves to be Malian citizens fled to the city of Bamako, fearing reprisals after violent demonstrations in the first week of February. The Tuareg rebels had been bolstered by an influx of battle-hardened fighters from Libya. On February 8th, the National Movement for the Liberation of Azawad (MNLA) seized the Mali-Algeria border town of Tinzaouaten as Malian soldiers crossed into Algeria. Islamist Ansar Dine demanded the imposition of Islamic law in northern Mali, while the secular Tuareg nationalist Azawad National Liberation Movement (MNLA) wanted an autonomous, if not completely independent, homeland.

To add to the confusion, a coup d'état followed weeks of protests against the way the government was handling the rebellion in the north. The president's popularity dropped tremendously. Soldiers demanded more weapons and resources for their campaign against the rebels and they were dissatisfied with the lack of the government support for the army. Soldiers were sent to the battle field in very bad condition. According to some soldiers, who I had the chance to interact with, they did not have decent meals and could not stand the climate.

Many people asked themselves if the coup d'état of March 21, 2012 was necessary. A coup d'état does more bad than good to a country, but it can be necessary in some critical situations. The coup against the second Mali President was necessary because people were suffering under President Moussa Traoré's regime. Mali citizens were living in fear and were ruled by a dictator. The recent coup, on the other hand, took place under different circumstances. Amadou T. Toure was serving his last term as president, so he was leaving power anyway. He was to leave office when his term expired after the presidential election in April 2012. The country was going through a rebellion, and a coup was not what the country needed at the time. According to the people in Mali,<sup>20</sup> the initiation of the coup d'état took place in Kati, an urban community and the largest town in Mali's Koulikoro Region. On March 21st, defense minister General Sadio Gassama went to the Kati military camp, 15 kilometers (9.3 mi) away from Bamako to defuse a planned protest. The soldiers he was addressing did not like what he was saying, so they started insulting him and throwing boos and stones at him, after that, things got heated. Kati is a military zone,<sup>21</sup> meaning that there are a few ammunition depots. The soldiers stormed the weapons and ammunition reserves of

<sup>20</sup> I was there in the summer of 2014, and got the chance to ask what happened. Most of my family are in the army. I interacted with my cousin who is a police officer (inspector), and some cousins in the army.

<sup>21</sup> I spent my secondary and high school in Kati Cadet School, Prytanée militaire de Kati.

the camp and made their way to the Whitehouse/Palace. Citizens reported hearing ten minutes of automatic gunfire near the headquarters of the Palace. Some people stated that the factors leading to the coup were that Bamako had difficulty controlling the northern territories of the country, which had been disputed by the MNLA and its precursor groups since the 1960s. Mali was going through a security crisis as al-Qaeda in the Islamic Maghreb flooded in from Algeria and other neighboring countries. Mali was also going through a harsh food crisis that led to displaced populations, refugee camps, and starving women and children.

The coup also created a conflict between different army forces. For instance, the *béret rouge* (who were said to be the supporters of the overthrown power) and *le béret vert* were at war. Many innocent people died because of that nonsensical conflict. Three of my relatives were killed just because they were *béret rouge*. Some of them were shot on their way home. Many *béret rouge* went missing, and even now their families do not know what happened to them. The body of one of my relatives who was killed is still missing. While the Malian army forces were spending time and energy killing each other, and destroying the city of Bamako, the presidential palace, stealing the government's money, and incarcerating former government workers, the MNLA and the Islamist Ansar Dine were conquering the northern regions of Mali. In situations like this, it is important to differentiate one's duty and priority from capris. President Toure was not a good president, but there have been worse leaders and he should not be blamed for everything that happened. Malians should know their duties and priorities. They should learn to love their country more and give it the respect it needs. Most importantly they should learn to respect their leaders. The coup wouldn't have happened if there was a mutual respect between the leaders—including officers and soldiers. I know that leaders should earn their followers' respect, but in what country do the citizens

beat up their president? Interim Mali President Dioncounda Traore had been taken to the hospital with a head wound after being attacked by demonstrators. They destroyed the Palace and stole most of the furniture and valuable materials there. I wonder where the army was when the incident happened. Using violence against the leaders of one's own country is unacceptable. Malians need to learn self-discipline. Stealing from your country and destroying it demonstrates a lack of love for your country. As a citizen, it is a duty to help build and develop your country. Malians have to keep in mind that no one will come from somewhere else to build their country for them. They have to show that they are committed to their country and determine to develop it. That will give developed countries the motivation to help.

Another reason I believe that Malians lack love and respect toward their country is because some Malians support the MNLA. They support them not because they share the same ideologies, but because they want a great life for themselves at any cost. They forget the patriotism that lives in them and embrace the ambition to get rich without effort, supporting the Tuareg instances of Mali. They want from the government the miracle of development at the same speed as some economic southern localities. Amaiguere Ogobara Dolo, a retired journalist working at Mali national television, stated in my interview with him that, the coup brought more prejudices than gain. Amadou Aya Samogo<sup>22</sup> did not have the ability required to manage the coup and the crisis in the north. The majority of those who could have intervened were bound by their proximity to power in place. The worst thing is that the other people or government members who could have acted were frustrated by the same power and were afraid to act. In his view of economy, politics, and stability, Mr. Dolo thinks that it will take a quarter of a century to repair the misdeeds

---

<sup>22</sup> The captain who conducted the recent coup d'état.



of the coup.<sup>23</sup> In discussions with 2012 Presidential candidate Yeah Samake, General Gabriel Poudiougou, Lieutenant Moussa Karembe, and some university graduates, all of them suggested that the coup did more damage than good.<sup>24</sup>

Corruption and its consequences had finished gnawing the country. Mali is a poor country but has rich citizens. I remember being shocked when one of my professors identified Mali as one of the poorest countries on earth. I grew up seeing people in so much comfort that I could not believe that we are considered to be that poor. Corruption is a big problem in Mali. Without it we would be a developed country by now. Mali has many natural resources such as gold and cotton, but only a small percentage of our resources belong to us. We do not have the equipment to mine our gold, so we have to seek help from foreign countries such as Australia, and a huge percentage of the gold goes to the country we partner with. Mali gets only 20 percent of the gold from its soil. Most of our products, such as gold and rice, are exported. This makes gold and rice expensive even though we produce them.<sup>25</sup> Based on the exploitation of the gold mining in Mali, I believe that developed and industrialized countries live on the wealth of poor countries. Large developed countries take advantage of the poverty and lack of resources and materials in order to exploit small countries, which cannot do anything about it. If Malians had the equipment to mine our mineral resources, they wouldn't have to give up 80 percent of their gold to foreign countries. The worst thing is that the little percentage

---

<sup>23</sup> Translated from French to English.

<sup>24</sup> I talked to General Gabriel Poudiougou when I was in Mali in September 2014 and also interacted with him on both phone and skype calls since returning to the US. I interviewed Lieutenant Moussa Karembe on skype since he was in a mission in Canada when I had his interview. I had the chance to interact with Yeah Samake when we had our Malian community dinner here in Orem Utah.

<sup>25</sup> Personal Interview, Madou Teme; mine worker in the Kaye region of Mali.

that Malians own is managed by dishonest leaders, who use the revenue for their personal comfort. Mali receives a lot of foreign aid, but it is not clear where that aid goes or what the government does with it.

The fact that the Malian army is not capable of fighting the rebels or securing the north is another consequence of corruption. The Malian army is full of people who either quit school or did not have the chance to attend. Most of the people in the army do not have a high school degree. Parents do everything to get their children in the army when they are not doing well with school or when they can't find a job, so the Malian army is not taken as seriously as it should be. The Malian army is a place to go when you don't have any other alternative. Very few people join the army for the love of it. During recruitment, parents bribe authorities so that their children will be selected. As a result, people who are not fit enough to do the physical training are often selected when they shouldn't be. Some parents even pay the training officers to make things easier for their children. When it is time to go to war, those same parents go to the heads of the different forces and cry for their children not to go to war. I remember seeing my house full of people coming and begging my father, General and former head of Malian army forces, not to send their children to war. And most of the time is it those same persons who come begging and asking my dad to help their children to get into the army. When my father tells them that their children do not have what it takes to be soldiers, they bribe officers from lower ranks, getting faulty test results for their sons and daughters. Considering the way people are recruited for the army, it is no wonder that the Malian army is not capable of defending its territory. The soldiers run away from the battlefield. They were not prepared or trained enough, and they do not have the skills to fight. Mali has thousands of people enrolled in the army, but still cannot secure its territory. In addition to corruption weakening the ranks of the Malian army,

the country is poor and doesn't have enough good military equipment. Mali could have used some of the foreign aid in building its army if the top authorities hadn't used the money for their own comfort.

Mali receives a lot of foreign assistance, but not all help is well intended. Mali was once a French colony, and most French colonies have problems or are underdeveloped. For instance, Congo and Guinea are in constant poverty, and Burkina Faso has conflict. Upon conversing with a few people, including soldiers, about their opinions on France's involvement in the conflict in Mali, I learned to my surprise that they don't think France helped that much, contrary to what people from other countries think. Moussa Karembe, a lieutenant of the Mali army stated that "I think it would be better to drop France and move to Russia, China, or the USA. You have to see, in Africa, all countries colonized by France have problems."<sup>26</sup> He also stated that, "Officially, I have not seen the French helping the rebels, but because of certain behaviors of French soldiers in northern Mali, it made us believe that they are with the rebels. It should be added that all countries involved in Mali have a vested interest not only France. So to achieve their goals, they will not always be on the side of Mali." Furthermore, France took over Kidal, one of the regions in northern Mali. They helped reconquer some regions and when they arrived in Kidal they did not want any Malian soldiers in that region. It should have been clear then, that like any other country, France doesn't do anything for free. Today, France has lost the confidence of Malians. Even the Malian government only pretends to love France. During the regaining of the northern regions of Mali, all the streets, towns and villages in Mali flew the flag of France—but not today. France officially came to help Mali, but unfortunately it was also attached to the Tuareg rebels, and those rebels are linked to the terrorist groups such as MNLA and AQIM. It is safe to say that France's aid was based on its interests.

---

<sup>26</sup> Personal Interview: Moussa Karembe; translated from French

Since 1957, during the colonial period, France through its Colonial Minister François Mitterrand, wanted to create a state populated by Tuareg including the Hoggar Algeria to the north, Adrar des Iforas of Mali to the south, and Niger's Aïr in the East. Having failed in this attempt at the time of the colonies' independence, the project was revived when François Mitterrand became President of the French in 1981. It is through the association "France Liberté" of his wife Daniel Mitterrand that the foundations of the rebellion were put together 1981 and 1990. During the Libyan crisis, Iyad Ag Ghali was called to demobilize the Raetorian Guard of Mouammar Kaddafi, mainly composed of Tuareg fighters from Mali and Niger. Fighters and weapons from Libya were rewarded to Iyad Ag Ghali from his mentors—including France. The fighters came to Mali with the weapons and recruited more people, which permitted them to build a stronger rebel army. France promised the Tuareg that if they would help them bring down the Libyan leader, it would help them get their independence. The creation of the MNLA and accommodation of its executives in Paris also show that France is not against the rebel group in Mali. France provided assistance to the rebel leaders by supplying them with arms, ammunition and food. As stated by General Poudiougou, "France is now more in favor of the Tuareg than the Republic of Mali as a whole. She wants guarantees for its ownership of the Malian Sahara mineral wealth. France seeks to completely weaken Mali. To impose the dictates prepared by the Tuareg"<sup>27</sup> It is very possible that Mali has petroleum in the desert, and this may be one reason that France is interested in northern Mali.

France was not the only third party in Mali, the United Nations was involved as well. The United Nations Multidimensional Integrated Stabilization Mission in Mali (MINUSMA) was established by Security Council Resolution 2100 (of 25 April 2013) to support political processes in that country

---

<sup>27</sup> Personal Interview, Gabriel Poudiougou; Translated from French.

and carry out a number of security related tasks. The Mission of MINUSMA was to support the transitional authorities in the stabilization of the country and implementation of the transitional roadmap. The council decided that the mission should focus on duties such as ensuring security, stabilization, and protection of civilians, supporting national political dialogue and reconciliation, and supporting the re-establishment of state authority, the rebuilding of the security sector, and the promotion and protection of human rights in that country. I don't know why, but the UN is not doing much for now. Mali needs international help to recover the integrity of its national territory, and to drive terrorists and their accomplices from its borders. It needs international help to stabilize and stand on its feet.

If the United Nations and the great powers of the world want MINUSMA to be able to provide the necessary assistance to Mali, they have to give MINUSMA the military means to create the conditions needed for a real stabilization of the country. The forces of MINUSMA are currently trying to be the peacekeeping force between the National Army Forces and the rebel groups that host the Al-Qauida Magrebe Islamique (AQIM) terrorists, but the intentions of MINUSMA are not clear. They once asked the Malian army to evacuate areas such as Kidal. It is the sovereign forces of Mali that are constantly under MINUSMA surveillance.

To help Mali, the forces of MINUSMA should require the cantonment of armed groups and perform control zone patrols throughout the national territory in the company of Malian Armed Forces to secure the population and drive out of combatant terrorist groups. Knowledge of the terrain and populations is an irreplaceable asset of Malian units. It is impossible and even absurd to pretend to fight against an enemy that one does not know, on ground that one cannot control. For now, MINUSMA cannot do much because it does not have the resources it needs to achieve meaningful change.

To completely eliminate rebellions, the Malian government must first go to northern populations instead of dealing directly with the armed groups. An armed man who believes in the merits of the cause of his fight cannot understand the opposing political language. Only the loss of legitimacy and logistical support from the community for which the rebels fight can force them to understand the language of the state policy. Islamists can only survive in a soil favorable to them. When they are not welcomed in a community, they have to go. Mali needs international support to help improve the living conditions of its northern populations, and to guard them against terrorists, and the manipulations of corrupt executives who present themselves on the international stage as defenders of Mali against the Tuareg all the while digging the country's grave. Since 1992, they have been involved in the management of all projects in northern Mali. They were primarily responsible, and they have diverted all funds to their own personal gain, leaving the Tuareg populations to their fate. To end the influence of the manipulators, it is necessary to develop road and airport infrastructure to reduce or negate the isolation of northern Mali. The government should create more connections between the southern food producers and the Nord. Security can then be restored. The government should send well trained military forces to the north, they will ensure the peace and security necessary for harmonious development. AQIM terrorists have won the heart of northern populations through their money from drug trafficking. They were the only ones constantly in contact with the nomadic populations.

In conclusion, the future of Mali depends on Malians. Change is possible and there is hope. Every developed country has experienced a tough time. It may take a long time, but Mali can recover. The recovery of Mali will depend on how much work the Malian citizens are willing to put in to it. Mali needs a strong will from the government, especially the personal commitment of the head of state, not only by his speech but

also by his actions. Malians are firm believers of the proverb that “Guineafowls follows the Guineafowl at the head of the line.” A culture of hard work must be imposed, and poverty must be eliminated in order to achieve justice. In these times of globalization, Mali needs to have strong diplomacy in order to protect and defend its interests. So let us negotiate our development and our security in a win-win partnership with our friends. Mali has few friends (such as China and Russia) that can help rebuild the country. Most of the roads in Mali were done by Chinese engineers and Russia has helped Mali in the past with military equipment. Mali needs to multiply the multidimensional and multifaceted international partnership for the real renaissance and economic development of Mali to ensure security, stability and peace, and to combat poverty, the main bottleneck of our development. The United Nations Multidimensional Integrated Stabilization Mission in Mali is not doing much to help, but the United Nations can help Mali if it accepts the MNLA and AQIM as terrorist groups instead of rebel groups. Once these groups are considered as terrorists the UN Security Council would probably be willing to take strike measure and finally help get rid of the MNLA and AQIM for good. The United States of America, China, and Russia should ensure the territorial integrity of the country by asking the former colonial power (France) to stop supporting the separatist Tuaregs (MNLA). For the management of the current crisis, France must recognize the need to go through the legitimate government of Mali. It is up to the Malian government to speak to the people, whether in the South or the North, to organize the country and live together in peace.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Amaiguere Ogobara Dolo, Retired Journalist in Mali, Personal interview in Segou Region in Mali, September 2014.
- Devon Douglas-Bowers. "The Crisis in Mali: A Historical Background" Last modified February 3, 2013. Accessed September 24, 2014. <http://www.foreignpolicyjournal.com/2013/02/03/the-crisis-in-mali-a-historicalbackground/>
- Freedom House. "Mali, Freedom in the World 2009" Accessed September 26, 2014 <http://www.freedomhouse.org/report/freedom-world/2009/mali>
- France 24. "Army claims victory in clashes with Tuareg rebels," Last modified January 2, 2009. Accessed September 30, 2014. (<http://www.france24.com/en/20090102-mali-armyclashes-tuareg-rebels-claims-victory>)
- France 24. "Mali's interim president beaten unconscious by mob" last modified May 22, 2012. Accessed October 30, 2014 <http://www.france24.com/en/20120521-mali-president-unconscious-attack-demonstrators-traore/>
- General Gabriel Poudiougou, Former head of the Malian army, personal interview, Bamako Mali, September 2014
- MINUSMA. "Supporting political process and helping stabilize Mali" accessed November 05, 2014 <http://www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/missions/minusma/>
- "Mali" *World Fact Book: Central Intelligence Agency of the United States*. Published June 20, 2014. <https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/ml.html>
- Moussa Karembe, Lieutenant of the Malian army, Skype Interview, November 2014
- Samuel Poudiougou, Police Inspector in Mali, personal interview, Bamako Mali, September 2014
- Madou Teme, Mali gold mine worker, Skype interview, December 2014

## BIOGRAPHY

Marie is an International Student from Mali in West Africa. She went in a cadet school, a military school when she was 12 years old, and spent her secondary and high school there. She was one of the presidential interns at Utah Valley University, serving at the Office of International Affairs and Diplomacy. Previously,



Marie did an internship with Orem City Justice Court in fall 2012. Also she did an internship with a presidential candidate (Yeah Samake) in Mali in fall 2011.

Marie recently graduated from Utah Valley University with a bachelor in Political Science with a concentration on International Relations and a minor in Peace and Justice. She was the president of the Foreign Affairs Club and an ISC (UVU International Student Council) member. Marie speaks the following languages, French (the official language in her country), Bambara (her native language), Dogon (her ethnic language), Spanish (basic) and English.

She is interested in Diplomacy, and would like to represent her country around the world as an Ambassador. She would like to make a difference in Africa by helping people achieve a better life, especially women and children. Marie would like to create her own NGO to help women and children in Africa.

## EDITOR IN CHIEF

**Tiffanie Butcher** was born and raised in Utah and is a first generation college student. She is studying History Education and is expecting to graduate December 2015. immediately after graduation, she is hoping to begin a graduate program in European History and continue until she has her Doctorate degree and is eligible to teach European History at the university level. Her favorite era of history is England during the 14-17th centuries. Besides history, Tiffanie has a passion for photography, spending time with her husband and family, traveling, and eating at every Mexican restaurant she can find,.



## MANAGING EDITOR

**Brandon Springer** is a Senior at UVU studying English with an emphasis in Writing Studies. He plans to graduate in Spring 2015, after which time he will depart for South America in order to work as a teacher of English. Brandon has spent most of his life in Utah, and loves to hike, spend time with his family, and learn new things.



## ASSISTANT EDITOR



**Shea Haskell** is has developed an obsession with written communication in her time as a student. In addition to her involvement as an editor in *Crescat Scientia*, she has also worked on the academic publications *Essais* and *Intersections* for several semesters. When not working in academic publications, her devotion to the speculative fiction journal, *Warp and Weave*, has allowed her to be Fall 2015's editor-in-chief.

## ASSISTANT EDITOR



**Kristen Gunnerson** is a History Education major and is expecting to graduate in Spring 2017. Following graduation, she is planning to teach in Utah while also contemplating graduate school. Kristen enjoys reading, baking, and spending time with her family





