

brown
journal
of
history

volume 9 / 2015

BROWN JOURNAL OF HISTORY

Volume 9 / 2015

the staff

EDITORS-IN-CHIEF

Catherine Wallace

David Sheinfeld

EDITORS

Alyssa Toh

Athena Bryan

Beau Eisenberger

Ben Orf

Lee Bernstein

Luke Perez

Maansi Vohra

Meher Ali

Perry Oasis

Reid Secondo

Summerset Thompson

Ted Clifford

Tyler Feldman

Will Garcia

William Lu

Zach Ingber

GRAPHIC DESIGN

Haley Scott

A Note from the Editors	5
Acknowledgments	6
The Betting War: The Culture of Gambling in the Civil War and its Memory by Caleb Miller	7
Against the Currents of His Day: Brittany, Louis the Pious, and Elite Insurrection by Alexander Demeulenaere	18
A Union Hagiography: The Memorial of John Stanton Slocum and the Culture of Conciliation by Adam Asher	34
The Rise and Ideology of the Generation of the Centenary by William Janover	45
The Great Emancipator: Lincoln's Role in Revoking Grant's Order to Expel the Jews by Zachary Ingber	75

A NOTE FROM THE EDITORS-IN-CHIEF

As the 2015 academic year comes to a close, so too does Brown's celebration of its 250th anniversary. Over the yearlong celebration, the Brown community has reminisced, challenged its past self, and shared visions and dreams of what the future could hold for this university. As the editors-in-chief of the Brown Journal of History, we attempt to be always cognizant of the lessons of our past so that they may help us build a brighter future. In addition to Brown's 250th year, 2015 also marks the 150th anniversary of the conclusion of the Civil War. As the university attempts to address its past's intimate connections to slavery—the origin of the Brown family's fortune, the construction of University Hall by slave hands, amongst others—a handful of essays in this year's edition analyze other aspects and effects of the war. They range from the implications of intra-troop gambling to General Ulysses S. Grant's Anti-Semetic expulsion Order No. 11 in Tennessee to patterns of remembrance for fallen soldiers. Other essays take us through space and time to medieval Europe and turn of the century Argentina, exploring the politics of memory and the development of national identity. Through each essay we see Brown students' commitment to fully understanding the causes and consequences of underexplored areas, helping to contribute to an accurate and complete history that leaves no stone unturned and grants immunity to no taboo. These are examples of academic history in its best form—unabashedly exploring and questioning without fail.

But Brown's 250th also orients us towards our future, prompting us to envision our university and selves in the years to come. In this spirit, we are proud to launch a new blog style website for the Brown Journal of History. In an effort to reassert the value of the humanities and make its lessons and fruits more visible to the wider Brown community, the blog will publish shorter, more interdisciplinary pieces of Brown undergraduate historical work. The requirements for the print journal—the length and primary source basis for each paper—are intimidating both to potential submitters and readers. Publishing papers that may be more appetizing to a general audience will help elevate the visibility of undergraduate humanities work produced on this campus. Amidst a tide of a pro-STEM, anti-humanities rhetoric in some civic circles, we believe it is important to reassert the value of the humanities and of history in particular. From history we craft the narrative of who we were, what we have done, inspiring us to dream of what we can be. Brown has had a storied 250 years, but its story is far from completed; only in history can we ground our accomplishments and failures and brace ourselves for the future.

As graduating seniors, we feel indebted to the Department and are honored and humbled to have had the chance to give back to the academic community that has fostered our growth over the past four years.

David Sheinfeld and Catherine Wallace

EDITORS-IN-CHIEF

This year's Journal of History could not have been published without the Brown University History Department, the generous help of our faculty advisor, Jim McClain, the history department's academic department manager, Cherrie Guerzon, director of undergraduate studies, Ethan Pollock, all of the professors and graduate students who reached out to their students and garnered submissions, our editors, who read and evaluated numerous peer works, and the student authors themselves, who wrote quality pieces of historical inquiry and gave us the material for this journal.

The Betting War:

The Culture of Gambling in the Civil War
and its Memory

by Caleb Miller

When a Civil War soldier retired for the night, popular opinion imagines him lulled to sleep by the sound of troops marching or perhaps far-off cannon fire. While Confederate and Union soldiers were treated to a late serenade on a typical night in camp, it was of a far different kind. "The peculiar and yet monotonous tones of the dealer could be heard at all hours of the day, interrupted with the sharp, sudden exclamation, 'Keno,' of the lucky man," described Confederate soldier Henry Clay Dickinson in 1864.¹ Often forgotten in the bulk of literature penned following the American Civil War — biographies of great generals, histories of climactic battles, and romantic fictions of heroic Northern men and genteel Southern women — is an institution of tremendous consistency and scale in the Civil War: gambling. "So far as my observation goes, nine men of every ten play cards for money," posited David Lane, a volunteer in the Union army.² While Lane's is a crude estimate, the sentiment rings true that gambling saturated camp life and a culture of betting arose within army regiments.

Betting culture in Civil War camps forced soldiers to confront the historically immoral and sacrilegious activity, transforming the way many of them viewed gambling to the point of considering its patrons the most honorable. However, from high school textbooks to in-depth scholarly works, cards, dice, and betting receive little but the occasional peripheral mention. This has created a gap in the historiography of America's greatest conflict. Scholars have dismissed the institution in favor of more idealistic descriptions of the men who donned the Blue or Gray, examining concepts of duty and honor without recognizing this critical day-to-day activity. The oversight is a significant one, as gambling culture had very real effects, primarily political ramifications in the North and economic consequences in the South. Historians are not entirely to blame for the historiographical omission, as explicit actions were taken by gambling soldiers to cover up the activities and the pervasiveness of the culture. Without more meaningful attention to Civil War betting, we

overlook a historical phenomenon whose study provides fertile analytical grounds for multiple interlocking dimensions of the Civil War, and whose historical obscurity is in itself another telling detail about the era.

The Epidemic

The first issue to address is the lack of acknowledgement of an activity on which Civil War armies spent an extraordinary amount of time. The popularity of gambling within the camps is undeniable and, in the case of some extremely committed gamblers, comical. One soldier's first response to getting three fingers shot off at Shiloh was, "Just me luck. I shall never be able to hold a full hand again,"³ and another group of Union soldiers, when fired upon by rebels during a card game, simply moved the game behind a tree and dealt again.⁴ These examples are outliers but the custom of card playing seeped to every member of many camps. Its popularity placed great value in a deck of cards, so when Zenas T. Haines was given the job of cleaning out the barracks for his Northern regiment, he found a deck in almost every tent.⁵ And in many regiments, "a pack of cards will be about the last thing thrown away on a long march."⁶ Particularly for Confederate soldiers, cards became difficult to come by late in the war, so very worn and partial decks satisfied gamers.⁷ The "epidemic that few escaped," as Samuel H. Hankins called gambling, continued even after soldiers were defeated in battle and thrown in prisoners of war camps.⁸ The truly remarkable aspect of gambling's grip is its uniformity in terms of affiliation and status. Men from both sides of the Mason Dixon speak of gambling's inundation in similar terms, and while the lowly infantrymen seem to be the most frequent gamblers, higher class and ranked men did not avoid the habit.⁹

While gambling's popularity sustained across allegiance, geography, and rank, the types of betting games were not so uniform from camp to camp. Variations of poker, or "bluff" as some called it, emerged as the most common form, but "we indulged in all of the different games of chess, checkers, backgammon, dominos and card playing," said one Union soldier — although he added "cards as usual in the army being the most patronized."¹⁰ Money could be and was placed on any of these games, and it did not stop there. Dice games like faro and chuck-a-luck, also called "sweat" in the North, gained large followings, and keno grew to such popularity in the confederate bases such that Dickinson heard the joyous "Keno" cry daily. Although less common, soldiers wagered on horse races and cockfights or raffled off anything from gold watches to a blanket in hopes of winning

a few dollars.¹¹ Without any cards, dice, or gambling supplies, one confederate troupe dropped their shoes in the water with paper sails and wagered on whose was the swiftest "boat."¹² More than a leisure activity that was played out of convenience, gambling developed a culture and games were sought out by whatever means necessary.

Because of the meager disposable incomes for war soldiers, the stakes were generally very low, and activity peaked in the week after soldiers were paid. Union soldier Charles W. Bardeen, whose journal provides perhaps the fullest account of gambling in the war, noted a payday on April 22, 1863, followed by card game results for seven of the next nine days including the entries "played bluff of course" on April 24th and "played Bluff as usual" on April 25th.¹³ Alfred Lewis Castleman recalls watching "two soldiers with a pack of cards, and the little pile of money which they received a few days ago, is rapidly changing hands."¹⁴ This recollection hints at the reciprocal nature of these transactions, an important aspect in examining gambling's impact outside camp life. The frequency of games and low pots meant the majority of gambling operated at relatively low risk for the loser and a high probability of winning your money back. Cheating — card marking or counting — was widespread but hardly fretted in the affable games within regiments. But as the war crawled on, occasionally the friendly, low-risk games escalated and antagonism grew.

Culture of Chance

The act of gambling and, more broadly, the concept of luck has never had a place in American morality. In a detailed survey of luck in the United States, historian Jackson Lears pronounces the clash between games of chance and American ideals from the beginning. Because the first colonies viewed themselves divinely ordained to lead the New World, the "providentially ordered society contained little space for gamblers." America's reputation for social mobility throughout the 19th century, an appealing element to scores of immigrants, further discouraged the concept of luck, as "fortunate people have always wanted to believe they deserved their good fortune."¹⁵ For these reasons, gambling's reputation was sealed as anti-Protestant, immoral, and lazy. It was against this backdrop that the Civil War gambling culture emerged.

Because gambling was popular in many forms in the Civil War camps, participating soldiers must have dealt with questions of reputation, in light of their engagement with this historically immoral

act. Public opinion was resolute in its declaration that betting in all forms was reproachable, but soldiers' opinions were much more complex. There was surely a great deal of negative sentiment espoused from all directions. At the top, General Robert E. Lee said in 1861 that he was "pained to learn that the vice of gambling exists, and is becoming common in this army."¹⁶ And some men of lower rank like Mississippi soldier G. W. Roberts abstained while the gambling fever swept his regiment, but perceived the moral decay of his comrades — "I have ask them to quit playing cards in our tent... There is men in this encampment that does not care for anyone."¹⁷ Even Bardeen, one of the most prominent of the Union gamblers who made a killing at bluff during his time at war, later called it a "disease" and "a pretty good game to leave alone."¹⁸ Religion was gambling's greatest foil, and soldiers' critiques often contained religious rationale. William G. Stevenson was one of many that cited a negative correlation between plummeting religious piety and rising gambling and vice in camp. "Gambling, in all the forms possible among soldiers, was the main amusement on the Sabbath-day." And it was "growing more and more monstrous continually."¹⁹

Complaints from the conservative or religiously devout only tell half of what was a more nuanced perception of the culture held by gamblers in the armies. To many men, gambling provided a positive outlet that was really only destructive when it went unregulated. Since the military combat that contemporary newspapers and subsequent historians want to write about happened, for some, only one day out of 30, card playing and betting offered a relief from boredom the other 29 days. One Union volunteer, with perhaps a hint of sarcasm, spoke positively of such an exercise, "Our officers are, during this temporary quiet, freely indulging in those refined tastes which army life is so well calculated to develop, by engaging in such innocent amusements and gentle recreations as horse racing, gambling, and their usual accompaniments."²⁰

For many, participation in the immoral activity could be rationalized as harmless entertainment if the gambling was regulated. Castleman promoted keeping items of "mirth" — cards, dice, or checkers — around camps and in hospitals to keep morale high but suggested any supplies be controlled by "judicious nurses."²¹ The presence of regulation — often consisting of bet-limits and allowing fewer people in games — differentiated the jovial, boredom-riding gambling from the more extreme games with higher risks of financial

loss and hostility among the players. Bardeen's account clearly defines these two types of gaming. "Only an inexperienced or an incapable person will deny the pleasure in draw poker at its best" played with regulated limits so "no one will remember the next morning whether he won or lost." However, he continues, "these conditions are hard to maintain." When it is played "for the money in it," by someone "who is a hard loser and insists on increasing the limit... Then all the pleasure disappears," and "men stay too late, lose too much, are not unlikely to quarrel."²² Bardeen himself played his way out of the light-hearted game and into the competitive level, where the real immorality of gambling was found. The point of such distinction is that gambling provided a necessary service for the weary soldier, but its potential for greed and even addiction would rear its ugly head, bankrupting and corrupting many young men.

The culture of betting that emerged in encampments did not exist outside the bubble of army life. In some regiments, a kind of "boys club" atmosphere, which expected all men to participate and exalted successful gamblers, differed greatly from the general public culture, which remained negative to all games of chance. "The soldier who endeavored to live right was ridiculed," said one Confederate man, adding that the man who favored reading the Bible over a card game would be teased: "Hello, parson; what time do you expect to start a revival in camp?"²³ Customary ideas of honor and chivalry were morphed so that "to be considered an accomplished gentleman it is necessary to be a scientific and successful gambler."²⁴ One of the South's most successful faro dealers, a Captain Coffee from Mississippi, was called "gentlemanly" and "a prince" for his administration of the games.²⁵ However, camp gambling should not be separated entirely from the gambling that was on the rise in cities across America, and the bubble in which gambling culture survived was not entirely cut off from the world outside camp. Armies would frequently patronize the gambling-houses in nearby cities and towns, which saw an influx of customers in the years of the war. The relationship between soldiers and local gambling establishments was great enough to warrant local governments in the North and South — primarily the South as that is where much of the fighting took place — to shut down gambling-houses for the reason that "they take from the soldiers and officers the money needed by their families."²⁶

Finally, the psychological effects of the gruesome war reinforced the culture of games of chance. Devoutly Protestant men were forced

to grapple with the tragedy of death on such an immense scale, so when “the randomness of fate took on a palpable and menacing form, the experience of the combat soldier made providentialism seem a cruel joke.”²⁷ As soldiers attempted to deal with the imminent threat of death and justify the death of their friends and brothers, the notion of a divinely ordained plan eroded. In its place, the men embraced randomness and luck, the manifestation of which was a hand of cards or a roll of the dice.

The Wider Reach

Gambling’s prevalence and reputation during the Civil War is critical because the betting culture in camps had very real consequences on society outside army bases. In the North, moral degradation as a result of gambling entered the political realm. The process of moral corruption among the soldiers — for which gambling joined drinking as key culprits — worried Northern wives and mothers, contributing to growing anti-war sentiment at home. Boston woman Lucretia Mott said the fighting, “which has so corrupted the public mind ... demoralizing the young, should serve as a caution to parents and the guardians of morals.” Instead, she called for a retraction from the battlefield, increased religious schooling, and “the discouragement of games of chance.”²⁸ Mott was not alone, and soon the moral destruction joined physical destruction and death in anti-war arguments from Copperheads. However, at the same time that gambling’s immorality aided the anti-war movement, the topic was avoided by Democratic leaders — namely 1864 Presidential candidate George McClellan. Knowing that the vast majority of the electorate was comprised of soldiers or the fathers, brothers, and sons of soldiers, McClellan steered clear of the “demoralization” argument so as not to insult the many troops. Instead, McClellan and others only spoke of the army in the highest terms, as New York Governor Horatio Seymour said at the 1864 Democratic National Convention: “Let not the ruin of our country be charged to our soldiers.”²⁹ This created a paradox in gambling’s political impact: gambling’s immorality turned private individuals against the war, but the unwillingness to blame soldiers for moral degradation kept gambling out of the public limelight and, later, the legacy of the war. So gambling impacted the time but avoided public memory.

While gambling’s influence in the North tended to be political, it inflicted a more economic effect in the South. The war brought a troubled financial climate across the South for a variety of reasons, and the greed of betters and proprietors of gambling-houses played a role.

In Richmond, for example, George Cary Eggleston said, “It became necessary also to suppress the gambling-houses in the interest of the half-starved people” for “their lavish rivalry in the poorly stocked markets had the effect of advancing prices to a dangerous point.” Richmond found gamblers’ greed so harmful that gamblers were subject to the cruel punishment of public whipping.³⁰ Similarly, the Department of the Gulf in New Orleans released a General Order blaming “the gambler and the ruffian” for the “deplorable state of destitution and hunger of the mechanics and working class of the city.”³¹ While these examples represent negative effects of city gambling, not camp gambling, the two were fundamentally intertwined in places like New Orleans, which was occupied by Union troops as early as April 1862, and Richmond, which held scores of Confederate troops throughout the war.

A Costly Omission

If Civil War gambling emerged as a culture in camps and spilled onto the home front with political and economic ramifications, it begs the question: why hasn’t anyone talked about it? The answer to this question begins with the gamblers themselves and a concerted effort to keep gambling from their families and communities. Before Bardeen’s rare detailed account of gambling, he opened, “I suppose my readers are surprised that I do not omit these references to gambling, but I am telling what did happen, not what ought to have happened.”³² The implication of such a preface is that there existed a broad and conscious effort by soldiers to avoid writing about card playing and betting within journals or letters. But the cover-up did not stop there. Confederate soldier Samuel H. Hankins described a common practice of separating oneself from gambling even after death:

When we would hear the sound of cannon, comrades would say: ‘Boys, do you hear that?’ Then after moving on nearer, when the cannonading became more frequent, you could hear: ‘Boys, we are going to get into it.’ Then there would begin the searching of pockets for gambling goods, playing cards especially. The thought of being killed with such in their pockets induced the soldiers to throw them away. The road would soon be covered with playing cards, dice, dice boxes, etc.³³

The desire to maintain one’s reputation grew with the severity of the gambling. Indeed, for some men, their extreme addiction to the games would have brought great embarrassment to them. After recalling faro pots of more than 100 dollars, one Confederate noted that gambling had such a tight grip that “many will risk their last cent,

probably advanced by some friend as charity."³⁴ Similarly on the Union side, one of Grant's soldiers Jacob Hyneman bemoaned gambling's financial impact, "only paid a week ago and I have not a cent now... I don't think I will play poker any more."³⁵ These accounts uncover the dependence soldiers felt for the game and further incentivize keeping their experiences quiet. The small number of laments such as Hyneman's likely exists as the tip of the iceberg, with many of the most extreme gamblers successfully keeping it from written record.

If public opinion and potential embarrassment was not enough motivation to keep the gambling under wraps, punishment from commanders and the government drove the institution further underground. Base commanders were in charge of policing their regiments' immoral habits. The Union's highest ranking generals espoused anti-gambling rhetoric. In 1865, General Ulysses S. Grant called for the arrest of any officer found gambling, and William T. Sherman defended the destruction of gambling houses by his generals.³⁶ Similar top-down decrees were made in the South, including one Tennessee Field Order on gambling that read, "It is expected that all regimental commanders will at all times be careful to discourage this growing evil."³⁷ The United States Congress even intervened with an act in 1864, calling for an examination of military personnel and if "any officer fails to pass a satisfactory examination by reason of intemperance, gambling, or other immorality... then such officer will be dismissed from the service without pay."³⁸

The consequence of anti-gambling policy was not less gambling, but more covert gambling. Games of chance continued either because of a lack of enforcement of the policies or a more deceptive effort to keep the games from a commander's eyes. Confederate Ruffin Thompson put it well, "Open gambling has been prohibited, but that amounts to nothing."³⁹ Henry Kyd Douglass travelled as an aid to Stonewall Jackson — a religious man who detested gambling — and recalls the concealment efforts around the General. "I noticed as we approached the tents, in many of them were sitting squads of fours ... absorbed in games of cards. As the General approached the light would go out, the cards would be put down." But "when he left, a line of soldiers followed him in escort to the edge of the camp and then, doubtless, returned to their cards."⁴⁰ In one comical instance, cockfighting brought together two Ohio regiments, and the cheers of the men drew the attention of their division commander Ormsby Mitchel. But the general thought the cheers were for him instead of a

chicken, so Mitchel left happy while the men evaded punishment.⁴¹ In this way, government or military orders were ineffective at suppressing gambling culture but more successful in keeping it secret, and the increased concealment subsequently contributed to history's ignorance to the scale of chance activities.

Despite their best efforts, neither the soldiers nor military policies could completely extinguish their gambling culture from written record — after all, had they been completely successful, this paper could not have been written. Instead the legacy of the Civil War and its histories abetted the removal of gambling from most Civil War narratives. For an example, James McPherson's popular book *For Cause and Comrades* attempts to get inside the heads of soldiers to answer the question of why — Why enlist? Why stay? Why fight? To his credit, McPherson does an excellent job of illustrating "the complex mixture of patriotism, ideology, concept of duty, honor and manhood" that steered soldiers on both sides of the conflict.⁴² But in his pursuit McPherson, like many authors before him, favors ideology over experience. A war based on ideals, in which soldiers' decisions are driven by a sense of honor for a family or duty to a country, does not mesh with the image of an army of gamblers, participating in games of chance as an outlet for boredom or source of income. Granted, these two visions are not entirely mutually exclusive, but in focusing on the perception of honor or duty, Civil War historians ignore the impact of more monotonous experiences. McPherson should not be singled out for this, because it is a phenomenon that goes back to Americans' first attempts to deal with the Civil War and reunification. By celebrating the virtues of the soldier, such as spirit, devotion, and courage, the destructive or rebellious nature of his actions could be discounted: ideals over experience.

Exceptional was the one soldier out of ten, according to David Lane, that did not gamble in the Civil War. Fueled as much by the horrifying randomness of war as by the boring drudgery of camp life, the culture of betting was so engrained in the Union and Confederate ranks that instances in combat were but interruptions to the pervasive institution. While the culture impacted a wider population than just the men that participated in it, history has largely forgotten or ignored the cards, dice, and raffling. While the fate of slavery and the unity of the country rested in the outcome of battles more than the outcomes of poker games, the gravity of the conflict necessitates a deep examination of the experiences of the Civil War soldiers. The culture of gambling, impactful in the Civil War but not in its legacy, deserves credence.

END NOTES

1. Dickinson, Henry Clay. Memoir of Henry Clay Dickinson, pp. 52. (Brown University Database: American Civil War in Letters and Diaries S1904-D001)
2. Lane, David. Diary of David Lane, pp. 217. (Brown CW S1546-D025)
3. Bardeen, Charles William, Memoir of Charles William Bardeen, in *A Little Fifer's War Diary*. C. W. Bardeen, 1910, pp. 177. (Brown CW S1593-D014)
4. Wiley, Bell Irvin. *The Life of Billy Yank*, (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill Company, 1951), 250.
5. Haines, Zenas T. Letter from Zenas T. Haines, pp. 18. (Brown CW S1393-D005)
6. Bardeen, 177.
7. Wiley, Bell Irvin. *The Life of Johnny Reb*, (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill Company, 1951), 37.
8. Dickinson, 124.
9. Putnam, Sallie Brock, Memoir of Sallie Brock Putnam, pp. 257. (Brown CW S913-D048)
10. Marshall, Albert O'Connell, Memoir of Albert O'Connell Marshall, pp. 54. (Brown CW S1486-D003)
11. Wiley, *Billy Yank*, 250.
12. Wiley, *Johnny Reb*, 38.
13. Bardeen, 176.
14. Castleman, Alfred Lewis, Diary of Alfred Lewis Castleman, pp. 34. (Brown CW S1394-D003)
15. Lears, Jackson. *Something for Nothing: Luck in America*. (New York: Penguin, 2003), 3.
16. Wiley, *Johnny Reb*, 36
17. Wiley, *Johnny Reb*, 37.
18. Bardeen, 182.
19. Stevenson, William G., fl. 1861-1862, Memoir of William G. Stevenson, pp. 106. (Brown CW S1366-D003)
20. Lane, 217.
21. Castleman, 74.
22. Bardeen, 181-182.
23. Haskins, Samuel H. *Simple Story of a Soldier: memoir of Samuel H. Haskins*, republished. (Fire Ant Books, 2004), 11-13.
24. Wiley, *Johnny Reb*, 36.
25. Dickinson, 50.
26. "General Order 16," *Headquarters of District of Cairo, Illinois*. April 2, 1864. (Cornell Making of America Database: War of the Rebellion)
27. Lears, 144.
28. Mott, Lucretia Coffin, 1793-1880, Letter from Lucretia Coffin Mott, May 28, 1860, in *James and Lucretia Mott: Life and Letters*. Hallowell, Anna Davis, ed., (Boston, MA: Houghton, Mifflin & Co., 1884), pp. 395. (Brown CW S115-D089)
29. "Official Proceedings of the Democratic National Convention, 1864" (Chicago: The Times, 1864), 23.
30. Eggleston, George Cary, Memoir of George Cary Eggleston, in *A Rebel's Recollections*. (New York, NY: Hurd & Houghton, 1875), pp. 102-3. (Brown CW S6429-D004)
31. "General Order 25" *The Department of the Gulf*, 1864. (Cornell CW)
32. Bardeen, 177.
33. Hankins, 11-13.
34. Dickinson, 51.
35. Wiley, *Billy Yank*, 152.
36. "Confidential Circular from U.S. Grant" June 22, 1865. And "William T. Sherman to Inquiry from Murphy in Tennessee."
37. "Field Order 39" Army of Tennessee. December 27, 1864. (Cornell CW)
38. United States Department of War. July 1, 1864. (Cornell CW)
39. Wiley, *Johnny Reb*, 39.
40. Douglass, Henry Kyd. *I Rode with Stonewall Douglass: a memoir by Henry Douglass*, 197.
41. Beatty, John. *Citizen-Soldier: Memoirs of a Volunteer*, 150.
42. McPherson, James. *For Cause and Comrades*, (New York: Oxford University, 1997), 11.

Against the Currents of his Day

Brittany, Louis the Pious, and Elite Insurrection

by Alexander Demeulenaere

During Louis the Pious's 36-year reign, he spent much of his time convening assemblies, securing his borders, and trying to govern his empire, rather than conquering and expanding aggressively as his father and grandfather, Charlemagne and Pepin, had done.¹ Louis's task was a difficult one since he had inherited long and autonomous frontier regions from Charlemagne.² These regions were often flanked by lengthy marches, in which the emperor would install counts or dukes to oversee frontier governance and help suppress and integrate their people.³

For the most part, Louis was successful in maintaining control over a vast empire that included most of modern day Western Europe and held significant influence over all former territories of the Holy Roman Empire. He effectively quelled rebellions and consolidated the empire's power and scope of rule. He orchestrated major religious assemblies and spread a very specific view of Christianity based on monasteries throughout his empire and its frontiers, even converting pagans. Louis's goals were clear with neighboring Muslim or pagan territories, but less so with the few Christian frontiers that did not acquiesce to his rule.

Brittany is a unique example of a Christian area that caused major issues for Louis and remained an insecure border to the Frankish heartlands in France and Germany throughout his reign. The territory emerged as an important frontier for Louis because of its disruption of his monastic view of empire. Furthermore, the Franks suffered numerous military defeats to these rebellious people. As a result, against the ideological currents of his court, Louis tried to deal with Brittany through force and military campaigns, leading to a series of revolts against him by the court nobility and family members.

In 830 A.D., according to *The Annals of St.-Bertin*, Louis the

Pious's sons and members of his court revolted openly, because they opposed a campaign into Brittany that Louis endorsed.⁴ Although this rebellion was rather short-lived, the fact remains that the question of conquering Brittany, a region rarely spoken about in contemporary sources, caused enough internal strife to start an uprising. Because the sources concerning Brittany are scant and problematic, the importance of the region in *The Annals of St.-Bertin* raises questions about why this frontier was causing difficulties for Louis and why the court was so opposed to conquering it. Julia M.H. Smith does much work in uncovering how Bretons and Carolingians interacted and how these interactions changed the political and social nature of Brittany.⁵ How the relations changed the Franks, however, does not seem a topic that modern historians have broached extensively. Scholars like Wendy Davies and James McIlwain have done incisive work painting a picture of Carolingian Brittany as an entity in and of itself.⁶

The main contemporary sources that deal with Brittany include a biography, *The Life of Emperor Louis*, by an anonymous author known as the Astronomer, Ermoldus Nigellus's panegyric *In Honor of Louis, the Most Christian Caesar Augustus*, by Ermoldus Nigellus, an Exile, *The Royal Frankish Annals*, and, of course, *The Annals of St.-Bertin*. Through these sources, Brittany emerges as an important region for Louis the Pious because of his specific conception of empire and the Bretons' barbarian ways that began to strengthen in the ninth-century. As we saw, his desire to invade Brittany did not please the elite and, furthermore, opposed the ideological currents of the 820s A.D., which eventually led to minor revolts.

Many historians in the past have focused on these revolts and the future civil wars during Louis's reign to claim that he was an unsuccessful ruler. The most recent generation of scholars, however, including Mayke de Jong, Thomas Noble and Karl Ferdinand Werner have opposed this notion and shown that Louis was an effective ruler with a very focused conception of his empire. Specifically, Noble and de Jong, along with Courtney Booker, another prominent Carolingian scholar, focus on Louis's monastic mode of kingship, which highlighted unity, sublime leadership, and penance, based on Benedict of Aniane's vision of the Rule of St. Benedict.⁷

To better understand the Breton subversion of Louis's monastic kingship, we must first address the hollow state of Carolingian authority over the Bretons. Franks had claimed rule over Brittany, the area west of the River Vilaine, since the sixth-century. Vannes was the only territory

relatively deep in Brittany that occasionally came under direct Frankish rule – west of this area, we hardly ever see Franks.⁸ Unlike most frontier territories, dependent or not on Carolingian authority, Brittany never saw any Frankish administrators until after 830.⁹ Moreover, Carolingians never really attempted to establish formal rule.¹⁰ A royal Frankish annalist wrote, “[The Breton people] had been subjugated by the kings of the Franks and made tributary and it used to pay the imposed tax, although unwillingly.”¹¹ Franks felt dominant over the region, as this statement shows, but, in reality, they had very little control, as evidenced by the lack of capitularies and Frankish administrators flowing in and out of the region. Vannes was the only seat, albeit intermittently, of Frankish power in Brittany, and the Franks often set off on campaigns from there.¹²

Furthermore, Bretons retained an independent religious identity, based on rural monasteries.¹³ The fact that the Astronomer did not even mention the Bretons until his treatment of Louis’s campaign in 818 A.D. exposes how little control the Franks must have had in the region.¹⁴ The same goes for the scant treatment Brittany receives in *The Royal Frankish Annals*, in which defeat or lack of control was so readily omitted. In short, the Franks felt that the Bretons, as frontier people under their control (however weak it was), should acquiesce to their demands and pay them tribute.

In a unique instance of visible interaction between Louis the Pious and the Bretons, Louis tried to impose a Frankish form of tonsure on Breton monks, thus highlighting that Bretons challenged his conception of empire. In 818 A.D., preceding a campaign into Brittany, Louis sent a letter to the monks of Landévennec, an important Breton monastery, ordering them to abandon Scottish (Celtic) tonsure and to take up the Rule of St. Benedict.¹⁵ For Louis, the problem lay in the fact that Celtic tonsure derived from the druidic, rather than the Christian, tradition.¹⁶ This instance is one of the only in which we have evidence for Louis actively engaging with Bretons and trying to impose Frankish customs (other than actual military campaigns, of course). Hair and beards, for laymen and ecclesiastical figures alike, functioned as important social and legal indicators in Brittany.¹⁷

The fact that Louis wanted to impose the *corona* style of tonsure, adopted by the Roman and Frankish church, seems significant since that desire attacked an important part of Breton culture. Furthermore, it is a singular instance of Louis trying to impose Frankish culture on Brittany. He clearly wanted to bring Landévennec, a major

Breton religious center, into his universal church. In this particular case, Landévennec conceded to Louis’s will, but we know that in most of Brittany Bretons met the imposition of the Rule of St. Benedict with harsh opposition.¹⁸ Regardless of the outcome, the evidence shows that Louis considered Breton independence from his church enough of a moral problem that he had to take action against it.

The Astronomer, an anonymous court noble who wrote a laudatory biography of Louis in 840 A.D. or shortly thereafter, engages with the Bretons only as barbarians. Throughout the text, the Astronomer rarely criticizes the Empire or Louis (although he was dead at the time) and emerges as a clearly pro-Louis source. As such, omission/silence or skewing of the narrative tends to indicate defeat or embarrassment for the Franks.

In 818 A.D., Louis made his first excursion into Brittany. Louis uncharacteristically went on the campaign himself and led his army to a crushing victory over the barbarous Bretons.¹⁹ This instance is the first in either *The Royal Frankish Annals*, the court-produced documents recounting the events, or the *Astronomer’s Life*, in which the authors named a Breton leader, Murman. Because the Bretons dared to name a king and rejected submission to the Franks, the Astronomer deemed them insolent. Furthermore, after Louis conquered the Bretons, the Astronomer claimed that they “...surrendered to whatever conditions the emperor might wish to impose; in the end, future servitude.”²⁰ Rather than accepting the Breton leaders on diplomatic terms, as Louis did with other frontier regions such as Denmark or Spain, he accepted them only as slaves.

The rhetoric of barbarianism highlights two aspects of Brittany. First, since the Astronomer’s text presents material that would most likely have pleased Louis, we see that Louis wanted to crush the Bretons and felt that they fell under his domain of submission. Second, since no diplomatic ties were established for tribute giving or hegemonic rule, it seems that Louis suffered crushing defeat at this frontier. By portraying the Bretons as savages and barbarians fit for “servitude,” the Astronomer, at the same time, reveals Frankish defeat but assuages the pain through a reshaping of history. In a subsequent encounter, the Astronomer maintains that the Bretons act on “reckless boldness and stupid audacity.”²¹ Again, the strongly negative rhetoric serves the same function as before and highlights the worthlessness of the territory – a sort of justification for defeat.

Ermoldus employs a similar rhetoric of barbarianism in dealing with the Bretons, somewhat unintentionally revealing issues at the frontier and emphasizing Louis's problem with the region. In *In Honor of Louis*, Ermoldus focuses on four moments in Louis's life: the siege of Barcelona; the imperial coronation; the Breton conquest of 818 A.D.; and the baptism of King Harald of Denmark.²² As in much of Ermoldus's text, speeches reveal the most important moments and sentiments. Count Lambert of the Breton March reveals the supposed perfidy of the Bretons: "Untrustworthy, [Bretons] keep only the Christian name, for their deeds and worship and belief are way off the mark. They take no thought for orphans, widows, or churches. A man will lie down with his sister; one brother will rape another brother's wife...wickedness abounds."²³ This statement explicates Louis's problem with the Bretons. They "keep only the Christian name" because the Franks saw them as pagans or worse since they put up a Christian front. Moreover, these claims seem quite exaggerated. In reality, the Bretons cared deeply for their churches, but as we have seen, did not adhere to the Frankish Christian customs because of their different forms of tonsure and monastic organization.²⁴

Ermoldus wrote his text to regain favor at the court, thus it appears he wrote what Louis wanted to hear and flattered him to the point of excess. Therefore, these statements show that Louis wanted to see the Bretons as Ermoldus portrayed them – godless pagans with no morals – because they hurt his vision of empire and kingship. In the same passage Louis claimed that Brittany was "his land."²⁵ This little indicator shows that Louis believed that the Bretons fell under his sway. Ermoldus asserts, however, that Murman refused to pay tribute and defied Louis by stating, "I do not farm [Louis's] fields, and I do not desire his laws. He has the Franks."²⁶ By having Murman defy Louis openly, Ermoldus underscores the barbaric nature of the Bretons and legitimates Frankish conquest over such a rebellious people. To reiterate, these were all things that Louis wanted to hear.

Finally, though, Ermoldus does not provide a clear outcome of the battle. He says that the Bretons took the Frankish yoke, accepting Frankish universal Christianity and law.²⁷ That claim is not necessarily true in light of the fact that the Franks engaged in at least two more major battles with the Bretons in the coming years.²⁸ This ambiguity, which also arises in the Astronomer's *Life*, connotes a major Frankish defeat and embarrassment for the Franks. Ermoldus expounds on subjects that would have, in theory, pleased Louis. To make a defeat

into a victory in a morally problematic region would have been a perfect vehicle for doing so.

Contemporary Frankish sources and some modern scholarship reveal that other pagan or Islamic frontiers during the reign of Louis the Pious, such as Denmark, Spain, and Pannonia, received much more respect than Christian Brittany. From Charlemagne to the tenth-century, Danish kings had a long tradition of conversion to Christianity at the will of the Franks.²⁹ The most visible example is that of Harald 'Klak' during the reign of Louis the Pious, described in Ermoldus's verse poem *In Honor of Louis*.³⁰ Carolingian kings engaged in these sorts of pagan conversions in the hope that they could, first of all, make these frontiers dependent states.³¹ Of course, the other reason was to create states that could fall into Louis's vision of empire, as in the case of Harald. In either case, the Franks treated the Northmen with a degree of respect, regarding their leaders as actual kings, even considering some family members and, of course, legitimate military threats.³²

Deep in Muslim Spain Louis sought patronage, wanted recognition of imperial authority, and aimed to expand Christianity through and beyond all frontier regions, so he adopted an equal and polite attitude towards the Moors.³³ He acted quite courteously and respectfully with Spain's Muslim people, even beseeching their support.³⁴ Moreover, contemporary sources have no qualms in naming Muslim kings' names, such as Abd ar-Rahman, king of the Saracens.³⁵ Furthermore, the Astronomer portrays the Moors and Saracens as fierce and cunning warriors equal to the task of taking on the mighty Franks, which he does not do with the Bretons.³⁶

Finally, on the eastern front, leaders of the Slavs in Pannonia, enemies of the Franks, fell under Frankish hegemony and earned positions as Frankish counts. Dukes Cadolah and Baldric of Friuli, who eventually fell out of favor, serve as prime examples of this phenomenon.³⁷ Furthermore, Liudewit, a main and troublesome Pannonian leader always received martial respect from the Franks.³⁸ Although *The Royal Frankish Annals* often portray him as deceiving and cunning, they also show a fierce and mighty warlord worthy of battle with the Franks. As shown previously, Brittany did not garner the same kind of respect from Franks as Denmark, Spain, or Pannonia.

Differences with the other frontiers highlight the fact that Brittany was treated worse by the Franks than the Muslim and pagan frontiers because as a Christian region it quietly did not fit into Louis's

monastic mold of empire whereas Muslims and pagans were clear enemies. On monastic reform, the Astronomer says, "This was the holy emperor's exercise, this was his daily game, this was his sport: seeing to it that the state might shine forth more brilliantly in holy teaching and practice, that he who adorns himself with sublime humility by imitating Christ in humility might rise higher in eminence."³⁹ If shining brilliantly in "holy teaching and practice" and acting with the humility of Christ were Louis's goals for his kingdom and for himself as a king, then the pagans and Muslims surrounding him were obviously enemies – enemies, which, in fact, he did end up conquering at one time or another.⁴⁰ But, the fact that Christians were imitating Christ wrongly and in opposition to the Frankish Empire clearly deeply disconcerted Louis.

Toward Brittany, Louis shows this apprehension and animosity through differences in relations with the Bretons between him and his father. Charlemagne interacted with Brittany three times according to *The Royal Frankish Annals* and Louis did so four times.⁴¹ Charlemagne never entered the region, whereas Louis abandoned his characteristically defensive frontier policy and did so three times.⁴² Furthermore, in Charlemagne's time, we never hear of Breton rulers, whereas we see rulers such as Wihomarc'h and Murman engaging in battle and limited diplomacy with Louis.⁴³ Finally, Louis established Nominoe, a Breton leader under Carolingian influence in 830 A.D., who would become known as the father of modern Brittany.⁴⁴ Louis clearly engaged more explicitly with the Bretons than Charlemagne. In light of the fact that his ambitions for empire were more specifically monastic and Christian than Charlemagne's, it seems that this importance arises from the fact that Brittany was a Christian region challenging Louis's Christian Empire.

The Royal Frankish Annals and the *Astronomer's Life* (and one passage in Ermoldus's *In Honor of Louis*) provide us with a good, albeit fragmentary, understanding of Louis the Pious's predominantly military handling of the Bretons. In 818 A.D., Louis led an army into Brittany from a general assembly at Vannes, supposedly destroyed everything in his path, and killed the Breton king Murman.⁴⁵ In all three sources, the Franks seem to have crushed the Bretons. But, in all three, no form of hegemony is set up, the Bretons do not need to pay tribute, and the outcome of the battle seems cursory and abrupt. These factors point to defeat and embarrassment rather than the supposed successes for Louis in this first recorded encounter. In 822 A.D., in the midst of other frontier battles in Pannonia and Spain, the counts of the Breton March invaded the territory of a Breton leader named Wihomarc and, according to the

annals, "[the] whole territory was ravaged by fire and sword."⁴⁶ Just four years after the first battle with the Bretons, this encounter legitimated the claim that Franks probably suffered defeat against the Bretons in 818 A.D. since they had to quash another rebellion with another relatively powerful leader shortly afterwards. Furthermore, these entries in the annals and in the *Astronomer's Life* are even shorter than the last. Being "ravaged by fire and sword," again leaves the outcome of the battle up in the air. Since the Astronomer wrote as a proponent for Louis, an ambiguous outcome certainly meant loss and humiliation at the hands of Christian, barbarian Bretons. Next, during the cold winter of 824 A.D., Louis decided to enter Brittany again, but he postponed the campaign till the following autumn due to famine. That autumn, Louis and his sons entered Brittany with an army split into three parts and ravaged the land once again. According to *The Royal Frankish Annals*, this campaign lasted more than forty days, much longer than previous ones.⁴⁷ The length of this excursion reveals that Breton forces and resistance were strengthening and giving the Franks even more trouble. Furthermore, the Astronomer does not even mention this campaign. This extremely significant silence points to severe defeat and shame at the hands of the Bretons. Evidence for this loss emerges in 825 A.D. when, for the first time, a significant Breton leader, Wihomarc, with his horde of Breton lackeys, is named at an assembly in Aachen.⁴⁸ Clearly Louis and his court wanted to initiate some sort of dialog with the Bretons to temper their defeats and try to install some stronger form of control in the region. Wihomarc promised to commit to Louis as his emperor and Louis accepted him mercifully and with gifts. This occurrence marked the first in which gift giving transpired between the two peoples. Nevertheless, quite soon after, Wihomarc reneged on his promise of peace and attacked Frankish people on the Breton border. In the last known attack of the 820s A.D., Count Lambert of the Breton March slew Wihomarc.⁴⁹ That Wihomarc was able to betray Louis's trust and mercy so easily reveals weakness at the court regarding Brittany. Furthermore, the embarrassment concerning a situation as such would have been immense. Even after Wihomarc was killed, no Frankish administrator is recorded as having entered Brittany. Bretons remained free from the Frankish yoke. Finally, *The Annals of St.-Bertin* reveal Louis's intentions to enter Brittany on another campaign in 830 A.D. This ill-advised campaign led to revolts led by Hugh and Matfrid, who had both recently fallen out of favor, and Pippin, Louis's son.⁵⁰ Although this campaign never came to fruition, Brittany obviously mattered enough to Louis that he tried to initiate a conquest at such an inopportune time.

The ideological currents of the day that opposed Louis's planned campaign into Brittany in 830 A.D. were characterized by war-weariness, embarrassment from losses at the hands of pagans, and fear of and a desire to appease an angry god. The 820s A.D. were riddled with crushing military defeats for the Franks. As we have seen, the Bretons caused many problems for Louis. Furthermore, in 827 A.D., the Franks suffered terrible defeats in Spain and Pannonia. In a rare admission of defeat, *The Royal Frankish Annals* claim that Frankish magnates arrived in Spain too late to be of any use in defending Barcelona against Aizo and Abd ar-Rahman, King of the Saracens.⁵¹ This rare admission shows that the Franks must have lost terribly. Hugh and Matfrid, the magnates who dropped the ball in Spain, lost their *honores*, in other words, their offices and titles.⁵² In Pannonia during the same year, the Bulgars defeated the Slavs led by Duke Baldric of Friuli, a Frankish march leader.⁵³ Furthermore, the sons of Godfred ousted King Harald, who Louis had recently baptized, from his kingdom in what turned out to be another public and massive disaster for both Harald and the Franks.⁵⁴ Political turmoil was running high and Franks were failing on the battlefield. Thomas Reuter, in his article arguing that Frankish leaders consciously ended Carolingian military expansion, demonstrates that through the capitularies of Louis, Frankish war-weariness emerges – an aversion to taking up arms.⁵⁵ This idea makes sense in the context of a shamed and struggling army that was travelling great distances on its campaigns.

The embarrassment and shame that arose from these military defeats at the hands of pagans led to panic and discord at the court fueled by religious fear. Mayke de Jong asserts that all these losses against pagans threw the Frankish court into a state of panic.⁵⁶ We know the situation was extremely dire, because for the first time in his reign, Louis did not hold a summer assembly – a sure sign of severe political turmoil.⁵⁷ People did not know why the Franks were suddenly losing in battle, so they assumed that they had angered god in some way. As Emperor, Louis functioned as a bridge between god and his people. He felt responsible for all the subjects in his empire, so rectifying the situation fell to him.⁵⁸ Because Hugh and Matfrid were the most commanding lay magnates in the empire, Louis took away their power as a way to scapegoat them and divert the embarrassment away from the empire and to individuals.⁵⁹ We see attacks against Hugh and Matfrid in the Astronomer, Thegan, and Nithard – so contemporary authors took to the scapegoating as well in their respective pro-Louis

re-shapings of history.⁶⁰ Mayke de Jong put the situation eloquently: "Perceived from Aachen, the world had become an unpredictable place, where divine intervention might strike at any moment, with an ever-increasing frequency."⁶¹ The ideological currents of the day followed this moral panic with a fixation on religion and penance, and turned away from war.

In 828-829 A.D., the foremost ecclesiastical and lay leaders of the kingdom alike convened in small assemblies/synods to discuss how to appease the wrath of god and return the Franks to their former position of greatness through penance and moral rectification.⁶² *The Royal Frankish Annals* framed these assemblies as ways to discuss the Spanish March debacle as both a religious and military crisis. On the religious front, Hugh and Matfrid (although they are never named) lost their offices, and Louis sent his sons to quell the Saracens as the salve for the military crisis (although they never did so since the threat was quite minor by this point).⁶³ In fact, the assemblies' scope delved much deeper than just these affairs. The main questions revolved around how to raise sufficient military power to combat enemies and how to placate a severely offended god. Einhard and Wala came to Aachen and presented *libelli*, little books full of divine inspiration. These men, especially Einhard, commanded immense respect in the court. Their books revealed precepts and mandates to be obeyed by the Frankish elite and instructed the people on god's truth. The main message in both books was to repent before it was too late. Louis accomplished few of the things in the books, and took them, rather, as admonishments.⁶⁴ Texts of these councils spread around the kingdom quickly, and leaders called for reform, which seemed ephemeral and unattainable.⁶⁵ Louis was in an interesting place. He embodied both the sin of the empire and its hope of emerging from this dark place. As an ecclesiastical leader, he placated his citizens by doing penance in front of god in 833 A.D.⁶⁶ In none of the sources, however, do the leaders of the assemblies make clear how to raise armies more effectively – it seems that all major leaders were paralyzed by defeat and shame, and saw religious penance as the only way out.

Louis's desire to invade Brittany in 830 A.D. was an act to try to rectify the shame and embarrassment of the last couple years regarding Brittany, of course, but also of other military defeats, but his wishes completely diverged from the non-military assemblies of 829 A.D. and the war-weary nature of the empire as a whole. In *The Royal Frankish Annals* we see more and more miracles and religious

affairs (such as young girls not eating for years or the transportation of relics) around 827 A.D.⁶⁷ The focus shifted away from the martial to the religious. This change highlights the courtly views on matters – stay away from conquest. Louis, nonetheless, decided to begin a campaign. Furthermore, the highly religious nature of the *Astronomer's Life* takes shape as a penitential document. The text leaves out Louis's desire to invade Brittany in 830 A.D. Since the *Astronomer* was a court figure, this omission shows that the court probably opposed this military action in favor of penance and sublime leadership.

Bretons posed a very strong moral and military problem for Louis, who miscalculated the ideological waves of his court and persisted in futile campaigns into the region, eventually serving as a factor in leading the nobility to revolt in 830 A.D. Sources such as the *Astronomer's Life*, Ermoldus's *In Honor of Louis*, and the various annalistic documents of the time, coupled with the Bretons' skewed vision of Christianity, show that Brittany disrupted Louis's specific and monastic view of empire. The same primary documents reveal his methods of combatting this pesky people and then show how these ways led to revolts in 830 A.D. by opposing the ideological tides of the day as explicated comprehensively by de Jong and Booker. Of course, embarrassment at other frontiers as political machinations amongst the high elite contributed to these revolts as well. We cannot downplay, however, Brittany's importance in the affair, as so many scholars tend to do. Louis clearly felt at odds about Brittany, with its bizarre and unique (with maybe the exception of Gascony, a region on which contemporary sources say even less than Brittany) status as a Christian region resisting the jigsaw puzzle of Louis's empire.⁶⁸ These revolts of 830 A.D. were relatively minor and Louis quelled them quite easily. But, the seeds of civil war were sown. By the 850s and 860s A.D. civil war had become part of Carolingian identity.⁶⁹ So, although Brittany folded into the Frankish Empire in the mid-830s A.D., this troublesome frontier helped tilt the Carolingian dynasty on a crash course, albeit seemingly an inevitable one, to collapse in the early tenth-century.

END NOTES

1. *The Royal Frankish Annals*, trans. Bernhard Walter Scholz (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1970) 97-125.

2. Janet Nelson, "The Frankish kingdoms, 814-898: the West," in *The New Cambridge Medieval History*, ed. Rosamond McKitterick (Cambridge:

Cambridge University Press, 1995), 111.

3. Julia M.H. Smith, *Province and Empire: Brittany and the Carolingians* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 61.

4. *The Annals of St-Bertin*, trans. Janet L. Nelson (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1991), 21.

5. Smith, *Province and Empire: Brittany and the Carolingians*

6. Wendy Davies, *Small Worlds: The Village Community in Early Medieval Brittany*, (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1988); James T. McIlwain, "The 'Celtic' Tonsure Revisited," *La Bretagne carolingienne: Entre influences insulaires et continentales*, ed. Jean-Luc Deuffic (Saint-Denis: Peccia, 2008).

7. For more information see the following: Thomas F.X. Noble, "The monastic ideal as a model for Empire: the case of Louis the Pious," *Revue bénédictine* 86, no. 3-4 (1976); Thomas F.X. Noble, "Louis the Pious and his piety re-considered," *Revue belge de philologie et d'histoire* 58, no. 2 (1980); Mayke de Jong, *The Penitential State: Authority and Atonement in the Age of Louis the Pious, 814-840*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009); Courtney Booker, *Middle Ages Series: Past Convictions: The Penance of Louis the Pious and the Decline of the Carolingians* (Philadelphia: University of Philadelphia Press, 2009), PDF e-book; Karl Ferdinand Werner, "*Hludovicus Augustus: Gouverneur l'empire chrétien—idées et réalités*," in *Charlemagne's Heir: New Perspectives on the Reign of Louis the Pious (814-840)*, ed. Peter Godman and Roger Collins (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990), 3-24; Karl Ferdinand Werner, "Missus-Marchio-Comes : Entre l'administration centrale et l'administration locale de l'Empire carolingien," in *Histoire Comparée de l'Administration (IVe-XVIIe Siècles)*, ed. Werner Paravinci and Karl Ferdinand Werner (Munich: Artemis Verlag Zürich und München, 1980), 191-239; Benedict's vision is clear in Ardo's biography, *Carolingian Civilization: A Reader*, ed. Paul Edward Dutton (North York: University of Toronto Press, 2004), 176-198.

8. Davies, 17.

9. Smith, *Province and Empire: Brittany and the Carolingians*, 72.

10. Davies, 209.

11. *The Royal Frankish Annals*, 63.

12. *Ibid.*, 104.

13. Davies, 24-25.

14. *The Astronomer*, 257.

15. James T. McIlwain, "The 'Celtic' Tonsure Revisited," *La Bretagne carolingienne: Entre influences insulaires et continentales*, ed. Jean-Luc Deuffic (Saint-Denis: Peccia, 2008), 63.

16. Ibid., 65.
17. Ibid., 64.
18. Smith, *Province and Empire*, 72.
19. The Astronomer, 258; *The Royal Frankish Annals*, 104.
20. The Astronomer, 258.
21. Ibid., 267.
22. Thomas F.X. Noble, *Introduction to In Honor of Louis, the Most Christian Caesar Augustus, by Ermoldus Nigellus*, trans. Thomas F.X. Noble (University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2009), 123.
23. Ermoldus Nigellus, *In Honor of Louis, the Most Christian Caesar Augustus*, by Ermoldus Nigellus, trans. Thomas F.X. Noble (University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2009), 157.
24. Davies, 25-26; on Breton monasteries see Jean-Luc Deuffic, "Le 'monachisme breton' continental: ses origines et son intégration au modèle carolingien," *La Bretagne carolingienne: Entre influences insulaires et continentales*, ed. Jean-Luc Deuffic (Saint-Denis: Peccia, 2008), 77-138.
25. Ermoldus, 157.
26. Ibid., 160.
27. Ibid., 167.
28. *The Royal Frankish Annals*, 111-116.
29. Simon Coupland, "From poachers to gamekeepers: Scandinavian warlords and Carolingian kings," *Early Medieval Europe* 7, no. 1 (1998): 85.
30. Ermoldus, 170-186.
31. Coupland, 89.
32. For Harald as a family member see Coupland, 90; as a king and threat see Astronomer, 261.
33. Jonathan Conant, "Louis the Pious and the contours of empire," *Early Medieval Europe* 22, no. 3 (2014): 338, 343.
34. Ibid., 340.
35. *The Royal Frankish Annals*, 101.
36. Astronomer, 240.
37. *The Royal Frankish Annals*, 105.
38. Ibid., 106.
39. Astronomer, 255.
40. *The Royal Frankish Annals*.

41. Ibid.
42. Timothy Reuter, "The End of Carolingian Military Expansion," *Charlemagne's Heir: New Perspectives on the Reign of Louis the Pious (814-840)*, ed. Peter Godman and Roger Collins (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990), 393.
43. *The Royal Frankish Annals*, 104-118.
44. Smith, *Province and Empire*, 81.
45. *The Royal Frankish Annals*, 104; Astronomer, 258; Ermoldus, 156-167.
46. *The Royal Frankish Annals*, 111; Astronomer, 263.
47. *The Royal Frankish Annals*, 115-116.
48. *The Royal Frankish Annals*, 117-118; Astronomer, 268.
49. Ibid.
50. *The Annals of St.-Bertin*, 21.
51. *The Royal Frankish Annals*, 121.
52. de Jong, 39.
53. *The Royal Frankish Annals*, 122.
54. Ibid.
55. Reuter, 395.
56. de Jong, 39.
57. Ibid., 35; *The Royal Frankish Annals*, 122-124.
58. See footnote 4.
59. de Jong, 148-149.
60. Astronomer, 271; Thegan, *The Deeds of Emperor Louis*, trans. Thomas F.X. Noble (University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2009), 217; Nithard's Histories, trans. Bernhard Walter Scholz (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1970), 131.
61. de Jong, 157.
62. Ibid.
63. *The Royal Frankish Annals*, 121-123.
64. de Jong, 159-163.
65. Ibid., 177.
66. Booker, 132.
67. *The Royal Frankish Annals*, 122-125.
68. Smith, *Province and Empire*, 62.
69. Marios Costambeys, Matthew Innes, and Simon MacLean, *The Carolingian*

World (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 379-407.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

- The Astronomer. *The Life of Emperor Louis*. Translated by Thomas F.X. Noble. University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2009.
- The Annals of St-Bertin*. Translated by Janet L. Nelson. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1991.
- Carolingian Civilization: A Reader*. Edited by Paul Edward Dutton. North York: University of Toronto Press, 2004.
- Einhard. *The Life of Charlemagne*. Translated by Lewis Thorpe. London: Penguin Books, 1969.
- Nigellus, Ermoldus. *In Honor of Louis, the Most Christian Caesar Augustus, by Ermoldus Nigellus, an Exile*. Translated by Thomas F.X. Noble. University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2009.
- Nithard's Histories*. Translated by Bernhard Walter Scholz. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1970.
- Thegan. *The Deeds of Emperor Louis*. Translated by Thomas F.X. Noble. University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2009.
- The Royal Frankish Annals*. Translated by Bernhard Walter Scholz. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1970.

Secondary Literature

- Booker, Courtney. *Middle Ages Series: Past Conviction: The Penance of Louis the Pious and the Decline of the Carolingians*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1987. PDF e-book.
- Conant, Jonathan. "Louis the Pious and the contours of empire." *Early Medieval Europe* 22, no. 3 (2014): 336-360.
- Costambeys, Marios, Matthew Innes, and Simon MacLean. *The Carolingian World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.
- Coupland, Simon. "From poachers to gamekeepers: Scandinavian warlords and Carolingian kings." *Early Medieval Europe* 7, no. 1 (1998): 85-114.
- Davies, Wendy. "Franks and Bretons: the impact of political climate and historiographical tradition on writing their ninth-century history." In *Frankland: The Franks and the World of the Early Middle Ages*, edited by Paul Fouracre and David Ganz, 304-321. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2008.
- . *Small Worlds: The Village Community in Early Medieval Brittany*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1988.
- Deuffic, Jean-Luc. "Le 'monachisme breton' continental: ses origines et son intégration au modèle carolingien." In *La Bretagne carolingienne: Entre influences insulaires et continentales*, edited by Jean-Luc Deuffic, 77-138. Saint-Denis: Pécia, 2008.
- de Jong, Mayke. *The Penitential State: Authority and Atonement in the Age of Louis the Pious, 814-840*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- McIlwain, James T. "The 'Celtic' Tonsure Revisited." In *La Bretagne carolingienne : entre influences insulaires et continentales*, edited by Jean-Luc Deuffic, 63-75. Saint-Denis: Pécia, 2008.
- Nelson, Janet L. *Introduction to The Annals of St-Bertin*, Translated by Janet L. Nelson. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1991.
- . "The Frankish kingdoms, 814-898: the West." In *The New Cambridge Medieval History*, edited by Rosamond McKitterick, 110-141. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- . "Kingship and Empire." In *The Cambridge History of Medieval Political Thought c.350-c.1450*, edited by J.H. Burns, 211-251. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/CHOL9780521243247.012.
- Noble, Thomas F.X. *Introduction to In Honor of Louis, the Most Christian Caesar Augustus, by Ermoldus Nigellus*, Translated by Thomas F.X. Noble. University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2009.
- . *Introduction to The Life of Emperor Louis*, Translated by Thomas F.X. Noble. University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2009.
- . "The monastic ideal as a model for Empire: the case of Louis the Pious." *Revue bénédictine* 86, no. 3-4 (1976): 235-250.
- . "Louis the Pious and his piety re-reconsidered." *Revue belge de philologie et d'histoire* 58, no. 2 (1980): 297-316.
- . "Louis the Pious and the Frontiers of the Frankish Realm." In *Charlemagne's Heir: New Perspectives on the Reign of Louis the Pious (814-840)*, edited by Peter Godman and Roger Collins, 333-348. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990.
- Reuter, Timothy. "The End of Carolingian Military Expansion." In *Charlemagne's Heir: New Perspectives on the Reign of Louis the Pious (814-840)*, edited by Peter Godman and Roger Collins, 391-405. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990.
- Smith, Julia M.H. "Fines imperii: the marches." In *The New Cambridge Medieval History*, edited by Rosamond McKitterick, 169-189. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- . *Province and Empire: Brittany and the Carolingians*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- Werner, Karl Ferdinand. "Hludovicus Augustus: Gouverner l'empire chrétien—Idées et réalités." In *Charlemagne's Heir: New Perspectives on the Reign of Louis the Pious (814-840)*, edited by Peter Godman and Roger Collins, 3-124. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990.
- . "Missus-Marchio-Comes: Entre l'administration centrale et l'administration locale de l'Empire carolingien." In *Histoire Comparée de l'Administration (Ive-XVIII Siècles)*, edited by Werner Paravinci and Karl Ferdinand Werner, 191-239. Munich: Artemis Verlag Zürich und München, 1980.

A Union Hagiography

The Memorial of John Stanton Slocum and the Culture of Conciliation

by Adam Asher

In *The Public Art of Civil War Commemoration*, Thomas J. Brown devotes considerable space in his introduction to discussing the “increased tendency to look favorably on the Confederacy” on the part of Union veterans, and refers to what one historian calls the “culture of conciliation” after the war.¹ Though the reasons for this shift in sentiment are complex², what is clear is that, given some distance from the battlefields of “the Great Rebellion,” former combatants in the Union Army showed little interest in reopening old wounds, seeking instead to create “a cosmology of nation, of Union...”³ In the *Memorial of John Stanton Slocum*, published in 1886 by the Slocum Post of the Grand Army of the Republic (G.A.R.) in Providence, Rhode Island, this attitude of reconciliation is evident in what is not mentioned—namely, the emancipation of the slaves and the attempted desecration of Colonel Slocum’s body by Confederate troops. Slocum is portrayed as an apolitical martyr figure. The *Memorial* emphasizes his virtue and “manly” qualities, shying away from the more controversial aspects of the war and transforming him into the incarnation of the most universal of American values.

The *Memorial* was published to commemorate the dedication of a funerary monument to Colonel Slocum at Swan Point Cemetery. It is divided into three parts: “Introduction”, “Erection of the Monument”, and “Dedication of the Monument”. The Introduction explains the purpose and background of the monument, as well as listing some of the Slocum Post members most instrumental in its creation. The second section contains an account of fundraising efforts for the monument—most notably a “Grand Fair and Bivouac”—a brief biography of Colonel Slocum, and “Col. John S. Slocum’s Grave,” the first of two laudatory odes in the book. The final section contains a detailed account of the day of the monument’s dedication, from the opening of the procession,

to the ceremony at the graveside, to the exercises that evening. It also contains a description of the monument itself, and transcriptions of remarks delivered that day.

John Stanton Slocum was born on November 1, 1824 in Richmond, Rhode Island (the son of Samuel Slocum, “the inventor of the solid-headed pin”).⁴ First commissioned as a lieutenant in the United States Army in 1847, he fought in three major battles of the Mexican-American War, reaching the rank of Captain and, on the eve of the Civil War, receiving an appointment as a member of the examining board at West Point.⁵ In April of 1861, following President Lincoln’s call for troops to defend Washington, D.C., Slocum was commissioned as a Major in the First Regiment, Rhode Island Detached Militia (under the command of then-Colonel Ambrose Burnside). Two months later he was promoted to Colonel and given command of Rhode Island’s Second Regiment.⁶ In his regiment’s first engagement of the war in the First Battle of Bull Run on July 21, 1861—roughly six weeks after he took command—he was mortally wounded at Sudley Ford, and died two days later.⁷

In depicting Slocum as a martyr, the *Memorial* is anything but subtle. Over the course of the book he is referred to as “a gallant martyr-comrade”, “a martyr, on Manassas Plains”, and a “true martyr-brave”.⁸ Additionally, references are made to “the martyr’s grave”⁹ and “the martyr’s tomb”¹⁰, as well as to the “martyred sons” of Rhode Island.¹¹ For good measure, Frederic Denison’s second of two laudatory odes to Colonel Slocum is titled “Martyr Memories.” At some points, the imagery seems almost to make Slocum into a Christ-like figure. This is particularly true of Denison’s first ode, “Col. John S. Slocum’s Grave”, which contains the couplet (emphasis added):

Upon his low, unlettered mound
The grateful ivy lifts its head,
Its rootlets nourished from the wound
*That for a nation’s healing bled.*¹²

This is an extreme image. It goes beyond Slocum dying for the sake of the Union—his blood shed in battle is literally life-sustaining.

This image coupled with Slocum’s monument being blessed “in the name of Jesus Christ, the Great Captain of our Salvation”¹³ is suggestive of the intertwining of religious and militaristic imagery, which appears throughout the *Memorial* and is emblematic of G.A.R. practice around the time of its publication.¹⁴ At the dedication ceremony, not

only Slocum, but each branch of the armed forces is placed in its Biblical context. Commander Theodore A. Barton asks Senior Vice-Commander Benjamin L. Hall and Junior Vice-Commander Gideon Spencer, in succession, “what words of Holy Scripture may apply to the navy?” and “what Scriptures may apply to the army?” He is answered in turn with relevant verses from the Bible.¹⁵ During the ceremony in general, the Bible is extensively cited. The ceremony was certainly touching for those present,¹⁶ but there is little if any discussion of the ultimate purpose of the war, and when there is, it is vague.¹⁷

A martyr is defined in the *New Oxford American Dictionary* as “a person who is killed because of their religious or other beliefs.” Which begs the question: If John Slocum was a martyr, what was he a martyr *for*? One possible answer would be the emancipation of the slaves. However, there is not a single mention of slavery, emancipation, or, for that matter, any acknowledgment that African-Americans even exist. This was most likely deliberate.¹⁸ Even if it was not, this is still a significant omission. By the end of the Civil War, many had come to see emancipation of the slaves as one of the chief aims of the Union Army. In 1886, the topic apparently does not even merit a single mention by a New England chapter of the G.A.R. The retreat from loftier views on racial equality in Northern states is a topic all its own. Suffice it to say for the purposes of this paper that such a retreat—what Stuart McConnell calls “a studied indifference toward issues of race”¹⁹ — is well-documented²⁰ and can be traced, in part, to the aforementioned culture of conciliation in the North.²¹

In the *Memorial*, then, emancipation has no place in Slocum’s legacy. But in constructing the “martyr-brave” image of Slocum, patriotism and love of the Union alone are not the whole story. This is where the ideas of manliness and virtue come into play. The *Memorial* makes references to Colonel Slocum’s “manly beauty”, “strength of manhood”, “manly virtues”, and “manly qualities”.²² In addition, we find references to virtue at several points,²³ and the concept of virtue features prominently in Professor Alonzo Williams’s oration following the dedication. Manliness and virtue are two sides of the same coin. The word “virtue” is derived from the Latin *virtus*, which in turn is derived from the word *vir*: man. Thus the word “virtue” is essentially the Latin equivalent of “manliness.”

Which brings us to a passage near the end of Alonzo Williams’s oration. Speaking as to the purpose of memorializing Slocum, he says:

It is not the man alone that we honor to-night, but the principle which he embodied. We worship the *vir* no less, but the *virtus* incarnate in him more. Our highest eulogy is not for the mortal, for the immortal rather.

The virtue we adore in him is self-sacrifice. That is the supremest lesson of the hour, as it is the supremest lesson of life...[I]n that heroic loyalty and sublime self-devotion which led him to die that we might live, does man rise to the supreme act of heroic living; and the heart of the world beats ever in grateful admiration for valor proved on the field of danger in defense of a righteous cause.²⁴

Here we see that the political element of Slocum’s self-sacrifice, in this context, is less important than the fact that he was willing to sacrifice himself at all. His self-sacrifice—in other words, his martyrdom—for the sake of the “righteous cause” of preserving the Union is what makes Slocum, the *vir*, worthy of “worship.” Nevertheless, Williams makes it clear that the truer object of their worship is Slocum’s *virtus* itself. What Slocum did in actuality matters less than what he comes to represent.

Colonel Slocum is, effectively, turned into *virtus* incarnate. This is in keeping with a Classical theme that appears throughout Williams’s remarks.²⁵ In particular, when he says that for Rhode Island’s schoolchildren, “Learning Slocum’s story [is] more important than learning about Achilles, Hector, Horatii, Arthur”, he places Colonel Slocum firmly in the pantheon of the greatest warriors of Western tradition.²⁶ He is not so much saying that Slocum has outdone any of these mythical figures in combat—indeed, if in his six weeks of command Slocum had managed to do so, it would be quite the impressive feat—but rather that, in Rhode Island mythology Slocum plays the same role as, for example, Achilles would have played in Ancient Greece. Slocum’s legacy, then, is painted in broad, classicized strokes. Does this necessarily mean, however, that this was done deliberately out of respect for Confederate veterans? This would be difficult to conclude were it not for the glaring omission of the attempted desecration of Slocum’s remains from his story in the *Memorial*.

Following the First Battle of Bull Run, Colonel Slocum’s body was buried near the battlefield along with other Rhode Islanders who had died in the battle, most notably Major Sullivan Ballou and Captain Levi Tower. In March of 1862, after Confederate troops had withdrawn from the area, Governor William Sprague led a group of soldiers (some of whom had been witnesses to the burial of Colonel Slocum) to Virginia

to retrieve the remains of the three officers and bring them back to Rhode Island. Upon arriving at the area where they were remembered to be buried, however, they were told by a young black girl that if they were looking for “Kunnel Slogun”, they were too late. Soldiers from the Twenty-First Georgia Regiment had dug up his body for trophies, burned the corpse by the nearby creek, and put out the fire shortly thereafter due to the vile stench it gave off. The girl led the men to the remains.²⁷

Upon reaching the banks of the river, the men were horrified to discover a headless, half-burned body—in keeping with what the girl had told them. However, upon finding two shirts in a nearby tree that had apparently come from the corpse, Governor Sprague and one Private Richardson—who had tended to Major Ballou shortly before his death—recognized them as having belonged to Ballou, not Slocum. Apparently, because Ballou had been buried in a coffin while Slocum had been buried in a plain pine box, the Georgian soldiers assumed that Ballou must have been of higher rank, and that he was the colonel whom had inflicted such casualties on their brothers in the Eighth Georgia Regiment.²⁸ Upon digging up the grave next to the empty one formerly occupied by poor Major Ballou, the Rhode Island soldiers found the body of Colonel Slocum, recognizable by “his distinctive red, bushy mustache” and “surprisingly intact”.²⁹ The next day, Captain Levi Tower’s body, alongside seven others, was found buried facedown—a sign of disrespect.³⁰ The remains of Slocum, Ballou, and Tower were brought back to Providence on March 30, 1862, stopping along the way in New York City where they lay in state at Astor House, a luxury hotel.³¹

At the time, this was huge news in the northern states. The story of Ballou’s mutilation, the disrespect shown to Captain Tower’s remains, and every step of their journey from Virginia back to Providence was covered extensively by the northern press, and was even the subject of Congressional testimony by Governor Sprague on “Atrocities at Bull Run, VA”.³² The men who wrote the *Memorial* would have been well aware of all of this—in fact, we know they were because they allude to it at least twice over the course of the book. At least one of the authors was present at the discovery of the three officers. Olney Arnold writes:

It was also the privilege of the compiler, as a member of the Governor’s staff, to take charge and direction of a detachment of troops for the recovery of the bodies of the officers of the Rhode Island regiments who were left on the field in that memorable fight. We succeeded in finding the bodies of Slocum, Ballou, and Tower...³³

And, in his post-dedication speech, Alonzo Williams references how “the Eighth Georgia never forgot, and never forgave...the utter destruction of its organization that day!”³⁴

On the one hand, it is possible—likely, even—that Rhode Islanders would have been so familiar with the story of the “Atrocities at Bull Run” that it did not even merit an explicit mention. It would have been understood by all those who read the *Memorial* and listened to Williams’s speech what they were referring to. This alone may explain why the specific events themselves are never mentioned. However, there are at least two reasons to believe that what was motivating the writers of the *Memorial* not to mention them was, in part, an attempt at reconciliation with the South. The first is, as we have already established, the lack of any mention of emancipation or slavery—the mention of which would surely have been a sore point with many Southerners. The second is that, as the *Memorial* itself tells us, it was not only written for Rhode Islanders in 1886. The conclusion reads:

And this memorial volume...it is trusted may find its niche in the annals of our state and our nation, to awaken in the bosoms of Freedom’s sons for generations to come a sacred sense of gratitude to our country’s defenders...³⁵

If they do not mention the desecration of Ballou’s body in the *Memorial*, it means that, for whatever reason, they did not find it to be an event particularly worth preserving in historical memory. It is difficult to square this with the near-glee with which Northern newspapers reported on it in 1862, only 24 years prior. One important consideration is that newspapers in nineteenth-century America were often sensationalist, and concerned with selling as many copies as possible. The story of the “Atrocities at Bull Run” was, simply put, compelling copy that would catch a prospective reader’s eye. The writers of the *Memorial*—a quasi-religious text—did not have the same business considerations.

While it is important to take the differences between the press and the *Memorial* into consideration, it is equally important that we consider the shifting emotional narrative of how Northerners viewed Southerners. In 1862, when the Union was actively at war with the Confederacy, it made sense to dehumanize Southerners. An infantry regiment from Georgia digging up the body of a respected citizen-soldier-poet³⁶, burning said body, and stealing its head, fits the narrative of Confederates being somehow sub-human. Whereas in 1886, when the Union had been restored and Reconstruction was ostensibly over,

it made little sense to dehumanize a large section of the populace. Bringing up an incident in the Civil War which cast Southerners in a despicable light would have been seen as unnecessary, and perhaps unbecoming of gentlemen.

The *Memorial* is, in a very real way, a hagiographical text. Its authors take great pains to emphasize Slocum's martyrdom, and make conscious choices about what aspects of his history to include and to omit. The goal of the book and the monument at Swan Point is to cement Slocum's legacy as a Rhode Island hero of the Civil War. Perhaps just as importantly, though, is that he be a hero who is palatable on a national scale. Williams, after he says that Slocum should be considered by Rhode Island's schoolchildren alongside the greatest warriors of Western tradition, expresses his wish that "they should be made to think on this hero...even as we did on those of the Revolution..."³⁷ He draws an equivalency between pride in the heroes of the American Revolution—the *sine qua non* of American patriotism—and pride in the heroes of the Civil War. Portraying these heroes in such a way that North and South alike can take pride in them, however, requires a tricky balancing act—it requires, essentially, that Slocum be a martyr without a named executioner, and that what he himself called "the enemies of my beloved country"³⁸ go mostly unnamed.

The Northern "culture of conciliation" would be benign enough if it did come at the cost of an increasing ambivalence when it came to issues of race. The *Memorial* speaks volumes of how Northerners in 1886 had come to view the Civil War. It is almost as if they had returned to President Lincoln's purpose for the war as stated in a letter to Horace Greeley in 1862:

My paramount object in this struggle is to save the Union, and is not either to save or to destroy slavery. If I could save the Union without freeing any slave I would do it, and if I could save it by freeing all the slaves I would do it; and if I could save it by freeing some and leaving others alone I would also do that.³⁹

The takeaway from the *Memorial* is that Colonel Slocum died valiantly for the sake of preserving the Union. Precisely whom he was fighting is rarely mentioned,⁴⁰ and the topic of emancipation is never broached. The reality seems to be that the struggle for racial equality ceased to be a central part of the Civil War narrative when it was no longer politically expedient. What we find instead in the *Memorial* is a sanitized, mythological version of the war and of Colonel Slocum. Like the accompanying monument in Swan Point Cemetery, it is meticulously

crafted with a specific image in mind.

It is important to note that, more often than not, public commemorations like the *Memorial* are the result of political compromise.⁴¹ The span of 15 years from the initial proposal for a public monument in 1871 to its dedication in 1886 testifies to the amount of planning and fundraising that went into its completion. It is likely that most members of the Slocum Post had their own very strong opinions about how best to memorialize their fallen colonel,⁴² and all of these opinions had to be accommodated in the final design of the monument and in the *Memorial*. Nevertheless, the book still represents a mainstream conception of the Civil War at the time of its publication. Perhaps more importantly, it represents how one group of Union veterans viewed the conflict, and the light in which they viewed their fallen heroes.

The *Memorial* can best be looked at as a delayed act of grieving. The book itself speaks of "the momentary revulsion in the country" after the war as a reason for the delay in dedicating Slocum's funerary monument,⁴³ and this too might account for the text's conciliatory tone. The *Memorial* is published and the monument dedicated at a time when, after the last troops have left Southern soil, America is finally ready to start putting the pieces of the broken nation back together in earnest. There was "a desire, or need, for a national solidity firmer than military triumph could ensure."⁴⁴ Shying away from issues of racial equality becomes no less unforgivable, but perhaps more understandable, if we consider that, at that point in time, it was simply easier for the veterans of the Slocum Post to do so. Rather than try to puzzle out the complexities of the Civil War's purpose, stated and unstated (a process that clearly has continued up to the present day), they chose to communicate Slocum's legacy in the universal language of martyrdom and manly virtue.

What seems to be indisputable is that the veterans of the Slocum Post had genuinely fond memories of Colonel Slocum, and thought extremely highly of him. Alonzo Williams says of Slocum's character and its effect on the Second Rhode Island Regiment:

...I cannot but think that the steadiness they displayed that day was due, in a large measure, to the character of their commander. He had over them a peculiar power. In the natural world there is a force too subtle for analysis or explanation...There are men who possess this mysterious, transmuting power. Colonel Slocum was such a man.⁴⁵

There is no reason to believe that Williams was not speaking honestly—the time, effort, and money required to pay for a monument and the publication of the *Memorial* are themselves a testament to the love the Slocum Post, and the state of Rhode Island, felt for Colonel Slocum.

Near the close of his remarks, Williams recites a catalogue of some of the men the Second Rhode Island Regiment lost in the war. “O, that they all, with their gallant leader, might ‘absent themselves from bliss awhile,’ and rise up in our midst to-night, and graciously accept from us these humble offices of commemoration!”⁴⁶ We see, then, that the monument and the *Memorial* were dedicated not only to Colonel Slocum and the *virtus* he embodied, but also to all of the men who embodied that *virtus*, men who were irrevocably lost in the Civil War. That is a loss that could be felt across state and community lines— as much in Georgia as in Rhode Island.

END NOTES

1. Thomas J. Brown, *The Public Art of Civil War Commemoration: A Brief History with Documents* (Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2004), 7, 10.
2. Brown, *The Public Art of Civil War Commemoration*, 9, 10.
3. Stuart McConnell, *Glorious Contentment: The Grand Army of the Republic, 1865-1900* (Chapel Hill: UNC Press, 1997), 15.
4. *Memorial of John Stanton Slocum, First Colonel of the Second Rhode Island Volunteers, Who Fell In the Battle of Bull Run, Va.* (Providence: J.A. and R.A. Reid Printers, 1886), 19-20.
5. Ibid.
6. *Memorial*, 21-2.
7. Ibid. 22-3.
8. Ibid. 10, 87, 89.
9. Ibid. 19, 36.
10. Ibid. 84.
11. Ibid. 27.
12. Ibid. 26.
13. Ibid. 47.
14. See McConnell, *Glorious Contentment*, 93.
15. *Memorial*, 43-44.
16. Cf. “Not a few eyes were anew suffused with tears...” *Memorial*, 50.
17. E.g. “I dedicate in memory of those who...fought for the authority of the Constitution and fell in defense of the flag.” *Memorial*, 48.
18. See Ted Nesi, “No peace for RI or Ballou’s head on Civil War’s 150th”, *WPRI.com*, 22 March 2011. Nesi describes Slocum as “a well-known abolitionist.” If true, this surely would have been part of his motivation in fighting so eagerly for the Union cause and worth at least a passing mention in the *Memorial*. However, Nesi gives no citation for this claim and, while there is no reason to believe it is necessarily false, it also cannot be assumed that it wasn’t simply an unverified piece of historical color he added to his blog post.
19. McConnell, *Glorious Contentment*, 109.
20. The fact that, by 1896, the concept of “separate but equal” had become enshrined in U.S. law, speaks volumes about race relations in the Gilded Age.
21. For an overview of the topic, see Brown, 7-10.
22. *Memorial*, 18, 23, 24.
23. Ibid. 18, 86.
24. Ibid. 75.
25. Additionally, in his “Tribute” which appears earlier in the *Memorial*, he says of Slocum, “Thy body rests upon it shield.” This is presumably a reference to the Spartan tradition that a soldier should return from battle “With his shield or upon it”, the implication being that it is better to die valiantly than survive through cowardice.
26. *Memorial*, 77.
27. Evan C. Jones, “Sullivan Ballou: The Macabre Fate of an American Civil War Major,” in *America’s Civil War* EDITOR (November 2004).
28. Ibid.
29. Ibid.
30. Ibid.
31. Sheila Lennon, “A sad day for Rhode Island—when, where why?” *Providence Journal* (Providence, RI) Apr. 12, 2013.
32. Ibid.
33. *Memorial* 24-5.
34. Ibid. 67. This seems to be an apparent misunderstanding on Williams’s part—while the Eighth Georgia did suffer heavy casualties at the hands of the Second Rhode Island, it was, in fact, the Twenty-First Georgia who desecrated the remains of Sullivan Ballou.
35. Ibid. 92.
36. See “Sullivan Ballou to Sarah Ballou, July 14, 1861,” in *The Civil War: An*

Illustrated History, ed. Geoffrey C. Ward et al. (New York: Vintage, 1990), 82-3.

37. *Memorial*, 77-8.

38. *Ibid.* 71.

39. "Abraham Lincoln to Horace Greeley, August 22, 1862," in *The Emancipation Proclamation: A Brief History with Documents* ed. Michael Vorenberg (Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2010).

40. See, for example, *Memorial*, 67 when Williams mentions specifically "Georgia, Alabama, and South Carolina" as well as the Eighth Georgia Regiment.

41. See Brown, *The Public Art of Civil War Commemoration*, 6: "But memorials are not merely permanent images of temporarily dominant viewpoints; they are sites of negotiation among different ideological positions, both within the sponsoring group and outside of it."

42. Alonzo Williams, in particular, seemed to take a particularly impassioned tone. He is the only author to specifically mention the Confederates, perhaps pointing to a less forgiving view on his part.

43. *Memorial*, 12.

44. Brown, *The Public Art of Civil War Commemoration*, 9.

45. *Ibid.* 69.

46. *Ibid.* 74-5.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Abraham Lincoln to Horace Greeley, August 22, 1862." In *The Emancipation Proclamation: A Brief History with Documents*, ed. Michael Vorenberg (Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2010).

Brown, Thomas J. *The Public Art of Civil War Commemoration: A Brief History with Documents* (Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2004).

Jones, Evan C., "Sullivan Ballou: The Macabre Fate of an American Civil War Major." In *America's Civil War*, Evan C. Jones (November 2004).

Lennon, Sheila. "A sad day for Rhode Island—when, where why?" *Providence Journal* (Providence, RI), Apr. 12, 2013.

McConnell, Stuart. *Glorious Contentment: The Grand Army of the Republic, 1865-1900* (Chapel Hill: UNC Press, 1997).

Memorial of John Stanton Slocum, First Colonel of the Second Rhode Island Volunteers, Who Fell In the Battle of Bull Run, Va. (Providence: J.A. and R.A. Reid Printers, 1886)

Sullivan Ballou to Sarah Ballou, July 14, 1861, in *The Civil War: An Illustrated History*, ed. Geoffrey C. Ward et al. (New York: Vintage, 1990).

The Rise and Ideology of the Generation of the Centenary

by William Janover

The conclusion of Nicolas Shumway's *The Invention of Argentina* leaves the reader with a cliffhanger. The book's focus on the formation of Argentina — physically and ideologically — in the nineteenth century almost leaves up to the imagination what will come next. In this essay, I will respond to the reader's anticipation by constructing a narrative of the intellectual tradition that succeeded liberals like Domingo Faustino Sarmiento, Juan Bautista Alberdi, Bartolomé Mitre, and, later, Julio A. Roca. In the first decade of the twentieth century, a group of young writers of similar backgrounds began to provide the most coherent and most successful response to a liberal paradigm that had controlled Argentina's politics and culture for fifty years. This group, often referred to as the Generation of the Centenary for their rise to prominence around the same time that the country was celebrating the hundredth anniversary of the May Revolution of 1810, would have an outsize influence on Argentina in years to come. Its members, most importantly Manuel Gálvez, Ricardo Rojas, and Leopoldo Lugones, would become giants of Argentine literature. They injected a new virulence to earlier forms of nationalism that had long been relegated to the fringes of the country's politics. In doing so, they became central to a three-decade period that would leave Argentina unrecognizable.

This essay is divided into two equally important phases. The first will discuss the origins of the Generation of the Centenary. After examining the existing historiography on this question, I will point to a short-lived magazine called *Ideas*, which one of their own, Manuel Gálvez founded in 1903. Many members of the Generation of the Centenary first worked together at this magazine at a very young age. Though a few historians have mentioned *Ideas* in their analyses of the origins of the nationalist movement in Argentina, none has conducted a sufficiently comprehensive investigation into the magazine's content and the extent to which it provided the earliest such proving ground for the ideology of the Generation of the Centenary. The second portion

of this essay will unpack the exact nature of this nationalist ideology, particularly during the first decades of the twentieth century. In analyzing this group's ideology, I will show how, even while often responding negatively to the society that men like Sarmiento helped construct, they sometimes adopted and built on these older writers' ideas. The terms of debate that the Generation of 1837 set had not yet become irrelevant.

In addition to looking at the magazine at which they first worked together, the first section of this essay also examines larger trends in Argentine history. *Ideas* may have been the vessel through which the Generation of the Centenary first articulated their ideology, but Manuel Gálvez published the magazine in a particular context within Argentina that one cannot ignore when thinking about the movement's roots. Indeed, as the beginning of this essay hints at, the turn of the century was a time of great flux in Argentina, and even more so in Buenos Aires. The astounding rates of growth that had begun under President Julio A. Roca in the 1880s continued — with a brief exception in the global economic crisis of the early 1890s — through the rest of the nineteenth century. On the back of a powerful economy focused on the export of refrigerated meat and grain, Argentina seemed poised to join the elite club of world leaders. Foreign investment from the British Empire had helped spawn a small but growing domestic industrial sector. At the very least, Argentina had established itself as the most developed nation in South America. Some contemporary writers even have compared Argentina's economic state at the turn of the twentieth century to that of China in recent years.¹ A flow of European immigrants that only the United States could match supported this breakneck pace of growth. At the start of World War I, Argentina's GDP per capita was greater than those of France, Italy, and Germany.² In every respect, it seemed that the vision of Domingo Faustino Sarmiento and the rest of the Generation of 1837 had proven to be a success. The liberals had pushed Argentina into the modern era by adopting the policies they had been proposing since the early 1840s.

Behind this façade of prosperity and unity, however, lay cracks in an ideological regime that never fully consolidated its power. The liberal elites of turn-of-twentieth-century Argentina — the heirs to Echeverría, Sarmiento, Alberdi, and Mitre — had established what was essentially a one-party government. The National Autonomous Party (PAN) controlled Argentine politics in large part due to the limited nature of suffrage in the country. The PAN, however, could only maintain its hegemony so long as it delivered consistent economic results. After the panics of

the 1890s, movements for broader suffrage gained popularity. A new political party, the Radical Civic Union (UCR), emerged as a powerful opponent to the PAN. Its leaders, Leandro N. Alem and in particular his nephew, Hipólito Yrigoyen, supported universal male suffrage and secret, mandatory voting to ensure broad and free participation in the democratic process. The UCR led unsuccessful rebellions against the existing government in 1890, 1893, and 1905. Yrigoyen finally was able to secure these rights for all male Argentines with the passage of the 1912 Sáenz Peña Law. Popular democracy and the politics of the masses had come to Argentina. There was no transition period or gradual implementation of suffrage. The country would have to grapple with the consequences of mass democracy immediately.³ As immigrants continued to stream ashore in Buenos Aires and domestic industry developed, the structure of the Argentine economy and society began to change in ways that no one could have foreseen.

It was into this tense intellectual and political climate that a new generation of intellectuals was born. A group of men who came of age as Argentina was celebrating the hundredth of the May Revolution in 1910 finally tore down the liberal order that had dominated the country's politics for almost fifty years. This Generation of the Centenary, led in particular by Ricardo Rojas and Manuel Gálvez, rebelled against the cosmopolitanism and Europhilia of the prior Generation of 1837. In doing so, they drastically reconfigured the terms of Argentine national identity. *Argentinidad* — a term that Rojas himself coined — took on a far more nationalistic flavor: a true Argentine worked the cattle ranches of the interior and was deeply faithful to the Catholic Church.⁴ He spoke Spanish and embraced his creole heritage. This reconfiguration of what it meant to be Argentine put these new nationalists in conflict with an inconvenient reality of their country's demographics in the early twentieth century. Argentina was welcoming immigrants to its shores at unprecedented rates, and among these immigrants were thousands of Jews who were particularly problematic in the eyes of the Generation of the Centenary. The size and influence of Buenos Aires was growing, not shrinking. At some points, over half of the city's population was foreign-born.⁵ The country was becoming more, not less diverse.

The principal members of the Generation of the Centenary, Gálvez, Rojas, and Leopoldo Lugones, along with their contemporaries Ricardo Olivera, Emilio Becher, and Alberto Gerchunoff, shared some important biographical traits. Unlike many leading intellectuals of the generations that preceded them, several of them hailed from outside

the province of Buenos Aires. Rojas was born to a powerful family from San Miguel de Tucumán in 1882. His father, Absalón, was governor of the state at the time of his birth. Rojas spent much of his childhood in Tucumán and the neighboring northern state of Santiago del Estero. Gálvez was born just two months before Rojas in Entre Ríos. He was part of a wealthy creole family that could trace its ancestry back to some of Argentina's most powerful original leaders. Lugones was born in 1874 in Villa María del Río Seco, a small town in the Córdoba Province. All three came from politically connected (if not always economic) privilege, but in their earliest years, they identified with different strains of the political left in Argentina. Rojas and Gálvez were socialists; Lugones was an anarchist.⁶ Over time, however, as the Generation of the Centenary's ideology matured and made the leap from a mere cultural program to a broader political movement, each moved further to the political right.

These new nationalists' attitudes toward *argentinidad*, however, did not appear in a vacuum. These writers often took their cues from their counterparts outside of Argentina. In his article "The Intellectual Precursors of Conservative Nationalism in Argentina, 1900-1927," David Rock identifies two thinkers in particular who provided the ideological foundations for the Generation of the Centenary. One, Ernest Renan, was French, the other, José Enrique Rodó, was Uruguayan.⁷ Rock repeats this claim in his contribution to Sandra McGee Deutsch's *The Argentine Right: Its History and Intellectual Origins, 1910 to the Present*, and Michael Goebel concurs in his book *Argentina's Partisan Past: Nationalism and the Politics of History*.⁸ It is interesting that Rock has identified these two men as the intellectual ancestors of Ricardo Rojas and Manuel Gálvez, as each contributed a key component of Argentine nationalism. From Rodó and the Nicaraguan poet Rubén Darío, they received some of the first rumblings of modern anti-imperialism and anti-materialism in Latin America. In *Ariel*, Rodó writes of a "Hispanic-America" that shares little in common with the United States. That country received its "utilitarian" legacy from the British, while the nations of Central and South America — including, of course, Argentina — were intrinsically less materialistic. This legacy, however, was now in danger. In the wake of Spain's embarrassing defeat at the hands of the United States in 1898, Rodó feared the possibility of an impending "de-latinized America" if its peoples were to imitate the industrial north.⁹ The message of *Ariel* resonated with the Generation of the Centenary in part because its author addressed the book "to the youth of America."¹⁰

From Renan, the nationalists received a second target for

their rage: the Jews. Indeed, it was Renan who first popularized the supposed ethnic difference between Jews (Semites) and Christian Europeans (Aryans).¹¹ In one of his most famous works, *General History and Comparative Systems of Semitic Languages*, Renan claims "the Semite hardly knows any duties except to himself... to ask that he keep his word, that he carry out disinterested justice, is to ask of him the impossible."¹² Later in the same book, he says Jews — to him, the "Semitic race" — "is recognizable almost uniquely by negative characteristics. It has no mythology, no epic, no science, no philosophy, no fiction, no plastic arts, no civic life."¹³ The racialized anti-Semitism of Renan's work would become central to the rise of fascism in the early twentieth century, and it is easy to see the links between his writing and Nazi propaganda during the 1930s. Though writers like Rojas and Gálvez often took a more restrained approach to their quarrels with Jewish — and Christian and Muslim — immigrants to Argentina, they invoked many of the same tropes in doing so. As members of the Generation of the Centenary radicalized in the 1920s and 1930s, their anti-Semitism increased significantly, and they gained more adherents to their ideology. Indeed, the Argentine government began to restrict Jewish immigration in the 1930s.¹⁴

When Rock references Renan as one of the ideological predecessors of Argentine nationalists like Rojas and Gálvez, however, he is not referring to the Frenchman's anti-Semitic works like *General History and Comparative Systems of Semitic Languages*. Instead, Rock identifies the play *Caliban, After the Conquest*, an alternate history of William Shakespeare's *The Tempest*, as Renan's most important work for the formation of the Generation of the Centenary.¹⁵ In *Caliban*, Renan crafted a dichotomy similar to the one Rodó constructed in *Ariel*, which is based on the former's work. Caliban, the self-educated slave, overthrows Prospero and takes control of the island they both occupy. The island's new ruler, however, is unable to govern effectively, and he quickly loses power again. Renan's reinterpretation of *The Tempest* is meant to show the author's disdain for the common people of his native France. He published *Caliban* in 1878, just seven years after the failed Paris Commune. Some critics have identified a link between the Communards' frustrated attempt to establish a socialist utopia in the French capital and Renan's contempt for Caliban, the avatar of the proletariat.¹⁶ No matter the allegory, Rock's main use for *Caliban* in his article is to prove Renan's contempt for liberal democracy. Indeed, both Renan and the Generation of the Centenary identified with a certain

illiberal — even proto-fascist — thread of nationalist thought. But perhaps Rock also should have evaluated the link between Renan's anti-Semitic tendencies and the tragedies that would befall Argentina's Jews in the first decades of the twentieth century.

Other authors have identified different sources as the early nationalists' inspirations. In his book *Transatlantic Fascism: Ideology, Violence, and the Sacred in Argentina and Italy, 1919-1945*, Federico Finchelstein identifies a different European source of right-wing nationalism on the Rio de la Plata. Owing in part to what Benito Mussolini would call "arterial links" between the two countries, the Fascist ideology in Italy could easily transport itself across the Atlantic.¹⁷ Indeed, these "arterial links" reflected a demographic reality in Argentina. By the 1920s, Italians were the largest immigrant group in Buenos Aires.¹⁸ The massive size of the Italian community in the Argentine capital is what in part inspired the famous Jorge Luis Borges quotation, "The Argentines are Italians that speak Spanish, educated by the English, who want to be French."¹⁹ Finchelstein's organizes his book around this metaphorical blood relationship between Argentina and Italy, jumping from overviews of complex intellectual histories of fascism to accounts of political back-channeling in the span of a few pages. This international orientation, however, means *Transatlantic Fascism* identifies the Argentine nationalism more as an import than as a domestic ideology. When the book does discuss the earlier writers that are the subject of this thesis, it classifies them as "still liberal cultural nationalists."²⁰ It explains the focus on *argentinidad* in these writers' works as a response to overwhelming amounts of Italian immigration, ignoring how threatening the Generation of the Centenary viewed other immigrant groups, especially Jews.²¹ Though they may not have begun their careers as such, it is clear that by the 1920s, writers like Rojas and Lugones were at best skeptical of the virtues of liberal democracy.

Finchelstein's is not the only alternative interpretation of the intellectual roots of nationalism in Argentina. In "Imagining 'El Ser Argentino': Cultural Nationalism and Romantic Concepts of Nationhood in Early Twentieth-Century Argentina," Jean H. Delaney instead claims German romantics of the 1800s provided the basis for the writings of Rojas and Gálvez.²² Indeed, Delaney's article shows that the conceptions of citizenship that the Generation of the Centenary constructed do share some common traits with that of romantics like Johann Gottlieb Fichte. To writers like Fichte, the "volk" are people who share "particular mental and emotional traits, and are bound together by language, religion,

and common descent. This understanding of nationality also entails a particular view of historical development that celebrates national uniqueness."²³ Gálvez and Rojas often utilize nostalgic language to appeal to a now lost, genuine sort of *argentinidad* found on the plains of the interior rather than the one found in cosmopolitan Buenos Aires. Particularly in the earliest years of their careers, Delaney's classification of the members of the Generation of the Centenary as romantics makes a lot of sense, even if there is more evidence for their having been aficionados of Darío and Renan than of Fichte.

Indeed, praising "national uniqueness" was one of the main motivations for the Generation of the Centenary's formation. In 1903, seven years before Argentina marked its hundredth birthday, Manuel Gálvez founded a monthly literary magazine called *Ideas*. This short-lived periodical — it was discontinued after just 24 issues in 1905 — not only brought together these young writers for the first time, but it also laid out an early form of the Generation of the Centenary's particular nationalist ideology. Though another literary magazine *Mercury of America*, founded in 1900, attempted to fill a role similar to the one *Ideas* did three years later, its writers did not include many of the key members of the Generation of the Centenary, including Gálvez, Rojas, Ricardo Olivera, and Emilio Becher.²⁴ Only *Ideas* provided the social linkages that were key to the rise of this movement. In the magazine's pages, these writers and others sought to forge a new Argentine culture. In the past, the country's cultural institutions had been more concerned with imitating fashionable foreign arts movements, marginalizing truly national art. For Argentina to become a world power, so the founders of *Ideas* suggested, it would have to create cultural products that were uniquely its own. This cultural nationalism permeated the pages of *Ideas*. Members of the Generation of the Centenary, however, did not content themselves by engaging with only cultural questions. Before long, they injected their nationalist ideology into Argentina's political sphere. The importance of *Ideas* as a proving ground for this group, then, cannot be understated. The magazine helped spawn a movement that forever reshaped Argentine politics and culture.

Despite its centrality to the formation of the Generation of the Centenary, however, *Ideas* has not received significant attention from those historians who otherwise have devoted time to this group. In "The Intellectual Precursors of Conservative Nationalism in Argentina, 1900-1927," David Rock devotes about a page of his article to the magazine. In it, Rock calls the "*Ideas* group... the first organ of traditionalism and

anti-positivism in Argentina."²⁵ His analysis of *Ideas*, however, relies more on Manuel Gálvez's autobiography *The Friends and Teachers of My Youth* than on any close reading of the magazine's issues. Two Argentine authors, Veronica Delgado and Mariana Bendahan, have written on *Ideas*, but the former does so as part of a larger dissertation on similar magazines and their influence on the country's literature, and the latter discusses *Ideas* in only a short journal article. In *The Early Nationalism of Manuel Gálvez and Ricardo Rojas*, Carlos Payá and Eduardo Cárdenas identify not the founding of *Ideas* but the publication of *La Restauración Nacionalista* and *El Diario de Gabriel Quiroga* by Rojas and Gálvez respectively as the first real record of nationalism in Argentina.²⁶ They do so even while clearly acknowledging the magazine's role in bringing the Generation of the Centenary together in the first place. Perhaps this lack of emphasis on the centrality of *Ideas* to the origins and ideology of the group has to do with the format of Payá's and Cárdenas's book: it often reads more like a biography of the two authors than a historical analysis of nationalism more generally. A biography of course would put a greater emphasis on a person's greatest works instead of his or her earliest works.

Ideas' purpose is clear from its inaugural issue. In a fiery editorial that opened the magazine, Ricardo Olivera delivered the Generation of the Centenary's opening salvo. The May 1903 issue begins with his article, titled "Sincerities." One can already see the outlines of the group's nationalism in it, though for now Olivera is more concerned with the quality of Argentina's intellectuals than its ethnic character: "There are many deceptions coming from our small intellectual circles. The newspapers generally are complacent in this excess; true criticism has very few representatives, and in the general public there exists an atavistic intellectual laziness that makes them accept without examination others' opinions."²⁷ *Ideas*, then, would take on a dual charge. On the one hand, its pages would attempt to provide "true criticism" of the literary, dramatic, and visual arts of the time in Argentina. On the other, it would attempt to engender in its readership a greater understanding of what a truly Argentine culture could look like. That culture would not just be a cheap knockoff of the latest trends from London or Paris. It would be original, and it would be American.²⁸ To the writers of *Ideas*, the challenge before them was monumental. It represented a veritable crisis: "National necessity screams its urgency, directing the strength of the youth at the prior generations and polarizing all its energies toward the creation of an ideal for the

Argentine people. The small group that has founded these pages does not want to delay its contribution to this grand work. Its initiative is a call to action.²⁹ Even at the time of its publication in 1903, it seems the members of what would become the Generation of the Centenary already understood the place it wanted to occupy in Argentina's cultural discourse.

The pilot issue of *Ideas* continued to lay out its agenda in its later sections. In its review of the month's painting and sculpture work in Buenos Aires, Martín A. Malharro asks, "Is the existence of a national art possible, in terms of painting and sculpture?"³⁰ He answers his own question in the next sentence: "It is undeniable that art can and ought to be national, concrete, to speak the language of the country and partaking of its emotions, to be a reflection of this. If we consider that the conception of feeling and action is not the same in our land as in Europe... we will find that a universal feeling of beauty does not exist."³¹ If there is no universal standard, then the best a nation can do is create art attuned to the values and priorities of its own people. Importing works of minor European artists to exhibit in Argentina — a common practice at the time — was a less desirable option than promoting the work of those who had always lived in the country: "In order to support a national painting movement, it is necessary to almost forget what we may have learned in the European schools. Face to face with the nature of our country, let us search for its mysteries, exploring, looking for the sign, the appropriate path to its interpretation."³² Malharro's article mentions the phrase "*pintura nacional*" — literally, national painting — multiple times. It is a common concept throughout the issues of *Ideas*, and it implies a dual task in the construction of a truly Argentine fine arts movement. National painting means celebrating and patronizing both painting of Argentina and painting by Argentines. And Malharro's pride in his country permeates his writing: "We have the shores of the Uruguay and the Gualeguay, the sierras of Córdoba, the wheat regions of Santa Fe and countryside of Tierra del Fuego; the forests of Chaco and the papas of Buenos Aires, all of them offering great beauty, intense poetry, all of them waiting for the artist with an *American soul*."³³ It is easy to understand why David Rock classifies these writers as "cultural nationalists;" their first forays into public life concerned the state of the Buenos Aires art scene far more than the ethnic makeup of the city.³⁴

In the opening issue's "Theater" section, Manuel Gálvez echoes Malharro's nationalist rhetoric. As he was the editor-in-chief of *Ideas*, one can treat Gálvez's first contribution to the magazine as a sort of

mission statement for the publication as well. In it, the 21 year-old author writes of the importance of creating a national theatrical tradition just as Malharro desired a national painting and sculpture tradition. Before beginning his reviews of recently-premiered plays in Buenos Aires, Gálvez lays out a brief, yet poignant manifesto on what he sees as *Ideas'* charge: "We will not make an agenda. We only promise to tell the truth."³⁵ By appealing to a universal understanding of truth instead of merely any political program as the rudder to his magazine's ship, Gálvez couches his forthcoming analysis — and, by extension, anything else that comes from his magazine — in the positivist language of old. Thus, when his first survey of the Buenos Aires theater scene opens with a scathing rebuke, his opinion becomes more than mere polemic; it elevates itself to the status of rational truth. Only with this appeal to truth could Gálvez succeed in delivering his harsh criticisms of Argentine theater: "If we were to make a computation of the works premiered there, we could see that the majority of them are translations and arrangements. It is easily understood that this is neither beneficial for national art, let alone a stimulation for the authors. For the moment it is much easier and profitable to translate a play from French or Italian than it is to write an original work."³⁶ Translation, in Gálvez's opinion, was a debilitating disease for Argentine theater. It was the easy way out for producers and directors in Buenos Aires. In the February 1904 issue of *Ideas*, he is able to list several translated plays that have premiered in the previous fifteen days. The translation "fever" would have to break before any national theater project could be born.³⁷

In this way, the cultural project of *Ideas* is very similar across art forms: there must be an intrinsically Argentine theatrical identity in the same way that there must be an intrinsically Argentine literary identity. The stages and publishing houses of Buenos Aires must ooze with *argentinidad*. This utopia could never exist without the support and praise of homegrown literary talents. Indeed, in the following issue, the writer David Peña writes a hypothetical dialogue that delivered the same indictment of the state of theater there titled "Promoting the National Theater."³⁸ Perhaps the writers that made up the staff of *Ideas* were so successful in influencing the general public because, from the magazine's first issue, Manuel Gálvez weaved the positivist language of old into his new nationalist message. Though their understanding of *argentinidad* was in many ways a departure from that of the Generation of 1837, the language they used was not so different and was therefore easy for readers to digest. The Generation of the Centenary framed their

ideology in a similar manner to earlier, more liberal thinkers.

Though the format of *Ideas* was not identical from issue to issue, Gálvez generally divided the magazine into familiar sections. Issues often opened with a sample of a literary work, perhaps a preview of a forthcoming novel, or a translated portion of a European work, or an original piece exclusive to the magazine. After that came a series of reviews of the various sectors of the arts world in Argentina: poetry, painting and sculpture, music, letters, and theater. The letters section often focused on Argentine or Hispanic-American developments from the past month, but some issues also included reviews of French or Spanish literature. This balance reflects *Ideas'* cultural priorities: though it did not discount the value of French or Spanish writing, its goal was to promote and critique an Argentine, or at the very least American, literary tradition.

It should be of no surprise, then, that one the Generation of the Centenary's leading figures, Ricardo Rojas, spent his time contributing to the section of the magazine devoted to literary criticism. When he was just 21 years old, he wrote his first entry in *Ideas* on the state of modernism in Latin America.³⁹ From his very first contributions to the magazine, Rojas was already articulating key aspects of his nationalist ideology. He was unafraid to critique leading lights of European literature, including José de Echegaray, the winner of the Nobel Prize in 1904. When reviewing Pompeyo Gener's *Things from Spain*, Rojas offers praise for the author's application of racial theories to the stagnation of that country in recent centuries. The claim that "the strong and noble races are those who populate the north of the peninsula... while those of the center and south, Semitic and pre-Semitic, are those who have brought ruin to the entire nation" of Spain was not in any way racist to Rojas.⁴⁰ Instead, Gener's book is "tough and brave. There are things [in it] that not everyone can say in Spain."⁴¹ In Rojas's eyes, *Things from Spain* simply delivers hard truths for its readers about why the once-powerful country had struggled, suffering defeat even at the hands of the United States in 1898. These sorts of claims, of course, are nothing new to Argentina. Alberdi and Sarmiento made normative observations about European groups decades before Rojas was writing for *Ideas*. In the hands of the Generation of the Centenary, however, these claims eventually would become national policy. The freedoms that the Constitution of 1853 promised to all would not last forever.

In the following issue of *Ideas*, Rojas expanded on his earlier

claims about racial difference while reviewing a story by Alfonso Danvila, a Spanish writer and diplomat. At one point, Rojas pauses his review, instead remarking on the state of Latin America's development in the past century: "The spirit of America, not content with having declared political independence, breaking the links that bound us to mother Spain, has also achieved... mental independence, while the migratory flood is completing the differentiation of the [American] race."⁴²

Constructing a national literary tradition would require preserving the "mental independence" that Rojas believes now existed between South America and Spain. This process was moving even more quickly in Argentina because of the astonishing number of immigrants it was receiving. For Rojas, this process had gone too far. Later in his review of Danvila's work, he delivers his interpretation of a century's intellectual history in Argentina:

The nineteenth century started for us with the reign of the French encyclopedia, and we have in its aftermath attended to a flowering of French literature as well. In this way, instead of completing that rebellion [against the Spanish Empire], with our own intellectual sovereignty, we have fallen into another servitude whose inconveniences and disadvantages I do not want to clarify here.⁴³

In Rojas's mind, the May Revolution and the Congress of Tucumán did nothing for Argentina but trade one sort of subjugation for another. The Francophilia of earlier groups of intellectuals like the Generation of 1837 had smothered the flame of a truly Argentine identity and intellectual tradition. At the same time, thanks to the policies of the late nineteenth century, Argentina was becoming something never before seen: a country that was neither wholly American nor wholly European. Understanding the nature of this new identity, then, would become the Generation of the Centenary's most important charge.

Though he departed from Sarmiento and Alberdi in his embrace of Argentina's former colonial overlords, Rojas did offer some nuance in his support for Spain. His love for that country was far from unconditional. Instead, he believed that Spain must engage in "the denial of its past, without renouncing the worship of its legitimate glories."⁴⁴ For Rojas this "denial" had one peculiar requirement. For Spain to become prosperous again, it would have to rid itself of the disproportionate influence of the Catholic Church. The root of Spain's decline in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries lay in the strength of the Church there: it "has had dire consequences for the

national character. Catholicism gave the people everything, [including] something of its exclusiveness and immobility."⁴⁵ It had even infiltrated art in Spain and its colonies. It was time for art in Spain — and in Argentina — to develop separate from the Catholic Church. Rojas's laicism does not seem so different from the anti-clericalism of earlier intellectuals like Sarmiento and Roca. Indeed, when the latter was president, he passed Law 1420, which removed the Church from the sphere of public education.⁴⁶ Neither Rojas nor Roca was interested in having religion play a major role in the formation of the nation, be it in the arts or education. This opposition to the Catholic Church would in fact put Rojas in conflict with other members of the Generation of the Centenary, most notably Gálvez and Emilio Becher.

Ricardo Rojas was not alone in articulating this new nationalist vision for Argentine literature. Other notable members of the Generation of the Centenary contributed to *Ideas'* ideology through the literary criticism articles that occupied each issue's final pages. In a review of Ángel de Estrada's "The Voice of the Nile," from the November 1903 issue of the magazine, the Jewish writer Alberto Gerchunoff comments on the state of Argentine literature and identifies two important figures for this thesis as leading lights of writing in the Americas: Leopoldo Lugones and Rubén Darío.⁴⁷ Gerchunoff's praise of these two men is quite common in *Ideas*. It is clear that Gálvez worked hard to use the criticism sections of the magazine to help build an intellectual movement. Members of the Generation of the Centenary constantly reviewed each other's work — with universal praise — in these pages. In the following issue of *Ideas*, Emilio Becher praises Rojas, who had just published a book of poems titled *The Victory of Man*, as "perhaps one of the three or four young men of his generation who will come to make a work... against the hate and contempt of the barbarians."⁴⁸ In the same review, Becher, like Gerchunoff the month before, cites Lugones and Darío as inspirations to the Generation of the Centenary.⁴⁹ The letters section of *Ideas* was in this way the key site for perhaps the magazine's most important contribution to Argentine history: it helped Gálvez and his comrades build an intellectual community that was united in its opposition to the existing liberal order. Part of what sets the Generation of the Centenary apart from earlier nationalist groups is the degree to which they were able to actually alter the ideology of Argentina's citizens. This success certainly had a lot to do with structural factors in the country's politics and culture, including increasing rates of immigration, global instability, the increasing threat of communism, and newfound economic

prosperity, but the Generation of the Centenary did not simply ride a wave of radical changes to a position of national acclaim. Their rise was an intentional one, and they made a concerted effort to promote each other's work and ideology.

Though *Ideas* was dedicated first and foremost to cultural commentary, it did occasionally make a foray into political questions. In its June 1903 issue, Juan Ángel Martínez published a brief article on the financial policies of then-president Julio A. Roca.⁵⁰ Even at this early date, one can divine a nationalist bent to the articles that *Ideas* publishes: "The false notion of the power of production, relative to what work produces in the Republic, as well as the misconception that our politicians have held and still hold, with respect to the political condition of the Argentine provinces, has resulted in one large and permanent anarchy in the legislation on taxes, public spending, and the use of credit."⁵¹ Martínez's indictment of Roca's economic policies represent a bridge of sorts between the Generation of the Centenary's cultural and political agendas. Though the group did not often engage with purely political questions at first, it is clear that these writers are beginning to tackle such issues more easily as they mature. In a later issue of *Ideas* from March 1905, Martín Malharro tackles the problem of educating the masses about Argentine art. Understanding of art used to be a "luxury, an exclusive privilege of aristocrats," but it was essential to the construction of "a complete life."⁵² Teachers in Argentina's schools would be responsible for teaching the "elevation of the senses" and "love for nature and life" as much as they would be tasked with training students in reading and writing.⁵³ In this way, Malharro, an accomplished post-impressionist painter himself, is advocating for preparing the youth of Argentina to understand the national art movement that *Ideas* was dedicated to constructing in the first place. It should be of no surprise, then, that education would be one of the first avenues through which members of the Generation of the Centenary would get involved in politics.

Martínez's staunch defense of the interests of the provinces of the interior in the June 1903 issue of *Ideas* reflects a larger wariness among the Generation of the Centenary of the notion that Buenos Aires was the social and political center of the nation. Many of the group's most famous works denounced the capital as cosmopolitan, dirty, impoverished, and immoral. It was crawling with whores, immigrants, and criminals. Indeed, this negative impression of the city is present

from Olivera's opening editorial on the nature of the magazine he had just helped found. He calls his homeland's capital "the synthetic expression of the Republic" that "has never had that loving predilection for spiritual things that is exquisitely exemplary of superior civilizations. To call it Athens has always been more sarcasm than praise."⁵⁴ In other instances, the city itself seems to become a single living, breathing prostitute. In the 1919 novel *Nacha Regules*, Manuel Gálvez chronicles the journey of Fernando Monsalvat, a young lawyer, who attempts to rescue the titular call girl from her life of sin. As the book's plot develops, Nacha becomes an allegory for the entire Argentine capital. During the supposedly utopian celebration of the country's centenary — a deliberate choice of setting from Gálvez — Fernando descends deeper and deeper into the underbelly of the city to save his missing sister from the "vast market of human flesh" that is Buenos Aires.⁵⁵ In this way, *Nacha Regules* articulates a key aspect of the Generation of the Centenary's ideology. Suspicion and even contempt for Buenos Aires abound in their writings. Given men like Gálvez and Rojas's upbringing in provinces far from the capital, a healthy guardedness of the relatively large and prosperous city would be understandable.

The significance of this attitude, however, transcends any biographical information about members of the Generation of the Centenary. Earlier leaders like Sarmiento and Mitre had placed Buenos Aires in the center of their plans for Argentina's development. As Governor of Buenos Aires, Mitre had battled the Argentine Confederation to preserve the capital's privileged position. In *Agirópolis*, Sarmiento's work detailing his utopian vision for a capital of the "United States of the Rio de la Plata" on Martín García Island off the country's coast.⁵⁶ The city Sarmiento described was never built, but his vision of a cosmopolitan city steeped in the culture and philosophy of Europe came true in Buenos Aires. The Generation of the Centenary aimed to repudiate this dream. Sometimes they did so rather directly: in 1908, Rojas published *Cosmópolis*, a nationalist rebuttal to Sarmiento's earlier work. The supposedly hard-working European immigrants were, in Rojas's eyes, merely "indigent multitudes."⁵⁷ He rejects the cosmopolitanism of Buenos Aires, claiming it is a cause of the city's moral ills: "Heterogeneous peoples, upstart peoples without spiritual unity, are peoples without perpetuity or a destination."⁵⁸ The quantitative improvements to the quality of life for Argentines that the Generation of 1837 had helped win had come at the cost of some intrinsic moral decay. For the nationalists of early twentieth century

Argentina, Buenos Aires was the perfect symbol of this decline. To them, the city meant something far different than it did for their predecessors.

In rejecting the allure of Buenos Aires, the writers of *Ideas* often did the same of Paris. For decades, the City of Light had been the cultural capital of the world for Argentines.⁵⁹ Though Argentina had been a Spanish colony, the latest fashions, political treatises, and works of fiction came from London and Paris more often than they came from Madrid. The pro-Hispanic ideology of the Generation of the Centenary, however, came with at the very least a skepticism of — and occasional denunciation — of the French capital. This guardedness began in the magazine's very first article: Ricardo Olivera's "Sincerities." In it, he explicitly compares Paris and Buenos Aires, and not in the most flattering way. He accuses his country's capital of attempting to be a poor imitation of the French one: intellectual life in Buenos Aires had few other purposes other than the "pretension... of repeating the case of Paris: to be for this America of the *caudillos* and riots what that one is for Europe and the rest of the world: a City-Light that absorbs all continental thought in order to radiate civilization."⁶⁰ For Olivera, Paris is a poor model for Argentina to follow, because Latin America has a totally different soul from Europe. It is the land of *caudillos* and should be proud of it. Continental France has a very different history, and attempting to emulate it would be a mistake.

Olivera also complained that artists, including Argentina's best painters, musicians, and sculptors, "leave [for Paris] and do not always return."⁶¹ *Ideas'* December 1904 issue included a similar account of the experience of young Latin American writers in Paris. The article describes the city as if it were the Buenos Aires of Gálvez's *Nacha Regules*. It "seduces;" it "leads one astray."⁶² There was a certain "frivolity" oozing from it, "distracting strong spirits" from Argentina.⁶³ A city that had been the model for liberals like Sarmiento was anything but in the minds of *Ideas'* writers. Rojas, too, criticized Paris's fame in the magazine. He could not stand the trend of Latin America's best men of letters moving to the city for an extended period of time. Their motivation, according to him, was clear: publishing "a European edition" or "a collaboration in foreign magazines" was lucrative business.⁶⁴ After such a trip, an Argentine author could return from Europe with some extra prestige, and his books would sell more.⁶⁵ Rojas, however, believed these writers had a duty to spend their time in their home country, constructing its literary tradition: "To pursue... European glory, seems like an illusion to me."⁶⁶ Any national literature would have

to come from within Argentina's borders or it would not be authentic.

The final issue of *Ideas*, from April 1905, closes with a printed version of a speech that Ricardo Rojas gave to a group of students in his home province of Santiago del Estero. The speech, titled "The Country of the Forests," represents an impressive encapsulation of the cultural nationalism that the Generation of the Centenary had articulated in the past two years of work at the magazine. In it, Rojas jumps from moments of nostalgia for his youth in the interior — a youth that could not exist anymore — to fiery praise for Santiago del Estero, which to him was the truest, "most characteristic region of the Republic."⁶⁷ This province was the most authentic area of Argentina because it blended indigenous and foreign, American and European, civilized and barbaric in the most effective manner:

You already see that time has not run in vain for the people or for me, and as the hours pass toward their unknown destination, let us toast: for the fruitful race of the Quechuas that left these traditions here in their language; for the first Spaniards who arrived here, opening with their heroism and their swords new paths between the virgin bushes; for those who went from here with the liberating legions to mark with corpses the borders of the nascent Republic; for the *montoneras* and *caudillos* who planted here the red banner of autonomy, while the vision and gallop of their armed centaurs crossing the shadows of the plain; for all those who from time immemorial have contributed to the civilizing of our land.⁶⁸

No other entry from *Ideas* so perfectly captures the combination of romantic wistfulness and righteous anger that typified the works of Rojas and his compatriots. At first glance, "The Country of the Forests" is nothing more than a romantic ode to his province and, by extension the interior regions that share its heritage. A closer reading, however, betrays its nationalistic bent. The symbols that he singles out for praise as the most authentic aspects of Argentine identity are representations of life in the interior. Some are quite obvious: the *caudillos* established power bases outside of Buenos Aires, relying on the agricultural economy for their wealth and local soldiers for their security. Other, however, are more obscure: the "armed centaurs" that Rojas mentions — perhaps a reference to Sarmiento's description of them in his memoirs — are the *gauchos*.⁶⁹ The same group that Sarmiento had vilified as barbaric brutes becomes a civilizing force in this speech. The objects of Rojas's admiration share, with the exception of the Quechuas, another common trait: they are unquestionably creole. Rojas expresses his affinity for Spain in other issues of *Ideas*, and here he links the

country to the most important symbols of *argentinidad*. The Generation of the Centenary had thrown its lot in with the interior, against much of the contemporary establishment. An older, more liberal member of the *porteño* intelligentsia probably would have recognized the attack Rojas delivers against Buenos Aires in this speech.

It would be a mistake, however, to argue that “The Country of the Forests” represents a complete rejection of the ideology of the Generation of 1837. Even while delivering his implicit indictment of Buenos Aires and the cosmopolitan leanings of the political establishment, Rojas uses the terms of debate that Sarmiento set decades before. The different groups that he toasts at the end of his speech — the *caudillos*, the conquistadors, and the *gauchos* — share a common goal: the “civilizing” of Argentina.⁷⁰ Though the Generation of the Centenary will dedicate much of their work to rehabilitating some of these figures that Sarmiento and Echeverría had denigrated so thoroughly in works like *Facundo* and “El Matadero,” such as the *caudillo* and the *gaucho*, the terms on which they do this work are very similar to the ones the Generation of 1837 first established. In addition, Rojas makes clear in his speech that he does not have a love for everything American about his homeland. Though he toasts the Quechua for having left behind some of their tribe’s traditions and myths, he does so at a time in which they have become nearly invisible. Since Julio A. Roca completed the Conquest of the Desert in the 1870s, there had been very few indigenous peoples in Santiago del Estero and its neighboring provinces.⁷¹ Sarmiento himself had great contempt for indigenous peoples, whom he believed to be “savages, incapable of progress.”⁷² In this way, their ideology lives on even after the rise of conservative nationalism in the twentieth century.

Nor is Rojas’s speech in Santiago del Estero an anomaly in this respect. Members of the Generation of the Centenary often used the language of their predecessors to respond to and build on the existing liberal school of thought. In his plea for expanded arts education in schools in *Ideas*, Martín A. Malharro argues that such a change is necessary because knowledge of painting, sculpture, and theater is proof of a citizenry’s “high grade of progress, of fortunate societies that have arrived at the total development of its strengths in agricultural, livestock, industry, and commerce.”⁷³ For a member of a group that, according to historians like David Rock, was noteworthy in their rejection of positivism, Malharro chooses similar words to describe his ideal society as Auguste Comte would use. Though no individual is perfectly

representative of a group’s ideology, the influence of the Generation of 1837 on how Malharro, Gálvez, and other writers for *Ideas* approach improving Argentina remains clear. Indeed, when concluding his article on increasing investments in arts education, Malharro points out that doing so will, above all, create “rational and civilized” citizens.⁷⁴ In using these two specific words, the post-impressionist painter appeals to the twin gods of Argentine liberalism: Comte and Sarmiento.

Fernando Devoto’s book *Nacionalismo, Fascismo, y Tradicionalismo en la Argentina Moderna: Una Historia* includes even more examples of this harmony between the two generations of intellectuals. Lugones’s *El Payador*, describes the *gaucho* with the same language that Bartolomé Mitre had used half a century before its publication in 1916.⁷⁵ In his 1908 work *The Jesuit Empire*, Lugones argues that the order had corrupted the Viceroyalty of the Rio de la Plata, just as Mitre had in *Belgrano*.⁷⁶ He also admired Sarmiento for his focus on education as the path to modernization.⁷⁷ According to Devoto, Manuel Gálvez thought of himself as an ideological successor to Sarmiento and Alberdi: their ideologies were part of the same “federal” historical lineage.⁷⁸ Indeed, to make a clear delineation between the works of the Generation of the Centenary and the Generation of 1837 makes little sense. The younger group constantly played off of and built on the work of the older one. Studying Gálvez, Rojas, and Lugones without an understanding of Mitre, Sarmiento, and Alberdi, is therefore impossible.

The writers of *Ideas* had an acute sense of their own place in history. As early as Ricardo Olivera’s opening editorial, it is clear that Gálvez and his comrades wanted to build a new literary and artistic movement. The Generation of the Centenary was born from this publication in an intentional manner. This new movement, however, did not represent a complete break from Argentina’s existing intellectual history. Instead, *Ideas* — and many literary works that would come after it from this group — sought to build on the ideology of earlier thinkers, most importantly members of the Generation of 1837 like Alberdi. They did so in many different ways, including incorporating the language of positivism and the duality of civilization and barbarity into their writing and even directly praising the heroes of old. In one article from *Ideas*, Ricardo Rojas’s brother Julio delivers a paean to Sarmiento rare in its steadfast praise: “Great and luminous soul of Sarmiento, I salute you triumphantly!”⁷⁹ To this less famous Rojas brother, Sarmiento’s greatest work, *Facundo*, has had all but “exclusive [influence] in the task of the

political organization of the country."⁸⁰ Nor was Rojas faulting Sarmiento for this outsize influence. Instead, he believes the former president's liberal project was necessary "to ensure democracy" in Argentina.⁸¹ Perhaps, then, Sarmiento's only crime in the eyes of the Generation of the Centenary was the extent to which his project was successful. Perhaps their first responsibility was to correct the excess of Argentina's older leaders.

After *Ideas* went out of print, the leaders of the Generation of the Centenary only grew in their prominence. Indeed, many stepped further into the public sphere, becoming more explicitly involved in the turbulent politics of the day. Given these writers' interest in raising the cultural consciousness of their fellow citizens, it should come as no surprise that many of the group's most prominent members made their first foray into politics through education. Gálvez became Chief Inspector of Secondary Education in 1906 when he was still only 28 years old.⁸² From this position, he would be able to influence how Argentina's young understood what it meant to be citizens of their country better than he ever could as Editor-in-Chief of *Ideas*. Rojas was also able to leave his mark on national education debates, but he did so largely from outside the sprawling federal bureaucracy.⁸³ Instead, he published a book titled *La Restauración Nacionalista* in 1909, hoping that his grievances would reach sympathetic members of the Argentine government and intellectual elite. He never could have anticipated the book's success. *La Restauración Nacionalista*, along with Gálvez's *Diary of Gabriel Quiroga*, became one of the seminal works of the Generation of the Centenary.⁸⁴ Though the book is ostensibly about the state of Argentina's public education system, Rojas takes the opportunity to expound upon many aspects of the ideology he had begun to articulate in *Ideas*. Four years after that magazine's final printing, however, he was not satisfied to keep himself out of major political debates.

Immigrants in particular bore the brunt of Rojas's attacks in *La Restauración Nacionalista*. Though he acknowledges that inviting some Europeans to Argentina's shores was essential to the consolidation of the country, further infiltration of the masses was going to do more harm than good. Nowhere was this clearer than in Buenos Aires: "Wealth and immigration have taken its ancient village homogeneity, but not to carry us to the organic heterogeneity that is the true job of social progress, rather, to return us to the original chaos" of the years after independence.⁸⁵ Perhaps Alberdi's famous phrase "to govern is to populate" no longer was true. Instead, the newly rich and populous

Buenos Aires "excessive influence over the rest of the country, in such a way that fourteen provinces live to its rhythm."⁸⁶ As in Gálvez's *Nacha Regules*, and in "The Country of the Forests," Buenos Aires is a decadent, bloated city that is entirely unrepresentative of the rest of Argentina. The solution to this "cosmopolitan corruption," however, was not to expel immigrants or even limit their entry, necessarily.⁸⁷ Instead, education represented the best avenue through which the state could imbue these people with the necessary *argentinidad* to no longer represent a threat to the nation. For Rojas, it was of the utmost importance to turn the schoolhouse into a nationalist space.

Doing so would require a complete curricular reform, and *La Restauración Nacionalista* spares no detail in this respect. In one chapter of the book, Rojas lays out an entire history curriculum for multiple years of school, including which major historical figures to emphasize (almost all of whom were Spanish kings).⁸⁸ Since, in his opinion, "the ends of teaching history is patriotism," it should not be surprising that the majority of his hypothetical curriculum centered on the Iberian Peninsula instead of the United States or Germany.⁸⁹ In this way, Rojas was just as concerned with constructing a uniquely Argentine person as he had been with constructing an Argentine arts movement while writing for *Ideas*. By refocusing the country's history curriculum on its Spanish origins, students would spend their time learning about the nation's true roots. Studying the history of the United States or the British Empire — the idols of Sarmiento and Alberdi — had turned Argentina into a cosmopolitan, amoral mass with no sense of a national soul. Immigrants in particular needed to be subsumed into a broader national identity. If forcing adults to undergo this process was an unrealistic proposition, at least their children could possibly do so. This was the underlying goal of Rojas's *La Restauración Nacionalista*: to incorporate an entire generation of children into Argentine society.

Part of the reason that immigrants felt the brunt of Rojas's policy proposals in *La Restauración Nacionalista* is that many newcomers to Argentina had established community schools to educate their own children. There were German schools, Italian schools, and Jewish schools in different neighborhoods of Buenos Aires. These schools, however, were unacceptable to Rojas. If allowed to persist, they would cripple his vision of a "communion of spirits in one language, one ideal, and one territory."⁹⁰ He attacked them with a particular virulence throughout the book. To him, a Jewish community school "creates the Jewish family whose patriarchal religion will prevent it from merging

with the families of the land and assimilating into our basically secular society." Rojas is able to cloak his particular suspicion of Jews in his hostility towards religion more generally. Though Haim Avni argues in his book *Argentina and the Jews* that he and other members of the Generation of the Centenary were xenophobic toward all immigrants and did not usually single out Jews for particularly poor treatment. Why, then, did Rojas make no similar special mention of Italian community schools? There were far more Italians in Buenos Aires in 1909 than there were Jews. Regardless of the possible anti-Semitic nature of parts of *La Restauración Nacionalista*, it is clear that Rojas's desire to transform immigrant children into "profoundly Argentine" individuals was placing him squarely at odds with the demographic trends in his own country.⁹²

The anti-materialist language typical to many articles in *Ideas* is also visible at multiple junctures in *La Restauración Nacionalista*. Rojas believed that the prosperity that had come to Buenos Aires in recent decades was in fact part of the problem with Argentine society. Wealth had led the country astray.⁹³ It had created a desert no different from the one that Alberdi had encountered over half a century before. This one, however, was philosophical, not physical. By focusing solely on economic concerns, the liberals had neglected to nurture the spirituality of their constituents. For Rojas, nothing better represented the "hard work of civilization" than the "constant accretion" of the spirit of the people.⁹⁴ Rojas followed *La Restauración Nacionalista* with *Blasón del Plata* and *La Argentinidad* in 1912 and 1916 respectively, continuing to build his vision for a new Argentina, united in a common culture, language, and spiritual identity. No work of his, however, garnered quite the same level of public praise as *La Restauración Nacionalista*. It, more than any other book, is a complete synthesis of Rojas's early ideology.

One also can learn a lot about Rojas's nationalist vision by visiting the home he constructed for himself in Buenos Aires. The house, which he helped design in 1929 with famous *porteño* architect Ángel Guido, is an extraordinary synthesis of "eurindian" architecture. After entering the arched doorway on Charcas street, visitors found themselves in a well-kept garden of a house that, at first glance, is reminiscent of an old colonial estate.⁹⁵ The imitation stucco walls are topped with a clay tile roof that looks like it should be in Rojas's home province of Santiago del Estero instead of a crowded street in Buenos Aires. The stonework that adorns most of the interior walls, however, represents a dramatic departure from a typical Spanish mission or fortress. Incan iconography, including representations of the Sun and

corn stalks, joins traditional Catholic images of saints and cherubs on the walls of Rojas's garden.⁹⁶ In this way, the house became a living testament to Rojas's vision of *argentinidad*: something clearly neither wholly European nor American, something unrecognizable in Buenos Aires yet somehow at home in the provinces, something authentic and original. As much as his work, his home was supposed to promote "the creation of an autochthonous American conscious for the valorization of all our historical predecessors, of all our geographical riches, and of all our spiritual possibilities."⁹⁷ It remains a testament to his nationalist dream to this day.

Rojas and Gálvez, however, did not always present a uniform ideology. As they matured, they began to diverge on their esteem of the Catholic Church and the importance of religion to *argentinidad*. In *El Diario de Gabriel Quiroga*, Gálvez's first major work of prose, he emphasizes the value of Catholicism even while Rojas and other members of the Generation of the Centenary remained skeptical of it: "Religion, like language, is one of the essential foundations of our nationality."⁹⁸ Christianity — specifically, Catholicism — was central to the nature of *argentinidad* for Gálvez. He used debates over religion to create a clear divide between himself and the Generation of 1837: "Someone has written that the salvation of Latin America is in Protestantism. [This] is a ridiculous and dangerous affirmation... Protestantism would mean for the Republic its complete denationalization."⁹⁹ The mysterious "someone" who wrote about the importance of Protestantism to Argentina's development was, of course, Juan Bautista Alberdi. Religious diversity was of no benefit to Gálvez. This emphasis on Catholicism not only put a divide between him and his friend Rojas, but it also made his writings especially hostile towards Jews as he grew older. In addition to the prestige of the Catholic Church, *El Diario de Gabriel Quiroga* flips many other priorities of the Generation of 1837 on their head. Juan Manuel de Rosas, the sworn enemy of Unitarians like Alberdi and Echeverría, instead became the one true "realizer of national unity who, supported by the peasant masses, busily defended [Argentina's] sovereignty."¹⁰⁰ He was an authentic manifestation of *argentinidad*. *El Diario de Gabriel Quiroga*, which Gálvez formats as the diary of a fictional man for whom he named it, is as clear a manifesto of the nationalist ideology as will emerge from the author.

From the beginning of the book, it is clear that Gálvez is using this fictional diary to set up a series of dualities that should now be

familiar: modern versus traditional, urban versus rural, American versus European, immoral versus immoral. At one point in Quiroga's travels through Argentina, he reflects on his country's recent history:

Until a few years ago, the country was poor. It lacked power and prestige; it had a sparse population; industry and commerce were just beginning to prosper; foreigners did not think about this corner of South America and we lived in continual revolutions and wars. But then, instead, there was a national spirit. Patriotism exalted our soldiers and our writers, ideals of homeland spread through all regions of the country; we were Argentines and not Europeans, and we had those great romantic spirits that felt the soul of the race and expressed it in our writings and deeds.¹⁰¹

Suddenly, the extraordinary transformations that Argentina had undergone in the four decades prior to the book's publication had become a tragedy. The "Europeanization" that the Generation of 1837 had dragged Argentina through had done nothing but split the country into European and American, littoral and interior, Buenos Aires and other provinces, when they should have been focused on uniting its people.¹⁰² The nostalgia that Jean Delaney identifies as reminiscent of nineteenth-century German romantics also represents one of the first attempts at revisionist history in Argentina.¹⁰³ The worldview of the Generation of the Centenary represents so radical a departure from that of Sarmiento, Alberdi, and Mitre that the totality of the country's experience over the past half century required reinterpretation. The *caudillo* Juan Manuel de Rosas was now a national hero. His formerly heroic detractors, the Unitarians, were cold, effeminate Francophiles. They were "artificial... aristocratic, and civilized."¹⁰⁴ His supporters, the Federalists, were "spontaneous, democratic, popular, and *bárbaro*."¹⁰⁵ I left this last word un-translated from Spanish here because it has a double definition. The word can mean barbaric, but, particularly in vernacular Spanish, it can also mean grand or fantastic. Here, Gálvez has flipped Sarmiento's duality, which had dominated Argentine culture since the publication of *Facundo*, on its head.

Even while fiercely attacking the consequences of the policies of the Generation of 1837, however, Gálvez still manages to praise their legacy. In *El Diario de Gabriel Quiroga*, he calls Sarmiento "the most Argentine of all men. No one understood the old national soul as deeply as he."¹⁰⁶ For him, as for many members of the Generation of the Centenary, one could attack the policies of one of Argentina's founding fathers without denigrating him as a national hero. He could personally embody admirable traits even if his beliefs had destroyed

the country's national character. Perhaps the title Gálvez chose for this book is no coincidence, then. Perhaps the fictional Gabriel Quiroga is a distant descendant of the *caudillo* Juan Facundo Quiroga about whom Sarmiento wrote his greatest work; perhaps Gálvez is writing a direct answer to Sarmiento, thus still playing within the terms of debate that he set decades before.

The ideology of the Generation of the Centenary is difficult to articulate in only a few pages. Perhaps it is so hard to boil down their beliefs to a pithy phrase or a list of policy points because there are so many important figures who make up the group. Ricardo Rojas, Manuel Gálvez, Alberto Gerchunoff, Martín A. Malharro, and the other members of the Generation of the Centenary each produced far too many works of art and literature to analyze in this thesis. Nevertheless, there are a few broad points of concurrence between these thinkers that are clear from the analysis of this essay. Most importantly, this group of nationalists believed that Argentina should preserve and celebrate what had made the country special. The recent breakneck pace of economic development in Argentina, and in Buenos Aires in particular, had come at the expense of something unique to their home country. Because of its peculiar ethnic makeup, Argentina had synthesized the greatest of American and European civilization. Waves of immigration from across the Atlantic, however, had put that harmony in jeopardy. To them, there was nothing in Argentina's American character to be ashamed of. The country's supposedly "barbaric" past was now a point of pride in many respects. The gaucho was now the perfect symbol of *argentinidad*. Though earlier writers like José Hernández, author of the epic poem *El Gaucho Martín Fierro*, had praised this mythic, extinct figure years before the emergence of the Generation of the Centenary, until this group rose to prominence, no thinkers had been able to redeem him. The success of the nationalist project of Gálvez, Rojas, and others sets them apart from their predecessors as much as any aspect of their ideology.

At the same time that members of the Generation of the Centenary began to have more influence on Argentine society, their nation was beginning to come apart around them. One incident in particular would foreshadow a far nastier stage in the development of Argentine nationalism. On November 14, 1909, a teenage Ukrainian-Argentine Jew named Simón Radowitzky threw a bomb at the feet of the chief of police of Buenos Aires, Ramón L. Falcón. On May Day of the same year, Falcón had presided over the execution of "Red

Week" — *La Semana Roja* — in which police killed five marchers and wounded dozens more who were protesting poor working conditions in the city's many new factories and port facilities. Falcón died in the explosion. Radowitzky, an anarchist, was arrested, and the Argentine government suppressed a rapidly growing labor movement in the country. The well-to-do in Buenos Aires knew that the assassin was Jewish, and their wariness of these new immigrants grew immediately. At Falcón's funeral, the head of a group affiliated with the ruling party called the Autonomous Youth lamented: "the nationality is in danger, and we of the native group must unite ourselves in a movement of common defense."¹⁰⁷ To this man, Argentina's thus far "improvised cosmopolitanism" had brought with it instability and a weakened national identity.¹⁰⁸ The head of the Autonomous Youth, the man who had drawn a dividing line between immigrants — Jews in particular — and native-born Argentines, was named Julio Rojas. Like other members of the Generation of the Centenary, the former occasional contributor to *Ideas* magazine had become aligned with ever more conservative elements of the ruling class as the first decade of the twentieth century wore on. Within the year, Julio's more famous brother, Ricardo, would publish *La Restauración Nacionalista*, a widely popular book that launched him into the political sphere. He had become part of the vanguard of a new generation of writers and politicians that would represent a dramatic departure from the openness and rationalism that typified the Generation of 1837. The nationalism that replaced this old order ran headlong into the reality of Argentina's rapidly diversifying population.

The nationalism of the Generation of the Centenary would also become more virulent in the next decades of the twentieth century. At the dead police chief's funeral, another young man praised Falcón as "a devoted supported of 'the dignity of the social order.'"¹⁰⁹ His eulogy won thunderous applause from those present. That man was named Manuel Carlés. He would later become president of *La Liga Patriótica*, a right-wing paramilitary group that would adopt the ideological tenets of Italian fascism and roam the streets, brutalizing their opposition. Falcón's death led to a crackdown on workers' movements on the left that culminated with the declaration of a state of siege in May 1910, in the middle of the celebration of Argentina's hundredth birthday. In the words of the historian Sandra McGee Deutsch, it was "an ironic setting for the centennial of the birth of liberty."¹¹⁰ Such illiberal, oppressive occurrences would become all too common in the years that followed. Argentina was coming apart at the seams.

END NOTES

1. "The Parable of Argentina," *The Economist*, 2/15/2014, <http://www.economist.com/news/leaders/21596515-there-are-lessons-many-governments-one-countrys-100-years-decline-parable>
2. Ibid.
3. Women, however, would not win suffrage until 1949 under Juan Perón.
4. Michael Goebel, *Argentina's Partisan Past: Nationalism and the Politics of History* (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2014), 36.
5. Raanan Rein and Jeffrey Lesser, *Rethinking Jewish Latin Americans* (Albuquerque, NM: University of New Mexico Press, 2008), 8-9.
6. Goebel, *Argentina's Partisan Past*, 37.
7. David Rock, "Intellectual Precursors of Conservative Nationalism in Argentina, 1900-1927," *The Hispanic American Historical Review* 67, no. 2 (May 1987), 273.
8. McGee Deutsch, "The Argentine Right and the Jews, 1919-1933", *Journal of Latin American Studies* no. 18 (1986), 6.
9. José Enrique Rodó, "Ariel" (Project Gutenberg, 1900), <http://www.gutenberg.org/files/22899/22899-h/22899-h.htm>
10. Carlos Altamirano and Beatriz Sarlo, "La Argentina Del Centenario: Campo Intelectual, Vida Literaria Y Temas Ideológicos," *Hispanamérica* 9, no. 25/26 (August 1980): 36.
11. William Brustein, *Roots of Hate: Anti-Semitism in Europe before the Holocaust* (Cambridge, UK ; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 118.
12. Ernest Renan, "Histoire Générale et Systèmes Comparés Des Langues Sémitiques" (The Internet Archive, 1855), <https://archive.org/details/histoiregnrale03renagoog>, 15.
13. Ibid., 16.
14. Fernando Devoto, *Historia de La Inmigración En La Argentina* (Buenos Aires, Argentina: Editorial Sudamericana, 2004, 392-393).
15. Rock, "The Intellectual Precursors of Conservative Nationalism," 273.
16. Roberto Fernández Retamar, "Para La Historia de Calibán," *Guaragua* 2, no. 4 (1997), 81.
17. Federico Finchelstein, *Transatlantic Fascism: Ideology, Violence, and the Sacred in Argentina and Italy, 1919-1945* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2010), 10.
18. Ricardo Feierstein, *Historia de Los Judíos Argentinos*, (Buenos Aires, Argentina: Galerna, 2006), 67.
19. Ibid., 366. In Spanish: "Los Argentinos son italianos que hablan español, educados por ingleses, que quieren ser franceses."
20. Finchelstein, *Transatlantic Fascism*, 145.
21. Ibid.
22. Jean Delaney, "Imagining 'El Ser Argentino': Cultural Nationalism and Romantic Concepts of Nationhood in Early Twentieth-Century Argentina," *Journal of Latin American Studies* 34, no. 3 (August 2002), 625-58.

23. Ibid., 629.
24. Leopoldo Lugones, however, did write for *Mercurio de América* for a time.
25. Rock, "Intellectual Precursors of Conservative Nationalism," 274.
26. Eduardo José Cárdenas and Carlos Manuel Payá, *El Primer Nacionalismo Argentino En Manuel Gálvez Y Ricardo Rojas* (Buenos Aires, Argentina: A. Peña Lillo, 1978), 13.
27. Ricardo Olivera, "Sinceridades," *Ideas*, May 1903, 9.
28. Of course, these writers understood "American" to mean of and pertaining to the entire Western Hemisphere, not the United States.
29. Olivera, "Sinceridades," 8-9.
30. Martín A. Malharro, "Pintura Y Escultura," *Ideas*, May 1903, 56.
31. Ibid., 56-57.
32. Ibid., 58.
33. Ibid., 59.
34. Rock, "Intellectual Precursors of Conservative Nationalism," 271.
35. Manuel Gálvez, "Teatro," *Ideas*, May 1903, 86.
36. Ibid., 89.
37. Manuel Gálvez, "Teatro," *Ideas*, February 1904, 191.
38. David Peña, "Fomento Del Teatro Nacional," *Ideas*, June 1903, 122.
39. Ricardo Rojas, "Letras Hispano-Americanas," *Ideas*, June 1903, 176.
40. Ricardo Rojas, "Letras Hispano-Americanas," *Ideas*, September 1903, 139.
41. Ibid., 141.
42. Ricardo Rojas, "Letras Hispano-Americanas," *Ideas*, October 1903, 205.
43. Ibid.
44. Ricardo Rojas, "Letras Españolas," *Ideas*, February 1904, 171.
45. Ibid., 173
46. Loris Zanatta and Roberto Di Stefano, *Historia de La Iglesia Argentina Desde La Conquista Hasta Fines Del Siglo XX*. (Buenos Aires, Argentina: Grijalbo-Mondadori, 2009), 346.
47. Alberto Gerchunoff, "Letras Argentinas," *Ideas*, November 1903, 301.
48. Emilio Becher, "Letras Argentinas," *Ideas*, December 1903, 384.
49. Ibid., 374.
50. Roca is most famous for having served as President of Argentina in the 1880s, but he won the office again in 1898 and served through 1904.
51. Juan Ángel Martínez, "Conferencia Sobre Finanzas," *Ideas*, June 1903, 117.
52. Martín A. Malharro, "La Estética En La Escuela," *Ideas*, March 1905, 316-317.
53. Ibid., 317.
54. Olivera, "Sinceridades," 3.
55. Manuel Gálvez, "Nacharegules" (The Internet Archive, 1919), <https://archive.org/details/nacharegulesnove00gl>, 43.
56. Brendan Lanctot, *Beyond Civilization and Barbarism: Culture and Politics in Postrevolutionary Argentina* (Lanham, Maryland: Bucknell University Press, 2014), 70.
57. Ricardo Rojas, *Cosmópolis* (Paris: Garnier Hermanos Libreros-Editores, 1908), 1.
58. Ibid., vii.
59. Even today, it is common to hear foreigners refer to Buenos Aires as the "Paris of Latin America."
60. Olivera, "Sinceridades," 3.
61. Ibid.
62. Alberto Tena, "La Juventud Hispano-Americana En Paris," *Ideas*, December 1904, 471.
63. Ibid., 470.
64. Ricardo Rojas, "Letras Hispano-Americanas," *Ideas*, August 1904, 410.
65. Rojas himself took such a trip in the mid-1900s.
66. Rojas, "Letras Hispano-Americanas," 411.
67. Ricardo Rojas, "El País de Las Selvas," *Ideas*, April 1905, 345.
68. Ibid., 346-347.
69. Ibid., 347.
70. Ibid.
71. David Rock, *Argentina, 1516-1987: From Spanish Colonization to Alfonsín*, (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1987), 154.
72. Lourdes Martinez-Echazabal, "Mestizaje and the Discourse of National/Cultural Identity in Latin America, 1845-1959," *Latin American Perspectives* 25, no. 3 (May 1998): 25
73. Malharro, "La Estética en la Escuela," 316.
74. Ibid., 318.
75. Fernando Devoto, *Nacionalismo, Fascismo Y Tradicionalismo En La Argentina Moderna: Una Historia* (Buenos Aires: Siglo Veintiuno de Argentina Editores, 2002), 104.
76. Ibid., 87.
77. Ibid., 90.
78. Ibid., 49.
79. Julio A. Rojas, "Sarmiento," *Ideas*, October 1903, 160.
80. Ibid., 161.
81. Ibid., 169.
82. Cárdenas and Payá, *El Primer Nacionalismo Argentino*, 85.
83. Though Rojas would later become rector of the University of Buenos Aires,

a public institution, in the first decade of the twentieth century Gálvez worked much more closely with the Argentine government.

84. Cárdenas and Payá, *El Primer Nacionalismo Argentino*, 13.
85. Ricardo Rojas, *La Restauración Nacionalista* (Buenos Aires: Ministerio de Justicia e Instrucción Pública, 1909), 89.
86. *Ibid.*, 88.
87. *Ibid.*, 71.
88. *Ibid.*, 62-63.
89. *Ibid.*, 43.
90. *Ibid.*, 169.
91. *Ibid.*, 127-128, from Avni, *Argentina and the Jews*, 88.
92. *Ibid.*, 141.
93. *Ibid.*, 88-89.
94. *Ibid.*, 63.
95. While conducting archival research at the Museo Casa de Ricardo Rojas, I also observed the site's architecture and took some photographs of the layout of the house.
96. Museo Casa de Ricardo Rojas, "Museo" (Ministerio de Cultura, 2015), <http://www.cultura.gob.ar/museos/museo-casa-de-ricardo-rojas/>.
97. Taken from a placard on the grounds of the Museo Casa de Ricardo Rojas, Buenos Aires, Argentina.
98. Manuel Gálvez, *El Diario de Gabriel Quiroga: Opiniones Sobre La Vida Argentina* (Buenos Aires: Taurus, 2001), 67.
99. *Ibid.*, 94-95.
100. Cárdenas and Payá, *El Primer Nacionalismo Argentino*, 108.
101. Gálvez, *El Diario de Gabriel Quiroga*, 85-86.
102. *Ibid.*, 137.
103. Goebel, *Argentina's Partisan Past*, 36.
104. Gálvez, *El Diario de Gabriel Quiroga*, 131.
105. *Ibid.*
106. *Ibid.*, 125.
107. McGee Deutsch, *Counterrevolution in Argentina, 1900-1932*, 35.
108. *Ibid.*, 35.
109. *Ibid.*
110. *Ibid.*

The Great Emancipator: Lincoln's Role in Revoking Grant's Order to Expel the Jews

by Zachary Ingber

Much has been written about Lincoln's role as Commander-in-Chief and various military decisions he made during the Civil War. In fact, much has been written not only about the tactical efficacy of his commands but also about the broader political and societal implications of those decisions. The Emancipation Proclamation is one such document that has been scrutinized in this way; while issued as a proclamation for war purposes, its political and societal effects cannot be overstated. It is in this vein that this paper will explore Lincoln's actions surrounding General Grant's General Order Number 11, a military order which infamously expelled all Jews from Grant's military district.¹

On December 17, 1862, General Ulysses S. Grant issued a General Order that required all Jews – all of whom were assumed to be involved in illegal smuggling aiding the Confederacy – present in his military district to leave within twenty-four hours of receiving the notice. The order states, "The Jews, as a class violating every regulation of trade established by the Treasury Department and also department orders, are hereby expelled from the department within twenty-four hours from the receipt of this order..."² The order was swift, resolute, and those who issued it understood it as well within their responsibility to conduct and win the war. And yet just three weeks later, President Lincoln demanded that the order be revoked, acting decisively to ensure that the General Order did not become law in Grant's district. Upon instructions from the Commander-in-Chief, General Henry Halleck ordered General Grant to revoke the order on January 4, 1863. Although he issued the order, Grant obeyed his superiors and went on to officially revoke the order a few days later on January 6, 1863.³

Neither the timeline of events nor the manner in which they unfolded is disputed. Though there are questions of strategy that arise whenever a political figure intervenes in the day-to-day conduct of war,

there is little disagreement over the fact that President Lincoln was well within his powers as Commander-in-Chief to revoke the order. But what is seldom discussed, and what this paper will attempt to answer, is *why* President Lincoln revoked General Order Number 11. What spoke to President Lincoln about this particular military order? Why, for a President known to move slowly and deliberately, did he take action in just a matter of weeks? There was no lack of political controversy surrounding Lincoln's decision to revoke the order. Fellow Republican Elihu B. Washburne expressed his dismay over Lincoln's actions, stating that the order was, "the wisest order yet made by a military command."⁴ Debates over Lincoln's actions and the merits of the order itself raged through Washington and Congress, with a proposal made (that eventually failed) to censure General Grant.⁵ And so for a President that took great care in not rocking the boat, the fact that he so quickly made a decision on something so controversial leaves historians in a quandary.

I will present two distinct but mutually reinforcing reasons that explain President Lincoln's actions. First, it seems clear that Lincoln saw this order as a violation of Jewish citizens' rights, and that Lincoln's personal morality and deep belief in equality warranted action. Second, I will argue that Lincoln's personal relationships with Jewish individuals provided him not only with a fondness and affinity for the Jewish people but also a familiarity that allowed him to counter the prevailing anti-Semitism that undergirded Grant's order. These two factors together provide a sound explanation as to why Lincoln acted with such expediency to revoke General Order 11.

It is imperative that I first explain the existing scholarship, its gaps and shortcomings, and the relevance of this research question. There has been a fair amount of research surrounding General Order Number 11, its formulation, and its effects on Jewish communities in America. Jonathan Sarna, possibly the premier authority on the history of Jews in America, has written extensively on Jews in the Civil War and General Grant's actions affecting Jews. But much of the debate surrounding General Order Number 11 has focused on Grant and the development and implementation of the order. The existing literature asks the question of why Grant issued this order. In his book *When General Grant Expelled the Jews*, Sarna argues that General Order Number 11 was not an aberration but merely a culmination of Grant's anti-Semitic tendencies and previously bigoted military orders.⁶ Grant had previously issued orders restricting Jewish travel and requiring Jews' bags to be searched.⁷ Yet Jacob Rader Marcus proposes a

radically different answer, suggesting that despite what appears to be an order embodying anti-Semitism, "Grant appears to be no Judeophobe." According to Marcus, Grant's Christian desire to alleviate suffering propelled him to issue such an order, and his later concern for persecuted Jews of the Russian empire proves his lack of ill-will towards the Jewish people.⁸ While this debate is a very interesting one, perhaps one that can elucidate some of the perceptions of Jews amongst the military and Union establishment, it does little to explain Lincoln's role in the revocation of General Order Number 11.

The biggest gap in the existing scholarship stems from a lack of material. There is very little primary source material explaining Lincoln's revocation of the order. In fact, Lincoln and his military aides in Washington knew nothing of the order until a group of Jews who came to Washington to petition the President for action brought it to their attention.⁹ The language in General Haskell's message informing Grant to repeal the order even expresses some confusion about the existence of the order. Haskell writes, "If such an order has been issued, it will be immediately revoked."¹⁰ At that point there was no guarantee that the order was in fact legitimate, and Haskell's words, "if such an order has been issued" reveal that there was at least uncertainty, and perhaps disbelief, that an order expelling Jews had been issued. There are no documents from Lincoln himself regarding General Order Number 11, neither reactions nor explanations of his decision to order its reversal. The only primary document available, which I will expand upon a little later, is what seems to be a short, last minute explanation attached to an unrelated memo from Halleck to Grant. The explanation is extremely minimal (and I imagine from Grant's perspective insufficient). Halleck suggests merely that while the President agrees with the sentiment of the order, he objects to the expulsion of an entire religious class, some of whom serve in the Union Army.¹¹ And while there is no explanation from the President himself, perhaps there is enough to connect the dots.

In order to best explain the arguments regarding Lincoln's reasoning for revoking General Order Number 11, it is imperative to understand a little bit about the order itself and the reasons for its existence. The circumstances of the order are fairly straightforward but important. In General Grant's military district, which sat in the Tennessee area on the border with the Confederacy, supplies were short and smuggling was a lucrative occupation in the war-torn economy. Corruption levels rose, and public officials in local government often perpetrated the worst acts of smuggling and war profiteering. And

while it is plausible that Jews participated in smuggling activities just as gentiles did, the suspicion directed towards the Jews of the region both assumed disproportionately high Jewish presence in smuggling rings and reflected common anti-Semitic stereotypes that Jews were inherently disloyal and unscrupulous.¹² The fact that there were Jews who were loyal to the Confederacy as well as Jews who were loyal to the Union further exacerbated the anti-Semitism in this border region; assumptions ran rampant in Union circles that Jews were secretly aiding the Confederacy any chance they had.

And so it was this set of conditions that led Grant to issue a series of orders aimed at curtailing smuggling that often resulted in the abrogation of rights for Jews. This culminated with General Order Number 11, which stated, "The Jews, as a class violating every regulation of trade established by the Treasury Department and also department orders, are hereby expelled from the department within twenty-four hours from the receipt of this order..."¹³ Fundamentally, the order referred to Jews as a *class*, a monolith that acted in cahoots to disrupt Union activities. Jews acting in coordination with each other as a fifth pillar to topple good government is a longstanding anti-Semitic canard, and this order enumerated that into law. Grant disregarded the fact that he had Jewish soldiers and officers under his command when he issued an order grouping all Jews together. In fact, Captain Philip Trounstine, one of the highest-ranking Jews under Grant's command, resigned in protest to the order; he cited not only the order itself but the rampant anti-Semitism in the Union army as grounds for his resignation.¹⁴ Regardless of Grant's motives and the presence (or not) of anti-Semitic sentiments within Grant, it is the characterization of Jews as a class that is operative in prompting a response from President Lincoln – both on the Constitutional and personal levels.

There is little question about Lincoln's reverence for the equality he believed underscored American government. And it is this belief in equality before the law that served as one chief reason why he acted so promptly to repeal General Order Number 11. Lincoln first heard of this order not from military channels but from livid Jewish Americans who contacted the White House (or the Executive Mansion, as it was then known) via letter and telegram. In fact, some prominent Jewish community leaders made the trek from the West to the White House in order to convey their dismay over what they believed to be an egregious violation of their rights. The framing of the order in language of Constitutional rights and equality resonated with Lincoln (most likely

with his moral compass as well as his political positions).

Cesar Kaskel, his brother Julius, and brothers Daniel, Marcus, and Alexander Wolff promptly sent the President a telegram upon hearing of their expulsion. The message explained the loyalty of the Jews to the country and the inappropriateness of collective punishment for the actions of a few. They wrote that they felt, "greatly insulted and outraged by this inhuman order; the carrying out of which would be the grossest violation of the Constitution and our rights as good citizens under it..."¹⁵ Framing this question as one of rights, equality, and due process surely struck a chord with Lincoln. While scholars debate the constitutionality of Lincoln's actions over the course of his presidency, there is no doubt that Lincoln himself had great reverence for the document and that he aspired to respect those rights protected by it. The telegram goes on to request immediate action from Lincoln, suggesting that if no action is taken then Jews will become "outlaws before the world." This seems particularly relevant both because Lincoln might have cared about the message he was sending to the world and because of the reason many Jews were in the United States to begin with. Jews came to America largely from places where they could not practice their religion freely and frequently faced violence for doing so. Thus if Lincoln did not protect the Jews from this order, there would be a clear indication to Jews (and perhaps other groups fleeing persecution) that America was not the meritocratic haven in which all are allowed to embark on the pursuit of happiness. This is not something Lincoln would have wanted to do; his personal life embodied the pursuit of happiness and the elevation from insignificance to power. And if Jews were expelled not unlike their native Europe, then America would not be the city upon a hill its leaders believed it to be.

The Kaskel telegram was not the only instance in which Jews explained General Order Number 11 in terms of rights. Jewish leader Adolphus Solomons, whose personal relationship with Lincoln I will expand upon later (though its existence is why his statements are particularly relevant, as they were likely expressed to Lincoln directly), explained to other Jewish leaders his commitment to protesting Grant's "ill-liberal and un-lawful" general order.¹⁶ While the legality of this order warranted debate, for it can be assumed that Grant would not issue an order without some sort of legal justification (strong or weak), it is almost certainly illiberal. President Lincoln would not want to be responsible for policies that were illiberal amidst a Presidency that rested upon grounds of a liberalization of sorts.

Similarly, a letter from the United Order B'nai Brith of Missouri, a prominent Jewish organization from the region affected by the order, sent Lincoln a letter that also objected to the general order on grounds of equality, legality, and due process. The letter first stresses the loyalty of Jews to the Union, something particularly relevant given the anti-Semitic conceptions that lay beneath the surface of the order. The letter even references Jews who had died for the cause of the Union and for the "suppression of this rebellion." But the letter was most effective when it read, "In the name of hundreds, who have been driven from their homes, deprived of their liberty and injured in their property without having violated any law or regulation."¹⁷ This claim is particularly strong and important for Lincoln; Lincoln's background as a lawyer must have caused him to take this claim particularly seriously. Explaining the Jews' loss of property as an "injury" is something a lawyer, such as Lincoln, would have appreciated. Lincoln's speeches and personal writings are abundant with legalistic language and musings on due process and property rights, indicating his propensity to think in that way. The letter goes on to appeal to Lincoln's sense of "religious liberty, of justice and humanity," a smart move when considering the fact that Lincoln was constantly touted for his moral fortitude and convictions.

The efficacy of these messages that framed General Order Number 11 in terms of rights, due process, and equality for loyal citizens are all reinforced by a personal encounter Rabbi Isaac Mayer Wise had with Lincoln surrounding Grant's order. After meeting with the President, Wise remarked that Lincoln, "feels no prejudice against any nationality," and "by no means will allow that a citizen in any wise be wronged on account on his place of birth or religious confession." Wise felt reassured that Lincoln not only rejected the stereotypes that prompted Grant's order but would also take action to prevent the collective punishment that the order called for. Clearly, Lincoln would not tolerate Grant's orders, and Wise seemed to have a fairly accurate read on Lincoln's attitude towards Jews as well as his desire to revoke the order. Wise recalls that Lincoln said, "To condemn a class...is, to say the least, to wrong the good with the bad. I do not like to hear a class or nationality condemned on account of a few sinners."¹⁹

The explanation of Lincoln's reasoning General Halleck gave to Grant seems very much in line with what Lincoln supposedly said to Wise. Lincoln was not opposed to punishing the "sinners." Halleck explained explicitly to Grant that the sentiment behind the order of punishing those who were disloyal to the Union was completely

appropriate. Halleck writes:

It may be proper to give you some explanation of the revocation of your order expelling all Jews from your department. The President has no objection to your expelling traitors and Jew peddlers, which, I suppose, was the object of your order; but as it in terms proscribed an entire religious class, some of whom are fighting in our ranks, the President deemed it necessary to revoke it.²⁰

Clearly it was the collective punishment argument that persuaded Lincoln to disagree with Grant's order. Lincoln's objection to the order, as presented by Halleck, disapproves of the punishment of a group by nature of membership in that group – a response to the notion that there is something intrinsically unscrupulous about that group of people. This message does not suggest that Grant is wrong in pursuing punishment for those who smuggle or defect, but it does require that Grant not punish an entire group of people in doing so.

The idea that General Order Number 11 constituted a violation of Jewish peoples' rights is incredibly important alongside the broader political situation occurring at the end of 1862 and the beginning of 1863. General Order Number 11 was issued at the end of December and was revoked on January 4, 1863 – this occurred just days after Lincoln issued the Emancipation Proclamation. Although the order is wartime document that seemingly accepts the status of blacks as property to justify emancipation as a wartime goal, underlying the document is a desire for emancipation and some form of legal status for blacks as people (as evidenced by the announcement that blacks are invited to serve in the Union Army). Lincoln had just incorporated equality, at least nominally, into his wartime goals. How could he simultaneously free slaves and expel Jews? Such an inconsistency would not have served him well politically and would have perhaps caused a problem for Lincoln's personal morality.

The debate and language surrounding emancipation of slaves was not lost on many prominent Jewish leaders of the time; many were aware of how the Jewish plight fit into the broader fight over equality that was the Civil War. Isaac Leeser, a prominent Orthodox Jew and frequent commentator on Jewish-related issues in America, penned an editorial for *The Occident* in which he discussed Grant's expulsion of Jews in the language of slavery. Leeser wrote, "We are still in bondage," subservient to, "decrees of those in power, who are not restrained by any feeling of humanity and justice from inflicting injury on us."²¹ His essay was entitled "On Persecution," and it suggested in no uncertain

terms that the Jews still existed in a state of fear and exile. His words reiterated ideas of Jews remaining the "other" in society despite living in America, a country "...which has ceased to be free except in name."²² Now it can be suggested that Jewish commenters such as Leiser appropriated the language of slavery from the black narrative, but it is important to remember that the discourse of slavery had been in the Jewish vernacular since biblical times. Not only were many of the Jews in the United States political refugees from anti-Semitic Europe but they were also well versed in Jewish history and Jewish enslavement in Ancient Egypt. As an Orthodox Jew, Leiser was intimately familiar with Jewish interaction with slavery throughout Jewish history.

The idea that General Order Number 11 was a manifestation of Jewish enslavement in America was coupled with the fear many Jews shared about black emancipation precipitating and fomenting anti-Semitism. With blacks no longer being formally enslaved, many Jews feared that the Jewish people would become the primarily subjugated group in America. Solomon Cohen of Savannah, Georgia wrote about this fear in a letter to his mother. He wrote, "that the epitaph long since written for us is about to be engraved upon the tomb of the Union: 'Here lies a people who in seeking the liberty of the Negro, lost their own.'²³ Jews were well accustomed to losing their own freedom, and the language of slavery resonated with many Jews who feared the worst from emancipation. This is not to say all Jews supported the institution of slavery. While many supported the Confederacy, some of the strongest abolitionist voices of the North were those of Jews. Ironically, Jewish familiarity with slavery pushed some to fear the emancipation of blacks while it pushed others to fight for it. But surely Lincoln was familiar with how important slavery was in Jewish historical memory. His knowledge of the bible was extensive, and the juxtaposition of Grant's order in the broader context of slavery surely impacted the President.

However, it is not convincing that moral arguments alone convinced the President to move so swiftly in repealing the order. Not enough attention is paid to the personal relationships Lincoln had with Jewish individuals. While a bit has been written on individual relationships, no scholarship has quite made the connection that it was these relationships that prompted Lincoln to act. These relationships are paramount because they helped Lincoln debunk the anti-Semitic myths that justified the order. Grant's language classified Jews as a class, a group inherently disloyal, sneaky, and dishonest. If Lincoln had never met a Jew in his life (not out of the question for the 19th century,

especially for a President from the West) or if Lincoln had no meaningful relationships with Jews then perhaps he would have believed those stereotypes to be true. And if he believed the stereotypes to be true, then perhaps the order would have been allowed to stand for its efficacy. But Lincoln had a number of meaningful friendships and professional relationships with Jews that proved these stereotypes to be untrue of Jews as a class, and thus Lincoln knew that the order had to be revoked. The following relationships between Lincoln and Jewish individuals suggest that Lincoln's perception of Jews was anything other than that they were disloyal and dishonest.

It is crucial to start with Lincoln's sincere friendship with fellow Illinoisan Abraham Jonas. Lincoln and Jonas share both a friendship and professional relationship dating back to the 1840's. The two became political allies, traveling in the same Whig, and eventually Republican, circles in Quincy and other cities in Illinois. In fact, it was Jonas who was responsible for arranging the Lincoln-Douglas debate in Quincy, something he did with great care for his friend Abraham Lincoln.²⁴ Jonas exhibited all of the qualities of a good friend, giving good political advice, taking on legal cases, and engaging in a long-standing letter exchange. In fact, it is even rumored that Jonas was the first to suggest that Lincoln should run for President. And while that fact is disputed, it is undisputed that Jonas worked tirelessly to help secure the nomination for Lincoln, working relationships in the fledgling Republican Party to see his friend on the ticket.²⁵ Evidence of Jonas and Lincoln's deep friendship is abundant: Lincoln appointed Jonas postmaster of Quincy and even paroled Jonas' son who was fighting for the Confederacy.²⁶ Though he had deep family connections in the Confederacy, Jonas remained loyal to Lincoln – he even warned Lincoln of a possible assassination plot that his family in New Orleans might have had a hand in planning.²⁷

However, Jonas' greatest display of loyalty and trustworthiness, character traits that Jews were usually accused of lacking, came at a moment when Lincoln's entire political career was in jeopardy. In the Presidential campaign of 1860, Lincoln was accused of attending meetings of the Know Nothing Party during his time in Quincy in 1854. Lincoln had publicly disapproved of the group's nativist and racist positions, and any serious thought that he had been a part of a local chapter could have derailed his Presidential campaign. In a letter marked "confidential," which captures the sincerity of the friendship between Jonas and Lincoln, the Lincoln asks Jonas to deal with this

delicate political situation. The letter reads, "...I was never in Quincy but one day and two nights, while Know-Nothing lodges were in existence, and you were with me that day and both those nights...An affidavit of one or two such would put the matter at rest."²⁸ That Lincoln would ask Jonas of all people to handle this specific task speaks wonders to the loyalty of Jonas and the depth of their friendship. Whether Lincoln is telling the truth in the letter is actually inconsequential; he is asking Jonas to publicly vouch for him (and maybe even lie on his behalf). At this moment, Lincoln is trusting Jonas with much of his political legitimacy.

Similarly, the relationship Lincoln had with a Jew named Adolphus Solomons represents the utmost honesty and professionalism in business transactions, something particularly relevant to Grant's order, as the order was issued in response to supposedly dishonest Jewish smugglers. In Washington, Solomons was involved with a printing firm, Philip and Solomons, which had a sizeable government contract for printing government documents and taking official government photos. It was in this professional capacity that Solomons had numerous interactions with President Lincoln, establishing a rapport characterized by light-hearted conversation and mutual respect. In his memoirs, Solomons recalled a time in which Lincoln told him a joke about two Jewish men, indicating that he had learned some Hebrew and Yiddish phrases. Solomons writes of Lincoln extremely highly, even referring to him as a "martyr-President." In fact, it was Solomons who took the final picture of Lincoln before he was assassinated. He was pleased with how that day went, writing that Lincoln made numerous "jocular" comments during the course of the photo session.²⁹ While some historians say this points to Jewish admiration of Lincoln but not the reverse, this relationship does reveal that Lincoln understood the capacity of Jewish individuals to act scrupulously in a professional setting.

But the most perplexing – and arguably the most intimate – relationship Lincoln had with a Jew existed between Lincoln and Dr. Isachar Zacharie. Zacharie treated Lincoln's ailments from leg pains to in-grown toenails. He was such a peculiar figure that *The World* noted that it could not understand "this remarkable intimacy" that Zacharie shared with the President.³⁰ Zacharie supposedly knew the Lincoln family socially as well and frequently spent time in the living quarters of the First Family. Lincoln even trusted Zacharie to travel on quasi-diplomatic trips to the South, charging Zacharie to interact with Southern locals and report back to Lincoln. He was instructed to act as an "informant" and to assess the potential of winning the locals' loyalty in places ranging from

New Orleans to Confederate strongholds in Mississippi.³¹ This leads many to believe that Zacharie was actually a full-out spy for the Union, using his cover as a foot doctor not only to circumvent Confederate authorities but also Union leaders as well. Zacharie's flamboyant personality garnered both praise and criticism, but his extravagance most likely persuaded those he encountered that he was either not working as a spy or was not well trusted by anyone of importance.

However, quite the opposite was true. The degree to which Zacharie and Lincoln had personal contact is astounding. For a President who often secluded himself from his family and hid behind his responsibilities as President, Zacharie had quite the perfect balance of professional rapport, friendship, and loyal servitude. This intimacy is demonstrated by the fact that Zacharie supposedly had access to the White House at all times.³² It is particularly interesting that when Zacharie was sent down to the South for reconnaissance or fact-finding purposes, he was given a letter from the War Department to show to military authorities stating that he was "operating upon the feet of the soldiers..."³³ Covert action, especially as a civilian performing espionage, represents a great amount of trust. Zacharie must have had access to classified information, let alone his physical access to the President of the United State. This cannot speak more clearly to the trusting relationship Lincoln had with Zacharie, a Jew who risked his life for the Union.

And while these individual relationships are only individual cases, the importance of individual relationships in forming a personal opinion is often understated. These three relationships, one of friendship, one professional, and one extremely intimate, surely helped Lincoln realize that Jews could not be the class of thieves and smugglers that Grant's order portrayed them to be. This is not to say that Lincoln might have opposed all orders targeting a "class" of people; if Lincoln knew something to be true about a class of people, say political activists sympathetic to the Confederacy, then perhaps he would have let an order expelling those people stand. But Lincoln's personal relationships with Jewish individuals proved that Jews – as a people – were not inherently dishonest, disloyal, or unscrupulous. And that fact is key in understanding why Lincoln rejected Grant's collective punishment of Jews.

General Order Number 11 marks a monumental moment for Jews in the United States. On the one hand, Jews saw what a good friend a President can be, especially one who lived up to his reputation for strong moral convictions. But, perhaps more darkly, Jews saw what

anti-Semitism could look like even in the land of opportunity. Grant's reasons for issuing the order are hotly debated, but regardless, before Lincoln revoked the order, Jews faced the dire situation of having to leave their homes.

But why did Lincoln move with such speech to revoke an order issued in the standard course of warfare? Why did Lincoln, with no significant military experience, intervene and contradict one of his most trusted generals? Lincoln's personal morality and belief in equality, due process, and liberty carry significant weight in this conversation. The success of Jews in portraying this issue as one of both legal and Constitutional importance must have resonated with a President who is largely defined by his identity as a lawyer. But history has shown that Lincoln was not afraid to balance individual rights to due process against the goal of the Union to win the war. It was Lincoln's personal relationships with Jewish individuals that allowed him to see past the absurdity of collective punishment for the wrongdoings of individuals. The power of these individual relationships – a distinct yet interrelated component to Lincoln's decision made from his personal morality – rebutted the anti-Semitic assumptions that Grant used to justify his order. Lincoln knew from his own experiences the capacity of the Jewish people to prove loyal, honest, trustworthy, and hard working. He knew the Jewish peoples' plight and what it would mean if America existed as just another place for Jews to live in fear. And so the quality of Lincoln's personal relationships helped inform a moral decision rejecting the confiscation of property and expulsion of individuals simply for being born Jewish. Thus while plenty of attention is given to Lincoln's moral compass surrounding slavery and emancipation, there is much to say about that morality helping the Jewish people in a time of need as well.

END NOTES

1. This is not to be confused with the more widely known and controversial General Order Number 11 of 1863, issued by Thomas Ewing Jr. From here on out in the paper, I will refer to Grant's 1862 order regarding the Jews as "General Order 11."
2. Sarna, Jonathan. *When General Grant Expelled the Jews*. New York: Random House, 2012. p. 7
3. Sarna, *When General Grant Expelled the Jews*. p. 155
4. Zola, Gary Phillip. *We called him Rabbi Abraham: Lincoln and American Jewry, a documentary history*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 2014. p. 99

5. Ibid.
6. Sarna, *When General Grant Expelled the Jews*. p. 45
7. Sarna, *When General Grant Expelled the Jews*. p. 153-154
8. Marcus, Jacob Rader. *The Jew in the American World: A Source Book*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1996. p. 197
9. Sarna, *When General Grant Expelled the Jews*. p. 21
10. Message from H.W. Halleck to Major General Grant, 4 January 1863, in *The Jew in the American World: A Source Book*, by Jacob Rader Marcus (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1996). p. 201
11. Message from H. W. Halleck to Major-General Grant, 21 January 1863, in *The Writings of Abraham Lincoln, Volume Six*, edited by Arthur Brooks Lapsley (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1906) p. 252-253
12. Sarna, *When General Grant Expelled the Jews*. p. 5-6
13. Sarna, *When General Grant Expelled the Jews*. p. 7
14. Sarna, *When General Grant Expelled the Jews*. p. 30
15. Message from Cesar Kaskel to Hon. Abraham Lincoln, 29 December 1862, in *The Jew in the American World: A Source Book*, by Jacob Rader Marcus (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1996). p. 200
16. Sarna, *When General Grant Expelled the Jews*. p. 22 Here is a picture of the original document: <http://nowweknowem.com/2013/12/17/general-ulysses-s-grant-issued-his-general-order-number-11-today-in-1862-that-expelled-jews-from-tennessee-mississippi-and-kentucky-now-we-know-em/>
17. Letter from United Order "Bne B'rith" Missouri Loge [sic], 5 January 1863, in *We called him Rabbi Abraham: Lincoln and American Jewry, a documentary history*, by Gary Phillip Zola (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 2014) p. 107
18. Sarna, *When General Grant Expelled the Jews*. p. 23
19. Sarna, *When General Grant Expelled the Jews*. p. 23
20. Message from H. W. Halleck to Major-General Grant, 21 January 1863, in *The Writings of Abraham Lincoln, Volume Six*, edited by Arthur Brooks Lapsley (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1906) p. 252-253
21. Sarna, *When General Grant Expelled the Jews*. p. 28
22. Sarna, *When General Grant Expelled the Jews*. p. 28
23. Rosen, Robert N. *The Jewish Confederates*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2000. p. 48
24. Rosen, *The Jewish Confederates*. p.148-149
25. Rosen, *The Jewish Confederates*. p.148-149
26. Marcus, Jacob Rader. *United States Jewry, 1776 - 1895*. Volume Three. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1993. p. 52

27. Rosen, *The Jewish Confederates*. p. 149
28. Letter from A. Lincoln to Hon. A. Jonas, 21 July 1860, in *Abraham Lincoln: His Speeches and Writings*, edited by Roy Basler (New York: The World Publishing Company, 1946) p. 557-558
29. Solomons, Adolphus. "Reminiscences of Abraham Lincoln" in *Memoirs of American Jews, 1775-1865, Volume Three*, edited by Jacob Rader Marcus (New York: American Book-Stratford Press, Inc., 1955) p. 354-356
30. Marcus, Jacob Rader. *United States Jewry, 1776 - 1895*. Volume Three. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1993. p. 51
31. Zola, Gary Phillip. *We called him Rabbi Abraham: Lincoln and American Jewry, a documentary history*. p. 46-47
32. Simonhoff, Harry. *Jewish Participants in the Civil War*. New York: Arco Publishing Company, Inc, 1963. p. 116
33. Letter issued from the War Department, 24 September 1862, in *We called him Rabbi Abraham: Lincoln and American Jewry, a documentary history*, by Gary Phillip Zola (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 2014) p. 69

Sarna, Jonathan. *When General Grant Expelled the Jews*. New York: Random House, 2012.

Simonhoff, Harry. *Jewish Participants in the Civil War*. New York: Arco Publishing Company, Inc, 1963.

Solomons, Adolphus. "Reminiscences of Abraham Lincoln" in *Memoirs of American Jews, 1775-1865, Volume Three*, edited by Jacob Rader Marcus. New York: American Book-Stratford Press, Inc., 1955.

Zola, Gary Phillip. *We called him Rabbi Abraham: Lincoln and American Jewry, a documentary history*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 2014.

Works Cited

Letter from A. Lincoln to Hon. A. Jonas, 21 July 1860, in *Abraham Lincoln: His Speeches and Writings*, edited by Roy Basler (New York: The World Publishing Company, 1946) p. 557-558

Letter from United Order "Bne B'rith" Missouri Loge [sic], 5 January 1863, in *We called him Rabbi Abraham: Lincoln and American Jewry, a documentary history*, by Gary Phillip Zola. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 2014.

Letter issued from the War Department, 24 September 1862, in *We called him Rabbi Abraham: Lincoln and American Jewry, a documentary history*, by Gary Phillip Zola. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 2014.

Marcus, Jacob Rader. *The Jew in the American World: A Source Book*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1996.

Marcus, Jacob Rader. *United States Jewry, 1776 - 1895*. Volume Three. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1993.

Message from Cesar Kaskel to Hon. Abraham Lincoln, 29 December 1862, in *The Jew in the American World: A Source Book*, by Jacob Rader Marcus. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1996.

Message from H.W. Halleck to Major General Grant, 4 January 1863, in *The Jew in the American World: A Source Book*, by Jacob Rader Marcus. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1996.

Message from H. W. Halleck to Major-General Grant, 21 January 1863, in *The Writings of Abraham Lincoln*, Volume Six, edited by Arthur Brooks Lapsley. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1906.

Rosen, Robert N. *The Jewish Confederates*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2000.