

The Dartmouth Undergraduate Historical Review



Winter 2023

About the Dartmouth Undergraduate Historical Review

The mission of the Dartmouth Undergraduate Historical Review is to encourage historical research and discourse among undergraduate students at Dartmouth and beyond. We inspire members to think critically about global history through scholarship. Our contributors employ investigative writing and editing skills to advance their arguments. Our goal is to motivate in-depth examinations of the global past from the viewpoints of undergraduate students.

The Review receives and publishes submissions annually from undergraduate students across the nation. Our articles are reviewed by our Editorial Board before publication.

The Winter 2023 Editorial Board

Editor in-Chief
Deputy Editor
Managing Editor
Editor
Editor
Editor
Editor
Editor
Editor
Editor
Editor
Editor
Treasurer
Secretary
Social Media Editor

Farah Almadani '25
Zhenia Dubrova '24
Jess Hilton '25
Brian Arruda '25
Jessica Chiriboga '24
Gabrielle Franklin '25
Marta Hulievaska '25
Caleb Liu '25
Jonah Manso '25
Hawa Hamidou Tabayi '26
Heather Wang '25
Jonah Manso '25
Noor Najeeb '25
Brandon Zhao '26

Letter from the Editor

Dear Reader,

After months of planning this edition, the Dartmouth Undergraduate Historical Review is proud to present our very first issue.

Formally established last Spring, our Historical Review is committed to supporting original historical thought. We believe that it is imperative Dartmouth provide an outlet for all undergraduate students whether they pursue history as a professional avenue post graduation or as personal interest. While we hope to inspire the next generation of historians, we understand that history surpasses barriers and is integral to each and every one of us. History motivates us to question perspectives of the past – but also of the present and the future.

Our selection of articles for this issue reflects the high standards and values of our publication. Our first article discusses the correlations between the Batak Massacre and Turkey's denial of the Armenian Genocide. Our second article analyzes the United States' systematic, ideological and institutional commonalities with the Roman Republic. With a focus on North American exploration, our third article explores cartographic practices used by Native Americans and Europeans and argues that the Lewis and Clark expedition benefited from indigenous map-making. Our fourth and final article touches on the gaps in critical geographies and life in rural Arkansas.

The creation of this copy is a testament to the diligent and thorough review work exhibited by our team of editors as well as the excellent research from our contributors. We look forward to curating our next issue – which will be published Spring 2023 – as well as future editions of our publications.

Sincerely,
The Editorial Board

Alexander Azar (pages 5-19)

“To Brand” As Much As “To Prevent”: How Gladstone’s Rhetoric in Bulgarian Horrors Directly Facilitated Its Refutation

Alexander Barr (pages 20-41)

Virtue, Glory, and Faction: A Comparative Analysis of Motives for Political Participation in the Early United States and the Roman Republic

Isabelle Cheney (pages 42-47)

Native American Maps, European Exploration, and the Cartographic Encounters of the Lewis and Clark Expedition

Thomas Lane (pages 49-62)

German-Americans and the First World War:
Through the Eyes of New Ulm, Minnesota and its Two Newspapers

Damien Solinger Jeffers (pages 65-83)

Imperial Migrants to Arkansas:
An Introduction to Latine, Asian and Marshallese Ties to “Big Chicken”

About the Contributors

Alexander Azar '25 is a sophomore at Dartmouth, originally from Bethesda, Maryland and Indianapolis, Indiana. He tentatively plans to double major in Government and Russian with a minor in Religion. Alex has written articles on the War of 1812 for the American Battlefield Trust, served as a member of their Youth Leadership Team, and worked as a legal intern.

Thomas Lane '24 is an undergraduate at Dartmouth College from Excelsior, Minnesota. Studying German and Economics, he is especially interested in state legislative issues. He was a 2022 Law and Ethics Fellow at the Dartmouth Ethics Institute and has previously served as a policy advisor. He also served on the steering committee for Granite State Physicians for a National Health Program. After college he hopes to pursue graduate studies in health policy, economics, and law.

Isabelle Cheney '24 is from Carrboro, North Carolina and studies Anthropology and Native American & Indigenous Studies at Dartmouth. Through the Anthropology department, she conducts research on the joint proportions of Miocene apes to better understand the evolution of bipedalism. Outside of her major, she also enjoys studying American history. She is also passionate about bringing people into the outdoors and hopes to work with the Dartmouth Outing Club.

Damien Solinger Jeffers is a Queer, first-generation undergraduate student at Dartmouth College and a candidate for a B.A. in Geography. Raised in the Ouachita Mountains of Arkansas, they are an alum of the Arkansas School for Mathematics, Sciences, and the Arts. Their childhood in the rural South and the personal connections they made at one of the country's few public residential high schools is foundational to their worldview and continues to manifest in their professional and academic endeavors. In their current professional capacity, Damien focuses on uplifting their fellow first-generation and low-income students, largely through their work with Dartmouth's First Generation Office.

Alexander Barr is from New York City, New York. He is a Sophomore at Dartmouth College pursuing a double major in History and Economics. He is most interested in two areas of research. The first is investigating the Classical world and its philosophical and political legacy which persists to the present day, a topic that his article discusses. The second is tracking the emergence of the market economy and financial institutions in Early Modern Europe and around the world. On campus, Alex is involved with the Dartmouth Consulting Group, the Dartmouth Investment and Philanthropy Program, and the Club Squash team. He is passionate about using historical perspective to help businesses thrive and adapt in a changing world, and after graduation, he hopes to pursue a career in consulting or finance. Alex's hobbies include hiking, sailing, and traveling, especially to places whose history he has previously studied.

“To Brand” As Much As “To Prevent”: How Gladstone’s Rhetoric in Bulgarian Horrors Directly Facilitated Its Refutation

Alexander Azar

Abstract:

In 1876, during the April Uprising, historically Christian Bulgarian populations revolted against an increasingly officious and overbearing Ottoman Empire. The focal point of the rebellion occurred in Batak, where irregular Ottoman soldiers summarily and indiscriminately butchered some 5,000 soldiers and non-combatants after an armistice. News of the Batak Massacre provoked ubiquitous outcry across Europe, the most prominent of which was *Bulgarian Horrors*, written by Liberal British politician William Gladstone.

Despite the remarkable success of Gladstone’s pamphlet, its needlessly inflammatory style, racist aspersions, and ad hominem invective distracted from its substantive objections to the Ottoman’s role in the Batak Massacre. As demonstrated in the anonymously published “A Study in English Turcophobia,” this pejorative rhetoric allowed the Ottoman Empire to dictate the grounds on which their refutation of such condemnations would be fought. Namely, in admonishing the racist style of those like Gladstone and defending the honor of the Turkish people, they impugned the credibility of the condemnations, rendering them null. The Turkish government, the successor to the Ottoman Empire, continues to employ such strategies in denying involvement in and the extent of the Armenian Genocide.

On April 24, 2021, President Biden called the Armenian Genocide a “Genocide.”¹ The response from Turkey was swift. In a speech two days later, President Erdogan dismissed the comments as “groundless and unfair.” According to Erdogan, this recognition was a blatant affront to the “Turkish people,” stemming from the “pressure” of “radical Armenian groups” and “anti-Turkish circles.” Erdogan was quick to point out the hypocrisy of Biden’s remark, recommending he “look in the mirror.” Refusing to mimic, as he saw it, Biden’s improper attacks, Erdogan continued, saying “I don’t even need to mention [the Native Americans] ... what happened is clear.”² In the following days, Turkish news and social media rebounded with these same talking points – Biden’s remark was racially motivated and lacked any moral authority. Could Biden have preempted these attempts to discredit him in his initial statement?

In this paper, I will answer this question in the affirmative by exploring a possible origin of these discrediting attacks. Specifically, I will discuss the polemics used by the Ottoman Empire to discredit European outcry surrounding the Batak Massacre of 1876. I will begin by reviewing the existing scholarship surrounding the Batak Massacre, its historical context, and its international reception, before discussing the event itself. Then, I will examine the most prominent international condemnation of the massacre, William Gladstone’s *Bulgarian Horrors*. Next, I will examine the Ottoman response to Gladstone through a representative sample, the anonymously published journal article, “A Study in English Turcophobia.” I hope to demonstrate how the racist, sensationalized rhetoric of Gladstone’s pamphlet afforded the Ottoman Empire an easy way to discredit the substantive objections he raised to their actions in the Batak Massacre. Namely, Gladstone’s pejorative rhetoric allowed the Ottoman Empire to reframe the international discourse surrounding their misdeeds as one in which the honor of the Turkish people was at stake. In defending Turkish honor, the Ottoman Empire discredited the authority of Gladstone and his accusations. I hope to suggest that this example established a precedent for how Turkey,

1 Joe Biden, “Statement by President Joe Biden on Armenian Remembrance Day,” The White House (The United States Government, April 24, 2021), <https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/statements-releases/2021/04/24/statement-by-president-joe-biden-on-armenian-remembrance-day/>.

2 Erdogan Recep, “Erdogan Slams Biden’s Recognition of Armenian ‘Genocide,’” Genocide News | Al Jazeera (Al Jazeera, April 26, 2021), <https://www.aljazeera.com/news/2021/4/26/erdogan-slams-bidens-armenian-genocide-recognition>.

the successor of the Ottoman Empire, continues to refute international condemnations today.

Much like the Armenian Genocide, the history of the Batak Massacre unduly remains a point of contention in historical scholarship. For Bulgarians, this event is central to the founding myth of their country. Any scholarship that has attempted to suggest any wrongdoings by Bulgarian revolutionaries in the event or to question its role in the Bulgarian conscience has been met with widespread outcry. Most notably, a 2007 conference to be held in Sofia, Bulgaria intending to explore the massacre's nationalistic and anti-Islamic import, was canceled after nationwide accusations of revisionism.³ For Turkey, the massacre is an uncomfortable reality about how its predecessor violently repressed ethnic minorities in the Empire. Pro-Turkish academics have downplayed the role of the Ottoman Empire.⁴ Others have simply dismissed the event as fiction.⁵ Despite continuing discord surrounding the massacre and its nationalistic import, news of the massacre is widely considered to have enabled greater European influence over the Ottoman Empire. The massacre provided the *casus belli* for Russian involvement in the Russo-Turkish War of 1877 and influenced the Ottoman's sweeping concessions of historically Christian territory in the Treaties of San Stefano and Berlin.⁶ However, historical discussion of the discourse surrounding the massacre between Western powers and the Ottoman Empire remains scarce. Nazan Çiçek has provided the best analysis of these debates.⁷ However, her analysis focuses only on the Ottoman response to international condemnations in isolation. Çiçek's analysis of the role Gladstone's rhetoric played in shaping the Ottoman response was cursory and, at worst, only implied. This paper will complement Çiçek's work by illustrating the importance of the distracting, inflammatory rhetoric Gladstone used in directly shaping the Ottoman Empire's response.

3 Cameron Whitehead, "The Bulgarian Horrors: Culture and the International History of the Great Eastern Crisis, 1876-1878" (dissertation, University of British Columbia, 2014), 100-113; "German Scientists Deny 5 Centuries of Bulgaria's History," Novinite.com - Sofia News Agency, accessed February 23, 2022, https://www.novinite.com/view_news.php?id=79747.

4 Justin McCarthy, *Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922* (Princeton, NJ: Darwin Press Inc, 2014), 60.

5 Millman, Richard. "The Bulgarian Massacres Reconsidered." *The Slavonic and East European Review* 58, no. 2 (1980): 218-31.

6 "Bulgarian Horrors," *Encyclopædia Britannica* (Encyclopædia Britannica, inc.), accessed February 23, 2022, <https://www.britannica.com/event/Bulgarian-Horrors>; Ayten Kiliç, "The International Repercussions of the 1876 April Uprising Within The Ottoman Empire Dergipark (Center for Eurasian Studies, 2014), <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/download/article-file/700978>.

7 Nazan Çiçek, "The Turkish Response to Bulgarian Horrors: A Study in English Turcophobia," *Middle Eastern Studies* 42, no. 1 (2006): 87-102, <https://doi.org/10.1080/00263200500399579>.

To assess the deficiencies of Gladstone's rhetoric, we must understand the reality of the material it discusses. In the late 19th century, the Ottoman Empire was bankrupt after defaulting on the loans they had received to modernize their military and infrastructure. To raise revenue, the Empire raised taxes in their Balkan territories. This increase in taxes exacerbated already festering separatist sentiments among the Christian populations of the Balkans. Beginning with the Herzegovinian Revolt in 1875 and lasting until 1878, various Christian populations across the Balkans revolted against Ottoman rule. Emboldened by the success of the Herzegovinians, the historically Christian Bulgarian population decided to revolt in the April Uprising of 1876.⁸ The focal point of the rebellion was in Batak, where 1,100 Bulgarian rebels revolted.⁹ The Bulgarian revolutionaries took control of the city and killed any local Muslims who resisted them. Around 200 Muslims, mostly those who resisted, were killed.¹⁰ In response to the uprising, 5,000 irregular *bashi-bazouk* Muslim soldiers, with the official support of the Ottoman Empire, surrounded the town. After a brief skirmish, the Ottoman leader of the irregulars offered an armistice under the condition that the Bulgarians abandon their arms. The Bulgarians assented, whereupon the irregulars killed them and pillaged the town. Indiscriminate summary executions and torture of the local Christian populace ensued.¹¹ One witness testifies to the gratuitous violence, describing wide-spread impaling of men and women and the bayoneting of babies in front of their mothers.¹² Much of the town was burnt down. Of the 15,000 Bulgarians that died in the April Uprising, 5,000 were killed in Batak.¹³ Though the Bulgarians had initially committed crimes against some local Muslims, the Ottoman response was disproportionate and constituted a premeditated, indefensible massacre.

News of the massacre spread fast. To curb its spread, the Ottoman Empire codified

8 "The 1875–78 Crisis," Encyclopædia Britannica (Encyclopædia Britannica, inc.), accessed February 25, 2022, <https://www.britannica.com/place/Ottoman-Empire/The-1875-78-crisis>.

9 Ismail Bey, *Memoire Sur Les Evenements du Sandjak de Philippopoli*, Constantiople: Typographie et lithographie centrales, 1877, 12.

10 Richard Shannon, *Gladstone and the Bulgarian Agitation 1876* (Hassocks: Harvester Press, 1975). pp. 47; Eugene Schuyler. "Report by Mr. Schuyler on the Bulgarian Atrocities," 10 August 1876, Philippopoli, Doc. 452, Inclosure in Doc. 450, *British Documents on Foreign Affairs*, Part I, Vol. II, 359.

11 Tetsuya Sahara, "Two Different Images," *War and Diplomacy: The Russo-Turkish War of 1877- 1878 and the Treaty of Berlin*, 481.

12 Kerelova, Bosilka and Robert Jasper Moore. *Under The Balkans, Notes of a Visit to the District of Philippopolis in 1876*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1877, 112.

13 Schuyler, *British*, 359.

new restrictions on the free press in the Empire.¹ Despite these measures, informal reports of the massacre spread throughout Western Europe and were met with widespread condemnation. The most prominent of these international condemnations was British politician, William Gladstone's *Bulgarian Horrors*. Gladstone's motives in writing this pamphlet were inextricably tied to his political interests. News first arrived in Britain in *The Daily Mail* on June 23, 1876 and was immediately met by the British public with horror and outrage.² As a prominent Liberal party leader in Britain, Gladstone recognized the difficult position the news of this massacre placed on the current Conservative government in power. Gladstone's rival, Conservative Prime Minister Benjamin Disraeli, was a staunch supporter of the Ottoman Empire. For Disraeli, the Ottoman Empire was a buffer state against an ever-belligerent Russian Empire and protected British imperial interests in India and Egypt. Just one month before the news had arrived in Britain, Disraeli had dissuaded other European powers from acting against the Ottomans during a revolt in Serbia.³ When news of the massacre arrived, Disraeli dismissed it and only reluctantly consented to investigate the matter.⁴ Gladstone understood that the worse he portrayed the Ottomans and their actions in his *Bulgarian Horrors*, the more indefensible Disraeli's support for the Ottomans and slow response became. Gladstone had a distinct political interest in portraying the Ottomans as unfavorably as he could. On September 6, 1876, Gladstone published *Bulgarian Horrors*. Just one month later, Gladstone's pamphlet had sold 200,000 copies and become the most popular piece of literature in Britain. Gladstone's response became the face of international condemnations of the Batak Massacre.⁵

Gladstone makes the political purpose of his pamphlet clear from the start. First, he appeals to his audience, the outraged public, commending them for their "honour, duty," and "compassion" in their response to the news of the massacre.⁶ However, Gladstone adds, this

1 Ipek Yosmaoğlu, "Chasing the Printed Word: Press Censorship in the Ottoman Empire, 1876-1913." *The Turkish Studies Association Journal* 27, no. 1/2 (2003): 19. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/43383672>.

2 Peers, Ewin. "The Assassinations at Constantinople. Moslem Atrocities in Bulgaria." Doc. 358, *British Documents on Foreign Affairs, Part I, Vol.II*, 263-266.

3 "Gladstone and Disraeli," *Encyclopædia Britannica* (Encyclopædia Britannica, inc.), accessed February 27, 2022, <https://www.britannica.com/place/United-Kingdom/Gladstone-and-Disraeli>.

4 Alexis Heraclides, and Dialla Ada. "The Bulgarian Atrocities: A Bird's Eye View of Intervention with Emphasis on Britain, 1875–78." In *Humanitarian Intervention in the Long Nineteenth Century: Setting the Precedent*, 148–68. Manchester University Press, 2015. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt1mf71b8.13>.

5 Heraclides, "The Bulgarian Atrocities," 153.

6 William Gladstone, *The Turco-Servian War: Bulgarian Horrors and the Question of the East* (New York: Lovell, Adam, Wesson, 1876), 9.

is not enough. These “wrongs” of the Ottomans should not only “receive effectual and righteous condemnation.”⁷ It is equally incumbent upon the people to ensure “security shall be taken against [their] repetition.”⁸ As Gladstone explains to the public, through the leadership of Disraeli, “we have been involved” in “some amount” of “moral complicity with the basest and blackest outrages upon the record of this present century, if not the memory of man.”⁹ To ensure that these outrages are prevented in the future, Gladstone implores the public “to speak through its Government,” and oust the Conservative leadership.¹⁰ Indeed, an equal amount of the pamphlet is spent admonishing the government’s dilatory response to the news as it is condemning the Ottomans. Thus, Gladstone explicitly declares the purpose of his pamphlet. By emphasizing the “moral complicity” of the Conservatives in enabling the Ottomans, Gladstone hopes to redirect the public outrage surrounding news of the Batak Massacre towards a popular rejection of the Conservative government.

Gladstone first emphasizes this moral complicity by condemning the substantive wrongs that the Ottomans perpetrated. As he admits, the Ottoman government that “we have been giving the strongest moral” and “material support” has perpetrated “crimes and outrages so vast in scale as to exceed all modern example.”¹¹ How is it, Gladstone wonders, “that villages could be burned down by scores, and men, women, and children murdered ... by thousands” by this ally of Britain?¹² Despite his hyperbolic language, what Gladstone says here is substantiated by fact and consistent with reporting such as *The Daily Mail*’s. His attacks are directed solely at the actions of the Ottomans. However, this was not to last. This simple, fact-based condemnation of the Ottomans’ actions was commonplace and would be unremarkable to the already outraged public.

To differentiate his argument and emphasize the moral complicity of the government, Gladstone turns to ad hominem and blatantly racist attacks of the Turkish people. By dehumanizing the Turkish people as a race, the Conservative government’s aid to them becomes even more indefensible. As Gladstone explains, for “a full comprehension of” the “erroneous

7 Gladstone, 9.

8 Gladstone, 9.

9 Gladstone, 8.

10 Gladstone, 9.

11 Gladstone, 9-10.

12 Gladstone, 14.

policy of the British Administration,” it is “necessary to describe the true character of Turkish power.”¹³ As he alludes to briefly in the introduction, the goal of his pamphlet is just as much “to brand” as it is “to punish...or to prevent.”¹⁴ Shortly after providing his condemnation of the Batak Massacre, Gladstone begins his explicit “sketch” of “what the Turkish race was and what it is:”¹⁵

It is not a question of Mahometanism simply, but of Mahometanism compounded with the peculiar character of a race. They are not the mild Mahometans of India, nor the chivalrous Saladins of Syria, nor the cultured Moors of Spain. They were, upon the whole, from the black day when they first entered Europe, the one great anti-human specimen of humanity. Wherever they went, a broad line of blood marked the track behind them; and, as far as their dominion reached, civilization disappeared from view. They represented everywhere government by force, as opposed to government by law.¹⁶

The primary purpose of this excerpt is to dehumanize the Turkish people. In no uncertain terms, Gladstone condemns the Turks as the antithesis of humanity and civilization. Degrading the Turks as “Mahometans” via their religion is not enough. For Gladstone, the problem is their humanity. After this first declaration, dehumanizing language pervades the pamphlet. In many areas, the Turks are simply referred to as “specimens.”¹⁷ In others, Gladstone calls them “*lusus naturae*” (“a freak of nature” in Latin) and “monsters of virtue or intelligence.”¹⁸

As Gladstone continues in the excerpt, the chief symptom of their inhumanity is their barbaric violence. They are a people who rule by “force” and leave a trail of blood behind them. Gladstone equates violence to their original sin, which has been present since they entered Europe. The evidence of their inhumanity is found in their insatiable lust for violence alone. Gladstone elaborates on this central point throughout the pamphlet. As he explains, “the only refinement of which Turkey boasts” is their “elaborate and refined cruelty.”¹⁹ It is no surprise, then, when Gladstone refrains from referencing the initial wrongdoings of the Bulgarians in the Batak Massacre against the local Muslims. To provide any reason for retaliation against Bulgarians would be to undermine the Turkish proclivity towards violence that undergirds their inhumanity. Thus, to further delegitimize the Conservative government’s cooperation

13 Gladstone, 10.

14 Gladstone, 10.

15 Gladstone, 10.

16 Gladstone, 10.

17 Gladstone, 11.

18 Gladstone, 11.

19 Gladstone, 22.

with the Ottomans, Gladstone's rhetoric devolves into a brazen racist diatribe against the Turkish people. Gladstone hopes the taint he has placed upon the Ottomans will spread towards Disraeli's government. Ultimately, Gladstone's strategy succeeded. Imitations of Gladstone's racist style soon inundated British newspapers and journals.²⁰ Unable to fully recover from his association with the shamed Ottomans and the Batak Massacre, Disraeli was unseated by Gladstone in 1880.²¹

While this inflammatory language adequately served Gladstone's political interests, it undermined the ostensive purpose of his pamphlet – to condemn the actions of the Ottomans in the Batak Massacre. The Ottomans knew they could not refute the content of condemnations such as Gladstone's. Therefore, they addressed their style. Specifically, this overtly racist rhetoric allowed the Ottoman Empire to reframe the international discourse surrounding their actions as one in which the dignity of the Turkish people was under attack. In rebuking the racist language of those like Gladstone, the Ottomans simultaneously discredited the authority of the accusations made against them. The Ottomans used these polemics extensively in the state-sponsored image-management campaign that followed the international outcry to the Batak Massacre. One such example is the aptly named article, “A Study in English Turcophobia,” anonymously published by the London Pan-Islamic Society in England in 1904. Though a few decades removed from Gladstone's influential pamphlet and published in England, Nazan Çiçek argues that this article represents the body of Ottoman responses to Gladstone and his imitators.²² If anything, the location and date of the publication demonstrate the influence and reach that this rhetorical strategy had.

The anonymous author of “A Study in English Turcophobia” is clear about their intentions from the beginning. The goal of this article will not be to respond to the Western concerns over the treatment of Christians in the Ottoman Empire. Rather, this article will focus on “the attacks which have been made upon ... [Turkish] honour” by those of the “Gladstonian school.”²³ If it were not for these racist attacks, the article stresses, there would be no need for

20 Paul Auchterlonie, “From the Eastern Question to the Dearth of General Gordon: Representations of the Middle East in the Victorian Periodical Press, 1876-1885,” *British Journal of Middle Eastern Studies*, Vol. 28, No.1 (2001), 11; Selim Deringil, *The Well Protected Domains, Ideology and the Legitimization of power in the Ottoman Empire 1876-1909* (London and New York: I.B Tauris, 1998), 135.

21 “Gladstone and Disraeli,” *Encyclopædia Britannica*.

22 Çiçek, “The Turkish Response,” 88.

23 “A Study in English Turcophobia,” (London: Pan-Islamic Society, 1904), 3.

a response. Though the author “is truly loathe to write this pamphlet,” they “feel constrained to defend the impugned honour of [the Turks].”²⁴ The “agitation became too outrageous to be left without reply.”²⁵ The purpose of this article is to demonstrate that “the Turk” will not die “like a sick man” under Western hostility, but rather “like a man struggling to defend his race and faith with unparalleled determination.”²⁶ Thus, by focusing on the rhetoric of Gladstone and his followers, the author reframes the international discourse surrounding their misdoings as an attack on Turkish honor.

Having reframed the argument, the author focuses on the racist motivations behind the accusations lobbed at the Turks. By denouncing this rhetoric, the substantive condemnations they include are equally dismissed as racially motivated. As the article explains, these condemnations are mere “bigoted” speech from “anti-Turkish crusaders” and lack credibility.²⁷ Throughout the article, all international condemnation is labeled as “anti-Turkish fabrications” and “radical” slander.²⁸ The condemnations are simply contrived by “political zealots” and “Turcophobe diatribists” who “strive hard to stir up public resentment against Turkey and Islam.”²⁹ This sinister, biased motive is clear, given the fact that these condemnations include “no mention” of the “provocations given to the Turks by revolutionary bandits.”³⁰ Also, it is politically expedient for politicians to use this racist rhetoric. This racist rhetoric is a political tool to appeal to an increasingly racist public.³¹ Thus, the condemnations of the Ottoman Empire made by those like Gladstone lack any factual authority. They are simply motivated by a racist prejudice against the Turkish people.

After delegitimizing the condemnations as racist, the author continues by attacking those who made the racist claims. Specifically, the author questions whether these British politicians and journalists even possess the moral authority to make such racist aspersions in the first place. As the author states, “We wish to discuss the true character of the humanity by which [the British] pretend to be prompted in their campaign.”³² Specifically, the author demonstrates

24 “A Study in English Turcophobia,” 4.

25 “A Study in English Turcophobia,” 3.

26 “A Study in English Turcophobia,” 30.

27 “A Study in English Turcophobia,” 3.

28 “A Study in English Turcophobia,” 12.

29 “A Study in English Turcophobia,” 8, 13.

30 “A Study in English Turcophobia,” 8.

31 “A Study in English Turcophobia,” 16.

32 “A Study in English Turcophobia,” 4.

the hypocrisy of the British concerning the Boer War (1899-1902) in their South African colony. How can the British condemn any mistreatment by the Ottomans and equate them to animals when they have been trying for “three years to bring the Boers to submission?” The author points out that even the “Englishmen themselves” have reported the oppression of the Boers as “deplorable.”³³ It is odd that “professional politicians seem to be more keenly concerned with the state of things in Turkey, than with the affairs of their own country.”³⁴ However, the author is careful to maintain the moral high ground, even while admonishing the British hypocrisy. The author explains, in criticizing the British for their hypocrisy, they do not hope to “imitate the reprehensible” and “excessively violent nature of their attacks” made against the Turkish people.³⁵ Rather, “a sense of decency prevents [the author] from insulting any nation” and its people with “indiscriminate aspersions.”³⁶ This article suggests that the British politicians, not the Turks, are the ones who resort to violence to achieve their goals. Thus, the British are both hypocrites and not cultivated enough to abstain from violent attacks as the Turks in the article do. Not only are the condemnations racially motivated, but also lack any moral authority over the Turkish.

The racist rhetoric of Gladstone’s condemnation of the Batak Massacre in his *Bulgarian Horrors* overshadowed the substantive objections it contained. The racist attacks enabled the Ottomans to dictate the rhetorical ground on which their defense would be fought. As demonstrated in “A Study in English Turcophobia,” the Ottomans focused their responses on defending Turkish honor. To do this, they discredited the condemnations as racially motivated and lacking moral authority over the Turks. The condemnations of their wrongdoings were simultaneously discredited with their rhetoric. Gladstone’s rhetoric turned what should have been an irrefutable censure, into a protracted and contentious debate. While the Ottomans surely would have contested the condemnations regardless, this rhetoric undoubtedly made their denial easier and more believable.

These same polemics are still being used today by President Erdogan to deny the Armenian Genocide. In this light, Biden could have preempted these rhetorical arguments by

33 “A Study in English Turcophobia,” 6.

34 “A Study in English Turcophobia,” 48

35 “A Study in English Turcophobia,” 4.

36 “A Study in English Turcophobia,” 4.

President Erdogan in his initial statement on the Armenian Genocide. This paper does not argue that there is a direct link between Erdogan's statement and the Ottoman response to Gladstone's pamphlet. Further historical research is needed to substantiate this claim. However, this paper does suggest that there is historical precedent for these rhetorical strategies in Turkey. In the same way the "Lost Cause Myth" created by the South following the American Civil War still informs contemporary denials of slavery's role in the war, so too might this rhetorical strategy still influence how contemporary pro-Turkish actors deny historical Turkish wrongdoings.³⁷ Additionally, this paper draws attention to the importance of how condemnations of atrocities are crafted. A condemnation should make the evidence of atrocity the only portion of its argument available to debate. This is especially true when the country being condemned, like Turkey, has a history of rebutting the rhetoric, rather than the evidence, of condemnations made against them. The evidence, in its proper context, must speak for itself.

³⁷ "Lost Cause," Encyclopædia Britannica (Encyclopædia Britannica, inc.), accessed March 5, 2022, <https://www.britannica.com/topic/Lost-Cause>.

Bibliography:

“A Study in English Turcophobia,” (London: Pan-Islamic Society, 1904).

Auchterlonie, Paul. “From the Eastern Question to the Dearth of General Gordon:

Representations of the Middle East in the Victorian Periodical Press, 1976-1885,” *Britishish*

Journal of Middle Eastern Studies, Vol. 28, No.1 (2001), 11.

Bey, Ismail. *Memoire Sur Les Evenements du Sandjak de Philippopoli*, Constantiople:

Typographie et lithographie centrales, 1877. p. 12.

Biden, Joe. “Statement by President Joe Biden on Armenian Remembrance Day.” The White House. The United States Government, April 24, 2021.

<https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/statements-releases/2021/04/24/statement-by-president-joe-biden-on-armenian-remembrance-day/>.

“Bulgarian Horrors.” Encyclopædia Britannica. Encyclopædia Britannica, inc. Accessed

February 23, 2022. <https://www.britannica.com/event/Bulgarian-Horrors>.

Çiçek, Nazan. “The Turkish Response to Bulgarian Horrors: A Study in English

Turcophobia.” *Middle Eastern Studies* 42, no. 1 (2006): 87–102.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/00263200500399579>.

Deringil, Selim. *The Well Protected Domains, Ideology and the Legitimization of power in the*

Ottoman Empire 1876-1909 (London and New York: I.B Tauris, 1998, 135.

Erdogan, Tayyip. “Erdogan Slams Biden’s Recognition of Armenian ‘Genocide’.” Genocide

News | Al Jazeera. Al Jazeera, April 26, 2021.

<https://www.aljazeera.com/news/2021/4/26/erdogan-slams-bidens-armenian-genocide-recognition>.

“German Scientists Deny 5 Centuries of Bulgaria’s History.” Novinite.com - Sofia News

Agency. Accessed February 23, 2022.

https://www.novinite.com/view_news.php?id=79747.

Gladstone, William. *The Turco-Servian War: Bulgarian Horrors and the Question of the East*.

New York: Lovell, Adam, Wesson, 1876.

“Gladstone and Disraeli.” *Encyclopædia Britannica*. Encyclopædia Britannica, inc. Accessed February 27, 2022. <https://www.britannica.com/place/United-Kingdom/Gladstone-and-Disraeli>.

Heraclides, Alexis, and Ada Dialla. “The Bulgarian Atrocities: A Bird’s Eye View of Intervention with Emphasis on Britain, 1875–78.” *Humanitarian Intervention in the Long Nineteenth Century: Setting the Precedent*, 148–68. Manchester University Press, 2015. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt1mf71b8.13>.

Kerelova, Bosilka and Robert Jasper Moore. *Under The Balkans, Notes of a Visit to the District of Philippopolis in 1876*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1877. p. 112.

Kiliç, Ayten. “The International Repercussions of the 1876 April Uprising Within The Ottoman Empire.” *Dergipark*. Center for Eurasian Studies, 2014. <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/download/article-file/700978>.

“Lost Cause.” *Encyclopædia Britannica*. Encyclopædia Britannica, inc. Accessed March 5, 2022. <https://www.britannica.com/topic/Lost-Cause>.

McCarthy, Justin. *Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922*. Princeton, NJ: Darwin Press Inc, 2014. p. 60.

Millman, Richard. “The Bulgarian Massacres Reconsidered.” *The Slavonic and East European Review* 58, no. 2 (1980): 218–31. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4208028>.

Peers, Ewin. “The Assassinations at Constantinople. Moslem Atrocities in Bulgaria.” Doc. 358, *British Documents on Foreign Affairs*, Part I, Vol.II, 263-266.

Sahara, Tetsuya, “Two Different Images,” *War and Diplomacy: The Russo-Turkish War of 1877- 1878 and the Treaty of Berlin*, 481.

Schuyler, Eugene. “Report by Mr. Schuyler on the Bulgarian Atrocities,” 10 August 1876,

Philippopoli, Doc. 452, Inclosure in Doc. 450, *British Documents on Foreign Affairs*, Part I, Vol. II, 359.

Shannon, Richard. *Gladstone and the Bulgarian Agitation 1876*. Hassocks: Harvester Press, 1975. p. 47.

“The 1875–78 Crisis.” Encyclopædia Britannica. Encyclopædia Britannica, inc. Accessed February 25, 2022. <https://www.britannica.com/place/Ottoman-Empire/The-1875-78-crisis>.

Whitehead, Cameron. “The Bulgarian Horrors: Culture and the International History of the Great

Eastern Crisis, 1876-1878.” Dissertation, University of British Columbia, 2014.

Yosmaoğlu, Ipek K. “Chasing the Printed Word: Press Censorship in the Ottoman Empire, 1876-

1913.” *The Turkish Studies Association Journal* 27, no. 1/2 (2003): 15–49.

<http://www.jstor.org/stable/43383672>.

Virtue, Glory and Faction: A Comparative Analysis for Motives for Political Participation in the Early United States and the Roman Empire

Alexander Barr

Abstract:

The influence of the Roman Republic on the development of the American political system during the founding of the United States is widely acknowledged, but modern historical research has revealed a wide gap between the Founding Fathers' conceptions of the Roman Republic and the historical reality. In light of the modern historiography of the Roman Republic, this article presents a comparative analysis of the political culture of both states and seeks to establish what, if any, systems, ideas, and institutions the American system shares with Rome. Specifically, it focuses on the systems, frameworks, and ideas that the Roman and American Republics used to ensure peaceful political cooperation within established boundaries and norms.

First, this article tracks the ideological legacy of Roman political culture through the term *virtus* and its English translation, "virtue", to show how Roman politics was misinterpreted and idealized by the Founding Fathers and other thinkers of their time. Virtue, which was a value of tremendous significance to both the American founders and the Romans, was taken by Eighteenth Century Europeans and Americans to mean selfless service to the state, while the term primarily denoted martial prowess and manliness to the Romans. This article then features a comparative analysis of the two systems and shows that they operate using the same underlying principle of controlled internal competition to respond to different historical circumstances. Despite a changing historical understanding, this article demonstrates that the similarities between Roman and early American republicanism are still visible.

Introduction

When the Founding Fathers of the United States set about the task of creating a new government for the nation, they faced a momentous task. Republican government was largely a historical oddity, especially in the world of the Eighteenth Century. They had no clear precedent or model for what they were attempting to do. To create a novel system, they drew on inspiration from across the realms of political knowledge. They studied history and philosophy, both modern and ancient, extracted the ideas they thought worked best, and synthesized new institutions. One of their most important sources of inspiration for this task was the Roman Republic. Very few examples of republican government existed in the thousands of years between Rome and the United States, and those that did were mostly city-states or dominions of similar size. Therefore, the Founders drew heavily upon Rome due to its relatively successful record as a large and stable power and the lack of other useful examples.

The Roman Republic had a particularly strong influence on early American political theory, and this article will examine the connection between the political foundations of both states, specifically the means for encouraging political cooperation within established structures and norms. However, the influence of Rome on the United States was not direct. The founders' understanding of the Republic was flawed and colored by various misconceptions compared to the contemporary scholarly consensus because history as a discipline was still in a nascent state.

When the founders looked to Rome, they misunderstood the motives that drove the Senatorial class to participate in government. They believed that the Roman concept of *virtus* meant selfless service to the state, which it did not mean at any point during the Republic. They believed that this value was the primary motivation for Roman aristocrats to work for the common good, which was not the case according to the modern understanding of the Republic. The founders were distrustful of their misconstrued conception of virtue, and they decided that it was not a stable basis for their government. They decided instead to build their political system on the principle of balancing opposing private interests against each other to create a stable political order. Though the founders may not have realized it, this same prin-

ciple also motivated political participation in Rome. Because both republics made use of the same principle, the United States and Rome employed similar structures for controlling private interests and maintaining the supremacy of the state over individual actors. This article will demonstrate how the Roman Republic and early American incentive structures are similar and argue that, despite the founders' misinterpretation of the Roman government and the concept of *virtus*, the two states still developed similar solutions to address the problem of political stability.

Ultimately, the Founding Fathers were able to use their knowledge of history to improve upon the precedent of Rome and create a system that addresses the faults of the Roman government. The Roman Republic fell in large part because of its inability to maintain a stable government as political conditions changed, but the American system was built to be far more adaptable with Rome's faults in mind.

1. Classicism and the Founding Fathers

The cultural, educational, and philosophical tradition of Classicism was omnipresent during the Revolutionary era. Across the Thirteen Colonies, the ancient world was a vital part of the shared culture among the educated elite. Once the Thirteen Colonies won their independence, this cultural touchstone became political and played an important role in the formation of a new political order.

Historian Thomas Ricks explained that "Greco-Roman antiquity was not distant to the leaders of the American Revolution. It was present in their lives, as part of their political vocabulary and as the foundation of their personal values".¹ Therefore, not only the aesthetics and stories of the ancient world, but the actual philosophical, moral, and political substance of antiquity, influenced the Founding Fathers.² These ideas were central in the drafting of the constitution and the debate that surrounded it.³ The Founding Fathers revered Rome and admired what the Romans were able to accomplish; for example, Alexander Hamilton once asserted that "the Roman Republic attained to the utmost height of human greatness".⁴ The founders' exposure to antiquity came through a variety of channels. Those who were educated

1 Ricks, *First Principles*, 3

2 Millar, *The Roman Republic in Political Thought*, 120

3 Millar, 121

4 Hamilton in Ricks, *First Principles*, 8

became intimately acquainted with the classical authors through the colonial colleges, where the curriculum consisted almost entirely of Latin and Greek literature, and those who were not formally educated picked up classical culture secondhand.⁵ The focus of the revolutionary generation rested primarily in Rome over Greece, and there was a particular emphasis on the Middle and Late Republic, from the Second Punic War to the Roman civil wars and the eventual collapse of the republican government.⁶ The most popular ancient authors were Livy, Sallust, Plutarch, and Tacitus, but above all Cicero was broadly held as the most important.⁷ The most widely revered political figures were men such as Cato the Younger and Cicero, who were seen as heroes for defending the Republic against tyrannical forces that sought to overthrow it.⁸ The fixation of the founders on certain authors and individuals demonstrates the outlook on the ancient world that they chose to adopt. They drew lessons about politics and statecraft primarily from Republican Rome over Greek or later Imperial authors, and they sympathized with the historical figures whom they saw as preserving the traditional system. They absorbed the values of the Classical authors they read, and they would try to adopt those ideas to their own political moment.

The founders' focus on literature also shows the extent of exposure they had to the ancient world. They did not have the abundance of archeological artifacts, linguistic analysis, and historiographical techniques that are employed in modern-day scholarship. Modern academia has produced countless volumes analyzing the Roman Republic, and by combining modern data and techniques with a close reading of the literary sources historians have constructed a far more nuanced picture of the ancient world than that which existed at the time of the American Revolution. The founders did not have the wealth of information that is available today, and as a result, their historical understanding was, through no fault of their own, lacking. This lack of detailed scholarship and nuanced understanding caused them to make a number of interpretive errors when examining the Roman Republic, and chief among these was their misinterpretation of the Roman concept of virtue.

The Revolutionary-era conception of the Roman idea of virtue, derived from the Latin

5 For example, see Washington in Ricks, 10-11

6 Ricks, 6-8

7 Ricks, 8

8 Ricks, 8

virtus, was central to the founders' understanding of the Roman Republic, but their conception was entirely inaccurate. The founders believed that participation in the Roman government was entirely driven by civic virtue, which they essentially defined as selfless service to the state. They believed that this was an untenable principle on which to build a stable government, so during the constitutional convention, they rejected it. However, the Roman system was not, according to the modern scholarly consensus, based on selfless service to the state.

Terms that denote morals and values are difficult to precisely define in a way that covers an entire society as value judgments are highly variable and subjective. This was as true for the Romans as it was for the Revolutionary era. While the definition of virtue in both eras was ambiguous to a certain degree, it is clear they meant very different things. The founders, when assessing the Roman idea of *virtus*, thought that it was “the essential element of public life,” according to Ricks.⁹ The definition that he gave for the Revolutionary-era understanding of the word virtue is “putting the common good before one’s own interests”.¹⁰ Historian Joyce Appleby defined the conception of virtue as when “leaders put the common good above their own interests”.¹¹ Philosophically, the founders were influenced by the enlightenment, and one of the most impactful works of political theory for the Revolutionary generation was *The Spirit of the Laws* by Montesquieu.¹² One of the primary case studies that Montesquieu employed in the treatise was the Roman Republic, and his conception informed the founders. American historian Harvey Mansfield described Montesquieu’s definition as follows.

Montesquieu defined it to be strict, stern, austere, and even ascetic. He compared the virtue of republican citizens to the love that monks have for their order. Just as monks subordinate their particular interests when living together, so do citizens for the general good of the republic. Virtue in this view is self-sacrifice, the very contrary of self-interest.¹³

Based on these definitions, it is clear that the founders saw Roman virtue as something entire-

9 Ricks, 5

10 Ricks, 5

11 Appleby in Chan, “Joyce Appleby, Historian of Capitalism and American Identity, Is Dead at 87”

12 Ricks, *First Principles*, 87-90; Millar, *The Roman Republic in Political Thought*, 121

13 Mansfield, “Liberty and Virtue in the American Founding”, 16

ly removed from personal motivations. The sole outlet of virtue was in service to the state, which was to come at the expense of personal loyalties. This definition does not match the Roman use of the term. However, this definition of virtue had a large impact on the founding of the United States.

2. The Roman Conception of Virtue

The Roman definition of *virtus* was dynamic, always in flux, and often politically charged. However, to the Romans, *virtus* never meant selfless service to the state. The word derives from *vir*, Latin for man, so in a basic and overarching sense, the word was associated with manliness.¹⁴ Besides manliness, the word took on more complex military and political meanings. *Virtus* was a core value to the Romans, and it played a large role in the Romans' view of their culture and their state. In his book on the subject, historian Myles McDonnell explained that “*Virtus* was regarded as nothing less than the quality associated with, and responsible for, Roman greatness, and was central to the construction of the ancient Roman self image”.¹⁵ For example, Cicero called *virtus* “the badge of the Roman race and breed”.¹⁶ For most of the republican period, the sole denotation of *virtus* was “martial prowess or courage”.¹⁷ This was the traditional definition of the term, but in the late republican period, certain authors, such as Cicero, began to consciously alter its meaning into a broader moral ideal.¹⁸ However, the new conception of the phrase as a “wide ranging and all-encompassing ethical concept” remained niche and decidedly non-traditional for the duration of the Republic.¹⁹ Both of these definitions of virtue, the traditional one which denoted martial power and the non-traditional one with broader connotations, do not match the Founding Fathers' conception of the term.

As previously established, the founders focused their attention on the Middle and Late Republic, and they believed that virtue was vital to the Romans' success during this period. It is therefore necessary to examine how the concept of virtue was defined during this time to

14 McDonnell, Roman Manliness, 2

15 McDonnell, 2

16 Cicero, Philippics 4.13

17 McDonnell, Roman Manliness, 5

18 McDonnell, 5

19 McDonnell, 5

understand the difference between the reality of the Roman government and the perspective the founders had. In the Middle and Late Republic until the generation of Cicero, *virtus* was used virtually exclusively to refer to “physical courage,” which was seen as an entirely positive value.²⁰ At the time, it was the only word in the Latin vocabulary to denote such an idea, and it was mainly used in a military sense or in other contexts that involved physical confrontation.²¹ While *virtus* was a value that was displayed and exercised publicly during this period, it was not a part of domestic politics until Cicero’s time.²² Virtue was, therefore, entirely a martial value during the period of the Republic’s meteoric rise to hegemony over the Mediterranean, and if it did cross into the political sphere, it was only in the context of war.

During the final generation of the Republic, a new definition of *virtus* as an ethical concept began to emerge. During the Late Republic, “*virtus* is often found as a unified, all-embracing value in non-philosophical as well as philosophical works”.²³ This change was due in large part to influence from Greek philosophy, and this definition became a distinctly separate and inferior value to the traditional idea of *virtus* as courage.²⁴ The rise of this new conception of *virtus* was largely attributable to Cicero. He used the term with increasingly diverse connotations, and he was the first to apply *virtus* as an ethical standard to the realm of politics.²⁵

Cicero was a *novus homo*, but unlike other new men and the established *nobiles*, he did not build his political career on military success, as was the standard. Instead, he established his reputation based on his oratory and success in court. This was an unconventional political path, and in order to claim the value of *virtus* for himself, he purposefully altered its use, taking the emerging Greek-inspired ethical definition and casting it as an important political element.²⁶ An example of the new meaning can be seen in his speech in defense of Cluentius, a seminal work of Roman legal theory.

As often as I rise to speak, so often do I think that I am myself on my trial, not only as to my ability, but also as to my virtue and as to the discharge of my duty; lest I should either seem to have undertaken what I am incapable of performing, which is an impudent act, or not to perform it as well as I can, which is either a perfidious action or a careless

20 McDonnell, 62

21 McDonnell, 59-71

22 McDonnell, 134-135

23 McDonnell, 294

24 McDonnell, 293-295

25 McDonnell, 333-344

26 McDonnell, 344-346

In this passage, Cicero conflated the act of advocacy and political duty with virtue. He claimed that arguing in court was a valid way of expressing virtue and that the effectiveness of an argument was a measure of virtue. This was the definition of civic virtue that the founders picked up through their reading of Cicero. However, this definition was not traditional and it did not denote selfless service to the state, as the founders believed it to do.

The new moral-political conception of virtue remained niche, even during Cicero's time, and the traditional definition of martial courage held far more sway. For example, Pompey, who lived during Cicero's time, was seen by his contemporaries as the most virtuous man of his day due solely to his military achievements.²⁸ Other authors and political figures contemporary with Cicero, such as Julius Caesar, only employed the military definition of *virtus*.²⁹ For example, in the *Bello Civili*, Caesar discussed the military ability of two Gauls who had served under him since the Gallic Wars. He called them "men of outstanding virtue, whose excellent and very brave services Caesar had employed in all his Gallic wars," which is a good example of the mainstream use of the term.³⁰ Throughout the *Commentarii de Bello Gallico*, Caesar used the term to refer to his soldiers in a way that clearly limited its meaning to martial prowess.³¹ Even Cicero himself used the traditional definition frequently, and he conceded that it was more common and more potent than the new conception he shaped.³² In the *De Officiis*, he stated that "Most people think that the achievements of war are more important than those of peace," which demonstrates the still-dominant role of martial prowess in the Roman mind.³³ Sallust also employed both definitions of *virtus* in his work, but he used the old and new definitions separately, keeping their meanings distinct from each other.³⁴ Notably, during the prologue to the *Bellum Jugurthinum*, in which he gives an account of the Roman political system that will be examined later, he used the term in its traditional, martial sense.³⁵

27 Cicero Pro Cluentio 51

28 McDonnell, Roman Manliness, 293

29 McDonnell, 300-304

30 Caesar, Commentarii de Bello Civili 3.59

31 McDonnell, Roman Manliness, 305-312

32 McDonnell, 348-349

33 Cicero De Officiis I.74

34 McDonnell, Roman Manliness, 356-357

35 McDonnell, 360

The dynamic definition of *virtus* was fundamentally misunderstood by the founding fathers. Its traditional use, which is important to understanding the structure of the Republic, was not political, but martial. Even the Ciceronian definition, which was political, did not entail selflessness but rather was an overall measure of a person's character and rhetorical ability. Additionally, the change in definition to include morality occurred when the institutions of the Republic were in decay, so it would not have been a helpful usage for the founders to copy.

The founders believed that *virtus* as they understood it was an insufficient principle to use as a basis for participation in politics. They were correct in this assessment; certainly, the Roman constitution was not based upon selfless service to the state. The system the founders devised to replace virtue - a system of balancing competing interests to create a stable political system - was in its underlying principles remarkably similar to the Roman system for controlling political actors.

3. Motives for Political Participation in the American System

In choosing to reject a system based on virtue as they understood it, the founders were primarily concerned with avoiding the destructive tendencies of what they called faction. Faction, as they defined the term, was the formation of political groups based around a common self-interest that would attempt to drive the policy of the state in place of virtue, or selfless service. The solution to this problem, theorized primarily by James Madison, was to balance competing interest groups against each other instead of relying on the virtue of political actors, which was made possible by a large federal representative republic. This system became enshrined in the constitution as a series of rigorous checks and balances and eventually came to dominate American politics through the two-party system. These two features are still hallmarks of the American government today, and they are the direct results of the founders grappling with the legacy of the Romans.

The founders were skeptical of virtue and ultimately rejected it due to concerns over its reliability as a motive for political participation. The founders were concerned about human nature and distrusted the idea that selfless service could be relied on as the sole principle to guide government.³⁶ For example, Alexander Hamilton stated that “it is not safe to trust to

36 Ricks, *First Principles*, 205-207

the virtue of any people,” demonstrating concern over the long-term reliability of virtue.³⁷

Contemporary political theorists such as Montesquieu also rejected civic virtue as a base for government; he argued that relying on virtue would always be unsuccessful because doing so required the suppression of personal interests, passions, and motives - an impossible task.³⁸

Ultimately, the founders did not trust virtue because they were worried about the formation of political factions based on these personal interests, and they believed these interests were impossible to suppress due to human nature. The very existence of faction was in opposition to the idea of civic altruism. The solution they eventually reached was not to try to prevent faction but to accept it and create a system that mitigated its negative effects.

The political system that dealt with the problem of faction was largely the design of James Madison, and he elaborated on the principles behind it *The Federalist X*. In the essay, Madison defined factions as groups that form out of differences in opinion or preference. He argued that factions could form over ideological or material disputes in matters ranging from religion and political theory to commerce and emotion.³⁹ Notably, he listed “an attachment to different leaders ambitiously contending for pre-eminence and power” as a potential problem, and he considered an “unequal distribution of property” to be the primary cause of political division.⁴⁰ Madison considered the formation of factions to be natural and inevitable in a society that possessed liberty, and he believed that it was impossible to “render them all subservient to the public good”.⁴¹

Madison argued that the solution was not to resist faction but to restrain its negative effects.⁴² This could be done by balancing competing interests against each other within a political system that allowed them to reach a peaceful compromise. Madison gave the example of promoting domestic manufacturing by restricting imports to illustrate his point. On one side stood the landed agricultural interests that relied on exports to sell their goods, and on the other stood the domestic manufacturers.⁴³ The balance of the compromise between the two interests would be determined by their relative political power within the government, and,

37 Alexander Hamilton in Ricks, 206

38 Mansfield, “Liberty and Virtue in the American Founding”, 16-17

39 Madison, “The Federalist X”, 56-57

40 Madison, 56-57

41 Madison, 58

42 Madison, 58-59

43 Madison, 57

ideally, “justice ought to hold the balance between them”.⁴⁴ Creating a system of government that would allow just compromises to be created was therefore of great importance: “to secure the public and private rights against the danger of such a faction, and at the same time to preserve the spirit and form of popular government, is then the great object to which our great inquiries are directed”.⁴⁵ Madison then argued that a large representative republic with a system of checks and balances is the best solution to the problem.⁴⁶ A representative system would “refine and enlarge” political views to make them less extreme and make their proponents more inclined to compromise; a large, federal state would prevent radical, niche factions and ambitious individuals from gaining enough support to control policy; a system which balances power between different branches and levels of government would block radical or unjust policies from gaining enough momentum to violate personal liberty or constitutional limits on governmental authority.⁴⁷ Ricks argued that this position was a paradigm shift in the understanding of civic participation. Madison argued that pursuing private interests was not against the spirit of popular government as the founders’ conception of virtue would suggest.⁴⁸ Instead, “the more interests that are at play in the historical arena, the smaller the chance that one intense passion will prevail”.⁴⁹ Mansfield argued that this system recast ambition as a vital part of politics as opposed to a problem.⁵⁰ When combined with a rigorous system of checks on power, “ambition leads to a new conception of responsibility”.⁵¹ In *The Federalist X*, Madison laid out a solution to the problems of popular government, problems that also plagued Rome. His solution was informed by the historical record, and, although he may not have realized, it resembled the Rome system for subordinating private interests to the authority of the state.

James Madison saw the problems of private interest and ambition as inevitable in a republican government. Certainly, the same problems of preserving private rights and popular government in the face of factions and individual demagogues also plagued Rome, and their system of balancing these interests will be examined in the next section. Madison’s solution

44 Madison, 57

45 Madison, 58

46 Madison, 59-62

47 Madison, 59-62

48 Ricks, *First Principles*, 207-209

49 Ricks, 207

50 Mansfield, “Liberty and Virtue in the American Founding”, 17-19

51 Mansfield, 18

was to create a governmental structure in which interest groups competed through legal means to advance their causes. This system encouraged the political class to compete amongst each other for representation in government and policy initiatives, forming the ideological basis for participation in the new government. The political players were kept in check by a system of checks and balances and responsibility to a large electorate through regular elections. Ultimately, these controls on power served to blunt the potential of any one individual or faction to usurp the state - if they became too powerful, other factions and the general populace could band together to resist their influence through legitimate political channels. Under the framework of the Constitution, the courts, legislature, and president have the means to effectively block the others from acting if there is strong enough opposition, which is a purposeful feature of the system.⁵² Madison's structure effectively restrains the negative effects of faction while allowing the positive effects to thrive. Ambition and private interest are more intense motivations to encourage political participation than selfless civic virtue, and the party system has successfully guided American politics for most of the country's existence based on the principles of faction. Thus far, history has shown Madison's solution to be largely effective. The Roman solution, which was similar in principle but far less extensive, was not as successful. It functioned well in the environment it was created for, but as the circumstances of the Republic changed, it collapsed, which eventually resulted in the downfall of the republican government.

4. Motives for Political Participation in the Roman System

The Roman system of political participation was highly effective for the specific historical circumstance that the Middle Republic existed in, and as a result, the state flourished and expanded for several centuries with relatively few internal threats to its fundamental stability. The system that emerged in the 4th Century B.C.E, following the Struggle of the Orders, was designed to encourage participation, balance competing interests, and check over-ambition in an aristocracy that was primarily focused on making war. However, when the necessary functions of the state began to expand substantially beyond matters relating to war during the Late Republic, the traditional system of checks and balances was unable to adapt.

52 See U.S. Const.

The Roman government was primarily concerned with the organization and pursuit of warfare, and the practice of war was central to the culture and values of the aristocracy. During all eras of the Republic, the Romans went to war virtually every year, and it was through war that they managed to rise to dominance over the Mediterranean.⁵³ Warfare was a formative part of a Roman aristocrat's youth, and service in the army was both a requirement for participation in the government and a part of the duties of many magistrates.⁵⁴ According to Polybius, "no one is eligible for any political office before he has completed 10 years' service," which illustrates the importance of militarism to the Roman government.⁵⁵ Once in government, martial matters remained of primary importance. Quaestors and Praetors both usually participated in warfare, and the primary duty of the consulship was military command.⁵⁶ This focus on warfare in the government was emblematic of a broader inclination towards military matters among the *nobiles*, who comprised the political class in Rome.⁵⁷ Their obsession with martial success, which in the vocabulary of Madison can be viewed as a form of private interest, formed the primary motive for their participation in government.

Roman society measured an individual's success primarily by their military achievements, and the prestige that was associated with martial prowess was of great importance to an aristocrat's personal and political ambitions. Historian William Harris described military success as "by far the most glorious kind of achievement by which [the Roman aristocrat] could demonstrate his prowess".⁵⁸ Military success was important because of the prestige associated with it, and this prestige conferred direct benefits in politics and society.⁵⁹ Therefore, partaking in military action that was successful for the state was also in the personal interest of the elite. Harris explained that military success "was of vital importance to many, probably most, Roman aristocrats".⁶⁰ Two terms that were associated with the prestige of combat were *laus* and *gloria*.⁶¹ The Oxford Latin dictionary defines the former as "praise" and "reputation" and the latter as "glory" and honor bestowed upon someone by "general consent".⁶² Both of

53 Harris, War and Imperialism in Republican Rome, 9-11

54 Harris, 11-12

55 Polybius Histories, VI.19.3

56 Harris, War and Imperialism in Republican Rome, 15

57 The *nobiles* as a group were defined by their participation in government, see Harris 28-30

58 Harris, 11

59 Harris, 17

60 Harris, 17

61 Harris, 17

62 Oxford Latin Dictionary, 2nd ed., s.v. "gloria," s.v. "laus."

these are values that denote honor and preeminence within the community, and they had personal as well as political connotations. Other terms associated with military success include *maiestas*, *honores*, *dignitas*, and *auctoritas*.⁶³ These terms also indicate the same concept, that some sort of prestige (greatness, honor, dignity, or authority) was associated with military achievements. Ultimately, the prestige of military success was fundamentally tied to the concept of *virtus*. The Roman conception of *virtus* emphasized martial prowess, and as *laus*, *gloria*, and other honors were awarded for success in war, demonstrating *virtus* would have been inherent in winning them.

Military glory was desirable for several reasons. Under the Roman values system, they were ends within themselves, and they were also part of what defined the elite as separate from the rest of the citizenry.⁶⁴ *Laus* and *gloria* could also be hereditary. The glory of one's ancestors could be passed down to them, and glory could be "accumulated by distinguished families".⁶⁵ Therefore, these values played an important social function which was complemented by their role in politics. *Laus* and *gloria* were "indispensable" to the political interests of aristocrats as they played an important role in elections and assemblies.⁶⁶ Prestige of this sort made one a more qualified candidate for political office, which was extremely important as the Roman aristocracy was highly competitive.⁶⁷ During the Middle and Late Republic, competition for the high magistracies was intense, and the status of the *nobiles* and their families was determined by their access to and success in the high offices.⁶⁸ Therefore, *laus* and *gloria* were inherent in the definition of the Roman aristocracy and necessary to maintain noble status. Glory was highly desirable and served as an intense private motivator for participation in the Roman government.

Participation in the Roman system was driven by personal interest, just as the American system was intended to be. The political cycle based around winning glory drove the

63 Holkeskamp, "Conquest, Competition, and Consensus", 99

64 Harris, War and Imperialism in Republican Rome, 30

65 Harris, 30

66 Harris, 17

67 Harris, 18, 30-31. There were, of course, other factors that determined qualification, but military achievements were primary.

68 Harris, 28-34

Roman elite to act in service to the state. As young men, future office-holders would distinguish themselves during their service, or would already be prominent because of their family name. This prestige would give them a competitive advantage against other aristocrats in running for lower offices such as the Quaestorship, where they would hope to gain more prestige through further military service. If they were prominent enough, they could run for the Praetorship and eventually Consulship, and if they won the elections, they would have the opportunity to command armies and gain even more glory. The height of this system was the Roman triumph, which would secure a commander's glory for life and would increase his family's prestige for generations.⁶⁹ For most of the Republic's existence, this system of rewards was highly effective at keeping individuals subordinate to the state and encouraging behavior that was beneficial to the community. Since, for most of the republican era, the state had a monopoly on the recruitment of the army and the allotment of command, the only way for individuals to win glory and advance their ambitions was to serve the state and play by the rules.⁷⁰ Since competition within the aristocracy was so fierce, it was hypothetically impossible to violate political norms to win glory without incurring the wrath of other powerful politicians who had a vested interest in keeping the playing field level.⁷¹ This focus on creating norms to regulate political advancement can be seen in the development of the *cursus honorum*, which attempted to standardize the path to high offices to control competition between aristocrats. The number of magistracies and short, single-year terms were also important in allowing a competitive pool of talent to rise. Notably, selfless service to the state was not one of the values that drove the *nobiles* to compete in this system.

The system of competition for honors as the main motive for government is supported by several historians as well as ancient sources. Harris was one of the first to provide an in-depth discussion of this system in 1979, and it has become a common perspective since then.⁷² Before then, historian Ronald Syme advocated for a similar understanding of a competitive,

69 Harris, 26

70 Harris, 11. It was for this reason that the state began to collapse when it lost control over the army and military policy as honor could be won and careers could be advanced by means that were subversive to the state. For example, the politicization of commands (ie the dispute between Marius and Sulla) and the Marian reforms.

71 Harris, 34. When the Roman political system functioned well, this was the case. However, when the violation of precedent and political norms became common during the Late Republic, the competitive nature of the aristocracy only exacerbated the collapse of the system because no means were off limits in the struggle for power.

72 See Holkeskamp, "Conquest, Competition, and Consensus", 97

interest-driven political system. He argued that “the political life of the Roman Republic was stamped and swayed... by the strife for power, wealth, and glory. The contestants were the *nobiles* among themselves, as individuals or in groups”.⁷³ When writing on the historiography of the Roman Republic, Karl Holkeskamp argued that “achievement in politics and above all in war thus gradually became the one and only criterion of access to, and rank in, the emerging patricio-plebeian ruling class”.⁷⁴ These statements emphasize the idea that the Roman elite competed amongst themselves for honor and power within the government. Additionally, while Harris’ argument focuses on the Republic from 327 B.C.E onwards, Holkeskamp located the beginning of this system earlier in the 4th century as an outcome of the struggle of the orders.⁷⁵ Therefore, it is generally accepted by modern historians that the political model described above was in place for the entirety of the Middle and Late Republic.

The clearest evidence for the political model described above can be found in the writings of Sallust, a Late Republican historian who was a contemporary to the collapse of the Republic. In his introductions to the histories of the Jugurthine War and the Catilinarian Conspiracy, he gave an analysis of the state of Roman politics and morals. He saw the Republic’s downfall as a result of the traditional system and values giving way: “given today’s morality, who in the world is there who does not vie with his ancestors in riches and extravagance rather than in uprightness and exertion?”.⁷⁶ Sallust explained that *gloria* was derived from *virtus*, definitively linking the two concepts: “And when [mankind] advances to glory by the path of virtue, it is abundantly powerful and potent”.⁷⁷ Because *virtus* was an inherently martial concept, this statement provides evidence for the link between military achievement and prestige. Sallust then explained why this prestige was important to the Roman elite.

“...eminent men of our country were accustomed to declare that their hearts were set heavily aflame for the pursuit of virtue whenever they gazed upon the representations of their ancestors... it was from the memory of accomplishments that this flame swelled in the breast of men that would not be assuaged until their own prowess equaled the fame and glory of those models”.⁷⁸

73 Syme, *The Roman Revolution*, 11

74 Holkeskamp, “Conquest, Competition, and Consensus”, 99

75 See Holkeskamp

76 Sallust *Bellum Jugurthinum* 4

77 Sallust *Bellum Jugurthinum* 1

78 Sallust *Bellum Jugurthinum* 4

This passage illustrates the importance of glory as a motivation for participation in government. The intergenerational nature of glory compelled the Roman aristocracy to strive to do great things in war and in service to the state so that they could match their ancestors, and so that their descendants would view their memory in the same way. The passage connected the “pursuit of virtue,” meaning martial prowess, to “fame and glory,” further demonstrating the link between the two concepts.⁷⁹

Sallust argued that the high magistracies were the proper domain of those who achieved glory. When discussing political offices, he complained that in his day, Romans “strive for power and distinction by relying on intrigue and open fraud rather than noble practices”.⁸⁰ Ideally, then, political office was the reward for noble practices, such as winning glory. Sallust also detailed the extreme competition inherent in the political system. When discussing the Early Republic, he stated that “every man began more and more to distinguish himself and place his talent to the fore... such a craving for glory arrived on the scene”.⁸¹ Sallust may have been projecting backward the attitudes of the more recent past, but his assessment of political motives is nonetheless useful. Sallust then explained that, even during war, “their greatest struggle for glory was with one another; each man hastened to strike down the foe, to scale a wall, to be observed while doing such a deed. This they considered riches, this fair fame and high nobility”.⁸² This supports the model of the Roman political system as a competition between the nobility for honors. Romans competed to visibly outperform each other in battle, which would be useful not because it advanced the interests of the community but because it conferred fame and noble status. This statement also shows the power of the Roman system when it worked well. It motivated the Romans to fight fiercely and work for the interests of the state, and it was a key factor in Rome’s meteoric rise.

79 Sallust *Bellum Jugurthinum* 4

80 Sallust *Bellum Jugurthinum* 4

81 Sallust *Bellum Catilinae* 7

82 Sallust *Bellum Catilinae* 7

The Roman *nobiles* were motivated to participate in government and abide by existing norms out of a desire to gain prestige for themselves and their families. This prestige played an important role in political power in addition to being an end in itself. The intense competition between aristocrats (as well as new men) kept the system working and allowed talented individuals to rise to the top. This system broke down towards the end of the Republic, but before then, it worked remarkably well for a remarkably long time. Ultimately, while the system was effective, it was limited in scope. It balanced power in a martial context between aristocrats, but it failed to incorporate non-martial aspects of politics and society that ambitious aristocrats eventually exploited to destabilize the political order.

5. Comparing Motives for Political Participation in the Roman and American Systems

For governments to properly function, they must build political norms that incentivize individuals to cooperate and work for the public good. These norms could be written or unwritten, conscious or subconscious, but they must exist for a state to function. Otherwise, there is nothing to prevent ambitious individuals or powerful interest groups from unjustly and illegally seizing control of the government. States without a source of singular authority, such as a king, at the top of the political hierarchy are especially susceptible to this problem. It was a problem that both Rome and the Founding Fathers grappled with, and similar solutions emerged in both societies. While the founders intensely studied Rome, they misunderstood the fundamental motives at play in Roman politics. They believed that the Roman Republic functioned due to the selfless service of the political class, but this was not the case. It is not difficult to see why the founders may have thought this: when the Roman system worked well during the Middle Republic, it was highly effective at incentivizing individuals to work courageously and tirelessly in service of the state (primarily during war). However, there were always personal interests behind this service, namely the acquisition of glory. The founders were familiar with Cicero's untraditional definition of

virtus, and this likely made it difficult for them to understand the Roman government as modern historians do. Despite this misunderstanding, both societies found similar solutions to the problem of encouraging political cooperation, regardless of the vast distances in time that separated them and the fog of historical misinterpretation that clouded the founders' views. This is perhaps a testament to the importance of the study of history, and more broadly, the importance of ideas.

The Roman and American systems of political participation operated on the same underlying principle despite manifesting that principle in different ways. Both systems functioned by balancing competing personal interests against each other to reach a functional median that encouraged individuals to act for the state. The American system accomplished this by balancing different political interest groups, which Madison theorized would primarily be based on economic interest. These groups would then have to compete in a large representative republic for political power, and they were restrained by a system of written checks and balances. To gain power, they (theoretically) had to be popular among the people, ensuring that whichever interest held power had the support of the body politic. The Roman system functioned by pitting the political class against itself in a battle for honors and higher offices. Glory, which could only be conferred by the community, was of vital importance to political and personal success, so political actors were encouraged to do positive things for the community and were discouraged from subverting the state. This system was only concerned with the military aristocracy, and while it allowed Rome to flourish, its great weakness was that it was not adaptable. This was a problem that the American system addressed.

The greatest innovation of the American system over the Roman one was that it was designed to be more flexible and more broad in scope. The Roman system did not incorporate numerous social and political issues into its balance of power, and those issues were eventually exploited by ambitious individuals to the detriment of the state. The Roman system did not address the power of the people, other than in their capacity as an electorate. It did not consider the power of the plebeian assemblies or the Tribunes. During the Late Republic, these political institutions were used in innovative ways to disrupt the political order, and the Roman

political balance could not adapt. The Roman system of competing for glory left little room for domestic political issues such as wealth inequality, citizenship rights, and legal prosecution. It was designed for a small state with a primarily military focus, but when Rome expanded and the government's responsibilities increased, the traditional system could not keep up. Even though the Americans did not understand the complex motives at play in the Republican government, they saw these problems emerge during the Late Republic and realized they represented a failure on the part of the government. Therefore, they designed a system that would be flexible enough to deal with a diverse array of issues. The American system was not only built to balance one type of political interest as the Roman system was. Madison realized that factions could emerge over almost any issue, and the American system was built to withstand it. The American system did not only account for the power of the political class; it incorporated the entire citizenry into the balance. Political factions were encouraged to harness the power of the people as this power was accounted for through a large representative system with a strong judiciary. So far, the American system has proven durable, but only time will tell if there will one day be a problem it cannot face. The survival of this idea under vastly different historical circumstances - the Roman Republic, the Revolutionary era, and the present day - demonstrates the timelessness of the quest for political stability and the importance of studying the historical record. The legacy of the Roman Republic is still embedded in the foundations of American political theory, and its significance is not easily overstated.

Bibliography:

Chan, Sewell. 2017, 2 January. "Joyce Appleby, Historian of Capitalism and American Identity, Is Dead at 87." *New York Times*. <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/01/02/books/joyce-appleby-historian-of-capitalism-and-american-identity-is-dead-at-87.html>.

Harris, William V. *War and Imperialism in Republican Rome 327-70 B.C.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979.

Holkeskamp, Karl J. "Conquest, Competition, and Consensus: Roman Expansion in Italy and the Rise of the 'Nobilitas,'" in *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte*, Vol. 42, No. 1, 12-39. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1993.

Holkeskamp, Karl J. *Roman Republican Reflections - Studies in Politics, Power, and Pageantry*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2020.

Madison, James. "Federalist X." In *The Federalist*, by A. Hamilton, J. Madison, and J. Jay, 54-62. New York: The Heritage Press, 1945. Reprint.

Mansfield, Harvey C. "Liberty and Virtue in the American Founding." In *Never a Matter of Indifference - Sustaining Virtue in a Free Republic*, edited by P. Berkowitz, 3-28. Stanford: Hoover Institution Press, 2003.

McDonnell, Myles. *Roman Manliness - Virtus and the Roman Republic*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

Millar, Fergus. *The Roman Republic in Political Thought*. London: Brandeis University Press, 2002.

Ricks, Thomas E. *First Principles - What America's Founders Learned from the Greeks and Romans and How that Shaped our Country*. New York: HarperCollins Publishers, 2020.

Syme, Ronald. *The Roman Revolution*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1939.

Native American Maps, European Exploration, and the Cartographic Encounters of the Lewis and Clark Expedition

Isabelle Cheney

Abstract:

Native Americans have created and used maps for centuries, and in many cases their conceptions of the land surrounding them have been different from those of the Europeans and Americans they've encountered.

Additionally, their knowledge of the land has frequently been more detailed, nuanced, and complete than European or American explorers. In this paper, I first explore some of the ways in which Native American maps are unique by considering and analyzing multiple native maps, and in some cases comparing them to maps of Europeans. This first section provides context for the Lewis and Clark expedition of the American West by establishing a framework for cartographic encounters between Natives and explorers.

In the second part of this paper, I will narrow in on the Lewis and Clark expedition, emphasizing Lewis and Clark's reliance on Native geographical information to reach the Pacific. From the cartographic perspective, the Lewis and Clark expedition represents a continuation of the long-standing tradition of explorers being newcomers to and beneficiaries of Native geographical expertise and intellect.

Lewis and Clark depended on maps throughout their American Epic of Discovery in the early 19th century. They began their journey with maps of North America from European cartographers who incorporated information from indigenous people. Thus, even before Lewis and Clark explicitly asked for guidance and directions, Native Americans were paving the way for them. As they encountered Native peoples, the pursuit of Native cartographic information became much more intentional. Lewis and Clark frequently sought navigational directions, information about physical features of the landscape, and the locations of other Indian nations. Native people shared this information through maps, stories, warnings, and in some cases by leading the way. Native American cartography, geographical knowledge, and sense of place guided Lewis and Clark, as well as European explorers before them.

The first section of this paper provides context for the Lewis and Clark expedition by considering Native American maps and cartographic encounters¹ between European explorers and Natives more broadly. I will outline some of the defining characteristics of indigenous maps of North America and compare them to European maps of North America. I will show how Native maps exhibit geographical prowess and how European maps exhibit uninformed projections. This clarifies the dynamics of cartographic encounters; explorers were in pursuit of information that Natives had. I will then show how the Lewis and Clark expedition fits into this framework for cartographic encounters, emphasizing Lewis and Clark's reliance on Native geographical information to reach the Pacific. From the cartographic perspective, the Lewis and Clark expedition represents a historical recurrence; it continued the long-standing tradition of explorers being newcomers to and beneficiaries of Native geographical expertise and intellect.

Native American maps emphasize connection to the landscape through mediums found in the local environment and local communities. Common map mediums were bark and shell, and some maps existed only in human memory and knowledge transfer between generations,² not tied to the physical landscape but instead to the people who lived on it. Native communities in the North used ivory tusks of walrus; in the West they carved maps onto rocks; and in the forested areas of the Northeast they used birchbark.³ The use of geo-specific map mediums exhibits a strong sense of place, indicative of a connection to and awareness of one's surroundings. These map mediums introduce the concept of "ephemerality,"⁴ which scholars

¹ "Cartographic encounters" is a phrase used by Malcolm Lewis (1998) and Robert Short (2009). I use it to mean an encounter related to maps, navigation, geographical knowledge, space, climate, and/or anything else that may be loosely related to indigenous understandings of the land.

use frequently to describe indigenous maps. Since many of these maps were made from the environment, they were susceptible to natural processes such as deteriorating, rotting, or washing away over time, resulting in fewer extant examples.

As the surviving maps suggest, distortion and symbols in Native American maps indicate social ranking. For example, the 1721 Catawba Indian map⁵ of over a dozen tribes of Virginia demonstrates distortion according to hierarchy. Rather than portraying their exact distance apart or the size of each tribe's territory, this map uses symbols⁶ to convey relationships. The map centers the "Nafaw" tribe, which is surrounded by the largest circle. The other tribes are surrounded by circles of varying sizes, revealing the relative significance of each tribe to the Nafaw.⁷ This map does not clarify boundaries; instead, the lines connecting different tribes could be interpreted as trade routes, providing insight into the relationships between those tribes at that time. According to Anthropologist Gregory Waselkov, the circles represent "social cohesion."⁸ Unlike the rest, Virginia is surrounded by a square and only one tribe is connected to it, suggesting that the Natives' relationship with Virginia was different from inter-tribal relations. These key features—distortion, symbols, and an emphasis on relationships—define indigenous maps.

Native American maps demonstrate comprehensive and detailed understandings of geography, including celestial bodies. On the topic of Native American cartographic abilities, Thomas Pownall, Governor of New Jersey in the late 18th century, remarked that [Natives] "are very attentive to the positions of the Sun and Stars, and on the Lakes can steer their course by them."⁹ According to Pownall, "in every spot [indigenous people exhibited] an almost intuitive Knowledge" of the places that Americans "mechanically [marked] by the Compass."¹⁰ Ioway Indian Non-Chi-Ning-Ga's 1837 map¹¹ of the Mississippi and surrounding rivers illustrates forty-seven features with accurate¹² relative placement and sizing.¹³ The map represented the route of Ioway ancestors.¹⁴ In the case of Non-Chi-Ning-Ga, geographical expertise stemmed from historical significance. Additionally, Cheyenne Chief White Bird's painting of the Battle of Little Big Horn² in 1895 captured the details of the battle relative to the major rivers.³ From this map, an understanding of the rivers is apparent, as well as ties to Cheyenne history.

² White Bird, Battle of the Little Big Horn (LEWIS, INDIAN MAPS: THEIR PLACE IN THE HISTORY OF PLAINS CARTOGRAPHY, 98, 1894).

³ LEWIS, "INDIAN MAPS: THEIR PLACE IN THE HISTORY OF PLAINS CARTOGRAPHY." 98.

While many of the maps discussed above are local or regional, Native American knowledge of the land was not limited to their immediate surroundings. For example, Geographer John Short cites a Chickasaw map that spans 386,000 square miles and explains that “Indigenous maps were not just of local areas; they also reflected wider regional knowledge and accumulated layers of spatial information.”⁴ Thus, indigenous maps exhibit depth and breadth.

Europeans needed Native knowledge of the land because they lacked detailed knowledge of the regions they tried to map. For example, “America Settentrionale”⁵ made by Italian cartographer Vincenzo Coronelli in 1688 exemplifies both European lack of geographical understanding as well as territorialism. The most glaring anomaly is California, which Coronelli portrayed as an island. Furthermore, the Mississippi River meets the Gulf of México too far to the west. There is no documentation of the Appalachian mountains, the very region that France claimed on the map. Lastly, stretching across modern-day México are the words “Nouva Spagna” and across eastern North America it reads “Canada Nuova Francia,” exhibiting claims to territory which both contrasts the indigenous convention of using symbols to depict tribal connections and clarifies European intentions of conquest.

Fifty years later, European maps of North America still contained egregious errors. Nicolas Bellin’s 1743 “Carte de l’Amérique Septentrionale”⁶ shows Lake Winnipeg, a lake documented by Cree Indians of the time, hundreds of miles misplaced to the west. Bellin relied heavily on Cree maps of the region north of Lake Superior when creating his 1743 edition, but put the pieces together incorrectly.⁷ These two examples portray European maps of North America as foundationally best guesses and primarily projections of power.

To Europeans, maps were a key part of the agenda of discovery, conquest, and competition with other European nations. That is why they encompassed areas well beyond anything European explorers had seen and incorporated claims to territory. To Native Americans, maps were about relationships—to the land and to other tribes—memory, and history. The differences between Native American maps and European maps provide context for the nature of cartographic encounters between Natives and explorers. More specifically, the differences emphasize the explorer’s need for information, and the Native’s expertise. From indigenous maps,

4 Short, “Amerindian Mappings,” 28.

5 Vincenzo Coronelli, *America Settentrionale* (Paul Cohen, “Mapping the West: America’s westward movement 1524-1890” 46-47).

6 Jacques Nicolas Bellin, *Carte de l’Amérique Septentrionale Pour Servir à l’histoire de La Nouvelle France* (Library of Congress Geography and Map Division Washington, D.C. 20540-4650 dcu, 1743), <https://lccn.loc.gov/2003627087>.

7 LEWIS, “INDIAN MAPS: THEIR PLACE IN THE HISTORY OF PLAINS CARTOGRAPHY,” 103.

we learn that Native people had a strong sense of the landscape, its physical features, and how to navigate it. From European maps, we learn they had an agenda and uninformed perceptions of the land. This resulted in explicit requests for information. An early example of the pursuit for cartographic information is from 1540, when Hernando de Alarcón asked a Native Halchidhoma for “as much as he knew concerning the Rio Colorado.”⁸ Based on this framework, the dynamics of a cartographic encounter are predictable—explorers seeking information from Natives—yet the actual exchange of information was not straightforward.

The difference in conventions emphasized cartographic and cultural barriers. Where indigenous maps exhibit distortion, European maps of North America were typically drawn to scale.⁹ Rather than employing symbols to explain inter-tribal relationships and dynamics, European maps emphasize territorial claims. Moreover, the way the Nez Perce explained geographical distance to Clark by counting the number of “sleeps” it would take to get to the Columbia river from their camp on the western edge of the Rocky Mountains was different from the European measurement of miles or leagues. Lastly, Native American maps were rarely oriented North/South per the European convention, and instead were oriented according to sunrise and sunset or the direction of travel.¹⁰ Historian James Ronda alludes to the challenge of different conventions when he asks “If Clark had to alter his angle of vision to cope with a Hidatsa warrior’s chart, what was involved when the young warrior tried to comply with the explorer’s request? Did his methods change to meet the needs of the bearded stranger?”¹¹ Ronda acknowledges that there is no clear answer, but brings visibility to the Native perspective.

Belyea develops the European perspective of a typical cartographic encounter. As Belyea explains, the process of acquiring Native cartographic information was a process of “geographical translation;” in order to understand the indigenous maps, explorers needed to translate them into “European equivalents.”¹² Belyea concludes with the point that “European mapping dominated and marginalized Amerindian convention, reducing [indigenous conventions]...to information.”¹³

The Lewis and Clark expedition serves as an excellent example of a typical cartographic encounter between explorers and Native Americans. While Lewis and Clark depended on Native Americans throughout their journey, the role that Native people and their knowledge

8 G. Malcolm Lewis, ed., *Cartographic Encounters: Perspectives on Native American Mapmaking and Map Use*, The Kenneth Nebenzahl, Jr., Lectures in the History of Cartography (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998), 18.

9 De Vorsey, “Silent Witnesses: Native American Maps,” 714.

10 JAMES P. RONDA, “A CHART IN HIS WAY’: INDIAN CARTOGRAPHY AND THE LEWIS AND CLARK EXPEDITION,” *Great Plains Quarterly* 4, no. 1 (1984): 48.

11 RONDA, 50.

12 Barbara Belyea, “Amerindian Maps: The Explorer as Translator,” *Journal of Historical Geography* 18, no. 3 (July 1992): 270.

13 Belyea, “Amerindian Maps: The Explorer as Translator,” 275.

played during the expedition does not always get the attention it deserves. For example, historian

Kenneth Stunkel summarized their expedition in his 1963 article “Pioneer Mapping by Lewis and Clark” without any mention of indigenous assistance. He refers to Clark’s map as “the cartographic landmark of the 19th century” and then praises the “remarkable accuracy” with which Clark captured the West.²⁷ This portrayal of Lewis and Clark as independent explorers and cartographers is misleading.

The reality of the situation is that Lewis and Clark relied on Native American familiarity with the land even before they encountered Native Americans. Before the expedition set out, they received European maps that incorporated Native knowledge. One of the maps that Lewis and Clark used was Aaron Arrowsmith’s 1802 map of North America,²⁸ which incorporated information from Blackfoot chief Ac ko mok ki about what is presently northwestern Montana.²⁹ Since Europeans had not yet penetrated that region,³⁰ Blackfoot knowledge was a key contribution to Lewis and Clark’s understanding of the Upper Missouri River, its physical features, and local tribes. Between the Mandan villages and the continental divide, Arrowsmith’s map is blank except for two faint, dotted, and unlabeled lines running parallel, representing his guess at the locations of the Upper Missouri and Yellowstone rivers. To the explorer, that region was “Open country,” as Arrowsmith wrote on the map. However, the Blackfoot region of the map contains specific creeks, lakes, mountains, and the location of coal. Arrowsmith leaves no guesswork as to where the information came from; in the Northwest corner, the map contains in small print: “The Indians say they sleep 8 nights in descending this river to the sea.”³¹ This information came from Native Americans, and Lewis and Clark were early beneficiaries of it.

Lewis and Clark were also newcomers to indigenous cartographic conventions. During their cartographic encounters with Native people, Lewis and Clark experienced difficulty understanding and interpreting Native cartographic information. On January 16th, 1805, Clark shared that a young Mandan chief “gave [them] a Chart in his way”¹⁴ of the Missouri River. “His way” was likely “grounded in Native concepts of time, distance and space.”¹⁵ Ronda explains that Clark’s choice of words “[reminds us] that Native cartographic information came to...Lewis and Clark in a variety of ways,”¹⁶ ways that were different from the European conventions and mediums that they were familiar with.

Sometimes, Lewis and Clark were unable to decipher the cartographic information. On October 17th, 1804, a Sioux chief told Clark “about Turtles, Snakes, and the power of a [particular] rock or Cave on the next river which informs of [everything].”¹⁷ It is likely that this story contained relevant geographical information—the rock—a warning about rattlesnakes—Clark nearly gets bitten by one on May 17th, 1805—or the Snake River or Snake Indians that they encounter later in the expedition. Yet Clark considered the details “[not worthwhile] mentioning.”¹⁸ Both language and cultural barriers were at play in this exchange. The translation from Sioux to English may have made what the Sioux chief was trying to communicate incomprehensible. Moreover, perhaps Clark did recognize cartographic information delivered in the format of a story.

At each stage in the expedition, Lewis and Clark received Native cartographic information. For example, in the middle of their winter with the Mandans, Chief Big White gave Clark a “[Sketch] of the [Country] as far as the high mountains, & on the South Side of the River Rejone,” as well as topographical information and insight into the amount of timber and number of beavers on the stretch ahead.¹⁹ While receiving this chart, Clark was drawing “a connected [plot] from the information of Traders, Indians & [his] own observations & idea,”²⁰ exemplifying the incorporation and translation process that Belyea discussed; Clark was piecing the information together and presenting it in his own way.

On September 22nd, 1805, once they were finally through the Rocky Mountains, Clark sought information about the Clearwater River from the Nez Perce. Clark pushed for this in-

14 Gary E. Moulton, *The Lewis and Clark Journals: An American Epic of Discovery the Abridgment of the Definitive Nebraska Edition* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska press, 2004), 79.

15 RONDA, “A CHART IN HIS WAY?: INDIAN CARTOGRAPHY AND THE LEWIS AND CLARK EXPEDITION,” 50.

16 JAMES P. RONDA, “A CHART IN HIS WAY?: INDIAN CARTOGRAPHY AND THE LEWIS AND CLARK EXPEDITION,” *Great Plains Quarterly* 4, no. 1 (1984): 44.

17 Moulton, *The Lewis and Clark Journals*, 60.

18 , 60.

19 Moulton, 77.

20 Moulton, 77.

formation because a Native had recently stolen a compass, technology that Lewis and Clark relied upon for navigation. While asking for directions, Clark navigated the language barrier with “signs.”²¹ Eventually, “Twisted” as Clark called him, drew the river on a white elk skin.²² This cartographic encounter encompasses indigenous cartographic conventions in the form of the elk skin, European conventions in the form of the compass, the language barriers that complicated the exchange of cartographic information, the explorers’ intention to exploit Native information, and the reliance on Native geographical expertise. Considering all of this, the Lewis and Clark expedition fits into the framework for cartographic encounters described earlier.

The Native knowledge that Lewis and Clark received was not limited to cartographic encounters in the form of directions. Native people also provided warnings and served as their guides. One of the most consequential warnings that Lewis and Clark received was on their way to the Rocky Mountains from the Pacific Coast. The Nez Perce told them to wait until well after June 1st to enter the mountains.²³ More specifically, they said to wait until the next full moon, but that well after that would be safer. On June 10th, 1806, only a few days after the most conservative recommended departure date, they left for the mountains, and on June 17th, they encountered 12-15 feet of snow, as the Native people most certainly predicted. They made it, but not without additional Native guidance in the mountains.²⁴ This exemplifies Native familiarity with the climate, and demonstrates the pertinence of Native directions.

The Lewis and Clark expedition exhibits extended cartographic encounters in the form of Native guides that traveled with them. Of the multiple guides they had, Sacajawea traveled with Lewis and Clark the longest, traveling from her Hidatsa village in North Dakota all the way to the Pacific coast and back to North Dakota. She does not receive much attention in the Lewis and Clark journals until they reach the foothills of the Rocky Mountains. At that point, food was limited, the terrain was rough, and spirits were low. They needed to locate the Shoshones and their horses to make it through the mountains. On July 22nd, 1805, Sacajawea recognized her homeland, which “cheered the [spirits] of the party who [then began] to console themselves with the anticipation of shortly seeing the head of the missouri...”²⁵ Not only did Sacajawea confirm that they were on the right course, but she also positively influence the emotional wellbeing of the men on the expedition with her timely recognition

21 Moulton, 213.

22 Moulton, 213.

23 , 310.

24 Moulton, 329.

25 , 155.

of the landscape. Moreover, her ties to the Shoshone facilitated amicable relations when Chief Cameahwait turned out to be Sacajawea's brother. In this case, Sacajawea's ties to and sense of place were key to the expedition's success.

Rather than saying that the Lewis and Clark expedition made history, perhaps we should be saying that their expedition continued a long-standing tradition of cartographic encounters between Native peoples and explorers. Lewis and Clark became a part of what was already an established history of Native and European cartographic exchange. From the cartographic perspective, Lewis and Clark were newcomers to and beneficiaries of Native cartographic knowledge just like explorers before them. Contextualizing the expedition with Native American cartography brings visibility to Native American maps and history and defines the Lewis and Clark expedition as a product of Native geographical expertise and intellect.

Bibliography:

- Arnold, Morris S. "Eighteenth-Century Arkansas Illustrated." *The Arkansas Historical Quarterly* 53, no. 2 (1994): 119–36. <https://doi.org/10.2307/40038232>.
- Arrowsmith, Aaron, and J. Puke. "A Map Exhibiting All the New Discoveries in the Interior Parts of North America." London, 1802. <https://www.loc.gov/item/2001620920/>.
- Bellin, Jacques Nicolas. "Carte de l'Amérique Septentrionale Pour Servir à l'histoire de La Nouvelle France." Library of Congress Geography and Map Division Washington, D.C. 20540-4650 dcu, 1743. <https://lccn.loc.gov/2003627087>.
- Belyea, Barbara. "Amerindian Maps: The Explorer as Translator." *Journal of Historical Geography* 18, no. 3 (July 1992): 267.
- . "Inland Journeys, Native Maps." *Cartographica* 33, no. 2 (Summer 1996): 1.
- BLAKE, KEVIN S. "GREAT PLAINS NATIVE AMERICAN REPRESENTATIONS ALONG THE LEWIS AND CLARK TRAIL." *Great Plains Quarterly* 24, no. 4 (2004): 263–82.
- Cohen, Paul E. *Mapping the West: America's Westward Movement 1524-1890*. New York: Rizzoli, 2002.
- Coronelli, Vincenzo. "America Settentrionale." in "Mapping the West: American's westward movement 1524-1890" p. 46-47, 1688.
- De Vorsey, Louis. "Silent Witnesses: Native American Maps." *The Georgia Review* 46, no. 4 (1992): 709–26.
- Douglas, Jesse S. "Lewis' Map of 1806." *Military Affairs* 5, no. 1 (1941): 68–72. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2937559>.
- Lewis, G. Malcolm, ed. *Cartographic Encounters: Perspectives on Native American Map-making and Map Use*. The Kenneth Nebenzahl, Jr., Lectures in the History of Cartography. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998.
- LEWIS, G. MALCOLM. "INDIAN MAPS: THEIR PLACE IN THE HISTORY OF PLAINS CARTOGRAPHY." *Great Plains Quarterly* 4, no. 2 (1984): 91–108.
- Moulton, Gary E. *The Lewis and Clark Journals: An American Epic of Discovery the Abridgment of the Definitive Nebraska Edition*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska press, 2004.
- Non-Chi-Ning-Ga. "Ioway Map." 1837. <https://archaeology.uiowa.edu/1837-ioway-map>.
- Nordland, Lori Podolsky. "The Concept of 'Secondary Provenance': Re-Interpreting Ac Ko Mok Ki's Map as Evolving Text." *Archivaria* 58 (Fall 2004): 147–59.

RONDA, JAMES P. “‘A CHART IN HIS WAY’: INDIAN CARTOGRAPHY AND THE LEWIS AND CLARK EXPEDITION.” *Great Plains Quarterly* 4, no. 1 (1984): 43–53.

———. “EXPLORING THE EXPLORERS: GREAT PLAINS PEOPLES AND THE LEWIS AND CLARK EXPEDITION.” *Great Plains Quarterly* 13, no. 2 (1993): 81–90.

Short, John R. “Amerindian Mappings.” In *Cartographic Encounters Indigenous Peoples and the Exploration of the New World*. London: Reaktion Books, 2009.

<https://www.proquest.com/books/amerindian-mappings/docview/911543770/se-2>.

———. “Encounters in Settled Land.” In *Cartographic Encounters Indigenous Peoples and the Exploration of the New World*. London: Reaktion Books, 2009.

<https://www.proquest.com/books/encounters-settled-land/docview/911543777/se-2>.

———. “Surveying the West: Lewis and Clark...and Others.” In *Cartographic Encounters Indigenous Peoples and the Exploration of the New World*. London: Reaktion Books, 2009.

<https://www.proquest.com/books/surveying-west-lewis-clark-others/docview/911543784/se-2>.

STUNKEL, KENNETH R. “PIONEER MAPPING BY LEWIS AND CLARK.” *The Military Engineer* 55, no. 364 (1963): 118–118.

Unidentified Catawba Indian. “Catawba Map of Virginia and Nearby Tribes.” in de Vorse’s “Silent Witnesses: Native American Maps” p. 721, 1721.

University of Iowa Office of the State Archaeologist. “Maps, Material Culture, and Memory: On the Trail of the Ioway: The 1837 Ioway Map.” University of Iowa, n.d. <https://archaeology.uiowa.edu/1837-ioway-map>.

Warhus, Mark. *Another America: Native American Maps and the History of Our Land*. 1st ed. New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1997.

Waselkov, Gregory A. “Indian Maps of the Colonial Southeast.” In *Powhatan’s Mantle: Indians in the Colonial Southeast*, edited by Peter H. Wood and M. Thomas Hatley, 292–343. Indians of the Southeast. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1989.

White Bird. “Battle of the Little BigHorn.” West Point Museums Collection, 1894. from LEWIS, INDIAN MAPS: THEIR PLACE IN THE HISTORY OF PLAINS CARTOGRAPHY, p. 98.

German-Americans and the First World War: Through the Eyes of New Ulm, Minnesota and Its Two Newspapers

Thomas Lane

Abstract:

Mere days after the entry of the United States into World War I, the Minnesota Legislature created a “Minnesota Commission of Public Safety” (MCPS) to not only coordinate support for the war effort but also to uncover and silence ‘subversive’ opinions. This commission, which was an antidemocratic outlier in the history of both Minnesota and the whole United States, was equipped with almost dictatorial authority.

I concentrate on news reporting on a large protest gathering of German-Americans in New Ulm, a southern Minnesota city that was founded by German immigrants. The participants were demonstrating mainly against the draft, and the event resulted in a harsh reaction from the MCPS against New Ulm’s local leaders. I analyze the pressures against German-Americans to be patriotic while simultaneously avoiding harming their old homeland. I accomplish this goal via an examination of the reporting from the New Ulm Post (published in German) and the New Ulm Review (published in English). These two left-leaning populist newspapers were run by the same editor. I conclude that although New Ulm had to accept compromises, the town held tenaciously to the idea that people with a migration background can stay true to two homelands.

Unknown to many in America today, up until the 1920s there was a thriving ‘ethnic’ or ‘immigrant’ press in America. More appropriately, this press was simply news in languages other than English. These newspapers followed migrants wherever they settled, and likely peaked in 1917 at over 1,300 different publications nationwide.¹ Of these various publications, the German press was the most prolific, at least until America joined World War I.² Over the course of the war, German-language newspapers declined from their peak of 793 to a meager 276, and they continued to decline thereafter.³ Why exactly did these papers die out? There are many reasons, some related to anti-German hysteria during the war and some not, but in the end numerous newspapers went out of business. This paper seeks to analyze one such German-language newspaper and its English-language counterpart that were managed by the same editor, a lawyer by the name of Albert Steinhauser. Both survived the war. These two weekly newspapers, the *New Ulm Post* (German) and the *New Ulm Review* (English), come from a prominent southern Minnesota town of that name which was settled almost exclusively by German immigrants. By analyzing these newspapers’ text during several important turning points (the US entry into the war, a large late-July community meeting of those opposed to the draft, and the meeting’s intense fallout), we gain a better understanding of the ways this particular German-American community reacted to unprecedented challenges to their identity and how they responded to Minnesota’s unique political climate during the war. Additionally, these experiences reveal an often forgotten perspective on the broader migrant experience applicable to this day.

Minnesota is not a very famous state, but during World War I it was quite special for unfortunate reasons. After war was declared, most states’ governors proclaimed ‘Councils of Defense’ to implement federal war mobilization policy, but when push came to shove, these councils were simply advisory.⁴ In Minnesota, where Germans were the state’s largest non-English speaking ethnic group and 70 percent of the total population was either first- or second-generation immigrants, the state acted with particular speed

1 Sally M. Miller, “Distinctive Media: The European Ethnic Press in the United States,” in *Print in Motion: The Expansion of Publishing and Reading in the United States, 1880-1940*, ed. Carl F. Kaestle and Janice A. Radway, Vol. 4 of *A History of the Book in America* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2009), 301.

2 *Ibid.*, 303-4.

3 Joshua L. Miller, *Accented America: The Cultural Politics of Multilingual Modernism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), 41.

4 S. Miller, “Distinctive Media,” 310.

Unknown to many in America today, up until the 1920s there was a thriving ‘ethnic’ or ‘immigrant’ press in America. More appropriately, this press was simply news in languages other than English. These newspapers followed migrants wherever they settled, and likely peaked in 1917 at over 1,300 different publications nationwide.¹ Of these various publications, the German press was the most prolific, at least until America joined World War I.² Over the course of the war, German-language newspapers declined from their peak of 793 to a meager 276, and they continued to decline thereafter.³ Why exactly did these papers die out? There are many reasons, some related to anti-German hysteria during the war and some not, but in the end numerous newspapers went out of business. This paper seeks to analyze one such German-language newspaper and its English-language counterpart that were managed by the same editor, a lawyer by the name of Albert Steinhauser. Both survived the war. These two weekly newspapers, the *New Ulm Post* (German) and the *New Ulm Review* (English), come from a prominent southern Minnesota town of that name which was settled almost exclusively by German immigrants. By analyzing these newspapers’ text during several important turning points (the US entry into the war, a large late-July community meeting of those opposed to the draft, and the meeting’s intense fallout), we gain a better understanding of the ways this particular German-American community reacted to unprecedented challenges to their identity and how they responded to Minnesota’s unique political climate during the war. Additionally, these experiences reveal an often forgotten perspective on the broader migrant experience applicable to this day.

Minnesota is not a very famous state, but during World War I it was quite special for unfortunate reasons. After war was declared, most states’ governors proclaimed ‘Councils of Defense’ to implement federal war mobilization policy, but when push came to shove, these councils were simply advisory.⁴ In Minnesota, where Germans were the state’s largest non-English speaking ethnic group and 70 percent of the total population was either first- or second-generation immigrants, the state acted with particular speed and harshness due to fears of sedition, treason, espionage, and sabotage.⁵ Ten days after the U.S. entered the war, the Minnesota Legislature passed a law creating a ‘Minnesota Commission of Public Safety’ (MCPS) to manage Minnesota’s participation in the war.⁶ On paper, the MCPS doesn’t appear particularly noteworthy, but in practice the

1 Sally M. Miller, “Distinctive Media: The European Ethnic Press in the United States,” in *Print in Motion: The Expansion of Publishing and Reading in the United States, 1880-1940*, ed. Carl F. Kaestle and Janice A. Radway, Vol. 4 of *A History of the Book in America* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2009), 301.

2 *Ibid.*, 303-4.

3 Joshua L. Miller, *Accented America: The Cultural Politics of Multilingual Modernism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), 41.

4 S. Miller, “Distinctive Media,” 310.

5 Carl H. Chrislock, *Watchdog of Loyalty: The Minnesota Commission of Public Safety During World War I* (St. Paul: Minnesota Historical Society Press, 1991), 18, 20.

6 Laws of Minnesota 1917, Reg. Sess. chapter 261, § 1, 11.

legislature had handed over most of its powers to this seven-member panel; it proceeded to wield almost dictatorial authority over the state until the war's end.⁷ The MCPS spent little time actually promoting the war effort, being more concerned with perceived disloyalty. While on paper Governor Joseph A. A. Burnquist was in charge of the committee, Minneapolis corporate lawyer John F. McGee emerged as the real leader, and he was so much more interested in rooting out the 'disloyalty' of groups like labor unions and the Nonpartisan League that he even drove the MCPS to clash with federal defense policy at times.⁸ The MCPS's efforts against supposedly disloyal German-Americans, while certainly significant, were actually just a sideshow to McGee's other crusades. These occurred largely because Minnesota elites conflated German-Americans with not only the wartime enemy but also the domestic usually left-wing political groups they sought to extinguish.⁹ In a way, this predicament mirrored national sentiments, where anti-German hysteria was typically strongest where German-Americans were (correctly or incorrectly) associated with pacifists, socialists, anti-semitic stereotypes of Jews, or any combination of the three.¹⁰ However, the precision and severity with which the German-American community was targeted was unparalleled. It was the perfect storm.

The United States officially joined World War I on 6 April, 1917. The coverage of both the *Review* and *Post* regarding the U.S.'s entrance to the war is surprisingly critical of Germany. The front page article of the *Review* on 4 April 1917, two days before war was actually declared, makes note that "war seems imminent" due to Germany's unrestricted submarine warfare, and that "even hospital ships carrying relief to the sorely bereaved and stricken people of Belgium" had been sunk.¹¹ The article goes on to lament the "wanton and wholesale destruction of the lives of noncombatants, men, women, and children... deemed innocent."¹² The *Post* published similar remarks on its 6 April front page article announcing the actual war declaration: "All types of ships have been recklessly sunk... even hospital ships and ships carrying relief for the suffering people of Belgium."¹³ These are certainly not the words of newspapers attempting to

7 Chrislock, preface to *Watchdog of Loyalty*, X; Matt Reicher, "Minnesota Commission of Public Safety," MNopedia, Minnesota Historical Society, published 23 June 2014, last modified November 25, 2019.

8 *Ibid.*, IX-X.

9 These other political groups were subjected to even more intense harassment and injury than New Ulm would be. Authorities frequently refused to allow peaceful assemblies, denied equal protection under the law, punished members arbitrarily, and at one point threatened to burn a group's offices down. Carol Jenson, "Loyalty as a Political Weapon: The 1918 Campaign in Minnesota," *Minnesota History* 43, no. 2 (Summer 1972): 51; Chrislock, preface to *Watchdog of Loyalty*, XI.

10 Peter C. Weber, "Ethnic Identity During War: The Case of German American Societies During World War I," *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 43, no. 1 (February 2014): 188; Chrislock, *Watchdog of Loyalty*, 136.

11 *New Ulm Review*, 4 April 1917, 1, Minnesota Digital Newspaper Hub, Minnesota Historical Society, St. Paul, MN, accessed 1 March 2022.

12 *Ibid.*, 1.

13 *New Ulm Post*, 6 April 1917, 1, Minnesota Digital Newspaper Hub, Minnesota Historical Society, St. Paul, MN, accessed 1 March 2022.

defend Germany. Neither is there any indication that Steinhauser is seeking to play both sides by writing a pro-Germany piece in German and an anti-Germany piece in English. Aside from slight modifications to reflect changes in the situation over the two days between issues, both Steinhauser's English- and German-speaking audiences are getting the same news.

However, deeper in the issues on those same days, a much more nuanced presentation appears. The *Review* includes an editorial about the possibility of a military draft, arguing that such a law would "make the United States a 'monarchy' in reality," that the East Coast has "caught the 'war fever,'" and that those who oppose a draft should not be branded traitors.¹⁴ The same page also includes a short article about how New Ulm's mayor, Dr. Louis A. Fritsche, refused to have New Ulm host a pro-war event proposed by a Chicago group, another article accusing a pro-war group in New York of seeking "to do away with the American rights of trial by jury, freedom of speech, and of the press," and even a short quip remarking that "'The United States can lend the Allies \$5,000,000,000,' bankers say... [but] thousands of people in the big cities of the United States are actually starving."¹⁵ Simply put, the *Review* doesn't mince words in branding the war as a threat to the community in its opinion pages. Surprisingly, the opinion page of the *Post* two days later is much milder in its handling of the war. Other than a very short note mentioning how New Ulm and two Wisconsin towns had made public declarations supporting peace, direct reaction to the war is limited to a short article describing how "millions of good and conscientious patriotic citizens of our republic" are lamenting the outbreak of hostilities, but reminds them that "calm is now the highest duty of citizenship."¹⁶ The next week's *Post* even goes so far as to advise German-Americans that they should avoid anti-war demonstrations, as they could only serve to make the situation worse at that point.¹⁷

While the English-language *Review* does not hesitate to proclaim its anti-war sentiments, the *Post* issue holds its cards close to its chest. This cautious behavior by the *Post* might be explained by the fact that German-Americans began coming under public scrutiny in America for their views on the war as early as 1915,¹⁸ but that explanation of self-censorship seems to fall apart given how much more stridently anti-war the *Review*'s opinion page is. There is also the fact that the *Review* is written in English and undoubtedly more accessible to outsiders. Sticking with its subdued behavior, the 6 April *Post* editorial page amusingly includes a very short note that unintentionally alludes to the future quite well. Reporting that some members of the state legislature want to put together an artillery regiment composed of lumberjacks and stockyard

14 *New Ulm Review*, 4 April 1917, 4.

15 *Ibid.*

16 *New Ulm Post*, 6 April 1917, 6.

17 *New Ulm Post* 13 April 1917, 6.

18 S. Miller, "Distinctive Media: The European Ethnic Press in the United States," 308.

workers, the article jokes that they should have “‘Teddy’ Roosevelt” command it too for good measure.¹⁹ In hindsight, it’s a pointed jab at the unrealistic expectations and overbearing nationalism of the state’s political leadership. Given Roosevelt’s past statements in favor of policies like making learning English a condition of admittance for new immigrants, it is unlikely the New Ulm German-American community had a high opinion of him.²⁰ While many immigrants may have appreciated his populism, they were less likely to be drawn to his anglo-centric linguistic nationalism. Yet, it is a much more indirect rhetorical attack on the war than the *Review*’s opinion pieces. Although the two newspapers strike very different tones, they both are clear-eyed about what they think the United States is walking into by joining the war.

On 25 July 1917, an estimated crowd of eight thousand assembled in New Ulm for a parade of two thousand, most of whom were young men eligible to be drafted.²¹ The number of people involved was actually larger than the town itself.²² Most of the town and many from the surrounding countryside must have come to see the spectacle. As the parade proceeded, it was accompanied by two whole brass bands and led by the county auditor, Louis G. Vogel.²³ At the end of the parade, Mayor Fritsche began addressing the crowd, telling them no one involved in the event had an “[intent] to cause any disaffection of the draft law” but only wanted to ask the government to prevent a predicament where “those drafted [have] to fight in Europe against their will.”²⁴ City attorney Albert Pfaender then took the stage to recount the bravery of German-Americans who served in the U.S. Civil War and the Spanish-American War, advocate for a constitutional amendment requiring referendums before declarations of war, and argue that drafting men for overseas conflict was unconstitutional. A petition was simultaneously passed around asking legislators to rectify this by allowing those who didn’t desire to serve abroad to carry out their service domestically.²⁵ Adolph Ackermann, a conservative Lutheran theologian and president of the local Dr. Martin Luther College, addressed the crowd as well, claiming joining the war was simply “fighting battles for Wall Street or John Bull.”²⁶ Pretty much everyone who was anyone in town gave a speech. Even *New Ulm Post* and *Review* editor Albert Steinhauser had his turn, which he used to decry a new law that allowed local postmasters to refuse to deliver publications they deemed ‘subversive.’²⁷ It was a quite robust anti-war event,

19 *New Ulm Post*, 6 April 1917, 6.

20 J. Miller, *Accented America*, 48-49, 39, 46.

21 Chrislock, *Watchdog of Loyalty*, 133.

22 New Ulm’s 1917 population was around 6,000. Bureau of the Census, U.S. Department of Commerce and Labor, “Statistics for Minnesota” in *Thirteenth Census of the United States taken in the Year 1910* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1913), 34; Bureau of the Census, U.S. Department of Commerce, “Minnesota,” in *Fourteenth Census of the United States: 1920 - Population* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office), 540.

23 Chrislock, *Watchdog of Loyalty*, 133.

24 *Ibid.*

25 *Ibid.*, 134.

26 John Bull is the English equivalent of Uncle Sam. Ackermann’s speech appealed heavily to anti-English sentiments. *Ibid.*, 134-136.

27 The law he is referring to is almost certainly the Trading with the Enemy Act of 1917, which required non-English newspapers to file English translations of their articles on war-related topics with the local postmaster before they could be published. Nationally, this led to self-censorship by German-language newspapers. S. Miller, “Distinctive Media,” 308-309; Elisabeth Fondren, “‘This is an American Newspaper:’ Editorial Opinions and the German Immigrant Press in 1917,” *Media History* 27, no. 2 (2021): 211-212;

but in the end no one actually advocated any sort of sabotage of the war effort or subversion of the draft.

The *Post* was the first of the two papers to have coverage of the anti-draft event, with its 27 July issue declaring in an elaborate four-part headline the “Powerful Demonstration in Turner Park: New Ulm’s Day of Glory: Vast Protest Gathering Against the Dispatch of American Soldiers: Presence of Thousands Shows the People’s Voice.”²⁸ The article proceeds to describe in gushing detail the pomp and circumstance of “a demonstration the likes of which New Ulm has never before seen” and how people from “all parts of the state, from neighboring states,... [and] all possible nationalities and professions were represented in the crowd.”²⁹ Mayor Fritsche’s opening address is quoted in full, followed by a detailed summary with long quotes of City Attorney Pfaender’s remarks that makes note of each moment where Pfaender received the audience’s applause.³⁰ Steinhauser receives an extensive summary of his remarks in his own paper, followed by a note about how his “speech received close attention from the audience and was loudly applauded.”³¹ After shorter summaries of two other speakers, even Ackermann, the conservative theologian whom Steinhauser had disagreements with, gets a detailed and largely positive summary of his remarks that closed out the event, albeit without a note commenting on the applause he presumably got.³² The English-language *Review*’s translated but otherwise almost identical article on its 1 August front page closes by declaring the event a “tremendous success.”³³

The news coverage of the event from the *Post* and *Review* was almost exclusively positive, as can be seen from the above descriptions. It also seeks to convey a sense that the movement it represented was extremely popular. Steinhauser’s papers wanted to show their readership an interpretation of the event that both emphasized their perception of the anti-draft movement’s ideological foundations and mass support but more importantly its reasonableness. To this effect, the front page *Review* article about the event includes extended references to Pfaender’s advice that those who are drafted should not attempt to resist duty under a bolded subheader stating “[Pfaender] Urges Law Obedience.”³⁴ There is additionally another bolded subheader proclaiming “New Ulm is Loyal” that is repeated in two separate locations of the article, along with other subheaders such as “Stand for Freedom of Press,”

Chrislock, *Watchdog of Loyalty*, 136.

28 *New Ulm Post*, 27 July 1917, 1.

29 *Ibid.*

30 *Ibid.*, 1, 12.

31 *Ibid.*, 12.

32 *New Ulm Post*, 27 July 1917, 12; Chrislock, *Watchdog of Loyalty*, 134.

33 *New Ulm Review* 1 August 1917, 1-2.

34 *Ibid.*, 2.

“[Steinhauser] Defends Freedom of Press,” and “Believe in Democracy.”³⁵ The newspaper is quite obviously bending over backwards to emphasize its reasonableness. It wants to leave no reader doubting either its loyalty or New Ulm’s given the extremely sensitive topic.

The two front page articles are clearly an attempt to rally local German-Americans to the anti-draft movement. This is emphasized by the fact that the *Review* article on the anti-draft meeting shares the front page with not only an article listing the names of all the soldiers from the city who had just received their marching orders, but also an article titled “Movement Against Draft is Growing” about the wider Midwest region.³⁶ This is followed up by not one, but two pieces about the first medical examinations then taking place for draftees, with those who passed examination grimly labeled as “candidates for trench honors.”³⁷ While the *Post* issue, which came out only two days after the event, sticks to coverage of the draft meeting itself, the *Review* coverage begins to branch out into adjacent issues as it makes an attempt to stir outrage among the local population. In any case, both news articles and the *Review*’s associated coverage strike a much different tone than the more even-handed reporting done when America first joined the war. The two papers are now fully onboard with their cause in both the news section and the opinion section. There’s no going back now.

Where both papers truly cement their positions on the anti-draft meeting and the draft itself is in their opinion sections. The 27 July *Post* includes a quite nuanced opinion article arguing that while America is justified in standing against Germany for its submarine warfare abuses, “that does not mean America should cooperate with other countries to lead a war of extermination against Germany.”³⁸ It continues on to argue that millions of Americans don’t want to see “our beloved star-spangled-banner fly next to all the flags of the many nations England has gathered around it to fight the Germans” and that participation in the war will “serve England’s interests alone.”³⁹ While never mentioning the draft directly, the point is very clear. The *Post* doesn’t want to see Americans, and especially German-Americans, thrown into a war it views as the creation of a foreign power that has interests conflicting with America’s own. Additionally, it demonstrates how the draft united German-American thought leaders otherwise deeply at odds;⁴⁰ conservative Ackermann’s draft meeting speech from earlier highlights this same anti-England theme. While desires to protect the old homeland from a dramatic reversal of its fortunes in the war likely do play some role in the opinion the *Post* expresses, American self-in-

35 *Ibid.*

36 *Ibid.*, 1.

37 *Ibid.*

38 *New Ulm Post*, 27 July 1917, 6.

39 *Ibid.*

40 Chrislock, *Watchdog of Loyalty*, 134.

terest is much more emphasized. The column is, after all, titled “Our Motto, America first - now and forever.”⁴¹ The *Post* wants to project its opposition to the war as defending America’s interests by preventing it from becoming just another pawn of the British empire.

The *Review*’s 1 August opinion section dives into the anti-draft cause much more directly. In fact, most of the page is related to it. The page begins with an attack on anonymous letter-writers who have been sending letters to the newspaper’s offices calling New Ulm “every name under the sun” due to the residents’ opposition to the draft.⁴² It then moves on to a short piece calling out the *Mankato Free Press* for printing a “a special dispatch... giving an unfair account of the [anti-draft event in New Ulm],” while thanking newspapers from Minneapolis and St. Paul for giving “a fair account of the meeting.”⁴³ A longer column bemoans the post office’s de facto censorship powers as “autocracy that will rival anything ever in force in Russia” and attacks the head of a newly-created federal department as “the High Priest of the Socialist Newspaper Suppression Bureau” for its harassment of a small socialist newspaper that published an anti-draft article.⁴⁴ Another column rails against a hate letter Mayor Fritsche received after speaking at the anti-draft event in which he and other New Ulm leaders are called “traitors and cowards.”⁴⁵ The letter’s writer is even alleged to have written that they hope Fritsche “might be court martialed [*sic*]” and that they “might be chosen individually to fire the shot of execution which would rid the world of the New Ulm mayor.”⁴⁶ A further reader’s letter explains how many New Ulm locals refused to aid a recent Red Cross fundraiser because the Red Cross not only barred German-American nurses from serving in Europe but also because the chairman of its war council wanted the group’s medical staff to refuse to treat the wounds of captured enemy (likely German) soldiers.⁴⁷ A final reader’s letter praises the *Review* for its “selfrestraint [*sic*]” in responding to attacks from other newspapers over its anti-draft position.⁴⁸ At this point, Steinhauser’s paper is surely beating a dead horse. The opinion page is simply filled with piece after piece on the war effort. Nothing else seems to matter. But, that is likely the point. The articles serve to inundate readers. They cannot escape what Steinhauser wants them to feel.

The big picture regarding the opinion pages is a clear attempt by the two papers to cultivate and direct the outrage that its news coverage on earlier pages began. The *Post* opens with

41 *New Ulm Post*, 27 July 1917, 6.

42 *New Ulm Review*, 1 August 1917, 4.

43 *Ibid.*

44 The *Review*’s editor, Steinhauser, also railed against these powers at the anti-draft meeting. *Ibid.*

45 *Ibid.*

46 The article names a Dr. Hard from Marshall, MN as the name attached to the letter, but makes clear no one seems to know who this Dr. Hard is. *Ibid.*

47 *Ibid.*

48 This letter comes from someone named “Figge,” which may be a Scandinavian last name belonging to one of Minnesota’s many immigrant farmers from that region. If so, that would indicate Steinhauser’s English publications had a broader readership than just New Ulm’s predominantly German community. *Ibid.*

a relatively reserved approach, which Steinhauser may have used to gauge reactions and weigh later pieces. Then, the *Review* hits the press a few days later, and the high frequency of war- and draft-related pieces, both news and opinion, are used to make it seem as though an exceptionally large number of people in the community are deeply interested in the issue (perhaps more than there actually were). The long length of many of these pieces serves to emphasize the issue's severity. It functions almost like an artillery bombardment; Steinhauser's predominantly German-American readers are hit with a massive number of high-explosive 'shells,' leaving them emotionally impacted and likely quite angry. At the same time, the tone of the pieces serves to reaffirm the papers' earlier objectives of 'reasonableness' and project an image of the paper as an unassailable patriotic defender of American values. When put together, all these elements act like a funnel, collecting the readership around this one understanding of an issue that Steinhauser feels is of paramount importance.

In the broader Minnesota context, the *New Ulm Post's* and *Review's* reaction is understandable. While the socialist press in the Twin Cities presented the anti-draft meeting positively,⁴⁹ and the other newspapers there were at least somewhat neutral according to the *Review's* own opinion page on 1 August, other papers went after New Ulm quite viciously. Nationally, the *New York Tribune* dubbed the German-American press the 'enemy-language press' and urged them to switch to English or cease production; *The Atlantic* called for outright censorship or forced closures of German-language publications.⁵⁰ In Minnesota, meeting participants were branded as traitors, particularly provocative commentators claimed New Ulm wanted to secede, and others cast suspicion on the town's loyalty by claiming hardly anyone there spoke English.⁵¹ This last attack is particularly worth noting. The debate over having a national language was very strong during the early twentieth century (and especially so during the war), and those who spoke English with an accent or not at all were suspected of being unpatriotic or threatening to American culture and national security.⁵² Foreign language speakers aroused great anxiety and were turned into scapegoats of nativism and fears of decline, despite the fact that many of those languages (including German) had been spoken in the territory that became the United States since before the United States even existed.⁵³ Prominent figures in society grabbed onto the debate.⁵⁴ As late as 1919 Nebraska and several other states passed bans on the use of languages

49 Chrislock, *Watchdog of Loyalty*, 137.

50 Kevin Grieves, "'It would be for the best to suspend publication:' The German-American Press and Anti-German Hysteria during World War I," *American Journalism* 37, no. 1 (2020): 56.

51 Chrislock, *Watchdog of Loyalty*, 137-138.

52 J. Miller, *Accented America*, 35-36, 39.

53 *Ibid.*, 42.

54 Henry Ford established English-language instruction schools at his factories and required workers who didn't speak English to attend classes in order to keep their jobs. Shortly after the war, famous German-American journalist H.L. Mencken jumped on the bandwagon by writing about 'American language' in a way that largely denied immigrants' contributions to

other than English in schools.⁵⁵ New Ulm's twin newspapers existed in an extremely heated climate, which is clearly reflected in their textual and stylistic choices. Their editorial choices came in the context of a time where they couldn't be too careful. They had to watch their backs and cover their tracks anywhere they might be perceived as seditious. If they slipped up, it was no stretch of the imagination to presume hate mail might be the least of their worries.

The MCPS was outraged at the anti-draft meeting. It summoned most of the event's speakers, including Fritsche, Pfaender, Steinhauser, Ackermann, and Vogel to explain themselves. They unsuccessfully sought to convince the elected officials among the speakers to sign a statement pledging their loyalty and to cooperate with the commission.⁵⁶ While Fritsche and Pfaender claimed they regretted the reaction the meeting received, no one backed down from their views; Steinhauser went so far as to call the MCPS "a joke" to their very faces.⁵⁷ Despite their best efforts to rationalize their participation, the MCPS had essentially already decided their fate and ordered Fritsche, Pfaender, and Vogel removed from office.⁵⁸ The MCPS didn't stop there either. They began harassing the trustees of Martin Luther College, where Ackermann was president and a professor, and eventually forced his resignation.⁵⁹ Steinhauser would later be targeted too. He was arrested, brought all the way to St. Paul to be charged with violation of the Espionage Act for his newspapers' "inflammatory" columns, and jailed for a short period.⁶⁰ Notably, he was never actually tried, although the case was extended several times.⁶¹ Clearly, the MCPS didn't want him to feel at liberty to publish freely. They wanted to be able to dangle the legal threat of a heated public trial over his head.

The backlash against the anti-draft meeting had a chilling effect on New Ulm. The MCPS sent Pinkerton agents to watch over the town afterwards, and in their reports, they noted that residents were very evasive when speaking about anything war-related.⁶² Steinhauser's papers

American English as a way of papering over his past of writing pro-Germany articles about the conflict before America joined the war. *Ibid.*, 58, 68-69, 81, 63.

55 The Supreme Court overturned Nebraska's law in 1923 in *Meyer v. Nebraska*, along with similar laws elsewhere in *Bartels v. Iowa* and *Pohl v. Ohio*. As can be inferred, these laws were largely a midwestern phenomenon, and were points of controversy across the region. *Ibid.*, 61.

56 Chrislock, *Watchdog of Loyalty*, 138-139.

57 Paul Nelson, "New Ulm Military Draft Meeting, 1917," MNopedia, Minnesota Historical Society, published 11 January 2017, last modified 25 November 2019.

58 It did so without any input from the voters who had elected them, showing the raw arbitrary power the MCPS held. Vogel would later be reinstated because as county auditor, he held no law enforcement responsibilities, and the MCPS's own lawyer had earlier asserted that the commission only had authority to remove officials with law enforcement responsibilities. Chrislock, *Watchdog of Loyalty*, 140, 154-155.

59 *Ibid.*, 155-156.

60 In an even more severe instance of similar nature, the editor of the St. Paul German-language *Volkszeitung*, Frederick W. Bergmeier, was jailed for being an 'enemy alien' and held until the war ended. In comparison, Steinhauser got off relatively unscathed, spending only a day in prison. Minnesota Historical Society, "New Ulm Post," Minnesota Digital Newspaper Hub: About the Titles, accessed 1 March 2022; Ehsan Alam, "Anti-German Nativism, 1917-1919," MNopedia, Minnesota Historical Society, published 23 December 2015, last modified 30 July 2021.

61 Minnesota Historical Society, "New Ulm Post."

62 Chrislock, *Watchdog of Loyalty*, 153.

changed their tone. Instead of focusing on the draft, they shifted to promoting peace-related charity work, such as the Red Cross's medical efforts.⁶³ That being said, Steinhauser was not silenced, and he continued to speak out about the war and its impact on German-Americans. His efforts show an important side of the migrant experience, both in World-War I era America and beyond. Migrant communities often feel quite fiercely that they can be loyal to two different homelands: both their original homes and their adopted ones. Steinhauser and his compatriots were convinced that their work didn't have to mean choosing one homeland at the expense of the other. On the contrary, they felt that their efforts to advance one also advanced the other. They saw standing up for themselves as German-Americans as also standing up for American values and rights. What their neighbors branded as treason was really the highest form of patriotism in their eyes.

After the war, the MCPS's victims were largely vindicated. Fritsche and Vogel were able to return to their old offices in 1920, and Ackermann became pastor of a church in Mankato.⁶⁴ The MCPS, after its crusade against New Ulm concluded, moved on to other targets it deemed more dangerous, mainly the Nonpartisan League and labor unions.⁶⁵ When the war ended, the MCPS and its antidemocratic reign of harassment were quietly closed down.⁶⁶ What had been an alarming departure from America's and Minnesota's normally democratic mode of government turned out to be simply an aberration. That being said, Minnesota was not the same again, and the state's German-American community was permanently impacted. Persecution against migrant communities, no matter where, always leaves scars behind. The saga of New Ulm's tumultuous journey through the Great War serves as an important warning of war's dark underbelly. Battlefields can extend all the way back into the heart of the home front, even if no shots are fired there. But, the saga also leaves behind a glimmer of hope. Steinhauser's newspapers show that even under great duress, brave individuals can summon up the courage to defy power and protect their otherwise cowed communities. In the face of threats of incarceration amidst a climate of intense scrutiny and hate, Steinhauser stood firmly by his convictions and perception of his community's needs. New Ulm, he felt, could be proudly American without giving up its immigrant roots. Perhaps it is that legacy which is the most lasting.

63 The paper donated without charge its full front page and a good portion of its interior pages in this particular issue to coverage of the Red Cross's work and need for donations. *New Ulm Review*, 22 May 1918, 1, 4-6.

64 Mankato is another significant southern Minnesota city about 30 miles from New Ulm. Nelson, "New Ulm Military Draft Meeting, 1917."

65 Chrislock, *Watchdog of Loyalty*, 142-146.

66 Reicher, "Minnesota Commission of Public Safety."

Bibliography:

- Alam, Ehsan. "Anti-German Nativism, 1917-1919." MNopedia. Minnesota Historical Society. Published December 23, 2015; last modified July 30, 2021. <https://www.mnopedia.org/anti-german-nativism-1917-1919>.
- "An act providing for the Minnesota public safety commission." Laws of Minnesota 1917, Regular Session chapter 261, § 1-11, 373-377. <https://www.revisor.mn.gov/laws/1917/0/Session+Law/Chapter/261/pdf/>.
- Bureau of the Census, US Department of Commerce. "Minnesota." In *Fourteenth Census of the United States: 1920 - Population*, 529-561. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.
- Bureau of the Census, U.S. Department of Commerce and Labor. "Statistics for Minnesota: Containing Statistics of Population, Manufactures, and Mining for the State, Cities, Counties, and Other Divisions." In *Thirteenth Census of the United States taken in the Year 1910*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1913.
- Chrislock, Carl H. *Watchdog of Loyalty: The Minnesota Commission of Public Safety During World War I*. St. Paul, MN: Minnesota Historical Society Press, 1991.
- Fondren, Elisabeth. "'This is an American Newspaper:' Editorial Opinions and the German Immigrant Press in 1917." *Media History* 27, no. 2 (2021): 210-223. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13688804.2019.1597628>.
- Grieves, Kevin. "'It would be for the best to suspend publication:' The German-American Press and Anti-German Hysteria during World War I." *American Journalism* 37, no. 1 (2020): 47-65. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08821127.2020.1715327>.
- Jenson, Carol. "Loyalty as a Political Weapon: The 1918 Campaign in Minnesota." *Minnesota History* 43, no. 2 (Summer 1972): 42-57. <http://collections.mnhs.org/MNHistoryMagazine/articles/43/v43i02p042-057.pdf>.
- Miller, Joshua L. *Accented America: The Cultural Politics of Multilingual Modernism*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Miller, Sally M. "Distinctive Media: The European Ethnic Press in the United States." In *Print in Motion: The Expansion of Publishing and Reading in the United States, 1880-*

1940, ed. Carl F. Kaestle and Janice A. Radway, 299-311. Vol. 4 of *A History of the Book in America*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 2009.

- Minnesota Historical Society. "New Ulm Post." Minnesota Digital Newspaper Hub: About the Titles. Accessed 1 March 2022. <https://www.mnhs.org/newspapers/hub/new-ulm-post>.
- Nelson, Paul. "New Ulm Military Draft Meeting, 1917." MNopedia. Minnesota Historical Society. Published January 11, 2017; last modified November 25, 2019. <https://www.mnopedia.org/event/new-ulm-military-draft-meeting-1917>.
- New Ulm Post*. Minnesota Digital Newspaper Hub. Minnesota Historical Society, St. Paul, MN. Accessed 1 March 2022. <https://newspapers.mnhs.org/jsp/PsBrowse.jsp>.
- New Ulm Review*. Minnesota Digital Newspaper Hub. Minnesota Historical Society, St. Paul, MN. Accessed 1 March 2022. <https://newspapers.mnhs.org/jsp/PsBrowse.jsp>.
- Reicher, Matt. "Minnesota Commission of Public Safety." MNopedia. Minnesota Historical Society. Published June 23, 2014; last modified November 25, 2019. <https://www.mnopedia.org/group/minnesota-commission-public-safety>.
- Weber, Peter C. "Ethnic Identity During War: The Case of German American Societies During World War I." *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 43, no. 1 (February 2014): 185-206. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0899764012458543>.

Imperial Migrants in Arkansas: An Introduction to Latine, Asian, and Mar- shallese Ties to “Big Chicken”

Damien Solinger Jeffers

Abstract:

The state of Arkansas is built upon racialized violence, including the genocide of Native peoples and the enslavement of Black communities in the Mississippi Delta, which must not be forgotten. Indebted to previous investigations of histories of race in Arkansas, this paper investigates how Latine, Asian, and Marshallese communities have been subject to state and corporate influence, emphasizing that of poultry giants.

I approach this topic through placing the context of Arkan-
san immigrant communities in conversation with individual
experiences and laborers’ rights in the state. After a brief in-
troduction to the local geography and the poultry industry,
I then explore individual experiences. I then offer a sketch
of immigrant labor rights as upheld by the state of Arkansas.
Through the concept of the imperial migrant, as proposed by
Mitchell-Eaton, I provide a foundational understanding of
how studying landscapes, such as those in Western Arkansas,
provide an insight into racialized, neoliberal geographies and
allude to histories of American imperialism abroad.

INTRODUCTION

Arkansas' Native peoples—the Quapaw, Caddo, and Osage—were forcibly relocated further west to Oklahoma in the early nineteenth century. Today there are no recognized tribes in the state. A wave of newcomers—willing and many unwilling—had descended on this land by the mid-nineteenth-century: slave-owning colonizers and Black persons brought from eastern states to propagate the Southern plantation economy. They succeeded in recasting the southeastern region of Arkansas into a violent, cotton-producing stronghold, built on stolen land and vehement anti-Blackness. Since emancipation reached Arkansas, its history and cultural landscapes have been produced by the movement of both white and Black residents in a series of complicated patterns. The genocidal realities of the frontier is well-analyzed through Cedric Robinson's theory of racial capitalism, which contends that capitalism is an inherently violent system that necessitates the creation and perpetuation of a lower race, deriving from a legacy of European traditions and changing economic realities in the early modern era.¹ Those racialized are subjected and shackled to the burdens of capitalist production and occupy the lowest ranks of a necessarily unequal society. In conversation with this literature, this paper considers the histories of immigration from later imperialized, peripheralized regions across the United States' informal empire to a land long-established as Euro-American territory.

The majority of Arkansas's Black population has remained south of Little Rock, with a few Black-majority counties in the southeastern portion of the state. This region is flatter and well-suited for large-scale farming or logging. In stark contrast, as you continue northwest into the Ouachita and Ozark mountain ranges, the land is better suited for livestock rather than plant-based farming, helping the poultry industry take root. The population also becomes much whiter. The resurgence of violent White Supremacy in the early twentieth century drove most Black Americans out of the Ozarks

¹ Cedric J. Robinson, "Racial Capitalism: The Nonobjective Character of Capitalist Development," in *Black Marxism, Revised and Updated Third Edition* (Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press, 2021), 9.

region of the Northwest as sundown towns became more common and even more hostile.² This racial context served as the backdrop for segregation in the mid-century and provides the basis for understanding racial diversification and immigration more recently. Though the arrival of migrants—those who have crossed state or national borders for (perceived) opportunities—has changed the precise racial makeup of the state, in many ways, the communities these migrants now reside in have been slow to change.

In recent years, many reporters and scholars have been intrigued by the demographic shifts emerging with the inflow of migrants-of-color in the state, especially as their numbers increased substantially in the 1990s. While the overall population of Arkansas increased by 13.7% over that decade, the Hispanic population increased by 15.9% each year and the Asian and Pasifika populations increased by 5.6% each year. These booming populations were primarily located in the northwestern counties.³ Shbikat and Striffler’s analysis of the 2020 census sought to characterize this booming population, writing “Interviews with Hispanics in Northwest Arkansas suggest that the majority come from Mexico, with approximately 25% arriving from Central America (particularly El Salvador). Most migrated from rural areas of Latin America, often with a strong work ethic but few economic resources.”⁴ While this analysis was timely and sufficient, it is quite limited. More detailed information would be necessary to understand the root causes of these migrations and the role of (perceived) opportunities in the poultry industry demands investigation.

Specifically, studying the situation in Springdale—which sits on the Ozark Plateau in the northwesternmost part of Arkansas—is essential as the city has experienced one of the largest population increases in the state over the last few decades. Springdale is home to a plant owned and operated by the major poultry producer Cargill, serves as

2 Perla M. Guerrero, *Nuevo South : Latinas/os, Asians, and the Remaking of Place* (Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 2017), 28-29.

3 Gazi Shbikat and Steve Striffler, “Arkansas migration and population.” *Arkansas Business and Economic Review* 33, no. 3 (Fall 2000): 3, <https://www.proquest.com/scholarly-journals/arkansas-migration-population/docview/198494948/se-2>

4 Shbikat and Striffler, 4.

home to Tyson Foods, and holds the official nickname “Poultry Capital of the World” according to AR Code § 1-4-132. While many Latine⁵, Asian, and Marshallese migrants are settling in Arkansas in search of economic opportunity, they are largely entering a community dominated by corporate influence in which poultry giants play a formidable role. Whether dubiously intentional or not, the practices within “Big Chicken” have created a system in which these migrants are exploited.

Mitchell-Eaton proposes the idea of the *imperial migrant*, whose experience is contoured by the cruelty of U.S. imperialism while also shaped by the mobility afforded to the imperial subjects of that empire.⁶ In conversation with the various communities that have recently made their home in Arkansas, I argue that there are unique imperialist relationships between the United States and (South) Vietnam, Mexico, El Salvador, and the Marshall Islands. These relationships date back centuries to the Monroe Doctrine and the later establishment of an American empire in the Pacific Ocean. With an understanding of the *imperial immigrant* and having identified them as present in Arkansas, what is their experience with “Big Chicken”?

IMPERIAL MIGRANTS IN ARKANSAS

In 1975, the first large and permanent communities of voluntary migrants-of-color settled in Arkansas when Fort Chaffee, near the city of Fort Smith, became a processing center for refugees of the Vietnam War. The refugees were initially welcomed by an enthusiastic crowd, including friendly Girl Scouts and an avid racist from Hot Springs. Xenophobic attitudes mixed with appreciation for Christians and ‘Commie-haters,’ creating a lukewarm reception overall. While not intending for most of the majority-Vietnamese crowd to stick around permanently, Arkansas businesses and private persons requested Vietnamese labor, and the sitting governor hoped to tackle the lack of physicians in rural counties with Vietnamese talent. Arkansas sponsored about 2,000 refugees, many Vietnamese, some Laotian.⁷ In the early 2000s, with some success, Tyson actively recruited

5 Latine [lah.TEE.ney] is a gender-neutral loanword from Spanish, i.e. Latino, Latina, and Latinx.

6 Emily Mitchell-Eaton, “New Destinations of Empire: Imperial Migration from the Marshall Islands to Northwest Arkansas” (Ph.D. dissertation, Syracuse University), 2016.

7 Guerrero, *Nuevo South*, 62-65 and 69-70.

Hmong families from midwestern states, often through newspapers, to move south and take a shot at contract chicken farming.⁸ Asian immigrants were often among the only people-of-color in many of the communities in which they settled, and their presence continues to challenge Arkansas's racial binary.

In 1998, *The Washington Post* ran a story by Lois Romano describing the situation of Rogers, part of the Northwest Arkansas (NWA) metro and home to Walmart founder Sam Walton's first store, when the local Hispanic population increased more than ten-fold in the 1990s. Among the interviewed residents were Mora Vidal, a local factory worker, and Eliseo Santillan. Vidal had left California for the job opportunities and lower cost of living in Rogers. Likewise, Eliseo described his move from California to Arkansas as a search for job security. The article claims that "Latinos are drawn to northwest Arkansas and other rural communities by word of mouth, experts say, as they try to escape bad neighborhoods in Los Angeles and overcrowding in Texas."⁹ While the influx of Latines into Northwest Arkansas filled an incredible amount of wage jobs, their presence also shapes the region as Spanish-language signage and a Latine material culture becomes increasingly visible.

The massive boom of this population is built upon a series of significant events in the late 80s and early 90s: The 1986 *Immigration Reform and Control Act* legalized many of those who immigrated to the United States prior to 1982 and explicitly banned any company from knowingly hiring undocumented persons; the passing of California Proposition 187 embodied xenophobic sentiments by denying undocumented people access to public care for much of the 90s; and NAFTA restructured the economic relationships between the North American countries in 1991. This rescrambling of the socio-economic order in North America paralleled the growth of the Latine community in NWA. In understanding why so many migrants specifically chose Arkansas, Guerrero lays it out plainly: "The lax enforcement of immigration documents and the state's low cost of living served to provide Latinas/os with opportunities of upward mobility and homeownership unavailable

8 Monica Potts, "The Serfs of Arkansas," *American Prospect* 22, no. 3 (2011): 23.

9 Lois Romano, "A Community Adapts to Newcomers," *Washington Post*, March 24, 1998.

in traditional states of immigrant reception and settlement.”¹⁰ The relative lack of legal compliance in the various poultry plants attracted thousands of migrant workers. This was quickly understood by local white residents, as work raids like Operation SouthPAW picked up in the mid-90s and immigration officers apprehended Latines from the *polleras*—poultry processing plants—for deportation. In response, Tyson and Simmons Food both released explicit statements that Hispanics had not come to steal white jobs, and many Latines continued to work in the *polleras*.¹¹

As their presence increased, the Hispanic population faced larger systemic issues. Lack of capital and lower rates of citizenship meant that Hispanic men were forced into lower work roles than men of other groups across the South.¹² Young Hispanics throughout NWA must negotiate the boundaries between spaces in which they belong and spaces where they are purposefully made to feel unwanted.¹³ This is amplified by the creation and perpetuation of exclusionary, white-dominated spaces within Springdale; the recent institution of entrance fees and the refusal to incorporate Latine cultural elements into the city’s Jones Center for Families upholds White Supremacy and works to exclude the Latine population, among others.¹⁴ By being the first large population in Arkansas that is neither white nor Black, the Latine community must confront new challenges and push to create new avenues to inclusivity within their chosen home.

However, there remain conflicts between various nationalities within this immigrant population. Namely, Mexican-Americans are worried about the arrival of “bad immigrants” and gangs, often insinuating that these should be associated with Salvadorians. On the other hand, Salvadorians prefer to distinguish themselves from Mexicans, who are associated with “illegality.” Overall, conversations with many different persons-of-color reveal that most agree that there is a sort of informal segregation that occurs along racial,

10 Perla M. Guerrero, “A Tenuous Welcome for Latinas/os and Asians: States’ Rights Discourse in Late Twentieth-Century Arkansas,” in *Race and Ethnicity in Arkansas: New Perspectives*, ed. By John A. Kirk (Fayetteville, AR: University of Arkansas Press, 2014), 149.

11 Guerrero, *Nuevo South*, 136-137.

12 Richard N. Turner, “Occupational Stratification of Hispanics, Whites, and Blacks in Southern Rural Destinations: A Quantitative Analysis,” *Population Research and Policy Review* 33, no. 5 (2014): 717–746.

13 Maria Andrea Escobar, “The Extent of Southern Hospitality: Hispanic Youths’ Sense of Belonging in El Nuevo South” (M.A. thesis, University of California, Merced, 2019).

14 Aarón Arredondo and Juan José Bustamante, “WhiteSpace, Brown Place: Racialized Experiences Accessing Public Space in an Arkansas Immigrant Community,” *Sociological Inquiry* 90, no. 3 (2020): 443–467.

ethnic, national, and class lines.¹⁵

Beginning in this century, poultry giants welcomed an emerging Marshallese community. The Marshallese, though, have an especially interesting history in Springdale. After conducting extensive fieldwork and research on the Marshallese in Springdale, Mitchell-Eaton describes the community's origin story: "Collective Marshallese community knowledge locates the birth of Springdale's Marshallese population with the arrival of a Marshallese man, John Moody, who settled there as early as the late 1970s after attending college in Oklahoma."¹⁶ The collective remembrance of such a particular origin reflects the strength and interconnectedness of their community, but it also reflects the harsh history that led them here. After World War II, the U.S. was given control of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands—of which it was supposed to ensure the rights and well-being of its inhabitants—before testing nearly 70 nuclear bombs on two inhabited Marshallese atolls by 1958. Further, the neocolonial relationship between the Marshall Islands and the carbon-polluting countries of the world all but ensures its inhospitality within the next fifty years or so.¹⁷ With the 1982 Compact of Free Association cementing a particular paternalistic relationship to the United States, the Marshallese are left without any choice but to emigrate.

Regarding their current settlement in Springdale, family connections, job opportunities, and access to education were discovered to be the biggest pull factors for migration among the Marshallese, reiterating their resourcefulness and the strength of their connections. However, the poultry industry unsurprisingly plays an oversized role in the establishment of this community: 70% of those surveyed were employed by either Tyson or Cargill while only 1% of them worked at a Walmart.¹⁸ The traumatic, involuntary nature of Marshallese migration paired with their resourcefulness makes them a key case study for understanding the intersection of climate migration, neocolonialism, and big busi-

15 Guerrero, *Nuevo South*, 48 and 143-149.

16 Mitchell-Eaton, "New Destinations of Empire," 82.

17 Autumn S. Bordner, Caroline E. Ferguson, and Leonard Ortolano, "Colonial Dynamics Limit Climate Adaptation in Oceania: Perspectives from the Marshall Islands," *Global Environmental Change* 61 (2020).

18 S. N. McClain, C. Bruch, M. Nakayama, and M. Laelan, "Migration with Dignity: a Case Study on the Livelihood Transition of Marshallese to Springdale, Arkansas," *Journal of International Migration and Integration* 21, no. 3 (2019): 851-853.

ness. It is for this reason that Mitchell-Eaton proposes the idea of the *imperial migrant*, whose experience is contoured by the cruelty of U.S. imperialism while also shaped by the mobility afforded to the imperial subjects of that empire. In her work, Mitchell-Eaton interrogates the nature of U.S. imperialism through a spatial lens, with Springdale as a “destination of empire” as a key example.¹⁹

THE POULTRY INDUSTRY

The poultry industry consists of massive, well-organized infrastructure and relations throughout the entire region. Springdale’s Tyson Foods, Inc. is a Fortune 100 company and the country’s largest producer of poultry. The University of Arkansas, based in the neighboring city of Fayetteville, boasts a leading poultry science degree program. A series of non-corporate actors make up the vital majority of the production network: contract farmers, processing plant wage workers, outsourced facilities management personnel, truck drivers, etc. The long-standing physical and social infrastructure of the poultry industry in Western Arkansas has strived to keep itself steady and maintain the supply chain at full pace by actively recruiting immigrants to fill many of the essential, lower-paid positions. To support this informal process, Tyson formally created the Tyson Immigration Partnership, which reimburses eligible employees for the costs of a citizenship application, up to \$725.²⁰

This paternalistic approach is also part of the same world in which the Justice Department has recently announced a suit against Cargill, Wayne Farms, and Sanderson Farms for conspiracy to artificially keep wages below the competitive market rate.²¹ In addition to the tendency to short-changing wage workers, a 2009 study of the conditions faced by Latine chicken-catchers in western North Carolina concluded that “Chicken catching is characterized by a work environment and organization of work that promotes

19 Mitchell-Eaton, “New Destinations of Empire,” 232.

20 “Immigrant Connection,” Tyson Immigrant Partnership, 2022. <https://www.tipwelcome.com/>

21 Danielle Wiener-Bronner, “Justice Department accuses poultry processors of underpaying workers for decades,” *CNN Business*, July 25, 2022.

injury and illness.”²² Upon arrival, immigrants must learn to deal with employers who undercut their employees and refuse to promote wellness and safety.

Even further, it is possible that some of these employers might be involved in corrupt activities before employees arrive on site. In spite of what appears to be goodwill gestures with their immigration partnership program and similar initiatives, Tyson faced significant investigative scrutiny by the federal government over twenty years ago for trafficking and/or knowingly hiring undocumented workers. However, the company and management were ultimately acquitted of all charges because the evidence that Tyson’s corporate management was directly involved in any of the activity was insufficient. Very shortly after, Tyson’s corporate offices released a statement that “rogue employees had taken matters into their own hands without approval from headquarters.”²³ Wage workers and those working under subcontracts within the industry are involved in a corrupt system of production.

Likewise, the farms on which the chickens themselves are raised also reveal a particular financially-coercive power dynamic. Local farmers own and operate their facilities while working under contract to raise chickens that are the property of their supplier. After chicken-catchers perform a sweep and the flock is returned to the supplier, the contract farmer receives a lump sum payment. This is often touted as an opportunity for individualism and entrepreneurship with limited financial risks, but the reality is that most contract farmers are in the position so that one wrong move would leave them in financial and personal ruin. It is not uncommon for many of these farmers to only make an annual profit of approximately \$20,000 and remain dependent on a spouse’s income.²⁴ A study published last year in the wake of the COVID-19 Pandemic highlighted this financial precarity. Whereas a grower who owns four chicken houses and grows 5-6 flocks a year could make a net income of \$43,500, a grower who produces four flocks annually has a 95% chance of losing

²² Sara A. Quandt, Alice E. Arcury-Quandt, Emma J. Lawlor, Lourdes Carrillo, Antonio J. Marín, Joseph G. Grzywacz, and Thomas A. Arcury, “3-D Jobs and Health Disparities: The Health Implications of Latino Chicken Catchers’ Working Conditions,” *American Journal of Industrial Medicine* 56, no. 2 (2013): 206–215.

²³ Guerrero, *Nuevo South*, 140-141.

²⁴ Potts, “The Serfs of Arkansas,” 23.

money.²⁵ In addition to wage workers, even the entrepreneurial contract farmer is forced into a position where they struggle to make ends meet.

EXPERIENCE IN THE INDUSTRY

Perla Guerrero tells the story of Javier and Andrea, who arrived in Fort Smith in 1994, excited about the potential opportunities awaiting them. Javier very quickly secured a steady job at one of the many *polleras* on first visit to the state. They were so pleased with the possibilities unfolding before them that they even recommended that their friends move to Arkansas. Working as part of the poultry industry would provide the means for the life they had been looking for in the United States. This new line of work would change their lives and provide them stability. The high demand for labor meant that many plants did not check for papers and were unable to blacklist you if you quit, and the low cost of living opened up the possibility of homeownership, which remained nearly impossible to many in places like California. Many also emphasized the importance of the *tranquilidad* [peace and quiet] of living in rural areas or one of Arkansas's small cities. These benefits were matched, though, by the brutal conditions of working in chicken.²⁶

This experience would also have a potent impact for the children of these migrants, like Guerrero, author of *Nuevo South: Latinas/os, Asians, and the Remaking of Place*. *Nuevo South* offers the first comprehensive history of the new waves of migration into Arkansas in the latter half of the twentieth century. Guerrero's own family moved to the state upon Javier and Andrea's recommendation over twenty-five years ago, strengthening the connections between communities in Zacatecas State in Mexico, Southern California, and now Arkansas. The parents of new migrant children stressed that there was no gang involvement in their new home, as Guerrero writes, but they could not protect this generation from having to cope as a cultural and racialized Other in an overwhelmingly white-majority region.

²⁵ Joshua G. Maples, Jada M. Thompson, John D. Anderson, and David P. Anderson, "Estimating COVID-19 Impacts on the Broiler Industry," *Applied Economic Perspectives and Policy* 43, no. 1 (2021): 324-325.

²⁶ Guerrero, *Nuevo South*, 126-151.

I interviewed Gene—who is a white woman and college student originally from Lincoln, Arkansas—to discuss her childhood on a small chicken farm. Until she was in third grade, her mother owned a farm out in Morrow that offered some means of living. Gene’s mother had grown up on the West coast and had come to live in Arkansas with her husband. Gene’s parents had bought the farm before their divorce with her father’s inheritance and her mom’s savings. It was an older, smaller farm, and Gene still recalls that Simmons Foods had been moving to phase farms like it out of their network. It was a very unique experience to be raised mostly by a single mother on a chicken farm in your formative years. Gene recalls “the everpresent smell of the chicken poop” and claims that “if I went to school it would stick to my clothes.” Her mom was always busy, even around bedtime, and she worked constantly until she was forced to sell the farm after some years. Even as a child, Gene remembers times of great financial hardship: “It’s just not a system built for my mom... It’s just not a system where you can survive as a farmer without an extra income. My understanding is that she didn’t earn enough money from the flock... you get paid once per flock and you don’t get paid until the next flock.”²⁷ It just wasn’t making enough money. Her mother then worked on the farm of a retired field representative for a major chicken company for about ten years.

Gene’s experience with the industry reflects its cruelty, but also gives insight into how migrant workers were integrated into it about two decades ago. When asked about her experiences with contract chicken-catchers, Gene highlighted the experience of being a young girl with a bunch of “random guys” running around the farm to collect the chickens to be sent to processing. She also then mentioned that the chicken-catchers were mostly Hispanic immigrants. When asked about other contract farmers in her area, she recalled little: “You’re not supposed to communicate a lot between farms anyway because of disease transmission.” When she was a bit older, though, she remembers that two Vietnamese families moved from California to buy farms in Lincoln—at least one of those families sold the farm within a few years. Her high school friend, Sonya

²⁷ Gene Walker (of Lincoln, AR) in discussion with the author, August 2022. The name presented in this research is a pseudonym, assigned to respect the informant’s request for privacy.

Chiewtrakoon—a second-generation Thai-American woman raised in Waldron—still recalls the farm that her parents sold when she was a teenager. To this day, she still enjoys drawing pictures of chickens.²⁸ Gene’s recollections of contract chicken farming is just one example of a common experience in Arkansas’s neoliberal landscape, and its impact on both working adults and their children can be quite powerful.

Like Gene, Lee Isaac Chung, the writer and director of *Minari*, attended Lincoln High School. His highly award-winning 2020 film highlights the struggles of the Yi family as they move into Arkansas in the 80s. Cultural values clash in the double-wide trailer out on the new family property as they struggle to both embrace and sustain their Korean culture while adapting to the particular struggles of farm life in Western Arkansas. The father reassures his son that it was better for them to leave California, telling him “we had nothing.”²⁹ The family as a whole is forced to deal with dubious neoliberal structures that had developed over the later twentieth century. In particular, they faced nefarious mortgage lending practices by agents who had not disclosed to Mr. Yi that the previous property owner had committed suicide.³⁰ They are also undercut on their first scheduled harvest at the last-minute by growers in California, a growing issue in that state’s transition to specialized agriculture in the neoliberal era.³¹ The Yi family also find themselves nearly unable to socially integrate into ethnic and religious spaces, creating a social and emotional struggle. This is particularly challenging for Mrs. Yi as she faces the most explicit social rejections while the relative security of wage labor—along with her husband’s debt—drive her to establish herself as a “shadow breadwinner.”³²

Working in the lower echelons of the poultry industry yields a variety of unique perspectives on the harsh conditions. While for some, their own farm might represent family-building, self-sufficiency, and independence, for others, the ample job opportunities in the processing centers translates to security and peace-of-mind. However, there are also positionalities within this system that are not marked by either independence or security, but instead suffer from a relative silencing of their experiences. Whether paid by the

28 Sonya Chiewtrakoon (of Waldron, AR) in discussion with the author, August 2022.

29 Steven Yeun, Yeri Han, Yuh-Jung Youn, Alan S. Kim, Noel Kate Cho, Will Patton, Scott Haze, et al. *Minari*. A24, 2021, 9:00.

30 Yeun et al., 1:20:55.

31 Yeun et al., 1:02:15.

32 Yeun et al., *Minari*, 1:10:00.

hour or by the flock, documented or undocumented, a common experience of relative socio-economic isolation and the constant negotiation with an exploitative industry for survival underrides the system as a whole.

THE LEGAL FRAMING OF IMMIGRANT LIVES

In the context of immigration and labor exploitation, it is essential to gain an understanding of which rights are realistically afforded to migrants, i.e. which rights are theoretically afforded to them and made accessible via due process. Here I will describe a series of six court cases from Arkansas that provide the legal positionality of migrants. *United States v. Polanco-Gomez* (1988) argues that returning to the United States after deportation is illegal for any reason. Polanco-Gomez was an undocumented Salvadorian immigrant who returned to the U.S. and was criminally charged. The bench of the United States Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit delivered the majority opinion that Polanco-Gomez could have applied for asylum before getting deported, that he could have migrated to a third country if he was truly under threat, and that due process was not violated because a translator was at the deportation hearing. The dissenting opinion, however, holds that having a translator at a deportation hearing for fifty-two people is still a gross violation of due process.³³ Even before the period of steady year-round migration of Latines into Arkansas, white insecurity and societal racism fed into an informal system of denying Latine immigrants asylum.

In 2011, the blatant illegality of hiring undocumented persons was reasserted by the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Arkansas in *United States v. Amador-Villaneuva*. The defendant formerly worked for his family's company out of Alma, a town outside of Fort Smith. The family and workers caught chickens on contract farms for harvest to earn revenue. The government shut down Amador Poultry Contracting, asserting that their workforce was 100% undocumented, and seized over one million dollars in business and personal assets before arresting the family members and charging them with

³³ *United States v. Polanco-Gomez*, 1988 U.S. App. LEXIS 2778 (8th Cir. 1988).

laundering. Mr. Amador-Villaneuva appealed to overturn his conviction or face lighter sentencing, claiming that he was never a part of managing business operations. Despite corroborating statements from family members, the court upheld the previous ruling, stating that if the service provided is completely inseparable from the act of labor—and if the entire workforce was undocumented—then the violation fell under the definition of laundering without exception.³⁴ Despite the failure to prove in 2001 that companies like Tyson were involved in human trafficking and laundering, it was reasserted in 2011 that employing and aiding undocumented individuals was plainly illegal—at least for persons-of-color and small businesses.

In *Doe v. Weiss*, delivered by the Supreme Court of Arkansas in 2010, the court ruled that undocumented status is not enough to permit an anonymous suit, as it was not an intimate personal identifier that could cause risk of harm to the plaintiff. The suit was brought forth by an unnamed woman from NWA, who had originally intended to sue the Arkansas Department of Finance and Administration for denying her a state ID card due to a lack of proof of legal residence. The court's ruling asserted that she could not continue to pursue such a case anonymously.³⁵ Given that her status as undocumented was central to the original complaint—whether the court recognized it or not—such a lawsuit would put her at risk of arrest, deportation, or even violent crime. It became clear that undocumented persons would not be able to sue under pseudonyms, and, in this way, could be barred from seeking justice through legal action at all.

In another blow to Arkansas immigrant communities, in *Term v. Williams* before the Court of Appeals of Arkansas in 2015, the court ruled that a language barrier is not a substantive enough excuse to miss deadlines or apply for extensions when it comes to the bureaucratic processes of seeking state aid. Term, a Marshallese woman from Springdale, had been laid off from work and was seeking unemployment benefits. However, Term missed the state's deadline to apply, explaining via translator that she was unable to read

34 United States v. Amador-Villanueva, 2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 78750 (W.D. Ark. 2011).

35 Doe v. Weiss, 2010 Ark. LEXIS 176 (Ark. 2010).

the notification delivered to her mailing address by the state. Although she appeared at the appropriate office before the deadline to ask for help, she was unable to provide a record of this interaction and had not successfully submitted an application for unemployment benefits. Because there was no proof of her ever being in the office, the appellate court upheld the prior ruling that she was ineligible for an extension. The court therefore upheld the idea that “[the] appellant did not establish that the untimeliness was due to circumstances beyond her control.”³⁶ While the decision of *Doe v. Weiss* in nature excludes undocumented migrants from seeking justice through the system, the disregard for language barriers present in the ruling of *Term v. Williams* means that native speakers of languages other than English—even those who are documented or hold citizenship—can not expect institutional support in Arkansas. Instead, they must rely on their own English language ability and the goodwill of individuals to navigate the bureaucratic and legal landscapes.

The unfortunate reality of Arkansas case law is that immigrants—most particularly the undocumented—have very limited access to the resources of the state and justice. Immigrants, however, were able to win a couple notable cases over the last decade. In 2012, in the case of *Tyson Poultry, Inc. v. Narvaiz* the Supreme Court of Arkansas insisted that all workers remain eligible for worker’s compensation unless they explicitly quit. Calling your supervisor a “mother-fucking bitch” at the moment in which you are injured is not a forfeiture of your job or any work-related benefits, even if you are an immigrant working for Tyson.³⁷ More importantly, the Court of Appeals of Arkansas affirmed that undocumented workers have equal labor rights in the 2017 case *Packer Sanitation Servs. v. Quintanilla*. In this case, Cecilia Quintanilla was working for a company contracted to clean Tyson’s processing facilities when she was injured while on the clock. For the commission that reviewed workers’ compensation claims, the case was simple, but her employer disputed the award and appealed. The appellate court released this in their ruling:

36 *Term v. Williams*, 2015 Ark. App. LEXIS 182 (Ark. Ct. App. 2015).

37 *Tyson Poultry, Inc. v. Narvaiz*, 2012 Ark. LEXIS 142 (Ark. 2012).

The Commission found that, accordingly, Cecilia was entitled to temporary total-disability benefits from May 8, 2015, to August 27, 2015. Packers does not dispute this reasoning; instead, it argues that... her incapacity to earn wages was because she was preempted from doing so by federal law... She was fired before the period of her disability ended, but because she did not leave voluntarily, she is entitled to temporary total-disability benefits for the duration of that disability. Whether she is an undocumented worker is inconsequential to this analysis.³⁸

Thus, in 2017, it became established case law in Arkansas that while being undocumented is not a protected identity, it also can not be an identity upon which employers may actively discriminate against after hiring. Immigrants in Arkansas are entitled to their most basic rights as workers, but the risk of being undocumented still greatly limits a person's ability to even express those rights as afforded by the state.

CONCLUSION

Scholars have demonstrated that the poultry industry has been instrumental in attracting new migrant populations while also taking advantage of the lowest classes of American society to perform the most devalued forms of labor. Recent scholarship investigates the particularly interesting positioning of Arkansas in this area of inquiry. However, a greater collection of both quantitative and qualitative research is needed to demonstrate the exact breadth and implications of this issue. In the neo-liberal era, *imperial migrants* face a unique struggle, as the uneven political relationships between their homelands and the United States drive their emigration and recast them as exploitable workers within the American heartland. While all citizens are forced to face the utter complexity as they navigate the competing and conglomerate powers of corporations and the state, the opaque nature of the legal and social order, and language and cultural barriers. Further, the near-complete lack of access to information is an amplifying and alienating effect not experienced by the majority of white Arkansans. While ideological racism is being dismantled and structural issues are being called out, these experiences demonstrate the prevalence of societal racism

38 Packers Sanitation Servs. v. Quintanilla, 2017 Ark. App. LEXIS 231 (Ark. Ct. App. 2017).

in the United States—which is made obvious in NWA, an emerging metropole of the neoliberal age. Despite this, many migrants still hope to take advantage of the job opportunities and the lower cost of living in the Natural State, and immigration will continue as they make this place a home.

Bibliography:

- Arredondo, Aarón, and Juan José Bustamante. “WhiteSpace, Brown Place: Racialized Experiences Accessing Public Space in an Arkansas Immigrant Community.” *Sociological Inquiry* 90, no. 3 (2020): 443–467. <https://doi.org/10.1111/soin.12273>
- Bordner, Autumn S., Caroline E. Ferguson, and Leonard Ortolano. “Colonial Dynamics Limit Climate Adaptation in Oceania: Perspectives from the Marshall Islands.” *Global Environmental Change* 61 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1111/soin.12273>
- Doe v. Richard Weiss, 2010 Ark. LEXIS 176 (Ark. 2010). <https://advance-lexis-com.dartmouth.idm.oclc.org/api/document?collection=cases&id=urn:contentItem:7Y4S-NJG0-YB0H-D02F-00000-00&context=1516831>
- Escobar, Maria Andrea. “The Extent of Southern Hospitality: Hispanic Youths’ Sense of Belonging in El Nuevo South.” M.A. thesis, University of California, Merced, 2019. <https://escholarship.org/uc/item/6sj8v75j>
- Guerrero, Perla M. *Nuevo South : Latinas/os, Asians, and the Remaking of Place*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 2017.
- Guerrero, Perla M. “A Tenuous Welcome for Latinas/os and Asians: States’ Rights Discourse in Late Twentieth-Century Arkansas.” In *Race and Ethnicity in Arkansas: New Perspectives*, edited by John A. Kirk, 141-152. Fayetteville, AR: University of Arkansas Press, 2014.
- “Immigrant Connection.” Tyson Immigrant Partnership. 2022. <https://www.tipwelcome.com/>
- Maples, Joshua G., Jada M. Thompson, John D. Anderson, and David P. Anderson. “Estimating COVID-19 Impacts on the Broiler Industry.” *Applied Economic Perspectives and Policy* 43, no. 1 (2021): 315–328. <https://doi.org/10.1002/aapp.13089>
- McClain, S. N., C. Bruch, M. Nakayama, and M. Laelan. “Migration with Dignity: a Case Study on the Livelihood Transition of Marshallese to Springdale, Arkansas.” *Journal of International Migration and Integration* 21, no. 3 (2019): 847–859. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12134-019-00688-7>

- Mitchell-Eaton, Emily. “New Destinations of Empire: Imperial Migration from the Marshall Islands to Northwest Arkansas.” Ph.D. dissertation, Syracuse University, 2016.
- Packers Sanitation Servs. v. Quintanilla, 2017 Ark. App. LEXIS 231 (Ark. Ct. App. 2017). <https://advance-lexis-com.dartmouth.idm.oclc.org/api/document?collection=cases&id=urn:contentItem:5N9J-YTT1-F048-H0BS-00000-00&context=1516831>
- Potts, Monica. “The Serfs of Arkansas.” *The American Prospect* 22, no. 3 (2011): 23–27. <https://www-proquest-com.dartmouth.idm.oclc.org/magazines/serfs-arkansas/docview/930511115/se-2>
- Quandt, Sara A, Alice E Arcury-Quandt, Emma J Lawlor, Lourdes Carrillo, Antonio J Marín, Joseph G Grzywacz, and Thomas A Arcury. “3-D Jobs and Health Disparities: The Health Implications of Latino Chicken Catchers’ Working Conditions.” *American Journal of Industrial Medicine* 56, no. 2 (2013): 206–215. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajim.22072>
- Robinson, Cedric J. “Racial Capitalism: The Nonobjective Character of Capitalist Development.” In *Black Marxism, Revised and Updated Third Edition*, 9–28. Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press, 2021.
- Romano, Lois. “A Community Adapts to Newcomers.” *The Washington Post*, March 24, 1998. <https://www.washingtonpost.com/archive/politics/1998/03/24/a-community-adapts-to-newcomers/70c842a9-cab8-48c7-a0b5-bc2ce0a7eea1/>
- Shbikat, Gazi. and Striffler, Steve. “Arkansas migration and population.” *Arkansas Business and Economic Review*, 33, no. 3 (Fall 2000): 1-5. <https://www.proquest.com/scholarly-journals/arkansas-migration-population/docview/198494948/se-2>
- Term v. Williams, 2015 Ark. App. LEXIS 182 (Ark. Ct. App. 2015). <https://advance-lexis-com.dartmouth.idm.oclc.org/api/document?collection=cases&id=urn:contentItem:5FGD-XF01-F048-H06F-00000-00&context=1516831>
- Turner, Richard N. “Occupational Stratification of Hispanics, Whites, and Blacks in Southern Rural Destinations: A Quantitative Analysis.” *Population Research and Policy Review* 33, no. 5 (2014): 717–746. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11113-014-9324-y>
- Tyson Poultry, Inc. v. Narvaiz, 2012 Ark. LEXIS 142 (Ark. 2012). <https://advance-lexis-com.dartmouth.idm.oclc.org/api/document?collection=cas->

es&id=urn:contentItem:5560-RG41-F048-J07Y-00000-00&context=1516831

United States v. Amador-Villanueva, 2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 78750 (W.D. Ark. 2011).
<https://advance-lexis-com.dartmouth.idm.oclc.org/api/document?collection=cases&id=urn:contentItem:53C1-C1D1-JCNB-10CM-00000-00&context=1516831>

United States v. Polanco-Gomez, 1988 U.S. App. LEXIS 2778 (8th Cir. 1988).
<https://advance-lexis-com.dartmouth.idm.oclc.org/api/document?collection=cases&id=urn:contentItem:3S4X-2B60-001B-K3JG-00000-00&context=1516831>

Wiener-Bronner, Danielle. “Justice Department accuses poultry processors of underpaying workers for decades.” CNN Business. July 25, 2022.
<https://www.cnn.com/2022/07/25/business/poultry-wages-lawsuit/index.html>

Yeun, Steven, Yeri Han, Yuh-Jung Youn, Alan S. Kim, Noel Kate Cho, Will Patton, Scott Haze, et al. Minari. A24, 2021.