THE ALEXANDRIAN

Troy University Department of History

& Phi Alpha Theta-Iota Mu

In Remembrance of Professor Nathan Alexander

A*lexandrian* Submission Guidelines

The Alexandrian accepts manuscripts pertaining to the subjects of history and philosophy. Accepted forms include book reviews, historiographical articles, articles, and essays.

Format: All submissions should be in Microsoft Word. They should adhere to the *Chicago Manual of Style*. Please include footnotes instead of endnotes, and refrain from using any headers.

Abstract: Any article submission must include an abstract of no more than 200 words. This is not necessary for submissions of book reviews or essays.

Author biography: A short biography of any relevant information should be included for the contributors' page of the journal. Such information includes your major and class designation, graduation date, research interests, plans after college, hometown, any academic honors of affiliations you deem relevant, etc. Author biographies should be no more than 100 words. Please be sure your name is written as you would like it to appear in the journal.

Please send all submissions to alexandrian@troy.edu.

Cover art depicts Voltaire, French author, humanist, rationalist, and satirist (1694-1778), drawn by Nathan Alexander.

THE

ALEXANDRIAN

Table of Contents

Introduction and Dedication

This is a special introduction for our inaugural issue. Doug Allen, a former student of Nathan Alexander, was the driving force behind the creation of this journal to promote student research at Troy University. He chooses to dedicate this publication in Professor Alexander's name. We miss you, Nathan.

"Cancer may take all my physical abilities. It cannot touch my mind, it cannot touch my heart, and it cannot touch my soul…those three are going to carry on forever." Though uttered by Coach Jim Valvano in his now infamous Espy speech, these words could easily have been attributed to Dr. Nathan Alexander. My first memory of Dr. Alexander is also the most lasting. As I made my way to one of my first history classes at Troy University, a tall, bright smile walked towards me in the empty hall. Though I was already late for class, this man, with what can only be described as a warmness about him, stopped me. I do not recall the exact words, but the conversation made me laugh, think, and enjoy his company. His demeanor made me feel at ease, and his jovial attitude gave no indication he was facing an uphill battle with cancer. It was not until the end of the conversation, after many divergent topics ranging from Troy University to beach vacations, that this man introduced himself, as simply Nathan. Dr. Alexander had an infectious personality and a magnetism that made everyone he met love him.

Dr. Alexander loved his students and always believed in their ability to contribute to the historical community at a high level. He treated his students as equal partners in the process of learning, and pushed the students at Troy to pursue ambitious goals. Phi Alpha Theta began a project to bring an online historical journal to Troy University. This project took many turns and even more setbacks before finally becoming a reality late in the spring semester. As a tribute to Dr. Alexander and his impact on the students of the history department at Troy University, Phi Alpha Theta decided to name the journal *The Alexandrian*. He constantly volunteered his precious time for his students, and *The Alexandrian* must thank the wonderful professors in the History Department of Troy University for volunteering their time to be readers, advisors, and editors. I would like to extend a special thanks to Dr. Karen Ross for leading this journal as our faculty advisor. Dr. Ross has been an invaluable part of making this journal a reality and has devoted her valuable time to keep *The Alexandrian*

on track despite numerous obstacles. She truly exhibits some of the best qualities of *The Alexandrian* seeks to honor and this journal would not have been possible without her dedication and generous volunteering of her time.

The articles in this inaugural issue of *The Alexandrian* are representative of the high quality research being done by graduate and undergraduate scholars at Troy University. The authors of these articles are honor students, award winners, and fellowship recipients. This assembly of articles so disparate in geography, time period, and theme is the perfect way to honor Dr. Alexander with its inaugural issue. Dr. Alexander could fluidly move from topic to topic across theme, time, or geography and read and studied across many different fields. Anyone who spent time talking with Dr. Alexander can only smile at remembering the way he changed topics quickly. His interests ranged as wide as the articles in this issue and it is a fitting tribute to his memory that the first issue of this journal is as diversely assembled as Dr. Alexander.

Dr. Alexander read widely and was a relentless learner throughout his life. The mind, he taught his students, was one of the greatest assets a person could develop. As amazing as his mind was, Dr. Alexander's generous heart was even more impactful on his family, friends, and students. Though his intellectual conversations were always enlightening and enjoyable, it was the personal talks that affected his students the most. Dr. Alexander had the ability to not only make his students understand history, but to believe in themselves. His kindness gives the people who knew him a standard to live up to. Lastly, Dr. Alexander's soul will be an example for others remember and follow. If we define the soul as the "actuating cause of an individual life," as Webster does, then one can only hope that they live up to Dr. Alexander's example. Dr. Alexander's "actuating cause" in his life was his family. This came in three parts: his university family consisting of his colleagues and students; his natal family consisting of his parents, brother and sisters; and the most important of all, his true actuating cause, his daughter Elisa. Somehow, Dr. Alexander found the time and energy to devote himself to these three families. Dr. Alexander gave of himself to all that encountered him in these settings, and as a result Dr. Alexander will mostly, and more importantly, be remembered through the memory of his family, friends, and students. It is my hope, though, that this journal will play a small part in helping "carry on forever" the memory of Dr. Alexander's mind, heart and soul.

To the students and professors at Troy University that he influenced, to his family, specifically his pride and joy Elisa, and most importantly to the memory of Dr. Nathan Alexander I would like to dedicate this inaugural issue of *The Alexandrian.*

Doug Allen

Co-editor and Author

Contributors' Biographies

Doug Allen

Doug Allen graduated with honors from Troy University with a bachelor's degree in history. While in attendance at Troy, he received the Colonial Dames American History Paper Award and served as the president of the Troy chapter of Phi Alpha Theta and was a recipient of the Chancellor's Fellowship. Allen currently teaches history at Monroe Comprehensive High School in Albany, Georgia. He plans to begin graduate school in the fall of 2012, with a concentration on African American history and the memory of slavery. He eventually aspires to become a university professor.

David Davenport

David Davenport completed his bachelor's degree in American history in May 2011. He is currently a graduate student at Sam Houston State University in pursuit of a master's degree in history. Davenport has presented at Troy University's College of Arts and Sciences 2011 Undergraduate Research Seminar. Davenport is a veteran of the U.S. Army and currently works for an aircraft maintenance contractor in FT. Rucker, AL. He serves on the Historical Preservation Committee of the Dothan Landmarks Foundation, Inc., and volunteers in his spare time for the National Parks Service at Horseshoe Bend National Military Park. Davenport plans to seek employment with the National Parks Service after the completion of his graduate degree.

Morgan A. Jackson

Morgan Jackson received an undergraduate degree at Troy University in History and Political Science departments in 2009. As an undergrad, Jackson served as president of the Troy Chapter Phi Alpha Theta for two years. Currently Jackson is pursuing a master's degree at Troy University for History Education. Her primary areas of focus are the history of popular culture, colonial America, and American Studies. After the completion of her graduate degree, Jackson intends

to become a secondary history teacher and begin the pursuit of her doctorate in colonial history.

Morgan Till

Morgan Till grew up in Georgiana Alabama. She graduated Summa Cum Laude with a Bachelor of Science in English from Troy University in 2011. At Troy, Till placed an emphasis on post-Colonial and Anglophone literature. Till intends to begin studies for a Masters Degree soon, toward her goal of teaching English as a second language. Currently, Till is working on Troy University's campus in Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam.

D. Seth Wilson

Seth Wilson is a senior at Troy University, with plans to graduate in May 2012. His primary area of interest is the American Progressive Era. While completing his undergraduate degree, Wilson is serving as president of the Troy chapter Phi Alpha Theta. In 2012, he presented at the Alabama Regional Conference of Phi Alpha Theta. After graduation, Wilson plans to attend graduate school, where he intends to continue his pursuit of historical research.

From 'Excellent Officer' to 'Little Consequence': The

Deterioration of Gates and Arnold's Relationship at Saratoga

Doug Allen

In 1852, British historian Sir Edward Creasy labeled the Battle of Saratoga as one of the fifteen most influential battles of the world. No other "military event," he argued, could "be said to have exercised more important influence on the future fortunes of mankind, than the complete defeat of Burgoyne's" army at Saratoga.[1] Creasy goes on to state that in this battle Benedict Arnold "did more for his countrymen than whole battalions could have effected."[2] Benedict Arnold is not primarily remembered for his contributions at the Battle of Saratoga; He is better remembered for his infamous defection and betrayal of the American cause. Benedict Arnold's legacy is so inseparably linked with his treachery that his name has become synonymous with betrayal—so much so that Dan Gilbert, in the effort to link LeBron James' "cowardly betrayal" of the Cleveland Cavaliers with Benedict Arnold, lowered the price of the LeBron James wall portrait to $17.41, Arnold's birth year.[3]

Arnold's betrayal, however, is more complex than is commonly remembered or portrayed. In fact, if Dan Gilbert was more knowledgeable of the many factors, of which money may have been secondary, leading to Arnold's betrayal, he would have probably avoided the connection altogether. Arnold's betrayal developed from a series slights ranging from seniority and rank issues between Arnold and the Continental Congress to personal envy issues between Arnold and Horatio Gates. Ultimately, Arnold's own superiors, like Gates, pushed him over the edge towards treason. Though Arnold and Gates began the war as friends, by the Battle of Saratoga in 1777 Arnold and Gates were engaged in a feud that contributed to Arnold's infamous betrayal.

Even before Saratoga, Benedict Arnold and Horatio Gates developed a strange and strained relationship. Arnold proved his worth to the Continental

---

[1] Edward Creasy, *The Fifteen Most Decisive Battles of the World: From Marathon to Waterloo*, (Richard Bentley: London, 1852), 463.

[2] Ibid, 482.

[3] Ricky Doyle, "Cavs Owner Dan Gilbert Changes Price of LeBron James Fatheads to Benedict Arnold's Birth Year," NESN.com, 9 July 2010, via http://www.nesn.com/2010/07/cavs-owner-dan-gilbert-changes-price-of-lebron-james-fatheads-to-benedict-arnolds-birth-year.html (05 March 2011)

army in 1775, at the Siege of Boston. Arnold co-commanded the force that captured Fort Ticonderoga's arsenal of cannons without a shot. These cannons were then transported by Henry Knox to be used by Washington to feint the British army into retreating from Boston back to England. This feat caught the attention of Horatio Gates, a military veteran of the French and Indian War. After Washington acquiesced to Gates' push for an invasion of Canada, Gates and Washington both agreed Arnold should lead the assault. Gates even helped Arnold prepare for his expedition through the Canada wilderness to capture Quebec. When Gates was selected to take over the American army in Canada, Arnold expressed happiness that Gates was on his way. Arnold even wrote Gates: "I shall be ever happy in your friendship." Though the Americans failed to capture it, the expedition itself showed Arnold's leadership and began what seemed to be an enduring friendship between Gates and Arnold.[4]

Gates became Arnold's patron general during Arnold's finest hours early in the war. In fact, it is not an overstatement to say Arnold saved the revolution at Valcour Island. Knowing that the Continental army could not withstand another British attack, Benedict Arnold suggested building a navy on Lake Champlain. Gates put Arnold in charge of the operation and made sure to praise and protect from Arnold from his critics. While Arnold raced against the British to build a fleet of ships on the shores of Lake Champlain, Gates wrote to Congress in the summer of 1776, "General Arnold, who is perfectly skilled in naval affairs, has most nobly undertaken to command our fleet." He added that he was "convinced" Arnold would "add to the brilliant reputation he has so deservedly acquired."[5]

Gates even protected Arnold from arrest at this crucial juncture. After Arnold accused Colonel Moses Hazen of incompetence for allowing supplies to be stolen during the Canadian campaign, Hazen demanded a court-martial to clear his name. During this court-martial Arnold's key witness, a Major Scott, was barred from testifying by the court. Arnold exploded in one of his infamous angry eruptions, insulting the court to the point that they demanded he apologize. Arnold refused in a similarly explosive episode, leading the court to order Arnold's arrest. Gates, however, came to Arnold's rescue. Writing to Congress, Gates informed them that the "United States must not be deprived of that excellent officer's service at this important moment." Arnold avoided this

---

[4] Joseph Cummins, *Great Rivals in History: When Politics Gets Personal,* (Sidney, Australia: Pier 9, 2008), 152; James Kirby Martin, *Benedict Arnold, Revolutionary Hero: An American Warrior Reconsidered,* (New York University Press: New York and London, 1997), 227; For more on the march to Quebec see: Thomas Desjardin, *Through Howling Wilderness: Benedict Arnold's March to Quebec, 1775,* (St. Martin's Press: New York, 2006); James Huston, "The Logistics of Arnold's March to Quebec," *Military Affairs,* Vol. 32, No. 3, (Dec. 1968), 110-24.
[5] Isaac Arnold, *The Life of Benedict Arnold: His Patriotism and His Treason,* (Jansen, McClung & Co: Chicago, 1880), 107-109.

political bullet that could have ruined his military career and Gates had been the one to pull him out of its way.[6]

Arnold, feeling indebted to Gates for being his patron and protector, treated Gates as a respected friend and superior. As Arnold continued to build his navy from scratch it became evident he needed more men and resources. Arnold disguised his requests for men and resources inside letters updating Gates on the status of the fleet at every turn. Arnold also asked Gates for his approval and suggestions on where to place the new American navy. Writing only a couple of weeks before the important naval battle, Arnold states he is moving the navy near Valcour Island and, in an obvious sign of respect Arnold would not have shown less than a year later, ends with "if you do not approve, will return." These acts of tact from the tactless Arnold seem to indicate a sense of respect for Gates.[7] Arnold, with Gates' support, helped save revolution at Valcour Island. As Arnold historian Willard Randall states, though two-thirds of the American fleet had been destroyed, "never had any force, big or small, lived to [a] better purpose."[8] This victory showed the potential of Arnold and Gates when they were working together towards a single goal.

Both Arnold and Gates, however, had large egos and the situation that materialized seems like an old Western; the American officer corps was not big enough for the two of them. Due to theses immense egos, Gates and Arnold's amiable relationship dissolved after Arnold's victorious defeat at Valcour Island. The issues between Arnold and Gates began with Gates's usurpation of General Schuyler and culminated with a number of problems at Saratoga. A subtle shift in Arnold's views about Gates can be seen in the closing of his letters in 1776 and 1777. Arnold signed his early 1776 letters to Gates, "I am, with real affection and esteem, dear General, your obedient, humble servant." While this may seem like a formality of the age, for Arnold this was also used as a personal statement of respect for the recipient. Only a year later, after Gates had taken command for Schulyer, Arnold no longer signed his letters to Gates in this fashion. He simply signed, "I am,&c." Though these two closings are essentially the same in meaning, Arnold continually signed his letters to Washington and Schulyer with a full closing while signing letters to Gates in the abbreviated

---

[6] Willard Wallace, "Benedict Arnold: Traitorous Patriot," in *George Washington's Generals and Opponents: Their Exploits and Leadership,* George Billias, Ed. (First Da Capo Press, 1994), 174-175.

[7] Ibid; The only other letters Arnold writes that hold this level of tactfulness are the letters to Washington, whom Arnold revered like a father, and Arnold's mentor General Schuyler, whom Arnold respected more than nearly anyone.

[8] For more on the Battle of Valcour Island see: James L. Nelson, *Benedict Arnold's Navy: The Ragtag Fleet that Lost the Battle of Lake Champlain but Won the American Revolution,* (McGraw Hill: Ohio, 2006); Quote, Alfred Thayer Mahan, *Major Operations of the Navies,* (Little, Brown, and Company: Boston, 1913); Quote found in Willard Sterne Randall, *Benedict Arnold: Patriot and Traitor,* (Quill: New York, 1990), 317.

form.[9] These closings show a quiet build-up to the explosive battle between Arnold and Gates at the Battle of Saratoga.

Arnold set the stage for the Battle of Saratoga, the combination of the 1st and 2nd battles of Freeman's Farm, when he chose Bemis Heights as the site of the contest in early September of 1777. Gates then ordered the area around Bemis Heights, about ten miles south of the town of Saratoga, to be fortified in preparation of an attack. For about a week the American forces traded their muskets for shovels and dug themselves in at Bemis Heights. When the British, under command of British general John Burgoyne, finally arrived at Saratoga, the Americans were firmly entrenched at Bemis Heights. To the British the Americans must have looked like a cohesive unit prepared to stick together through a long battle. If this is what the British believed, though, they would have been wrong as disagreements between Arnold and Gates had already begun.[10]

This feud between the former friends began even before the British and American forces met on the field of battle and began primarily because of military politics. General Horatio Gates and his partisans had been maneuvering to overtake General Philip Schuyler, an even closer friend of Arnold than Gates, as commander of the Northern Army. Gates' maneuvering ended in triumph when Schuyler turned over his command to Gates on August 19, 1777, at the behest of Congress. While Gates received the command of the Northern Army, Arnold received word from Congress that they would not restore his seniority. This put Arnold in a "defiant mood," and he retaliated against Gates and Congress by naming Colonel Livingston and Richard Varick, former Schuyler aides, to his own staff. Livingston and Varick were unabashed Schuyler partisans and acted as constant reminders that Schuyler's influence had not totally been purged. Arnold, thus, fired the first shot in this feud, but it quickly became mutually hostile during the Saratoga Campaign.[11]

Arnold's placement of Livingston and Varick on his staff was a slap in the face to Gates, and Gates retaliated in kind. Gates had been given the power to "suspend any officers for misconduct."[12] With this knowledge, Gates attempted to goad the quick tempered Arnold into defying orders. This would allow Gates to either suspend Arnold or force him into getting rid of the rest of

---

[9] Benedict Arnold to Horatio Gates, 31 August 1776; Benedict Arnold to Horatio Gates, 28 August 1777; Benedict Arnold to Philip Schuyler, 24 October 1776; Benedict Arnold to George Washington, 6 March 1780, found at Familytales, via http://www.familytales.org/results.php?tla=bea (6 March 2011)

[10] Willard Sterne Randall, *Benedict Arnold: Patriot and Traitor,* (Quill: New York, 1990), 350-52.

[11] James Kirby Martin, *Benedict Arnold, Revolutionary Hero: An American Warrior Reconsidered,* (New York University Press: New York and London, 1997), 364-68.

[12] President of Congress to Horatio Gates, August 14, 1777, Mss., Gates Papers, N-YHS, found in Randall, 354.

Schuyler's staff. Gates' attempt to goad Arnold took the form of a routine camp duty. As was customary of the second-in-command, Arnold had the duty to assign incoming militia units to their respective commands. He fulfilled this duty of assigning the New York and Connecticut militia units to their brigades only to wake up on the morning of September 10th to find his orders countermanded in the days general orders.[13] The general orders for September 10th were posted around the camp for all to see. Gates had overridden Arnold's orders publically and, in an added insult, did not tell Arnold beforehand. Even worse, according to Arnold, was having the orders countermanded by Deputy Adjutant Wilkinson, the officer actually signing and authorizing the general orders. To have his orders reversed by a camp aid was the highest insult of all. Arnold, though within walking distance of Gates' tent, became so angered that he scratched out a letter to Gates late in September exclaiming his resentment at being placed in the "ridiculous light of presuming to give orders I had no right to do and having them publicly contradicted."[14] Gates' posting of these general orders angered Arnold like never before and ratcheted up the Gates-Arnold feud.

The relationship between Gates and Arnold may have still been salvageable at this point but events that followed at the Battle of Freeman's Farm and the Battle of Bemis Heights would drive a permanent wedge between them.[15] On the morning of September 19, 1777, Burgoyne, pressured by dwindling supplies, ordered his men to march towards the American position at Bemis Heights. Gates, an especially cautious commander, thought the best course of action was to wait behind the Bemis Heights fortifications for Burgoyne. Arnold, however, urged Gates to take a much more aggressive strategy. The two engaged in a heated argument about which course of action to take, even though Gates was never going to acquiesce to Arnold's plan. Finally, in a mutually disagreeable compromise, Gates agreed to allow Arnold to send Daniel Morgan's riflemen and Henry Dearborn's light infantry on a reconnaissance mission; Arnold, however, would have to remain in the camp.[16] Though Gates had made this concession to Arnold, Gates began to exclude Arnold from offering his plans and stopped inviting Arnold to staff meetings. This only further insulted and angered Arnold's large, yet fragile, ego.[17] Morgan's Riflemen, meanwhile, reached the farm of loyalist John Freeman at the same time as Burgoyne's main army. Morgan and his men took aim at the British, specifically the British officers, and fired a couple volleys. Though the

---

[13] Randall, 354.
[14] Benedict Arnold to Horatio Gates, September 22, 1777, Mss., Gates Papers, N-YHS, found in Randall, 354.
[15] Randall, 354-355.
[16] James Lunt, *John Burgoyne of Saratoga,* (Harcourt Brace Jovanovich: New York and London, 1975), 209-29.
[17] Randall, 355.

Battle of Freeman's Farm had begun, it was still the Gates-Arnold battle that offered the greatest threat to the Americans.[18]

Arnold, the official commanding officer of the American troops engaged in the battle, ordered out a number the remaining troops from his left flank, but as the battle continued it became clear to Arnold that he could rout and possibly destroy Burgoyne's army with a larger portion of the American army. Repeatedly he asked for more troops from Gates, though considering Arnold's infamous lack of tact Gates most likely viewed these pleas for more troops as demands rather than requests. Gates denied Arnold's requests believing it would pull too many men away from the defense of Bemis Heights. In addition, Gates had a "healthy respect for the British soldier's skill with the bayonet," coupled with "little faith in [the American troops] fighting competence."[19] As a result, Gates looked to avoid an open field battle with the British. The predictably cautious Gates most likely had "little faith" in these troops ability to rout the powerful British army no matter the general in charge, but this would have been lost on Arnold. Arnold saw everything in personal terms and Gates' refusal to send more troops, as far as Arnold was concerned, was part of the ongoing feud between them.

While Gates sat in his tent with his aides and friends, Arnold frantically sent orders to the front lines. Arnold, apparently fed up with being out of the action, eventually rode to the front to personally lead an attack against British general Fraser. Though now engaged personally in leading men in battle, Arnold still returned to Gates a number of times to request more troops with which to defeat the British. Still, Gates refused, even calling back one of Arnold's regiments to guard his headquarters.[20] Finally, after Arnold had rode back yet again to request more troops, Gates succumbed to Arnold's request, but Gates, fed up with his insubordinate underling, had to show Arnold his place. Instead of sending Arnold with more troops, Gates sent Larned's Brigade. This brigade got lost in the woods on the way to battle, which certainly would not have happened if Arnold, who had ridden this trail numerous times to request troops, been allowed to lead them.

With the delay of these troops and the loss of Arnold's leadership, the battle began to tilt in favor of the British. As Arnold paced in front of Gates' tent, Colonel Morgan Lewis rode up and told Gates the battle was not going well. Arnold, furious at *his* signature victory slipping away, immediately rode off towards the battle only to be given a direct order to return to camp by Gates. Arnold, being a man concerned with military honor, could not ignore or defy a

---

[18] Lunt, 209-29.
[19] Ibid, 209; Martin, 370.
[20] Barry Wilson, *Benedict Arnold: A Traitor in Our Midst,* (McGill-Queen's University Press: Quebec City, 2001) 139-40.

direct order from a superior, at least at this point.[21] The American forces were eventually forced to retreat to their defenses at Bemis Heights, but they had delivered an important blow to Burgoyne's army thanks to the command of Arnold, the field leadership of Morgan, and the marksmanship of Morgan's Riflemen.

This marked only the beginning of the Arnold-Gates feud. After the 1st Battle of Freeman's Farm Gates wrote the official report to Congress, but he did not even mention Arnold by name in the report despite the nearly universal agreement by the field commanders that Arnold deserved most of the credit for the successes of the battle. Arnold, already angry at Gates' refusal to give him the troops he needed to defeat Burgoyne, now became even more infuriated at the insult dealt him when Gates' refusal to give him or his men credit for their part in the Battle of Freeman's Farm. To add injury to insult, Gates removed Morgan's Riflemen from Arnold's command and put them under his own. Since Gates commanded the center of the American forces and Arnold had command of the left flank, this move made no military strategic sense. The move simply served as a political move to humiliate Arnold by stripping him of his best troops and his friend Daniel Morgan. Arnold stormed to Gates' tent to demand an explanation. The two could be heard shouting "high words and gross language" at each other from outside the tent. In the end, "Arnold retired in rage" because Gates had informed Arnold that when General Lincoln arrived in camp, only about one or two days away, Arnold would be relieved of divisional command. In addition, Gates told Arnold he was "of little consequence to the army," and would gladly give Arnold a pass to leave.[22]

Arnold took Gates' offer and requested to "join General Washington." Arnold, though, could not ignore a chance to take a shot at Gates, stating he would "serve my country, although I am thought of no consequence in this department."[23] This remark was especially insulting to Gates considering he had been suspected by Nathanael Greene of attempting to conspire with Congressman Thomas Mifflin to "supplant His Excellency from the command of the Army and get General Gates at the head of it."[24] This remark, in essence, told Gates he had made a mistake believing Arnold was not valuable to the army and Washington would not make such an ignorant mistake.

However, when Arnold's men and the officers in Gates' army heard he might leave, or the even worse rumor that he might quit the army altogether, they took action. Arnold's aide Colonel Livingston wrote to Philip Schuyler that

---

[21] Randall, 358-59

[22] James Wilkinson, *Memoirs of My Own Times,* Vol., 1, (Abraham Small: Philadelphia, 1816), 254-256.

[23] Ibid.

[24] Terry Golway, *Washington's General: Nathanael Greene and the Triumph of the American Revolution,* (Owl Books: New York, 2006), 156-57.

"When the general officers and soldiers heard of [Arnold's leaving], they were greatly alarmed." They then took action by writing a letter to Arnold, "signed by all the general officers, excepting Lincoln, urging him to remain."[25] Arnold, enamored with the support of his troops and anticipating another confrontation with Burgoyne's army, requested Gates to reinstate him to a command, an act that must have pained Arnold to make. Gates, again seeking to put Arnold in his place, refused to give Arnold back his command unless he relieved his aide Colonel Livingston. Arnold, intensely loyal to those loyal to him, ardently refused, but Livingston and Varick resigned on their own rather than be liabilities for their friend.[26] Things seemed to be looking up for Arnold, Gates, and the American army. Arnold had his command and the support of the majority in Gates' army. Gates had put Arnold in his place again and had successfully exculpated the last remnants of Schuyler's command. The American army had withstood Burgoyne's first attack and survived, for the moment, the larger battle going on inside its own officer's ranks.

The Arnold-Gates feud was not over though; it was not even declining in ferocity. Although Gates had offered to give Arnold back a command if he relieved Livingston, Gates still excluded Arnold from staff meetings. Worse, he gave Lincoln full command of the right flank and took the left flank, Arnold's previous command, under himself. He also declared if Arnold was caught objecting to this arrangement or issuing his own orders Arnold would be arrested for insubordination.[27] Gates was very effectively undercutting Arnold's authority and influence with the army. Arnold, not to be outdone in this feud, continued to send Gates advice by letter despite Gates obvious disregard for Arnold's opinion.[28] On October 1, Arnold, probably sensing the coming battle, wrote to Gates, "Conscious of my own innocency and integrity, I am determined to sacrifice my feelings and continue in the army at this critical juncture, when my country needs every support."[29] Gates had no intention of letting Arnold back into any part of the army. Gates saw Arnold not only as an impetuous, risky commander but also a true threat and rival for his authority with the soldiers, perhaps displacing him just as he had displaced Schuyler.[30]

On the morning of October 7, Burgoyne personally led a reconnaissance force towards Bemis Heights. As Gates sat in his tent with his aides Wilkinson, the pickets reported the advance of Burgoyne's force. Gates seemed as if he would do nothing until he suddenly requested Morgan to attack, probably at the behest of Morgan himself, maybe even acting on Arnold's

---

[25] Livingston to Schuyler, September 23, 1777, found in Isaac Arnold, *Life of Benedict Arnold: His Patriotism and His Treason,* (Jansen, McClurg, and Co.: Chicago, 1880), 178.
[26] Randall, 362.
[27] Martin, 391.
[28] Randall, 362-63.
[29] Issac Arnold, 194.
[30] Ibid.

behalf. Whatever the reason, Gates ordered Morgan to advance on Burgoyne's army and attack much as Arnold would have liked. Arnold, however, was under a quasi-house arrest and acted as surprised as anyone when the battle began.[31]

Arnold would not sit idly in his tent as the battle continued though. As the apocryphal story goes, Arnold heard the gunfire as Morgan's Riflemen opened fire on the British. He walked out and paced back and forth in front of his tent as the sounds of battle rang in the air. Eventually, no longer patient enough to wait for news, Arnold rode to Gates' tent. There he grew even more impatient when he saw Gates sitting outside his tent while his division, the one he was supposed to be commanding, was in battle. Arnold, his impatience tested to its limits, jumped on his horse, dug in his spurs, and galloped full speed towards the sound of battle to the cheers of the soldiers in the camp. Gates watched Arnold gallop off with what must have been extreme shock and rage. He immediately sent an aide to order Arnold back, but the aide had no hope of catching the determined Arnold. When Arnold decided on a course of action, especially the rebellious type, there was no turning back.[32]

As Arnold rode towards the front lines, he rallied Americans retreating from the battle, and ultimately he became the catalyst for the monumental American victory. When Arnold arrived at the battlefield, so the story goes, he saw British general Simon Fraser leading his troops effectively against the Americans. Arnold then turned to Daniel Morgan and ordered, "That officer upon the gray horse is of himself a host, and must be disposed of; direct the attention of some of the sharpshooters among your riflemen, to him."[33] Moments later General Fraser had been mortally wounded and Arnold led the Americans in another charge. He charged between the two lines, bullets flying around him from both directions, forcing the British to retreat further. Arnold's leadership had given the Americans the upper hand in a battle that had been a stalemate.

However, just as Arnold had Burgoyne on the run, a bullet struck Arnold's horse and another struck his leg. Arnold's horse collapsed, pinning his unwounded leg under it. An American soldier came to help the fallen general and asked him where he had been shot. Arnold replied, "In the same leg…I wish it had been my heart."[34] At the time Arnold probably wished this because he knew the extent of the wound to his leg and knew that the surgeon would want to amputate it. However, his words, if truly spoken, would take on a much different meaning later in his life.

Arnold lay on the surgeons table demanding the surgeon not cut-off his leg. Had it been anyone else the surgeon would not have even waited before

---

[31] Martin, 395.
[32] Randall, 365-66.
[33] Isaac Arnold, 200.
[34] Randall, 368.

amputating the leg, but Arnold's reputation and personality helped his demands win over the doctors. Arnold even insisted that he would rather die than be a cripple for the rest of his life. In the meantime, while Arnold lay in the hospital slipping in and out of consciousness, Gates reported back to Congress the news of the battle. Burgoyne had surrendered his entire army, 6,000 soldiers, in a monumental victory. Gates, as he did in Freeman's Farm, failed to give Arnold credit in the report, only mentioning that he had been wounded. [35] Also, while Arnold fought for his life, Gates, who spent most of the battle in his tent arguing with British prisoner Sir Francis Clarke, accepted Burgoyne's sword that Arnold had fought so hard to attain for the Americans.[36]

After three arduous months recovering from his leg wound, Arnold's fortunes seemed to be improving. He had survived a second wound to his leg while leading the Americans to their most important victory in the war; Congress had restored his seniority; Middletown, where his children attended school, hailed him as an American hero; and after being restored to active duty, Washington wasted no time in giving Arnold the prestigious appointment as military governor of Philadelphia. The city had been retaken after the victory at Saratoga, and Washington needed a trustworthy general to govern the fledgling nation's most important city. Washington, though, had dropped Arnold into a city irreparably divided by radical revolutionaries and Loyalists. As historian Willard Randall states, "It was probably the worst mistake either man ever made, placing Arnold in the middle of a murderous…political crossfire."[37]

While in Philadelphia Arnold would turn from the consummate patriot to a despised traitor, and if not for the fortuitous capture of Major John Andre', he would have succeeded in not only handing the British the important fort at West Point but also handing over the top military leaders of the Continental Army, including Washington himself. Arnold's name became synonymous with traitor, "to be forever associated with the absence of light."[38] Congress even passed a resolution directing the "Board of War to erase Arnold's name from the register United States army officers."[39] Arnold went home after the war a broken, defamed, and poor man. He died June 14, 1801, leaving his family with overwhelming debt. His obituary in a Massachusetts newspaper illustrates his legacy in America. It simply reads, "Died—In England, Brigadier-General Benedict Arnold; notorious throughout the world."[40] Arnold's life went into a steep decline after Saratoga that ended with his death in poverty and obscurity.

---

[35] Ibid, 371-72

[36] Lunt, 249.

[37] Randall, 407.

[38] Martin, 6.

[39] Benjamin H. Irvin, *Clothed in the Robes of Sovereignty: The Continental Congress and the People Out of Doors,* (Oxford University Press: Oxford, 2011), 258.

[40] *Columbian Centinel* August 1, 1801.

Saratoga is the place when Arnold lost two of his largest patrons during time on the American side, Philip Schulyer to his institutional nemesis Congress and Gates to a short but intense feud. It is impossible to know if Arnold would have defected if he had not been entangled in a feud with his former friend Horatio Gates, but it is known that one of Arnold's many complex reasons for his defection was he felt unwanted, disrespected, and unfairly treated by Gates and Congress. The Gates-Arnold feud prevented Arnold from destroying Burgoyne in September of 1777. The feud also led to Gates not heeding Arnold's advice to deploy his troops in an attack, which forced Arnold to disobey Gates and lead an attack himself. This ended in Arnold leading the Americans to victory at Saratoga but also getting shot in the leg. Because Arnold could not ride a horse due to the crippling effects of his wound, Washington sent his best field general to be military governor of Philadelphia, a city rife with political partisanship between radicals and Loyalists. While in Philadelphia Arnold courted and married Peggy Shippen, the daughter of a Loyalist and a woman with British connections. Arnold was also persecuted and pushed further and further from the patriot cause by the radicals in Philadelphia led by Joseph Reed.

Eventually this led to Arnold betraying the American cause and the deterioration of Gates and Arnold's relationship was pivotal to this incredible course of events. As mentioned before, Dan Gilbert would not have made the connection between Benedict Arnold and LeBron James had he been more knowledgeable. The insinuation to an acute observer is that a mutually disagreeable feud ensued between Gilbert and James, contributing to James' decision leave Cleveland. With the uproar in Cleveland over James' betrayal, any connection indicating Gilbert's ego contributed to a feud that ended in James leaving the Cavaliers would not be taken kindly.

Southern Unionists in a Fractured Confederacy: A Historiography

David Davenport

Abstract: With the exception of recent scholarship, there is little monographic or article literature devoted exclusively to Southern Unionists in the Civil War. When Unionists are acknowledged, they are usually relegated to only a paragraph or footnote in most general studies. Therefore, it is entirely appropriate that during the 150th anniversary of the Civil War, we re-examine the existing literature regarding Southern Unionists. Southern Unionist literature can be grouped into three eras. First, the era from 1865 to the 1890s was one that acknowledged Southern Unionists and their contributions to the Union war effort and Confederate defeat. Second, the era immediately following the war and stretching into the early twentieth century called the "Lost Cause" era. The final period runs from the Great Depression to the present, in which gradually, more and more literature is written regarding Southern Unionists and their contributions during the war. These works have evolved into more detailed studies that focus on the cultural, social, and other aspects that distinguish the Southern Unionists from their pro-Confederate counterparts in the South. Studying the historiography of Southern Unionists allows students, teachers and those with interest in the Civil War to see the biases that have existed in the literature over the years. In addition, it identifies other areas that need further research on the topic.

With the exception of recent scholarship, there is little monographic or article literature devoted exclusively to Southern Unionists in the Civil War. Therefore, it is entirely appropriate that during the 150th anniversary of the Civil War, we re-examine the existing literature regarding Southern Unionists. In addition, studying Southern Unionists allows us to realize the impact that Unionists ultimately had on Confederate defeat.

Examining Southern Unionists adds an important dimension to Civil War studies. As Eric Foner, Professor of American History at Columbia University, wrote in his article "The South's Inner Civil War," "To fully understand the vast changes the war unleashed on the country, you must first understand the plight of the Southerners that *didn't* want secession." Also, the author states that

> … as the smoke of these historiographical battles clears, and a more complex view of the war and Reconstruction emerges, it has become abundantly clear that no one can claim to fully understand the Civil War era without coming to terms with the South's Unionists, the persecution they suffered, and how they helped determine the outcome of our greatest national crisis.

Foner is correct in his observation. It is with this in mind that a review of the literature and its areas that need more research is required.[41]

This study will analyze the differences of authors' interpretation of Southern Unionists and their impact upon the Confederacy during the Civil War. Southern Unionist literature can be grouped into three schools, two of which overlapped. First, from 1865 to the 1890s one school acknowledged Southern Unionists and their contributions to the Union war effort and subsequent Confederate defeat. Also, beginning at the end of the war and stretching into the current century is the so-called "Lost Cause" school. This school depicted Confederate life as one of solidarity towards "the cause" and Unionists are rarely mentioned except as "tories" or traitors. [42]   The final school runs from the Great Depression to the present, in which gradually, more and more literature has been written regarding Southern Unionists and their contributions during the war. These works have evolved into more detailed studies that focus on the cultural, social, and other aspects that distinguish the Southern Unionists from their pro-Confederate counterparts in the South. Studying the historiography of Southern Unionists allows students, teachers, and those with interest in the Civil War to see the biases that have existed in the literature over the years. In addition, it identifies other areas that need further research on the topic.

Historians of the era during and immediately following the Civil War did acknowledge the contributions of Southern Unionists on a small scale. This acknowledgement was often limited to the writings and memoirs of people who actually participated and lived through the war. Additionally, these acknowledgements tend only to contain first hand experiences with Southern Unionists that actually took up arms or in some way aided the Union Army. These writings do not tend to take into account areas that the Union Army was unable to penetrate. In addition, they are not detailed accounts of Southern

---

[41] Eric Foner, "The South's Inner Civil War," *AmericanHeritage.com*, March 1989, under "Magazine," http://www.americanheritage.com/articles/magazine/ah/1989/2/1989_2_46.shtml (accessed March 6, 2011).

[42] John R. Neff, *Honoring the Civil War Dead: Commemoration and the Problem of Reconciliation* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2005), 143-145; Gaines M. Foster, *Ghosts of the Confederacy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987), 4.

Unionists, which study the social, geographical, and cultural aspects of each Unionist population.

General Ulysses S. Grant provides an example of this initial school of thought. Grant, after learning he had cancer, raced to complete his memoirs. Originally published in 1885, Grant's *Memoirs*, portrayed Southern Unionists as making a valuable contribution to the war effort. In referring to Unionist troops from the south, Grant said, "We had many regiments of brave and loyal men who volunteered under great difficulty from the twelve million belonging to the South." In addition, Grant wrote that many southern Unionists would greet him and his army along their marching paths. While marching through and around the Cumberland Gap, Grant noted that loyalists were supportive. Grant said that "I found a great many people at home along that route, both in Tennessee and Kentucky, and, almost universally, intensely loyal. They would collect in little places where we would stop of evenings, to see me, generally hearing of my approach before we arrived." The general also gives an account on how he averted potential capture with the help of a southern Unionist. While occupying Memphis, he was visiting a Union man by the name of De Loche. Mr. De Loche became agitated upon the visit of a neighbor, Dr. Smith, who was a pro-Confederate. Mr. De Loche later apologized to Grant that he did not ask Grant to stay for dinner because he knew Dr. Smith would inform the Confederate General in the area of his presence.[43]

Grant also wrote about his sympathies for the disaffected in the South. He sympathized with the poor whites in the South and seemed to have an understanding of the class struggle that was behind the reluctance to support the Confederacy. Grant wrote, "Under the old regime they were looked down upon by those who controlled all the affairs in the interest of slave owners, as poor white trash who were allowed the ballot so long as they cast it according to direction." Grant also noted that poor southerners at the beginning of the war "…needed emancipation." Grant also was helpful to those Unionists in need whenever possible. He gives an account in his memoirs of meeting an elderly woman who was staunchly Unionist. Her husband and son had joined the Union army and she did not know their whereabouts. The woman and her daughter

---

[43] Ulysses S. Grant, *Personal Memoirs of U.S. Grant* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1996), , vii, 636; 397; 230-31, EBook available through Net Library at http://www.netlibrary.com/urlapi.asp?action=summary&v=1&bookid=41690 (accessed April 11, 2011).

were low on food and nearly out. Grant ordered that they be supplied rations from the army.[44]

Another example of post war writings that acknowledge the existence of southern Unionists exists in the memoirs of Union General William Tecumseh Sherman. Originally published in 1875, Sherman released a second edition in 1886 to allow letters from others that disputed some of his accounts of events. Although Sherman did not have as strong of sentiments for the Unionists as Grant did, he did acknowledge a strong union presence in North Alabama. In 1862, Sherman received reports of this Unionist sentiment along the Tennessee River. He states "…several of the gunboats, under Captain Phelps, United States Navy, had gone up the Tennessee as far as Florence, and on their return had reported a strong Union feeling among the people along the river." It is from this same area of strong Union Sentiment that elements of the Union Army would recruit the 1st Alabama Cavalry United States Volunteers.[45]

Another interpretive school arose simultaneously with which Grant exemplified. This "Lost Cause" era in Southern Unionist literature is one that severely limits the study of Unionists in the South. In some ways, this literature takes a step backward from the historians who wrote about Unionists earlier. Extending well into the twentieth century, "Lost Cause" literature sought to paint a picture of a South that while defeated, was still proud of its past and those who had supported and died for "the cause." It was during this era that most courthouse squares began to see Confederate monuments being erected and the almost deification of General Robert E. Lee and other Southern leaders.[46]

Eric Foner describes the "Lost Cause" era as one that has hampered the efforts to tell the story of Southern Unionists more accurately. Foner states that "Perhaps this is because the story of Southern Unionism challenges two related popular mythologies that have helped shape how Americans think about that era: the portrait of the Confederacy as a heroic 'lost cause' and of Reconstruction as an ignoble 'tragic era.'" Foner points out that portraying

---

[44] Ibid., 133, 477.

[45] William T. Sherman, Memoirs of General William T. Sherman, (Norwalk, Conn: Easton Press, 1996), http://www.netlibrary.com/Details.aspx?ProductId=17015&Terms=william+t.+sherman&ReturnLab el=lnkSearchResults&ReturnPath=/Search/SearchResults.aspx (accessed April 7, 2011), 1121-22; 362; 245; G. Ward Hubbs, "Civil War in Alabama," in Encyclopedia of Alabama, http://www.encyclopediaofalabama.org/face/Article.jsp?id=h-1429.

[46] Karen L. Cox, "Lost Cause Ideology," in Encyclopedia of Alabama,http://www.encyclopediaofalabama.org/face/Article.jsp?id=h-1643 (accessed March 7, 2011).

Unionists in any way other than villainous traitors to the Confederacy did not mesh well with the romantic, celebratory picture that "lost cause" authors wanted to portray of the antebellum and Civil War South.

One of the most recognizable examples of "Lost Cause" literature is that of E. A. Pollard's aptly named *The Lost Cause*. Pollard was the editor of the *Richmond Examiner* during the Civil War. This work mentions virtually nothing about the Southern Unionist as a factor in the defeat of the Confederacy. Rather than focus on internal strife, Pollard focuses on Northern superiority in manufactures and manpower as a cause for defeat. In addition, he blames Confederate leaders for not taking advantage of the geographical space of the Confederacy. He compares the advantage of space that the Confederacy had to the advantage of space that the colonists had during the American Revolution. The author states that this advantage should have superseded any material or manpower advantage that the North had. Pollard also claims that the fact that the South was on the defensive should have been an advantage that led to victory. The author explains that these advantages should have been enough for victory and blames the mismanagement of these advantages on Confederate leaders. He asserts that this mismanagement resulted in the reduced will of the people to continue the fight but makes no mention of the significant portion of the population of the Confederacy that was in opposition to "the cause" as a factor in defeat.[47]

Another example is Walter L. Fleming's *Civil War and Reconstruction in Alabama*. Fleming, a student of William A. Dunning, hailed from Brundidge, Alabama, and received his Ph.D. from Columbia University. Dunning, who exemplified the "Lost Cause" school of thought, was a professor at Columbia University. While at Columbia, Dunning taught a multitude of soon to be scholars. Dunning and his students were all white southerners and tended to write in response to the hated Reconstruction era.[48]

---

[47] Edward Alfred Pollard, *The Lost Cause; A New Southern History of the War of the Confederates, Comprising a Full and Authentic Account of the Rise and Progress of the Late Southern Confederacy--the Campaigns, Battles, Incidents, and Adventures of the Most Gigantic Struggle of the World's History* (New York: E.B. Treat, 1866), 129-33.

[48] Jean and Alexander Heard Library, "Special Collections: Walter L. Fleming, Overview," Vanderbilt University, http://www.library.vanderbilt.edu/speccol/flemingwl.shtml (accessed March 5, 2011); Clarence L. Mohr, "Bibliographical Essay: Southern Blacks in the Civil War: A Century of Historiography," *The Journal of Negro History* 59, no. 2(April 1974): 179-80, http://www.jstor.org/stable/2717330 (accessed March 5, 2011).

Fleming's work on Alabama, does give insight into Unionist activity in Alabama. However, it is with strong bias. The author constantly refers to the Alabama Unionists as either "tories," "traitors" or "mossbacks." Indeed, many Unionists were classified as traitors but Fleming goes overboard with the portrayal. For example, Fleming classifies the "tory" class as one of the lowest class of citizens in Alabama at the time. He writes that the Alabama tory was

> …as a rule, of the lowest class of the population, chiefly "mountain whites" and the "sand mountain" people, who were shut off from the world, a century behind the times, and who knew scarcely anything of the Union or of the question at issue.

Certainly there were many poor white Unionists that fit the description Fleming gives, however, there were equally as many poor and uneducated whites that were pro-Confederates of which Fleming gives no account. In addition, Fleming portrays Unionists in Alabama as men not liked by the Yankees when they came. He says "…northerners who had dealings with the 'loyalist' did not like him, as he was a most unpleasant person, with a grievance which could not be righted to his satisfaction without giving rise to numerous other grievances."[49]

Fleming also gives multiple accounts of all the atrocities that Unionists committed against the good Confederate people. Indeed, the Civil War was a time of desperation throughout the South and Alabama was no exception. Unionists did commit atrocities as well as Confederates. However, Fleming once again is unbalanced in his accounts. He portrays Alabama Unionists as motivated mainly to "…rob, burn, and murder." Fleming mentions few of the atrocities committed by the Confederates against the Unionists.[50] The author gives only images of ruthless Unionist marauders. Fleming portrays the Confederate soldiers as heroes who took leave from the army to come home and "…clear the country of tories, who had been terrorizing the people."[51]

Although Fleming presents such a bias towards Unionists in his work on Alabama, his study does present a breakthrough in historical literature on the subject of Southern Unionists. Fleming, a trained historian, uses primary and secondary sources to present his work on the Civil War and Reconstruction in

---

[49] Walter L. Fleming, *Civil War and Reconstruction in Alabama*, Micro-Offset Books (New York: P. Smith, 1949), 114, 122.

[50] David McRae, "Free State of Winston," in Encyclopedia of Alabama, http://www.encyclopediaofalabama.org/face/Article.jsp?id=h-1850 (accessed November 2, 2010).

[51] Fleming, *Civil War and Reconstruction in Alabama,* 120-21.

Alabama. His use of the *Official Records* of the Civil War is extensive. It is not the methods of Fleming that are to be criticized but the lens through which he looks at the evidence. Fleming's writings reflect the times in which he lived as well as his particular training under Dunning. The era in which he lived was dominated by a white supremacist thought. In addition, the image of the "Lost Cause" could not be damaged by a patriotic telling of the story of Southern Unionists. Scholars can still effectively use Fleming's contribution to the literature today, as long as they keep in mind the biases he presents.

The contemporary period in Southern Unionist literature is one that examines the contributions of Southern Unionists more closely. This period in literature has gradually appeared since the Great Depression and persists into the present day where it overlaps the now-fading "Lost Cause" school. The works since the Great Depression have expressed a desire to examine Southern Unionism in all its aspects—social, cultural, and geographical—as well as their contributions to the defeat of the Confederacy. This era has produced many works that look at Southern Unionists as individual pockets of resistance to the Confederacy rather than one individual entity. This is because each pocket of Unionist population often had its own individual characteristics and should be studied separately.

One example of this individual look at Southern Unionism is Hugh C. Bailey's "Disloyalty in Early Confederate Alabama". Published in 1957 in the *Journal of Southern History*, this article is an excellent example of a detailed study on one geographic area steeped in union sentiment. Although it promises a look at Unionism in North Alabama as a whole, it digresses solely to a study of Winston County, Alabama. Though narrowly focused on a particular locale, the article is still extremely useful as a social and political study of Unionism.[52]

Bailey gives many examples of how the Unionists in Winston County, Alabama, tried to undermine the Confederate government in Alabama. First, the largely pro-Unionist population of the county quickly elected pro-Unionist officers to any position in the local government that became available. Second, they elected pro-Unionist officers into the local militia. This effectively disabled the use of Winston County militia by the Confederacy from the outset of the Civil War. These examples serve to prove the author's thesis that pro-union

---

[52] Hugh C. Bailey, "Disloyalty in Early Confederate Alabama," The *Journal of Southern History* 23, no. 4 (November 1957): 522, http://www.jstor.org/stable/2954390 (accessed February 14, 2011).

sentiment existed in North Alabama prior to the spring of 1862 when the Confederate Conscription Act swayed many to a position of Unionism.[53]

Bailey's article gives examples of the consequences a Unionist family had to face for their loyalties. Unionists, always the minority in the South, had to live with the sobering fact that even family members could be against them. Bailey's work uses the primary documents of the Bell Family letters to show the internal strife of a family split over Unionists/Confederate sympathies.

Henry Bell, a loyal Confederate citizen then residing in Choctaw County, Mississippi, received letters from his father, James, and his brother, John, concerning their disappointment that he had sided with the Confederacy. James and John resided in Winston County, Alabama and expressed their strong Unionist sentiment to their brother in hopes of swaying his opinion. Their letters had the opposite effect and Henry turned their letters over to the then governor of Alabama, A.B. Moore. Henry wanted to express the dangers of the sentiments that existed in Governor Moore's state.[54]

In order to not rely on the letters of one family as the sole evidence to support his thesis that widespread disaffection existed in the county, Bailey also examines the results of the election of a secession convention delegate from Winston County. The Unionist candidate, Charles Sheets, was elected by a vote of 515 to 128. Additionally, letters from the concerned pro-Confederate citizens of the county to Governor John Gill Shorter explained that there was a strong Unionist sentiment in and around Winston County that threatened to undermine Confederate efforts in the area.[55]

Bailey's article, while not entirely proving his thesis that widespread disaffection existed in North Alabama prior to 1862, is an excellent example of localized study of a particular area within the Confederacy that resisted the efforts of the Confederate government to control it. Bailey's study of this resistance to the Confederacy in North Alabama is a significant contribution to the literature of Southern Unionism and its contribution to a Confederate defeat.

Similarly, Donald Bradford Dodd's dissertation on Unionism in Confederate Alabama is an excellent study of one geographical area of Union sentiment. Dodd examines the social, economic, and geographical factors that

---

[53] Ibid., 522-23.
[54] Ibid., 524-28.
[55] Ibid., 523-24.

led to a strong pocket of Unionism in North Alabama. Published in 1969, Dodd's work is of value to anyone studying North Alabama Unionism.

Dodd explains that one of the causes of Unionism in Alabama is related to a deep sectionalism within the state. This sectionalism resulted from the geographical differences that tended to isolate people in the hills from the planters of the more fertile regions of Alabama. He explains that this region of North Alabama was like other regions of the Appalachian chain that run from Virginia into North Alabama, stating, "…the causes of Alabama Unionism may well be the causes of Unionism in the hill and mountain sections throughout the Confederacy." This entire region shared some common factors. First, it displayed a tendency for strong Union sentiment. Second, it was mountainous and isolated. Third, it faced the threat of Confederate enforcement of conscription and tax laws. Finally, an opportunity existed to assist the Union army once it penetrated the region.[56]

Dodd also cites some socio-economic reasons for the sectionalism that resulted in the Union sentiment in North Alabama. One was the existence of mostly small subsistence farming there, which distinguished it from other regions of the state that thrived on large-scale plantation agriculture. More important, the hill country had few slaves compared to areas in South Alabama. This difference led to a less passionate stance on the defense of slavery by the hill people in North Alabama. In addition, the people of this area were strong supporters of Andrew Jackson and his belief in a strong Union. Dodd states that the people "…of the Plateau-Ridge and Valley were followers of Jackson and were still quoting 'Old Hickory's' statement that the Union must be preserved when the secessionists met in Montgomery."[57]

Dodd gives examples of how these Unionists affected the Confederacy. He states in his conclusion that the people of the hill country in Alabama "…rebelled against the aristocratic lowlanders," and "…joined the Union army, gave assistance to the deserters and conscription evaders, raided surrounding areas, furnished intelligence to the Federals, and in general refused to support the Confederate war effort." These examples are evidence of Unionist impact on the Confederacy in Alabama as well as other areas within the Confederacy. In addition, it proves that other factors were involved in a Confederate defeat

---

[56] Donald Bradford Dodd, "Unionism in Confederate Alabama," (PhD diss., University of Georgia, 1969), iii-iv.
[57] Ibid., 108-109.

than just the North's superior numbers in manufacturing and manpower, as Pollard claims.[58]

Another example of the contemporary era in southern Unionist literature is Richard Nelson Current's *Lincoln's Loyalists: Union Soldiers from the Confederacy*. Current received his Ph.D. in history from the University of Wisconsin in 1940 and is the author or co-author of several books on Civil War history. He has won several awards for his writing and has taught at institutions including Rutgers University and the University of North Carolina at Greensboro where he was professor and head of the history department.[59]

Current's main purpose is to tell the story of the "…forgotten men of the Civil War." Although the book is a holistic study of union troops from the south, it examines each individual southern state and the union troops they produced. In addition, Current explains the many hardships that Unionists within the Confederacy had to face in their own communities. Finally, the chapters included estimates of how many Union soldiers served from each Confederate State.

Current opens with the two states that had the largest Unionist populations, Virginia and Tennessee. From the outset, Western Virginia had a strong loyalist sentiment and more in common with neighboring Ohio, Pennsylvania and Maryland than with their fellow Virginians. This led it to send large numbers of volunteers to the Union Army. As in many southern states, the number who volunteered overwhelmed the supply system. Many tired of waiting for arms, ammunition, and equipment, so they simply went back home. The Unionists sentiment in Western Virginia was so great that it led to the establishment of a pro-Union government and later admission to the Union as the state of West Virginia. Likewise, in East Tennessee, there was also a strong Unionist sentiment at the outset of the war. President Lincoln realized this early on and desperately wanted to send assistance to help the constantly tormented Unionist population there. The mountainous terrain made it hard to evacuate

---

[58] Ibid., 108.

[59] Wisconsin Library Association, "WLA Literary Awards Committee," Appleton Public Library, http://www.wla.lib.wi.us/readers/wlac/notable/notable1988.html#Richard (accessed February 14, 2011).

these people, but thousands of Tennesseans found their way through the mountainous paths into Kentucky to enlist in the Union Army.[60]

Current then summarizes the Union troops from other southern states. One reoccurring theme in the book is that if the Union Army could have gotten into pro-Unionist areas quicker, they may have had the opportunity to crush the rebellion in half the time it did. Pockets of Unionists, while always the minority, were a significant resource of potential manpower for both sides. The Confederacy, already outnumbered in population by the North, needed every available man of fighting age to be in its army. This would not be the case for the Confederacy, and Current points out that as much as a tenth of the potential southern fighting force may have actually been in the Union army at some point. This was a major blow to the Confederacy. These men were not only lost to the Confederate cause, but they were also a gain to the Union army that already vastly outnumbered them.[61]

Current's study of the Union soldiers from the south is a beneficial addition to the literature of Southern Unionists. Written in 1992, it was a long overdue study that closed a huge gap in the story of southerners' contributions to a Confederate defeat. Current uses primary and secondary sources to tell the story of the loyalist soldier. These sources include official records and testimonies of participants in the Civil War as well as a multitude of secondary monographs and articles. The only criticism of this work is that it spends a vast majority of its pages covering the Unionists from Virginia and Tennessee. This is understandable because a majority of the loyalist troops did come from those areas; however, the lower southern states require more research.

Another valuable contribution to the literature of Southern Unionists is Margaret M. Storey's *Loyalty and Loss: Alabama's Unionists in the Civil War and Reconstruction*. Storey is an assistant professor of history at DePaul University in Chicago and has written extensively on Southern Unionists.[62] She combats the "Lost Cause" view that the Alabama Unionist was only of the poorly educated, backwoods type. She uses extensively the records of the Southern Claims Commission to show that Alabama Unionists came from a

---

[60] Richard Nelson Current, *Lincoln's Loyalists: Union Soldiers from the Confederacy* (Boston: Northeastern University Press, 1992), 5-27; 29-60.
[61] Ibid., 218.
[62] DePaul University, "Margaret M. Storey: DePaul University: Associate Professor, Department of History," The Berkeley Electronic Press, http://works.bepress.com/margaret_storey/ (accessed March 12, 2011).

diverse background and that some were even slave owners. By using the records of the Southern Claims Commission, she is able to look at the names of the actual Southern Unionists and their claims of losses suffered during the war. Details that emerge are whether these Unionists were slave owners or not, their economic standing, and their geographic locations. This information is a groundbreaking look at the social, cultural, and economic makeup of Southern Unionists in Alabama.

Storey examines social reasons for the continuation of Unionism as the war progressed. She claims that their close network of family and community allowed Unionists to be able to resist Confederates, writing, "…Unionism prompted considerable social dislocation for its adherents, but it was also the shelter under which many intimate social ties were crowded together in mutual aid and comfort."[63]

Storey also challenges the works of Walter L. Fleming and other historians on the demographic makeup of North Alabama's Unionist population. In response to these other historians' writings that most of North Alabama's Unionists were "economically and politically alienated from wealthy slaveholding secessionists," she has some new findings. For example, she writes that "…closer investigation, however, reveals a more complicated demographic picture, a reality that challenges the usefulness of a class-based or narrowly antislaveholder/antislavery, explanation of Unionism." Storey also claims that classifying North Alabama as a monolithic sub region is misleading in the first place; that to properly study the area, scholars should consider North Alabama as containing the Hill Country and the Tennessee Valley. The author claims that the Hill Country "…*did* contain mostly small, subsistence farms, located on poor soil, which relied very little on slave labor." The Tennessee Valley Region, on the other hand, "…had long invested heavily in slavery and cotton production, moreover, the sub region exhibited a diversified economy, including lively commercial, manufacturing, and mercantile interests as well as yeoman subsistence farming in the more rolling areas."[64]

Storey challenges the "Lost Cause" vilification of the Unionist population in Alabama as ruthless renegades. Rather, she portrays the Unionists as victims of the Confederacy. The author blames the Confederate Conscription

[63] Margaret M. Storey, *Loyalty and Loss: Alabama's Unionists in the Civil War and Reconstruction*, Conflicting Worlds (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2004), 6.
[64] Ibid., 7-8.

Act for much of the Unionist resistance and the resulting friction between them and the Confederates. "…Conscription," she maintains, "by making criminals of those who refused the Confederacy not only their hearts and minds, but ultimately their bodies—redefined a subsection of the Unionist population as treasonous, and therefore legally subject to arrest and imprisonment without trial."[65]

Some of the Unionists did, in fact, refuse Confederate service "with their bodies". North Alabamians enlisted in the First Alabama Cavalry U.S. Volunteers and, as Storey explains, served many purposes for the Union Army including scouting, conducting counter guerilla operations, and using their knowledge of their homeland to assist and recruit other Unionists. On the important issue of recruitment, Storey writes that "Because the soldiers who made up regiments like the First Alabama were intimate with area Unionists, they were perfectly suited for surreptitious recruiting missions." These contributions to the Union Army are very different from the useless traitors that writers of the "Lost Cause" era depicted Southern Unionists to be.[66]

The author also recognizes Southern Unionists' value to the Union Army as scouts, noting that Unionists "…functioned as the eyes and ears of Federal commanders" and were "…eager to serve in this capacity." She also notes that wherever Union armies showed up, Unionists soon appeared to assist them.[67]

Storey's work is a valuable contribution to Southern Unionist literature because it gives the reader a better picture of Unionists in Alabama than ever before. Her study of the Southern Claims Commission records has allowed her to explore more than other authors who these people were. One criticism is that she relies a little too heavily on these records, for they, themselves, might be tainted. At a time when Southerners sought recompense for property lost, destroyed, or taken during the war, almost anyone claimed to have had strong Unionist loyalties. Nevertheless, these records let us look more closely at whom these people were and the types of lives that they lived.

Victoria Bynum's *The Free State of Jones: Mississippi's Longest Civil War* is another example of why Southern Unionism must be looked at in its individual geographical pockets. Bynum gives multiple reasons to why Southern

---

[65] Ibid., 57.
[66] Ibid., 103-105.
[67] Ibid., 153-154.

Unionism existed in Jones County other than patriotism. Often, Unionism was a result of deep underlying resentment between local populations. One underlying reason, according to Bynum, for disaffection in Jones County, Mississippi, was a class struggle that pre-dated the Civil War. Citing that a majority of Jones County settlers' families originated from North Carolina, Bynum states, "…tensions over taxes and lands culminated in North Carolina when farmers organized the Regulator Movement to overturn corrupt local governments dominated by elite planters, merchants, and lawyers." In addition, Bynum says, "…these families were many ancestors of Jones County settlers who later shared a historical predisposition to F the Civil War as a 'rich man's war and poor man's fight'".[68]

Bynum does not limit her work to the traditional studies of Jones County, which restrict themselves to the narrative of the infamous Newt Knight and his band of deserters who resisted Confederate authority. Bynum however, provides a deeper study including women's contributions to the Unionists, "women who shared the antisecession views of their fathers, sons, and husbands often encouraged them to desert at the first opportunity," thus demoralizing the Confederate soldiery and depleting its ranks. In addition, Bynum notes "…women who suffered from hunger, illness or abuse at the hands of Confederate soldiers also provided men with ample personal reasons to desert and return home."[69]

The literature of Southern Unionists has evolved over the years through three interpretive schools that, while separate, often overlap. The first school resulted in the post war accounts from those who actually participated in the Civil War. While these accounts were limited in their scope, they are a valuable contribution to the literature and serve as early examination of Southern Unionists' contribution to Union victory and Confederate defeat. The second school, the "Lost Cause," gives more details about Southern Unionists but was often biased and told from a pro-Confederate point of view. The contemporary school that began around the Great Depression and continues to the present day has shed more light on Southern Unionists and their individuality. Studies have become more focused on specific areas of Unionist populations. In addition,

---

[68] Victoria E. Bynum, *The Free State of Jones Mississippi's Longest Civil War*, (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2001),
http://www.netlibrary.com/urlapi.asp?action=summary&v=1&bookid=79148 (accessed April 19, 2011), 11-12.
[69] Ibid., 94-95.

these contemporary studies take into account the social and cultural conditions that Unionists had to face within the Confederacy.

Despite the new trend in contemporary literature, more extensive research is still needed. Although we are learning more about Unionists and what kind of people they were, most studies still focus on the men who participated in the war. Women, while beginning to get their due recognition, still need to be researched more along with their contributions to the family and local Unionist communities. Additionally, more research is needed on the states of the Deep South and their Unionist populations. A majority of the literature focuses on the upper southern states. While they did contribute the most Southern Unionists, this is not a reason to neglect the stories of the lower southern states that, being even more of a minority, possibly faced worse treatment by the larger pro-Confederate populations that surrounded them. Finally, additional research is also needed on the home front in Unionist communities. Often only mentioned as a side bar, Unionist communities had to face constant raids and terrorization by Confederate guerillas. Continued contribution to the literature in these areas will be much needed additions and help to expose the often forgotten side of the Civil War.

Bibliography

Bailey, Hugh C. "Disloyalty in Early Confederate Alabama." *Journal of Southern History* 23, no. 4 (November 1957): 522-28. http://www.jstor.org/stable/2954390 (accessed February 14, 2011).

Bynum, Victoria E. *The Free State of Jones: Mississippi's Longest Civil War*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2001. <http://www.netlibrary.com/urlapi.asp?action=summary&v=1&bookid =79148>. (accessed April 19, 2011).

Cox, Karen L. "Lost Cause Ideology." *Encyclopedia of Alabama*. http://www.encyclopediaofalabama.org/face/Article.jsp?id=h-1643 (accessed March 7, 2011).

Current, Richard Nelson. *Lincoln's Loyalists: Union Soldiers from the Confederacy*. Boston: Northeastern University Press, 1992.

DePaul University. "Margaret M. Storey: DePaul University: Associate
        Professor, Department of History." The Berkeley Electronic Press.
        http://works.bepress.com/margaret_storey/ (accessed March 12, 2011).

Dodd, Donald Bradford. "Unionism in Confederate Alabama." PhD diss.,
        University of Georgia, 1969.

Fleming, Walter L. *Civil War and Reconstruction in Alabama*. Micro-Offset
        Books. New York: P. Smith, 1949.

Foner, Eric. "The South's Inner Civil War." *AmericanHeritage.com,* March
        1989.
        http://www.americanheritage.com/articles/magazine/ah/1989/2/1989_2
        _46.shtml (accessed March 6, 2011).

Foster, Gaines M. *Ghosts of the Confederacy.* Oxford: Oxford University Press,
        1987.

Grant, Ulysses S. *Personal Memoirs of U.S. Grant*. Lincoln: University of
        Nebraska Press, 1996.
        http://www.netlibrary.com/urlapi.asp?action=summary&v=1&bookid=
        41690. (accessed April 7, 2011).

Hubbs, G. Ward. "Civil War in Alabama." Encyclopedia of Alabama.
        http://www.encyclopediaofalabama.org/face/Article.jsp?id=h-1429
        (accessed April 11, 2011).

Jean and Alexander Heard Library. "Special Collections: Walter L. Fleming,
        Overview." Vanderbilt University.
        http://www.library.vanderbilt.edu/speccol/flemingwl.shtml (accessed
        March 5, 2011).

McRae, David. "Free State of Winston." *Encyclopedia of Alabama*.
        http://www.encyclopediaofalabama.org/face/Article.jsp?id=h-1850
        (accessed November 2, 2010).

Mohr, Clarence L. "Bibliographical Essay: Southern Blacks in the Civil War:
        A Century of Historiography." *Journal of Negro History* 59, no. 2
        (April 1974): 177-95. http://www.jstor.org/stable/2717330 (accessed
        March 5, 2011).

Neff, John R. *Honoring the Civil War Dead: Commemoration and the Problem of Reconciliation*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2005.

Pollard, Edward Alfred. *The Lost Cause A New Southern History of the War of the Confederates, Comprising a Full and Authentic Account of the Rise and Progress of the Late Southern Confederacy--the Campaigns, Battles, Incidents, and Adventures of the Most Gigantic Struggle of the World's History*. New York: E.B. Treat, 1866.

Sherman, William T. *Memoirs of General William T. Sherman*. Norwalk, Conn: Easton Press, 1996.
http://www.netlibrary.com/Details.aspx?ProductId=17015&Terms=william+t.+sherman&ReturnLabel=lnkSearchResults&ReturnPath=/Search/SearchResults.aspx

Storey, Margaret M. *Loyalty and Loss: Alabama's Unionists in the Civil War and Reconstruction*. Conflicting Worlds. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2004.

Wisconsin Library Association. "WLA Literary Awards Committee." Appleton Public Library.
http://www.wla.lib.wi.us/readers/wlac/notable/notable1988.html#Richard (accessed February 14, 2011).

Mindless Monsters: The Evolution of Vampire Mythology in Modern Fiction

Morgan A. Jackson

Abstract: Vampires existed in mythology for centuries, serving as terrifying reminders of humanity and death. They have as monsters, sexual deviants, religious blasphemers or reflections of religious values, romantic antagonists, and even the tortured undead. This article discusses the evolution of vampires in modern fiction as a facilitator for discussion of taboo topics. These topics include race, gender, religion, and intolerance within society.

Vampires existed in mythology for centuries, serving as terrifying reminders of humanity and death. They have as monsters, sexual deviants, religious blasphemers or reflections of religious values, romantic antagonists, and even the tortured undead. Even with all of the roles that vampires fill, until the 1970s most vampire portrayals remained largely homogenous. Vampires drank the blood of their victims, changed into animal form, and shied away from garlic and religious relics. Essentially, vampires remained mindless monsters. After the publication of Anne Rice's first novel, vampires modernized, challenging and defying traditional vampire mythology. Anne Rice reinvented vampires, and her example led writers such as Charlaine Harris, Joss Whedon, and Stephanie Meyer to use vampires as tools of discussion for taboo topics like gender, race, religion, and intolerance within society.

The character of Louis de Pointe du Lac from Anne Rice's *Interview With the Vampire* differs from traditional vampires because he possesses passions, desires, anger, triumphs and disappointments. Louis's ability to experience these emotions makes him into more than just a monster, yet his natural instinct to feed upon human blood, and his ultimate decision to do so places him between a monster and a human. "I'm flesh and blood, but not

human. I haven't been human for two hundred years."[70] Louis says of his existence, recognizing that though he shares characteristics with humans, he also resembles and behaves like a monster. He continues by saying, "What constitutes evil, real evil, is the taking of a single human life," as defense of why he more closely resembles a monster.[71]

In order to reconcile his own conscience and his desire to feed from humans, Louis first decides only to feed from animals, and later decides that though he will feed on humans, he will not take their lives while doing so. "Pain is terrible for you…You feel it like no other creature because you are a vampire," Lestat, Louis's sire, tells him earlier in the story.[72] Louis spends much of his early life as a vampire revolted by what he is. He lives just as miserably as when he was human, though now much more solemnly, despite the company of his sire and his continued existence as the master of a large plantation. After several weeks of feeding off of chicken blood, Louis burns down his plantation house in the middle of a slave revolt, a form of penance for his evil existence.[73] Louis' guilt consumes him in the time after he burns down his Louisiana home, and he separates from his creator for the first time.

When Lestat finds Louis again, he mocks him for living off the blood of rats, then tempts him with the blood of a dying child. After some internal struggles, Louis gives in to his deepest carnal desire and feeds upon the young girl. "Her blood coursed through my veins sweeter than life itself. And as it did, Lestat's words made sense to me. I knew peace only when I killed, and when I heard her heart in that terrible rhythm, I knew again what peace could be."[74] From this point onward, Louis accepts his role as an evil entity, feeding on humans as needed. Unlike traditional vampires, Louis detests what it means to be a vampire, and he fights the associated urges in order to maintain his remaining humanity. Ultimately, and after much suffering, Louis gives into his natural instincts, not because he is evil, but because he must in order to have a peaceful existence.

Rice's vampires also challenge traditional vampire myth in another way. In an article about the roles and behavior of vampires, George E. Haggerty argues that writers of current vampire fiction, especially Anne Rice of *The*

---

[70] *Interview with the Vampire*. DVD. Warner Home Video, 2000.
[71] Anne Rice. *Interview with the Vampire*. New York: Ballantine, 1976. 238.
[72] Rice, 88.
[73] *Interview with the Vampire*. DVD. Warner Home Video, 2000.
[74] *Interview with the Vampire*. DVD. Warner Home Video, 2000.

Vampire Chronicles fame, uses vivid imagery and vampires themselves in an expression of "homoeroticism."[75] Much of the argument focuses on vampire Louis' companion, the vampire Lestat. Lestat, according to Haggerty, represents older western culture, specifically that of 18th century France, before unwillingly transforming into a vampire. At the same time, Lestat also represents the return to the homosexual origins of vampires themselves which had not existed in vampire literature since the Victorian Era.[76]

According to Haggerty, Rice's vampires reflect a homosexual lifestyle (despite the inability to engage in any sexual practice) and did so prior to and during the AIDS epidemic in the 1980s. Haggerty suggests that the public reading these books were groups of "emasculated men" and a society terribly afraid of the devastating effects of AIDS. Rice's books, however, portray homosexual men as strong and unaffected by disease. Rice's novels found an outlet for their growing need for accepted homosexuality and sexuality itself.

Although the publication of *Interview with the Vampire* marks the birth of modern vampire mythology, other popular works continue to redefine vampires and their roles in modern fiction.

Joss Whedon's *Buffy the Vampire Slayer* served as an outlet of another kind, stretching over a fifteen year period of time. Vampire historian and author Stacey Abbot points out that the most interesting difference between older vampire legends and those that became popular in the 1970s and onward involves a connection to Christianity and other religious or ritualistic practices.[77] Vampires resembling those in traditional myths and stories share a common reverence or fear of religious relics or practices. In addition to Abbots's assertions, historian Christopher Herbert points out that older vampire fiction, such as Bram Stoker's *Dracula*, specifically promoted religious convictions while at the same time, criticized a return to the belief of superstition and black magic. The characters in *Dracula* frequently asked God for salvation from the terror of Dracula.[78]   The idea here, as Herbert suggests, is that religion itself should be utilized in such a way that it completely combats the magical elements of the world. However, modern vampire fiction contrasts with traditional

---

[75] George E. Haggerty. "Anne Rice and the Queering of Culture." *Novel: A Forum on Fiction.* 1(1998): 5.

[76] Haggerty, 7.

[77] Stacey Abbot, "A Little Less Ritual and a Little More Fun: The Modern Vampire in Buffy the Vampire Slayer." *Slayage: The International Journal of Buffy Studies.* 3 (2006): 9. http://slayageonline.com/.

[78] Christopher Herbert, "Vampire Religion." *Representations.* 79. (2002): 100.

vampire fiction in its unique regard to the role religion continues to play. Clearly, the abandonment of religion played a key part in the transition.

Season one of *Buffy the Vampire Slayer* depicts a more traditional view of vampire myth. Ancient vampires remain regarded as superiors within the vampire community, and their goals and orders are not only respected but closely followed by younger vampires. These older vampires and their followers concern themselves with religious observances, often praying to or worshipping some deity. These vampires also recognize the existence of hell specifically as the fate of any vampire who dies. Vampire creation also involves aspects of religion and spirituality as it consists of draining a victim's blood, letting that victim drink blood from a vampire, the soul leaving the body of the victim, and a demon replacing the soul, though the newly created vampire retains the memories of the soul that formerly inhabited it.[79] The demonic possession of the vampire body causes vampires to behave violently and immorally. Once a vampire obtains a soul, the vampire chooses to behave morally and ethically, but obligation to do so does not exist.[80] Despite the choices made by vampires containing souls, many continue to fear going to hell.

Buffy challenges traditional vampire mythology in several ways. This struggle continues throughout the whole series, and concerns not only the vampires within the story, but also the manner in which they are regarded and fought. The antagonist of season one is an ancient vampire known as the Master.[81] The Master is considered one of the oldest existing vampires, although debates exist due to inconsistency between various episodes. His age affords him leadership of the Order of Aurelius vampire cult, more defined powers, strength, and respect from his fellow vampires.[82] In contrast with ritualistic and traditional vampires like the Master, *Buffy* also portrays another group of vampires who lack any loyalty to or observance of traditional vampire roles and practices. These vampires, such as series regular Spike, a vampire turned in the 1800s, remain largely self-indulgent throughout despite their age or experience.

Spike drinks, smokes, engages in poker games, and even mocks traditional vampire rituals. Spike's first appearance in *Buffy* shows him killing

---

[79] *Buffy the Vampire Slayer: Collectors Set*, Season One. DVD. 20th Century Fox, 2006.
[80] *Buffy the Vampire Slayer,* Seasons 1-7.
[81] *Buffy the Vampire Slayer: Collectors Set*, Season One.
[82] *Buffy the Vampire Slayer, "*Welcome to The Hellmouth*,* Season One. DVD. 20th Century Fox. 2006.

members of the Order of Aurelius and tying up and verbally assaulting a. Order of Aurelius vampire before killing him. During this encounter, Spike criticizes the behavior of the traditionalist vampires, revealing that many of the claims they make about their own holiness and purity as vampires often derive from lies. "If every vampire who said he was at the crucifixion was actually there, it would have been like Woodstock," says Spike.[83] He observes no spiritual or ritualistic activities and is generally violent towards those who do, going so far as to demand the abandonment of rituals to make way for a new order. "From now on, we're gonna have a little less ritual and a little more fun around here."[84] Spike's personal disregard for religious ceremony becomes as equally present in Sunnydale, the location of the show, as the more traditional set of vampires.[85]

The basic characteristics often associated with vampires do not consistently comply with Whedonverse vampires. These vampires look exactly like human beings and can blend in with humans undetectably. When a vampire feeds, the face and teeth undergo a physical transformation, revealing the demonic possession of the body. This differs from the Anne Rice vampires who permanently possess the physical requirements that allow feeding and are also eternally beautiful. Additionally, vampires within the *Buffy* myth can alter their appearance such as cut and dye their hair in much the same way that humans can where as Anne Rice vampires eternally look the way they did at time of death. Such practices can be observed with the character of Angel. Angel's hair changes length based on the period of time shown in the series. He also builds muscle mass between seasons one and two, indicating that vampires can work out and build muscle mass.

Vampire diet in the Whedonverse reflects more traditional aspects of vampire mythology. Vampires drink blood from humans, both dead and alive. Human blood remains preferable over other blood to the Whedonverse vampire, but these vampires also tend to enjoy and survive well on warm pig's blood.[86] Nothing within the Whedonverse suggests that vampires do less well on substitutes for human blood, though the taste of human blood differs from other blood. Consumption of blood remains the only important matter for the vampire. Whedon's vampires exist as a hybrid of tradition and modern adaptation, both

---

[83] *Buffy the Vampire Slayer,* "School Hard"*, Season One. DVD. 20th Century Fox. 2006.
[84] *Buffy the Vampire Slayer,* "School Hard"*, Season One. DVD. 20th Century Fox. 2006.
[85] Spike does, in later seasons, contradict his aversion to vampire tradition in the episode "All The Way" when he scolds a younger vampire for violence on Halloween. "It's Halloween," he tells the young vampire, "You're supposed to take the night off."
[86] *Angel the Series,* Seasons 1-5. DVD 20th Century Fox, 2007.; *Buffy.*

honoring and mocking the roles of vampires. However, Joss Whedon is not the only person to follow Anne Rice in creating a modern vampire mythology.

The vampires in Charlaine Harris's novels, and in the HBO television series inspired by her novels, most resemble the traditional vampires out of all of the vampires discussed for this research. According to Harris's first novel, *Dead Until Dark*, vampires drink human blood for sustenance, and suffer from starvation or insanity if they do not feed often enough. These vampires suffer when exposed to sunlight, eventually leading to death, are irritated by garlic, and they also die from the application of a sharp wooden object through their hearts.[87] All of these traits link these vampires back to their monstrous origins. Of course, there are some traits that resemble the new trends in vampire mythology, such as the vampire conscience which allows them to choose whether or not to feed off of humans or animals, and they also lack any fear of crucifixes.[88]

The evolution of the vampires in this myth focuses less on the vampires themselves and more on the world in which they live. The premise of Harris's books revolves around the idea that mystical creatures, such as vampires, werewolves, werepanthers, and shape shifters, openly coexist with humans. In the first book/season of this story, vampires expose their existence to the human world, and this occurs almost simultaneously with the release of a Japanese invented blood substitute for medical purposes and later for the vampire diet. Vampires can drink the substance and obtain all the required nutrients for survival. Drinking the synthetic blood has an unintended, although positive side effect. Those who choose to drink synthetic blood tend to be less violent, more moral, and more human than the vampires who choose to continue drinking human blood. There are deterants for drinking synthetic blood. Among the less serious is the that synthetic blood, labeled True Blood, does not resemble the taste of blood which presents a problem for many vampires.[89]

Those vampires who choose to go mainstream, or enter the world of humans while observing the laws and rules of society, face having to exist solely on a diet of True Blood. Those who do not choose to go this route must remain essentially underground. Humans create legislation to ensure the civil rights of vampires within human society, but those rights must coincide with

---

[87] *True Blood, "*Strange Love." HBO. 2008.
[88] *True Blood, "*Sparks Fly Out." HBO. 2008.
[89] Charlaine Harris. *Dead Until Dark.* New York: Ace, 2008.

mainstreaming. "Discrimination against vampires is punishable by law in the great state of Louisiana," says Malcolm, a vampire trying to obtain service at a local bar within an episode of *True Blood*.[90]   With all of these things in mind, Harris's vampires live in a world where their existence is an accepted part of life, but they do not receive a warm welcome from most humans. The only human who seems to consistently welcome vampires into the human lifestyle, Sookie Stackhouse, cannot even claim to be fully human, though this particular information remains unknown until later in the series.[91]

One interesting point to mention about the vampire abilities in Harris' vampire mythology involves the human consumption of blood. A human can consume small amounts of blood from vampires in order to gain heightened physical abilities.[92]   Harris's vampires use the ability more often than other stories. The main difference in the consumption of vampire blood by humans in these stories, at least according to the television adaptation of Harris's story, revolves around the idea that vampire blood possesses drug like effects on individuals who consume too much of it. In the first novel, a market exists for vampire blood because of its ability strengthening on humans as well as its use as an aphrodisiac, but the television show turns the possibility of overconsumption into an all-out addiction.[93]   In both the television show and novel, humans attack and hold down a vampire, named Bill Compton, with the intent of draining his blood. In doing this, the humans demonstrate more monstrous behavior than some of the vampires within the story, which questions why vampires are considered evil when humans engage in activities similar to vampires.

One of the most recent vampire mythologies that provide another reinvention of the vampire genre first appeared in 2005 with the publication of the young adult book *Twilight* written by Stephanie Meyer. In an interview with Twilight author Stephanie Meyer, Meyer reveals that many times, the mythology of any specific vampire tale is either made up, or a combination of bits and pieces of other vampire myth as well as personal ideas.[94]   Evolution of vampires within this fiction relates more to physical aspects of vampirism than to other characteristics, but others do exist as well. Meyer's vampires do not die very easily. Their skin resembles marble: cold, smooth, and rock solid. For that

---

[90] *True Blood, "Burning House of Love."* HBO. 2008.
[91] *True Blood.* "The First Taste." HBO. 2008.
[92] *True Blood.* "Sparks Fly Out." HBO. 2008.
[93] Harris, and *True Blood.* "The First Taste." HBO. 2008.
[94] Stephanie Meyer Interview. http://wwwyoutube.com/watch?v=Adftz0CdjC4.

reason, beheading and staking, two traditional means of killing vampires, have little effect on the vampire body. The vampire body receives no damaged from exposure to sunlight either. Edward Cullen, a character within the fiction, tells protagonist Bella Swan that the only certain way to kill a vampire, "is to tear him to shreds, and then burn the pieces."[95]

The method of making vampires also differs from other vampire myths discussed in this research because it does not include the vampire draining the victim and the victim drinking vampire blood in return. Instead, Edward Cullen tells Bella Swan that when a vampire begins drinking the blood of its victim, stopping almost becomes an impossibility.[96] If a vampire does bite a human victim, and manages to stop, the victim will suffer from venom spreading throughout the body, slowly and painfully transforming that person into a vampire.[97] As discussed in all the prior works of vampire fiction within this research, vampires within Meyer's world possess a conscience and can make a choice to eat and/or drink blood from a source other than humans. In *Twilight*, vampires choose to either exist as "vegetarians," a term applied to vampires who feed off of animals and not humans, or they choose to feast from humans.

Given all of the changes in vampire mythology since 1976, it becomes clear that vampires from the past received different portrayals that the more modern vampires. Slowly but surely, vampires transformed from mindless monsters to thinking and rational individuals who possessed the ability to think and reason in the same manner that human beings do. These stories modernizing vampires serve as vehicles for forbidden topics in society.

Sexuality and sexual relationships continually show in vampire fiction. These relationships range from the more conventional and conservative pairing of male and female sharing the same social, racial, and class background to more liberal relationships. Traditional vampire myths share the range of relationships types with more modern vampires, but the modern vampire stories more frequently show less conventional relationships. Anne Rice, for example, frequently uses male vampires and their relationships with one another to further the story. As suggested by Haggerty, homoeroticism plays a large role in Rice's novels. In *Interview with the Vampire* alone, Louis makes up part of two

---

[95] Stephanie Meyer. *Twilight*. New York: Little Brown and Company, 2005. 398.
[96] Meyer, 262.
[97] Meyer, 332, and *Twilight*. DVD. Summit Entertainment, 2009.

separate couples. In the first half of the novel, Louis's relationship with Lestat exists because of loyalty that Louis feels towards his maker, affection from Lestat towards his creations, and a need for companionship that both vampires desire. As the novel continues onward, Louis loses interest in Lestat, breaks free of him, and begins a relationship with another vampire named Armand. *The Vampire Chronicles*, first published in the 1970s and 1980s, addressed the presence of homosexuality in the world, presenting it as a normal part of life, challenging the conservative and homophobic view the general public took of homosexuality at this time.

Commentary on interspecies relationships also exists within vampire fiction. The fiction of Whedon, Harris, and Meyer all revolve around this concept. The premise of each story involves a female human meeting and falling in love with a vampire (or multiple vampires) and entering into relationships with these creatures. Buffy from *Buffy the Vampire Slayer* engages in two such relationships, first with Angel and then with Spike. This relationship garners negative attention and criticism from Buffy's friends in both cases who believed that humans, especially a human destined to fight evil as is Buffy's lot in life, should not enter into a relationship with monstrous creatures like vampires. Sookie Stackhouse from Harris's novels enters into several different relationships with several different vampires, and these relationships gained the same negative attention from her friends and acquaintances as Buffy had from her own. Bella Swan from Meyer's work enters a relationship with Edward Cullen and later marries him, which differs from the relationships of the others mentioned. She too receives negative feedback from her friend Jacob Black on her relationship with a vampire.

Often, the objection to these relationships does not focus on the dangers of a human-vampire relationship, and instead often mention the inferior nature of the vampire in comparison to humans. Xander Harris of *Buffy* often compares vampires to animals unable to control their primal instincts around humans while Tara from *True Blood* makes a similar claim. Jacob Black from *Twilight* even uses the derogatory terms "blood sucker" and "leech" when talking about vampires. Such reactions from humans within these different fictions come off as similar to reactions made over interracial relationships. Real life interracial couples, even if not hassled during the whole length of their relationships, often find themselves subjects of critical judgment from outside sources. No matter legislation or experience, the women and vampires in these stories face the same difficulties and lack of support that interracial couples do in real life.

Feminism and gender equality, two other controversial topics, also receive frequent references within vampire stories. For the *Twilight* series Meyer creates the character Edward Cullen as a self-loathing, possessive, and selfish individual whose behavior frequently undermines the idea that his girlfriend Bella Swan can take care of herself or ever make informed and valid decisions. Edward's decisions always take precedence over Bella's, despite Edward's frequent reference to his existence as a monster. Even though Edward does not think highly of himself, he thinks less of Bella, at least according to his actions, even speaking to her as though she were a child rather than a teenager. In fairness to the character of Edward, Meyer creates Bella as a rather dependent character who clings to the men in her life for support (Edward, her father, her friend Jacob Black, and others). Her emotional, mental, and physical identity is identified by her roles as a woman within these men's lives, and she plans her existence around that of Edward.

In contrast to Bella, the relationships between Buffy and other vampires serve to empower her as a woman. Vampires, a fierce and physically intimidating class of monsters, present very little challenge to Buffy who often outwits the creatures as well as physically overpowers them. Buffy serves as Bella's polar opposite. Unlike Bella, Buffy does not require rescuing from dangers. Where Bella finds her identity and gender role defined by her relationship with her vampire boyfriend, Buffy defines her own role as a woman by her ability to overcome the mental and physical abilities of the vampires surrounding her.

The vampires inspired by Charlaine Harris serve as vehicles for several different controversial topics: violence, civil rights, and drug use. Here, vampires constantly face the danger of kidnap, torture, and death brought on from either the intolerance of the humans that live in the same area or from members of society looking to drain vampires of their blood in order to turn a profit from the selling of an illegal substance. The first season of True Blood portrays several instances of this hatred of vampires, both of which encompass two of the controversial topics.

One such instance involves the vampire Bill Compton getting kidnapped and subdued by two humans who attempt to drain him of his blood, and therefore kill him, in an effort to obtain his blood to sell on the drug market. In order to accomplish this, the two humans place silver on Bill's skin, paralyzing him. A second instance, a multi-episode event, portrays two humans

capturing a friendly and non-threatening vampire named Eddie, and keeping in their home for several days. During this time, the humans frequently withdraw blood from Eddie, starve him, physically abuse him, and ultimately kill him.[98] Both instances became public in one form or the other, and yet no governmental agency ever involved itself in the punishment of the humans responsible. Any punishment received came from other sources.

Vampires who choose to go mainstream within Harris's world find their decision difficult on both sides. Other vampires do not support any decision to abandon the pre-coming out lifestyle, often responding with violence and other results of their displeasure. Many humans also react violently against mainstreaming vampires. Bill Compton experienced a similar two sided protest. After deciding to enter a bar in order to purchase a bottle of synthetic blood, Bill finds that many of the servers refuse to serve him because he is a vampire, similar to the treatment that many minorities still experience in the United States. Later in the series, a few humans burn Bill's house down in an effort to kill him and other vampires. Within some of the same episodes, Bill receives criticism from his vampire friends for choosing to mainstream. In an effort to sway him back, they threaten violence against him and humans he has grown fond of. Later on, Bill makes the choice to falsify abandoning his human lover Sookie to appease his vampire friends.[99]

Religion, another controversial issue, appears in newer vampire myths as well. Many new vampire myths do not stress religious observance. As discussed in the primary research, older vampires within *Buffy* more frequently observe religious practices while younger vampires do not. Recalling the thoughts of Spike, many younger vampires find that religion has no place within the existences of vampires since most of the practices do little or nothing for the practical purposes of feeding and survival. Similarly, Edward Cullen from *Twilight* does not believe that vampires have souls and finds it difficult to believe in an afterlife of some kind. His surrogate father, an older vampire name Carlisle, believes that vampires do own souls and can achieve salvation or damnation in the same way that humans can. This resembles a growing trend in American society that shows that the past several decades have marked a decline in religious practices and observances among adults and children.

---

[98] *True Blood.* "Sparks Fly Out." HBO. 2008.
[99] *True Blood.* HBO. 2008.

Vampire fiction and mythology, a historically popular genre, continues to thrive despite drastic changes within the genre in the past forty years. Vampires in these works of fiction transitioned from mindless, soulless, and monstrous creatures into creatures possessing a conscience and having the ability to make choices between good and evil. These changes become obvious after studying modernized vampires in works of fiction such as Anne Rice's *Interview with the Vampire* which began the transition from traditional to modernized vampire while also allowing for a return to homosexuality among vampires. Joss Whedon's *Buffy the Vampire Slayer* and *Angel,* two different vampire fictions, serve that transition by following the abandonment of religious practices and beliefs in the United States while also promoting gender equality. Charlaine Harris's vampire books add to the transition by highlighting problems with race relations and civil rights, drugs, and violence among individual over uncontrollable difference among individuals. Stephanie Meyer provides a challenge to the achievements of Buffy in her portrayal of the human-vampire relationship within *Twilight.* The real transition of these stories does not refer only to the differences in vampire appearance and behavior, but also on the purpose of their creation, and their creation exists, at least in part, to reflect the problems and concerns within a society.

Bibliography

Abbot, Stacey. "A Little Less Ritual and a Little More Fun: The Modern Vampire in Buffy the Vampire Slayer." *Slayage: The International Journal of Buffy Studies.* 3 (2006): 9. http://slayageonline.com/.

Angel the Series, Seasons One. DVD 20th Century Fox, 2007.

Buffy the Vampire Slayer: Collectors Set, Season One. DVD. 20th Century Fox, 2006.

Haggerty, George E. "Anne Rice and the Queering of Culture." *Novel: A Forum on Fiction.* (1998): 5.

Harris, Charlaine. *Dead Until Dark: The Southern Vampire Mysteries*. (New York: Ace, 2008).

Interview with the Vampire. DVD. Warner Home Video, 2000.

Meyer, Stephanie. *Twilight.* (New York: Little, Brown and Company, 2008).

Meyer, Stephanie. Interview. http://wwwyoutube.com/watch?v=Adftz0CdjC4.

Rice, Anne. *Interview with the Vampire.* (New York: Ballantine,1976).

*True Blood, "*Burning House of Love." HBO. 2008.

Twilight. DVD. Summit Entertainment, 2009.

Navigating the Dark Waters of Evil: the Roles of Colonial Interference, Propaganda, and Obedience in the 1994 Rwandan Genocide

D. Seth Wilson

Abstract: In April 1994, the Rwandan Genocide erupted. The Hutu people, an ethnic group in Rwanda, endeavored to annihilate the Tutsi, an ethnic group that had coexisted with the Hutu for hundreds of years in the Rwandan region. Neighbors killed neighbors, friends killed friends, preachers killed church members, and family killed family; the question is "why"? How could churches open their doors to the innocents only to hold them for the coming slaughter? How could adults lead children to water to drown? This research shows that because of the European colonial interference after World War I, the propaganda of the Hutu-controlled government, the Rwandan's idea of obedience, and the feeling of ethnic pride that surged through the Hutu and Tutsi people, the Rwandan Genocide of 1994 had been in the making for over thirty years.

In 1957, Hutu intellectuals of Rwanda drafted the "Bahutu Manifesto," a political document that called for the ethnic and political unification of the Hutu people and the disenfranchisement of the Tutsis.[100]

> Many Hutu felt that as the overwhelming majority of the colony's residents (84%) that they should politically dominate the country. As a result, much anti-Tutsi sentiment and talk of retribution began to sweep across the Hutu intellectual class...The result was the Bahutu Manifesto.[101]

It was this document that was the basis for the April 1994 genocide in Rwanda. It was then that the Hutu extremist regime began to kill thousands and thousands of Tutsi civilians. Both Hutu and Tutsi have lived together in virtual peace for years, intermarrying with one another, sharing friendships and language, as well as religious beliefs. Yet one day, they began slaughtering the ones they once held dear.

First, the setup of the Rwandan government, both pre-colonial and postcolonial, had a major effect on the minds of the Hutu murderers. Secondly, the use of propaganda and obedience manipulated the Hutu population, as is

---

[100] "Bahutu Manifesto (1957)" http://www.blackpast.org/?q=gah/bahutu-manifesto-1957 accessed on 27 March, 2011.
[101] Ibid.

evident in the testimonies of both killers and victims. Finally, the analysis of the aftermath of the genocide based on the International Tribunals shed more light on the causes of the Rwandan genocide question. There is no one concrete answer, yet the evidence shows that because of the interference of the Belgians, the previous anti-Hutu movements by the Tutsis, the emotions of obedience, fear, and loyalty that flow through the veins of Rwandan culture, the Hutu extremists believed that it was their right and duty to slaughter the Tutsi population.

Transition to Colonial Rwanda: the Seeds of Genocide are Planted

Pre-colonial Rwanda was divided into kingdoms of Hutus and Tutsi. Rwanda was made up of three "ethnic" groups: Hutu, Tutsi, and Twa. However, during the late 19th century a fourth ethnic group migrated to Rwanda from Western Europe called the Bazungu.[102] Bazungu is a deviation of the word "mzungu" which means "white person."[103] The Bazungu peoples eventually took over the Rwandans by both force and diplomacy.[104] With their help, the Tutsi aristocracy's control over the land and the Rwandans expanded profoundly and the Hutus were forced under their centralized command.[105]

The Bazungu, made up of Germans and Belgians, put the Tutsi in power because of their belief in the ethnic superiority of the Tutsi due to their more European physical features.[106] However, the Tutsi made up only about fifteen percent of the population, while the Hutus comprised about eighty-five percent. It was under this indirect rule that "social relationships in Rwanda became more uniform, rigid, unequal, and exploitative than ever, with a clear hierarchy from Bazungu to Tutsi to Hutu to Twa, with each higher level having privileges denied to the lower level and with an ideology of racial superiority underlying this system of inequality."[107] This example speaks to the theory of social Darwinism which served as a justification for the colonizing Europeans. Because of the social structure set up by the Bazungu, the staunch caste system caused deep resentments between the Hutu and Tutsi.

In 1919, after World War I, the League of Nations declared that Rwanda was a mandate territory[108] under the control of the Belgians. The Belgians broke the ethnic groups into three separate sections: the aboriginal

---

[102] Peter Uvin, *Aiding Violence: The Development Enterprise in Rwanda* (West Hartford: Kumorian Press, Inc., 1998), 16.
[103] "Mzungu," http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/mzungu. Accessed on 27 March, 2011
[104] Uvin, *Aiding Violence,* 16.
[105] Ibid, 16.
[106] Ibid, 16.
[107] Uvin, *Aiding Violence,* 17.
[108] After World War I, Rwanda was a Class B territory that was not considered politically or socially advanced enough to be declared independent, thus they were placed under the mandate of a League of Nations member state.

Pygmies (Twa), Bantu peasants (Hutu), and the Nilo Hamitic aristocrats (Tutsi).[109] The Belgians made the citizens obtain ID cards identifying each individual race, thus fortifying the racial tensions. For the forty-three years that Rwanda was under Belgian control, the Belgians instituted the Tutsi minority as the rulers, because the Belgians believed that due to their lighter skin complexion, the Tutsi were somehow racially and ethnically superior to the Hutu and the Twa.[110]

In July 1962, Rwanda was given its independence from the Belgians after years of colonial rule. Because the Hutus made up approximately eighty-four percent of the population, while the Tutsi and the Twa together make up the other sixteen percent,[111] the Belgians set up the Hutu as the new leaders of the country, not the Tutsi. After the Hutu rise to political power, the Hutu people began to feel a surge of ethnic pride which caused extreme resentment towards the Tutsi people causing much anti-Tutsi violence throughout the 1960s. The radical switch from Tutsi leadership to Hutu leadership laid the foundation for the Rwandan Genocide of 1994.

Propaganda of the Hutu Extremist Regime

The first president of Rwanda, Gregoire Kayibanda, was in office from 1962 until 1973. Kayibanda was very discriminatory towards the Tutsi population; in the early 1960s and in 1973, there was a series of anti-Tutsi massacres.[112] The second president of Rwanda was Juvenal Habyarimana, who was president from 1973 until 1994.[113] As a Hutu moderate, Habyarimana was more lenient to the Tutsi population. On April 6, 1994, Habyarimana was assassinated, but by whom, no one is exactly sure. Some historians argue it was the Hutu hardliners, while others claim it was the Rwandan Patriotic Front. After the president's assassination, the Hutu extremists grabbed power and began to put the plans of the genocide into action.

The Rwandan government's use of propaganda, in all forms, was one of the main factors in the Hutu population's involvement in the slaughter of the Tutsis. In countries where television sets are scarce and illiteracy runs rampant, radio is the public's main access to news and information. Many of these radio stations are government owned and limited on what can be said. According to a United States' congressional transcript in 1994, the encouragement of ethnic

---

[109] Alex de Waal, "Genocide in Rwanda," *Anthropology Today* 10 (1994):1.

[110] *The Black Past: Remembered and Reclaimed,* "Bahutu Manifesto," http://www.blackpast.org/?q=gah/bahutu-manifesto-1957. Accessed on 27 March, 2011

[111] "The World Factbook" https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/rw.html.Accessed on 30 March 2011.

[112] Scott Strauss, *The Order of Genocide: Race, Power, and War in Rwanda* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001), 23.

[113] Ibid, 23.

hatred, along with the arming of militias, was one of the strongest signs of genocides.[114] It was the job of the "hate radio," known as Mille Collines,[115] to convince the Hutu population that their lives were menaced by the Tutsi and the moderate Hutu.[116]   One quote from this radio transcript is especially telling, "...the majority of Kigali is safe again, from some part of the outskirts which must be seriously cleaned by our soldiers with the help of the population."[117] The station specifically mentioned the "help" of the population with the "cleaning" of the Tutsis. This is just one example of how the radio recruited civilians and persuaded them to kill.

Other than the Bahutu Manifesto, another document used by the Hutu to persuade the masses was known as the "Hutu Ten Commandments." This document was released in the Hutu extremist magazine designed to spread ethnic pride of the Hutu. It also preached the need of the decimation of the Tutsi, much like Mille Collines, but in print media. The "Hutu Ten Commandments" read as follows:

> 1. Every Hutu must know that the Tutsi woman, wherever she may be, is working for the Tutsi ethnic cause. In consequence, any Hutu is a traitor who:
> - Acquires a Tutsi wife;
> - Acquires a Tutsi concubine;
> - Acquires a Tutsi secretary or protégée.
>
> 2. Every Hutu must know that our Hutu daughters are more worthy and more conscientious as women, as wives and as mothers. Aren't they lovely, excellent secretaries, and more honest!
>
> 3. Hutu women, be vigilant and make sure that your husbands, brothers and sons see reason.
>
> 4. All Hutus must know that all Tutsis are dishonest in business. Their only goal is ethnic superiority. We have learned this by experience from experience. In consequence, any Hutu is a traitor who:
> - Forms a business alliance with a Tutsi
> - Invests his own funds or public funds in a Tutsi enterprise
> - Borrows money from or loans money to a Tutsi
> - Grants favors to Tutsis (import licenses, bank loans, land for construction, public markets...)

---

[114] "Crisis in Central Africa," http://openlibrary.org/books/OL23291756M/Crisis_in_Central_Africa. Accessed on 27 March, 2011
[115] *Mille Collines* translates to "of a thousand hills" in English.
[116] Frank Chalk, "Hate Radio in Rwanda" in *The Path of a Genocide: The Rwanda Crisis from Uganda to Zaire,* ed. Howard Adelman and Astri Suhrke (New Bruswick: Transaction Publishers, 2000), 94.
[117] "Digital Repository: Translations of Mille Collines" http://repositories.lib.utexas.edu/handle/2152/7166/browse?order=ASC&rpp=20&sort_by=1&etal=-1&offset=0&type=title accessed on 30 March, 2011

5. Strategic positions such as politics, administration, economics, the military and security must be restricted to the Hutu.

6. A Hutu majority must prevail throughout the educational system (pupils, scholars, teachers).

7. The Rwandan Army must be exclusively Hutu. The war of October 1990 has taught us that. No soldier may marry a Tutsi woman.

8. Hutu must stop taking pity on the Tutsi.

9. Hutu wherever they be must stand united, in solidarity, and concerned with the fate of their Hutu brothers. Hutu within and without Rwanda must constantly search for friends and allies to the Hutu Cause, beginning with their Bantu brothers. Hutu must constantly counter Tutsi propaganda. Hutu must stand firm and vigilant against their common enemy: the Tutsi.

10. The Social Revolution of 1959, the Referendum of 1961 and the Hutu Ideology must be taught to Hutu of every age. Every Hutu must spread the word wherever he goes. Any Hutu who persecutes his brother Hutu for spreading and teaching this ideology is a traitor.[118]

As the Commandments illustrate, the Hutu wanted to make it explicitly clear that the Tutsi were the enemy. The Hutu put these ideals into place approximately four years before the genocide began. These two documents, the Bahutu Manifesto and the Hutu Ten Commandments, were designed to manipulate the Hutu population to the point where the masses felt it was their right and their duty as Hutu to exterminate the Tutsi. Moreover, the constitution of Rwanda revised in 1991 shows the corruption of the times. It speaks of a government that is "of the people, for the people, and by the people."[119] Article 12 of their constitution is very chilling. "The human being shall be sacred."[120] However, the Tutsi was not considered human. They were called inyenzi, or "cockroaches," by the interahamwe[121].

Before the killings, we usually called them cockroaches. But during, it was more suitable to call them snakes, because of their attitude, or zeros, or dogs, because in our country we don't like dogs; in any case, they were less-than-nothings. For some of us those taunts were just minor diversions. The important thing was not to let them get away. For others, the insults were

---

[118] Genocide in Rwanda, "The Hutu Ten Commandments as published in Kangura No. 6" http://www.trumanwebdesign.com/~catalina/commandments.htm. Accessed on 17 April, 2011.

[119] Rwandan Constitution of 1991, http://www.servat.unibe.ch/icl/rw0000_.html. Accessed on 18 April, 2011/

[120] Ibid.

[121] The *interahamwe* was the name of the militant Hutu population who traveled ins search of Tutsi citizens to slaughter. The word translates into "those who attack together" in Kinyarwanda, the native language of the Rwandans.

invigorating, made the job easier. The perpetrators felt more comfortable insulting and hitting crawlers in rags rather than properly upright people. Because they seemed less like us in that position. [122]

Obedience and Fear: Essential Tools of Genocide Orchestration

At the end of the genocide, seventy-five percent of the Tutsi population was wiped out, yet some survived and lived to tell their stories. Adele, a young Tutsi woman, told a story of how the killers would take children and march them to "the lake." [123] In this lake, the children would step into the water going deeper and deeper until they went under. Some swam miles and miles to safety, like Adele. Others drowned. How could men and women lead children to their deaths? It is because of the Rwandan cultural belief of obedience and respect to those in power. Marie Beatrice Umutesi tells of an experience she had while fleeing Rwanda. Umutesi was a woman who lived through the genocide with her family and crossed the border, fleeing the interahamwe.

> ...we began to pass bodies of the dead and the dying...My eye fell on a teenager hardly sixteen years old. Like the others she was lying at the side of the road, her large eyes open...A cloud of flies swarmed around her. Ants and other forest insects crawled around her mouth, nose, eyes, and ears. They began to devour her before she had taken her last breath. The death rattle that from time to time escaped her lips showed that she was not yet dead. [124]

This is an example of the amount of death these people encountered every day for the hundred days during the genocide. The killers were immune to the cries for mercy and screams of children. They had one mission: to kill. Another Tutsi woman who escaped the clutches of the Hutus, retells something she will never forget:

> Distant kneeling[125], and the thwack thwack thwack of small arms goes on for a couple of endless minutes. Then there's an enveloping silence. Where silhouetted forms had been running, there is now no movement, Bodies, like puddles after a shower, lie everywhere. [126]

When the Rwandans were given their independence, the newly formed Hutu extremist government had "requirements" of the male citizens. First, both

---

[122] Jean Hatzfield, *Machete Season: The Killers in Rwanda Speak* (New York: Picador Press, 2003), 132.

[123] Voices of Rwanda, http://voicesofrwanda.org/testimonies/. Accessed 20 March, 2011. Accessed 30 March, 2011.

[124] Marie Beatrice Umutesi, "*Surviving the Slaughter.*" 104.

[125] This is in reference to the actually physical positions of the Tutsi when the Hutu were killing. In most cases the Hutus would make groups of Tutsis kneel and then hack them to death with machetes, or shoot them.

[126] Louise Mushikiwabo and Jack Kramer, *Rwanda Means the Universe: A Native's Memoir of Blood and Bloodlines* (New York: St. Martins's Press, 2006), 44.

Hutu and Tutsi peasants were forced to provide free labor "for the state and towards the good of development."[127] Furthermore, Rwandan citizens were required to attend meetings called "animations." These "animations" were large gatherings of small communities to pay tribute to the state, nation, and MRND[128] using song and dance. According to Baines, "...enthusiastic Rwandans were rewarded for their vigor in repeating nationalist slogans, often identified for specific community tasks and resultant political rewards. A more pernicious fate awaited those who were less enthusiastic, in particular for those who opposed the ideology of the national party."[129]

Some Hutus killed because of political reward and enthusiasm for the "Hutu cause," however, not all participants in the genocide were "willing" participants. According to Ravi Bhavani, ten percent of Hutus helped during the genocide, thirty percent were forced to kill, twenty percent killed reluctantly, and forty percent killed enthusiastically.[130] Some Hutus and their families were threatened with death if they did not comply. They were to kill or be killed themselves. Therefore, obedience was used by the Hutu regime to manipulate some of the Hutu population into participating in their killing missions.[131] As one of the killers put it, "Rule number one was to kill. There was no rule number two."[132] Another said, "...the judge announced that the reason for the meeting was the killing of every Tutsi without exception. It was simply said, and it was simple to understand."[133] The civilians were given their orders and they obeyed. No questions. If they had questions, they were subject to death themselves. As one killer put it, "Some began the hunts with nerve and finished them with nerve, while others never showed nerve and killed from obligation. For others, in time, nerve replaced fear."[134] It was obedience that drove most of the killers. However, the sheer fear of death of themselves or their families drove many Hutu to slaughter their Tutsi neighbors. They would become numb to it, no longer feeling the guilt or shame. Eventually it was just their job as a Hutu.

One famous man accused of genocide was a preacher in the Seventh Day Adventist Church, Elizaphan Ntakirutimana. He was accused of promising safety in his church to Tutsi and then turning them over to the interahamwe to be

---

[127] Erin Baines, "Body Politics and the Rwandan Crisis," *Third World Quarterly 24* (2003): 482.
[128] MRND stood for "Mouvement Revolutionnaire National pour le Développement" or National Revolutionary Movement for Development in English.
[129] Baines, *Body Politics,* 482.
[130] Ravi Bhavnani, "Ethnic Norms and Interethnic Violence: Accounting for Mass Participation in the Rwandan Genocide," *Journal of Peace Research 43* (2006): 651.
[131] Ibid, 651.
[132] Hatzfield, *Machete Season*, 10.
[133] Ibid, 11.
[134] Ibid, 48.

slaughtered.[135] He was found innocent and released. The case of Paul Bisengimana sheds a little more light on his motives in the genocide. From the case file we are told the following:

> Paul Bisengimana was appointed bourgmestre of Gikoro commune by the President of the Republic of Rwanda upon the recommendation of the Minister of the Interior. He acknowledges that as bourgmestre, he represented executive power at the communal level. Further, he had administrative authority over the entire commune and was responsible for ensuring peace, public order and the safety of persons and property, and for the implementation of local laws and regulations, as well as government policy. The Accused admits that he had a duty to protect the population, prevent or punish the illegal acts of the perpetrators of attacks against persons or property. Further, he was responsible for informing the central government of any situation worthy of interest in Gikoro commune...Paul Bisengimana acknowledges that he had a duty to protect the population, prevent or punish the illegal acts of the perpetrators of the attacks at Musha Church and Ruhanga Complex but that he failed to do so. He admits that he had the means to oppose the killings of Tutsi civilians in Gikoro commune, but that he remained indifferent to the attacks. With respect to the Musha Church massacres, Paul Bisengimana acknowledges that his presence during the attack would have had an encouraging effect on the perpetrators and given them the impression that he endorsed the killing.[136]

He admits that he remained indifferent and even condoned the killings. It was his duty as a Hutu to make sure the Tutsis were exterminated, not kept safe. In reality, his job was to keep the Hutu and make sure their mission was accomplished.

Conclusion

One hundred days after the genocide started, it was over. This research was designed to answer the question "why?" The first reason was because of the colonial set up of Rwanda. The German and Belgian colonizers who created such rigid classes between the Hutu and the Tutsi planted a seed that eventually grew into fruition: the genocide. Secondly, many Hutu participated because of the widespread propaganda. "Hate radio" was used to convince the Hutu population that the Tutsis were a threat to their life and that the Tutsis were planning on taking over again, subjecting the Hutu to the persecution they faced under the Tutsi monarchy. Respect, fear, and obedience were also used to manipulate the Hutu masses into participating. Embedded in the social fabrics of Rwandan society is the respect and obedience of power. When the people were

---

[135] "International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda: the Case of Elizaphan Ntakirutimana" http://www.unictr.org/Cases/tabid/127/PID/46/default.aspx?id=4&mnid=4. Accessed 30 March, 2011.
[136] "The International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda: The Case of Paul Bisengimana" http://www.unictr.org/Cases/tabid/127/PID/20/default.aspx?id=4&mnid=4. Accessed 29 March, 2011.

commanded they did as they were told. Some Hutu only participated out of fear for themselves or their families, because not only were Tutsis killed in the genocide, but Hutu who stood up for the Tutsi cause were slaughtered as well. With every kill, it got easier. With every life taken, it was not as hard to take the next. The Hutu masses became a mob of killing machines, no longer seeing themselves as individuals, but as a Hutu nation. We may never fully understand the reasons why the killers killed, but the sources presented in this article hoped to shed some light on the darker parts of the minds of the killers.

Bibliography

Strauss, Scott. The Order of Genocide: Race, Power, and War in Rwanda. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2006.

Uvin, Peter. Aiding Violence: The Development Enterprise in Rwanda. West Hartford: Kumorian Press, Inc., 1998.

Baines, Erin K. "Body Politics and the Rwandan Crisis."

Third World Quarterly 24 (2003): 479-493.

Bhavnani, Ravi. "Ethnic Norms and Interethnic Violence: Accounting for Mass Participation in the Rwandan Genocide." Journal of Peace Research 43 (2006): 651-669.

De Waal, Alex. "Genocide in Rwanda." Anthropology Today 10 (1994): 1-2.

"Crisis in Central Africa." http://openlibrary.org/books/OL23291756M/Crisis_in_Central_Africa.

"Digital Repository: Translations of Mille Collines,"http://repositories.lib.utexas.edu/handle/2152/7166/browse?order=ASC&rpp=20&sort_by=1&etal=-1&offset=0&type=title.

Hatzfield, Jean. Machete Season: The Killers in Rwanda Speak. Translated by Linda Coverdale. New York: Picador   Press, 2003.

International Constitutional Law Project Information. "The Rwandan Constitution of 1991." http://www.servavt.unibe.ch/icl/rw0000_.html.

"International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda: The Case of Elizaphan Ntakirutiman," http://www.unictr.org/Cases/tabid/127/PID/46/default.aspx?id=4&mnid=4.

"International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda: The Case of Paul Bisengimana," http://www.unictr.org/Cases/tabid/127/PID/20/default.aspx?id=4&mnid=4.

"Memorandum for Secretary of Defense: Presented by Senator Edward Kennedy," http://www.rwandadocumentsproject.net/gsdl/cgi-bin/library?e=d-01000-00---off-0usdocs--00-1--0-10-0---0---0prompt-10---4-------0-1l--11-en-1000---50-about---00-3-1-00-0-0-11-1-0utfZz-8-00&a=d&c=usdocs&cl=CL3.7.6.

Mushikiwabo, Louise and Jack Kramer. Rwanda Means the   Universe: A Native's Memoir of Blood and Bloodlines. New York: St. Martin's Press, 2006.

"Mzungu," http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/mzungu.

Umutesi, Marie. translated by Julia Emerson. Surviving the Slaughter: The Ordeal of a Rwandan Refugee in Zaire. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2004.

"Security Council Meeting 3377," http://www.undemocracy.com/securitycouncil/meeting_3377.

"Voices of Rwanda: Video Testimonies," http://voicesofrwanda.org/testimonies/.

"Bahutu Manifesto," http://www.blackpast.org/?q=gah/bahutu-manifesto-1957.

"The World Factbook," https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/rw.html.

Genocide in Rwanda, "The Hutu Ten Commandments as published in Kangura No. 6" http://www.trumanwebdesign.com/~catalina/commandments.htm

Book Reviews

Brought to Bed: Childbearing in America, 1750-1950

Morgan Till

Judith Walzer Leavitt. *Brought to Bed: Child-bearing in America, 1750-1950*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1986.

Brought to Bed: Childbearing in America, 1750-1950, written by Judith Walzer Leavitt, is a detailed history of the journey undertaken by both parturient women and doctors struggling to find their place in the birthing rooms of America. Covering the periods between 1750 and 1950 chronologically and categorically, Leavitt attempts to recreate in as much detail as possible the stereotypes and medical difficulties encountered in childbirth. Drawing from the personal records, journals, and correspondences of both the women and doctors involved, the author is able to untangle complex meanings from the history of obstetrics.

Leavitt explains her endeavor in writing this book as a direct result of her personal interest in the medical changes taking place during this time period in America and her personal knowledge about the centrality of childbirth to the experience of womanhood. As such, Leavitt focuses on two planes of childbirth experience. First, Leavitt addresses the then scientific aspect of childbirth, such as the use of anesthetics, forceps, and cleanliness. Second, but not in importance, Leavitt also focuses on the emotional experiences of women during childbirth, such as their fear of death and their desire to remain in control of their own childbirth in a time normally represented by a shift in medical authority from the patient to the doctor. Rather, Leavitt allows the reader to understand that while many changes were occurring in the medical field, many of the resulting techniques and procedures affected a very small portion of women. Most women continued to give birth in their homes, and it was not until 1940 that over half of American women began giving birth in a hospital environment[137]. Even when moving childbirth to such a strange, new environment, birthing women still exhibited their ability to make the practice of obstetrics meet their personal needs; many women chose the hospital environment voluntarily because they believed it presented them greater hope for a safe delivery. Although this entailed being without relatives and other

---

[137] Judith Walzer Leavitt. *Brought to Bed: Child-bearing in America, 1750-1950*. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986), 171.

loved ones at such a critical moment, Leavitt writes, "In seeking life and health, women were willing to relinquish some of their traditional supports." [138]

Leavitt presents her arguments with both factual astuteness and a sense of consideration for all parties involved. While recognizing that the pregnant women discussed within the text deserve control over their own bodies, Leavitt also acknowledges their sometimes uneducated decisions in the birthing room, which were the direct result of emotional considerations rather than scientific knowledge. Also, Leavitt accepts the difficult position of obstetricians in such cases; they were genuinely interested in advancing the science of childbirth but oftentimes produced more harm than good through poor knowledge of when to intervene in birth, the effects of the drugs being used without regulations, and the pressure to "do something."[139] Juggling the widely varying perspectives of so many groups is a difficult task, which Leavitt conquers with aplomb. The litany of problems encountered and subsequently overcome by birthing women and obstetricians is impressive, and Leavitt is thorough in naming and discussing as many of these problems as possible.

Although supplying a somewhat tedious amount of detail at times, Leavitt possesses a thorough arsenal of sources which she uses to exemplify her arguments. There are literally pages and pages of journal articles, medical textbooks, and personal letters which the author incorporates into this thorough study of childbirth in America. The author uses medical records, though few, medical journals, and personal correspondences from both women and doctors to illustrate her arguments and establish credibility. Leavitt is careful to avoid over-simplified generalizations on the part of the mothers or doctors. Some of the correspondences mentioned addressed unusual situations or opinions. Therefore, Leavitt is careful to acknowledge that the feelings of certain parturient women are not necessarily consistent for the entire female gender and that the individual medical methods of private practitioners may not reflect the profession as a whole.

Leavitt is a formidable writer and is able to bridge the difficulties of portraying a long period of time both chronologically and categorically with ease. Unfortunately, because doing so requires frequently crossing back and forth through time, the reader is subject to some amount of repetition both within the chapters and throughout the book. However, the intended subject matter is certainly complex enough to warrant reiteration and the author's varying use of language makes the fault forgivable. In conclusion, Leavitt is more than capable of addressing such a broad and difficult subject. The author is able to convey both her technical knowledge in the history of child-bearing in America and her own vested interest in the progress of obstetrics. The author

---

[138] Leavitt, *Brought to Bed*, 182.
[139] Leavitt, *Brought to Bed*, 43.

leaves the reader understanding that the relationship between doctors and parturient women has always been a tenuous, volatile one, experiencing progress and regress simultaneously. Women throughout the ages have found many ways of influencing the circumstances they found themselves in and have found many other areas in which they held no influence at all. As such, until parturient women are able to deliver their own children, this elastic relationship between birthing women and obstetricians is sure to continue.

Department News for 2011

Dothan campus news: **Robin O'Sullivan** has a new book on the history of organic food and farming in the United States under contract with the University Press of Kansas.

Troy campus news: **Bryant Shaw** retired as chair in January and from the faculty in May, having served as our fearless leader since 2005. Bryant and Carol, greatly missed here in Troy, are enjoying a well-deserved retirement in Florida. **Allen Jones** has been named as the new chair this past year. **Timothy Buckner's** *Fathers, Preachers, Rebels, Men: Black Masculinity in U.S. History and Literature, 1820-1945* was published by the Ohio State University Press. Tim was also promoted to Associate Professor this past year. **Joseph McCall** and Sylvia Li tied the knot in November! Congratulations to the happy couple.

Montgomery campus: **Scott Merriman** has an article, "Theory Vs. Practice: History Says That Practice Makes Perfect (and That Judges Are Better Too)," in the journal *Theoria*. **Dan Puckett** was on sabbatical for the fall semester 2011 starting a new book project, a biography of Rabbi Milton Grafman of Birmingham. His article "Reporting the Holocaust: The View from Jim Crow Alabama" appeared in the fall 2011 issue of *Holocaust and Genocide Studies*. His book, *In the Shadow of Hitler: Alabama's Jews and the Holocaust*, is forthcoming from the University of Alabama Press.

Professor Nathan Alexander Remembered

Barbara Patterson

Nathan always used to stop by the office and our conversations were always very wide and diverse. One afternoon, as we were talking, Nathan came with me to the copy machine that is 30 feet away from the Chancellor's boardroom. I could tell that the Chancellor was having a luncheon and it was a little after 1:00 pm so I knew he and his guests would be getting out soon. To appreciate this story, you must know that I am Catholic, and Nathan began describing how he explained the Eucharist (communion) to his class. For Catholics, we believe the Eucharist is the body and blood of Christ. Nathan as he is telling me how he describes this to his classes, begins kinds of dancing and jumping around in the hallway. Nathan is so enthusiastic and energetic in his description, but as a Catholic I was horrified and also laughing at the same time – wondering if this was a near occasion – or actual occasion – of sin. I am also watching the doorway of the Chancellor's boardroom, telling Nathan the Chancellor and his guests might walk out any minute. We escaped without the notice of the Chancellor and his guests!

Nathan and I also served on the committee for the selection of the book the first year students read. Dean Eleanor Lee would tell us bring three books to the committee meeting that we would like to recommend. Me, being the obedient one, would bring three recommendations, other members would bring five or six, and Nathan would bring a box out of which he would pull 15 to 20 books, the books would keep coming out of the box! He described each in detail: the advantages and disadvantages. I would be the one at the committee meeting telling Nathan – Dean Lee said three not 20!

Lastly, Nathan was so excited to have his daughter in Troy going to Camp Butter and Egg. He took her around to the Troy University offices and introduced her to everyone!

Timothy Buckner

I met Nathan Alexander at the new faculty orientation meeting in 2005. Professor Shaw came by the meeting and said I should keep an eye out for the other new hire in history who had just arrived from Harvard.

I said "Ok, but how will I know which one he is?"

Shaw said, "You'll know."

He was right. I did. [This in no way implies that either I or Professor Shaw believes that all people who went to Harvard look the same.]

I liked Nathan immediately and over the course of the years we were here he became the way that I made sense of Troy, of Alabama, and of the South that I had spent most of my life living within. He thought everything was interesting, and usually, funny. He had terrible luck with speeding tickets, airlines, mechanics, insurance companies, all things that turn me into a raving lunatic, but things he would shrug off as if they were nothing. Everyone thought that Nathan was with them politically, but if you paid attention, you noticed that he let you talk and he volunteered very little. He was too smart to let anyone pin him down on anything.

He taught me how to take myself less seriously. He taught me to love my job. Once he got sick, he taught me that my petty problems were just that and I learned that I needed to be more like him. I haven't been able to do that yet, but I still try.

Joe McCall

What I remember the most about Nathan is how he reflected what a friend of mine used to call a "study in contrasts." Nathan would come to work some days dressed in a grey suit, a crisply pressed white shirt, and tie. Later in the afternoon, you might find him wearing the most torn-up sweatshirt and shorts imaginable, sitting in his office discussing a fine point of French history with a few students. In conversations with Nathan, I could always count on him to listen as if what you were saying was the most interesting thing he had ever

heard, but he was also willing and ready to debate your point with enthusiasm and respect.

Nathan and I both spent a good deal of time in the Boston area earlier in our lives. Although I had my roots in the South, for Nathan, living in Alabama was a new cultural experience. When I was briefly out of a job at Troy in 2006, I asked Nathan if I could park my old Jeep pickup at his house in the countryside for the five months I'd be abroad on a round-the-world trip. With his usual graciousness, Nathan accepted. I got him to promise to drive it some so he could improve his standing with the locals in his rural neighborhood. His car, which was as often likely to be at the mechanic's shop as on the road, did not work for most of the time I was gone and Nathan became a true "country boy," driving the back roads of Troy in a rusty old truck and alternately dressed to kill or looking like a mess—adding another dimension to his persona.

Nathan was also fascinated by southern culture after he arrived at Troy. I'd give him four or five books on Alabama history or on southern regionalism and two days later he'd have read them all and would remind or inform me of segments of the book I'd forgotten or never considered. His mind was like a vacuum cleaner, absorbing books and articles with enthusiasm and then moving on to a new room in his incredibly expansive and curious mind. But unlike his study of books or his contemplation of high-minded ideas, Nathan's greatest gift was his love for encounters with people from all walks of life. I could always count on Nathan to reflect, with compassion and intensity, what Walt Whitman reflected on in his poem "Song of the Open Road":

From this hour I ordain myself loos'd of limits and imaginary lines,
Going where I list, my own master, total and absolute,
Listening to others, and considering well what they say,
Pausing, searching, receiving, contemplating,
Gently, but with undeniable will, divesting myself of the holds that would hold me.
I inhale great draughts of space;
The east and the west are mine, and the north and the south are mine.
I am larger, better than I thought;
I did not know I held so much goodness.

I miss my friend Nathan and am glad that the *Alexandrian* will remind us of his "goodness" and his intellect.

Scout Blum

My son, Aidan, turned three in August of 2008. A few weeks after his birthday, he got a virus - it didn't seem like anything unusual for a three-year-old in daycare. He was sick over a weekend, and seemed a lot better early the next week. The next weekend he was a bit lethargic, and he woke up Sunday morning covered in what looked like red pinpricks. I thought he was having an allergic reaction, so my husband Sean and I got up and took him to the emergency room. When they took blood from his finger, it took forever to stop bleeding. The nurse returned to get a second sample from his arm, and within minutes, a huge black bruise, covering the entire midsection of his arm, appeared. Our doctor came by and told us that Aidan's platelet count (the part of the blood that helps clotting), which should have been around 150,000, was literally 0. They started talking about leukemia and any type of injury being life threatening, as we bundled him up and took an ambulance ride to Children's Hospital in Birmingham. Aidan stayed in the hospital for three days, received a platelet transfusion, and made a full recovery within a few days. Our pediatrician said she had never seen someone bounce back so fast. I have never felt so helpless in my life.

I posted something on Facebook, and Nathan responded almost immediately. I had known at that point that he had been ill, but really didn't know the details. He was so kind and understanding, and was there to explain a lot of the blood results - since he had so much experience with that. He was rather quick to tell us that, since the rest of Aidan's blood work was normal, it was unlikely he had leukemia. We emailed back and forth, and talked when I got back to school. Even in the midst of sickness himself, Nathan was able to use his experience to help me feel better. He was a generous soul, and when I think about that time in the hospital, I remember the friendship he showed me and my family, rather than the fear and worry of being a parent of a sick child. Thank you, Nathan! Miss you very much!

Bryant P. Shaw

My favorite memory of Nathan Alexander is a conversation we had soon after his arrival at Troy. We talked of our families. Speaking of his young daughter, Elisa, he noted how much he loved reading with her. I was confused, because earlier Nathan had mentioned that Elisa lived in Massachusetts. No problem, replied Nathan. Each evening they fixed a special time to read to each other over the phone--Elisa reading one part of a book, Nathan the next.

This sticks with me for what it says both about Nathan personally and about his sense of his profession. Regardless of circumstance, he was consistently positive—"resilient" is the word a mutual friend might use. He loved learners and learning. He knew teachers were life-long learners. Above all, he reveled in the joy of learning and always made time for sharing it.

So, when I think about teaching and learning, I think of Nathan and Elisa and their evening phone reads to each other, learning together and loving every minute of it.

Allen and Patty Jones

Allen: The last Harvard graduate to work in Troy's history department was my predecessor, a medievalist who stuck it out for a single semester before bolting. I remember wrestling with this fact as I sat on my back porch, pouring over candidates' files while looking to fill the position for a new historian. The best candidate was a fellow from Harvard, and I recall finally convincing myself to throw caution to the wind: "What's to say another guy from Harvard won't like Troy." So we hired Nathan. And I was wrong. He didn't like Troy; rather, he flat out loved it! Nathan embraced this town like no other. Of course, he delighted in talking about all manner of academic topics with scholars from a variety of disciplines. But also, he played basketball with students, and he went fishing with his barber, Raymond! But as Patty and I came to understand, Nathan's fondness for Troy arose from something bigger, a love for life.

Patty: The day after Nathan passed away, I overheard a well-meaning professor say of Nathan, "He was young in his academic career. He had such potential. It is really tragic." I know that he didn't mean for it to be callous, but reducing the death of Nathan Alexander to merely a loss of academic potential really bothered me because Nathan was a person whom I felt privileged to know, and not just because he was the most prolific reader that I have ever met. I've spent most of my adult life around professional academics, but Nathan was unique. He exhibited a profound enthusiasm for life and everything in it that continually amazed me. Instead of belittling and mocking this small town, as even the locals do incessantly, he thought that Troy, Alabama was absolutely amazing, from the brightness of the stars in the sky, (that he couldn't see in Boston), to the wall of

deer at Raymond's barbershop. Even surgery didn't get him down!   When Nathan had a dangerous growth removed from his scalp, he delighted students, colleagues, and friends by donning a variety of headgear: a "young and hip" do-rag, a variety of baseball caps, and a yarmulke.

I miss hearing him tell me what books he and Elisa were reading together nightly over the telephone. I miss his Pollyanna, "I've found a reason for being glad," outlook on life. I miss seeing Troy through his eyes. I am honored to have known him, and I am sad that he had to leave so soon.

Phi Alpha Theta Inductees 2011

ΦΑΘ

Jared A. Brannon	Patrick Jones
Daniel Brasher	Anthony Lynwood Mays
Peggy M. Buchanan	Stephanie Lynn New
Ryan S. Collins	Lisa Thomley Pandori
David L. Cook	Russell B. Register
Gary Dobbs	Colby Turberville
Vanessa K. Eccles	D. Seth Wilson
Mark D. Engwall	Timothy W. Winters
Amy K. Griffin	Nichole Woodburn
Ashley N. Ivey	