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Emily Amos, University of Mobile

“Fritz Ritz”: The Experience of German Prisoners of War in World War II Alabama

During World War II, hundreds of thousands of soldiers were taken prisoners all around the world. Many of the German prisoners taken by the Allies were sent to the rural South, where opportunity for sabotage was limited and labor was desperately needed. Around 16,000 of these German prisoners of war were sent to Alabama and their presence deeply impacted our great state. My paper argues that these German prisoners greatly benefitted wartime Alabama, and the citizens of Alabama in turn influenced these Germans both directly and indirectly. Experiences in Alabama led the Germans to a greater understanding of America, her citizens, and democracy. My paper uses many accounts of both Germans and Alabamians who experienced life in and around the prisoner of war camps to show the influences shared between these groups. Alabamians quickly learned that Germans were not the monsters shown in propaganda, but just regular humans. Most significantly, Germans noted the hypocritical treatment of African Americans in the so-called “land of freedom,” and camaraderie between these fellow prisoners was born out of their mutual frustration. My paper addresses life in Alabama prisoner of war camps, opinions about Germans in America, and how racial discrimination shaped the way Germans viewed America. All of these factors helped to change Germans’ view of wartime America and to determine their own place in a new, post-war world.

David Beutel, Samford University

Ebenezer’s “Good Conscience”: The Inevitability of Slavery in Colonial Georgia’s Most “Moral” Community

\footnote{Ms. Alsobrook and Mr. Leonard’s abstracts not available.}
This paper discusses the introduction of slavery in colonial Georgia by analyzing the economic, political, and theological influences on a Pietistic Lutheran settlement of German refugees at Ebenezer, Georgia. Why did these colonists, called Salzburgers, eventually consent to and advocate for a practice that some declared contradicted their own doctrine? The debate in secondary literature over the motivations of the Salzburgers has been inconclusive, but I compare the public writings of the Salzburgers’ minister Johann Martin Bolzius with the testimony of Ebenezer’s visitors and neighboring colonists to show the Salzburgers’ changing assessment of slavery was natural, albeit unforeseen by the Georgia Trustees who invited them to Georgia in part because of the Salzburgers’ free-labor stance. I conclude that the mixture of the religious authority of Ebenezer’s ministers with the secular authority given to them by the Trustees encouraged Ebenezer’s ministers to accommodate their theology to their secular desires for the settlement given that Ebenezer’s affairs were naturally interwoven with the economy and politics of the rest of Georgia. The Salzburgers’ ministers came from a theological background that was predisposed to make moral compromises on slavery, and in their roles at Ebenezer they were the primary influencers of the settlement’s moral and economic directions. By considering these factors, I reject charges in secondary literature that the Salzburgers were insincere in their religious doctrine. Instead, I favor a more nuanced approach to describing the challenges of the religious faithful in the economic and political climate of the southern English colonies.

**Shelby Cranford, Judson College**

The Voodoo Queen: The History and Life of the Most Talked about Priestess

In this paper I explored the life and death of the well-known Voodoo priestess, Marie Laveau. Not only does this paper explore the roots of what is now known as modern voodoo, but as well the roots of Laveau. At some point in her life there was much conflict with the practice of voodoo and Laveau was seen as the all-powerful in New Orleans. Many
believe that she is the reason that most of the homes are haunted. Through using the sources provided I have found that there are many aspects of Marie Laveau’s life that were overlooked and that made her life one to be remembered. To the ones who practice voodoo Laveau was and is the queen of voodoo. She is the one that people consider to have really brought it into what it is known as today. A popular television show included her in their series run and showed a little bit of what is true of her life. Although many of the stories that have been told about her, this paper explores and defines what is true and what is not. There are many people who look to her today as an icon and still believe that she is still around and practicing the art. In New Orleans the name Marie Laveau is one that has become feared in some parts. Many people visit the historic city just to see her burial site, and this paper tells of her death and eventually her body’s final resting place.

Rachel Fitts, Judson College

The Pazzi Conspiracy

This paper deals with the events leading up to and following the controversial Pazzi Conspiracy in Renaissance Italy in the 1470's and 80's. It analyzes the causes and events that led up to the assassination attempt of Florence's prominent leaders Lorenzo de' Medici and Giuliano de' Medici. It covers and details the event that took place in April 1478 during High Mass at the Florence Cathedral.

The paper includes the involvement of Pope Sixtus IV and other prominent figures from the Pazzi family and further analyzes the motives of these individuals. After the half-failed assassination attempt I cover the riots that ensued in Florence and throughout Italy as its citizens protest against the Pazzi family and express their outrage at the plot. Lorenzo's decree of treason sends the plotters and the majority of the Pazzi family into exile, but immense searches with enthusiasm and help from Italy's citizens bring the culprits back to justice.

The Pazzi family is forever exiled from Florence and forced to change their name.
I briefly discuss the disputation and short war with the Pope Sixtus IV and the city of Naples and its effects on Florence and Naples.

I also cover the outcome of Lorenzo's government and the changes he made after Florence's immense approval and support of his tyrannical rule over its citizens.

**Lillie Hobson, Judson College**

**Remember the Ladies: Recounting the Pen of Abigail Adams**

This paper examines the private letters that Abigail Adams wrote to her close friends, relatives, and most notably her husband John Adams. Adams' personal correspondence gives a poignant look at her personal ideals and opinions on various subjects of her day. Her letters also give a window into which to examine the extent of female education during the later part of the 1700s in regards to her unique usage of spelling and punctuation and also the extent of her literary background.

Adams wrote and expressed her views on a variety of topics including the inequality of educational opportunities between men and women, the political rights that women should be given, the freedom and liberties that the slave population should be allowed to possess, the need for the colonies to participate in a move to separate themselves from the British government, and the necessity for the newly formed United States government to remember the patriotic services that the women generously gave to their nation's cause. More personal matters that Adams wrote on include correspondence of adoration and feelings that she wrote to John Adams in their time our courtship and lengthy absences during his long public life of service, her appreciation of John for both his services to his country, and also in his role as an honorable father and husband.

With the focus on these letters, the paper examines Adams' political thoughts in light of the era in which she lived. Her revolutionary stance and political courage, in spite of her gender, is a critical analysis of this paper.
Rebecca Johnson, Troy University

Women’s Political Activism in Prohibition Repeal: A Study of the Women’s Organization for National Prohibition Reform

The Women’s Organization for National Prohibition Reform (WONPR), established in 1929, advocated for repeal of the Eighteenth Amendment and mobilized women politically. This study varies from previous scholarship in that it provides an in-depth look at WONPR’s strategies to mobilize members as political actors. WONPR used constitutional arguments in its call for repeal such as states’ rights and limited federal power, which stood apart from other women’s organizations during this period. WONPR’s arguments for repeal served a dual purpose—to retain a respectable image for women involved and to mobilize women into politics with direct, political language. Also in its push for repeal, WONPR selectively created partnerships with male-dominated organizations against Prohibition and rejected alliances with women’s groups. WONPR employed this highly selective strategy to gain recognition and political access in ways that women’s organizations could not offer the organization. WONPR positioned women to engage directly in the politics of repeal, which culminated in members’ involvement as delegates in the state conventions that ratified the Twenty-First Amendment. The experience that members gained from WONPR allowed some women to continue their political work afterwards through elected office or public administration. WONPR did not dramatically alter women’s political involvement for the nation as a whole but it offered women an alternative form of political activism.

Ansley Markwell, Troy University

Progressive Movements of the American Communist Party in the Early Twentieth Century

The purpose of this project is to examine the role of the American Communist Party in the progressive movements and reforms of the early twentieth century. This research contains the involvement of the
American Communist Party in the creation of labor unions as well as its participation in the fight for racial equality in the early 1900s. The American Communist Party was involved in these movements and reforms as active and included participants—not as outsiders on the fringe. This focus showcases the continually evolving relationship between the American Communist Party and the Soviet-controlled Comintern and how this affected the American Communist policies in regards to events in the United States. The research draws upon primary sources such as the Communist Manifesto as well as the legal documents from the Scottsboro Boys case and newspaper articles from that time. This research highlights the progressive contributions to American history and society from alternative political parties.

**Jesse Miles, University of West Alabama**

Napoleon, Davout, and the Check to Ambition: The Impact of Fatigue and Fear of Failure at Borodino

The Battle of Borodino was the costliest battle during the French march towards Moscow. Due to the frontal assault type of battle, the losses were high for both sides. Marshall Louis Davout proposed an ambitious maneuver to outflank the weak Russian left and drive them towards the other half of the Grand Army. Napoleon knew the significance of the battle. He knew that this was an opportunity to strike the opposition for a decisive victory. He also knew that practicality of such a move was next to impossible. Napoleon disregarded Davout's proposition for such an ambitious movement because the French Grand Army was exceptionally fatigued, and he feared a failure reminiscent of Eylau.

**Natalie Mooney, West Alabama**

*Le Resistance*

After France was defeated by Germany in 1940, the leaders of the National Assembly decided to give Phillipe Petain full governmental authority. He and his cabinet agreed to sign the Franco-German armistice with the German government. This armistice formed Vichy France,
which would eventually become a large source of controversy within the country. Although the popular perception is that France never contributed anything more beyond the Battle of France, France did in fact contribute throughout the war. It was not, however, by any legal means. Throughout France people disagreed with the ease in which the French government had surrendered to the Germans. These people eventually began to form what the Franco-German armistice termed guerilla groups and what the French people called Le Resistance. Despite the name, this was not a singular entity; rather, it was a collective term referencing the individual resistant groups throughout France and outside of the country. Vichy and the Resistance were heavily interdependent because the Vichy policies enacted by Petain and his Prime Minister Pierre Laval had profound effects on the public’s opinion of the resistance. This change in opinion led to increased numbers of resistance organizations and it also created support for the resistance. This support for Le Resistance allowed the organizations to cause more effective disruptions to the Germans within the country and eventually allowed the Resistance to pull off their largest plans in conjunction with Operation Overlord.

**Sean Moran, Birmingham-Southern College**

**A Fair Hope of Success: The Extent of Racial and Gender Equality in the Fairhope Single Tax Colony**

Fairhope, Alabama, founded in 1894 by Populists and followers of Henry George’s progressive ideology, served as a testing ground for more than economic ideas. This paper examines the manner in which women and African-Americans were treated within the Fairhope single tax colony with special emphasis placed on attitudes about racial and gender equality held by the colony’s founders and principal leaders during the colony’s first forty-five years of existence (1890-1939). Most early historical research about Fairhope is concerned with its unique tax system and its economic effects, but Paul Gaston, Cathy Donelson, and Mary Louis Timbers have examined social and cultural aspects of the community. While these historians display no overt biases, their intimate
ties to Fairhope warrant an outside critical examination of the single tax colony. Relying principally on archived editions of The Fairhope Courier, the records of the Fairhope Museum of History, and photographs collected by various authors, this paper concludes that while the single tax colony embraced the concept of gender equality, it accommodated racial inequality for several years before improving its race relations.

Marianna Nichols, Judson College

Bacchic and Christian Persecutions

This essay seeks to address the question of whether or not analysis of the Romans’ second century restrictions against the Bacchic cult may lead to any pertinent conclusions concerning the later persecution of Christians; while investigating this issue, the essay will concurrently observe the differing ways in which scholarly opinions concerning the connections between these two alternative religions have varied. This thesis question is intriguing in that it addresses a particularly puzzling question; namely, why did the Romans, ordinarily hailed for their tolerance, react so decisively against the Bacchic cult. Any potential answer to this query may be pertinent to the later study of Roman responses to Christianity, as this religion presents the other major, known instance in which the Romans are seen to have acted aggressively against an alternative cult. Understanding the problems associated with the Bacchic cult may, thus, provide greater enlightenment as to why the Romans would ultimately come to have issues with Christians. Though there will likely be any great variance of opinion when attempting to address this concept of Bacchic-Christian similarity, evaluation of both past and more current opinions on this topic may provide elucidation not only into how the ancients reacted against certain cults but also the way in which perceptions and understandings of such events have been presented.
Matthew O’Leary, University of North Georgia

The Legacy of the Risorgimento on Italian Identity, Nationalism, and the Rise of Fascism

Prevailing scholarship promotes the narrative that the period and influence of the Risorgimento, the Italian unification movement, began in 1796 with Napoleon’s invasion of Italy and closed with the successful unification of Italy by 1870. Ideas of revolution, nationalism, and liberalism initially influenced the moment. However, scholars often overlooked the unsettled influences which the Risorgimento, or “Resurgence” in English, had on Italian national conceptions of their identity leading up to the fascist era of the 1920s and ‘30s. Using government documents, letters, and propaganda publications, this paper argues that Mussolini’s Fascist movement synthesized three competing ideas of the Risorgimento to shape Italian identity over half the century after the official end of the Risorgimento period. These ideas are the populism of Giuseppe Garibaldi, the conservatism of Camillo di Cavour, and the continually redrawn claims of terra irredenta, or land perceived by nationalists as culturally or historically Italian. Fascism fused these formerly competing ideologies under the fascist banner and focused on applying the methods of Garibaldi and Cavour to expanded claims of terra irredenta. Thus, the end of the direct influence of the Risorgimento on Italian political culture came not with the official unification of the Kingdom but rather with the defeat of Fascism. This defeat saw the claims of terra irredenta officially renounced, the Cavourian approach stripped of any remaining international legitimacy, and the Garibablian mythos of achieving populous aims through the use of force of arms discredited.

Leslie Pope, Judson College

How the Exchange of Food Crops During the Columbian Exchange Affected Both the Old World and the New World
The Columbian Exchange which began when Christopher Columbus set sail in 1492 is one of the most important exchanges in history. It was responsible for exchanging people, ideas, and diseases from the Old World to the New World and vise-versa. However, the most important commodity that the exchange facilitated was the foods and other gifts from the two worlds. Cuisines of many countries would be entirely different today had they not been revolutionized by the exchange. Not only did the exchange bring life to local cuisine, these new food products had other uses as well, especially in the world of medicine. Columbus’ voyages helped shape the world as we see it today. Foods such as tomatoes, potatoes, and chocolate were all beneficiaries of the exchange and without it countries in the Old World may have never received them. The foods and dishes found in both the Old and New Worlds are important staples and they have all received the gifts of the exchange. The main purpose of this paper is to discuss the topic of food crops traded between both worlds and the way they have affected global cuisine and cultures. Attention will also be given to the gifts that the Old World gave the New World and their effects on cuisine, culture, and overall quality of life.

Sam Rogers, Samford University

The History of the Bangor Cave Nightclub

This research tells the story of Alabama’s scandalous, underground speakeasy. Today, the Bangor Cave Night Club and Speakeasy is a little known venue of the past. In the mid-1930s, however, Alabamians far and wide followed the progression of Alabama’s underground nightclub. This paper focuses on the lifespan of the Bangor Cave Nightclub and Speakeasy, a unique, if not illicit, hangout for high society in the conservative South. While the club was only active for a limited amount of time, the cave’s landscape endured. Over the course of the twentieth century, the cave’s identity developed with the town in which it was housed. No longer a functioning institution, Bangor Cave currently stands idle with a scant resemblance to its former life.
Built inside a cave in northern Alabama, the mysterious caverns that housed the Bangor Cave Nightclub offered the chance for an economically failing town to enliven its nights with the thrills of any major city: including gambling and drinking in a town where the two were illegal. More so, the Bangor Cave Nightclub even offered a grandiose experience to guests who were unaware of the illegitimate activities housed within the establishment. After its time as a nightclub ended, Bangor Cave still held a vital role to the town of Bangor. For the remainder of the twentieth century, Bangor, Alabama fulfilled the role that its community needed and eventually fell into an unpleasant state, leaving much to be desired by its glorious past.

This work is centered on primary documentation describing the construction and demise of the Bangor Cave Nightclub. The life of the Bangor Cave Nightclub and Speakeasy presents an interesting historical narrative to the detailed interaction between humans and caves, questioning the relationship that humans share with their natural environment.

**Jay Sandlin, University of West Alabama**

Marxism through the Slave Trade: Tragedy from the Golden Age of Social History

The record of American slavery and the study of tribulations for its victims has fundamentally changed in a relatively short period of time. My research examined the shifts in focus through situated inferences that led various historians into what I consider to be the “Golden Age” in social history in American slavery studies. A grassroots focus on the plight of individuals in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries marked a notable era of reexamination and outright rejection of traditional viewpoints regarding slavery.

My research presented classical, contemporary, and revisionist viewpoints that clashed in the annals of slavery historiography. The rising focus on social history, cultural shifts, and liberal academic freedom led to a revised scholarship to the record that dulled the
traditional lionization of capitalistic ventures. Most importantly it dispelled an environment that allowed for slavery apologetics. In finding the best voices from the studies into the social history of slavery my research sought the latest in scholarship from Marcus Rediker, Stephanie Smallwood, Edward Baptist, and other contributors. My research concluded the later twentieth and twenty-first century saw a flood of Marxist-based critiques of slavery through social history studies and predicted the future path of the field.

Margaret Schultz, Samford University

The Guatemalan Defeat Through Victoria 82: How Rural Violence Increased During the Guatemalan Civil War from 1982 to 1983

General Efrían Ríos Montt served as President of Guatemala for a year and a half from 1982 to 1983. During this short presidency, at least two thousand Guatemalan people are believed to have been killed and thousands more were raped, tortured, or displaced because of the tactics Ríos Montt used to fight the communist guerrillas. While many historians have examined Ríos Montt’s presidency, this paper focuses specifically on his Plan de Campaña Victoria 82 and how its means of implementation failed to achieve its goals of reducing violence, and instead significantly increased violence in rural areas. This was accomplished by examining a variety of primary and secondary sources spanning from interviews, human rights reports, and documentaries, to documents from the U.S. State Department. This research indicated that rural violence increased due to Victoria 82 because the plan implemented: 1) a scorched earth campaign that resulted in wide-spread military violence and massacres of civilians; 2) the destruction of villages by military forces, displacing over 500,000 people and forcing those who were captured into harsh, military-run camps; and 3) civil patrols made up of citizens, who were intended to combat guerrillas, but instead inflicted even more violence on rural populations, both by their own behavior and by inciting guerrilla retaliation. This research emphasizes the cruelty of Ríos Montt’s presidency, showing that his plan
Victoria 82 did not help end violence, but rather made violence a matter of policy.

**Keely Smith, Samford University**

**Power of the Mob: The Role of Effigies as Identity Markers in Colonial America**

Modern Americans often recognize the Founding Fathers, some of the country’s first great thinkers, as the trailblazers of the American Revolution. While these leaders’ collaboration and determination were essential to the colonies’ independence, many fail to realize the indispensable role of the colonial crowd, often referred to as the mob, in precipitating the Revolution and in formulating the American identity. One of the most common forms of mob action was the centuries-old tradition of the usage of effigies to represent the most hated or blamed figures in society, and this practice was continued in the American colonies. Although colonial effigies were originally crafted to demonstrate loyalty to England, the creation of the Stamp Act angered colonists and inspired effigies depicting stamp collectors and other colonial officials. However, the mob did not express a complete shift in national loyalty or show aspirations for independence until after the Declaration of Independence, which is when effigies of the King emerged. Through analysis of colonial mob ritual, specifically of Pope’s Day celebrations, Stamp Act demonstrations, and the demolition of King George III’s statue at Bowling Green, New York, in 1776, I argue the colonists’ change of effigial targets in mob demonstrations served as a representation of the evolving colonial identity from British to American. This research demonstrates the under-appreciated role of the colonial mob in the circular support system of ideological encouragement that arose between the elites and the crowd, which simultaneously provoked and responded to the widespread usage of effigies in the colonies.
Whitney Spake, Troy University

Stalin’s Poland

Joseph Stalin was infamous for his leadership of the Soviet Union and his hard line policies. However, what many are unaware of is Stalin’s policies in the late 1930s and early 1940s centered on his paranoia of a minority uprising. Despite the suppression of the minority, Stalin, as in the case with the “Polish Military Organization,” imagined fictional enemies of the state.

Due to the fear and paranoia of both real and unreal enemies usurping Stalin’s authority, Stalin utilized the NKVD, the People’s Commissariat for Internal Affairs, to suppress the minority. While my paper highlights the NKVD’s actions towards Poland, the Poles were not the only group explicitly targeted by Stalin; they were simply one of many minority groups.

When Stalin invaded Poland in 1939, he then utilized the NKVD to eliminate the minority. The elimination of the Poles was seen in both executions, such as Katyn, and deportations, many were sent to Kazakhstan. Through my research, I show the methods carried out by the NKVD, orders from Stalin, and reactions from Poles during 1939-1941. Many primary source accounts from survivors were used to show the cruelty of Stalin’s policies and the extent Stalin went to in order to eliminate the minority he so feared. Through my paper I show a different angle of Stalin, a Stalin who fears minority groups will take his power. This paranoia resulted in the deaths and deportations of hundreds of thousands of people across the Soviet Union.
Ebenezer’s “Good Conscience’: The Inevitability of Slavery in Colonial Georgia’s Most “Moral” Community

David Beutel

On the morning of May 18, 1734, Israel Christian Gronau experienced for the first time a dilemma that would shape the rest of his life: he was given the task of assigning punishment to a black slave who had violently threatened a white overseer. Gronau, a recently arrived Lutheran refugee in the new British colony called Georgia, detested the institution of slavery for moral reasons, yet he found the responsibility of dealing with a slave-based economy nevertheless thrust upon him. He was a pastor of the newly formed Ebenezer settlement, and in that capacity he oversaw much of the settlement’s progress towards economic self-sufficiency. However, Gronau’s main charge was to care for the spiritual development of his flock, and his desire to evangelize pushed him to see all human beings as potential converts. Gronau’s two roles thus left him indecisive in his judgement of the slave cast before him. After hesitating and asking a nearby parishioner to take charge, Gronau watched the slave succumb to a whipping while Gronau stepped back into the ironic position of being a white Lutheran minister who had assented easily to such a punishment.1

Pastor Gronau had traveled far in the preceding months. Gronau and his superior, Pastor Johann Martin Bolzius, crossed the Atlantic in the early months of 1734 with a small contingent of Lutheran refugees who had been expelled from their native Salzburg in 1731.2 After temporarily wandering in Bavaria, twenty-five of these Salzburgers traveled to Britain at the invitation of the Society for the Promotion of Christian

---

2 On October 31, 1731, the Catholic Archbishop of Salzburg, Count Lepold Anton Eleutherius von Firmian, completed his political struggle to evict all Protestants from the city. His Edict of Expulsion intensified the persecution of Salzburg’s Protestants because instead of allowing religious exiles the customary three years mandated by the 1648 Treaty of Westphalia, Firmian required that they leave within eight days. Salzburg’s Lutheran community was especially targeted. See George Fenwick Jones, *The Salzburger Saga: Religious Exiles and Other Germans Along the Savannah* (Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 1984), 5-11.
Knowledge, a missionary organization working in the British colonies. The SPCK convinced a sympathetic King George II to resettle the Salzburgers in Georgia in hopes they would prove their reputation as hardworking model subjects. Georgia’s Trustees agreed to this plan, and the Salzburgers arrived in Savannah in March of 1734.3

In an attempt to maintain denominational purity under Anglican Georgia’s Trustee government, the two pastors strictly held to their theological background in Lutheran Pietism. Both Bolzius and Gronau came to the Salzburg congregation from the Francke Foundation in Halle, Prussia where they studied and taught under its founder, August Hermann Francke, a chief leader of the Pietist movement.4 Once in Georgia, the pastors submitted their offices to the authority of a “constitution” for their new congregation, named Jerusalem Evangelical Lutheran Church. In keeping with the Pietistic ideal of pastors who did not only preach but also oversaw the communal development of Christian morality, this constitution charged all church officers with “see[ing] that all sins, disgraceful conduct, and scandal be avoided; or otherwise, duly punished and corrected.” One way the pastors heeded this charge was by identifying sin through bold public declarations on matters of moral ambiguity, the largest of which was slavery. Bolzius denounced slavery in his regular reports to Samuel Urlsperger, one of the Salzburgers’ “Reverend Fathers” in Europe, asserting “no Christian can buy such a black in good conscience, since it is known how such things usually come to pass; for they are snatched away from their own country and brought here, although people seek to paint the matter in favorable colors.” Slavery’s brutal nature was an offense to Christian morality, and as such slavery should have no place in the Salzburgers’ new settlement.5

---

3 Jones, The Salzburger Saga, 5-11.
5 Ebenezer Record Book, 1754-1781: Births, Baptisms, Marriages and Burials of Jerusalem Evangelical Lutheran Church of Effingham, Georgia, More Commonly Known as Ebenezer Church.
However, beginning in 1749 Bolzius seemingly reversed his position by advocating for the introduction of slavery. Bolzius first signed a petition to the Trustees, requesting the ban on slavery be lifted. After slavery’s official legalization in Georgia in 1751, Bolzius partook of the institution he once publicly condemned, acquiring several slaves for himself as well as pursuing a policy of non-interference towards his parishioners who wished to do the same. Historians disagree over the exact cause of Bolzius’s reversal. Philip Strobel and Douglas Stange argue that Bolzius’s stance reflected the views of his parishioners and that the Salzburgers’ morality was never in doubt. For Strobel, writing before the American Civil War, the Salzburgers accepted slavery grudgingly, intending all the while to use righteous motives to repulse the tide of history. For Stange, writing in the mid-twentieth century, the Salzburgers embraced the coming of slavery as a benefit for their evangelization practices. Since the Salzburgers had limited means of going where the majority of slaves were, God brought slaves to Georgia so the Salzburgers could convert them. These two authors assume Bolzius and the Salzburgers recognized the humanity of slaves, but other authors such as George Fenwick Jones and Codrina Cozma dispute the notion that the Salzburgers had righteous motivations. Jones contends that while there is evidence to support a sympathetic view of slaves among Salzburger leaders, the rhetorical purposes and political audiences for these writings necessitated a selective editing of Bolzius’s daily journal and correspondence from Ebenezer. Hence, Bolzius’s acceptance of slavery worked towards his overarching desire to preserve the Salzburgers’ tenuous hold on their presence in Georgia. For Cozma also, interpreting Bolzius’s rhetorical reversal on slavery through the lens of his personal feelings on the issue is irrelevant. Instead, she argues that Bolzius’s myriad of professional duties as the leader of the settlement necessitated a response to slavery’s all-but-inevitable presence that would ensure the settlement’s survival. Bolzius may indeed have personally opposed slavery on moral grounds, but the opposing view of his parishioners and other Georgia colonists demanded that he accede to the politically expedient.  


6 Jones, The Salzburger Saga, 103; Detailed Reports, 7:194-195; P.A. Strobel, The Salzburgers and their Descendants, 1855, (Reprint, Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 1953); Douglas C.
Who, then, is responsible for the Salzburgers’ inconsistency on the issue of slavery? A careful analysis of primary source material leads to skepticism of Bolzius’s claims about slavery in his public writings due to his obvious desire to remain in the good graces of both secular and religious European authorities. Given the lack of extant writings not meant for review by these authorities, it is nearly impossible to ascertain Bolzius’s personal views on slavery from written material. By comparing evidence from Bolzius’s writings against the testimony of other visitors to the Salzburgers at Ebenezer, I intend to show the organic nature of the Salzburgers’ changing views on slavery: by taking advantage of the Salzburgers’ subordination to their ministers and while recognizing the ministers’ Pietistic attraction to free labor during the colonization process, the Georgia Trustees unintentionally ensured the expansion of slavery, the opposite economic system, among the Salzburger community.

The Trustees accomplished this primarily by allowing the Salzburger’s ministers to hold secular authority over Ebenezer. Bolzius and Gronau’s spiritual authority over their flock made them ideal candidates for secular authority, and their religious authority over Ebenezer was the first source of the town’s civic connections with other parts of Georgia. Because Bolzius was one of very few German ministers in Georgia, colonial officials asked him to preach occasionally to the German Reformed (Calvinist) congregations in Savannah, reasoning that “it was better to have a Lutheran sermon in German than a Calvinist sermon in English.” Bolzius agreed, and during his occasional sojourns to Savannah, he became politically involved in the debate over slavery in Georgia. On one such trip in October of 1749, Bolzius presented the Salzburgers’ moral perspective on slavery and was intrigued by the perspectives brought by leaders from around the colony. After returning to Ebenezer, he could not help but remain involved in the discussion through correspondence, desiring a copy of the proposed regulations for slavery under consideration by the Trustees. Bolzius recognized that

developments in other parts of the colony would affect Ebenezer sooner or later, so he resolved to have a hand in shaping the colony’s future.7

The ministers’ secular authority gave them this ability to interweave Ebenezer’s affairs with the economy and politics of the rest of Georgia. After another trip to Savannah in January of 1750, Bolzius recorded his interactions there with James Habersham,8 who offered to buy slaves for the monetarily poor Salzburgers on his own credit after hearing Bolzius complain of the Salzburgers’ meager agricultural yields. A trip in September of that year convinced Bolzius to tell Urlsperger of Ebenezer’s need for a new sawmill which, through trade, could alleviate the town’s debts. Bolzius was also involved with Ebenezer’s participation in the silk industry due to his civic position. In a 1757 letter, Henry Ellis, Georgia’s second royal governor, described Ebenezer’s silk filature and the various arguments over how to best manage it.9 Ellis mentioned that Bolzius had a stake in the filature because the silk industry, if expanded at Ebenezer, would benefit the Salzburgers by giving marketable skills to Ebenezer’s women. Before Georgia’s royal administration began the Trustees had promised to pay Bolzius a stipend for his advocacy for expansion of the silk industry in Georgia. By advocating for various economic causes, Bolzius could ensure that white productivity, as well as black productivity in the slave era, enhanced relations between Ebenezer and Georgia’s other towns.10

If Bolzius and his fellow ministers were so ensconced with various types of authority, what caused them to relent and allow slavery’s introduction into Ebenezer? One answer is that these ministers came from a
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7 Jones, The Salzburger Saga, 44; Detailed Reports, 13:120-121.
8 Habersham (1712?-1775) was a planter, one-time manager of the orphanage at Bethesda, and colonial politician who steadily rose through the ranks of Georgia politics. He eventually served as President of the Georgia Council and as acting royal governor during the 1770s. He had three sons, James Jr., Joseph, and John, two of whom became colonial leaders in the Revolutionary era. See Harold Davis, The Fledgling Province: Social and Cultural Life in Colonial Georgia, 1733-1776, (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1976), 40 and passim, 41-247. For proof of Habersham’s wealth and political connections, see National Society Colonial Dames of America in the State of Georgia, Atlanta Town Committee, Abstracts of Colonial Wills of the State of Georgia, 1733-1777, (Hapeville, GA: Longino & Porter, 1962), 65-66.
9 A filature was a place where raw silk threads could be removed from cocoons and spun onto reels. See “filature, n.,” Oxford English Dictionary Online, March 2016, Oxford University Press (accessed May 11, 2016).
10 Jones, The Salzburger Saga, 103; Detailed Reports, 14:18, 14:128-129; Henry Ellis to the Board of Trade, 11 March, 1757, Original Papers of Governors Reynolds, Ellis, Wright, and Others, 1757-1763, vol. 28, part 1 of The Colonial Records of the State of Georgia (Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 1976), 12; Detailed Reports, 14:19.
theological background that was predisposed to make moral compromises on slavery. Training in the individualism expressed by the Pietism of the Francke Foundations influenced the ministers to consider all moral dilemmas in terms of providential retrospection. That is, every situation could be used by God to further his purposes (and thus could be good) even if a temporal government chose to mandate disobedience to one of God’s specific moral commands as expressed in the Bible. This was not Calvinistic predestination or determinism. The Pietists did not believe that specific real outcomes were divinely chosen to occur; instead, while God might praise the morality of certain actions above others, he was able to accomplish his purposes through a myriad of possible temporal events. It was in this tradition that Bolzius, Gronau, and Hermann Heinrich Lembke, Gronau’s replacement, studied and taught immediately before receiving the call to pastor the Salzburgers.11

The ministers continued in this tradition when dealing with the question of slavery. When Bolzius first heard of the Trustees’ willingness to give in to the demands of Georgia colonists for slaves, he expressed his reaction in providential terms, saying “I do not feel that I can object when people wish to introduce Negroes into our community; in this as in all things I trust in God, who will show us in good time whether or not this practice is of any advantage to our people here.” This did not imply that Bolzius did not take into account temporal factors. He recognized that the introduction of slavery would jeopardize white Salzburgers’ earning potential, and he expressed frustration at the colonial situation which suppressed his moral stance against slavery. However, “God’s hand could be involved in this matter,” so a sensitivity to God’s will relegated Bolzius’s views to little more than personal preferences. However much Bolzius personally detested the institution of slavery, he agreed to baptize slave children into the church during his ministry at Ebenezer. The subjectivity which was characteristic of Bolzius’s Pietistic faith had facilitated a step towards slavery’s eventual ascendency.12

The debate about slavery in Georgia began early in the colony’s history. Some groups that the Trustees invited into Georgia vowed to maintain free white labor as their standard work practice. One such group was the


12 _Ebenezer Record Book_, 22-38; _Detailed Reports_, Vol. XIV, 93-95.
Salzburgers. On Bolzius’s first trip back to Savannah from the primitive early Ebenezer town site, he condemned the colonial capital’s inhabitants for “Laziness, Drunkenness, and several Disorders” which disqualified them from reaping the benefits of the town’s intercolonial commerce. In contrast, Bolzius described the Salzburgers as hardworking and willing to “[build] their own Houses and [till] the Ground” when not constrained by other pious obligations. However, other colonists desired the introduction of as many slaves as possible. Even before the Salzburgers arrived, Samuel Eveleigh, a South Carolina merchant, expressed a common proslavery argument in an early letter to James Oglethorpe, writing that European immigrants were not physically capable of taking full economic advantage of Georgia’s large amount of virgin forest. Whites “were not used to Worke” and would have great difficulty felling trees and planting the necessary crops such as corn in Georgia’s hot climate. The Trustees ultimately rejected Eveleigh’s argument when crafting laws for the new colony, deciding to found Georgia as a haven for white debtors and religious refugees (as well as a military buffer against Spanish Florida) instead of an economic venture for would-be slaveholding aristocrats.13

After the Trustees’ initial refusal to permit slavery, pressure from the colony took a different form. Although economic reasons were the primary motivations for planters to support slavery, many colonists allowed other perspectives to influence the specifics of how they believed slavery should be introduced. One set of reasons was political. Eveleigh wrote several times to Oglethorpe and Benjamin Martyn, one-time secretary to the Trustees, asking the Trustees to exercise more oversight in ensuring a limited number of slaves entered Georgia. This arrangement, he said, would provide Georgia with a “golden mein [sic]” of slaves, ensuring there would be enough slaves to meet agricultural demand while making certain there would not be enough slaves to foment a successful rebellion such as that which had occurred in the northern colonies. Eveleigh used the Carolinas as an example of a slave importation policy to be avoided, noting that imprudent Carolinians allowed ten times the number of slaves as in the Jerseys, where a recent slave uprising put that colony’s white inhabitants in danger. Behind Eveleigh’s statement was also the ever-present danger of being in close

proximity to Spanish Florida. Since the founding of Georgia, English settlers had been wary of provoking the Spaniards to war without sufficient military force. In turn, the Spaniards, with their eye on Savannah, took advantage of Georgia’s relatively weak defenses and provoked the colony’s native Indian population to disrupt colonists’ home life and commercial ventures. The natives, encouraged by Spanish bribes, were especially disposed to stealing or driving off horses from Georgia’s outlying settlements. If the Spaniards could influence the Indians, they could influence Georgia’s slave population to do the same. (The prospect of further Spanish incursion in Georgia’s affairs and any sign of military campaigns frightened the colony’s inhabitants because of Georgia’s numerical inferiority, so much so that in 1742 Bolzius offered to bolster Savannah’s military contingent with Salzburgers.) Because of the obvious legitimacy of these fears, Georgia colonists could sincerely advocate for the introduction of a limited number of slaves, all the while maintaining the notion that those slaves were economically essential.14

The economic arguments for slavery as set forth by Eveleigh and others appealed to the Salzburgers due to the demands of Georgia’s social and agricultural cohesiveness. The presence of social and agricultural ties between the Salzburgers and other Georgia colonists ensured that the Salzburgers had opportunities and frustrations that were similar to those experienced by the rest of the colony. First, the strength of Ebenezer’s own identity contributed to its high esteem among the rest of Georgia. Before the introduction of slavery, Ebenezer was a home for several major social institutions that only existed in a few places in the colony. By 1750, the Trustees had given Ebenezer one of Georgia’s three original general stores, and the town had erected one of Georgia’s three major libraries of the early colonial era. Besides the library, Ebenezer possessed other rare educational institutions that assisted in promoting Bolzius’s Pietistic mission. The Salzburgers began municipal planning for a wide-reaching system of schools immediately after arriving in Georgia,-desiring to educate children both in Ebenezer itself and on

surrounding plantations. The Salzburgers saw the education of children as a way to promote the sustainability of religious knowledge, so the Salzburgers regarded access to education as an essential part of their society. At the request of the Trustees, teachers in these schools taught English to their pupils, in order to warm relations with other Georgians who had little familiarity with the German language or had tended to ignore Ebenezer due to ignorance of the Salzburgers’ culture. For a time, the Salzburgers also maintained an orphanage at Ebenezer, and Ebenezer’s name recognition grew due to the orphanage’s additional roles as a hospital and a hostel. These institutions proved to non-Salzburgers that Ebenezer was a place of civilization not to be regarded as inferior to that of English settlements.15

Residents of Ebenezer also came to possess many similar cultural experiences to those experienced elsewhere in Georgia. In regard to religion, Ebenezer hosted the famed clergyman and founder of Methodism, John Wesley, in 1737, and the prominent itinerant preacher and one-time parish minister of Savannah, George Whitfield, in 1738 and 1740. Due to Bolzius and Gronau’s training at the Francke Foundations at Halle, the home of denominational songwriters as well as theologians, the Salzburgers also acquired one of the most extensive musical traditions in all of Georgia. Their variety and quality of music attracted visitors to Jerusalem Church. However, Ebenezer also shared less joyful aspects of their culture with other Georgians. The general mortality rate among all Georgians, especially in the colony’s early years and particularly for infants, was high given the lack of doctors or in many places outside of Savannah and the colony’s major settlements. Taverns were another ubiquitous cultural aspect, and given the prevalence of taverns in Ebenezer after 1750, it is likely that many existed at the settlement before the introduction of slavery. Ebenezer’s orphanage brought in workers from other parts of the colony, in particular artisans such as shoemakers to fill the human needs of the orphan house’s occupants. These everyday experiences revealed Ebenezer’s cultural similarities to neighboring settlements and connected Ebenezer’s

---

populace with like-minded citizens and equivalent institutions elsewhere in Georgia.16

Additionally, common challenges arose from shared agricultural endeavors between Ebenezer and other Georgian settlements, and these challenges demanded the presentation of a united front in the colony’s correspondence with London. The Trustees had advocated for the development of the silk industry in Georgia, and progress in this industry continued under the later royal government. However, changes in the weather proved to make annual silk production levels variable. Governor John Reynolds bemoaned one low year to London officials, and the primacy he gave to Ebenezer in his correspondence about the silk issue proves that Ebenezer played a significant role in Georgia’s economy. In addition, Reynolds advocated on Ebenezer’s behalf to London by noting that reopening the town’s silk filature as a rival to the colony’s main filature at Savannah would benefit the colony’s silk industry as a whole. However, Reynolds made this desire contingent on his reception of proof of Ebenezer’s productivity, placing the responsibility for Ebenezer’s economic development on the town itself. By doing this, he indicated that if Ebenezer wanted to continue its progress towards dominance in Georgia’s silk industry, Ebenezer would have to express commercial solidarity with its neighbors in achieving a certain level of output. Out of economic self-interest, Ebenezer was bound to municipal cooperation.17

This evidence demonstrates that the pressure on Bolzius and other Ebenezer ministers to acquiesce to slavery was weighty. As the more senior minister, Bolzius in particular experienced substantial pressure to allow the Salzburgers to purchase slaves and put them to use in Ebenezer. The compound effect of Bolzius’s Pietistic theological background and his dual colonial roles as both the civic leader and religious leader of Ebenezer all but guaranteed that his personal beliefs would be accommodated to fit his worldly circumstances (assuming the moral condemnations of slavery he expressed in his public writings were his own views). Living with such varied responsibilities in such turbulent temporal circumstances drove him to publicly break with his religious

16 Jones, The Salzburger Saga, 42; George Whitfield, George Whitfield’s Journals (1737-1741) To Which is Prefixed His “Short Account” (1746) and “Further Account” (1747), (1905; repr., Gainesville, FL: Scholars’ Facsimiles & Reprints, 1969), 153-154, 436; Davis, The Fledgling Province, 196, 190-191, 89, 118, 111.
17 John Reynolds to the Board of Trade, 12 May 1756, Colonial Records, 27:115-116; Reynolds to the Board of Trade, 29 September 1756, Ibid., 27:291.
superiors and the Trustees’ original free labor plan for the Ebenezer settlement as expressed through the Trustees’ correspondence. If the Trustees had meant to oversee the development of a colony that used the conscientiousness of its “religious, industrious, and cheerful [p]eople” to pursue a North American utopia for white settlers, they had allowed the wrong individuals to become the wrong type of leaders needed to shepherd the Trustees’ ideal settlement in the new colony.

18 Jones, *The Salzburger Saga*, 16.
Remember the Ladies: Recounting the Pen of Abigail Adams

Lillie Hobson

My Friend,
Weymouth April th 16 1764

I think I write to you every Day. Shall not I make my Letters very cheep; don’t you light your pipe with them? I care not if you do, tis a pleasure to me to write, yet I wonder I write to you with so little restraint, for as a critic I fear you more than any other person on Earth, and tis the only character, in which I ever did, or ever will fear you. What say you? Do you approve of the Speech? Dont you think me a Courageous Being? Courage is a laudable, a Glorious Virtue in your Sex, why not in mine? (For my part, I think you ought to applaud me for mine.)- Exit Rattle. Solus your Diana.¹

This section of a letter from Abigail to John Adams, written six months before their marriage, shows a passing example of Abigail’s tenacity and opinion regarding her sex’s virtues and rights. Throughout her adult lifetime, Abigail used her letter writing to share her views with many of her friends and relatives, but most notably with her husband John Adams, a prominent figure during the colonies’ fight for Independence and later the second President of the newly formed United States. These letters give the deepest insight available into the life of Abigail Adams, a revolutionary of civil liberties in her own right.

 Providentially for future generations, a majority of her correspondence with her fellow contemporaries has survived throughout the centuries. During Abigail’s lifetime, it was very routine to save one’s correspondence, and the Adamses sensibly made sure to save “every scrap they wrote.”² According to Elizabeth Deane, the writer and producer of the NEH supported documentary titled John and Abigail Adams, “The letters are a wonderful window into a marriage of true

companions—which was also one of the greatest political partnerships in American history”.

Abigail was educated at home, and learned to read because of the customary practices during the 1700s for women to be able to at least read the Bible. Yet, it was not customary for young women to read secular literature, but Abigail did read this genre of books extensively primarily including Shakespeare, Pope, and Cowper. Abigail learned to write well by composing letters to relatives and young female friends. Her letters are constantly filled with emotion, humor, and her unique usage of spelling and punctuation. Because of her unstandardized usage of grammar and penmanship, according to Edith Gelles, “reflected the lack of rigor in women’s schooling during her childhood.”

Abigail Adams eventually saw the inequality between men and women’s educational opportunities and in 1776 during the midst of the Revolution wrote to John:

> I most sincerely wish that… our new constitution may be distinguished for Learning and Virtue. If we mean to have Heroes, Statesmen, and Philosophers, we should have learned women. The world perhaps would laugh at me, and accuse me of vanity, [but if] as much depend as is allowed upon the early Education of youth and the first principles which are instil[ld] take the deepest root, great benefit must arise from literary accomplishment in women.

She reiterated this same vein of thought in a letter to a friend writing, 

> It is really mortifying Sir, when a women possesd of a common share of understanding considers the difference of Education between the male and female Sex, even in those families where Education is attended too.

The basis of Abigail Adams’ view regarding education is that women should be educated equally and equivalently with men because they possess the same intelligence, cleverness, aptitude, and thirst for learning as men do.

---

5 Ibid.
To really understand the life and works of Abigail Adams, it is duly important to understand the role she played within the framework of her husband John Adams’ life and career. When the future couple first met, they found each other completely unflattering. John came across short, fat, and bald, whereas Abigail was quite slender in a time when being on the more fleshy side was thought of as being much more attractive. Yet, even after their dismal first meeting their interest for each other soon grew. The building attraction for each is most easily seen in their correspondence to one another. In the latter part of 1761, their written communication was quite scandalous in the context of their Puritan upbringings which included unambiguous terms of strong physical and sexual longings.\(^7\) An example from John addressed to “Miss Adorable,” dated October 4, 1762, reads,

> By the same token that the bearer hereof [JA] satt up with you last night, I hereby order you to give him, as many kisses, and as many Hours of your company after nine o’clock as he please to demand, and charge them to my account.\(^8\)

Even in the earliest letters, it is easy to see John’s tendency to write with a more boisterous, yet awkward style whereas the letters that survived from Abigail to John tend to expressed more of a greater and deeper affection for him. A letter from Abigail to John, that proclaims their mutual attraction as instinctual as well as being logical, reads:

> And there is a tye more binding than Humanity, and stronger than Friendship… unite these, and there is a threefold chord- and by this chord I am not ashamed to say that I am bound, nor do I [believe] that you are wholly free from it.\(^9\)

While sexual teases were apparent on both sides, most often they came from John in a standard inappropriate for the times. He wrote, “Patience my Dear! Learn to conquer your Appetites and Passions!”\(^10\) Abigail, though, had a tendency to not reply to John’s outpourings. Her preference was to express her intimate feelings by showing her concern for John’s health. Also, she would address John with the salutation “My

\(^8\) Ibid., 5.
\(^9\) Ellis. *First Famil*, 5.
Friend,” that in the eighteenth century borne a high level of intimacy not found in today’s twenty-first century language.11

Even though Abigail tended to not echo her emotions in the same regular occurrences as John, she would occasionally add a sensual tease to her writings. An example would be a letter she sent to him after they had spent the evening before together stating that she was glad they had departed because “we might, if we had been together, have been led into temptation.” Yet, she soon downplayed her tease by writing afterwards, “I don’t mean to commit any Evil, unless setting up late, and thereby injuring our Health, may be called so.”12 According to David McCullough,

> His marriage to Abigail Smith was the most important decision of John Adam’s life, as would become apparent with time. She was in all respects his equal and the part she was to play would be greater than he could possibly have imagined, for all his love for her and what appreciation he already had of her beneficial, steadying influence.13

Abigail Smith and John Adams were wed on October 25, 1764. Their marriage took place in Weymouth, in the same parlor where the first met each other and found the other one so dreadfully unappealing. Unfortunately, the information regarding the early years of their marriage together is rather sketchy because very few letters traveled between them during this time. Yet, in her very last letter to John before their marriage, Abigail wrote requesting his help to take in a cart of her belongings that she was forwarding to their new home in Braintree where she added in closing, “And then Sir, if you please you may take me.”14

In the beginning of their marriage, both John and Abigail provided dowries that provided more to them than what most couples had to start off with in comparison to the standards of New England at this time. John, whose father had died in 1761, brought a small house on top of sixty acres of land he had received through inheritance into their marriage. Abigail, on the other hand, provided a household servant

---

11 Ibid.
12 Ibid., 17.
14 Adams, Abigail, and John Adams. The Book of Abigail and John, 46.
named Julia, who, in some measure, was paid for by her father, and a cartload of furniture.  

One very important subject to comment on is the issue of their relationship to each other within the context of their marriage. During this period in New England, the wife was permanently fixed to the patriarchy hold on society, and she was wholly dependent on the means of her husband, for she could now not purchase or own property, and all her wealth she accumulated legally became his to do as he pleased with. Yet, John and Abigail, while still applying the patriarchal mold to their union, saw their marriage not only as partnership, but as a friendship. Within their own marriage, the division of labor between them was not entirely defined. While they each respectively attended to the expected duties as a mother and wife that served to her household obligations and as a husband and father that served as a provider and protector, they each added individualities to the marriage—Abigail as a “political confidante” and John as a deeply involved father in the lives of his children.”

According to Joseph Ellis,

In that sense they were both androgynous, not for any deeply ideological reasons but because neither one was comfortable denying any important dimension of their respective personalities. And the more they interacted, the more they defied rigid gender categories and completed each other.

The year and surrounding events in which Abigail and John spend their first years of their marriage together are very significant. During the decade following their wedding, key events that led to the American Revolution began to unfold. In 1765, the Stamp Act, which led to the colonial protest in defiance of their supposed “taxation without representation” argument that became the foundation of the American Revolution, was passed by Parliament. John soon was swept into the growing revolution and in 1774 was elected to the First Continental Congress as one of four men to represent the colony of Massachusetts. Abigail, though disliking the idea of her husband being in Philadelphia with the remainder of their family staying in Massachusetts, wrote John the following, “You cannot be, nor do I wish to see you, an inactive

---

15 Ellis. *First Family*, 7-8.
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17 Ellis. *First Family*, 17.
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spectator. We have too many high sounding words, and too few actions that correspond with them” John, however, was very apprehensive about his upcoming position as a Congressman and wrote her saying, “There is in Congress a collection of the greatest men upon this continent. I mope. I ruminate. I feel unutterable anxiety, unequal to their business.” John, even with his doubts, became one of the dynamic forces behind the Continental Congress’s vote for independence and one of the key negotiators for gaining peace with Britain.20

The years 1764-1774 would be the only decade that Abigail and John lived together regularly (with the exception of their three to four years in Europe together) until after John’s departure from the White House in 1801.21 Gelles commentary on their separation reads, “They were repeatedly separated for long periods during a quarter of a century, and the strongest link between them was the letters they wrote to each other. Neither of them anticipated this future when they took their vows in the Weymouth parsonage in 1764.”22

Even with the breaking national and political events embodying their first decade together, John and Abigail’s parenthood began not even nine months after their wedding with the birth of a little baby girl named Abigail, but most commonly known as “Nabby.” She was born on July 14, 1765 and was “the dear image of her still dearer Papa,” according to the records of the child’s mother.23 In three days short of Nabby’s second birthday, Abigail and John welcomed a little boy named John Quincy into the Adams family. They named their son after Abigail’s dying grandfather the day following his birth.24 After John Quincy’s birth, the Adams family moved from Braintree to the city of Boston and during this time Abigail was pregnant with their third child Savannah, who was born on December 28, 1768. Unfortunately, little Suky (what the family called Savannah) was a frail child. With the family living in the foul- aired city of Boston, Abigail decided to take Suky back to their farm in Braintree to be cared for by an unnamed relative, but which was most likely Abigail’s mother-in-law, while the other Adams family members remained in Boston. Sorrowfully, this arrangement did not work for

21 Gelles. First Thoughts, 22.
22 Ibid.
23 McCullough, David G. John Adams, 58.
Suky’s health, and on February 4, 1770 she passed away at the tender age of thirteen months old.\(^{25}\)

A month after Savannah’s burial, and two months before Abigail would give birth to their fourth child, the Boston Massacre erupted in the streets. Regrettably, Abigail’s opinion, if it was ever recorded, has not survived. Yet John, who loathed the idea of British soldiers occupying the town of Boston, believed the colonial crowd to be in the wrong and described them as “motley rabble of saucy boys, negroes and molattoes, Irish teagues, and out landish Jark Tarrs.” When Captain John Preston, the British soldier that the massacre revolved around, was arrested, John hastily agreed to represent him in court.\(^{26}\) According to Woody Holton, author of *Abigail Adams: A Life*, reports that,

> Part of his motivation was to disprove the widespread allegation that a British officer could never receive justice in an American court. If John could persuade the jury to acquit Preston, he would demonstrate that mobs like the one that had gathered outside the Customs House were not the true face of American resistance to imperial tyranny.\(^{27}\)

The mounting political fame that John was experiencing in the midst of their final two children being born—Charles, born in the summer of 1770, and Thomas Boylston, born September of 1772\(^{28}\)—gave Abigail more and more of a chance to really have an inside look at the coming revolution. Fortuitously for future generations, most of Abigail’s most honest opinions have been preserved through her personal correspondence with John, and numerous friends and relatives. In a letter that described the events of a day near the death of her mother, Abigail wrote John saying, “My pen is always freer than my tongue. I have wrote many things to you that I suppose I never could have talk’d.”\(^{29}\) This opinion of herself tended to be true in most cases, not just in describing personal events. The following pages will examine her influential opinions that she shared with her pen to not only John, but generations of freedom loving Americans to follow him.

Following their marriage in 1764, Abigail decided that her pseudonym ‘Diana” was too juvenile, thus she dropped the fictitious title and began
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signing her letters with her own name. However, in May of 1775 when she became fearful that her correspondence might be captured by the patriots’ enemy, she once again adopted a pseudonym, using the name Portia which referred to the unfailing supporting wife of Brutus, the assassin of Julius Caesar. Portia, in the eyes of both Abigail and her greatest friend Mercy Warren, was a powerful symbol that personified personal sacrifice for the cause of liberty.30

As already discussed, Abigail believed in the freedom and liberation not just for the colonists and her own sex, but the equality for the slave population as well. While Abigail had benefited from unpaid labor during her youth, no evidence has been found regarding a favorable opinion towards the practice of slavery. However, John and Abigail never even deliberated on the thought of purchasing a slave (their servant Julia was paid for her labor). At some unknown point during their marriage, they discussed their similar views of opposition on the issue. Abigail, writing John on September 22, 1774, states,

I wish most sincerely there was not a Slave in the province. It allways appeard a most iniquitous Scheme to me- fight ourselfs for what we are daily robbing and plundering from those who have as good a right to freedom as we have.31

In the latter part of 1775, a new aspect of their relationship showed its beginnings between them and it continued for forty-three years up until Abigail’s death. In the words of Holton, “Whenever John took a stand on some political issue, Abigail invariably adopted a more extreme version of the same view point.”32 The example Holton uses is that even when no one in the colonies favored separating from the British quite yet, John was already insistent on his congressional colleagues to act as if a cry of independence had already been declared. In a letter from John to James Warren dated July 24, 1775 (that was unfortunately intercepted by the Loyalists), he vied that the colonists “ought to have had in our Hands a month ago the whole Legislative, executive and judicial of the whole Continent, and have completely modeled a Constitution; o have raised a naval power and opened all our Ports wide.”33 Abigail, however, in a time span of only four months later wrote John using much more radical

30 Ibid., 74-75.
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language than he had previously used, said she could never join “in the petitions of our worthy parson, for reconciliation between our, no longer parent State, but tyrant State, and these Colonies. Let us separate.”

While the opinions of John and Abigail were both seamlessly together regarding the issue of American independence, they found themselves not only several steps ahead of the majority of the colonist’s opinion, but also in disagreement on how the colonies’ independence should look like once it was finally reached. Abigail wrote John in a political rant,

If we separate from Britain, what Code of Laws will be established? How shall we be governed to retain our Liberties? Can any government be free which in not administered by general stated Laws? Who shall be frame these Laws? Who will give them force and energy?

Abigail’s poignant questions would developed into a concise framework that would dictate the negotiations and discussions of the American statesmen during the years following the revolution. John answered her questions, not in a personal letter, but by publishing it in *Thoughts on Government* in April of 1776. Instead of focusing on a national governmental scene like Abigail had questioned him on, he preferred to give his thoughts on how a state government should be ran. He believed that if he focused on the national level government so early on during the revolution, it would be politically suicidal for his career because of the controversies that might develop from such a proposal. In his article in *Thoughts on Government*, John proposed that each state adopt a system of government composed of three branches (the executive, judicial, and legislative) with the distinguishing structures of the principle of checks and balances, a bicameral legislature, and an independent judiciary. This structure of government by John became particularly important aspects of the federal Constitution eleven years later.

During the beginnings of the revolution while John was away, the separation was a particular hardship for Abigail. For her, the extra duties that were required of her to attend to her household and farm at Braintree were but a small infortune. She considered herself very lucky considering the she never lost her land or properties, her husband was neither killed nor disabled, and although the areas surrounding her land
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was threatened by the British it was never lost or destroyed; yet, the worst portion of the Revolution was her constant struggle of loneliness, fear, and anger that is expressed often and deeply in her letters.37

In 1777, after a brief visit with his family, John once again was called to attend business in Philadelphia. Abigail wrote to a friend,

I had it in my heart to dissuade him from going and I know I could have prevailed, but our public affairs at that time were so gloomy an aspect that I thought if ever his assistance was wanted it must be at such a time. I therefore resigned myself to suffer much anxiety and many melancholy hours for this year to come.38

While her letters expressed her fear and loneliness, they also included much information about her domestic life, along with being both warm and passionate concerning her absence from John. In April of 1776, she wrote to John saying,

I miss my partner, and find myself unequitable to the cares which fall upon me; I find it necessary to be the directress of our husbandry and farming.... I hope in time to have the Reputation of being as good a Farmeress as my partner has of being a good Statesman.39

The more passion filled moments followed:

Write me how you do this winter. I want to say many things I must omit, it is not fit to wake the Soul by tender strokes of art, or to ruminate upon happiness we might enjoy, least absence become intolerable. Adieu Yours.40

In the postscript she added the comment, “I wish you would burn all my Letters.”41

Several issues plague her temper, but one of the most distressing issues to her was the constant lack of credit given to women for their sacrifices and patriotic services.42 In the spring of 1776, Abigail wrote John the
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most quoted letter of her existence to combat his form of government he had published in *Thoughts on Government.* It reads,

> And, by the way, in the new code of laws which I suppose it will be necessary for you to make, desire you will remember the ladies and be more generous and favorable to them than your ancestors. Do not put such unlimited poser in the hands of husbands. Remember, all men would be tyrants if they could. If particular care and attention is not paid to the ladies, we are determined to foment a rebellion, and will not hold ourselves bound by any laws in which we have no voice or representation.\(^{43}\)

Unfortunately for Abigail, John answered on the conclusion that she was simply being “playful,” which in some extent she was, however John did not infer the seriousness that underlined her message. He replied that he knew all men understood that their wives were the real tyrants in the home, and that he had no objective of substituting the dictatorship of King George III for “the Despotism of the Petticoat.” To make his opinion so much less favorable to Abigail, he added, “As to your extraordinary Code of Laws, I cannot but laugh.”\(^{44}\) Abigail, however, was not amused about his reply. She retorted,

> I can not say that I think you very generous to the Ladies, for whilst you are proclaiming peace and good will to Men, Emancipating all Nations, you insist upon retaining an absolute power over Wives. But you must remember that Arbitrary power is like most other things which are very hard, very liable to be broken- and notwithstanding all your wise Laws and Maxims, we have it in our power not only to free ourselves but to subdue our Masters, and without violence throw both your natural and legal authority at our feet.\(^{45}\)

According to Jack Shepherd, author of *The Adams Chronicles,* John Adams was unmoved.\(^{46}\)

John Adams, in contrast to the previous example, deeply respected Abigail’s opinion. She wrote him in May of 1776 expressing another view of hers regarding the colonies’ separation from Britain,
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A people may let a king fall, yet still remain a people, but if a king let his people slip from him, he is no longer a king. And as this is most certainly our case, why not proclaim to the World in decisive terms [our] own importance?47

John merely replied, “I think you shine as a Stateswoman.”48

Throughout the remainder of Abigail’s life, this constant back and forth writing between Abigail and John existed. While not every issue that Abigail wrote about has been addressed in the previous pages, hopefully the perception on how she viewed certain issues during her life has been discussed. She was an exemplary women full of insight and incredible virtue wherever she went, whether as the wife of a diplomat, congressmen, or President. Her legacy has remained for over two centuries with no sign of ever passing away.

These are the times in which a genius would wish to live. It is not in the still calm life that great characters are formed. The habits of a vigorous mind are formed in contending with difficulties. Great necessities call out great virtues.49
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The Progressive Movements of the American Communist Party in the Early Twentieth Century

Ansley Markwell

For much of the latter half of the twentieth century, the word "communism" incited fear in a large majority of the democratic world. It brought to mind the purges of Stalin, the terrors of secret police organizations, the threat of nuclear war, and competition of the space race. In America, many people associated communism with the Soviet Union which was viewed as the biggest threat to democracy after World War II. Despite this fear of communism, it is a counterintuitive reality that America had its own communist party and that the Communist Party of the United States of America (CPUSA) was very involved in lobbying for the equality of the working class as well as for the equality of African-Americans and women. In American history, communism tends to have negative connotations even though many see capitalism as having far more victims. However, the CPUSA often supported progressive ideas about how to better the quality of life for minorities and the working classes in America. From 1919 to the present, American communism has continued to claim that they “…championed the struggles for democracy, labor rights, women’s equality, racial justice, and peace for 97 years”. Despite all the negative press that communism has received in America, the American Communist Party benefitted working-class Americans by its fight towards equality for all races as well as its promotion of labor unions.

To truly discover the benefits that American communism has given to American society, it is necessary to understand its history by examining the party’s beginnings. The first American communist party was birthed from American socialism. The first American socialist party was formed in 1876 and was named the Socialist Labor Party (SLP). The SLP was a
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political force to be reckoned with both domestically and internationally. However, like most political organizations, factions developed within the SLP by the 1890s. A more radically left-wing faction became more dominant as the communist Daniel De Leon gathered SLP members under his wing. Yet, there was still no official split from the party until after World War I. With the culmination of the Russian Revolutions of 1917 and World War I in 1918, the schism between the left and the center of SLP deepened. The communist faction within the party wished to officially align itself with Bolshevik Russia while the more moderate members felt this to be an exceedingly unpatriotic move. When Vladimir Lenin called the SLP to join the Communist International (Comintern), many extreme left-wing members saw this as an opportunity to destroy the influence the moderates had over the whole party. When the invitation was voted on, 90% were in favor of acceptance. However, the moderate leadership suppressed this decision as well as expelling nearly all the leftists elected to party leadership. This led to mass chaos as both sides called for the ejection of the other. In the frenzy that followed, the moderate leadership expelled upwards of two-thirds of the entire membership.

In 1919, the SLP called for an emergency convention in order to reclaim control over the radical left-wingers. Some of the SLP members who had more of a communist bent decided to disrupt the proceedings by sending exiled delegates to the convention. When this plan failed, they left the SLP and formed the Communist Labor Party. Others abandoned the party and their fellow dissidents completely to form a separate party called the Communist Party of America. Over the next two years, the conflict escalated which led to two communist parties. The Comintern was very displeased with this infighting and ordered the merger of the two. By 1921, the American Communist Party was fully formed and under the leadership of the newly fashioned party.

The American Communists began a long-term fight for the rights of the working class citizens while they were still members of the Socialist Labor Party. As the forerunner of American communism, the Socialist Labor Party helped to enact some social and economic change on the behalf of the working class despite the conflict and division. One of the
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most important organizations formed as a result of the SLP’s efforts was the Socialist Trade and Labor Alliance (STLA). In 1895, a dissident group named the Knights of Labor formed the STLA subsequential to when it left the labor union. This event occurred under Daniel De Leon’s leadership after he attempted to adhere to Marxist ideology which, in essence, says that the working class united can throw off the oppressor. De Leon sought to help improve wages and working conditions for his fellow working-class laborers. He castigated the current labor unions of the time which labeled them as compromising with the right to the great detriment of the proletariat. De Leon was not alone in denouncing the standing labor unions of the day. Other SLP members abhorred the trade unions because of their occasional criminal activities and seemingly hopeless bureaucratic nonsense. In order to combat the possible defunct labor unions, the SLP formed the STLA. The SLP believed that their new labor union would unite the proletariat under a common banner.

The STLA was moderately successful as a labor union and was also crucial in building the reputation of left-wingers as champions of the people, a title which it has claimed throughout its tenure. Through the STLA, the Workers International Industrial Union (WIIU) was formed. The WIIU was another labor union sponsored by the SLP that helped the working class make changes in their working conditions. They called themselves champions of the people and worked to confirm their reputation in spite of persecution from the same government that promised to protect the peoples’ civil liberties.

American Communists sought to continue the good work they had accomplished during their time in the Socialist Labor Party. However, the CPUSA came under fire almost immediately after its inception. In a vein of persecution that would continue for decades, the United States Department of Justice ordered a series of arrests of many members of the
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party, most of whom were foreign-born. Many of the arrests resulted in deportation. Because of this mistreatment and other means of persecution similar to it, the American communists went underground. It did not emerge again until 1922 after the hysteria of the Red Scare died down. However, the whole party did not come back. A portion called the CPUSA secret apparatus stayed perpetually covert. This return marked the beginning of poor public opinion of communism in America. Americans, in general, viewed communism as synonymous with Bolshevism. The Red Scare of the early 1920s perpetuated the belief that American communists were snakes in the grass waiting to strike the heel of American democracy as seen the campaign cartoons of William Harding.14

The importance of labor unions and the protection of the working class to the CPUSA were directly tied to the USSR. The rights of the working class are integral to communism as a whole as well as seen in Marx and Engels’ *The Communist Manifesto*. In the Soviet Constitution adopted in 1936, each chapter and article stresses the importance and protection of the proletariat.

Until roughly 1929, the CPUSA was characterized by factional wars and minor skirmishes with the Comintern and the USSR. While communism made progress in terms of gaining allies as well as a small amount of political offices around the country, the focus of the party was set on aligning itself correctly to the right side of the Soviets and on making allies. The Comintern understood that capitalism had been preserved and thus outright revolution would not be the best tactic to move forward in American politics. Because of fighting within the party, the Comintern interceded to stabilize the party. However, this effort was disrupted due to the unfortunate miscalculations of some of the party leadership in their associations with Leon Trotsky and Nikolai Bukharin, Joseph Stalin’s rivals. As a result, a sizable portion of the CPUSA’s leadership was purged.

From 1928 to 1935, the CPUSA declined as a result of Stalinist foreign policy during that time. Stalin decided to cut ties with all western socialist parties. This event had far-reaching ramifications in many countries other than the United States. However, the CPUSA felt the weight of Stalin’s decision more so than most as their numbers declined
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from 24,000 in 1928 to 6,000 in 1932. This time of decline represented a change in policies concerning labor unions as the party switched allegiances from the Trade Union Educational League to the Trade Union Unity League.

The American Communist Party’s relationship with the Soviet-controlled Comintern was complicated and constantly evolving. Some historians attempt to argue that the CPUSA only changed its policies to reflect the Comintern’s changing policies. Other historians argue that the fluctuating policies of the CPUSA reflect more on the shifts in American events. From 1935 to the beginning of World War II, the CPUSA followed the lead of the Comintern and presented what is called a popular front which united all groups against fascism. As a result, the party no longer opposed Roosevelt’s New Deal and provided aid and organizers to the Congress of Industrial Organizations. The party also began to support the Democratic Party in national elections claiming it was the lesser evil in comparison to the Republicans. During this time, the CPUSA supported the Spanish Republic during the Spanish Civil War with funds and medical aid as well as military volunteers from its own members as well. The CPUSA also supported the Stalinist purges of the 1930s comparing the opposition to disease and Confederate secessionists. When the Comintern flip-flopped, the CPUSA flip-flopped.

During World War II, the CPUSA held many different positions concerning the war as a reflection of the Soviet positions. While its numbers had swelled to roughly 75,000 by 1938, the party declined again as a result of the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact. The party was not strongly against all foreign involvement in the conflict until 1941 as a result of the Nazi and Soviet invasions of Poland. The CPUSA turned from its popular front of opposing fascism to advocating for peace. The party began attacking only British and French leadership for objecting to Hitler at first but later spread its attack to Roosevelt as well. Until Hitler’s betrayal of Soviet Russia, the CPUSA was distinctly pro-German. As a result of the Nazi invasion of Russia, the CPUSA, once again, changed its song and became militantly and vocally pro-war. The party also
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expected the alliance between the United States and the Soviet Union to commence a new state of political and social congruence after the war.\textsuperscript{19}

The importance of racial equality to communists on both sides of the Atlantic dictated the relationship between the CPUSA and the USSR. In the Soviet constitution chapter 10 article 123 states, “Equality of the rights of citizens of the USSR, irrespective of their nationality or race, in all spheres of economic, state, cultural, social and political, life is an indefeasible law”.\textsuperscript{20}

In March 1919, revolutionary socialists from more than two dozen countries met in Moscow to found the Communist International. Their conference manifesto announced, “At best, Wilson’s program aims at no more than changing the label on colonial slavery…. Colonial slaves of Africa and Asia: the hour of proletarian dictatorship in Europe will also be the hour of your liberation”.\textsuperscript{21}

One of the most important events in African American history occurred in Russia in the early twentieth century. There, Otto Huiswoud and Claude McKay advocated for the Comintern’s adoption of a world strategy for the liberation of blacks. Lenin wrote, “All communist parties must directly support the revolutionary movement among the nations that are dependent and do not have equal rights (for example Ireland, the Negroes in America, and so forth), and in the colonies.”\textsuperscript{22} The Comintern declared that dynamic liberation was a prerequisite for membership in the Comintern.

"The Communist International views with satisfaction the resistance of exploited Blacks to the attacks of their exploiters, since the enemy of their race and of the white worker is identical: capitalism and imperialism. The international Black movement must be organized on this basis” in the United States, Africa, Central America, and the Caribbean. The assistance of our oppressed Black fellow human beings [is] absolutely necessary for proletarian revolution and the destruction of capitalist power.” Communists should “apply the [Second
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Congress] Theses on the Colonial Question to the situation of Blacks,” who form “an essential part of the world revolution.”23

A practical application of these words from the Comintern is seen in the case of the Scottsboro Boys. This is a famous legal case based on racism and is an excellent example of American Communist efforts to advocate for racial equality. Nine African American males were accused of raping two white girls while illegally riding a train24. These accusations originated from a gang of white teenaged boys who had been beaten and humiliated in a fight by the accused. The Scottsboro Boys, as they were dubbed by the media (because the case was originally heard in Scottsboro), were arrested by a posse in Paint Rock, Alabama. In continuation with a theme of racism that has colored Alabama’s history since its birth, the boys were granted abysmal legal representation. As a result, the first trial ended in all defendants but one, a twelve-year-old, convicted of the charges of rape and ultimately sentenced to death.25 At this time, the death penalty was not an unusual sentence for this crime despite a lack of physical evidence.

As a result of this gross injustice, the case of the Scottsboro Boys garnered national attention. When the CPUSA caught wind of it, they began a longtime partnership with the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and began the appeals process on behalf of the boys. An interesting part of the story is that CPUSA hired a Democrat lawyer named Samuel Leibowitz rather than retaining one of their own party members. To some at the time, this action seemed indicative of the CPUSA’s intentions in seeking true justice for the Scottsboro Boys rather than being more concerned with making a political statement.26 While Leibowitz worked on the case with the International Labor Defense (ILD) which was affiliated with the CPUSA, he took the lead in defending the boys. In hindsight, it might not have positively helped the Scottsboro Boys to be backed by American Communists because communism is seen as something that is specifically un-American since the Russian Revolution. However, Leibowitz resisted the Alabama practice of excluding African-Americans.
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from their juries and used this issue as the basis of his appeals to the Alabama Supreme Court and the United States Court. As a result, the United States Supreme Court reversed the Alabama decision and called for a new trial with African American members on the new jury. Throughout the legal battles that continued after this reversal, the CPUSA funded Leibowitz and his case through the end.27

Ultimately, five out of the nine defendants were found to be guilty and awarded lengthy prison sentences. The other four had their charges dropped.28 Long before the Civil Rights movement was born, the CPUSA would stage sit-ins at white restaurants and businesses. While the CPUSA and its crusade for racial equality in the judicial sphere were ultimately unsuccessful for the Scottsboro Boys, it set the standard for American Communists in the cause of equality and inclusion for African-Americans.

The American Communist Party has not been a major political force in the United States for some time and, as a result, has slipped from the minds of many. When it is contemplated, most prefer to see it as a party in opposition to America and allied with Russia. Others think of McCarthyism and the Cold War. The CPUSA’s crusades for racial equality are not always forefront when considering the legacy of American Communism. However, the case of the Scottsboro Boys and the Socialist Trade and Labor Alliance are just a couple of examples of the progressivism found in the CPUSA. However, while usually making an effort to do good for American society, the CPUSA tended to toe the Comintern line. In spite of the animosity directed its way, the American Communist Party has been characterized as an organization which battles for the working class, specifically in its fights for ethical labor unions and racial equality.
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After France was defeated by Germany in 1940, the leaders of the National Assembly decided to give Phillipe Petain full governmental authority. He and his cabinet agreed to sign the Franco-German armistice with the German government. This formed Vichy France and it caused many problems for France. Although the popular perception is that France never contributed anything more beyond the Battle of France, France did in fact contribute throughout the war. It was not, however, by any legal means. Throughout France people disagreed with the ease in which France had surrendered to the Germans. These people began to form what the Franco-German armistice termed guerilla groups and what the French people called Le Resistance. Despite the name, this was not a singular entity; rather, it was a collective term referencing the individual resistant groups throughout France and outside of the country. When studying the Resistance it is important to understand the political workings of the Vichy government. This is because the Vichy policies enacted by Petain and his Prime Minister Pierre Laval had profound effects on the public’s opinion of the resistance. This change in opinion led to increased numbers of resistance organizations and it also created support for the resistance and aided in the multitude of sabotages that occurred past 1942 including the Resistance plans for D-Day, which included Plan Vert.

Vichy France was ratified in July 1940 after the Franco-German Armistice was signed on 22 June 1940. After the French military was devastated and humiliated by the German blitzkrieg, Germany could have completely destroyed France as a sovereign being. Hitler decided on a much more cunning plan, which involved the wehrmachtführungsstab formula. The idea behind the formula was to use a light hand regarding the dealings with France in order to prevent the
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1Blitzkrieg Warfare was the tactics of the German army during World War Two. The term Blitzkrieg is considered foreign in origin to the Germans. Hitler created a very adaptable and mobile army, creating more of a breadth of different corps. This breadth helped to create an adaptable force that could alter its attack quickly and efficiently and did when the leaders received intelligence from their spies. These techniques completely destroyed outdated war tactics that many countries such as France and the Lowlands still used. Dennis E. Showalter, Reader’s Companion to Military History (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt Publishing Company, January 1996), 56.
French Army officials from leaving to establish a base of operations in London to continue the war against German forces.\(^2\) Hitler also assumed, like many, that the war would be over relatively quickly and he would be more assertive during the final peace conference.\(^3\) The resulting Franco-German armistice was very undemanding and it allowed many concessions to the French populace. The armistice conceded a 100,000 man army under French command, the French fleet would also remain under neutral French control, there were no current territorial demands, the occupied portion of France was only to include necessary tactical points for Germany to invade Britain, and the government of France would be able to administer both territories. All of these concessions pacified many soldiers and France’s need to get revenge and preemptively struck at the Free French movement under de Gaulle by helping retain the soldiers under the national army.\(^4\) The importance of having a national army was highly valued because it could be used later for French purposes. The aptly named Armistice Army was used to maintain France’s eastern boundary and North Africa. Essentially, it was used for German purposes throughout most of the war, especially in the unoccupied zone, which consisted of the south eastern portion of France. The German occupation zone included most of the northern part of France and lined the Atlantic coast down to Spain. Although these so-called great concessions were made for France, there were many debilitating limitations placed upon Vichy.\(^5\) For example, even though Vichy had rights to administer to both zones as per the Franco-German armistice, the armistice also states that Vichy must defer to the German administration in the occupied zone and must support Germany’s decisions in both zones.\(^6\) This creates a disparity of power and clearly proves Vichy only maintained puppet sovereignty. Another injunction of

\(^3\) Paxton, *Parades and Politics*, 7.
\(^4\) Ibid.; William Langer, *Our Vichy Gamble* (New York: Norton Library, 1947) 74. Revanche, or revenge, was an aspect that many French people were concerned about. They believed that the Germans deserved retribution for their victory over the French people and they needed to get it. The term revanche is generally an idea of what amounts to be karma. The French people decided that since it was impossible to get revenge using the military, because they knew how strong the German army was, that the way to give Germany their comeuppance was to create a stronger social and economic situation in the future. Many politicians argued that they must look out for the future generations since nothing could be done against German might. The interesting point to note is how Germany is actually stronger and more stable in the economic and social world than France. Paxton, *Parades and Politics*, 41-43.
the armistice was that the French government had to pay occupational and support costs as well as clearing war deficits. The Germans demanded an exorbitant amount of money and this led to huge levels of inflation that were comparable to other countries that were under German occupation. The most controversial and limiting point of the armistice that would be detrimental to de Gaulle’s Free French and many pockets of resistance throughout France, was Article X. It stated that all of the military forces had to not only return to France, but the French government had to ensure that the French citizens and soldiers would not take up arms against the German government. Any civilians or militia that tried to fight the Germans would be regarded as guerilla and as such would be summarily executed. It could also cause the termination of the armistice in which case Germany would take over the entirety of France. This created difficulties for de Gaulle and the resisters because he could not easily claim governmental legitimacy as an outlaw in the eyes of the French populace and not many were willing to give their lives to a Resistance.

One of the major problems in Resistance history is that many people mistakenly believe that de Gaulle is not only the original leader of the Resistance, but his call to resist is the reason why the Resistance itself started. This false statement is something that de Gaulle propagated himself. During the war the question of legitimacy of the Resistance and Free France was always in question and it was hard for de Gaulle to claim legitimacy after 44 different countries sent ambassadors to Vichy France legally recognizing Vichy as the legitimate government of France. Jean Monnet in his memoirs informs readers that there was a need to solve the legitimacy of the resistance government, “But they would have left the problem of legitimate authority wholly unsolved…” When De Gaulle left France in 1940, Vichy was forced to brand the general as an outlaw because he was in direct violation of Article X of the armistice. So since Article X deems any military resistance to the Germans in France as guerilla fighters, the armistice basically states the Free French to be illegally founded, by terms of the armistice, which the legitimate government had ratified. Vichy itself was founded after the National Assembly disbanded and gave Petain free reign. He then passed
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laws which gave him all executive and legislative power. This was formed within the confines of a legitimate government and its laws. As de Gaulle’s proviso government was determined illegal, he needed the Resistance to work as a subordinate in order to establish legitimacy. By having local administrative governments loyal to De Gaulle and functioning under the government of the Resistance, the Comité Français de Liberation Nationale or CFLN, it was easier to recognize de Gaulle’s provisional government as a temporary legitimate government until a new permanent government could be put in place. Even though this leads to the misconception that de Gaulle was the leader of the Resistance because of the subordinance of said organization, it did not begin this way. The Resistance and the Free French were two extremely different organizations. They did not always get along with each other and were based in two different locales. The Free French was the organization first based in London that was under the direct control of de Gaulle. The Resistance was a collective name for the various groups that sprouted around France in order to fight against the offenses to “patriotism and humanism” the Nazi party had committed against France herself. Although many of the groups in the early years of the war were small, they were evidence of a public retaliation against the political affairs of Vichy. As Colonel Costa de Beauregard states it was “…Not a willful creation from above, but a spontaneous surge from the base…” Before the summer of 1942 the Resistance was a collective of small organizations, including the communist party, scattered throughout both occupied France and the unoccupied portion of the country. It is imperative to note that these resisters were well within the minority of France. As resistance groups were first being founded after the ratification of the Franco-German armistice, a huge majority supported Petain and his government. There were few people who thought badly about the Marshall, the hero of Verdun, much less the government he led. That put the resistance groups as part of a minority. “In the beginning one must say, the Resistance had been the affair of an
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extremely small and nonconformist minority.” 15 Even if people did try to somehow resist the Germans, in the early years of war they did not want to risk their lives for it. Claude Terrail worked at a restaurant during the war, when Germans would come in to dine and order wine “We tried to push the cheaper stuff. But we didn’t play tricks. It wasn’t worth dying for.”16 It was not until the spring of 1942 that the public’s opinion of the Vichy government started changing.

The most well-known aspect of Vichy France was its collaboration policies with Germany that Vichy had been a part of since its establishment. These policies extended from social to military affairs. They were also an attempt to gain an upper hand in the New Order that would be established after the war was won by the Germans. It was commonly believed after the rapid defeat of France, England would fall to the German army shortly thereafter.17 Because of this mistaken belief, the leaders of Vichy desired to become equals in Hitler’s New Order and collaboration appeared to be the quickest route to German approval. Collaboration was also popular among many politicians because France’s devastating loss to Germany created a sense of helplessness and apathy that filtered into the politics of the country. As the war dragged on and Germany lost power, there is evidence that Germany began to threaten Vichy into enacting collaborationist policies or France would face severe sanctions.18 In 1942, Pierre Laval had just been reinstated as the prime minister of the Vichy government. As the war continued it became harder for Vichy to maintain its popularity and sovereignty. Within two months of Laval’s return to Vichy politics, a German official by the name of Fritz Sauckel was searching for laborers to work in Germany. At this point in the war there were roughly 100,000 French men working in Germany. Sauckel planned to establish a law that would conscript the French people. Laval tried to persuade Sauckel to keep it voluntary. Sauckel agreed, but he ordered an increase in the volunteers to work in Germany. Laval argued that the only reason volunteer rates would rise is

16 Don and Petie Kladstrup, Wine and War, 52.
17 Paxton, Parades and Politics, 8. After the French defeat, the European populace assumed that England would not be able to withstand the German military. Especially since France had been preparing for the German invasion since the end of World War 1 and lost so quickly. Not many considered that the reason France had lost was due to the inability of France’s military leaders to adapt and reconstruct military tactics to prepare for modern warfare.
if there was an incentive. Laval formulated what would eventually be known as the reléve scheme. Laval originally wanted for every three workers sent to Germany, two prisoners-of-war would be released and a third would go into German civil work. Germany deemed it too exorbitant of a demand and the rate of release was changed to one prisoner-of-war. On top of this embarrassment in his foreign policy, his own people were giving him problems. Nearly no one volunteered despite the prolific amount of propaganda and posters created for this effort. Soon after this Sauckel was demanding 100,000 workers each month and he was going to create and enforce his labor charter. In an effort to maintain Vichy sovereignty, and once again another effort at collaboration, Laval instituted a similar law himself creating the Service Travail Obligatoire in March 1943. This was a mandatory work force that would conscript many men and women. By the end of the war, Germany had 1,344,000 single male workers from France. This is far and away the largest amount of men sent to work in Germany compared to all of Europe. Most of these men were also the only ones that were required by their own government to go and work. In an attempt to prevent people from skipping out on this mandatory organization, Laval formed what was called the milice. The milice was a paramilitary police force. Their jobs included to find resisters and those who would oppose the Vichy government. The milice essentially became the French gestapo. There were many downsides to the STO and the only good consequence that came from this work draft was the increase in pro-Resistance sympathizers and members.

In the summer of 1944, the umbrella resistance group that was led by De Gaulle and titled Mouvements Unis de la Resistance, or MUR, created the Corps Francs de la Liberation, or the CFL. This was created by uniting all of the paramilitary and sabotage groups that worked under MUR into one corps. This umbrella label was also used so that the sabotage groups and paramilitary groups Action Ouvrière, groupes francs, Resistance-Fer, the Armée Secrete, and the Maquis would
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20 Warner, Pierre Laval, 364.
21 Don and Petie Kladstrup, Wine and War, 125.
22 Warner, Pierre Laval, 369.
23 Paxton, Old Guard New Order, 366-368.
24 Don and Petie Kladstrup, Wine and War, 125. The gestapo was the German secret police or SS. The milice were not liked by the general populace at all and were generally dregs of French society or misguided patriots who still believed in Petain and his government.
collaborate and create more united and threatening attacks. This was necessary because of the impending invasion of France. De Gaulle and the Free French had come up with a system of attacks that were listed by colors and an animal. These were *plan vert, violet, rouge, bleu, and tortue*. Each plan was crucial to the landings in Normandy as all would essentially isolate the area from the rest of France. *Plan Vert* was the sabotage of the railways. It was to prevent Germans from reinforcing either the Channel or Mediterranean coasts. Methods would include cutting rails and sabotaging switch facilities to delay or divert the trains coming with reinforcements. It also involved assassinating key German personnel at target rail hubs. The Resistance-Fer was extremely important in the accomplishment of this task. The prioritized lines were those that ran around the Maginot through Belgium and into Germany. It also included those around Bordeaux and Northeastern France. By June 1944 there were 486 rail cuts reported and by the 7th June there were 26 trunklines that were absolutely inoperative including main lines between Avranches to St. Lô, from St Lô to Cher bourg and St Lô to Caen. Shortly prior to the invasion, rail traffic in Burgundy and Eastern France was halted. There were 37 rail lines cut in and around Dijon just before the Allied invasion. *Plan Vert* was complimented by *Plan Tortue*, tortoise plan, as that strategy was to cause sabotage and delays on the roads throughout France. This with all the other plans caused a slowed German retaliation and it gave the allies a foothold to begin their liberation of France. It also caused a slowed German retreat. The final action the Resistance-Fer took was during the liberation of Paris. The *chemins* along with postal workers, telephone operators, and police officers all went on strike in August 1944. After Paris was liberated and France was saved resisters followed one of two paths. They either joined the Free French Army and continued to fight, or they went back to their professional jobs. After the liberation and de Gaulle rode into Paris, across France there was a collaborationist witch hunt. As H.R. Kedward states, “No Resistance Historian should try to minimize the incidents of injustice, malicious indictment, and personal vendetta.” There were 4,500 people who were executed by a tribunal, 160,000 who were
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charged with collaborating with the enemy, 7,000 death sentences 800 of which were carried out, and 38,000 of those charged were given prison terms. \(^{31}\)

In order to understand Resistance politics and actions it is first necessary to have a basic understanding of Vichy France. The collaborationist policies of Petain and Laval were essential in the downfall of Vichy. The Resistance itself was not synonymous with de Gaulle and it was not just a paramilitary unit. Dispelling the misunderstandings of the Resistance and its relationship with de Gaulle is essential in learning the true actions and who the Resistance was as a collective.

---
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The Bacchic-Christian Relationship
Marianna Nichols

Many scholars would agree that one of the lasting legacies of the Roman Empire has been its reputation for religious tolerance; however, this presumption of leniency all too often obscures the fact that the Romans are known to have undertaken two particularly acute religious persecutions. The first of these instances occurred during the state’s Republican period and was directed against the infamous Bacchic cult; the second persecution occurred roughly two centuries later, against the rise of Christianity. Though the events are by no means identical, these persecutions are similar in that scholars remain divided concerning the Romans’ exact motivations for acting as they did; thus, in evaluating these examples, the question which arises is whether or not any parallels between them may lead to the development of a unified thesis concerning Roman religious policy. However, regardless of whether or not such analysis may lead to any definitive conclusions, noting the manner in which various scholars have approached this issue allows one to trace the evolution of opinion regarding the Bacchic-Christian relationship.

Concerning the Bacchic cult, little is definitively known about its origins within Italy; indeed, the most conclusive statement which may be safely made is that in 186 BC the Bacchists fell out of favor with the Roman Senate. Tensions culminated in the Senate’s focused persecution of the cult, a movement which saw approximately four thousand individuals put to death. Virtually nothing is known of the cult’s fate after 180 BC, and

though it appears to have ultimately reasserted its influence, it did so as a much more controlled reincarnation of its former self. Unfortunately, one is forced to largely rely upon secondhand accounts of this event, namely Livy, whose writings must remain at least somewhat suspect due to his presumed tendency to over-sensationalize and indulge in potentially baseless rhetoric. The only other primary source for the Bacchic persecution is a surviving copy of the Senate’s regulatory edict, a text which merely lists restrictions placed upon the cult.

One should also briefly introduce the Christian persecution; thankfully, in this case, there is no lack of primary evidence. However, this persecution has proven difficult to interpret simply because it was not carried out as a single, unified wave but in a series of stages. Within the first phase many of the Romans’ actions appear to have arisen out of provincial authorities’ attempts to curtail local unrest. The second phase began under Nero, specifically after Christians were blamed for the great fire of AD 64, and one of the more enlightening texts from this period details a correspondence between Pliny the Younger and the Emperor Trajan; in this interaction, Pliny’s main concern was the proper way in which Christian trials should be conducted, especially those of former Christians who claimed to have abandoned their faith. Interestingly,
Trajan’s response to this inquiry was to discourage the active pursuit of Christians. The persecution’s third wave began with the edict of Emperor Decius and continued until the revolutionizing actions of Constantine; the determinative aspect of this phase is that, with the Decian edict, one finally has evidence of a specific law under which legal reasons for the persecution may be outlined. Thus, legally, this final wave is more easily understood than the preceding stages.

Unfortunately, these brief elucidations cannot, as has been noted, definitively address what conditions initiated the persecutions. When focusing on the Bacchists, one may theorize that, due to the cult’s Greek origins, a driving motivation was the Senate’s growing fear of what was then seen as a corrupting foreign influence. However, certain scholars have argued that the presentation of anti-Greek sentiment found within Livy could be the result of propaganda and not, in fact, the true reason for the Senate’s reaction. This aforementioned theory leads into another major proposition; namely, considering the cult’s popular influence amongst underprivileged classes, it could have been perceived as a threat to internal stability. Thus, in this sense, the persecution may be perceived as a check upon a growing, cohesive unit of individuals who could potentially incite political revolt.

Yet another theory states that the Senate’s motivation may be traced to the Bacchists’ supposedly salacious ritual acts, as rumors speaking of the members’ criminal activities and deviant sexual practices are known to have circulated amongst the

17. Livy, History XXXIX.
Romans. However, a counter approach views the persecution not as an expression of Senatorial fear but rather an example of the Senate seeking to demonstrate its own authority.

In turning focus to the Christian persecution, one should first note that Christianity was vastly different from other alternative cults in that it demanded singular loyalty from its adherents; hence, one may understand why the Christians carried with them a unique connotation of exclusivism. This factor necessarily meant that Christians did not participate in the Empire’s established religious system, an action which was potentially interpreted as a communal expression of disloyalty. Certainly, however, it stands that this refusal to worship official Roman deities was a major motivation for persecution, as multiple martyr accounts relate that it was the action of sacrifice which could either save or condemn an individual.

Thus, with an established understanding of the cults in question and the major theories concerning the motivations behind their persecutions, one may turn attention to their precise relationship. Certainly, some level of comparison may be made in that both the Christians and Bacchists were associated with the socially underprivileged, specifically slaves and women. This association is, however, perhaps overshadowed by both groups’ rumored deviance. Some specifics of such rumors have, for the Bacchists, been previously noted; for Christianity, similar tales cast

members as little more than incestuous cannibals seeking to lure impressionable Romans away from traditional religion.\textsuperscript{27}

However, these commonalities do not negate the fact that the two groups in question were separated by many differences. Namely, one should note that the manner in which the Romans carried out the persecutions varied significantly. In the Bacchic instance, one sees that persecutory actions were conducted in an extremely deliberate and controlled progression; indeed, when analyzing the Senate’s proscriptions, it is evident that the Romans knew specifically what aspects of the cult they wished to restrict.\textsuperscript{28} One simply does not see this level of detailed focus when studying the Christian persecution; not only do primary texts indicate a seeming lack of official interest during its first two stages, but martyr accounts reveal that accused Christians would typically be offered multiple opportunities to cooperate with the Roman authorities.\textsuperscript{29} Secondly, whereas the Bacchic cult was at the vanguard of what may be considered the incursion of alternative cults, Christianity was merely one unofficial religious group among many. Thus, if seeking to say that it was the newness and uncertainty surrounding the Bacchists which cast them as a perceived threat, one cannot necessarily make the same assertion for Christians. Thirdly, one should note that the Bacchists, unlike the Christians, do not seem to have required their members to refrain from participating in the official religious system.\textsuperscript{30}

Taking into account these comparisons and contrasts, one appears to be left with a paucity of definitive evidence concerning the Bacchic-Christian relationship. However, this factor does not preclude the emergence of a more general statement; namely, the Romans appear to not have been overly concerned with initiating official, direct persecution until the cults began to emerge as distinct sub-level societies, the predominance of which could have been perceived as a threat to the


state’s sovereignty. Certainly, one may argue that this conclusion holds true in the case of the Bacchists, for, despite what one reads in Livy, both archaeological and textual evidence reveals that the cult would have been well-known to the Senate prior to its persecution; presumably, it was allowed to exist, despite its foreign nature, until reaching a certain point of internal development. This same argument may be made concerning Christianity in that it does not appear to have been considered worth determinative attention until established as a separate religion apart from early Judaism; what’s more, one may note that as the Christian church became more organized both in terms of doctrine and clerical hierarchy, there is a parallel rise in Rome’s organized, concentrated efforts against it.

Though the aforementioned concept extends beyond the limitations of this particular essay, one may best briefly expound upon this theory by reiterating that there was an extremely close association between Roman religion and politics. That is, if one presumes that the Romans considered a developed, sophisticated religious system to be one of the hallmarks that separated an autonomous, self-determinative society from other cultural groups or organizations, it may be argued that the Bacchic cult and Christianity were believed to have become so highly developed, both in terms of religious conceptualization and internal organization, that they were viewed as separate, emerging societies distinct from that of Rome. Such a conceptualization accounts for the many theories which address persecutory motivation, as each of these theorized, motivating factors may be considered sub-level societal identifiers.

Regardless of whether or not one accepts this interpretation of the Bacchic-Christian relationship, a greater, more nuanced understanding of the issue at hand may be achieved by observing the ways in which it has been approached by various Classical scholars. One of the earlier opinions on which it would be beneficial to comment is that of W. Warde Fowler, who, writing in 1911, greatly exemplifies larger trends within

early twentieth-century scholarship. Specifically, one may note that Fowler’s analysis of Roman religion is overtly influenced by Developmental theory; that is, Christianity was perceived as a more highly evolved religious form than its pagan precursors. However, a concurrent aspect of Fowler’s approach venerated the older, more reputable aspects of Roman religion, such as its strict order and insistence upon moral decency, due to the fact that these attributes were believed to have positively influenced early Christianity; the way in which Fowler chooses to phrase this particular concept is that pagan elements were ‘baptized’ into the Christian ethos.

In evaluating how these opinions relate specifically to the Bacchic-Christian relationship, one may first note that Fowler almost unquestioningly considers the Bacchic persecution to be the result of the cult members’ presumed engagement in wild, ecstatic, orgiastic rituals. However, though quick to disparage such pagan actions, Fowler provides the caveat that such ecstasies would have been offensive to the sobriety and dignity of traditional Roman character; in this way he is able to maintain his earlier assertions concerning the benefits of Roman influence upon Christianity. Hence, considering these factors, one may state that Fowler viewed the Bacchic-Christian relationship to be comprised of situational opposites. That is, whereas the Bacchic cult exemplified all that the venerable, stoic Roman mindset could not abide, Christianity came under persecution not because it could not meet Roman moral standards but because it was more theologically developed than the pagan systems around it and thus posed a threat to established religious, and societal, organizations. Therefore, in a sense, Fowler conceives that one cult reveals the Romans’ moral strength, whereas the other exemplifies the inherent, inescapable wickedness within a pagan system.

One may also utilize the opinions of Hugh Last and A.N. Sherwin-White; writing respectively in 1949 and 1952, these scholars posited that, when considering persecutory actions against alternative cults, it was the cults’ association with inflammatory, anti-social acts which ultimately incited the Romans to action. Last, who initially presented this approach, specifically assigned it to Gallic Druids; Sherwin-White may be credited with taking Last’s assertion and applying it to the Bacchic cult and Christianity. Within this particular theory, the Romans are said to have deemed regulatory action necessary whenever a cult became inseparable from its disreputable rituals; thus, both the Bacchic and Christian persecutions may be attributed to the existence of “barbarous, demoralizing rites,” the savagery of which necessitated official interference. Though this theory takes into account an acknowledged comparison between the Bacchists and Christians, its tone betrays its dated nature. Specifically, by considering the existence of licentious acts, and rumors dealing with licentious acts, to be the driving force behind the persecutions, the authors reveal their inclination to attribute religious conflict to purely moral or spiritual ideological variance, which is, in essence, a decidedly post-Christian approach.

A third, more recent analysis of the Bacchic-Christian relationship may be seen in the work of John North. North, in contrast to previously mentioned examples, openly asserts that there are simply too many variances between the two cults for there to be any determinative conclusion about how one group related to the other. Instead, North chooses to emphasize the cults’ essential differences. In specifically analyzing the Senate’s motivations for enacting the Bacchic persecution, North notes that the senatorial edict appears specifically concerned with the cult’s privatized, complex internal organization. This observation leads North to conclude that the cult’s intricate hierarchical structure was

considered a threat to state authority and should, thus, be deemed the Senate’s major motivation.46

By evaluating North’s position, one may observe that the last remnants of Developmental theory have seemingly given way to more neutral analysis. That is, North chooses to avoid the overworked topics of the cults’ moralities and, for the Bacchists, focus less upon Livy and more upon the Senatorial edict. However, though North does an excellent job of analyzing the Bacchic cult, this concentrated focus causes him to downplay the very real parallels between the Bacchists and Christians. Though he is not necessarily incorrect in asserting that there may be no conclusive determination made concerning the extent that the former cult may have influenced policy for the latter, North’s lack of analysis concerning their potential commonalities certainly weakens his argument.

In assessing these presented examples of scholarship, it quickly becomes apparent that within the last century there has been a marked shift in how scholars view the Bacchic-Christian relationship. Namely, for the first half of the twentieth century, analyses remained predominantly concerned with the presumed moral or spiritual factors at hand. A large component of such interpretations was the general acceptance of Livy’s account as completely accurate and free from bias, and, in accepting Livy’s presentation of moral factors or sensibilities as the driving concern behind the Bacchic persecution, it would not have been difficult to connect this assumption with popular conceptions of Developmental theory. Though one sees this bias begin to wane by the middle of the century, focus remained centered upon the moral nature of both groups. Only within the past three decades may one note a definitive shift in terms of how Livy’s text is perceived; namely, Livy is now understood to have himself likely been influenced by popular propaganda.47 Though dealing specifically with the Bacchists, these considerations are nevertheless important, as they set the overall tone for the way in which the Bacchic-Christian relationship may be interpreted. That is, if the

Bacchists are viewed as little more than a group of crazed, emotional deviants, then Christians are typically cast as their moral opposites; similarly, with the recent, scholarly shift, one sees that the Christians, like the Bacchists, have had new emphasis placed upon the political significance of their internal organization and doctrine.

In conclusion, reiteration of the aforementioned arguments reveals that one may perhaps best describe the Bacchic-Christian relationship as an association which reveals a particularly fascinating, long-lasting aspect of Roman religious policy. Namely, when taken together, these groups’ persecutions indicate that though the Romans were indeed highly tolerant, the state would not allow alternative cults to continue unchecked when they appeared to have developed into sophisticated sub-level societies. However, analysis of scholarly opinions detailing the nature of the Bacchic-Christian relationship reveals that such an assumption is by no means determinative, and similar opinions will, without question, continue to develop and alter.
The Legacy of the *Risorgimento* on Italian Identity, Nationalism, and the Rise of Fascism

Matthew O’Leary

Prevailing scholarship promotes the narrative that the period and influence of the *Risorgimento*, the Italian unification movement, began in 1796 with Napoleon’s invasion of Italy and closed with the successful unification of Italy by 1870.¹ Prevailing scholarship often overlooked the unsettled influences which the *Risorgimento*, or “Resurgence” in English, had on Italian national conceptions of their identity leading up to the Fascist era of the 1920s and ‘30s.

Using government documents, letters, and propaganda publications, this paper argues that Mussolini’s Fascist movement synthesized three competing ideas of the *Risorgimento* to shape Italian identity over half a century after the official end of the *Risorgimento* period. These ideas are the populism of Giuseppe Garibaldi, the conservatism of Camillo di Cavour, and the continually redrawn claims of *terra irredenta*, or land perceived by nationalists as culturally or historically Italian. Fascism fused these formerly competing ideologies under the Fascist banner and focused on applying the methods of Garibaldi and Cavour to expanded claims of *terra irredenta* to further expand Italy’s empire and legitimize the Fascist state. Thus, the end of the direct influence of the *Risorgimento* on Italian political culture came not with the official unification of the Kingdom but rather with the defeat of Fascism. This defeat saw the claims of *terra irredenta* officially renounced, the Cavourian approach stripped of any remaining international legitimacy, and the Garibablian mythos of achieving populist aims through the use of force of arms discredited.

The origins of the *Risorgimento* movement were far from monolithic, instead the idea came to draw interest from across the Italian world. Whether true believers or crafty opportunities, the proponents and

---

¹ Ideas first introduced to Italy during the French occupation included the revolutionary spirit, nationalism, and liberalism that shaped the Young Italy moment, which attempted to replicate an idealized “revolution” to revive an Italian kingdom or republic such as the one that existed during the Wars of Revolution and Napoleonic Wars.
advocates of the Risorgimento had the French Revolution and subsequent Napoleonic Wars to thank for inspiring much of their ideology. As it did elsewhere in Europe, Napoleon I’s occupation of Italy from 1796 through 1796 changed the course of the nation’s history. Though the Congress of Vienna, in 1814 and 1815, restructured much of the Italian Peninsula back to the political boundaries which it processed from before the war, certain Napoleonic ideas had taken root. Ideas such as popular revolution, liberalism, and nationalism shaped Italy’s political and cultural future for over a century after the last French forces withdrew. These ideas proved as controversial and divisive in Italy as in Revolutionary France, and the Risorgimento also became defined by ideological and political struggles of liberal monarchs, republican socialists, and military strongmen who all claimed to be representing the true nature of the nation and its people. The expulsion of foreign reactionary powers from Italian speaking lands developed as one of the earliest aims of the various factions within the movement that became to be known as the Risorgimento. The Congress of Vienna firmly established the Austrian Empire’s influence over and interest in the peninsula by granting them the territory of Lombardy-Venetia and other “protectorate” regions and this increased the urgency which the Italian patriots felt overthrow these foreign nobles. Though there had been sporadic attempts at revolution throughout the region before, Risorgimento really begins to gain force following Giuseppe Mazzini’s organization of “Young Italy” to fight for Italian unity and liberation.

First generation Italian nationalism, from the 1830s through the 1850s, took inspiration from Giuseppe Mazzini and his “Young Italy” movement. The “piteous” state of the Italian peninsula during his youth, ruled by various despots both Austrian and Hapsburg, inspired his movement. Motivated not only by his liberalism and belief in individualism, he also looked to establish a new-order which stressed Italian greatness and the removal of outdated, unrepresentative existing political structures. Though not initially successful, his work combined elitist intellectualism with populist ideology in a manner reflected throughout the struggle of the Risorgimento even after other nationalist
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leaders eclipsed Mazzini himself. Giovanni Gentile and other Fascist ideologues revived this same fusion to strengthen and unify the Italian kingdom following the disarray and disappointment of the First World War, especially in regards to the creation of a revolutionary nationalism rather than a traditionalist nationalism.

Following the failure of the first generation of Italian nationalists and their revolutionary republican actions within the Two Sicilies, Rome, and Venice in 1848, a more conservative approach to the Risorgimento rose to the forefront. Piedmont-Sardinian participation in the Italian national struggle though war with Austria in 1848 further bolstered support for an autocratic-led Risorgimento. In 1852, this approach found its champion with the appointment of Count Camillo di Cavour to the position of Prime Minister of Piedmont-Sardinia. He held this position throughout the height of the Risorgimento period and acted as the archetypical example of the conservative nationalist which focused on international machinations as a method of unification. Instead of rallying the common people to his side with promises of a new order within a new Italy, the Prime Minister looked outwards in his belief that Italian unity could be achieved through manipulating an alliance system with the other “liberal” powers against the “reactionary” forces of Europe. In a successful execution of his ideology, di Cavour secured a secret agreement with the French Emperor Napoleon III to secure military support in a war against Austria in exchange for Nice and Savory being handed over to France. To further cement his kingdom as a European power, di Cavour led his Kingdom into the Crimean War alongside the “liberal” monarchies of the United Kingdom and the French Empire in an attempt to bolster its status abroad among the allied European powers. The alliance’s victory in 1859 vindicated military adventurism in Italy, a legacy which the Fascists inherited with their ill-fated invasions of Ethiopia and the Balkans.
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10 “Liberal” here refers to the monarchies in France, Prussia, and the United Kingdom which utilized representative and nationalist propaganda to bolster their legitimacy, while “reactionary” refers to the traditionalist monarchies of the Hapsburgs and Romanovs.

A much different type of Risorgimento unfolded in 1860 and its populist approach evoked an ever more increasing patriotic fervor among the Italians. Lead by Giuseppe Garibaldi, his volunteer army, the Thousand or the Red-Shirts, successfully overthrew the southern monarchy via populist uprising. Unlike the aristocratic Count di Cavour, Garibaldi had revolutionary experience and developed a populist liberal following. Though seen by his contemporaries as a consummate republican, whether that meant a dangerous anarchist or a champion of the common people depended on the contemporary, Fascism elevated a different part of Garibaldi’s mythos; namely its violent, populist history.

Despite the official creation of the Kingdom of Italy in 1860, it remained intellectually and socially divided. The agreement between Garibaldi and King Emmanuel II, along with an Italian-Prussian war against Austria in 1866, led to a nationalist victory shared between Italy’s revolutionaries and conservatives. The triumphant spirit of unity which pervaded much of the Italian socio-political culture during the 1860s and 1870s provided the idyllic foundations for many of Italy’s ill-fated flirtations with boldness in the first half of the twentieth century; from Prime Minister Antonio Salandra’s secret betrayal of the Center Powers and Italy’s entrance into WWI to Benito Mussolini’s aggressive rise to power and Italy’s entrance into WWII. With the occupation of Rome by Italian forces in 1870, King Victor Emmanuel II declared Italy to be whole and unified. He proclaimed his intent that the energy expended in achieving this end be redirected towards the mundanities of governance, rebuilding, and improving their new nation. This, naturally, proved easier said than done. Where once a unified national purpose had existed, in the drive to unification the fragmentary states, people, and ideas of Italy, the nation lacked such a guiding principle after the goals of the Risorgimento had essentially been met. This conspicuous lack of a national drive or identity served as a key tool to the Fascists during their rise to power; they claimed that they would be able to awaken Italy to a unified nationalist purpose once again.

---

Along with the *irredentist* agenda, fears over Italy’s national pride also dominated Italian political culture following the *Risorgimento*. Whether due to whole-hearted belief in national advancement or mere political expediency, Italian leaders since the end of the *Risorgimento* declared that the Kingdom’s 1870 borders were insufficient. For the early *irrendtists* these aims primarily focused on Trentino and Trieste, Italian majority regions bordering the newly united kingdom. Later, the Fascists expanded these claims to include regions with either an Italian minority or those historically occupied by Italians such as Nice, Ticino, Dalmatia, Malta, and Corsica. Unlike the Alsace-Lorraine dispute between Germany and France, the majority of Italy’s *terra irredenta* held little economic or industrial value, rather Mussolini’s regime held their recapture as a method to rally popular support and nationalistic fervor. In the unenthusiastic and divided political climate of the Kingdom, calls for revival of the revolutionary spirit which filled the *Risorgimento* period must have held a certain allure to many politicians and citizens.15

After 1870, three general philosophies competed to guide the nascent nation-state’s foreign policy; first, a path of peace and neutrality protected behind its Alpine borders, second, a path of armed intervention to liberate peoples under foreign oppression, and third, a path towards the establishment of a reborn Roman Empire.16 The echoes of these doctrines remained within Italian politics into the twentieth century. During the First World War, the socialist movement split between the internationalists who favored a policy of neutrality and the nationalists, including successful newspaper editor Benito Mussolini, who favored joining the war.17 The entrance of Italy into the Great War essentially ended the political relevancy of the isolationist factions, though Mussolini courted both the interventionist and imperialist ideological camps during his rise to power and interwar regime.

Fascism, in the Italian context before the Second World War, focused around essentially a national-revivalist movement. To draw support from the people, Fascist leaders such as Benito Mussolini and Giovanni Gentile spoke to deeply rooted national myths of centralist conservatism, populist uprisings, and the utilization of both to “reclaim” *terra irredenta*. The Fascists argued that only their revolution could restore
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15 Croce, *A History of Italy*, 2.
16 Croce, *A History of Italy*, 3.
Italy to the spiritual and material position from which it could achieve the true ends of the *Risorgimento*. From this template, Mussolini crafted the *Partito Nazionale Fascista*, the National Fascist Party, which combined socialist street violence and totalitarian agenda with the conservative virtues of “order, discipline, and hierarchy.”

One of the key tenets which separates Fascism from the more conventional autocratic doctrines is that it got its first real taste of political power and sway as a street-movement. Mussolini and Gentile may have been persuasive writers and theorists, but the movement’s rise to international success could not have occurred without the mass mobilization of an enraged populace directly against socialists, communists, and even the agents of the “decadent” state itself. Unlike the traditionalism, conservatism, and monarchism from the circles of Count di Cavour, Fascist propaganda developed an ideology of revolution that drew from the movement’s socialist roots. As the Fascists often noted, Garibaldi rallied his supporters to engage in populist direct action against elites considered traitors to the people’s interests. Through this, the Fascists grew their support among the disenfranchised lower classes, just as revolutionaries of the nineteenth century did; by claiming to represent something new and on the side of the people, in opposition to the traditionalism of the “out-of-touch” elites.

The political machinations of the Fascists continued a long trend of using nationalism to plaster a rapidly faltering political coalition in the name of the *Risorgimento*. The Italian laborer or agrarian following the *vittoria mutilata* provided the latest example of Italians who sacrificed their republican ideals to do what they thought best for the nation. At the height of the *Risorgimento*, though distrustful of the aristocratic nature of di Cavour and many northern Italian leaders, Garibaldi voluntarily surrendered his southern republic to King Victor Emmanuel II of

---

19 Ibid, 310.
21 Ibid, 132-135.
23 “Mutilated victory,” the term used by Italian nationalists to describe their “betrayal” during post-WWI treaty negotiations.
Piedmont-Sardinia. Italians in October of 1860 recognized the powerful symbolism of this union and it retained its impactful message well into the twentieth century; the handing over of hard won populist triumphs to the royal standard-bearer of centralized state power.

The nascent nation-state of Italy began the twentieth century entwined within the defense Triple Alliance between Germany and Italy’s historic rival, Austria-Hungary. This alliance naturally proved less than enthusiastic, and Italy declined to join the First World War on the side of its allies. Instead, Prime Minister Antonio Salandra declared Italy’s policy of “sacred self-interest,” which stated that Italy would seize the best opportunity presented to it to secure its *terra irredenta*. This opportunity came in 1915 in the form of the Treaty of London. The Entente Powers promised to Italy the region of Tyrol along with certain cities along the Illyrian coast, both key regions in the narrative of *terra irredenta*, and in exchange Italy joined them in WWI. The war proved far less unifying than the wars of the *Risorgimento*, and the following peace incensed the population even more.

Though on the victorious side of the war, Italy received far less land from the Treaty of Versailles than the Entente promised initially, with most of the Illyrian *terra irredenta* becoming a part of the new Yugoslav state. Known as the “mutilated victory,” Italian nationalists considered themselves betrayed at the negotiation table, and failed by the purely Cavourian machinations of its parliamentarians, the grand politicking and deal-brokering which led Italy into the brutal fighting of the Great War in the first place. From the ashes of the elitist diplomatic efforts which brought Italy into the First World War, a desire for another movement in the vein of Garibaldi’s “Thousand” was born. The beginnings of the movement took shape in Fiume from 1919 to 1924.

Fiume, today known as Rijeka, was an Italian majority city along the coast of Illyria, which the Entente promised but not delivered to Italy. The Treaty of Versailles instead gave it to the Kingdom of Yugoslav, a Pan-Slavic state forged from the ashes of the old Hapsburg Empire.
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Fiume became the center of ethnic intense strife between “Yugoslavs,” Croats and Slovenes under Serbian leadership, and Italians. Though the situation threatened to escalate into outright war, the Entente, who looked to compensate Serbia following the war they started, tied the Italian military’s hands and forbid any official intervention into the city. The situation in Fiume descended into an ethnic proxy war. Into this chaos stepped Gabriele D'Annunzio. He established the “Italian Regency of Carnaro” from the turmoil by integrated coordinated propaganda and artistic styles with populist street action around his own “eccentric” personality to show the dominance and unity of the Italian majority within the city. Italy annexed the territory, by then known as the “Free State of Fiume,” in 1924 with the Treaty of Rome.

Integration of irredentist ideas from the Risorgimento with interventionist national-liberation narratives provided a central facet to the overall success of Italian propaganda surrounding the conflict over Fiume. Italian victory within this tumultuous microcosm of conflicting national struggles showed the apparent effectiveness of the mass mobilization of Italian veterans, populists, intellectuals, and artists around the organization of a new-model Italian ethno-state. It foreshadowed the events which followed the rise of the Fascist party, who likewise used nationalist framework to blend philosophic and artistic movements with populist direct action.

Following the perceived failure of the Treaty of Versailles to adequately compensate Italy for her losses and ambitions, there was another nationalist upswelling in public opinion and national politics. While the rise of Fascism owed much to Italy’s economic slump and internal political disarray, their ready adoption of Risorgimento ideology and the incorporation of Italian activists from the “Free State of Fiume” into their ranks cannot be overlooked. The evolution of these extreme nationalists culminated in the Blackshirts, whose nomenclature deliberately referenced both Garibaldi’s Red-Shirts and the famed Arditi.
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units of WWI.\textsuperscript{35} From the trenches of WWI came the justification for Fascism’s unique organizational concept; a system supposed egalitarian in its comradery yet deferential to a hierarchical command structures, all bound together by fanatic loyalty and interpersonal devotion.\textsuperscript{36} Calling for a revision of the Treaty of Versailles to address Germany’s struggles and well as Italy’s, Mussolini further demonstrated his willingness to embrace Cavourian international machinations as well as Garibaldian direct action methods in order to achieve his ends.\textsuperscript{37}

These calls proved instrumental in the rise of Benito Mussolini and the Partito Nazionale Fascista in Italy. Mussolini’s foreign policy once again recalls traces of nineteenth century idealism. The Italian dictator made outright appeal to the nationalistic idealism of the Risorgimento period when he spoke of leading Italy into its “destiny” as a revived Roman Empire.\textsuperscript{38} He also expanded the use of prepackaged irredentist propaganda to justify wars fought more to gain international prestige than to “reclaim” historically or culturally Italian lands such as the occupation of Albania in 1939.\textsuperscript{39}

Fascists adopted more than just medieval inspired conceptions of terra irredenta, they also incorporated the Roman ideal of the paternalistic relationship between Rome and her imperial domains to justify the establishment Italy as a paternalistic power within southern Europe, North Africa, and the Near East.\textsuperscript{40} While nineteenth century interventionists saw Italy’s role as the liberator other nationalities oppressed as its peoples had been, Mussolini’s Italy embraced a role as the protector and supporter of other rising fascist states.\textsuperscript{41} Though diametrically opposed to the liberal national-determinism espoused by interventionists following the Risorgimento, Italy’s interwar diplomacy still reflected nineteenth century views of the nation-state’s role in supporting foreign nationalist movements to gain allies against the more established powers. Italy modeled its nuovo ordine, or “New

\textsuperscript{35} The Arditi served as the Italian Army’s elite mountaineering shock-troops during the First World War, distinguished by the black uniform regalia which distinguished their infantrymen.
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Mediterranean Order,” on the presumed superiority of the Italian culture and its Roman glory. As still a rising power, the Fascist state looked to overthrow British imperial control over the region, to establish provinciae et coloniae,42 and to bring states from France and Spain to Bulgaria and Romania into “associate” status under Rome. Various Fascist ideologues defended these expansionist claims through an appeal to lost Roman grandeur and as a method of “complet[ing] the mission begun by Mazzini” where Europe existed in peace as a continent of unique “ethnic and cultural individualities.”43

Italy and the Axis Powers lost WWII and this loss finally precipitated a general shift in Italian conceptions of their nation’s role. Italy was forced to renounce all claims to terra irredenta and to withdraw from many of the provinces which it had occupied or annexed by various means since the 1920s.44 Rather than using this peace as a time to further machinations to aid in the reclamation of Italian terrain or to mobilize the Italian population to seize disputed territory, this peace held. Italy has yet to declare any wars on its neighbors nor sponsored any wide-spread Italian uprisings throughout south-central Europe. The peaceful nature of modern Europe is far more of an exception than a rule and the end to a century of nationalist violence and revolution only came about with the utter destruction of Fascist power and the militaristic national populism it represented. The end of the direct influence of the Risorgimento on Italian political culture came not with the official unification of the Kingdom but rather with the defeat of Fascism. This defeat saw the claims of terra irredenta officially renounced, the Cavourian approach stripped of any remaining international legitimacy, and the Garibablian mythos of achieving populous aims through the use of force of arms discredited.

42 “Provinces and colonies,” a deliberate reference by the Fascist planners to the organizational system of the Roman Empire.
43 Rodogno, Fascism’s European Empire, 48-53.
The History of the Bangor Cave Nightclub

Sam Rogers

In the late 1930s, Alabamians waited breathlessly as the press enticed the public audience with news of a coming nightspot in northern Alabama. Located in what was declared to be “one of the most gorgeous underground beauty spots in the world,” the Bangor Cave Club, a nightclub and speakeasy in Blount Springs County, Alabama, promised to combine a long heritage of naturally beautiful attractions with worldly pleasures. With a grand entry made completely of stone, the cave represented a feat of modern engineering. From the white marble dance floor to the hanging stalactite formations, the Bangor Cave Club was a staggering experience. The establishment of the Bangor Cave Nightclub demonstrates the telling relationship between the cave and the surrounding community. According to Stephen Daniels and Dennis Cosgrove, landscapes are cultural images that structure or symbolize their surroundings. A range of developers and property owners altered Bangor Cave to suit the needs of the community as they changed, thus making the Cave a manifestation of larger historical trends. However, the Cave outlived its purpose, and over time, after which it fell into a state of disarray. The construction and abandonment of the Bangor Cave Club reflects the relationship that humans share with the natural environment, and demonstrates the shameful legacy that humans leave when environments are no longer useful.

The Bangor Cave Club is not only an interesting geological development, but it is also a fascinating example of society’s relationship with caves. In the book Exploring Alabama Caves, geologists explain it this way, “Caves are, by nature, mysterious landscapes. Because of this fact, caves have always held a fascination for humans.” The beauty of a cave is two-fold. It lies both in the natural beauty of the landscape as
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well as in its mystery. Caves are both beautiful and awe-inspiring while mutually presenting a shadowy, hidden space that draws out simplistic human desires. The innate magnetism of Bangor Cave was its initial attraction. However, the owner of the property, Breckenridge Musgrove, understood that more could be done with the space. Musgrove destroyed the natural interior of the cave, leaving only a faint resemblance to its original landscape and replacing it with what can only be described as an outrageous cosmopolitan appeal. Within the confines of the cave, the desire for profit drove developers to modify the cave’s natural setting to suit illicit activities such as gambling, the prohibited sale of alcohol, and dancing. Bangor Cave advertised its “naturalness,” but in reality, tempted its visitors with artificial additions and environments.

Located in Blount County, Alabama, the city of Bangor is the namesake and location of Bangor Cave. Blount County had a reputation that was contingent on its geographic features. In the early 1900’s, people frequently vacationed in Blount County for its natural hot springs. Prior to housing a nightclub, the town’s major attraction was a recreational area named Bangor Cave Park. This recreational center entertained visitors at the turn of the century. Disaster struck the park in 1915 when the county’s major hotel burned down, making it more difficult for guests to stay near the cave and springs. Even worse, some years later, the Great Depression cut down on vacations to the area, taking a significant amount of income away from the residents of Blount County.

Tourism in Blount Springs fell in the 1930’s leading to neglect of the property. By 1936, the property’s owner, Breckenridge Musgrove, resolved to return the cave to its former status as a major attraction. Musgrove and his investors planned to construct a 76 acre park on the property. The railroad was conveniently located near Bangor Cave. In order to make the new attractions more accessible, Musgrove and his team of investors planned to build a viaduct crossing over the railroad,
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placing guests 1,100 feet away from the park’s main features. The contributors planned these improvements in order to welcome masses of people to Bangor’s newest attraction.

Musgrove insisted that the cave had to maintain its natural appeal, conceding that he saw the landscape’s innate beauty. The cave presented an aesthetic that was pleasing, yet unsophisticated, making Musgrove’s decision to install a nightclub all the more interesting. Musgrove and his team blasted a 50 foot clearance for entry into the caves in order to make the entrance a spectacle for visitors. Throughout the construction process, Musgrove permanently changed the cave’s natural state in order to generate a source of income. In front of the clearance, the team decided to construct a stone and concrete roof to conduct rainwater away from the cave. Next, Musgrove and his team decided to build a stone bungalow over the man-made entrance to serve as a foyer.

Stalactite formations on the ceiling of the cave posed a continuous problem throughout construction of the inner cave. While the stalactites were needed as reminders of the club’s natural setting, they proved to be an annoyance to builders. For example, light fixtures were supported by electrical conduits in the ground so as to avoid damaging the rock formations. These conduits linked to neon lights and added a dazzling effect. One newspaper reflected that the lights made the cave look as though it was lit up like Broadway. The brilliant lights—and the ingenious engineering that preserved the stalactites—ultimately proved to be the limit of developers’ patience with the cave’s original landscape.

During the rest of construction, the Cave’s natural aesthetics were painstakingly removed, leaving behind only its immediate structure. The total investment for the club’s construction was $250,000 and months of hard work. Upon entering the cave, visitors stepped into the main
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entertainment room, complete with an artificial white marble floor. The floor complimented what developers thought a cave should look like, while offering style and convenience to visitors. The room also featured an orchestra stand large enough to hold 30 musicians and a large bar. Both were constructed out of rock chiseled from the cave’s other rooms, and concrete mixtures. Aside from the main room, the remaining floors throughout the cave were covered in red carpet. A local artist added artificial stars and moons to the ceiling. Each addition added to Musgrove’s goal of making the cave a glamorous experience for customers. Again and again, Musgrove’s plans fundamentally altered the cave’s natural state while using artificial enlivements to present appearance of a mysterious natural landscape.

Publicly, the cave’s central attraction was the grand room. Located in the back of the caves were secret caverns. These caverns held slot machines, blackjack tables, roulette wheels, and alcohol - in a county which had recently been voted dry. The cave opened for operation on June 1, 1937, and supposedly investors made their money back on the investment in just two nights. Infamous gamblers and undesirables even made an appearance at the club, one of whom was Joseph “the Yellow Kid” Weil who made a name for himself by wearing exclusively yellow clothing and driving a yellow car. Weil was a conman from Chicago, who held several roles in the cave. For a long period of time he served as a cashier, however, for a time he also masqueraded as a physician. The club brought in crowds from all over Alabama, and eventually the United States, its success brought money back to a community which desperately needed it.

The nightclub’s completion forced the destruction of a natural landscape that can never be fully recovered. The cave’s artificial additions show that Musgrove and his investors saw the need to add artificial decor in order to enliven the space. Musgrove kept some of the natural aspects of the cave, such as its stalactite formations. These natural assets provided a
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unique worldly appeal, playing an important role in the club’s identity. The cave’s visitors entered an environment that must have felt both natural and artificial. Musgrove exploited the unique combination of original and fabricated qualities within the cave. The Club’s lighting served to exaggerate the caves structure, while mutually serving as an attraction within itself. Another example of this was the placement of a natural stone bar and marble dance floor. Despite their artificiality, Musgrove’s additions were intended to place emphasis on the landscape’s natural appeal.

The establishment quickly caught the attention of Alabama authorities. Supposedly, the Nightclub was closed more than it was open. The first alleged raid on the cave occurred within its first 17 days of opening, where no criminal activity was reported. Reports of illicit activity continued and Governor David Bibb Graves ordered the cave to be shut down. Keeping true to its speakeasy origin, the club did not comply. As a result, at midnight on July 31, 1937, Police Chief Clarence Miller successfully raided the club. Miller was the only police chief in Alabama who convicted criminals on grounds of gambling at the cave and was able to confiscate tables and gambling paraphernalia. Miller was praised by the Blount County Grand Jury for ridding Blount County of liquor and gambling establishments.  

Although the Bangor Cave Club was filled with mystery and glamour, it was short lived. Ownership of the cave changed hands, but scandals never ceased. Gambling continued in a different area of the cave with an intense screening before entry, however, the cave was officially padlocked by order of the circuit court on January 10, 1939. After its closure, the cave was ransacked multiple times for anything that could be taken. On May 3, 1939 a fire destroyed the remains of the Bangor Cave Club. The cause of the fire was never discovered and the evidence remaining in the cave was lost.

The years immediately following the fire left the cave dormant. One newspaper claimed that the road leading customers toward the cave fell apart. Further, a bridge leading to the cave rotted away, making it unsafe
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The loss of The Bangor Cave Club left a void in the immediate town of Bangor. Its disappearance left the town without a major attraction. All that was left in Bangor was a small railroad shed, a post office, a few houses, and the memory of enchanting evenings accompanied by illegal activities. When the club was in operation, the town had an influx of visitors; when it closed the visits ceased. Without the unique new attraction in Bangor, there was no reason to visit at all. Moreover, the cave landscape had almost completely lost its untouched, natural appeal.

In 1961, the cave found new life. The Cullman County National Guard converted it into a fallout shelter at the height of the Cold War. The National Guard cleared rubbish left in the cave, preparing it to house as many as 1,000 people during a nuclear attack. After the National Guard’s use of the cave ended, it changed hands three more times. By 2010, the cave had earned a reputation as one of the most vandalized caves in the nation. Prolonged use and eventual degradation add a disheartening chapter to the life of the cave. The current state of Bangor Cave shows the result of human disregard for natural landscapes once they have fallen out of use.

Bangor Cave served a plethora of roles. Musgrove ensured that its natural beauty was a central part of the aesthetic appeal during the nightclubs construction. The unique challenge of wiring the electricity through the ground is an example of the care that was put into maintaining the cave’s natural beauty. Additionally, many natural aspects were preserved to maintain the caves atavistic atmosphere during construction. Examples of this include the all-natural stone bar, the rock ledge that was used as a stage for the musicians, and the stone bungalow built to house the entrance of the cave. While artificial, these additions to the cave contributed to the natural theme of the club and served to exaggerate the importance of natural structures.

Ultimately, the management of the Bangor Cave Club agreed that success was more important than maintaining the caves natural beauty,
leading them to alter the cave. The lifespan of the Bangor Cave
Nightclub also shows the legacy that humans have left on the cave.
Humans changed the landscape in order to attract business, and in doing
so, they removed the cave’s original assets. Human additions
supplemented the natural wonders of the cave, leaving only a remnant of
its original beauty. The Bangor Cave Club was only partially as beautiful
as the untouched landscape. After the Nightclub closed, humans left an
even less appealing mark on the cave, providing both an interesting
narrative and a sobering example of the devastation that can occur when
the natural environment is treated as any other human possession. The
use and eventual disregard of the Bangor Cave Night Club and
Speakeasy exemplifies the result of human selfishness in its relationship
with nature.