

Janus: The Undergraduate History Journal

Spring 2018

University of Maryland: Department of History <https://www.umdjanus.com>



Produced and Edited by:

Aaron Gladstone

Clay Capra

Tahira Ismail

David Malamud

Faculty Advisor: Dr. Saverio Giovacchini

Department Chair: Dr. Phillip Soergel

Director of Undergraduate Studies: Dr. David Freund

Table of Contents

Mongols in Russia: “Long Distance” Governing – Yaroslava Kuzina	3
On the Government of God and Salvian of Marseille – Camden Raynor	10
Nationalism, Division, and Reunion: The Story of Nineteenth Century America Through the Lens of Arlington House – Charlie Rogers	18
Historical Events Resulting in the U.S War with Afghanistan – Leah Silinsky	32
Confederate Female Spies: Changing Northern Perceptions in Fiction and Nonfiction and Its Effect on Popular Opinion of the Confederate Cause – Rachel Edmonston	39

Mongols in Russia: “Long Distance” Governing

By Yaroslava Kuzina

The Mongol Jochid Khanate ruled Russia for about 250 years and its rulers earned the reputation of ruthless and oppressive overlords. This khanate, also called the Golden Horde, has often been credited with Russian lack of technological advancement that later made it difficult for Russia to catch up to Europe. In this essay, I will analyze the Mongol influence on Russian government, administration, and culture. I have read two contemporary Russian chronicles- *The Novgorod Chronicle* and *The Nikonian Chronicle*-in order to amass primary evidence. My research found that the Mongols barely took part in Russian culture, and preferred to rule Russia from a distance-they stayed in their capital Sarai. Their involvement in Russian life was primarily military-the initial invasion and then recurring raids-and economical-they took censuses and collected taxes. The several centuries of occupation by the Mongols (or Tatars as the Russian sources call them) did have a severe effect on the Russian psyche because of their foreignness and violence, but there was quite a lot of violence in the Russian principalities to begin with. Although, the Mongol occupation of Russia was definitely violent, I would like to argue that the Mongol-Russian relationship was much more complicated than just oppressor versus oppressed: there was some collaboration going on too-and lastly, while the simple Russian peasants might indeed have viewed the Mongols as God’s punishment for their sins, the Russian princes probably did not. In this essay, I will first look at the start of the Mongol invasion, the accompanying violence and the reactions of the Russians. Next, I will explore what the Russians thought of as Mongol “oppression.” Finally, I will attempt to evaluate whether the Russians truly viewed the Mongols as oppressors, or if there was a more complicated relationship between them.

The first time that the Russian chronicles mention the Mongols is in 1224, when they fought an army of Russian princes, and defeated it soundly. In fact, this battle need not have happened, but the Russian princes decided to defend the Polovets peoples, who the Mongols fought with first. This encounter left the Russian people shaken, not only because they had no idea who the Mongols were, but also because of the extreme violence of their incursion.¹ This very first attack of the Mongols left the Russians shaken and served as the foundation for the latter narrative of how horrible the Mongols were. *The Nikonian Chronicle* describes how the Mongols campaigned in “cities and occupied all lands and villages, and burned them: and no one could resist them because the entire land was empty. The Tatars could raid there without fear. It is said that in Kiev, alone, 60,000 people were killed. It is impossible to say how many were killed in others because only God knows their numberless number.”² The casualties must have been astounding, after all, the Mongols did often slaughter people who stood up to them, and the Russian lands were not an exception. After this first incursion, the Mongols stayed away from Russia for about another fifteen-twenty years, until the Jochids decided to conquer the land that had been granted them by Chinggis Khan. In 1238, “foreigners called Tartars came in countless numbers, like locusts, into the land of Ryazan,... [and] sent their emissaries to the Knyazes of Ryazan, a sorceress and two men with her, demanding from them one-tenth of everything: of men and Knyazes [Princes] and horses-of everything one-tenth.”³ The sorceress was probably a shaman,

¹ *The Chronicle of Novgorod 1016-1471*, trans. Robert Michell and Nevill Forbes, London, Great Britain, 1914, 64.

² *The Nikonian Chronicle 1132-1520*, ed. Serge A. Zenkovsky, trans. Serge A. Zenkovsky and Betty Jean Zenkovsky, Vols. 2-3, (Princeton, NJ: Kingston Press, 1984), 2:290.

³ *Ibid.*, 81.

and this episode hints at two of the future problems that Russians would have with the Mongols: tax collection and periodical religious intolerance.

After Batu conquered Russia, Lithuania, Poland, Hungary, and other eastern European lands, he retired to his capital Saray, which was on the south Volga River, on the Caspian Sea. He chose to rule from afar, instead of personally enforcing his rule over his empire, and “claimed at least indirect control over most of the Russian principalities way to the north,” and if need be, he could send troops in to assert this control.⁴ The Khan often sent troops in to recapture Russian cities or put down unruly Russian princes. Due to this reticence, “the Mongol impact on urban life in the territories of the Golden Horde varied considerably.”⁵ Mongols generally stayed in Saray, coming to the Russian lands only for raids, to join in local wars and for tax collection. Most of these excursions, especially the military ones, were temporary and the Mongols did not settle in Russia, returning instead back home to Saray. However, some of the Mongol administrators had to settle in Russian towns in order to complete their tasks, which meant that they would bring their family with them. However, the Mongols did not always use force-sometimes they were willing to be bought off. For example, in 1293, when the Tatars wanted to march on Novgorod, the princes paid them off: the Tatars “accepted the numberless multitude of gifts, retreated to the prairie, to their land, and returned to the Horde.”⁶

Although the Khan himself stayed mostly in Saray, and expected the Russian princes to come to him, the Mongol troops did make raids into the Russian lands. Initially, these raids were to punish disobedient princes or to reinforce Mongol rule, but over time, they were led by greedy envoys and generals, or by those generals who had decided to break away to conquer land on their own. For example, in 1318, “A mean envoy named Kokcha came from the Golden Horde and he killed one hundred twenty people at the city of Kostroma. Then he marched further and waged war in the entire Rostov land.”⁷ These kind of raids kept the memory of the Mongols’ first brutal conquest alive, and reinforced the Russian populace’s horror of their conquerors. Furthermore, in 1377 and 1378, the Mongols took Nizhni Novgorod and Suzdal again, in order to beat the princes down, and assert their rule. Due to the internal struggles of the Russian princes, some of the towns and princes would rise in power from time to time and have to be brought into obeisance again. One of these battles, however, which was meant to subdue the Russians, proved to be a resounding defeat for the Mongols instead. In 1379-80, Prince Dmitrii defeated Mamai at the Battle on the Kulikovo Field, and gave the Russians a first glimmer of hope that they could someday win back their freedom.⁸

But, it would be too simple to say that the only battle fought were when Mongols asserted their power over the Russians. In fact, after the initial conquest “there were occasional armed incursions, often instigated not by the Mongol rulers themselves but rather by Russian princes who enlisted Mongol support for attacking other Russian princes.”⁹ This flows into my next point, that the Russians sometimes viewed the Mongols as their allies, not their enemies: they enlisted

⁴ Daniel C Waugh, "The 'owl of misfortune' or the 'phoenix of prosperity'? Rethinking the impact of the Mongols," *Journal of Eurasian Studies* 8 (2017): 16.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 17.

⁶ *The Nikonian Chronicle 1132-1520*, 3:82.

⁷ *The Chronicle of Novgorod 1016-1471*, 103.

⁸ *The Chronicle of Novgorod 1016-1471*, 156.

⁹ Waugh, “The ‘owl of misfortune’,” 17.

Mongol troops and support in their battles against other Russian princes. For example, in 1270 AD, when Prince Yaroslav started to collect troops against Novgorod “he sent Ratibor to the Tartar Tsar asking for help.”¹⁰ This shows that the Russian principalities were far from united, and they warred amongst themselves quite often both before and during the Mongol occupation. Thus, while they might have viewed the Mongols as enemies and oppressors, this evidently, was not enough of a reason to unite and expel the Mongols from Russian lands. It was quite important for a Russian prince to have accurate information “about the political situation in the Horde” because “even normal political functioning required knowing whom it was worthwhile to bribe or petition.”¹¹ In some cases, the Mongols were better allies for the Russian princes than other Russian princes, and therefore, they probably did not see the Mongols as quite the same horrific invaders, that the modern mind might paint them. Instead, for the Russian princes, the Mongols were probably just another tribe, who had conquered them, but afterwards left them more or less alone.

In addition to getting Mongol help to fight against each other, the Russians would sometimes unite with the Mongols against the Germans or Lithuanians. The Russian principalities already had a troublesome history with the German Livonian knights who periodically campaigned in northern Russia. The most famous examples of these battles occurred on the Neva River, when Prince Aleksandr Nevskii destroyed the German forces. In response to German invasions, the Russian princes attacked German territories, too, and asked for Tatar assistance during them. For instance, in 1269, Grand Prince Iaroslav Iaroslavich “Sent to Vladimir to assemble troops for the campaign against the Germans. A strong force was gathered; with them came the Great Baskak, Amragan, his son-in-law, Aidar, and many Tatars.”¹² In another instance, the Russian princes and Tatars led a joint campaign against Lithuania in 1274.¹³ It is also important to remember that the Mongols had conquered Lithuania during their campaign in Russia and eastern Europe, therefore, they were personally interested in maintaining control there. The shifting allegiances between states and Russian principalities point to the fact, that war had a constant omnipresence. While the Mongol conquest was unspeakably and traumatically brutal, this did not prevent the Russians from seeing them as allies later on. Furthermore the Mongols might have not personally incite the Russian princes against each other, they probably supported these petty wars, because it kept the Russians busy and disunited, which prevented them from rebelling successfully against the Mongols.

Besides, asking for Mongol help in their own petty conflicts, the Russians were often conscripted to fight in Mongol conquests. In the late 14th, early 15th century, “the Golden Horde was locked into a titanic struggle with the Timurid empire in which Russian contingents fought in the forces of the Horde.”¹⁴ Halperin also mentions the “Russian conscripts who served in the Imperial Guard stationed outside Peking.”¹⁵ It is well-known that Mongols made some army contingents out of conscripted local populations, it is therefore logical that the Russians also had to take part in this campaign. *The Nikonian Chronicle* describes how in 1277, “Khan Mangu Temir

¹⁰ *The Chronicle of Novgorod 1016-1471*, 103.

¹¹ Charles J. Halperin, “‘Know Thy Enemy’: Medieval Russian Familiarity with the Mongols of the Golden Horde,” *Jahrbücher Für Geschichte Osteuropas, Neue Folge*, 30, no. 2 (1982): 170.

¹² *The Nikonian Chronicle 1132-1520*, 3:45.

¹³ *Ibid.*, 3:54.

¹⁴ Halperin, “‘Know Thy Enemy’,” 167.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 165.

decided to do battle, and he ordered all the aforementioned princes to make ready...” and to fight with him.¹⁶ Therefore, the military relationship worked both ways-the Russians asked for Mongol military assistance, and the Mongols also required Russian conscripts to fight for them.

Despite my previous points about how the Russian princes probably enjoyed having Mongol assistance in their own wars, the common people were less than happy at the Mongol occupation. The Russian peasants and artisans were interested in their own lives, instead of any kind of war, be it local or foreign. Therefore, for them the Mongol occupation was a burden not only because of the periodic raids and violence, but also because of the taxes. The first step of tax collection was to take a census so that the Mongols knew how much tribute to extract. An example of how this went can be found in the *Nikonian Chronicle* entry for 1257: the census takers came from the Golden Horde and took a census, but did not include any clergymen, priests, or other people who worked for the church. This is because the Mongols never taxed religious institutions and therefore they did not need to include them in their census. Then, before leaving “they assigned there their own officers of tens, hundreds, thousands and ten thousands.”¹⁷ This, shows that while most Mongol officials did not live in the Russian principalities, some military leaders and government overseers were stationed there. It is obvious that the Russian people did not like taxes and therefore, treated the census takers with hostility. For instance, in 1258, “The Tatars began to levy tribute, and the Novgorodians did not accept this. They gave many gifts, however, to the Khan and to his envoys, and let them go in peace; but they killed their *posadnik*, In this way the evil people perished in an evil manner, and the Tatar census takers went with peace, being satisfied.”¹⁸ It is interesting to note, that the *Chronicle* calls the local Russian officials the evil people, not the Mongol census takers. Perhaps, they saw the Russian officials as traitors, who turned them over to the Mongols and helped the Mongols levy taxes.

So great was the Russian discontent, that the Mongol tax collectors sometimes feared for their lives. In 1259, several Mongol tax collectors “began to fear death; they said to Olexander: ‘Give us guards, lest they kill us.’ And the Knyaz [Prince] ordered the son of the *Posadnik* and all the sons of the Boyars to protect them by night.”¹⁹ However, the Mongols did not always send tax collectors-sometimes they had the local Princes collect taxes for them. For example, in 1340, when Prince Semion came back from the Horde, he started collecting taxes “in Torzhok, and began to act violently.”²⁰ Perhaps, he resorted to violence to extract extra taxes, which he could keep for himself. Another reason, why the Russian populace hated the Mongol tax collectors was because the Mongols periodically used the extremely unfair tax farming system: individuals would bid for the right to collect taxes and then extort enormous amounts in order to make a profit. In 1261, several princes united to drive Mongol administrators from their cities because they saw the Mongols as a cause of violence: “The rich ones would farm out from the Tatars the collection of taxes, and then would greedily increase their own benefit; therefore many people were forced to accept serfdom in order to pay the interest.”²¹ This entry is not only evidence for the burdensome Mongol taxes, but also shows that there were permanent Mongol administrators living amongst

¹⁶ *The Nikonian Chronicle 1132-1520*, 3:58.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 3:34.

¹⁸ *The Nikonian Chronicle 1132-1520*, 3:35.

¹⁹ *The Chronicle of Novgorod 1016-1471*, 96.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 135.

²¹ *The Nikonian Chronicle 1132-1520*, 3:37-38.

the Russians, with whom some profiteering Russians collaborated. This is important, because although most Mongols lived in Saray, there were Mongol administrators (who probably had families) who came to live in Russian towns, and thus there might have been a small amount of cultural mixing going on as well.

Another negative consequence of Mongol rule was their periodical religious intolerance: while the Mongols had a reputation of practicing religious tolerance in general, there were some exceptions. For instance, sometimes the Mongols would demand that Russian princes who came to visit them, had to follow their rituals. In 1246, when Prince Mikhail Vsevolodich of Chernigov came to the Khan, the Mongols told him: ““You, too, must pass between the bonfires and ow to the sun and to the fire.””²² Prince Mikhail, a Russian Orthodox Christian like most other Russians at the time, refused and was killed. In another, earlier case, Prince Vasil’ko was kept captive in the Mongol Horde in 1237 and forced “to live according to their pagan way”, and when he did not submit, he, too, was executed.²³ A final example of the religious hostility between Russians and Mongols was the calumny against Grand Prince Roman Ol’govich of Rostov. Other Russian princes spread rumors against him and “he spoke irreverently of the Great Khan and that he offended the latter’s faith.”²⁴ The Khan sent Mongols to force Roman to convert, and when he did not, he was executed. These examples illustrate, that while the Mongols did not force everyone to live by their faith, they did demand respect of it, and when that respect was withheld on religious principle, their retribution was swift and cruel.

Now, while, life under the Mongols might have been tough for the plain Russian people, it was not so for the Russian princes—they not only could receive help from Mongol troops for their own campaigns, but they could also get the title of “Grand Prince” from the Mongol khan, and the power that went along with it. Granted, the Grand Prince was still in submission to the Mongol khan, but the Khan was far away in Saray, and in the meantime, the Grand Prince could enforce order in his lands, the way that he wished. The Khan exercised complete power over who was Prince or Grand Prince; the two Chronicles are full of instances when princes went to the Horde and were killed, probably because the Khan did not approve of them. For example, in 1319, “The Tsar [Khan] killed Knyaz Mikhail of Tver in the Horde and gave the title of Veliki Knyaz to Yuri.”²⁵ Another example, of the Khan’s authority was when in 1353, the men of Novgorod sent envoys to the Khan to request that he make Prince Konstantin of Suzdal their Grand Prince. The Khan refused, however, and bestowed the title on Prince Ivan.²⁶ As proof of their titles, the princes got charters from the Khan called “yarlyks” (jarylk, iarlygh). The metropolitans of the Russian Orthodox Church also got yarlyks which guaranteed its “fiscal and judicial immunities.”²⁷ As can be seen, the Khan himself was practicing “long distance” government: he was far away in Saray, and all the Russian princes had to come bow before him (thus, pledging their allegiance and renewing their yarlyks). This was required whenever a new khan came to power, or whenever a khan wished it. For instance, in 1246, Batu “commanded all the Russian princes remaining in

²² *The Nikonian Chronicle 1132-1520*, 3:18.

²³ *Ibid.*, 2:314.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, 3:49.

²⁵ *The Chronicle of Novgorod 1016-1471*, 121.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, 145.

²⁷ Halperin, “‘Know Thy Enemy’,” 167.

Russia to come to him and to bow before him.”²⁸ It is interesting all the Russian princes did indeed visit the Horde (if there were examples of disobedience, the chronicles do not mention it). This means that the threat of the Mongols still loomed over them: and failing to go to Horde would mean punishment.

As can be seen, the Mongol influence on life in the Russian principalities was relatively minor. There were some Mongol officials living with families amongst the Russians, Russian princes visited the Horde, and some married Mongol princesses, however, other than this, the cultural mixing was minimal.²⁹ The Mongol influence on Russia was chiefly military and economical: the Mongols raided the principalities from time to time in search of booty or to reassert their control. They also sent troops to the Russian princes, whom they favored, and campaigned jointly against Lithuania from time to time. Although, the Mongol conquest and subsequent raids were extremely violent and brutal, it is important to remember that the Russian princes were constantly warring against each other anyways. Therefore, the horror of the initial conquest soon receded, and the Russian populace kept living normally. They were disgruntled with Mongol taxes, but, otherwise, violence and war were a commonplace occurrence for the Russians. It is even possible that the Mongols encouraged petty wars amongst, in order to prevent the Russian princes from uniting against the Mongols (which eventually did happen). Overall, it is no question that the Mongol conquest was brutal; however, in an time of constant petty wars and ever-shifting alliances, the Russian-Mongol relationship was not as black-and-white as we now paint it, and the Russians (especially the elite) could get much benefit from the Mongols, if they played their cards right.

²⁸ *The Nikonian Chronicle 1132-1520*, 3:17.

²⁹ *The Nikonian Chronicle 1132-1520*, 3:101.

Bibliography

- Halperin, Charles J. "‘Know Thy Enemy’: Medieval Russian Familiarity with the Mongols of the Golden Horde." *Jahrbücher Für Geschichte Osteuropas, Neue Folge*, 30, no. 2 (1982): 161-75. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41047563>.
- Halperin, Charles J. "The Missing Golden Horde Chronicles and Historiography in the Mongol Empire." *Mongolian Studies* 23 (2000): 1-15.
- The Chronicle of Novgorod 1016-1471*, Translated by Robert Michell and Nevill Forbes, London, Great Britain, 1914.
- The Nikonian Chronicle 1132-1520*. Edited by Serge A. Zenkovsky. Translated by Serge A. Zenkovsky and Betty Jean Zenkovsky. Vols. 2-4. Princeton, NJ: Kingston Press, 1984.
- Vasary, Istvan. "The Golden Horde Term Daruga and its Survival in Russia." In *Turks, Tatars and Russians in the 13th-16th Centuries, 186-97*. N.p.: Ashgate Variorum, n.d.
- Waugh, Daniel C. "The 'owl of misfortune' or the 'phoenix of prosperity'? Rethinking the impact of the Mongols." *Journal of Eurasian Studies* 8 (2017): 10-21.

On the Government of God and Salvian of Marseille

By Camden Raynor

As the Roman Empire approached the middle of the fifth century C.E., serious structural problems permeated the empire's security and long-term viability. Gradual losses of territory across a wide swath of the borderlands made it clear that Rome no longer exercised the influence it once did over the Mediterranean world. Various barbarian kingdoms flourished along the empire's borders and Rome's ability to control its provinces and army diminished during those final decades of the empire. This paper will discuss how Roman hegemony in western Europe was crumbling at an accelerating rate during Late Antiquity .

A central figure during this period of tumultuous politics and imperial decline was Salvian, better known as Salvian of Marseilles. Born in Gaul in the late fourth or early fifth century C.E., Salvian was likely a member of a local elite family.³⁰ Salvian came of age in an unstable period in Gaul and, as he testified in his work, was an eyewitness to barbarian invasion and destruction in several Gallic cities in the early to mid-fifth century C.E. Salvian, along with his rough contemporary Augustine, wrote extensively about the state of Roman Christianity and its vices. Best known for his unfinished treatise of eight books, *On the Government of God*, Salvian was a constant voice of criticism and harshly rebuked the practices and beliefs of Roman Christians. A biblical scholar in his own right, Salvian effectively used the teachings of the Bible to argue with his contemporaries over the reasons for the collapse of the Roman Empire and its mighty institutions.

On the Government of God, is a treatise of eight books written by Salvian in the mid-fifth century C.E. All eight books come together to support Salvian's thesis that the collapse of the Roman Empire and rise of barbarian nations along its borders was primarily due to the insufficient piety of Roman Christians. God, in Salvian's view, was displeased with the various sins committed by the peoples of the Empire, which he described in considerable detail in the second half of *On the Government of God*.

On the Government of God is broken into eight separate books, each of which provides a distinct analysis of late-antique Roman society to support Salvian's overarching thesis. The first two books, although interesting because of their incredible descriptions of the God of the Old Testament, focus on examples of how God interacted with human governments throughout the Old Testament and provide analysis of God's retribution and judgement, which are peripherally related to the subject of this paper. The third book describes how horrible Christians can be, despite their alleged understanding of the teachings of God. Most relevant to this paper are the fourth, fifth, sixth, and seventh books, all of which provide specific details on the sins and debauchery of Roman Christians during the fifth century C.E. Covering a wide range of topics and sins, those four books provide the most important views of Salvian regarding the moral and spiritual decline of the Roman Empire during that period. The eighth book reads as a conclusion of sorts, with a call to action by Salvian for Christians to come together to fight against imperial decline and bring back Christian orthodoxy to the Empire. All eight books are supported by substantial biblical evidence,

³⁰ O'Sullivan, Jeremiah F., *The Writings of Salvian, The Presbyter* (The Catholic University of America Press, 1947), 1.

as well as firsthand accounts of Salvian regarding the dramatic events he allegedly witnessed during his life in Gaul.

This paper seeks to analyze Salvian's views regarding the decline of Roman Christianity in the fourth and fifth centuries C.E. to draw several conclusions about the reasons for the collapse of the Roman Empire in the west, as well as how Romans, notably Salvian, viewed barbarian incursions and the changes they brought. Although *On the Government of God* is an obviously polemical work, Salvian effectively argues that the inability of the Roman Empire to control its borders and maintain its massive land area was a direct result of corruption and greed among Roman elites and, more importantly to Salvian, the insufficient religious conviction of Roman Christians and their relative lack of moral standards in comparison to the barbarian invaders.

Salvian is clear throughout the fifth and sixth books of *On the Government of God* that the excessive greed and corruption among Roman elites was, at least in part, directly responsible for an exodus of the lower classes to barbarian states and contributed to the moral and religious decline of the empire in the fifth century C.E. Describing the taxation situation during the middle of the century, Salvian claims that "the rich have become wealthier by the decrease of the burdens they bore easily, while the poor are dying of the increase in taxes they already found too great for endurance."³¹ His bleak assessment of the alleged exploitation of the poor indicates that the elites of the Roman Empire had already placed significant tax burdens on the laboring classes in past centuries. The simultaneous decrease in spending by the wealthy and the increase of tax levies on the poor was, as Salvian suggests, not bearable for many of the already impoverished people of the empire. The Roman state was being "strangled by the cords of taxation,"³² with the great mass of the population paying a disproportionate amount of taxes to support the lifestyles of an elite class which continued to live lavishly.

The need for higher taxation was compounded by the general decay of the Roman Empire in its later years. Salvian accurately noted the state of fiscal affairs in the empire when he somberly wrote that "we do not have the peace and wealth of former times. All things which were are either gone or changed."³³ Possibly alluding to the loss of major Gallic cities, such as Treves³⁴, or to the devastating economic impacts of the Vandal conquest of the province of Africa in the early fifth century, Salvian recognized that the empire was struggling to maintain fiscal solvency when faced with shrinking borders and likely demographic decline as well. However, his earlier criticism of the ruling class makes his position clear that the solution out of fiscal crisis is not to continue levying additional taxes on the poor, but rather atone for the sins which have brought about the very decline which necessitated additional taxation.

The effects of an unjust taxation policy, which laid an unfair share of the tax burden upon the poor, lead Salvian to conclude that poor Romans should and would leave the boundaries of the Roman Empire and resettle in barbarian states. Claiming that barbarian peoples, including the Franks, Huns, Goths, and Vandals, do not tolerate such unjust taxation policies, Salvian predicted that Romans will "cast us aside in order to flee to them."³⁵ In a world with no labor or capital

³¹ *Government of God*, 4.6.

³² *Ibid.*, 4.6.

³³ *Ibid.*, 6.18

³⁴ *Ibid.*, 6.15.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, 5.8.

restrictions, Salvian's prediction would likely come to fruition as those most egregiously affected by the Roman state would leave the empire.

However, Salvian anticipates and provides his own rebuttal to his original position that the poor would flee for barbarian nations. Due to the obvious inability of poor people to move their land and significant investments and possessions, the poor, unable to shoulder the heavy tax burden, "give themselves to the upper classes in return for care and protection."³⁶ To escape and meet the demands of a system designed to help the wealthy, the poor submit themselves to those who put such a system in place. Now, in return for temporary help given to a poor couple by a wealthy landowner, not only has the poor couple submitted their livelihood, but have also surrendered the rights of their children to their property, in perpetuity. This adept analysis of the early days of an economic system, which one could begin to recognize as a form of early feudalism, trapped poor farmers and laborers by tying them to the land which they worked but no longer owned.³⁷ Therefore, while one would assume that the pressures of heavy taxation would encourage people to leave the empire, it in fact led to a system of subtenant farming where mobility became extremely restrictive.

The combination of higher taxation due to, in Salvian's opinion, greed by Roman elites and a loss of territory during the fifth century led to, as Salvian suggests, a world in which opportunities for the poor declined while a system of labor based on an association to a plot of land increased the power of the elite landowners themselves. This perverse economic system, where the poor, in order to pay taxes in the short-term, submit to paying taxes in perpetuity, was a representation of Salvian's feelings regarding the greed and corruption of the wealthy during this period.³⁸ Not only was the exploitation of the poor already morally reprehensible, but it also contributed, in Salvian's view, to the general decline of the empire.

This understanding on the economic crises in Gaul during this period is controversial among historians. Some, including Peter Sarris, claim that Salvian has accurately informed his audience of the impending economic order of the coming centuries.³⁹ However others, most significantly J.F. Drinkwater in his book *Fifth Century Gaul: A Crisis of Identity?*, are suspicious of Salvian's claims regarding the hardships faced by the poor. According to Drinkwater, if his descriptions of the destruction Gallic cities are true, then the Gallic poor, far from being impoverished, were prospering as a result. Due to the smaller population and continued demand for labor, workers enjoyed "high wages and a generally more mobile labor market."⁴⁰ The elite would suffer in this situation due to increased labor prices combined with lower rents and prices. However, while there is significant disagreement over Salvian's interpretation of the economic situation in the later Roman Empire, Drinkwater does concede that the all taxpayers suffered due to a "taxation base that was damaged and shrinking."⁴¹ Therefore, while the detailed descriptions provided by Salvian are likely exaggerated, the general concept of a struggling economy is widely agreed upon.

³⁶ Ibid., 5.8.

³⁷ Ibid., 5.8.

³⁸ Sarris, Peter, *The Origins of the Manorial Economy: New Insights from Late Antiquity* (The English Historical Review, 2004), 283.

³⁹ Ibid., 283.

⁴⁰ Drinkwater, J.F. *Fifth Century Gaul: A Crisis of Identity?* (Cambridge University Press, 1992), 210-211.

⁴¹ Ibid., 212

In combination with the economic decline of the Roman Empire, Salvian concurrently witnessed religious issues among the Roman Christian population. Especially clear in the sixth book of *On the Government of God*, Salvian describes a society where morality is in decline and debauchery dominates in the cities of the empire. Within his criticism of Roman Christians, he lays out two important sub-arguments which define his reasoning for why the empire is in decline. First, Salvian discussed, in detail, the sins of Roman Christians and why they are displeasing to God. Salvian views the actions of sinful Christians, as the primary reason for the gradual dissolution of the Roman Empire. Second, Salvian lays out his reasoning for why the sins of barbarian states and peoples are less severe than those of the Romans. He claims that Romans were aware of God's holy commandments and the teachings of Christ, then their sins were far worse than those of the barbarian cultures, who were blissfully ignorant of God's teachings. Salvian, in the later books of *On the Government of God*, harshly criticizes the practices of Roman Christians while simultaneously defending the actions of barbarian states.

Salvian begins by claiming that Roman Christians have fallen of favor with God and, as he claimed that Jewish people did centuries earlier, have "long since left off the worship of God."⁴² Salvian claimed that a similar loss of proper worship has led God to punish those remaining in the Roman Empire, implying that the Jewish worship of idols and rejection of Jesus Christ as the Messiah meant that they were no longer the people of God..

The consequences of forsaking God are severe and long-lasting. As referenced earlier, Salvian witnessed the destruction of the cities of Trier and Mainz, which, he claimed, collapsed due to the impiety of their populations. He went as far to say "Therefore, let nobody think that the city perished only at the time of its own ruin. Where such things are done, the inhabitants already (morally) perished long before they (physically) perished."⁴³ Similar to the biblical depictions of the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah, Salvian portrayed the Gallic cities as cesspools of sin and vice, full of people who turned away from their faith in favor of the finer luxuries of life. Alluding to the reasons as to why those cities fell, Salvian claimed that the moral decay of the population predated and directly led to the physical destruction of the population as well. The depiction of the destruction gives readers, most likely Roman Christians, a dark representation of the consequences to society from generations of sinful practices. Chapters thirteen, fourteen, and fifteen in the sixth book provide an ominous warning to the people of the empire as to just how devastating the destruction could be.⁴⁴

A variety of sinful practices corrupted the people of the Roman Empire. Most discussed in *On the Government of God* are the deadly sins of pride and lust. In his rant to those reading about the deadly consequences to Christians for their impiety, Salvian was further enraged by the audacity of some Christians who, as he alleges, are blinded by their own pride, those Roman Christians who "do not wish to recognize any guilt in ourselves, but we dare to claim the right to judge others."⁴⁵ The inability of Roman Christians to see their own sins was, in Salvian's view, as bad as the commitment of the sins themselves. That hypocrisy within the Christian community runs rampant in the eyes of Salvian, particularly in the institution of marriage. In pagan Rome, extramarital relationships and homosexual affairs, particularly with slaves, were common and

⁴² *Government of God*, 4.1.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, 6.13.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 6.13-15.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 4.2.

accepted, especially among the wealthy elite. However, upon the adoption of Christianity, marriage shifted towards an institution which supported monogamous, heterosexual marriage. However, Christian men often took mistresses despite their marital status, thereby “deforming the sanctity of holy matrimony.”⁴⁶ The corruption of the institution of marriage, which by definition is a union, at that time, between one man and one woman, is particularly reprehensible to Salvian and indicated the immorality Roman Christians embraced.

Most dramatically, Salvian compared the behavior of impious Christians to that of slaves, claiming that Christians are like runaway slaves, fleeing from the authority of their masters.⁴⁷ Just as slaves continuously attempt to subvert the will of their masters, Christians subverted the will of God through their sins. Salvian went a step farther and justified the actions of a slave, for “in all likelihood he is running away from a bad master, while you flee from a good one.”⁴⁸ That statement was extraordinary because of the stinging social comparison Salvian made by comparing Roman Christians to those of lowest social class, slaves. The comparison indicated the immense frustration and shame Salvian attempted to place upon sinful Christians, while also reaffirmed the eternal grace of God. To subvert God’s will is worse because God is a perfect master with reasonable rules. Therefore, not only does Salvian compare the actions of Roman Christians to those of slaves, but also implied that the sins of Christians are worse than those of slaves, who after all, were only attempting to rid themselves of a bad master. In plain language, due to their sin and hypocrisy, “certain nobles are worse than slaves”⁴⁹ in Salvian’s eyes.

The crux of Salvian’s argument came when he claimed that not only are Roman Christians no better than slaves, but that the sins of Roman Christians were worse compared to the sins of barbarians. Salvian wrote “this is why I lamented a short time ago that we are much worse than the barbarians, because ignorance of the Law excuses them, while knowledge of the Law accuses us.”⁵⁰ Barbarian societies, due to their lack of knowledge regarding Christian theology, can be easily forgiven for the sins they commit. In contrast, the sins of Roman Christians were far worse because the sins they commit are willful. Therefore, a Roman Christian committing adultery is more serious than a barbarian pagan committing adultery because the Roman knows what he is doing is wrong, while the pagan is ignorant of the law of God. The sins committed in barbarian states are not to be encouraged, but they are more forgivable than sins committed by Romans. He used the example of the theaters and circuses of the Roman Empire to help prove his point. Roman Christians, he claimed, “prefer stage plays to the churches of God,”⁵¹ while pagan barbarians did not enjoy such public entertainment at all. Even if the pagans did enjoy such vices, Salvian believed that those transgressions would “not involve violation of a sacrament,”⁵² because the sins were not committed in defiance of God. Roman Christians, though, were displeasing God by merely witnessing sin in a public place. Watching animal fights in an arena or hearing an actor blaspheme God was as bad as committing the sin itself,⁵³ for “while the spectators approve and gladly watch them, all perform them through sight and consent.”⁵⁴ Attendance to a forum where sins were

⁴⁶ Ibid., 4.5.

⁴⁷ Ibid., 4.3.

⁴⁸ Ibid., 4.3.

⁴⁹ Ibid., 4.5.

⁵⁰ Ibid., 6.2.

⁵¹ Ibid., 6.7.

⁵² Ibid., 6.7.

⁵³ Ibid., 6.4.

⁵⁴ Ibid., 6.3

committed was regarded by Salvian as passive approval for the activity shown, whether that be murder, lust, or any number of sins. The existence of those events, be they in a theater or arena, was abhorrent to Salvian because they represented the consent of Roman Christians to the event depicted. The spectacles of the circuses and theaters were particularly troubling for Salvian because faith must be accompanied by good works, for “unless a Christian has performed good works, he cannot prove his faith at all, and since he cannot prove it exists, it must be considered altogether nonexistent.”⁵⁵ If one attended a sinful event, then he was considered to not be living a life full of good works. The mere attendance and acknowledgement of sin in the public sphere was enough for Salvian to assume one has no faith.

In contrast to the willful sins of Roman Christians, Salvian wrote to defend barbarian sins and made a case for why barbarian society was preferable to Roman life. A Glenn Olsen notes in his essay on the religious reforms enacted by Salvian, Salvian exhibited surprisingly positive views about barbarians because he saw their cultures as untainted by the “civilization, wealth, and luxury”⁵⁶ which afflicted Roman Christians. Barbarian society was free from the vices of sins due to their blissful ignorance of the word of God.⁵⁷ It was impossible for barbarians to commit acts as evil to those of Roman Christians because they lived in societies where “their sin and guilt would be less offensive to what is holy, because...there would be no violation of the sacrament.”⁵⁸ *On the Government of God* represented Salvian’s interesting contradictory positions about barbarians, where he freely admitted that they are heretical pagans, but also felt that they did not choose to live in sin. This contradiction supports Salvian’s argument that the sins of those who understood that they were sinning, however small the infraction, were worse than those who lived in ignorance of the tenets of Christianity.⁵⁹

However, it is important to recognize the potential faults in Salvian’s argument both the economic injustice in the fifth century C.E., as well as the extent of Christianity’s moral decline during the period. While Salvian was certainly passionate regarding the exploitation of the poor, *On the Government of God* is first and foremost a collection of Salvian’s views about the world he experienced, which were not necessarily what the world was at the time. Chris Wickham, in his book *The Inheritance of Rome*, reminds readers that Salvian’s work is essentially a “hell-fire sermon,”⁶⁰ with details that “cannot be taken too seriously.”⁶¹ The lack of reliable data from the period, as well as the subjective nature of works like *On the Government of God*, initially may lead one to agree with Wickham’s assessment that Salvian is an often-unreliable source. However, Salvian’s purpose for writing, and the purpose of this paper, is not to provide deep analysis of the events surrounding which his life. Rather, it was to provide an explanation for the seemingly inexplicable events occurring around him within his area of expertise. It is important for historians to analyze the varying historiography surrounding the periods they study. Therefore, *On the Government of God*, while certainly comprised of polemical essays, provides crucial information

⁵⁵ Ibid., 4.2.

⁵⁶ Olsen, Glenn, *Reform after the Pattern of the Primitive Church in the Thought of Salvian of Marseille* (Catholic University of America Press, 1982), 2.

⁵⁷ *Government of God.*, 6.10.

⁵⁸ Ibid., 6.7.

⁵⁹ O’Donnell, James J, *Salvian and Augustine* (Villanova University Press, 1983), 27.

⁶⁰ Wickham, Chris, *The Inheritance of Rome* (Penguin Group, 2009), 84.

⁶¹ Ibid., 84.

for understanding how Salvian, and perhaps his contemporaries, understood and explained the rapid societal changes of the fifth century C.E.

Salvian of Marseilles' epic work *On the Government of God* provides an important firsthand account of some of the events of the last century of the western Roman Empire. Salvian's views, while not necessarily always supported by empirical evidence, represented a crucial attempt by a religious figure to make sense of the sudden and often distressing changes during the fifth century C.E. Salvian explained the collapse of Roman institutional authority in the west, particularly Gaul, by claiming that exploitative taxation of the poor and religious and moral decline among Roman Christians directly led to God essentially forsaking the Roman people. Corruption by Roman elites, as well the open acceptance of sin by Christians, led Salvian to conclude that God, while merciful, inflicted his divine retribution upon the people of the western Roman Empire. Salvian's sharp indictment of the state of Christianity and relative tolerance of barbarian societies indicated his deep concern for the people and leaders of his era. It is crucial for historians, and the public at large, to analyze and understand the opinions and concerns of past historians, especially when their works relate to modern society. It is because of its relevance that *On the Government of God* was such a pleasure to read; Salvian's grappling with his society's moral decay felt surprisingly relevant to modern times. He just had the unfortunate luck to have been born as the western Roman Empire was beginning to die.

Bibliography

- Drinkwater, John and Hugh Elton. *Fifth-century Gaul: a crisis of identity?* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- Frank, R. I. "Ammianus on Roman Taxation." *The American Journal of Philology* 93, no. 1 (1972): 69-86. doi:10.2307/292902.
- O'Donnell, James. "Salvian and Augustine." *Augustinian Studies* 14, (1983): 25-34.
- Olsen, Glenn W. "Reform after the Pattern of the Primitive Church in the Thought of Salvian of Marseilles." *The Catholic Historical Review* 68, no. 1 (1982): 1-12.
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/25021255>.
- O'Sullivan, Jeremiah F. *The Writings of Salvian, The Presbyter*. Washington, D.C: The Catholic University of America Press, 1947.
- Salvian. *On the Government of God*. Cedar Rapids: Aeterna Press, 2015.
- Sarris, Peter. "The Origins of the Manorial Economy: New Insights from Late Antiquity." *The English Historical Review* 119, no. 481 (2004): 279-311.
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/3490231>.
- Wickham, Chris. *The Inheritance of Rome*. New York: Penguin Group, 2009.

Nationalism, Division, and Reunion:

The Story of Nineteenth Century America Through the Lens of Arlington House

By Charlie Rogers

In 2016, over 1,050,000 people visited Arlington House, the Robert E. Lee Memorial.⁶² This remarkable increase from a yearly average of around 620,000 speaks to the growing controversy surrounding Lee and other confederate leaders that has arisen in recent years. Cities and towns throughout the southern states have received criticism for maintaining public monuments honoring heroes of the Confederacy. While many have been removed or relocated, some still remain; and the debate surrounding these statues and sites has brought America's racist history back to the forefront of discussion.

Unlike the monuments to Lee found throughout the South, Arlington House serves as a *memorial* to the former general. While monuments are intended to glorify the individual or event that it represents, a memorial serves as a reminder of an individual's significant role in history; positive, or negative. While most of these monuments were created by local governments and can be taken down with relative ease legislatively, Arlington House is a memorial designated by Congress, and would require congressional action to lose its status.⁶³ Because monuments for Confederate leaders have begun to fall throughout the country, and Arlington House has a particular opportunity and obligation to relay the influence and significance of the life of Robert E. Lee.

There is however, more history to Arlington House than just the life of Robert E. Lee. The family of George Washington was the original owner of the home, tying the nation's first President and the Confederacy's greatest general together through the history of this estate. When it was built at the turn of the nineteenth century, Arlington House served as the country's first memorial to George Washington, and as the home of his adopted step-grandson, George Washington Parke Custis. The house's pristine view of the capital made it the perfect location for a shrine to the first president. In an era of instability in the young United States, the memorial represented the strength and unity that the colonies had exemplified in winning their freedom from Great Britain, and served as a reminder of the importance of maintaining this freedom. Arlington House became a hub for high-society in and around the capital, and came to represent the new and unique American identity.

While not heavily focused on production, Arlington was also a functioning plantation, and was home to dozens of slaves for most of the antebellum period. These slaves were responsible for the majority of hard labor needed to build the estate, and their life at the estate can be seen as a microcosm of slave life throughout the country at the time. While the treatment of slaves at Arlington could be seen as relatively progressive for the era, it was still an undoubtedly inhumane practice; and the national argument over its legitimacy steadily intensified through the 1800s.⁶⁴

⁶² National Parks Service, *Annual Visitation Report by Years: 2006 to 2016*, updated January, 2017. Accessed August 26, 2017.

⁶³ Custis-Lee Mansion Name Change Act of 1972, Public Law 92-333, 92nd Cong., 2d sess. (June 30, 1972).

⁶⁴ Allen C. Guezlo, *Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation: The End of Slavery in America* (Simon & Schuster Paperbacks, 2005), 10.

As the country became increasingly divided by this debate, war quickly became inevitable.⁶⁵ Families throughout the United States would be forced to take a side when the country split, and would likely be pitted against family and friends who had joined the opposition. When secession began and the country was divided in half, Arlington House fell almost directly on the line of the split. As the head of his family, Robert E. Lee would be forced to decide which side of this line he and his family fell on, and his decision would become one of the most important in American history.

Following the war, Arlington became both a symbol of Lee's traitorous actions, and a trophy that the Union took during the conflict. However, Lee's rhetoric that promoted reunion after the war, and the establishment of the land as a national cemetery helped give it its reputation as a much-needed symbol of reunion following the Civil War.

This complex history behind Arlington House allows the property to serve as a microcosm of the changes taking place across the United States during the nineteenth century. Touching on themes of nationalism, slavery, secession, war, and reunion, the story of the house provides historians with a unique and valuable perspective on this complicated and tenuous period in American history.

I

Following the Revolutionary War, the young United States found itself in an extremely unique position. After a successful rebellion against one of the world's foremost military superpowers, Americans had both the opportunity and the desire to create a strong new national identity. As the Napoleonic Wars in Europe put increasing pressure on trade in the United States, and the War with Britain challenged the country's newly won independence, it became clear that self-reliance and separation from European influence would be crucial to the success of the nation. Beyond just economic needs, Americans also wanted to establish their separation from Europe culturally. The creation of monuments and memorials in honor of American heroes of the Revolution is one of the earliest examples of this effort, and George Washington Parke Custis, the adopted stepson of George Washington, distinguished himself as a leader of this patriotic movement in the early nineteenth century.

When Custis' father, John, died in 1781, the young boy was sent to live with his grandmother Martha Dandridge Custis Washington, and her husband George at Mount Vernon. George and Martha Washington adopted and raised Custis as their son, and during his time at Mount Vernon he grew very close with his adopted stepfather. Following Washington's death in 1799, Custis began plans for a new estate on land that he had inherited from his birth father John, which sat along the shores of the Potomac in Virginia.⁶⁶

Americans throughout the country held the same admiration for Washington as Custis did, and his role as an iconic leader and general during the Revolution was one of the critical reasons for the success of the young nation. His position as a figurehead of the emerging democracy, combined with his ability to unify citizens made him a widely respected and revered individual. An increasingly intense battle between federalists and anti-federalists, combined with constant

⁶⁵ James M. McPherson, *Battle Cry of Freedom* (New York: Oxford, 2003), 8.

⁶⁶ Murray Nelligan, *Arlington House: The Story of the Lee Mansion Historical Monument* (Burke, Virginia: Chatelaine Press, 2001), 41.

pressure from European powers, left the United States in an exceptionally vulnerable position. Washington's foresight allowed him to lead the country in an astounding fashion.⁶⁷ In his iconic farewell address, he urged all citizens to remember that, "the name of American, which belongs to you in your national capacity, must always exalt the just pride of patriotism more than any appellation derived from local discriminations."⁶⁸ These words would be cast aside by most by the beginning of the Civil War, but they would play a deciding role in the direction of the country heading into the turn of the century. By asserting his positive and wise leadership, Washington was able to set a universal precedent in uniting the states and their citizens during this volatile period of American history. In creating a memorial to Washington, Custis hoped to draw on this appeal to unity, and saw it as an opportunity to further project his late guardian's ideals.

When Custis left Mount Vernon, he brought with him dozens of paintings, pieces of furniture, and other heirlooms, that he planned on using to decorate the house in honor of the late President. While he had inherited some possessions through the will of Martha Washington, he acquired most of the items connected to George Washington through the estate sale. Although Custis' spending at this auction would put him in a significant amount of debt, and restrict his ability to pay for the house's construction, it left Mount Vernon with a much smaller collection of prized memorabilia, and asserted Arlington House as the premiere memorial to Washington in the country. From lesser items like paintings, furniture, and silverware, to the most sought after memorabilia like Washington's stagecoach, tents used during the war, and memorial flags, Custis got as much as he possibly could from his former home to create a memorial at Arlington. The "Washington Treasury" as Custis called it, was the foundation that he would use to turn his home into a focal point for high society around the capital.

The location of the house had a tremendously important effect in creating this allure. The twelve hundred acres that John Custis had left his son stretched along the Virginian shores of the Potomac, and sat directly across from the quickly growing capital.⁶⁹ Rising up from the riverbank stood a steep bluff that overlooked the city and expansive forestlands surrounding it. Custis felt that this distinct location would serve as the perfect site for his new home, and he began construction on the area in 1802. It was from here that he would watch the capital be consumed in flames during the War of 1812, and see it triumphantly rise again even more magnificent than before.⁷⁰ Even though it offered an exceptional view of the city, it would seem that Custis chose the location for a different reason. In creating a memorial to Washington, Custis intended to make the home a spectacle, and the house's location on the bluff would be unavoidable to anyone in the city who happened to look to the West across the river.

The architecture of Arlington House further emphasizes Custis' intention to create an American monument. The most distinct feature is the large portico that stretches across the front of the house serving as a grandiose entrance. Eight columns standing twenty-three feet tall, and measuring five feet in diameter at the base, surround the portico and give the house a pronounced and unavoidable design.⁷¹ One British traveller wrote in 1832 that the house was, "...visible for many miles, and in the distance [had] the appearance of a superior English country residence

⁶⁷ James Flexner, *Washington: The Indispensable Man* (Sterling, 2012), 116.

⁶⁸ George Washington, *Farewell Address*. September 19, 1796 (The Washington Papers, University of Virginia).

⁶⁹ Nelligan, *Arlington House*, 71.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, 113.

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, 124.

beyond any place I had seen in the states.”⁷² Custis had succeeded in making the house an irresistible attraction for visitors to the capital. The distinct features, reminiscent of Greek style temples, amplified the intrigue that surrounded the presidential memorial, made the house an unmistakable landmark overlooking Washington D.C., and projected the newfound American pride.

II

Similar to most large landowners throughout the South, one of the ways that Custis was able to afford the costs of construction on his home was a heavy reliance on slave labor. Custis owned hundreds of slaves between his three properties, and kept dozens at Arlington House.⁷³ While years of history have neglected the impact and importance of these people, it is clear that they had a profound effect on the success of the estate, and that they deserve such recognition. Slaves at Arlington were tasked with clearing land for roads on the property, leveling the site for the house, making bricks for the foundation, and almost all other manual labor.⁷⁴ Custis’ use of slaves on the property would continue throughout the years leading up to the Civil War, as the nation-wide argument over the issue steadily intensified. Custis’ treatment of his slaves was in no way uncommon for his time, and the process of using them to promote his personal agenda was sadly a very common theme in the United States up to the beginning of the Civil War.

There were however, many aspects of slavery at Arlington House that differed significantly from many other estates and plantations throughout the country. While most slaveholders constantly tried to save as much money as they could in providing for slaves, Custis held a very different philosophy. One of the key issues faced by former slaves during this period was establishing themselves as members of society after being freed. Many either continued to work on plantations for menial wages, or headed north and struggled to succeed in an ever-divided society. As abolition spread throughout the northern states, the profitability of the slave trade experienced a steady increase, and selling slaves south became ever more enticing. Despite the fact that Custis faced periods of financial difficulty due to his investments into the house and the Washington Treasury, the slaves at Arlington were always afforded much greater benefits that were common at the time. Custis believed that it was his responsibility to educate his slaves, and even when he cut costs on building his home, like using painted cement to look like stone, he always allocated money that was to be used to teach his workers. Custis even searched for someone to live at the estate and work as a full time teacher for his slaves; and when he could not find someone for the position, his wife Mary took on the responsibility.⁷⁵ Some of Custis’ slaves recounted how they would be free to visit the capital on certain days, and even hold their own property in some cases.⁷⁶ In his later years, Custis began to realize that the small freedoms and minimal education that he provided his slaves would not be enough to allow them to succeed in a country so extremely divided over the race of its citizens. It is for this reason that he became one of the leading advocates for the American Colonization Society, an organization that aimed to

⁷² Godfrey T. Vigne, *Six Months in America* (London: Whittaker, Treacher & Co., 1832), 147.

⁷³ *We Have a Claim on This Estate: Arlington from Slavery to Freedom*. (National Parks Service, Department of the Interior, 2004)

⁷⁴ *We Have a Claim on This Estate*, (National Parks Service, 2004)

⁷⁵ Nelligan, *Arlington House*, 75.

⁷⁶ *We Have a Claim on This Estate*, (National Parks Service, 2004)

relocate former slaves to the West Coast of Africa where they believed they would be able to live a more prosperous life.⁷⁷

Through the first half of the nineteenth century the treatment of slaves in the south grew increasingly harsh.⁷⁸ Arlington House was unfortunately an extremely rare example of fairer treatment of slaves. Plantation owners during this period were driven by a powerful economic interest in agriculture. As the North became economically dominated by manufacturing in the early 1800s, many Southerners began to fear that their increase in power through industry would lead to extreme inequality between the North and the South. Using technological advances that came about at the turn of the century, like the steam powered engine, factories in the North were able to train workers quickly, and turn highly efficient profits selling products that only required cheap raw materials to produce.⁷⁹ In order to combat the North's rapidly expanding economy, southerners invested heavily into the growth of cash crops like tobacco, indigo, and cotton. The only option to sustain success in their agriculture-based economy was to use the cheapest labor possible, which at the time were slaves that were bought and sold on the open market, and could be treated as property in almost every aspect. Without a need to provide anything more than the bare minimum for their workers, Southern plantation owners were able to maintain their economy and lifestyle at the expense of these enslaved people.⁸⁰ This increasing reliance on slave labor ensured that southerners would stand by the institution, leading to further division in the country.

As it became increasingly clear that the South's economy was almost totally reliant on the production of cash crops, and that the use of slave labor would be the anchor to the success of this plan, southerners knew that their system would not be able to survive without slavery. While some make the argument that the split between the North and South was due more to issues of federalism and states' rights, it is clear that fear of a failing economy drove southerners to commit to sacrificing their lives in the Civil War.

This theme of movement in the right direction by few, while the division between groups as a whole intensified, is one that was extremely prominent during the build-up to the Civil War. While some families like the Custises took more measured approaches on the treatment of their slaves by providing them with limited education and freedom, there were far more that viewed further oppression as the only option. While the abolitionist movement in the North gained momentum, their progress was limited by the radicalization of southern slave owners. During the mid-nineteenth century, both sides became increasingly entrenched in their views and division between the North and South grew even clearer. As the argument polarized the country to its extremes, more and more moderate families like the Custis' were forced to make a decision and join one half of the country or the other.

III

As a resident at Arlington House, Robert E. Lee would be forced to make the decision between supporting the Union or Confederacy, just like countless other Americans at the time. The weight of Lee's decision however, was far greater than that of most any other citizen. Lee spent

⁷⁷ Nelligan, *Arlington House*, 129.

⁷⁸ *We Have a Claim on This Estate*, (National Parks Service, 2004)

⁷⁹ "Rise of Industrial America, 1876-1900," Library of Congress, accessed September 6, 2017,

⁸⁰ Daniel Howe, *What Hath God Wrought: The Transformation of America, 1815-1848* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2009), 56.

much of his adult life distinguishing himself as one of the United States' premiere military leaders, and when it became clear that the secession of the Southern States was a sign of the war to come, Lee had established himself as an unparalleled asset that both sides desperately needed in their ranks.

Almost from his birth it seemed decided that Robert E. Lee would rise to success in the American military. His father, Henry "Light-Horse Harry" Lee was one of the country's most important military heroes of the Revolution. After joining the colonial army at the outbreak of the war, Henry Lee quickly rose in the army's ranks, and made a name for himself by impressing General Washington with his swift victories, like the one he led at the Battle of Paulus Hook. When Lee retired and began his family with Anne Hill Carter, they would frequent trips to Arlington House to visit the family of the former President, and became close with the Custis family. It was on one of these trips that his son Robert, and Custis' only surviving daughter Mary Anna, met for the first time during their childhood. The two grew very close, but Lee's military commitments kept them from marriage for quite some time. After graduating second in his class from West Point Academy, Lee was primed for a prosperous military career that he did not wish to lose by marrying out of his duties.⁸¹ Following his graduation in 1829, Lee was assigned to work leading the corps of engineers in the creation of a military base on Cockspur Island in South Carolina.⁸² Despite the lack of appeal in such an assignment, Lee followed orders and was forced to place his life with Mary Custis on hold until June of 1831, when they were married at Arlington House.

Beyond just his ties with great Revolutionary War heroes like his wife's great-grandfather-in-law George Washington, or his father Henry; Robert E. Lee was an asset that both sides wanted for the Civil War because of his own military accomplishments. After some shorter assignments around the country, Lee was given the opportunity he had always strived for at the beginning of the Mexican-American War in 1846. During the war, Lee used his position under the legendary general Winfield Scott to learn about military leadership, as well prove himself as a superior military mind. Lee's accomplishments under the command of Scott elevated him to the rank of Colonel, and positioned him to serve as the superintendent of West Point from 1852 to 1855. Lee's impressive résumé distinguished him as the top contender for the position of General of Union forces when the Civil War finally began.⁸³

Lee, of course, did not accept this offer, and made a decision that would drastically alter the path of the Civil War. Despite the fact that Lee was always driven to top the military ranks and serve as a renowned general, he was reluctant to take the position of Commanding Officer of the Union Army. When the secession of the Southern states began with South Carolina in December 1860, it became clear that the conflict over slavery was quickly coming to a head, and soon sides would have to be taken. In the beginning, Lee hoped for peace and avoidance of open conflict entirely; however he knew that if Virginia was to decide to leave the Union, his hand would be forced. In January 1861 Lee made these feelings clear, writing to his son Custis that he could, "...anticipate no greater calamity for the country than the dissolution of the Union. It would be an accumulation of all the evils we complain of, and I am willing to sacrifice everything but honor for its preservation."⁸⁴ The most important part of this letter comes in the phrase, "everything but

⁸¹ McPherson, *Battle Cry of Freedom*, 56.

⁸² Nelligan, *Arlington House*, 159.

⁸³ McPherson, *Battle Cry of Freedom*, 281.

⁸⁴ Robert Lee, *Robert Lee to Custis Lee*, January 23, 1861, letter, Library of Virginia, *Virginia's Historic Inventory*.

honor.” Even though Lee was a proud leader of the American military, and strongly advocated against secession, his loyalties to his native state were too strong to be severed so quickly. Many accounts of Lee’s contemplation of the issue cite that he felt that the roots his family had planted in Virginia, and his extended family that lived throughout the state would make him a traitor to his own blood. On April 17, 1861 Lee’s loyalties were tested when the Virginia State Convention voted to secede from the Union.⁸⁵ Lee now had to decide whether he would be a traitor to the Union, or to his family.

Lee’s decision to leave the Union was a monumental moment in his life for a number of reasons. When Lee made his final decision in the early hours of April 20, he sat at his desk in Arlington house to write the letters addressed to President Lincoln and General Scott regarding his choice. Lee knew that by leaving the Union, his life, and the lives of his family members, would be irreparably changed. Lee had been around Arlington House for almost thirty years of his life. The property was now his only home after his marriage to Mary Anne Custis; it was the only home that she or her children had ever known. Lee knew that the location of the house on the border of the North and South would be an issue when he left the Union. Just across the Potomac from the capital, the house would be an easy target for Union soldiers and would not be a suitable place for the general of the Southern armies to live. Two days after Lee made his decision, he had already left Arlington House for Richmond, and would never return to the property. Lee had adopted Arlington as his home, and was undoubtedly devastated to leave it, describing it as the place, “...where [his] affections & attachments are more strongly placed than at any other place in the World.”⁸⁶ His family suffered equally as much from Lee’s decision, and knew the gravity of Robert’s choice; his daughter even reported that when he told them his decision it was as if there had been a death in the family.⁸⁷ Mary Lee chose to remain at Arlington House for around three weeks after her husband left, but came to feel that the fear of Union troops crossing the river and ransacking the house was too great to stay in her childhood home.

Beyond permanently altering the life of the Lee family, Robert’s decision to leave the Union to lead the Army of Northern Virginia also marked a monumental moment in the history of the country as a whole. Much like Lee in his contemplation of the situation, many Americans, especially in the South, were torn on where their allegiances would lie at the outbreak of the War. A strong military leader with a decorated background like Lee was an asset to the Confederacy, and Lee’s decision inspired a sense of confidence in many Southerners. As Lee surpassed expectations throughout the war, and quickly distinguished himself as the leader of the South’s military campaign, he became a hero in the eyes of many Confederate supporters. Lee stated in his decision to leave the Union that, “...though opposed to secession and deprecating war, [he] could take not part in an invasion of the Southern States.”⁸⁸ Despite the fact that he was hesitant about the cause from its start, he was idolized in the South as the hero of the Confederate cause; and this reputation, justified or not, would forever tarnish his legacy.

IV

⁸⁵ "Secession." *Library of Virginia: Civil War Research Guide*, Library of Virginia, n.d. Web.

⁸⁶ Nelligan, *Arlington House*, 312.

⁸⁷ *Arlington House: A Guide to Arlington House, the Robert E. Lee Memorial*. (Division of Publications, National Parks Service, 1985)

⁸⁸ Nelligan, *Arlington House*, 387.

Less than a week after the Lees left Arlington House, the Union ordered thousands of troops across the Potomac into Virginia to set up a perimeter around the capital. Although Arlington House itself was not occupied immediately, control of the surrounding land was a priority for Union officers. Much of the area was cleared in order to create roads and room to house soldiers, but the Union's attitude changed in July of 1961 following the Battle of Manassas, when it became clear that the war would not be an easy victory. General Irwin McDowell, who commanded the troops at Arlington, had promised Mrs. Lee that the House would remain unoccupied, but with a growing need for defense of the capital he could no longer justify leaving the house unused.⁸⁹

When Mrs. Lee left Arlington House, she left behind many of the priceless memorabilia of the Washington Treasury, hoping that the house would be respected and remain safe during Union occupation. The slaves at Arlington were told to run the estate as though the family were to return any day; and Mrs. Lee's personal maid, Selina Gray, was left with the keys to the house, showing her utmost faith in Gray to protect her family's most prized possessions. After some time of the occupation, Gray discovered that soldiers had stolen some of the family's heirlooms. After ordering the soldiers "...not to touch any more of Mrs. Lee's things", Gray reported the issue to General McDowell and urged him to take action to protect the Washington heirlooms.⁹⁰ Most of the remaining pieces in the house were sent to the U.S. Patent Office for safekeeping, and thanks to the efforts of Selina Gray, saved from uncertain fates.

Arlington's use would change suddenly when Congress passed the D.C. Compensated Emancipation Act of 1862, which freed all slaves in the District of Columbia, amounting to about 3,100 individuals.⁹¹ Although this legislation was clearly necessary and just, it caused problems around the nation's capital. Thousands of slaves fled from the northernmost Confederate states to Washington, looking for freedom and for work. With Lincoln's issuance of the Emancipation Proclamation in 1863, that number would only increase as African-Americans looked for an escape from the South. This influx of impoverished and uneducated citizens put tremendous pressure on the city and it quickly became overpopulated and the infrastructure quickly began to suffer. Officials were already searching for ways to put Lee's former residence to use, and on May 5, 1863 Arlington was officially chosen as the location for Freedman's Village. This project, led by Lieutenant Colonel Elias Greene and Danforth B. Nichols, a Methodist minister, intended for Arlington House to serve as a government supported town that would help former slaves establish a foothold in American society. The village was meant to alleviate some stress that had fallen upon the capital, and also to serve as a model for villages of freed slaves that could be established throughout the North. While this project had the correct goals in mind, Freedman's Village struggled through its existence almost from the start. A lack of planning on the government's part, combined with the rising value of the Arlington property led to the failure of the project. There were, however, positives to this endeavor at Arlington. Despite the difficulties that residents had at Freedman's Village, they were able to experience the full freedoms of a citizen for the first time.⁹² Many of the slaves at Arlington became residents at the pop-up town, and were able to live freely on the land where they used to be enslaved. When the estate was later dedicated as the

⁸⁹ "The Beginnings of Arlington National Cemetery," National Parks Service, U.S. Department of the Interior (Web, accessed September 6, 2017).

⁹⁰ *We Have a Claim on This Estate*, (National Parks Service, 2004).

⁹¹ "Ending Slavery in the District of Columbia," emancipation.dc.gov. Accessed August 4, 2017.

⁹² Nelligan, *Arlington House*, 430.

national cemetery, around 3,800 of the residents of Freedman's Village were given burials, recognizing their contributions to the property.⁹³

The story of Freedman's Village was not an uncommon one during this period in the United States. As the War raged on more and more slaves were able to escape to the North and to freedom. While thousands of these former slaves poured into the Union, the United States government was so focused on the war effort that it was unable to prepare for the arrival of these newly freed people. Sudden influxes of African-Americans who never received an education or learned the skill of a trade were crowding cities throughout the North. In response, the Federal Government created housing developments like Freedman's Village that were destined to fail. In both the example of Freedman's Village and in the country as a whole, there was a plan to prepare former slaves for entry into society, but the lack of execution would have massive ramifications that are still relevant today.

By 1864 the war had escalated to a period of unparalleled violence. As the Union headed south to try and crush their forces once-and-for-all, soldiers were falling at an astonishing rate. Because of Washington's position on the border of the Confederacy, thousands of dead or injured troops were sent there for treatment or burial. As local cemeteries quickly filled up, Union officials set out to establish a suitable site for an official cemetery. The U.S. Government purchased the Arlington Estate at public auction in January of 1864, and had already begun to bury soldiers along the northern border of the land by May in order to try and combat the dire situation.⁹⁴ It was Quartermaster General Montgomery Meigs who led the effort to dedicate the site officially in June 1864; and he intended to leave the Union's mark on Lee's former property. Meigs worried about the future of the cemetery, fearing that the Lees may try to take their home back from the government after the War and remove the graves that they had put there. In an effort to deter them from ever coming back to Arlington, Meigs ensured that the gravesites be put as close to the house as possible, and also ordered the creation of the tomb for the unknown Civil War soldiers killed in the war. The massive stone vault containing the remains of 2,111 soldiers found at battlefields surrounding Washington was placed in the rose garden directly behind Arlington House in April 1866.⁹⁵

While many saw the burial of these soldiers on Lee's front lawn as a sign of blatant disrespect, there are many more sides to the story than that. The Lees never did return to Arlington, and instead settled further south in the state in the town of Lexington where Robert served as the President of Washington and Lee University until his death in 1870. There is no doubt that General Meigs used the plan as a way to repay Lee's decision to leave the Union, and for the deaths of all the men that he was responsible for during the war. However, Arlington did, in many aspects, serve as a remarkably good location for the national cemetery. Not only was the land directly across the Potomac from the capital, it was also an expansive property in a picturesque location. The land was legally under the control of the Federal Government, which put no barriers in their way in officially designating it as national land. The property was eventually returned to the Lee family when the Supreme Court ruled 5-4 in their favor on the matter in 1882, but was then promptly sold back to the Federal Government for \$150,000 in 1883⁹⁶. In some respects, this ruling

⁹³ "The Beginnings of Arlington National Cemetery." National Parks Service, U.S. Department of the Interior (Web, accessed September 6, 2017).

⁹⁴ "The Beginnings of Arlington National Cemetery", (Web, accessed August 25, 2017).

⁹⁵ "The Beginnings of Arlington National Cemetery", (Web, accessed August 26, 2017).

⁹⁶ Nelligan, *Arlington House*, 432.

did provide the family with some level of compensation, but the symbolism of the location of the cemetery gave it an infamous reputation as a slight at the Lee family.

As the 20th century progressed, the government saw the need for another bridge connecting Washington and Virginia across the Potomac, and in 1929 Arlington Memorial Bridge was built. The bridge and avenue that follows its path into Virginia were created as a symbol of the reunion of the North and South after the Civil War. Running directly between the Lee Memorial at Arlington House, and the Lincoln Memorial in D.C., the bridge crosses the former border between the Union and Confederacy and connects the memorials of the two most iconic leaders of the era.

The theme of reunion that has led Arlington House since the end of the Civil War can also be found in Lee's actions in the years leading up to his death. Lee died in October of 1870, only five years after the end of the war. Despite Lee's choice to fight for the Confederacy in the Civil War, he was never a proponent of the division of the country. Once the fighting ended, Lee became one of the leading proponents of reunion in the South. He spoke openly about these feelings, responding, "...I think it wiser, moreover, not to keep open the sores of war, but to follow the example of those nations who endeavored to obliterate the marks of civil strife" when asked about his opinions on erecting monuments to the Confederacy at Gettysburg in 1869.⁹⁷ When Lee accepted his position as President of Washington and Lee University, he stated that he made the decision based upon the idea that it was his job, and everyone's job, to do what they can to reunite the country.⁹⁸ Despite these efforts, white supremacist groups like the Ku Klux Klan used Lee as a symbol for the Confederate cause through the war and into reconstruction. This use of Lee as a figurehead for the Confederacy would cement his legacy, correctly or incorrectly, as tied to the ideals of the secessionist states and the Confederate cause.⁹⁹

* * *

The history of Arlington House is one that is filled with themes that have come to define the story of the United States. When George Washington Custis set out to build the house in 1802, he knew that he wanted to create something more than just a building. The pristine location, and grandiose design of Arlington House ensured that Custis' mark would be seen, and it quickly became one of the first landmarks in the United States. Beyond just the appearance of the mansion overlooking the capital, the complex past of the near two-century-old home has made it into a vital tool in studying American history.

Following the Revolution, the United States needed to define its character and assert its independence not only from Great Britain, but from all the European powers that hoped to take the remaining land in North America or completely crush the nascent country. One of the ways Americans chose to combat this was to create a strong national identity that celebrated what little history the country did have; and George Washington Custis set out at the turn of the century to accomplish just that. By spending nearly his entire inheritance on Washington's possessions at auction, he was able to outfit Arlington House with some of the first President's most prized possessions. Rather than decorate his home to admire it himself, Custis would keep the house open for visitors, host parties for Washington's elite, and dedicate the house as a unifying national

⁹⁷ *The Republican Vindicator*, September 3, 1869.

⁹⁸ Matthew Penrod, interview by author, Arlington VA, June 12, 2017.

⁹⁹ James C. Cobb, "How Did Robert E. Lee Become an American Icon?" *The Magazine of the National Endowment for the Humanities*, vol. 32, no. 4 (July/August 2011): accessed September 6, 2017.

memorial to his late adopted-grandfather. While the creation of Arlington can represent the positives of this unstable but victorious period for the United States, it is riddled with signs of the issues to come.

Similarly to the history of the country as a whole, it is impossible to examine the story of Arlington House without addressing the issue of slavery. When the Custis family moved in to Arlington House they brought with them around sixty slaves that would become deeply rooted in its story. These slaves were the ones who did much of the work building the house, remained there when the Lee family left, and kept safe the invaluable items in the Washington Treasury. Later in life many lived on the property as free citizens in Freedman's Village, and few were even honored with burials at the property after it had become the National Cemetery. Unfortunately, both the history of Arlington House and the history of the United States as a nation are built off of the labor of these individuals; today, it is vital to remember the role that they had.

As the argument over slavery escalated, war became inevitable. As a successful military veteran, Robert E. Lee was a sought after general by both the Union and the Confederacy. Lee faced a decision that all Americans had to make during the Civil War, and like many others he had no interest in picking one side over the other. While Lee has become an iconic figure for confederate sympathizers, and is chastised by many as a traitor and villain, he never supported the secession of the southern states. The country as a whole was polarizing, forcing citizens to turn on one another. It was in his office at Arlington House that Lee finally made the difficult decision to leave the Union and pledge his loyalty to the state of Virginia. Although he would never return to his home after the war, he left a powerful legacy that remains today.

After the Civil War, the country was desperate for remedies to the deep division that had been created. While this process was a long and slow one, Arlington House was able to play a huge role in it. Before the war had even ended, Union soldiers were being buried on Lee's former property. The use of Arlington as a National Cemetery began the tradition of the location serving as a place of unity and remembrance. Rather than loot or destroy the house, Union leaders like General Meigs had the foresight to put Arlington to good use. Today, this tradition lives on, as the storied house still stands high upon the bluff overlooking the capital and the National Cemetery.

Bibliography

- Arlington House: A Guide to Arlington House, the Robert E. Lee Memorial, Virginia*. N.p.: Division of Publications: National Parks Service, 1985. Print.
- "Civil War Timeline." *National Parks Service*. U.S. Department of the Interior, 25 Mar. 2015. Web. <https://www.nps.gov/gett/learn/historyculture/civil-war-timeline.htm>
- Cobb, James C. "How Did Robert E. Lee Become An American Icon?" *The Magazine of the National Endowment for the Humanities*, vol. 32, no. 4 (July/August 2011). Accessed September 6, 2017. <https://www.neh.gov/humanities/2011/julyaugust/feature/how-did-robert-e-lee-become-american-icon>
- "Ending Slavery in the District of Columbia." *Emancipation.dc.gov*. Dc.gov, n.d. Accessed August 4, 2017. Web
- Flexner, James Thomas. *Washington: the Indispensable Man*. Sterling, 2012.
- Goodwin, Doris Kearns. *Team of Rivals: The Political Genius of Abraham Lincoln*. N.p.: Penguin, 2013. Print.
- Guelzo, Allen C. *Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation: The End of Slavery in America*. N.p.: Simon & Schuster Paperbacks, 2005. Print.
- Howe, Daniel Walker. *What Hath God Wrought: The Transformation of America, 1815-1848*. Oxford University Press, 2009.
- "An Interview with Jim Parks." *Washington Star* [Washington D.C.] 1928: n. pag. Print.
- McPherson, James M. *Battle Cry of Freedom*. N.p.: Oxford UP, 2003. Print.
- National Parks Service. *Annual Visitation Report by Years: 2006 to 2016, NPS Stats*. National Parks Service, 26 Aug. 2017. Web. [https://irma.nps.gov/Stats/SSRSReports/National%20Reports/Annual%20Visitation%20By%20Park%20\(1979%20-%20Last%20Calendar%20Year\)](https://irma.nps.gov/Stats/SSRSReports/National%20Reports/Annual%20Visitation%20By%20Park%20(1979%20-%20Last%20Calendar%20Year))
- Nelligan, Murray H. *Old Arlington: The Story of Arlington House, the Robert E. Lee Memorial*. 2nd ed. N.p.: Chatelaine, 2001. Print.
- "Republican Vindicator, September 3, 1869." *The Virginia Center for Digital History at The University of Virginia*. University of Virginia, n.d. Web.
- "Rise of Industrial America, 1876-1900." Library of Congress. Accessed September 6, 2017. <http://www.loc.gov/teachers/classroommaterials/presentationsandactivities/presentations/timeline/riseind/work/>
- "Robert E. Lee." *Civil War Trust*. Civil War Trust, n.d. Web. <https://www.civilwar.org/learn/biographies/robert-e-lee>
- "Secession." *Library of Virginia : Civil War Research Guide*. Library of Virginia, n.d. Web. <http://www.lva.virginia.gov/public/guides/Civil-War/Secession.htm>

“The Beginnings of Arlington National Cemetery.” National Parks Service, U.S. Department of the Interior, www.nps.gov/arho/learn/historyculture/cemetery.htm.

Vigne, Godfrey. *Six Months in America*. London: Whittaker, Treacher & Co., 1832

Washington, George. “Farewell Address-Transcription.” The Washington Papers, University of Virginia, gwpapers.virginia.edu/documents_gw/farewell/transcript.html.

We Have a Claim on This Estate: Arlington from Slavery to Freedom. N.p.: National Parks Service, Robert E. Lee Memorial, Department of the Interior, n.d. Print.

Young, Rogers W. "Robert E. Lee." *National Parks Service*. U.S. Department of the Interior, 12 Aug. 2016. Web. <https://www.nps.gov/arho/learn/historyculture/robert-lee.htm>

Historical Events Resulting in the U.S War with Afghanistan

By Leah Silinsky

Among the most contested and controversial wars in recent American history, the war with Afghanistan did not occur in a vacuum, nor did it solely occur because of the attack on the World Trade Center on September 11, 2001. Rather, this war was the result of growing tensions between the United States and Afghanistan. The war between the United States and Afghanistan occurred because of the civil war in Afghanistan, the Soviet Invasion of 1979, the Taliban becoming the main governing force, and the 9/11 attacks themselves as well as several smaller scale attacks. This paper will also explain the United States' attempts to acquire political power and might in Afghanistan by invading the country to overthrow the Taliban and replace it with an established, stable society. This paper will also discuss efforts of the Taliban to undermine the West, the United States specifically, by disseminating Islamist, anti-Western propaganda among the masses, as well as by physically attacking American soldiers, civilians, and political dissidents. In other words, the Taliban both used ideological, as well as physical methods to undermine the United States.

Operation Enduring Freedom took place in October 7, 2001, following the 9/11 attacks.¹⁰⁰ The United States and United Kingdom entered Afghanistan with the goal of creating a stable, centralized society in Afghanistan. They also came with the goal of finding and destroying weapons of mass destruction, as well as stripping the Taliban of its governing power.¹⁰¹ At first glance it appears that entering Afghanistan did not make sense, as Osama bin-Laden, leader of Al-Qaeda and main perpetrator behind the 9/11 attacks, was based in Iraq.¹⁰² However, Al-Qaeda itself moved its headquarters from Sudan to Afghanistan in the 1990s.¹⁰³ Additionally, the Taliban made a safe haven for bin-Laden in Afghanistan, and refused to turn him in, upon the requests of the U.S. government, which is why the United States invaded Afghanistan.¹⁰⁴ While the 9/11 attacks were the events which ultimately led to Operation Enduring Freedom, it is important to understand the historical events prior to these attacks—starting with the divisions in Afghan society, which resulted in the 1978 civil war in Afghanistan.

A civil war does not occur in a unified society, which perfectly explains why it occurred in Afghanistan. Aside from being decentralized and economically weak, Afghan society was highly divided in terms of ethnicities. There was no unified Afghan culture or society. Turks, Uzbeks, Pashtuns, and Tajiks all lived within the country which created a divided society. Some might argue that this ethnic division only made it easier for the Taliban to acquire power in 1996.¹⁰⁵ While important for context, these ethnic tensions alone were not enough to cause the 1978

¹⁰⁰ Beth L Bailey and Richard H. Immerman, eds., *Understanding the U.S Wars in Iraq and Afghanistan*, (New York: New York University Press, 2015), 41.

¹⁰¹ *Ibid*

¹⁰² *Ibid*

¹⁰³ *Ibid*, 81

¹⁰⁴ *Ibid*, 35

¹⁰⁵ Raphael Veit, "Afghanistan: War on Terror / War in Error?" *AQ: Australian Quarterly* 74, no. 4 (2002): 7-40. <http://www.jstor.org.proxy-um.researchport.umd.edu/stable/20638100>, 7.

Afghanistan civil war. This war was caused by more ideological tensions and disputes, in the form of radical socialism and Islamism.¹⁰⁶

In addition to being ethnically divided, by the 1960s, the citizens of Afghanistan were starting to realize that they were technologically, politically, economically and developmentally far behind their neighbors and the rest of the world.¹⁰⁷ This invoked much anger among citizens, who felt that they were being robbed of opportunities by a corrupt, aristocratic government.¹⁰⁸ This discontent manifested itself in two ways. Radical revolutionaries sought change through the avenues of radical socialism, or through radical Islam, and competed over what school of thought would reign order over a changing Afghanistan.¹⁰⁹ This discontent resulted in the government of Afghanistan changing from an aristocracy to a republic. In 1973, Mohammad Daoud Khan took the position of the president of Afghanistan, which was the result of an anti-monarchist coup, replacing the monarchy with a republic.¹¹⁰ This change however, did not reduce the tensions and divisions among socialists and Islamists. In 1978, Mohammad Daoud Khan, was assassinated and the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan (PDPA) took over, which officially started the Afghanistan civil war.¹¹¹ Upon taking control, the PDPA communists wanted change faster than the country was ready for and, despite much support from the Soviet Union, Soviet government officials themselves urged the communists to facilitate change at a slower rate.¹¹² They made this demand because communistic changes were being forced onto rural Afghani populations who had no interest in adopting these new values and changes to their societies, and were starting to resist these new impositions.¹¹³ A year later, in 1979, the Soviet Union invaded Afghanistan both to support the socialist regime and to prevent it from radicalizing too quickly.¹¹⁴ Once Soviet soldiers stepped foot onto Afghan soil, many traditional and Islamic counter-revolutionaries fled to Peshawar, Pakistan to form alliances and conduct jihad.¹¹⁵ Ultimately, the Soviet Invasion of Afghanistan was unsuccessful, and the Soviet Union withdrew its troops in 1989.¹¹⁶ This event is important because it left Afghanistan less stable than before the invasion, making the society weak and vulnerable to insurgent groups taking over, which is what the Taliban did.

In the Cold War climate, the Soviet war in Afghanistan was easy to predict. The Soviet Union had every incentive to spread communism where it could, as well as prop up and support

¹⁰⁶ Beth L. Bailey and Richard H. Immerman, eds., *Understanding the U.S Wars in Iraq and Afghanistan.* (New York: New York University Press, 2015), 25.

¹⁰⁷ James Rupert, "Afghanistan's Slide toward Civil War." *World Policy Journal* 6, no. 4 (1989): 759-85. <http://www.jstor.org.proxy-um.researchport.umd.edu/stable/40209132>, 762.

¹⁰⁸ Ibid

¹⁰⁹ Ibid

¹¹⁰ Beth L. Bailey and Richard H. Immerman, eds., *Understanding the U.S Wars in Iraq and Afghanistan.* (New York: New York University Press, 2015), 25

¹¹¹ Rupert, "Afghanistan's Slide toward Civil War," 762 and Shahrani, Nazif M. "War, Factionalism, and the State in Afghanistan." *American Anthropologist* 104, no. 3 (2002): 715-22. <http://www.jstor.org.proxy-um.researchport.umd.edu/stable/3567249>, 717

¹¹² John Prados, "History and September 11: A Round Table - Notes on the Cia's Secret War in Afghanistan." *The Journal of American History* 89, no. 2 (2002): 466.

¹¹³ Rupert, "Afghanistan's Slide toward Civil War," 762.

¹¹⁴ Bailey, *Understanding the U.S Wars in Iraq and Afghanistan*, 23.

¹¹⁵ Ibid

¹¹⁶ Ibid, 26

existing communist regimes.¹¹⁷ Not only did the Soviet Union see invading Afghanistan as an opportunity to spread its communist ideology, but they also saw it as an investment. During the 1973 Arab oil boycott, oil from the Persian Gulf was highly inaccessible. Oil prices skyrocketed, and several countries could not buy oil from the Persian Gulf at all.¹¹⁸ It would therefore make sense that the Soviet Union had an interest in having close ties with a country that not only had access to oil, but could control other nations' access as well.¹¹⁹ The appeal of Afghanistan lied in that fact that it had the potential of becoming a pro-Soviet, socialist proxy-state, with access to a highly coveted natural resource: oil.

While the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan was pro-Soviet, much of Afghan society was not. Many individuals living in rural farmland were deeply opposed to any foreign intrusion, which manifested itself in violence and resistance in the Pashtun regions.¹²⁰ Again, the invasion only added more tension and destabilization to an already divided society. Various Afghani revolutionary leaders banded together to drive out the Soviets, which resulted in infighting among the group leaders, which, in turn, led to a rise in Islamism in Afghani society.¹²¹ As mentioned previously, upon the Soviet invasion, many Afghani Islamists fled to Peshawar to work together to work as mujahideen—those who conduct jihad. Those who left for Pakistan in political opposition were divided into mujahidin and traditionalists who both wanted the Soviets out.¹²² The similarities between these groups ended there. In Pakistan, these opposing groups used guerilla warfare to attack each other, which gave rise to an increasingly Islamist environment and mentality among those who fled to Peshawar in the first place.¹²³ These dissidents formed various factions while in Pakistan. Some were more traditionalist, and called for a secular political system, while others were highly Islamist and wanted to create a social revolution in which sharia law and a strict interpretation of the Quran would take place.¹²⁴ While seemingly antithetical to American values, various mujahideen and Soviet resistance groups received funding from the United States.¹²⁵ Following the logic of “an enemy of my enemy is my friend,” the United States was quick to support any anti-Soviet resistance groups in Afghanistan. In doing so, they continued their policy of containing Communism. After realizing their efforts were going nowhere, and after attempting to fight opposing Afghani factions, the Soviet Union completely withdrew from Afghanistan in 1989.¹²⁶

¹¹⁷Gompert, David C., Hans Binnendijk, and Bonny Lin. "The Soviet Invasion of Afghanistan, 1979." In *Blinders, Blunders, and Wars: What America and China Can Learn*, RAND Corporation, 2014.

<http://www.jstor.org.proxyum.researchport.umd.edu/stable/10.7249/j.ctt1287m9t.18>, 131

¹¹⁸ “Oil Embargo, 1973–1974”, *Office of the Historian*, <https://history.state.gov/milestones/1969-1976/oil-embargo>

¹¹⁹ Bailey, Beth L, and Richard H. Immerman, eds. *Understanding the U.S Wars in Iraq and Afghanistan*. New York: New York University Press, 2015, 24.

¹²⁰ Gompert, "The Soviet Invasion of Afghanistan, 1979," 131.

¹²¹ Ibid

¹²² James Rupert, "Afghanistan's Slide toward Civil War," *World Policy Journal* 6, no. 4 (1989): 759-85.

<http://www.jstor.org.proxy-um.researchport.umd.edu/stable/40209132>, 762.

¹²³ Ibid

¹²⁴ Ibid, 763

¹²⁵ Beth L. Bailey and Richard H. Immerman, eds, “: *Understanding the U.S Wars in Iraq and Afghanistan*,” (New York: New York University Press, 2015), 26.

¹²⁶ David C. Gompert Hans Binnendijk, and Bonny Lin, "The Soviet Invasion of Afghanistan, 1979," In *Blinders, Blunders, and Wars: What America and China Can Learn*, RAND Corporation, 2014. <http://www.jstor.org.proxy-um.researchport.umd.edu/stable/10.7249/j.ctt1287m9t.18>, 134

After the Soviet Union removed the last of its troops from the central Asian state, the mujahideen took governing power, stripping the PDPA of theirs.¹²⁷ By 1991, they controlled Kabul.¹²⁸ This control, much like that of the previous governments, was not stable and did not last long. By the time the mujahideen took power, the society in Afghanistan remained highly divided. The Soviet withdrawal of 1989 did little to quell the divisions sharply present in Afghanistan. There was still much tension between these groups, and ethnic and tribal divisions widened through a general escalation of violence. The mujahideen were unable to appeal to and include various other factions in their military campaign, including Shiite resistance groups and traditional tribal leaders.¹²⁹ Ultimately, the mujahideen were unable to retain their grasp on power and were replaced by the Taliban, who consolidated power in 1996, receiving much financial support from allies in Pakistan.¹³⁰

The Taliban did not simply obtain control overnight. This process was the result of much internal division and conflict as well as the Soviet withdrawal. Some have made the claim that the Soviet withdrawal of 1989 directly led to the Taliban taking governance over Afghanistan.¹³¹ However, the withdrawal alone was not enough to bolster a group to the position of power it was in, especially given the fact that the Taliban was not highly representative of its constituency. While the Taliban did adhere to a highly strict and draconian interpretation of the Quran and prided itself in its espousal of Islamist ideology, it followed and enforced Deobandi Islam, which contrasted with Afghanistan's Hanafi Islam.¹³² The Taliban was also highly violent, and persecuted ethnically non-Pashtun minority groups.¹³³ Had these ethnic, religious, and tribal tensions not existed, the Taliban would not have been able to seize power. From divisions drawn among ethnic lines, to the competition over political power between communists and Islamists for power, Afghanistan in the 1970s was the furthest thing from a unified, stable society.

The Taliban was originally formed by individuals who fled to Peshawar when the communists took control. Even upon returning, the effects of Peshawar were felt in Afghanistan among the masses. An entire generation of children was raised with and indoctrinated with Islamist values because the schools they entered and the charities which helped them were all financed and supported by Islamists from Pakistan.¹³⁴ Saudi Arabia also financed much of the newly built madrassas (religious Islamic schools) in Afghanistan, which in turn espoused a highly conservative and radical form of Islam called Wahhabism. The students at these schools were often impoverished refugees fleeing from the Soviet invasion and the following civil war.¹³⁵ Before, many of them had not been from especially religious families or felt any connection with the concept of jihad. The leading Islamic political party in Iraq later changed the leading form of Islam practiced from Wahabi to Deobandi, the main ideolo-religious belief system behind the

¹²⁷ Rupert, "Afghanistan's Slide toward Civil War,"768.

¹²⁸ Bailey, "Understanding the U.S Wars in Iraq and Afghanistan,"28.

¹²⁹ Rupert, "Afghanistan's Slide toward Civil War,"789.

¹³⁰ Bailey, "Understanding the U.S Wars in Iraq and Afghanistan,"48.

¹³¹ Gompert, "The Soviet Invasion of Afghanistan, 1979,"134.

¹³² Paul D. Miller. "Graveyard of Analogies: The Use and Abuse of History for the War in Afghanistan." *Journal of Strategic Studies* 39, no. 3 (2016): 446-76. doi:10.1080/01402390.2016.1145588, 463.

¹³³ Ibid

¹³⁴ Bailey, Beth L, and Richard H. Immerman, eds, "Understanding the U.S Wars in Iraq and Afghanistan," (New York: New York University Press, 2015), 41.

¹³⁵ Ibid.

Taliban.¹³⁶ From the 1973 coup to the Soviet withdrawal, Islamists and traditionalists competed for power, but ultimately the Islamists won. This victory occurred when the Taliban took over Afghanistan in 1996. The Islamists were more successful than their opponents because the traditionalists lost all political and organizational fighting with the Soviets and during their withdrawal. Instead, drug dealers and commandants took control of the rural regions which generally supported traditionalists, creating anarchy.¹³⁷

While the traditionalist front was getting weaker, the Islamist front was only getting stronger, especially the Taliban. The Taliban entered the political scene of Afghanistan in 1994, mostly recruiting from the Pakistani and Saudi funded madrassas mentioned previously and from Afghan refugee camps and tribal groups.¹³⁸ In addition to having more members, the Taliban also received funding and support from the Pakistani army and air force, which made it easier to completely strip the mujahideen of its power by 1996.¹³⁹ Once in power, the Taliban immediately began transforming the society of Afghanistan into a more religious one, enforcing religion through law, and a newly established police force called Amr Bil Marof Wa Nai An Munkir, which roughly translates to the “Promotion of Virtue and Suppression of Vice.”¹⁴⁰ Among the chief goals of the Taliban were to create an Islamic Caliphate and to purify Islam.¹⁴¹ The Taliban had no problem in using their newly established police force and other methods of violence to enforce this vision, which included the technologically advanced method of stoning.¹⁴² Like clockwork, once the Islamists gained their freedom, the general populace lost theirs. As mentioned previously, once the public realized who was now in control, they were less than pleased. Rebellion took form in the Northern Alliance: a dissent group, composed mostly of ethnic Tajiks.¹⁴³ These rebellions did little to change the fate of Afghanistan, as it was ultimately in the control of the Taliban.

Because of Taliban rule, Afghanistan turned into the hub of Islamist activity in Central Asia, attracting many new Islamist groups and individuals to it. Osama bin-Laden was one of them. Originally from Saudi Arabia, Osama bin-Laden fled to Afghanistan to fight against the Soviets during the Soviet Invasion of Afghanistan, to spread global jihad.¹⁴⁴ While on his jihadist adventures, bin-Laden gave several speeches undermining and attacking the West. It is key to note that efforts at undermining the United States were not only present in physical assaults and attack, but also in an ideological setting. This was done in the form in which anti-American values and rhetoric were being disseminated at an alarming rate. During the 1990s, bin-Laden gave speeches accusing the United States of spreading a war against Islam, and that the United States was on a steadfast mission to destroy and occupy Muslim lands.¹⁴⁵ In 1998, he gave a speech titled, “Jihad Against Jews and Crusaders”, in which he argued that there was an alliance between Jews and the

¹³⁶Thomas H. Johnson and M. Chris Mason. 2007, “Understanding the Taliban and Insurgency in Afghanistan,” *Orbis* 51 (1): 71–89. doi:10.1016/j.orbis.2006.10.006, 73.

¹³⁷ Ibid.

¹³⁸ Ibid.

¹³⁹ Ibid, 74.

¹⁴⁰ Ibid.

¹⁴¹ Patrick Porter, "Long Wars and Long Telegrams: Containing Al-Qaeda." *International Affairs* 85, no. 2 (2009), 297.

¹⁴² Ibid.

¹⁴³ Ibid.

¹⁴⁴ Bailey, “*Understanding the U.S Wars in Iraq and Afghanistan*,” (New York: New York University Press, 2015,) 28.

¹⁴⁵ Ibid, 41.

United States to go on a crusade to destroy Islam and Muslim lands and holy sites, which is more or less a continuation of his previous rhetoric.¹⁴⁶ In addition to undermining the United States through rhetoric there were actual physical attacks, such as the attack on the USS Cole in Yemen in 2000, which killed 17 American citizens and the first attack on the World Trade Center in 1993.¹⁴⁷ Ultimately, these small scale attacks lead to the infamous 9/11 attacks, which then led to the war with Afghanistan. At first glance, it does not make sense to lump Osama bin-Laden with Afghanistan. This is because Osama bin-Laden was the leader of Al-Qaeda-the organization responsible for 9/11, which was based in Iraq, not Afghanistan. However, Al-Qaeda relocated to Taliban-controlled Afghanistan, which offered Al-Qaeda and bin-Laden a haven, by refusing to turn him in to the United States government.¹⁴⁸

While there were efforts of the Taliban and Al-Qaeda to undermine United States sphere of influence, the United States also made considered efforts to enforce its power in Afghanistan, by fighting to strip the Taliban of theirs. This was primarily visible in the invasion of Afghanistan itself, which was done to destroy the Taliban, stabilize the society, and to destroy terrorist training camps.¹⁴⁹ However, this was also visible when the United States financially and military supported the mujahedeen during Afghanistan's civil war, as the mujahedeen were the Soviet adversaries, and the United States was willing to support any organization, so long as that organization fought against the Soviet Union.

In short, the war between the United States and Afghanistan was one that was preceded by decades of instability and growing anti-American animosity. The ethnic and ideological divisions in Afghani society, made it susceptible to the civil war which took place. The divisions brought on by pre-civil war society were only heightened after the Soviet Invasion of 1979. This invasion created a society so weak and poor, that an entire generation grew up to be radicalized because of Pakistani and Saudi-funded madrassas. This radicalized generation later formed the Taliban, which took control of Afghanistan, and offered the once borderless Al-Qaeda, a haven to seek refuge in. By studying and understanding these various historic events and developments, we can understand how the society of Afghanistan became susceptible to the Taliban rule.

¹⁴⁶Paul R. Pillar and John Nagl, "Is Afghanistan the Right War?" *The National Interest*, no. 106 (2010): 33-41. <http://www.jstor.org.proxy-um.researchport.umd.edu/stable/42897706>, 36.

¹⁴⁷ Ibid, 37.

¹⁴⁸ Ibid, 41.

¹⁴⁹ Bailey, Beth L, and Richard H. Immerman, eds. *Understanding the U.S Wars in Iraq and Afghanistan*. New York: New York University Press, 2015, 45.

Bibliography

- Bailey, Beth L, and Richard H. Immerman, eds. *Understanding the U.S Wars in Iraq and Afghanistan*. New York: New York University Press, 2015
- Gompert, David C., Hans Binnendijk, and Bonny Lin. "The Soviet Invasion of Afghanistan, 1979." In *Blinders, Blunders, and Wars: What America and China Can Learn*, RAND Corporation, 2014.
<http://www.jstor.org.proxyum.researchport.umd.edu/stable/10.7249/j.ctt1287m9t.18>
- Johnson, Thomas H, and M. Chris Mason. 2007. "Understanding the Taliban and Insurgency in Afghanistan." *Orbis* 51 (1): 71–89. doi:10.1016/j.orbis.2006.10.006
- Miller, Paul D. "Graveyard of Analogies: The Use and Abuse of History for the War in Afghanistan." *Journal of Strategic Studies* 39, no. 3 (2016): 446-76.
doi:10.1080/01402390.2016.1145588
- Prados, John. "History and September 11: A Round Table - Notes on the Cia's Secret War in Afghanistan." *The Journal of American History* 89, no. 2 (2002)
- Pillar, Paul R., and John Nagl. "Is Afghanistan the Right War?" *The National Interest*, no. 106 (2010): 33-41. <http://www.jstor.org.proxy-um.researchport.umd.edu/stable/42897706>
- Porter, Patrick. "Long Wars and Long Telegrams: Containing Al-Qaeda." *International Affairs* 85, no. 2 (2009)
- Rupert, James. "Afghanistan's Slide toward Civil War." *World Policy Journal* 6, no. 4 (1989): 759-85. <http://www.jstor.org.proxy-um.researchport.umd.edu/stable/40209132>
- Shahrani, Nazif M. "War, Factionalism, and the State in Afghanistan." *American Anthropologist* 104, no. 3 (2002): 715-22. <http://www.jstor.org.proxy-um.researchport.umd.edu/stable/3567249>
- Veit, Raphael. "Afghanistan: War on Terror / War in Error?" *AQ: Australian Quarterly* 74, no. 4 (2002): 7-40. <http://www.jstor.org.proxy-um.researchport.umd.edu/stable/20638100>

Confederate Female Spies: Changing Northern Perceptions in Fiction and Nonfiction and Its Effect on Popular Opinion of the Confederate Cause

By Rachel Edmonston

Since the end of the American Civil War, popular perceptions of crucial events and key players during the war have been influenced and shaped by the literature of the era: both fiction and nonfiction. According to historian Alice Fahs, the shift of popular literature away from Northern heroines towards the soldiers on both sides of the conflict, as well as sympathetic wealthy white Southern heroines, helped to soften the harsh views of the Confederacy that existed during and after the war. This perspective promotes a romanticized view of the antebellum South and raises Confederate agents onto pedestals equal to that of their Northern enemies.¹⁵⁰ The effect of this on American history is visible. Other than the Confederates, the losing side in wars, especially civil wars, are reviled, and seen as a challenge to the hegemony. In a strange twist, however, many revere the Confederacy, and Americans have built statues, carved plaques, and written fiction in order to immortalize its cause. This fascination extends to the cases of Confederate female spies. In the years following the Civil War, accounts of white female Confederate spies captivated the nation. This paper will discuss how literary fascination shifted onto Southern heroines between the years 1865 to 1920 by analyzing the Northern public's perceptions of Confederate women spies during the war compared to portrayals of female Confederate spies in post war literature. In doing so, this paper will support Alice Fahs' theory that romantic literature focusing on Southerners helped shape a sympathetic view of the Confederacy and its cause in the eyes of the American public.

Fiction about wealthy, white, Southern women from the Antebellum period remains popular largely because in fiction authors can recreate a world that has since been lost or severely damaged, and do so in a way which brushes over the imperfections of the past. The romantic view of the Old South, which Fahs argues sprang up in the Reconstruction era, replaced fiction focusing on Northern heroines and instead revolved largely around the domestic sphere of the Southern "belle."¹⁵¹ This domestic sphere, where Southern women could court gentlemen and dance at debutante balls represented the romantic side of the Confederacy and the Old South. Post-war authors, hoping either to reconcile Northern readers with their former enemies or preserve the traditions of the South, focused on this romantic sphere of Antebellum Southern culture. The focus on the Southern belle and the genteel ways of life presented a sympathetic, if not romantic, viewpoint of the South, which helped in turn to mend relations between Northerners and Southerners. Fahs writes that many of these reconciliation stories focused on a romanticized Southern belle marrying a Union officer, representing the reconciliation of the entire nation.¹⁵²

Unlike this reconciliatory literature, however, there were other viewpoints of Southern women that arose in the post-war era. Fahs neglects to mention literature which presents Southern women as anything other than a peaceful, reconciliatory force. No doubt inspired by tales of daring Southern women during the war, such as the famous Belle Boyd and Rose O'Neal, some fiction

¹⁵⁰ Alice Fahs. "The Feminized Civil War: Gender, Northern Popular Literature, and the Memory of the War, 1861-1900." *The Journal of American History* 85, no. 4 (1999): 1490, accessed September 28, <https://academic.oup.com/jah/article/85/4/1461/751791?searchresult=1>.

¹⁵¹ Ibid.

¹⁵² Ibid.

also presented these women in a far more ferocious light.¹⁵³ Often focusing on Confederate spies, several books and short stories were published presenting a daring and often dangerously enticing Southern woman who flirted with Union officers to aide her beloved Confederacy. These books present an interesting interpretation of Southern women, despite the fact that they were generally less popular. Though these books took a different approach than those romanticizing docile Southern belles, these women were used in a very similar manner to represent and idealize the values of the Old South.

The main focus of this paper is to analyze Confederate women spies in literature and their role in the normalization of Northern public appreciation for the Confederate cause, yet it is important to understand the driving force behind the actions of the Southern spies who inspired these tales. While women were used as a noble and reconciliatory force in literature, the reality behind many of the real women spies' actions lies in the darker side of the Confederacy which literature often hid or romanticized.

When the Civil War broke out, it ripped through the domestic sphere of the Southern elite by threatening the institution of slavery, which represented the very core of what allowed wealthy white women to perform their domestic rituals. As Betina Entzminger states "though they [Southern women] may have had conflicting views about the enslavement of another race, they overtly validated the patriarchal family structure of a strong, benevolent husband-father and physically weak but morally strong wife-child, a hierarchical configuration that rested on slavery and was wrapped in the Old South's defense of the institution."¹⁵⁴ This statement indicates that, alongside the institution of slavery, there was the clearly developed hierarchy with white men at the pinnacle and white women just below them, in a subordinate yet dignified position above African American slaves. Whether the elite women of the South acknowledged this or not, the Civil War threatened their way of life, because a Union victory would remove the labor force which allowed them to enjoy their lavish lifestyle without working for it. With this threat to the institution of slavery, and with the men largely being away in the war, Southern women were forced to react to the realities of the world. They could not remain within their domestic spheres where they would usually pursue and cultivate their social graces; instead they were forced to defend the Confederacy and its institutions as a way of defending their way of life.¹⁵⁵ While most women preserved this way of life by continuing to operate their plantations while their men were away—overseeing their enslaved workforce and defending against the tides of Union troops that swept across their properties—some women took a more direct action against their Northern enemies by becoming spies.

Becoming a spy for the Confederacy was no simple task, however. Espionage in the 1860s was far different than espionage of today. When the Civil War broke out in 1861, neither the United States nor the Confederate States of America had formal intelligence agencies. The Bureau of Military Information was the Union's primary source on military intelligence, but it operated for specific generals rather than the entirety of the U.S military. The Confederacy, benefitting from

¹⁵³ "Women in the War." *The United States Service Magazine* 4, no. 3, (September, 1865), accessed November 5, 2017, <https://search.proquest.com/docview/127505800?accountid=14696>.

¹⁵⁴ Betina Entzminger, *The Belle Gone Bad: White Southern Women Writers and the Dark Seductress*, (Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana State University Press, 2002) 2.

¹⁵⁵ Drew Gilpin Faust, *Mothers of Invention: Women of the Slaveholding South in the American Civil War*, (Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press, 1996) 5-8.

the southern position of the Union capitol, had a more extensive network of spies in Washington D.C. In addition to this, the Confederate Signal Corps, “devoted primarily to communications and intercepts” housed the Secret Service Bureau, which ran espionage operations throughout the North. Through these operations, several women, key among them Rose O’Neal Greenhow, became spies for the Confederacy.¹⁵⁶

The popular image of a daring woman, risking all odds for the Confederacy, did not arise during the war, however. True to the Union, Northern newspaper reports detailing the involvement of female Confederate spies during the Civil War are a far cry from the later fiction that would be written about them. Writing in August of 1861 to *The Philadelphia Press*, Colonel Forney of the Union Army remarked that “the most malignant and mischievous of the spies are females. Some of them are ladies of high position too, who, shielding themselves behind the so called weakness of their sex, reject the disguises assumed by their husbands, fathers and brothers, and proclaim their sympathy with treason.”¹⁵⁷ In the same month, an editorial from *The Hartford Daily Courant* remarked that a female rebel spy is no different from a male and “could and should be hung, as an example to the rest of the traitors.”¹⁵⁸ Writing a year later, *The Chicago Tribune* reported on a Mrs. Clara Judd, who was caught noting the positions of Union troops and was found in possession of large quantities of medicine to be sent south, describing her offense as “most flagrant.”¹⁵⁹ Regarding a collection of female Confederate spies held under arrest in Washington, the most famous among them being Rose O’Neal Greenhow, the *Tribune* reported in 1861 that the women “have been tolerated already too long, and their petticoats will shield them no longer from richly merited punishment.”¹⁶⁰

Yet despite these vehement declarations that female spies were just as treacherous as their male counterparts and should be punished accordingly, the punishments afforded to Confederate female spies were far different than that of male spies. Numerous primary accounts record the executions of male Confederate spies by the federal government. According to the Central Intelligence Agency, it is not known how many spies were executed on either side due to “the lack of records and the secrecy that surrounded most executions.”¹⁶¹ A claim made by the *New York Times* on May 1, 1863 which stated that “no spies have been hung by our [United States] military authorities since the war began,” was soon undermined twenty-eight days later, when the *Alexandria Gazette* reported the execution of four Confederate spies: Thomas Perkins, John R. Lyle, George P. Sims, and George S. Burgess, who were all sentenced to hanging.¹⁶² Ten days

¹⁵⁶ US Central Intelligence Agency, “Intelligence in the Civil War”, 4, accessed November 3, 2017, https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/intelligence-history/civil-war/Intel_in_the_CW1.pdf.

¹⁵⁷ “Spies at Washington.” *The Independent*, Aug 15, 1861, accessed November 6, 2017, <https://search.proquest.com/docview/90084553?accountid=14696>.

¹⁵⁸ *Hartford Daily Courant*, Aug 31, 1861, accessed November 4, 2017, <https://search.proquest.com/docview/553346222?accountid=14696>.

¹⁵⁹ “FEMALE SPY.” *Chicago Tribune*, Dec 27, 1862, accessed November 4, 2017 <https://search.proquest.com/docview/175281822?accountid=14696>.

¹⁶⁰ “The Female Spies at Washington.” *Chicago Tribune*, Aug 30, 1861, accessed November 5, 2017 <https://search.proquest.com/docview/175230385?accountid=14696>.

¹⁶¹ US Central Intelligence Agency, “Intelligence in the Civil War”14.

¹⁶² “A Spy Condemned to Death”, *New York Times*, May 1, 1863, accessed November 6, 2017, <http://www.nytimes.com/1863/05/01/news/a-spy-condemned-to-death.html>; *Alexandria Gazette*, 29 May 1863, accessed November 6, 2017, <http://chroniclingamerica.loc.gov/lccn/sn85025007/1863-05-29/ed-1/seq-2/>.

later, two more male Confederate spies, Colonel Lawrence Williams and Lieutenant Walter G. Peters were hanged in Franklin, Tennessee.¹⁶³ In November of the same year, Sam Davis was hanged, going down in “Confederate legend... as a spy... ‘the South’s Nathan Hale.’”¹⁶⁴ It was clear that the Union responded to espionage like a terrible crime, and those who attempted it risked death.

This harsh reality was not the case for female spies during the Civil War, however. According to the CIA, “neither side ever executed a woman as a spy.”¹⁶⁵ Many accounts detailing the capture and imprisonment of female spies were published in various newspapers during the war, so this discrepancy did not occur because these spies were not caught. Famous accounts detail the imprisonment of Rose O’Neal Greenhow, the charge against her being: “maintaining treasonable correspondence with the enemy” and Belle Boyd, who “for a long time past has been engaged in carrying rebel mails from points within our lines to Richmond.”¹⁶⁶ Other accounts of lesser known female spies also littered newspaper reports during the war. Some include the aforementioned Clara Judd, a woman named Jane Ferguson (who was captured in Burkesville Kentucky and held in the Military Prison there), and a Sarah Jane Smith, who was arrested and “convicted of giving information to the rebels,” as well as Mrs. Phillips of Alabama and her two daughters, who were imprisoned alongside Greenhow for the same charge.¹⁶⁷ The results of these imprisonments, as with all other instances where women spies were caught during the Civil War, was release either during the war or immediately after. Therefore, despite the condemnation of these women by Northerners, veiled sympathy seemed to spare these women from the punishment that would normally fit their crime. Even during the war, the Northern military harbored a soft spot for Southern women, solely on the grounds of their sex. After the war, writers recognized this bias and manipulated it to create a genre depicting Southern women as exciting figures, even while acknowledging their active role in the conflict.

The shift from this negative view of Confederate women spies as “active and mischievous” agents, who moved in “the first society of the North” and committed “treason and wicked deeds” to exciting and heroic figures began not long after the war.¹⁶⁸ The case of Belle Boyd represents a

¹⁶³ Execution of Spies at Franklin, Tenn.; Interesting Narrative of the Concluding Scenes. The Trial. Preparations for the Execution. The Execution and Burial. The Object of their visit.” *New York Times*, June 21, 1863, accessed November 5, 2017, <http://www.nytimes.com/1863/06/21/news/execution-spies-franklin-tenn-interesting-narrative-concluding-scenes-trial.html>

¹⁶⁴ US Central Intelligence Agency, “Intelligence in the Civil War”, 14.

¹⁶⁵ US Central Intelligence Agency, “Intelligence in the Civil War”, 18. An important exception to this may be Mary Surratt, who was implicated and charged in the assassination of Abraham Lincoln and was executed by the federal government. However, she was not charged with espionage and was executed after what most consider to be the end of the Civil War.

¹⁶⁶ The Female Spies at Washington.” *Chicago Tribune*, Aug 30, 1861; “From Baltimore---Capture or Belle Boyd, the Female Spy.” *Hartford Daily Courant*, Aug 04, 1862, accessed November 6, 2017 <https://search.proquest.com/docview/553391879?accountid=14696>.

¹⁶⁷ “Female Spy. Mrs. Jane Ferguson” *New York Times*, July 3, 1864, accessed November 8, 2017, <http://www.nytimes.com/1864/07/03/news/female-spy-mrs-jane-ferguson.html>; “FROM MISSOURI: Cruelty of Rebels Continued--Attack on Fayetteville, Ark.--Military Changes--Guerrillas in the South-East--Thanksgiving for the Soldiers--A Dangerous Female Spy”, *The New York Daily Tribune*, Dec 1, 1864, accessed November 7, 2017, <https://search.proquest.com/hnpnewyorktribune/docview/570727843/abstract/8DB818A1C9134C05PQ/1>; The Female Spies at Washington.” *Chicago Tribune*, Aug 30, 1861.

¹⁶⁸ “Women in the War.” *The United States Service Magazine*, 4, no. 3 (August, 1865): 235

perfect example of this shift. Already famous in both the North and the South for her flashy methods of espionage, Boyd was once referred to as the “chief of” Southern female spies, who possessed “acknowledged superiority for machinations and intrigue” which had “given her the leadership and control of the female spies in the Valley of Virginia.”¹⁶⁹ She was a pest to the Union army, given her publicized actions against the Northern cause, yet her publication of her memoirs *Belle Boyd in Camp and Prison* was met with interest from Northern audiences in the months following the end of the Civil War. Originally published in London, Boyd’s autobiography soon made its way to American audiences. While the *New York Daily Tribune* maintained in July of 1865 that Boyd’s new book was “unsavory,” and referred to the Confederacy as “the enemy,” and *The Nation* said of the book that “it is not worth a reprint,” other Northern newspapers reprinted articles from London newspapers regarding Boyd’s new book and advertising Boyd’s book in new book lists.¹⁷⁰ The *American Literary Gazette and Publishers Circular*, of Philadelphia, advertised Boyd’s new book by reprinting a review from the *London Saturday Review* for its Northern audience, which concluded that “the tendency to find fault is lost in the sense of gratification with which we welcome the heroine of so many thrilling escapades, and the narrator of so many telling anecdotes.”¹⁷¹ Already the sense of adventure had trumped patriotism for the Northern cause. A month later, in August of 1865, this same newspaper acknowledged the recent publication of Boyd’s book in the United States.¹⁷² This shift occurred just five months after General Lee’s surrender at Appomattox and President Lincoln’s assassination. In November of that year, the *Burlington Free Press* out of Burlington, Vermont listed Boyd’s autobiography under its New Books section, as did the *Alexandria Gazette*.¹⁷³ Though not as forceful an endorsement as reviews from newspapers in London, or that from the in *The American*, it is telling that a book written by a traitor to the Union was soon published and promoted in Northern newspapers not even a year after the end of the conflict. The case of Belle Boyd represented just the beginning of the shift from the cautious and resentful views of Confederate women spies during the war to the fascination that would surround the literary genre in the years following the war.

The mixed reception of Boyd’s book in America asserted that while Northerners were willing to accept former traitors to the Union back into the fold of American society, the country was not immediately ready to embrace the Confederate cause. At the time, the reconciliation between the North and South to the point where Confederate statues would be erected nationwide likely would have seemed absurd to Northern citizens in 1865. The intense desire for

¹⁶⁹ "Southern Female Spies--Miss Belle Boyd." *The Sun*, Jul 21, 1862, accessed November 7, 2017, <https://search.proquest.com/docview/533680755?accountid=14696>.

¹⁷⁰ "New Publications." *New York Daily Tribune*, Jul 27, 1865, accessed November 8, 2017 <https://search.proquest.com/docview/570676659?accountid=14696>; "Literary Notes." *Nation*, 1865, *The Nation Archives*, accessed November 10, 2017, <http://web.a.ebscohost.com/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?vid=2&sid=6fe7c0c5-7e55-4297-8a65-8d104d112ea6%40sessionmgr4006>

¹⁷¹ "Advertisement 11 -- no Title." *American Literary Gazette and Publishers' Circular*, Jul 01, 1865, accessed November 10, 2017 <https://search.proquest.com/docview/89704608?accountid=14696>.

¹⁷² "LIST OF BOOKS RECENTLY PUBLISHED IN THE UNITED STATES." *American Literary Gazette and Publishers' Circular*, Aug 01, 1865, accessed November 10, 2017, <https://search.proquest.com/docview/89700211?accountid=14696>.

¹⁷³ *Burlington Free Press*, October 20, 1865, accessed November 11, 2017, <http://chroniclingamerica.loc.gov/lccn/sn84023127/1865-10-20/ed-1/seq-4/>; *Alexandria Gazette*, November 13, 1865, accessed November 10, 2017 <http://chroniclingamerica.loc.gov/lccn/sn85025007/1865-11-13/ed-1/seq-2/>.

reconciliation, however, was not absurd. Northerners also wanted relations between the North and South to return to normal, and literary works written after the conflict reflect this desire. According to Nina Silber, however, efforts of reconciliation by Northerners had “less to say about the real-life South and more to say about the ideal and desired South.”¹⁷⁴ Idealizing the South to fit the victor’s approval included expanding the literary scene to include sympathetic or otherwise heroic views of the South. One small subsection of this literary genre was devoted to female spies.

As stated previously, the shift to pro-Southern literature was not instantaneous. In *Harpers New Monthly Magazine*, the 1865 April, May, June, July, and August issues focused on the war through a Northern lens. The April 1865 issue of *Harpers*, which was published in the last month of the war, featured “Recollections of Sherman.”¹⁷⁵ Similar articles appeared in the following issues including “Recollections of Thomas,” “Recollections of Grant,” as well as “Recollections of Lincoln” and “Recollections of Sheridan.”¹⁷⁶ Also featured in the July issue of the magazine was an article entitled “Prison Life,” which was a Union soldier’s recollection of his time as a Confederate prisoner of war, and “Chip,” a work of fiction that featured a war weary Union soldier as the protagonist.¹⁷⁷ This pattern reflects the popularity of Northern literature throughout the war. In the year 1862, of the forty-six war stories that were published in *Harpers Weekly*, less than sixteen included Southern heroines, while the remaining thirty stories represented Northern women’s struggles. The same can be said in the year 1863, where of the forty-one war stories published in *Harpers*, over half of them were devoted to Northern characters.¹⁷⁸ It is evident that literature still focused on Northern issues in the first few months after the end of the war, much as it had throughout the war. In September of that year however, “Margaret Bronson” was published, featuring a wealthy Southern belle who, having freed all her slaves, haunts her plantation until one day she is met by her old sweetheart, a Union soldier, whom she resolves to join in battle.¹⁷⁹ Though not alone in its theme of Southern women falling in love with Union soldiers, it did represent a distinct reconciliatory tone which would soon become popular in the years following the war. Stories similar to this littered the pages of *Harpers* after the war and contributed heavily to the “conciliatory culture” that Northerners hoped to promote after the war to mend the divide between North and South.¹⁸⁰

In the late 1860s and early 1870s, fictionalized accounts of the war abounded, as did tales of Antebellum fiction and “plantation fiction,” which many Northerners enjoyed and perhaps led Drew Gilpin Faust to conclude that white Southerners “won the popular battle for its [The Civil War’s] memory.”¹⁸¹ Whereas during the war sympathetic views of Southern women had

¹⁷⁴ Nina Silber, *The Romance of Reunion*, (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1993), 2.

¹⁷⁵ William Franklin Gore Shanks, “Recollections of Sherman,” *Harpers New Monthly Magazine*, April, 1865, 640-646.

¹⁷⁶ William Franklin Gore Shanks, “Recollections of Thomas,” *Harpers New Monthly Magazine*, May 1865, 754-759; William Gore Shanks, “Recollections of Grant,” *Harpers New Monthly Magazine* June, 1865, 68-76; William Franklin Gore Shanks, “Recollections of Lincoln,” *Harpers New Monthly Magazine* July, 1865, 222-230; William Franklin Gore Shanks, “Recollections of Sheridan,” *Harpers New Monthly Magazine*, August 1865, 287-297.

¹⁷⁷ B.S. Calef, “Prison Life,” *Harpers New Monthly Magazine* July, 1865, 131-150; Helen Wall Peirson, “Chip,” *Harpers New Monthly Magazine*, July, 1865, 254-258.

¹⁷⁸ Fahs, *The Feminized Civil War*, 1463.

¹⁷⁹ Elizabeth Stuart Phelps, “Margaret Bronson,” *Harpers New Monthly Magazine*, September, 1865, 498-504.

¹⁸⁰ Silber, *The Romance of Reunion*, 2

¹⁸¹ Fahs, *The Feminized Civil War*, 1490.

been far less prevalent in fiction, and women Confederate spies downright loathed by the Northern public, soon they became exciting topics in literature. In June of 1867, a story called “Mrs. F’s Waiting Maid” was published in *Harper’s New Monthly Magazine*. Describing a Southern spy, a woman who he had loved in his youth, the protagonist remembers woefully that she was a “soft voiced siren,” with “dark brilliant eyes” that had “set his heart beating with old memories.” This dark romantic viewpoint presents the Southern woman in a dangerous yet appealing light. The conclusion of this novel is reminiscent of the conclusions that were drawn by the Federal government during the war. The Southern spy was afforded a “gentle judgment,” having avoided criminal punishment, due to “her youth and her sex” and leaves the Union officer to mourn her departure, despite the fact that her final remark to him is one of respect: “You have done your duty, Major Luce, and I honor you for it.” The conclusion drawn by this work was one of mutual respect. Her honor to her country, the protagonist concludes, was equal to that of his. Therefore, the beauty of the Southern woman and her duty to her state made her actions admirable, despite the fact that she was acting illegally against the federal government.¹⁸² This story was widely read by Northern audiences (*Harpers Magazine’s* readership at the time was over 100,000), thus promoting a fantastical and admirable element to female Confederate agents that differed from the perceptions of Southern spies by Northerners during the war.¹⁸³ Ellen Peck’s *Renshawe*, published in the same year and which also focused on a female spy, likely had a similar effect on Northern audiences.¹⁸⁴

As the years went on, novels with Southern heroines as the main characters continued to be published, with a small section of the genre devoted to female rebel spies. One anecdote—a poem entitled “The Little Black Eyed Rebel”—saw a little rebel girl steal letters from a young boy, all which are addressed from the front by men “fighting for freedom that they meant to gain or die,” She fools him by offering a kiss.¹⁸⁵ As seen in “Mrs. F’s Waiting Maid,” yet another male Northerner is fooled by an enticing Southern girl. The playful nature of the poem, which was complete with a rhyme scheme and illustrations, is a far cry from the wartime reports that saw women imprisoned in federal jails for the same crime. No doubt an attempt to make light of the past in accordance with the Northern goal of reconciliation, literature like this began to hint at a brand of forgiveness which went beyond mere toleration and crossed over into the territory of acceptance. Perhaps Northerners, in their intense desire for a national healing, became willing to overlook crimes which had once been reason enough for war.

This theme would continue. In August 1882, *Harpers* published “The Rebel,” a short story in which yet another Union officer is fooled by a beautiful Southern spy, this time to his death. The fantastical events of their passionate kiss in the night (“they kissed for the first time— and the last,”) his deliverance and then destruction by her hands (“she drew it and levelled it at her lover... she shot him through the heart,”) and her putting her love of country above her love of him (“I love my country and I hate her enemies”) all made for an sensational read, and likely would have engaged *Harpers’* readers.¹⁸⁶ With the war seventeen years passed, it was no longer fresh in the public’s minds, and the thought of a dead Union soldier at the hands of a Southerner became uncontroversial enough to be published in a popular Northern magazine without the fear that it

¹⁸² Nora Perry, “Mrs. F’s Waiting Maid”, *Harpers New Monthly Magazine*, June, 1867, 74-79.

¹⁸³ *Harpers Weekly*, June 15, 1861, 369.

¹⁸⁴ Ellen Peck, *Renshawe*, (New York: Carlton, 1867).

¹⁸⁵ Will Carleton, “The Little Black Eyed Rebel”, *Harpers New Monthly Magazine*, June, 1876, 156-157.

¹⁸⁶ Julian Hawthorne, “A Rebel”, *Harpers New Monthly Magazine*, August 1882, 408-414.

may provoke outrage. After all, it was just fiction. Perhaps the years of reconciliation had reunited the nation. The literature of the era, which was able to look either humorously (in the case of “The Little Black Eyed Rebel”) or romantically (as in “The Rebel”) represented the drastic change in Northern public opinions since the war.

This pattern continued. In 1888, James J. Kane published *Ilian* in Philadelphia. This too, centered around a Southern woman who was described by Albert J. Menendez in his *Civil War Novels: An Annotated Bibliography* as “a beautiful Southern spy” who, “captivates all she meets.”¹⁸⁷ No doubt that Kane capitalized on the fascination with female spies to write his heroine, ignoring or perhaps not even considering the implications that popularizing a female Confederate spy would have on the public viewpoint.

The implications of these changes are perhaps most evident in works of nonfiction twenty to fifty years after the conflict. As early as 1889, *The Baltimore Sun* released an article which put Belle Boyd in an undeniably fashionable light. Seemingly unbothered by Boyd’s violent actions against the Union, the *Sun* reprinted passages of Boyd’s own story, describing it as “remarkable.”¹⁸⁸ Similarly, the *The Sun* out of New York City, printed “Belle Boyd, The Rebel Spy” in February of 1891, describing Boyd in similar terms. *The Sun* praised Boyd’s “striking appearance,” her “devotion to the South,” and her “excellent West Virginia family.”¹⁸⁹ Three years later, in February of 1894, *The Wilmington Daily Republican* out of Wilmington, Delaware, printed an ad for Boyd’s lecture series, describing her adventures as “daring deeds and dashing exploits.”¹⁹⁰ The continued attention given to Boyd and the words of praise bestowed upon her—which differed from the initial reactions to her in Northern newspapers immediately after the war—indicates the fantastical element that began to surround real female Confederate spies in the later years of the 19th century, just as it had surrounded their fictional counterparts.

While it is tempting to dismiss Boyd as the exception, not the rule for female Confederate spies after the Civil War given her fame, Boyd was not the only female spy given this sort of positive attention. This was particularly noticeable in the 1910s, the decade that marked the war’s fifty-year anniversary. In 1912, *The Washington Post* printed “Women Who Served in the War,” which was essentially a suffragist publication that highlighted the efforts of women in the Civil War. The pamphlet lavishes praise upon four different women spies. Of these four, three were Confederate spies, while only one was a Union spy. The pamphlet describes Rose O’Neal Greenhow as a “zealous and most trusted friend of the Confederacy;” Belle Boyd as “an ardent daughter of the Confederacy” who “risked her life time and time again” for the cause; as well as

¹⁸⁷ Albert J Menendez. *Civil War Novels: An Annotated Bibliography*, (New York, NY: Garland Publishing Inc., 1986) 77.

¹⁸⁸“The Real Belle Boyd: A Famous Confederate Spy.” *The Baltimore Sun*, February 12, 1889, date accessed November 7, 2017,

<https://search.proquest.com/docview/535116110/fulltextPDF/2D6ADB79B04240F0PQ/1?accountid=14696>.

¹⁸⁹ “Belle Boyd, The Rebel Spy” *The Sun*, February 21, 1891, date accessed December 14, 2017,

<https://chroniclingamerica.loc.gov/lccn/sn83030272/1891-02-21/ed-1/seq-2/#date1=1889&index=0&rows=20&words=Belle+BELLE+BOYD+Boyd&searchType=basic&sequence=0&state=New+York&date2=1900&proxtext=belle+boyd&y=15&x=15&dateFilterType=yearRange&page=1>.

¹⁹⁰“Belle Boyd Coming” *The Wilmington Daily Republican*, February 19, 1894, date accessed December 14, 2017,

<https://chroniclingamerica.loc.gov/lccn/sn88053055/1894-02-19/ed-1/seq-4/#date1=1889&index=1&rows=20&words=BELLE+Belle+Boyd+BOYD&searchType=basic&sequence=0&state=Delaware&date2=1900&proxtext=belle+boyd&y=21&x=11&dateFilterType=yearRange&page=1>

Nancy Hart, who's adventures were described as "stirring" and whose person was labeled as "intrepid."¹⁹¹ A similar display of respect for female Confederate spies could be found in *Harpers New Monthly Magazine* in the same year when *Harpers* published a biography of Greenhow in their March edition, which described Greenhow as "beautiful, accomplished, wealthy, and noted for her wit and forceful personality."¹⁹² This study of Greenhow is oddly similar to those which focused on Union generals nearly fifty years before. The same year, *The Washington Post* published another celebration of female spies which equated the deeds of Southern spies to Northern ones in a single sentence: "the Northern girl and the Southern Lassie rushed into danger for their country's sake." Clearly, female Confederate spies were celebrated in the same manner as their Northern counterparts.

In 1913 and 1914 respectively, two new celebrations of Rose O'Neal Greenhow emerged. One, published on January 12, 1913 in *The Boston Globe* entitled "Famous Scouts and Spies of the Civil War", referred to Greenhow as a woman of "great charm and originality." A year later, *the Globe* published "The War Day by Day, Fifty Years Ago" and referred to Greenhow as "the most celebrated spy in the Confederacy" who possessed "talents and [an] attractive personality." It is therefore easy to ascertain a sort of veneration to these women, which mixed a respectful acknowledgment of their patriotic duty to their country and an interest in their attractive features and personalities— both qualities that were reflected in works of post-war fiction involving Confederate female spies. Therefore, it can be understood that the changing attitudes towards Southern spies after the Civil War affected the Northern population so much so that they began to celebrate in newspapers the spies who were once written in print with detest.

With this change, however, came the erasure – or at the very least idealization – of what had initially caused the conflict. The fiction focusing on Southern women had, according to Alice Fahs, "bathed slavery in a nostalgic glow."¹⁹³ The crimes of real-life female spies, similarly, were glamorized, which overrode the truth that many of these upper-class women were, by defending the Confederacy, defending the institution of slavery. Popular fascination with female spies has brushed over this topic, just as the stories of reconciliatory Southern belles in Fahs' essay have done. As Nina Silber states "forgetfulness, not memory, appears to be the dominant theme in reunion culture."¹⁹⁴ Northerners seemed to forget that wealthy white women in the antebellum South owed their now romanticized lifestyle to the hierarchy of the South which rested on the oppression and enslavement of blacks. As Drew Gilpin Faust says, "as the women who benefited most from the South's class and racial arrangements, females in slaveholding families had the most to lose from war born transformation," and thus were the most determined to defend it.¹⁹⁵ The actions of wealthy Confederate women spies, while captivating for the public, ignore this and thus has helped reconcile citizens of the United States with the actions of the Confederacy, hereby raising the Confederacy to a position equal, and in some places above that of the Union.

¹⁹¹ "Women who Served in Warfare", *The Washington Post*, July 8, 1912, accessed November 13, 2017, <https://search.proquest.com/docview/145188508/abstract/D039BC9C66F043C2PQ/6>.

¹⁹² William Gilmore Beymer, "Mrs. Greenhow", *Harpers New Monthly Magazine*, March 1912, 563-578.

¹⁹³ Fahs, *The Feminized Civil War*, 1464.

¹⁹⁴ Silber, *The Romance of Reunion*, 4.

¹⁹⁵ Drew Gilpin Faust, *Mothers of Invention*, 7.

Bibliography

- "From Baltimore---Capture or Belle Boyd, the Female Spy." *Hartford Daily Courant*, Aug 04, 1862.
- "Southern Female Spies--Miss Belle Boyd." *The Sun*, July 21, 1862.
- "The Female Spies at Washington." *Chicago Tribune*, Aug 30, 1861.
- "Women in the War." *The United States Service Magazine* 4, no. 3, September, 1865.
- "A Spy Condemned to Death," *New York Times*, May 1, 1863.
- "Belle Boyd in Camp and Prison," *American Literary Gazette and Publishers Circular*, July 1, 1865.
- "Belle Boyd, The Rebel Spy," *The Sun*, February 21, 1891.
- "Editorial Article 2" *Hartford Daily Courant*, Aug 31, 1861.
- "Execution of Spies at Franklin, Tenn.; Interesting Narrative of the Concluding Scenes. The Trial. Preparations for the Execution. The Execution and Burial. The Object of their visit," *New York Times*, June 21, 1863.
- "Famous Scouts and Spies of the Civil War", *Boston Globe*, January 12, 1913.
- "Female Spy. Mrs. Jane Ferguson," *New York Times*, July 3, 1864.
- "FEMALE SPY." *Chicago Tribune*, Dec 27, 1862.
- "Foreign Miscellany," *Alexandria Gazette*, May 29, 1863.
- "FROM MISSOURI: Cruelty of Rebels Continued--Attack on Fayetteville, Ark.--
Military Changes--Guerrillas in the South-East--Thanksgiving for the Soldiers--A
Dangerous Female Spy," *The New York Daily Tribune*, Dec 1, 1864.
- "Literary Notes." *Nation*, July 1865.
- "Spies at Washington," *The Independent*, Aug 15, 1861.
- "The Great Book of the Day," *Alexandria Gazette*, November 13, 1865.
- "The Real Belle Boyd: A Famous Confederate Spy." *The Baltimore Sun*, February 12, 1889.
- B.S. Calef, "Prison Life," *Harpers New Monthly Magazine* July, 1865.
- Civil War*, Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press, 1996.
- Crozier, Robert Haskins. *The Confederate Spy*, Gallatin, TN: R.B. Harmon, 1866.
- Elizabeth Stuart Phelps, "Margaret Bronson," *Harpers New Monthly Magazine*, September, 1865.
- Entzminger, Betina. *The Belle Gone Bad: White Southern Women Writers and the Dark Seductress*, Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana State University Press, 2002.
- Fahs, Alice. "The Feminized Civil War: Gender, Northern Popular Literature, and the Memory of the War, 1861-1900." *The Journal of American History* 85, no. 4 (1999): 1461-1494. Accessed September 28, 2017, <https://academic.oup.com/jah/article/85/4/1461/751791?searchresult=1>
- Faust, Drew Gilpin. *Mothers of Invention: Women of the Slaveholding South in the American*
- Helen Wall Peirson, "Chip," *Harpers New Monthly Magazine*, July, 1865.
- Julian Hawthorne, "A Rebel," *Harpers New Monthly Magazine*, August, 1882.
- Menendez, Albert J. *Civil War Novels: An Annotated Bibliography*, New York, NY: Garland

New Publications," *New York Daily Tribune*, Jul 27, 1865.

Nora Perry, "Mrs. F's Waiting Maid," *Harpers New Monthly Magazine*, June, 1867.

Peck, Ellen. *Renshawe*, New York: Carlton, 1867.
Publishing Inc., 1986.

Silber, Nina. *The Romance of Reunion*, Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1993.

US Central Intelligence Agency, "Intelligence in the Civil War," accessed November 3, 2017, https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/intelligence-history/civil-war/Intel_in_the_CW1.pdf.

Will Carleton, "The Little Black Eyed Rebel," *Harpers New Monthly Magazine*, June, 1876.

William Franklin Gore Shanks, "Recollections of Lincoln," *Harpers New Monthly Magazine* July, 1865.

William Franklin Gore Shanks, "Recollections of Sheridan," *Harpers New Monthly Magazine*, August, 1865.

William Franklin Gore Shanks, "Recollections of Sherman," *Harpers New Monthly Magazine*, April, 1865.

William Franklin Gore Shanks, "Recollections of Thomas," *Harpers New Monthly Magazine*, May, 1865.

William Gilmore Beymer, "Mrs. Greenhow," *Harpers New Monthly Magazine*, March, 1912.

William Gore Shanks, "Recollections of Grant," *Harpers New Monthly Magazine* June, 1865.