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A Monkey Could Do It?
Inadequate Agents of the Prohibition Bureau

Heather Yarbrough

…and anyway it looks to me like the moonshine business is going to be pretty good in [the United States] and some of us want to get in on the ground floor. At least we want to get there in time to lay in a supply for future consumption.¹

~Letter to Bess Wallace from Harry Truman

The imminent prohibition of alcohol for which legislation began in 1919 received different reactions from Americans, including this laissez-faire attitude of Harry S. Truman who was of great enough character to be elected as a United States President, regardless of his thirst for drink. Pushed by the temperance movement, which had been working toward nationwide prohibition for over 100 years, Congress finally gave in to the pressures and created the Eighteenth Amendment to be ratified by the states, officially prohibiting “…the manufacture, sale, or transportation of intoxicating liquors within, the importation thereof into, or the exportation thereof from the United States and all territory subject to the jurisdiction thereof for beverage purpose.”² Blaming poverty levels, high unemployment, poor health, domestic problems, and criminal activity on alcohol, the ‘drys’ finally convinced the majority of

² U.S. Constitution, Amendment 18, sec. 1.
the American states that they must ban this devilish substance. Put into effect on January 29, 1920 after 36 states ratified it, the law was in force only 13-years and became the only act of the Constitution of the United States to be repealed. The amendment for the repeal was the fastest ever to be ratified. An attitude such as Truman’s, seen in his comment to Bess, indicates the potential difficulty of enforcing such a law in a land where drinking alcohol was a big part of the culture of many people.

The list of reasons for the failure of prohibition is long and greatly disputed. President Roosevelt argued that the repeal was necessary in order to “[achieve]…the break-up and eventual destruction of the notoriously evil illicit liquor traffic, and…[receive]…the payment of reasonable taxes for the support of Government.”3 His statement reinforces the historical focus on the facts that the Eighteenth Amendment created more crime and that the government lost a huge amount of revenue when sales and income tax on alcohol were transferred to the pockets of criminals through their illegal sales. Intertwined with these two problems was the fact that prohibition created great opportunities for corruption on the part of law officials. Additionally, millions of jobs relating to the liquor industry were lost. Finally, lack of cooperation at the state and local level and lack of public support are blamed, as the enforcers of prohibition did not ensure this support was in place at the implementation of the law. Although this list of reasons certainly contributed to the fiasco that prohibition came to be, a failure in the crucial planning stages by the Federal Government played a part, as well.

My research in the secondary literature on Prohibition suggests that historians often overlook one crucial factor in the Eighteenth Amendment’s failure: the hiring and training of Prohibition agents. My analysis of dozens of *New York Times* articles from the Prohibition era confirms the significance of this element; the government was simply unprepared for the daunting task of enforcing prohibition because it did not have an effective hiring and training program in place before the law went into effect. The purpose of this paper is to shed light on the fact that Prohibition failed because the Federal government did not put proper programs in place for the effective hiring and training of agents who would be successful in enforcing the law which so many Americans saw as an infringement on their rights.

All successful organizations need properly trained employees, yet those charged with Prohibition, a Federal institution, were not. Rather than create a solid plan for the hiring and training of effective prohibition agents, the developers had a mindset that followed the old adage that the job was so easy ‘a monkey could do it.’\textsuperscript{4} The task of enforcing prohibition was given to the Internal Revenue Service, as it was the organization that previously collected taxes on liquor. However, IRS personnel were expert at collecting taxes, not dangerous law enforcement. Fletcher Dobyns argues in his book, written about prohibition in 1946, that when liquor was legal and subject to tax, it was

---

\textsuperscript{4} Andrew Sinclair, (New York: Harper & Row, 1962), 273. Sinclair quotes from the session of the 66\textsuperscript{th} Congress, as well as a letter written by prohibitionist Wayne B. Wheeler to Senator Sheppard. He states that the enforcement plan began with an allocation of $2,000,000; even though one Senator noted at the time that they would need $50,000,000 to properly enforce it, while another Senator said $5,000,000 would be sufficient. This simple disagreement between Congressmen predicts that there would be no hope for agreement on creating an effective enforcement organization at the beginning of the “Noble Experiment” that Prohibition would come to be known. Without the necessary funds, a hiring and training program for enforcement agents would be ineffective.
sensible for the Treasury Department to be responsible for the investigation of any cases of tax evasion. He continues, “When, however, the liquor traffic was made a crime and the tax was abolished, to assign the enforcement of a purely criminal law to that department was a patent absurdity.” Therefore, although the newly formed Enforcement Bureau was faced with serious budget constraints from its inception, a more difficult challenge was the Internal Revenue’s lack of experience in criminal investigations beyond tax evasion.

In order to ensure the passage of the National Prohibition Act, the ‘drys’ allowed the spoils system to remain in effect for the hiring of the enforcement agents. The spoils system was the practice of awarding government positions to people who were loyal to the political party in power, as opposed to appointment based on merit. A clause in the Volstead Act stated that Prohibition agents would not be subjected to Civil Service exams. It is very curious that a mailman who was simply responsible for a pile of letters would be subject to the exams and the merit system, yet someone in charge of enforcing the Constitution of the United States could be hired, and remain in his position, no matter his qualifications or performance. This hiring method allowed political connections rather than performance to determine government employment. It also made corruption even more of a temptation, as Prohibition agents actually made less than a garbage collector! The Prohibition Bureau would continue to run on the spoils system for eight years.

---

6 Sinclair, 183-4. Corruption was to become a major factor in the failure of prohibition, beginning with one of the authors of the amendment on whose farm it was reported in the *New York Times* that a still making 130 gallons of liquor a day was found. This corruption would continue throughout the period of prohibition from local police, to state police, to prohibition agents and their administrators, and all the way up to congressmen.
years and the salaries, although increased slightly each year, would not be sufficient for such dangerous work.

Within two months of the law’s effective date, citizens complained of Prohibition’s adverse effects on society. In March of 1920, a newspaper article quoted a Cardinal who insisted, “dry laws are a menace in that they are causing unrest in the country.”7 This article was not the first concerned with the negative effects of prohibition—and certainly not the last. One year into prohibition, it was obvious that the government did not plan for proper enforcement. The Chicago Crime Commission reported that, since the enactment of the Eighteenth Amendment, there had been a huge crime wave and cites “improper enforcement of prohibition” as the leading cause.8 In addition, newspaper articles of the time are filled with stories of major mistakes of prohibition agents and a growing reputation for the Bureau as botching the enforcement of the new law: bureau personnel failed to identify themselves as federal agents, made searches and arrests without warrants, randomly shot at vehicles and unarmed citizens, planted liquor bottles to make unjustified arrests, beat citizens, dismissed cases due to flimsy evidence, and even resorted to murder.9 In one dramatic instance, agents took four children away from their mother because they found one pint of liquor in her home.10

9 “Cites 14 Charges Against Dry Agents,” New York Times, June 22, 1924. These 14 points were made by the head of the Associate Against the Prohibition Amendment and includes the complaints against federal prohibition agents cited above. Several other articles in the New York Times spanning from 1919 to 1927 substantiate this statement and give examples of more mistakes of the agents in their enforcement efforts.
10 Ibid. It is interesting to note that possession of liquor was not actually listed as a crime in the 18th amendment and, also, that agents were supposed to focus on commercial business and not to search private homes.
In 1919, before national prohibition was officially in effect (although wartime prohibition was), a *New York Times* article discussed the complaints sent to the Railroad Administration that referred to prohibition agents’ “cruel and insolent conduct” and “humiliating treatment”\(^{11}\). Agents with lights and guns woke women in their compartment clad only in nightgowns—which at that time was, of course, a scandal—in order to search for liquor. One woman reported that, after the agents went through her suitcases, they “proceeded to appropriate wearing apparel which pleased their fancy” and then stole the things she had purchased on her trip.\(^{12}\) This is a clear indication of the lack of professionalism the prohibition agents would demonstrate from the beginning and through the majority of the prohibition period.

By 1922 it was clear that current enforcement methods were not working. In his message to the United States Congress in December 1922, President Harding stated that there were “conditions relating to [Prohibition’s] enforcement which savor of nation-wide scandal. It is the most demoralizing factor in our public life.”\(^{13}\) Although he acknowledged the problem of corruption in the enforcement effort, he did not recognize the lack of training of the agents as a source of this problem. Instead he called for cooperation between national and state agencies in enforcement. It was almost five years before Civil Service Requirements, including a criminal check and character investigation, finally applied to the agents, along with the creation of a training school.

Year after year following the start of nationwide prohibition, the law became more and more ignored. As an example of the view of the

\(^{12}\) Ibid.
\(^{13}\) President Warren G. Harding, United States Department of State, Message of the President of the United States to Congress, December 8, 1922.
time, consider this letter to the editor of the *New York Times* by a ‘dry,’ who was actually against the prohibition law: “My business necessitates my visiting such widely separated cities as Chicago, Memphis, Dallas, Houston, New Orleans, Atlanta &c., twice a year, and in each of those cities I have noticed the same disregard for the Eighteenth Amendment.”14 At the end of 1925, there were two conflicting opinions as to the effectiveness of prohibition: the ‘wets,’ on the one hand, thought that vice, crime, and corruption were rapidly increasing due to the Volstead Act; the ‘drys,’ in opposition, contended that “industry, commerce, art, literature, music, learning, entertainment, and benevolence all find their finest expression in this saloonless (sic) land.”15 For the two groups to have such widely differing views as to the current status of the success (or failure) of prohibition indicates that enforcement was not yet effective.

In 1920, Prohibition Bureau leaders were confident that they could effectively enforce prohibition. In fact, a federal agent was so bold as to state:

> We are going to achieve prohibition…to do this, an educational campaign will be necessary and the officials in Washington have figured that it will require six years. In that time the sentiment of every law-abiding, self-respecting citizen will be solidly behind prohibition.16

Unfortunately, the education to which he referred was the education of the *public* on the evils of liquor, not the education of *agents* who would enforce the laws. By 1924, administrators still placed little on the need for systematic training of prohibition agents. Mabel Walker

---

Willebrandt, the Assistant Attorney General in charge of prosecuting prohibition cases saw the failures of enforcement firsthand. In an article she wrote in 1924, Mrs. Willebrandt voiced her concern for the continued use of the spoils system and expressed her desire for prohibition agents to come under the civil service rules. This issue was given one short paragraph in her article, while the remainder focused on court congestion and repeat offenders due to lax sentencing.\textsuperscript{17} At this time, she did not recognize the need for training. Fortunately, in 1927, the new director of prohibition, Colonel Amos W. W. Woodcock, recognized this need and established the following:

\begin{itemize}
  \item Character investigation
  \item Fingerprints to confirm their criminal statements were true
  \item Oral test
  \item Rated on training and experience
\end{itemize}

Required Training Course\textsuperscript{19}
\begin{itemize}
  \item Crime detection techniques
  \item Law of evidence, including preparation for and presentation of cases
  \item Conduct and morale
\end{itemize}

It took eight years to realize that the agents of the Prohibition Bureau were completely failing in their enforcement, and that—according to Col. Woodcock—it was largely due to “deplorable

\textsuperscript{17} Mabel Walker Willebrandt, “Problems to be Solved in Establishing 100% Enforcement,” \textit{Congressional Digest} October 1924, 14.
conditions of selection and training of agents.”  When the Bureau of Prohibition Act was enacted in 1927 to enforce these requirements, 59% of the agents already in service failed the examinations, thereby proving the insufficiencies of the hiring and training system up to that point.

Five years after writing her synopsis of the problems of prohibition enforcement, *A Time Magazine* article depicts Mrs. Willebrandt as “worn, tired, looking at least ten years older,” presumably due to the exhausting task of enforcing prohibition. At that time, Mrs. Willebrandt resigned as the Assistant Attorney General and began expressing the views she had developed based on her experiences. Ten years into Prohibition, she concluded that prohibition was not enforced effectively but that it could be. In a *New York Times* article, she discussed issues of corruption, hypocrisy, and other excuses for the failure to enforce prohibition, but stressed that the government had been unfair to agents from the law’s inception. She finally brought to light that Civil Service requirements and systematic training should have been established from the beginning, describing the situation in the following words: “outrages against law-abiding citizens which have inflamed the public mind and done more harm to orderly enforcement than anything else…have been the result of lack of intelligence or lack of training.”

Other intelligence and investigation organizations in 1919 had to undergo training and testing, so the federal prohibition agents should have been under the same requirements.

The inadequate training of agents is exemplified by the fact that, of the thousands of agents, only two were consistently in the headlines

---

20 Ibid.
22 “Questions and Answers,” *TIME*, August 26, 1929.
for their successes. Isadore ‘Izzy’ Einstein and Moe Smith became famous for disguises that enabled them to arrest sellers of illegal alcohol. Because agents received no proper training, Izzy Einstein’s success must be in part attributed to his natural ability for undercover work. According to one observer, “Izzy Einstein stands forth with his trusty lieutenant Moe Smith as the master hooch-hound, alongside whom all the rest of the pack are but pups.”

For years other agents failed at undercover work, while Izzy and Moe constructed ever more creative ways to catch criminals. They “decided the way to catch rum sellers was to look and act the part of any and all walks and classes except the unwelcome ones.”

The duo were true chameleons, becoming Hungarian workers, trumpet players, milk drivers, grave diggers, baseball players, farmers, high-class businessmen, and even a man and wife. They did whatever it took to convince a seller they were just two more good customers. However, rather than take a cue from the successes of two agents—especially in the early stages of prohibition—and teach similar methods to other agents, the authorities fired Izzy and Moe. They gave the excuse that the duo had become too well-known and were, therefore, unable to continue undercover work. It is true that they would occasionally be recognized, but their successes certainly outweighed the few times they were exposed. During their five years of service, Izzy and Moe were involved in 20% of all arrests in Lower Manhattan, were responsible for almost 5,000 arrests, and confiscated 5 million bottles of liquor.

Consequently, the prohibition administrators’ decision to fire them

---

25 Ibid.
shows the lack of foresight in obtaining and maintaining effective enforcement agents. Izzy himself argued the reason enforcement of prohibition was so difficult was “almost entirely a question of personnel.”\textsuperscript{27} Charles Merz said that “no more substantial contribution was made to enforcement of the law than by these two resourceful agents.”\textsuperscript{28} Thomas Coffey emphasizes this point with his argument that “by 1925, Izzy Einstein had arrested so many people and confiscated so much liquor that he was an embarrassment to his colleagues (none of whom even approached his productivity).”\textsuperscript{29} These historians, one from the era of prohibition and one looking back 40 years later, are in agreement that Izzy and Moe’s successes emphasized the fact that the majority of the prohibition agents were thus far inadequate.

In 1930, after a decade of obvious enforcement failure, the National Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement was given the task of investigating the work of the Prohibition Bureau. The report focused on corruption, the law’s shaky start, public opinion, economic impact of prohibition, and the strain on the courts and penal institutions. They came to several conclusions, including ‘the agencies for enforcement [being] badly organized and inadequate’ and that by the end of 1930 “there is yet no adequate observance or enforcement.”\textsuperscript{30} The Commission concluded that the Eighteenth amendment should not be repealed, but many changes must be introduced in order to make it effective. Unfortunately, all the findings of the report were issues that should have been considered in 1919 when the amendment was written.

\textsuperscript{27} Izzy Einstein, \textit{Prohibition Agent No. 1} (New York: Frederick A. Stokes Company 1932), 260.
\textsuperscript{28} Merz, 137.
\textsuperscript{29} Coffey, 155-156.
By 1930, when the problems of prohibition were finally being investigated fully, the chances of quickly creating effective methods of enforcement were low, losing any possibility of gaining public support for keeping the amendment in effect.

In their defense, the agents were up against criminals who had far more funds and power and embarrassingly superior organization than the Prohibition Bureau. Crime and the number of criminals increased over the first decade, while the number of agents at any given time stayed essentially the same. On the other hand, the death toll increased due to murders committed by the agents. In a law review of the 21st amendment, Sidney Spaeth argues, “The enforcement of Prohibition represented the nadir of government regulation of liquor…and [there were] many shooting deaths which the government justified by its goal of banning liquor.”31 Despite the untamed shootings that often occurred at the beginning of prohibition, an actual rule prohibiting agents “from using firearms promiscuously” was not written until 1928.32 The agents were battling a very dangerous business, and had little chance of achieving control with their lack of training—especially in shooting restraint.

Looking back, it is easy to see the many reasons that prohibition failed. Inability to enforce it was the main broad reason for failure, but many issues contributed to the poor enforcement. Historian Andrew Sinclair explains, “An efficient enforcement agency demands three things: continuity of personnel, large enough salaries to make graft unnecessary, and public and federal co-operation. The Prohibition

Bureau had none of these essentials.”33 Because Congress did not fund the Bureau properly and allowed hiring by the spoils system, they created an environment that was ripe for corruption and high turnover. Additionally, no one involved in prohibition enforcement either realized or acknowledged the need for thorough agent training in detective work, proper searches and arrests, and general conduct. This administrative blunder resulted in a string of inept, even harmful, agents for the first seven years. All of these issues led to a lack of public confidence in the system, leading to a vicious circle: without public support, no reform movement can succeed; and without a respected and well-trained enforcement agency, that public support cannot be gained.

Bibliography


33 Sinclair, 184-5.


“Questions and Answers.” *TIME*, August 26, 1929.


Walker Willebrandt, Mabel. “Problems to be Solved in Establishing 100% Enforcement.” *Congressional Digest*, October 1924.

Poison Words:

Depictions of Gas in World War I

Joseph Pinter

World War I saw the introduction of many new and frightening weapons. One of the most important of these weapons was poison gas. Lethal gas was first introduced by the Germans, but soon most of the warring countries were using the weapon. The media, especially newspapers, played a major role in selling the use of gas to the public. The tone of writing regarding the Germans using gas intended to demonize the Germans with frightening images and hateful rhetoric. Writing regarding Entente gas use, especially British gas use, provided scientific explanations and practical justification. The Entente powers of Britain, France, and Russia used journalism as a branch of propaganda to attack Germany barbarity and praise Entente humanity. However, both of these views are distorted given the purpose and effectiveness of the gasses used. The morality of using gas during war is not clear. Regardless of the morality however, gas was still a fearsome weapon. The newspapers of the Entente powers, in particular the London Times, exploited the frightfulness of gas weapons to depict Germany as evil and to vindicate the use of gas by England and its allies.

The first major use of gas as a lethal weapon was during the Battle of Ypres on April 22, 1915. During this battle the Germans unleashed approximately 150 tons of chlorine gas upon the French army. The gas attack broke the French defensive line, but the Germans failed to take advantage of the weakened French defenses. The true importance of the battle at Ypres was the introduction of a gas weapon intended to kill.
Before this battle, both the French and Germans had used irritant gasses with the intention of aggravating the senses and then overtaking the enemy forces. The Germans used gas with the purpose of killing soldiers. This use brought about a new type of warfare, which escalated as the armies created newer and deadlier gasses.¹ The use of chlorine gas at Ypres marks a significant departure from the old ways of waging war. Immediately, a negative opinion formed regarding gas weaponry. For example, a medical correspondent for the *London Times* wrote on April 29, 1915, one week after the Battle of Ypres that

> To-day I have been enabled to see and examine several of the victims of the outrage and also to discuss with them the effects of the gases. The conclusion forced upon me by this study is that the extent of the new German “frightfulness” is not, even yet, realized by the public…The terrible sufferings about to be inflicted upon our men were fully understood and had been measured beforehand.²

This and similar accounts reveal that gas immediately became a weapon of fear. Newspapers and other media sources used this fear in order to portray the enemy as barbarians who had violated the rules of war. The media exploited the fear of gas as a tool of propaganda.

The *London Times* reported extensively on the German use of poison gas. These reports paint the German army as immoral. An article from May 15, 1915 states that “the feelings of the troops…have undoubtedly changed towards the enemy…the former feeling of honest


dislike has been succeeded by intense bitterness.”³ The British desired honorable combat between two armies engaged in fair combat. The introduction of gas meant the end of honorable combat and the beginning of a terrifying new method of warfare. The days of soldiers fighting their enemies face to face in a contest of strength were long gone; now soldiers feared that they could be killed en masse without ever seeing the opponent, choking to death on the poisonous gasses deployed by the enemy. This new and frightening style of combat was a constant theme in newspapers of the era. An article published June 14, 1915 states that “the use of poisonous gases by the Germans, involving as it does far-reaching suffering, promises to present one of the blackest pages in the world’s history…the general situation caused by the use of gas is so filled with inhumanity and misery.”⁴ The theme of misery is continually revisited in articles with first hand accounts of the aftermath of gas attacks. The reports are filled with horrific imagery; focusing on the torture that gas inflicted, and on the disease-like effects of the gas.⁵ These feelings that the use of gas was inhumane and barbaric come not only from a natural reaction to their use, but also in previous agreements regarding poisonous weapons. Specifically, The Hague Conferences of 1899 and 1907 prohibited the use of asphyxiating gas weapons and poisonous weapons.⁶ The purpose of these conferences was partially to prevent a gas attack designed to kill the enemy. Germany’s use of chlorine gas at Ypres clearly violated the Conferences. This factor and

the devastating effects of chlorine gas prompted the negative writing regarding the German army. Gas was an evil weapon, and any country that would dare use the weapon was evil as well.

The belief that countries that used gaseous weapons were evil extended only to Germany. Soon after Germany’s use of lethal gas, the British introduced gas weapons of their own. These gases were just as poisonous as the gases that Germany used. In addition, favorable wind patterns and large supplies of rubber for gas masks meant that British gas attacks were more effective while German gas attacks could end up completely ineffective.\(^7\) The reaction by the press to British gas use is remarkably different from the ways in which Germany was depicted. One article from the *London Times* discussing a British gas attack reads “along our front north of the River Anere, gas was discharged at several points. The enemy’s reply, said Headquarters, was feeble. Our patrols were able to enter the German trenches and to take prisoners.”\(^8\) The view of gas as an inhumane weapon that threatened to destroy civilization had been replaced with an almost accepting attitude. This view was not limited to England’s press, as a similar view of gas use is expressed in an article in the *New York Times*:

Mustard gas, the deadliest instrument of warfare yet devised, is not a gas, but an amber field of a faint sweetish, not unpleasant odor. It is no more volatile than turpentine. It kills by inhalation and maims or blinds by contact. In one recent attack, lasting forty-eight hours, it was estimated that the Germans used 7,000 tons of it...And although the United States is admittedly behind in its gas program, it may be said, for whatever aid and comfort it affords Berlin, that the kind of mustard gas

---

\(^7\) Girard, 24-25.

being manufactured is one-fourth more toxic than the kind being used by the Germans.9

The frightening rhetoric used to describe German gas use is absent in this description of mustard gas even though it is described as “the deadliest instrument of warfare.” Instead, the focus of the article is on the scientific aspect of the gas and the level of toxicity that American mustard gas possesses. Even this view on the “deadliest” weapon changed, as an article published a short time later reported that “it [mustard gas] is not a lethal gas, and seldom kills outright, but it seriously affects the skin and membranes, inflicting most painful burns and putting men out of service for three months.”10 The deadliness of mustard gas was no longer emphasized in reports of Entente use as it was in reports of German use.

The reasons for this view of Allied gas use are understandable. Immediately after the Germans introduced poison gas at Ypres, the London Times and other newspapers began criticizing and attacking the Germans’ use of the weapon. For the press to do the same in regards to Entente gas use would undermine their efforts in the war. Also, heavy censorship of the press affected the articles and images that could be printed. England, for example, censored the press first by limiting the amount of journalists on the battlefields and then by censoring the information that was acquired.11 In doing so, the government could control how German gas use appeared in newspapers, and how Entente gas use appeared. If the press had reported British gas use in the same way as German gas use they would risk a public outcry. The decision was made to focus on the science involved in gas weapons and the now-

10 “Allies at Last Have a Supply of Mustard Gas; Americans Get Quick Effect with It on the Marne,” London Times, July 12, 1918, 1.
11 Girard, 129.
necessary gas counterattack by the Entente powers. 12 This scientific focal point legitimized Entente gas use, and the censorship of the media worked to maintain popular opinion in favor of gas use. By doing so, Britain and its allies became defenders of humanity while Germany became a barbaric nation threatening the future of mankind.

These views of Britain and Germany were inaccurate. Yes, Germany introduced poison gas as a weapon of war, but they were not the first to use gaseous weapons. The French had used gaseous weapons as early as 1914. The difference between the French and German use of gas is that the French used an irritant whereas the Germans retaliated with a lethal gas. The French experimented with ethyl bromo-acetate first as a rifle shell and later in a hand grenade. The effect of the ethyl bromo-acetate was an irritation of the senses; prolonged exposure could potentially be lethal, but short term exposure was not fatal. 13 The effects of chlorine, which the Germans used at Ypres, were significantly more horrific. Marion Girard quotes a first hand account by Sgt. Elmer Wilgrid Cotton in the book *A Strange and Formidable Weapon: British Responses to World War I Poison Gas*, detailing the effects of chlorine gas:

Chlorine Gas produces a flooding of the lungs—it is an equivalent death to drowning only on dry land—the effects are these:—a splitting headache & a terrific thirst (to drink water is instant death) a knife edge pain in the lungs the coughing up of a greenish froth off the…lungs and stomach ending finally in insensibility & death—the colour of the skin from white turns a greenish black or

---

13 Trumpener, 462.
yellow, the tongue protrudes & the eyes assume a glassy stare—it is a fiendish death to die.\textsuperscript{14}

Even though the effects of chlorine gas were exponentially worse than those of earlier irritants, an argument can be made that chlorine and other deadly gasses were a natural step past those irritants. The introduction of irritant gasses potentially paved the way for the deadly gasses that Germany brought in to World War I. Early German attempts to develop gas weapons were largely unsuccessful, but the use of irritants by the French army may have provided Germany a greater opportunity to develop their gas weapons. Germany also started with the development of irritant gasses similar to the French. From there they progressed to lethal gasses.\textsuperscript{15} If the Germans were merely answering gas attacks with gas attacks, they were also answering irritation with death. The British in doing the same answered death with death. This response is the basis for justifying British gas use: the British used gas as a means to respond to the death that Germany delivered. This viewpoint is in contradiction to the \textit{New York Times} article quoted above, where it is stated that American mustard gas was more deadly than German mustard gas. An interview quoted in that article with Dr. Benjamin T. Brooks, a chemist who worked on mustard gas states further that “one reason the mustard gas is so dangerous is that it seems so innocent. The smell is faint, and it is not especially disagreeable.”\textsuperscript{16} The use of a deadly weapon that gives little warning to its danger can not be justified by claiming righteous retaliation. If Germany was inhumane for using deadly gas weapons, then so were Britain and its allies.

\textsuperscript{14} Girard, 1.
\textsuperscript{15} Trumpener, 461-463.
Another reason why the views regarding the gas use by the warring nations are incorrect is that not everyone viewed the use of gas as inhumane. An account from the Cologne Gazette of Germany that was quoted in the *London Times* provides an example of this belief:

Why should a stupefying gas, which one sees openly and slowly approaching, and before which one can retire, be less humane than the invisible and unavoidable gas which bursts shells and with their splinters tears bodies into bloody shreds? Or the gas which flames up under one’s feet from a secretly exploded mine and hurls thee and dozens of thy comrades in atoms towards the firmament? What if it were ‘poisonous’ and killed?17

This viewpoint that gas was more than or just as humane as bullets or other weapons was not held exclusively by Germans. The United States’ Captain Alfred T. Mahan, a noted military officer, also viewed gas as a humane weapon. He compared asphyxiating gasses with men drowning during battles at sea, and that gasses could also be used to knock the enemy out and then be taken prisoner, safely.18 This view of gas, held by parties on both sides of the war, indicates that the view of Germany as an immoral entity was not as definite as the *London Times* articles stated. Rather, it introduces other viewpoints entirely. The use of gas could be considered a better way of waging war, instead of the end of society. To ignore or minimize arguments in favor of gas use suggests irresponsibility at the hands of some news sources. In the United States, there were some newspapers which supported the view that gas use was humane, but for the most part Entente newspapers reported extensively on the barbarity of Germany, yet quickly abandoned such a view of gas.

18 Slotten, 478.
once the Entente began to use the weapon. The newspapers focused heavily on the fearfulness of the new weapon when Germany began to use it, in order to rally the population in support of the war.

A third factor in the inaccuracy of the reporting of gas use deals with the effectiveness of the weapons. There is little doubt as to the effectiveness of the lethal gas used during the Battle of Ypres. Gas was effective there because of the surprising nature of the weapon and the wide area in which the gas was released. Later in the war, a statement that originally appeared in German newspapers would argue that gas was too effective to quit using. The statement reads:

To-day, however, practical experience shows that both parties believe themselves to be in possession of a powerful weapon in gas, and only that party which feels itself to be inferior in its employment will readily decide to abandon it. For the weaker party, therefore, this propaganda against the use of stupefying gas will be a welcome means of attempting to strike an effective weapon out of the stronger party’s hand.

Contrary to this report, however, gas became less and less effective as the war continued. Due to improvements in gas mask technology, gasses would be unleashed with minimal casualties. Gas was less an effective weapon of war and more a weapon of fear that the government through the newspapers could unleash on their own people.

These divergent opinions regarding the use of gas suggest that it was not a black and white issue. Instead, the use of gas fits into the gray area in the middle, with many different ways to look at the issue. Gas could be lawful, because everything is lawful during war, or it could be

19 Slotten, 478-479.
unlawful, because everything about war is unlawful. German gas use might be unlawful, because it violated the Hague conferences, while British gas use was lawful, because it was merely a justified response to the Germans. It is difficult to determine with certainty the morality of using lethal gasses during war. What is certain is that the news media of Britain and its allies played upon the natural fears of poison gas in order to rally support for the war.
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Charles Babbage was an inventor and scientist in early Victorian England. Among other things, he is credited with the invention of the Difference Engine, which was an early computing device. He was also involved in many of the scientific societies of the time, such as the British Association for the Advancement of Science, the Statistical Society of London, and the Astronomical Society. However, despite his many scientific and inventive achievements, he was not always well regarded in the scientific community. Much of the problem he had within the scientific community involved his penchant for seeing the undesirable traits in his contemporaries. Because he was at heart an honest and honorable man who was not given to mincing words, he was not the least bit shy, or diplomatic, in how he pointed out those faults. Babbage did not limit his criticisms to the scientific community; he also freely criticized society at large. His criticisms were also sometimes aimed at some of his closest associates, a trait that, among other things, led to his failure to complete his Difference Engine. In an era that valued diplomatic, decorous speech and writing even in criticism, Charles Babbage stood out as a blunt, honest speaker and writer with little use for the conventions of polite company when he saw faults that he felt needed to be exposed.

Babbage’s tendency toward blunt criticism appeared at an early age. He had an uncomfortable relationship with his father, some of which seems to have come from his father’s wish that the young Charles Babbage concentrate on making himself a man with some financial
means.¹ In spite of his father’s wishes, he married just after college, in 1814, before he had established himself in a career. This led to a quarrel with his father, which Babbage seemingly took rather lightly. In a letter to his longtime friend and fellow Cambridge student John Herschel, Babbage commented, “I am married and have quarreled with my father.”² However, Babbage did not stop with this simple statement, but went on to characterize his father as a man with “no rational reason” for objecting to his marriage³. He further described his father as hating the idea of marriage and of being unusually fond of money⁴. Herschel was rather shocked at how lightly Babbage seemed to take the quarrel with his father and wrote back to take Babbage to task for his cavalier attitude. Babbage’s response, however, demonstrated his penchant for not mincing words in his criticism of others. In his return letter to Herschel, Babbage describes at length the failings of his father as a person, describing him as a man with one foot in the grave, uncultured, and with a terrible temper, and said his father tormented everyone around him⁵. This description was an unusually harsh one for the standards of the time, which normally accepted a man’s treatment of his family as a personal matter that was rarely, if ever, considered on the basis of justice or fairness to others in the household. Societal convention of the time saw the man as the head of the household and not really subject to criticism. Babbage’s willingness to criticize his father to someone outside the family, and in such uncompromising terms, was rather

³ Ibid.
⁴ Ibid.
unusual. It also apparently put some temporary strain into his relationship with his Herschel, judging by the fact that his friend found it necessary to take him to task for his statements about his father.

Babbage’s criticism of his father was not an aberrant episode, however. It was merely an early example of a pattern that was to show itself over and over again throughout Babbage’s life. In 1826 he published a book, *A Comparative View of the Various Institutions for the Assurance of Lives*, which thoroughly explains the business of life insurance, which was a growing industry in Victorian England. Although the book was intended as an explanation of life insurance for those who did not work as agents, it ultimately functioned as a consumer protection document. Babbage, as a very honorable man himself, was quite unhappy with some of the practices he found in the industry and used the book as a forum to highlight things he found distasteful. Among other things, he comments on the fact that solicitors often received some sort of compensation for directing clients to a particular firm offering life insurance. This was something he found reprehensible, and he makes no effort to cloak his disdain for such practices. He opens the chapter by titling it “Of Commissions to Agents.”6 In the very first paragraph of the chapter, he then proceeds to explain why commissions to agents are an evil that should not be tolerated by saying, “It is… of the utmost consequence that no motive should be presented to those who are thus confidentially employed, which should induce them, from any prospect of advantage to themselves, to recommend one office in preference to others.”7 Babbage does not stop with this explanation, however. He continues by saying, “… the frequency of its occurrence is

---

7 Ibid., 132.
unfortunately so great, as to cause it in some measure to have lost, in the
eyes of those who practise it, the disgrace which, in all other
transactions, is attached to the offer or the acceptance of a bribe.”
He clearly saw such commissions as a shameful matter, and he certainly
made no attempts to be diplomatic in his condemnation of the practice.
What is most surprising, perhaps, is that Babbage made such an effort to
explain an industry to the common people. Victorian England generally
operated under laissez-faire economics and was not particularly
concerned with consumer protection.

Babbage did not limit his criticisms to the business world. In
1830 he published a book entitled Reflections on the Decline of Science
in England, and on Some of Its Causes. In publishing this book, he
created a huge controversy and lost the support of some of the people in
the Royal Society who had previously backed his work. As an example,
his lifelong close friend John Herschel wrote to him saying, “If I were
near you and could do it without hurting you and thought you would not
return it with interest I would give you a good slap in the face.”
While Herschel actually agreed with Babbage that the Royal Society and the
state of science in Britain were in need of improvement, he also
understood the benefits of using diplomacy to effect the changes. He
also saw the danger Babbage posed to his own work; one of the people
Babbage implicated was Sir Humphry Davy, a previous president of the
Royal Society who helped ensure Babbage had funding for his
Difference Engine.

He also probably irritated many in the education system; his first
chapter proposes, “A young man passes from our public schools to the

---

8 Ibid., 132-133.
9 Swade, 61-65.
10 Letter from John Herschel to Charles Babbage, quoted in Swade, The Difference
Engine, 63.
universities, ignorant almost of the elements of every branch of useful knowledge…”11 Clearly, Babbage had little respect for the public schools of his time, and as always, he was not shy about saying what he thought was wrong with a particular institution. Babbage spoke in part from experience with regard to the education system. His problems with the education system in Britain began long before he published his book *Reflections on the Decline of Science in England, and on Some of Its Causes*. For example, he was frustrated with the teaching of mathematics at Cambridge because it paid little attention to innovations from other parts of the world. Cambridge professors used an old curriculum and were mainly uninterested in new developments in Europe. His frustration with the Cambridge curriculum caused him to help found the Analytical Society, which was involved with efforts to improve and reform the teaching and usage of mathematics in England.12

Babbage also tried to see that justice was done in regard to awards given in the scientific community. In 1847 there was a controversy regarding whether an award should be given to Mr. Le Verrier, who published information leading to the discovery of the planet Neptune. The controversy started because a Mr. Adams mentioned that he found the same information in his own research at an earlier time than Le Verrier, although Le Verrier published his research before Adams did. The Astronomical Society voted not to give the award to Le Verrier, by a narrow margin. Babbage proposed, in a letter he sent to the Astronomical Society and *The Times of London*, that two awards should be created, one for 1846 and one for 1847.13 Although the award

12 Swade, 18.
ultimately was not given to Le Verrier, Babbage showed, once again, that he had no hesitation in showing where a problem existed. In this case, he even quoted Adams, who said he mentioned the dates of his discoveries only to clarify when he had done his own work and to prove he had done his own work. Adams also said he had no intention of interfering with Le Verrier earning his award. Babbage also pointed out in his letter that such discoveries are credited to the person who publishes first, and that it was undisputed that Le Verrier published his work before Adams did. Therefore, it was Babbage’s opinion that Le Verrier should earn the award. Despite his letter, the award was given as originally planned.

Perhaps the most distressing setback Babbage experienced as a result of his bluntness of speech and action and his unfailing sense of honesty and fairness involved his Difference Engine. Babbage worked for several years with an excellent draftsman and machinist by the name of Joseph Clement. Babbage began his work on the Difference Engine in 1822, working with Clement to construct the mechanism of the device, as well as the highly intricate system of gears required to work the calculations Babbage wanted solved. Although the pair worked together on the Difference Engine until 1834, there were several occasions where Babbage’s attitude about honesty and fair dealing cause problems between the two men. One of the main problems involved money. As Clement was one of the most talented machinists in London, he accordingly charged high prices for his labors. While Babbage did not mind paying a high price for the best quality of work, he did insist that accounts be kept regularly, detailing what costs were accrued and how. This record keeping became even more important after 1830, when the

14 Ibid.
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However, the pair reached an impasse in 1829 due to Babbage’s insistence that Clement’s books be examined for accuracy. In addition, Babbage tried, later than he perhaps should have, to make sure he and Clement each had his own intellectual rights in the project protected. Clement was not pleased at having someone look over his books and was unhappy that Babbage wanted him to agree to not make copies of the Difference Engine. The dispute arose because while the ideas and designs for the Difference Engine were Babbage’s, the tools and the labor to build it were Clement’s. Ironically, Babbage did not insist on these things being done because he felt any distrust of Clement. On the contrary, he simply was trying to be fair and ensure that both he and Clement received due recognition of the work they did, whether it was the initial work of developing the concept or the design and manufacture of specific elements. Babbage also apparently wanted to be sure Clement was adequately compensated for his work, and examining Clement’s financial records was meant as a means of ensuring Clement was paid appropriately. Clement ultimately refused to agree not to make copies of the Difference Engine, but did agree to have his books looked at. The issue was resolved temporarily through arbitration and the accounts settled up in 1830.\footnote{Swade, 60-61.}

Unfortunately, that was not the end of the dispute between Clement and Babbage, and work finally stopped for good in 1834. The Difference Engine was not yet complete, but due to the falling-out between Babbage and Clement, the Engine was destined to remain incomplete, despite the many years of work. In the end, Babbage’s

efforts to handle everything fairly were his undoing with Clement. The two had their final falling-out in 1834. They had intended on putting the Difference Engine in a fireproof building to help protect it. Clement ended up in a position of needing to split his business between the building he was in and the new building for the Difference Engine and tried to insist that the British Treasury, which was funding the Difference Engine by this point, should pay compensation for his difficulties in doing business. Babbage tried to convince Clement to withdraw the request, perhaps because the Treasury had already paid large amounts of money to help fund the project. In the end, Babbage’s insistence that Clement not petition the Treasury for something Babbage felt was not a fair charge put the final split in their partnership and caused the Difference Engine to remain unfinished.18

In the final analysis, Babbage certainly had a sense of honesty, honor, and fair play that lived up to the best Victorian expectations of what a moral attitude should be. His failing was in his expression of his principles. His blunt speech in insisting that honor be upheld, and his willingness to widely proclaim his displeasure at the behavior of others caused him to lose the support of others in the Royal Society. Even more damaging, it caused the failure to complete the full Difference Engine. Perhaps modern computing would not have been affected much by the Difference Engine being completed, as many of Babbage’s concepts were used in building the first of the modern computers in the 20th century. However, it is entertaining to wonder if perhaps computer technology as we know it might have been farther along at an earlier date if the Difference Engine had been completed. Perhaps the most enduring legacy Babbage has is that of an inventor whose most influential invention was never completed. Ironically, it was his sense of honor and

18 Swade, 66-67.
fairness that ultimately stymied the completion of his best-known invention.
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The American Revolution

Daniel Stearns

The American Revolution is a pivotal event in American history and maintains an important place in the history of the world. In the two-hundred plus years following our country’s war of independence, historians have studied and investigated nearly every angle of this massive and complex conflict between an upstart nation and a colonial super power. Even so, there are some aspects of the American Revolution that have yet to come under the scrutiny of an extensive investigation into their place in this historical event. One facet of the vast history of the American Revolution that has attracted nominal attention from historians is the participation and the outcome of revolution for Native Americans. Admittedly, the role of Native Americans in the fighting during the war is mentioned, albeit briefly, in some texts. Few historians, however, have looked thoroughly at the consequences of the revolution through the eyes of the indigenous people of North America. Understandably, the significance of the Native American presence in the American Revolution was not fundamental in its outcome; perhaps this may be the reason for the lack of rigorous attention given to this particular subject. However, through my research, it has become clear that their involvement was a catalyst for their disintegration.

While the disintegration of the Native American nations may have been inevitable in the long run, with or without the existence of the American Revolution and regardless of the war’s outcome, the conflict none the less acted as a catalyst in their collapse. In order to understand the variables that led to the mass crumbling of an entire nation of people
in such a short period of time, it is necessary for one to attempt to gain prospective by trying to see the effects of the conflict on the home front of the Native Americans. Collin Callaway’s book, *The American Revolution in Indian Country* does a wonderful job explaining the experience of communities. Most sources, probably for reasons mentioned prior, do not attempt to acquire this kind of grass roots insight. Instead, they tend to focus on providing a brief overview of the conflict in the eyes of the Indians. Francis Jennings’ book, *The Ambiguous Iroquois Empire* provides an excellent history of the Iroquois nations but mentions nothing at all about their pivotal involvement in the American Revolution. This widespread occurrence may show a belief amongst historians that the American Revolution simply did not play any significant role in Native American history, a theory that does not do justice for those tribes who lost significant amounts of land as a result of the war and American Independence all together. Roger Nichols wrote a synopsis of American History involving Native Americans. In it, he describes how “in the first few years after American independence, the Native people west of Pittsburgh failed to deal effectively with the government agents. These negotiators extracted harsh treaty concessions…” ¹ Nichols goes on to name a few treaties such as the Treaty of Fort Stanwix of 1884 which ceded lands from the Iroquois, the Treaty of Fort McIntosh of 1785 which ceded land from the Wyandot, Delaware’s, and Ojibwas as well as the Shawnees in the Treaty of Fort Finney in 1786. All of these were direct results of a newly formed nation who saw these tribes as a “conquered peoples”.

The American Revolution was not the first war that pitted European against European. Many of these conflicts, like the others prior to it, would engulf Native Americans in a struggle which was not theirs to begin with and would yield little or no benefits for them. Before the American Revolution, Native American tribes had already suffered the consequences of contact with the Europeans. Epidemics of small pox, diphtheria, and measles had reduced Indian populations significantly.\textsuperscript{2} Frequent trade with the whites served to disrupt Native American lifestyles and cultures and over time, Native peoples became increasingly dependent on the goods which the Europeans offered. The introduction of guns to the Native Americans increased the amount of game killed each year and therefore allowed for much larger families; in turn, these larger families had to adapt by buying more guns and killing more game until they had virtually wiped our their food supply. Aside from guns, Native Americans become dependant on many other trade good brought by the Europeans such as steel knives and axes, which out lasted and were far superior to their stone tools, as well as many other items. Much of what the Native Americans bought was purchased on a system of credit that they could not repay and many fell into debt. Consequently, many were forced to sell off their lands or were subjected to a life of endearment in order to repay their suppliers.\textsuperscript{3} Land was taken from Native Americans in many other ways like treaties and open conflict.

The Native American loss of property is at the epicenter of their conflicts with both colonists and the British. To the Native American, cession of their lands was a moral blow to their social infrastructure. “Tribal domains represented the home of passing generations, a region

\textsuperscript{3} Nichols, 55-56.
now filled with not only deities but also the spirits of these ancestors.”

The social structure of the tribes themselves made them particularly vulnerable as well. Francis Jennings describes the populace of Native Americans as being peoples “whose political organizations were founded on kinship and locality and who had no sense of racial solidarity.” This organization explains why Native Americans were unable to unite and instead were fragmented. Even tight tribal communities were not safe from the dividing decision over whether or not to side with the British or the Colonists as the American Revolution loomed on the horizon. The outcome had a drastic effect on the structural integrity of the social and political infrastructure. Younger warriors, fueled by their hate for the colonists who constantly encroached on their land, ignored elder chiefs and shamans and attacked white settlements. While the choice to side with loyalist or patriot was indeed very much individualized, it is widely accepted by historians that the majority of Native Americans sided with the British.

The American Revolution was not the first conflict between European and European in which the Native Americans had taken part. Prior to the revolution, trade rivalries with the Indians between various European territories belonging to France, Spain, and England had sparked numerous conflicts such as the Seven Years war into which certain tribes were drawn. More often than not, the Native people wished for neutrality but could not avoid the whirlwind effect of these quarrels from which they rarely gained anything and frequently walked away.

---

from much weaker than before. This type of situation happened so often that “by the time of American Independence in 1783,” writes Roger Nichols, “…many village societies were well experienced at trying to survive the upheavals the invaders brought.”\textsuperscript{6} The American Revolution would play out much the same for the tribes of what was then the western frontier. Again, for most tribes such as the Abenaki, neutrality was the favored seat in which to sit during the war. By the end of the war, the Abenaki were “…politically divided but physically intact. In a conflict that tolerated no neutrals, internal turmoil was a small price to pay for group survival.”\textsuperscript{7} All this was due to the fact that they were able to “keep the war at arms length”. Success stories like the Abenaki, however, are rare. Neutrality for Native American villages, as described by Calloway, “…was a perilous strategy, more likely to make the village a target than a haven when British and Americans alike adhered to the notion that if Indians were not fighting for you, they would fight against you.”\textsuperscript{8} More often than not, these tribes or communities would ally themselves to the side which they felt benefitted them more. Factors that might sway Native American choice included the supply of provisions, history of treatment, and geographic location. To the majority of Indians, the British seemed to be the more favorable of the two because of their ability to provide more goods. A certain predisposition of the colonists to ever expanding settlement onto Native American land also pushed many to side with the Crown whom, they believed, would help to maintain and respect their borders to a greater extent than the Americans. Not all would side with England however. The American Revolution would tear apart tribes and tribal alliances that had been around for generations. One

\textsuperscript{6} Nichols, 61.
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example of this phenomenon can be found in the case of the Iroquois Nations.

The empire of the Iroquois, otherwise known as the *League of the Iroquois* or to the Europeans, the *civilized tribes*, is a conglomerate of five tribes.⁹ The Seneca, Oneidas, Mohawks, Cayuga, and Onandoga where linked not only geographically but shared similar language and cultural practices as well. The Iroquois alliance, thought to have originated around the late fifteenth century, began as a league in which disputes between neighboring tribes could be solved with peaceful negotiations instead of open conflict. Gradually, this league turned into an alliance with a powerful ability to harness warriors from all of the five nations. With this unification, the league of the Iroquois had unprecedented power among the Native American tribes of the region. The people of this “confederacy” called themselves the Hodinohyesoni or, “People of the Long House”. The term had symbolic use as it referred to the many tribes under one roof.¹⁰ Due to their location atop many trade routes at the time, the five nations of the Iroquois, for many years, acted as a broker between opposing European countries in trade. This unique and very advantageous position allowed the Iroquois tribes to play one European power off of another so as to avoid the consequences of so many conflicts which ravaged many other tribes. In addition to location, the Iroquois maintained various traditional practices which kept their tribes from yielding to conflict and epidemic. In order to avoid severe population depletion, the tribes of the Iroquois would engage in raids on neighboring tribal villages to capture replacements for their dead.¹¹ For

---
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many years, the League of the Iroquois presented a political and numerical superiority over most northwestern tribes of the time and for this reason, in the British, the Iroquois had a strong ally. British superintendent (a sort of envoy) Sir William Johnson had successfully secured the allegiance of the empire during the Seven Years war.

By the eve of the Revolution however, the circumstances for the Iroquois looked much different. At this point, the league of the Iroquois was now made up of six nations and the “Peace of Paris” treaty that ended the French and Indian war in 1763 left much of the land of Iroquois under British ownership thus making them, in the eyes of the British, subjects under their rule. Due to pressures from colonial expansion, many from the tribe of the Tuscarora had moved north and were taken in by the Oneida. While they were recognized as a sixth nation of the Iroquois, they were not allowed to hold any seats in the Grand Council, a group that convened with representatives from each tribe to discuss matters of all kinds. Through many years and many conflicts and even through the early years of colonization the League of the Iroquois held firm. By maintaining their neutral stance and playing one European power off of another, the League had avoided direct controversy and more importantly, the relationship between the tribes remained concrete. However, cracks in the alliance began to form with advent of two conflicts in which the Iroquois failed to maintain their general unanimity that had supported them for so long. The first was known as the War of Austrian Succession and the second, the French and Indian war. Both polarized, if only slightly, the tribes.12 The approaching revolution would serve to exploit these differences and put a strain on the alliances between the six tribes much as the two previous conflicts had

12 Glatthar, 46.
done before. This time however, the Iroquois would not be able to keep the conflict from reaching their villages and by the end of the America’s war of independence a once great power of the North would lie in ruins.

The story of the Iroquois empire in the American Revolution would be, as with many other tribes, a tragic one. In the opinion of Colin Calloway “The American Revolution had perhaps no more direct and devastating impact than in the Iroquois country. The conflict shattered the ancient unity of the Iroquois League and pitted brother against brother. Vicious border warfare disrupted normal patterns of Iroquois life, and American invasions crashed into Iroquois, burning crops and villages, and sending refugees fleeing to the British for shelter.”13 The American Revolution caused a split amongst the nation of the Iroquois that had not been seen in many years and would erupt into all out conflict that would position neighbor against neighbor. Tribal divisions were pushed to the breaking point and by the time of the outbreak of war the Seneca, Onondaga, Cayuga, and Mohawk had proclaimed their allegiance to the crown while the Oneida and the Tuscarora allied with the rebels. Officially, at a council in Albany in 1775, the League of the Iroquois declared that they would retain a neutral stance in the coming conflict. However in the politics of the Confederacy, a decision to engage in all out war would require, amongst all the tribes, a unanimous decision. Since this decision was absent from the conference, a stance of neutrality was proclaimed. This decision did not however stop the individual tribes themselves from taking sides. Thus the split at the council would indeed lead the entire Iroquois empire to destruction.

13 Calloway, 34.
Much of the alliance of the majority of the Iroquois Indians was all in thanks to the charismatic leadership of a Mohawk chief named Joseph Brant. Brant had spent many years in Britain. From his ventures, Brant was convinced that, with an alliance between the Iroquois and Great Britain, the Iroquois empire would grow in power and size. The Iroquois at this time had reason to fear the rebels. Land encroachment by settlers and overkill of game by hunters across boundary lines set aside for the northern tribes sparked numerous border conflicts between Indian and white settler. Armed with this universal indignation amongst Native Americans, Joseph Brant was able to secure the alliances from four of the now six tribes the made up the Iroquois empire whose villages were located in closer proximity to British forts and loyalist settlements. Brant amassed a sizeable force of around 800 warriors and began to lead raids on local towns. If it was Joseph Brant representing the British in the Iroquois nations, than Samuel Kirkland would be a possible counterpart acting on behalf of the Colonies. Samuel Kirkland was a Presbyterian missionary and worked with the Oneida and Tuscarora tribes who held him in high regard as he had spent many years living with the Oneidas. This being the case, Kirkland was able to convince the Oneida and Tuscarora to side with the colonists. The pinnacle of the subject of the Iroquois involvement in the American Revolution may be found at the battle of Oriskany where Oneida warriors fought against fellow Iroquois in a long and bloody struggle to halt the advance of the Saratoga campaign. The battle of Oriskany was the first, if not the only, engagement that was made up of so many native warriors. Throughout most of the war, however, the Six Nation Indians were mainly used as guides and scouts. Their skills and knowledge of the woodland frontier made them invaluable tools in the realm of intelligence gathering.
With the ending of the American Revolution, the fate of the Native American population that sided with the British was in question. Many from the tribes of the Seneca, Mohawk, Onondaga, and Cayuga waited anxiously for the mandates of the Treaty in Paris to be revealed. To their dismay, their allies, the British, had decided not to include them in the final agreement and “the treaty, finally ratified in Paris on September 3, 1783, left the bulk of the Six Nations vulnerable to the potential wrath and ever-expansive land grabbing predilections of those former British colonists who had now become citizens of the United States.”

As far as the Government of the United States was concerned, those Native Americans who had fought on behalf of the British were a conquered people whose land was open for the taking. The treaty of Fort Stanwix, ratified in October of 1784, ceded their territory in Ohio. As peace began to settle in, some of the Six nations began to return to their homeland. The Mohawk, the most loyal to the British of all the Iroquois Nations, moved north and resettled in Canada as the thought of living in territories surrounded by rebels was not appealing. The Oneida, on the other hand, fared much better, at first. The initial treaties intended to claim Iroquois land, were not made to include them. The service of the Oneida and the Tuscarora on the side of the Colonists was celebrated and congress pledged that “the Oneida and Tuscarora Nations shall be secured in the possession of the Lands on which they are settled.”

To the “People of the Standing Stone”, this was seen as a great victory on the basis of which the Oneida became the head of what little remained of the Iroquois Nations due to declined status of all the other Iroquois tribes. Regardless of the boundary settings which the Oneida maintained, the internal implications of the war would soon surface for the Oneida.

14 Glatthar, 288.
15 Glatthar, 303.
Years of warfare had ravaged the land of the Oneida and many irreplaceable lives had been lost. Cracks in their foundation began to form along the lines of pro-British and pro-American allegiances. These once kindred people now held bitter views among one another. The leadership ladder of the Oneida system of governing began to weaken as well. During the war, war chiefs and their new warrior class maintained much status and great influence. By the end of the war however, these war chiefs refused to give up their authority. A controversy ensued between the youthful warrior classes who had gained prestige after the war while the older and less radical elders had lost respect. This “passing [of] the torch” as described by Joseph Glaathar, was “tugging the Oneida community in numerous directions at once.”

Amid the great cultural changes and morale struggles that were a result of the Americans revolution, Governor Clinton of New York arranged a meeting with the Oneida at Fort Herkimer in June of 1785. The Oneida believed that the purpose of the meeting was to “block and unauthorized land sale and to check encroachments on the Oneida estate.” Governor Clinton’s intentions, however, were quite the contrary. Due to competition among the states to expand their territories westward, the government of the State of New York greatly desired much of the lands of the Six Nations so as to claim the land and sell it before the other States had an opportunity to do so. The Oneida representatives were stunned as Governor Clinton informed them of his intention to purchase the Susquehanna Basin from them. Having learned from previous experience the dangers of such an offer, the Oneida representatives refused it. To the Oneida, these lands represented a great deal of hunting territory that was

16 Glatthar, 303.
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invaluable to their survival and their status as a leading Native American Nation and they could not accept such a proposal. The Oneida refusal was quite frustrating to Clinton and his associates. None the less, they continued to press the Oneida and resorted to challenging the validity of those who held authority among the people. In addition to this, Gov. Clinton “brought selected Oneidas into his quarters and offered these poverty stricken leaders money—and on doubt ample amounts of alcohol—in exchange for their support.”\(^{18}\) Finally, with the influences of Governor Clinton having infiltrated the Oneida leadership and exploiting the cracks in its society, the Oneida agreed to abide by the terms of the land sale. This event represented one of many similar events that would follow. States continued to push the pressure numerous points of vulnerability that plagued the Oneida and many other Native Americans alike. By exploiting “the Indians poverty, internal divisions, power rivalries, and fondness for alcohol,”\(^{19}\) the newly formed United States began to slowly disintegrate the lands that once belonged to the Native Americans.

The situation as it played out for the Iroquois was tragic indeed but was not limited to them. The American Revolution was a no win situation for Indians, regardless of the allegiances fostered on either side. Calloway’s book focuses primarily on communities which were comprised of several Native American tribes. One of these was the town of Stockbridge, Massachusetts, which was made up of Mohican, Housatonic, and Wappinger tribes. Despite the hardships they faced from encroaching settlers and increasing social alienation, the Stock Bridge Indians enlisted in the continental army and “earned a reputation for zealous service in the patriot cause, serving at Ticonderoga and in

\(^{18}\) Glatthar, 306.
\(^{19}\) Ibid., 306.
Operations around Saratoga.”20 Their commitment to the fight for America’s independence was unquestionable. However the consequences of years of conflict had a lasting toll on the lives of the Stockbridge Indians and from their sacrifices they would gain little. This is nothing more than a pattern in the disastrous history of the Native Americans since the time of the contact with Europeans. The American Revolution, while only part of this tale, is none the less a stepping stone on the road to the disintegration of the Indian populace. Therefore, it is necessary to further perform research on this topic as it has gained little attention. One may argue that this dissolution of an entire world of culture was in fact an inevitable occurrence. However it may not be disputed that the American Revolution acted as a means for speeding up this process and had both immediate and lasting consequences on Native Americans for many years to come.
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While the nuclear arms race was the most visible front on which the cold war was waged, a real battle was also fought for the hearts, minds, and resources of third world locales whose loyalty was based not on strong ideological bonds with America or Russia, but on the will of whoever had controlled them during the colonial period in their history. Many historical documents touch on how the fear of nuclear aggression, the American and Soviet needs for oil, and the desire for beneficial public relations came together to influence relations between America and key third world countries such as Iran, Puerto Rico, and Ghana. Each of these countries provides a fascinating case study of how the cold war impacted their societies and economies and how American foreign policy acted on and reacted to three different sections of the third world.

Sitting between Egypt, which had then just thrown off the last vestiges of British colonialism, and Russian held Turkey, Iran held a keystone position. It was desired for its oil resources by the US and UK on one side and Russia on the other and for its strategically important geographic position. Eastern nations friendly to the West and against communism would become a barrier to what President Eisenhower called the “domino effect,” the theory that if one country fell to communism then the others around it would as well, eventually impacting the whole world. With missiles in Turkey and a financial and political interest in Egypt, America felt the need to secure Iran’s oil production for the forces of democracy and to keep the oil from flowing to the communists. In 1951 Iran’s leader, Shah Mohammad Reza
Pahlavi, appointed Dr. Mohammad Mossadeq prime minister. President Harry Truman’s Secretary of State Dean Acheson called Mossadeq, “…essentially a rich, reactionary, feudal-minded Persian inspired by a fanatical hatred of the British and a desire to expel them and all their works from the country regardless of cost” (Andrew, 202). That same year the people of Iran voted to nationalize the oil industry, ousting the British controlled Anglo-Iranian Oil Company. At that time American official policy was to support the nationalization effort; the unofficial policy was to do anything in America’s power to unseat Mossadeq. (Weiner, 81-83) In his telegram to President Truman, dated June 11, 1951, Mossadeq clearly stated Iran’s need to nationalize oil in response to what he considered the “…terrible poverty and acute distress…” of the Iranian people (Mossadeq, 329). In his eyes, the nationalization would not affect the US or UK because he intends to continue production and sales. The only difference would be that Iran and her people would get a much higher percentage of the profits, because, he stated, “…the Iranian people [are], the sole owners of the oil” (Mossadeq, 329).

Mossadeq insisted in a telegram to President Truman that the nationalization effort would not have been necessary had the United States aided him after World War II. Even had they not interfered, the day to day operations of Iran could have been gradually restored—farming would have returned to normal and the economy revived—if not for the insistence on production of oil for the United States and the United Kingdom. He implied that the flow of oil was the only concern of the United States. Given that the United States instituted, “An expansive ‘public diplomacy’ campaign [which] simultaneously used pamphlets, posters, media outlets…in order to guide ‘revolutionary and nationalistic pressures’,” Mossadeq seems to have correctly understood what America really cared about; securing Iran’s natural resources
Mossadeq, impassioned and irate, calls this leaflet campaign “…all kinds of strong and revolutionary propaganda…” and states that this pressure from America was a key reason for nationalizing the oil industry (Mossadeq, 329). Thus America used many types of persuasion to influence the minds of the third world countries and by pushing its ideals with bull-headed insistence managed to close those minds to any rational persuasion.

Through the propaganda campaign, America hoped to overwhelm Iran’s nationalist sentiment, and instill American capitalism and pop culture in its place. This process which took place worldwide was called Americanization or as Reinhold Wagnleiter, an Austrian born at the beginning of the cold war, called it, Coca-Colonization. Said Wagnleiter, “…the culture of capitalism in which the marketplace is promoted as the highest cultural value in itself is by definition popular culture, and pop connotes the United States” (Wagnleitner, 3). It is the resistance to this Americanization that we see in Iran because, as Wagnleiter says, “‘Americanization’ signifies…a process of cultural transformation…in which parts of the social memory that refused to identify themselves with the logic of the consumer society—the equation ‘survival=consumption’—had to be worked over by propaganda and advertisement.” (Wagnleitner, 7). However, the events that led to the nationalization hold different meanings depending on who interprets them, as shown by American Ambassador to Iran Loy Henderson in his telegram to the State department, dated 28 July 1952.

A further reason for Mossadeq’s desire to nationalize Iran’s oil industry was the huge amount of control the US had, not only in the profits, but in production. Half of the oil from the Middle East was processed in some way by America (Paterson, et al., 300). Backed by the CIA, Henderson was integral in a disinformation campaign aimed at
discrediting and eventually toppling Mossadeq from power (Weiner, 85-86). In his telegram, the Ambassador put a great deal of emphasis on how Mossadeq acted and almost no emphasis on what he said. He finds Mossadeq, “…exhausting and depressing,” and almost three quarters of the letter is devoted to a detailed character assassination (Henderson, 331). To Henderson, Mossadeq was, “…dominated by emotions and prejudices…” and so he did not see any need to try to reason with him or indeed even find out what Mossadeq actually wanted the US to do (Henderson, 331).

That Henderson was not only personally prejudiced but conspiring with the Shah and the CIA to topple Mossadeq is a great pity because Mossadeq made some very forceful arguments regarding the joint United States/United Kingdom venture into Iranian oil not the least of which was that “’Iran wld [sic.] never, never want UK and US to have any differences over it. Iran wld [sic.] prefer go Communist than cause any trouble between US and UK’” (Henderson, 331). The viewpoint of Henderson and the CIA was reinforced by Mossadeq’s above statement. It is unclear if the Soviet Union needed the oil, or would have bought it solely to keep it out of American hands, however while this declaration of communist intent confused Henderson, I think that Mossadeq was trying to play King Solomon with Iran. If he offered it to someone else, maybe the two parental figures of the United States and the United Kingdom would stop fighting to tear it in two.1

Throughout his telegram Henderson uses gendered language such as “silly,” “extravagances,” “strain,” “fatigue,” and “emotions.” When looking at the language used to speak about different countries in

---

1 In 1953, after being fired by the Shah for planning a coup, Mossadeq was deposed and eventually captured by the Shah, who in cooperation with the CIA, had Mossadeq stand trial. Prados, 94-97.
the world, historically the third world has been seen as feminine, weak, in need of protection, and the first world, America, European countries, and the industrialized Asian countries, have been seen as the strong, masculine protectors. An analysis of this type of gendered language is reflected in an essay by Andrew Rotter, “The Gendering of Peoples and Nations,” where Rotter says, “The Western representation of India as female conferred effeminacy on most Indian men” (Rotter, 13). It is possible that since Henderson served as ambassador to India previous to being the ambassador to Iran that to him Iran was comparable to India, which colored his judgment in regards to Mossadeq’s behavior (Rotter, 14).

Mossadeq’s relations with Western leaders suffered because many middle-Eastern customs seem strangely feminine and alien to the west. In addition to the everyday customs such as the wearing of long flowing garments practical for a hot sandy climate, Heiss mentions the informality of receiving state visitors in bed, in his pajamas.2 Rather than the sign of weakness, it is a great compliment.3 In many Eastern nations receiving people into your bedroom means that you trust them and want them to feel as if they are part of your household. Also, passion is much valued in Iran, which was Persia in antiquity. Emotional expression is seen as very masculine, and there is no shame in being moved to tears, as Mossadeq so often was. It is also possible that when he was well enough to go out in public, Mossadeq would have held hands with another man. In extraordinarily misogynistic societies, such as Iran, where male/female contact is proscribed, male/male contact and

---

2 Heiss, 343. Addendum: at this point, an aging Winston Churchill received visitors of state in the same manner, Weiner, 83.
3 Although he was physically weak, reinforcing the stereotype.
female/female contact are merely ways of expressing friendship, and do not have the same romantic meaning as in the West.

Throughout the latter half of American history, America’s presidents have had a tendency to swagger, to show off their status as “real men.” They swear. They build big phallic missiles. They flex their muscles by putting down other countries as weak (Paterson, et al. 2005). Where aggressive countries such as Pakistan and Israel were seen as strong, protectorates such as India and Iran were seen as weak and feminine. In her essay, “Culture Clash: Gender, Oil, and Iranian Nationalism,” Mary Ann Heiss begins by outlining the transition from Iran/United Kingdom control of the oil industry to Iran’s nationalist stance (Heiss, 340-348). Once again emphasizing the importance of the historical role of the nation, Heiss says that “The Anglo-Iranian oil dispute seemed irresolvable from the start. Each side saw the conflict through the prism of its own history and perspective…” (Heiss, 340). It is important to realize that if not for the cold war, Iran would have had less significance to the west; the industrialized economic climate after WWII spurred the need for oil due to the demands for consumer goods, and ramped up the need to nationalize Iran’s oil industry because Iranians were starving for a bigger piece of the profits. In addition to America’s desire for oil, there was the ever present threat that if Iran and America could not cooperate, Iran would sell its ability to produce oil to the Soviets, and eventually be able to capitalize on the Soviet nuclear technology and produce its own nuclear weapon, thus changing from a weak feminine country to a powerful masculine country. Heiss uses the example of paired sets of opposing traits used to describe Western leaders strongly and Mossadeq weakly, such as, “…‘strong’ and ‘weak,’ ‘rational’ and ‘irrational,’ and ‘realistic’ and ‘emotional…”’ with the first word in the pair being masculine and the second, effeminate (Heiss,
Heiss makes the point that diplomats often used this type of language in descriptions of other nations’ actions and intent.

Emotional demonstrations, such as fainting, would have seemed to the United States to be even more evidence of Mossadeq’s feminine behavior. As Heiss writes, “One day during an emotional speech on the floor of the Majlis, Mossadeq collapsed in a heap...Mossadeq’s pulse when [a doctor on the scene] he expected to find weak and fluttering...was quite surprised when it was strong and regular” (Heiss, 346). This implies that Mossadeq was faking at least some of his weak behavior. Of the weak, effeminate countries discussed by Rotter and Heiss, (India, Korea, Vietnam, and of course Iran), all have tried to achieve the ultimate male power symbol of the cold war: the atomic bomb. One can follow the historical track from the CIA’s bungling of Mossadeq’s desire to nationalize oil, and his subsequent attempt of a coup, to the anger of Iran’s citizens toward the United States, and ultimately to Iran’s current nuclear program. While at the time of the conspiracy between the CIA and the Shah to unseat Mossadeq the threat of nuclear annihilation was just a threat, the Kennedy administration had to deal with the reality of nuclear fallout. This problem encompassed both actual fallout from the bombing of Japan which ended WWII, and political heat from the Russian missiles which sat just ninety miles away in Cuba and were aimed at the United States. However, the Kennedy administration made its move toward peace, civil rights, and a new upbeat American outlook by endowing the Peace Corps.

After the election of 1960, America turned its face from the setting sun of the Eisenhower administration to the new dawn of the Kennedy administration. Kennedy’s reign, called Camelot after the legendary golden age of the mythical King Arthur, saw the coronation of America’s new sweethearts John and Jackie Kennedy, and gave
Americans a sense of hope, a desire to look to the future, and imbued the public with an almost palpable energy. The tonality of Kennedy’s statement upon signing the order establishing the Peace Corps in 1961 mirrors the speaking tone of President Franklin Delano Roosevelt (Heiss, 347). However, while FDR thanks each person for their sacrifice in his famous fireside address to the nation, Kennedy’s somber speech praised, “…an immense reservoir of such men and women—anxious to sacrifice their energies and time and toil to the cause of world peace and human progress,” and noted that,

…if the life [in the Peace Corps] will not be easy, it will be rich and satisfying. For every young American who participates in the Peace Corps…will know that he or she is sharing in the great common task of bringing to man that decent way of life which is the foundation of freedom and a condition of peace (Kennedy, 332).

Here Kennedy is speaking of the hard work, low conditions, and effort needed to make the Peace Corps successful. He goes on to outline what the participants will bring to their jobs, and what those jobs will require of the participants. Although this speech is short in length, it shows how charismatic Kennedy was when he spoke. The reader can almost feel his words ringing off the page, especially the passage, “…the responsibility for peace is the responsibility of our entire society” (Kennedy, 333).

Kennedy’s ability to inspire is a collective historical fact; however despite his efforts historian Thomas G. Patterson noted, “Peace Corps monuments—irrigation systems, water pumps, larger crops—arose throughout Latin America and Africa, but…fell far short of eradicating the Third World’s profound squalor.” (Paterson, et al., 333). It is distinctly possible that no one, not even someone as strongly idealistic yet practical as Kennedy was, could have successfully “fixed” the third
world. Many presidents and organizations both before Kennedy and since have thrown money and manpower at the problems of starvation and crumbling infrastructure in the third world, yet there has been little change in its status. However, many of the attempts to rearrange the third world were thwarted by the despots and dictators under which the nations lived. Kennedy did his best to rid the world of these leaders, including participating in a government operation, titled Mongoose, with the CIA, the FBI and the mafia with the intent to kill Fidel Castro, the leader of Cuba’s communist government. (Agency 2005, Printing Office and Senate, 2005).

While previous presidents tried to fight nationalism and ramp up xenophobic cold war fears, such as the Truman administration deposing Mossadeq in Iran, Kennedy decided to use the national spirit by building the concept of autonomy into the Peace Corps. Despite the fact that volunteers were Americans on foreign soil, Kennedy’s emphasis on “Nation Building,” comforted the national leaders who hosted Peace Corps volunteers (Paterson, et al., 332). The leaders were well aware that Kennedy did not see the Peace Corps as a chance to expand America’s imperial holding, as previous presidents had done in Latin America, but as a way to give much needed health, infrastructure, and food to some of the world’s most impoverished nations. One anonymous letter, included in Iris Luce’s book “Letters from the Peace Corps,” looks at how the ideal of the Peace Corps compares with the reality.

The letter is seemingly written to instruct new volunteers on the reality of serving in the Corps, and in the alien culture that was Ghana. The author begins by telling how important it is to try to speak the native language: “The knowledge of their language has a profound effect on the villagers…if you have the proper answer to a greeting it raises your prestige a great deal” (Anonymous, 334). This is especially important as
many times volunteers were sent into service without proper instruction, as noted by Paterson in American Foreign Relations, “In some cases, as in Ethiopia, Peace Corps volunteers when abroad with too little understanding of foreign languages and cultures.” (Paterson, et al., 333). However, in the letter the volunteer in Ghana was received very well, finding the Ghanaian people eager to extend friendship and help. He remarks that the only people who were difficult to get along with were the Russians, reinforcing the stress the cold war placed on all relations between nations. Despite the hard hours of work, volunteers had time for socialization and leisure, at a club called the Lido, and at various hotels and restaurants.

This particular volunteer seems to have been a man of good character and industriousness, as he shuns the social aspect of the Lido which, “…has a bad reputation as a place for pickups,” and concentrates on the band and the inexpensiveness of the drinks (Anonymous, 334). While this volunteer laments the unavailability of quality movies, new books, culture and women, he also seems dedicated to the Peace Corps cause, extolling the virtues of his living space and health care. This positive, helpful, and optimistic attitude is what the Kennedy administration wanted in the Peace Corps volunteers, as Kennedy was trying to win the Cold War on two fronts; the military/armament front with regards to Castro and his dealings with the Russians, and the public relations front through the Peace Corps.

With a leader trained in the United States, Ghana held a completely different political climate from Iran. Having met with Kennedy, Ghanaian president Kwame Nkrumah could believe in the promise of the Peace Corps The historian Elizabeth Cobbs Hoffman, in her essay, “Cultural Cooperation: The Peace Corps in Ghana,” focused on how the American and Ghanaian cultures mixed well, despite having
little in common (Hoffman, 348-354). One would think that a nation who gained independence from British colonialism only three years before the initiation of the Peace Corps would not welcome American interference. However, President Nkrumah had spent ten years as an American student. As such, he gained, “…first-hand experience of American segregation [which] encouraged a race-consciousness…” which made him welcome Americans who were willing to help with the nation building needed for Ghana (Hoffman, 348). Also, Nkrumah was impressed by the volunteers, who stepped out of the plane and attempted the Ghanaian national anthem.

Despite this energetic will to please on the part of the volunteers, Hoffman writes, “…the majority of the Peace Corps teachers were not qualified for the job. Most were neither education majors nor majors in the fields they were assigned to teach” (Hoffman, 349). In fact, as America settled deeper into the cold war, Nkrumah became more and more paranoid that volunteers for the Peace Corps were secret CIA spies. He subsequently banned the volunteers from teaching English and history, but never kicked them out entirely, leading one of the volunteers to state, “‘If it were really thought we were ‘agents’ of the C.I.A. type, I don’t think we would be in Ghana at all’” (Hoffman, 350). This emphasis on spying versus helping is typical of the paranoid cold war mentality. However, it is interesting to note that there is no direct record of CIA involvement in the Peace Corps in general, or in Ghana in particular (Weiner 2007). While American “help” was welcome in Ghana, it was seen as always possible that the help would come at the cost of forcible regime change, as in Iran, attempted assassination as in Cuba, or other types of American colonialism, such as an imposition of American values on the local populace. Nkrumah may have trusted
Kennedy, but after Kennedy’s death there seemed a feeling in the world that there was no longer enough trust or idealism left to go around.

As members of a country which broke away from colonialism by itself, American’s have typically seen the need for help as a sign of weakness. While this is not unusual, most countries of the world distaining the need for aid and resenting the countries which give aid, there are a few countries such as Ghana where allowing someone to help you is a sign of friendship. Luckily for the Peace Corps volunteers, “The…aspect of Ghanaian communalism that enhanced the volunteer experience was the cultural openness to ‘help’” (Hoffman, 351). It is ironic that in this respect, Ghana embraced a communist attitude without embracing the political system of communism which would have ruled out the chance for American aid.

Because of the chance to get to know outside cultures and take initiative, the volunteers received the rich and full experience that they had signed up for. The volunteers showed adaptability to the land and the culture, and a willingness to lend a hand with whatever the villagers needed. This meant the Ghanaians received a good trade from the volunteers in return for their hospitality, as, “…it was difficult to find a person who had achieved white-collar status who had not had a Peace Corps teacher at some point” (Hoffman, 354). Kennedy’s intention to broaden the opportunities for Ghana was a positive step away from the clandestine attitudes of the cold war, and worked to his advantage until his untimely death. However, where the hearts and minds of the people Ghana seemed available for equal trade, those of the people of Puerto Rico took some more bargaining.

Sitting just over the 18th north parallel, Puerto Rico is geographically and culturally a part of Latin America. However, as it is also an American commonwealth whose people hold American
citizenship, the inhabitants of the small island off the coast of the Dominican Republic can appear to be conflicted, with loyalties to both their heritage and to the American wealth that became available through tourism. Even before WWII ended, Puerto Rico and countries like it were of strategic importance in the American fight against the spread of communism for their positions in the Atlantic as barriers to Russian missile stations as well as financial importance due to American banking and control over vital crops such as bananas and sugar cane (Paterson, et al., 151-163). Ceded to America in the Spanish-American War, Puerto Rico liaised with American business and government in 1949 in a plan for tourism intended to bootstrap the island into the 20th century (Bird, 336-338).

In addition to pointing out why a tourist would want to visit Puerto Rico, the plan outlines what the island will do in the next few years and decades to attract more tourists. The success of tourism relied on making the destination country as interesting and comfortable as possible, and Puerto Rico shows how nice it could be;

**Climate** Close to ideal…Winter temperatures 68° to 70°, summer 70° to 88°…**Beauty** …two national forests…scenic variety delights visitors and encourages their stay…Tropical fruits and flowers abound…**Interest** …400 year old walls and fortifications…typical Spanish plazas…Phosphorescent Bay… (Bird, 336).

While the first part of the plan shows what Puerto Rico was, the second and third parts show what it was setting out to become. The second part, titled “The Government’s Commitment,” gives facts and figures to emphasize how important tourism development is to the island (Bird, 337). Tied into America’s ideals of “nation building” the government of Puerto Rico gave a fifteen year tax exemption to resort
hotels and legalized gambling, which attracted investment in the hotels by Americans and attracted American tourists with what they could not do at home. The third part dealt with the newly formed Tourist Advisory Board and the money earmarked by the Puerto Rican Government for development and promotion. The plan focused on the hotel accommodations which attracted wealthy Americans used to luxury and not suited to rural island life. For example, “…the Caribe-Hilton Hotel is being built—300 rooms—all air conditioned—in an ideal location with its own beach …in the middle of San Juan” (Bird, 337). Also in the works was a remodeling of the Isla Grande airport to make people feel welcome as soon as they stepped off their plane.

Tourism can bring affluence. It can bring progress, both in technology and in culture. Tourism can bring curious wealthy people who respect the history of the host country to be greeted by smiling native faces and open arms. This side of tourism is demonstrated by a photograph from the Conrad Hilton collection, “Modernity Goes on Display: San Juan’s Caribe Hilton Hotel, 1949” (Bird, 337). This photograph shows how the hotel’s 300 rooms each had their own balcony, and because of the situation of the hotel on the land, both sides of the hotel, (inferring by the photo that the hotel is two rooms thick with a corridor in between), look out onto the sea. The parking lot is studded with palm trees, and the cars in the lot appear to be newer makes and expensive models including one convertible parked toward the bottom of the picture, and a Rolls Royce parked in the drive at the front of the hotel. Taxis are lined up on the drive, waiting for tourists who want to visit the attractions of Puerto Rico. This document is literally a picture of American affluence being spent as tourist dollars in an institution that came to be owned by the Puerto Ricans.
In looking at this picture one has to think about the effect of American cultural influence, in the form of Hilton International Hotels, on the landscape and population of San Juan. The first thing to look at is that, “All [Hilton International Hotels] were planned according to the Hilton program and styled as American Modern” (Wharton, 3). This would give the American tourist in a foreign land something immediately identifiable, a source of comfort to those whose desire to escape the trials of daily life did not extend to “roughing it.” However, it contributed to the inevitable cultural alienation felt by the inhabitants of any city graced by a Hilton International Hotel, where it would stand as an intimate and forceful reminder that American tourists had no intention of participating in local culture, just in observing it, and not too closely at that. As, “Hilton’s earliest experiment abroad…opened in 1949,” the Caribe Hilton brought not only modernity and monetary growth, but also the indifference of America’s wealthy visitors (Wharton, 186).

Tourism can bring filth. It can breed hatred in the native population and disdain in the hearts of the tourists. Tourism can break down historic relics and wear away at centuries’ worth of culture. Having been conferred American Citizenship in 1917 Puerto Rico was in no way overshadowed by the threat of a communist takeover; however the commonwealth’s divided loyalties led to tensions between mainland tourists and native islanders. This darker side of tourism is shown by a cartoon drawn by a Puerto Rican artist in 1960 which depicts how tourists held the Puerto Rican peasantry in contempt even as they were willing to use them, in this case as a human rickshaw (Merrill and Paterson, 339).

The man pulling the rickshaw, obviously Puerto Rican, is asked by a stereotypical American child what he thinks of segregation as tourists in the cart being pulled are commented on the street signs which
are names of mountains, all Americanized. One tourist laments that the Puerto Ricans have no imagination, while another asks why they came if it was just going to be a poor imitation of America.\(^4\) This cartoon reflects clearly what is being said in essays by the historians Emily Rosenberg and Gerald C. Horne, “Cultural Interactions” and “Race and the American Century.” (Rosenberg, 7-12 and Horne, 17-23). The cartoon can be seen as an instance where, “The American cultural invasion of the interwar years brought a backlash of cultural nationalism” (Rosenberg, 9).

This backlash is the natural feelings of a people who consider themselves a nation, and yet are treated as inferior in their own country by American tourists. Horne, who quotes W. E. B. Du Bois—an influential African-American writer of the early 20\(^{\text{th}}\) century—called it not a “Black” and “White” racial issue but, “…’the relation of the darker to the lighter races of men [sic] in Asia and Africa, in America and the islands of the sea’” (Horne, 17). However, the success of the Caribe-Hilton Hotel and other primarily American ventures in Puerto Rico shows that while the tourism boom and Kennedy’s “‘Action Intellectuals,’” may have failed to win the hearts and minds of the Puerto Ricans, they did win their pocketbooks (Paterson, et al., 326). In fighting the cold war influence of the Russians and communism, the latter victory is almost as important as the former loss, however, it is a loss from which neither America nor Puerto Rico ever fully recovered.

As shown in the cartoon, tourism in Puerto Rico caused a culture clash. Historian Dennis Merrill takes a deeper look at the reasons behind this clash in his essay, “Cultural Negotiation: U.S. Tourism in Puerto Rico” (Merrill, 355-365). Americanization of the world in the years post

\(^4\) In fact the Caribe Hilton, which largely contributed to the American “look” of Puerto Rico, was designed by three Puerto Rican architects, (Wharton, 187-188).
WWII led to a world-wide tourism explosion, including the push to place American hotels and casinos on Puerto Rico. However, Merrill states that, “[in] Depicting tourism as a one-way-street, where visitors bestowed progress upon hosts, the advertising hype oversimplified the give-and-take inherent to tourism” (Merrill, 356). While the presence of American tourists did bring benefits to Puerto Rico, such as air-conditioning and hotel jobs for the unskilled, that presence also brought the twin problems of racism and sexism.

According to Merrill, in the 1930s, “Most of the travel literature however, advanced a derogatory set of perceptions. Guidebooks disparaged the island’s poverty, illiteracy, and health problems, and depicted a helpless, dependent people, a foreign ‘other’ who lived outside the boundaries of the civilized world” (Merrill, 357). As Puerto Rico’s plan for tourism showed, by 1949 this was not the vision the Puerto Ricans had of themselves. To fix this image issue, Puerto Rico turned to the Muñoz family. Luis Muñoz Marín, the son of Puerto Rico’s resident commissioner in Washington D.C., attempted to change the world’s view of the island. This led to the organization of a locally based and organized tourism bureau which protested the American inundation of the island’s beaches for the purpose of hotel building by renovating existing Puerto Rican hotels. Despite Muñoz’ best efforts to rehabilitate Puerto Rico’s image, “…the 1958 Broadway musical West Side Story reinforced these images by choreographing its characters as hot-tempered, knife-wielding juvenile delinquents” (Merrill, 359). Also, most of Puerto Rico held the same poverty as before the Muñoz revolution. This was exacerbated by the unwillingness of tourists or even American business owners to learn the language. The language barrier, however, did not stop the practice of sexual harassment by both the tourists and the islanders.
Merrill states, “Although travel literature historically depicted Puerto Rico as an alluring woman, female tourists frequently encountered the island’s patriarchy. Most common were complaints of sexual harassment, assaults, and rapes” (Merrill, 362-363). Although it seems that this problem would cross cultures, according to Merrill the Puerto Ricans were appalled at how free and open the American women were about their sexuality, and implied that if the Americans were not willing to follow Puerto Rican customs, they got what they deserved. Also causing problems were male American tourists who thought that the alluring woman which was Puerto Rico should put up with an occasional pinch on the bottom. Male visitors would routinely frequent prostitutes, “…and Puerto Ricans and tourists alike complained of overt solicitation outside bars and casinos” (Merrill, 363). This period in the history of Puerto Rico also saw a thriving and barely underground homosexual community. All of these problems factored into Puerto Rico’s ambivalence toward its supposed benefactors.

From the role of the overthrow of Prime Minister Mossadeq undertaken by the United States in Iran, to the more gentle roles of the Peace Corps in Ghana and the collusion with Puerto Rico’s tourism board, America had its fingers in many third world countries’ political and cultural pies. These countries’ positions were crucial, not only to halting the spread of communism, but to the economic and social interests of America. One can see how fear of nuclear aggression and desire to stop communism influenced various presidents and their diplomatic assistants to change the way developing countries viewed America. In essence, Presidents Kennedy and Truman, Secretary of State Acheson, and Ambassador Henderson made the decision to impose American systems of progress—politically, socially, and culturally—on countries where the spread of communism threatened American interests.
Following the cold war through to its conclusion—President Reagan’s “détente” policy of nuclear de-escalation, and the fall of communism in the 1990s—Iran, Ghana, and Puerto Rico were instrumental in shaping how America saw itself. These three locales acted as a mirror which showed America what it could do to change its foreign policy and influence how it was seen by the world.
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Shock overcame Berliners as they woke up on the morning of August 13, 1961 to see that a wall of barbed wire had been erected during the night, completely closing the border between East and West Berlin. The wall was constructed by the Communist East German government, in compliance with Soviet leaders in Moscow. The decision to close the wall came after a long and dangerous crisis during which hundreds of thousands of East Germans left the communist state to live in West Berlin. It was argued that closing the border had become necessary to retain East Germany’s skilled workforce and to ebb the weakening of its economy.1 Communist threats and tightened controls at the East Berlin border enticed thousands of East Germans to leave their homes and cross the border to live under the western-controlled democracy, creating an increasingly embarrassing situation for Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev. As the situation intensified, rhetoric of war was crafted between Khrushchev and newly installed U.S. President, John F. Kennedy, to manipulate and threaten the other into a resolution befitting their respective agendas. Tension mounted over the fate of West Berlin: Khrushchev was determined to gain control of a “unified” Berlin and Kennedy was committed to preserve democratic freedom enjoyed by West Berliners. As the crisis grew desperate; any small misjudgment or misplaced word could have caused world-wide

destruction. While the sudden appearance of the Berlin Wall shocked millions, it had dissolved the crisis that threatened the uneasy peace which existed since the end of the Second World War.

As tired and weary nations recovered from the Second World War in 25 years, a Cold War soon emerged between the United States and the Soviet Union as they became competing world powers. A power struggle over Berlin began just three years after the division of the city among Western and Soviet governments when, in 1948, the Red Army cut West Berlin from its support of its governing democratic nations. Years later, the crisis in Berlin sharply intensified when Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev demanded that a peace treaty be signed to unify Berlin, allowing total Soviet control over the entire city. After occupying the Nazi capital, the former Allied powers had divided the city along ideological lines—once allies, the communist and democratic nations both legally existed in Berlin but were separated by a profound distrust of one another. The existence of a democracy in an otherwise communist Germany was “awkward,” but the Western powers were not willing to give up occupied West Berlin to the Communists.  

In 1958, the newly installed Khrushchev began pushing in earnest for a peace treaty which would demilitarize Berlin and unify the city under one government. Unification demanded the exit of Western armies in the western sector of the city, threatening the security of democracy in West Berlin. Khrushchev’s attempt to entice Western powers to agree to a unified Berlin governed by the German Democratic Republic failed; the West recognized that a demilitarized West Berlin would be easily susceptible to a swift overpowering of East Germany and would be enveloped into the Eastern Communist Bloc.
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Meanwhile, in the months leading up to the eventual construction of the Berlin Wall, reports numbered the East German refugees in the tens of thousands\(^3\)—coming from East Berlin and beyond the city. They flooded into West Berlin, adding to those who had fled socialist rule since the Germans’ fall to Russia in 1945. East Germany had greatly depended upon the population in East Berlin to build the workforce and stimulate the East German economy. East Germany was losing workers at a rapidly increasing rate. The number of refugees leaving East Berlin for the western sector of the city reached record numbers during the first six months of 1961. The first two weeks of July of that year saw 12,576 refugees streaming in to West Berlin.\(^4\)

Both the *Times of London* and the *New York Times* reported on measures taken by the German Democratic Republic leader, Walter Ulbricht, to restrict the number of East Germans escaping to the west. The East German leader criticized the West for luring his workers away from East German jobs by promising jobs and made it the responsibility of every East German to hand over those who crossed the border to escape the Communists.\(^5\)

Meanwhile, East Germany increased the difficulty in East Berliners leaving the Socialist side of the City. A *Times of London* report provides a first person report of East Germans experiencing the “increasing number of trials of east Germans suspected of attempting to escape or accused of having helped refugees.”\(^6\) Another report describes East German attempts to compel men to leave their jobs by having their
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wives tell West Berlin employers that their husbands were being detained by the Communist police until they had given notice to leave their jobs with West Berlin firms and agreed to work in East Germany.  

Efforts of the People’s Police to control the movements of East Berliners, and their giving the title of “traitors” to refugees, had only resulted in an increased sense of panic and mobilized many more East Germans to leave the city.  

The increased intimidation was attributed to the tripling of refugees registering in West Berlin. The East German communists’ attempts to keep workers in the East only drove them away in higher numbers. To cultivate an East German following, Foreign Minister Lothar Bolz criticized the West for “becoming a Center of the slave trade where West German and allied agents tried to lure away East German workers.”

Complicating the issue of refugees was the increasing number of East German residents who crossed the border to fill West Berlin jobs; these workers were referred to as Grenzgänger and were persecuted for their willing association with Western capitalists. It was reported that 43,000 East Berliners crossed the border to work in West Berlin, while over 12,000 West Berliners maintained jobs in East Berlin, and this number of this particular workers had been decreasing. In an attempt to draw them back to the East, the communists targeted the Grenzgänger in a campaign to weaken the workers’ resolve. These workers were charged with “contributing to produce slanderous literature and hostile
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press products.” Communist leaders also prepared resolutions calling for action against the *Grenzgänger*\(^\text{11}\) because their movements were a threat to the prestige of communism, for which Khrushchev demanded from the rest of the world.

In response to a question posed during an August 10, 1961 press conference, Kennedy stated that the “tremendous speedup of people leaving the Communist system to come to the West and freedom, of course, is a rather illuminating evidence of the comparative values of free life in an open society, and those in a close society, under a Communist system.” Kennedy also indirectly answered the claims of the East Germans by stating that he [did] not attempt to encourage or discourage the movement of refugees.\(^\text{12}\)

The fleeing East Germans had a profound, negative effect on the East German Communists. The *Times of London* exposed a confidential communist document that officially stated the real threat on East Germany’s economy if an additional 200,000 East German workers left the city.\(^\text{13}\) What’s more, West Germans bought Soviet-subsidized goods sold in East Germany. As a result, East German shortages increased exponentially, deepening the debt that the GDR owed Moscow.\(^\text{14}\) By August 8, the reality of losing the driving force of the East German economy contributed to the potentially explosive tensions in Berlin. Leaders contemplated the ultimate resolution to the crisis.

But Kennedy was adamant in defending West Berlin from the throes of Communism. A June 25 article in the *New York Times*
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identified the Soviet threat against democratic West Berlin and placed the responsibility of a positive outcome upon Khrushchev. Kennedy was committed to protecting the freedom of West Berlin but the actions taken by the world power depended upon its ability to recognize the veracity of the threat.

Kennedy, in a later press conference statement dated July 19, personally argued the intentions of the Soviets in their aggressive push for a peace treaty over Berlin. Kennedy stated to the press that

…the [peace treaty] speaks of peace but threatens to disturb it. It refers to the Four Power Alliance of World War II, but seeks the unilateral abrogation of the rights of other three powers. It calls offers certain assurances while making it plan that its previous assurances are not to be relied upon. It professes concern for the rights of the citizens of West Berlin, while seeking to expose them to the immediate or eventual domination of a regime which permits no self-determination.\(^{15}\)

In this statement, Kennedy outlined the three key positions held by the United States: while there was presently peace in Berlin, the Soviet Union is solely responsible for destroying that peace; that the United Nations recognizes the freedom of West Berliners; and that the military presence of the U.S., Britain and France is legal and previously acknowledged by the Soviet Union. Kennedy’s strong language in this conference included criticism for the Soviet Union’s attempts to “invade the rights of others and manufacture tensions.”\(^{16}\)

The President intended to appeal to nations around the world which valued free societies; the strong and justified position of the U.S. in the Berlin Crisis was that freedom already legally existed in Berlin and

\(^{15}\) Johnson, 132.
\(^{16}\) Ibid., 119-121.
the only purpose in challenging the current free status of West Berlin, as much as it was “awkwardly” surrounded by the rest of communist Germany, was to threaten its free status. Kennedy claimed his absolute, undeniable right to uphold the legal and Soviet-acknowledged free state of West Berlin and thus created an identity of “defender” against any threat of such freedom, regardless of how well that threat was wrapped with the deception of peace.

In a July 25, 1961 televised address, President Kennedy soberly asked his country prepare for the worst by asking them to construct bomb shelters. Kennedy was prepared and had committed to protect West Berlin from being overtaken by Communists:

That we cannot permit...We are clear about what must be done—and we intend to do it...these actions will require sacrifice on the part of many of our citizens...they will require, from all of us, courage and perseverance in the years to come. But if we and our allies act out of strength and unity of purpose, with calm determination and steady nerves—using restraint in our words as well as our weapons, I am hopeful that both peace and freedom will be sustained.17

Kennedy appealed to the Americans who had guided the nation during previous wars on the war front, and on the home front; and demonstrated steely resolve, making it impossible for freedom-loving nations to turn away from the plight of West Berlin without searing their own national conscience. Kennedy was not going to compromise on the freedom of West Berliners and shifted the responsibility to the Communists by recognizing that Khrushchev’s actions would determine the fate of the world. The reporting of the New York Times created the sense of danger inflicted by Khrushchev, deepening the conflict between

the two powers and developing a war rhetoric that drove the Crisis.\textsuperscript{18} This speech was, up to that point, the most frightening address that Kennedy delivered, wherein he addressed the ultimate danger of this Crisis: the threat to the basic struggle for life.

Khrushchev answered Kennedy’s position and somber challenge by making his own televised speech\textsuperscript{19} on August 7, as reported by the \textit{New York Times}. In this speech, he responded to the seriousness of Kennedy’s position by inviting the United States, Britain and France to “honestly meet at a roundtable conference, let us not fan up war psychosis, let us clear the atmosphere; let us rely on reason and not on the force of thermonuclear weapons.”\textsuperscript{20} Khrushchev accused the United States of threatening the balance of power between the Soviet Union and the U.S.

The Soviet leader charged the U.S. for creating “war hysteria” and had threatened, as an imperialist, “an armed attack on Socialist States.” In the same August 7 speech, Khrushchev urged the crucial need for peace treaty to defend the sovereignty of the German Democratic Republic; upon renunciation of the treaty, the West would “demand the liquidation of the socialist system within the GDR.”\textsuperscript{21} Khrushchev did not trust the West and the West certainly distrusted Khrushchev; mistrust and their disgust of ideology of each other’s nations deepened the divide between the two leaders, and the possibility of reaching an agreement was slim.

\textsuperscript{19} These remarks were made at a speech celebrating the return of Majo Titov from his space flight, a positive event to push propaganda that Soviets were the right and just parties of the Berlin Crisis.
Four days later, and two days before the appearance of the wall, Khrushchev called for calm negotiations for peace between the Soviets and the “whole world...so that the seeds of new conflict do no sprout on the soil left over from the last war.” Khrushchev appeared defensive of the “prestige” of the Soviet power, calling for “recognition of our majesty,” while calling out his adversaries for their apparent failures. Khrushchev danced around his perennial claim for peace when he made the implied threat that “the Soviet Union has assumed power and created a state with which you imperialists and colonizers must reckon.” Khrushchev continued to appear benevolent by insisting that Soviet’s intention of peace while imperialist countries continue to resist what they claimed to be an unreasonable demand to change the status of free West Berlin.22

Walter Ulbricht, secretary of the SED (Sozialistische Einheitspartei Deutschlands), increased the intensity of the Communist threat when he urged the world to reach an agreement and sign a treaty—he warned disapproving nations that, those who do not support the peaceful resolution of the building crisis, favored war.23 In spite of Ulbricht’s intimidation, a peace treaty would not be signed by Western powers, and the probability of the unification of Berlin became slim. Further warnings from Ulbricht indicated the immediate plans of the Soviets to resolve this issue. The Times of London reported Ulbricht’s warning that the “recent decree requiring registration [of travelers through the border] was not all that was to come.”24

Ulbricht’s threat was realized in the very early hours of August 13, Communist troops moved in under the guard of night and sealed off

22 “Mr. Khrushchev Expects Negotiations; Western Leaders ‘Sensible Men,’ Russia Not to Encroach on West Berlin,” The Times of London, August 11, 1961.
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the border between East and West Berlin, permanently closing in hundreds of thousands East Germans behind a wall of barbed wire.”  

Nikita Khrushchev’s son describes the emotional state of his father as the first days pass after the construction of the Wall. Khrushchev was nervous and jittery as he feared Kennedy’s response to his last-ditch measure to save face. Days, then weeks passed with no threat of retaliation from Kennedy. Kennedy had not promised to free East Germans but to keep West Germany from being overtaken by the Communists, and he stood firm in his commitment.26

The crisis in Berlin soon faded into distant memory. The cries of freedom floated up over the Wall and the debate over the justification of the Soviet measure to close the border began in earnest. For the sake of the world, war was averted. But, as Khrushchev’s foreign policy assistant claimed, the Wall was “a silent recognition that Khrushchev had not achieved his aim [of securing a peace treaty favorable to the Soviets].” Khrushchev had sought for three years to force Western powers into a treaty which gave Soviets full, uninterrupted control of the Eastern Bloc. The West did not compromise their position, forcing Khrushchev to compromise his, and the Berlin Wall was erected to block off all contact between Communist East Germany and the West.27

John F. Kennedy biographer Robert Dallek held a similar opinion of Khrushchev: Khrushchev was determined to save face in due to apparent weakened condition at the ultimate resolution of the Berlin crisis. Khrushchev had publicly emphasized his determination not to be intimidated and had predicted that “the Soviet nuclear superiority could
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make Kennedy America’s last president.”

Khrushchev’s harsh words placed him in a position which forced him to compromise in lieu of following through with his stated threats and intimidations.

The Berlin crisis in 1961 was, to that point, the most dangerous moment during the Cold War. During the crisis, it became clear to Khrushchev that Kennedy was absolutely committed to maintaining the sovereignty of democracy of West Berlin. For the Soviets and the GDR, closing the border between East and West Berlin became the only resolution of the crisis that Khrushchev had created, through his demands and threats of against democracy. Fifteen months after averting World War III over the sovereignty of West Berlin, Kennedy would have a second opportunity to demonstrate his resolve that democracy and freedom would not be threatened nor negotiated.
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The Jewel of a Faulty Crown

Erin Turinetti

Russia, never considered one of the victors of World War I, has always been considered a principal player of the allied front. Its weaknesses were known from the beginning. As political leaders ignored the needs of a largely poor population, society became increasingly hardened. Russian society had suffered through starvation, civil strife, and leadership that continually shifted. Any change that came was either in minute steps benefitting Russian society or large leaps backward that harmed it. Russians had used the practice of revolt for centuries as a solution to problems. The need for positive change was ever-present for a peasant class that had evolved from serfdom a few decades earlier. Food was scarce in the years preceding and during the war, and the government had done little to address the needs of its public, though it presented the image of doing so. In addition, Russia found itself in a precarious position as it struggled to supply a large army with ammunition. The ammunition crisis and the army’s subsequent revolt turned the tide for the Russian Revolution and caused the withdrawal of the Russian army from World War I.

Russia’s imperial family and court relied heavily upon its military, which was the pride of Tsar Nicholas II. The Romanov Empire founded its history on the use of the military, and “the needs of the army and the navy always took precedence in the formulation of tsarist
In reality, the military was nothing more than the tsar’s plaything as he favored spending time fussing over military parades and uniforms. The court was also immersed in the military philosophy. It was the supposed favored jewel for the royal crown of Russia. Yet, this jewel was not supported, as it should have been. Russian soldiers were poorly trained and ill-equipped for the war. Compared to Austria and Germany, Russia spent far less time and money on its military than its neighbors did, just ten years before the war. Soldiers spent more time meeting dress standards or learning formal modes of address than they did training to fight. A large portion of the military was composed of the peasant class, so they had to tend to their crops at home in order to survive. Russia did not provide for conscripted soldiers, in contrast to provisions for officers. Very few soldiers received proper training for trench warfare, the dominant strategy used in World War I, and the availability of munitions and training was scarce. Training that did take place involved more parades than war games meant to train soldiers for combat.

At the center of Russia’s military problem was its struggle to maintain reliable munitions supply. Just as all the other European armies expected a short war, Russia relied on this same belief and faced immediate shortages as a result. The first signs of shell shortages took place in September 1914 when Grand Duke Nikolai started complaining about the shortage, but any attempt of the government resolving the issue

---
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proved disingenuous. While leaders spoke on the subject, true action on the military’s behalf was lacking. Until the summer of 1915, munitions supplies proved a troubling issue for the military. This was “exacerbated by utter mismanagement of the available supply of shells and other resources.” In response to the arms crisis at the front, the government ordered the supply of munitions to be boosted by an increase in the employment of war refugees, likely from Poland and West Russia, and civilians in munitions production and for munitions plants to be built. The front still did not receive any reliable supply, as much of the new supplies were sent to “useless and obsolete Polish fortresses.”

The government showed some possibility of restoring the ammunition supply when the tsar dismissed Minister of War Sukhomlinov. He was later tried for the shortage that hindered Russian military success. There was also hope when Russia negotiated a contract with Japan. Although secondary sources show reasons for going abroad as a result of logistical problems and charges of espionage for Minister of War Sukhomlinov, one primary source goes so far as to claim industrial ineptitude. The home front was not able to supply enough ammunition, so Russia started looking elsewhere. The New York Times quoted a Tokyo newspaper stating, “The Russians as a people are not given to industrial pursuits….” The author went on to state that every effort was made to train the workers, but “it proved to be almost a hopeless task….” The author also verifies logistical problems as he states
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that the supply of ammunition would have come sooner, but the harsh winter hampered communication, and the railroad supply was cut off in the spring. Japan also had to produce enough ammunition for itself, due to tensions between Japan and China becoming serious. In addition to the supply being limited from Japan due to weather, the war, and Japanese foreign relations with China, supplies sent from the United States were very small and France and England were dealing with their own munitions shortages.\(^\text{14}\)

By August, Russia declared the shell shortage crisis over. Chairman Shingarev of the Duma Defense Committee was interviewed and said, “The quantity of munitions … has been more than doubled and all necessary supplies are going forward promptly. The Russian Army now is in splendid fighting condition.” He went on to state that the Teutonic armies were struggling with the weather and would be hampered enough to diminish any perception of their foe as a general threat.\(^\text{15}\) Shingarev was a caring physician from a poor family\(^\text{16}\) that became an ignorant and possibly ill-used politician in an overwhelmingly elitist government.\(^\text{17}\) This statement was likely made due to poor military intelligence or from pressure by other members of the Duma. Either he did not know how flawed a statement he had made or he was producing dangerous propaganda for Russia, as his statement was incorrect.

Another news report, though written on August 16, 1915, surfaced from Stockholm on September 15, 1915 showing just how wrong Shingarev was and how it affected the Russian populous in total.
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This report stated that despite the large quantity of munitions, the bullets did not fit the Russian guns. The bullets were manufactured according to German specifications, so despite the supplies, the Russians were helpless on the battlefield. The reaction in Russia was one of anger. They were not discouraged, they were not submissive, they did not give up on the war; instead, they shared “intense indignation” over the lack of responsibility of government leaders. The author shares Russian anger by describing the sorrow over the soldiers’ circumstances: “These soldiers were determined, experienced fighters, Russia’s best troops, acquitting themselves with unusual bravery in every bayonet action, but crippled and finally demoralized by insufficient ammunition and the knowledge that it was this lack of ammunition that ordered their continued retreat from one position to another.” The Russian people wanted to know how a country was supposed to continue to fight against foreign aggressors when its men were expected to go to battle without reliable ammunition due to an inept government. They were slaughtered as a result. The author goes on to say that this fury was felt and expressed freely by all:

For once, expression of opinion in Russia has become free and unhampered. No attempt is made to conceal this reproach against the methods of the bureaucrats who are accused of having crippled Russia’s fighting strength and materially delayed the end of the war. It is not expressed alone by men of revolutionary inclinations or opposition tendencies, nor is it uttered in hushed voices or secret places, but it is loudly and clamorously current everywhere among men of all parties and classes.
The seeds of revolution were spreading due to inept leadership in adequately supplying munitions.18

By September of 1915, assurances were lacking regarding the possibility of the Russian army receiving an adequate and reliable supply of ammunition; therefore, the military could only retreat. The country was not quite ready to pull out of the war, and was not ready for surrender. Russia’s hope relied heavily on its industry. An anonymous military officer from the Allies stated, “Petrograd is almost essential to the Russians, not on account of any sentimental reason connected with its being the capital, but because three-fourths of the industries directly connected with supplying the troops are located there, and their loss would be a blow from which it would be difficult for the Russian troops to recover.” They went on to state that this was proven by the cycle of supplies in relation to Russian success. Whenever the troops would receive ammunition, retreat would end, a slow but sure advance would start, and enemy prisoners would be taken. History has shown that as soon as ammunition ran low, retreat would start again. This officer did not see manpower as an issue because fresh troops were constantly being sent to the front; however, ammunition was not following the troops to the front quickly enough.19

By the end of 1915, the Russian army was beginning to fall apart. Desertion, contempt, and disobedience spread like wildfire. An order given by General Ivanov showed the situation in which leaders found themselves. It describes, “extraordinary plundering in the rear of the army, particularly on the Western Front.” The order goes on to mention instances of disobedience, and disorder that resulted in
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casualties and death. Soldiers were lacking the appropriate
documentation, and desertion was becoming widespread, with deserters
“stirring up the people with imaginary stories slandering the
commanding staff.” Russia was finding itself in a precarious position as
it struggled to command an army that was fed up with feeling its only
purpose was to die without any means of defense.20

Still, Russia found itself continuing the arms struggle through
early 1917. Although Russia had been receiving supplies from the
United States, accidents and ineptitude continued to plague Russia’s
ability to acquire supplies. A fire in a New Jersey munitions plant
destroyed the latest contracted supply of shells for the Russian army.
Despite the knowledge of previous issues in the design of the shells,
these designs contained the same flawed designs that had supplied the
army two years previously; they had originally been designed by a
German munitions company.21 Clearly, Russia was not going to receive
the supplies it needed for its already floundering military.

By March, Russia finally collapsed. The same soldiers that
suffered at the front took pity on the people at home. After all, these
were their people, their family, “The people’s cry for food reached the
hearts of the soldiers, and one by one the regiments rebelled, until finally
those troops which had for a time stood loyal to the Government
gathered up their arms and marched into the ranks of the revolutionists.”
It all started because a food strike had incited an over reactive police
action on the part of the military. Troops did not understand why they
should fight against people that were simply hungry and wanted nothing

20 Allan K. Wildman, The End of the Russian Imperial Army: The Old Army and the
21 “Exploding Shells Rain Four Hours; $5,000,000 Loss,” The New York Times, January
12, 1917.
more than food, so they joined in and defended the people. The clash between those troops loyal to the government and those loyal to the people had begun. For a time, government troops controlled the principle squares of the city, but then it was “impossible to distinguish one side from the other. There was no definite line between the factions.” After a short silence, government troops joined the revolutionaries. The troops broke the government’s control and turned the tide. The revolutionists now had the real power to back up their demands, as the government no longer had enough troops to back them up. The united front was surely something to behold. Students, workers, and troops, were as one. Nicholas II had no choice but to resign.22

Mrs. Miriam Finn Scott, a Russian that gave an interview with the *New York Times*, stated that the war is what “paved the way for the Russian revolution, because it brought the army to the side of the people.” She said the soldiers started to suffer in a way they had never suffered before and realized they could not rely on the government leadership, “so they became revolutionists, and then the revolution was inevitable.” The soldiers could no longer stand separate from the rest of the people as they were suffering just as they were. They naturally became part of a revolutionary force that overrode the government.23

The government was not the only thing that Russia’s people and soldiers were revolting against. By May of 1917, Russia could no longer stand beside its allies and continue fighting the war. In an appeal of the Council of Workmen’s and Soldiers’ Delegates to the soldiers, the war was viewed as nothing more “than the monstrous crime of the imperialists of all countries who by their greed for aggrandizement of

their rapid frenzy for armaments prepared the way and made inevitable this worldwide conflagration. … The Russian revolution of labor workmen and soldiers is a revolt not only against Czarism, but also against the horrors of the worldwide slaughterhouse.” Not only were soldiers revolting against the leaders for their lack of leadership and honest care for their well-being, they were also revolting against all leaders in a world that would continue to fight for nothing more than land or power. Russia’s people refused to go on.24

Yet, the Russian government continued to persist. The Duma called upon the people for loyalty and tried to assure the people and soldiers that munitions and food would be supplied.25 The Russian military was not interested. As stated in a New York Times interview, “the situation at the front … is characterized by a decline of interest in the war and the great national effort which it involves.” Military duties had been abandoned, soldiers were still deserting, though its rate was decreasing, but the soldiers at the front were seen as passive. It was possible that Russia’s soldiers had practically resigned themselves to peace with Germany. A report in the London Times actually suggested that the only hope for Russia’s soldiers to take part in the war was a German offensive that would force the Russian soldier to fight.26 Nonetheless, the soldiers could not be convinced. By the end of May of 1917, Russian soldiers were still calling for ammunition. In the midst of continuing food shortages throughout Russia, the soldiers were still left defenseless.27 There was no improvement and no hope for improvement.

By early 1918, Russia was out of the war as it negotiated a peace treaty with Germany. 

Although the causes for the revolution include other key factors such as food shortages and workers’ rights strikes, the ammunition crises was a definitive blow on Russian leadership and the war. Again and again, Russia’s leaders supplied the soldiers with the wrong shells or no shells. As comrades died when they could have had a chance, military morale sank deeply and became a permanent mark upon the soldiers’ psyche. The Russian soldier had become nothing more than German shooting targets and the situation at home gave them no reprieve from the depressed state they found themselves stuck in, and military leaders were doing little to give them hope. Dissatisfaction turned to anger and anger turned to open revolt. That revolt soon supported the demand at home for food and rights. When ordered to take action against their own people, given their own circumstances, it is natural that the soldier would question the authority of those orders. The February Revolution in Petrograd was the beginning of a new nation that had been permanently scarred by its leaders. The jewel was no longer willing to be supported by a faulty crown. Nevertheless, the new leadership would be tested just as the last had been. The arms crisis continued through the war until Russia had to pull out and sign a treaty with Germany. The arms crisis continued to be a test of the true character of Russian leadership.
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El Teatro Campesino of Chicanos, by Chicanos, and for Chicanos

Cassandra E. Nwokah

Mexican theatrical expression has long been used as balm for the wounds of the oppressed and under-represented minorities. El Teatro Campesino developed as a grass roots assemblage with a goal towards uniting Mexican American farm workers under Cesar Chavez and the UFW’s ¡Huelga! banner during the Chicano civil rights movement. As the works of Luis Valdez illustrate, its primary contribution to the Latino world was in identity-building.

Latino theatre has its roots in oral traditions from indigenous ancestral tribal gatherings and the morality plays of the Spanish colonizers, pastorelas.¹ In the eighteenth century a type of Mexican tent theatre, carpa, could be called the predecessor to the contemporary theatre of Mexicans and Chicanos.² Out of that performance tradition arose the vaudeville-esque practices of Mexico’s Teatro Campesino in the 1930s. Interestingly, all of these traditions were established for the entertainment of a poor and disenfranchised public. El Teatro Campesino of the 1960s followed in that same tradition; however, with the inclusion of German theatrical elements from movements like expressionism and Bertolt Brecht’s Epic Theatre, the new Teatro was able to add two new layers of purpose to their ancestral performance

heritage: education and politicization. Comparative to the Mexican *carpas*, a particular performance form called *actos* was adopted by the *Campesino* ensemble. These were short plays that gave abundant political encouragement via parodies of Chicano campesino life. The mass of campesino families that grouped together to enjoy these entertainments could readily identify with the characters exhibited on stage and were stirred to solidarity. Thus, the theatre began as a radical faction performing in warehouses, on streets, and quick-set stages.

Born in 1965 under the direction of Luis Valdez in an effort to assist in organizing farm workers for the grape boycott and strike, Chicano theatres soon spread to campuses and communities throughout the Southwest. From the very beginning, hundreds of Chicano theatre groups performed in streets, parks, churches or any space available in order to communicate to the grassroots their social and political messages.³

El Teatro Campesino served as a meeting point for Mexican Americans during the Chicano civil rights movement. Theatre historian Eugene Van Erven writes that “their organization, creation, and acting proved much closer to the style of the European radical popular theatre groups that developed in the wake of the events of 1968.”⁴

Luis Valdez, creator of el Teatro, is a leading voice for Chicanos. His journey from farm worker to writer-director-filmmaker represents the experience of Chicano culture and its rise from obscurity. Valdez was a student at California’s San Jose State University when the farm workers began to strike. He began el Teatro Campesino as a virtual nobody. After having studied the radical theatre traditions of nineteenth century Europe and traveling as a student to some volatile parts of Latin
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America he chose to take an active role in remedying the plight of his people, los campesinos. Through an examination of his work at the beginning and then towards the end of the movement, the focus of the Teatro ensemble can be properly analyzed.

“Starting out as the cultural branch of … the union, … the militant beginnings of el Teatro Campesino have been well documented.”

Valdez wrote the 1967 play Los Vendidos to be performed for the Brown Beret junta in Elysian Park in East Los Angeles. The Brown Berets being a self-appointed paramilitary student group modeled after the Black Panther Party, it was necessary for Valdez’s work to induce the rebellious brand of activism that they employed. The play also follows in the European theatre tradition of Commedia dell’ Arte with its use of stock characters that play to stereotype. With characters like Honest Sancho, Johnny Pachuco, Farm Worker, and Revolucionario, this satire of Chicano stereotypes explores the manner in which dominant, oppressive societies diminish minorities, specifically Chicanos. The play was dynamic for the campesinos in the sixties and remains so for audiences today. Its plot is an attack on the Reagan administration in its exploitation and repression of Mexican-Americans. In Los Vendidos, pressure to survive causes one Chicano salesman, Honest Sancho, to try to sell Reagan’s secretary different versions of the Mexican-American stereotype. Through the action of the play Sancho’s character is revealed as a traitor to his own people, culminating in a harsh indictment of Chicanos who take advantage of other Chicanos and therefore were enemies to the movement.

---

5 Van Erven, 43.
Los Vendidos gained recognition just as Valdez was redirecting the theatre’s focus. The play retains the parody characters that the Campesino audience had enjoyed since el Teatro’s inception but also incorporates the acto form of performance that would become the ensemble’s signature. Jorge Huerta writes that the play “does not offer ready-made solutions like the previous worker’s actos.”\(^6\) The fact that it was performed in affiliation with the Brown Beret junta illustrates the group’s quick turn away from the campesinos towards the more active student groups as a target audience. In another respect, it shifted from the rural to the urban.\(^7\)

During this reformatory period of el Teatro’s existence, Valdez was inspired by Corky Gonzalez’s masterpiece poem, “I Am Joaquin.” In 1969, he and other members of the group made a film that set Gonzalez’s work to music and pictures, with an impressive narrative performance by Valdez himself. In his epic poem “Pensamiento Serpentino,” written in the early 1973, he validates the need for and value of Chicano theatre. It is aptly subtitled “A Chicano Approach to the Theatre of Reality.”\(^8\) The designation of the project as the Theatre of Reality is evocative of the expressionist and surrealist philosophies of earlier European theatre-a nod to his collegiate studies.

The poem “Pensamiento” is an affirmation of Chicano identity through a symbolic explanation of the world, creation, and the roots of the Chicano people. It is a reflection of the joy of being Chicano. He writes, “to be CHICANO is to love yourself, your culture, your skin, your language.”\(^9\) He goes further to say that loving yourself allows you

\(^7\) Huerta, 52-54.
\(^8\) Luis Valdez, Early Works (Houston: Arte Publico Press, 1990), 168.
\(^9\) Valdez, 175.
to love others, like “los Europeos,” who need it more. The poem addresses many topics in Chicano culture including the indigenous roots of the people, the mythical Aztlan, religion, and the hopes for the Chicanos’ future. In the text of the poem he explains the etymology of the name “Mexico,” linking it to the ever-shedding serpent, which becomes the great feathered serpent\textsuperscript{10} of the Aztecs, the Chicanos’ Indigenous ancestors.\textsuperscript{11}

Both of these pieces, like most of Valdez’s work, stand alone as literary masterpieces and priceless Latino historical records. Teatro Campesino was a feature of the Chicano movement that continues into the present day. Originally, the Teatro was formed by Valdez as a source of entertainment and education for the farm workers during the movement. It still exists in that same capacity today; however, its audience and its body of work have expanded. Valdez continues to head the organization. He now also tours to educate Chicano youth and others who can respect the work of el Teatro.

After 1980, the contemporary Teatro Campesino organization shed its original skin in favor of a more commercial venture. With the dissolution of the initial ensemble, Valdez began to move the organization in new directions. The new group sought and garnered U.S federal support through an “annual grant of $300,000 from the National Endowment for the Arts.”\textsuperscript{12} Also the membership has expanded greatly to include many of today’s most popular Latino artists.

From the Chicano theatre movement have sprung many of today’s Mexican American actors, directors, filmmakers and drama professors, as well as the first

\textsuperscript{10} Perhaps harkens to the Eagle and Serpent gods of Aztec mythology. Valdez, 199.
\textsuperscript{11} Valdez, 177-191.
\textsuperscript{12} Van Erven, 52.
Mexican American play, *Zoot Suit*, to reach Broadway and to become a Hollywood, feature-length film.¹³

Luis Valdez, especially, has gone on to become one of the most successful Chicano professional artists. The exposure gained with both ventures of *Zoot Suit* launched him and el Teatro further into the mainstream and, with it, Chicano cultural awareness further into unchartered sociopolitical spheres. In this vein, el Teatro Campesino has remained true to its origins. The point of the Chicano movement was to gain rights for Chicanos. In a 1985 interview when asked about the growth and change of *Teatro Campesino* Valdez thoughtfully reflects:

> I have been challenged in a number of different ways with the way that El Teatro has developed. […] While we had the strength and urgency of the struggle, our artistry had to sustain our politics. Ultimately it is artistry that makes the point and cuts across the barriers to understanding. There is a certain quality of excellence that we have discovered over the years.¹⁴

Through el *Teatro’s* use of mainstream media and performance culture, the image of the Latino and, more specifically, of the Chicano has been and continues to be honed by Chicanos themselves. The two (and arguably now three) phases of el Teatro Campesino’s existence and work, though differing in approach and forms, have maintained the singular purpose of Chicano advancement.

If it is true that “theatre is a reflection of the society that creates it…,”¹⁵ there is much to be said about Chicano theatre. The Teatro organization has done more to propel a more accurate image of Chicanos

---

¹³ Kanellos, 37-38.
to the world. As el Teatro enters into the 21st century, Valdez’s work to assert the theatre’s professional and invaluable character is paying off. Though el Teatro Campesino is still primarily remembered for its involvement in the Chicano rights movement, Luis Valdez is committed to encourage the Chicano youth of today and educate audiences of all races on the past, current, and future Chicano experience. Before Teatro Campesino, no Mexican American theatre existed in the professional realm. Now American and, indeed, world theatre history is incomplete without it.

Bibliography


