CORNERSTONE

AN UNDERGRADUATE HISTORICAL JOURNAL

Le Negligé Galant Ornés de la Cœffure à la Belle Poule

Editors:
Eduardo Garcia
Hailee Menchaca
Marina Murillo Sanchez

Faculty Advisors
Dr. Brian Lloyd and Dr. Jody Benjamin

Managing Editor: Lynda Vernia

Department of History
University of California, Riverside

CONTENTS

"Dominium Mundi: The Ottoman Claim to Roman Succession"

Justin Taack

In 1453 the Ottoman Sultan Mehmed II was successful in sacking the city of Constantinople, bringing an end to Byzantine rule over the last remnants of the Roman Empire. It marked the end of an era the likes of which the world would never see again, signaling the climax of a period of Islamic barbarism encroaching upon the sovereign lands of Christendom. The success of the Ottoman Turks in conquering the Roman Empire was a tragedy. This is the narrative pushed forth in Western retellings of history. Thankfully, recent scholarship has pushed back against this narrative, especially as the world becomes increasingly more interconnected. However, these ideas can still be seen persisting in American public schools. Unfortunately, Western bias has undoubtedly impacted the legacy of the Ottoman Empire, creating avenues to define their rule as one of aggression and usurpation, belonging to the Orient and the heretical religious sect of Muhammad. Modern Turkish narratives are also doing their part in placing an arguably negative light on Ottoman history, pushing forth narratives to justify theocratic ethno-nationalism. To counter these polarized narratives, we are challenged to view the Ottoman Empire in a new light. Arguably one of the most interesting avenues in exploring this is through studying the imperial claims of the Ottoman Empire, with one claim in particular rising above the rest—the continuity of the Roman Empire under Ottoman rule. Among Ottoman claims of succession to the Roman Empire, we can see this emerge in the Sultan's titular assignment of Kayser i-Rum, with Rum being a designation for the lands and people of Anatolia once belonging to the Byzantine Empire. Thus, the ultimate goal of this essay is to provide viable evidence to support this claim culturally, politically, and geographically through analyzing

1

segments of the Ottoman governing body and the early modern concept of dominion while placing a particular focus on Ottoman imperialism through the lens of architecture.

The Ottoman conquest of Constantinople had been a work in progress since the founding of the Ottoman state under Osman I. Following the collapse of the Seljuk Sultanate of Rum at the hands of the Mongols in the early 14th century, the absence of dominion left a power vacuum in Anatolia. Having been subject to the rule of the Seljuk Turks since the 11th century, Anatolia was left splintered with various groups of Oghuz Turkic states vying for power.[1] Osman I, from whom the Ottomans took their name, ultimately prevailed in this conflict of competing Turkic states, conquering much of Anatolia and beginning the reign of the Ottoman Empire. What is interesting here is the course the Ottomans take in empire building after establishing a secure foothold in Anatolia. Though this could have been for strategic reasons, seeing the strength of the Mongolian Empire as too difficult a challenge, we see the Ottomans turn their attention not east but west, towards conquering European territory in the Balkans. The first Ottoman conquest on the Balkan Peninsula was at Adrianople in 1362, with the entire peninsula being conquered or admitted into pseudo-vassalage by the end of the following century.[2] This, however, was not done entirely for the purpose of obtaining land from the crumbling Byzantine Empire. The Ottoman conquest of Byzantine territory was in fact a statement of imperial legitimacy.

By the time the Ottomans had conquered Adrianople in 1362, Western empires were in a state of disarray and collapse while warfare in the east raged over claims to succession over the Mongolian Empire. Though the Ottomans did make this claim of Mongolian succession, their initial attention was spent focusing on the conquest of the Byzantine Empire, also called the Eastern Roman Empire due to their continuity of the Roman tradition. Though having secured dominion in Anatolia, the Ottomans were no strangers to the region, having been there themselves for at least a century prior to their rule. Despite having Turkish origins, the Ottomans

---

[1] Halil Inalcik, S. Tekeli, and G. Öney. *The Ottoman Empire: The classical age 1300-1600.* (Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 2013), 171-242.
[2] Inalcik, et al, *The Ottoman Empire*, *The Ottoman Empire,* 247.

were subject to influence by Roman culture as much of Anatolia still retained Roman cultural practices, traditions, and people. Being a Sunni Muslim empire, the Ottomans found themselves ruling over a diverse religious population of Muslims, Jews, and Christians, a legacy of Anatolia's Roman past.[3] Thus, for over a century of Ottoman rule, not only had the Ottomans established dominion in previously held Roman lands, the empire held a population in which Islam was not a religion observed by the vast majority, especially after the conquest of Constantinople and the rest of the Balkans.

This is significant because through the Ottoman focus on conquering Europe, we can see that the Ottoman claim to imperial legitimacy initially rested in their claim to imperial succession not over eastern empires, but more importantly the Roman Empire itself. In fact, the Ottomans, though proud of their Muslim identity and claims of dominion over eastern empires, more so shunned being associated with the people of the eastern territories over whom they asserted dominance, including fellow Turks.[4] This may seem odd considering the Ottomans are often associated with the Turks, however, what we see when studying Ottoman history is the fact that many, especially those belonging to the Ottoman aristocracy, had backgrounds of mixed ethnic and religious origin.[5] To understand this we must return to the origin of the situation at hand.

Following Ottoman dominion over European territories and the conquest of previously Byzantine lands, the Ottomans found themselves ruling over a significant Christian population. This, however, was not seen as a challenge to Ottoman rule but rather an opportunity. Having developed a way to benefit from this circumstance, the Ottomans turned to the utilization of their slave class known as Kul. Beginning in the 14th century, young enslaved males were often impressed through a levy process called Devshirme, a heavy tax on conquered territories by which Christian children were taken from their places of origin and converted to Islam while subsequently being raised by the state to serve the Sultan in an indentured capacity.[6] It is

---

[3] Halil Inalcik, S. Tekeli, and G. Öney, *The Ottoman Empire,* 171-242.
[4] Nebahat Avcioğlu, *The age of Sinan: Architectural culture in the Ottoman Empire.* (2006). 39-42.
[5] Avcioğlu, *The age of Sinan,* 39-42.
[6] Avcioğlu, 36.

significant to note that Christian children from agrarian communities in the Balkans were the desired individuals for Devshirme as Muslims were barred from this system.[7] One 17th century Ottoman source attributes this to Muslim families abusing the privileges gained by having a child serve as a slave directly to the Sultan, enumerating that: "Their relatives in the provinces would oppress the *reaya* (lower class) and not pay taxes. They would oppose the sanjek beyis and become rebels."[8] This sentiment likewise served as a deciding factor in the class of individuals who saw advancement in the Ottoman court.

For those impressed by Devshirme, some were sent directly into service in Ottoman palatial environments, serving as 'pages' and often being granted provincial governorships following completion of their education.[9] However, many were placed in the Janissary Corp, the world's first standing army since that of Philip II and Alexander the Great, commanded by the Ottoman Sultan. Having been taken from their families and converted to Islam, their ties to all but the Sultan and Islam had been severed. Thus, they were seen as the most formidable warriors of the Ottoman military for having no reservations in fighting and dying for the Ottoman state.[10]

Due to their unwavering loyalty to Islam and the Sultan, Kul were the preferred individuals to climb the ladder of Ottoman societal status, with many becoming viziers or pashas.[11] This is the case especially during and after the reign of Sultan Suleyman I, who took an interest in educating and training Kul in order to populate a loyal aristocracy. Under his reign from 1520 to 1566, only four of Suleyman's twenty-three viziers were born to Muslim families, the rest being converts who climbed the social ladder.[12]

Women alike were no strangers to Ottoman enslavement. Often living as concubines or house servants, female Kul can also be seen rising in the established hierarchy of the imperial

[7] Inalcik, et al, *The Ottoman Empire* , 1660.
[8] Kavānin-i Yeniçeriyān, ms. in Topkapi Sarayi Museum, Revan K. nos 1319, 1320.
[9] Inalcik, et al, *The Ottoman Empire* 1713.
[10] Avcioğlu, *The age of Sinan,* 40.
[11] Avcioğlu, 36-40.
[12] Avcioğlu, 36.

court. Like those impressed by Devshirme, female slaves were typically of Christian and Balkan origin and received both education and court training.[13] However, unlike their male counterparts, female Kul were not part of the levy system established by Devshirme but were rather acquired through slave markets or as prisoners of war.[14] These women particularly populated the palatial harems of the Sultan.[15] By the second half of the 15th century, Ottoman Sultans began to have children exclusively with these concubines of non-Turkish, slave origin, a practice beginning with the intermarriages that spawned from the initial conquest of Anatolia in the 14th century.[16]

By the mid-16th century, it is apparent that a new Ottoman identity had been fully formed. What we see is not something entirely Turkish but something uniquely Ottoman in the admixture of various ethnic identities and religious backgrounds. It is in this identity that we can see why the Ottoman aristocracy shunned the 'Turkish' label. For many, they considered themselves to be strictly Ottoman, recognizing their Christian and Rum or Balkan origins while embracing their syncretic Muslim identity which strongly merged with an aristocratic European culture.[17] In fact, according to much of the Muslim world, when the Ottomans rose to power they were considered to be another Roman Empire due to their admixture of Roman and Islamic cultural influences. But why is this important and how does it relate to the Roman legacy of the Ottoman Empire?

Through our study of the Ottoman aristocracy and lineage of the sultans, it is apparent that the Ottoman legacy was built upon the people and cultures of the former Roman Empire. Though devoutly Muslim, the Kul aristocracy was composed of individuals who would've otherwise been considered Romans even after Ottoman conquests. Of course, by the beginning of the 16th century we see a grand shift in Ottoman policy towards claiming dominion over the entire Muslim world as the rightful heir to an Islamic empire, having conquered the occupied

---

[13] Inalcik, et al, *The Ottoman Empire,* 1811.
[14] Inalcik, 1811.
[15] Inalcik, 1811.
[16] Avcioğlu, *The age of Sinan,* 9-40.
[17] Avcioğlu, 40.

lands of the Mamelukes in 1517 and being threatened by Shia expansion in the East.[18] Nevertheless, this hardly stopped the formation of a 'Roman' aristocracy, leaving the upper echelons of Ottoman society dominated by Roman Ottomans from Europe and Anatolia.

This Roman aristocracy at the head of Ottoman society reached its height in the 16th century and set the foundation for the future of the Ottoman ruling class. Despite limitations set on the social elevation of individual Kul in the 17th century, the legacy of the Kul aristocracy was quite literally set in stone. In the spirit of the Italian Renaissance, the construction of grandiose architectural projects throughout the Ottoman Empire drastically increased during the apex of the Kul aristocracy. As in Italy among individuals and families such as the Medici and Ruccelai, Ottoman aristocrats also competed for status and reputation through sponsoring various construction projects. Often funding religious structures, we find a new type of Islamic architecture emerging in the age of Sinan, the chief imperial architect of the Ottoman state from 1539 until his death in 1588.[19]

As Suleyman I came to power in the 16th century and set in motion the birth of an Ottoman renaissance, the conditions were ripe for the rise of an architectural genius the likes of which the Ottoman Empire had never seen nor would ever see again. This came about through a man named Mimar Sinan. Though a devout Muslim, Sinan was a convert, taken from a noble Christian family as a young man and enslaved by the Ottomans through Devshirme. Being already an adult, Sinan was impressed in the Janissary Corps to undergo training as an officer, during which time he served in various campaigns as a combatant and military engineer.[20] After returning from a campaign in Moldavia, Sinan was promoted to chief imperial architect by Sultan Suleyman I.[21]

---

[18] Inalcik et al. *The Ottoman Empire,* 543-763.
[19] Mimar Sinan, "Treatise on Architecture," Crane, Howard, and Esra Akin. *Sinan's autobiographies: five sixteenth-century texts.* (Brill, 2006,) 58-63.
[20] Sinan, "Treatise on Architecture," 58-63
[21] Sinan. 58-63.

It was under this post as chief imperial architect that Sinan was able to oversee the architectural accomplishments of over 350 structures. Sinan articulates this in his autobiography:

> "...I set out on the Moldavian campaign. And upon my return, the office of chief imperial architect was committed to my charge. And from that time until the present, in the days of three most glorious padishahs, that is, Sultan Süleyman Khan [I], Sultan Selim Khan [II], and Sultan Murad Khan [III]…"[22]

Arguably, the most magnificent feats of architecture by Sinan can be observed in his Friday Mosques. Embracing Byzantine architectural designs with Islamic elements from the Near East, Sinan's most exemplary grand Friday Mosque was not only a significant achievement for Ottoman and Islamic architecture, it represented a new era of the Roman Empire. Completed in 1557, Sinan's Suleymaniye Mosque was commissioned by Sultan Suleyman I to serve as a hallmark symbol of his reign and piety while commemorating his dead son Mehmed, the former crown prince. When looking at the architectural plans of the mosque, it is no secret that Byzantine engineering greatly influenced its design. In fact, this was done on purpose. According to his autobiographies, Sinan's plans for the mosque of Suleyman were deliberately designed after Hagia Sophia, the largest religious structure in the city of Constantinople until the construction of the Suleymaniye Mosque.[23] This is significant because it shows that the mosque was not merely a religious structure built in honor of the sultan to house Friday prayers, it was symbolic of Islamic, Ottoman dominance over Rome. By taking the form of Hagia Sophia, Sinan was able to assert Muslim dominance over Roman culture in the face of adverse attitudes coming from Christians throughout the region.

---

[22] Sinan. "Treatise on Architecture," 58.
[23] Sinan, 89,130.

This can further be seen in his autobiographies in addressing verbal attacks aimed at the architectural ambitions of the Ottomans, slights over which he proclaims a victory through the construction of his self-proclaimed masterpiece, the Selimiye Mosque:

"And one [reason] the people of the world said [such a construction] was beyond human capability was that no dome as large as that of Hagia Sophia had been built in the lands of Islam. [Thus,] those who passed for architects among the sinning unbelievers used to say, 'We have scored a victory over the Muslims'… I exerted myself in the construction of the above-mentioned Friday mosque, and, with the help of God, the Lord, the Judge, showed my capabilities during the reign of Sultan Selim Khan, and made this exalted dome…"[24]

In successfully completing the intricate architectural designs of the Selimiye mosque, Sinan had struck a blow to the naysayers during a time in which Ottoman conquests increasingly encroached upon European lands. From this we can see that the Ottomans viewed themselves as competing with Europe over both religious and imperial dominance with a strong focus on the territory once belonging to the Roman Empire. When analyzing the writing of Sinan, his Friday mosques can be seen overtly embodying the spirit of Ottoman religion and imperialism. Going back to Sinan's Suleymaniye Mosque, the religious and imperial connotations here are emblematic of Islamic superiority over the former Byzantine Empire and Christian architecture mainly in the West. Where we can see the construction of the Suleymaniye Mosque as a victory for the Ottomans over the Christians, delivered by divine providence and Muslim superiority, the religious connotations go deeper into biblical claims of imperial succession.

Designed to improve upon the plans of Hagia Sophia, the symbolism of surpassing the Romans in architectural abilities can be seen as having a basis in the claims of Justinian I in his

---

[24] Sinan. "Treatise on Architecture," 63.

ambitions to build Hagia Sophia. Upon its completion, Justinian had proclaimed that Hagia

Sophia had surpassed the grandiose and splendor of the Temple of Solomon, the grand temple

built by the legendary Hebrew king, Solomon, who reigned as the last monarch of a united Israel

in the Hebrew Bible.[25] By constructing the Suleymaniye Mosque, Sinan had effectively

surpassed the very achievement which claimed superiority over the Temple of Solomon, thus

taking on the mantle of Solomon's Temple itself in the eyes of Sinan. When looking at the

architectural design of the mosque, we can also see that its mausoleum can be strikingly

compared in similarity to that of the Dome of the Rock, the site of the Temple of Solomon.[26]

This is not merely speculation. In his autobiographies, Sinan often refers to Sultan

Suleyman I as 'Solomon of the age', comparing the sultan to King Solomon. To adopt this title

of 'Solomon' is a significant claim to sovereign rule not only over the lands of Israel but the

entire world as God's chosen monarch.[27] According to Ottoman tradition based in Quranic

scripture, to attain the title of sultan was to be accepted as God's sovereign monarch on Earth

and to carry on the mantle of King Solomon. With Suleyman I ruling as the living representation

of King Solomon, Sinan undoubtedly saw himself as building the Temple of Solomon in his

construction of the Suleymaniye Mosque, thus solidifying Constantinople as the 'New

Jerusalem'. This is further seen in his description of French slaves who hoisted the marble

columns of the mosque, referring to them as 'demons of Solomon'.[28] To Sinan, the biblical

connotations of the Suleymaniye Mosque complemented the Ottoman claim to world

domination, especially as the Ottomans began to increasingly take control over predominantly

Muslim regions. However, we can also see that Sinan's reason behind attributing the legend of

Solomon to the mosque is deeply rooted in competition with Christian Europe.

In 1506, work began in Rome on the construction of a new St. Peter's Basilica, with

Donato Bramante initially serving as head architect of the project. Built as a means of replacing

---

[25] Sinan. "Treatise on Architecture," xiii.
[26] Gülru Necipoğlu-Kafadar, "The Suleymaniye Complex in Istanbul: An Interpretation." *Muqarnas* (1985): 92-117.
[27] Sinan. "Treatise on Architecture," 58-63.
[28] Necipoğlu-Kafadar, "The Suleymaniye Complex," 123.

the old basilica and asserting a new age of Catholic supremacy, it is evident that the idea of building a basilica to rival Hagia Sophia, and thus the Temple of Solomon, also penetrated European circles. This sentiment is also shared by art historian Marie Tanner. In her book *Jerusalem on the Hill*, Tanner dives into the symbolism of St. Peter's Basilica and argues that the new St. Peter's Basilica in Rome served as both a symbolic and physical representation of Solomon's Temple in the New Jerusalem.[29] This argument is made in the context surrounding the Roman invasion of Jerusalem in 70 CE under the reign of Emperor Titus.[30] According to the Church narrative, after the Romans sacked the city of Jerusalem, they brought the relics of the Temple of Solomon to the Temple of Peace in Rome. Though St. Peter's Basilica was never built atop the ruins of the Temple of Peace, as had been planned by Bramante, the belief that the relics of the Temple of Solomon resided in Rome allowed, in their eyes, the Church to claim Rome as the New Jerusalem and St. Peter's Basilica as the new Temple of Solomon.[31]

With the emergence of Renaissance Humanism in the 15th century challenging the legitimacy of the Donation of Constantine, the papal claim to authority as God's chosen 'Solomon' ruling from a 'New Jerusalem' in Rome became heavily dependent upon the above-mentioned criteria. By the beginning of the High Renaissance, the pope was no longer head of the Roman Empire in the eyes of many Christians, especially as the Protestant Reformation sparked and intrigued notions of sovereign rule in Europe. Not only do we see the pope continuing to promote himself as the head of the Roman Empire, we also see the Habsburghs, French, and Russians doing the same for various reasons. In this competition of rights to succession on the basis of imperial and religious standards, as we have seen, the Ottoman Empire was no stranger in European politics. When looking at the writings of Sinan, it is apparent that the Ottomans were in open competition with Christian nations in Europe in regards to cultural dominance and signs of divine providence.

---

[29] Marie Tanner, *Jerusalem on the Hill: Rome and the Vision of St. Peter's in the Renaissance.* (Harvey Miller Publishers 2010,) 39-47.
[30] Tanner, *Jerusalem on the Hill,* 40.
[31] Tanner, 39-47.

In returning to St. Peter's Basilica, it is possible to argue that Sinan himself was also in direct competition with none other than Michelangelo in regard to building their respective temples of Solomon, Michelangelo being the head architect of St. Peter's Basilica during the construction of Sinan's Suleymaniye Mosque. In fact, Michelangelo's work was well known in Constantinople as he was allegedly invited by the sultan to travel to the city to design a bridge that would span across the Golden Horn, an offer he declined.[32] Interestingly, it is apparent that the diffusion of Renaissance Humanism into Ottoman territory had greatly impacted Ottoman architecture, with famous Italian architects, such as Brunelleschi, Filarete, and Alberti, and their work inspiring Mehmed II in his plans for religious imperial constructions including his own mosque.[33] With the Suleymaniye Mosque being completed well before St. Peter's Basilica, it is possible that Sinan's attitude of victory over the naysayers in his autobiographies also comes from a mind of triumph granted by divine providence over the efforts of Christians in Rome.

By building his Temple of Solomon in Constantinople, the former capital of the Roman Empire, Sinan had effectively strengthened the Ottoman claim to Roman succession in several ways. Not only was the mosque built in Constantinople, for a time it established Islamic architecture as supreme to the early Christian architecture that built Hagia Sophia, bolstering an Ottoman assertion that the Roman Empire was effectively an Islamic empire through right of conquest and, most significantly, *dominion*. Because the Ottomans claimed dominion over the former territories of the Eastern Roman Empire and much of the former territory of the Roman Empire in North Africa and West Asia, establishing the religious grounds to reinforce said claim to Roman succession was the final step in cementing Ottoman legitimacy. With this completed through the construction of the Suleymaniye Mosque, Sinan's Temple of Solomon, the Ottomans maintained the necessary evidence to declare themselves as successors to the Roman Empire atop the foundation of early modern discourse surrounding imperial validity, despite the

---

[32] Sinan. "Treatise on Architecture," vii-xvi.
[33] Sinan, vii-xvi.

objections of their competition in Europe. This assertion, however, did not go unchallenged practically.

Among the adversaries of the Ottoman Empire stood arguably the most powerful family of the early modern period - the Habsburghs. Amidst this rivalry between the Ottomans and the Habsburgs, conflict between the two can be said as having begun with the Ottoman siege of Vienna in 1529 under the rule of Suleyman I.[34] Despite having failed to take Vienna, the conflict between the Ottomans and Habsburghs would last until the beginning of the 20th century, with an interesting occurrence taking place in the 16th century which may shed light on the ideas behind Sinan's fervent language in asserting the Suleymaniye mosque as the new Temple of Solomon. In 1593, Ottoman advances in Hungary triggered another conflict with the Habsburg monarchy titled the Long Turkish War.[35] During the war, in 1596 a Jesuit architect, Juan Bautista Villalpando, working under the assignment of Philip II, drew images depicting full scale constructions of the Temple of Solomon allegedly as biblically described.[36] According to an essay by Catherine Wilkinson titled *Planning a Style for Escorial: An Architectural Treatise for Philip of Spain*, Villalpando's design for the Temple of Solomon was based in Vitruvian ideas implemented into biblical descriptions of the building, which ultimately derived from an architectural project that redefined classical aesthetic - El Escorial.[37] In Juan de Herrera and Juan Bautista's construction of Philip II's El Escorial palatial and monastic complex, the classical design being implemented was based on counter-reformation ideas. Wanting to avoid the pagan aspects of Italian Renaissance architecture which was increasingly progressing towards the baroque style, an anonymous treatise on architecture addressed to Philip II shows that El Escorial was a return to the mundane, classical architecture of antiquity seen as ordained by God.[38] This

[34] Inalcik et al. *The Ottoman Empire*, 784.
[35] Inalcik et al, 920.
[36] Hieronymus Pradus, *Hieronymi Pradi ET Ioannis Baptistae Villalpandi e societate Iesv in Ezechielem explanationes ET apparatus vrbis, ac templi Hierosolymitani: Commentariis ET imaginibvs illvstratvs opvs tribvs tomis distinctvm quid vero singulis contineatur.* Vol. 3. 2017. 613.
[37] Catherine Wilkinson, "Planning a style for the Escorial: an architectural treatise for Philip of Spain." *The Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 44, no. 1 (1985): 37-47.
[38] Wilkinson, "Escorial,"38.

shift in focus from the intricate Italian architectural styles to one based more on that of early Christianity became a hallmark focus of the counter-reformation in Spain, showing the imperial implications behind religious Spanish architecture. Therefore, we can view Villalpando's plans for the Temple of Solomon not only as an attempted religious feat, but representing Spanish imperial efforts to claim religious dominion for the Catholic faith.

From the examples we have seen thus far, it is apparent that the idea of building and possessing the Temple of Solomon was a potent aspect of early modern imperialism and ideology surrounding the concept of *dominion* through divine providence and thus, Roman succession. From this, we can see that imperial competition in the early modern period was not a one-sided battle waged by the Ottomans against Christendom as a means of proving their claims to imperial authority. Rather, the Catholic Church can be seen competing just as much against both Protestant and Ottoman expansion to prove their own imperial claims. Following the Treaty of Zsitvatorok between the Habsburgs and Ottomans which ended the Long Turkish War, it is apparent that Christendom and the Ottomans saw each other as competing on an equal playing field, with the Ottoman sultan recognizing the Holy Roman emperor as Padishah, a recognition already given to the Ottoman sultan by the Holy Roman Empire following the Treaty of Constantinople in 1533.[39]

Though previously touched on, it is necessary to further explore the concept of *dominion* and its importance in early modern imperialism more in depth. One year after the construction of Sinan's Selimiye Mosque, in 1576 French lawyer and political philosopher, Jean Bodin, articulated a redefinition of international common law accepted among European nations known as *ius gentium*, which is broadly defined as a set of international norms that derived from Ancient Rome and continued to evolve in the early modern era.[40] Unlike the *ius gentium* of the Middle Ages which established princely jurisdictions, Bodin's philosophy, argued in his written

---

[39] Kenneth M. Setton, "The Papacy and the Levant (1204-1571). Vol. IV: The Sixteenth Century from Julius III to Pius VI." *Memoirs of the American Philosophical Society Philadelphia, Pa* 162 (1984): 565-1179.

[40] Daragh Grant, "Francisco de Vitoria and Alberico Gentili on the Juridical Status of Native American Polities." *Renaissance Quarterly* 72, no. 3 (2019): 910-952.

collection, *The Six Bookes of a Commonweale*, interpreted providential sovereignty as the defining standard for adherence to the *ius gentium*.[41] Guided by the Renaissance emphasis on the Ten Commandments, Bodin argued that God's permissiveness required his will on Earth, obedience and loyalty, to be enforced through the hand of a sovereign monarch.[42]

With Bodin's idea of sovereignty popularizing in the West, so too was his philosophy of securing it. According to Bodin's idea of *ius gentium*, in order to establish legitimate sovereign rule over a commonwealth, a government must maintain dominion in those claimed territories. This idea of dominion would be instrumental in the Ottoman claim to legitimacy in their conquered territories not only as a usurping ruling power but also in their claims to rightful succession of various imperial titles. Prior to the emergence of Bodin's definition of *ius gentium*, a Spanish philosopher by the name of Francisco de Vittoria was among the first to rationalize new ideas surrounding *ius gentium* following Spain's colonization of the Americas in the early 16th century. Vittoria proposed that the idea of a *dominus mundi*, or monarch chosen to reign over the world, was part of the natural law and therefore could be achieved as once thought to have occurred under the Roman Empire. Despite being Catholic himself, his idea of *ius gentium* rejected the notation that the papacy retained the right to interfere in affairs regarding non-Christians, thus in a likely unintentional congruence with Protestant doctrine, the papacy did not have the right to claim *dominus mundi*, a title which could only be reserved for a universal monarch who had established a universal commonwealth.[43] Therefore, according to the new philosophy of the *ius gentium*, the establishment of a universal commonwealth is reliant upon established dominion through divine providence by God's chosen monarch, a philosophy which can be seen promoted as early as the 14th century by Richard Fitzralph and John Wycliffe who argued that *dominium* was dependent upon the grace of God.[44]

---

[41] Grant, "Francisco de Vitoria and Alberico Gentili," 910-952.
[42] Grant, 910-952
[43] Grant, 919.
[44] Grant, 918.

With these concepts emerging from the Middle Ages and continuing to evolve in the early modern period, it is apparent that the Ottomans were not only aware of these ideas popularizing in Europe, they were actively indulging them. With the Ottoman imperial justification shifting from a focus on securing a European identity to adherence to Sharia law and a strong Muslim identity, central to these early modern ideas of dominion and international law was the religious practice of confessionalization.[45] Adhered to by both Christian nations and the Ottoman Empire, confessionalization is the strict adherence to religious dogma, reinforced by social disciplining. Not only was confessionalization a factor in Ottoman imperialism, according to Dr. Robert Clines in his dissertation:

> "Scholars such as Daniel Goffman and Tijana Krstić have demonstrated how confessionalizing impulses drove the Ottomans' efforts to ground their imperial ideology in religious orthopraxy. This enabled them to participate in a religio-imperial rivalry with the papacy and the Hapsburgs, which resulted in a type of "Euro-Ottoman symbiosis" that rendered the Ottoman Empire more like its European counterparts than has been previously acknowledged."[46]

This is significant because it shows that the Ottoman shift in focus on their Muslim identity was not simply to accommodate their rising Muslim population, it was a conscious effort made on behalf of Ottoman imperial ideology for the purpose of competing in the early modern competition for dominion. By the late 16th century, the Ottoman Empire had nearly seen the climax of its territorial expansion and was closing in on naval dominance over the Mediterranean Sea. Losing this advantage after the Ottoman defeat at the battle of Lepanto in 1571, the Ottomans continued to compete with their European counterparts in regards to colonial expansion, establishing naval dominance and forging alliances in Ethiopia and Southeast Asia.[47] Like with European imperial efforts, this was an attempt at affirming their own dominion to

---

[45] Robert Clines, "Confessional politics and religious identity in the early Jesuit missions to the Ottoman Empire." Ph.D. diss., Syracuse University, 2014.
[46] Cline, "Confessional politics," 8.
[47] Inalcik, et al, *The Ottoman Empire,* 882.

further support their claim to *dominium mundi*, or world dominion, both economically and militarily.

With *ius gentium* being reinvented to support the sovereignty of Protestant princes, it could also be used to support the Ottoman claim to *dominium mundi*, with Catholics viewing the Protestant-Ottoman relationship as a de facto alliance against the supremacy of the Church. In the eyes of the Ottoman's, the sultan's claim to sole sovereign ruler had been established through successful conquests and sustained dominion in Europe, Asia, and Africa, conquests which would have been seen as victories granted by divine providence, especially according to the ideas promoted by Wycliffe and Fitzralph. These acts of divine providence, having aided the cultural and military expansion of the Ottoman state, would be seen as undoubtedly resting with the Ottoman sultan, who naturally inherits the scepter of King Solomon according to Ottoman tradition.

In the writings of Sinan, we can see that this idea of divine providence was well established and contributed to the growth and renaissance that occurred within the Ottoman state. This is indicated multiple times in Sinan's given credit to God for guiding the construction of his Friday Mosques, including his Temple of Solomon manifested in the Suleymaniye Mosque. Despite being Muslim, the concept of divine providence which resonated with Christians in Europe had the same effect with the Ottomans, especially considering that both Christians and Muslims worship the same god and share many of the same religious texts. Therefore, for the Ottomans, not only did they hold themselves as a sovereign empire to the standards of *ius gentium,* they were faced with the challenge of holding Islam and Islamic imperialism to the same standards, an attempt made through strict adherence to the aforementioned doctrine of confessionalization. Considering the hostility that much of Europe had towards the Muslim - Ottoman state, one might have difficulty in understanding why the Ottomans would have wanted to submit to European standards of dominion and sovereign rule established by the Catholic Church.

There are two things that must be considered here: the Ottoman cultural competition with Europe and their position in European politics. To ultimately claim dominion over Christianity by Europe's own standards, the Ottoman Empire would have established itself as the rightful *dominus mundi*. In regards to European politics, the Ottoman Empire was not only the great enemy to the east, they were Europe's access to the Silk Roads and to Asia, one of the main reasons that Christian nations began their own naval expeditions to the Indian Ocean in the late 15th century.[48] The Ottoman Empire also held dominion in the Balkans from the early days of the empire until the 20th century. As we have seen with the origin of many Kul and Valide sultans, the Balkans had always been integral to Ottoman history, culture, and expansion. According to historian and professor Daniel Goffman:

> "Even as Sultan Suleyman challenged Emperor Charles V on the Mediterranean Sea and the Balkans militarily and ideologically, Ottoman subjects busily wove together the social fabric of Ottoman and Christian Europe…What emerged by 1700, however, was an almost universal perception of the Ottoman Empire as a European state."[49]

Thus, like European Protestants, the Ottomans were not submitting to Catholic standards of imperialism and sovereign rule, they were competing with them in an attempt to establish Ottoman, Islamic supremacy over a united world commonwealth. However, in this competition with Christian European powers, we do not see the Ottoman Empire acting as a mere adversary to Christian Europe. Instead, we see the Ottoman Empire acting as a European power competing with its Christian contemporaries, despite their Islamic state religion, over Ancient Roman concepts which sought to justify *dominium mundi* over a world commonwealth, a concept that was first established by the Roman idea of *Imperium*.[50] In other words, the Ottomans competed in the Western race to establish a united world commonwealth under the rule of a singular,

---

[48] Inalcik, et al, *The Ottoman Empire,* 767-883.
[49] Daniel Goffman, *The Ottoman Empire and early modern Europe*. (Cambridge University Press, 2002,) 18.
[50] Grant, "Francisco de Vitoria and Alberico Gentili," 910-952.

sovereign prince who would successfully inherit the mantle of the Roman Empire as determined by God.

In returning to the idea of imperial architecture and its role in establishing dominion, the Ottoman Empire not only had the right to claim Roman succession through right of conquest, blood ties to Europe, or a Roman past, the state religion of the Ottomans equally holds Roman continuity that contributes to the validity of this argument. With Islamic dominion being a defined characteristic of Ottoman conquest, it is significant to note the Roman influence on Islamic architecture that helped shape and define aspects of not only Ottoman, but Islamic culture. As we are left with many architectural examples to show this occurrence throughout the Mediterranean region as Islam spread from the Arabian peninsula and interacted with Roman visual and material culture, we can turn to the oldest surviving example of Islamic architecture which emulates the intertwined diffusion of Islamic and Roman cultural influences in the territories of the former Roman Empire - the Dome of the Rock. This Abrahamic shrine which continues to stand at the center of the Al-Aqsa Mosque complex serves as an adequate example in justifying Islam in a stand-alone capacity as capable of claiming Roman heritage through syncretic cultural influences.

With Islam being introduced as a new world religion in the 7th century, it is understandable that Islamic architecture would take influence from the imperial Christian engineering of the Romans. Though historians argue what aspects of the Dome of the Rock definitively come from a precedent in Roman architecture, it is apparent that the structure takes on the rotunda plan and domed architecture which emerged from Ancient Rome and was further developed by the Byzantines.[51] Another interesting Roman feature of the Dome of the Rock is the columns which support the drum of the dome and the ambulatory. Made of marble and adorned with double volute Corinthian capitals, these columns were taken from Byzantine churches in

---

[51] Grant, "Francisco de Vitoria and Alberico Gentili," 910-952.

Jerusalem and reused in to support the structure.[52] Distributing the weight of the drum onto the columns, the arches of the shrine's interior also show Roman continuity, displaying both a stylistic and structural engineering component known as "ablaq". Literally meaning piebald, referring to alternating rows of light and dark stones or brick, historians have argued that ablaq was developed in Syria from Byzantine Opus Listatum, as famously seen on the walls of Constantinople.[53] Having origins in Byzantine architecture both stylistically and practically for the purpose of reducing material usage by having one row stone and the other brick, this became widely used in Islamic architecture. By the late Middle Ages, it is apparent that ablaq had been adopted as a stylistic cosmetic in both churches and mosques throughout the Mediterranean, becoming established as an Islamic architectural art form which had also been widely adopted and co-opted by the Ottomans, especially Sinan, in their own architectural feats. In special regards to Sinan, we can see this ablaq style being used in many of his buildings, especially in both his Suleymaniye Mosque and Selimiye Mosque.

As we can see, Islam did not seek to alienate Roman culture but rather embraced it. Like the Ottoman conquest of Constantinople, the adoption of Roman culture in Islam served as proof of dominion and solidified Islam's imperial claims. In this Muslim adoption of a near continuity of Roman traditions, it is necessary to view Islam as equally a Roman tradition as Christianity. Both religions were based on a precedent of Judaism and saw their rise in the Near East. Both religions spread throughout the territories of the former Roman Empire. Both religions came to dominate a former capital of the Roman Empire. Both religions adopted Roman art and architectural practices. Whereas Christianity saw a Roman adoption of Jewish traditions, Islam saw a Roman adoption of Arab and Persian traditions. With Roman culture itself already embracing a syncretic form of various cultures from within the borders of its empire, the addition of Islam to this syncretism does not constitute the death of Romanism. Despite the collapse of

---

[52] M. Anwarul Islam and Zaid F. Al-Hamad. "The dome of the rock: Origin of its octagonal plan." *Palestine exploration quarterly* 139, no. 2 (2007): 109-128.

[53] Mehrdad Shokoohy, "Terry Allen: A Classical Revival in Islamic Architecture," xi, Wiesbaden: Dr Ludwig Reichert Verlag, Wiesbaden, 1986." *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 52, no. 1 (1989): 141.

the Roman Empire itself, Romanism survived within the Byzantine Empire, it survived in the populations which resided in the territories of the former Roman Empire, and it survived in Islam. This is not only an observation made from the view of a contemporary lens with a biased angle towards proving Roman elements in Islamic architecture. In 16th century Spain, Christian architects also marveled at the sight of Islamic architecture conjured by the Moors. In their analyses of Moorish engineering, they themselves were able to draw connections to Vitruvian features, with architectural historian Cammy Brothers writing: "For example, Ambrosio de Morales and Alonso de Morgado, in 1575 and 1587, saw Vitruvian features in the mezquitas of Cordoba and Seville, and as a result concluded that their origin must be Roman rather than Moorish."[54]

In conclusion, we return to the claim that the Ottomans rightfully held dominion over the continuity of the Roman Empire. As seen in pages prior, the view of Islam as having been greatly influenced by the surviving culture of the Roman Empire only further supports the Ottoman claim to the Roman throne. This is significant because, as previously mentioned, the 16th century witnessed a shift in Ottoman policy from placing an emphasis on European dominion to one focused on religious piety and Islamic imperialism along the lines of religious confessionalization. If we are to view Islam as a promoting factor of Roman tradition in the Mediterranean region, then the Ottoman focus on religious piety only accentuates the legacy of the Ottoman Roman aristocracy and non-Muslim European and Rum descent of the Ottoman sultans. Just as significantly, it complements the imperial Roman influences behind the ideology of Islamic imperialism surrounding the construction of Renaissance Ottoman architecture such as Sinan's Friday Mosques. As we have seen, Sinan's architectural accomplishments retain the overtones of Muslim dominion in the lands of the former Roman Empire and work to satisfy the Roman concepts of *ius gentium* and *imperium* as a means of proclaiming the Ottoman Empire as

---

[54] Cammy Brothers, "The Renaissance Reception of the Alhambra: The Letters of Andrea Navagero and the Palace of Charles V." *Muqarnas* 11 (1994): 79-102. 94.

having attained *dominium mundi*, marking them as the rightful rulers of a united world commonwealth as detailed by Jean Bodin and Francisco de Vittoria.

      With the entire European world competing over ideas of religion, sovereignty, and *imperium*, the Ottomans were no strangers to this heated tournament of warring nations, rather they placed themselves at the center of it. Though unsuccessful in claiming *dominium mundi*, as with all others who had made this imperial claim, the Ottomans were able to cement their dominion in Europe, Anatolia, and Northern Africa, regions which held long standing histories of Roman rule. This is significant because we can see that the Ottomans found themselves emerging as an empire of incredible cultural diversity, allowing for the cultural diffusion of various ethnic and religious groups into a recognizably Ottoman identity, one which was seen as different from solely Turkish or Balkan heritage. In this, we see Christians and Jews marrying Ottoman sultans and producing heirs. We see Muslim converts such as Kul rising through the ranks of the imperial court to the position of grand vizier. And from this we see the formation of an entirely Roman aristocracy under the rule of Suleyman I, a legacy which would more or less be maintained under Ottoman rule until the dissolution of the empire. With all of these elements coming together, we can view the Ottoman Empire as a culturally Roman state competing with its European contemporaries in the early modern period and which co-opted Islamic culture, including Islamic law, as a defining aspect of the Ottoman identity as a means of satisfying and reinforcing their imperial claims to *dominium mundi* in the face of Christian and Shia expansion. Thereby, as per the above stated reasons, the Ottoman Empire retained both the necessary and rightful elements culturally, geographically, and politically to claim the succession of the Roman Empire.

Bibliography-Primary Sources

Brothers, Cammy. "The Renaissance Reception of the Alhambra: The Letters of Andrea
Navagero and the Palace of Charles V." *Muqarnas* 11 (1994), 79-102.

Kavānin-i Yeniçeriyān, ms. in Topkapi Sarayi Museum, Revan K. nos 1319, 1320.

Pradus, Hieronymus. *Hieronymi Pradi ET Ioannis Baptistae Villalpandi e societate Iesv in
Ezechielem explanationes ET apparatus vrbis, ac templi Hierosolymitani: Commentariis
ET imaginibvs illvstratvs opvs tribvs tomis distinctvm quid vero singulis contineatur.* Vol.
3. 2017.

Sinan, Mimar. "Treatise on Architecture," Crane, Howard, and Esra Akin. *Sinan's
autobiographies: five sixteenth-century texts*. Brill, 2006.

Bibliography-Secondary Sources

Avcıoğlu, Nebahat. *The age of Sinan: Architectural culture in the Ottoman Empire.* (2006).

Clines, Robert J. "Confessional politics and religious identity in the early Jesuit missions to the
Ottoman Empire." PhD diss., Syracuse University, 2014.

Grant, Daragh. "Francisco de Vitoria and Alberico Gentili on the Juridical Status of Native
American Polities." *Renaissance Quarterly* 72, no. 3 (2019): 910-952.

Goffman, Daniel. *The Ottoman Empire and early modern Europe*. Cambridge University Press,
2002.

Inalcik, Halil, S. Tekeli, and G. Öney, *The Ottoman Empire: The classical age 1300-1600.*
Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 2013.

Islam, M. Anwarul, and Zaid F. Al-Hamad. "The dome of the rock: Origin of its octagonal plan."
Palestine exploration quarterly 139, no. 2 (2007): 109-128.

Krautheimer, Richard, and Slobodan Ćurčić. *Early Christian and Byzantine Architecture*. Vol.
    24. Yale University Press, 1992.

Necipoğlu-Kafadar, Gülru. "The Suleymaniye Complex in Istanbul: An Interpretation."
    Muqarnas, 1985, 92-117.

Setton, Kenneth M. "The Papacy and the Levant (1204-1571). Vol. IV: The Sixteenth Century
    from Julius III to Pius VI." *Memoirs of the American Philosophical Society Philadelphia,*
    162, 1984, 565-1179.

Shokoohy, Mehrdad. "Terry Allen: A Classical Revival in Islamic Architecture," xi, Wiesbaden:
    Dr Ludwig Reichert Verlag, Wiesbaden, 1986." *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and
    African Studies* 52, no. 1, 1989, 141.

Tanner, Marie. *Jerusalem on the Hill: Rome and the Vision of St. Peter's in the Renaissance.*
    Harvey Miller Publishers, 2010.

Wilkinson, Catherine. "Planning a style for the Escorial: an architectural treatise for Philip of
    Spain." *The Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 44, no. 1, 1985, 37-47.

"The Heart of The Home: An Analysis of Black Women's Resistance Within Domestic Positions During the Reconstruction Era"

Kerri Cook

Since the introduction of chattel slavery into the United States, the Black community was forced into a system of free labor, enslaved under the US's capitalist social structure. As the United States' sociopolitical foundation began to fracture under the pressures of westward expansion, the Civil War led the government to create the thirteenth amendment, which in turn legally abolished the enslavement of millions of individuals. In the period following emancipation, the United States government attempted to reconstruct American society and equip the Black community with tools to become successful citizens. Unfortunately, many people held tight to their confederate ideals and prejudiced outlooks, refusing to view Black individuals as citizens of the United States, creating new systems of oppression and exploitation of formerly enslaved peoples. Though the Civil War and the passage of the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth amendments legally ended slavery, it did not end the centuries of anti-black racism that had been built within the United States' political structure.[55] During this era of reconstruction, the Black community fought tirelessly for their freedom and equality within American society. Various social, political, and violent uprisings fought by both Black and

---

[55] Henry Louis Gates, *Stony the Road : Reconstruction, White Supremacy, and the Rise of Jim Crow*. (New York: Penguin Press, 2019).

White men during the reconstruction era have been studied thoroughly throughout history, however, the role of Black women in the reconstruction era are often overlooked in midst of these violent and turbulent uprisings. In this essay, I will explore how Black women utilized their roles as domestic workers to leverage their autonomy and citizenship by claiming their freedom and retaliating against years of brutality through acts of vigilante justice.

Under enslavement and continuing into the post-emancipation period, Black women faced unimaginable acts of violence against them. Often placed in precarious positions as domestic workers in White employers' homes, these women used their prominent and often overlooked positions of power at the heart of White employers' homes to fight back and cause political and social shifts. By analyzing excerpts from newspapers produced during the reconstruction era, we can see how Black women used their domestic positions to retaliate against their abusers and broader corrupt societal reconstruction reforms by administering poison to White perpetrators. These poisonings, whether executed individually or as a part of an alliance, collectively formed a successful domestic resistance to the reconstruction era violence and corrupt societal conditions that Black women faced on a daily basis. We will start by taking a closer look at the roles that Black women filled within the homes of their enslavers who continually sought to oppress them and how these practices carried into emancipation, as women attempted to lay boundaries with their employers. Next, we will examine and analyze newspaper excerpts from the reconstruction era that demonstrate Black women's resistance and vigilantism through their acts of poisoning their White tormentors. Lastly, we will explore how women's resistance impacted their experiences individually, and as a community when allied with prominent Black political candidates to create social change.

Oppression In The Midst Of Emancipation

The plantation household was the epicenter of chattel slavery. Slave owners would assign enslaved women to work within their homes. These women would cook, clean, and raise their oppressors' children; they ran the plantation households under the constant threat of violence. Once granted emancipation these women were not always able to leave their previous enslavers due to strict regional laws that restricted emancipated Black individuals from claiming their true freedoms; these suffocating set of laws were set in place to control everything from their right to marriage, property, and overall autonomy, in hopes of keeping an era of chattel-romanticism alive. Though they were federally legally sanctioned to leave the homes of their abusers, Black women who wished to leave the households of oppression often faced egregious post-antebellum state laws, or Black Codes, which were created by regional lawmakers intending to define freed peoples' new "rights" and responsibilities within society, these limiting laws were often passed in southern states and hindered the newly emancipated Black community by threatening violence or legal action.[56] This uncertainty led many women to continue to work within their domestic positions in their previous enslavers' homes. Through the sharecropping system of the post-emancipation era, it was a widespread practice for freedpeople to stay on their previous enslavers' plantations and continue to work the fields and be domestic servants. Ex-slave owners would now be employers and pay their newly emancipated employees a minimal wage while pushing the agenda of sharecropping as if they were doing the Black community a favor.[57] Emancipated individuals had little to no say in the crops they harvested and were required to rent tools to tend the same land they were made to work on as slaves; unavoidable debt from tool,

---

[56] Herbert C. Covey and Dwight. Eisnach. *How the Slaves Saw the Civil War : Recollections of the War through the WPA Slave Narratives*. (Santa Barbara, California: Praeger, an Imprint of ABC-CLIO, LLC, 2014,) P. 220-222
[57] Covey and Eisnach, *Civil War*, 235

land, and housing rentals was accumulated by those who fell victim to the illustrious illusions of

sharecropping creating another form of bondage between the emancipated community and their

previous oppressors.[58] To stabilize massive societal shifts, local governments sought to

continually oppress the Black community in hopes of continuing an era of chattel-romanticism.

When given their freedom many Black women sought to claim their autonomy, but this was not

always an easy feat as these women were never previously granted any inkling of equality or

self-governance. In the firsthand account of an emancipated woman, Jeptha Choice, she recalled

the news of her emancipation received on the plantation, stating,

> Some Federal provost officers on horseback, came to the plantation and told the
> old Missus to call everybody up to the house, and then read a proclamation saying
> that we niggers was as free as our masters; and not to work anymore unless we
> got paid for it–and that if we wanted to, we could have land free to farm.[59]

The news of emancipation brought hope to the Black community, and they were promised

equality and prosperity alongside the populations that benefited from their oppression. However,

the thought of true equality between both White and Black communities brought a wave of panic

over the post-antebellum south and previous enslavers fought with all their power to keep

equilibrium from being reached.

As leaving was not always an option for newly freed people, many were left with no

other option than to stay and try to claim their freedoms in a space where they were never

previously granted any. Black women spent their lives being abused, manipulated, and degraded

by their previous enslavers. Shifting to wage-labor contracted employment and placing

boundaries was a new challenge these women faced as mistresses were one of the most

prominent perpetrators of hellish punishments toward Black women running the household. The

---

[58] Susan A. Mann, "Slavery, Sharecropping, and Sexual Inequality." Signs 14, no. 4 (1989): 774–98.
http://www.jstor.org/stable/3174684.
[59] Covey and Eisnach, *Civil War,* 224

plantation household was the epitome of racial violence, where White mistresses were at the root of sadistic violence inflicted on Black domestic workers; for example, Mistresses would threaten Black women with the fear of being damned to hell for disobedience, verbal abuse, extreme beatings, slaps, pinches, burnings, and even murder.[60] In their positions as domestic workers, Black women were made to run their White employers' households while simultaneously running their own, creating a system of additional labor. With the promises that emancipation brought, Black women aimed to be the head of their own households and care for their own families while earning wages to support them. Unfortunately, White mistresses did not see Black women as capable or deserving of their own households and would call domestic workers "lazy" for not continuing to work as they did before emancipation.

Within a news article excerpt from 1868, we can observe how Black women were labeled as selfish for enforcing boundaries with their employers. The article titled "Domestic Dramas" states,

> When a wench gets very hungry and ragged, she is ready to do the cooking for
> any sized family, but after she gets her belly well filled with provender, she
> begins to don't see the use of working all day and every day and goes out to enjoy
> her freedom. She's free as anybody, and won't work if she don't want to.[61]

What was seen as laziness or unappreciativeness in the eyes of White women, could be seen as Black women claiming their autonomy and setting boundaries with their time and energy. The White community continually devalued Black women as mothers, Black women were most commonly employed in the domestic sphere as low waged cooks, maids, and nannies.[62] This

---

[60] Thavolia Glymph, *Out of the House of Bondage: The Transformation of the Plantation Household.* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 3-35. Accessed November 28, 2022. ProQuest eBook Central.

[61] "Domestic Drama", *Atlanta Daily New Era*, February 27, 1868. Georgia Historic Newspapers

[62] Nina Banks, "Black Women's Labor Market History Reveals Deep-Seated Race and Gender Discrimination." *Economic Policy Institute*, February 19, 2019. https://www.epi.org/blog/black-womens-labor-market-history-reveals-deep-seated-race-and-gender-discrimination/.

was the conundrum and contradictions of the reconstruction era expectations; White women thought Black women were poor mothers but in turn, relied on them to mother their own children. Without Black women's labor, the White domestic household would fall into disarray. Emancipated Black women understood their power within the heart of the White household and leveraged their necessity with their employers. In an effort to fully embrace emancipation, these women attempted to set boundaries as simple as saying "no" to a task, to be identified as individuals who had lives of their own, and to put an end to the violence inflicted upon them for it. Black women faced immense retaliation for their autonomous efforts, they were beaten, berated, raped, and killed by those who refused to see them as anything other than property. The government, the state, and its citizens did a great injustice to Black women by not legally enforcing what the reconstruction era had promised. Oftentimes, leading these women to take matters into their own hands and retaliate against their White oppressors by poisoning the very food they were ordered to make.

<div align="center">**Vigilantism In The Heart Of The Home**</div>

As Black women's battle for autonomy raged, the American government failed to properly support their efforts, leaving them alone in their fight. Examining publications from the reconstruction era, we can see how commonplace attempted poisonings were in post-antebellum society. In an article entitled "A Poisoning Case: A Negro Woman Attempts to Poison a Whole Family" published in *The New Orleans Daily Democrat* in 1877, we can see how Black women enacted vigilante justice upon those who committed acts of violence against them or their families. The article describes how emancipated domestic worker Sylvia Coffee, attempted to poison her employer Margaret Fox and her family. However, Coffee was caught poisoning the Fox family's morning coffee by a neighbor who was passing by the kitchen house and was

stopped before she could put her plan into action.[63] Clearly written and intended for a White audience, the article immediately villainized Coffee with no regard to the context of the attempted poisoning. The article quickly grazes over the fact that Fox's daughter assaulted Coffee's child by stating, "Mrs. Fox's daughter became involved in a difficulty with one of the negro woman's children, and it seems that the negro got the worst of the fight."[64] Examining this article with the context of Black voices during the reconstruction era, we can see how this poisoning was an attempt of vigilantism on Coffee's behalf. It is unknown if this was the first assault at the hands of the Fox family, but other similar examinations of freedpeople and their experiences in both enslavement and emancipation, it is likely that Sylvia Coffee and her family had faced many counts of violence and brutality at the hands of White oppressors.

Similarly, in an article published in the *Thibodaux Sentinel* in 1869, two Black domestic workers attempted to poison a group of eight White men who were employed on the plantation. The newspaper writes these women's efforts off as an act to "gratify a little spite entertained against one of the party."[65] With no explanation as to what transpired between these Black women and White workers, it makes way for a one-sided event in which this article illustrates these women as spiteful and vindictive, acting with little to no reason. Within articles from the reconstruction era the voices of emancipated Black women were silenced or misconstrued to be the villain of every situation strategically to ensure that their White counterparts stay in a position of power and maintain their image of guiltlessness following the abolition of chattel slavery. For some emancipated women, attempted poisoning was the only way out of a horrible

---

[63] "A Poisoning Case: A Negro Woman Attempts to Poison a Whole Family." Newspapers.com. *The New Orleans Daily Democrat*, June 2, 1877.
[64] "A Poisoning Case".
[65] "Black Women Cook Poison for White Employees on the Plantation." Newspapers.com, *The Thibodaux Sentinel*, April 10, 1869.

situation. Black women faced egregious vagrancy laws if they were to quit and risked violent retaliation through the implementation of high fines for being unemployed; many women were unable to pay these fines and would be imprisoned for their "vagrancy," this led to the cycle of peonage where these local legal systems would have Black women "pay off" their debts to the state through loaning them to do labor on various plantation properties.[66] Poisonings were a way for Black domestic workers to enact a form of justice when the state's judicial system was formed against them. By examining these articles from the reconstruction era, we can see how the White community did not recognize Black women as viable threats to racial equality, but as villains lurking within their homes ready to strike without reason. Looking deeper, from the emancipated women's perspective, we can observe how these poisonings were deemed necessary to create both political and societal shifts in racially prejudiced post-chattel society in order to claim their humanity and give weight to their claims of freedom through action.

When examining the actions of Black domestic workers, the act of poisoning could be viewed as an act of brutality in itself; but with the context of the injustices and acts of violence the reconstruction era brought, these attempted poisonings could be seen as necessary from the viewpoint of these women. The government had granted legal rights that they failed to uphold, creating a wave of regional laws placed to keep the Black community continually oppressed in the South. By examining an article entitled "A Child Attempts to Poison" published in *The Times Democrat* in 1866, we can observe the true desperation for justice and change in post-antebellum society.[67] The article describes the attempted poisoning of plantation Mistress, Madame Duval, at the hands of a child, Anne Stephenson, who was deemed "not yet of that age when the law

---

[66] N. Gordon Carper, "Slavery Revisited: Peonage in the South." *Phylon (1960-)* 37, no. 1 (1976): 85–99. https://doi.org/10.2307/274733.

[67] "A Child Attempts to Poison: New Orleans, Louisiana ." *The Times-Democrat,* May 11, 1866. Newspapers.com

presumes her acquainted with the distinction of right and wrong."[68] It is unknown why Anne Stephenson attempted to poison Madame Duval, but it demonstrates how these children were utilized in the fight for bodily autonomy at such a young age. These children underwent unimaginable horrors starting from a young age and waged with their own sense of autonomy in an age where children are not yet considered as an individual. In this case, It is likely that this child was prompted, or had observed the practice of administering poison and was almost successful in her attempt. The enlistment of a child in acts of vigilantism demonstrates the true anguish that Black domestic workers faced, where their children were not able to relish in their innocence, but rather were forced to face unimaginable acts of violence at the hands of bigoted persecutors and learn to fight for their freedoms from a very young age.

Conclusion: Community Ties and Collective Action

To the emancipated Black community, the amendments passed by the government proved to be empty words on a page as there was no action on the government or judicial systems part that provided true protection against the brutality of White supremacy. With little to no support, Black women in domestic positions used their integral positions in White employers' homes to ally with emancipated political vigilantes to assist in bringing social change for equality and safety for both themselves and their children.

Black domestic workers often allied with Black political candidates with hopes of creating lasting change in the post-antebellum United States. Historically, Black men have been frequently documented in their fight against racial inequality, but Black women, who were often at the heart of these efforts, are not as well documented within history. Using their positions in plantation households to aid the fight for equality shows their commitment and importance in the

---

[68] "A Child Attempts to Poison"

movement. A major contender in this fight was John Gair, an emancipated political candidate for

a post-slavery state. Gair, who was considered a threat to White supremacists as he exhibited

social power in his political position, was also seen as a symbol of hope to the emancipated

community in their quest for opportunity and equality. In newspaper articles produced during the

reconstruction era, there are recurrent mentions of Gair and his role in orchestrating domestic

workers' plantation poisonings. An article by the *New Orleans Republican* published in 1875,

describes the successful positioning of a White doctor named J.W. Saunders during the Clinton

Riots.[69] The woman responsible for the positioning was named Babe Matthews and was said to

be working in alliance with Gair. In turn, Matthews was hanged for her vigilantism, and Gair

was assassinated by White supremacists. This article paints emancipated Blacks as unfit for

political power or equality by stating,

> This is the last chance these functionaries [Gair, et al.] will ever have of aping the
> official is as certain as certainty can be. A few short months and they will only
> step down and out, with a full consciousness that never more will they occupy
> positions of knowledge and ability.[70]

Centuries of prejudiced racial outlooks limited emancipated Blacks from claiming their true

freedoms and humanity in the prejudiced eyes of the White community. Domestic worker Babe

Matthews was willing to die in hopes of equalizing the never-ending racial power struggle and

creating lasting societal change. By analyzing the deeper tones of these articles, it is clear the

turmoil that the Black community faced during the reconstruction era. Post-antebellum society

did not see the Black community as individuals, as they have always dehumanized them in order

to continually extort them for capital and personal gain. During the reconstruction era, Black

women fought for themselves and for their community by allying with each other. Black women

---

[69] "Woman Administers Poison to JW Saunders." *New Orleans Republican*, October 16, 1875. Newspapers.com.
[70] "Woman Administers Poison."

who were considered to be property all their life, were seemingly suddenly aiming to self-govern and claim equality. In reality, these women had been fighting for freedom and autonomy their entire existence even in the presence of chattel slavery. When these women in domestic positions allied with members of their community, they were able to aid in leading the future of their community into a new era of freedom.[71] Black domestic workers utilized their proximity and knowledge of their White perpetrators to enforce their own judicial system and claim their individual and communal liberties.

Black women faced unimaginable acts of brutality during their enslavement that continued into post-emancipation within their positions as domestic workers in White employers' homes. Through newspaper publications during the reconstruction era, we can see how these women used their prominent and often overlooked positions of power at the heart of White employers' homes to fight back and cause political and social shifts by enacting vigilante justice through the act of poisoning White oppressors. These poisonings, whether executed individually or as a part of an alliance, collectively formed a successful domestic resistance to the reconstruction era violence and corrupt societal conditions that Black women faced on a daily basis. Though these women were written off by White oppressors as villains attacking without cause, we can observe just how integral Black domestic workers were in the fight for autonomy within the reconstruction era. For Black women in the reconstruction era, acts of vigilantism through poisonings were essential to the protection, projection, and continuation of the true embrace of emancipation. Reconstruction after the Civil War proved to be brief and did not fulfill all that was promised to the millions of Black individuals who had overcome the unimaginable hell that is chattel slavery. Black women who had little to no other option than

---

[71] Martha A. Jones, *Vanguard: How Black Women Broke Barriers, Won the Vote, and Insisted on Equality for All.* (New York, NY: Basic Books, 2021).

staying in White households after emancipation utilized their constitutive positions at the heart of

the plantation household to create their own form of a judicial system in which they protected

their families, community, and rights as citizens of the United States.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

"A Child Attempts to Poison: New Orleans, Louisiana ." *The Times-Democrat*, May 11, 1866. Newspapers.com.

"A Poisoning Case: A Negro Woman Attempts to Poison a Whole Family." *The New Orleans Daily Democrat*, June 2, 1877. Newspapers.com.

"Black Cook May Have Set Fire." *The Times-Picayune*, October 18, 1875. Newspapers.com.

"Black Women Cook Poison for White Employees on the Plantation." *The Thibodaux Sentinel*, April 10, 1869. Newspapers.com.

"Domestic Drama.*" Atlanta Daily News Era,* February 27, 1868. Georgia Historic Newspapers.

"Woman Administers Poison to JW Saunders." *New Orleans Republican*, October 16, 1875. Newspapers.com.

Secondary Sources

Banks, Nina. "Black Women's Labor Market History Reveals Deep-Seated Race and Gender Discrimination." *Economic Policy Institute*, February 19, 2019. https://www.epi.org/blog/black-womens-labor-market-history-reveals-deep-seated-race-and-gender-discrimination/.

Brown, Leslie. *Upbuilding Black Durham Gender, Class, and Black Community Development in the Jim Crow South*. Chapel Hill, N.C: University of North Carolina Press, 2008.

Covey, Herbert C., and Dwight. Eisnach. *How the Slaves Saw the Civil War : Recollections of the War through the WPA Slave Narratives*. Santa Barbara, CA: Praeger Press, 2014.

Carper, N. Gordon. "Slavery Revisited: Peonage in the South." *Phylon (1960-)* 37, no. 1 (1976): 85–99. https://doi.org/10.2307/274733

Gates, Henry Louis. *Stony the Road : Reconstruction, White Supremacy, and the Rise of Jim Crow*. New York, NY: Penguin Press, 2019.

Glymph, Thavolia. *Out of the House of Bondage : the Transformation of the Plantation Household*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2008.

Hunter, Tera W. *To Joy My Freedom : Southern Black Women's Lives and Labors after the Civil War*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1997.

Jones, Martha S. *Vanguard: How Black Women Broke Barriers, Won the Vote, and Insisted on Equality for All*. New York, NY: Basic Books, 2021.

Mann, Susan A. "Slavery, Sharecropping, and Sexual Inequality." Signs 14, no. 4 (1989): 774–98. http://www.jstor.org/stable/3174684.

"Anti-War Movements in 1960s Riverside, CA"

Brianna Brizuela

Anti-War Movements in 1960s Riverside, CA

It is a known fact that the 1960s politics and social movements changed United States culture and national identity forever. You ask anyone to name a major historical event from the 1960s, and there will most likely be various answers due to the variety of political and social events that occurred. Though, one event that would be mentioned would ultimately outlast the 1960s, the Vietnam War. The Vietnam War originated out of internal conflicts between North and South Vietnam over forming their government as a newly independent state.[72] The United States was in the midst of a Cold War with the Soviet Union and was prepared to intervene anywhere to avoid the spread of communism, especially surrounding North America. The United States supported South Vietnam and sent American troops to fight North Vietnam forces and their communist allies from 1954-1973.[73] This ongoing war started massive unrest across the United States as the formation of the Anti-War movement began in the 1960s. Americans saw thousands of their fellow citizens sent off to war only to not return or return physically or emotionally injured.

The context of the anti-war movement and student movement is imperative to understanding the significance of the publicity and platform these individuals were able to attain.

---

[72] David R. Farber and Eric Foner, *The Age of Great Dreams: America in the 1960s*, 1st ed, American Century Series (New York: Hill and Wang, 1994), 120-125.
[73] Farber and Foner, *The Age of Great Dreams*, 120-125.

The Vietnam War and the anti-war movement public response showcases Americans changed from a passive stance on politics to an active stance. For instance, the increase of United States involvement in the Vietnam War was inevitable and was stated as "Vietnam was less a war to be won than a demonstration project illustrating how the United States could reshape a Third World revolutionary struggle".[74] This is critical to understanding the massive resistance to the Vietnam War because the United States ultimately cared more about the idea of 'saving' a Third World country from communism than actually helping the war effort and the citizens of North and South Vietnam. The United States wanted to go down in history as the hero, but would ultimately be remembered as the antagonist who hurt thousands of people due to being unable to accept defeat.[75] In a changing society, American citizens were not bystanders of the tragedies occurring overseas, but instead decided to publicly protest and challenge the Vietnam War and the United States involvement in it. For example, the origins of the Anti-War movement are where "Many people [...] learned to 'question authority.' [...] The faith of many Americans in their society's complex web of cultural authority and political legitimacy was weakened, even destroyed, by the government's failed policies in Vietnam".[76] Differences regarding the United States involvement in wars was not a new concept in the 1960s, but collectively and publicly doubting authorities and hosting huge gatherings in protest was. This shows how those in opposition to the Vietnam War and the growing losses of American citizens would actively participate in their democratic society to stand for change.

  I would like to emphasize how all of this social unrest and growing Anti-War movement came to California's city of Riverside. The local impacts of these significant movements and

---

[74] Farber and Foner, *The Age of Great Dreams*, 119.
[75] Farber and Foner, 119.
[76] Farber and Foner, 140.

events are not widely known, but they too made an impact socially, politically, and culturally. Riverside citizens demonstrated against the Vietnam War on pacifist and religious grounds and also appealed to local sentiment by consistently reporting the tragedies of the war. UC Riverside students demonstrated against the war on campus and off campus by protesting with their own Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) chapter and spreading the Free Speech Movement (FSM). Students rallied together with Riverside's community by holding all-night vigils, sit-ins, a love-in, and protests against business and military recruiter visits. In this paper, I intend to examine how both the citizens of Riverside, California, and the students at UC Riverside between 1965-1970 demonstrated and justified their anti-militarism in response to the ongoing anti-war and student movements occurring across America. Their demonstrations and published accounts are documented in local newspapers such as the *Press Enterprise*, as well as UC Riverside's *The Highlander*. These articles serve as primary sources of the community involvement and local activism that ultimately captured state government attention showing the significance of Riverside's activism. Riverside's activism mirrored nationwide community and student movements by adapting their own demonstrations and media stirrups to a local level. While there were more notable movements occurring across the United States, Riverside's community activism exhibited suburban unrest and challenged the Vietnam War.

I hope to deepen our understanding of anti-war protest during the 1960s by documenting what it looked like in the Riverside, California. The anti-militarism perspective was found in Riverside's community through one *Press-Enterprise* article from April 17, 1969; that also is a prime example of a young adult participating in anti-war activism. Vic Pollard introduces to readers to David Larson, a young 21-year-old Army Specialist of Riverside.[77] However, David

---

[77] Vic Pollard, "Riverside GI refuses Vietnam assignment; faces court martial," *Press-Enterprise*, April 17, 1969, Riverside Public Library.

Larson becomes a sought-after individual when he refused to report for processing to be sent to Southeast Asia for his next assignment.[78] Army Specialist Larson commented publicly stating "I said I would not serve in any combat or in direct support of any armed conflict. I recognize, by our own declaration of independence, every man's right to the pursuit of life [...] I don't feel that violence can be justified in pursuit of any goal worth obtaining".[79] Larson makes it clear he does not want to support any form of violence, nor does he think it's justified. He uses the Constitution to justify his refusal to commit violence by emphasizing his free will and his commitment to a pacifist perspective. Larson represented the young Americans who publicly challenge the government, or in this case the military authority, that is forcing them to go to Vietnam. This is significant because he remained firm with his pacifist beliefs against violence though it jeopardized his military career and reputation. While this did occur all across the country, Army Specialist Larson stands against Vietnam on Riverside's behalf. A local Riverside citizen participating in the movement truly shows the depth in which these movements touched down throughout America.

Moreover, David Larson ropes in an older Riverside veteran to speak out against the war, his father. Robert Larson who served as a Marine captain in South Korea, defends his son by publicly stating:

> " 'I think it would have been an easy course to spend his last few months of service in Vietnam [...] But I guess that doesn't face up to the fundamental moral issues with which our young people are wrestling with these days. [David's] right to his position is what our generation fought for 25 years ago. That is what freedom is all about' [...]".[80]

---

[78] Pollard, "Riverside GI."
[79] Pollard.
[80] "Father defends son's defiance of Army orders," *Press-Enterprise*, April 18, 1969, Riverside Public Library.

Here, we have an older Riverside citizen acknowledging David Larsons's use of the Constitution to justify his decision and defending it as a war veteran himself.[81] This shows the pacifist and anti-militarism groundings Riverside citizens used in their public demonstrations. Robert Larson understands his son's justifications and expresses his regard for free will. Robert Larson uses the phrase, "That is what freedom is all about" demonstrating the shared drive to honor the Constitution and the rights it promises its people. This connects to the larger themes of the 1960s such as counter-culture and the free-speech movement. It was about an American's right to freedoms and pursuit of life at their own discretion. While there were no doubt consequences to these themes all around, it was a constitutional right to demonstrate and to face the following consequences. Larson's father represents the nationwide anti-war movement and how it inspired thousands of people no matter their generation to speak up about Vietnam.

Furthermore, Riverside community activism led to the creation of the Riverside Peace Action Committee (RPAC) who exhibited their anti-war perspectives on the grounds of pacifist and religious convictions too.[82] The *Press-Enterprise* article from October 23, 1967 showcases the way the Vietnam War was discussed in a different light publicly.[83] *Press-Enterprise* journalist, Carrol Mills, notes that about 200 citizens gathered at Fairmount Park to hear Reverend Ronald Quinn and Revered Philip Smith discuss the meaning of life and the realities of supporting the Vietnam War.[84] Miller writes "Rev. Ronald Quinn told them, 'is killing of another, is violence in our streets, a decision of the big people or of all of us?' [...] The high school students, the college students, the university professors, the clergymen, the families - they

---

[81] "Father defends son's defiance."
[82] "Busy Day For SDS: Picketing And Love-In," *The Highlander*, May 24, 1967. Calisphere, University of California, Riverside Highlander student newspaper, Calisphere, https://calisphere.org/item/ark:/86086/n2vd71tp/.
[83] Carrol Mills, "Peace Service Protests war, affirms humanity," *Press-Enterprise*, October 23, 1967, Riverside Public Library.
[84] Mills, "Peace Service Protests."

were there to show their concern".[85] Miller's article here is critical because she highlights which parts of the community attended this discussion and the values they gather to represent. These groups of individuals share pacifist beliefs and are against the war on religious grounds. By attending this talk, they were consuming the same ideologies about the war that David Larson would reject his military orders on. This is very significant because it shows that pacifist and religious questioning of the Vietnam War was spread at a community event and initiated by religious leaders. It shows the origins of pacifism in Riverside and just how much the anti-war movement was a collective effort of the City of Riverside.

Even more so, the religious discussion of the morality of the war and the question "Why must we kill in order to save lives?" can be traced to other *Press-Enterprise* articles that bring the death toll to the forefront of Riverside's media coverage of the war.[86] One article dated November 11, 1967 reports, "A 19 year-old Riverside man was killed yesterday on the 7th day of a continuing assault by North Vietnamese forces [...][Mrs. Moore] said her son was reported missing in action Thursday, and his body was found yesterday".[87] This article brings the tragedies and loss occurring in the war front and center in Riverside. It makes sure to show that the Vietnam War has claimed one of Riverside's own youth. It invites community readers to join the anti-war movement by invoking local sentiments regarding the war losses. Those who may have attended the religious discussion in Fairmount Park a few weeks prior certainly bear witness to the ways the war has taken a local life. This exhibits the way in which the war was a prominent issue in Riverside and spread pacifist beliefs against the war. To contextualize Riverside's loss even further is the *Press-Enterprise* article that lists the names and photos of

---

[85] Mills, "Peace Service Protests."
[86] "Vietnam War claims 116 Riverside County men," *Press-Enterprise*, December 15, 1969, Riverside Public Library.
[87] "Riverside youth killed in action in Vietnam," *Press-Enterprise*, November 11, 1967, Riverside Public Library.

more of Riverside's own lost to the ongoing war.[88] The pages reveal the young faces of Riverside who will never return home and a few anecdotes about them. One story told is of George Inglalls, a Corona resident, who "[...] became the county's second winner of the Congressional Medal of Honor [...][because] Ingalls threw himself on an enemy grenade to save the lives of several buddies".[89] This just adds to the evidence that the Vietnam War did in fact impact the Riverside community directly and contributed to the growth of pacifist beliefs against the continuation of the war. Since the media consistently updated local losses regarding the war, the community was flooded with the negative aspects of the war. Just like the national demonstrations, it would stir nothing but motivation to act against the war but at a local level.

Moreover, after covering the community origins of the anti-war movement, I now want to focus on the UC Riverside student movement and demonstrations.[90] For context, the formation of activist groups such as the Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) greatly change the social and political environments of college campuses. SDS is described as a group who "[...] believed something had gone very wrong with America. [...][They] belonged to what was beginning to be called the New Left [and] dreamed of forging a new democracy in which all Americans could, and would, have a voice in their own communities and play a role in shaping their nations destiny".[91] The words "own communities" are very important because it connects to Riverside's own community activism and illustrates the way nationwide influence touched down in a local suburban city. The *Port Huron Statement* describes the values and goals of Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) as their inaugural document at the Port Huron Convention in 1962.[92]

---

[88] "Vietnam War claims 116. "
[89] "Riverside youth killed."
[90] Farber and Foner, *The Age of Great Dreams*, 138-141.
[91] Farber and Foner, 139.
[92] Tom Hayden, *The Port Huron Statement: The Visionary Call of the 1960s Revolution* (New York : [Berkeley, Calif.]: Thunder's Mouth Press ; Distributed by Publishers Group West, 2005), 43.

Tom Hayden, an SDS staff member, speaks to students directly stating "As a social system we seek the establishment of a democracy of individual participation, governed by two central aims: that the individual share in those social decisions determining the quality and direction of his life; that society be organized to encourage independence in men [...]".[93] Hayden wastes no time to ignite a fire in students across America to participate in their democracy and encourage independent thought. He makes sure to stress that they need to be a part of the decisions determining their life at a time where the draft is in command. Hayden does not only address activism, but also shares SDS's views on militarism and war. For instance, Hayden writes "[...] most Americans accept the military-industrial structure as 'the way things are' [...] and [...] that the arms race is important enough to sacrifice civil liberties and social warfare".[94] This emphasizes the way in which the PHS caused students to think critically about activism, militarism, and war. For once, they were encouraged to think and act for themselves through the media and publications being distributed to them. It exhibits the larger values and ideologies that UC Riverside students would consume when protesting against recruiters, hosting vigils, and spreading word of the horrors of the war.

Additionally, the student movement would grow with the formation of the Free Speech Movement. The Free Speech Movement originated out of UC Berkeley's administration rigidly regulating demonstrations and protests on their campus.[95] Students gathered and demonstrated for several months to defend their political freedoms.[96] The movement escalated as police began to arrest students and intervene in demonstrations while administration did not budge. There is

[93] Hayden, *Port Huron Statement*, 53.
[94] Hayden, 87-89.
[95] Downing Cless, "Unrest, insight and change at UC characterize year of FSM activity," *The Highlander*, September 13, 1965. Calisphere, University of California, Riverside Highlander student newspaper, Calisphere, https://calisphere.org/item/ark:/86086/n24q7xc6/.
[96] Farber and Foner, *The Age of Great Dreams*,196-197.

no doubt that Berkeley opened the door for student movements to spread across the nation. The Berkeley administration ended up allowing protests to ensure the "The Free Speech Movement" died away, but it was too late as it had already influenced university students beyond Berkeley and across America.[97] UCR's own *Highlander* covers Berkeley's series of incidents exclusively in their article from September 13, 1965.[98] Understanding the roots of the student movement is essential to understanding the significance of UC Riverside's efforts to be like their sister school and not back down.

UC Riverside's student activism was not entirely welcome by administration on the UC Riverside campus. The *Press-Enterprise* adds onto the news coverage by showing the chancellor's efforts to shut the protests down.[99] Tom Green discloses that Chancellor Ivan Hinderaker told students they "[...] face suspension and possible dismissal if they disrupt students, interviewers or the operation of the university".[100] This demonstrates an internal struggle between students and administrators, but both are dealing with severe topics. The students are battling for the right to assembly and freedom of speech and the administration is trying to maintain the status quo of the entire campus. Yet, the student activists and SDS members are being forced to stop or face suspension or worse. Green quotes Chancellor Hinderaker as stating " 'Academic freedom… cannot exist unless there are bounds set by law and regulation [...]' ".[101] This began an ongoing controversy between students and administrators. For example, UCR student activists did not stop their demonstrations, but rather

---

[97] Farber and Foner, 196-197.
[98] Farber and Foner, 196-197.
[99] Tom Green, "UCR Warns Protestors: Chancellor's Warning follows anti-military demonstrations," Press-Enterprise, November 11, 1967, Riverside Public Library.
[100] Green, "UCR Warns Protestors."
[101] Green.

went further and held a sit-in inside the lobby of UCR's administration building.[102] Tom

Patterson discloses that:

> "The group, calling itself the Coalition for Permanent Action, issued a leaflet saying 'The Chancellor's threat of immediate suspension [...] is typical of an authoritarian. It is becoming clear that administrators achieve rank at the university in proportion to the unthinking spasticity of their whip hand'".[103]

These are strong words of defiance from UCR's SDS members and students. They make it clear to the press and the community that they won't back down from their student movement by intervening on the decision made for them. It demonstrates the significance and power of the *Port-Huron Statement* amongst students at UC Riverside. These larger themes and ideologies were maintained and practiced in the local city of Riverside. It gained so much ground it began a push and pull between students and administrators.

UC Riverside students continued to challenge the administration on campus by publishing student opinions in their "Letters to the Editor" column in *The Highlander*.[104] This is very important because UCR students spoke in favor of Berkeley students and spread awareness to the student body of the regulations occurring at Berkeley. Since this was published in the school newspaper, it spread concern and worry at the UC Riverside campus of what kind of regulations they would have to face. For instance, a student makes their concerns about Governor Ronald Reagan known.[105] The student writes:

> "I heard vague rumors that [President Clark Kerr's] dismissal had to do with the riots in Berkeley. [...] Unruh on one side yell[s], " This administration is attempting to justify tuition as a punishment for student activists [...] On the other side was Reagan insisting that the money situation was tight and that he could not spare the money for the

---

[102] Tom Patterson,"30 students sit in, 'reject' UCR policy," Press-Enterprise, October 29, 1968, Riverside Public Library.

[103] Patterson, "30 students."

[104] "Letters to the Editor: Confusion," *The Highlander*, February 14, 1968. Calisphere, University of California, Riverside Highlander student newspaper, Calisphere, https://calisphere.org/item/ark:/86086/n23n25r4/.

[105] "Letters to the Editor: Confusion."

47

University. [...] Why were we UCR students never consulted concerning these proposed standards of conduct? What is a student to do? Is the community afraid of students?".[106]

The student's open letter to the editor here illustrates the frustration felt by students amidst the disputes with administrators and state authorities over student rights and university regulations. This is a UC Riverside student sympathizing with Berkeley and questions their fellow students about the same issue at UCR. The student questions the student body collectively to think independently about how to proceed. This connects directly to the PHS value of being a part of major social decisions. The student's published opinion here had potential to be influential on the student body and push students to go even further with the movement. It did in fact push UC Riverside students to continue demonstrating, so much so they captured state government attention.

Moreover, one *Press-Enterprise* article from November 9, 1967 showcases the anti-militarism presence at UCR's campus.[107] Green disclosed that UC Riverside students had been protesting several military recruiters and also employment recruiters from chemical organizations and weapon test centers.[108] Green writes "Twenty-five persons sat down at the entrance to a UCR office yesterday to protest the presence of two Air Force recruiters who were spending the day on campus".[109] This is an important primary source because it provides an account of the growing anti-militarism and counter-patriotism within UC Riverside. The students were publicly taking up space and making noise with their "Immolation Army Band".[110] This not only would embarrass UCR administration and antagonize visiting recruiters, but illustrates the

---

[106] "Letters to the Editor: Confusion."
[107] Tom Green, "UCR students sit down in protest of recruiters," *Press-Enterprise*, November 9, 1967, Riverside Public Library.
[108] Tom Green, "UCR students sit down in protest of recruiters."
[109] Green.
[110] Green.

presence of the anti-war movement and student movement in Riverside. Exhibited here is one of the grounds in which community activists and students fought against the war - anti-militarism and anti-patriotism. It has to be noted that UC Riverside students protests expanded so much that it was documented by the *Press-Enterprise* for years. It was not just a onetime event and this highlights the impact of the students alone.

Furthermore, UCR had its own chapter of Students for a Democratic Society that was founded in 1965.[111] SDS had already shared its values and goals nationwide in the early 1960s as seen in Tom Hayden's *Port Huron Statement* (PHS).[112] However, these values were translated onto UC Riverside's campus and can be identified within *The Highlander* newspapers. One *Highlander* article from May 24, 1967, describes the outreach of UCR's SDS activism on campus and off campus all throughout Riverside.[113] For example, the writer notes that "In the late morning and early afternoon hours, SDS, in conjunction with the Riverside' Peace Action Committee (RPAC) picketed March Air Force Base. March was holding an open house for the public. The occasion was Armed Forces Day".[114] This is a significant primary source because it not only shows the momentum UC Riverside students had achieved, but it shows a collaborative effort between UCR students and the Riverside community. The public demonstration at March Air Force Base was primarily an anti-militarism perspective, but can also be interpreted as a pacifist effort.[115] For example, the article states "The picketers took the position that the public was coming to view weapons used to destroy human life in Vietnam, and that they should be aware of the use to which these weapons were being put".[116] The article continues to disclose

[111] Amanda Miller, "SDS Chapters 1962-1969," Mapping American Social Movements Project" University of Washington, https://depts.washington.edu/moves/sds_map.shtml.
[112] Hayden, *The Port Huron Statement*.
[113] "Busy Day For SDS: Picketing And Love-In," *The Highlander*.https://calisphere.org/item/ark:/86086/n2vd71tp/.
[114] "Busy Day For SDS."
[115] "Busy Day For SDS."
[116] "Busy Day For SDS."

that the activists had plans to hold a vigil for the Vietnam War and try to talk to the event

attendees about the realities of the war.[117] However, the activists were met with resistance at

March Air Force Base and were not allowed entry on the premises.[118] This was due to March

officials infiltrating SDS earlier in the week to discover and prevent their picketing plans.[119] This

SDS event showed the group's pacifist beliefs and their mission to participate in their democracy.

They wanted to make a change by spreading awareness of the violence and corruption of the

war. It echoes the PHS call to action and stress for independent thought regarding critical

political issues, like the Vietnam War. This is important because it shows that UC Riverside's

SDS chapter had obtained enough grounding for authorities to want to prevent their

demonstrations and outreach efforts at a suburban level.

In addition to the March demonstration being prevented, this 1967 *Highlander* article

describes a "Love-In" at Fairmont Park in Riverside.[120] The 'Love-In' is described as a musical

concert and gathering where "[...] participants passed out candy, cookies, flowers, and incense:

others blew bubbles. [...] Over the 10-hour period, two different bands played for the audience:

The House of the DBS, and The Backstreet Scandal".[121] While it seems to be more of a counter-

culture and young adult event, this 'Love-In' is an important public demonstration within the

Riverside community. Though this event is not framed or initiated as a demonstration, it exhibits

a gathering community where one can see Riverside citizens and UC Riverside students coming

together for one cause. The cause being love - love for one another in a humanitarian context that

---

[117] "Busy Day For SDS."
[118] "Busy Day For SDS."
[119] "Busy Day For SDS."
[120] "Busy Day For SDS."
[121] "Busy Day For SDS."

represents the pacifist views in the Riverside community. The public appearance identifies them in the same way the SDS students were identified at the base, as symbols of change.

Furthermore, UC Riverside's SDS chapter is documented as sponsoring a protest march and peace vigil in Downtown Riverside in remembrance of those lost to the Vietnam War.[122] Joel Blain's *Press-Enterprise* article from October 18, 1965, examines the efforts of SDS students. Blain describes the march saying it "[...] comprised mainly of students from the University of California, Riverside, paraded on Main street [...] distributing leaflets. [...][The leaflets] allege that the United States has violated the 1954 Geneva Accords respecting Vietnam [...][and] called for withdrawal of all foreign troops [...]".[123] This article exhibits a successful peaceful march by SDS students. It showcases that the anti-war movement and student movement was publicly visible and identifiable throughout the streets of Riverside. After the march, SDS students held a "[...] 24 hour protest of U.S. military involvement in Vietnam and an overnight vigil on the County Court House steps in Riverside [...]".[124] Student activists pulled off a successful march, but were unable to maintain a completely peaceful overnight vigil due to loud hecklers and citizens egging the SDS students sitting on the courthouse steps.[125] However, the student activists are described as staying strong and ended up converting those in disagreement with their cause into joining them on the steps.[126] The article puts into perspective the true peaceful and nonviolent essence of the students by stating "The Group broke up exactly at noon yesterday, after washing down the egg splatters with soap and water, cleaning up papers, coffee cups and other litter".[127] This is an incredible primary source because it emphasizes the student movement

---

[122] Joel Blain, "Vietnam protest march comes off peacefully," *Press-Enterprise*, October 18, 1965, Riverside Public Library.
[123] Joel Blain, "Vietnam protest march."
[124] "Students end quiet protest vigil," *Press-Enterprise*, October 18, 1965, Riverside Public Library.
[125] "Students end quiet protest vigil."
[126] "Students end quiet protest vigil."
[127] "Students end quiet protest vigil."

from UCR into the heart of the Riverside community. The leaflets from the march reflect the values Tom Hayden writes about in the PHS and the ways in which the war and military unrest did not just have to be accepted as is.[128] It shows how far the nationwide movements and anti-war ideologies reached UC Riverside students. It is significant in understanding Riverside's own social and political unrest. Here the students show they have done their political homework and are ready to ask others to do the same.

Finally, the significance of Riverside's community and student activism is seen in the conservative backlash against Riverside's progression and attained platform. It is seen in UCR's largest student protest that captured the attention of the state government and Governor Ronald Reagan.[129] J.D. Warren contextualizes why university students detested Governor Reagan by stating "Reagan realized a hard line on student protests would boost his populist stock with the growing California conservative movement. Once in office, one of his first orders of business was to dispatch UC President and icon Clark Kerr, a liberal who he had named as the person responsible for Berkeley's unrest".[130] This is important because Reagan made clear he would do whatever it takes to be elected, even if it meant sacrificing student's right to assembly and freedom of speech. It justifies UC student movements and showcases their public platform in uniting against Regan. Warren states that Reagan was scheduled to visit UC Riverside's Air Pollution Research Center to promote his re-election campaign.[131] However, UCR students reminded him of his actions against Berkeley. Warren writes:

> "[...] Reagan's procession [...] was met by 300 protestors who had migrated from a planned 2pm protest at the bell tower. Their signs read 'Four years is enough,' and 'Keep UC Free' [...] 25 Riverside police officers streamed from the Fawcett laboratory in riot

[128] Hayden, *The Port Huron Statement*, 87.
[129] J.D. Warren, "The day the '60s protest movement came to UCR," University of California, Riverside, March 11, 2020, https://news.ucr.edu/articles/2020/03/11/day-60s-protest-movement-came-ucr.
[130] Warren, "60s protest movement."
[131] Warren, "60s protest movement."

gear [...] They made a "V" formation and cleared the road, wielding billy clubs and shoving students out of the way".[132]

Warren here shows just how far UC Riverside student movements had grown and the platform they achieved by forcing Governor Reagan to leave. This illustrates the power of UCR's student movement and their direct influence from the nationwide ideologies of pacifism, SDS's participatory democracy and the Free-Speech movement. It showcases the impact of a smaller scale university in a suburban city. These cities too, were able to partake and demonstrate their anti-war movement and student movement and also capture attention of the state officials.

One last example of Riverside obtaining the attention of state government officials is George Wallace visiting Riverside's Ramona High school for a talk. Green introduces readers to Ken Katz, a 24-year-old "[...] young man who, in 1961 graduated as a superior student from Ramona [High School]. But there he was, back at Ramona, threatening to start a shouting match with the former governor of Alabama".[133] Ken Katz was attending a presentation from George Wallace discussing the House Un-American Activities Committee (HUAC) whose primary focus was to investigate community insurgencies and suspicious activity that could be linked to Communist ties.[134] Needless to say, George Wallace's presentations and claims were not welcomed by a majority of the activists in attendance. David Knopf of *The Highlander* writes "The second walkout occurred when Wallace attacked the dissenters of the Vietnam War. After this walkout a youth was forcibly evicted when he tried to ask a question".[135] Knopf here is

---

[132] Warren, "60s protest movement."
[133] Tom Green, "A young activist explains why he continues to stir things up," P*ress-Enterprise*, November 12, 1967, Riverside Public Library.
[134] "House Un-American Activities Committee," Harry S. Truman Library, *National Archives*, https://www.trumanlibrary.gov/education/presidential-inquiries/house-un-american-activities-committee.
[135] David Knopf, "Wallace Invades Riverside: Met by Cheers, Protestors," *The Highlander*, November 8, 1967. Calisphere, University of California, Riverside Highlander student newspaper, Calisphere, https://calisphere.org/item/ark:/86086/n2q81gds/.

referring to Ken Katz who could not stand Wallace's racist and elitist claims. Green quotes Katz as stating, "[Wallace] had a right to speak, but he did not have a right to go unchallenged".[136] I want to emphasize "unchallenged" because it connects to the sole purpose of SDS which was to challenge authorities and participate in politics. Ken Katz was only practicing the rights Larson declared, Berkeley students declared, and Hayden declared. Both articles are a prime example of the state government attention Riverside received.

Overall, the 1960s were full of change politically and socially across the nation. Nationwide movements against the Vietnam War were most definitely present within suburban communities and college campuses. The city of Riverside and UCR students demonstrated and justified their anti-militarism in response to the ongoing anti-war and student movements occurring across America. Local newspapers such as the *Press Enterprise*, and UC Riverside's *The Highlander* showcase the pacifist, religious and local groundings in which the community and student activism demonstrated. Together, these primary sources tell a different story about the 1960s activism. They provide an intimate look of how nationwide movements translated to local levels and made just as a powerful impact that is too often overlooked.

---

[136] Knopf, "Wallace Invades."

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Blain, Joel. "Vietnam protest march comes off peacefully." *Press-Enterprise*, October 18, 1965,

     Riverside Public Library.

Cless, Downing. "Unrest, insight and change at UC characterize year of FSM activity." *The*

     Highlander, September 13, 1965. Calisphere, University of California, Riverside

     Highlander student newspaper, Calisphere,

     https://calisphere.org/item/ark:/86086/n24q7xc6/.

Green, Tom. "A young activist explains why he continues to stir things up." *Press-Enterprise*,

     November 12, 1967, Riverside Public Library.

Green, Tom. "UCR students sit down in protest of recruiters." *Press-Enterprise*, November 9,

     1967, Riverside Public Library.

Green, Tom, "UCR Warns Protestors: Chancellor's Warning follows anti-military

     demonstrations." *Press-Enterprise*, November 11, 1967, Riverside Public Library.

Knopf, David. "Wallace Invades Riverside: Met by Cheers, Protestors." *The Highlander*,

     November 8, 1967. Calisphere, University of California, Riverside Highlander student

     newspaper, Calisphere, https://calisphere.org/item/ark:/86086/n2q81gds/.

Mills, Carrol. "Peace Service Protests war, affirms humanity." *Press-Enterprise*, October 23,

     1967, Riverside Public Library.

Patterson, Tom. "30 students sit in, 'reject' UCR policy." *Press-Enterprise*, October 29, 1968,

Riverside Public Library.

Pollard, Vic. "Riverside GI refuses Vietnam assignment; faces court martial." Press-Enterprise,

April 17, 1969. Riverside Public Library.

Press-Enterprise. "Father defends son's defiance of Army orders." April 18, 1969, Riverside

Public Library.

Press-Enterprise. "Riverside youth killed in action in Vietnam," November 11, 1967, Riverside

Public Library.

Press-Enterprise. "Students end quiet protest vigil." October 18, 1965, Riverside Public Library.

Press-Enterprise. "Vietnam War claims 116 Riverside County men." December 15, 1969,

Riverside Public Library.

The Highlander. "Busy Day For SDS: Picketing And Love-In." May 24, 1967. Calisphere,

University of California, Riverside Highlander student newspaper, Calisphere,

https://calisphere.org/item/ark:/86086/n2vd71tp/.

The Highlander. "Letters to the Editor: Confusion." February 14, 1968. Calisphere, University of

California, Riverside Highlander student newspaper, Calisphere,

https://calisphere.org/item/ark:/86086/n23n25r4/.

Secondary Sources

Farber, David R., and Eric Foner. *The Age of Great Dreams: America in the 1960s*. 1st ed.

American Century Series. New York: Hill and Wang, 1994.

Hayden, Tom. *The Port Huron Statement: The Visionary Call of the 1960s Revolution*. New

York : [Berkeley, Calif.]: Thunder's Mouth Press ; Distributed by Publishers Group West,

2005.

Miller, Amanda. "SDS Chapters 1962-1969." Mapping American Social Movements

Project, University of Washington, https://depts.washington.edu/moves/sds_map.shtml.

National Archives, "House Un-American Activities Committee." Harry S. Truman Library,
https://www.trumanlibrary.gov/education/presidential-inquiries/house-un-american-
activities-committee.

Warren, J.D. "The day the '60s protest movement came to UCR." University of California,
Riverside, March 11, 2020, https://news.ucr.edu/articles/2020/03/11/day-60s-protest-
movement-came-ucr.

"'A Deplorable Impression upon our People:' California Nativism and US-Japanese Relations"

Orlando Cabalo

Early 20th century California, like many parts of the American west coast, was rife with anti-Asian sentiment. Due to the relentless racism of key state leaders such as James Phelan, the San Francisco Mayor from 1897-1902 and later US senator, and corporate media, California became a breeding ground for racist exclusionary policies designed to curb what Phelan and the news media called the "silent invasion" of Asians into the United States. While animosity toward Asian immigration was nothing new in California by the 1910's, the early years of this decade proved to be pivotal to the development of state policies devised to handicap economic upward mobility of non-American born Asians in the state, by forbidding these individuals from owning or purchasing land. While the passage of the 1913 California Alien Land Law prevented any non-citizen from owning land, the intended goal of the legislation was aimed at denying Asians, and especially Japanese-Americans, from property ownership.[137] Combining explicit and heightened anti-Japanese sentiment coming from California, with already existing immigration laws which forbade Asians from becoming naturalized US citizens, the 1913 California Alien Land Law largely succeeded in its goal of denying Asian land ownership.[138] The purpose of this paper is to analyze how a coalescence of extremely anti-Asian actors in California negatively

---

[137] Thomas A. Bailey, "California, Japan, and the Alien Land Legislation of 1913." *Pacific Historical Review* 1, no. 1 (1932): 36–59. https://doi.org/10.2307/3633745.

[138] MountVernon.org. "Naturalization Acts of 1790 and 1795." George Washington's Mount Vernon. Accessed February 25, 2023.

impacted US-Japanese relations in the early 1910's, culminating in the 1913 Alien Land Law and its aftermath.

Through an examination of California's broader impact on the world stage, through the exclusionary 1913 Land Law and growing anti-Asian sentiments, this work will provide a more complicated insight into the awkward relationship the United States had with the Imperial Japanese government of the early 20th century and attempts by the Wilson administration to maintain a friendly posture with Japan while also placating the racist anti-Asian white constituents in California. While anti-Japanese sentiment certainly predates the passage of the 1913 Alien Land Law, and increases after it, an analysis of this state legislation and its repercussions reveals the interwoven network of state actors who, for a series of racist intentions, coalesced in advocating for anti-Japanese measures and pushed for even more stringent policies to prevent Asian upward mobility. By the early 1910's, ideological investment in Japanese exclusionism was embedded into the framework of California's political system; which can be seen through corporate newspapers which incited anti-Asian fervor, state political leaders who doggedly pursued creating these racist state policies, and pivotal California organized-labor officials who sought to protect their white membership from market competition of Japanese laborers.

The deeply-rooted and interwoven anti-Japanese sentiment in California is best illustrated by key founding labor leaders in the state, like Olaf Tveitmoe, a prominent San Francisco trade-unionist, who had close ties to city politics and was a founding member and president of the Asiatic Exclusion League (AEL). Highlighting its nativist extremism, the AEL sought to push for the segregation of Asian students in San Francisco schools, and even attempted to strike down the 1913 California Alien Land Law through a statewide petition in order to adopt an even

59

more stringent punitive land law.[139] While this research is critical in examining the systemic ties between California institutions and staunch anti-Japanese sentiment, this paper also analyzes how the state's 1913 Land Law was received by the Imperial Japanese government and Japanese-Americans. Further, this work will highlight how the Wilson administration attempted to balance and maintain US-Japanese relations to ensure that the United States would remain a "white-man's country," as espoused by California leaders like Phelan.[140] As will be discussed, the passage of this Land Law was received by Japanese officials and subjects as a bitter insult, resulting in many disputes between US and Japanese diplomats who attempted to resolve what would be referred to as the "California controversy."[141]

San Francisco: A Nest for Nativism

Laying bare the political factions around Asian exclusionism, demonstrates that the fight to disempower and segregate Japanese in California was a long-standing effort amongst state policymakers and citizens. Beginning with labor organizations, as more moderate unions like the American Federation of Labor (AFL) focused on organizing white workers who specialized in certain trades, much of the institutional California labor movement followed in a similar vein.[142] Many of the left-leaning Building Trades in California which were affiliated with the AFL, especially in San Francisco, were embroiled in and heavily tied to fierce anti-Asian advocacy groups which sought to close Asian immigration into the United States, which economically

[139] *Sausalito News*, Volume XXVIX, Number 21, 24 May 1913. - California Digital Newspaper Collection, 1913.
[140] James Phelan, "Telegram defending CA Alien Land Law." *The Papers of Woodrow Wilson Digital Edition.* Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, Rotunda, 2017.
[141] *New York Times* ,1914. " US-Japanese Relations." *The Papers of Woodrow Wilson Digital Edition.* Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, Rotunda, 2017.
[142] *San Francisco Call*. Volume 97, Number 168, 15 May 1905. - California Digital Newspaper Collection. Accessed February 25, 2023.

disadvantaged Asians already residing in America.[143] Central to this ideology were key state

labor leaders, like Olaf Tveitmoe, who was both a prominent official in California Building

Trades and briefly the Vice President of Building Trades for the American Federation of

Labor.[144] Concurrent to Tveitmoe's leading role in California's labor movement was his deep

involvement and leadership in anti-Asian organizations which spread across the Pacific Coast as

far reaching as Canada, as stated through his development of the Asiatic Exclusion League

(AEL).[145] Being the President and one of the founding members of the League from 1905 to

1912, Tveitmoe oversaw major policies the AEL advocated for, which ultimately affected U.S.

policy toward Asian immigration, especially from Japan. As the organization was initially known

as the "Japanese and Korean Exclusion League" until its renaming in 1907, one of the first major

acts of the League was to fiercely push for school segregation of Japanese and Korean students

in San Francisco in 1906.[146]

 This intense anti-Asian fervor spouted by many white Californian's involved in labor

organizations, the AEL, and corporate news organizations culminated in a large race riot

targeting Asians and especially Japanese in San Francisco in 1907.[147] The result of this riot led to

the Roosevelt administration creating the 1907 Gentlemen's Agreement which officially barred

Japanese immigration to the United States and was a tactic between the two nations to reduce

inflamed anti-Asian tensions.[148] The explosive growth and power of the League is further spelt

---

[143] Kornel Chang, "Circulating Race and Empire: Transnational Labor Activism and the Politics of Anti-Asian Agitation in the Anglo-American Pacific World, 1880-1910." *The Journal of American History* 96, no. 3 (2009): 678–701. http://www.jstor.org/stable/25622474.

[144] *Organized Labor*, Volume 6, Number 23, 1 July 1905. - California Digital Newspaper Collection. Accessed February 25, 2023.

[145] Chang, "Circulating Race and Empire,"

[146] *Evening Star.* (Washington, DC), Dec. 18, 1906. Pg 24 https://www.loc.gov/item/sn83045462/1906-12-18/ed-1/.

[147] *Evening Star,* 24.

[148] *Evening Star,* 24.

out in the December 18th 1906 edition of the Evening Star (Washington D.C.), in which the

Roosevelt administration released a detailed report on what the newspaper described as

"Japanese Troubles" in San Francisco, spurred on by the Asiatic Exclusion League and by the

"Cooks and Waiters' Union Local 30" who organized a boycott against Japanese restaurants and

urged "White men and women [to] patronize your own race."[149] A report by the Roosevelt

administration found that the AEL was "composed almost entirely of members of labor

organizations," as anti-Asian sentiments were far reaching across labor relations.[150] The

League's 78,500 members, who were primarily in the San Francisco area, further reveals its

impact and its affiliations with Building Trades and major political actors across the Pacific

Coast, pushing for Asian exclusionism.

As author of the report, Victor Metcalf explains, "The action of the [San Francisco

school] board in the passage of the resolutions [mandating Japanese, Chinese, and Korean

student segregation] … was undoubtedly largely influenced by the activity of the Japanese and

Korean Exclusion League [aka Asiatic Exclusion League].[151]" With the widespread backing

from organized labor in San Francisco and support from political institutions, the rapid growth of

political power of the League demonstrates both the growing fear and animosity toward Japanese

in California.

Political Power and the 1912 Presidential Election

Highlighting the widespread institutional and public support for anti-Japanese

exclusionism is critical to setting the stage for analyzing the political forces surrounding the 1913

---

[149]*Evening Star,* 24.
[150]*Evening Star,* 24.
[151]*Evening Star,* 24.

California Alien Land Law, its supporters, opponents, and the balancing act the Wilson

administration was forced to walk between positive US-Japanese relations and what xenophobes

would call "coolie" immigration and "another race problem."[152] Throughout the early 1900's to

the late 1910's, two frequent arguments emerged from California nativists. The first argument

promoted heavily by labor leaders was that "if there is to lie a war between American citizens

and [Japanese] subjects, it will be fought on our own soil, and not with bullets, shells and other

implements of modern warfare, but with smaller pay, long working hours, insufficient food and

poor clothing.[153]" Showing that groups like the Asiatic Exclusion League feared that continued

immigration from Asian nations would result in lower wages for white workers, since the

aforementioned immigrants would accept lower pay and worse working conditions from their

exploitative employers. Their argument for exclusionism is combined with overtly racist and

stereotypical beliefs that Japanese immigrants were accustomed to 'living in squalor' and were

"a veneered Chinaman, with all the vices of their ancestors but few of their virtues.[154]" The

second argument, propagated by California political actors, was that the United States already

had a 'race problem.' Throughout news publications, California nativists consistently compared

Asian immigration and the already residing Asians in the state to black Americans living in the

South. Spreading Anglo fears of an Asian Pacific Coast and a black South. Therefore, groups

like the AEL acted as a political force pushing for Congress to close what they called

"unrestricted Oriental immigration.[155]" In short, by the Presidential election of 1912 and the later

1913 Alien Land Law, California nativist organizations like the League had become such a

---

[152] The term coolie throughout various California publications was used as a slur to refer to low-wage immigrant workers often from East, South, and Southeast Asia.

[153] *Organized Labor*.

[154] *Organized Labor*.

[155] *Organized Labor*.

powerful and far-reaching political organization that local and state politicians attempted to satiate members of the organization in exchange for support. .

Cementing the ties nativists made between comparing Japanese and Asians-widely to black Americans, James Phelan, wrote consistently to then Presidential candidate Woodrow Wilson in the 1912 election urging him to firmly speak against "Oriental coolieism" and advocate for closing Asian immigration to the United States.[156] At the time of the 1912 election, corporate newspapers owned by mogul William Randolph Hearst slammed President Wilson on supposedly supporting Asian immigration to the United States.[157] As yellow journalism was rampant during the early 20th century, Wilson released a public announcement in order to assuage fears of California nativists and win votes in the state. Demonstrating California's power on a national stage, Wilson refuted Hearst's claims that he supported Asian immigration by stating "in the matter of Chinese and Japanese coolie immigration I stand for the national policy of exclusion …We cannot make a homogeneous population out of people who do not blend with the caucasian race. … Oriental coolieism will give us another race problem to solve and surely we have had our lesson [referring to black Americans].[158]" As Wilson was in the middle of his run for President in the 1912 election, due to his own racist prejudices and the political reward of taking a popular stance like Asian exclusionism, it is apparent that these stances aligned with both Wilson's own political philosophy and California nativism.

In fact, correspondence to Wilson during his Presidential campaign reveals the political skirmish between newspaper-mogul William Hearst, Wilson, and attempts to gain favor with the

---

[156] James Phelan, "Letter to Wilson on 'Oriental Coolieism,'" *The Papers of Woodrow Wilson Digital Edition.* Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, Rotunda, 2017.
[157] Woodrow Wilson "Letter supporting a 'National Policy of Exclusion.'" *The Papers of Woodrow Wilson Digital Edition.* Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, Rotunda, 2017.
[158] Wilson, "Letter."

corporate newspapers. A letter from Chicago lawyer Roy D. Keehn, who was general counsel for the Chicago Examiner and the Chicago American (both Hearst owned newspapers) wrote to Wilson in 1912 explaining that "the [Presidential] ticket deserves the heartiest support of the Hearst papers and should get it. I believe I can offer some helpful suggestions, and it is for this reason only that I have written so freely. I know you understand that it is in the interest of the ticket only that I have made these suggestions.[159]" This document follows soon after the nomination of Wilson to the Democratic party ticket and infers that the Hearst-owned newspapers didn't support Wilson but there was room to win over the papers. Bringing it back to California specifically, it becomes apparent that the Hearst papers did not back Wilson, and instead were attempting to undermine his candidacy through claims he supported Asian immigration, as previously referenced. Correspondence between James Phelan and Wilson reveals the latter's motive to release a statement against Asian immigration in order to "effectually serve to silence Mr. Hearst.[160]" Attempting to parry attacks from Hearst-owned newspapers in California, this 1912 correspondence demonstrates the political popularity of the state's nativist forces like the Asiatic Exclusion League as it shows that Wilson felt it necessary to forcefully come out supporting Asian exclusionism, during the 1912 election in order to gain votes within Pacific coast states; especially California.

What this all ties back to, from the growing popularity of groups like the AEL to California's political influence in the 1912 election, is the fact that domestically, anti-Asian nativism was a political winner for politicians in the early 20th century. With Wilson's already existing racial prejudice, aligning himself with the goals of California groups like the Exclusion

---

[159] Discussion on getting Hearst Papers to Support Wilson 1912. *The Papers of Woodrow Wilson Digital Edition.* Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, Rotunda, 2017.
[160] James Phelan , "To Wilson on 'Silencing Mr. Hearst.'" *The Papers of Woodrow Wilson Digital Edition.* Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, Rotunda, 2017.

League, its affiliated labor unions, and state politicians were clear popular stances the then-Presidential candidate could take in order to garner votes in the state. And although Wilson ultimately lost California in the 1912 election, it is key to note that it was by a slim margin that broke for former President Theodore Roosevelt, under the banner of the Bull Moose Progressive Party.[161] It is equally important to emphasize that Roosevelt was responsible for officially closing Japanese immigration to the United States due to his signing of the Gentlemen's Agreement in 1907, which was a major goal of California nativists in order to end Japanese immigration. With that being said, this bolsters the fact that advocating for Asian exclusionism was very popular in California, especially for Presidential candidates.

Japan's Reaction to the California Land Law

This makes it exponentially more surprising that after taking office, the Wilson administration was heavily against the 1913 California Alien Land Law and its policy of stripping noncitizens from owning or purchasing real estate. The answer to this conundrum of why the Wilson administration would oppose this anti-Asian policy lies within international affairs between the Empire of Japan and the United States. The xenophobic policies, nativism, and outright violence inflicted on Japanese-Americans in California, time and again became international points of contention between the two Pacific nations. As nativist state legislators passed the 1913 Land Law, across the Pacific, Japanese subjects from "all classes and political affiliations" were left with a "deplorable impression," as politician and Japanese diplomat Baron Nobuaki Makino stated repeatedly to American officials.[162] The sheer and widespread anger that

---

[161] "1912 Electoral Vote Tally, February 12, 1913." National Archives and Records Administration. National Archives and Records Administration. Accessed February 25, 2023. https://www.archives.gov/legislative/features/1912-election.

[162] Nobuaki's Meeting with the American Ambassador on 1913 CA Land Law *The Papers of Woodrow Wilson Digital Edition.* Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, Rotunda, 2017.

was felt from Japanese society in response to the 1913 Land Law was made plain to American

diplomats who were told by officials like Nobuaki that, "agitations of serious magnitude had

broken out among certain quarters in Japan, and, while every endeavor was being made to

appease popular resentment, it would apparently be impossible, so long as the cause of

grievances was left unremedied, to remove the sentiments of grave concern and dissatisfaction at

the unfair treatment to which Japanese people were subjected in California.[163]" The Land Law's

impact transcended the borders of California, and like the attempted school segregation in San

Francisco just a mere eight years prior, this pivotal piece of state legislation stirred another

international controversy between the two nations.

In a 1914 New York Times report entitled "Foreign Powers to be Placated," the

"California controversy," crisscrossed the Pacific and made foreign diplomacy with Japan even

more arduous. To put it bluntly, the California Land Law strained an already awkward

relationship between the United States and Japan. As the article goes on to examine, 1914 saw

Japan and the US encountering diplomatic difficulties due to the former supporting President

Huerta of Mexico, who was opposed by the United States during the Mexican Civil War. The

article describes a situation where "the battleship *Idzumo* was dispatched to the Mexican coast, a

five-day festival in honor of the Japanese naval officers has been proclaimed by President

Huerta, and every new detachment of Gen. Huerta's newly re-organized army is equipped with

Japanese rifles and ammunition bought at low prices from the Japanese Government.[164]" Not

only were US-Japanese relations hampered by the xenophobia of the California Land Law, but

outside of it, the Japanese government was providing arms to US adversaries. The strained US-

---

[163] Nobuaki's Meeting with the American Ambassador.
[164] *New York Times* 1914 Article discussing US-Japanese Relations *The Papers of Woodrow Wilson Digital Edition.*
Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, Rotunda, 2017.

Japanese relationship was put on full display in this 1914 report stating that, "Japan is giving chief cause for worry…Some Senators, indeed, scout the idea of a final break with Japan, but others say that the real point of last night's meeting was the Japanese question.[165]" This makes key connections between the diplomatic debacle of the California Land Law and increased tensions from proposed US attempts to intervene in Japanese arm shipments to the Huerta faction in Mexico.

As a direct result of the Land Law, public backlash in Japan was so great that proposed attempts to settle the 'California controversy' by having the US State Department leak previous diplomatic conversations on the topic between the nations would lead to a "jingo element in Japan and probably cause the overthrow of the [Japanese] Government after a bitter parliamentary onslaught.[166]" The inflamed US-Japanese relations present due to the Land Law's backlash relates directly back to other key foreign policy matters including the Mexican Civil War. This 1914 news report expands on the fact that "the lifting of the embargo on arms offsetting the steady shipments of munitions from Japan to Gen. Huerta, … would yet serve to intensify the feeling of distrust that now exists among [Japan's] subjects.[167]" To summarize this situation, the US sought to counteract Japanese arms going to President Huerta by lifting an arms embargo in order to "favor the Carranzistas," who were supported by the United States.[168] But as this report points out, there was by 1914 an already intense "feeling of distrust" toward the US by Japanese subjects. Because this directly followed the passage of the 1913 California Alien Land Law and the Japanese public backlash toward it, it can be inferred that this "feeling of distrust" was grown in large part because of anti-Japanese state legislation. What this

---

[165] *New York Times*, 1914.
[166] *New York Times*, 1914.
[167] *New York Times*, 1914.
[168] *New York Times*, 1914.

examination in the crossroads between the California Land Law and Japanese arms shipments

reveal, is that the aforementioned Land Law negatively impacted US-Japanese relations severely

enough to have bled into a myriad of other international affairs; including the Mexican

Revolution. Due to these strained relationships within the US, "some Senators … [scouted] the

idea of a final break with Japan" while simultaneously Japanese officials and everyday

individuals were livid following the passage of the California Land Law.[169] This is critical to

analyze, as the strained relations between the two nations, made worse because of the Land Law,

demonstrates how unrelated international actions like arm shipments to Mexico put Japan and

the US further at odds. In short, US-Japanese relations became worse because of the 1913

California Alien Land Law, which in turn resulted in increased diplomatic clashes between the

nations, outside of the Land Law and California's borders.

Turning directly back to Japan's reaction to the California Land Law, correspondence

between Japanese diplomats, Viscount Sutemi Chinda, and aforementioned Baron Nobuaki

Makino, on conversations with American diplomats reveals Japan's stance on the state

legislation resulting in attempts to lobby President Wilson to overturn the Land Law through an

agreement between the two nations with or without Senate approval. In an August 19th letter

between Nobuaki and Chinda, sent merely three months after the passage of the California Alien

Land Law, Nobuaki informs Chinda of a conversation he had, had with an American ambassador

detailing a "proposed Japanese-American Agreement respecting alien land tenure," which Japan

advocated for in response to the enacted California Land Law.[170] In the conversation, Nobuaki

references "the fact that the two nations had always placed special importance [on] their mutual

relations of genuine friendship, and that no serious differences of political significance had ever

---

[169] *New York Times*, 1914.
[170] Nobuaki's Meeting with the American Ambassador.

69

marred the record of their long standing intercourse, until the questions of immigration and of land ownership came up for adjustment.[171]" This is followed up by Nobuaki telling Chinda that he had "refrained [himself] from discussion on those features of the California alien land law…but pointed out that the discrimination against Japanese subjects…unmistakably created a deplorable impression upon our people.[172]" This response from Nobuaki toward the American ambassador illustrates the grave insult felt by Japanese society and the "marring" of relations caused because of the Alien Land Law. In response to this, Japan leaned on the Wilson administration to adopt an agreement respecting "alien land tenure" in the United States. While nativist sentiments in the Pacific Coast from prominent politicians put pressure on Wilson for the 'need' of the Land Law, the Japanese government put equal pressure against the law.[173] The Wilson administration was effectively cornered between domestic support for the anti-Japanese Land Law and vehement opposition to this law from the Japanese government.

This difficult situation the administration was put into because of the Land Law, is seen with Wilson's response to the legislation. In order to maintain US-Japanese relations, the Wilson administration sent federal officials to the California legislature in order to curb the bill before its passage. Nobuaki references this as a "profound appreciation, felt by the Government and people of Japan… in urging upon the Californian authorities, while the land bill was under discussion, the advisability of suppression, … of certain objectionable clauses, and in sending the Secretary of State to Sacramento to give counsel to the State Legislature.[174]" While the Wilson administration's opposition to the passage of the California Land Law appeared to be a strong

---

[171] Nobuaki's Meeting with the American Ambassador.
[172] Nobuaki's Meeting with the American Ambassador.
[173] Phelan, "Telegram defending CA Alien Land Law." *The Papers of Woodrow Wilson Digital Edition.* Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, Rotunda, 2017.
[174] Nobuaki's Meeting with the American Ambassador.

response, towards positive US-Japanese relations, later telegrams between Nobuaki and Chinda reveal the President's strong reluctance to sign any agreement to protect "alien land tenure." As Japan's solution to effectively overturn the California Land Law, telegrams from Japanese diplomat Chinda, recount failed meetings and attempts to have the President agree to Japan's proposal. In a meeting between Chinda and Wilson, the President is seen evading agreeing to sign the Japanese proposal without US Senate approval.[175] Chinda's letter to Nobuaki explains that,

> the President answered clearly that he recognized the righteousness of the purport of this draft and that he had no objection to its general principles. However, there might be certain senators who would strongly oppose this draft of the treaty because they would think that it violates the principle of state rights, which had been one of the fundamental planks of the Democratic platform.[176]

After Wilson admitted to Chinda that attempts to "prevent legislation by the State of California" were unsuccessful, Chinda pressed the President for executive action by stating that he "urged strongly that the United States Government express its good will by pledging that it would exercise its executive power and sign the treaty without regard to whether the Senate would approve it or not.[177]" Ultimately however, for the remainder of said meeting between Chinda and Wilson, the President evaded any commitment to signing a treaty overturning the Land Law, without Senate approval. Unwilling to buck his own party, "states' rights," and especially California nativists, the Wilson administration dawdled on any treaty that would overturn the Land Law.

---

[175] "Chinda's meeting with Wilson on CA Land Law." *The Papers of Woodrow Wilson Digital Edition.* Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, Rotunda, 2017.
[176] "Chinda's meeting with Wilson on CA Land Law.".
[177] "Chinda's meeting with Wilson on CA Land Law."

This is followed by another telegram detailing a meeting between Wilson's Secretary of State and Chinda, in which the Wilson administration doubled-down in their hesitation to support Japan's proposal without official approval from the Senate. Wilson's Secretary of State, William Jennings Bryan, expressed to Japanese officials that "he strongly opposed the plan of signing the treaty, regardless of the possibility of its approval by the Senate because such a plan might cause great difficulties for the President in the future.[178]" While this reasoning from the Wilson administration on not taking executive action can be seen as politically sound, the administration's hesitation to negotiate a treaty can be seen as a lack of commitment to "negotiations between the executives of the two governments. [179]" For this second proposed process of negotiating a US-Japanese agreement regarding "alien land tenure," while Secretary Bryan did not definitively reject the idea, like the previous meeting with Wilson, both again evaded committing to a process of negotiation. Taking this in conjunction with the reality of the US Senate, which had a number of nativist representatives, it is clear that the Wilson administration was evading Japan's efforts to create a treaty addressing the impacts of the California Land Law. As nativism and anti-Japanese sentiment was very popular in the era, especially in California, reaching the Senate's approval on Japan's proposed treaty would have little chance of passing. Taking into account popular hyper-nativist organizations like the Asiatic Exclusion League, who actually opposed the California Land Law because they claimed 'it didn't go far enough,' it is clear that domestic support for anti-Asian policies was high.[180] Because of the Land Law, US-Japanese relations were severely injured and In 1913, Wilson was

[178] "Chinda's meeting with Sec. of State W.J. Bryan on CA Land Law." *The Papers of Woodrow Wilson Digital Edition.* Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, Rotunda, 2017.
[179] "Chinda's meeting with Sec. of State W.J. Bryan on CA Land Law."
[180] *Sausalito News*, Volume XXVIX, Number 21, 24 May 1913. - California Digital Newspaper Collection, 1913.

forced to walk a tenuous tightrope, between balancing diplomatic relations with Japan and appeasing California nativism which gripped the nation with its immense popularity.

And as this proposed US-Japanese treaty, Japan advocated for in response to the Land Law, was focused heavily on protecting Japanese-Americans, it is clear that signing said treaty would be politically toxic for the President. Chinda's telegrams are important to this analysis as he emphasizes on what a proposed treaty would consist of. Writing to Nobuaki, Chinda explains that "as for the other problems than those concerning land, I also have already thought that more remains to be done than to prevent anti-Japanese legislation. … I consider it worthwhile to make an effort to solve these problems after we have proceeded to negotiate about the land problem, which is the most urgent one and the main point of this treaty.[181]" The California Land Law left the Wilson administration with two choices, either work with Japan on introducing a politically unpopular treaty that would effectively overturn the land law but improve US-Japanese relations, or allow relations to remain severely injured and refuse to commit toward treaty negotiations without Senate approval. Knowing that Senate approval would be unlikely, Wilson chose the second option, resulting in US-Japanese relations remaining marred, but not having to take the political unpopularity of treaty negotiations addressing the Land Law. So, while the Wilson administration sided with opposing the California Land Law before its approval, after it took effect, negotiating a treaty effectively overturning the law was a political risk the Wilson administration was not willing to take. This means that the California Land Law significantly harmed US-Japanese relations and would remain harmed, as the federal government couldn't muster the strength to overturn it.

---

[181] "Chinda's meeting with Sec. of State W.J. Bryan."

By analyzing both entrenched California nativism of the early 20th century and Japan's policy priorities in response to the 1913 California Alien Land Law, it is clear that not only was the Wilson administration forced to balance both groups' goals, but ultimately US-Japanese relations were severely harmed by the aforementioned land law. The rapid growth and support of California-based anti-Asian organizations like the Asiatic Exclusion League are central to this analysis, as it demonstrates how nativist sentiment permeated many facets of California society and coalesced around the creation of these hyper-xenophobic organizations which grew to influence state and federal policy-making; both including the 1907 Gentlemen's Agreement as well as US-Japanese relations after the 1913 Land Law. From state politicians, corporate newspapers, to even organized labor, this trifecta of California political actors reveals how the Wilson administration was unable to prevent the passage of the California Land Law and the sheer depth of anti-Asian and especially anti-Japanese sentiment present in the state. Taking into account the electoral political power of California, the examination of the 1912 Presidential election, and the political promises made by Wilson to support anti-Asian immigration policies is critical since it contrasts heavily to later actions taken by Wilson to prevent the passage of the Alien Land Law and discussions with Japanese diplomats on possible remedies to the California law. However, equally as important to highlighting the worsening US-Japanese relations, is how the Wilson administration failed to commit to signing any treaty to protect Japanese-American land ownership; without US Senate approval, something that the federal legislature would not agree to. Illustrating the Wilson administration's balancing act between Japan and California nativists, by not agreeing to protecting Japanese-Americans' right to buy property, Wilson ensured that US-Japanese relations would not improve. And with poor US-Japanese relations, the California Alien Land Law's unintended consequences included an infuriated Japanese society,

Japanese arm shipments to US opponents in the Mexican Revolution, and an overall tense

relationship between the nations. While Wilson did demonstrate a baseline commitment to

oppose the 1913 Land Law, in an attempt to protect US-Japanese relations, because of the

electoral strength and widespread popularity of anti-Asian nativists in California, backing a

treaty to overturn the Land Law would be politically ruinous for Wilson. Ultimately because of

legislation enacted in California and the state's anti-Asian sentiment, US-Japanese relations of

the early 1910's was severely impacted

Works Cited

Primary Sources

"1912 Electoral Vote Tally, February 12, 1913." *National Archives and Records Administration*.

Accessed February 25, 2023. https://www.archives.gov/legislative/features/1912-

election.

"Chinda's meeting with Sec. of State W.J. Bryan on CA Land Law." *The Papers of Woodrow*

Wilson Digital Edition. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, Rotunda, 2017.

"Chinda's meeting with Wilson on CA Land Law." *The Papers of Woodrow Wilson Digital*

Edition. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, Rotunda, 2017.

Chinda's meeting with Sec. of State W.J. Bryan on CA Land Law." *The Papers of Woodrow*

Wilson Digital Edition. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, Rotunda, 2017.

Discussion on getting Hearst Papers to Support Wilson 1912. *The Papers of Woodrow Wilson*

Digital Edition. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, Rotunda, 2017.

Evening Star. (Washington, DC), Dec. 18, 1906, 24 https://www.loc.gov/item/sn83045462/1906-

12-18/ed-1/.

MountVernon.org. "Naturalization Acts of 1790 and 1795." George Washington's Mount

Vernon. Accessed February 25, 2023.

New York Times "1914 Article discussing US-Japanese Relations" *The Papers of Woodrow*

Wilson Digital Edition. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, Rotunda, 2017.

"Nobuaki's Meeting with the American Ambassador on 1913 CA Land Law," *The Papers of*

Woodrow Wilson Digital Edition. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, Rotunda,

2017.

Organized Labor, Volume 6, Number 23, 1 July 1905. - California Digital Newspaper Collection. Accessed February 25, 2023.

Phelan, James. "Letter to Wilson on 'Oriental Coolieism,'" *The Papers of Woodrow Wilson Digital Edition.* Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, Rotunda, 2017.

Phelan, James. "Telegram defending CA Alien Land Law." *The Papers of Woodrow Wilson Digital Edition.* Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, Rotunda, 2017.

Phelan, James. "To Wilson on 'Silencing Mr. Hearst.'" *The Papers of Woodrow Wilson Digital Edition.* Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, Rotunda, 2017.

San Francisco Call. Volume 97, Number 168, 15 May 1905. - California Digital Newspaper Collection. Accessed February 25, 2023.

Sausalito News, Volume XXVIX, Number 21, 24 May 1913. - California Digital Newspaper Collection, 1913.

Wilson, Woodrow. "Letter supporting a 'National Policy of Exclusion.'" *The Papers of Woodrow Wilson Digital Edition.* Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, Rotunda, 2017.

Secondary Sources

Bailey, Thomas A. "California, Japan, and the Alien Land Legislation of 1913." *Pacific Historical Review* 1, no. 1 (1932): 36–59. https://doi.org/10.2307/3633745.

Chang, Kornel. "Circulating Race and Empire: Transnational Labor Activism and the Politics of Anti-Asian Agitation in the Anglo-American Pacific World, 1880-1910." *The Journal of American History* 96, no. 3 (2009): 678–701. http://www.jstor.org/stable/25622474.

"Patriot Pirates? A Reassessment of American Privateers in the Revolutionary War"

Joaquin Lopez

Spurred by scenes of "exercising [...] soldiers, […] the sound of martial music and the call for volunteers," fourteen-year-old Andrew Sherburne hurried to enlist with the American forces during the early years of the American Revolution. Following his eldest brother's footsteps, he enlisted with the Continental Navy. After two years aboard the Continental Navy sloop *Ranger,* he returned home in 1780 and discovered that his older brother and father had died. Unable to find reliable employment, Sherburne found himself without the means to provide for his mother and sisters.[182] He agreed to temporarily serve aboard a privateer ship, *Greyhound*, to make money before rejoining the Navy. Unfortunately, British privateers captured the *Greyhound* and its crew. Sherburne would be held as a pirate and traitor for the remainder of the war. For three years, he endured severe malnutrition at Mill Prison and prison ship *Jersey*.[183] Sherburne returned home in 1783 penniless and permanently handicapped.[184] His memoir, published in 1831, provides a harrowing account that encompasses the experiences of thousands of other privateers. It does not detail famous battles or the experiences of officers and politicians. Sherburne's memoir, at its core, is a "ground-up" view of how the general population

---

[182] Robert H. Patton, *Patriot Pirates: The Privateer War for Freedom and Fortune in the American Revolution* (New York: Pantheon Books, 2008), 168-169.
[183] Andrew Sherburne. *Memoirs of Andrew Sherburn, a Pensioner of the Navy of the Revolution* (Providence: H.H. Brown, 1831), 35-36.
[184] Sherburne, *Memoirs*, 126-127.

experienced the war. However, the story of Andrew Sherburne and his fellow privateers is often

forgotten or misrepresented in historical discussions.

During the American Revolutionary War, the United States, France, and Britain

employed thousands of privateers on ships like *Greyhound* to disrupt merchant shipping in the

Atlantic Ocean. Privateers were civilians that held special government commissions to engage in

naval warfare. Historians have struggled to represent the experiences of these sailors, depicting

them as a vital supplement to the Continental Navy but also closely tied with piracy, greed, and

unpatriotic behavior. An analysis of surviving memoirs, correspondence, letters of marque, and

ordinances uncovers American privateers' complex and muddled history during the war. These

sources reveal that privateering was a legally complicated affair undertaken by individuals whose

behaviors and motivations are difficult to homogenize. A reassessment of privateers thus helps

resituate privateers within historiography and focus the broad history of the war through the

experiences of ordinary people. Privateers allow us to reexamine why and how people

participated in the American Revolution, explore legal frameworks developed by the United

States to deal with its constituents, and how its citizens interacted with the emerging nation-state.

Given the nature of their occupation, privateers were subject to criticism from various

groups. For instance, Continental Navy and Army officers were critical of privateers' behaviors

and effects on the war. Among members of the Continental Navy, Captain John Paul Jones was

the most fervent critic of privateering. Jones protested that he had to sail alongside self-interested

men who "pretend to love their country."[185] Jones' principal concern was that privateers were

---

[185] Kylie A. Hulbert, *The Untold War at Sea: America's Revolutionary Privateers* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2022), 159.

siphoning human resources from the Navy by offering higher wages or employing deserters.[186]

In a letter to Robert Morris, Jones concludes that "sordid adventurers in privateers [sport] away

the sinews of our marine."[187] Esek Hopkins, commander-in-chief of the Continental Navy,

echoed Jones' criticisms of privateering. Hopkins, in one letter, claimed that a third of the men

assigned to Navy ships had joined privateers, leaving the Navy with a severe manpower

shortage.[188] Hopkins would later defend Jones in an incident where Jones boarded a ship and

took four privateers into the Navy's service as he suspected they were deserters.[189] Finally,

George Washington expressed his disapproval of privateers, characterizing them as "inconsistent

and disloyal" and entirely self-interested.[190] These primary sources depict privateers as a

nuisance to the Continental Navy and as unpatriotic. Historians Gardner W. Allen and James M.

Volo have reiterated the criticisms levied against privateers. In the conclusion of Allen's 1913

book *Naval History of the American Revolutio*n, he states that if one-half of the "men, money,

and energy absorbed in privateering" had been invested into the Continental Navy, then it

"would have provided a force able to act offensively against the British navy to some

purpose."[191] Volo's *Blue Water Patriots* asserts that privateers enlisted because of "simple

economic self-interest" and created significant manpower shortages in the Navy.[192] Jones,

Hopkins, Washington, and Allen hold unpatriotic privateers responsible for the Continental

Navy's shortcomings.

---

186 See also C. Kevin Marshall, "Putting Privateers in Their Place: The Applicability of the Marque and Reprisal Clause to Undeclared Wars," *The University of Chicago Law Review* 64 (1997), 970. The failure of the 1779 Penobscot Expedition also created animosity between privateers and the Continental Navy.
187 Hulbert, *Untold War*, 159-169.
188 Hulbert, 151. See also *Thomas Butts to his cousin*. Butts, a British sailor captured by privateers, states that only "seasick country bumpkins" were available to the Continental Navy.
189 Hulbert, 151.
190 Hulbert, 159.
191 Gardner Weld Allen, *A Naval History of the American Revolution* (New York: Russell & Russell, 1962), 663.
192 James M. Volo, *Blue Water Patriots: The American Revolution Afloat* (Connecticut: Praeger Publishers, 2007), 45.

Other criticisms of privateering created an association between pirates and privateers. In a 1789 article published in the *Gazette of the United States*, Benjamin Franklin declared the practice a "remnant of the ancient piracy" and called for its abolishment. Franklin accused privateers of being pirates with government protections, "wantonly and unfeelingly" destroying lives and families in their practice and continuing that destruction in post-war America.[193] Officers of the British Navy, who took hundreds of privateers as prisoners, also did not differentiate between pirates and privateers. The letters of marque did not guarantee a privateer's legal immunity from piracy charges. When captured by the British, privateers were "held under a bill of attainder charging them with both piracy and treason."[194] Privateers were also excluded from prison exchanges by Britain, being a "foe unworthy and undeserving of such consideration."[195] Privateers were not differentiated from pirates by the British and Americans.

Historiographical discussions have also deepened privateers' ties to piracy. Robert H. Patton's 2008 book, *Patriot Pirates*, claims to be a history of privateering during the American Revolution. However, the book's title only indicates that the negative perception of privateers persisted into the twenty-first century. The book's flap copy and introduction describe American privateers as part of a "massive seaborne insurgency involving thousands of money-mad patriots plundering Britain's maritime trade."[196] The terminology used in this synopsis portrays privateers as an unsanctioned group of sailors, like pirates, greedily hunting down merchant ships. A more objective perception would acknowledge the gray area privateers occupied during the war. Some privateers committed illegal captures, employed deserters, and offered higher

---

[193] Benjamin Franklin, Against Privateering." *Gazette of the United States No. 61* (New York, NY), November 11, 1789.

[194] James M. Volo, *Blue Water Patriots: The American Revolution Afloat*. (Westport, Connecticut: Praeger Publishers, 2007,) 45.

[195] Hulbert, *Untold War*, 66. See also Patton, *Patriot Pirates*, 33-34. The 1777 Treason Act denied due process for privateers and only allowed them freedom if they chose to serve in the British Royal Navy.

[196] Patton, *Patriot Pirates*, flap copy text.

wages to draw sailors away from the Continental Navy.[197] Other privateers were praised for their

contribution to the war effort and demonstrate alternative perspectives not found in

oversimplified descriptions of privateers.

Individuals like John Adams and Nathanael Greene were in favor of privateering. While

both John Adams and John Paul Jones advocated for a larger Continental Navy, Adams

conceded that privateers were an effective way to bolster the nation's naval fighting

capabilities.[198] Bureaucratic issues delayed the organization of the Continental Navy in its early

years. Conversely, there was an established precedent for using privateers in wartime, such as

during King George's War. State governments could hire privateers in such a way that allowed

hundreds of ships to sail out. In a letter to Pennsylvania delegate Benjamin Rush, Adams wrote

that "there should not be the least obstruction to privateering [...] I firmly believe that one sailor

will do us more good than two soldiers."[199] While Benjamin Franklin denounced them after the

war, he assisted privateers operating from France. Franklin also organized a strategy that

intensified attacks on "British shipping […] in order to fan the fire of public resentment against

the further prosecution of the war."[200] Privateers were a persistent threat to the British economy

throughout the war, exacerbating war weariness in England. Like Adams and Franklin,

Nathanael Greene saw their potential and financed several privateers throughout the war. Greene

never explicitly stated any criticisms about privateers or their behaviors but did believe that they

were a vital extension of the nation's formal armed forces.[201] Opinions on privateering among

---

[197] See "Thomas Butts to his cousin reporting on the capture of his ship by privateers." Correspondence. From Gilder Lehrman Institute of American History, *The Gilder Lehrman Collection*. Butts recalls his capture by privateers disguised as a friendly British vessel.
[198] See Gardener Weld Allen, *A Naval History of the American Revolu*tion. (New York: Russell & Russell, 1962,) 662-664. Although Gardner Allen argues a greater focus on the Navy and a reduction of the privateer force would have been preferable, he recognizes that privateers emerged out of necessity.
[199] Hulbert, *Untold War*, 141.
[200] Volo, *Blue Water Patriots*, 224.
[201] Patton, *Patriot Pirates*, 107-108.

ordinary American people seemed to vary; they were seen as the "lifeblood of New England" as they brought in goods and supplies that were otherwise scarce. However, they were also periodically blamed by the public for the limited availability and high prices of goods.[202] Although these perspectives of privateering by other figures of the American Revolution do not address the criticisms laid out by Allen, Franklin, or Jones, they indicate that perspectives on privateering were contested before the American Revolution was over.

To better understand privateering's nature, it is crucial to recognize that privateers, in contrast to pirates, had to operate under strict regulations and oversight. An overview of relevant ordinances and law demonstrates how they were regulated and organized. Instructions published in April 1776, for example, outlined specific rules for all privateers serving under the Continental Congress' letters of marque.[203] These rules outlined whom privateers could target, that being any ship transporting "soldiers, arms, gunpowder, ammunition, provisions or any other contraband goods, to any of the British Armies or Ships [...] employed against the colonies."[204] The document also instructed privateers that they had an obligation to report any captures to an admiralty court immediately, ensure the humane treatment of all prisoners, and not engage in ransoming activities. Finally, the instructions warned that any privateers found breaking the rules would have their letter of marque revoked, bond forfeited, and forced to pay reparations.[205] These rules emphasized the lawful seizure of goods and dissuaded privateers from recklessly attacking merchant shipping or causing unnecessary damage.

---

[202] Marshall, *Privateers*, 964. See also Marshall, 966-968. Preexisting moral criticisms from before the American Revolution were also a source of the public's animosity towards privateers.
[203] The same instructions published in 1776 had been in effect in Massachusetts since late 1775 through the *Act For Encouraging The Fixing Out Of Armed Vessels*.
[204] *Instructions to the commanders of private ships or vessels of war, which shall have commissions or letters of marque and reprisal, authorizing them to make captures of British vessels and cargoes*. Document. From Library of Congress, *Documents from the Continental Congress and the Constitutional Convention, 1774 to 1789*, II, https://www.loc.gov/item/90898006.
[205] *Instructions*, III-VII.

Several revisions and additions corrected the initial rules throughout the war to further deter overzealous privateers from illegally capturing ships. A 1781 ordinance published by the Continental Congress, for instance, clarified the pretenses under which a privateer could condemn a vessel and reiterated a privateer's duty to bring all prizes back to an admiralty court.[206] Another ordinance, published in 1782, sought to resolve the "great variance in the decisions of several maritime courts" regarding prizes by clarifying who was entitled to receive payment in the event of a successful capture.[207]

Privateers in service to the Continental Congress were under strict regulation and liable to lose their commissions and lawsuits if they violated the rules. Barzilla Smith and Gustavus Conyngham are examples of privateers punished for breaking these rules. John Hancock issued a $5,000 bond and a letter of marque to Smith in October 1776.[208] A letter from September 1777 indicates that Hancock revoked Smith's bond as a result of illegal capture and signed it over to the owners of the captured vessel.[209] Similarly, French authorities detained Gustavus Conyngham when he brought British ships to Dunkirk.[210] Like all American privateers, Conyngham and Smith had little time to make decisions and were isolated from Congress and the admiralty courts. However, these types of events were rare.[211] In addition, cases of illegal

---

[206] *An Ordinance, Relative to the Capture and Condemnation of Prizes*. Document. From Library of Congress, *Documents from the Continental Congress and the Constitutional Convention, 1774 to 1789*. https://www.loc.gov/item/90898066.

[207]*An Ordinance, for Amending the Ordinance, Ascertaining What Captures on Water Shall Be Lawful*. Document. From Library of Congress, *Documents from the Continental Congress and the Constitutional Convention, 1774 to 1789*. https://www.loc.gov/item/90898068.

[208] *Privateer bond of Barzilla Smith, Joseph Chapman, and Elijah F. Payne*. Document. From Gilder Lehrman Institute of American History, *The Gilder Lehrman Collection, 1493-1859*. http://www.americanhistory.amdigital.co.uk/Documents/Details/GLC01450.014.02.

[209] *Assignment of privateer's bond by John Hancock to Joseph Hewes and Robert Smith*. Document. From Gilder Lehrman Institute of American History, *The Gilder Lehrman Collection 1493-1859*. http://www.americanhistory.amdigital.co.uk/Documents/Details/GLC01450.014.01.

[210]Hulbert, *Untold War,* 68-69.

[211] Marshall, *Privateers*, 971 citing Gardner Weld Allen, *Massachusetts Privateers of the Revolution* (Massachusetts: Massachusetts Historical Society, 1927), 15.

captures were not always purposeful and sometimes were a result of intentional deceit by

merchants attempting to evade capture by disposing of any form of identification and paperwork

overboard.[212] Privateers, in contrast to pirates, were tightly restricted by law and had unique

considerations that carried serious legal and personal risks.

People from all social classes signed up to become privateers without discussing their

motivations. While there were cases of enslaved men put into service in privateers, most

privateers were volunteers. Christopher Vail left a detailed account of his life during the war.

Yet, the reasons why he became a privateer remain elusive. Vail enlisted in several units of the

Continental Army and privateer vessels throughout the war. He was imprisoned twice by the

British and held in deplorable conditions. Like Andrew Sherburne, Vail joined new privateer

ships after escaping prison. In discussing Vail's journal, John O. Sands notes that Vail never

gives "evidence of strong political opinions nor an awareness of the issues over which the war

was fought."[213] However, Vail had some eagerness to fight as he served several tours with the

Army and privateers throughout the war despite experiencing the conditions of British prisons

and impressment. Nathaniel Fanning's story is like Vail's. He served as an officer in the

Continental Navy, working under John Paul Jones before leaving to take charge of a privateer,

having "found Jones so insufferable that he politely refused any [...] place among his officers"[214]

He also endured poor conditions under British capture. Nonetheless, he enlisted with another

privateer after his release. It seems that some men joined privateers because they wanted to fight.

Unlike Vail or Fanning, Nathanael Greene became involved in privateering through the

financing of the purchase of ships, arms, and provisions. Greene invested significant parts of his

---

[212] Hulbert, *Untold War*, 68-69.
[213] John O. Sands, "Christopher Vail, Soldier and Seaman in the American Revolution," *Winterthur Portfolio* 11 (1976), 54.
[214] Volo, *Blue Water Patriots*, 223.

pay into funding privateers, reasoning that his "business" as a Continental Army officer required the materials supplied by their captures. His investment, according to himself, was not for financial gain but to "annoy the enemy and consequently favor our cause."[215] While Greene's motivations are not explicitly patriotic, it was strategic and military matters that prompted his involvement.

Promises of payment and wages made joining a privateer more attractive than the Continental Navy and allured many men. Some men, like John Whiting, explicitly stated that they would only serve until they received payment.[216] Andrew Sherburne joined to support his widowed mother.[217] The promise of capturing a ship and cashing out a large prize was an attractive incentive to those who enlisted. However, privateers also knew that financial gain was not guaranteed as admiralty courts often prevented them from profiting in their venture. Admiralty courts forced privateers to prove that their captures were legal in cases that could take years to settle. Congress only established a formal court of appeals in May 1780, five years into the war. For most of the war, a privateer's right to appeal their case was not guaranteed in some states, and attempting to appeal a case carried the risk of exorbitant legal fees.[218]

Thomas Rutenbourgh spent a year in court trying to prove that they had conducted a legal capture as the captured ship's crew had thrown all identifying paperwork overboard. Rutenbourgh would lose the case and his prize and try to appeal. The courts denied Rutenbourgh's appeal and forced him to pay legal fees to Congress. He had lost money for capturing an enemy ship.[219] Hugh Hill would go through a similar experience, eventually having

---

[215] Patton, *Patriot Pirates*, 108.
[216] Hulbert *Untold War*, 30.
[217] See also Sherburne, *Memoirs*, 35. Sherburne describes children "not a dozen years old" aboard *Greyhound*. It is not clear why they had joined *Greyhound*.
[218] Hulbert, *Untold War*, 114.
[219] Hulbert, 122.

his prize confiscated by the Continental Congress and paying $1,056 in legal fees.[220] Gustavus Conyngham, mentioned previously, also appealed to Congress for a significant amount of back pay owed him from prizes he had captured. The courts and commissioners would dismiss the appeal eighteen years after Conyngham's request.[221] These cases would also influence public opinion. In concluding her discussion of the admiralty courts, Kylie Hulbert suggests that their legal battles left privateers in an "unpatriotic position" as they "came to be viewed as profiteers more often than not" despite acting on the Continental Congress' orders.[222] As a result of complex and constantly changing legal systems established by Congress, the privateering business could not guarantee financial gain. Even if Nathanael Greene did have underlying motivations based on the profit potential, the fact that he was bankrupt by the end of the war only further indicates that privateering was not a completely profitable venture.[223] The admiralty courts prevented many privateers from making a profit and unintentionally made privateers appear to be overly preoccupied with money.

Within the crews of the thousands of privateer ships that sailed during the war, there may have been men who were the unpatriotic, self-interested pirates and deserters that Jones or Washington believed privateers to be. However, the notion that money solely motivated all privateers is invalid, as privateers knew admiralty courts were challenging to navigate. Many, as mentioned previously, also adhered to the rules established by the Continental Congress even as Congress periodically placed embargoes on them and forced them to give up potential prizes. There was no uniformity in what motivated men to enlist as privateers. As a collective, privateers stand in a gray area where they are neither uncontrolled pirates nor hardline patriots.

---

[220] Hulbert, *Untold War*, 1-2.
[221] Patton, *Patriot Pirates*, 183-184.
[222] Hulbert, *Untold War*, 135.
[223] Patton, *Patriot Pirates*, 211.

The captains, crews, and financiers of privateer ships commissioned by the United States

represent a significant component of the American Revolution that has been subjected to

inaccurate characterizations that do not consider their unique circumstances. Robert Patton

asserts that "no study of Revolutionary privateering could pretend to give a complete picture of

that complex era."[224] However, understanding that privateering was legally complex, barely

resembled piracy, and that privateers were not homogenous in their behaviors allows for a more

accurate discussion of privateers and their role in history. Some contemporary histories have

demonstrated a new trend in the interpretation and integration of privateers into the popular

history of the American Revolution. Kylie A. Hulbert's *The Untold War at Sea* discusses

privateering from the privateers' perspective and explores the legal challenges they encountered.

Nathan Perl-Rosenthal's *Citizen Sailors* does not exclusively explore privateering. However, he

depicts privateers as a racially and ethnically diverse group that prototyped American

citizenship. While privateers still stand in a gray area regarding their motivations and behaviors,

historiography has trended toward a discussion that acknowledges and discusses the complexities

of privateering.

In the conclusion of her book, Kylie Hulbert suggests that a nuanced discussion of

privateers can provide "new thread into the complex story of the American Revolution [and] of

the American experience."[225] Whereas the exploits of the Continental Army and Navy are well

known, Hulbert believes that privateers were "erased from public memory without much

resistance in the postwar period" because their "actions and experiences were unfamiliar and

unique unto themselves"[226] In publicizing their experiences and making previously unfamiliar

---

[224] Patton, *Patriot Pirates*, XXI.
[225] Hulbert, *Untold War*, 181.
[226] Hulbert, 5.

actions clear, privateers can enter the mainstream history of the American Revolution.

Addressing the misconceptions surrounding privateering and understanding their conditions

allows them to exist as more than a historical oddity or "legal pirates." Historians can then

recognize privateers for their uniqueness and their potential historical value. For example,

historians of the "New Social History" approach and the "Neo-Progressive" movement, as

defined by Michael D. Hattem, could gain a valuable source of experiences by looking at

privateers. The New Social History originated in the 1970s and focuses on the lives of everyday

people. This historiographical movement studies "history from the bottom up" as opposed to

"Great Man" history. The Neo-Progressive movement, similarly, deals with the experiences of

individuals. However, it also highlights their involvement in radical political and social change

amid the pursuit of their own interests, "thereby integrating them into the larger political

narrative of the Revolution."[227] Historians who belong to either of these historiographical

movements can integrate the stories and experiences of privateers as they are better understood

and removed from previous misrepresentations that sullied their standing in history.

Privateers can also fit into works that follow the "current trend that posits the war in its

global context."[228] The "Atlantic" or "Neo-Imperial" schools of interpretation analyze the war

beyond the North American continent and discuss the global consequences of the war.[229] Nathan

Perl-Rosenthal's book, for example, fits into this school and represents a recent integration of

privateers into a broader history. Privateers were some of the few Americans that went beyond

the shores of North America, making them a valuable resource for historians of this movement.

---

[227] Michael D. Hattem, "The Historiography of the American Revolution," 2017,
https://cdn.knightlab.com/libs/timeline3/latest/embed/index.html?source=19P0MD9TrV5Tx62DC3fImj_uNLA5l
AsnV6TmRu2fWdL4.
[228] Hulbert, *Untold War*, 181.
[229] Hattem, "American Revolution."

Although there is still much to research about privateering, they are more visible in history now

than they have ever been.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

An Act For Encouraging The Fixing Out Of Armed Vessels To Defend The Sea-Coast Of
  America, And For Erecting A Court To Try And Condemn All Vessels That Shall Be
  Found Infesting The Same. Document. From State Library of Massachusetts, Acts and
  Resolves, 1692-1780. https://archives.lib.state.ma.us/handle/2452/117010.

An Ordinance, for Amending the Ordinance, Ascertaining What Captures on Water Shall Be
  Lawful. Document. From Library of Congress, *Documents from the Continental*
  Congress and the Constitutional Convention, 1774 to 1789.
  https://www.loc.gov/item/90898068.

An Ordinance, Relative to the Capture and Condemnation of Prizes. Document. From Library of
  Congress, *Documents from the Continental Congress and the Constitutional Convention,*
  1774 to 1789. https://www.loc.gov/item/90898066.

Assignment of privateer's bond by John Hancock to Joseph Hewes and Robert Smith. Document.
  From Gilder Lehrman Institute of American History, *The Gilder Lehrman Collection*
  1493-1859.
  http://www.americanhistory.amdigital.co.uk/Documents/Details/GLC01450.014.01.

Congressional certificate authorizing vessels to engage in military activity. Document. From
  Gilder Lehrman Institute of American History, *The Gilder Lehrman Collection 1493-*
  1859. http://www.americanhistory.amdigital.co.uk/Documents/Details/GLC04870.

Franklin, Benjamin. "Against Privateering." *Gazette of the United States No. 61* (New York,
  NY), November 11, 1789.

Instructions to the commanders of private ships or vessels of war, which shall have commissions or letters of marque and reprisal, authorizing them to make captures of British vessels and cargoes. Document. From Library of Congress, *Documents from the Continental Congress and the Constitutional Convention, 1774 to 1789*. https://www.loc.gov/item/90898006.

Privateer bond of Barzilla Smith, Joseph Chapman, and Elijah F. Payne. Document. From Gilder Lehrman Institute of American History, *The Gilder Lehrman Collection, 1493- 1859*. http://www.americanhistory.amdigital.co.uk/Documents/Details/GLC01450.014.02.

Sherburne, Andrew. *Memoirs of Andrew Sherburne, a Pensioner of the Navy of the Revolution*. Providence: H.H. Brown, 1831.

Thomas Butts to his cousin reporting on the capture of his ship by privateers. Correspondence. From Gilder Lehrman Institute of American History, *The Gilder Lehrman Collection 1493-1859*. http://www.americanhistory.amdigital.co.uk/Documents/Details/GLC01450.613.

Secondary Sources

Allen, Gardner Weld. *A Naval History of the American Revolu*tion. New York: Russell & Russell, 1962.

Allen, Gardner Weld. *Massachusetts Privateers of the Revolution*. Massachusetts: Massachusetts Historical Society, 1927.

Fowler, William M. *Rebels Under Sail: The American Navy During the Revolution*. New York: Scribner, 1976.

Hattem, Michael D. "The Historiography of the American Revolution." 2017.

    https://cdn.knightlab.com/libs/timeline3/latest/embed/index.html?source=19P0MD9TrV5

    Tx62DC3fIimj_uNLA5lAsnV6TmRu2fWdL4.

Hulbert, Kylie A. *The Untold War at Sea: America's Revolutionary Privateers*. Athens:

    University of Georgia Press, 2022.

Maclay, Edgar Stanton. *A History of American Privateers*. New York: Burt Franklin, 1899.

Marshall, C. Kevin. "Putting Privateers in Their Place: The Applicability of the Marque and

    Reprisal Clause to Undeclared Wars." *The University of Chicago Law Review* 64 (1997):

    953–981. https://doi.org/10.2307/1600316.

Patton, Robert H. *Patriot Pirates: The Privateer War for Freedom and Fortune in the American*

    Revolution. New York: Pantheon Books, 2008.

Perl-Rosenthal, Nathan. *Citizen Sailors: Becoming American in the Age of Revolution*.

    Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2015.

Sands, John O. "Christopher Vail, Soldier and Seaman in the American Revolution." *Winterthur*

    Portfolio 11 (1976): 53–73. http://www.jstor.org/stable/1180590.

Volo, James M. *Blue Water Patriots: The American Revolution Afloat*. Westport, Connecticut:

    Praeger Publishers, 2007.

"Dressing Up the Revolution: The American Revolution in French Style"

Chelsea Younglove

Abstract

At the time of the American Revolution, French culture developed a fascination with America. This trend was expressed in many forms, including fashion, artwork, and architecture, all contributing to French narratives about the United States and the American Revolution. The foremost of these narratives were the portrayals of America as a neoclassical, republican idyll and as a rustic, pastoral return to the romantic concept of nature. French figures who donned the "American" style played a large and often conscious role in crafting such cultural narratives. During the period of 1776 to 1789, the "American" style in France took on a variety of contradictory meanings in French culture and politics. French figures like the Marquis de Lafayette, the Duchesse de la Tour du Pin, and the Marquis de Condorcet took on a French - American identity and styled themselves as "Americans" to express different political views. By analyzing these individuals' political views and sartorial styling, this essay examines the impact of French "American" style on the French perception of America. The essay utilizes contemporary publications such as newspapers and fashion magazines, as well as the memoirs and correspondence of French figures. Through these sources, I examine the narratives surrounding "American" style and identity in France. This reveals the complex relationship between French style and politics, contributing to the ongoing historical discourse on the cultural lead-up to the Revolution of 1789.

KEYWORDS: American Revolution, France, fashion, 18th century

Introduction

The American Revolution had a profound impact on the contemporary culture of France. French fascination with America was expressed in many forms, including fashion, architecture, and artwork. One result of this cultural exchange was the development of a popular "American" style in France, which encompassed a wide range of expression, including clothing, hairstyles, and etiquette. Between 1776 and 1789, French expressions of "American" style and identity reflected French discourse surrounding America itself, shaping French narratives about the United States and the American Revolution. During this time period, competing forms of

sartorial presentation reflected the changing, pre-revolutionary political and philosophical currents. For example, the *negligé*, or informal style, of famous figures like Benjamin Franklin was recognized as a symbol of "democratic beliefs" and the American Revolution.[230] The trend was one facet of the "American" style popularized in French culture at this time.

Themes of "American" Style

In France, American style was characterized by simplified dress and manners, which sought to evoke the rustic imagery of homespun farmers and Quakers.[231] This associated America with an idealized concept of nature, which carried many meanings in contemporary France. In French discourse, popular works by writers like Jean-Jacques Rousseau romanticized a return to a natural, uncorrupted state of politics, philosophy, and art. Later French authors, including Jean de Crèvecœur and the Marquis de Lafayette, associated Rousseau's rustic ideal with America. Following this theme, rustic fashions equated "natural beauty" to the natural virtues of civic society.[232] However, not all French writers agreed with this association. In the *Tableau de Paris*, a chronicle which described life in Paris during this time, French writer Louis-Sébastien Mercier called this fashion "affected simplicity," satirizing the affectations of *elegants*, the wealthy Parisians followed the trend.[233] Mercier portrayed this trend as a shallow reaction against the elaborate styles that had previously been popular in Paris.

Another theme that overlapped with American style in France was neoclassicism. Neoclassicism referenced Greco-Roman history, evoking concepts of democracy, republicanism, and civic virtue, the meanings of which were often disputed within political discourse. This style, characterized by art, fashion, architecture that evoked Antiquity, supported "classical models of liberty, political association, and artistic vitality," emphasizing an idealized image of Ancient

---

[230] Kimberly Chrisman-Campbell, "American Idols: Fashions 'à l'américaine' in Prerevolutionary France." *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society* 109, no. 5 (2021): 190.

[231] Robert Darnton, *George Washington's False Teeth: An Unconventional Guide to the Eighteenth Century* (New York, NY: W.W. Norton & Company, 2003): 128.

[232] Dagmar Freist, "Belief," in *A Cultural History of Dress and Fashion in the Age of Enlightenment*, ed. Peter McNeil, vol. 4 (Bloomsbury Academic, 2021): 104.

[233] Mercier Louis-Sébastien, *Panorama of Paris: Selections from Le Tableau De Paris*, trans. Jeremy D. Popkin (University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2003): 61.

Greece and Rome.[234] In France, neoclassical elements of American style tied the United States to the legacy of ancient democracies and republics. French writers used this comparison to turn America into an idealized example of democracy and representative government, further associating the United States and the American Revolution with the political philosophy of the Enlightenment.

Both the neoclassicism and the idealized rusticity of American style associated the United States with a utopian image of equality. Writers like Michel Guillaume Jean de Crèvecœur, a French aristocrat who traveled to America and published *The Letters of an American Farmer*, described the United States as a nation "close to nature," where "the first principles of universal morality" arose naturally from the citizens' simple, agriculture-based lifestyle.[235] While these idealized portrayals did not go undisputed, they were extremely popular in France, shaping French perceptions of America and fueling contemporary discourse.

The French discourse surrounding American style suggests that, across the French social order, many people were aware of its political meanings. Fashion periodicals such as the *Galeries des Modes*, which ran from 1778 to 1787,[236] were published primarily in Paris, the center of French fashion. These publications were read by people of all social classes, especially women.[237] Fashion magazines established a "continuous visual present" by informing readers of constantly changing trends, typically set by the upper classes.[238] In addition to providing realistic illustrations, these publications also explained the meaning of each fashion. This context for each style situated trends like the American style within intense contemporary political discourse, discussed across different social classes through France's rich print culture.

One of the most famous and controversial examples of an "American" fashion trend was the *pouf* coiffure. *Poufs* were elaborate headpieces worn over women's tall hairstyles. This style

---

[234] Amelia Rauser, *The Age of Undress: Art, Fashion, and the Classical Ideal in the 1790s* (New Haven, CT: Yale, 2020): 189.

[235] Darnton, *George Washington's False Teeth*, 124.

[236] Stella Blum, *Eighteenth-Century French Fashion Plates: 64 Engravings from the "Galerie Des Modes," 1778-1787* (New York, NY: Dover Publications, 2016): 2.

[237] Christian Huck, "Visual Representations," in *A Cultural History of Dress and Fashion in the Age of Enlightenment*, ed. Peter McNeil, vol. 4 (Bloomsbury Academic, 2021): 183.

[238] Huck, "Visual Representations,"180.

was worn almost exclusively during the period of the American Revolution and often reflected French opinions toward America.[239] *Poufs* were heavily politicized hairstyles, often referencing key events or topics of debate in France.[240] During the American Revolution, the *Galerie des Modes* published illustrations of styles entitled "Bunker's Hill, or America's Headdress"[241] and "Independence, or The Triumph of Liberty,"[242] accompanied by text with news of events like the Battle of Bunker Hill and French-American naval victories over the English. Clothing was also used to convey American sentiments. Another fashion plate, published in 1779, shows a full outfit labeled *habit à l'insurgent*, or "dress of the insurgents," with a description praising American women for their role in the American Revolution.[243] The *Tableau de Paris* mentions similar styles, named "The Boston" and "The Philadelphia," both of which expressed support for the American Revolution.[244]

---

[239] Kimberly Chrisman-Campbell, *Fashion Victims: Dress at the Court of Louis XVI and Marie-Antoinette* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2015): 170.

[240] Lynn Festa and Joseph Roach, "Fashion and Adornment," in *Cultural History of Hair in the Age of Enlightenment*, ed. Margaret K. Powell, vol. 4 (Bloomsbury Academic, 2022): 69.

[241] Festa and Roach, "Fashion and Adornment," 69.

[242] Chrisman-Campbell, *Fashion Victims*, 161.

[243] Chrisman-Campbell, 184.

[244] Mercier, *Panorama*, 65.

Anonymous. *Galerie des Modes.* Fashion Plate. Paris. From Bibliothèque nationale de France, département Estampes et photographie. https://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/btv1b6940322k (last accessed 05/08/2023)

The *Tableau de Paris* also addresses the political nature of this style, mocking the

Parisians who took on an Anglo-American "republican air" without understanding the "serious

questions" of contemporary politics, particularly the ongoing military conflict between France

and England. Satirizing this sartorial hypocrisy, Mercier wrote, "He will talk of how Jamaica

must be seized; what does he know of Jamaica? He thinks India is part of America."[245] Mercier's

comments reflect a French interest in British-American politics, mocking fashionable French

people who took on Anglo-American styles without understanding the political ramifications of

such fashion. This also demonstrates the widespread popularity of American style, which was

worn throughout Paris, the center of French culture.

However, in many cases, French concepts of American style deviated from the fashions

that were actually worn in contemporary America. For example, after the American Revolution,

many women in Philadelphia began to wear elaborate "English" fashions, including silk clothing

---

[245] Mercier, *Panorama*, 148.

and "borrowed hair," or hairpieces.[246] This fashion, which broke with the idealized French concept of American dress, provoked a negative reaction from Brissot de Warville, a visiting French aristocrat. Brissot viewed elaborate, European style clothing as a detriment to the United States' civic virtue, as it conflicted with the rustic ideal of a simple, agriculture-driven republic.[247] This shows how French perceptions of "American" style shaped the French view of actual American people, particularly women, who were expected to uphold the neoclassical virtues of the United States' republic.

Similarly conflicted sentiments are reflected in broader French discourse surrounding the United States. The "craze for America" in France went much deeper than aesthetic style, extending to the topics of politics and philosophy.[248] During this time period, many French individuals cultivated "American" socio-political identities, a role that had multiple controversial meanings. The conflicts between different French individuals' American identities became increasingly apparent as political discourse deepened in the lead-up to the French Revolution.

French "Americans"

The Marquis de Lafayette, a French aristocrat who fought in the American Revolution and supported the American cause in France, styled himself as an "American" and gained American citizenship during this time. Lafayette's expressions of "American" style often played into contemporary neoclassical aesthetics, evoking an idealized image of Greco-Roman culture. Throughout the 1780s, as Lafayette constructed and decorated a new household in Paris, he deliberately mixed American and neoclassical elements. For example, he hired the furniture designer Bernard Moliter, known for neoclassical design. He also displayed his American mementos, including his own awards from the war, along with Greco-Roman symbols in his home. Lafayette associated this style with "the virtues of ancient republics," comparing the United States to the Republic of Ancient Rome.[249] This idealized image of the United States is

---

[246] Kate Haulman, *The Politics of Fashion in Eighteenth-Century America* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 2011): 194.
[247] Haulman, *Politics of Fashion*, 195.
[248] Darnton, *George Washington's False Teeth*, 121.
[249] Laura Aurrichio, *The Marquis: Lafayette Reconsidered* (Vintage Books, 2014): 134.

apparent in his memoirs, where he writes of the American Revolution, "Such a glorious cause had never before attracted the attention of mankind; it was the last struggle of Liberty, and had she then been vanquished, neither hope nor asylum would have remained for her."[250] Lafayette used his personal style to promote this political message in France.

Another French individual who took on both an "American" style and identity was Henriette-Lucie Dillon, Marquise de la Tour du Pin. Like many other educated, aristocratic Frenchwomen, Tour du Pin engaged with politics and philosophy through *salons*, where she met influential American figures like Benjamin Franklin and Thomas Jefferson. Her husband, the Marquis de la Tour du Pin, also served as a military officer in the American Revolution.[251] Tour du Pin supported her husband's political goals as he sought to apply the "American experience" of Enlightenment to France,[252] cultivating an American style in their household to reflect these ideas. Tour du Pin embraced the "newfound taste for simplicity in dress" and directly compared her style to that of American women.[253]

In her memoirs, Tour du Pin describes her American style and eventual move to America as a rustic, idealized escape from French culture and society. Describing her life on an American farm, she writes, "On the day I moved into the farm, I adopted the dress worn by women on the neighboring farms — the blue and black stripe woolen skirt, the little bodice of calico and a colored handkerchief."[254] In another passage, which idealistically describes a "ceremony of manumission" for formerly enslaved people, she compares the United States to "Ancient Rome."[255] This evokes a neoclassical, utopian view of America, somewhat similar to Lafayette's writings. However, Tour du Pin directly opposed Lafayette's view of America, writing, "the details of [the War of Independence] have since been blurred by the insipid memoirs of thar

---

[250] Marie Joseph Paul Yves Roch Gilbert Du Motier, Marquis de Lafayette, *Memoirs, Correspondence and Manuscripts of General Lafayette.* (New York: Saunders and Otley, 1837): 5-6.
[251] Caroline Moorehead, *Dancing to the Precipice: Lucie De La Tour Du Pin and the French Revolution* (London: Vintage, 2010): 71.
[252] Moorehead, *French Revolution,*85.
[253] Moorehead, 66.
[254] Lucie Henriette de la Tour du Pin, *Memoirs of Madame de la Tour du Pin*, trans. by Felice Harcourt (New York, NY: McCall, 1971): 266.
[255] Tour du Pin, *Memoirs,*283.

simpleton, La Fayette."[256] Following Lafayette's participation in French politics, particularly conflicts like the 1787 Assembly of Notables, Tour du Pin accused him of using "American" style and rhetoric to support radical politics. This demonstrates how French individuals who adopted the "American" style often came into conflict over what "American" ideals represented in France.

The Marquis de Condorcet provides a contrasting example of the conflicts inherent to French "American" identity. During this period, Condorcet published multiple political writings about America, including a pamphlet entitled *The Influence of the American Revolution on Europe*, published in 1788. In this pamphlet, Condorcet wrote, "France will profit more than any other European nation from the sound ideas Americans have on property rights and natural liberty."[257] Condorcet's interpretation of the American Revolution portrayed the United States as a role model for France. He also associated America with Rousseau's idea of the common will, writing of the Revolution, "Let men be enlightened, and soon you will see good arise spontaneously from the common will."[258] Through his work, Condorcet supported the political and philosophical ideas associated with America, identifying himself as an "American" philosopher.

Condorcet also expressed this support through personal style, as he appears to have deliberately donned "Americanized" clothing for portraits, including a painting done by the artist Jean-Baptiste-François Bosio. This fashion is similar to the style worn by both Lafayette and Tour du Pin, evoking a rustic version of American style. Condorcet references this view in his writing, referring to the United States as a "nation of farmers."[259]

---

[256] Tour du Pin, 2 *Memoirs*,73.
[257] Condorcet, "Condorcet's The Influence of the American Revolution on Europe." *The William and Mary Quarterly* 25, no. 1 (1968): 102.
[258] Condorcet, *Influence of the American Revolution*, 101.
[259] Condorcet, 104.

Jean-Baptiste-François Bosio. *Marie-Jean-Antoine-Nicolas de Caritat, Marquis de Condorcet.* Drawing, 6 5/8 x 4 11/16in. (16.8 x 11.9cm), Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York.
https://www.metmuseum.org/art/collection/search/334834 (last accessed 05/09/2023)

Despite this shared sartorial style, Condorcet's writings often came into conflict with other French "Americans," who wrote idealistically of America. Condorcet challenged French writers like Brissot de Warville and Crèvecœur, both of whom used America as a utopian idyll in their works.[260] In response to these exaggerated portrayals of America, Condorcet provided a more realistic interpretation of the American Revolution, centered on the "concept of progress."[261] Condorcet sought to praise the progress achieved by the United States while also acknowledging injustices like the American institution of slavery. His direct challenge to other French writers shows how the meanings of American style and identity were frequently and publicly disputed in France.

Discourse over America and American identity often reflected the current political conflicts in France. By adopting American style and supporting the American cause, French individuals of various political persuasions could espouse support for their own vision of the

---

[260] Darnton, *George Washington's False Teeth*, 128.
[261] Darnton, 122.

Enlightenment. These visions ranged from the monarchist opinions of Tour du Pin, who supported reform through France's absolute monarchy, to the revolutionary ideas of writers like Condorcet, who supported the republican concepts of the United States' newly formed government. The contradictory "American fantasies" portrayed in France, often at odds with the reality of the United States,[262] reflect the issues that divided French politics at this time.

During the intense political upheaval that occurred in France between 1776 and 1789, many French individuals disputed the definition and enactment of the politics and philosophy of the Enlightenment. Many challenged the authority of the French absolute monarchy, using America as a symbol of Enlightened government. In this context, American style and identities provided an area of discourse, where French individuals disputed their conflicting visions for the future of France. Individuals who donned this style, particularly political writers like Condorcet, were often highly conscious of the conflicting and controversial ideas that it represented.

For example, during the 1788 Assembly of Notables, while some French "Americans" supported the concepts of democracy and republicanism, others advocated for more conservative approaches to reform, particularly the implementation of a constitutional monarchy. One conflict occurred when Lafayette sided with a faction of monarchist Breton nobles. This caused Condorcet, who was Lafayette's ally at the time, to express concern that Lafayette had given up his Enlightenment ideals for "noble prerogatives."[263] In a friendly condemnation of Lafayette's political actions, Condorcet referenced the Potomac river and the Continental Army of America, alluding to both Lafayette's and his own identification with America. Despite their shared "American" identity, tension between Lafayette and Condorcet's different political ideas was increasingly apparent in 1788. This reflects the growing conflict and division in French society during this time.

Conclusion

---

[262] Darnton, *George Washington's False Teeth*, 121.
[263] Auricchio, *The Marquis*, 167.

After 1789, the conflicting nature of different French-American identities became far more evident and controversial. During the French Revolution, many French individuals who had previously shared an American style and identity found themselves in opposing political factions. After the Flight to Varennes in 1791, Lafayette continued to argue in favor of a constitutional monarchy, while Condorcet supported republicanism, eventually allying himself with the Girondin faction.[264] In her memoirs, Tour du Pin strongly opposed the views of both Lafayette and Condorcet, finding their interpretations of the American Revolution to be too radically republican and revolutionary.[265] Though they had previously interacted as allies during the 1770s and 1780s, the intense conflict of the French Revolution revealed that these three French "Americans" held very different political views, and had donned American style in support of their respective political factions. This demonstrates the close link between style and politics. In future research, historians should draw from these often-overlooked sources to better understand the different factions that arose during this complex period of French history.

During the period of 1776 to 1789, American style in France took on many different forms and meanings. The rustic and neoclassical themes that defined this style associated the United States with the ideas of the Enlightenment, shaping French narratives about America and the American Revolution. French style effectively "dressed up" the American Revolution, providing an area of discourse for many conflicting views of this event. French individuals who donned this style and cultivated "American" identities did so in support of vastly different politics, ranging from monarchism to republicanism. In the tumultuous, changing world inhabited by French figures like Lafayette, Tour du Pin, and Condorcet, the American Revolution had major, controversial, and far-reaching effects. The styles and identities through which these French "Americans" expressed themselves are powerful windows into the complex politics and philosophy of their time.

---

[264] David Williams, *Condorcet and Modernity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007): 33.
[265] Tour du Pin, *Memoirs*, 273.

Works Cited

Auricchio, Laura. *The Marquis: Lafayette Reconsidered*. Vintage Books, 2014.

Blum, Stella. *Eighteenth-Century French Fashion Plates: 64 Engravings from the "Galerie Des Modes," 1778-1787*. New York, NY: Dover Publications, 2016.

Condorcet, Jean-Antoine-Nicolas de Caritat. *Condorcet: Writings on the United States*. Ansart, G. (trans.), University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2012.

Condorcet, Jean-Antoine-Nicolas de Caritat. "Condorcet's The Influence of the American Revolution on Europe." Echeverria, D. (trans.), *The William and Mary Quarterly* 25, no. 1 (1968): 85–108.

Chrisman-Campbell, Kimberly. "American Idols: Fashions 'à l'américaine' in Prerevolutionary France." *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society* 109, no. 5 (2021): 181–99.

Chrisman-Campbell, Kimberly. *Fashion Victims: Dress at the Court of Louis XVI and Marie-Antoinette*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2015.

Darnton, Robert. *George Washington's False Teeth: An Unconventional Guide to the Eighteenth Century*. New York, NY: W.W. Norton & Company, 2003.

Festa, Lynn, and Joseph Roach. "Fashion and Adornment." Essay. In *Cultural History of Hair in the Age of Enlightenment* 4, edited by Margaret K. Powell, 4:53–73. Cultural History of Hair. Bloomsbury Academic, 2022.

Freist, Dagmar. "Belief." Essay. In *A Cultural History of Dress and Fashion in the Age of Enlightenment* 4, edited by Peter McNeil, 4:87–104. Cultural History of Dress and Fashion. Bloomsbury Academic, 2021.

Haulman, Kate. *The Politics of Fashion in Eighteenth-Century America*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 2011.

Huck, Christian. "Visual Representations." Essay. In *A Cultural History of Dress and Fashion in the Age of Enlightenment* 4, edited by Peter McNeil, 4:161-183. Cultural History of Dress and Fashion. Bloomsbury Academic, 2021.

Lafayette, Marie Joseph Paul Yves Roch Gilbert Du Motier. Memoirs, Correspondence and Manuscripts of General Lafayette. New York: Saunders and Otley, 1837.

La Tour du Pin, Lucie Henriette. *Memoirs of Madame De La Tour Du Pin*. Translated by Felice Harcourt. New York, NY: McCall, 1971.

Mercier, Louis-Sébastien. *Panorama of Paris: Selections from Le Tableau de Paris*. Translated by Jeremy D. Popkin. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2003.

Moorehead, Caroline. *Dancing to the Precipice: Lucie De La Tour Du Pin and the French Revolution*. London: Vintage, 2010.

Rauser, Amelia. *The Age of Undress: Art, Fashion, and the Classical Ideal in the 1790s*. New Haven, CT: Yale, 2020.

Williams, David. *Condorcet and Modernity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

About *Cornerstone*

Cornerstone, an Undergraduate Historical Journal, is published yearly by students of the Department of History at the University of California, Riverside. The journal provides undergraduates with the opportunity to publish historical works and to train graduate students in the editorial process of an academic journal. Recent issues are posted publicly on our website; past print issues are available in the department.

If you are interested in submitting your article for publication in *Cornerstone*, please visit our website listed below for information on our calls for submissions. We also welcome feedback, suggestions, and general inquiries from our readers. Contact us at the email listed below.