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Letter from the Editors

As both editors and students, we are proud to present the 60th edition of The Historian. We take great pleasure in continuing to offer a platform for NYU’s incipient historians to publish their original research. The rigor of the drafting, editing, and publishing process speaks to their historiographical talent as well as the overall quality of their work. We are appreciative of this year’s diversity in topics and we believe that each piece offers a substantial contribution to its respective field of study.

We thank the NYU Department of History for their continued support, financial and otherwise, which allows us to publish this body of work. We would also like to thank the faculty and administration who have aided us in our efforts: Jackie Menkel, Professor Anne O’Donnell, and the History Department’s administrative staff.

Last but certainly not least, we want to extend our appreciation to the contributors to this year’s edition of The Historian, who graciously afforded us the privilege of publishing their work. Without their hard-bitten research, The Historian would not be what it is today.

We hope this iteration of a sixty-year historiographical tradition at NYU affirms the importance of student-led academic publication, and we look forward to reading the ever-improving subsequent editions down the road.
Letter from the Faculty

You hold in your hands the sixtieth issue of New York University’s student-led undergraduate research journal, The Historian, one of the longest-running such publications in the United States. From research and writing to selection and editing, the work of bringing The Historian to life has been undertaken entirely by our energetic History concentrators, guided ably by Co-editor-in-chiefs Daniel Brioso and Cameron Wong. I’d like to extend a special thanks to Daniel, Cameron, and their peers for the diligence and inspiration they have brought to this year’s publication; they do us all proud.

This year’s issue features articles spanning across five centuries and far-flung in their global geographic scope, reflecting the great diversity of interests that History concentrators pursue in their time at NYU. Each of the eight articles included in the volume represents the fruit of original research, combined with rich methodological inquiry. We have here articles deploying the tools of microhistory, biography, and political economy, set in Civil War hospitals, pirate ships, and Parliaments.

I am delighted to present this volume for publication and grateful to have had the opportunity to watch it unfold under the initiative and labor of our undergraduates.

Anne O'Donnell
Assistant Professor
Departments of History and Russian and Slavic Studies
New York University
Ashanti Goldweights: A Timeless Archival of the Ritual Traditions and Economic Practices of the Ashanti Kingdom

KARISHMA BHAGANI

The Akan-Ashanti gold weights have a long-standing history associated with commerce within the Ashanti kingdom and evidence the complex system of trade established in pre-colonial Africa. Located in West Africa around modern-day Ghana, the Ashanti kingdom, home to over one million people in the seventeenth century, is most famously known for its involvement in the gold and salt trade with Europe, and also its eventual involvement in the trans-Atlantic Slave trade.¹ The Akan-Ashanti gold weights serve as a primary example of an art form that substantiates the existence of a structured system of trade and commerce within an established pre-colonial state that also has a complex system of justice, leadership, and rich culture and traditions.

In addition to playing an integral role in the kingdom’s trade with Europe, the gold influenced the day to day life of the Ashanti people. The gold weights primarily functioned as a measuring tool for gold dust, the Akan currency used to trade with European and Arab merchants. “As trade with European and Arab travelers increased, the methods and materials used to produce gold weights evolved.” At first, iron was used as trading currency within the barter trade system, and the weighing system was developed based on he less sophisticated Islamic and European systems of weighing.² But, an increase in the outreach of trade exposed the Ashanti people to a wider range of weighing techniques and precipitated the development of a more complex system of measuring currency. This sparked the change from a mundane iron

¹ Carl Kjersmeier, Ashanti-Vaegtlodder (København: Gjellerup, 1948). 12.
³ Both these systems of weighing were introduced to the Ashanti people over a long period of time, and with the increase in interaction through commerce.
cast weighing system to brass and bronze metal casting, which were more valuable elements.\textsuperscript{4} Gold weights produced from braze and bronze were made using a wax cast molding system, which continued to evolve over the course of the trade and as a result of improvements in craftsmanship. This shows the impact of trade on the wax-casting system, as the access to new techniques and material elements such as brass and bronze changed the gold weight system. Furthermore, the greater value of the brass and bronze elements increased the overall value of the gold weights. As a result of increased trade, the Ashanti people gained greater access to advanced technology and developed a greater level of craft specialization in molding the weights.\textsuperscript{5}

Trade-induced innovation in gold weight production had a profound influence on the Kingdom’s internal social and economic life. The growing sophistication of the gold weights elevated craftsmen within the Kingdom’s social hierarchy, pushing them closer to chiefs and kings. Also, in looking at a gold weight collection, one may notice that “…the same motifs are applied again and again, but each single weight bears the stamp of the individual personality of its creator.”\textsuperscript{6} The gold weights also maintained sustainable economies within family structures, as “crafts-families” continued their ancestral legacy by engaging in the business of molding weights. The gold weights also played a role in justice, banking, and social systems of the Ashanti kingdom. The weights were used “in justice…[where]…it was possible to obtain absolution from punishment for most crimes by paying a fine in gold dust.”\textsuperscript{7} Often times, gold weights would also be used to remind creditors to return their loans, to show kinship between families, and when paying dowry for marital alliances. The weight was used as a placeholder for

\textsuperscript{5} Ibid, page 38.
\textsuperscript{6} Carl Kjersmeier, \textit{Ashanti-Vaegtlodder} (København: Gjellerup, 1948). 16.
\textsuperscript{7} Ibid., 15.
loans and marital deals, and sometimes the gestures of the goldweights were linked to folktales that reminded people to pay their debt. Thus, the development of a more complex trading system spurred the adoption of a more advanced method of measuring gold dust using gold weights, which in turn altered the social and economic dynamics of families and communities in the Ashanti kingdom.

A deeper understanding of the use of the gold weights within daily lives and trade in the Ashanti Kingdom is helpful in providing a contextual background of the evolution of the weights. However, one is inclined to interpret the meaning of specific gestures, images and representations of daily life in the gold weights. Not only do the Akan gold weights indicate a complex system of trade and craftsmanship between the Akan people, they can also be seen as a form of art history to deepen our understanding and reconstruct the social structures of the Ashanti peoples. The questions this raises are: In what other ways are the Ashanti-Akan gold weights indicators of a rich cultural heritage within the Ashanti kingdom? To what extent are the gestures, images, and symbols found in the gold weights representative of ritual sacrifices and moral values imbedded within daily life? To answer these questions, one must adopt a cultural lens, and gain a richer understanding of some of the ritual practices that govern the daily life of the Ashanti people.

According to Timothy Garrard’s book, *Akan Weights and the Gold Trade*, the Ashanti gold weights served a purpose much larger than just commerce. These weights were deeply embedded within the cultural and ritual traditions of the Ashanti Kingdom. Specifically, Garrard contends that the gold weights are often referred to as ‘proverb-weights’ because they are strongly tied to rituals and symbols associated with Akan society.8 “The proverb could be

---

employed with great effect to make a discreet allusion or to point a moral in a delicate and inoffensive way. It was also an important conversational weapon." In describing the conversational importance of proverbs, Garrard is alluding to the importance of oral storytelling and wisdom passed down through generations through orature. Proverbs were often associated with folktales and were used to pass down traditional wisdom and rituals, often using the gold weights as a visual symbol. Despite the connection between folktales, proverbs and gold weights, it is important to note that the proverbs and folktales existed independently of the gold weights, that is, they are integrated within performance, and day to day objects and practices without necessarily being associated with the function of the weights. Still, gold weights were both prominently featured in and symbolic embodiments of the culture and traditions of the Akan society.

Patricia Mireku-Gyimah, in her journal article *Story-telling: A Memory and Remembrance Activity in the Akan Tradition of Ghana*, suggests that the folktales within the Akan kingdom belonged to specific communities and that these stories are publicly owned. However, “a storyteller has to rely on his or her memory to deliver a good story” and the process of telling the story becomes a “memory and remembrance affair.” The transcendence of these narratives from one generation to another in turn reinforce the aesthetics, values, rituals and morals of the Akan society. Arguably, the Akan gold weights serve as visual representation and archive of each of the folktales to which they relate, because they embody the cultural traditions, morals, values and belief systems that the Ashanti people follow. In order to better understand and contextualize some of the ritual practices that are passed down the generations, we will

---

survey some of the Akan folktales that relate to the Ashanti gold weights. Traditionalist practices and religion was at the core of the social structure of the Ashanti kingdom, and so day to day ritual practices had a strong spiritual connection and attempted to connect the liminal space between the higher power and the material world. Accordingly, one of the most common motifs within Akan gold weight imagery and folktales from the Ashanti kingdom is the notion of ritual sacrifice. On the one hand, Kjersmeier claims that the human and ritual sacrifices performed within the kingdom “secured for Ashanti the reputation of being the goriest of West-African states.” On the other hand, one could argue that the Akan-Ashanti kingdom is deeply rooted within religion, which manifests itself in daily life through sacrificial rituals and traditions. As a result, it is easy for an outsider who does not understand the oral pedagogical system to assume that the human and ritual sacrifice is “gory” and “cult-like” within this context. Contrary to this, the gold weights depict multifaceted religious customs and varying spiritual beliefs of the Akan peoples, many of which are rooted in pleasing the Gods through ritual sacrifice. Hence, “the figurative weights take their motifs from the customs of the Ashanti…” and serve as visual representations of the morals and themes that form the foundation of their daily practice.12

Eric de Kolb’s selection of gold weights in his gallery catalog, Ashanti Gold Weights suggest that many of the figurines represent a form of ritual sacrifice. For example, his collection refers to gold weights that show a “Man Offering Fowl”, an executioner, and many other ritual forms of sacrifice, that are also often associated with proverbs. Considering many of these proverbs and meanings are passed down through oral tradition, it is evident that there are common threads between the proverbs, visual images of the Ashanti gold weights and folktales. Many of the documented folktales, center around pleasing specific gods that are related to nature,

such as the Sky-God and his children. The character that guides the story, either by performing the sacrifice, or committing a wrong action (from which the reader is expected to learn a lesson), is Anansi the spider. In gaining a deeper understanding of the purpose and characters within the folktales, one can draw connections between the visual significance of the gold weights, and the morals from the folktales.

**Anansi the Spider – The Trickster Character within Ashanti Folktales**

Traditional folktales formed a critical part of the oral pedagogy present in the Ashanti kingdom. Many of these folktales were based on morals, comparable to a modern day “Aesop’s Fables” text. According to R.S Rattray, the *authentic* presentation structure of these stories is “at night, by the old folks, under the stars.”

Despite Rattray’s rather *exotic* interpretation of the performance of folktales, his work raises an important point; the older generation often times shared these stories with the younger generation. Hence, the characters in the folktales all served as symbols to teach children larger moral lessons and the value of humanity.

Many of these folktales have one common character, Anansi, the Spider. Anansi is most commonly associated with the Ashanti creation myths, and so he serves as a character that controls and negotiates the “liminal space between the sacred and mundane worlds” i.e. between the gods and the common people. In many of the folktales, Anansi usually needs to obtain something or perform a sacrifice, to save the population, or to gain power over the other gods.

One of the most famous folktales is: *How Spider Obtained the Sky-God’s Stories*. Anansi asks the Sky-God how he can buy all the Sky-God’s stories to share with the rest of the people. The Sky-God said that the only way this is possible, is if Anansi obtains Onini the python.

---

14 Jacob D. Campbell, *Power and Paradox in the Trickster Figure*, PhD diss., Southern Illinois University Carbondale, 1999 (Carbondal, IL: OpenSIUC, 1999), 6.
(among other animals and ritual objects). In order to satisfy the Sky-God’s demands, Anansi the spider tricks the onini (python) into believing that he is measuring the python’s body, but captures him for the Sky-God instead.

“Is it not my wife, Aso, who is arguing with me that this palm branch is longer than you, and I say she is a liar.” And Onini, the python, said, “Bring it, and come and measure me.” Ananse took the palm branch and laid it along the python’s body. Then he said, “Stretch yourself out.” And the python stretched himself out and Ananse took the rope creeper and wound it in the sound of tying was nwenene! nwenene! nwenene! until he came to the head.

In this folktale, Anansi depicts the cunning qualities of a “stock” trickster character. This trait is supported in other folktales. For example, in Spider Read the Sky God’s Thoughts, Anansi disguises himself to read the Sky-God’s mind and find out who will succeed him as king. Many of the goldweights that are shaped in the form of spiders and insects usually draw from this myth. In other words, the specific aesthetic characteristics closely reflect some of the subtle meanings of the Ananse myth. An example of a myth is explained below:

When Ananse reached the path, he said to himself, “I do not know his thoughts and yet I said, ‘I know them.’” And he plucked some feathers out of every bird, stuck them on himself and flew off, alighting on a gyedua tree in the sky-god’s village. And when the people saw the bird, they all made a great commotion which sounded like “Ye-e-e-e!” And the sky-god came out of the house and came under the gyedua tree and said, “Were Ananse here, he would have known the name of this bird. I had decided that Owia, Sun, is the one I wanted to make a chief, so I asked who knew what was in my head and Ananse said that he did. Now I have gone and pulled up the yam known as ‘Kintinkyi,’ and he who knows its name and utters it, to him I shall give it, my blackened stool. That is why Ananse has gone off to bring my children. Had he been here, he would have known the name of this bird.” (87)

The above example enhances Anansi’s trickster character, as his disguise is also unrecognizable by the Sky-God. Anansi is further depicted as cunning and selfish, as he intends to read the Sky-God’s mind to determine who the next king will be. He goes to the extent of disguising himself as a bird to find all the Sky-God’s children.
In unpacking the trickster traits of Anansi in various Ashanti creation myths and folktales, his character is often times viewed as a “trickster, with few scruples, who uses his wit and cunning to get an advantage over animals who are bigger and stronger than himself. His stories show him as selfish and cruel...[and]...he will help other creatures, but only when it suits his own purposes.”

While, within a Western context, these trickster traits may be interpreted as jokers or buffoon like characters, within the African context, specifically for the Ashanti kingdom, trickster characters were ‘intrinsic to a true understanding...[of the]...religious communities...[that]...invoke him.’ The trickster character often perform sacred actions, as depicted in many folktales. These actions inform the moral spectrum of the Ashanti people, and day to day rituals are performed to invoke the trickster’s legacy. Evidently, the trickster serves as a ‘transitional figure that brings about change through his charismatic communication’, and specifically in the case of Ananse the spider, Robert Pelton argues that Ananse embodies a form a transaction. He transforms the social landscape and links the spiritual and material worlds by playing out his inner impulses and learning from the consequences of his actions. As a result, his actions largely influence human interaction through ‘the social manifestation of his personal attributes’. Furthermore, in the case of Anansi the spider, his presence within folktales results in the emergence of text which is ‘grounded in parables, poetics and symbolic referencing’. Not only does this form a concrete framework for proverbs, but also allows for varied interpretations.

16 Jacob D. Campbell, Power and Paradox in the Trickster Figure, PhD diss., Southern Illinois University Carbondale, 1999 (Carbondal, IL: OpenSIUC, 1999), 6.
17 Ibid, 39.
18 Jacob D. Campbell, Power and Paradox in the Trickster Figure, PhD diss., Southern Illinois University Carbondale, 1999 (Carbondal, IL: OpenSIUC, 1999), 39.
19 Jacob D. Campbell, Power and Paradox in the Trickster Figure, PhD diss., Southern Illinois University Carbondale, 1999 (Carbondal, IL: OpenSIUC, 1999), 41.
of gestures and symbols within the Ashanti gold weights. The gold weights serve as a visual and tangible manifestation of many of these oral stories. Thus, in many ways, these weights serve as an archive of the creation stories and folktales in the Ashanti culture.

Therefore, in unpacking the folktales revolving around Anansi the spider, not only do we gain a deeper understanding of the morals, ethics and values that the Ashanti people govern their life by, but also, one is able to develop a new context and framework within which the gold weights can be interpreted. On the one hand, the Ashanti folktales help reaffirm some of the existing proverbs used to explain gold weights. On the other hand, other folktales provide a deeper context through which we can curate and assign a different meaning and moral significance to the Ashanti gold weights. To illustrate this, I will provide a case study of selected weights that show multiple interpretations of the folktales and proverbs associated with the gold weights. With this, not only do I hope to reaffirm the connections between the oral traditions and cultures of the Ashanti kingdom but also, I hope to highlight the possibility of differing interpretations of the same images based and hence curate the contextual backgrounds of the gold weights.

**Figure 23 – Man Offering Fowl**

According to Eric de Kolb, this image represents a man offering fowl, which is considered a sacrifice to the Sky-God. Although there is no proverb associated with this specific image, there are multiple gold weights that have the same meaning. One can argue that the gestures represented in the gold weights refer to the folktale *Spider Read the Sky-God’s Thoughts*. The Sky-God says “…were Ananse here, he would have known the name of this bird,” which suggests that the God
desired for the spider to return and help identify the bird. Thus, the sacrifice of the fowl is deemed to please the Sky-God’s desires.

**Figure 85-88: Porcupine**

Eric de Kolb, associates the porcupine gold weights with the proverb “One should never rub bottoms with a porcupine”, which means “Don’t get an altercation with someone who can hurt you more than you can hurt him.” The proverb associated with this gold weight also feeds into the context of the folktale *How the Hoe Came to the Ashanti*. The porcupine showed Anansi how to hoe a farm and together they both covered a huge tract of land. Anansi the spider, without asking the porcupine said that he would “…come and take…[the porcupine’s hoe]…” to do his work, and plow his own farm. Arguably, the spider took advantage of the porcupine’s niceness and willingness to teach. The spider did not know how to make his hoe stop and it “hoed until it came too far away.” Therefore, with this example, we can see yet again that the proverbs of the gold weights and the folktales have similar contexts and the stories deepen our understanding of the gestures.

**Figure 102-107B - Sankofa Bird**

---

The Sankofa bird is usually depicted with head turned backwards, sitting on a pyramid, or on a step-pyramid and, occasionally, on a tree or four-sided pyramid. It is a royal emblem, the emblem of the Sun-King.”^{24} It is associated with the proverb, the King sees everything. Often times, it is also associated with the idea of learning “from past experiences and not to be afraid to try to redeem mistakes already committed.”^{25} When associated with Spider Read the Sky-God’s Thoughts, the bird holds a symbolic power as it represents the Sun-King, and hence stands for the growth and prosperity of the Ashanti kingdom as a whole. The Sun-King was selected as the Sky-God’s successor, and this was because Ananse disguised himself as a bird, read the Sky-God’s mind and helped in completing the action of bringing the Sun-God to his father’s kingdom. In this way, the future growth and regeneration of the kingdom depended on Ananse’s ability to return to the Sky-God’s past thoughts and determine who the desired king was.

On the other hand, while proverbial interpretations provide a deeper context into the cultural underpinnings of the gold weights by reflecting the Ashanti daily practices, one can argue that there are multiple contexts within which the gold weights possess a moral value and symbolic meaning. Although each gold weight may have a proverbial significance, the examples below illustrate a diverse range of interpretations of each of the figurines.

---

Figure 54 – One Man Helping Another Up the Tree

According to de Kolb’s this figurine is associated with the proverb “He who has no friends will have no-one to help him up.” While this proverb matches well with the gold weight, because it literally depicts one man helping another up, it also has a moral significance, one could argue that the gestures of the gold weight would also line up well with the Ananse folktale *How It Came About That Wisdom Came Among the Tribe*. In the folktale, Kwaku Ananse the spider ‘swept up all the knowledge, gathered it together in one spot, and placed it in a gourd pot.’ As a result, he expected that no one in the town, including his son, would have any wisdom, until he shared all the knowledge he had gathered. However, when Anansi was trying to place the pot of knowledge on a treetop, away from the rest of the townspeople, it was his son that suggested that he should carry the gourd on his back. Ananse realized that his own son was very wise, even though Ananse supposedly collected the town’s knowledge. Based on this folktale, the image of the gold weight could represent Ananse’s son supporting him up the tree with the gourd on his back. The son carrying the father is a symbolic reference to wisdom and knowledge existing within multiple generations within the Ashanti kingdom. Not only do the references in the folktale and the image of the gold weight suggest that knowledge is spread amongst all generations, but also it teaches us not to underestimate the power of those younger than us.

The executioner gold weight has the executioner’s sword in the right hand and a severed head in the left hand. It is associated with the proverb “once a man has cut off his head, he no longer fears anything.”\textsuperscript{28} When placed in the context of the folktale \textit{How It Came About That the Hinder Part of Kwake Ananse, The Spider, Became Big, at the Expense of His Head, Which Became Small}, the gestures in the gold weight begin to represent a different meaning. The moral of the story is that one should be satisfied with what they have access to, instead of pushing for more and being greedy. Kwaku Ananse, the spider, loses his head because of his excessive greediness for more fish. With this context in mind, the executioner gold weight represents the spirit that cuts off Anansi’s head (which is in the left hand). The spirits took the head and replace it at their own will, and the power that the spiritual world has over the material universe is clearly depicted through the gold weight.

This gold weight is connected to the proverb “As long as the head remains, one cannot avoid carrying loads about.” This suggests that one must bear the burdens to commit a good deed and work towards a good cause. When placed in conversation with the Ashanti folktale \textit{How Kwaku Ananse (The Spider) Got Aso in Marriage}, the gold weight could refer to the journey that the spider’s father takes to Aso’s village with dowry to ask for her hand in marriage. “Father Ananse took the meat and palm-leaf basket and set it on his head and set out on the path leading to the

\textsuperscript{28} Eric De Kolb, \textit{Ashanti Goldweights} (New York: Gallery DHautbarr, 1968), 13.
Akwasi…settlement.”29 One can interpret the gestures of the gold weight as an offering of dowry, and a depiction of the long journey of desire that one must take to come together with another in holy matrimony. Furthermore, it is Ananse’s father that makes the journey to Aso’s village with the dowry, which suggests that an alliance in matrimony does not only affect the two individuals concerned, it is an alliance between two families.

From the above examples, we are able to see that the Ashanti gold weights are not only significant tools of economic commerce for the Ashanti peoples, but also serve as a form of archive for the rituals, traditions and moral values of the community. When placed in conversation with the Ashanti folktales, it is evident that there are common threads and themes of ritual sacrifice, kinship and other relationships, that are valued and form the foundation of social relationships in the kingdom. Hence, the performative gestures of each of the gold weights take different meanings when applied within different contexts. Due to the fact that many of the traditions and ritual practices were passed down through oral tradition and oral histories, one is likely to find multiple variations and interpretations of each of the gold weights. This raises the question of the manner in which information transcends from one generation to another and evolves based on the generational developments. The evolution of these gold weights over the generations, give them a “vitality and wit, qualities that also distinguish much of Ashanti folklore,” which allows us to appreciate the power of oral tradition and pedagogy, and how that allows for a fluid interpretation of images and objects such as the gold weights.30 In conclusion, the Ashanti gold weights are unique art pieces that both archive the cultural, social and economic

29 Robert Sutherland. Rattray, Akam-Ashanti Folktales (Oxford University Press, 1930), 133.
history of the Ashanti kingdom in a way that is timeless and fluid, capturing the evolution of traditional practices throughout the generations.
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Note: all images and archival materials were retrieved from the RC Chaim and Gross Foundation.
A Country “Electrified”: Memory, Commemoration, and the Memoir of Colonel Benjamin Tallmadge

JORI JOHNSON

It was “the shot heard round the world”\(^{31}\) that drove Benjamin Tallmadge to leave Weathersfield, Connecticut and ride on horseback to find out “what was going on near Boston.” Following the conflicts at Lexington and Bunker Hill in 1775 which ignited the American Revolution, Tallmadge remarked that “the whole country seemed to be electrified,” and he that too had “caught the flame which was thus spreading from breast to breast.” Though he initially had no intentions of entering a military life, discussions with friends who were embroiled in the battle at Bunker Hill forced Tallmadge “to think of the oppression which was so abundantly expressed by the British government towards the Colonies, until [he] finally became entirely devoted to the cause in which [his] country was compelled to engage.” Tallmadge “returned to Wethersfield full of zeal in the cause of [his] country,” and by June of 1776 was officially commissioned to become a lieutenant.\(^{32}\)

These are the words with which Tallmadge described his introduction and entrance to the Revolution. The impassioned language—evoking a country electrified, devoted to its cause, compelled to engage, and full of zeal—paints a picture of the Revolutionary era that is familiar to the modern reader. It aligns with stories told today of “a Revolution led by a group of ‘demigods’ who towered above their fellow colonists, led them into a war against tyranny, and established a democratic nation dedicated to the proposition that all men were endowed by their


\(^{32}\) Benjamin Tallmadge, Memoir of Colonel Benjamin Tallmadge (New York: Gilliss Press, 1904), pp. 5-7.
creator with equal rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.” However, this narrative of the Revolution wasn’t so clear from the start of the war, or even in the decades following its completion. According to historian Michael A. McDonnell, the war and its purpose were complicated by “divisions among colonists themselves over whether to fight, what to fight for, and who would do the fighting.” This complicated collective memory of the war in its immediate wake; the American people didn’t know what to make of the trauma brought by eight years of war, betrayals by family and neighbors, and the loss of long-established ties to Britain. The vastly different experiences of the war across the colonies left the memory of the war up for contention, allowing it to constantly shift and to be adapted for the need of the historical moment in the decades after the war. Revolutionary participants seized the opportunity. As this paper will argue, the Memoir of Colonel Benjamin Tallmadge was crafted to build and support the late-emerging collective memory of the American Revolution, rather than as a true recollection of Tallmadge’s wartime experiences.

The fervor for the Revolution that emerges in Tallmadge’s writing was a new sensation to him, as “nothing was further from [his] intention at that time than to have entered upon a military life.” Born on Long Island in 1754 to a Yale-educated father, Tallmadge was privileged enough to receive a liberal education throughout his childhood. At the age of thirteen he was declared college-ready by the President of Yale himself, but his father “deemed it improper” for him to go to college at such a young age and postponed his Yale education for two more years. After graduating in 1773, Tallmadge took up a job as a high school superintendent in Connecticut, where he remained until the start of the Revolution. For someone who previously had no interest

in a military life, Tallmadge truly rose to the occasion when he was swept up by the Revolutionary cause: leaving his administrative life in Connecticut behind, he would go on to serve in the Continental Army for seven years, climbing from Lieutenant to Major of his regiment and making himself enough of an asset to be in personal communication with General Washington. Tallmadge’s privileged background likely played a part in easing his rise to such an elevated position during the war. This heightened position also would have given him a perspective of the war different from that of the typical soldier of the Revolution, a position which would impact his approach to writing a memoir about his wartime experiences.\textsuperscript{34}

While Tallmadge likely avoided the struggles that the majority of the Continental Army encountered, his memoir practically erases the horror and uncertainty soldiers dealt with during the war. Tallmadge described the first scenes of battle he witnessed as leaving him “solemn beyond description,” and noted by the end of the campaign of 1776 that “all was confusion and dismay, and it seemed as if we were on the eve of despair and ruin.” In the same pages, though, Tallmadge remarks on the “enthusiastic zeal” soldiers were filled with upon hearing about the adoption of the Declaration of Independence. He comments on the “entire change in all our military system” that occurred when Washington and Congress decided to raise a larger army, leading “those who felt ardent in their country’s cause” to “step forward and engage in her service.”\textsuperscript{35} These hopeful descriptions seem to be at odds with the reality of popular opinion on the Revolution: many soldiers were solely concerned with defending their own towns or colonies, not the fledgling United States. Many more were not interested in joining the war effort at all; the early history of the war is full of accounts of desertion, mutinies, and resistance to

\textsuperscript{34} Tallmadge, \textit{Memoir of Colonel Benjamin Tallmadge}, pp. 4-22.
\textsuperscript{35} Ibid, pp. 11-22.
While there were certainly soldiers who fervently believed in the cause they were fighting for, these sentiments weren’t so common until well after the war. In this context, the patriotic feeling asserted in Tallmadge’s writing is more fitting of a later era than it is of the Revolutionary period.

This anachronistic style likely emerges from the fact that Tallmadge’s memoir was not published immediately after the war. Though it focuses on the seven years he spent in the Continental Army, Tallmadge didn’t pen his story until forty-five years after the war’s end. Furthermore, the memoir was only published by son Frederick August Tallmadge in 1858, over twenty years after his father’s death. According to the preface written by Frederick, Benjamin initially wrote his memoir “at the request of his children, and for their gratification.” Tallmadge was not unique in this claimed personal motivation for writing; accounts of the war written so that friends and family might be able to revere and pass down the legacy of the Revolution were common from the 1780s onward. Even more of these stories were published in the wake of the 1818 Revolutionary Pension Act, through which veterans were required to share their experience of the war as part of the application to receive pension for their service.

Generally, these stories were “self-consciously subjective and individualistic view[s] of the Revolutionary War.” The memoir of veteran Levi Redfield, for example, was written in “a very humble, individual voice.” A music teacher hailing from Connecticut, Redfield decided to record his war experience because he had no remaining family to preserve his memory after his death. Ebenezer Fletcher, another veteran from Connecticut, wanted the public to recognize his bravery.
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in the war. His memoir was detailed with descriptions of wounds sustained in battle, imprisonment by the enemy, and his eventual escape. Similarly to Tallmadge, each of these Connecticut veterans sought to record their experiences for posterity in writing their memoirs. Yet, their stories turned out to be far more individualistic and intimate in nature than Tallmadge’s; where extensive details of personal action are found in the memoirs of other veterans, nothing of the sort is identifiable in his. This is especially surprising as Frederick Tallmadge also notes in the preface that the memoir is “confined, principally, to those incidents of the Revolutionary War with which he was more immediately connected, and therefore becomes the more interesting to his descendants and family friends.” From this description, one would expect a highly personal account from Tallmadge.

The account we are presented with, however, is paradoxically personal and impersonal: it is written uniquely enough that a patriotic voice is identifiable, but also so general that readers are given no sense of Tallmadge’s own actions during each year’s campaign. Instead, the memoir tends to generalize about movements of the army and the enemy as whole units. “As the enemy advanced, Gen. Washington took his station on the left bank…near which river it appeared probably that the hostile armies must engage, as they had now advanced within a few miles of each other,” wrote Tallmadge about the army’s actions in late 1777. In that passage, Tallmadge goes on to provide extensive detail on the movement of General George Washington and his men. “At night Gen. Washington took his station at Chester…the next day Gen. Washington retired to Philadelphia…Gen. Washington retreated to the high grounds about Germantown…Gen. Washington now recrossed the Schuylkill…Gen. Washington removed his army to
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Pottsgrove,” and so on. Tallmadge’s only reference to his own action comes at the end of the passage, where he briefly mentions that his “own position was at the head of Gen. Sullivan’s division” and that they found themselves “close in upon the scene of action.” This selection is not by any means an anomaly in Tallmadge’s memoir; the majority of the account reads more like a military record than a personal record of memory.\(^{41}\) His decision to split the memoir into chapters by year of campaign is also more fitting of a military record than a memoir; veterans often had difficulty determining sequences of events when writing or speaking about their war experiences.\(^{42}\)

The lack of intimacy in Tallmadge’s writing cannot be dismissed as a literary trend of the time period. Even veterans with different goals in writing emerged with more individualistic memoirs. John Paul Jones, a naval officer, wrote a self-aggrandizing memoir and quasi-propaganda piece in 1785. His goal in writing was to salvage his reputation, which was in shambles due to his decision to join the French and Russian navies in the years after the Revolution. Jones “tried to bolster his own heroic reputation by presenting an unflinching portrait of his talents and refined judgment.”\(^{43}\) At the other end of the spectrum, veteran Joseph Plumb Martin sought to highlight the hardships faced by the average soldier in his memoir. It was distinctive for frequently breaking “from narrating linear sequences of events to recount shambling anecdotes and to record vivid (and static) sense-memories, especially those arising from being hungry.”\(^{44}\) Consciously or unconsciously, each of these veterans approached the writing of their memoirs with distinctive voice, viewpoints, and agendas. In comparison to these
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veterans, Tallmadge’s personal voice is completely shrouded within his own memoir and replaced with a generalized, military-style, impersonal retelling of the Revolutionary War.

If Tallmadge’s intention was to create a story that could both shed light on his personal war experiences and be shared among his friends, family, and descendants, then why would he have attempted to bury himself in his own story? It is worth noting again that more than forty-five years passed from the war’s end before Tallmadge finally wrote his memoir. In the past when examining an individual’s memory of events, historians have been concerned “by the observer’s physical proximity in time and space to the event” as memories tend to fade over time. In this context, it would make sense that Tallmadge’s recollections of his wartime experiences might not be crystal clear. The lack of personal touch in his writing could simply have emerged from a lack of memory of his individual wartime actions, rather than an active attempt at hiding his own story.

However, historians have come to recognize that proximity isn’t quite as important as initially thought; research has shown that memory is actually produced from a series of stimulations and associations. One thought will trigger a series of associations until the person remembering has decided that they recall as much as is needed in the present moment. Rather than being a piece of information that can only wither with time, memory is ever so slightly reconstructed every single time remembrance is performed. “In each construction of a memory, people reshape, omit, distort, combine, and reorganize details from the past in an active and subjective way,” explains David Thelen in an article detailing the study of memory in history. Each memory is “an active and new construction made from many tiny associations, not a passive process of storing and retrieving full-blown objective representations of past

experiences.” With this knowledge, Thelen argues that it matters less how near a person is in time or place to an event and how accurately they remember it. Rather, the crucial point is the individual’s need, motive, circumstance, mood, and bias at the time that they construct the memory. “Since an individual’s starting points change as the person grows and changes, people reshape their recollections of the past to fit their present needs.” This begs the question: what were the needs, motives, circumstances, moods, and biases that influenced Tallmadge’s reconstruction of his memory?

In the immediate wake of the war, historian Sarah J. Purcell writes that there was a need for people to “impose meaning on the chaos of war around them.” At a time where men questioned what it meant to fight for a country that did not yet exist, soldiers needed to be assured that their efforts would mean something – that their sacrifice for the United States would be worthwhile. According to Purcell, a culture of “hero worship” emerged from this need; the sacrifices of soldiers were commemorated to ensure that lives were not lost in vain. Some soldiers who died early on in the war were made to be martyrs for the American cause, inflated into larger-than-life characters whose memory “inspired patriotism during the war and stimulated the national imagination as an example of the glory that would accrue to those who made the ultimate sacrifice for the sake of American political principles.” The commemoration and martyrization of these individuals was accomplished in a variety of ways: orators spoke about war heroes; writers commemorated them in almanacs, broadsides, booka, and newspapers; and the general public attended celebrations, church services, parades, and picnics in their honor. By recognizing and honoring martyrs, their deaths could be “transformed and sentimentalized into a

tool for mobilizing public support for the war.” It allowed people throughout the colonies to recognize the sacrifices that were being made by people locally, and to see that the people of other colonies were making those same sacrifices. Identifying these shared sacrifices was a key first step in making sense of the war and connecting people throughout the colonies to a shared national identity. This form of commemorative culture can be found in Tallmadge’s memoir, especially in his references to George Washington. The constant description and praise of the actions of “his Excellency” align perfectly with the idea of hero worship: as leader of the Continental Army, Washington became a symbol of the nation unified as a whole.

However, not everyone possessed such high opinions of Washington in the years after the war, and examining the differences in opinion demonstrates how a nation of divided Americans began to use and interpret Revolutionary memory to different ends. Though America had emerged victorious from the war, there were still many uncertainties to be addressed regarding the political, economic, and social landscape of the new republic. Many survivors of the war “felt neglected, playing no role in the future-minded republic.” There were five hundred thousand Loyalists suddenly in a country that no longer represented their interests, approximately twenty-five thousand deaths of soldiers to grapple with, and a vast population of civilians who were only loosely linked together as a country. As military memory was continually used to “envision a more democratic nation,” the divide among the American people led to different uses and interpretations of that memory. In the case of Washington, his “Federalist sympathies” in the eyes of Democratic-Republicans led to a shift in his image. Rather than standing as a symbol of the newly formed country’s unity, he became a controversial figure, especially as Federalists
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attempted to use his image as a military hero “to bolster support for his political achievements, which were far more controversial.” In this context, Tallmadge’s frequent reference to Washington also takes on a more political form; it suggests that his elevation of Washington’s presence over his own within the memoir was a calculated decision.

A look into Tallmadge’s later life supports this idea. The Colonel was elected to Congress as a member of the Federalist party in 1800, and he continued to serve as a Representative of Connecticut until 1816. If Tallmadge had political motivations in writing his memoir, he wouldn’t have been alone. In addition to veterans who used their war stories to establish their place in history, there were many other groups who co-opted Revolutionary memory for their own causes, ranging from abolitionists to labor unions to political parties. Approaching the War of 1812, supporters and opponents of the war used Revolutionary memory to argue their cases. Democratic-Republicans believed that “the blood that was spilled in the Revolution argued for a defense of national honor in the War of 1812,” while Federalists thought that it would be “a betrayal of the true principles of Revolutionary warfare” to engage in a conflict in which “America’s grievances were not severe enough” to justify a war. In all likelihood, Tallmadge aligned with his party on this issue; he was offered a high commanding position in the army by President James Madison in 1812, which he declined. Tallmadge’s political biases certainly had some influence on his memory of the war and thus the writing of his memoir, even though the Federalist party did not exist until after the Revolution. In glorifying Washington and asserting patriotic tones in his memoir, it is likely he sought to remind readers of those true
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principles of Revolutionary warfare that would be betrayed if the nation engaged in the War of 1812.

Examining Tallmadge’s postwar life outside of politics provides even further insight to the influences on his memory and the writing of his memoir. After the dissolution of the Continental Army, Tallmadge writes that officers sought to establish a group through which they could ensure “the remembrance of this vast event” and “the mutual friendships which have been formed under the pressure of common danger.”\(^5\)\(^5\) This group became the Society of the Cincinnati, and Tallmadge served as Treasurer and President of the Society’s Connecticut branch. Tallmadge’s involvement in such a group suggests his interest in preserving the memory of the Revolution even before he wrote his memoir. Additionally, it shows that he believed veterans should be given status in society for their sacrifices, as the Society was meant to “provide stability for the American government while at the same time enhancing members’ personal prestige.”\(^5\)\(^6\) This prestige was also meant to be carried down family lines, as membership in the Society was passed from father to son. Eventually the Connecticut branch of the Society was abolished; Tallmadge wrote that “there seemed to be a jealousy in the minds of some that it would be like encouraging a sort of self-erected aristocracy.”\(^5\)\(^7\) Even beyond Connecticut, the organization was widely criticized for “perpetuating the very despotism they had fought to overthrow.” Many believed that the inheritable nature of the Society’s prestige would create an elite class of individuals with unfair influence over the government and memory of the Revolution, especially because membership in the Society was exclusive to officers rather than all who served in the war.\(^5\)\(^8\)
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That Tallmadge remained in this Society for several years despite its elitist reputation speaks to his character and the perspective from which he wrote his memoir. Tallmadge held a greater position of power than most Revolutionary war veterans: he was educated, a Major of his regiment, held personal correspondence with Washington during the war, and eventually became a member of Congress. This privilege undoubtedly influenced his memory of the war and his postwar experiences; he did not enter the war as one of “the poor, the landless, the young, and the foreign-born, looking for a wage and individual advancement,”\(^{59}\) nor did he have to scramble to prove his experiences after the war in order to receive a pension that would provide livelihood. It seems this elite social position allowed Tallmadge to look back on the war fondly and with a more patriotic mindset than his contemporaries.

While studying Tallmadge’s postwar life certainly gives some insight into why his memoir is patriotic but impersonal, it is necessary to dig deeper into what his life was truly like during the war. As David Thelen mentions, omission is just as much a part of memory construction as active remembrance is, and omission is especially pertinent to Tallmadge’s story.\(^{60}\) One of the Colonel’s most important contributions to the Revolution was the ring of spies he developed in order to obtain intelligence for George Washington. Today this is known as the Culper Ring, and it is best known for exposing Major John Andre, a British soldier who plotted with Benedict Arnold to surrender at West Point. While Tallmadge did devote a considerable section of his memoir to the capture of Major John Andre, he focuses only on his fascination with Andre as a character. Any reference to the Culper Ring is vague at best. “This year (1778) I opened private correspondence with some persons in New York (for Gen. Washington) which lasted through the war.” Only through the notes added onto the memoir after publication does it become clear that
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this correspondence is the one involving the spies, and that secrecy went as far using invisible ink in these letters. That Tallmadge chose to omit almost all details of this major contribution to the war from his memoir only seems to further reveal that the account wasn’t written solely “at the request of his children, and for their gratification.”\textsuperscript{61} If his goal in writing was to share his honest experience of the war, surely he would have included his involvement in this exciting and pivotal work.

Ultimately, the lack of Tallmadge’s presence in his own memoir leads us to believe that he had political and ideological motivations in writing it; the memoir succeeds at celebrating the war’s heroes and the Revolutionary spirit as a whole, but fails to give any real notion of Benjamin Tallmadge as a person, or of his real actions during the war. Alternatively, it functions as a work which seeks to commemorate the Revolution and promote it as a patriotic event, seemingly a contribution to the many stories which sought to lay the groundwork for collective memory of the Revolution. Memories provide “identity…security, authority, and legitimacy,” all of which would have been crucial to the creation of community and shared identity that was so necessary for the United States to prosper after the war.\textsuperscript{62} Participants of the Revolution, especially elites like Tallmadge, seized the story of the Revolution as an opportunity to mold the country and its memories in ways that would benefit their politics and ideologies. By writing a memoir which asserted the Revolution as a heroic, patriotic moment, Tallmadge chose not to tell a story of his own experiences or those of any other soldier, but to to make his contribution to shaping the United States’ past – and its future.

\textsuperscript{61} Tallmadge, \textit{Memoir of Colonel Benjamin Tallmadge}, pp. I-130.
Benjamin Tallmadge died on March 7th, 1835, at the age of eighty-one. At that point he belonged to a generation that was disappearing, one that newer generations were scrambling to gather stories from so that Revolutionary memory and whatever wisdom veterans had to offer would not be lost to time. Tallmadge’s memoir would remain private for over twenty years until finally being published by son Frederick in 1858. That Tallmadge’s story finally saw the light of day on the eve of another landmark moment in American history, the Civil War, seems like an interesting coincidence, but was almost certainly intentional. Memories are always invoked to provide answers to present needs, not just to remind us of the past. Over the first half of the 19th century, the country grew increasingly divided over the issues of slavery and states’ rights, expansion and economics, demonstrating that the creation of a shared national identity after the Revolution was never truly solidified. In the context of the Civil War, Revolutionary memory and the commonly recognized symbols that had emerged from creating a shared national story were used by both the North and the South to “animate sectionalist military fervor” and “motivate military action in the early days of the Civil War.” Once again the country was electrified with political divisiveness, and it would have to endure a long, brutal, bloody war to determine its future identity.
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“Ever since the waterways and seas of the world have been used for transport, there have been sea robbers ready to emulate their land-bound colleagues.”
— Robert Ritchie, Captain Kidd and the War Against Pirates

Piracy has been an aspect of the maritime world since its inception with the earliest records found in Early Antiquity in Greece. Plutarch even wrote about when Julius Caesar was captured by Cicilian pirates in 75 B.C.E. They refused to release the would-be emperor until their demands for “twenty talents” were met. The Vikings of the medieval era plundered ships and towns across Northern Europe. In fact, the Old Norse word for “Viking” meant “freebooting, piracy”. Even today pirates are active off the coast of Somalia by opportunistic Somalis drawn in by the wealth of the large frigates passing through the Red Sea. Wherever people are trading goods across water there will be those seeking to seize that wealth for their own economic gain. But despite the world’s long history of piracy, one time period has captured the minds of historians and everyday people to this day: the Golden Age of Piracy.

According to the Royal Museum of Greenwich, the Golden Age of happened roughly between 1650 and 1720 and saw the deployment of thousands of pirates across the world. This was the era of famed pirates such as Blackbeard, Captain Kidd, Henry Morgan, and Calico Jack. The exploits of the most famous of these pirates were compiled in Captain Charles Johnson’s
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famous work *A General History of the Pyrates* in 1724 and would later serve to inspire novels like *Treasure Island* and *Peter Pan*. A myriad of factors made the early modern era of piracy so well-known and remembered, including the discovery of the New World and the improvements in maritime technology which opened the door to deep-sea marauding for the first time in history. But the largest factor, both literally and figuratively, is the sheer scale of piracy during this period. The 17th and 18th Century saw piracy explode as thousands of pirates began to roam the world’s seas and terrifying the maritime world. But what exactly caused the rapid expansion of piracy?

At the start of the 15th Century, organized piracy was confined to local seas like the Mediterranean but by the end of the 17th Century there was not a piece of the world untouched by piracy. What began as an experiment into privateering by European empires turned into an infestation of piracy on a global scale and created a world where no sea was safe. It was not, however, merely the ingenuity of naval highwaymen that caused the spread of piracy to be so large but rather the imperial and colonial forces actively and passively supporting the practice. In the imperial case, continuous warfare and poor government oversight led to groups of privateers who were originally commissioned with the goal of seizing foreign goods to become the greatest raiders and pillagers of their time. In the colonial case, decades of imperial economic neglect forced colonists to adopt piracy as a core economic engine of growth. These two powers’ interests drove piracy to expand and change in new ways and ultimately led to its spread across the colonial world.

In 1571, Sir Francis Drake met up with a French partner named Guillame Le Tetsu and together they attacked a Spanish mule train of gold and silver of the coast of Central America. While Tetsu died in the attack, Drake made off with 40,000 pounds worth of gold and silver and
Ordinarily this act of piracy was seen as little more than heinous villainy but upon his return, Drake was treated as a hero. He was well received because Queen Elizabeth herself commissioned him to plunder any Spanish ship he came across, and the royal government received part of the treasure. The story of Francis Drake and his capture of countless Spanish ships serves as an example of the kind of imperial leeway given to privateers in the early modern era. Privateering, as was Sir Francis Drake’s profession, was generally considered legal by the imperial powers and seen as a legitimate way of seizing rival goods during times of war. But in practice, privateering was no different than piracy and involved the same kind of criminal activities. By actively encouraging and commissioning privateers to roam the seas of the world, royal governments were inadvertently spreading piracy to a scale which they themselves could not have predicted.

Before delving into how the European powers facilitated the expansion of piracy, it is important to understand why privateers even existed in the first place. When the Spanish empire began to establish their American trade routes, huge wealth began amassing in the Atlantic as the Spanish extracted resources from the previously closed off region. With that wealth, however, came imperial rivalries. Soon France, England, and the Netherlands wished to access the gold, silver, and other valuable resources the Spanish were jealously guarding. The main issue facing these nascent rivals was that it was impossible for them to amass a force sizeable enough to contest the Spanish fleets in deep water. The solution was privateers. Privateers fitted their own ships so it cost the royal government nothing and if the ship was destroyed or brought back no rewards it was of no expense to the government only the investors who provided the financial backing. Additionally, privateers were in no short supply as many men wanted to make it rich on
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the new Trans-Atlantic trade routes. Privateering seemed like the perfect solution to British, French, and Dutch naval concerns.

There is very little separating the privateers that went out on imperial commission and the pirates that attacked all ships irrespective of allegiances. A privateer is described quite humorously and aptly in the Encyclopedia Britannica as a “Pirate with papers.” The only thing separating a pirate from a privateer was a document from a royal government licensing the privateer to attack ships of certain nationalities typically Spanish and Non-European empires. A Portuguese commission, or letter of marque, to Captain Charles Bil from 1662 reads as follows,

“Itt Is my [The King of Portugal] will and pleasure to nominate and by these Presents doe name for Capt. of a shipp of warr, by virtue of w’ch power hee may pro vide att his owne charge a shipp of one hundred Tonnes with whatt boates nessesarie, and provide her with Gunns, People, ammunition and provisions as hee shall thinke Con-venientt, to wage warr with the subjects of the Kinge of spaine, Turks, Pirats, Sea Roavers, take there shippsh and there marchandizes and all that belongs unto them and Carry them to Any Portts of this Kingdome to give An Accountt of them in my office, where they shall bee taken Account of In a booke kept for said purpose, where they shall bee Judged if Lawfull Prizes.”

Though the distinction between a privateer and a pirate is quite clear in legal terms, as seen by the thoroughness of the Portuguese commission, in practice the line between the two terms is quite blurry especially when money is involved. The interesting thing about this commission and many others is in the last line where it mentions that seized goods will be “judged if Lawfull Prizes.” Historian Virginia W. Lunsford argues that many Dutch imperial officials were more than willing to turn a blind eye to extracurricular piracy if it netted them a decent profit. So
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even if some privateers committed piratical acts they could still claim non-piracy on others, further blurring the line between pirate and privateer. The 19th Century American historian, John Franklin Jameson, confesses that when he was gathering the depositions from various court records and interviews, many witnesses “make it clear how narrow was sometimes the line that divided piracy and privateering, and how difficult it must have been to learn the truth from witnesses so conflicting and of such dubious characters, testifying concerning actions of lawless men in remote seas or on lonely shores.”

The thin line between privateers and piracy is exactly why many privateers turned to lives of piracy in the first place. Captain Charles Johnson puts forward the idea “that Privateers in Time of War are a Nursery for Pyrates against a Peace,” and many of the tales of piracy he tells are evidence of that. Many famous pirates such as Captain Avery and Captain Teach, better known as Blackbeard, sailed as privateers in the “late French war.” Historians believe the war that Johnson is referencing is the War of Spanish Succession in the late 17th Century. In times of war, the wealth created by privateering was enough on its own for many would be pirates, but it is in times of peace when commissions are withdrawn and privateers are recalled that many turn to piracy to sustain themselves. But was it only that captains were looking to make some more money at sea that made them turn from privateering to piracy or are there other factors that pushed many to make that decision? This is a question that bothers Johnson throughout his book as he wonders why some men such Captain England, the pirate who popularized the Jolly Roger, who possessed such a “great deal of good Nature” would turn to such a heinous trade as piracy.
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The answer ironically enough can be found in Johnson’s own book whether he realized it or not. An important thing to understand about many of these private ships and especially pirate ships was the fact that the captain did not wield supreme power. Many of the decisions that occurred onboard many of these ships were put up to the “test of a vote” with the majority holding the power. Thus, if a newly minted privateer ship’s crew decides it wants to strike it as a pirate crew there is no way for a privateer captain, no matter how duty bound and lawful, to stop them lest he be killed or cast adrift. For example, when the pirate captain Charles Vane attempted to stop his crew from pursuing a French man-of-war, he was outvoted and then left abandoned on a deserted island. This kind of lawless democracy operated in part because of the lack of imperial oversight in the colonial Americas. Turning pirate had no immediate consequences so many crews would induce their ship to piracy with little or no repercussions; for a time, at least.

Another factor in why many privateers pursued piracy was the social mobility it provided many. In the regimented and codified navy, titles and nobility meant everything and a common man could only rise up to a certain position before a ceiling. Typically, officers and higher ranks were reserved for those who possessed noble titles and acquiring such a title through non-genealogical means was extremely rare. The reason why privateering was so widely popular was rooted in the fact that anyone with enough money and resources could fit out a ship and set sail regardless of noble status. In, fact records indicate that many privateers and pirates were crew of former navy men and merchant sailors who sought to strike it rich. The pirate captains, Avery and Edward England were both formerly mates “of a Merchant-Man” before turning to their
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piratical ways. For other men like Bartholomew Roberts, however, piracy was about living a better life than they had ever lived before and a means of escaping the confines of a restrictive common life.

“In an honest Service, says [Roberts], there is thin Commons, low Wages, and hard Labour; in this, Plenty and Satiety, Pleasure and Ease, Liberty and Power; and who would not ballance Creditor on this Side, when all the Hazard that is run for it, at worst, is only a sour Look or two at choaking. No, A merry Life and a short one, shall be my Motto.”

As a result, the social restrictions and limitations placed on many citizens by the imperial governments served to galvanize many to take up the mantle of piracy and privateering. Many of these ships promised not just better pay and provisions but a chance for many to lead better, more socially mobile lives.

Of the imperial powers of Europe, however, there was one empire who saw privateers as nothing but pirates and did not directly encourage piracy. The Spanish empire were the ones to suffer the most out of all the empires at the hands of pirates and privateers. In fact, they were the reason the privateering system took off in the first place. In almost every deposition or letter concerning pirate wealth or money in Jameson’s collection, it is always measured in Spanish “pieces-of-eight” which speaks to the ubiquity of pirate raids on Spanish ships if that is the de facto currency for pirates. That isn’t to say that the Spanish did not commit piratical acts, as many Asian empires like the Mughal and the Chinese saw Spanish ships raid their sea routes. The difference however is that since it was the official Spanish navy committing these acts, many of their European contemporaries did not see them as piracy.
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What began as an economic solution to the European empires’ 16th Century naval woes quickly began to spiral out of their control and by the 18th Century there was not a corner of the world untouched by piracy. Pirates raided the coastlines of the Americas, West Africa and the Asian Sub-continent. The empires of Europe were not innocent victims of these pirates but rather key figures in their expansion by providing many of these would-be pirates the means to act on their ambitions. The creation of the privateering system, the poor management and oversight of said system, and the stifling social restrictions on common life were the ingredients the imperial powers provided to create what we know today as the Golden Age of Piracy. Whether the imperial forces understood the risks utilizing of privateering and piracy to achieve their economic and military goals is unclear, but what is certain is that the actions committed by these governments furthered the ambitions of naval sailors across the globe and gave them the means to engage in a piracy the scale of which the world has never known. But despite the enormity of the imperial contribution to piracy, the largest culprits were not the royal governments of Europe but rather the governors and citizens of the colonies they ruled over.

When William Penn arrived in Philadelphia in 1699, he sought to curb the piracy that had threatened his colony and restore civic order. What Penn did not expect, however, was to see the government of his colony not pursuing these pirates but instead letting them roam unhindered and protecting them from legal repercussions. In historian Mark G. Hanna’s work on colonial support for Anglo-American pirates, he notes Penn’s horror as he realizes that not only were pirates allowed to act as they please- many of them owned property, conducted business, and married into prominent Quaker families with even one of the pirates marrying Penn’s niece.83
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Penn’s 1699 Proclamation highlighted his embarrassment at his own colony’s cooperation with what he saw as little more than lawless crooks. He writes,

“Whereas several Piracies and Robberies at Sea and on Sea-Coasts have of late years been committed in Many parts of the World, to the great Injury of Trade, the Terrou and Ruine of many peaceable honest People under Governments in Amity with the Crown of England, and to the horrid Scandal of the English Nation: And whereas divers Persons justly suspected to be guilty of having practised the Aforesaid Crimes, as well by the Nature and Quantity of the Treasure about them, as by their being unable to give any good Account of themselves, their Residence or Commerce, have for some time been observed to land on, and scatter themselves through these Northern English Colonies of America, with a manifest Design of enjoying with Impunity and Safety their ill-gotten Riches.”  

But if these pirates were, in Penn’s eye, heinous criminals who needed to be caught for their crime against “peaceable honest people”, why was it so widely accepted even supported in Philadelphia and many other “Northern English Colonies?” As it turns out, despite being seen as nothing but economic leeches by the empires of Europe, albeit useful ones, pirates in the 17th and 18th Century were powerful economic engines that fueled many of the nascent colonies across the Americas. The continued protection and support by colonial colluders allowed piracy to expand.

Not all the colonies were ardent supporters of piracy and in fact some of these colonies were instrumental in the capture and killing of several notorious pirates. The most famous of these confrontations is when Blackbeard began to raid ships out of South Carolina and the governor of Virginia sent two men-of-war after the infamous pirate. In the bloody and famous naval battle, Blackbeard was killed after receiving “five and twenty Wounds, and five of them by shot.”  

The Virginian governor’s swift response and Blackbeard’s subsequent death displays the level of hostility Southern colonial authorities held towards piracy in the 18th Century. Late
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colonial resistance in colonies like Virginia may have to with the political distinctions between the types of colonies. By the early 18th Century, colonies like Virginia and Jamaica were crown colonies, meaning that the governors of these colonies were appointed not by the colonists but by the royal government. As a result, many of these imperial governors, like the one Johnson describes as Blackbeard’s killer, were dogged pirate hunters. But, as Hanna argues, even these fierce pirate hunter colonies in the 18th century, began as pirate friendly towns. John Smith, one of the founders of the Virginia colonies was close friends with a well-known pirate, Thomas Fleming, and admitted that’s pirates were “necessary for lengthy voyages and brutal warfare.”

Despite the crown colonies’ strong opposition to piracy in the late 17th and 18th Centuries, they owed their existence to piracy and private ships in the early years.

Piracy’s economic advantages were undoubtedly the main reason for colonial support of the practice. The mercantilist policies of the empires made it difficult for colonial merchants to accrue any amount of sizeable wealth as a result of the imbalance of trade; merchants would have to sell low to their imperial masters and buy high the finished European goods. So, when pirates were looking to offload their illegally acquired goods many port cities were more than willing to buy. While pirates have a reputation for stealing and plundering stolen gold and silver, many of the ships they robbed also contained a lot of other staple goods like rum, linens, foodstuffs, and even slaves. While it is difficult to think of slaves as goods today, many of these burgeoning colonial economies saw slaves as relatively cheap labor goods that were essential to colonial survival. The colonies were provided goods as well as hard money that they
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could not acquire from within the imperial system and in exchange provided pirates with hubs where they could sell their illegal prizes.

But the economic relationship between pirates and colonists extended beyond a trade partnership. Many merchants and even colonial governors would outfit privateering ships and set them loose upon the seas to generate wealth for the investors as well as the colony, itself. Captain Kidd was one of the many would-be pirates that started off as a privateer under the Lord Bellamont, the governor of Barbados, after the governor saw what money could be made from piracy. The active investment of pirates by the colonial administrators and merchants was one of the key drivers in expanding piracy in the colonial era. A perfect example of these pirate-merchant economic cooperatives can be seen in one of the largest pirate havens of the 17th, 18th, and even 19th Century; the colony of New York.

New York was well known for its goodwill towards piracy. Blackbeard corresponded often with New York traders, for example, and the colony granted safe passage for Major Stede Bonnet after he plundered and burned ships off the Virginian coast. So what made New York such a popular pirate haven and why were New Yorkers so welcoming of pirates who were supposed to be enemies of the crown?

By the time piracy started to appear in real force in New York in the late 17th Century, the colony was already out of Dutch hands and under British. Although the council and governor were selected by the Duke of York, the assembly received little or no imperial guidance. As a result, the assemblies of the New York government were dominated by the merchant
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communities and it was ultimately these merchant families that would go on to fund countless privateering and piracy outfits across the Atlantic. Frederick Philipse, a wealthy and powerful merchant in New York, was a notable investor in pirates. He funded famed pirates like Captain Burgess and made a great fortune. With the government in hands of dissatisfied merchants, piracy was the perfect tool to circumvent the restrictive imperial economic framework and seek wealth through their own means.

On top of a privately-held government New York in the late 17th Century suffered from nearly non-existent economic growth. The American historian and writer Robert Ritchie argues in his book on colonial piracy that New York’s economy suffered greatly as the war between France and Britain began to escalate and traditional New York trade routes across the North Atlantic became blockaded by French ships. So when pirates arrived from places like Madagascar and the Indian ocean with great deals of wealth, New York was quick to open its doors as a friendly pirate haven. This evidence of economic warfare is corroborated by Johnson’s account of Captain Kidd where Kidd’s secondary commission from the British government was “to justify him in the taking of French merchant ships, in case he should meet with any.” This was presumably to attempt to cripple the French financially in the same way the war was hurting Britain and on his way to New York, Kidd does in fact plunder a French ship off the coast.
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Ritchie attributes New York’s economic growth to the refitting and re-provisioning of pirate ships and to the merchants selling pirates supplies in exchange for their stolen goods which typically included “slaves, sugar, salt and logwood.” But New York piracy also shaped the economy in a number of other ways. For example, through the rapid enlistment of much of the New York youth to the pirates’ ships that docked, the labor dynamic shifted greatly within the colony. When Captain Kidd set out to enlist recruits he “increased his company to 155 men” which suggests there was an ample amount of labor supply willing to work on these ships. The willingness to join pirate ships has a lot to do with the idea of equality within many of the pirate ships at the time. Johnson speaks at length in his book about how pirates, from the deckhand to the captain, split the gains from plunder equally. This did not always hold true – some ships had the captain receiving more shares, and in a particularly heinous example, Captain Avery abandoned the majority of his men, stealing away and dividing the wealth amongst his other conspirators. But the idea of going out and striking it rich regardless of class or status was appealing to many colonists who felt economically and socially restricted operating within the imperial labor system.

Madagascar’s transformation into a pirate haven and trading outpost also affected the New York economy. Many New York merchants, like Frederick Philips, invested heavily into transforming Madagascar from a pirate refitting station to a pirate trading hub where these same merchants could acquire cheap goods, like slaves, as well as more exotic goods such as drugs, spices, and textiles without crossing the Royal African company’s monopoly over the
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continent. Madagascar was also a good choice because, as Johnson wrote, “[Madagascar’s States] have innumerable little Princes among them, who are continually making War upon one another they have innumerable little Princes among them, who are continually making War upon one another.” The political divisions and wars that existed within Madagascar provided pirates with ample resources and slaves as they curried favor with warring princes. The most important thing about the creation of the Madagascar pirate trade post, historian John C. Appleby, wasn’t just its economic value but the fact that it is the first pirate haven to exist outside of an empire. Suddenly pirates were no longer bounded to the squabbles of the European empires but possessed an informal pirate empire that stretched beyond the borders of the imperial world. Through the support of New York merchants, piracy was able to attain new heights and through the goods brought by pirates, New York merchants reached new economic highs. The symbiotic relationship between colony and pirate was a powerful one.

Religion also played a role in colonial collusion with pirates. The colonial era is known to be a deeply religious time with Protestant-Catholic rivalries from Europe spilling over into their colonial holdings. So how could these moral colonial Christians justify the buying and selling of illegal goods attained through heinous acts of piracy? At the end of the day piracy really was just the murder and theft of passing ships regardless of affiliation or innocence. Even the deeply pious John Winthrop described his encounter with pirates in the mid 17th Century as “the providence of God” and considered those pirates a generous and good people. That has to do with whom the 16th and 17th Century’s pirates targeted for theft. Most early pirates did not make
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their wealth raiding the coast of Colonial America, but rather in the Indian Ocean and the Red
Sea. The pirates were not robbing fellow good Christians but rather Mughal and other Asian
heathens. Because of this, pirates of the 16th and 17th Century were seen as beloved merchants in
Atlantic waters, with the exception of an occasional European plundering, and vicious marauders
in the Indian and Pacific Oceans. This is partly why groups like the East India Company and
other imperial Asian monopolies detested piracy from its inception, while the merchants and
companies of colonial America did not sour on piracy until the 18th and 19th Centuries when
pirates like Blackbeard and Charles Vane turned their attention to the Atlantic and began
harassing American merchant ships. 102 The about face on the evilness of piracy as soon as
friendly ships began being attacked speaks to the shakiness of religious arguments for piracy.
Many colonists knew about the dubious morality of piracy even against non-Christians but their
many economic needs required them to look past their morality to secure a better economic
future.

Through their ability to fulfill an economic need in the colonies such as New York,
pirates were able to garner colonial support as well as colonial funds to continue their activities
at sea. The relationship between pirate and colonial merchant continued to grow and strengthen
all the way until the 18th Century, the relationship turned parasitic, with many more pirates
hunting in colonial waters than ever before. But even when relations soured piracy remained a
vital part of the north English colonies well into the 19th Century. This is in part due to the fact
that not all pirates especially ones in the northern colonies, had merely a passing relationship
with the colonies. Captain Kidd is a perfect example of the integration of pirate and colonial life.
Similar to the pirates Penn encountered on his return home, Kidd was a pirate with a colonial
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home and married the wealthy widow of an established merchant family.\textsuperscript{103} Kidd also reportedly fought against Jacob Leisler, a wealthy New York merchant, when he seized power in the famous Leisler Rebellion in 1691 and earned the goodwill of the re-established merchant oriented government.\textsuperscript{104} But Kidd also shows the limitations pirates faced in trying to lead a colonial life alongside a pirate one. Johnson writes in-depth about how Kidd’s various pirate exploits finally caught up to him and the governor of New York at the time, Lord Bellamont, -ironically the one who commissioned Kidd to become a pirate - was pressured by British merchants into arresting the pirate captain. Despite Kidd’s land holdings and high social status in New York, the law was not flexible enough to grant him a peaceful death and in 1701 he was hanged.\textsuperscript{105} Kidd’s tale shows how powerful the relationship between pirate and colonist can be, but it also highlights how quickly that relationship can end if the costs outweigh the benefits. The best way to describe it is a relationship of convenience.

The case of early modern piracy shows us how the economic wants and needs of the colonial world superseded any kind of legal framework with officials, both colonial and imperial, often overlooking the crimes of privateers and pirates if the seized prize was large enough. The imperial support of piracy as a means of crippling rivals also connects back to this day with talks in the news of Pakistan and its usage state-sponsored terrorism in an attempt to destabilize its neighbors.\textsuperscript{106} The Somali pirate crisis of the early 2010s on the other hand falls more in line with colonial interests and highlights a country’s desire for economic gain when its government fails
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to address those needs. Somali pirates were a result of the failure of the Somali government to meet the needs of its people, due to its collapse in 1991, and frustrated out of work fishermen who were losing felt they were losing their sea to international competition. The tactics employed by the imperial and colonial factions are nothing new, and the reality is that extralegal systems like piracy have always existed whenever states fail to meet the economic demand of its people and formerly disenfranchised groups, whether it be the unemployed Somali fisherman or the common colonial pirate, are able to step in and meet that demand.
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One of the most well-known and sought-after gemstones on the face of the planet is a diamond. It is believed that diamonds were formed in the Earth’s mantle and pushed to the surface by deep volcanic eruptions some millions of years ago. The journey of such a gemstone from deep below the Earth’s surface to above ground is arduous, thus increasing the value of finding a pure rough diamond. Although diamonds are immensely valuable, they have little practical use in the day-to-day lives of many people. Diamonds are unable to power entire empires unlike another well-known organic sedimentary rock. Another name for this organic sedimentary rock is coal, and although it is not nearly as valuable as a diamond on a per ounce basis, this rock is still referred to as a “Black Diamond”\textsuperscript{108}. Coal’s reference as a black diamond is derived from its practical use as an energy source. It was the main source of energy for many imperial nations during the eighteenth, nineteenth, and early twentieth centuries. Therefore, an imperial empire controlling the production of coal was able to increase and maintain its prestige throughout the world. This black diamond aided the British Empire in maintaining its lead as a global hegemon during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.\textsuperscript{109} From colonial conquests to wars like World War I, coal was necessary for the most important branch of its military, the Royal Navy, to protect the interests of the British Empire. Yet, beyond England’s defense, coal became prominent in the sphere of diplomacy and the maintenance of relationships between other imperial powers. For all the strategic advantage Britain had from producing coal
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domestically, the assurance of its imperial dominance by the Royal Navy would not have been accomplished if it were not for the people who mined the coal to fuel their imperial engine. The collectivization these coal miners attempted to exercise must be further examined to fully appreciate the far-reaching consequence that coal had on the aspects of maintaining an empire.

*Historical Literature on the Genesis of Coal and its Effect on British Imperialism*

From an overall macro perspective, the use of coal as a primary source of energy for nations and empires is well documented. Although coal was to eventually be replaced by oil as the primary source of energy in the world, it was coal that also replaced another abundant and obsolete energy source. Coal replaced wood as the primary source of energy for many nations for a couple of main reasons. First, coal was cheaper to extract and use than wood. When there was a shortage of timber and the price of coal rose, a new piece of technology called the Newcomen atmospheric engine was created to aid the extraction of coal from water filled mines therefore making coal more accessible as a resource.\textsuperscript{110} The Newcomen engine was not only put to use throughout England, but more importantly it was the precursor to the Watt steam engine which was used in Britain throughout its industrial revolution and relied on both coal and steam to produce energy.\textsuperscript{111} This innovation, rooted in coal’s importance as a commodity, aided the rapid progress toward further industrialization in Britain. The second main advantage of using coal as a primary source of energy was the efficient use of land.\textsuperscript{112} Mitchell argues that populations that formerly relied on timber as their main source of energy were now freed from the restrictions of size and proximity of any woodlands within a given region.\textsuperscript{113}
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corroborated by Kenneth Pomeranz, whose book *The Great Divergence: China, Europe, and the Making of the Modern World* argues that the most revolutionary innovations for creating sustained growth across industries were those that were, “land saving ones in one way or another, particularly those associated with fossil fuels, which reduced reliance on forests for energy”\(^{114}\). Being freed from this constraint allowed for the reuse of land for purposes other than energy production when coal had become the main energy source. Yet, the production of coal had no purpose unless it made other industries more efficient. For example, Mitchell stated that the iron industry became dependent on coke, a purified version of coal, and also the aid of steam driven bellows to expand the production of iron-based products. And Pomeranz states coal’s importance in the glass making and beer industries because of its ability to save money.\(^{115}\)

Aside from the use of efficient land, it is argued that the proximity of coal fields within Europe allowed for the ‘Great Divergence’ from the rest of the world. Mitchell states how China had large reserves of coal, but they were located in a logistically difficult place, away from the main centers of industry and population. Contrarily, Europe had convenient access to an incredible concentration of coal that a great deal of industries would eventually rely upon.\(^{116}\) Pomeranz concurs with Timothy Mitchell’s opinion stating that in retrospect, “European advances in finding ways to use heat had a greater revolutionary potential than China’s edge in capturing heat efficiently” and again, that this could have only occurred with, “The advantage of favorably located coal”.\(^{117}\) As opposed to China, the geography of many of these European nations created numerous knowledge spillovers which was conducive to the competitive growth
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throughout the region.\textsuperscript{118} This is essentially what happened with coal and aided the rapid industrialization of Europe compared to other regions. A more specific example of this occurring is given by both Mitchell and Pomeranz where they claim that there were many inventions directly influenced by coal, especially the steam engine, which experienced incremental improvements and continued to push for the search for the most efficient use of coal by all countries involved.

Besides the uses of coal and the advantages of its use as a source of energy, Pomeranz and Mitchell paint a background picture of how coal influenced imperial dominance. The empire that had the greatest amount of control over the coal trade was Britain. Mitchell states that, “Britain’s coal reserves, produced a quantity of energy equivalent to the cumulative oil production of Saudi Arabia”\textsuperscript{119} Along with this astonishing evidence is the statistic that H. Stanley Jevons produced. He states that the British Empire in 1912 exported about a third of its total coal and accounted for two-thirds of the earth’s seaborne coal. And a majority of this coal, around ninety percent, was exported to contiguous regions in Europe, giving Britain a great amount of control over other imperial nation’s energy supplies.\textsuperscript{120} Mitchell argues that the amount of control that Britain had over the supply of coal allowed for the, “Ability to slow, disrupt or cut off supply”\textsuperscript{121}. Each of these sources comes to a consensus that the massive control Britain had over the coal trade helped its ascension into the hegemonic imperial power of Europe and the world. Along with Britain’s ascension, the control over the supply of coal is
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exactly what Britain exercised with the use of its Royal Navy and global coaling stations in the late nineteenth century and early twentieth century to further their imperial dominance.

Existing historiography which depicts coal as one of the drivers for British imperial expansion is sparse.¹²² Yet, coal is unquestionably one of the main factors for the British Empire’s expansion and, more importantly, its imperial defense. As Britain’s hegemonic prowess began to be challenged during the 1870’s, there was continued pressure on the question of imperial defense, more specifically the defense of Britain’s coaling stations which were crucial to its imperial possessions. Each coaling station was of immense value because they were part of a larger infrastructure which allowed for the swift protection of Britain’s maritime colonies by the Royal Navy in the case of an emergency. The stations were positioned in relatively close proximities of one another so as to ensure that every ship of the navy was able to patrol the international waters many of Britain’s colonies bordered without fear of running out of fuel.¹²³ But as Steven Gray, the author of *Steam Power and Sea Coal*, states, “Coal’s importance to other parts of this [imperial] debate have largely been ignored by historians.”¹²⁴ This is peculiar not only because coaling stations were integral to the imperial defense system but also since coal was the main source of energy for the Royal Navy’s steam-powered ships which enforced the metropole’s imperial and trade interests. Furthermore, Gray asserts that the study of coal and its infrastructure is a necessity for furthering the study of imperialism by saying, “This lack of understanding of the fueling infrastructure of the navy is also a gap in our

understanding of nineteenth-century imperialism”. Gray’s work has brought light to this gap in the historical narrative of coal as an energy resource for the British Empire.

Coal’s Role as a Part of British Imperial Defense

The imperial naval defense structure of the British Empire is a salient example for the necessity of coal for a global empire during this time. As a consequence of an empirical study conducted by the government and the increasing need for logistical support for its navy, the construction of global coaling stations ensured Britain’s prowess as the most dominant naval power of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries and helped establish coal’s peak use as an imperial tool. By the 1870’s the Royal Navy became increasingly reliant on coal, but there was no proper infrastructure in place for refueling the Royal Navy’s steamships, leaving them vulnerable and hampering both trade and the protection of imperial interests. During 1879 the Carnarvon Commission was created to submit a review of the defense infrastructure of colonial possessions. One of the main topics discussed was a coaling infrastructure for the Royal Navy. Lord Carnarvon himself stated that special attention must be given to the general importance of coaling and repairing stations for its navy.\footnote{London Gazzete, 12 September 1879.} The commission lasted until 1882 and gave suggestions for a sweeping overhaul of the Royal Navy. Statistical data such as imports, exports, fleet locations, telegraph networks, and total number of warships were taken into account to provide a view on just how crucial coaling stations would become for the British Empire. Other considerations within the commission included the relative strength of foreign coaling stations, where new coaling stations should be placed, and certain considerations when building these coaling stations that were particular to the climate in which they were being built.\footnote{Steven Gray, *Steam Power and Sea Power: Coal, the Royal Navy, and the British Empire, c. 1870-1914*, (Palgrave Macmillan UK, 2018) 33-35.} But
eventually, a new party took power in Parliament therefore slowing the progress on what was put forth by the Carnarvon Commission. Yet, the Carnarvon Commission still proved to be essential for the Royal Navy for it was used as a guide for future defense proposals in the 1890’s. These proposals included the Spencer Program in 1894 as well as the Naval Works Act in 1895, both of which expanded the assembly of new defenses for naval ports as well as significantly increasing the rate of creation of global coaling stations for the Royal Navy.\textsuperscript{127}

To further understand these coaling stations, their logistical importance must be explored. In total, the British coaling infrastructure system had some sixty global imperial fortresses and coaling stations. There were specific first class and naval coaling stations restricted only for the Royal Navy, as well as commercial coaling stations which allowed for streamlined shipping for British commercial exports. Coaling stations throughout the British Empire were located in the ports of British imperial possessions already outfitted with telegraph and mailing networks. This placement of the stations allowed for seamless lines of communication for any resource needs that a coaling station might have. Also, each station exclusively held and supplied Royal Navy ships with high quality coal, essentially eliminating any fueling concerns that a naval fleet may have. The fact that many other European empires had a relative dearth of coaling stations compared to Britain’s 181 stations throughout the world was a useful bargaining chip in diplomatic relations.\textsuperscript{128} It did not matter if a vessel was French, German, Spanish, or American. It was almost a guarantee that at some point between a vessel’s initial origin and its destination that it would need to stop at and refuel at a British coaling station.\textsuperscript{129} As a matter of fact, as late as 1912 the British Empire supplied ninety-eight percent of the Austro-Hungarian navy’s coal
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usage through both its coaling stations and shipments of British coal.\textsuperscript{130} If another rival power were to fall out of favor with the British, that country would not be able to refuel its coal supply along the vast coaling station network that the British created. A similar situation happened to the Russian’s Baltic fleet in 1905 as they were attempting to sail to Japan during the Russo-Japanese War.\textsuperscript{131} The British and the Russians had an intense rivalry during the nineteenth and early part of the twentieth century which spilled over into the Russo-Japanese war. The Russians were denied access to the Suez Canal, which was under British control, so the fleet had to sail around the cape of Africa to get to Japan. The fleet did not have a sufficient amount of coal available for the journey and the Russians did not have nearly as extensive a coaling infrastructure as the British. Out of pure necessity, the Russians attempted to refuel at British coaling stations but were promptly refused. Because of the lack of fueling, the journey went on for longer than expected which mentally and physically drained the sailors. This culminated in a devastating loss for the Russians once they battled the Imperial Japanese Navy and showed a possible consequence of the far-reaching influence of British coal. With the lion’s share of coaling infrastructure, the British were able to partly influence the decimation of another country’s navy without even going to battle.

*Labor Struggles and Worker Collectivization Effects on Coal*

For all the power that coal gave Britain over other nations for their imperial conquests and trade interests, the one vulnerability that a domestic concentration of this commodity had was the vulnerability to the disruption of production from the collectivization of miners. Both Steven Gray and Timothy Mitchell outline the impacts that the collectivization of miners had on
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the British coal industry, domestically and abroad, in each of their respective works. The vulnerability of strikes occurring greatly worried the British admiralty about the coaling infrastructure of the Royal Navy. When coal miners went on strike in Wales during 1898, there were worries that the strike would be long-term and cause disastrous supply issues, leaving the Royal Naval Fleet vulnerable to foreign attack. Although the strike lasted some twenty-one weeks and five days, alternative suppliers and contingency plans allowed for swift action that alleviated any supply problems, proving the durability of the British coaling infrastructure.\textsuperscript{132} Gray also mentions how through the plethora of private coal suppliers available to the Royal Navy, they were able to keep an effective and high-quality supply of coal for an extremely low cost. Although the logistics of mining coal caused very few problems between private companies and the British government, there was another problem which caused the companies themselves to be concerned.

Coal strikes were not effective in stymying British imperial defense systems, but they were effective in disrupting individual coal firms. Timothy Mitchell offers a different view of the collectivization of workers from Steven Gray as he attempts to argue that the political power that miners had gained increased their bargaining power for better working conditions and higher wages. Mitchell argues that the limitations on being represented in government, which included restrictions based on property, age, and sex, excluded the majority of British population from public life. This exclusion of representation in public life, along with the rapid rise of liberal revolutions across Europe during the 1870s, enabled workers to push back, “against the great inequalities in well-being that industrialization had brought”, and created new political parties and give way to a new type of politics.\textsuperscript{133} Mitchell further argues that this new democratized
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unionization of workers relied upon reaching the populations within cities and manufacturing, especially coal miners, who enabled the, “Flows of carbon that connected chambers beneath the ground to every factory, office, home or means of transportation”.  

Mitchell’s argument displays the collective bargaining power miners began to gain because of the immense importance they had to the empire. His mention of the 1889 dockworker strike of Glasgow exhibits some of the specialized labor that is needed for production and manufacturing to run efficiently. Thus, if another specialized labor force like miners were to go on strike, labor productivity would go down for the amount of time these new workers would need to adjust to the job, both technically and physically. Normal bourgeoisie people in an empire like Britain’s are simply oblivious to what occurs underneath the surface of the earth which keeps day to day life from coming to a complete halt. Or as George Orwell puts simply: “Practically everything we do, from eating an ice to crossing the Atlantic, and from baking a loaf to writing a novel, involves the use of coal, directly or indirectly”. That is, British imperialism itself would be impossible if the production of coal were to come to a standstill. Therefore, a major strike like the Welsh Coal Strike of 1898 caused a great deal of strife for colliery companies and there the need for a resolution was met between the companies and workers. The power that the coal miners saw they could wield from the Welsh Coal Strike was a main impetus for trade unionism and gave birth to the South Wales Miners’ Federation. Orwell’s consensus on the power the collectivization and unionization coal miners had was true, at least when it came to bargaining with company leaders. Yet this same collectivization of coal workers is, what Timothy Mitchell states, one of the reasons there was a determined transition from coal to oil.
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The Genesis of Oil and its Effect on Imperialism

As much as the domestic production of coal was able to give Britain a wide advantage over its competitors in the latter part of the nineteenth century and the very early twentieth century, the literature is pretty clear in detailing how and why the rest of the imperial world was able to pivot towards using oil as a more efficient energy source. In Steven Gray’s journal entry titled Fueling Mobility, it is stated that within twenty years of the United States sailing the Great White Fleet around the globe in 1910, “it was Britain that relied on the United States for naval fuel”\(^\text{138}\). The advent of oil caused Britain as early as 1914 to realize their vulnerability in relying on coal as a main energy source. In that same year the British Government purchased a majority stake in Anglo-Persian oil, which had wells in Iran, to help fuel the Royal Navy.\(^\text{139}\) Yet, it makes sense as to why Britain would make such a maneuver. Gray states a few of the advantages of oil such as ships being able to, “reach higher speeds than those powered by coal, and unlike coal, oil did not require huge amounts of man power to load”.\(^\text{140}\) Timothy Mitchell also states the relative ease with which large quantities of oil were shipped across the sea from Europe to the United States or other regions of the world as compared to coal, which had never really been traded across oceans. This is because oil was produced using methods different from coal which allowed it to be, “Transported over longer and often more flexible routes, for reasons connected in part to the different physical and chemical form of carbon it contains”.\(^\text{141}\) Mitchell also brings up another crucial point in the history regarding the transition from coal to oil when he tracks knowledge spillovers stemming from the use of oil. The introduction of the internal combustion
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engine had spread quickly after 1900 and gave immediate use for oil as a mechanized source of energy. And since there was, “no readily available substitute [for oil], both in the lightweight gasoline engine and the more powerful diesel engine”, oil would continue its climb to overthrow coal as the predominant source of energy in the world.\textsuperscript{142} Each of these factors culminates in what Steven Gray has aptly quoted from Winston Churchill’s statement on Britain’s increasing reliance on oil and shift away from coal while he was First Lord of the Admiralty: “We used to be a source of fuel; we are increasingly becoming a sink. These suppliers of foreign liquid fuel are no doubt vital to our industry, but our ever increasing dependence upon them ought to arouse serious and timely reflection.”\textsuperscript{143} No matter the foresight that may have come with the advent of oil, each author opines that the rest of the world would be able to catch up, and some even surpass, Britain as the leading supplier of energy in world.

Britain’s only option was to change its main source of energy from coal to oil in order to keep up with its peers. Yet, with oil there came an entirely new crop of problems that Winston Churchill and the British had to encounter. It was necessary for the British to find solutions for the supply, storage and transport of this oil. Finding a source of oil was extremely difficult since it was in the hands of oil trusts and magnates under foreign control. But, as stated earlier, the British Government bought a majority stake in the Anglo-Persian Oil Company, put two members on the board of directors, and were able to negotiate a contract for the Royal Navy to supply it with oil for twenty years.\textsuperscript{144} Although Britain did want to have total control over a more efficient energy source for its military with the advent of oil, there was another factor present that aided as the impetus for Britain’s overhaul of its energy resources.
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Germany was one of Britain’s main rivals during the last decade leading up to the advent of World War I. During this period, the British Royal Navy was the premiere navy of the world and its size was that of the next two largest navies in the world combined\textsuperscript{145}. Admiral Alfred Von Tirpitz of the Imperial German Navy believed in order to force the British to make concessions in the domain of imperial diplomacy, Germany too needed to have a navy which rivaled that of the Royal Navy. Thus, Admiral Tirpitz began the pass a series of laws in the late 1890’s to overhaul and bolster the German Imperial Navy. From this, the Anglo-German Arms race began and any new innovation that was found was to be exploited for a gain in this race. The Germans were able to churn out a remarkable four new battleships a year, increasing their fleet size to about two-thirds the size of the Royal Naval Fleet\textsuperscript{146}. But the most important innovations occurred with the creation of the HMS Dreadnought by the British in 1906. The first primary energy source for this new surface battle ship was coal until the design and final innovation of the Anglo-German arms race, the Queen Elizabeth-class battleship. From the suggestion of First Sea Lord Admiral Fisher, the Royal Navy created one of the first fast battleships of its day. And the main innovation of this type of battleship did not come from its design, but from the source of energy it used. Oil was the only feasible energy source to achieve a desired speed of twenty-five knots, which was four knots faster than what could be achieved during that time. These “superdreadnoughts” were commissioned in 1915-1916 during World War I and are one of the main reasons for Britain’s victory at sea during the war. The maneuverability and speed of the ships were unparalleled for a time specifically because of the shift of this class of ship’s energy source from coal to oil. On the use of oil to fuel these new class of ships Winston Churchill states, “The fateful plunge was taken when it was decided to
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create the fast division. For the first time, the supreme ships of the navy, on which our life depended, were fed by oil and could only be fed by oil.”\textsuperscript{147} This same shift was a foreboding sign as to what was to come for not only the rest of the Royal Navy, but also for the rest of the world. Therefore, by way of the Anglo-German Arms race and the resulting knowledge spillovers of each country, rapid innovations in naval technologies and energy usage occurred in these fifteen or so years by both the countries.

**Politics of Oil**

One of the primary reasons that the British were able to lead the world in coal production was the amount of natural coal found within Britain. The advantage of domestically producing coal afforded the British a complete grip on the preeminent primary energy source of the world during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Therefore, Britain’s geography was conducive to the predominance of collieries throughout the country during the nineteenth century. Yet, as the rest of the world began to switch to oil as a main source of energy, Britain’s geographical advantage disappeared. The British Isles had next to no domestic sources of oil reserves. And compared to regions within Russia and the Middle East, the North Sea had a relatively limited amount of oil reserves.\textsuperscript{148} Aside from the technical advantages, one aspect which must be probed further is the domestic production of oil. Certain countries had a similar advantage that Britain had with the domestic production of coal when it came to the production of oil. But, during the nineteenth century Russia was one of the only major powers to exploit their domestic oil reserves from the Caucasus Region and use this oil as the main source of
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energy for their mechanical and transportation industries.\textsuperscript{149} This completely changed during the early twentieth century when there was a wave of discovery of natural oil reserves within countries like the United States. These new oil reserves enabled countries to use their domestic production of oil as a means of breaking free from dependency on other countries like Britain for coal, transitioning themselves into a new era of energy.

Along with the discovery of new oil reserves came oil cartels from each of these countries that competed for oil contracts. Old rivalries such as the Anglo-German rivalry were reignited for the competition of oil reserves. These oil companies came from a plethora of different countries, included the Standard Oil Company from the United States, Deutsche Bank from Germany, and Royal-Dutch Shell Company from Britain and the Netherlands. Deutsche Bank and the Anglo-Persian Oil Company were two fierce rivals who competed for exclusive rights to certain export outlets from their Mesopotamian oil fields.\textsuperscript{150} Germany’s rivalry with Britain spilled over into another imperial competition aside from industrial export outlets. Deutsche Bank’s bid to build a “Berlin to Baghdad” railway was approved and led to the discovery of further oil reserves in Mosul, Kirkuk, and Basra.\textsuperscript{151} This news was alarming to the British since it greatly shifted power within the region with the Ottomans seemingly having favor with the Germans, even when the British had the first claims to oil in the Persian Gulf. The Anglo-Persian Oil Company then released a series of legal attacks on Deutsche Banks to bolster their claim as the primary producer of oil in the gulf during 1912. Although Deutsche Bank and the Anglo-Persian Oil Company served as a symbol of the deteriorating diplomatic conditions between the British and the Germans, each company served as an example of another form of
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imperial domination in progress. Yet, this time it wasn’t the countries themselves racing for colonial possessions, it was these companies competing on behalf of those countries for oil reserves within different markets like Mesopotamia and newer markets in Asia.

The advent of the transition from coal to oil during the twentieth century led the British to the realization that it was no longer the global energy hegemon. But, the administration and maintenance of its empire was still largely dependent on a coal and therefore oil was not as important in maintaining its status as a global hegemon. For example, as late as 1970, 47.12 percent of energy consumed in Britain was coal-powered compared to oil’s 43.98 percent. Yet, with the many locations of oil reserves throughout the world, the British lacked the same sort of diplomatic advantage that the coaling stations formerly had to offer. Many countries were no longer nearly as dependent on Britain for energy. The advantages that an energy resource like coal had for the British navy disappeared. By World War II every large navy had adopted oil, neutralizing the advantages of Britain’s energy production through coal. In terms of running and maintaining the British Empire throughout the twentieth century, oil continued to become of increasing importance. Also, by World War II the British Navy itself almost became exclusively dependent on oil. This is not to say that coal was swiftly replaced by oil during the twentieth century in Britain, but rather coal slowly faded into irrelevance by the end of the century due to the continual rise of oil.

Complications of Collectivization Due to Oil

---
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In order for these oil companies to continually find and produce oil needed to run the world, there needs to be a smooth operation without any sort of political distractions occurring from within by their workers. Compared to the coal industry, oil companies were able to exploit a multitude of advantages to mitigate the effect a collectivization of workers had on the production of oil.

With the meteoric rise of oil as a global and primary source of energy by the early twentieth century, one major trepidation that many oil companies had was the political power of their workers. This worry was prominent due to the multiple strikes by coal miners which had occurred in the previous century. Since coal miners were able to disrupt flows of energy, they gave birth to organizations of labor across Europe who had the ability and power to demand work improvements and rights. Although many of those strikes did not bring the production of coal to a complete halt, they were successful in causing private companies a great deal of stress by lowering the efficiency and total output of each colliery. Due to certain nuances in the production of oil such as new technology introduced and increased supervision by production managers, the collectivization of oil workers to use their trade as a political tool was rendered ineffective when compared to that of the coal miners.

Since the genesis of the conversion from coal to oil, many oil companies’ goal was to effectively weaken the coal miners’ political position. This goal was successfully achieved for the first half of the twentieth century for reasons specific to the process of producing oil. With the assistance of pumps, oil is fielded above ground due to underground pressure of water trapped beneath it or gas trapped above it. Thus, the production of oil required a smaller labor force than coal for each unit of energy produced.155

---

Oil was also less prone to forms of “invisible” sabotage by workers or sabotage which cannot be continuously screened for. Coal miners had an advantage of sorts in this aspect of labor revolt since they worked in the hellish conditions of the underground where management was reluctant to go. Since the process of oil production took place above ground, management was better able to supervise its workers which helped prevent any invisible conflict that the oil worker may produce. Along with constant supervision, the transport of oil was not nearly as vulnerable to sabotage as the transportation of coal.

Since the production of coal used teams of workers to transport it to and from different sites, there was a continual need for harmony amongst a system of different workers. Each of these workers, from the railway engine operator to the workers who load and unload coal at each junction, were capable to go on effective strikes or sabotage a transport of coal at any moment. Such vulnerabilities were close to nil with the transport of oil since oil pipelines were created to avoid sabotage in the supply chain of oil.\textsuperscript{156} These pipelines streamlined oil from the area where oil was produced directly to places where it was needed or to ports where it would be shipped globally. Even with this sort of innovation, the pipelines were prone to sabotage since holes could be drilled into them. But these sabotage attempts were unsuccessful because of the ease in repairing these pipes. Another part of the distribution network that enabled oil to shift political power in the favor of companies was shipping. Compared to the use of railways, shipping was not constricted by certain countries labor regulations since they operated outside of these areas. Many of these shipping companies avoided further regulation of labor by registering under countries which did not have labor laws in place. This is what many United States shipping companies began to do during the 1920s.\textsuperscript{157}
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What came out of the production of oil for the further collectivization of energy workers is simple: they encountered a large setback due to the shift from coal to oil. The workers on actual oil sites were tamed by above ground production and close supervision, therefore limiting any immediate danger of a worker uprising. More importantly, the flow of oil was able to overcome any labor disruption in its supply network due to the multiple channels its transport had.

Like so many other innovations, finding new ways to harness energy will always come at the expense of older more established energy sources. This obsolescence is something that is to be embraced in the coming future, especially with oil. For all the money and political power that there is behind the production of oil, there will be a day where it too will be overtaken by another source of energy. Similar to how oil decreased the value of coal as an energy resource, oil will eventually become just another source of energy among many to choose from. Yet, even with the transient nature of primary sources of energy, one aphorism about the control of energy resources remains. A country or company who produces a considerable amount of an energy resource will have a significant amount of political power and maneuverability due to the constant demand for their product. Even with the immense amount of political power that comes with the control of energy resources, countries and companies today are still vulnerable to the collectivization of workers’ demand for guaranteed rights and protections. For it is these same workers who aid in harvesting the energy that moves nations and accommodates the masses with little to no public exposure. Therefore, it is necessary to study the transitions between energy sources, so prior transitions can be examined for potential solutions to any problems which may disrupt the equilibrium of energy production.
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Austria’s Interwar National Identity and its Struggle for Popular Support

TRAVIS SCHMIDT

Chancellor Kurt von Schuschnigg stands before the Austrian legislature. Having concluded a meeting with German chancellor Adolf Hitler just 12 days prior, Schuschnigg received demands which foretold the annexation of Austria into the German Reich. Early in his rousing speech, he passionately states, “Österreich muss bleib”; Austria must stay. 158 With these words, there remains little room for doubt that the Austrian state refuses to back down.

Schuschnigg continues, saying “there stands, like a wall, the inner freedom of the Austrian people and the inner Value of our country.” 159 The speech’s tempo reaches a feverish boiling point, and Schuschnigg explodes, crying out, “bis in den Tod, rot-weiß-rot [until death, red-white-red].” 160 The parliament erupts into a deafening cacophony of clapping, yelling, and praise that lasts for a complete minute. As the speech nears its conclusion, the parliament joins together to sing the Austrofascist Lied der Jugend. On February 24th, 1938, Schuschnigg and the parliament declare their stance, they declare their nationality: they are Austrians, not Germans.

One month later, as German soldiers march into the country unopposed, teeming crowds of Austrians line the streets, giving the Nazi salute, celebrating the Anschluss with Germany. The German annexation of Austria was met not with tears of sorrow, but with screams of jubilance by most. The dissonance between Schuschnigg’s government and his citizens reflected the two different interpretations of what it meant to be Austrian. Born from the vacuum created by the Habsburg Empire’s collapse, Pan-Germanists and Austrian nationalists fought to capture the
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hearts and minds of the Austrian population. However, the nationalist camp, largely championed by the Vaterländ Front (Fatherland Front), failed to rally the larger population behind it. The existence of a distinct national identity in interwar Austria is a non-question. Instead, one must look at the scope of this national identity: who did it resonate with most; how did the identity promulgate itself; and why did it fail to attract larger support from the general population? In order to answer these questions, one must explore the actions and documents of various political actors in, as well as the wider (and ever-evolving) cultural sentiments of, the various Austrian polities which rose and fell between 1918 and 1938.

With the end of the Habsburg monarchy, Austria’s National Assembly penned the Staatsgesetzblatt, outlining what this emerging state was and how it perceived itself. In the first two articles of the November 12th declaration, the National Assembly said, “Deutschösterreich ist eine demokratische Republik…Deutschösterreich ist ein bestandteil der Deutschen Republik.” (German-Austria is a democratic republic... German-Austria is a part of the German republic) 161 In these early articles, the emerging Austrian government stressed its republican and, more importantly, German character. With the demise of the Austro-Hungarian empire, its German-speaking population was deprived of one of its largest unifiers: the Habsburg dynasty. They did not see themselves as Austrians in the contemporary sense, but as “‘Germans’ within the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy.” 162 Because the “Austrians…clearly saw themselves as ‘Germans,’” the new Republic of German-Austria perceived itself as a temporary bridge: it would act as the transitionary state which transferred the German subjects and their territories of the former Habsburg empire to the northern German Reich. 163 The National Assembly did not intend for
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protracted independence, but rather for swift incorporation. However, one year later, the Treaty of Saint-Germain-en-Laye dashed these intentions. Without a seat at the negotiation table, the Republic of German-Austria received a treaty she had no choice but to sign. Upon signing, much of German-Austria’s population became (often large) national minorities in Czechoslovakia, Italy, and the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes, and, as stated in Article 88 of the treaty, her independence became “inalienable otherwise than with the consent of the Council of the League of Nations.” 164 Instead of fulfilling its original role as a transitionary state, the Republic of Austria (now without the German moniker) was to become an independent state, politically distinct from, but ethnically overlapping with, Germany. Instead of receiving a fair seat at the table, the Austrian delegates, like their northern brothers, were met with a predetermined treaty with no option but to sign, for the war’s continuation would doom the already weakened remnants of the old monarchy. The Entente’s negation of the Staatsgesetzblatt at Saint-Germain-en-Laye left Vienna as the capital of, as Hellmut Andics’ 1962 book called it, “Der Staat, den keiner wollte”; the state that nobody wanted.

Instead of formalizing the “expression of the ‘national’ right of self-determination” that Woodrow Wilson stressed so heavily in his 14 Points, Austria was treated as an exception, as a geopolitical other that was prevented from actualizing her desire for unification. 165 While Czechoslovakia, Poland, and Romania received the right of self-determination, Austria was deprived of it. However, the restrictions placed upon Austria did not quell the population’s pan-Germanic sentiments. The republic’s continual independence served, to the pan-Germanist, as a reminder of a dictated existence; instead of her independence day being a day of national pride,
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of Austrian pride, it became a reminder that the larger German nation was divided. On both sides of the political aisle, much of Austria’s population yearned for unification. During the left-wing SDAPÖ’s (Social Democratic Workers’ Party of Austria) celebration of the republic’s seventh anniversary, “the symbols of the republic, such as the red-white-red flag and the de facto national anthem ‘Deutschösterreich, du herrliches Land’ [German-Austria, you beautiful country]…were either barely noticeable or conspicuously absent.” 166 Instead of displaying the Austrian national symbols, “many members carried black-red-gold banners”; 167 guest speakers declared that they were “‘kämpfen, bis die Grenzpfähle verschwunden sind und alle Deutschen auf dem Kontinent ein einiges und freies Volk bilden’ [fighting until the borders disappear and all Germans on the continent form a united and free people] ”; 168 and they named this celebration “‘Der Tag der Republik: Große Kundgebungen für den Anschluß an Deutschland’ [The Day of the Republic: Great Demonstrations for the Unification with Germany].” 169 The Day of the Republic was not a celebration of an independent Austria, but an annual reminder of the hope for, and the urgency of, a unification with the Weimar Republic. By prioritizing the necessity for unification, the SDAPÖ bolstered the notion that Austria is comprised not of Austrians, but of Austrian Germans who are detached from their northern brothers. Days of national celebration are vital for the propagation and reinforcement of a shared national identity, yet citizens of the First Austrian Republic were constantly reminded that they were Germans who did not reside in Germany. Instead of preaching the great achievements of Austrians and building optimism for the new republic, the SDAPÖ reinforced the importance of the großdeutsch (Greater Germany) idea; it
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reiterated that Austria should be a constituent of a larger German state and not a state in and of itself. The SDAPÖ was no political outlier: they were one of the largest political parties in the state, with SDAPÖ politicians serving as chancellor (the head of government) and acting as the bulwark of the early republic’s legislature. This had a profound impact on the public, for it reinforced, and, through the electoral process, validated, a pan-German message in a country that struggled to justify its continued existence to its citizens. To the SDAPÖ, and other leftist groups, “the großdeutsch idea, with its roots in the 1848 revolution and early socialist movement, [assisted in] assert[ing] that German nationalism was, in fact, compatible with socialism, republicanism, and democracy.” 170 The SDAPÖ believed that an Austrian unification with Germany would strengthen the larger German nation and, consequently, strengthen Germany’s ability to spread the socialist message.

The SDAPÖ was not alone in spreading this pan-German message, however. On the opposite end of the political spectrum, right-wing press and organizations uttered similar Anschluss-oriented rhetoric. Largely inspired by the radical German nationalist, Georg Ritter von Schönerer, who, throughout much of the 19th Century, advocated for the dissolution of the Austro-Hungarian empire, the Anschluss of Austria with Germany, and hardline anti-semitic policies, pan-Germanists—especially those right of center—became increasingly vocal and radical. This made the possibility of an independent Austrian national identity successfully rooting itself in the public consciousness increasingly difficult. The conservative Austrian forces “formed a relatively unified bloc of intellectuals in the early postwar years [that was] opposed to socialism, Judaism, capitalism, and democracy…[creating] a common front to do away with the
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new Republic and restore Austrian, German, and Catholic greatness.” 171 While the left desired to unify the larger German nation to strengthen the new democratic institutions established during, and after, the war, the right sought to rectify the wrongs of Versailles, of Saint-Germain-en-Laye, by uniting the German Völk under one flag and finally embodying the großdeutsch lösung from the previous century.

Yet, unlike the left, the right-wing bloc splintered amidst disagreements over the Anschluss. On this (seemingly fundamental) question of national identity, the right split into two distinct camps: the pan-Germanists and the fledgling Austro-nationalists, those who hoped to foster a distinct Austrian national identity and maintain an independent Austrian state. Throughout the twenties, these two doctrines wrestled for backing from similar pools of supporters and constituents. Many belonging to the Austro-nationalist front sought to ‘re-christianize’ the public (allowing the Catholic doctrine a more intensive role in daily life), the restoration of a monarchy, and, as historian Janek Wasserman and his analysis of the conservative periodical, Das neue Reich, highlights, a "distinct ‘Austrian cultural idea’ that emphasized Austrian centrality for German-Christian culture…[and] an independent Austria [that] rejected a Prussia-dominated Anschluss.” 172 The division of public opinion within the Austrian right proved a difficult space to build nationalist fervor. Instead of being unopposed, Austro-nationalists faced opposition from both sides of the political spectrum and the general population’s lingering desires for Anschluss. The nationalists faced an intense uphill battle to gain support. Nevertheless, the pro-independence Christian Social Party and their ‘big tent’ platform of anti-semitism, anti-liberalism, and support of the Habsburg monarchy and Catholic

Church enabled them to govern Austria for much of the First Republic’s history. However, their coalition government included the Greater German People’s Party, which advocated for anti-Bolshevism and, most importantly, Austrian-German unification: the ideological divide of the right manifested itself in Austria’s governing coalition.

Stemming from discontent and feelings of unmet political goals, both the right and the left, as the decade progressed, grew increasingly radical. While the rest of the country swung right, ‘Red Vienna’ remained the Social Democrat stronghold. This progressive Viennese government, despite now lacking national control, remained the subject of vitriol by those whom “excoriated liberal cosmopolitanism and lauded the ‘Habsburg myth’ of a transnational Austria.”

173 This anti-socialist ‘Black Vienna’ grew increasingly radical due to the deteriorating economic conditions and fears that Bolshevism would grip the country. Joseph Eberle, after leaving Das neue Reich (The New Realm), founded Die Schöner Zukunft (The Better Future) which would, eventually, outpace DNR’s readership. Eberle “argued that intellectuals must transform postwar Central European politics and society behind strong centralized leadership”; 174 that his journal “would organize a new, militant Catholic conservative movement in Central Europe.” 175

Tensions reached a boiling point when, on July 15, 1927, SDAPÖ protestors clashed with police forces during a general strike. After the heavily armed police put down the protests, nearly one hundred were killed and the right grew stronger and more hostile to the left, who sent a clear message in their song Die Arbeiter von Wien, which sang “Lords of the factories, you lords of the world...finally will your supremacy fall...We, the army which creates the future...demolish
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the narrow prison of shackles.” 176 By the end of the 1920s, political turmoil gripped Austria, with the left and the right prepared for tensions to escalate further. During this time of crisis, the conservative debate between pan-Germanism and Austrian nationalism “[took] a backseat [in order] to [handle] conflicts with [the] socialists.” 177 For the time being, the various right-wing groups shared a common enemy: Austria’s socialist movement. However, the divisive question of Austria’s national identity and the country’s future would return to the forefront of discussion once the dust of civil conflict settled.

Appointed on May 20th, 1932, Chancellor Engelbert Dollfuss of the Christian Social Party sought to combat the left and unify the right by abandoning the republican model, quickly moving the government, instead, towards authoritarianism. The transition, however, was not met with great support and fervor from the general populace, but, instead, with criticism and animosity from leftists and Austrian Nazis who opposed Dollfuss’ pro-independence policies. Dollfuss’ shifts towards non-democratic methods of governance occurred amidst fears that the Christian Social Party would lose their parliamentary majority after the 1932 Viennese elections. The independence-minded CSP was losing its ground and popular support and, in response, the unelected Engelbert Dollfuss took authoritarian measures to maintain his grip on power and to curtail the pro-Anschluss DNSAP, which became increasingly popular as Hitler’s Nazi party gained power in Germany. On February 12th, 1934, the four-day Austrian Civil War broke out after right-wing paramilitary forces searched properties belonging to the Social Democratic Party and were met with armed resistance. After several hundred deaths, Dollfuss and his government defeated the left-wing resistance, abolished the SDP, and, on May 1st, 1934, proclaimed the May

Constitution, which established the authoritarian, undemocratic Federal State of Austria with a Vaterländ Front-led government.

Austria’s struggles extended beyond these (not atypical) left-right clashes. From 1918 to 1934, Austria’s intellectuals and political elites engaged in a tense ideological struggle. The debate over Austria’s future (either as a sovereign state with an independent identity or as a southern territory in a larger, unified German state) weighed heavily on the country. While the populace at large, and many political parties, championed a pan-German identity, the governing Christian Social Party sought to undermine this sentiment through its staunch defense of Austrian sovereignty. As tensions escalated and political violence threw the republican model into question, more intensive and radical policy decisions made themselves available to those in power. The Austrian Republic witnessed a constant and extensive struggle between the pan-Germanists and the Austro-nationalists in politics; in the press; and in public discourse. Despite Saint-Germain-en-Laye, the Austrian public never fully abandoned the desire to achieve the Anschluss. Politically active elements, however, began to diverge from this sentiment and managed to rule the country through its big tent party platform. With the abandoning of the 1920 constitution on May 1st, 1934, the sixteen-year-old republican model ended, and Dollfuss and the Vaterländ Front entered a new stage of Austrian politics where constitutional restraints and limits no longer hindered their efforts to inspire the Austrian public to internalize this developing national identity.

The successor to the Christian Social Party, the Vaterländ Front also strived to maintain Austrian sovereignty. A state, however, cannot easily maintain independence if the people lack the fervor to support it or, even worse, fail to identify with the very state they reside in. Therefore, one of the Vaterländ Front’s highest priorities was to, in an effort to bridge the void
between the (mostly) pan-German population and the nationalist government, promulgate the Austrian national identity’s wider adoption. To achieve this goal, the VF emphasized certain elements of Austria’s history and population which distinguished the country and its citizens from Germany and the rest of Central Europe. The VF perceived Austrians as the “‘better Germans,’” as the Catholic Germans who ruled and defined Central Europe. 178 Similar to the Bavarian population of Germany, the Austrian people’s Catholic nature differentiated it from the ‘Prussian,’ predominantly Protestant, government in Berlin. Thanks to Prussia’s Kulturkampf and its lingering effects, to be a Catholic was to be an ‘other.’ The historic struggle between Austria and Prussia was, among other things, a struggle between Protestantism and Catholicism. The former Austrian empire was a Catholic empire with a Catholic dynasty at the helm. This long-standing empire and its Catholic connections was utilized by the VF: if we are to return to our former days of greatness, then we must return to a strong Catholic tradition; to be Austrian is to be Catholic. By directly connecting Austria’s religious tradition to its historical heritage, it creates a continuity that extolls the Catholic faith, distinguishing Austria from the German Reich and its sectarian divisions. Like their CSP predecessors, the Vaterländ Front supported “Catholic teachers [who] instructed pupils that Austrian Germanism was the heir of the Holy Roman Empire.” 179 Patriotism and nationalist fervor are fostered at a young age, and the “Catholic Church [received] a leading role in education and [was] guaranteed the autonomy of the Church’s youth and other social and corporate organizations”; 180 schools taught the “‘Austrian ABC’…[with] ‘C’ for Christentum… ‘D’ for Deutschtum… and ‘V’ for Vaterland.” 181 The
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new Austrian state was not theocratic in nature, but it did not shy away from utilizing religion as a tool to build the Austrian identity.

Additionally, the VF, and some members of the arts and the intelligentsia, emphasized Austria as politically and ideologically distinct from the rest of Germandom. Austrofascism hoped to marry nationalism with pan-Germanism, arguing that Austria’s former position in Central Europe enabled them to spread their culture and civilization throughout the region. Catholic theologian Dietrich Hildebrand avoided arrest in Germany by fleeing to Dollfuss’ Austria. He founded Der christliche Ständestaat publication, which became the “unofficial organ of the Austrofascist state.” 182 The publication argued that the “Christian worldview would show the way out from this Weltanschaungskampf (ideological struggle)…that Austria [was] Europe’s hope for a Christian future and a third way between the political extremisms.” 183 Austrian playwrights similarly proselytized the public, hoping to spread a nationalist message. They hoped to dramatize and chronicle the great tales of Austria’s past in an effort to spread the Völkisch message of the Austrofascist state. Historical dramas such as the “Österreich-Trilogie by Hanns Sassman (1892-1944), comprising Metternich (1929), Haus Rothschild (1930) and 1848 (1932) [were] ’der erste Versuch, ein national österreichisches Drama zu schaffen’ (the first attempt to create an Austrian national drama).” 184 However, Sassman’s plays were considered “theatrically dull” 185 and Austrofascist intellectuals walked a “delicate tightrope…attacking the German nationalists…while also supporting the regimes in Italy, Hungary, Portugal, and Spain…[leaving] little room for them to carve out a distinctive Weltanschaung (world view).”
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Despite the ascension of the independence-minded Vaterländ Front, the Nazi party continued garnering further support and Austria’s populace yearned for the historical what-if of a 1918 Anschluss. The efforts to distinguish Austria as a distinct Germanic entity fell upon (mostly) deaf ears.

The Austrian state did not just attempt to build its national identity domestically, but also sought to acquire foreign allies against Nazism and German expansionism. In 1933, Dollfuss traveled to London “making a successful effort to raise a $40,000,000 loan and to persuade foreign governments that they had a deep responsibility for Austrian stability.” The next year, on March 17th, 1934, Dollfuss signed the Rome Protocols, three separate treaties concerning Austrian, Italian, and Hungarian economic relations. In the first protocol, the three governments agreed:

To confer together on all problems which particularly concern them…in the spirit of the existing treaties of friendship between Italy and Austria, Italy and Hungary and Austria and Hungary, which are based on a recognition of the existence of numerous common interests, a concordant policy directed towards the promotion of effective co-operation between the States of Europe and particularly between Italy, Austria and Hungary.

While the treaties were entirely non-binding, it reflected a larger effort by the Austrofascist government to garner allies in the near-abroad, something the state lacked at the time. The fascist-led Kingdom of Italy served as Austria’s best, and only viable, candidate for a strong European ally. The Austrofascists “believed independence could still be viable if it leaned on Mussolini’s Italy as a counter-weight to German influence,” but, after the German government provided aid in the Italo-Abyssinian War, the potential Italian alliance was thrown
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into question. When Italy “joined the Rome–Berlin Axis and gave Hitler carte blanche to take over [Austria],” the Austrofascist state suffered a major geopolitical blow. Despite Austria becoming “a cultural investment in which every forward-looking person in the world holds a share,” chancellor Schuschnigg lacked the international clout to resist Hitler’s demands during their meeting on February 12th, 1938, which included the appointment of Austrian Nazi Arthur Seyss-Inquart as Minister of Public Safety (effectively giving the Austrian Nazi party full control of the police force).

Despite its domestic efforts to promulgate the Austrian national identity and diplomatic politicking to gain international guarantees of support, the Austrofascist government failed in achieving its goal. The Austrian Nazi party’s virulent and continual growth, Die Schönere Zukunft’s victory over both Das neue Reich and Der christliche Ständestaat, and Italy’s abandoning of Austria for a German alliance left the Vaterländ Front without significant domestic support and without dependable foreign allies. Dollfuss, Schuschnigg, and the VF, despite all their efforts, failed to garner popular support and promote their interpretation of the Austrian national identity. There were Austrians who had “real fears about National Socialism,” but these fears often failed “to amount to ideological or political commitment to the Fatherland Front.” Despite these (often desperate) efforts by the VF government, the Austrian people seemingly rejected the proposed identity: they were Germans first and foremost. Why should Germans, they believed, remain separated from Germany? That was what we wanted from the beginning. Amidst the continual pressure from the Austrian Nazi party and Adolf Hitler,
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Chancellor Schuschnigg declared, on March 9th, 1938, that a referendum on Austrian independence would occur on March 13th. In an effort to garner votes for Austria’s continued sovereignty, Schuschnigg reopened the political sphere and promised to legalize the outlawed Social Democratic Party. Yet the referendum never occurred, for German forces crossed the Austrian border on March 12th. Two decades after its first attempt, Austria was finally unified with Germany, ‘correcting’ the ‘wrongdoing’ of Saint-Germain-en-Laye and Versailles.

Austrian nationalism was not defeated in 1938, however. Academic, political, and art circles sowed an early foundation for Austrian nationalism. Resistance did occur after the Anschluss and during World War II, but it was limited. The only “large demonstration against Nazism after [the] Anschluss was in October 1938 under the slogan ‘Our Führer is Christ’ (rather than Hitler).” 193 Despite the lack of large-scale protestation, resistance forces began subverting their German occupiers. This armed insurrection was "conducted by a small minority for the benefit of the masses,” and is best exemplified by Ernst Bürger and the Kampfgruppe Auschwitz, who’s memorial at the aforementioned concentration camp lauds them as Austrian patriots who defied Nazi expansionism. 194 The ideological conflict to inspire a mass adoption of an Austrian national identity continued throughout World War II: much of the country willfully supported the Nazi government (reflecting the pan-German sentiments), but there were (albeit in small numbers) Austro-nationalists who subverted the state to the best of their abilities. The Catholic-centered, uniquely Austrian narrative pitched by the interwar nationalists laid the groundwork for a new national identity, but these foundations would not be expanded upon until that insatiable urge for unification was satisfied. Austria’s nationalist movement failed to achieve its goals before the Anschluss because, since the country’s inception, the people were denied their first
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choice: union with Germany. Every year as an independent state was another year separated from their fellow Germans. Despite the efforts of the Austrian nationalists, they were always justifying the existence of der Staat, den keiner wollte; they were always fighting against the current. This already difficult argument was further magnified by left-right tensions, an unstable global economy, and the resurgence of a powerful Germany.

After the horrors of World War II and the exoneration of Austrian complicity in the war and the Holocaust by the 1943 Moscow Declarations, the Austrian nationalists were able to garner large-scale support from a traumatized, newly re-independent nation. Austria, almost out of necessity, needed to distance itself from its großdeutsch past. With the reestablishment of a democratic Austria in 1955, it declared itself permanently neutral and was forbidden from uniting with Germany again. This was the Austro-nationalists’ second chance and, after the entire German nation collectively experienced the horrors of the largest military conflict in history, they stood far better prospects of success: the populace could distance itself from its problematic involvement in World War II and craft a distinct national identity. While Austrian nationalism began successfully taking root in the larger population after the Second World War, its foundations were laid in the preceding decades. The efforts by interwar Austrian nationalists may not have immediately succeeded, but their aspirations would be realized in the years to come. Despite the population’s initial rejection of the nationalist message, the sobering military defeat, and the ensuing reflection on what the Anschluss resulted in, assisted in converting public opinion. Only after the tragedy of 1938-1945 could the Austrian public begin considering its ‘second-best’ option. With the foundations laid by the interwar nationalist movement, the Second Republic of Austria, and her people, could begin truly embracing their national identity, embracing the state nobody once wanted.
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Afro-Cuban Immigration to the United States (1965-1995)

ESTHER SONG

At the height of the Cuban Revolution in 1959, large numbers of Cubans began leaving their homeland for the United States. Initially, those who left Cuba were mostly white elites fleeing the revolution led by Prime Minister Fidel Castro. Furthermore, throughout the post-revolutionary period, political and economic conditions continued to drive many other Cubans off the island. In an effort to undermine Castro (who the U.S. feared due to his close alliance with its Cold War rival — the Soviet Union), the U.S. shaped its foreign policy so as to favor Cuban migration into the U.S., which attracted many migrant Cubans to the country.

Except for a brief period during the 1980 Mariel Boatlift, the majority of Cuban immigrants entering the U.S. between 1959 and 1995 identified as white. As such, the dominant narrative of post-revolution Cuban migration tends to focus on white Cubans, thereby obscuring the experiences of Afro-Cuban immigrants. This paper attempts to shed light on Afro-Cuban immigration to the United States between 1965 and 1995. Since the outbreak of the revolution, significant numbers of Afro-Cubans began entering the United States after Castro opened the port of Camarioca to migrants in 1965. Therefore, a study of Cuban migration since the time of the Camarioca boatlifts (1965) can offer illuminating insights into the experience of post-revolutionary Afro-Cuban immigrants. By examining the migration of Afro-Cubans until 1995, one begins to grasp the distinct motivating factors, processes, and settlement patterns of Afro-Cuban migration.

Afro-Cubans who migrated between 1965 and 1995 have often cited racial and economic motivations for leaving Cuba. The two were rarely mutually exclusive, for race often precipitated the economic disparities between black and white Cubans. In fact, race played a central role in
almost every aspect of Afro-Cuban immigration in this period: the driving forces behind migration; the immigration process; and the adjustment patterns of Afro-Cubans once in the United States. Discrimination barred Cubans of African descent from accessing economic opportunities typically available to white-identifying Cubans, which drove them to the United States in search of greater opportunities. However, Afro-Cuban migrants also faced discrimination in the U.S., which similarly stunted their economic mobility. A study of Afro-Cuban immigration both reveals how racial inequality in the U.S. and Cuba has historically suppressed the social progress of Afro-descended peoples while privileging the progress of whites, and also shows how racial inequality continues to persist in both societies today.

Furthermore, Afro-Cuban migrants have expressed a struggle to negotiate their hyphenated identity as black and Cuban in the United States — either they are seen as “too black” by their white Cuban counterparts or “too Latino” by African Americans. This struggle illustrates a larger problem which remains pervasive to this day: the inability of the American consciousness to acknowledge an Afro-Latinx identity. By failing to acknowledge this, the U.S. erases the identity of an entire group of people. This erasure is harmful, because it can force Afro-Latinos to compromise their identity in order to fit a racial or ethnic category that lines up with American perceptions.

The initial exodus of Cuban migrants following the revolution was comprised of white, wealthy elites — namely supporters of the ousted Cuban leader, Fulgencio Batista. Of the approximately 248,000 Cubans who entered the U.S. between 1959 and 1962, over 90% identified as white. (Those Cubans who identified as white Latinos were largely of European descent). After the Cuban Missile Crisis of 1962, the influx of migrants declined as
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commercial airlines stopped operating between the U.S. and Cuba. Eventually, immigration from Cuba peaked once more when Fidel Castro opened the port of Camarioca (located approximately 200 miles from Miami), in 1965, to Cubans with relatives living in the United States. After the first few weeks, the U.S. ceased the boatlifts of Cuban migrants into Miami and replaced them with an airlift, called the Vuelos de la Libertad, which flew Cuban migrants from Varadero to Miami — a distance of nearly 189 miles. Between 1965 and Castro’s termination of the airlifts in 1974, approximately 260,000 immigrants entered the U.S. This second wave largely consisted of middle class Cubans, such as small merchants, independent craftsmen, skilled and semiskilled workers. Nearly 83% were white Cubans, while the rest identified as non-white (namely black and “mulatto”). Despite the increase of incoming Afro-Cubans during this period, the migration remained a movement of mostly white Cubans.

What contributed to the relative absence of Afro-Cubans in the first two waves of immigration after 1959? An examination of government policies and socioeconomics helps explain the dearth of Afro-Cuban arrivals between 1959 and 1980. For example, the 1965 “Memorandum of Understanding” between the U.S. and Cuban governments gave Cuban migrants, with families already in the United States, first priority for immigration. Since many of the Cubans living in the U.S. were white, this policy favored white Cubans over black Cubans. Even if the policy itself did not mention race, the socioeconomic inequality that was embedded within the Cuban migration process gave white migrants an advantage that black migrants did not have.
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Furthermore, the racial disparity inherent in the migratory process reflected the existing socioeconomic inequalities in pre-revolutionary Cuba. These patterns also reveal why so few black Cubans migrated to the United States in the first two waves. According to Puerto Rican and Latinx Studies scholar, Alan A. Aja, in Miami’s Forgotten Cubans, “Afro-Cubans were excluded from the upper echelons of Cuban society,” and the middle class marked “the glass ceiling of Afro-Cuban mobility, if and when they were able to access it.” In other words, one’s economic status in pre-revolutionary Cuba was intricately linked to his or her race; thus, the low numbers of Afro-Cubans in the first two, largely upper and middle class, waves of immigration can be understood. These statistics clearly display the correlation between race and economic status in Cuba — namely, that the lighter one’s skin, the higher one’s economic status. But this does more than illustrate the inequality of a past Cuban society; it reveals how racialized economic disparities spilled over into the migration process itself, and were thus maintained. By enacting the “Memorandum of Understanding” the U.S. perpetuated unequal advantages enjoyed by white Cubans at the expense of Afro-Cubans. Therefore, an indepth look at the migration policies and socioeconomic norms of Cuba not only explains the relatively small number of Afro-Cuban arrivals to the States before 1959; but it also reveals how Cuba and the U.S. perpetuated racial inequality. Given these limitations, one can see why more Afro-Cubans did not start to enter the U.S. until the Mariel Boatlift of 1980, which brought in mostly working-class immigrants from Cuba.

In 1979 more than 100,000 Cubans living in the U.S. visited friends and relatives in Cuba. Their seemingly better-off lifestyles, as well as their stories of economic opportunities abroad, sparked a desire in many other Cubans to migrate to the U.S. As a result, in 1980
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approximately 10,000 Cubans crowded the Peruvian Embassy in Havana, demanding permission to leave for the U.S. In response, Castro opened Mariel, so that those seeking to leave might be picked up at the port by relatives living abroad. From the port of Mariel, these migrants sailed to Key West, Florida — a journey that spanned approximately 124 miles. Thus, this wave of out migration from Cuba became known as the Mariel Boatlift.

Among the immigrants who arrived during the Mariel Boatlift of 1980, 60-80% identified as white. According to Historian Heriberto Dixon in “The Cuban-American Counterpoint: Black Cubans in the United States”, the wide range of those who identified as white may likely have “resulted from the attempts to classify the mulattos, i.e., those racially mixed.” Dixon indicates that many of the “lighter mulattos” may have attempted to “pass” for white in the United States.199 The reason for this is unknown; however, the disparate and often conflicting views of race in Cuba and the United States may be at fault. Historically in Latin America, racial mixing was seen as a step toward whiteness; whereas in the U.S., “miscegenation” (the pejorative term denoting the so-called mixing of blood) was seen as a step toward blackness. This may explain why many Cubans of African descent chose to pass as white when entering the United States during Mariel. In any case, Afro-Cubans comprised anywhere from 20-40% of the 125,000 Mariel immigrants.

Another distinctive feature of the third wave was the social and economic makeup of the group. The majority of Cuban immigrants who came during the Mariel Boatlift represented the Cuban working class; approximately 70% of the Mariels were blue collar workers.200 This shift in racial demographic, as well as the relatively lower economic status of the Mariel migrants
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compared to those who arrived in the first two waves, is important to note. The fact that a
greater influx of darker-skinned migrants coincided with working class migration further attests
to the racialized economic inequality that already existed in Cuba. Also interesting to note is that
almost half of the Mariels came of age during the late 1960s or 70s. Therefore, unlike the earlier
immigrants — who left a nation transitioning to communism — “the Marielitos and the recent
emigres knew no other society than Cuba in communism.”201 Sociologist Silvia Pedraza, in
*Political Disaffection in Cuba’s Revolution and Exodus*, claims that, for this reason they are
often referred to as the “children of the revolution.” This is significant, because it suggests that
these later immigrants did not leave Cuba out of a sense of nostalgia for the non-communist past
as their predecessors had. In fact, many Afro-Cuban migrants of this period claimed that
communism in Cuba initially benefited Afro-Cubans. But over time, they saw how even under
communist rule, Cuban society continued to perpetuate racial inequality.

Indeed, at the outset of the Cuban Revolution, Fidel Castro made certain equalizing
changes that benefitted Afro-Cubans. Unlike Jim Crow in the United States, pre-revolutionary
Cuba did not have a legalized system of segregation. That did not mean, however, that Cuba was
fully integrated. On the contrary, Silvia Pedraza argues that race-based segregation appeared in
the social arena, even if it was not codified in law. Black Cubans were excluded from “yacht and
country clubs, the best vacation resorts and beaches, hotels, [and] private schools reserved for the
elite.”202 The “elite” here would refer to white Cubans, since black Cubans were barred from the
upper echelons of society, as mentioned earlier. Upon assuming power, one of the first acts of
the Castro regime was to make these exclusive facilities public, thus expanding membership to
blacks and other people of color. Additionally, the government increased employment and
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educational opportunities for Afro-Cubans. For example, the Castro regime expanded positions in skilled professions that were previously limited to white Cubans, such as teaching and practicing medicine. It seemed that with Castro in power Afro-Cubans began experiencing greater social and economic mobility, and Cuba seemed headed toward a racially egalitarian society. However, the progressive changes introduced early in the Castro regime fell short of eliminating discrimination in Cuba.

Nevertheless, the experience of Joel Ruiz’s family provides a glimpse of how the revolution initially removed racial barriers for black Cubans and provided some space for economic and social mobility. Joel Ruiz was a “child of the revolution” — an Afro-Cuban who came of age in the 1980s. New York Times reporter, Mirta Ojito, published his story in an article titled, "Best of Friends, Worlds Apart.” Ruiz explained to Ojito that the Castro government enabled his family to move from a one-bedroom living space to a three-bedroom apartment. Furthermore, his mother, who used to work as a maid for wealthy white families, was able to go on and pursue a nursing career. Ruiz recalled that his mother did not believe those changes would have been possible if not for the Cuban revolutionary government.203 Ruiz’s family story illustrates some of the economic and social advantages the Cuban Revolution brought for Afro-Cubans.

But if Afro-Cubans experienced greater socioeconomic mobility under Castro, and the country seemed to move towards racial equality, why, then, did such significant numbers of Afro-Cubans (20-40%) choose to leave for the United States in 1980? Based on interviews with black Cubans who arrived during or after the Mariel Boatlift, it is evident that the revolution fell short of addressing the pervasive structural racism and bias in Cuba. As such, many black

Cubans grew disillusioned with post-revolutionary Cuba, and were motivated to leave. For example, Silvia Pedraza cites interviews of several working-class Cuban immigrants in Chicago. After conducting a number of interviews, the interviewer concluded that for both white and black Cubans, the heightened awareness of race in post-revolutionary Cuba created tension. That is, “whites complained of favoritism, blacks of tokenism.” Moreover, black Cuban workers claimed that the institutional elimination of racial discrimination did not eradicate racial prejudice from the hearts and minds of the Cuban people.\footnote{Pedraza, 159.} One might wonder why racism suddenly factored in Afro-Cubans’ decisions to leave. After all, black Cubans had faced racial discrimination for centuries. Though it is true, unfortunately, that racial prejudice was not a new phenomenon for black Cubans, it is possible that the progressive changes implemented by the Castro regime created new hopes for the complete elimination of racism. Therefore, any continuation of racial prejudice may have upset Afro-Cubans who believed the revolution would eliminate racism. This disappointment was painful enough to make them leave.

Not only did racial prejudice continue to exist, but the Cuban Revolution failed to eradicate structural racism from its society. Likewise, a number of Afro-Cubans who migrated to the United States in or after 1980 cited institutional inequality as the reason for leaving Cuba. Silvia Pedraza’s interview of Jose Macias illustrates this. Jose Macias was a gay Afro-Cuban who immigrated to the United States on the Mariel Boatlift. Commenting on his experience as a gay, black person in two different countries, Macias claimed that in the U.S., being gay was not as big of a deal as being black; whereas in Cuba, the converse was true. Though his comment may seem to dispute the prevalence of racism in Cuba, he went on to explain that this was not the case. Indeed, he refused to credit post-revolutionary Cuba for being post-racial (that is, marked
by an absence of racial discrimination). Rather, he argued that while the Castro government may have opened up some opportunities for blacks, whites by and large remained the ones in power. He equated the government’s opening of once-closed social facilities to “giving blacks some candy, while whites still retained the best opportunities.” He continued, “Look at the Central Committee of the Communist Party. How many blacks are there? Only three…. Look at the sports teams — 80 percent black… And then you go to the prisons in Cuba, and they are full of blacks.”

In other words, the limited social gains for black Cubans in the revolution fell short of creating a truly equal society for Cubans of all colors.

The continued racial inequality in post-revolutionary Cuba reinforced the existing economic disparities between races. In particular, the extent of racialized economic inequality can be seen after the fall of the Soviet Union in 1991. Since the mid-1980s, Cuba’s economy had been declining, but the collapse of the Soviet Union tipped the country’s economy over the edge and contributed to a severe economic recession that hit Cuba in the early 1990s. The loss of Soviet subsidies, as well as Eastern European socialist trading partners, forced Cuba to adapt its economic model and integrate into the world capitalist market. Furthermore, the tightening of the U.S. embargo in 1992 only exacerbated the conditions of a failing economy. These conditions took a toll on Cubans, and some began to look abroad to improve their economic welfare. In August 1994, the Cuban government once again enabled Cubans to leave the country, sparking what is now known as the Balsero Crisis. Between August and September of the same year, more than 30,000 Cubans left the island for the United States. The race of the Balseros is difficult to determine, given that the Immigration and Naturalization Service listed all incoming migrants as “Hispanic,” regardless of how they identified. That said, Latin American Studies scholar, Holly
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Ackerman, concludes in “The Balsero Phenomenon, 1991-1994” that approximately 8% of the Balsero immigrants were Afro-Cuban — closer to the proportion of Afro-Cubans in the earliest waves of the post-revolutionary Cuban immigration. In spite of the dip in Afro-Cuban immigration during the fourth wave, a look at the Afro-Cubans who entered the U.S. in this period offers insight into the race-based economic inequality that continued under the Castro regime. Particularly in a moment of severe economic recession, these economic disparities further disadvantaged black Cubans, which compelled some of them to leave.

In response to the economic recession in Cuba in the 1990s, many Cuban Americans began sending remittances to their families back home. This had the unintended effect of widening the economic gap between white and black Cubans. Since most Cubans in the United States were white, the majority of Cubans benefitting from remittances were also white. Furthermore, in an effort to compensate for the loss of Soviet subsidy and trade with Eastern European nations, Cuba started building its tourism industry. Oddly enough, the rise of the tourism industry also contributed to the economic suppression of Afro-Cubans. Roberto Zurbano, former editor and publisher of the Cuban government-owned publication, Casa de las Américas, wrote an opinion piece for the New York Times in 2013, titled “For Blacks in Cuba, the Revolution Hasn’t Begun.” He argues that the revolution failed to undo the structures of racism in Cuba, and thus failed to produce a truly egalitarian society. As an example, he points to the 1990s, when “it was common for hotel managers… to hire only white staff members, so as not to offend the supposed sensibilities of their European clientele.”

The tourism industry became a lucrative sector, and as such, employment in the industry provided Cubans with
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opportunities to overcome their economic hardships. In particular, European tourism in Cuba saw a 6% increase from 1989 to 1997. Therefore, hotel managers engaged in whitewashing their staff in order to appease European clients. Aside from the obvious racism, the practice of hiring only white staff barred Afro-Cubans from the best paying jobs in tourism, such as working in the lobby, where frequent contact with tourists might lead to more tips. Instead, blacks were relegated to menial jobs, such as cleaning while the well-paying jobs went to whites. This only deepened the economic inequality between white and black Cubans. In sum, the sending of remittances and the exclusion of blacks from the hospitality sector inhibited the economic mobility of Afro-Cubans in Cuba during the post-Soviet economic crisis. On the other hand, those same factors created greater opportunities for white Cubans to climb the economic ladder, or at least to rise above their economic hardships. In other words, the revolutionary Cuban government failed to tear down all the structures that perpetuated racial inequality; in fact, it even allowed new forms of institutionalized racism to emerge, via the Cuban tourism industry (whether its leaders realized it or not).

Within the context of economic recession, made worse by the rampant racial and economic inequality, a number of Afro-Cubans decided to leave Cuba in search of better opportunities. One such man was Joel Ruiz — the same Ruiz who earlier described the ways in which the Castro regime helped improve the lives of his family. In 1994, Ruiz moved to Florida with his best friend, a white Cuban named Achmed Valdes. If the revolution helped create a better life for Joel and his family, why did he decide to leave as an adult? It seems that the faltering Cuban economy of the 1990s heightened public awareness of the racialized economic disparities between whites and people of color. For example, Ruiz explained that he was in
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military school until he left to attend a cooking program, hoping that he could find a good job in a tourist hotel. However, after “he graduated, the only job available for him was washing windows. ‘Look around, co-workers told him, look who's getting the good jobs’. The answer was whites.” In other words, neither one’s qualifications nor education alone was enough to land a well-paying job in Cuba — race mattered. Joel Ruiz’s story offers an illuminating insight into the failure of the Cuban Revolution to remove racial discrimination. In the early stages of the revolution, his family seemed to benefit from the expanded social and economic opportunities offered to Afro-Cubans; they moved into a more spacious apartment, and his mom went from working as a maid for white families to becoming a nurse. But as the years went by, and as the country faced economic hardships, Ruiz began to see the harsh reality — even with the increased benefits afforded to blacks by the revolution, Cuban society continued to reserve the best opportunities for whites.

As Ruiz began to recognize the economic and social limits placed on him in Cuba simply because of his skin color, he started to covet the opportunities that might be awaiting him in the United States. He explained that he noticed, when watching American television at his best friend Achmed's, house, “that some blacks seemed to live well in America. He saw black lawyers, politicians, wealthy athletes. It made him think: ‘It's not so bad over there. Blacks are all right.‘” Tentatively embracing the hope that Uncle Sam would offer him greater opportunities, Joel Ruiz climbed onto a raft and sailed for Florida in August of 1994.

At the end of a difficult, and often dangerous, journey to the United States, what awaited people like Joel Ruiz? For Afro-Cubans, the answer is complex; in North America, they were not “classic” Cuban immigrants. Unlike white Cuban immigrants, who are often characterized as
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having economically succeeded despite their humble beginnings, the economic mobility of Afro-Cubans has been stymied by racial discrimination in the U.S. If the patterns of Cuban immigration have demonstrated the function of racial inequality within the migratory process, then the socioeconomic statuses of Afro-Cubans in the U.S. illustrate the continuation of inequality against people of African descent in the United States. In general, black Cuban immigrants who arrived in the U.S. between 1959 and 1995 had worse standards of living than white Cuban immigrants. A 2000 census of Cuban immigrants “based on race and stages of arrival in the Miami-Dade County,” reveals that unemployment rates among black Cubans were much higher than their white counterparts. In addition, median household incomes were lower among Afro-Cubans than white Cubans. Also interesting to note is the statistic on college education and median household income of both white and black Cuban immigrants between 1959 and 1979 (pre-Mariel). Even though the two groups had an equal rate of college education (34%), white Cubans had a higher median household income average compared to black Cubans ($56,500 for whites compared to $48,000 for blacks).\footnote{Aja, 126} In other words, less education is not the reason for the lower economic success of Afro-Cubans compared to their white counterparts. If the disparity in income cannot be attributed to a difference in education or merit, then the tragic conclusion must be that racial discrimination in the U.S. has kept Afro-Cubans from attaining similar levels of economic success as their white Cuban counterparts. However, these statistics on Afro-Cuban Americans only paint a portion of a much larger problem plaguing this country: the racial inequality that overwhelmingly inhibits the socioeconomic mobility all Afro-descended people groups in the U.S. to this day. This can be seen in the 1990 Miami-Dade County census below.
A census of Miami-Dade County in 1990 summarizes socioeconomic statistics by demographic groups. It reveals that black Cubans have similar rates of unemployment, at 11.52%, as non-Latinx blacks and other black Latinx groups. On the other hand, white Cubans have some of the lowest unemployment rates at 6.49% — comparable to white Anglos and Asian/Pacific Islanders. Overall, black Cubans share more socioeconomic similarities with other local black groups than with white Cubans. The fact that black people — regardless of ethnic identity — generally suffer the most economically, in comparison to other racial groups, implies that economic inequity in the U.S. is owed largely to racial discrimination. In fact, the findings of the Pew Research Center in 2013 reinforces this notion.

In 2013, the Pew Research Center conducted a study which analyzed social and demographic trends and compared them across races. The findings revealed that the gap between whites and blacks in household incomes and home ownership was just as wide, if not wider, than during the Civil Rights era of the 1960s. Furthermore, incarceration rates among black men were more than six times higher than white men — slightly higher than the gap in the 1960s. At the same time, the study notes that blacks had made significant progress in other areas, such as education. Accordingly, since the Civil Rights era, the gap in high school education between blacks and whites has decreased. Furthermore, voter turnout among black people has gone up significantly, even surpassing white voter turnout for the presidential election in 2012.211 These two seemingly contradictory sets of statistics should make Americans pause and contemplate. Despite higher education rates and voter turnout, the gaps in economic status and incarceration rates between white and black people have remained stagnant for the past four decades. These

statistics clearly show that it is not a lack of effort on the part of black people that have led to their continued economic and social suppression. Rather, the perpetuation of systematic racial inequality is to blame. In the conclusion of I’ve Been Black in Two Countries, Historian Michelle A. Hay argues that “for people of African descent race continues to be salient and to represent a powerful barrier to social mobility.” Indeed, the available data on socioeconomic status by race confirms her statement. If the typical qualifiers of socioeconomic progress — education and the right to vote — fail to equalize the status of blacks and whites in the U.S., then the problem lies in the ugly truth that anti-blackness continues to hinder the mobility of Afro-descended people in this country.

In addition to illuminating the racial inequality in Cuba and the U.S., Afro-Cuban immigration between 1965 and 1995 reveals another issue in American society: the inability of the American consciousness to acknowledge an Afro-Latinx identity. Afro-Cubans have often expressed that since arriving in the U.S., their Cubanness and blackness have been challenged on all sides, and they struggle to justify both. Amongst African Americans, Afro-Cubans tend to be viewed as Cuban rather than black; but amongst white Cubans, Afro-Cubans are often othered — that is, perceived as different or foreign — for their blackness.

The struggle to negotiate a hyphenated Afro-Cuban identity in the U.S. is illustrated by Joel Ruiz’s experience in the United States. Journalist Mirta Ojito writes, “Whites see him simply as black. African-Americans dismiss him as Cuban. ‘They tell me I'm Hispanic. I tell them to look at my face, my hair, my skin,’ he says. ‘I am black, too. I may speak different, but we all come from the same place.’” Ruiz’s comment sheds light on a notion many black Cubans face in the U.S.: the association of blackness with an American national identity. That is,
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one can be black and American; but one cannot be black and Cuban. By pointing to his physical features, Ruiz implied that one’s blackness was not defined by one’s birthplace. Furthermore, his comment to African Americans that they both “come from the same place,” connected them based on their shared roots as descendants of the African diaspora — regardless of national identity. Ruiz’s struggle to negotiate his simultaneously black and Latino identity in America is symptomatic of a general perception problem in the U.S., in which blackness is deemed irreconcilable with a Latino identification. This expectation is a problem, because it leaves no room for Afro-Latinx communities to identify as such.

Furthermore, the struggle of Afro-Cubans to maintain a hyphenated identity among Americans is exacerbated by encounters with their white Cuban counterparts. For example, Michelle A. Hay provides insight into the discrimination of Afro-Cubans by white Cuban immigrants from a conversation with a group of middle-class black Cuban women. In particular, Hay recalls one woman, named Ana, who shared that she often heard white Cubans talk disparagingly of black people. Whenever she confronted such Cubans in Spanish, they would react with astonishment, and ask, “Where did you learn to speak Spanish”, to which she would reply, “The same place you did.”214 Ana’s story attests to the larger experience of Afro-Cubans who immigrated to the United States. Amongst fellow Cuban ethnics, Afro-Cubans were often othered for their dark skin, and immediately assumed to be African Americans — almost as though a Cuban identity could only belong to white Cubans. Alan A. Aja’s interview of David Rosemond corroborates this experience.

David Rosemond and his family are atypical Afro-Cuban immigrants, yet their experiences in the United States reflect the complexities of juggling a black and Cuban identity.
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which many Afro-Cubans in the U.S. have encountered. The Rosemond family arrived in the United States in 1969 through the family reunification clause spelled out in the 1965 U.S.-Cuba Memorandum of Understanding. The Rosemonds were exceptional Afro-Cubans in two ways: they enjoyed middle-class status and lived alongside white Cubans in pre-revolutionary Cuba; and, they had relatives in the United States. Yet their relatively privileged economic status did not shield them from the discrimination other Afro-Cubans faced. For example, David describes his experience searching for a job within Miami’s ethnic Cuban networks in the 1970s. He recalls interviewing for a position for a white Cuban man, who thought David was Dominican, and accused him of faking a Cuban accent in order to get hired. At that point in the story, David turned to look at Aja, the interviewer, and exclaimed in disbelief, “it’s like Cubans could only be white.”

Despite his family’s middle-class status, David struggled to secure a job within Miami’s Cuban network because he was black. His experience underscores how one’s race could hinder one’s economic opportunities in the U.S. Furthermore, the apparent inability of white Cubans to acknowledge Afro-Cubans as fellow ethnics is a curious phenomenon that appears unique to the U.S.; it seems implausible that white Cubans would never have encountered black Cubans during their time in Cuba. Why, then, did the existence of Afro-Cubans astonish them in the U.S.? On the one hand, the failure of even white Cubans to acknowledge Afro-Cubans in the U.S. might be attributed to the overall whiteness of the post-revolutionary Cuban migration — meaning that the movement of Cubans to the U.S. was largely dominated by white identifying immigrants. Perhaps this led white Cubans to undermine the presence of Afro-Cubans in the U.S., thus, they were surprised when they did run into Afro-Cubans. But a likelier explanation is

\[\footnote{Aja, 33.}\]
that white Cubans adapted to the racial perceptions of American society, and thus became accustomed to divorcing blackness from the Latinx community.

Within this American framework — where blackness and Cubanness mix like water and oil — how have Afro-Cubans living in the U.S. maintained their hyphenated identity? The answer is complicated, and one should always be careful not to generalize. That said, the evidence seems to suggest that many Afro-Cubans prefer to identify primarily as black, and then as Cuban. Deborah Rosemond-Wilson, the sister of David Rosemond, explains her decision to identify primarily as black. In an interview with Alan A. Aja, she told him that in Cuba, she did not feel as though she were “looked upon as being black;” she just felt like one of the girls. However, since coming to Miami, the same friends she used to socialize with all the time in Cuba began distancing themselves from her. This made her more aware of her blackness. She concluded, “I think those experiences are what made me switch to saying that now I am black. I’m not really Cuban.” Rosemond-Wilson’s story highlights an important point: while in Cuba, she did not feel any less Cuban for being black. It was not until she came to the U.S. that her blackness became a point of contention for her ethnically Cuban identity. That is, her blackness somehow made her feel “less Cuban.” This underscores the earlier point that, white Cubans had no problem seeing Afro-Cubans as fellow Cubans until they came to the United States. In fact, Rosemond-Wilson’s white Cuban friends simply saw her as “one of the girls” when they were in Cuba. But it seems that the racial perceptions of U.S. society forced both white and black Cubans to adapt to the existing racial categories in the U.S. — none of which allow room for an Afro-Latinx person.
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The problem with not allowing for a racial category that reconciles a black and Latinx identity is, it obscures an entire group of people living in the United States. For example, in a recent survey I came across which asked participants to check a box to indicate their ethnicity, I made a disturbing observation. The survey allowed one to identify as Hispanic/Latino, “regardless of race,” but in parenthesis next to the “Black or African American” choice were the words “not Hispanic or Latino.” What is one to do when he or she would like to identify as both, but is not given an option to do so? The only option, then, is to choose between being black or being Latino, rather than embracing the fullness of one’s identity — just as Deborah Rosemond-Wilson chose to identify as black over Cuban.

In conclusion, the study of Afro-Cuban immigration to the United States between 1965 and 1995 offers a narrative distinct from classic white Cuban migration. However, the importance of Afro-Cuban immigration goes beyond the fact that it offers a different perspective. Likewise, a closer look at Afro-Cuban immigration in the post-revolutionary period reveals that racial inequality continues to plague Cuba and the United States, perpetuating a harmful history of suppressing black people’s social and economic mobility. Furthermore, the experiences of Afro-Cuban migrants in navigating their racial and ethnic identity points to a perception problem that the U.S. must address if it seeks to be a more inclusive society: the inability of the American consciousness to acknowledge an Afro-Latinx identity.
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Healthcare’s Color Line: Black American Medicine and the Civil War

SARAH WANG

On May 9th, 1863, at roughly 9:45 P.M., a young Union soldier with a bleeding gunshot wound came under the care of Burt G. Wilder, a surgeon in the 55th Massachusetts Infantry Regiment - an all-Black unit then stationed in Washington D.C. Dr. Wilder, a freshly graduated twenty-two-year-old physician, described his treatment of this soldier in a concise, clinical manner: “I opened the wound at once by cutting the stitches while the nurse controlled the artery as well as he could [...] and Dr. Badger put a ligature about it and the man was safe.” He then proclaimed that “had [the man’s bleeding] not been discovered in season he would have bled to death.”218 Dr. Wilder’s knowledge and quickness of treatment had successfully saved another life.

This course of treatment seems appropriate enough, and not dissimilar from the course of action that would be followed today if a man showed up to an emergency room with a bleeding gunshot wound: find the source, stop the bleeding, close the wound. The process is streamlined, the work appropriately delegated. However, germ theory would not make its way into the popular realm of medicine for another fifteen or so years, and Dr. Wilder, for all his experience and expertise, practiced medicine in a primitive way by modern standards. The American Civil War changed American medicine, not with radical medical breakthroughs -though there were some new inventions and innovations- but through reshaping the structure, organization, and identity of American wartime medicine.219 Hospitals both at and away from the warfront became more efficient, coordinated, and most importantly survivable. The Confederates’ – later Union’s,

after the fall of Richmond, Virginia – renowned Chimborazo Hospital boasted an overall patient mortality rate of about nine percent. From 1861 to 1863, Chimborazo’s mortality dropped to as low as 6.62 percent.\footnote{Ruth, Dave. “Chimborazo Hospital.” Encyclopedia Virginia. Accessed November 09, 2018.} For comparison, the Brethren’s House, a Revolutionary War hospital in Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, which had been in use barely ninety years prior- had a mortality rate around twenty-five percent.\footnote{Blanco, Richard L. “American Army Hospitals in Pennsylvania during the Revolutionary War.” Pennsylvania History: A Journal of Mid-Atlantic Studies 48, no. 4 (October 01, 1981): 354.}

Despite the technological and scientific shortcomings of his time, Dr. Wilder, by serving with the 55th Massachusetts Infantry Regiment, had involved himself in arguably one of the greatest revolutions in American medicine: the involvement of Black doctors and nurses in treatment, and the creation of the United States’ first generation of educated Black medical staff. What the hospitals of the Civil War lacked in medical expertise, they gained back by creating a new subculture of medicine that for the first time, involved Black American men and women. In spite of centuries of systemic oppression and neglect from the White American healthcare system, Black Americans managed to carve out a space for themselves in the medical profession after the Civil War, establishing hospitals, medical schools, and nursing schools independent of the existing system.

The 55th Massachusetts Infantry Regiment was an extension of and sister regiment to the renowned 54th Regiment- the unit that became immortalized in the 1989 film *Glory* (Zwick, 1989). After Black Americans were officially permitted to enlist in the Union army following the Emancipation Proclamation of 1863, the ranks of both units were quickly filled by young Black volunteers, eager and willing to fight for the Union cause. John A. Andrew, then the governor of Massachusetts, proclaimed that the enlistment of Black men would give them “a chance to vindicate their manhood, and to strike a telling blow for their own race, and the freedom of all
their posterity.”\textsuperscript{222} Most enlisted men in the 54th and 55th Regiments were freed slaves from the
North and most were literate.\textsuperscript{223} They were representatives of an emerging free Black working
class in the North—farmers, factory laborers, waiters, barbers, cooks, and the odd skilled artisan
or craftsman.\textsuperscript{224} The service of these men marked the beginning of a shift in the popular view of
the role of Black Americans in wartime, which shifted from passive bystanders and collateral
damage to active participants in the effort. The perception of Black American healthcare workers
followed a similar path.

The involvement of Black Americans in field medicine was not limited to the Union side. Though
one may assume that Black American involvement in field medicine was limited to the
Union side, such is decidedly not the case. Although the Confederacy did not mobilize Black
Americans to the degree of the Union’s efforts, many isolated incidents of heavy slave presence
among hospital staff occurred throughout the course of the war, most notably in the
aforementioned Chimborazo hospital in Richmond. The surgeon-in-charge, James Brown
McCaw, noted in May 1862 that if the slaves serving as nurses, cooks, and other staff were
removed by their masters, “it will be entirely impossible to continue the hospital without them.”

\textsuperscript{225} Confederate surgeon general Samuel P. Moore agreed: “If these negroes are permitted to
leave, the hospitals will be abandoned and the sick left destitute of nurses.”\textsuperscript{226} The irony here, of
course, is that these Black workers were relied upon to perform services for the very
Confederacy whose entire war effort sought to keep them subjugated.
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\textsuperscript{223} Fox, Charles B. \textit{Record of the Service of the 55th Regiment of Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry}. Cambridge,
Massachusetts: John Wilson and Son, 1868, 110.
\textsuperscript{224} There were a few differences between the demographics of the 54th regiment and the 55th. More men in the 54th
regiment identified themselves as laborers than as farmers (about a third versus a quarter), while in the 55th
regiment, a much higher percentage (60%) of men identified themselves as farmers. Nonetheless, these men were
generally self-sufficient, employed freed men prior to the War. (Wilder, \textit{Practicing Medicine}, 5.)
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Despite important medical contributions of slaves in the Confederate Army, their humanity went unrecognized. This silenced their stories, and no known accounts exist. However, at least thirteen Black American physicians served in full capacity with the Union Army during the Civil War.\textsuperscript{227} Black nurses numbered around 3,000 in Union and Confederate Armies combined. There is no evidence of Black American physicians among the Confederate ranks.\textsuperscript{228} There were likely more Black American enlisters that served in the capacity of physicians who were not officially noted as such in documents, because they received their training through apprenticeships and had no reputation or formal degree.

Most Black physicians who held official degrees obtained them in Canada or Europe, as few American medical schools had opened their doors to Black applicants at the time of the Civil War’s outbreak. Alexander Augusta, native to Norfolk, Virginia, was denied entry to the University of Pennsylvania School of Medicine, and promptly moved to Toronto, where he was easily accepted by the Trinity Medical College at the University of Toronto.\textsuperscript{229} Anderson R. Abbott, who would also serve at the Freedmen’s Hospital, obtained his medical degree at the University of Toronto as well. Dr. William B. Powell, Jr., who became the Head Surgeon of Freedmen’s Hospital in Washington, DC, spent the majority of his young adult life obtaining his medical education in London, England, away from his hometown of New Bedford, Massachusetts. Of the thirteen known Black physicians in the Union Army, only six received medical degrees in the United States. Those degrees came from Yale, Dartmouth, Western
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Reserve -now Case Western- and the University of Iowa.\textsuperscript{230} Of the sixty-nine medical schools in the United States in 1860, only nine had official policies to admit Black students.\textsuperscript{231}

The University of Pennsylvania, which turned away Augusta in 1845, would admit its first Black student in 1879. Nathan Francis Mossell, who founded the Frederick Douglass Memorial Hospital and Training School in 1895, wrote in his autobiography: “In the fall of 1878 I made formal application for admission to the opening session of the School of Medicine. I was promptly informed… that the department had never admitted a colored student.”\textsuperscript{232} At a later date, the faculty of the University of Pennsylvania School of Medicine informed Mossell that it had voted in favor of his admittance. The experiences of Augusta and Mossell highlight one of the greatest changes that took place after the Civil War with respect to Black Americans in medicine: the expansion of educational opportunities for Black men and women who wished to pursue careers in medicine.

Mossell founded the Frederick Douglass Memorial Hospital and Training School, did so for the expressed purpose of creating pathways into medical careers for Black Americans. “With all, we wish it had not been necessary to establish the Douglass Hospital,” Mossell told an interviewer in 1930. “but [the hospital] has continued faith however in the final triumph of righteousness.”\textsuperscript{233} Augusta, though not admitted at the University of Pennsylvania, became a founder of and was appointed the first anatomy professorship at the new Howard University College of Medicine in 1868. A year later, Charles Purvis, another Black Civil War physician, joined him on the faculty. Sterling M. Lloyd, the Medical School’s Associate Dean for

\textsuperscript{230} Of the 13 known Black Union Civil War physicians, only Benjamin A. Boseman, Cortlandt Van Rensselaer Creed, John Van Surly DeGrasse, William Baldwin Ellis, Charles B. Purvis, and Alpheus W. Tucker received degrees in the United States. The seven others either received their training through informal apprenticeships (J.D. Harris, Willis R. Revels, Charles H. Taylor) or outside of the country (Augusta, Abbott, Powell, and John H. Rapier)
\textsuperscript{232} Butts,\textit{ African American Medicine}, 25.
Administration at the time of writing, writes that “The development and present position of the medical school at Howard University is due to Dr. Purvis more than to any other single individual.”\(^{234}\) The work of Dr. Purvis and his contemporaries was vital to the future advancement of Black American nurse and physicians.

Dr. Mossell’s Frederick Douglass Memorial Hospital and Training School was many things, but it was not a medical school, insofar that it did not train or graduate any doctors. Its primary mission was to train and graduate Black American female nurses for employment.\(^{235}\) The popularity of the nursing profession among Black American women is also a direct byproduct of the Civil War; the experiences of Black female nurses, such as Susie King Taylor, demonstrated a need for them to fill massive nursing shortages that existed before, during, and after the war. This was due in part to White women’s unwillingness to work grueling hours for little pay. Nursing was also an opportunity for historically disadvantaged Black women to obtain education and skilled work. Sojourner Truth, a prominent abolitionist and women’s rights activist, would lend her labor as a nurse alongside Dr. Anderson Abbott at the Freedmen’s hospital. Harriet Tubman, most famous for leading numerous slave rescue missions, was also a nurse at Port Royal, caring for soldiers who were mostly afflicted with dysentery and smallpox.\(^{236}\) The involvement of these distinguished women in medicine would help bring nursing to the forefront as one of the earliest skilled labor opportunities for Black women in the United States.

Susie King Taylor was born into slavery in 1848 in Georgia and was illegally taught to read and write by her grandmother. After being freed by Union forces at Fort Pulaski in 1862, Taylor became embedded within the 33rd United States Colored Troops, as a nurse and
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laundress. Taylor is one of the best-remembered Black female nurses of her time, thanks in large part to her autobiography, the only one ever written by an Black American Civil War nurse. She demonstrated an immense sense of duty at her post, commenting that, “It seems strange how our aversion to seeing suffering is overcome in war… and instead of turning away, how we hurry to assist in alleviating their pain, bind up their wounds, and press the cool water to their parched lips.”

Taylor followed the 33rd regiment to the end of the war, tending to the wounded at every conflict. Yet despite her service, she did not receive a single cent in compensation, nor was she eligible for army pension. Despite the unfairness of her situation, however, she accepted it without complaint, “I gave my services willingly for four years and three months without receiving a dollar. I was glad, however, to be allowed to go with the regiment, to care for the sick and afflicted comrades.”

The issue of post-war pensions for all nurses would escalate into a bigger problem than any Union generals could have ever predicted. They were taken in by the army to fill various other positions such as laundresses or cooks, but were still heavily involved in nursing nonetheless. Accounts of the participation of Black-American women during the war by White officers, doctors, and nurses, almost universally referred to women like Taylor in vague terms like “helper,” “steward,” or simply “Negro.”. Sally Louisa Tompkins, a White nurse who worked closely with Black staff described her experience on the front lines, “My faithful helpers … Phoebe my beloved Mammy, and also from the two Betsy’s.” Explaining how hard her Black-American staff worked, Tompkins noted that they labored “long hours at grim and dirty work, assisted by one steward.”
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performed all the tasks that Tompkins did as a nurse. Though their labor was systematically ignored and dismissed, the importance of the contributions of these women and others, like Susie King Taylor, cannot be doubted.

Colonel Charles Tyler wrote to Taylor in 1902, shortly after the publishing of her memoir: “I most sincerely regret that through a technicality you are debarred from having your name placed on the roll of pensioners, as an Army Nurse.” That technicality was her official status as a laundress, which was never altered throughout her service despite how much time she actually spent caring for others. The 1892 Union Army Nurses Pension Act outlined the eligibility criteria for pension applicants:

“All women employed by the Surgeon General of the Army as nurses, under contract or otherwise, during the late war of the rebellion, or who were employed as nurses during such period by authority which is recognized by the War Department… [shall be] entitled to receive a pension of twelve dollars per month.”

As Taylor would come to realize, the use of language such as “under contract” and “employed” (implying presence of compensation) would unintentionally but effectively bar the vast majority of Black wartime nurses from the benefits offered. Taylor was not alone in her struggle to obtain official recognition and financial help after the war. Mary Ann Jones, another nurse from Huntsville, Alabama, wrote in 1894 to the Pension Bureau: “I am old now and stand greatly in need of my pay. I am asking only for what I labored for when it became a law for hospital nurse to get their pay” Neither Taylor nor Jones would ever see any form of reimbursement. As Black women, they were not recruited or employed as nurses due to their race, but performed the same duties as White “official” nurses. Their service and labor were denied recognition or
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support, not necessarily on explicitly racist grounds, but through an unfair system nonetheless. The denial of payment for the service these women provided in the Army along with the obstacles that Black physicians faced in becoming admitted to medical school are just two examples of the deep entrenchment of racist ideas in American medicine.

The first three nursing schools in the United States, Bellevue Hospital in New York City, Massachusetts General Hospital in Boston, and New Haven Hospital in New Haven, which is now the Yale-New Haven Hospital, were founded in 1873. Just a generation later, nearly 400 nursing schools had been founded across the country. Despite their diversity in size and location, one aspect was universal amongst these schools: they did not accept Black students. The one exception to this rule was the New England Hospital for Women and Children, which graduated the first female Black American professional nurse, Mary Elizabeth Mahoney, in 1879. While this lack of access to education could potentially have impeded the rise of the nursing profession among Black-American women, Black men and women responded to these closed doors by building ones of their own.

Although these schools were founded with noble intentions, the harsh realities of ongoing segregation and Jim Crow laws became immediate barriers for both students and administrators. Employment of Black staff at most major Southern hospitals was forbidden at the time, and a separate, but not equal, healthcare and hospital system existed to serve the Black-American population. These hospitals were poorly-funded, inadequately staffed, and in a few cases, did not even have running water. The situation was only marginally better in the North, where segregation was not officially enforced by law, but existed nonetheless, perpetuated by the administrators of the mostly privately-owned hospital systems. Few large and reputable hospitals

below the Mason-Dixon line allowed Black student doctors or nurses to train there, and virtually none accepted contracts or collaborations with the newly established Black medical and nursing schools. Many schools, such as the Hampton Institute, were forced to resort to sending their students to better-funded Northern Black hospitals to gain hands-on experience. This was an expensive and time-consuming task that left students and faculty disillusioned about the prospects of Black medicine.\textsuperscript{246} It was in this struggle for education that a new movement was born: one that was not concerned with appealing to the current system to “accept” Black presence, but with creating a new system for and by Black people.

In an address in 1900 to the Phyllis Wheatley Club of Chicago - an association of Black women named after the accomplished slave poet, Black American doctor Daniel Hale Williams urged his audience not to accept the status quo:

“No view of this cruel ostracism, affecting so vitally our race, our duty seems plain. Institute Hospitals and Training Schools. Let us no longer sit idly and inanely deploring existing conditions. Let us not waste time trying to effect changes or modifications in the institutions unfriendly to us, but rather let us seek to promote the doctrine of helping and stimulating our race.”\textsuperscript{247}

Near the turn of the century, health conditions and access to care among Black residents in the South had hardly improved since slavery. Representative C.A. Darden of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), an organization then in its infancy, noted that “Black patients admitted to hospitals are housed in basements or crowded into the halls. Everything in these hospitals is separate, except the sewage, they allow that to flow together.”\textsuperscript{248} These “separate but equal” facilities were not remotely equal. The health of Black citizens at these hospitals had become a nuisance and an afterthought.

With respect to medical care of Black citizens, the Civil War and the emancipation of slaves created more questions than they answered. Under slavery, medical care for Blacks in the South was mostly handled by rudimentary clinics and facilities that barely qualified as hospitals. Most of these plantation hospitals contained only a few beds and charged slave owners flat fees for providing care to their “property.” In that way, they were established to benefit White slave owners, doctors, and staff. A physician in Tennessee wrote in 1853: “Every plantation should be provided with a hospital… By bringing all the sick into the same house, the convenience of the physician is subserved, the time of the nurses economized, and better attendance secured.”\textsuperscript{249} The main purpose of these hospitals was not to provide quality care to slaves who otherwise had no healthcare access, but to ameliorate concerns of white residents regarding their “diseased” and “dirty” Black co-habitants.

During and after reconstruction, this concern surrounding Black “dirtiness” persisted. White self-interest influenced Black healthcare as germ theory became popularly accepted; whites realized that germs have no color line. Segregation in daily life alone did not protect White people from the diseases of Black people, as the rhetoric went at the time. White people felt that separate healthcare facilities needed to be established, because Black people were “dirty,” and without access to healthcare they were dangers to society. As an editorial published in 1895 in the \textit{Atlanta Constitution} argued:

“...from that segregated district negro nurses would still emerge from diseased homes, to come into our homes and hold our children in their arms; negro cooks would still bring bacilli from the segregated district into the homes of the poor and the rich white Atlantan; negro chauffeurs, negro butlers, negro laborers would come from within the pale and scatter disease.”\textsuperscript{250}
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The medical care of Black Americans became a priority only when it became evident that microbes did not discriminate based on skin color. The author of the editorial came to the conclusion that “to purge the negro of disease is not so much a kindness to the negro himself as it is a matter of sheer self-preservation to the white man.”

But these calls for reform and refurbishment from all sides were followed by little to no action. Well into the twentieth century, Black hospitals continued to have “No hot water...No screens in windows or doors...No plumbing anywhere...No Diet kitchen...No gas for cooking nor for lighting,” according to staff physician Mary Glenton. Although White public health officials provided lip service for their concern regarding Black-American healthcare access, they left the brunt of healthcare reform on the shoulders of newly established and poorly funded Black nonprofit organizations. Despite the systematic disbarment of Black-Americans from medical and nursing schools in the Jim Crow era, Black schools alleviated some of the scarcity pressures affecting the implementation of higher quality healthcare by and for Black-Americans. But the lack of action on the part of white public health officials had effectively left them to their own devices when they were not prepared to do so.

In 1895, a group of Black doctors founded the National Medical Association (NMA), with the mission of addressing healthcare inequality between Black and White communities. It was the first organization of its kind, also dedicated to advancing the place of Black Americans in medicine by acting as a governing body for Black physicians, nurses, and hospitals. In 1923, the NMA formally founded the National Hospital Association (NHA) to ensure that Black-run hospitals would meet the accreditation standards of the AMA. Dr. H.M. Green, the president of the NMA, addressed his colleagues, warning them that should Black hospitals not catch up to the new standards being imposed, they could be wiped out altogether:
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“This [standardization] movement, however wise, strikes a death blow at us as a profession. With 100 beds as a basis of standardization, 85% of the hospitals operated for and by us as a group with be outlawed… We do not charge that anyone is purposely planning to hurt us. It is possible that they have not considered us at all, but just there comes the rub. We want to be considered; we must be considered.”\textsuperscript{253}

With the situation becoming increasingly evident that raising the standards of Black-operated hospitals was no longer a matter of principle, but a matter of survival, the NMA and the NHA would go on to launch the greatest Black public health initiative since the end of the Civil War.

But the road to standardization would not be a smooth one. For one, not all members of the Black medical community were comfortable with the plan to raise Black hospital standards to the level of white hospitals, but preferred instead to push for integration as a whole. The reasoning was that the only permanently effective method for Black physicians to achieve full professional recognition was for all hospitals to open their doors to all people, doctors and patients alike. Those opposed to Dr. Green’s plan argued that only through full integration of hospitals could Black doctors rid themselves of second-class status within the medical community.\textsuperscript{254} To these critics, the better, more potent course of treatment for elevating the status of Black doctors was clear: fight the system, rather than find compromise within it. The founding of the NHA had laid down the groundwork for desegregation on the medical front. It was a good start, now the NMA just needed to follow through with the treatment.

To Dr. Green and the rest of the executive leadership of the NMA, however, such a plan of integration was frivolous and would be doomed from the start. First, although the NMA was the preeminent organization for Black medical professionals within the United States, it still
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represented a miniscule percentage of the population. In 1923, the NMA had just barely reached three thousand official, dues-paying members - making it a far cry from the numerically advantaged AMA, which boasted tens of thousands of members. Launching a campaign for hospital integration would inevitably open a Pandora’s box of extraneous issues that the NMA was nowhere near prepared to address. If hospitals were to be desegregated, certainly the next step could be to desegregate medical schools, or schools as a whole. In short, members feared that one issue would snowball into another, and that the NMA would be unable to handle the backlash and controversy. To advocate for desegregation in hospitals would potentially force the NMA to face even bigger issues of desegregation that as a new minority organization it was unable to face. The question that the NMA faced was not one of one specific issue in one specific time- it was a question of survival.

Not only were the top officers of the NMA cognizant of the potential social ramifications of an all-out integration movement, they were also aware of the issues surrounding legislation. Jim Crow laws had, in the preceding decades, effectively stripped Black-Americans in the South of their civil rights. Integration was a David-and-Goliath-type of battle that the NMA did not want to fight, nor was it one it believed it stood any chance of winning. There was private discussion in board meetings that suggested that much of executive leadership of the NMA viewed fighting Jim Crow as a certain fight to the death.255 The cause was noble, but the consequences were not worth the sacrifice of this new community. In 1930, Peter Marshall Murray, the newly elected president of the NMA, decided to take another different approach to the reform movement. Under his leadership, the NMA’s plan for hospital expansion movement shifted from an “inside-out” approach to an “outside-in” one. Rather than relying on internal support and calling for mobilization of members, he instead urged Black physicians to seek and
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accept the “assistance of the broadminded, sympathetic white profession.”256 But there was wide disagreement among NMA members. Damningly, Murray’s presidency only lasted one year.

It was amid this internal struggle that the nationwide refurbishment of Black-run hospitals slowly began. The AMA’s standardization movement’s most imminent threat to Black-run hospital’s was its 100-bed requirement for hospital accreditation- a requirement that, as Dr. Green mentioned in his address, over 85% of Black hospitals at the time failed. The expansion effort required contributions from all NMA members and officers. High-ranking officers such as Willis E. Sturrs of Alabama travelled across their respective states, visiting Black-run hospitals and issuing reports on their expansion and standardization efforts. In his report of his visit to the Cottage Home Infirmary in Decatur, Alabama, Dr. Sturrs acknowledges the positive aspects of the small clinic:

“The facilities… are not inadequate… The floors and walls are free from stains or otherwise uncleanly sights… The infirmary is serviced by two physicians and four nurses, who are rarely on duty simultaneously… [The infirmary] is of indispensable service to the community, however, and the patients of a cheery mood… Negroes of the township use [the infirmary’s] services extensively.”257

The clinic was perfectly suited for the town’s needs, and Dr. Sturrs fully recognized this fact. Despite his praise for the clinic and his acknowledgement that it was fully functional, Dr. Sturrs was also forced reluctantly acknowledge the illegitimacy of the Cottage Home Infirmary under the new standardization guidelines.

“It was with much regret that I informed Dr. Daniels that should his clinic not increase in size in due time that it may not survive the wave of standardization. He responded that he saw no issue with the current state of affairs, nor did I, but such is the insult of this operation!”258

258 Ibid.
These mobilization efforts on the part of NMA officers quickly exposed another barrier to Black hospital standardization: the problem of community. White hospitals had enjoyed much longer histories of expansion, servicing entire cities or sectors of cities for centuries. The Massachusetts General Hospital and New York-Presbyterian, formerly the New York Hospital, had both existed since the eighteenth century, and had slowly expanded along with their respective cities. Most Black hospitals and clinics, with the exception of a handful of urban-based hospitals such as that of Howard University, were centered around smaller, more rural communities. These communities did not need bigger hospitals and they could not afford to build them. The standardization movement was beginning to emerge as an inadvertent but serious attack on the viability of Black hospitals as a whole.

In the end, the NHA did not solve the standardization problem, or lack thereof, at Black hospitals, as much as the problem solved itself. The first steps of the NHA’s standardization movement was accompanied by one of the greatest eras of American urban development and migration. Because the U.S. economy fared better than any other in the world post-World War II, the 1940’s and 50’s in the United States were marked by extensive and rapid urbanization that forced much of the working class, Black and White alike, into urban centers. Areas that were once rural or suburban quickly became incorporated into their adjacent cities and communities that were once small and isolated grew exponentially during these years. This urbanization was especially apparent in the South, where cities such as Dallas, Texas and Atlanta, Georgia grew into sprawling metropolises.

The Cottage Home Infirmary never did reach the one hundred bed requirement. Although it is unclear when exactly the hospital officially closed its doors, land records indicate a sale in 1934.259 The main hospital in the town of Decatur, which soon became the city of Decatur,
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became Decatur Morgan Hospital, which was founded in 1915 as a segregated hospital and which expanded rapidly during the interwar period. The hospital remains the main hospital of the area to this day. Where the Cottage Home Infirmary once stood is now an assisted living facility. Healthcare, both Black and White, became centralized as a result of economic development, and regional hospitals replaced local clinics. The unfortunate ending to the story of the NHA is that despite all its efforts in matching the standard of Black hospitals to that of White hospitals, it was all for naught.

123 years have passed since the National Medical Association initiated its founding members in 1895. In this time, the United States has experienced two World Wars and a Civil Rights movement, all of which were pivotal events for the American Black community. Although hospitals are no longer officially segregated, there is much work to be done. The number of Black American physicians has yet to come close to the Black demographic share of the total American population. Racial minorities are 29% of all hospital patients, but only 14% of hospital board members and executive leadership. Black patients still receive subpar care, and have higher hospital death rates than white patients. In 2015, the hospital death rate for Black Americans was 851.9 deaths per 100,000 patients. For White Americans, the rate was 735 deaths per 100,000 patients. Thankfully, this “death gap” has been in steady decline since 1999. Black mothers are three times more likely to die from childbirth-related complications than white mothers. Residential segregation is still rampant, and remains the leading cause of hospital closings due to funding biases surrounding Black low-income. A century has passed, with

---

respectable progress thanks to the work of trailblazing Black healthcare professionals, but
dangerous shortcomings still remain.

But this is not to say that the efforts of the early Black physicians and the NMA were not
impactful. These pioneers’ struggles helped insert Black Americans into the American medical
narrative, where they had not previously been present at all. Activists such as Nathan Mossell,
Susie King Taylor, and the countless Black medical staff who risked their lives for the Union,
have helped bring Black presence in American medicine to unprecedented heights. No matter the
long-term outcome of their efforts, what is more important is that they started the conversation.
The conversation began as one regarding whether Black Americans have a place in medicine. A
century or so later, the conversation is now one of realizing full, unconditional integration. This
is a conversation about what American medicine needs to be.
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Tea for Two: The Domestication of Chinese Tea into British Culture

Jenny Yae

I. Introduction

A simple drink composed of two ingredients—leaves and hot water—has had a complicated history that has transgressed boundaries and culture. The factual story on the discovery of tea remains undecided, but its existence dates back to ancient China. The most popular and accepted legend is that Emperor Shen Nung discovered tea in 2732 BC: he was sitting under a tree when the wind blew leaves into his pot of boiling water. Known as the “Father of Traditional Chinese Medicine,” Emperor Shen Nung tested thousands of herbs prior but immediately recognized the health benefits of this new discovery. He named the brew “ch’a,” which is the Chinese character that translated to “check” or “investigate.” The written characters are meant to illustrate wooden branches, grass, and a man between the two, symbolizing how tea would bring balance and nature for Chinese people and their culture.265

Although tea originated in China, it has become a commodity detached from its Chinese origins and now interwoven into British culture. “Tea and biscuits” is a collocation that is inseparable from each other, which raises the questions of how this “exoticness” has morphed into British identity. This paper will delineate the transition of tea from a Chinese commodity to a pillar of British life by examining excerpts from Punch, a satiric and humorous British magazine. Since its first issue in 1841, Punch published countless pieces on the history, culture, and adaptation of tea into British national identity. Punch represented tea in three revealing ways: a beverage for the upper class, a democratized and social necessity, and an evil toxicity

from China. Tea has retained its cultural significance in China, traversed boundaries and cultures to become English, and now exists as a drink that each Briton could individualize to suit their own taste. Ultimately, tea transitioned from being a Chinese commodity into an inextricable part of British culture and this paper examines the process by which that happened.

II. The Exclusivity of Tea

Tea made its first appearance in Britain when Catherine of Braganza of Portugal brought tea as her dowry when she came to marry Charles II in England in 1668. Tea was not only exclusive because of its price, but also because it was not readily available for purchase in stores and restaurants. In the early 1800s, Anna Russell, the Duchess of Bedford, decided five o’clock was the proper time of day for “teatime.” She believed the hiatus between lunch and dinner was too long and wanted dedicated time to socialize with other women. This quickly became a widespread movement and deepened British dependency for the drink. Although tea became less of a luxury by the 1840s, *Punch*—mostly through cartoons and subtitles—depicted the upper class and their tea etiquette in publications throughout the 19th century. *Punch* reimagined the time in which tea was exclusive and showed the cultural significance tea had to the only people who were able to consume it.

For *Punch*’s ten-year anniversary in 1851, their fifth publication was titled “Tea First Introduced Into England, September 2nd 1668.” The cartoon depicted hoards of people at a party with the men wearing barrister wigs and the women gowned in Victorian-style dresses.

---


In this publication, tea was being served during a social function for the upper class. As tea was assimilating into British culture, the etiquette, presentation, and equipage changed to better suit the British. The Chinese drank tea in cylinder cups, but the British created teacups—usually made of porcelain and with handles—that were paired with saucers. Larger teapots were manufactured to serve multiple people at once. Additionally, miniature milk and sugar bowls were made to complement the teapot and were then sold as a set. This trifecta created the social atmosphere for parties and had tea as an integral part within them.

Anna Russell normalized “teatime,” thus setting five o’clock as the common time for women to gather for tea and conversation. Although tea was a recreational beverage for both men and women, tea was especially seen as a galvanizing force for women. Upon the normalization of women gathering together for tea, *Punch* published “The Secret of Delicate Appetites” in 1869, to represent what teatime looked like for the upper class.

---
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Similarly to “Tea First Introduced Into England, September 2\textsuperscript{nd} 1668,” this publication sketched women of a similar caliber, serving British tea. The caption was a snippet of a conversation, encouraging Kitty to have more tea because there was still an hour left before dinner. The sketch and caption represented Anne Russell’s intention of having tea after lunch and before dinner.\footnote{269 “The Secret of Delicate Appetites,” \textit{Punch}, 1 May 1869, p. 182. \textit{Punch Historical Archive, 1841-1992}, http://tinyurl.galegroup.com/tinyurl/8W9t30. Accessed 6 Dec. 2018.} Multiple publications preceding these showed the customs of tea within upper class British culture.

\textit{Punch} published a series of cartoons titled “Five O’Clock Tea” in the late 1870s, showing women exchanging dialogue over cups of tea.\footnote{270 “Five O’Clock Tea,” \textit{Punch}, 2 Jan. 1875, p. 10. \textit{Punch Historical Archive, 1841 1992}, http://tinyurl.galegroup.com/tinyurl/8RS8gX. Accessed 25 Nov. 2018.} Their social class was illustrated through their setting—homes with fancy tablecloths, furniture, and wallpaper—and the women’s attire. The captions were excerpts of their conversation, ranging from the banality of their days to...
an interesting event happening in their lives. The “Five O’Clock Tea” series was a real-life depiction of teatime for women, which was becoming a commonplace occurrence.

Tea was adopted into upper class culture as an essential part of social gatherings and parties. In 1873, “Tea-Cup Time” was published and it emphasized the importance of afternoon tea and how the host should try the best to make it “lively and agreeable” so “…the guests do not go away protesting that the entertainment had been a humdrum affair.” Good company and a commendable social gathering became dependent on how agreeable teatime was for the guests; a social gathering could not have been complete without a cup of tea. This integration also gave agency for Britons to personalize their tea. In 1894, “Trying!” was a cartoon showing multiple people gathered in an ornate living room. The scene was of discombobulated and urgent ladies with the caption stating: “First lady says ‘No sugar in my tea please!’ while the second lady says ‘Oh, please only a very little milk in my tea!’ while the third lady says, ‘Oh pardon! No milk at all in my tea!’ while the forth lady says, ‘no cream, please in my tea!’ and the cantankerous old gentleman says, ‘Um! No water in my tea, please!’” This was a satirical yet true representation of tea drinkers. Although green tea was more popular in China, black tea was more popular in Britain because it blended well with milk and sugar. Every tea drinker could now have the freedom to personalize their tea to suit their preferences. The “cantankerous old gentleman” sarcastically ordered water to be removed from his tea, which showed that the British had modified tea down to its core. Britons were adding doses of other elements that made tea into an unrecognizable product from its original form. This article therefore showed the prevalence of
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tea, its adjustment to the British palate, and how the people had been catering it to fit their individual preferences.

The upper class formed the tea culture in Britain which was then integrated into British identity. The etiquettes associated with it, the formation of equipage needed for its consumption, and dedicated time for tea have all contributed to how Britain as a whole would eventually drink tea. Tea etiquette was established to suit the needs of the upper class, but remnants of it have trickled to the everyday people. However, the growing availability of tea provided free agency for people to take their tea as they pleased. The next section will show how tea became available in other social enclaves, and the greater role it played in British society.

III. Democratization of Tea

In 1706, Thomas Twining introduced tea into his coffee shop, which influenced other coffee shop owners to sell tea as well. Within a decade, tea was sold in nearly 500 coffee shops. In 1721, more than one million pounds of tea was imported and became an even more popular drink than coffee. With the influx of imported tea and its popularity, Twinning opened the first teahouse in 1734. This was a pivotal moment because the emerging establishment of teahouses made the drink more accessible to lower class communities through the larger supply in the marketplace. The democratization of tea was when the definition of exclusivity changed: tea was exclusive to the upper class, but then became a hegemonic symbol that was inclusive to British identity. This was the turning point in which tea ceased to be a luxury good and became a necessity. Britain’s surreptitious plan to capture the tea market ultimately propelled its popularity, but that will be explained in the next section. This section will focus on the representation of tea in everyday life during the 1850s to 1870s.
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“The Cup of Prosperity,” published in 1852, stated that Britons have consumed an immense deal of tea since 1842, contributing to approximately £5,970,000 in revenue. It was also added that Britons have become as much of tea-drinkers as beer-drinkers.\textsuperscript{275} Tea was a money making entity because of its availability to a wide variety of people and the number of people consuming it was increasing every year. With its increasing prevalence, this Eastern drink had been accepted as a Western ideal and the drink itself created a culture of specific mannerisms and presentation style.

In 1855, there was a cartoon published of a head nurse serving tea to three children. The caption states: “Miss Mary! You shall not stir your tea with the snuffers! It is not lady-like.” The cartoon showed one of the girls holding the teacup and bringing it up to her lips and another one eating a biscuit. The presentation of teatime—with the biscuits, teapot, teacup, and saucers—were introduced to children at an early age.\textsuperscript{276} Tea etiquette had become part of what defined a British lady and established standards of what it means to be “ladylike.” Breeding girls to abide to these tea customs was becoming widespread, showing how embedded tea had become in British culture.

In 1858, there was a short article published on how to make tea: “Go to any cheap advertising Grocers, and you will soon learn (to your cost) how tea is made!”\textsuperscript{277} This article showed that tea had become a commonplace item that could be purchased and found in shops for affordable prices. Because anyone was able to purchase tea, lower and middle class Britons were able to participate in the British ritual of drinking tea at five o’clock. When tea was exclusive to

the upper class, there would be a dedicated host who was responsible for creating the proper atmosphere and tea brew. However, the mass availability of tea in shops allowed anyone to become a host. The main focus of tea was no longer having a formal social setting—it became an agent to bring people together despite any formalities.

“The Loving (Tea) Cup” was published in 1864 and represented tea consumption within the lower class. The orientation of their teatime resembled what the upper class parties had: a teapot, saucers, teacups, and biscuits. However, the setting was in a cozy home with a simple table rather than an ornate common space for a lavish party.


The men’s attire, posture, and setting were different from the depictions of the upper class and their teatime. However, their rituals were the same; they were meeting to drink tea and converse. Tea was commonplace and had become an even more essential part of the culture because it was prevalent in everyone’s lives despite their social standing.
Punch published “Sweet Girl-Graduates, Afternoon Tea Versus Wine” in 1873, which was a sketch of a graduation party, with students in caps and gowns having conversation while drinking tea. There were male and female students—in what one could assume to be a library—crowding among each other, mingling, and singing. In addition to tea being an essential element in social settings, this cartoon showed that tea was also suited for ceremonial events. Tea was therefore not only a beverage served in homes or upper class parties, but also in celebrations for young people.

Punch published a poem titled “A (Tea) Drinking Song” in 1872, and it expressed the sentiments of drinking tea among the lower class. The poem began with: “My brethren all, /Come drink with me, /Both great and small.” Tea had become an all-inclusive drink that “inebriates not, but only cheers.” This showed that tea was an organic source of true bonding. The poem also referenced different teas from China—such as Pekoe, Souchong, and Kaisow—but “…with Assam / [I’m] content as can be.” At this point, tea from Assam, India was more popular than tea from China. Because the British founded and manufactured tea in Assam, it was owned by Britain and thus not known as Indian tea. The narrator of the poem stated that he preferred tea from Assam to variations of other Chinese tea, which perpetuated the notion that tea in Britain was no longer a commodity imported from China, but a British drink. The poem continued with describing festivities and concluded by stating: “…we will take/The old Bohea.” Bohea was an English term for a blend of black and oolong tea. Although Bohea was a Chinese tea, originally known as Wuyi, the British white-labeled the commodity and processed it as their own.
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In democratizing tea, it had become less Chinese because all Britons were able to drink it and thus had the power to modify it by their preferences. The Chinese only drank tea with tea leaves brewed in water, but the British changed the customs, tea-ware, and beverage itself so that it had become unrecognizable from its original source.

IV. The Making of Chinese Tea into British Tea

The British’s adoption of tea was seamless in that tea became a common commodity, a beverage that everyone was able to drink. Britain’s tea ownership was facilitated by forced misrepresentations of the Chinese in publications such as *Punch*. British readers were compelled to reject Chinese tea and adopt British tea instead. Britain imported all of its tea from China until the early 1840s, when the East India Company lost the monopoly on tea trade with China from the other emerging tea markets. Losing the monopoly meant Britain had to strategize alternate ways of obtaining tea. Sir Joseph Banks had reported tea plants growing in Assam, India in 1788, but his discovery was forgotten until 1823 when Robert Bruce rediscovered the leaves on a military expedition.²⁸⁰

²⁸⁰ Banks, 44.

²⁸¹ Banks, 48.

The British tea industry was established in Assam in 1834. However, the British wanted to grow Chinese plants instead of the ones native to India. After drinking Chinese tea for more than a century, the British were hesitant on the lesser-known tealeaves of Assam.²⁸¹ In 1848, the British East India Company sent botanist Robert Fortune to China to steal the secret of tea horticulture and manufacturing. His mission was to visit Canton, which was the main area of tea growth located in the interior of China. This area was forbidden to strangers, so Fortune disguised himself as a Chinaman from the coast to surreptitiously acquire the method of making Britain’s national drink.
Whereas tea itself was a beverage made of tea leaves and boiling water, the manufacturing process was not as intuitive. Playing the part of a curious Chinese expert in tea, Fortune was invited to explore a tea factory in Canton. He saw that green tea leaves were left to expose in the sun for two hours, tossed in a furnace room, and then cooked. The leaves were then flattened with bamboo rollers and were placed on a flat surface to cook again. The last step was for the workers to parse through the leaves to remove any insects or unclean remnants. Watching this process, Fortune realized green and black tea came from the same plant, but the difference came from the way they were processed. He took careful notes on these discoveries and was also looking to validate or demystify a rumor going around Britain. Some assumed the Chinese were engaging in extreme manners of duplicity in their tea processing techniques.

Fortune observed blue substances on the hands of the Chinese workmen who were parsing the leaves. He then uncovered that it was iron ferrocyanide. More commonly known as Prussian blue, this was a pigment that was also found in paints. In conjunction with Prussian blue interacting with the tea leaves being exported to Britain, gypsum was also found in it. More than half a pound of Prussian blue and gypsum was included in every hundred pounds of tea that was being prepared for exportation. The rumor was true: Chinese tea was poisoning British consumers. Fortune stole samples of the toxins and displayed them in London’s Great Exhibition of 1851. It was later found that the Chinese were not “poisoning” the tea for malicious purposes, but to make the green tea look greener. The Chinese thought the British wanted their tea to look extra green and uniform to be more suitable for presentation. Yet, this truth was revealed too late. The misrepresentation of the Chinese remained and became a toxic stereotype that the media perpetuated.282 Throughout the 19th century, Punch represented Chinese as either “the

other” or accusing them for poisoning the British. These publications thus villainized the Chinese and asserted British tea as the most popular tea.

“A Pretty Kettle of Tea!” was published in 1851, immediately after the London’s Great Exhibition. In the *Punch* publication, tea was described as “ruinous and detestable stuff that contains nothing nutritious.” The article described green tea with “…greenness as a mere dye, communicated by Poison.” The piece ended with a reference to Shakespeare’s *Macbeth*; the three witches were diabolical and mixed their caldron with toxicity but “…the caldron of those things contains nothing half so horrid as the contents of the teapot…”283 This parallel associated the Chinese with the witches and the tea with the caldron, which dehumanized the Chinese. Using popular culture portrayed the Chinese in a more “relatable” way for the British; the comparison put the situation into perspective and the exaggeration also amplified this misrepresentation.

The comparison to *Macbeth* was published in 1897 in “The Chemistry of Tea.” This article was published 50 years after “A Pretty Kettle of Tea!,” which proves that Punch continued to publish misleading content to perpetuate a negative image of the Chinese. This paralleled *Macbeth*’s famous scene with the witches chanting: “Double Double toil and trouble…” The *Punch* article replaced three witches with three maids and the caldron with a teapot. The first maid threw “ingredients with awful names” into a “deadly pot.” All three then came together and chanted: “Double, double toil the trouble; fire burn and kettle bubble.” The second maid added the “acid and alkaloid for the unholy brew” and concluded her portion by calling the teapot a “hell-broth.” The third maid began her lines by pouring in “assamin and quercitrin, phloroglucin, theophylline” into the teapot. She continued by adding other fictional

toxins and a “boheic acid green to put the drinker into panic.” Bohea, as mentioned before, was an English term for a category of black and oolong tea. “Boheic acid” was meant to symbolize the essence of the tea Britons drank on the daily. The article concluded with all three maids chanting: “Double, double toil and trouble, fire burn and kettle bubble.” The final ingredient of “Boheic acid” and the obvious parallel to Macbeth continued the misinformation that the Chinese were trying to poison the British. Using popular fictional references helped the audience relate more to the content, even though the comparison further distanced viewers from the truth.

*Punch* continued to publish misrepresentations of the Chinese and their “unethical” manufacturing practices until the late 1890s. Some depictions were more gruesome than others, but revealed the same sentiment that the Chinese were trying to kill British consumers. “The Ballad of Sir T. Tea-Leaf,” published in 1851, showcased both the toxicity of the tea and the barbarity of the Chinese through a poem and cartoon.

![Punch. The Ballad of Sir T. Tea-Leaf. 1851. Gale.](image)

The poem began with the line: “It was three gallant Chinamen, /with long tail and pig eye/And they have sworn a solemn oath, /Sir T. Tea-Leaf must die.” The Chinamen were derogatorily described throughout the poem and Mr. Tea-Leaf was symbolic of the tea that was exported to
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Britain. Mr. Tea-Leaf was the abused Chinaman on top of the table and was “…dosed first with Prussian blue till his poor face turned green.” This line was a satirical way to depict that the Chinese were adding Prussian blue to their tea for malicious purposes. The rest of the poem described other ways of torture and concluded with: “…when there’s green-tea in the pot, / May I not drink—that’s all.”

Punch dramatized the situation by creating a more vulgar depiction of the malicious Chinese. This poem showed how abusive the Chinese were and how they added toxins that made the tea deadly and undrinkable. Besides Punch’s attempt for the British to “visualize” the horrifying reality of the tea they are drinking, Punch also depicted the Chinese in a stereotypical way. The Chinamen in the cartoon were short and round, but also had angry facial expressions. Because Punch only depicted the Chinese in aggressive and stealthy ways, the British were less inclined to drink Chinese tea or think of the Chinese favorably. This was a ploy from the British government the drive British consumers away from Chinese tea and toward British tea. Racializing the Chinese as evil was a way to deem tea as good or bad, depending on where it was produced. The public there began to associate Chinese tea with deathliness, creating a stark distinction between Chinese and British tea. In actuality, there was no glaring difference between the two.

Although the Punch articles exposed the problem with poisonous tea, the main focus was on the agent of the issue: the Chinese. Some of the publications, such as “A Pretty Kettle of Tea!” and “The Ballad of Sir. T. Tea-Leaf,” were more humorous, whereas other publications were more direct and framed as news stories. “Poisoned Tea,” published in 1857, had a call to action for the Britons by beginning the article with: “British public, look to your tea pots!”

article announced that the Chinese poisoned a few thousand chests of tea. The article did not give any further context and merely stated that the Chinese had poisoned chests of tea the British had been consuming. “Falsified Faces” published in 1870, accused the Chinese of adding mineral powder into the English market. The facts were being skewed to fit the purposes of publishing humorous or exciting context, which in turn hurt the image of the Chinese.

*Punch* magazines from the early 1870s primarily focused on tea itself rather than highlighting the Chinese as agents of production. “Physic in the Tea-Pot” was published in 1873 and described tea as “spurious and adulterated.” The article also stated that the President of the Local Government Board sampled “…44% of it [tea] was composed of iron-filings, sand, and colouring matter, and that on applying his magnet to it, the whole mass of so-called tea was attracted.” These ingredients are inedible, but familiar. Yet, other articles depicted tea as a drink mixed with foreign components. “The Dangers of Tea-Drinking” from 1872 stated that out of 27 specimens from Glasgow, only six were genuine whereas the majority contained “iron, plumbago, chalk, China clay, sand, and Prussian blue.” The article continued to state: “Old jokers often say that tea is a slow poison, but when tea is made of sloe-leaves mixed with turmeric, plumbago, indigo and Prussian blue, it can hardly be considered a fit matter for a joke.” The foreignness and toxicity of these ingredients portrayed the tea as specifically Chinese, and thus representative of the people who lived there. With these publications on imported Chinese tea, the British began to entrust the British tea that was produced in Assam. In

1875, “Lie Tea” labeled Chinese tea as a beverage that “…does not inebriate, but causes stupor.” The article described the tea as being made up of indigo and turmeric, but the foul ingredients were not the primary focus of the content. “Lie Tea” alluded to the idea that the entity of Chinese tea—its health benefits and content—was fabrication. The contradictory and various representations of tea influenced the public’s image on Chinese tea as toxic and Chinese people as evil. “Death in the Cup,” published in 1895, suggested that drinking a cup of tea was equivalent to drinking a “dose of prussic acid” and whomever offered such should be sent to the police. Even after the British began harvesting their own tea in Assam, *Punch* continued to represent the Chinese with the same misconceptions from 1851.

Published in 1873, “The Tea-Table Tragedy” was another satirical poem on green tea and the effect it had on Britons. The poem was a story about a husband and his wife, Miriam, and their addiction to “Delirium Tea.”
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The narrator prepared “Hyson, the finest of green tea” and drank multiple cups of it with Miriam. After the tenth cup of tea, Miriam felt delirious and shouted: “‘Behold the Green-Tea Devil, /As green as green can be, /Is leading up his revel /Across your cup of tea. /Beware! Or he will bevil/ Your nose against your knee!’” Miriam drank ten cups of tea in one sitting, which was an exaggerated way of representing how much tea Britons drank per day. However, with a semblance of truth, “The Tea-Table Tragedy” showed how popular tea was and how excited people were to have it during the day. Miriam’s reaction to the “Green-Tea Devil” represented the Chinese and their “intentions” of poisoning the British. The cartoon showed Miriam in horror with a devilish figure hovering above them with a teacup. Hyson tea had been associated with the “Green-Tea Devil,” which ultimately demonized the drink and created more animosity between Britons and their view of the Chinese.

Upon the British East India Company losing monopoly over tea trade in China and also continuing to believe the Chinese were poisoning exported tea, the British had to create their own techniques for cultivation in Assam. The process of growing, cultivating, producing, and packaging tea became entirely British. *Punch* publications as well as other representations in media pulled people away from Chinese tea and attracted them to British tea. People needed their tea and depended on the British tea market, which eventually made Assam the biggest tea producer, surpassing China. The continuous publications of the Chinese and their tea until the 1890s continued the paranoia and negative sentiments on “the other.” Thus, distancing tea from

---
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its origins transitioned tea into a British entity; tea was uncultured as a Chinese beverage and then adopted into British culture instead.

V. Conclusion

What was once entirely Chinese became entirely British. The domestication of Chinese tea into British culture was a process that happened in waves and *Punch* depicted this transition throughout the 19th century. Tea was represented across three themes: the domestication into the upper class, democratization as a commonplace drink, and disassociation with its Chinese origins. *Punch* was a reliable way to examine these themes because of its tendencies to showcase truth through satirical but also directive cartoons, poems, and excerpts. Analyzing *Punch* from 1851 to the end of the 19th century showed a first-hand account of certain sentiments and trends that ultimately remained in existence throughout multiple publications. Additionally, a number of publications leveraged race in order to drive more nationalism for British tea. Poems addressing the Chinese would also be accompanied by racist sketches of Chinese men looking aggressive and angry. The publications accused the Chinese of poisoning their exported tea and labeled the Chinese as “the other.” This drew British consumers away from foreign tea and toward British tea instead. *Punch* was a popular magazine that was supposed to be representative of the majority opinion, so the publication wielded power in asserting specific stereotypes, which then became the majority impression. *Punch* ultimately created content that highlighted certain themes, histories, and insights to the masses about tea and its importance in British culture, which has now indefinitely become a part of their identity.
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