Lesser Civil Wars

Lesser Civil Wars:
Civilians Defining War and the Memory of War

Edited by

Marsha R. Robinson

CAMBRIDGE
SCHOLARS
PUBLISHING

Lesser Civil Wars:
Civilians Defining War and the Memory of War,
Edited by Marsha R. Robinson

This book first published 2012

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

12 Back Chapman Street, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2XX, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN (10): 1-4438-4166-8, ISBN (13): 978-1-4438-4166-5

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INVERTING HISTORY WITH MICROHISTORY

PREFACE TO THE SERIES

Inverting History with Microhistory is a series of edited volumes in which scholars lead us to question the allocation and appropriation of power by individuals in relationship to their societies. Microhistory has a long tradition of fascinating stories about the past that help us interpret the present and shape our immediate future. Microhistory can be as powerful as macrohistory and, therefore, microhistory makes some people nervous.

The oldest microhistory that I have ever read was that of a great hunter standing up to a charging bison. It was painted on the walls of a Lascaux, France cave some fifteen thousand years ago by prehistoric humans. Actually, I "read" the second edition of the story in a full-size reproduction that was created for tourists like me. Even though it has been two decades since I visited that microhistory, its story is so basic that I have not forgotten it. In fact, I have been inspired by its powerful message. In our lifetimes, events happen in a way that can be described as charging bison that suddenly appear in our paths. What we choose to do at those moments is our contribution to the drama of human history.

The oldest stories that I am aware of are stories about individuals who faced overwhelming challenges in particular places. When the stories were told near firelight or by moonlight, the great story tellers could capture the passing breeze and work it into the story. They illuminated the stages of our imaginations with moonlight and fire flare-ups. They held us in a spell as we waited to hear about the choices the protagonists made and the traumas they endured. We remembered the stories and the life lessons of cleverness and foolishness, of bravery and loyalty. We came to identify each other by the stories we shared. Our stories are where our communities were born. We were members of small communities in those moments and we told microhistories that we could relate to on a personal level.

Along the way, other storytellers introduced new characters such as Nation and Empire. These giants were invading us or we were numbered with them as invaders. Our stories now featured great monarchs and gener-als who led us or our enemies into macrohistory, and who were

justified by the metanarratives written by the victors who broadcast these bigger histories to larger audiences by daylight in imposing and official public places like schools and stadia.

Behind the waving flags of battalions and nations in marketplaces and military encampments, humans continued to gather around the firelight to hear stories of individuals facing the challenges of ever more complex societies with all of the rules and structures that provide order out of the chaos of masses of people engaged in the art of survival. The micro-level stories grabbed us, comforted us, taught us, inspired us, and identified us as individuals who matter.

Inverting History is a series of edited volumes that contain stories about individuals, the challenges that they faced and the decisions that they made. In our globalizing world, we have a challenge facing us. Will our stories of the past unite us or divide us? Will we fight over limited resources or share our knowledge and creativity to overcome zero-sum game local and regional wars? How will we choose to deploy our power to shape the present and the near future? Our resource desperation is charging at us like giant bison.

Stories and Power

Power is perhaps the most elusive prey in history. The hunt for power seems to be one plot in that oldest recorded story in the Lascaux cave. The quest to capture power from the Other is a plot in discussions about adding marginal individuals and groups to official narratives of history. Stories empower their audiences. So, it may be important to control microhistory if one wishes to limit or expand the number of empowered individuals.

Stories about events along the human trek through time influence the allocation of power in the present. Sociologist and historian Charles Tilly saw this connection. “Social pressures,” he wrote, “are path-dependent. That is why history matters.”[1] Tilly identified three types of constructions of past events: metahistory, world-systems, and macrohistory. Such narratives often imbue the Nation/Empire/State with so much power that only superhuman titans like Octavian Augustus or Elizabeth I could discipline these new characters. Ordinary people seem to follow almost mindlessly in their wake, sucked into history en masse by the riptides and crosscurrents of the charisma and superiority of each titan who is singularly qualified to challenge the charging bison of historic moments and trends.

Sometimes, empowered, mindful, ordinary individuals like Fannie Lou Hamer or Napoleon Bonaparte succeeded and that makes some titans rather nervous. Such individuals, whether born into work-a-day families or

as less-empowered nobility, manage to focus the energies of compatriots into a political wedge that threatens the stability of elite castes. Individuals like Joan of Arc, Sundiata Keita, Sojourner Truth, Vicente Guerrero, Aung San Suu Kyi, Benjamin Franklin, Rosa Parks, and Mohandas Gandhi empower ordinary people through their example. Histories about such relatively ordinary people who stood up to the political bison of their times fall into a category called microhistory. Tilly identified this fourth type of history as microhistory which is the study of "the experiences of individuals and well-defined groups within the limits set by large-scale structures and processes."[2] Stories about these individuals have the potential to reinforce or to weaken the power of the official histories that created a comfort zone for the ruling titans.

One scholar whose words seem to express some trepidation over microhistories of ordinary people is Gertrude Himmelfarb, an American expert on Victorian intellectual history.

> "Race/gender/class…any part of that trinity involves a considerable revision of the past," she wrote, "but the whole requires nothing less than its deconstruction."[3]

As far as I know, there were people of varying races, social classes, and genders in the Victorian era and many of them were intellectuals who were featured on lecture circuits and in various gazettes. Queen Victoria graced many of them with an audience. Queen Victoria's audiences confess, to some extent, a measure of the diversity of her imperial subjects by race/class/gender and reflect the diversity of her empire's global trading partners. This reality gave me pause when I read Dr. Himmelfarb's words about "women, blacks, Chicanos, etc." She wrote,

> "What they are all 'clamoring for' is not a place on the periphery of history—that they always had—but at the center, and not intermittently but permanently."[4]

Himmelfarb's comments suggest that history belongs to white male titans and everyone else is relegated to a dream-like story of standing up to charging bison as painted on the wall of a cave.

What if titans fear ordinary people more than they fear bison? This question arises after reading Sigurour Gylfi Magnusson's summary of microhistory as a movement in Europe. Magnusson was associated with the Center for Microhistorical Research in Reykyavik, Iceland. His essay can be used to map a tense space between Tilly's and Himmelfarb's perspectives on the subfield of microhistory. Magnusson wrote that his

entry to microhistory occurred around the time of the Ronald Reagan administration. At this time, Magnusson saw that microhistory was tinged with the residue of European colonialism. He included the linguistic turn, the contribution of Foucault and Derrida, and the microhistory tension between the French *Annales* school and the post-fascist Italian school exemplified by the work of Ginzburg. "In the final analysis," he wrote in 2003, "so far as I am aware, the ideology of microhistory has as yet failed to make any deep and lasting impression upon the discipline at large."[5] If Magnusson is correct, then from his side of the Atlantic Ocean, microhistory must fail as surely as the Lascaux artist recorded the injury of a human who stood up to the charging bison.

Magnusson's assessment, however, leads me to query the trepidation even further by interrogating the very ancient microhistory in the Lascaux cave. As I understand Foucault and the others mentioned by Magnusson, the question underlying those approaches is this: How in the name of titans' History did the colonized subjects ever find the power to topple European colonial administrations? Titanic histories lose power when microhistories are admitted. Therefore, if Magnusson's assessment is correct, microhistory must fail for its success will open up a Tilly-type path that leads to the democratization of global economic power and a Himmelfarb-type reconstruction of the European-dominated global economic order. (Before I proceed, it is important to reveal that I toured Versailles Palace, emblem of French national and imperial power, before I visited Lascaux.) What if the paintings on the wall of Lascaux's caves are an invocation or a spell rather than a history? What if a shaman wished individuals to take on the spirit of the rampaging or charging bison and dominate the other humans and animals of the region? Given that the territory above the Lascaux cave became a stage upon which Julius Caesar, Charlemagne, Louis XIV, and Napoleon launched empires, we should leave a door open to the possibility that the Tilly-type residue of the least microhistory, even the simple yet empowering story of a human standing up to a bison, may change world orders on a Himmelfarb scale over many generations and millennia.

According to the oldest story that I have ever read, the crafting of microhistories is older than the crafting of macrohistories. According to Kathleen Canning, the trinity of race/class/gender was practiced in the field of women's history long before it was discovered by Foucault or Derrida.[6] In this subfield, the great charging bison was white male dominance. Women's history had at least two objectives: "the decentering of the Western white male subject and the reformulation of subjectivity as a site of disunity and conflict," and an end to the "historical exclusion of

women and the identification of human with male."[7] With their pens, early women's historians claimed a permanent place in the narratives of the past, just as Himmelfarb described.

Historians who factored for race/gender/class show something rather curious, something that is not always so readily apparent in other history. In African American history, the master narrative centers upon slavery, namely that most African Americans entered the American theater of history as conquered commodities. Microhistories of the plantation experience, including abolition literature, often reinforced the idea that power belonged to white males. However, an early African American practitioner of microhistory, George Washington Williams, used his pen in the late nineteenth century to restore African American soldiers to the stage of macrohistories about American wars when he published his *History of the Negro Race in America from 1619 to 1880; as Negroes, as Slaves, as Soldiers, and as Citizens.* He claimed a place for them in the victors' narratives just as surely as many African American veterans received their pensions. In the history of the nation of India, European dominance is only the most recent hegemony. In the imperial cycles of Indian history, the elite castes eventually shared power with the invaders. Mrinalini Sinha affirmed this with her observation that in Indian history, "neither feminism nor women are ever articulated *outside* macropolitical structures that condition and delimit their political efforts."[8] Such Indian women, along with many American women, were not standing up to the charging bison of social power. In both of these cases, those who are identified by race/gender/class, some African American veterans and some privileged women in India, claim a share of power in the established Nation or Empire. The subjects of these microhistories wanted to run beside the charging bison called Nation or Empire. They reinforce the macrohistory that Himmelfarb did not wish to see deconstructed.

So, while I think that the images painted on the Lascaux caves are the texts of one of the oldest microhistories, I dare not pretend to give an authoritative interpretation of the text. In the same manner, I do not predict that microhistories will undermine official histories. In fact, some reinforce macrohistories, world histories and metanarratives written in the long twentieth century. Microhistories often privilege the experience of an individual or a small group of individuals against the backdrop of narratives about such historical titans as Franklin Roosevelt, Winston Churchill, and Mao Zedong. In these contexts, microhistories do tend to invert the place of historical actors on the stage of the past but they do not always subvert the hegemony. The microhistories in this series recognize that

individuals and groups have the agency to support and to reject systems of organizing society.

Marsha R. Robinson, series editor

Notes

[1] Charles Tilly, "Future History," in *Theory and Society* 17, no. 5 (September 1988).
[2] Ibid., 706.
[3] Gertrude Himmelfarb, "Some Reflectimes on the New History," *American Historical Review* 94, no. 3 (June, 1989): 668.
[4] Ibid., 664.
[5] Sigurdur Gylfi Magnússon, "'The Singularization of History': Social History and Microhistory within the Postmodern State of Knowledge," *Journal of Social History* 36, no. 3 (Spring 2003): 701-735.
[6] Kathleen Canning, "Feminist History after the Linguistic Turn: Historicizing Discourse and Experience," *Signs* 19, no. 2 (Winter 1994): 370.
[7] Ibid., 371.
[8] Mrinalini Sinha, "Mapping the Imperial Social Formation: A Modest Proposal for Feminist History," *Signs* 25, no. 4 (Summer 2000): 1078.

CHAPTER ONE

LESSER CIVIL WARS: CIVILIANS DEFINING WAR AND THE MEMORY OF WAR

MARSHA R. ROBINSON

> In connection with the plan of a campaign we shall hereafter examine more closely into the meaning of disarming a nation, but here we must at once draw a distinction between three things, which, as three general objects, comprise everything else within them. They are the MILITARY POWER, THE COUNTRY, and THE WILL OF THE ENEMY.
> ~General Carl von Clausewitz, ca. 1830[1]

Civilian definitions of the Will to war and of the Memory of war are assets and liabilities in the planning of battles. Military theorists from von Clausewitz to Chandragupta to Dingiswayo calculated the Will of their own soldiers and of the enemy's soldiers. Sometimes the Will is assigned an erroneously low strength as Abraham Lincoln learned quickly at the onset of the United States Civil War. Around the Mediterranean, from 2010 until this book went to press, the Will of the ordinary citizen to fight dictatorships seems to have emerged like a phoenix out of the Memory of anti-colonial wars, reminding all that an armistice at the national level may only dissipate the Will to war so that, on the plane of civilian Memory, the belligerence continues as a perpetuated lesser civil war.

Will-Memory-Will: A Perpetual Civilian Micro-war

Ohio and the Ohio River Valley are an ideal location for the study of the construction of the Memory of war and the incubation of the Will to war on two counts. It is a frontier between nations, be those nations European and Native American or the United States and the Confederate States of America. It is also a microcosm in which generations of citizens

actively battle over the definition of the Will of the populace and over the construction of that definition through public performance in the form of protest or ritual. This latter microhistory makes this a timely case for nations around the world that have experienced revolution in the last two decades. The war does not end with the armistice or accord, as von Clausewitz suggests in *On War*. Rather, the Will to war is a force so formidable that any peace accord may only dissipate the caloric energy of war into the cool dark of Memory where it coagulates into collective thought and calcifies into the Will of the next generation. This transformative cycle of Will-Memory-Will can be observed in the picture of Ohio and Ohio River Valley regional history created by the essays in this collection, each one a particular case study of different aspects of these lesser civil wars.

Many students of war admire von Clausewitz's genius, especially his clear enumeration of the factors, fixed and variable, in the calculation of war. The Will of the two sides is the animating force, a kinetic one at that. Taken on a Clausewitzian scale, it is a force that can be quantified and consumed. Von Clausewitz realized that war is not over until the Will of the dominated is overcome. This volume shows that the Will of the dominated is banished into private and public memory but it might not be defeated.

Here I offer two examples of banished Will. One is an ancient North African precedent for the 2010-2012 revolutions around the Mediterranean and the other is a precedent for Eastern Europe. First is the lesser civil war over Berber history. In Robert Austen's *Trans-Saharan Africa in World History*, Berber history begins with the creation of the dry Sahara and "the colonization of the North African coast by Carthaginians, Greeks, Romans (814-146 CE)." Such a narrative has been published despite Jocelyne Dakhlia's 1987 observation that the pre-Islamic history of Berber peoples has been suppressed.[2] Dakhlia and other scholars have noticed that these histories are relegated away from patriarchal history to the plane of Memory because much of that history involved powerful Berber women and the men who follow their leadership. In this case, the patriotic Berber obligation is to speak the collective memory before it is forgotten.

The second case concerns the Memory of the soldiers who created the largest European empire since Napoleon. The glory of Germany's victorious twentieth century moment was banished to the shadows of Memory when the Holocaust came to light. There were years of victory that fed a Will to commit atrocities. There were years of defeat, something described by G. W. Sebald as "the sense of unparalleled national humiliation felt by millions in the last years of the war."[3] In this case, the

residue of the Will, the percussive wave of the war, has been isolated in the vacuum of Memory rather than dissipated for "those directly affected by the experience neither shared it with each other nor passed it on to the next generation."[4] Here, the patriotic obligation is voluntary amnesia in the form of collective silence.

The decision to remember or to forget the myriad actions of ordinary people in war does not take place in the cold vacuum of the rational mind. The words of the Honorable William Everett, graduate of Harvard and Cambridge's Trinity College, bring this discussion back to nineteenth century United States. War demoralized men, he wrote, "and to the period immediately following war leaves a legacy of passions which have no place in the human heart." His definition of patriotism is less about amnesia and more about anesthesia.

> If we know of the atrocities of soldiers, we are adjured in the name patriotism not to mention them and not to bring the perpetrators to a just punishment.[5]

The situation Everett describes is a continuous micro-war in the hearts of combatants and civilians alike. This is the least of the civil wars—each individual's war to remember or to forget—and no armistice or accord brings it to an end.

The very nature of the Will-Memory-Will cycle will not let the dissipated force of the Will of a nation remain a micro-war for it will by human nature coagulate into a collective thought. Maurice Halbwachs wrote about collective thought as something that is not a "metaphysical entity." Collective thought, the precursor or residue of the Will, "exists" and "it is, in short, only a certain order of arrangements or relationships between individual minds." He wrote on the eve of World War II, when rumors about the fate of Jews and others were stifled by the songs of the emerging phoenix of the German Will. The feature that makes this transformation of Memory into Will and of Will into Memory is that it is often directed by "the states of consciousness of a greater or lesser number of individuals comprising the group."[6] A few people can incubate Memory into the force of Will that animates a war.

So, this is not a book about the atrocities committed during war. This is a book about the conversion of the Will into Memory where the war continues for generations until a new war requires the resurrection of the Will. As these essays show, sometimes it only takes a few individuals to prosecute these Memory wars wherein the rules of engagement do not necessarily include civil behavior. These are micro-wars between civilians over control of the Will of the nation. They are, indeed, lesser civil wars.

Civilian Memory and the Will to War in the Greater Ohio Region

The decision to bracket the U.S. Civil War with an essay about a century prior to and essays about a century following it is intentional in order to demonstrate the incubating power of the Memory stage of the Will-Memory-Will cycle, the plane energized by microhistory. Civilian-controlled Memory incubates the Will to war.

The second reason for this bracket is to provide a structure in which to observe continuities in the definition of a nation's Will. The impetus for the U.S. as a nation was refuge from European oppression and deference to aristocracy—the honor once reserved for lords and ladies was now awarded to non-slaves in the U.S. Along with that honor, though, came the benefits of socially acceptable cruelties as the foundation for a way of life.

A third reason for this bracket is to echo a lesson in caution to nations undergoing radical changes in power structures. While the immediate concerns are to stabilize the macro-systems of government and economy, the mid-range threat to national stability festers in Memory where the Will of the defeated and the displaced from the former regime is reshaped and acid-etched with shame to preserve their honor before the eyes of their grandchildren.

So, these lesser civil wars at the civilian level and between belligerent generations and their descendants must be attended to and each of the following scholars shows us the importance of civilian-generated rituals and reenactments that sacralize the fallen, the wounded, the victorious and the defeated. They also show the importance of permitting dissenting voices at the time of conflict as part of a natural cycle of building consent to deploy the collective Will in time of war. It may seem counter-intuitive to many but public discourse through public assembly or through media like newspapers, the ancestors of electronic social media, actually galvanized the Will rather than eroded it. If this collection is any indication, the Memory phase can last three to seven generations or more, emerging as a dynamic carrier wave that permeates the oppressed classes and the class that benefitted from formerly acceptable cruel practices, even those who are displaced and those who are called by patriotism to sacrifice for issues that touch them ever so remotely. The Will is harvested from the intergenerational plane of Memory.

James Seelye in "Missionary Wars in the Early Republic Great Lakes" brings us the story of Rev. Abel Bingham, a "simple Baptist missionary who opened a school for Ojibwa children in Michigan." It is a simple

event, one that Clausewitz would color as signs of defeated Ojibwa and Seneca nations. Seelye brings us evidence of unsettled emotions, of pacified but undefeated and empowered peoples. Consider the wars that happened within the lifetime of the grandparents and great-grandparents of Bingham's students: the Sevens Years War 1756-1763, the American Revolution 1776-1783, and the War of 1812. Seelye sets the stage for us with a review of conflicts and competition between Native American nations over international trade among themselves and to overseas markets via the Great Lakes and major waterways to the Atlantic Ocean. This northern border of Ohio was as much a military highway as it was a major import-export route for fur pelts, minerals and finished goods. These are the macro-level issues.

Our gaze is upon that classroom for the school with fifty-six students was itself a nexus of micro-wars over Memory. The Reformation and the Wars of Religion in Europe ten generation prior still festered in Bingham's squabble with a Jesuit priest beside a sick man's bed and it profoundly colored his presentation of Fr. Baraga who has been elevated to venerable status for his successful missionary work among Catholics in the Great Lakes region. So desperately did this Memory of religious wars from Europe fester in Bingham's subconscious that a single man's soul was another contested battlefield on which to perpetuate these long ago wars. The English Civil War truce affirmed when Presbyterian, Baptist, Methodist and Congregational missionaries sought harmonious teaching. Then there is a tiny event, a micro-battle involving Slovene Fr. Baraga who was dispatched to this field by his Cincinnati-based Belgian superior of the Leopoldine Foundation. It was a skirmish fought with pen and petition to the Office of Indian Affairs over a piece of land in an area where a massive copper deposit would soon be exploited. One wonders if this association of Catholic missions near a copper deposit incubated in Memory and produced the Will to exploit copper in King Leopold's Belgian Free State, a religious mission field still suffering from mineral deposit wars even as I write. Seelye takes great care to show us this missionary war as experienced by missionaries like Abel Bingham whose view is dramatically different from that read in Catholic Church history.

As we linger on the shore of Lake Erie, Jeremy Taylor in "The Great Equalizer: Weather and the Shared Suffering of Union Guards and Confederate Prisoners at Johnson's Island Prison, 1864" brings us forward to Johnson's Island near where Commodore Oliver Hazard Perry led a United States Naval squadron from Presque Isle inlet to Put-in-Bay Island in a victorious battle in the nation's second war of independence and national sovereignty. Lake Erie was also a gateway to unchallenged

freedom from Southern slavery. The same lake that symbolized a victorious united nation and that stood for emancipation, a lake full of memories, was used to humiliate Confederate officers in a Union prisoner-of-war camp. In this case, Memory was used to defeat the Will of Confederates—historical irony that often nails psychological salvos to enemy minds. Taylor uses diaries and letters of these Confederate POWs to show the human impulse for freedom. On January 1, 1864, white Confederate officers, pro-slavery agents, crawled on frostbitten hands and knees across frozen Lake Erie, risking drowning by falling through the ice. They crawled like so many slaves had crossed the frozen Ohio River. Taylor brings us John Stakes's failed crawl to freedom in Canada the reaction of hundreds of Confederate officers who saw the wounds the lake lashed upon his body, wounds similar to the maiming imposed on slaves in the South. This Confederate memory is not a popular one. John Stakes's whimpers of pain were locked in a collective anesthetic vacuum until Jeremy Taylor retrieved them for us. In Taylor's pen, weather equalized Yankee and Confederate, tortured them both into the primal Memory of the Will to survive the ultimate war with Nature.

Americans usually discuss Ohio's contribution to abolition and the Civil War as a black-and-white issue and so it would be in keeping with standard practice to place Bradley S. Keefer's chapter on the newspaper wars in that context. We will not do so. This is a volume about the Will-Memory-Will cycle. "'Thus Ends the First Sympathizing War': Archibald McGregor and the Newspaper War of Words in Canton, Ohio, 1861-1864" is a story about the Will to war in Ohio. White Ohioans were not all abolitionists and the wealth garnered in the South from unpaid slave laborers created a steady group of slave-owning customers for many Northern manufacturers. For others, banning slavery in Ohio was about personal economics for it created a Northern oasis that guaranteed an absence of unfair competition with slaves for low wage and/or high skilled jobs for working and middling class white families. The Civil War did not begin as a war to end slavery. In Ohio, this was a war to preserve the Union in order to protect Ohio's borders from a potential third British invasion, one that the North could not win without the Southern economic machine. Memory of the War of 1812, the American Revolution and the Seven Years'/French and Indian Wars incubated a sense of personal security through national unity.

Keefer brings us a story about a moment in American history when civilian dissent was illegal *de facto* through civilian enforcement before it became illegal *de jure* through martial command. It is a story of appeasement to preserve the Union rather than war to enforce the Union.

Peace Democrats of the 1860s worked to poison the Will to war in Ohio, using biting words in newspapers like Archibald McGregor's *Stark County Democrat*, words that stung like Ohio's only venomous non-rattler snake—the copperhead. Keefer's research findings prompt questions. Can one really legislate or command dissent out of existence? Can one only consign dissent to Memory of whispered events that will emerge in a later generation's civil unrest over the Will to war again? Can one control the sympathies of civilians whose Will to war was incubated by dissimilar events on the plane of Memory?

Gregory Jones, in "Violence on the Home Front: Democracy and Disunity in Southeastern Ohio during the American Civil War," gives us another perspective on the sympathy wars and reminds us again that the Will to war for the preservation of the Union was incubated in the Memory of the wars of independence from England and the sacrifices of their great-grandparents against the "Tories" who attacked the United States from Canada, the Gulf of Mexico and the Chesapeake Bay. A divided United States would not survive another three-prong attack in a third American Revolution. Unpaid slave labor in the South and middling class entrepreneurship in the North bought liberty from British impressments.

For the Copperheads, according to Jones, the Conscription Act sparked enough Memory of impressments to manifest as Will in the Hoskinsville Rebellion of April 1863. For the Unionists, toxic Copperhead sympathies with the South betrayed Ohio's border via Mississippi/Ohio River waterways and Unionist Memory of 1776 and 1812 led to gunshots and knifings at the Copperhead Ball and to the death of the Cameron brothers, Copperheads who were "cut to pieces" like one might kill a venomous snake. This violence increased after President Lincoln issued the Emancipation Proclamation to strike at and cripple the Southern economy. For some Unionists, this proclamation was just as threatening as secession for it also left Ohio's southern approach more vulnerable to foreign invasion as Memory taught. This sympathizer war on the home front explains some of the "community based collateral damage" that happened in southeastern Ohio, in the Balkans, in Rwanda, in the Sudans, in Afghanistan, in Ethiopia, in Syria, in Israel/Palestine. Lincoln's decision to cripple the Southern economy coincided with elevating civilian micro-wars about dissent on the home front to lethal levels, according to Jones's research findings, and this episode of Memory can lead civilians to ask if a national leader is ever justified and secure when deciding to bankrupt a region of the nation/polity as a price of maintaining national sovereignty in the global economy.

Clausewitz calculated civilians as assets in the prosecution of war, assets as impersonal as factors like trees, cattle, buildings. African American slaves were recognized as property in the 1861 Confiscation Act and they could be confiscated if their labor supported Confederate States of America (CSA) efforts. Ryan Bixby wants us to restore life to those who had been reduced to scribbled ciphers on a page. He adds dimension to these things and people who had been fodder for scorched earth policy and who were factors in vanquishing the Will of the enemy, transforming them into incubators and monuments of Memory.

Bixby brings us to Harper's Ferry, WV where many of the guns were manufactured that were used to protect the U.S. against Britain in 1812. A town that grew at the confluence of the Potomac and Shenandoah Rivers in an area that President George Washington promoted as a gateway to securing the greater Ohio region from the French and the British and as a route to the Virginia Military District of land promised his soldiers in the Seven Years' War, Harpers Ferry incubates the Will to be free of English and French oppression. Under Bixby's pen, Harpers Ferry became an incubating monument to revenge oppression—where the children of former peasants and serfs could enjoy the lord's and lady's lifestyle afforded by Southern plantation living even though very, very few people in Harpers Ferry ever came close to that scale of luxury. In 1931, the United Daughters of the Confederacy erected a monument to freed person Shepherd Hayward, an employee of the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad who was shot by John Brown's men when he tried to warn the rail passengers of what looked like a train robbery. According to Bixby, the UDC etched a phrase that suggests that African Americans preferred racial oppression.

> …who so conducted themselves that no stain was left upon a record which is the peculiar heritage of the American people, and an everlasting tribute to the best of both races.

Bixby takes this phrase to task. Through his analysis, we see the monument inscription as an intoxicating mantra to delete from Memory the formerly acceptable cruelties that some readers may find objectionably omitted in the other Civil War articles in this book. Rather, Bixby uses another memorial in Harpers Ferry—John Brown's Fort/Armory Fire Engine House—as an anti-inebriant and testament to the reality of the formerly acceptable cruelties. Bixby also includes scars on the earth that keloided and that have remained despite fifteen decades of weather and development. In the Will-Memory-Will cycle, bodily scars vanish from sight after the third generation and leave only their emotional residue to nurture the Will. Bixby asks us to see the scars on the land as evidence of

bodily scars of slaves and soldiers, soldiers like John Stakes and civilians who fought the Copperheads at Hoskinsville. Scarred land will prompt children to ask difficult questions of grandparent veterans and answers must be crafted wisely.

Drewry Wofford III gives us a telling story about one woman's attempt to craft those wise answers as she chronicled the birth of a new nation, the Confederate States of America, and then spent the rest of her life revising her diary for posterity. Wofford's pen reminds us that history is often edited by the vanquished before it falls into the hands of the victors. At least this is what may be a victor's view from a macrohistory level. Mary Boykin Chesnut, wife of the first Senator to resign from the U.S. Congress when South Carolina seceded from the Union, kept a diary that should have made her an Abigail Adams or Harriet Martineau. Through her diary we get a Confederate civilian's view of Ohio Generals Grant and Sherman.

Mary's micro-war is as old as Mauryan Emperor Ashoka the Great, devastator of Kalinja in India in 62 BCE. Ashoka was so appalled and disgusted that he had ordered such carnage and wholesale collateral destruction that he converted to *ahimsa* (a religious principle of non-violence). Imagine his officers whose career successes were suddenly national anathema. What kind of inner turmoil might this have caused? What of Confederates for whom the cruel liberties of slave ownership were suddenly anathema after the Civil War? What of the inner struggle of white supremacists unseated and their unmasked helpless dependence on freedmen's benevolence, something that Mary and other plantation aristocrats experienced? Wofford takes us into one woman's micro-war between her own memory and her legacy. In Wofford's pen, Mary's diary descends from victorious chronicle to dirge for "the end of a way of life—her way of life." He asks if it is possible to separate Mary's personal life from "the political and social turmoil of the time."

Wofford and Keefer bring us to the incubation phase of Memory, the phase made sacred by succeeding generations after the belligerent generation edited their own actions. This is the phase that must be tended gingerly for it shapes the grandchildren's view of grandparents' choices about formerly acceptable cruelties. Wofford gives us a full century of debate over Mary's diary and over scholars' ability to accept Mary as the woman she was rather than the woman she ought to have been however a generation may define that condition. Hers is a first-person micro-war of a witness.

The tone of "Shameful is the Nation that Forgets: Collective Memory, Civil War Reenacting and Battlefield Preservation" by Bradley S. Keefer is decidedly different from some of the earlier chapters because he writes

from within the space of the immediate and he artfully models lessons for preserving historic events before they are acid-etched into the conditional realm of the historical and the marketable. What will happen to all of the faxes and Twitter messages and video clips on camera phones that fomented the current demands for popular dignity and democracy during our global Great Recession? Will there be living history museums and reenactors? How will they train? Who defines authenticity? How does one acquire land to create public parks where the Will of the present generation is sacralized into the incubating Memory of the Will for future wars? Keefer gives us another first-person witness to defining the condition of the past as he traces the evolution of reenactors of Civil War battles—those who dedicate themselves to preserving Memory and transferring Memory to succeeding generations. Keefer carefully points to the power of reenactors to shape the Will of the next generation and that generation's relationship to its ancestors. Here, he brings the micro-wars of many, ordinary citizens, micro-wars that are similar to the one Bixby highlights over the Memory of and the memorial to Shepherd Hayward and that are similar to the one Wofford highlights about Mary's anti-Semitism and ambivalence about slavery. Keefer suspends the reader's tour of reenactments to deliberate continued display of the Confederate flag. Is it a coincidence that reenactments increased as civil rights for all, including poor whites, increased? Is it a monument to the honor—the deference that lords and ladies exacted from Southerners' European ancestors—that slavery and plantations yielded even workaday whites? Is it an anti-inebriant full of the formerly acceptable cruelties that were the true bones of hoop skirts and corsets? Keefer leaves us with a challenge to cultivate honest portrayals of the past in order to preserve a condition of being humane for all who share the Memory.

Thomas Weyant closes our bracket on lesser civil wars in the Ohio and Ohio River Valley region by taking us to Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, where the Ohio River begins and near the area where George Washington delivered a message from the British Army to the French Army at Ft. Duquesne at the beginning of the Seven Years' War. Ironically, the war that is contested in Weyant's chapter concerns U.S. support of imperial France in Indochine/Vietnam. In the intervening three hundred years, the Will to war has been incubated in the plane of Memory that is controlled, edited, acid-etched and sacralized by ordinary civilians who define war. Weyant's chapter shows unconscious continuities in the actions of very ordinary people. What does it mean to be a citizen and a patriot? What is the relationship between the citizen and the state? Does the government have the right to impress or conscript soldiers? Is there a right to dissent?

Is the current military action consistent with the acceptable goals of prior military action and the national heritage? How is the Will to war extracted from Memory in order to create popular support for the military effort, the soldiers and their families? How will the scars and graves be sacralized? In this case, Weyant used editorials and articles in student newspapers as a modern application of the media war that Keefer brought us in chapter four. There is ecumenical "harmonious" support by local clergy that we learned of in Seelye's essay. Women participate in the letter writing and in the marches as men destroyed or laminated their draft registration cards. There are draft resistors who faced prison terms and exile, with the Kent State Shootings echoing the Hoskinsville Rebellion. There are peace mongers and appeasers. The list goes on and as it does one must address something about human nature.

This volume is part of a series entitled *Inverting History with Microhistory*. It is inspired by the thousands of ordinary citizens around the world who are making great sacrifices to withdraw consent from oppressive or disconnected governments. How in the world can an undereducated, underpaid ordinary person topple the most sophisticated, internationally supported regime? If the collective wisdom of these chapters is any indication, the ordinary citizen wins because the citizen controls the plane of Memory and always wins that lesser civil war.

Notes

[1] General Carl von Clausewitz, *On War*. trans. J. J. Graham (New York: Barnes & Noble, 1962), 1: 27.

[2] Robert Austen, *Trans-Saharan Africa in World History* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 139; Jocelyne Dakhlia, "Des Prophète à la nation: la mémoire des temps anté-islamiques au Maghreb," *Cahiers d'Études Africaines* 27, no. 107/108 (1987): 241-267.

[3] Marcia Cavell, *Becoming a Subject: Reflections in Philosophy and Psychoanalysis* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2003), 42.

[4] Cavell, 42.

[5] William Everett replaced Henry Cabot Lodge as Massachusetts's delegate to the House of Representatives 1893-5. His comments are taken from "How War Demoralizes Men: Address at Northampton, Massachusetts, April 18, 1903" as printed in *The Advocate of Peace* 65, no. 5 (May 1903): 91-92.

[6] Maurice Halbwachs, "Individual Consciousness and Collective Mind," trans. John H. Mueller, *American Journal of Sociology* 44, no. 6 (May 1939): 818.

CHAPTER TWO

MISSIONARY WARS IN THE EARLY REPUBLIC GREAT LAKES

JAMES SEELYE

The European quest for empire began in earnest in North America during the latter decades of the sixteenth century. Before long, English, Spanish, French and even Dutch colonists found themselves in a struggle for land, resources and allies with the numerous Native American nations who lived in the contested territories. Eventually, open warfare began between both Native Americans and Europeans and between different European powers, all hoping to obtain native allies.

This warfare spilled over to all aspects of Native American life and the tricky alliances often put different Indian nations into open conflict with one another. A prime example of this occurred in the middle of the seventeenth century during the "Beaver Wars" when demand for beaver furs by European consumers put increased pressure on Native Americans to provide pelts and when the Iroquois, one of the most powerful confederations of Indians in North America, attempted to expand their territory as they depleted their own supply of beavers.

Missionaries played an increasingly important role in American Indian life during the colonial period. Whether it was the Franciscans with the Spanish, the Jesuits with the French, or a variety of Protestant denominations with the English, they all vied for the harvest of native souls. They employed a variety of methods in their proselytizing and achieved varying degrees of success. As European powers were pushed out of North America throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth century and Americans populated the nation during the nineteenth century, missionaries continued to exert some power and influence over Native Americans. Furthermore, they often clashed with one another over territory and religious methods. They all felt that their way was the only true way to save Indian souls.

The life of a missionary is tough. Conditions can be miserable, the pay is lousy and there are innumerable challenges, both foreseen and unforeseen. The unforeseen challenges proved to be especially difficult. In the Great Lakes during the middle of the nineteenth century, a number of missionaries, representing a variety of faiths, proselytized among the Indians of the region. The missionaries varied widely in their temperaments, viewpoints and methods. When the saturation level approached and they continued to increase, a battle of sorts broke out between missionaries over the harvesting of souls. These battles created many headaches for the missionaries but, more importantly, they created a great deal of mistrust and confusion among the Indians they hoped to convert. This does not mean, however, that Indians sat silently while missionaries threatened to literally beat each other over the head with a stick. They were often proactive and let missionaries know who was welcome and who was not.

An illustrative example is found in the career of Baptist missionary Abel Bingham. Long before he arrived in Michigan's Upper Peninsula, he and his wife established a mission among the Seneca in New York, commencing his missionary work at Tonawanda on April 4, 1822. He reported that a number of Native Americans greeted him and seemed pleased at his arrival. Four days later he started a school with approximately ten scholars.[1] By April 10 the situation changed dramatically. Bingham was unaware of an existing conflict on the Seneca reservation between Christian and non-Christian Native Americans. He soon discovered it, however. On April 10 he received a summons, along with the Christian, or "friendly," Native Americans to meet with the "pagans." Bingham described the meeting.

> Red Jacket (with a firm and malicious countenance, his eyes sparkling with savage ferocity, being surrounded by about 20 of his adherents) addressed me and stated what the whites had done in driving them from their habitations and murdering their people. Then stated what he was witness to our ministers receiving pay from poor people for preaching and how some had made themselves rich by instructing the Indians etc., and after a lengthy harrang [*sic*] closed by stating that I must leave the village. After which I made a reply, endeavored to remove several objections that was raised, but all to no purpose. The decree went forth that I must leave their village tomorrow. I then returned home...considered Missionary trials just commencing, viewed it time for prayer.[2]

It was just six days after he began his missionary journey that this unimaginable hurdle presented itself. The following day the "friendly" Native Americans visited him to discuss the previous day's developments.[3] Bingham told them that he could not leave the mission

without direction from the missionary board. All present agreed that he must write the board without delay to inform them of the situation.

With the exception of a few more suggestions that he again meet with the non-Christian majority, the next few days passed uneventfully. On April 20 he received another summons but, since his wife was ill, he again declined. Then the entire group appeared at his house and ordered him to leave immediately. He did not. On May 24 the friendly Native Americans told him how happy they were that he stayed and assured him of their support. Bingham said, "Never did I feel my attachment to them as sensibly as at this time. I assured them that I was willing to go hand and hand with them through any trials."[4]

The rest of April passed without incident and perhaps Bingham fell into a false sense of security. On May 19 he heard a rumor that the non-Christians planned to gather their numbers and take Bingham, his family and their possessions off the reservation and leave them on the state road. Nothing happened until May 28 when Red Jacket returned. He called Bingham into a council and ordered him to pack and be ready to leave by noon the following day. He recorded that he wanted to speak, but was not allowed to, and he felt it best to respect their rules. He also noted that the Christian Native Americans present received a tongue-lashing as well. The following morning the Binghams proceeded about their normal routine. They locked up their house and went to the school. As promised, at noon a group of between thirty and forty non-Christians arrived. They asked Bingham to let them in, which he obviously refused to do. They somehow secured another key and let themselves in. The Binghams' furniture was removed and left at the state road. The following day Bingham went to the state road to see what happened to the furniture. Apparently it was looked after by the Christian Native Americans who provided the family with provisions and supplies.[5] From that point on, until Bingham received a new missionary appointment in 1828 that moved him and his family to Sault Sainte Marie, Michigan, his position was uncertain at best.

Bingham first considered the possibility of transferring to Sault Sainte Marie in late 1827 and by 1828 the possibility became reality. He arrived at his new station on October 10, 1828, and was greeted by Henry Schoolcraft immediately after he walked off the steamer. Schoolcraft served him breakfast and then introduced him to a Congregational minister who had established a "brief domestic mission" at Sault Sainte Marie. The appointment had recently expired and the minister waited to see if he would be reappointed. However, upon Bingham's arrival, the Congregationalist told him that since Bingham was a regularly appointed missionary, he would surrender the field to him. Then the minister invited

Bingham to lodge with him. Bingham was impressed with the departing missionary and felt that he possessed an "excellent spirit." Before the Congregationalist left Sault Sainte Marie, the two men shared the pulpit.[6]

Bingham followed the usual missionary practice of introducing himself to the local Native American leadership. His first month at Sault Sainte Marie was eventful. He met with a "minor" chief and told him that he was there to establish a school and to preach the "gospel of the Lord Jesus." According to Bingham, his words were met with satisfaction. He secured the services of Charlotte Johnston to interpret for him, as she was fluent in both French and Ojibwa. Like Baraga and Pitezel, Bingham also preached to area whites and for him this included troops at Fort Brady. The American Baptist Missionary Union instructed Bingham to "establish religious services and extend the benefits of the mission to all within reach" of his influence. They also told him that they would provide an interpreter if needed.[7] He toured the area and lamented about the drunken state of most of the Native Americans. He also saw a Midewiwin initiation that he briefly discussed without commentary. By December he had a new interpreter because Charlotte Johnston was ill. John Tanner was called upon and was glad to serve. Overall, Bingham's journals illustrate a man who thought it was basically a waste of time to try to work with Native Americans when there was no interpreter around. Although he eventually learned how to phonetically read sermons in Ojibwa, he never learned the language well enough to converse. Finally, he started a school. On the first day he had twenty-seven scholars, the second day fifty and on the third day fifty-seven.[8]

Although he differed with some of their methods and doctrine, Bingham fervently believed in cooperating with other Protestant missionaries but not with Catholics. In April 1829 he travelled from Sault Sainte Marie to Mackinac on snowshoes and met with Presbyterian minister William M. Ferry. The two men felt a strong bond and preached together while Bingham was at Mackinac. He stated that although the two men were of different faiths, "we seemed to feel as much at home when at each others station as if we belonged to the same denomination."[9]

While his relationship with Ferry seemed to be smooth, things were not always so with others. Again, Bingham believed in missionary cooperation.[10] That did not mean, however, that debates did not occur. In April 1834 he wrote to Methodist missionary John Clark to challenge baptismal practices. Interestingly, this came after an 1833 letter Bingham sent to Clark about the importance of Christians of different denominations to "harmonize as much as possible, and especially missionaries laboring for the salvation of the heathen."[11] It seems that Clark was ready to baptize

some Native Americans. Bingham was "truly desirous to remove all external differences among us as far as we can without violating any principles of our faiths." As long as Clark fully immersed those who gave evidence of their piety, Bingham agreed to "cheerfully receive them to our communion."

The baptismal debate did not stop there. It continued in 1840 with Rev. William Brockway, the Methodist missionary superintendent. Bingham invited Brockway over for dinner. Brockway replied that he could not go in good conscience. He told Bingham that his attendance at dinner "would be a violation both of the letter and the spirit of your constitution. For though I was immersed I believe the man who done it had not been immersed himself." Brockway believed that Bingham felt that if what Brockway said about his baptism was true, then his baptism was invalid. Brockway concluded by stating that he believed in the validity of immersion and also believed that sprinkling on both adults and infants was equally valid.[12]

Bingham's debates with other denominations went beyond baptism. In 1848 he met a Mormon from Beaver Island. Located in northern Lake Michigan, schismatic Mormons started a colony on Beaver Island in 1848.[13] The Mormon visitor claimed to be a "seer," or a prophet. Bingham and this unnamed Mormon had a discussion over the Mormons' "peculiar doctrines and claims." The man admitted to the truth of revelation and said that they held strictly to all of the truths and doctrines the revelation taught, but overall they felt the Bible was merely a history of the Jewish nation through the times of the apostles. The Mormons had their own specific revelation—*The Book of Mormon*. They felt that their work was equal in authority to the sacred scriptures, Bingham recorded, and it was designed to form a part of divine revelation. Both the Father and the Son possessed a material body while the Holy Spirit did not. The Holy Spirit was a spirit that dwelled within both the Father and the Son. Bingham asked the Mormon how he knew this and the man replied that he had seen it. Bingham asked, "Have you seen the Father?" The man replied, "I have seen the judge of all the world." Bingham pressed on, "That was not the question." The man continued with his reply that he had seen the judge of all men to which Bingham countered, "Christ is the judge, and he possessed a human body. But have *you* seen the father?" The man did not change his response and maintained that the gift of miracles and of prophecy was contained in their church and that he possessed it.[14]

The Mormon attempted to quote from Proverbs 29:10: "Where there is no vision the people perish…" However, Bingham said, "with all his (the Mormon) prophetic knowledge he was unable to quote it, but said it could

be found in Psalms." The conversation continued as the Mormon told Bingham that Mormons possessed the gift of tongues and were able to speak in new tongues. Bingham inquired about them addressing Native Americans in their own language. The man claimed that he had heard of such a thing occurring two years prior. Bingham countered that there was no proof because such an event would have been reported all over the area. "When the apostles began to speak in new tongues, it spread through Jerusalem like fire through the dry forest." Bingham pressed him further and asked if the Mormons had ever preached to Native Americans or the French in their own languages. The Mormon said not that he was aware of, but that the time had not yet come. Bingham asked him what evidence he possessed that the man could speak in tongues. He replied that one person would rise and speak in a language no one knew and someone else would rise and interpret it. Bingham wondered if the new language was understood by anyone other than the interpreter and the man replied that sometimes two or three others did. Then Bingham asked, "Does any unbeliever or person not in your communion" understand? "No." The Baptist finished the barrage by telling his visitor that the Mormons failed in furnishing the gospel.

> When the apostles spoke with tongues, it was to give instruction to some who did not understand their native language and when it was interpreted it was that the address might be understood by all the assembly.[15]

Bingham certainly felt that his faith was the one true faith and he possessed a great deal of ammunition to support this. This exchange also shows that he understood the importance of being able to communicate in their own language to those he served as a pastor and missionary, even if he never fully learned to do so himself.

Abel Bingham was more accepted among Indians at Sault Sainte Marie but he found himself battling other missionaries on many levels. Bingham's most furious encounter over religious differences occurred with an unnamed Jesuit priest at Sault Sainte Marie in 1834. He visited the house of a sick man and the priest ordered him out. Then the following happened.

> I let him know that I was in a free country and should do as I pleased about that. He wished to know what I was there for. I told him, because I pleased to come and visit my neighbor. He said if I wished to visit him, visit as a neighbor and bring none of my books. I replied that I should bring what books I pleased, and the man might do as he pleased about reading them. He seized a tract and went to the fire under pretense of flinging it into the