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AN EDITORIAL COMMENT

The editors of this 12th issue of the Atlanta Review of Journalism History are pleased to present six essays, instead of our usual four. All the authors have been presented their research at academic conferences; their subjects range in historical periods from 1820s South Carolina to 21st Century France. A common issue is the press coverage of controversy and conflict. Anne Corbett Roberts examines the ethnic and religious friction in France surrounding a controversial law banning the wearing of the burqa in public. Erik Clabaugh provides a detailed reexamination of a massacre that concluded the U.S. war against the Sioux tribes. Jeffrey Clarke Rowell reveals how racism in baseball 1880s American caused the professional league to order segregation nationally, blocking African-Americans until 1947. Erika Pribanic-Smith provides a preview of a divisive issue that predisposed South Carolina against the U.S. Congress more than three decades before the Civil War. Jerri Lynn Mann shows how one editor of one newspaper can be credited with elevating Abraham Lincoln to the presidency. And Miglena Sandmeier uncovers the “liberator” of her native Bulgaria whose name had been erased from the country’s history.

Anne Corbett Roberts’ award-winning essay provides valuable insight and context for the controversy in France concerning its Muslim population. Arguments in Parliament over the law to ban the wearing of the burqa in public revealed the depth and nature of the cultural and religious issues. As Ms. Roberts found through extensive research here and in France, “By establishing the act of wearing the burqa or niqab as a threat to ‘republican values’ in France, the French press “created a rhetorical situation in which the limitation of religious expression could be legally justified.” Her research paper, written while she was an M.A. student at Georgia State University, was presented in 2011 at the national AEJMC conference in St. Louis where she received the International Division’s Top Student Paper Award. After graduating, she became the Program Assistant to Educational Programs at the Carter Center, and currently is a policy analyst at the Southern Office of the Council of State Governments.

Erik Clabaugh’s essay examined U.S. press coverage of a national problem in 19th Century America: conflicts with the Sioux Indians before and after the massacre in 1890 at Wounded Knee Creek. “Prior
to, and immediately following, the massacre,” Clabaugh noted, “the Sioux were depicted as a particularly savage, yet innately intelligent, threat to white society. Such portrayals were in keeping with what Juan Gonzalez and Joseph Torres have described as a dominant “white racial narrative” that was put forward by the nation’s press and worked to reinforce racial biases, inflame group hatred, and justify discriminatory government policies as well as the country’s unrelenting westward expansion.” Clabaugh’s research, presented at the national conference of the American Journalism Historians Association in Kansas City in 2011, “calls attention to an early moment of national self-reflection and highlights the beginning of a gradual shift in the public perception of Wounded Knee that continues to this day.” He wrote the paper while an M.A. student at Georgia State University; he is now studying here for the Ph.D. in communication.

Racism in 19th Century America was also the key issue in Jeffrey Rowell’s essay on the origin of segregation in professional baseball in the 1880s. His research led him to the outstanding catcher Moses Fleetwood Walker who became a professional player in 1883 when newspapers did not pay as much attention to his race. By 1887 he was one of seven talented black players. That year, white players threatened to quit “on account of the colored element” causing their league to prohibit “the employment of colored players but its clubs.” The segregation of professional baseball continued for 60 years, until 1947 when Jackie Robinson broke the color barrier. Rowell’s research was presented in 2014 at the 22nd Symposium on the 19th Century Press, Civil War and Free Expression at the University of Tennessee-Chattanooga. He is currently completing his M.A. degree at Georgia State University.

Politically-charged rhetoric in the South that prefigured Southern secession is the focus of Erika Pribanic-Smith’s award-winning study of six newspapers across South Carolina in 1828. “State rights rhetoric largely consumed the southern newspapers’ pages,” she noted, “mirroring and in some cases amplifying what occurred in other political forums.” In South Carolina, newspapers “lashed out against” Congress’ Tariff of 1828 as unconstitutional, some even urging “disunion.” Dr. Pribanic-Smith’s essay, part of her Ph.D. dissertation while at the University of Alabama, won the Best Faculty Paper Award in 2012 at the Southeast Colloquium of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication in Blacksburg, Virginia. Currently, she is an assistant professor in the Department of Communication at the University of Texas at Arlington and is serving this year as President of the American Journalism
Historians Association.

**Jerri Lynn Mann**'s research documented “the level of influence that journalists had on political outcomes”—specifically Horace Greeley in New York and Joseph Medill in Chicago. Focusing on Medill, Mann documented how his *Chicago Tribune* crusaded continuously for Abraham Lincoln to win the contested Republican nomination for President in 1860 and then the Presidency. Among other methods, the *Tribune* printed Lincoln’s speeches verbatim. Meanwhile, Medill “corresponded with Lincoln throughout the election, offering support and advice.” Medill exemplified “how the power and influence of the media essentially manipulated politics during the 1800s.” Mann presented her research at the 2014 Southeast Colloquium of the American Journalism Historians Association at Panama City Beach, Florida. She graduated Summa Cum Laude with a B.A. degree in May 2014.

**Miglena Sandmeier**’s essay illustrates the power of countries to suppress undesirable aspects of their history. She discovered that an American journalist from Ohio—Januarius MacGahan—was once heralded as the “liberator” of Bulgaria. However, growing up in Bulgaria during the Communist regimes, Sandmeier had never heard of MacGahan. The American journalist’s name, she found, had been “deleted from Bulgarian history.” Her essay “restores MacGahan’s role in the liberation of Bulgaria from the Ottoman Empire.” She concluded that MacGahan’s dispatches against the slaughter of Bulgarians in the 1870s demonstrated his “resolve and passionate outcry against injustice and cruelty,” aroused public opinion, and “altered the course of European diplomacy.” Sandmeier presented the paper at the 2013 Southeast Colloquium of the American Journalism Historians Association at Panama City Beach, Florida. The paper became her master’s thesis; in 2014 she graduated with the M.A. degree from Georgia State University and is currently studying for the Ph.D. in communication.
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Veiled Politics:  
Legitimating the Burqa Ban in the French Press

Anne Corbett Roberts

In October 2010 the Constitutional Council of France approved a law banning the burqa and niqab from all public places. Joining the ongoing scholarly discussion on veiling, this study seeks to understand the role the French press played in legitimating the ban, the first of its kind to be implemented in Europe. This media narrative legitimated the legislation by presenting the veil as intolerable and “against public social order.” Made necessary by rapidly shifting demographics in contemporary France, this discourse was couched in a defensive employment of laïcité.

A Genealogy of the Bill

The law, which has come to be known as the “Burqa Bill,” passed the French Senate on Tuesday, September 14, 2010 with an overwhelming majority of 246 to one. The press did not publish the identity of the sole dissenter. Having passed the lower house in July, the Constitutional Council reviewed the bill and approved it on October 7, 2010.

The law banning wearing the burqa and the niqab in public places was first conceived following a speech that President Nicolas Sarkozy delivered to Parliament on June 22, 2009. In this speech, Sarkozy declared, “The Burqa is not welcome in the territory of this Republic. It is not an idea that the Republic believes brings dignity to women.”

Though legislators ran into difficulties drafting a bill that they perceived to be legally sound, the French cabinet approved a draft of a law intended to ban the Muslim full-face veil from public spaces on Wednesday, May 19, 2010. Following this victory, Sarkozy told assembled ministers that “in this matter the government is taking a path it knows to be difficult, but a path it knows to be just.” In a document obtained by Le Figaro listing the reasons the bill was necessary, the drafters “evolve the dignity of the human person – even though some women would be willing –

public order in its broad sense, a sense of community and finally, issues of security."  

On Tuesday, July 6, 2010, the parliament began a three-day period of debate. Members of the Socialist Party announced that they would boycott the vote, protesting the ban on the full-face veil in all public places. Following the debate period, the National Assembly voted on Tuesday, July 13, 2010 to approve the ban by a vote of 355 to one. As promised, members of the Socialist Party abstained from voting.

The law contains seven articles and bans full-face coverings in all public places. It makes exceptions for ski masks, helmets, carnival masks, masks worn for welding and construction work, and interestingly, Father Christmas costumes. It defines public space very broadly, including government buildings, public transportation systems, and all streets, markets, thoroughfares, private businesses and entertainment venues. The law also allowed for a six-month grace period to educate women. Following the grace period, a fine of €150 would be imposed on those caught wearing the veil. Upon their first offense, women may choose to participate in a citizenship course instead of paying the €150 fine. Men who force their wives or daughters to cover themselves for religious or cultural reasons face harsher penalties, this constitutes the creation of a new crime, that of forced facial concealment. They may be fined up to €30,000 and face a one-year jail term. The fines will be doubled if the concealed person is a minor. The law also applies to tourists.

While much scholarship concerns itself with the treatment of French-Muslim women within the context of the headscarf ban in public schools, the free expression of religion (even Islam) has remained protected in public places until recently. Therefore, no current scholarship on the banning of the full veil exists. This paper, then, joins the ongoing scholarly discourse of veiling at a point of unique convergence. It argues that the women’s rights frame offered

---

**Notes:**

5 Ibid.
6 “French lawmakers approve full veil ban,” Agence France Presse, September 13, 2010.
7 “N° 2262 - Rapport d’information de M. Éric Raoult fait au nom de la mission d’information sur la pratique du port du voile intégral sur le territoire national,” n.d., www.assemblee-nationale.fr/13/rap-info/i2262.asp. (The informational report of Mr. Éric Raoult in the name of the inquiry of the practice of wearing the full veil in the territory of the state)
by mainstream print media in France is itself a veil. Behind it one finds a familiar patriarchal discourse of the Muslim woman as victim, legitimating – and, necessitating – a law to “save” her. This discourse is couched in a defensive employment of laïcité (secularism), the French concept of secularism.

**Significance**

The burqa law demonstrates a break from French legal precedence. Previous legislation has been limited to regulating the religious expression of minors in public schools, which are publicly owned and therefore public institutions. This is because minors in France are not deemed legally capable of making informed decisions about group membership and identification. Other legislation has targeted the religious expression of adults, but this has been limited to government employees working in publicly owned spaces. These employees, as government representatives, are not permitted to display membership to any group (other than the French Republic) that may affect the way other citizens interact with or perceive them. The current law, then, breaks from this legal precedence by limiting the religious expression of adults in all public places.

France is the first European country to ban the burqa and niqab from public places. However, after the approval of the ban by the Constitutional Council, several European countries began drafting similar legislation, demonstrating France’s influence on European domestic policy making. This paper explores the way this legislation was negotiated and, ultimately, legitimated in the French press.

Drawing from more than 150 French news articles from daily publications throughout France, this project paints a detailed picture of the “Burqa Ban” in the French press. Joining the ongoing scholarly conversation on veiling in France, this study seeks to understand the role the French press played in legitimating the ban on the full veil and contributes to the understanding of the discourse surrounding the veil, a powerful symbol of Islam throughout the world.

---

8 Turkey passed a law banning the burqa in 1925 but has not yet been granted membership to the European Union. Additionally, Belgium passed a law banning the burqa and niqab from public places in 2010 but the law had not been implemented at the time this paper was written.
Research Questions

1. How was the state-determined political agenda promoted or opposed in the French press to legitimize or delegitimize the Burqa Ban legislation?

2. What frames and arguments were used in the legitimation and delegitimation process?

Data

To answer these questions, I examined coverage of the “Burqa Bill” in two Parisian dailies, *Le Monde* and *Le Figaro*; one French news agency, Agence France Presse (AFP); and four regional French dailies: *Ouest France, Sud Ouest, Midi Libre*, and *L’est Républicain*. It is crucial to include regional dailies in this study because they reflect the great importance attached to regional identity in France and are thus important tools used in the construction and maintenance of public opinion. Furthermore, the Parisian dailies are essential sources because they are the newspapers of choice for the well-educated and elite classes; these are the classes from which policy makers often hail. All publications in this study were selected for their historical importance as news sources, their high circulation, and their reputations as well-respected sources for news in France.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publication</th>
<th>May ‘10</th>
<th>July ‘10</th>
<th>September ‘10</th>
<th>October ‘10</th>
<th>April ‘11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Le Figaro</em></td>
<td>50 articles</td>
<td>29 articles</td>
<td>9 articles</td>
<td>13 articles</td>
<td>9 articles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15 included</td>
<td>7 included</td>
<td>4 included</td>
<td>4 included</td>
<td>3 included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>AFP</em></td>
<td>32 articles</td>
<td>17 articles</td>
<td>17 articles</td>
<td>21 articles</td>
<td>7 articles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 included</td>
<td>6 included</td>
<td>6 included</td>
<td>5 included</td>
<td>2 included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Ouest France</em></td>
<td>17 articles</td>
<td>9 articles</td>
<td>5 articles</td>
<td>9 articles</td>
<td>8 articles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 included</td>
<td>3 included</td>
<td>2 included</td>
<td>3 included</td>
<td>3 included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sud Ouest</em></td>
<td>24 articles</td>
<td>13 articles</td>
<td>7 articles</td>
<td>12 articles</td>
<td>8 articles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 included</td>
<td>4 included</td>
<td>3 included</td>
<td>4 included</td>
<td>3 included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Midi Libre</em></td>
<td>55 articles</td>
<td>11 articles</td>
<td>7 articles</td>
<td>9 articles</td>
<td>14 articles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12 included</td>
<td>4 included</td>
<td>2 included</td>
<td>5 included</td>
<td>5 included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>L’Est Républicain</em></td>
<td>4 articles</td>
<td>0 articles</td>
<td>1 article</td>
<td>1 article</td>
<td>9 articles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 included</td>
<td>0 included</td>
<td>1 included</td>
<td>1 included</td>
<td>3 included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Le Monde</em></td>
<td>25 articles</td>
<td>11 articles</td>
<td>9 articles</td>
<td>8 articles</td>
<td>20 articles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 included</td>
<td>5 included</td>
<td>4 included</td>
<td>3 included</td>
<td>8 included</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To create a manageable yet comprehensive and representational data set, this study was comprised of a random sampling of all stories concerning the burqa, niqab, or the law banning them from each of the seven sources during the months of legislative action. Therefore, articles were gathered for the months of May 2010, July 2010, and October 2010. Additionally, a random sampling was taken for all seven sources from the month of April 2011, the month that the law was implemented. Because news about the “Burqa Ban” was less timely and relevant during the months when no legislative action took place, and therefore less likely to appear in the press, those months were not included in this study.

To ensure the collection of a truly random sample, an online random sample generator was used. A random, proportional sample was taken from each source for each month selected for the study. Articles were assembled chronologically before undergoing sampling. To see a breakdown of the samples taken by month and publication see Table 1.

Framing Theory and News Media

Framing theory is omnipresent in the social sciences and humanities, however, it is particularly useful in media studies, where it can be helpful in understanding and describing the power of a communicating text. According to Entman, to frame is “to select some aspects of a perceived reality and make them more salient in a communicating text, in such a way as to promote a particular problem definition, causal interpretation, moral evaluation, and/or treatment or recommendation for the item described.”9 A frame then, diagnoses, evaluates, and prescribes. By establishing problems, frames also limit the possible solutions. He notes, “the problem is that facts do not speak for themselves. Choosing how to put facts together and which to emphasize inevitably affects what audiences perceive as reality…”10

Frames function to make a piece of information more noticeable, meaningful, or memorable to audiences. Reese’s work on framing and the “war on terror” demonstrates that once a dominant frame has been established, it is extremely difficult for a convincing counterframe to be advanced. The result, he notes, is that “political debate takes place largely within the boundaries set by the frame with general acceptance of

the assumptions built into it.”

What is excluded from a frame is just as important as what is included. In their discussion of the connection between framing of AIDS policy and public perception, Sniderman, Brody and Tetlock found that “the effect of framing is to prime values differentially, establishing the salience of one or the other.” Therefore, what is not included in a dominant frame or stock of frames is not likely to enter into public consciousness. Unpublicized, alternative views will gain few supporters and are unlikely to have a significant effect on public opinion or perception.

Kosicki and Pan’s influential work on framing analysis points out the role of three different players in the media framing process: journalists, sources, and audience. This multifaceted approach to framing obviates that frames emerge for different reasons, depending on the characteristics of the involved actors. Therefore, as Entman has suggested, “the frame in a news text is really the imprint of power – it registers the identity of actors or interests that competed to dominate the text.”

Methodology

The discourse of each text was analyzed using a Discourse-Historical Approach (DHA), a research approach of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). CDA critically investigates social inequality as it is “expressed, constituted, legitimized and so on, by language use.” One of the aims of the DHA is to “demystify” the hegemony of specific discourses by deciphering the ideologies that establish, perpetuate or fight dominance.” The DHA also considers intertextual and interdiscursive relationships between texts, genres, and discourses, as well as social and sociological variables, the history of the problem in

14 Entman, “Framing: Toward Clarification of a Fractured Paradigm.”
question and situational frames. Reisigl and Wodak describe the DHA approach to CDA as being three-dimensional: after “(1) having identified the specific contents or topics of a specific discourse, (2) discursive strategies are investigated. Then, (3) linguistic means and the specific, context-dependent linguistic realizations (as tokens) are examined.”17 Heuristically, scholars using the DHA orient themselves to questions of how persons, objects, events, processes and actions are referred to linguistically, what characteristics are attributed to certain actors, objects, events and processes, what arguments are employed in a given discourse, from what perspective these arguments are addressed and whether they are intensified or mitigated.

Though the Discourse Historical Approach focuses on many discursive strategies18, this project is interested in strategies of argumentation and of framing or discourse representation. Using the DHA, the discourse of each text was analyzed, with special attention given to dominant, intertextual frames. While exploring the strategies of argumentation used in the texts, I focus on the justification of positive and negative aspects of the “Burqa Ban” and how these arguments were used to legitimize or delegitimize the legislation.

Legitimating the Veil in the French Press

The Interior Minister of France has estimated that a mere 2,000 women in France wear the full Muslim veil. France’s population, including its overseas territories is estimated to be 65,312,24919 meaning that the “Burqa Ban” affects a mere .003% of the French population. What, then, has caused this seemingly disproportionate reaction? To understand this, one must first understand why Muslim veiling, a practice that has been controversial in France since 1989, is a particularly sensitive issue. In responding to this, an appreciation of the effective mobilization of public sympathy for the women who wear the veil, often depicted as victims who have been forced to wear these garments, and a knowledge of France’s history associated with veiling is essential.

17 Ibid.
18 According to Reisigl and Wodak, the DHA focuses on discursive strategies such as referential strategy or strategy of nomination, strategies of predication, strategies of argumentation, strategies of perspectivization, framing or discourse representation and strategies of intensification and mitigation within the texts. Reisigl and Wodak, “The Discourse-Historical Approach.”
France’s political and religious heritage has played an important role in influencing the mediated discourse surrounding the veil. Throughout the 20th and 21st centuries the practice of Muslim veiling has been represented as incompatible with French “republican values.” To understand why this practice is perceived to be fundamentally un-French, despite being worn by many France-born Muslims, one must comprehend the uniquely French conception of republicanism and secularism. For this reason, this study explores the development and manifestation of secularism, or laïcité, in France and its connection to French republicanism.

These values are fundamental to French society. Therefore, although the drafters of the ban did not explicitly list them among the government’s reasons for the ban, they nevertheless created a powerful frame used to make the “Burqa Ban” appear legitimate and necessary.

Finally, this study concludes with a discussion of the implications of the frames used (and not used) in legitimating the “Burqa Ban” in the French press. It demonstrates the difficulty of generating new frames to describe a problem and the effectiveness of deploying commonly used frames.

The Veil and French Republicanism

*This is an important decision for the values of the Republic*
- François Fillon, October 8, 2010

As one scholar has noted, France’s reaction to Muslim veiling has been greatly shaped by “France’s republican tradition of thinking about citizenship, the relation of citizenship to membership in social and religious groups, and most importantly secularism or laïcité.”20 Indeed, the frame of “republican values” was one of the most frequently used frames in news coverage of the “Burqa Ban.” In using this frame, politicians and journalists alike suggested that French Republican values were in danger, needed protecting, and were purposefully rejected by the French Muslim population. This strong political and philosophical argument resonated most clearly with the political elite, but also with the general population. Republican values, in the French context, are closely linked with the concept of laïcité, or secularism, and have roots in the

---

French Revolution and Jacobinism.\textsuperscript{21}

Explaining the effectiveness of this frame in legitimating the legislation requires attention to the historical intricacies of French political thinking and the specific French context. Therefore, this study provides a brief history of French republican values, with special attention paid to \textit{laïcité}, illustrating how these concepts are fundamental pillars of the French political ethos and demonstrates the unique problem that the French Muslim population poses for these concepts. This study then will turn to a discussion of how the burqa has been framed as a threat to ‘republican values’. This frame was necessary for two reasons. First, in order to impose a restriction on the expression of religion the state had to demonstrate that the expression posed a legitimate threat to public life, and second, the implications in this frame guaranteed popular public and political support of the ban. Finally, this study concludes with a discussion of the significance of the use of this frame in legitimating the “Burqa Ban.”

\textbf{Secularism, Citizenship, and French Republicanism}

To understand the use of this frame in press coverage of the “Burqa Ban,” an appreciation of French conception of citizenship and secularism and the historical traditions associated with these concepts is absolutely essential. The values inherent in contemporary French republicanism have their roots in the French Revolution. Beginning in 1789, the French Revolution aimed not only to overthrow of the monarchy, but all forms of hierarchical undemocratic power, including the Catholic Church.\textsuperscript{22} Before this time, the French monarchy had ruled by divine right with the belief that God had granted the king sovereignty. The Catholic Church officiated over the ordination of each king and for this reason, Catholicism and the monarchy were deeply intertwined in a system through which their power was mutually validated.

The Roman Catholic Church and the French monarchy were so inseparable that when revolutionaries eliminated the monarchy and began to conceptualize a democratic form of government, they sought to establish a secular state, one as free from religious oppression as it was from monarchial oppression. Indeed, the secular state is one of the most

\textsuperscript{21} Carle, Robert. “Hijab and the Limits of French Secular Republicanism.” Society 41, no. 6 (September 2004): 63.

valued legacies of the Revolution.\textsuperscript{23} For more than a century, however, the separation of church and state remained only partial. The 1905 Act finally imposed complete secularism, prohibiting any state recognition, funding or endorsement of religious groups.\textsuperscript{24}

\textit{Laïcité} was further enshrined in France’s conception of republicanism by the decisions of the Stasi Commission, which established that:

> the secular state, guarantor of freedom of conscience, protects not only freedom of religion and of speech but also the individual; it allows all to freely choose, or not, a spiritual or religious option, to change it, or to renounce it. It makes sure that no group, no community can impose on anyone a belonging or a denominational identity, especially because of his or her origins.\textsuperscript{25}

Here one finds a notion of secularism that differs from the liberal tradition of separation of church and state more familiar to American observers. While American freedom of religion mandates that religion be protected from the state, France’s semi-theocratic heritage led to the belief that the state and its citizens should be protected from religion. In this way, overt expression or identification with a particular religion or religious group may be seen as a threat to the state and its secular values.

During the Revolution, groups known as Jacobin Clubs began to appear. These clubs constituted the most popular political group of the Revolution. Before long, the term “Jacobin” came to refer to anyone who supported revolutionary ideas. Preference for centralization of control and a unity of value systems, characteristic of France, stems from this tradition. In contemporary France, the centralized, unitary Jacobin system necessitates an individualist relation between the state and people. This means that no institutions or groups should represent citizens within a society. The Jacobian philosophy insists that a uniform, republican identity must take precedence over any other aspect of an individual’s identity, be it linguistic, religious, ethnic, or other.\textsuperscript{26}
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put, a citizen’s individuality should be emancipated from the pressures of groups seeking to control members’ identity through coercion. Therefore, within the public sphere, the French people are to relate to one another first and foremost as a single, unitary group of citizens. This can be seen as the greatest guarantor of national identity. In this system, the ethnic citizen does not and should not exist.

For this reason, French notions of integration revolve around assimilation. One should shed one’s minority identity in favor of “Frenchness” and strive to achieve cultural similarity. France’s approach to colonizing Algeria reflected this approach to assimilation. The colonization of Algeria was not merely economic, but cultural as well. The French Republic, to a certain extent, considered the Algerians to be really French. Indeed, as Vivian notes, “much of the historical interaction between France and Algeria was characterized by France’s recurrent assertion that Algeria was essentially French.” They erected French-style architecture in Algerian towns and encouraged the Algerians to adopt the French language. Additionally, in the early days of the Algerian colonization, the French military enacted a policy of forced assimilation that included the unveiling of Algerian women.

Seen in this way, secularism and French republicanism are as deeply intertwined as the monarchy and Catholicism. If French republicanism mandates a uniform populace, then religion must remain wholly absent from the public sphere. Within this framework, Christianity and Judaism present no real threat to republican values because, in most cases, there is no outward or “ostentatious” marker of “otherness” among these groups. They are rarely seen wearing overt markers of their faith and do not often participate in public expressions of their religion such as praying in the streets. French Muslims, however, are a highly visible and identifiable group both ethnically and religiously. The majority of French Muslims are of North African heritage. Therefore, they are ethnically distinct from those members of the French population whose ancestry is strictly European. Furthermore, many Muslim women practice veiling, choosing to wear the burqa, niqab,
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or hijab. These veils, though not historically Muslim, today function as the most recognizable symbol of Islam. These outward markers of religious membership are seen as a threat to French republicanism, a refusal to assimilate and a violation of laïcité.

**The Muslim Population in France**

Muslims have been part of French society for more than a century. They constitute a large and highly visible portion of the French population. In fact, France has the largest population of Muslims – an estimated 10% - of any European country, the majority of whom are of North African descent. Islam is now the second largest and fastest growing religion in France. This growth has been accompanied by ethnic tensions between Muslims and non-Muslims.

The first influx of North Africans into France took place between 1915 and 1918. During this time, France recruited approximately 150,000 laborers from its colonies in North Africa. The French government transported these workers to France and later granted them citizenship. The majority of laborers came from the French colonies of Morocco, Algeria and Tunisia. Typically, the government only recruited men for labor. However, many of the men who immigrated as laborers later called upon their families to join them in France.

**Veiling and Laïcité**

Since the veil controversy first emerged in 1989, it has been tied to the concept of laïcité, one of the most fundamental republican values. During the Creil Affair, the headmaster justified his decision to suspend the two young girls for wearing hijabs by claiming that it violated laïcité by placing a highly visible marker of religion in the most sacred of secular institutions, the public school. By asserting the girls right to
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wear religious attire, the Council d’état reinforced laïcité and asserted the state as a governing entity that would not restrict religious expression. It qualified this decision by stating that such attire should not be “ostentatious or provocative” in a way that could constitute propaganda.\textsuperscript{40} Using this element of the decision, the Minister of Education, Lionel Jospin, issued a (non-binding) document stating that “ostentatious or provocative” symbols should not be worn in schools.\textsuperscript{41} Throughout the 1990’s, girls continued to challenge administrators by wearing headscarves and state and national officials continued to search for ways of outlawing these symbols from public schools. Tensions continued to rise as the issue remained unresolved.

In 2003, President Jacques Chirac established the Stasi Commission to investigate the application of the principles of laïcité in the Republic\textsuperscript{42} and tasked it with producing a report detailing suggestions for implementation.\textsuperscript{43} Chirac’s government highly publicized these conclusions and sought to harness laïcité’s broad public legitimacy to shape a new consensus about how to best integrate the large and increasingly visible French-Muslim population.\textsuperscript{44} As part of this plan, the report called for a law banning “ostentatious” religious symbols in public schools. It argued that the purpose of public schools was to assure “autonomy” and “openness to cultural diversity” and that the assumption of secularity was inherent.\textsuperscript{45} This resulted in the 2004 law banning “ostentatious” religious symbols in schools. Although in theory this law applied to all religions, many Muslims saw it as an attack on their faith.\textsuperscript{46}

In this way, the Commission established the defense of laïcité as grounds for limiting the expression of difference and even the expression of cultural and religious identity.\textsuperscript{47} The Commission reaffirmed assimilation as the best means of integration, cautioning that:
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...the exacerbation of cultural identity should not become a fanatical defense of difference, binging with it oppression and exclusion. In a secular society, each person must be able to take some distance with regard to tradition. The law itself reflects the importance of secularism in French society.48

This decision set an important precedent. It created legal justification for the limitation of individual and religious expression. For this reason, it was essential that the burqa be framed as a threat to “republican values,” particularly, laïcité. In framing the act of full veiling this way, the French press created a scenario in which policy makers were justified in limiting the religious expression of Muslim women.

The law banning full veiling makes no mention of Islam, Muslims, the burqa, or niqab.49 This marks it as a secular bill because it does not overtly regulate religion or a religious practice. In this way, laïcité is preserved. However, Sarkozy himself has made it clear that the law is intended to target the practice of full veiling.50 He repeatedly insisted that the veil is unwelcome in France. This insistence was coupled with the law’s widely used nickname, the “Burqa Ban.”

Many scholars have found the tension caused by veiling in France to be binary in nature. Ardizzoni discussed the rhetoric surrounding the veil in France as being couched in terms of restricting binaries: secularism vs. Islam, Us vs. Them, and East vs. West.51 Silverman argued that the initial headscarf affair in 1989 was constructed in terms of a “binary opposition between secularism and difference” in a debate in which “Islam denotes religion whereas the secular republic is beyond religion; Islam as obscurantist and anti-rational where as the secular republic is founded on the rationalist principles of the Enlightenment.”52
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For Croucher, this binary is manifest as a conflict between Islam and Christianity and the inability of a government institution to control identity formation and negotiation effectively.\(^{53}\)

Implicit in most discussions of the veil in France is the necessitation of assimilation mandated by a neocolonial interpretation of laïcité. Gudykunst and Kim define assimilation as “a state that reflects a maximum convergence of strangers’ internal conditions with those of the natives and a minimum maintenance of the original cultural habits.”\(^{54}\) While they argue that assimilation creates more “functional” immigrants, other scholars assert that assimilation can lead to feelings of isolation, depression, hatred toward the host culture, and to a state of monoculturalism.\(^{55}\)

All this is not to say France is racist, nor that it has a “race problem.” Rather, it seems, that France is wrestling with issues faced by all former colonial powers. The challenges that the Muslim population poses to French republican values, first raised by colonialism, have been exacerbated by globalism and a seemingly irresistible trend towards cultural homogenization. In an article published by AFP, France’s Justice Minister acknowledged this difficulty, arguing that “at a time where our societies are becoming more global and complex, the French people are pondering the future of their nation. Our responsibility is to show vigilance and reaffirm our commonly-shared values.”\(^{56}\)

“An Important Decision for the Values of the Republic”

Having discussed French republicanism and the values therein, one must now ask, what are the republican values referred to in French press coverage of the “Burqa Ban?” How are they used and to what end? The two most commonly used values in connection

\(^{53}\) Croucher, “French-Muslims and the Hijab: An Analysis of Identity and the Islamic Veil in France”


\(^{56}\) “French lawmakers approve full veil ban.”
with “republican values” are laïcité (secularism) and the government frame of living together. Discourse in the press also treated gender equality as a republican value. Most often, however, the press used the threat posed to “republican values” as a stand-alone frame, void of any description or qualification. “Republican values,” then, should be read as the values of secularism, assimilation, and gender equality. The first two of these values, being enshrined in the founding principles of French republicanism, are values that no French citizen could object to. Therefore, even at its most basic level, the frame of “republican values” is both powerful and persuasive.

Press coverage of the “Burqa Ban” framed French “republican values” as being threatened
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or in need of protecting. This frame was extremely effective in legitimating the “Burqa Ban” because any reasonable citizen would want to protect their national values. It is also an argument that was necessary in order to justify the codification of such restrictions.

This frame was particularly salient because, as Le Figaro reports, many French citizens “worried about their country in decline. Many of them expressed fear that communitarianism is weakening national cohesion and solidarity.” Communitarianism, or, communautarisme, is considered to be a danger, underpinning this is the assumption that, if society becomes divided into different and clearly identifiable groups, these groups will ultimately come into conflict with one another. This reference to the precarious balance which national cohesion must constantly negotiate can, understood in the context of French republicanism and its ideal, uniform populace, be conceived as a failure by the Muslim population to satisfactorily integrate into French society. This perceived failure to integrate points to the fact that both ethnically and religiously, Muslims in France constitute a highly visible subset of the population, a subset which, according to this particular political philosophy, ought not exist.

The fears expressed by Le Figaro are made more apparent when one considers that “71 percent of the French believe that their country is in decline (against 66 percent in 2005).” Indeed, the ongoing fiscal crisis and high unemployment rates gripping Europe have triggered fear and strong antipathy towards immigrants and many are asking themselves
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what it means to be French today. However, many French believe that the country is capable of reform. The “Burqa Ban,” then, became necessary in order to reverse national decline because full veiling was framed “contrary to the basic requirements of living together in French society.” This law offered a solution to the problems the burqa came to symbolize.

The ethnic and religious visibility of Muslims in French society also contributed to the perceived threat to secularism and other republican values. Indeed, “as the Muslims are of a greater visibility, non-Muslims have the feeling of being invaded.” This feeling is complicated by the growth in the Muslim population during the past century. The visible growth and the challenges that accompanied it have given rise to a number of questions. In an interview with Le Figaro, Henri Guaino insisted:

> behind the burqa is a question essential for our future: ultimately, what kind of society do we want to live in? Yes or no, do we want a Republic? Yes or no, do we reject communitarianism? Yes or no do we want gender equality? Yes or no do we want to defend our identity, our way of life, our conception of secularism? Now is the time that each must answer.

This is a clear and effective move to rally French citizens behind the ban. It implied that continuing to allow the burqa to be worn publicly would signal the downfall of French society and the republican values that underpin it. Guaino’s insistence that “now is the time” made the threat feel imminent, as if a decision to ban the burqa had to be made immediately, for the sake of France.

The high visibility of the Muslim population, symbolized by the burqa, is seen as rejection of “republican values” because it suggests that Muslims have chosen membership to their religion over French
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citizenship. This is intolerable under the French conception of secular republicanism. Therefore, a law needed to be passed in order to promote effective assimilation by forcing French Muslim women to cast off the garments that publicly mark their allegiance to Islam.

The press consistently framed the act of banning the burqa as necessary in order to protect the republican value of living together. This is closely tied to ideas of assimilation and integration inherent in French republicanism. By wearing burqas and niqabs, Muslim women publicly mark themselves as followers of Islam, a practice inconsistent with that of a uniform populace. In fact, Justice Minister Michèle Alliot Marie praised the bill, insisting that the burqa constituted “a refusal of the spirit of the Republic, by openly questioning the idea of integration.”

The “citizenship course” offered to women who have been caught wearing the full veil in public places as an alternative to paying a fine reflected the concern over the failure of some Muslims to integrate into French society. The assumption here is that if the women are educated on what it means to be a French citizen, they will assimilate more effectively and embrace French republicanism. The “citizenship course” suggests that French Muslims do not share the same history or culture as other French citizens.

The popular support that the ban received reflected the effectiveness of the frame that the burqa threatened “republican values.” French papers reported that “more than eight in 10 people in France said they would approve of a ban on Muslim women wearing full veils in public,” and that only 17 percent of French people opposed a ban on burqas. The salience of this frame was also reflected in the outcomes of the vote taken on the ban in both the National Assembly and the Senate. The National Assembly approved the ban by a vote of 355 to one while the Senate approved it by an overwhelming majority of 246 to one.
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Contesting the Dominant Frame

Interestingly, the defense of “republican values” was not a universally accepted frame. In fact, many editorials and interviews rejected this frame, suggesting that it distracted from the real problems faced by society. Though he considered the burqa to be an “attack on republican principles of equality and anticommunitarianism,” Jean-Michel Quillardet, president of the International Observatory of Secularism, expressed fears that “secular fundamentalists…are now using the defense of secularism to fight the ‘Islamization of society’… this is particularly disturbing because these people never talk about secularism against Christianity or Judaism, even though there is fundamentalism in all religions.”

Furthermore, in an editorial examination of France’s “national mood,” Le Monde reporter Gerard Courtois asserted that while Le Monde denounces “all obscurantism, fundamentalism and practices detrimental to human rights or dignity of women (and the wearing of the full veil)… the problem is not the principles, but the relevance of the means used to enforce them effectively.” These opinions represented opposition to the frame, but not to the ban itself. It is the means of achieving the results that Quillardet and Courtois questioned. This is because many believed that the law would be difficult to enforce and would unfairly stigmatize a vulnerable group.

Other editorials pointed out discrepancies in the enforcement and protection of laïcité. In a section entitled Vos choix which closely resembles the US model of Letters to the Editor, a reader asked his fellow countrymen how such a law could be imposed “when we allow all our soccer players to sign (cross themselves) on many occasions when they go on the field, or pray to a god when they score a goal?” This illustrates the inconsistencies of laïcité. With most of France being Roman Catholic (by heritage if not by practice), such an act would not be considered an affront to national values because it appeals to a value (Christianity) that most members of the French population share. A similar discrepancy can be found in the text of the law itself. Although it outlaws full-face
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coverings in all public places, an exception is made in the verbiage of the bill for “Father Christmas costumes.” In this way, full-face coverings worn by Muslim women are banned, yet an exception is made for Santa Claus costumes. Although he is a secular figure, Santa Claus is inextricably linked to the Christian holy holiday of Christmas. Here again, the religious expression of a group of “outsiders” is regulated while an exception is made for those whose values are considered mainstream.

These discrepancies reflect the inherent ambiguousness of frames such as “republican values.” The meaning of these values vary from person to person, yet everyone believes in protecting what they deem to be “republican values.” It is for this reason that the frame was so salient.

Conclusion
The success of this frame in legitimating and necessitating the “Burqa Ban” is not surprising. As numerous articles examined for this project indicate, France is in the midst of an identity crisis. High levels of unemployment, economic distress, and social tensions, call for immigration reform, and the effects of globalization are taking their toll on this once culturally unique country. Many French citizens feel that their culture, their language, and their values have been threatened by these forces. Given this tense societal climate, framing a law as necessary for the protection of foundational French republican values virtually guarantees popular support.

The social tensions, immigration concerns and cultural heterogeneity that France is experiencing today are considered by many to be a product of failed assimilation. Therefore, emphasizing the importance of republican values such as “living together,” “respecting the same values,” and integration was an effective way to legitimate legislation to such threats because no French citizen could object to these values. This frame functioned to unite French citizens under the cause of protecting their fundamental national values.
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Since French revolutionaries overthrew the monarchy and its cohort, the Roman Catholic Church, *laïcité*, or secularism, has been an essential component of French republican identity. French Muslims pose a unique threat to that value because they are an ethnically and religiously visible group. The burqa itself is seen as a jarring marker of religiosity in public sphere, an imposition of the private into the public, and a rejection of secularism. This is exacerbated by the practice of many Muslims, particularly in Paris and its suburbs, of praying in the streets. Evoking *laïcité* as a value that must be protected from these attacks functions as philosophical and political argument against the Muslim "other." Because *laïcité* is a value born congruent with the Republic itself, it is virtually unquestionable. Indeed, the strength of this value is reflected in how infrequently the press challenged its implementation.

In the French press, the burqa became a symbol of outside forces that threaten to weaken democracy from the inside.\(^81\) It represents "the will of certain fundamentalist Muslims to question the values underlying the republican pact and humanism,"\(^82\) and "a refusal of the spirit of the Republic, who lives openly, and calls into question the idea of integration."\(^83\) By framing the burqa and niqab as a challenge, threat or rejection of republican values, the French press created an argument against these articles of clothing guaranteed to persuade their audience. Republican values, after all, are values that no French citizen can object to. Therefore, in a time of deep national uncertainty, discourse in the press made the ban appear necessary in order to safeguard French culture. In short, it became the answer to France’s national identity crisis.

Finally, and most importantly, by establishing the act of wearing the burqa or niqab as a threat to “republican values,” the French press created a rhetorical situation in which the limitation of religious expression could be legally justified. In order to ban the burqa, the historical and legal precedence set by the Stasi Commission in 2004 made it necessary for the burqa to be framed in this manner. Therefore, this frame was not accidental, nor was it original. Actors in the French press selected this frame from the traditional stock of frames that have
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been used in connection with Muslim veiling since controversy first arose in 1989. The use of this frame then, not only guaranteed popular and political support for the ban, by presenting national values as being in danger, it created a situation in which the banning of the burqa was not only legally defensible, it was necessary.

Citizens objected to this frame in interviews and letters to the editor. They suggested that this frame distracted from the real problems faced by French society. Others contested that the law would be difficult to enforce and would unfairly stigmatize Muslims, an already vulnerable group. Some editorials pointed out discrepancies in the enforcement and protection of laïcité. In a letter to the editor, one Frenchman asked his compatriots to consider that soccer players are allowed to pray after scoring a goal, yet Muslim women could not wear a burqa. Such discrepancies reflect the inherent ambiguousness of the frame of “republican values.”

It is significant that opposition to the law was expressed using the same frames intended to support it. This simultaneously emphasizes the effectiveness of dominant, salient frames and the difficulty of advancing a tertiary frame. However, because discourse surrounding the veil traditionally used these frames to delegitimize the practice of veiling, oppositional use of these frames was ineffective.84

This study was limited by the scope of the sample. This project looked only at those articles printed during the month of a legislative decision and the month that the law was enacted. Eleven months elapsed between the date that a draft of the “Burqa Ban” was first proposed and when it became an enforceable law. Of those eleven months, only five were included in the sample. This limited the time frame of the study and may have resulted in the exclusion of additional frames not present during the months analyzed here.

In order to create a manageable sample size, this project used random sampling. The creation of a manageable sample size naturally results in the exclusion of some articles from the data set. Including all articles published by the selected sources would have created a more complete research project. Scholars wishing to expand this area of research would be well advised to include news articles from Arabic publications in France.

Finally, as the primary sources that inform this study represent

84 This opposition is deemed ineffective because discourse in the press primarily focused on the ban’s broad support. The law ultimately passed with a sweeping majority and since its enactment in April of 2011, little coverage has been given to the law.
regional perspectives and are associated with differing ideologies, future scholars of this topic are advised to compare and contrast French press coverage of the ban. In doing so, one may discover a more nuanced view of the issue.
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The Evolution of a Massacre in
Newspaper Depictions of the Sioux Indians at
Wounded Knee, 1876 - 1891

Erik K. Clabaugh

By examining a chain of events beginning with Custer’s defeat at Little Bighorn, and culminating in the weeks and months following the Wounded Knee Massacre, this paper identifies an evolution in newspaper portrayals of Native Americans, and the Sioux in particular, in relation to the massacre itself. Previous scholarly research has focused primarily on the culpability of the press regarding their reportage leading up to Wounded Knee. This paper does not concentrate on issues of responsibility. Rather, it illustrates the ways in which depictions of the Sioux and the massacre evolved over time.

The Massacre

As the sun rose over the frozen fields near Wounded Knee Creek, South Dakota on December 29, 1890, the women of the Lakota Sioux were singing.\(^1\) They had reason to sing. Although surrounded on all sides by soldiers of the 7\(^{th}\) U.S. Cavalry Regiment, the Lakota were hopeful. They believed that they would soon be on their way to the Pine Ridge Agency where they would receive much needed rations and be reunited with their “Oglala cousins.”\(^2\) It is generally believed that the Lakota numbered 120 men and 230 women and children.\(^3\)

The previous day, on their way to Pine Ridge, Major Samuel Whitside and his forces intercepted the Indians. The Lakota leader, Big Foot, immediately ordered the flag of surrender raised. Whitside and his troops accompanied Big Foot and his people to Wounded Knee Creek, an area better known to the Indians as Cankpe Opi Wakpala. There, they made camp for the night. Colonel James W. Forsyth arrived later that evening with reinforcements. The ranking officer, Forsyth, was to “take command of the arrest and disarming of Big Foot’s band.”\(^4\)

---

2 Conger Beasley Jr., *We are People in This World* (Fayetteville: University of Arkansas Press, 1995), 96.
3 The exact number is unknown; Dee Brown, *Bury My Heart at Wounded Knee* (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1970), 441.
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On the morning of the 29th, shortly after a breakfast of hardtack, bacon, and coffee with sugar, Colonel Forsyth “asked the Indians to leave their tepees and come forward to a council, where they could be counted.” Once assembled, Forsyth requested that the Lakota surrender their weapons. Unsatisfied with the number and conditions of the armaments produced by the Indians, Forsyth ordered a search of the camp and body searches of the Indian men.

It is at this point in the retelling where agreement as to what occurred largely ends. According to popularly accepted accounts, one of the Lakota warriors refused to surrender his weapon to the soldiers. In some versions of this story he is named Black Fox, in others he is called Black Coyote. In certain instances the warrior is said to be deaf; in others he is simply reluctant to relinquish his weapon because of its value. In some it is avoidable, in others inevitable, but in all versions, a single shot is fired as he tried to hold on to his gun.

In response, the men of the 7th Cavalry opened fire on the Sioux with side arms, rifles, and four Hotchkiss Cannons. Because of their position encircling the encampment, the soldiers suffered casualties as the result of friendly fire. The soldiers fired on themselves, the Indian men, women and children. As the Sioux ran, they were hunted down and killed, sometimes miles from the encampment. When they took shelter in the ravines, they were systematically shot to death. By the end of that day, scores of Lakota men, women, and children had been killed.

What and Why?

For a matter of much historical and cultural importance, surprisingly little is known with any “certainty” about the events that unfolded near Wounded Knee Creek, South Dakota on December 29, 1890. Questions of motivations, who fired the first shot, and the exact number of the dead and wounded remain unknown.

This is not to say that everything that occurred there that winter day is shrouded in mystery. Authorities and stakeholders have established, and concur on, a number of fundamental details. For example, there is no debate about where this event occurred. There is

---
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no controversy surrounding the date it took place, and the identity of the combatants is agreed upon.

However, if we view the events through the lens of the journalistic “Five Ws” popularized by Pulitzer’s “new journalism,” a murkier picture begins to emerge.  

That is, when we consider Wounded Knee from the perspective of who, what, when, where and why, it becomes apparent that while consensus exists regarding matters of who, when, and where, the nature of what occurred, and why, are far more troublesome.

In fact, these issues have proven so problematic that disagreement has existed for more than 100 years regarding the character of the conflict itself. Over the past forty or fifty years, the advent of the civil rights movement in America, and the nascent ascendency of Native American studies as a field of scholarship have firmly shifted popular opinion toward understanding Wounded Knee as a “massacre.” Nevertheless, at various times in the past, the massacre has been described as a “fight,” a “skirmish,” and perhaps most frequently as a “battle.” Today, the historic marker located at the site neatly illustrates these changing perceptions. A piece of wood reading “massacre” has been nailed to the marker to replace the original word, “battle.”

The lack of lucidity regarding what happened at Wounded Knee and why, can be partially attributed to the nature of the events themselves. Any violent encounter involving hundreds of people necessarily invites confusion and ambiguity. However, additional cause for this record of uncertainty can be ascribed to the coverage and commentary provided by the press. Much of the pre-massacre reportage can be characterized as xenophobic, inaccurate, jingoistic, and ultimately reflective of what American culture and literature scholar Gordon Brotherston ominously describes as “… the darker side of Manifest Destiny.”

Such reports are hardly surprising. As Juan Gonzalez and Joseph Torres observe, from the appearance of Harris’ Publick Occurrences forward, the nation’s press labored to create a long-standing “white racial narrative” by “routinely portraying non-white minorities as threats to white society and by reinforcing racial ignorance, group hatred, and discriminatory government policies.” This narrative regularly cast Native Americans as savages, who, despite their primitive customs and
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beliefs, possessed a highly sophisticated and seemingly inexhaustible capacity for treachery and deceit. Even more to the point, these accounts sought to popularize and add legitimacy to the notion that the Native American people were “undeserving of the vast lands coveted by the European settlers.” Thus, by perpetuating a two-fold discourse of fear and contempt, early newspapers made Manifest Destiny appear all the more “manifest” and worked to assuage any feelings of collective guilt associated with the nation’s genocidal westward expansion.

What is surprising, then, is that after the massacre at Wounded Knee, a number of newspapers deviated—even if only slightly—from this well-worn white racial narrative. In some instances, papers that had previously been sites of strong anti-Indian sentiment ran pieces that either directly or indirectly challenged the actions, competency, and moral leadership of the military. In others, they presented accounts that focused on the human toll of the tragedy by detailing the senseless slaughter of Indian women and children. After a time, at least one newspaper seemed to break with the narrative entirely by giving voice to one of the Sioux survivors. These accounts, in combination with the coverage afforded the massacre by newspapers outside the white mainstream press, are important because they provide a foundation for the evolution in the popular understanding of the events that transpired at Wounded Knee.

While a number of previous scholarly efforts have focused on the culpability of the press vis-à-vis their coverage of events leading up to the massacre, this project traces press depictions of the Sioux in an effort to identify how these portrayals changed over time. By following a chain of historical events beginning with the defeat of Custer and the 7th Cavalry Regiment at Little Bighorn, and concluding in the weeks and months that followed the Wounded Knee Massacre, this paper reveals the first stages of an evolution—an evolution of how a tragedy and people were framed in the nation’s press, an evolution from a battle to a massacre.

**Historical Location and Method**

This examination is historically located between the years of 1876

---
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and 1891. In the context of this research, the Battle of the Little Bighorn and the Wounded Knee Massacre serve as necessarily related bookends that demarcate and situate the temporal boundaries of this study.

With the time period established, this research focused primarily on an examination of the 500 newspapers available through the Gale Digital Collections- 19th Century U.S. Newspapers database. The Gale database provides full-text content and images from newspapers of the period from throughout the United States. A series of keyword searches were used to cull relevant articles and a simple textual analysis was employed to establish the tenor and tone of the pieces. Although many of the newspapers considered herein were/are geographically located in the American West and Mid-West regions, pains were taken to include newspaper accounts and depictions from all areas of the country in an effort to provide a more comprehensive analysis. This paper considers content from twenty-four newspapers located in fifteen states. Papers from the American Northern, Southern, Western, and Mid-Western regions are all represented.

Custer, Press Depictions & Public Sentiment

The Wounded Knee Massacre can be regarded as the final link in a chain of events that began on June 25, 1876 at the Battle of the Little Bighorn. The defeat of the 7th Cavalry Regiment of the United States Army and the killings of General George Armstrong Custer and his entire battalion constituted a decisive victory for the Lakota, Northern Cheyenne, and Arapaho Indian forces. Tales of the battle quickly earned public interest as they were “propelled by the instant notoriety of Custer’s defeat.”

As a Civil War hero, relentless self-promoter, and icon of the American frontier, Custer enjoyed the adoration of both the public and the press. His popularity seemed to reach its zenith in 1874 when the publication of his memoir, My Life on the Plains, coincided with his expedition’s discovery of gold in the Black Hills of South Dakota. Newspapers of the time featured humorous, nostalgic reminiscences about his rocky career at West Point. A mediocre student, Custer by his own admission did not graduate with his class because he was, “locked… up… in the guardhouse…” for neglecting his duties as

officer of the day and failing to stop a fight. Despite this inauspicious start, his flamboyant and aggressive military tactics quickly endeared him to the press. What’s more, his cultivated demeanor and dashing appearance made Custer a celebrity amongst a legion of readers anxious to romanticize his military accomplishments. As James E. Mueller observes, “His clothing and long, golden hair and flowing mustache gave him a look that was easy to remember. It was a look that inspired hero worship in men and crushes in girls.” Another 1874 article from the Arizona Weekly Miner typified the fawning coverage afforded the General. “He is a great man, a noble man is General Custer… manners as gentle and comely as the traditional prince… I have never sat with a more courteous host, or generous entertainer, or polished conversationalist.” For many, Custer was more than a man; he was an “indestructible hero.”

Given Custer’s legendary status in life, it is perhaps understandable that the press sensationalized his death. Despite a complete dearth of verifiable eyewitness accounts, stories detailing his fate and emphasizing the barbarous actions of the Sioux proliferated. Chicago’s Daily Inter Ocean reported:

The Yellow-haired Chief’s body was not respected by the savages, but horribly mutilated. The death-wound was given by a chief known as Rain-in-the-Face, who, after killing Custer, cut out his heart, elevated it on the point of his lance, and waved it aloft while his followers executed a war-dance around him.

This recounting of events is almost certainly untrue. Despite being
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false, the oft-repeated Rain-in-the-Face story captured—or alternately, helped to manufacture—the zeitgeist to the extent that it inspired Henry Wadsworth Longfellow to pen the poem, *The Revenge of Rain-In-The-Face*. It reads, in part:

```
But the foemen fled in the night,
And Rain-in-the-Face, in his flight,
Uplifted high in air
As a ghastly trophy, bore
The brave heart, that beat no more,
Of the White Chief with yellow hair. 24
```

Such high-profile accounts served to amplify existing public attitudes towards the Sioux, who held the distinction of being simultaneously respected, feared, and vilified. Even in the context of the dominant white racial narrative perpetuated by the nation’s press, the Sioux were portrayed as a particularly threatening people. Evidence of this is eloquently, if disturbingly, captured in this description from the *Milwaukee Sentinel*:

```
In reality the Sioux is the only great Indian since the decay of the Iroquois. He has more natural intelligence than any wild nation we know of, but is branded with wickedness… When Goethe drew the merry demon Mephistopheles he drew the Sioux… [They] and the wild horse… meet in equal depravity… their union is the Centaur, the winged murderer, the mounted Cain. 25
```

The defeat of Custer and his forces at Little Bighorn set the stage for the events to follow. The death of a beloved General and the subsequent press coverage served to galvanize public opinion of the Sioux as a singularly dangerous and adept enemy. Years later, this perception was to be further enhanced by the press through the misinterpretation and inaccurate depictions of a sacred Indian rite, the Ghost Dance.

**A Difficult Time**

---

The 1880s were not kind to the Lakota. By 1877, the majority of the tribe had been forced onto reservations and the following decade saw a series of treaties and agreements that steadily decreased the size of their land. In 1886, Senator Henry Dawes sponsored legislation that “subdivided the Indians’ ancestral holdings by allotting each family a parcel of 160 acres, which the families were expected to farm in a manner that would make them self-sufficient.”

The Dawes Severalty Act was introduced as a method for “civilizing” the Indians. An article from the Boston Daily Advertiser observed:

The whole plan is to break up the tribes, individualize the Indians, make them self supporting on their own land, throw open the reservations to white settlement, and settle the Indian problem by education and the contact of civilization.

Dawes, confident in the effects of his legislation, noted that, “the question of the Indian as an Indian in this country is ended.”

Despite Dawes’ assurances, it quickly became evident that the Act failed to account for a host of practical concerns. Forced into a new mode of subsistence, many of the Lakota attempted farming, but found they lacked the necessary tools. In his testimony before the 48th Congress, Sitting Bull lamented, “You have sent me here and advised me to live as you do… I want you to send me some agricultural implements, so that I will not be obliged to work bare-handed.”

In addition to an absence of tools, the Lakota faced environmental challenges. The searing summers and arid soil of South Dakota were not conducive to farming. During the 1880s, the Northern Plains experienced a severe drought and a series of grasshopper infestations, which wiped out the few crops that survived the already
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inhospitable conditions.\textsuperscript{31} The 1891 Annual Report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs detailed the situation, “Suddenly, almost without warning, they [the Lakota] were expected at once and without previous training to settle down to the pursuits of agriculture in a land largely unfitted for such use.”\textsuperscript{32}

Instead of affording the Sioux a new, self-sufficient way of living, the Dawes Severalty Act ultimately resulted in an even heavier Indian reliance on government food rations. Poor soil, a lack of tools and experience, adverse weather conditions and plagues of insects all conspired to make farming untenable. In combination with the disappearance of the buffalo, and an outbreak of “Black-Leg” disease amongst their livestock, left the Sioux with little other nourishment.\textsuperscript{33}

As dependence on food rationing increased, the rations themselves were diminishing. In violation of existing treaties, the government had been decreasing rations to the Sioux since the 1870s.\textsuperscript{34} By the early part of the 1880s, they were receiving only two-thirds of the quantity of beef rations they were promised.\textsuperscript{35} As a result, by the winter of 1889, starvation was rampant, and many of the Sioux children were dying.\textsuperscript{36}

Concurrently, disease spread through the Lakota community. In 1889 and 1890, the Lakota suffered large-scale outbreaks of measles, whooping cough, and influenza.\textsuperscript{37} These epidemics added to both the misery of the Sioux and the growing death toll.

Given this backdrop of suffering, the Lakota were instantly captivated when they caught wind of tales of salvation coming from the West. A new religion had been born and was quickly spreading throughout Native American communities. A hybridization of Judeo-Christian and Native American beliefs, this new faith offered the promise of reunion with departed loved ones and a return to prosperity.

Wovoka and The Ghost Dance

The Ghost Dance religion originated with a Paiute Indian from
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Western Nevada named Wovoka. Also known by the Wasichu name Jack Wilson, Wovoka’s youth was heavily influenced by interaction with white settlers and exposure to Christianity. Orphaned at the age of fourteen, he went to work as a ranch hand for a local family with strong Christian beliefs. In an 1894 issue of the *Morning Oregonian*, Rene Bache described Wovoka’s religious upbringing:

> The boy Wivoka [sic] became attached to the family of a stockman in Mason valley named David Wilson. From this association he gained some knowledge of English, together with a confused idea of the white man’s theology, modifications of which enter into the religion of the ghost dance.

Wovoka adopted Wilson’s name, and practiced as a Christian until the age of thirty, when, during a solar eclipse, he experienced a profound vision. Wovoka’s vision foretold of the second coming of Christ, who would reveal himself to the Indians and usher in a new world, an Indian utopia. The buffalo and other game destroyed by settlers would return, and the white man would disappear. All of the Indians, both living and dead, were to be reunited and would live without the threat of disease and free from misery.

Importantly, Wovoka stressed non-violence in his new religion. Relying on some of the same theological tenets as Christianity, “Wovoka exhorted his converts not to hurt anyone, not to fight, always to be good and to work hard.” As these sentiments suggest, the Ghost
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Dance religion preached a form of benign surrender rather than active resistance.

The ritual Ghost Dance was central to the fulfillment of the prophecy. As Wovoka himself explained, “All Indians must dance, everywhere, keep on dancing... tell Indians to send word to all Indians to keep up dancing and the good time will come.”47 In his now famous work, *Black Elk Speaks*, the Lakota Holy Man recalls the instructions Wovoka shared with members of his tribe, “they must dance a ghost dance... If they did this, they could get on this other world when it came, and the Wasichus would not be able to get on, and so they would disappear.”48

Word of the prophecy spread quickly, and the Ghost Dance was embraced by a variety of tribes, including the Lakota. Again, Black Elk recalls, “it seemed that everywhere people believed all that we had heard, and more... I heard the gossip that was everywhere now... I heard many wonderful things...”49

Ignoring its roots in pseudo-Christian theology, newspapers seized upon the Ghost Dance and quickly incorporated it into the dominant white racial narrative by describing it in wildly ethnocentric terms. Thus, in Chicago’s *Daily Inter Ocean*, this dance that was intended to reconcile Indians with departed loved ones became “ghastly,” “horrible,” “reckless,” and “induced by blind religious fanaticism.”50 The *Rocky Mountain News* described the Ghost Dance as “a most horrible thing,” noting that its practitioners “foam at the mouth like mad dogs.”51 The piece concludes by suggesting that ritual self-mutilation was not far off, “They do not yet cut their bodies, but that will soon come.”52 Not to be outdone, the *Los Angeles Times* ran a story featuring a first-hand account that seemed to suggest that merely witnessing the event was enough to alter the psyche and inspire dread in soldiers. “They returned without executing the order, both officers being in a dazed condition and fearing the powers of
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Kicking Bear’s medicine.” And, in a most startling, yet matter-of-fact telling, a post trader’s wife supplied a morbid account of the Ghost Dance that included acts of cannibalism:

One of the braves was to go into a trance... he would come to life as a buffalo. They were then to kill the buffalo, and every Indian who did not eat a piece of him would become a dog... I suppose they have killed and eaten him by this time.54

Further playing to sensationalism, other newspapers portrayed the Ghost Dance as a harbinger of violent Indian uprising. Such depictions are particularly tragic in light of the peaceful tenets of the religion itself. Nevertheless, the Atchison Daily Globe ran a bold-face headline proclaiming, “The Ghost Dance. Fanaticism Nearing To Bloodshed.”55 The article itself suggested that, “[The Indians] openly threatened to cut off the ears of the soldiers...” and “they have strapped on their guns and are dancing fully armed.”56 As far away as the Raleigh, North Carolina, the papers warned, “The dancing Indians have the agency and the surrounding country in a state of terror... the fight may be expected at any moment.”57 Similarly, the Atchison Champion cautioned its readers that “The Redskins at Wounded Knee Indulge in a Regular War Dance.”58 The text of the article further amplifies the threat, “over 2,000 Indians at Wounded Knee... resumed the ghost dance with many warlike accompaniments... they were formed in the regular war dance proper and were swearing vengeance upon the whites...”59

These accounts clearly contradicted the peaceful ideals that guided the Ghost Dance religion. Yet, they were firmly in line with an already well-established pattern of behavior in which, “press
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organizations consciously misled the public and inflamed racial bias.”

Importantly, such misrepresentations not only worked to justify the government’s campaign of oppression and soothe the conscience of Anglo-Saxon Americans, they also helped to sell newspapers. In a letter posted from the Pine Ridge Agency, physician John Vance Lauderdale explained to his wife, “There are many reports in the papers that you need not believe. There are half a dozen reporters in the room… who are writing for their bread and spin long yarns for their readers. Their opinions… are of little value.”

In his 1943 essay entitled, “The Last Indian War,” Elmo Watson described the reporting:

> Unverified rumors were presented as reports from reliable sources or eyewitness accounts; idle gossip became fact; and once more a large number of the nation’s newspapers indulged in a field day of exaggeration, distortion and plain faking.

Regardless of authenticity, it is difficult to overestimate the degree to which reports of the Ghost Dance captured the public’s imagination. Performances were regularly put on by touring groups throughout the country and were popular with curious crowds. This excerpt, which ran in the *St. Paul Daily News* on the day of the Wounded Knee Massacre, heralded just such a performance, “A party of six Sioux braves, consisting of one old buck and five young men, have come to Minneapolis, and at the Palace Museum next week will dance their strange ghost dance.”

Announcements of such displays often focused on the “authenticity” and exotic strangeness of the ritual dance. An article in *The Milwaukee Sentinel* provides just such an example, “a band of genuine Sioux Indians, present the wild and weird ghost dance in precisely the same manner that it was performed by the infatuated red skins on our frontier…”

---
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Proof of the societal impact of reportage regarding the Ghost Dance is manifested in stories of the time that describe mock Ghost Dance celebrations put on by non-Indian groups. Headlines such as, “The Cowboys of the Panhaudle [sic] Have a Great Ghost Dance”\(^{65}\) and “The Rusk Guard’s Ghost Dance at the Squadron Armory”\(^{66}\) were common. One such piece describes a “Pow-Wow and Ghost Dance” put on by the Willamette Tribe Number Six of the Improved Order of Red Men. This august organization was described as a “German-speaking lodge, and among the most prosperous fraternal organizations in the city, having a fat bank account and a carefully chosen membership of solid citizens.”\(^{67}\) Clearly, these celebrants enjoyed a different lifestyle than the Indians who turned to the Ghost Dance in hopes of salvation.

Tales of the Ghost Dance figured so centrally in the public imagination that it eventually even found its way into advertising. A long running series of advertisements in New Orleans’ *Daily Picayune* proudly proclaimed, “The ‘Ghost Dance’ is soon to end among the Indians of Dakotas. There is no end, however, to the demand for Marsden’s Pectoral Balm.”\(^{68}\)

Ultimately, the sensationalized, inflammatory reporting of the Ghost Dance influenced the public, and reinforced stereotypes of the Indians, and the Sioux in particular, as a savage and unknowable people bent on violent confrontation. Whether this kind of irresponsible reporting had a hand in preparing the stage for the massacre at Wounded Knee, it certainly helped to set the tone for the coverage that followed.\(^{69}\)

### After the Massacre: Initial Reactions

Much of the press coverage immediately following the Wounded Knee Massacre placed blame squarely on the Sioux and suggested that their deceitfulness made the bloodshed unavoidable. Two days after the massacre, the *Los Angeles Times* reported, “not less than three hundred Sioux paid the penalty of Big Foot’s treachery and the murderous
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assault of his followers on the United States cavalry at close range.”

Similarly, another report published the same day in Chicago posited that, “the treachery of the Indians leading to the skirmish was to have been expected.” Perhaps the *Indianapolis Journal* characterized the alleged treachery most succinctly:

The Indians are treacherous beyond conception, and never more to be feared than when apparently submissive. Their sudden attack in this case was in keeping with many others... Under the circumstances no punishment was too severe.

These initial reports featured prominent quotes from military and political leaders that described the massacre as unfortunate and regrettable but focused on the Sioux as an especially dangerous enemy and seemed to suggest, “they had it coming.” Commanding General Nelson Miles, quoted in Chicago’s *Daily Inter Ocean*, explained, “These Indians under Big Foot were among the most desperate there were. All their movements were anticipated, and their severe loss at the hands of the Seventh Cavalry may be a wholesome lesson to the other Sioux.”

The same article quotes Adjutant General Keller, “It was not to be presumed for a moment that the Indians... would consent to lay down their arms peaceably without a protest.” Keller goes on to explain why the Sioux constituted a fearsome enemy, “He has all the instincts that tend to good marksmanship. A quick eye, a sure touch, and nerves under perfect control... amid the greatest danger he is always cool.”

---
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The papers were quick to link the events of Wounded Knee to the Battle of Little Bighorn. Some intimated that the 7th Cavalry had acted rashly, yet simultaneously pointed to Custer’s defeat as justification for the army’s actions at Wounded Knee. Although it had taken place nearly a decade and a half before the Wounded Knee Massacre, it was clear that the death of Custer and his men was still fresh in the minds of many. The Philadelphia Bulletin wrote, “We may denounce this as barbarous warfare, unworthy of civilized troops, and so it was; but it must be remembered that this is the regiment that lost so many of its members in the Custer Massacre…” The Indianapolis Journal said of the 7th Cavalry, “as these [soldiers] belonged to Custer’s old regiment it would not be strange if they took summary vengeance on the savages.” A recounting in the Kansas City Globe neatly summarized the sentiments of the 7th Cavalry, “along the grim line of boys in blue there were many faces frowning, and not a few murmured their regrets that they could not pay off some of the unsettled scores of 1876. So the “boys in blue” made opportunity later…”

The first newspaper account of the massacre was run on the day of the fighting in the evening edition of the Omaha Daily Bee. Authored by Charles H. Cressy, the report ran with the headlines, “A Bloody Battle” and “Many Red Devils Bite the Dust.” The story itself was brief and offered little more than an acknowledgement that fighting had occurred and that many were wounded.

The following day the Bee ran a more in-depth firsthand account by Cressy. In it, he placed blame for the fighting on the Sioux and claimed that, although unprovoked and vastly outnumbered, it was the Sioux who began firing on the soldiers. “About a dozen of the warriors had been searched when, like a flash, all the rest of them jerked guns from under their blankets and began pouring bullets into the ranks of the soldiers…” Cressy went on to describe the fate of the Indians with an almost gleeful zeal. “But how they were slaughtered after that first volley! The firing lasted half an hour and even as I write these words I hear that
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Hotchkiss pouring shots into the gulleys to the north where a few of the 
reds have taken refuge.”

Cressy’s account made little mention of the Indian women and 
children that were killed or wounded. The picture he paints is that of a 
one sided battle, not a massacre. This passage makes Cressy’s feelings 
quite clear as to who provoked the fight and his opinion concerning the 
actions of the soldiers:

To say that it was a most daring feat, 120 Indians attacking 
500 cavalry expresses the situation but faintly. It could 
have only been insanity which prompted such resistance. 
The members of the Seventh Cavalry have once more 
shown themselves to be heroes in deeds of daring.

Cressy and the Bee did not stand alone in their endorsement of the 
military’s show of force at Wounded Knee. In the early days following 
the massacre a variety of papers espoused similar sentiments. The 
Philadelphia Ledger observed, “The whole management of the campaign 
is highly creditable to the soldiers and their commanders…” The 
Minneapolis Tribune insisted, “If the government will just let General Miles 
alone now he will teach the Sioux a lesson that will be forever profitable 
to the survivors.”

After the Initial Reactions

Interestingly, however, in the days, weeks, and months following 
the first reports, coverage began to appear that was critical of the 
government and the military in light of the massacre. Some of these 
articles expressed outright condemnation, while others took a more 
nuanced approach. Even newspapers that had previously helped to 
stoke the nation’s fear of the Sioux and sensationalized the Ghost Dance 
seemed to alter their position.

On January 5, 1891, Chicago’s Daily Inter Ocean, which just 
days before had run a story blaming the “treachery” of the Sioux for 
the massacre, published a piece entitled, The Children at Wounded Knee.
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Although the article did not express outright disapproval of the military’s excessive use of force, its graphic descriptions of wounded Indian children spoke volumes. In it, the author recounts a visit to an Episcopal church that had been turned into a makeshift hospital to care for the wounded. The author tells of one Sioux boy:

He was a horrible sight, having nothing around him but a blanket and his little bare, lean arms looked pitiful. They were all hungry, and when we fed this little boy we found he could swallow… When I saw him yesterday afternoon he looked worse than the day before, and when they feed him now the food and water come out the side of his neck.  

The Atchison Daily Globe, which prior to the massacre had been a source of strong anti-Indian rhetoric, also seemed to waiver in its position. The headline of two days later read, “Too Many Women and Children Killed.” The body of the article described a series of telegraphed communications between Generals Miles and Schofield in surprisingly frank detail. In rejoinder to a telegram from Schofield celebrating the brave conduct of the 7th Cavalry, Miles responds:

Your telegram… is received, but as the action of the Colonel commanding will be the matter of serious consideration and… will undoubtedly be the subject of investigation… do you wish your telegram transmitted as it was sent?

Miles continues, criticizing the placement of troops and artillery as “fatally defective” and notes, “a large number of soldiers were killed… by fire from their own ranks and a very large number women and children were killed.”

Another piece, written by reporter Carl Smith, paints a harrowing portrait of the battlefield awash in the blood of innocents. “These children lay everywhere, half buried in the snow which had fallen to
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conceal the blood stains which made their trappings of paint and fringe so piteous.”\textsuperscript{91} Then, as if sensing that he had gone too far with his sympathies, Smith qualifies his statement with, “They are, of course, no more pitiable in death… than are the orphans made by the death of the soldiers who went down in the fire.”\textsuperscript{92} He does, however, conclude with the assertion, “That is something that is hardly worth while to pursue.”\textsuperscript{93}

Other newspapers, particularly those outside of the mainstream press, saw no need to qualify their opinions. They immediately understood the confrontation at Wounded Knee as a massacre and did not hesitate to criticize both their fellow news organizations and the government’s handling of the “Indian problem.” For example, the \textit{Cherokee Advocate} took the mainstream press to task for its dehumanizing descriptions of the victims of Wounded Knee saying, “The newspaper correspondents flippantly style the dead as ‘bucks, squaws and papooses.’ It would have been in better taste to have said men, women and children.”\textsuperscript{94} The story goes on to describe the fighting at Wounded Knee as “unnecessary slaughter…” and suggests that the actions of the 7\textsuperscript{th} Cavalry constituted “a wanton destruction of human life by that arm of the Government which should have been their benefactors and protectors instead of their destroyers.”\textsuperscript{95}

Similarly, it is clear that at least one member of the African-American press understood Wounded Knee as a senseless massacre. In his article entitled, \textit{A Bugle Note}, the Reverend Albery A. Whitman laments the fate of the Indians and points out, “that the tendency is to accord a home to every white pauper of Europe, in the lands of this country; even though the most solemn and sacred treaties with the aborigines are violated.”\textsuperscript{96} He suggests that the massacre should serve as a warning to other people of color, “The dead squaws and children of the Wounded Knee, and their homeless wandering survivors, in the bleak and wretched wastes of the Dakotas ought to be at least, a hint to us, that the torch of sentiment is well nigh extinguished in the Anglo-Saxon breast.”\textsuperscript{97}
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Initially newspapers of all kinds were noticeably devoid of Indian accounts or perspectives about the massacre. It was not until February 1891, after an investigation had begun into the conduct of the 7th Cavalry, that the Indians were given a voice in the press. An article from the *Atchison Champion* extensively quotes the testimony of an Indian named American Horse as given in front of the Conference on Indian Affairs. When questioned about the killing of innocent Indian women and children, American Horse recalls:

They had no firearms to fight with... [The soldiers] turned their guns, Hotchkiss, etc., upon the women who were in the lodges, standing there under a flag of truce. The women, who were fleeing with their babies on their backs, were killed together, shot right through.\(^\text{98}\)

He concludes his testimony in part:

Of course it would have been all right if only the men had been killed. We would have been most grateful for it. The fact of the killing of the women, and especially the killing of the young boys and girls who are to go to make up the future strength of the Indian people, is the saddest part of the whole thing, and we feel it very sorely.\(^\text{99}\)

**Conclusion**

The nature of press depictions of the Indians, and the Sioux in particular, evolved over time. Following Custer’s defeat at Little Bighorn, newspapers represented the Sioux as a particularly fearsome, treacherous adversary. Simultaneously respected and feared, the Sioux were singled out in the press as a band apart from their American Indian contemporaries. Later, sensationalized accounts of the Ghost Dance seized the attention of the public at large and the press created the picture of a savage people bent on war.

After Wounded Knee, public and press sentiment towards the Sioux underwent changes that were substantial and worthy of note. Immediately following the massacre, many in the press continued to support the actions that were taken by the 7th Cavalry; however, there were hints of sympathy for the Indians and allusions to the impropriety
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of the military’s conduct. Finally, in the weeks and months that followed, newspapers began to offer Indian perspectives on Wounded Knee and ran stories that focused on the Native American women and children that were killed or wounded. In these instances, the line between “battle” and “massacre” had begun to blur.

It is important to recognize the evolution in coverage related to the Wounded Knee Massacre for several reasons. First, it reveals a break in the pernicious racial narrative perpetuated by the nation’s press. Second, this shift helped to set in motion a gradual change in the popular understanding surrounding the events at Wounded Knee that continues to this day. Finally, and perhaps most importantly, this evolution is significant because it might also be regarded as a brief instant of national self-awareness. Wounded Knee was not the first time that news organizations departed from the dominant racial narrative. Indeed, as Hugh Reilly has observed, signs of balanced coverage can be found in various journalistic accounts surrounding the Great Sioux Uprising, the Sand Creek Massacre, the Nez Perce War and the Cheyenne Outbreak.

Thus, when placed alongside these other departures, the shift in the coverage of Wounded Knee may be understood as one of several tragically fleeting moments of clarity for a nation long drunk on the heady brew of Manifest Destiny.

100 Reilly, Frontier Newspapers, 129-36.
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“Political Demagogues and Over-zealous Partizans”:
Tariff of Abominations and Secession Rhetoric in
the 1828 South Carolina Press

Erika Pribanic-Smith

Robert Barnwell Rhett built a reputation in the 1830s and ‘40s as a “fire-eater” — one of a group of radical politicians set on secession as the only effective means of redress against national policies deemed unequal and oppressive. Rhett laid the foundations for this reputation in 1828, following Congress’ passage of what came to be known as the “Tariff of Abominations.” Then a South Carolina state legislator going by the name Robert Barnwell Smith, the Beaufort native called for revolution in a June address at the Colleton District town of Walterborough that sent a ripple of disunion cries throughout the state.¹ The Charleston Mercury was his megaphone.

Founder of the Charleston Mercury and sole editor for its first 15 years, Henry Laurens Pinckney descended from a long line of politicians and war heroes, and his kin were among the key political players in South Carolina’s battle against the tariff. In 1828, his cousin Col. Thomas Pinckney, Jr., was a respected political leader in the upcountry, while his brother-in-law Robert Young Hayne, a native of the Colleton District, was serving the state in Washington, D.C. as a senator.² These family ties to men who shared many of Robert Barnwell Smith’s ideals made the Mercury a natural mouthpiece for their renegade movement, propagandizing disunion as the rightful remedy for the hated tariff.

The Mercury was not alone. The editor of and contributors to another Charleston paper, the Southern Patriot, believed the Tariff of 1828 to be so arduous that the people of South Carolina should go to any lengths necessary to preserve their rights. Editorials and letters published in other South Carolina newspapers accused the rebellious
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Charleston press of using radical language intended to make the public believe the tariff was a greater crisis than it really was and to incite the people to disunion over it. This highly polarized debate in South Carolina’s partisan press helped plant the seed of southern secession in the minds of the state’s readers.

South Carolina eventually became the first state to withdraw from the Union because it harbored a defiant group born of the state’s unique geography and demographics—a faction that advocated disunion earlier and with more vigor than in any other southern state. South Carolina’s economic dependence on agriculture surpassed that of other southern states, and its aristocratic origins created a ruling planter class intent on preserving a slave-driven way of life as well as their political and social dominance of the state. As these South Carolinians clung to their agrarian ideals in the early nineteenth century, they became increasingly agitated by the industrialist North’s growing power. This agitation first came to a head during the Missouri statehood debates of the late 1810s and early 1820s, when most of the state’s Congressmen turned zealously sectionalist.

---


The chasm between South Carolina and The Union widened when Congress passed protective tariffs in 1824 and 1828 to encourage domestic manufacturing. Americans nationwide had supported a tariff passed in 1816, due to an atmosphere of rampant nationalism in the wake of the War of 1812. Sectionalist accusations arose when the 1824 tariff added imports that the prior act had not included, which were perceived as specifically protecting western and northern interests. The act also raised existing taxes to as much as 37 percent of the goods’ value, making them prohibitively expensive for a state that had been hit particularly hard by a depression beginning in 1819. Rather than heeding South Carolinians’ complaints and reducing the taxes, Congress passed in 1828 what many southerners labeled the “Tariff of Abominations,” raising rates to as much as 50 percent of the goods’ value.5

Many South Carolinians argued that the bill was unconstitutional,
in that they did not believe the federal compact granted the general government the power to enact protective duties on imports. Tariff opponents were most vehement, however, in their insistence that the bill oppressed the South while ensuring the North an unequal share in the nation’s prosperity. While these tariffs served to increase profits for northern industry, cultivation of cotton had superseded a majority of such efforts in agrarian southern states such as South Carolina, where planters felt they could make enough money from the sale of cash crops to buy everything else they needed. Southerners thus were forced to either purchase certain items from northern manufacturers at a much higher cost than they had been paying for European imports or continue purchasing from overseas at a rate inflated by the tariffs. Furthermore, some feared that retaliation from abroad would reduce the foreign market for raw materials produced by southern planters, especially cotton. Ultimately, some opponents predicted, southern planters would be forced to abandon the way of life they held sacred to begin factories in order to share in the nation’s wealth. Short-staple cotton growers from the middle of the state suffered from the early tariffs more than the coastal rice and Sea Island cotton planters. By 1828, however, the coastal plain aristocrats began to see the tariff issue as part of a pattern of majority tyranny, and the Charleston elite joined the movement against federal protectionism.6

Ultimately, South Carolina declared the 1828 tariff null and void, but nullification did not happen overnight. Ardent supporters of free trade and state rights—such as Rhett, Hayne, the Pinckneys, Warren Davis, George McDuffie, and John C. Calhoun—spent four years engaged in a political and rhetorical battle before winning enough support to pass the Nullification Act in 1832, which many deemed revolutionary.7 They waged this battle largely through the partisan press.
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Historians have emphasized the importance of newspapers throughout the South during the politically-charged antebellum era, beginning even before the tariff controversy. Because the southern press remained fiercely partisan until after the Civil War, political issues of the day became editorial issues. States’ rights rhetoric largely consumed the southern newspapers’ pages, mirroring and in some cases amplifying what occurred in other political forums.8

South Carolina’s press was no different. Scholars of Nullification-era politics have used South Carolina’s newspapers as crucial sources in their work, and some researchers have investigated the state’s antebellum press history, either in sweeping general accounts of the state’s media or focused studies of Charleston publications.9 Taken in total, previous research demonstrates that the state’s political parties had strong
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statewide networks of newspapers. No prior work, however, has focused on South Carolina newspapers in the immediate aftermath of the Tariff of Abominations, as political arguments in favor of disunion began to take shape. Doing so illuminates early attempts by the state’s partisan press to both stir up and settle down early rumblings about secession.

This paper’s author identified all South Carolina newspapers for which copies remain of the entire year’s run and examined every issue published from January 1828, as Congress earnestly began its debates over the tariff, to December of that year, when an event took place that radically changed the tariff and disunion dispute. As 1828 drew to a close, the South Carolina legislature received a pamphlet that John C. Calhoun authored anonymously, titled the “South Carolina Exposition and Protest.” The document spelled out the doctrine of nullification and stated that South Carolina would secede if Congress did not repeal the tariff, setting off a new firestorm of controversy in the state’s newspapers over the potential for disunion. Since subsequent press argument centered around the Exposition, just prior to its publication marks an appropriate point to end an exploration of newspapers’ response to the tariff itself.

The six newspapers under study provide a geographical cross section of the state, with three newspapers from the densely populated Charleston area in the coastal plain (the Mercury, Southern Patriot, and Charleston Courier), two from the middle of the state (Camden Journal and Columbia State Gazette and Commercial Advertiser), and one from the mountainous upcountry (Pendleton Messenger).

A qualitative analysis of all original items relating to the tariffs—consisting of signed and unsigned editorials as well as letters and reports submitted by correspondents (which generally shared the editors’ respective tones)—revealed that these newspapers represent a variety of political standpoints. Although he declared his columns open to


11 Only five additional newspapers published in the state during that time, and few, if any, extant copies remain of those titles for the year under study.
items on both sides of the tariff issue, the editor of the *State Gazette and Commercial Advertiser* refrained from making any comment on the tariff act or potential means of redress himself, pledging his paper to be entirely neutral.\(^\text{12}\) The *Gazette* certainly was an anomaly. The *Mercury* and *Southern Patriot* vehemently opposed the tariff and aggressively pressed for resistance; the *Charleston Courier* staunchly supported the Union and federal government (including its right to levy the tariff), preaching forbearance and submission; and the *Camden Journal* and *Pendleton Messenger* held the middle ground, waging a moderate protest against the tariff and encouraging the establishment of homespun industry to combat its ill effects.

**Tariff Debate in Congress**

When the 20\(^\text{th}\) U.S. Congress met for its first session in December 1827, a Committee on Manufactures was appointed to deliberate on the tariff matter. On 31 January 1828, the committee presented its report and a draft of the tariff bill, which the committee expected to fail. The bill contained high duties on raw materials for which New Englanders wanted low duties, so the committee members against the tariff erroneously expected that New England Congressmen would balk and prevent its passage, killing the tariff issue.\(^\text{13}\)

The contentious tariff bill provoked three months of vitriolic and highly partisan debate, but the House of Representatives did pass it on April 22. A brief Senate debate resulted in passage of the House’s tariff with amendments on May 14, and the House approved all amendments by the Senate on May 15.\(^\text{14}\)

At the onset of the tariff debate, a *Mercury* editorial entitled “Signs of the Times” proclaimed, “Questions touching the peculiar institutions of the Southern States have been broached, and doctrines have been advanced dangerous to their rights and interests.” The editor suspected
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that some northern politicians intended to form a party based on aversion to southern principles, with protective tariffs chief among the issues on the northern platform. The Mercury’s editorials voiced opposition to the measure and lamented that its proponents were “too well organised [sic] to give the friends of Commerce and Agriculture any fair chance whatever.” Throughout the Congressional session, Mercury editors and correspondents used adjectives such as “onerous” and “exceptionable” to describe the bill, and vaguely predicted “ruinous consequences” should it pass. Editorials and letters expressed fear of compromise with the tariff’s “selfish” supporters, but encouraged cooperation of southern members with opponents of the bill from eastern states to effect its defeat.15

Tariff commentary in the Mercury’s fellow Charleston paper, the Southern Patriot, similarly emphasized the widening division among factions promoting their own interests. Editorials accused Congressmen of being selfish in their aspirations both in the increasing or decreasing of duties and the distribution of funds obtained through them for internal improvements, all for sectional advantage. Supporters of an increase in woolen duties, for example, fought against similar increases in hemp and molasses. In promoting their respective interests, the two sides produced confusion among their fellow Congressmen and the public through misrepresentation of facts and diatribes that contained no facts at all but were simply rhetorical flourishes. Nonetheless, the Patriot’s editor surmised that squabbling between East and West to protect their respective interests offered the only chance for the South to avoid “being squeezed to annihilation” by ever-increasing duties. He also credited South Carolina congressmen, who had kept their wits about them and ignored claims that increased duties on indigo and cotton would be a boon to the South. Resisting such amendments proved that the “Plantation States” were not stooping to the level of others by pushing for protection of their own chief exports; instead they continued to oppose the tariff on principle.16

Likewise, an editorial in the Camden Journal called for all parties to “forget their local prejudices and policies; to make those mutual concessions which are requisite to the general prosperity; and in some

instances, to sacrifice their individual advantages to the interest of the community.” The editor considered it unfortunate the tariff matter generated so much disagreement that people failed to listen to the call of reason. An editorial in the Pendleton Messenger similarly lamented that the debate had drawn out due to the “mania of speech-making” by “ferocious partizans [sic] on both sides, who are less careful of falling into error themselves, than of detecting supposed management and dishonesty in their adversaries.”

Ultimately, the Journal's editor believed the tariff should be defeated because Congress operated outside of its constitutional bounds. The Constitution, he proclaimed, was a compact among the states as separate and independent sovereignties, and by passing a law for duties to be collected from the states without their consent, Congress was violating that compact. A correspondent, published in the Charleston Courier under the penname “Hamilton,” disagreed. Throughout the month of January, Hamilton wrote lengthy essays for the Courier dealing primarily with the constitutionality of the tariff and Congress’ power to enact it. Hamilton’s detailed analysis of the Constitution provided evidence that Congress was well within its rights as detailed in the national charter to legislate over commerce, agriculture, and manufacturing. The states were not the ultimate power; they had relinquished the power to regulate trade when they ratified the Constitution. Had the states retained individual power, confusion and disorder would prevail, whereas the general government legislated with the goal of uniformity and harmony. Hamilton further averred that protection of domestic manufacturing was necessary to prevent dependence on foreign entities and that the restrictive system would benefit cotton growers. The writer chastised the more militant tariff opponents for assuming “the attitude of menace and defiance; to throw down the gauntlet, and rush into mortal strife with the Government of the Union.”

Once the bill passed the House, correspondence appeared in the Mercury explaining the vote. One letter declared that anti-tariff men had voted for its passage because they believed seven weeks was

---

17 “The increased duties – their inevitable effects,” Camden Journal, 15 March 1828, p. 2; Pendleton Messenger, 2 April 1828, p. 3, emphasis in original.
enough time for discussion, and because they knew they could not say or do anything to prevent its passage. What’s more, they anticipated that further discussion could only result in amendments which would make the bill more harmful to the South. Correspondence in the *Southern Patriot* similarly argued that southern congressmen had done “all that men could do in their situation” to oppose the measure, to no avail. The letter echoed the *Patriot* editor’s sentiments that the question had devolved into a squabble among promoters of various interests and predicted that now that the “agony” of the tariff subject had ended, the House could return to reason and立法 for the benefit of the entire nation. The correspondent had little hope that the Senate would act any differently, predicting that the bill would pass after “many efforts to make it exclusively beneficial to the manufacture of Woollen [sic] goods.”

South Carolina Senator Robert Y. Hayne, the brother-in-law of *Mercury* editor Pinckney, became that newspaper’s hero as the Senate debate drew to a close. Hayne declared that in the entire tariff debate, “the interests of the South have been sacrificed, shamefully sacrificed! Her feelings have been disregarded—her wishes slighted—her honest pride insulted!” He urged his fellow southerners not to “sit coolly and see the parties who are to benefit by this system compromise with each other, while we are to be the losers under all circumstances.” He later presented a motion to postpone the bill indefinitely, supported by what a *Mercury* editorial called a “long and able speech, in which he entered a solemn protest against it as unjust, oppressive, and unconstitutional.” The *Mercury* published a summary of the speech in which Hayne particularly objected to duties on indigo, one of his state’s cash crops, and questioned whether “the *American system* means a system for the exclusive benefit of particular employments and particular states…—whether the manufacturers were the only class in the country who are to enjoy the protection of this system.”

**Reaction to the Tariff’s Passage**

Outcry reached fever pitch after the House’s final passage of the Tariff bill, as many of the newspapers published editorials and essays lamenting what they considered to be a terrible transgression against the agricultural states. As they reacted to Congress’ vote, arguments shifted from emphasizing the sectional and partisan nature of the tariffs to their

20 *Charleston Mercury*, 22 April 1828, p. 2; “To the Editor,” *Southern Patriot*, 29 April 1828, p. 2.
effect on foreign trade and the federal government’s increasing tyranny.

The *Mercury* responded to the bill’s passage with an editorial proclaiming that the people of the state felt they had been “reduced to a condition almost tantamount to colonial vassalage,” and that the tariff act was but a forerunner of other acts that would further demonstrate the general government’s propensity to assume power beyond what the Constitution allowed. Additional *Mercury* editorial comment declared that citizens throughout the South “suffer equally under the cruelty of the ‘oppressors,’” and called upon the southern states to assemble in a convention for the purpose of devising and recommending “such measures, consistent with the Constitution, as may be best calculated to protect them against the operation of the Act.” Although the *Mercury’s* editor asserted that the South must resist the tariff, he questioned “whether by any possible course of conduct, we can avert the misfortunes which threaten us, without incurring the hazard of others, still more dreadful and appalling.”

The *Camden Journal* editor’s primary complaint was that the tariff would produce retaliation by the nations whose produce would be taxed through the “mad and mischievous” bill. He predicted the “violent measure will give the death blow to reciprocity as well in the Western as in the Eastern world.” Viable competition from Egyptian and Brazilian exporters intensified the editor’s fear that South Carolina would lose Great Britain as a purchaser for its cotton.

Complaints about decreasing foreign cotton exports appeared frequently in the *Southern Patriot* as well. Its editor complained that the tariff “invades the very sources of our prosperity by striking at our means of production.” Chief among the editor’s concerns over exports was Great Britain’s reduction of duties on cottons from British possessions, namely the British East Indies, and other cotton imports. The *Patriot*’s editor considered the measure retaliation to “our absurd and suicidal attempt to legislate away the commerce of the country” and lamented that South Carolina planters would not be able to compete with East India cotton growers in British markets under the disadvantage of higher duties. The *Patriot* argued that domestic manufacturing could not progress quickly enough to catch up with previous foreign demand. To make matters worse, the pledges by some South Carolinians not to purchase northern

---
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fabrics caused some northern manufacturers to retaliate by pledging not to use raw cotton from Charleston. The *Patriot*’s editor explained, “Charleston being the Metropolis is to be placed under commercial proscription, as a punishment for the *sins of the State at large.*”

A letter signed “A True Whig” in the Columbia *State Gazette and Commercial Advertiser* questioned the arguments of the anti-tariffites, particularly regarding the constitutionality of the measure. The writer quoted passages from the Constitution as evidence that Congress had the power to lay duties for the general welfare of the United States, arguing that protection of domestic manufactures would benefit everyone by ultimately depressing the price of goods.

The *Courier* published several letters signed “A Native” in the months following the tariff’s passage, which also served to defend the tariff proponents against the arguments of others in the state. Native argued that the tariff was not as unfair and oppressive as others would encourage the public to believe, but was in fact good for the economy, North and South. Rather than raising the cost of goods, the tariff would equalize and eventually reduce them. As consumption shifted to domestic manufacturers, they would flourish and lower their prices. Native called arguments that cotton planters would be forced to give up their vocation absurd. Not only did the writer dispute that British markets for cotton would close, he predicted that new domestic markets would open to supplement them. The situation only had become a crisis because a faction of “enemies to the Union” had made it one by attempting to throw the public into confusion. The tariff could create a nation “competent to the supply of each other’s wants—confident in each other’s candour [sic] and justice, and harmonizing in fair and honorable commerce.” Instead, certain South Carolinians used the tariff as an excuse to destroy the Union through its rhetoric and leave commerce and manufactures prostrated. “Often I have been astonished at the facility with which the public are made to swallow ‘non sequitors’ by those who can pass them off with an air of conviction,” Native wrote, “but never was there a more gross one attempted than this.”

Other correspondents in the *Courier* supported Native’s points. A rice planter under the pseudonym “A Country Rustic” argued that Congress had spent so much time discussing and deliberating on the tariff that it could not be accused of passing the bill with sinister motives. The writer believed that the bill was for the general welfare and not to oppress the South, and that all would benefit. Another correspondent accused the anti-tariff group of misleading the public through its rhetoric, proclaiming, “NEVER has the public mind been so completely deceived by barefaced assertion and miserable sophistry, as in the case of the Tariff.” Cotton planters would not be robbed of their produce to pay the tariff, and the writer told the public to distrust men who tried to convince them otherwise. The same themes emerged in a series of letters signed “Union,” which questioned the reasoning of the tariff opponents and pointed out the “fundamental errors” of their arguments. Union admitted that if South Carolina were oppressed to the point of ruin by unequal legislation, it would be prudent to resist. However, “notwithstanding all the noisy and heated declamation, the artful descriptions, and the bitter and heartburning complaints which are daily and even hourly assailing our ears,” that was not the case with the tariff. The *Courier*’s editor quoted from a personal letter predicting that the public would discover that the arguments were false and would settle down: “The noise now making about the Tariff, I think will all end in smoke.”

**Anti-Tariff Meetings and Expressions of Resistance**

Instead of settling down, those riled by the tariff increased their “noise making.” In June, a group of citizens from the Colleton District gathered at Walterborough Court House to contemplate modes of resistance. Considered by many to be a formal act of rebellion, the meeting sparked a marked increase in disunion rhetoric throughout the state. The Colleton meeting and those across South Carolina that mimicked it in the ensuing months demonstrated that a large number of the state’s citizens shared the views of the renegade newspapers.

The group passed a resolution accepting an address by State Congressman Robert Barnwell Smith, the avowed disunionist from
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nearby Beaufort. Smith, who had a longstanding cozy relationship with the *Charleston Mercury*, used the address to recommended outright revolution:

> If you are doubtful of yourselves—if you are not prepared to follow up your principles wherever they may lead, to their very last consequence—if you love life better than honor—prefer ease to perilous liberty and glory; awake not! stir not! — Impotent resistance will add vengeance to your ruin. Live in smiling peace with your insatiable Oppressors, and die with the noble consolation, that your submissive patience will survive triumphant your beggary and despair.

Accompanying editorial comment in the *Mercury* called the address “fervid, eloquent, and impressive,” and declared that it “embodies the political creed, the popular feeling, and probably the determined policy of South Carolina.”

Anti-tariff meetings elsewhere echoed the sentiments of those voiced in Colleton. Proceedings in St. John’s Parish, which the *Mercury* likened to the earlier meeting in neighboring Walterborough, resolved that “treason consists not in resisting usurpation, but in submissively yielding to its dictates.” At St. John’s and many other South Carolina meetings, resolutions generally voiced opposition to the tariff, supported active resistance, and called on the state government for aid in procuring its repeal. In the state capital of Columbia, “a very large and respectable meeting of citizens” met to sign a petition for the state legislature, “upon which alone the hopes of the people rest.” Later on the same night, in the same city, a less civilized group burned the tariff act along with effigies of Henry Clay and other congressmen responsible for its passage. In Edgefield, Congressman George McDuffie spoke for an hour and a half explaining the facts with “irresistible argument and impassioned eloquence,” and “portrayed the odious unjust, unequal and monopolizing spirit of the whole prohibitory system, and of the degradation and ruin to which the south would be reduced by submission to the present law.” Citizens of the Pendleton district met under the leadership of Col. Thomas Pinckney, Jr., son of a former governor and cousin of the *Mercury*’s editor. The Pendleton meeting heard impassioned pleas by Congressmen Hayne and Warren Davis before passing resolutions focusing on the unconstitutionality of the tariffs and the need for South
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Carolina to exercise to sovereignty in order to the check the Federal
Government’s lawless power. The *Mercury*’s editor proclaimed that the
meetings, which had taken place in almost every section of the State, had
“with a dignity and firmness becoming them as free-men,…asserted their
rights, and taken counsel of each other as to the best and most efficient
means of procuring a reparation of their wrongs.”

Letters poured into the *Mercury*’s office supporting the meetings’
anti-tariff resolutions. The correspondence vehemently opposed the tariff
(which more often than not, their writers described as “oppressive”) and
equated the northern manufacturers with pirates and plunderers. One
writer declared it painful that Carolinians must consider disunion, but
proclaimed southern citizens “disgraced if we submit, and we cannot
effectually resist but by assuming an attitude of virtual secession, by
resuming our full sovereignty.” A writer under the name of “Sidney”
concurred that submission had become a vice and resistance a virtue
and penned several letters exploring the sovereignty of the states. He
declared that the tariff’s supporters had disregarded the ties of the South
to the rest of the country and inquired “of what value is our union with
such men?” A writer who called himself “Leonidas” penned a series in
which he also defended southerners in the disunion movement on the
principle that the tariff’s proponents already had destroyed the Union and
torn the Constitution to pieces. Letters under the pseudonym “Colleton”
 admonished those who supported moderate recourse in a case in which
“we are forgotten, neglected, and despised, as if we did not belong to
the American family.” Colleton asserted that disunion was preferable to
submission. Another writer similarly dismissed suggestions of moderate
recourse, insisting that the evil “lies too deep to be probed and eradicated
by a remedy of this sort,” and that the “suffering states” must voice their
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veto to protect themselves and future generations from violations of their rights.\(^{30}\)

Similar letters and editorials appeared in the *Patriot*. The editor insisted that some sort of action was necessary to force Congress to see the error of its ways. He argued that thirteen states who act together to injure eleven shall not go unanswered; those in the minority should have the power to rectify the wrong and redress injury to them by the “wicked or ignorant majority.” A letter-writer called X pointed out that the South faced a great dilemma: non-consumption of northern goods forced consumers to pay prices rendered enormous by the tariff on foreign products, while using domestic fabrics entailed enormous expense and “would be laying still deeper the foundation of that system which we should strenuously oppose, on the double ground of its impolicy and unconstitutionality.” They had no choice but to protest so that Congress heard their grievances. X argued that it was for the protection of the Constitution and union that they fought, because they were protesting against a measure that produced a conflict of rival interests.\(^{31}\)

Similar ideas were expressed via toasts delivered at various celebrations throughout the summer, which were published in the state’s newspapers. Editorial comment accompanying the report of one dinner proclaimed that the proceedings, when taken together, proved that on the subject of the tariff, “there is but one common feeling throughout the state.” Common themes included free trade, equality of rights, the spirit of revolution, the sovereignty of South Carolina, and fervent opposition to tyranny in general.\(^{32}\)

Fourth of July celebrations provided ample opportunity for toasting, focusing on the heroes of 1776. One speaker at a celebration in Charleston compared 4 July 1776, when “the sun of our glory arose in brilliancy and splendor,” to 1828, when “clouds, and darkness, and shadows rested upon it.” The Spirit of ’76 became a catch-phrase,
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particularly among those who drew the parallel of taxation without representation and hoped that its results “in the present instance” would be “brilliant as in the first.” Another toast to the Spirit of ‘76 called for it to arise “like the Phoenix, with renewed splendor, from the political conflagration which threatens to assail us.” During a celebration at Anderson Court House, Congressman Warren Davis reminded partygoers not only of the patriots who protected against tyranny during the Revolution but also of the soldiers in the War of 1812, who went to war for free trade. Both, he said, faced calls of treason similar to what Carolinians now heard as they protested violations of their rights, and both lead forward “their gallant battalions to victory and freedom.”

Reaction to the Fervor

As the rhetoric of resistance flooded meeting halls and some newspapers’ pages, other speakers and newspapers called for temperance and moderation. The excitement raised alarm, even among many who disagreed with the tariff. Despite the perceived oppression and inequality of the measure, many writers believed the tariff bill did not represent a severe enough circumstance to warrant a militant resistance against the government.

Orators at a Pendleton Independence Day celebration lamented that the Federal government had pursued a course that divided the nation and urged South Carolina to repair it rather than rip it further asunder. One toast called for the state’s course to “be marked by calmness and deliberation, not angry feeling or hasty violence.” At a celebration marking a Revolutionary War battle reported in the *Courier*, toasters similarly indicated that a better compliment to the heroes of that day would be to patriotically protect the Union they fought to establish rather than to imitate their resistance. Col. C. J. Steedman toasted specifically to state rights, noting that if infringed, “moderate and judicious remonstrance would insure their security.” Governor John Taylor, speaking in response to a toast in his honor at a separate celebration in Columbia, admitted that the tariff was unjust “in taking out of the pockets of one class of citizens to enrich another” and declared it South Carolina’s duty to push for repeal. Yet he urged a moderate course, arguing that for the state to act rashly on her own would be folly and potentially could

lead to civil strife. He believed that when Congress realized the tariff’s
effect on foreign relations, it would retrace its steps.\textsuperscript{34}

A writer for the \textit{Camden Journal} concurred, noting that the
rhetoricians spewing the language of disunion did so with complete
disregard for its consequences. Although the writer thought the tariff
was unconstitutional and that it would bring poverty to the South, he
argued that South Carolina should not avoid a minor evil by resorting
to a greater one. He believed writers “arrayed in the most inflammatory
costume” had intruded their sentiments upon the public with the sole
purpose of arousing their passions. “With the true spirit of freemen,” he
proclaimed, “let us rather submit to a little inconvenience than be the first
to secede from a union ‘cemented by the blood of our forefathers.’” The
\textit{Journal}’s editor similarly lamented that the “fearful subject” of disunion
had become common place. A group of rabble-rousers had “hurried into
inconsiderate language” and “told the tale of their grievances in terms
too fervid and inflammatory.” He felt that the people of South Carolina
would not be talked into secession at the moment but feared that they
could be if the American System should continue.\textsuperscript{35}

The \textit{Courier} came out strongly against the disunionists via
numerous letters and editorials. The outspoken correspondent “A
Native,” in letters under the heading “Constitutionality of the Tariff,”
pointed out that much of the argument regarding the bill’s adherence
to the national charter had to do with the sovereignty guaranteed the
respective states. Native lamented that no one could read an anti-tariff
resolution “without seeing in it, from beginning to end, a preparation for
revolution.” Like the writers in the \textit{Journal}, Native accused anti-tariffites
of purposely attempting to turn the public against the general government
and urged South Carolinians to pray for the country’s well-being.\textsuperscript{36}

Other correspondents to the \textit{Courier} agreed that a certain faction
had used forceful language regarding the tariff to spread fear and excite
the public into feelings of disunion. “Carolinian” accused “political
demagogues and over-zealous partizans [sic]” of misleading the people
through a picture of despair that left no mode of redress but resistance.
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The writer proclaimed that “reason and experience have become lost in the violent declamation of overheated imaginations.” A writer known as “Lowndes” used similar language, arguing that reasonable men could see that regulation of trade enacted by the proper authority is a principle of a republican government, unrightfully opposed under the pretext of state sovereignty. Surely, he argued, the anti-tariffites realized the truth and were simply endeavoring “to foment incurable animosities amongst the different sections of our country” and the general government. A letter by “Anti-Tariff and Union” pinned the disunion sentiment specifically on two of South Carolina’s most respected statesmen, Congressman George McDuffie and McDuffie’s mentor, Vice President John C. Calhoun. Anti-Tariff proclaimed that those two men would like nothing better than to separate the state from the nation for their own selfish political gains and that the tariff was the only measure through which they could hope to excite the public toward that aim.\(^\text{37}\)

In a series of letters, a correspondent under the pseudonym “One of the People” blamed a number of over-zealous orations at anti-tariff meetings, disseminated through the *Mercury* and other newspapers, for spinning the situation out of control. The writer only hoped that the people would avert the impending danger of disunion through good sense. A writer going by “Lalius” also blamed the anti-tariff meetings for a “violent current of public feeling” that had “drowned the voice of reason.” The letter noted that five months after the tariff’s passage, planters were getting more for their produce and paying less for manufactured goods, indicating that there was no grounds for the public furor.\(^\text{38}\)

Some *Courier* writers agreed with the principles of secession, but they did not think the time had come to exercise it. “A Citizen of the United States” wrote that governments are intended to uphold the rights and happiness of their constituents, and that it is the duty of the people to alter or abolish governments that fail to accomplish that end. However, such was not the case in the United States. The writer called the general government “the best man had ever known” and avowed that to destroy


it would be “the deed of a fool, a madman, or a fiend.” “Moderation” similarly insisted that the tariff was insufficient cause for dissolving the Union, declaring that no one had proven that the tariff law was injurious to the South, but even if it was, “as ours is a government of compromise, the good sense of the nation will correct the evil much sooner than by a violent course of proceeding on our part.”

The Courier’s editor praised the people of Charleston for refusing to be excited to the same sentiments as their brethren in Colleton and other towns, proclaiming, “The sober and reflecting portion of THE PEOPLE appear, indeed, to have already ‘calculated the value of this Union,’ and to have arrived at a conclusion exactly the reverse of that which was so much desired, and so confidently anticipated by the ‘great apostles of disunion.’” He encouraged the people to look with horror and indignation upon the words of those who sought to alienate the state from the Union. The tariff would not bring the annihilation that anti-tariffites predicted, but separation from the nation would.

Similarly, Pendleton’s Messenger contained articles rejoicing that the people of his district could not be stirred to disunion but instead, “the bare insinuation of a contemplated dissolution of the Union produces so much feeling” against it. Following the anti-tariffite uprisings, the Messenger’s columns filled with items lashing out against those who would so hastily disrupt the union. He pleaded with South Carolina’s legislators to set an example by tempering their orations with calmness and chastised those “violent partizans [sic] and ambitious men” who would attempt to incite the public toward disunion for their own political gain. He also published a series of letters by a correspondent who signed as “A Farmer,” who argued that the tariff was constitutional and just. Farmer noted that those who raised clamor against the tariff merely used it as a tool to strike against the U.S. government, peace, happiness and good fellowship. “It is certainly a dangerous experiment,” Farmer wrote, “and must end in difficulty and loss.”

---

Homespun as a Moderate Alternative

Rather than inciting revolution and disunion, several writers encouraged developing a greater manufacturing base in South Carolina to reduce the reliance on imports. Defending against accusations that the Camden Journal’s response to the tariff had been lukewarm, its editor argued that he, unlike others, had exercised common sense and a calm and dispassionate mind. He claimed that the folks of Kershaw District intended to act and not merely to talk, via establishment of manufactures that would push the state to the utmost point of success. The editor used his July 4 editorial to detail the history of South Carolina’s planter culture, arguing that planters had created a vicious cycle of growing cotton to buy negroes and buying negroes to grow cotton, “thus commencing a new and equally ruinous slave trade, as well as simultaneously abandoning the cultivation of provisions.” This habit had created a necessity to import every need and luxury from either old or New England. He declared homespun to be the order of the day to end the cycle of dependence on others, and later announced that the “disposition to foster domestic manufacture of the State is advancing rapidly” in the upper districts of York and Chester. A letter from a reader concurred that people needed to stop complaining about past evils and instead turn their energies toward providing for the future and becoming independent. The writer called for the people of Camden to meet and open books for stock in a manufacturing company. The people of Richland District met with a similar aim. The State Gazette reported the formation of a committee to determine what branches of industry could be carried on in the state “without an investiture of great capital, and to devise every means in our power to free us from this system of plunder.” The editor of the Pendleton Messenger avowed that associations to erect manufactories for cotton bagging and clothes would do more to facilitate relief against the tariff than the meetings to remonstrate against it, and he declared that it would be “more patriotic to assemble for the purpose of enquiring into the practicability of establishing our independence in this way than for that of ‘calculating the value of the union.’”

Like the Journal’s editor, the Courier’s editor also blamed the cotton

planters for the dependence on imports and argued that they “ought to turn our attention to something more promising and productive.” The correspondent “A Carolinian” similarly proclaimed the tariff to be a blessing in that it caused the planters to see the “true cause of depression under which agriculture languishes” —their own extravagance. If the planters resolved to be independent by producing for themselves every necessary article for consumption, domestic economy would triumph over faction. “A Cotton Purchaser” specifically encouraged South Carolina to begin manufacturing goods required for the reaping and sowing of cotton and rice. Other writers declared South Carolina the perfect place to manufacture cotton cloth. One proclaimed it silly to transport raw cotton thousands of miles and back again for manufacturing, when the high lands of the South Carolina upcountry contained an abundance of water power that could be used to produce cotton fabrics at a much lower price than those made in New England. Another asked why South Carolina let foreign countries profit by turning her raw material to clothes but complained about the North becoming rich by doing the same. The writer noted that the state had ample raw material at its disposal and should avail itself of the bounty that comes from manufacturing with it.  

Months later, under a new editor, the Journal maintained its stance that homespun was the best recourse “to convince the monopolists of their impolicy.” The new editor, like the disunionists, invoked the spirit of the eighteenth-century revolutionaries, but with the aim of stirring patriotism in his readers. Like the patriots of old, he insisted the people of South Carolina should band together to redress the wrongs of exclusive legislation and general taxation for particular benefit. Although a push toward disunion never could be unanimous, he believed everyone could agree on homespun. If everyone joined hands “clad in the uniform of principle, the costume of resistance to tyranny,” the tariff would die a natural death.  

Not everyone could agree on homespun, however. The Southern Patriot and Mercury both published arguments against it. The Patriot’s editor insisted that southern states could not compete with northern


states, which in addition to a quarter-century head start establishing industry, had infrastructure suitable for shipping as well as abundant coal mines needed for steam manufacturing. He declared that South Carolinians should not be distracted from their natural profession of farming. The *Mercury* agreed with the *Journal*’s editor that unanimity of sentiment on the proper course to be pursued was necessary for the state to successfully combat its foes, but argued that homespun was not the answer. He considered the establishment of manufacturing to be submissive to the American System, and that like the tariff, it would benefit only a few individuals without effecting general relief. He insisted that only through repeal of the tariff would the South be saved, and the efforts of all the state’s writers should go toward that singular goal.\(^45\)

**Conclusion**

As Congress debated and passed the Tariff of 1828—intended to enhance protection of domestic industry through the increase of duties on exports established in 1816 and 1824—newspapers throughout South Carolina lashed out at the measure. Editors and correspondents in most newspapers argued that the act was unconstitutional, unequal in its benefits, and oppressive to the South.

Following Robert Barnwell Rhett’s rousing speech in Walterborough calling the state to action, citizens opposed to the tariff met in their respective districts statewide throughout the summer and early fall of 1828, passing resolutions that called for unqualified resistance to what they perceived as a gross usurpation of power by the federal government. Their toasts and speeches invoked the Spirit of ’76, comparing the plight of 1828 South Carolina to that of the patriots who risked their lives to resist tyranny during the Revolutionary War.

Editorials and letters in the state’s most radical newspapers—the *Charleston Mercury* and the *Southern Patriot*—celebrated the anti-tariff meetings and echoed the language of politicians who favored drastic action. Although some writers regretted that the state might have to resort to disunion, they believed it a necessity to exert the state’s sovereignty and protect its people against an increasingly despotic federal government that had trampled their rights and destroyed the Constitution. According to those writers, submitting or attempting a moderate means of redress would demonstrate weakness—a trait they deemed unbecoming of a Carolinian. To prove the state’s integrity, they

argued, its people must resist.

As cries of disunion rang out across the state, some editors and correspondents became alarmed and issued arguments countering those of the most militant tariff opponents. Writers in the state’s most conservative paper, the *Charleston Courier*, avowed that the Constitution afforded Congress the right to regulate foreign trade for the general welfare of the nation, and they insisted that South Carolina would not be injured as much as the radical anti-tariff camp would have the people believe. Furthermore, these writers declared that protecting the Union for which the patriots fought would be a better way to honor the memory of the Revolutionary War than to mimic their resistance.

Even writers in the *Camden Journal* and *Pendleton Messenger*, both of which shared the *Mercury* and *Patriot*’s disdain for the tariff, attacked the rebellious editors and correspondents who advocated disunion. Like the *Courier*, the moderate newspapers did not believe the crisis to be as dire as the militant sheets professed. They proclaimed that instead of crying tyranny, South Carolinians should become more industrious to reduce the necessity of purchasing northern or foreign goods and to ensure an equal share of the tariff’s protection. That, they insisted, would be more productive than attempting to rally South Carolina’s people to secession, when the state’s people held the Union too dear to be duped by men who obviously were blowing smoke.

Newspaper content during the explosive year in which Congress passed the “Tariff of Abominations” demonstrates the overwhelmingly partisan nature of the South Carolina press at that time, the quiet Columbia *State Gazette and Commercial Advertiser* being the exception. Not only were the newspapers’ editors and their like-minded letter writers extremely vocal regarding the primary issue of the day and how to solve it, but they also were quick to attack each others’ ideas about the tariff and recommended means of redress. What’s more, the newspapers vigorously attempted to call readers to action in one of the following three ways: accepting the tariff, working to establish homespun industry, or rising up against the tyrannous government.

A limitation of this study is the inability to determine the extent to which the newspapers’ rhetoric caused readers to act. Reports in the newspaper indicate that as arguments in favor of homespun appeared in print more frequently, citizens began forming associations with the aim of establishing manufacturing businesses. Furthermore, as disunion clamor built in newspapers, more and more citizens met in anti-tariff meetings, passing resolutions similar to those that the *Mercury* and *Southern Patriot*
publicized from the Colleton District. Further research is required, however, to determine if and how the newspapers’ arguments and the public’s actions are related.

From this study of the newspapers’ content, though, one relationship is perfectly clear: As the *Mercury* and *Patriot*’s editorials and letters became more radical, the state’s moderate and conservative newspapers expressed increasing fear that the inflammatory rhetoric would push the public toward actions those writers deemed too bold and dangerous. What’s more, the political nature of the newspapers created this contentious atmosphere. Even before the tariff controversy reached its peak, the *Pendleton Messenger* blamed newspapers’ partisan ties alone for their “distasteful” content. He accused the party press of suffering from a “*phobia of truth*” and lamented that its readers were “stimulated by the constant cry of *intrigue, bribery, and corruption*, or the repeated charges of *tyranny, blood-thirstiness, and insubordination*,” which he claimed was for the political benefit of individual men.46

Thus, this paper demonstrates that South Carolina’s partisan newspapers were an important part of the debate that erupted following the tariff’s passage—a debate that planted the seeds of disunion in a state that would nullify a federal law in 1832 and become the first state to secede later on.

---

46 *Pendleton Messenger*, 30 January 1828, p. 3, emphasis in original.
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Moses Fleetwood Walker and the Establishment of a Color Line in Major League Baseball, 1884-1887

Jeffrey Clarke Rowell

Racial integration of professional baseball was not strictly a Twentieth century issue. Early on in baseball’s history there was the occasional black player on teams with mostly white players. The newspaper coverage of these incidents ranged from nothing at all to an objective reporting of the facts. Some papers even showed support of integration. Looking back at the lone major league season of Moses Fleetwood Walker in 1884 and the refusal of the all-white St. Louis Browns to play an exhibition game against the all-black Cuban Giants, this paper looks at how the newspapers reported the games involving both white and black baseball players in order to see the scope of their reporting.

The racial integration of professional baseball was gaining steam by 1887. That year, according to the Society of American Baseball Research (SABR), the International League had at least seven black players on white teams. An article by Merl F. Kleinknecht on SABR’s website listed the seven players as: John “Bud” Fowler, William Renfro, and William Pointter with the Binghamton team, George Stovey and Moses Fleetwood Walker with Newark, Robert Higgins with Syracuse, and Frank Grant with Buffalo. Kleinknecht mentioned some of the success that these black players had in the white leagues -- Fowler batting .350 for Binghamton, Grant batting .366 for Buffalo, and Stovey winning 34 games for Newark.1 The Sporting Life listed another black player in the International League named Jackson, but it didn’t list which team he played for, only that he was a black second baseman.2

Before the 1887 season, at least one newspaper ran an article about an emerging colored League. The Times in Philadelphia published an article about the organization of the “National colored League of Base Ball Clubs.” The article discussed the cities that would field a club, and that one team not joining the league would be the established colored club, the Cuban Giants, because they had “made a name and fame for themselves and do not care to risk it with this new fledgeling.” The

---

2 “Base Ball Notes,” The Sporting Life [Philadelphia], 1 June 1887, 10.
Giants would face the Philadelphia Pythians during the year three times in Trenton and the same number of times in Philadelphia.  

One potential negative for the league was the possibility of the colored clubs losing their best players to white clubs. Underneath The Times’ headline of “Black Ball Players,” were three subheadings, the third of these stated, “Whites Clubs Pick Up Colored Men When They Are Good.” The article stated “one of the drawbacks to be met by the colored League is that the white clubs, many of them, permit neither color prejudice or money considerations to interfere with their power to draw the best players to themselves.” Thus when colored clubs “produced extraordinarily good players, they have lost them by being bought off by the white clubs.” The article mentioned Fleet Walker and George Stovey going over to the white Newark club as examples.  

Newspapers covered the colored League’s struggles. This was especially true with The Sporting Life, one article before the season stated that the league “will not get the protection of the National Agreement,” which protects a league from having its players raided by other leagues. It continued that the colored League didn’t need that protection “as there is little probability of a wholesale raid upon its ranks even should it live the season out.”  

In June, The Sporting Life declared “The Color League a Failure,” and detailed the plight of its members from the Boston club being stranded in Louisville to the Philadelphia club disbanding due to not enough financing.  

The newspaper coverage of black players in white leagues and all colored teams was typically factual, many times the stories referred to the black players in a positive manner even while mentioning that they were colored. In several articles throughout 1887, The Sporting Life spoke well of the black players. One article discussed a colored team that would tour the South and California at the close of the season as “the strongest colored team that has ever appeared in the field,” and that they would “play great ball and undoubtedly be a drawing card.” The article mentioned that the team would be comprised of “Newark’s famous colored ‘battery’” of Stovey and Walker, the crack second baseman Grant, and five members of the noted Cuban Giants team.” A May 4
recap of a Binghamton game listed Fowler’s work at second base as “wonderful,” and made no mention of his color. In that same edition, another article noted that Grant “is a hero with the colored population of every city where his club appears.” An article after the season had ended, referred to Fowler as “the noted colored second baseman” when it detailed how he would pass his winter. In the next week’s edition, an article referred to Stovey as “the crack colored pitcher” when discussing how he would spend his winter.

The Toledo Blue Stockings began integration in earnest four years prior in 1883 when they employed Moses Fleetwood Walker, simply known as Fleet Walker, as their catcher. The following season, the Blue Stockings moved from the Northwestern League to the American Association, which at that time was one of the two established major professional leagues, the two leagues that year were joined by a third major league called the Union Association. With Walker still on the Toledo roster, he disputably became the first black player in a major league. Walker was no stranger to playing with white men by this time, having played on integrated teams at Oberlin College and the University of Michigan. He also wasn’t a stranger to the prejudices of his skin color, which were prevalent in society during the late nineteenth century. While playing as an amateur for the White Sewing-machine Company of Cleveland in 1881, Walker encountered this rampant prejudice and racism in Louisville, Kentucky, when his team played the semi-pro team,

11 “Notes and Comments,” *The Sporting Life* [Philadelphia], 4 May 1887, 11.
12 “Notes and Comments,” *The Sporting Life* [Philadelphia], 2 Nov. 1887, 2.
13 “Notes and Comments,” *The Sporting Life* [Philadelphia], 9 Nov. 1887, 2.
16 The Society for American Baseball Research (SABR) has recently potentially uncovered a player named William Edward White who played with the Providence Grays of the National League in 1879 for one game. According to their research, SABR says that White was of mixed birth with a white slave owner for his father and a black slave for his mother. However, since White lived his life claiming to be a white man, including the color or race box on his death certificate reading “white,” it hasn’t been verifiably proven as of yet. See: Morris, Peter, and Stefan Fatsis. “Baseball’s Secret Pioneer: William Edward White.” http://sabr.org/latest/baseballs-secret-pioneer-william-edward-white (accessed July 1, 2014).
the Eclipse. As the *Louisville Courier-Journal* reported, the St. Cloud hotel refused accommodations to Walker because of his skin color. That afternoon the manager and some of the Eclipse players refused to play if Walker was in the lineup, again, based solely on his skin color. The Cleveland Team protested as Walker was their best player and their catcher, but they acquiesced to the Louisville club and substituted for Walker rather than forfeit their portion of the gate for that day’s game.  

The local newspaper did not blindly support the actions of their home team nine, and actively voiced its displeasure of the players who refused to play against a black ballplayer. The *Courier-Journal* took offense to the actions of the Louisville nine, and supported the inclusion of the black player. The article made the paper’s position clear under the three-tiered headline:

The Cleveland, Short Their Best Player, Defeated by the Eclipse  
An Uncalled for Exhibition of Prejudice on the Field Towards a Quadroon  
Considerable Feeling Displayed

The article asserted that the Eclipse objected for practical reasons related to Walker’s playing ability rather than his skin color. They “feared Walker, who has earned the reputation of being the best amateur catcher in the Union,” and that could have been the locus of their prejudice. The article pointed out that Walker had already “played against the League clubs, and in many games with other whites, without protest.” The *Courier-Journal* also contended that the Cleveland team “acted foolishly in playing. They should have declined to play unless Walker was admitted and entered suit for gate money and damages.” For, as the article pointed out, “no rules provide for the rejection of players on account of ‘race, color or previous conditions of servitude’.”

The article praised the response of the crowd when Walker’s replacement was hurt to a point that he couldn’t continue. West, Walker’s replacement in the lineup, was doing a shoddy job behind

---

19 A quadroon is defined by Merriam-Webster as “a person of one-quarter black ancestry.” As both of Walker’s parents were mulattos, half white and half black, according to David W. Zang in *Fleet Walker’s Divided Heart*, page 2.  
20 “A Disabled Club,” 8.  
21 Ibid.
the plate and was getting his hands beat up, as the players didn’t wear catchers gloves like they do today, but instead wore a fingerless glove with little padding.\(^{22}\) When the crowd saw that West couldn’t continue, they called for Walker, albeit with an insulting epithet that the article says was done in “good nature.” This shows that, although the newspaper used objective reporting in regards to Walker, it still condoned and justified the racist attitude of the times. When Walker began to practice, the crowd was delighted, however; two of the Eclipse players, Jonnie Riccius and Fritz Pfeffer, walked off the field while the rest of the team complained about Walker playing and Walker decided not to play. The crowd was disappointed and jeered the remaining players because “the crowd was anxious to see Walker play, and there was no social question concerned.”\(^{23}\)

The *Courier-Journal* article praised Eclipse’s Vice President Carroll’s handling of the situation. The crowd’s cries were so strong that Carroll went down to the Cleveland side and invited Walker to play. The article said that Carroll “acted very properly in the matter.” Walker was hesitant at first but agreed eventually to practice.\(^{24}\)

The story stated that without Walker the games would not be as intriguing as if he were allowed to play. The article closed its summary of the incident stating that Walker went home, and that the rest of the games, “will be totally uninteresting, since without [Walker] the Clevelanders are not able to play the Eclipse a good game.”\(^{25}\) The article is a sign that many were only concerned with seeing the best of the best on the field regardless of their physical characteristics.

When Walker became a professional baseball player in 1883 after he joined the Toledo Blue Stockings of the Northwest League,\(^{26}\) his race wasn’t noticed immediately. Upon his signing in late January, the *Louisville Courier-Journal* reported only “F. Walker, who caught last season for the University of Michigan nine, has signed with the Toledo club for next season.”\(^{27}\) The article made no mention of Walker’s race, and, being that the article appeared on page ten, either his race was not yet known, or the paper just didn’t consider it an important enough issue.

---


\(^{23}\) “A Disabled Club,” 8.

\(^{24}\) Ibid.

\(^{25}\) Ibid.


It wasn’t long after Walker signed with Toledo that his race did become a subject of conversation. The Northwest League met on March 14 to discuss many of the rules and regulations of the league, and Walker’s race was one topic they discussed. The SABR Baseball Biography Project’s Fleet Walker page recounts the March 15 Toledo Blade’s statement that:

A motion was made by a representative from Peoria that no colored player be allowed in the league. This created quite a discussion. It is well known that the catcher of the Toledo club is a colored man. Besides being a good player he is intelligent and has many friends. The motion which would have expelled him was fought bitterly and finally laid on the table.28

The debate about not allowing Toledo’s black player didn’t appear in The Cincinnati Enquirer, which reported on the meetings without a mention of Walker.29

Before the 1883 season, newspapers mentioned Walker’s race at least one time in the papers, and in a veiled negative way. The Cincinnati Enquirer ran an article entitled “Of Course ‘Twas on Merit” after the Pittsburgh Alleghenys of the major league American Association defeated Toledo in an exhibition game on April 20.30 The article made note that the “Toledos appeared in good form, and with their colored pitcher,31 Walker, a famous one.”32 The article’s title could be a slight to Walker, but, since the content did nothing more than mention his race, the paper’s intent cannot be determined.

During the season the references to his color found in the papers were still present, if less frequent. Sporting Life made two such references to Walker and his color in their “Notes and Comments” section of the July 22 edition. First, the article surmised with growing, begrudging respect, “Walker, Toledo’s colored catcher, is looming up as a great man behind the bat.” After several other notes, the article returned to Walker, stating, “Columbus has a deaf mute and Cleveland a one-armed pitcher;

30 “Of Course ‘Twas on Merit,” The Cincinnati Enquirer, 21 Apr. 1883, 2.
31 They may have managed to get his position incorrect, but their important part was he being colored.
32 “Of Course ‘Twas on Merit,” 2.
Toledo a colored catcher and Providence a deaf centre fielder; and yet these men can earn $2,000 per annum apiece."\(^{35}\) Despite the paper’s incredulous tone, it does show that some in baseball were willing to pay for talent regardless of any differences from the norm.

Walker’s next encounter with racism on the field also occurred in 1883 while he was with the Toledo club, and it involved Cap Anson, one of the more veteran and popular players at the time. Anson was the captain of the Chicago White Stockings team in the National League. Anson, according to a biographer of Anson, by 1881 was “not only the leading manager in the National League that year, but also its premier hitter.”\(^{34}\) By the beginning of the 1883 baseball season, Anson was one of only ten players who had played in all previous seven seasons of the National League.\(^{35}\)

Newspaper coverage favored Walker’s side during his incident with Anson. On August 10, Walker’s Toledo team was scheduled to play an exhibition game against Anson’s Chicago team. Before arriving, Anson had informed the Toledo club that he objected to sharing the field with black players, and Toledo planned to oblige him only because Walker had an injured hand and wasn’t scheduled to play anyway. However, Anson loudly reiterated his concerns once he arrived at the ballpark. The Toledo manager, Charles Morton, was so bothered by Anson that the Toledo Blade reported, “The decision was given then and there, to play Walker, and the beefy bluffer was informed that he could play his team or go, just as he blank pleased.” Morton inserted Walker as the right fielder and Anson threatened to take his club off the field, but Morton retaliated and threatened to withhold Chicago’s share of the gate receipts. Anson buckled but swore he would play no more games with the black in the lineup. The Blade had nothing but negative words about Anson and his Chicago team, calling them “dirty,” “uncouth,” and that it would be “a very cold day when they again carry a substantial bundle of gate receipts out of Toledo.”\(^{36}\)

The game didn’t attract much media attention outside Toledo and the Chicago Tribune didn’t even mention the controversy,\(^{37}\) but about a month later a small paragraph about the contest did appear in the

---

33 Ibid.
34 “Notes and Comments,” Sporting Life, 22 July 1883, 7.
36 Fleitz, 111-112.
37 Ibid., 112.
*National Police Gazette* with a positive slant towards Toledo and a negative one towards Anson. The *Gazette* recounted the events of Anson “trying to bulldoze the Toledo club” and Toledo showing their “spunk and good common sense” when it told Anson that he could take his team and go, but they wouldn’t dictate to them. The *Gazette* stated that Anson “weakened like a whipped cur and went on to play the game, with nothing more to say.” The *Gazette* did refer to Walker as “the coon” but indicated that there shouldn’t be any issue with whites taking the field with blacks by stating that Toledo showed its common sense.38

When Toledo joined the major league American Association, it appeared that Walker’s color would not become an issue. Toledo made the move to the American Association in November of 1883 along with three other new clubs in Indianapolis, Brooklyn, and Washington D.C., and the notice did not mention Walker as a member of Toledo.39 Toledo’s first game was against the Louisville club on May 1, 1884. The day of the game, the *Louisville Courier-Journal* previewed the match-up with no mention of Walker’s color. The article’s only mention of Walker was to inform the reader “Mullane and Walker will be the battery for the visitors this afternoon.”40

The lack of attention to Walker’s color didn’t last long. The *Courier-Journal*’s recap of the previous day’s game stated that “Walker, the colored catcher, who had been spoken of as something of a wonder, appeared to be badly rattled, and managed to make all the errors himself. His throwing to bases was also very poor.” By placing the phrase “who had been spoken of as something of a wonder” just after the reference to Walker’s color and before the recounting of his poor performance, the article appears to make a sly notion that the black player isn’t as ready to play with the whites as people say.41

Walker’s color wasn’t made as much of an issue as it could have been. In the remainder of the *Courier-Journal*’s recap of the game, the article made no other mention of Walker’s race when recounting his miscues. In the fourth inning, the article stated “Wolf [Louisville’s right fielder] started down to second a moment later, and Walker attempted to throw him out, but the ball went wide of its mark.” Next, “Miller

39 “Base Ball: Stray Balls From This and Other Diamonds,” *The Times-Picayune* [New Orleans], 17 Nov. 1883, 8.
41 “A Brilliant Opening: The Louisvilles Play Without an Error and Defeat the Toledos, 5 to 1,” *Louisville Courier-Journal*, 2 May 1884, 8.
[Toledo’s shortstop] fielded the ball to Walker, who failed to hold on to it, and Wolf scored.” In the sixth, the article stated, “Cline [Louisville’s center fielder] struck out, but Walker dropped the ball, and then threw badly to first.”42 In addition to only mentioning Walker’s skin color once in the recap, the paper also featured an advertisement for the three games with Toledo without making reference to Walker being a black player, or even mentioning him at all.43

Walker faced overt prejudice in the press in the other Louisville paper. Walker’s biographer detailed the reception that Walker received from the Louisville Commercial. On April 30, the Commercial wrote that Walker “enjoys the honor of being the first real brunette in the profession. He can play good ball behind the bat, and is a skillful thrower to bases.”44 Walker’s biographer called this a set up for when Walker was hitless the next day and made four errors45 the Commerical's headline read: “The Negro Catcher’s Disastrous Errors,” and the account linked Walker to the political National colored Convention being held in Louisville at the same time.46

At least one other Toledo opponent’s city newspaper mentioned Walker’s skin color. Toledo played the Cincinnati Red Stockings on May 9, and the following day The Cincinnati Enquirer gave a recap of the game and mentioned Walker’s color. The article mentioned Toledo pitcher Tony Mullane being “supported by Walker, the colored catcher.”47 After the third game of the series, The Cincinnati Enquirer mentioned that “Walker, the colored catcher, who had played a splendid game, putting out nine men.”48 In an article later in the season about Toledo’s injury woes, the Enquirer stated that Toledo was without Walker stating, “the well-known colored catcher, had to remain behind on account of a broken collar-bone.”49

The Cincinnati newspaper didn’t focus on Walker’s race in every story about Toledo. In a short article that announced the May 9 game,
the *Enquirer* didn’t mention Walker at all. In a recap of a game between Brooklyn and Toledo, the *Enquirer* relayed via special dispatch from Brooklyn that “the catching of Walker was cleverly done, and was a feature of the game.” Another article stated that Walker was “in no condition to play” with no mention of his race.

The papers in St. Louis and Baltimore were also more veiled in their comments about Walker’s race, occasionally praising, but still often hostile. Zang mentioned that the *St. Louis Globe-Democrat* “attributed several Toledo losses to the play of their ‘colored catcher.’” Zang also stated that the *Baltimore Sun* “deemed his play ‘hardly satisfactory,’ despite some ‘wild pitching to handle’ and ‘some marvelous stops.’”

The larger cities tended more to ignore Walker’s race entirely. *The New York Times* typically elided Walker’s race altogether when recapping Toledo’s games with the New York Metropolitans. In the recap of Toledo and New York’s July 10 game, Walker was mentioned as one of the Toledo players who “did good execution with the bat,” but made no mention of his skin color. In a weekly recap of the National League and American Association standings, *The New York Times* only mentioned the fact that Toledo had beaten the Metropolitans twice, knocking them from first place, without making any unnecessary mention of Walker and his race.

Southern papers didn’t refer to Walker or his color, but just relayed scores of the games if they printed anything at all. The *Memphis Daily Appeal* gave only the city of the home team and the score of the previous day’s game between Toledo and St. Louis. The same set up was used for Toledo’s July 26 victory over Indianapolis and their September 4 victory over Allegheny. The last is interesting if only because September 4 is credited at Walker’s last major league game.

Northern cities that had no teams in the American Association

---

50 “At the American Park,” *The Cincinnati Enquirer*, 9 May 1884, 2.
51 It is interesting to note that Brooklyn had a Walker on its team as well, and the recap makes no effort to differentiate between the two, even by color.
54 Zang, 42.
60 “Fleet Walker,” Baseball-Reference.com, Online.
also didn’t mention Walker’s race, but just gave the score or a box score. The Milwaukee Sentinel, the day after Walker’s debut on May 1, gave only a line score\(^{61}\) for the Toledo game versus Louisville.\(^{62}\) The paper gave only the score for Toledo’s May 21 loss to the St. Louis Browns.\(^{65}\) In Boston, who did have a National League team, the Boston Daily Advertiser gave box scores for all of their league’s games and some local college games from the previous day, but only gave a line score for Toledo’s 2 to 1 victory over the Alleghenys.\(^{64}\)

During the season, on July 25, Toledo played an exhibition game against Cap Anson’s Chicago team, and the papers were very quiet about Walker’s absence from the game. According to another biographer of Anson, the Toledo Blade only mentioned that Walker was the more injured of the two catchers and would thus sit out.\(^{65}\) The Cincinnati Enquirer provided a box score of the game the next day with the only remark being “A multiplicity of bad errors enabled the Chicagos to take the game by the following score.”\(^{66}\)

Walker also had to deal with prejudices on his own team. According to a 1993 article cited by Walker’s biographer, Walker’s teammate Curt Welch was an “ardent segregationist,”\(^{67}\) which seems to be a nice way of calling him a racist. Walker’s biographer put forth that pitcher Tony Mullane stated in 1919 that:

He [Walker] was the best catcher I ever worked with, but I disliked a Negro and whenever I had to pitch to him I used to pitch anything I wanted without looking at his signals. One day he signaled me for a curve and I shot a fast ball at him. He caught it and walked down to me. He said, “I’ll catch you without signals, but I won’t catch you if you are going to cross me when I give you signals.”

---

\(^{61}\) A line score consists of only the runs scored for each team per inning and their total runs as opposed to a box score which breaks down numerically how each participant did at the plate and on the mound.

\(^{62}\) “The League Games: Opening of Baseball Season Here and Elsewhere,” Milwaukee Sentinel, 2 May 1884, 2.

\(^{63}\) “Sporting News: Baseball,” Milwaukee Sentinel, 22 May 1884, 2.

\(^{64}\) “Other Games,” Boston Daily Advertiser, 31 May 1884, 8.


\(^{66}\) “Chicagos’ Game,” The Cincinnati Enquirer, 26 July 1884, 2.

\(^{67}\) Lonnie Wheeler, “Hounded Out of Baseball,” Ohio, 16 (May 1993), 26, cited by Zang, 43.
And all the rest of that season he caught me and caught anything I pitched without knowing what was coming.68

It is ironic that Walker’s biographer didn’t mention after this quote that it was Mullane who pitched the first Major League game that Walker caught, the game in which he committed four errors.

Walker’s younger brother Weldy also played with Toledo in 1884, but his time with the club was short lived,69 and thus there is little newspaper coverage on his time there. The SABR Bioproject page for Weldy Walker revealed that Weldy played in only four games for Toledo, so that should explain the lack of newspaper coverage. The page did mention coverage in the Toledo Evening Bee the day after Weldy’s debut game. The page stated that the Evening Bee article reported that “To fill out the nine, the Toledos secured the services of Weldy Walker, the brother of the Toledo catcher, who is visiting here, and put him in left field,” and that he performed well.70 The lack of either Walker brother’s race could be due to the hometown paper, or selective quote pulling on the part of the SABR page.

After the 1884 season, press coverage of Fleet Walker was infrequent. This is partly because Toledo had disbanded and left the major league American Association.71 It is also because Walker bounced around the smaller minor leagues before reaching Newark in the International League72 in 1887, where he was joined by the black pitcher George Stovey. The two of them formed a rare colored battery in a white professional league.73

One incident involved Anson while Walker was on the Newark team. Rosenberg detailed the game of July 14 and quoted the Newark News, which stated that Stovey was replaced due to sickness. Rosenberg further quoted the Newark Sunday Call stating, “that Anson had objected to a colored man playing,” and the New York Telegram stating that Anson

71 “Base Ball Notes,” The Times (Philadelphia), 2 Nov. 1884, 6.
72 “Fleet Walker,” Baseball-Reference.com, Online.
73 “The National Game,” Murfreesboro Index [Murfreesboro, N.C.], 17 June 1887, 1.
notified the Newark club that they were not to play Stovey and Walker in the exhibition game.\textsuperscript{74} *The Sporting Life* ran a short blurb in its “Notes and Comments” section a couple weeks later, which stated, “Anson wouldn’t let Newark put in the colored battery against Chicago in their recent exhibition game.”\textsuperscript{75}

Fleet Walker had one other publicized run-in with Cap Anson. In 1888 Walker played for the Syracuse Stars in the International League, and on September 27 was on the scorecard before an exhibition game against Anson’s Chicago club. *The Evening Herald* in Syracuse reported that once Anson saw Walker’s name he “at once refused to play the game with Walker behind the bat on account of the star catcher’s color.” The Stars substituted another player, and Anson played the game. The article put forth that “the result of the change was the loss of the game.”\textsuperscript{76}

The occasional black player on a white team ran contrary to the segregationist history of professional baseball. In his book, *When Baseball Went White*, Ryan A. Swanson stated that baseball became segregated at the same time it became popular during the Reconstruction Era of the late 1860s and early 1870s. The book gave one cause as being white baseball leaders that barred black baseball players from joining white leagues and clubs.\textsuperscript{77} The book detailed the colored Philadelphia Pythians attempt to gain inclusion in the Pennsylvania Association of Amateur Base Ball Players (PAABBP) in 1867, and the organizations denial of that request.\textsuperscript{78} Robert Peterson, in his book, *Only the Ball Was White*, quoted the Nominating Committee of the National Association of Base Ball Players in 1867:

> It is not presumed by your Committee that any club who have applied are composed of persons of color, or any portion of them; and the recommendations of your Committee in this report are based upon this view, and they unanimously report against the admission of any club which may be composed of one or more colored persons.\textsuperscript{79}

\textsuperscript{74} Rosenberg, 430.
\textsuperscript{75} “Notes and Comments,” *The Sporting Life* [Philadelphia], 3 Aug. 1887, 5.
\textsuperscript{76} “Big Anson’s Team: The Gentlemen From Chicago Shut Out Our Syracuse Stars,” *The Evening Herald*: Syracuse, 28 Sept. 1888, 4.
\textsuperscript{78} Ibid.
Over the years the white player’s views on black players began to relax somewhat. Sol White, a player in the colored leagues, later wrote a history of the colored leagues. Even his history, published in 1907, the move from total segregation to partial integration was not explained. White stated, “as far back as 1872 the first colored ball player of note playing on a white team was Bud Fowler, the celebrated promoter of colored ball clubs, and the sage of baseball.” From there, White cited other black players, including the Walker brothers (Fleet and Weldy), and more black players who played on professional white teams -- Frank Grant, George Stovey, and Robert Higgins – many of whom played in minor leagues such as the International League.

In addition to a few black players being brought on to white teams during the 1880s, all-white teams of the major leagues, the National League and the American Association, often played exhibition games against colored teams, as did many of the minor league clubs as well. The colored Cuban Giants played white teams as early as 1885. *The New York Times* reported on October 4 that the Cuban Giants would play the New York Metropolitans the next day, stating “the white-and-black game promises to be very amusing.” In 1887, the Cuban Giants played the American Association’s Cincinnati club on June 3, and again on June 14.

In September of 1887, one instance of a white club cancelling a scheduled game against the Cuban Giants due its members refusing to play a colored team gave the papers quite a story. On the night of September 10, the St. Louis Browns team president Chris Von Der Ahe, dining at the Continental Hotel in Philadelphia, was interrupted by one of his players sheepishly putting a letter down on his table and leaving in a hurry. The letter stated that several of the players refused to participate in a scheduled exhibition match-up against the colored Cuban Giants that Von Der Ahe had arranged for the next day. Two days later *The Times* in Philadelphia ran a story with the headline, “Color Line in Baseball: The Revolt of the Members of the St. Louis Club,” and stated that, “for the
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first time in the history of baseball the color line has been drawn.” It was soon established that white players did not want to play against blacks. While in past instances, one or two white players refused to play against teams with even one black player, now almost an entire team dissented. *The Times* printed the player’s letter, which stated the following:

We, the undersigned members of the St. Louis Baseball Club, do not agree to play against negroes to-morrow (sic). We will cheerfully play against white people any time, and think, by refusing to play, we are only doing what is right, taking everything into consideration and the shape the team is in at present.

Von Der Ahe read the letter signed by his eight players, and immediately left his table, found them in the lobby, and confronted them. In a colorful recreation, *The Times* described how each avoided answering Von Der Ahe’s questions. Getting no response, Von Der Ahe abided by their wishes, and he cancelled the exhibition.

Newspapers gave the account of the team’s manager Charlie Comiskey. *The Times* quoted Comiskey, who hadn’t known about the letter beforehand, as saying, “I think some of the boys wanted a day to themselves…They have played against colored clubs before without a murmur, and I think they are sorry for their hasty action already.” One Cap Anson biographer discussed the incident and quoted Comiskey in the *Philadelphia Press* as stating that, since Comiskey had hurt himself, there were only eight men to play, and the others didn’t want to run any risk.

The Philadelphia paper didn’t dismiss the Cuban Giants, but gave a fair description, and a short history of the Cuban Giants. The club was “originally organized at Trenton about two years ago [1885] as an independent club.” In the 1887 season, “they have been located at various places in close proximity to New York City.” The writer called them “the noted colored club,” and stated that “they are good players and the team has made money.” The article also noted that several other
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prominent clubs have played the Giants, and that this was the first time a team refused to play because of their color.\textsuperscript{90}

Newspapers in other major cities picked up the Philadelphia article the same day. \textit{The New York Times} ran a similar headline, and focused on the “color line.” The article began its story by announcing that “The Philadelphia \textit{Times} will say to-morrow,”\textsuperscript{91} and followed with a reprinted copy of the Philadelphia paper’s article. \textit{The Boston Daily Globe} also ran the same story the same day with the same information, but put the story on page 2 and didn’t give as prominent a headline.\textsuperscript{92} In Washington D.C., \textit{The Washington Critic} also ran the story on page 4 of its Monday evening edition, among other stories under the heading “Sports of the Season,” and deleted Comiskey’s excuse for the players.\textsuperscript{93}

The news spread to other cities. The day after \textit{The Times} story, the \textit{Boston Post} printed a very truncated version, taking only the beginning of \textit{The Times} story and the very end about the Cuban Giants.\textsuperscript{94} The truncated story took all the colorful retelling out, and just laid the salient facts bare.

That same day, the \textit{New York Sun} took a different angle. The \textit{Sun} told the story from the Cuban Giants perspective, stating that “Manager Bright of the Cuban Giants was the most surprised man in New York yesterday when he learned that the St. Louis Club had refused to keep its engagement on Sunday on account of color.” Since the St. Louis players had known about the game a week before, Bright was under the impression that “everything was all right.” The article maintained that “no objection could be made, as the St. Louis Club had played the club once before.” Mr. Bright went on to offer, “We thought nothing of the club coming from Philadelphia…as they played two morning games in Connecticut last week, leaving their hotel at 3½ in the morning and returning in time to play championship games here in the afternoon.”\textsuperscript{95}

The \textit{New York Sun} gave information about how the Cuban Giants planned to respond. The article contended “Mr. Bright intends to bring

\textsuperscript{90} “Color Line in Baseball: The Revolt of the Members of the St. Louis Club,” \textit{The Times} [Philadelphia], 12 Sept. 1887, 1.
\textsuperscript{95} “The Browns Go on Strike: They Refuse to Come to New York to Play the Cuban Giants,” \textit{New York Sun}, 13 Sept. 1887, 3.
suit for damages against Mr. Von Der Ahe.” This is because there were “several thousand spectators at the West Farm grounds expecting to see the St. Louis Club play, and because they did not put in an appearance the managers were denounced as frauds.” The *Sun* thus was the only major city newspaper to reveal the effect of the St. Louis players’ actions. The *Sun* postulated also that the color of the Cuban Giants was an excuse, and stated that the members of the city’s local clubs had no problem playing against colored players.96 The *Sun* had also listed the game in its Sunday edition.97

The colored press didn’t editorialize on the meaning of the “color line,” but merely reported the news if the papers printed it at all. The *Western Appeal* out of St. Paul and Minneapolis reported the story a few days after *The Times*. The paper printed a very truncated version of the story boiling it down to “The St. Louis Browns refused to play the Cuban Giants of Trenton, N.J., at Philadelphia, Pa., a few days ago because the latter organization was composed of colored players.”98 This article was among various news items about black people from around the country instead of specifically in a sports column.

In the days following *The Times* of Philadelphia and the other major cities breaking the story, several other smaller towns picked it up and ran it in their editions. The *Daily Evening Bulletin*, in Maysville, Kentucky, ran the story the next day after *The Times* with the same truncated story as the *Boston Post*.99 The *St. Paul Daily Globe* in Minnesota also ran the story the day after *The Times*, and printed the original article almost verbatim.100 The *Bangor Daily Whig and Courier*, in Bangor, Maine, ran the story a couple of days later almost verbatim as well.101 *The Herald-Dispatch* in Decatur, Illinois ran the story even a few days later still, and it also truncated the story, although it kept the names of the players involved.102
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A few papers did give follow-up stories about what was happening with the Cuban Giants’ manager’s threat of a lawsuit. The Washington D.C. *Evening Star* reported simply that the manager was threatening the lawsuit, although the *New York Sun* had already broken that story four days prior. The *Boston Daily Globe* did the most thorough job of updating its readers about the Cuban Giants and the St. Louis Browns, with several days’ worth of news. On September 16, the *Daily Globe* had a blurb that stated, “It now appears that the color line had nothing to with the refusal of the Browns to play the Cuban Giants. It was merely an excuse to get a day off.” The following day, the *Daily Globe* ran a short paragraph that stated that Browns’ third baseman Arlie Latham had been fined $100 for “his share in the refusal to play the Cuban Giants on Sunday.” The article quoted Von Der Ahe as saying:

> The failure to play the game with the Cuban Giants cost me $1000. If it was a question of principle with any of my players I would not say a word; but it isn’t. Two or three of them had made arrangements to spend Sunday in Philadelphia, and this scheme was devised so they would not be disappointed.

Some papers ran articles on a proposed rescheduling of the cancelled game. On September 19, the *Daily Globe* reported “Von Der Ahe has agreed to play the Cuban Giants on Oct 16, the day before the Browns play the Detroits in Boston.” Other papers followed up on Von Der Ahe’s agreement to play the Cuban Giants on October 16. The *Goshen Daily News* in Goshen, Indiana reported a month after the incident that Von Der Ahe had determined not to play the Cuban Giants on October 16, but that is all it mentioned. Likewise, the *Evening Gazette* of Cedar Rapids, Iowa also printed the same day the short sentence about Von Der Ahe deciding against playing the Cuban Giants on October 16 in a column with the same title as Goshen, the only difference being the page number. The day after the scheduled rematch, the edition of *The Brooklyn Daily Eagle* reported on an exhibition game the day
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before between the Brooklyn team and the St. Louis Browns, which the
Brooklyn team won, but made no mention of the prior agreement of the
Browns to play the Cuban Giants. After the box score of the Brooklyn
and St. Louis game, the article mentions that a “picked nine which
included several of the New York teams defeated the Cuban Giants by 11
to 5.”

The Browns’ refusal to play the Cuban Giants in September
wasn’t the first blow to the integration of professional baseball in
1887. In June of 1887 two players had issues with their teams in the
International League due to the color of their skin. Pitcher Robert
Higgins was signed by the Syracuse Stars and was regarded as a valuable
addition to the team. However *The Sporting News* reported that, not
long after Higgins was signed, one of his teammates, Dug Crothers,
refused to sit for the team photograph with him, and Crothers engaged
in an argument with the manager. *The Daily Commonwealth* in Topeka
reported that the Binghamton Club released John “Bud” Fowler with the
understanding that he could sign only with the Cuban Giants. Fowler’s
online SABR biography page stated that the reason for Fowler’s and
black teammate Renfro’s release from Binghamton was due to the refusal
of white teammates to play unless the two black players were released.
The page quoted the *Boston Herald* as reporting “The players of the
Binghamton club have each been fined $50 by the directors for having
refused to go upon the field six weeks ago unless Fowler, the colored
second baseman, was removed.”

Another setback to integration occurred in a league wide setting.*The Sporting Life* reported, in the same section where they praised black
players, that “the Canadian papers are advocating the exclusion of
colored players from the International League.” The article quoted the
*Toronto World* as stating:

Their presence on the teams has not been productive of
satisfactory results, and good players as some of them have
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shown themselves, it would seem advisable to take action of some kind looking either to their non-engagement or compelling the other element to play with them.\textsuperscript{116}

On July 14, the International League held meetings where it was agreed upon that they would no longer buy black players, although the black players in the league would continue to play. A few days later, The Sporting Life mentioned that at the meetings “several representatives declared that many of the best players in the League were anxious to leave on account of the colored element.” This caused the board to finally direct “Secretary White to approve of no more contracts with colored men.”\textsuperscript{117} Rosenberg quoted the New York Telegram as stating “the color line has been drawn in base-ball. The International League officially has taken action against the employment of negroes by white clubs.”\textsuperscript{118}

The International League decision went largely unreported outside of The Sporting Life and the New York Telegram, until the St. Louis Browns’ refusal to play the Cuban Giants. At the end of The Times in Philadelphia article, and most of the major cities reprinting, it stated “the International League recently adopted a resolution prohibiting the employment of colored players by its clubs.” The article stated the reason for this resolution was due to “opposition from the players, who objected to playing with black Second Baseman Grant, of the Buffalo Club, and black Pitcher Stovey, of the Newark Club.”\textsuperscript{119}

At the end of 1887, at least one paper lamented the drawing of the color line. The Sporting Life reprinted an article from The Detroit Free Press with the headline, “A Loss to the Game.” The article claimed that “some of the finest ball players in the country are colored men,” and that they “would prove a boon to some of the weak clubs of the League and Association.” The Cuban Giants were described as a club that “some very fine ball talent, and has proven its prowess by vanquishing the best of League and Association clubs.” It further discussed the fact that, despite the necessary talent, that black athletes won’t get the opportunity in the National League or American Association because the “if there is one thing the white ball player insists on doing it is drawing the color line very rigidly.” Lastly, it noted that some minor league clubs contained black men, and that “the white members of some clubs have shown
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commendable toleration.”

Over the course of the years from when Walker made his debut with Toledo, the newspapers were more objective about race than the intolerant players were toward integration. Some newspapers did hurl veiled racist remarks towards Walker in their coverage of his playing, but most did not come out and attack Walker based on his color. The newspapers questioned the motives of the Browns’ players for not wanting to play against the Cuban Giants, and at the same time showed the Cuban Giants respect based solely on their playing ability and not the color of their skin. The papers were objective, despite accepting and passing along the excuse that the Browns players really just wanted a day off and were not against playing a colored team. The majority of the papers across the country stayed with the objective reporting of the sports news instead of editorializing about colored players playing along side white players. This objectivity allowed the papers to appear professional despite what the editors’ personal views may have been.
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Getting Lincoln Elected:

Jerri Lynn Mann

This paper focuses on how publisher Joseph Medill and his Chicago Press and Tribune kept Abraham Lincoln’s name prominently in the news before and during the 1860 Presidential election campaign. The Tribune’s coverage and support of Lincoln over other candidates leading up to the Republican Convention in Chicago and continuing throughout the election campaign was unmatched by other newspapers. As one way to provide support, the Tribune printed Lincoln’s speeches verbatim. Meanwhile, Medill corresponded with Lincoln throughout the campaign offering support and advice.

The coverage of Abraham Lincoln’s 1860 Presidential nomination campaign by the Chicago Press and Tribune is said to have helped elect Lincoln. An opinion column 150 years later in the May 16, 2010, Tribune spoke of the commitment to Lincoln’s nomination at the 1860 convention. Its part owner and editor, Joseph Medill, “spared no newsprint or superlative in promoting Lincoln for president.”1 The article noted that Lincoln had been a loyal subscriber of the Tribune and included a picture of Lincoln with a copy of the Chicago Press and Tribune on his lap. The column went on to say that the managing editor and part owner of the Tribune, Joseph Medill had actually altered the photograph and attributed it to overzealous marketing. The article confirmed that Medill shared a common goal with Lincoln to abolish slavery and he used his position at the newspaper to promote Lincoln.2

The Tribune printed its first issue on June 10, 1847. The original founders were Joseph K. C. Forrest, James J. Kelly, and John E. Wheeler. In December 1847, the Tribune installed telegraphic news service and became the first newspaper in the west to receive news over the wire. It would not be until 1855 when Medill would become a driving force behind the success of the Tribune.3

Medill was born in Canada and grew up in Ohio. By the time he

---
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was 26, Medill had become a newspaper owner and publisher. Medill, at the age of 32, sold his newspaper *Cleveland Morning Leader* and moved to Chicago. Medill partnered with Dr. Charles Ray, a political advocate and medical doctor with newspaper experience, and purchased the *Tribune*. As editor, Medill used the paper to speak out against slavery, even in Illinois, a free state. Medill was one of the founders of the newly formed Republican Party.\(^4\) He followed the Dred Scott Supreme Court decision requiring that slaves be returned to their masters from non-slave territories with an editorial saying, “Slavery is now national, freedom has no local habitation nor abiding place save in the heart of Freemen. Illinois in law has ceased to be a free State!” Medill followed up the paper’s declaration by publishing a proposed remedy, “Let the next President be a Republican, and 1860 will mark an era kindred with that of 1776.”\(^5\)

Later in his career, Medill would be elected mayor of Chicago to help rebuild the city following the Great Chicago Fire. In 1874 Medill returned to the *Tribune* as editor-as-chief after purchasing a controlling interest in the paper.\(^6\)

The *Tribune* announced its support of Abraham Lincoln as Republican nominee in the 1860 presidential race on February 16, 1860. “We favor the nomination of Mr. Lincoln for the first place on the National Republican ticket,” stated the editorial written by Ray.\(^7\) The headline read “The Presidency--Abraham Lincoln:”\(^8\)

Abraham Lincoln of Illinois is the peer of any man yet named in connection with the Republican nominations, while in regard to availability, we believe him to be more certain to carry Illinois and Indiana than any one else, and his political antecedents are such to command heartily to the support of Pennsylvania and New Jersey.\(^9\)

The article pointed to Lincoln’s popularity within the party. It mentioned Lincoln’s campaign against U.S. Senator Stephen A. Douglas and the popularity for Lincoln that was generated. The article outlined

\(^4\) Ibid.  
\(^5\) Editorial, *Chicago Tribune*, June 18, 1855  
\(^6\) Ibid.  
\(^7\) “The Presidency - Abraham Lincoln,” *Chicago Press and Tribune*, February 16, 1860, p. 2. [The newspaper was renamed *Chicago Daily Tribune* on Oct. 10, 1860.]  
\(^8\) Ibid.  
\(^9\) Ibid.
four elements that summed up, “his popularity and strengths.”\(^{10}\)

The article first covered Lincoln’s character. “A gentleman of unimpeachable purity of private life. His good name is not soiled by a single act, political, social, moral or religious, that we or his friends need to blush to own as his.”\(^{11}\) The examination of the first element expanded on his character stating that he was an honest man that even an enemy could not, “place his finger and say, ‘this is dishonest,’ or ‘this is mean.’”\(^{12}\)

The article then highlighted Lincoln’s intellect. “Not learned in a bookish sense, but master of great fundamental principles, and of that kind of ability which applies there to crises and events.” It mentioned his performances in the Lincoln-Douglas debates, as well as other speeches stating, “...mark him as one of the ablest political thinkers of his day.”\(^{13}\)

Next the article discussed Lincoln’s political record. It spoke to his loyalty to the Whig party before its dissolution, and his involvement in the early part of the development of the Republican Party. The article also addressed his position on slavery.

The *Tribune* also favored Lincoln’s “executive capacity.” The article concluded by lauding his character and work ethic:

> Never garrulous, never promising what he cannot perform, never doing anything for show or effect, laboriously attentive to detail, industrious and conscientious, he would see to it that no want of promptness, attention or industry on his part should defeat the reforms in the administration of national affairs which Republicism is pledged to inaugurate.\(^{14}\)

Medill led the *Tribune*’s support of Lincoln. The two men first met in 1855 when Lincoln walked into the *Tribune* office. Recalling the first meeting, Medill said, “He was a very tall, remarkably thin man, his legs were absurdly long and slender, and he had enormous hands and feet.”\(^{15}\) Lincoln’s reason for going to office was to pay for a six-month subscription to the *Tribune*. He said to Medill, “I like your paper, I didn’t before you boys took hold if it; it was too much of a Know-Nothing
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Medill was later impressed with Lincoln during the organizing convention of the Illinois Republicans held later that year. Both men attended the convention as delegates, where Medill also covered the convention for the Tribune. The formation of the Republican Party occurred

The Tribune had supported Lincoln during his race against Douglas for the U.S. Senate from Illinois. The two candidates agreed to conduct a series of debates in seven of the nine Illinois congressional districts. The debates began on August 21, 1858, and prior to the debates, on August 10, Medill wrote to Lincoln that the Tribune had appointed C. Davisson to follow Lincoln and write articles during the campaign. The debates covered the issues of slavery and popular sovereignty, issues thought to be critical in the next presidential election. As promised, the Tribune provided full coverage of the debates touting Lincoln’s performances.

Medill and the Tribune also provided other types of support during the Senate campaign. They arranged railcars to take Lincoln supporters to the debates from Chicago. More than 1,000 supporters took advantage of the special round-trip fare of $4.85 the paper had arranged to attend the Freeport debate. While he lost the race, Lincoln became nationally known because of the press coverage of the debates.

The Tribune praised Lincoln in defeat. On November 10, 1858, the Tribune stated that his candidacy had given him a national reputation, partly because of the Tribune’s coverage.

We know of no better time than the present to congratulate him on the memorable and brilliant canvass that he has made. He has fully vindicated the partialities of his friends, and has richly earned, though he has not achieved, success. He has created for himself a national reputation that is both envied and deserved; and though he should hereafter fill no official station, he has done in the cause of Truth and Justice what will always entitle him to the gratitude of his party and to the admiration of all who respect the high moral qualities and the keen, comprehensive and sound intellectual gifts that he has displayed. No man could have done more.17
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Lincoln, the Tribune declared, was a representative of the new Republican Party. As such, the Republican Party owed Lincoln “for his truthfulness, his courage, his self-command, and his consistency; but the weight of their debt is chiefly in this: that, under no temptation, no apprehension of defeat, in compliance with no solicitation, has he let down our standard in the least.”

Lincoln may have hinted to the Tribune that he was not giving up. On November 20, 1858, in a letter to Dr. Ray he wrote, “I believe...you are feeling like h--l yet... Quit that. You will soon feel better. Another blow-up is coming; and we shall have fun again.”

Lincoln acknowledged the Tribune’s support. On June 15, 1859, he expressed his appreciation to the paper:

Herewith is a little draft to pay for your Daily another year from today. I suppose I shall take the Press & Tribune so long as it and I both live, unless I become unable to pay for it. In its devotion to our cause always, and to me personally last year, I owe a debt of gratitude, which I fear I shall never to able to pay.

Lincoln unofficially hit the presidential campaign trail in September 1859. He made 17 speeches between September and December of 1859. The Tribune had sent Robert Hitt to follow Lincoln, who sent back word-for-word transcripts so that the newspaper could reprint the speeches. During the delivery of the speeches, Lincoln’s audience did not exceed 25,000. The exposure to his speeches that the Tribune provided was more than 500,000.

Before he supported Lincoln, Medill backed Ohio Governor Salmon P. Chase for President. On June 8, 1859, Medill wrote to Chase, “We do not think it policy thus early to commit our paper publicly to any candidate, but to work underground for you and openly for a Western man.”

Medill withdrew his commitment concerned that Chase could not gain support from the states that would be necessary to secure a victory.
by a Republican candidate. Medill wrote on October 30, in a letter to Archibald W. Campbell, editor and part owner of the *Intelligencer*, the only Republican daily paper in Virginia, a slave state, “Personally I prefer Gov. Chase to any man--believing that he possesses the best executive ability but if he is not considered available is not Old man the man to win with.” Medill added, “The friends of the gallant old Abe will never consent to put the tallest end of the ticket behind.”

Prior to publically announcing their support, Medill and the *Tribune* had unofficially backed Lincoln. The coverage the *Tribune* provided in support of Lincoln during the 12-month period between February 1, 1859 and February 1, 1860 was expansive. There were 34 articles during that time where Lincoln’s name appeared in headlines. Lincoln’s named was also mentioned 120 times in articles that ran in the *Tribune* during the timeframe. This type of exposure was important to Lincoln’s campaign.

Much of the *Tribune*’s coverage compromised of articles reprinted from other newspapers praising Lincoln. A reprint from Pennsylvania’s *Berk’s Journal* read, “This is the most delicate compliment to Mr. Lincoln whose speeches are among the very best expositions of Republican doctrine, anywhere, on record.”

The *Tribune* provided a response to a letter to the editor that demonstrated its unwavering support of Lincoln. The letter appeared in the February 27, 1860 edition of the *Tribune* signed with the initials A.P.C. questioning Lincoln’s candidacy, “. . . but is his political record such that it bear the test of these times?” It also questioned whether he had, “given pro-slavery votes.” The reply by the *Tribune* provided validation of its support:

Mr. Lincoln’s record both political and personal is without a line of which any Republican need be afraid or ashamed. He was from the beginning of his political life, up to the day of the dissolution of the Whig party, a Whig, honestly imbued with the notions which Whigs entertained. As a member of the Illinois Legislature of the House of Representatives or as a popular political speaker, we do not know that he has ever written a line or spoken a work that ought to lower him in the esteem of any honest, patriot
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The response continued by addressing Lincoln’s position on land ownership and the railroad. It concluded praising Lincoln’s integrity, “He is personally so pure that no government dollars would, if elected, stick to his fingers or be appropriated to partisan purposes. Now what more would ‘A.P.C.’ ask? Is not Lincoln the man of the hour?”

The Tribune’s support of Lincoln was covered in other newspapers. On February 22, 1860, the Daily Milwaukee News ran a story entitled, “Greeley and Douglas,” that focused on which candidate the New York Tribune editor, Horace Greeley, would support for President. The article stated, “But the name sake of the Tribune, published in Chicago, is quite decided in the language which it uses in this connection and insists that no one but a tried republican ought to be nominated — and to show its pluck puts forward Mr. Lincoln for the place.” The article went on to call Lincoln, “the idol of the Chicago Tribune.”

On February 28, 1860, Joseph Medill ran an editorial defending his position in support of Lincoln. The article entitled, “A Word of Caution,” addressed the grumblings of various Republicans, “without this candidate or that,” they would “not go into the fight.” The article continued citing that the “cause” was the primary concern, not a single candidate: “if our judgment is confirmed and our personal feeling gratified by the nomination of Mr. Lincoln, we will be glad; but if another is singled out for the honor which Lincoln deserves, no matter who he is, so that he represents the Republican idea, he shall have our support.” The article urged others have the same attitude.

The Tribune continued to reprint articles from other papers to keep Lincoln in the headlines. On March 2, it ran an article from the Cincinnati Gazette reporting on a county resolution in support of Lincoln. The March 5 edition reported Lincoln’s confirmation by the Bloomington, Illinois Pantagraph and the Kansas Daily Register.

The March 8 Tribune reported Lincoln’s political appearance in
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New Hampshire, relaying a story in the *Boston Atlas and Bee*:

The Concord *Statesman* says that notwithstanding the rain of Thursday, rendering traveling very inconvenient, the largest [hall] in that city was crowded to hear Mr. Lincoln. The editor says it was, “one of the most powerful, logical and compact speeches to which it was every our fortune to listen; an argument against the system of, and in defence of the position of the Republican party from the deductions of which no reasonable man could possibly escape. He fortified every position assumed by proofs which it is impossible to gain-say; and while his speech was at intervals enlivened by remarks which elicited applause at the expense of the Democratic party, there was nevertheless, not a single work which tended to empair the dignity of the speaker, or weaken the force of the great truths which he uttered.”

A March 15 article in the *Tribune* responded to an accusation by the Illinois *State Journal*. The article “Seward and Lincoln” begins, “The *State Journal* will not provoke a controversy with us by its misconstruction of our article of Saturday last, in relation to the comparative chances of Seward and Lincoln for the nomination at Chicago. The views expressed in that, we doubt not, are the views of Mr. Lincoln himself.”

The article provides a point-by-point detail of the *Tribune*’s position on the nominees. The first point agreed that Seward was the favorite of the majority of the Republican Party. The second point acknowledged that Lincoln was smart enough to know that Seward was favored. The article then reconfirmed the *Tribune*’s committed support of Lincoln, “Mr. Lincoln is our candidate--as been from the beginning and will be until the convention takes from us the rights as partisans to press his claims.”

The March 17 edition of the *Tribune* provided continued coverage of Lincoln’s campaign trail. “Mr. Lincoln in New England,” reported on Lincoln’s New England successes:

Our late advices from the East both through private
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and public channels, concur in saying that Lincoln’s introduction to the people New England has produced a very remarkable impression on the public mind in that quarter. The Republican journals of New Hampshire and Rhode Island speak of his progress through those states as something like the march of a conqueror, or a great public benefactor. We hazard nothing in saying that no man has ever before risen so rapidly to political eminence in the United States. Mr. Lincoln’s style of argument commands the admiration of the scholar and politician no less than that of the artisan and the day laborer.

The presence of Lincoln’s name increased in the paper as the date of the convention drew nearer. The April 20 Tribune ran a blurb on the front page about a local artist who was completing a life-like bust of Lincoln. This was followed on April 21 with an article on the history of dueling. The article recounted Lincoln’s experience in a duel, “the acceptance of the challenge was the meanest thing he ever did in his life.” On April 24 an article announced reprints of campaign speeches being for sale.

Press coverage prior to the convention was an important element in the nomination of Lincoln. Because the convention was held in Chicago, the Tribune took advantage of the opportunity to generate support through promotion in the paper. “I would point directly to Abraham Lincoln of Illinois and say unto him ‘thou art the man,’” appeared in the text of an article appearing in the May 11, 1860 edition of the Tribune. This quote followed a question posed to readers about which candidate would be able to carry the Western states.

Another article appeared in the May 14, 1860 edition entitled, “The Choice of Illinois.” The article stated, “No one who has watched the political current in Illinois this year can doubt that ABRAHAM LINCOLN is empathically the choice of the State for President.”

The week before the convention, the Saturday edition front-page lead article prominently displayed its support of Lincoln, “Republican
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Nominations, For President of the United States, Abraham Lincoln.” The article also named the candidates for state positions the Tribune supported. The same article appeared as the lead story for the next three days of print.

Coverage of Lincoln increased on the second day of the convention. In the Tribune’s May 17 edition, the headline used in the previous editions was modified, removing “Republican Nominations.” The headline was the lead of the paper and appeared alone, excluding the article.

Also in the May 17 edition, the paper’s first column on the front page carried an article entitled “The Man Who Came to Win.” The article talked about Lincoln being the paper’s “preference” over the other candidates. It addressed his presence in the 1858 Senate election against Douglas and his strength as a candidate, “We believe him to be the to-day, the strongest man in the party.”

Another article appeared on page 4 of the same March 17 edition of the Tribune. The article covered polling of delegates headed to the convention on the New Albany and Salema Railroad. Lincoln received the most votes with 51, followed by Seward with 42.

During the convention, Lincoln received the unlikely support of the New York Tribune’s Horace Greeley, who had previously supported Seward. Greeley felt that he had been politically betrayed by Seward and his associates in previous years. Greeley’s support was critical as he used his influence to boost Lincoln through his negative cry of “Anybody but Seward” that he used throughout the convention. Lincoln and Greeley had served together as Whig legislators in the late 1840s and both men were instrumental in the formation of the new Republican Party.
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The *Tribune* kept Lincoln’s name in the news on the last day of the convention. Along with the continued running of the headline, the *Tribune* ran a reprint from the Illinois *State Journal*. The article read, “No feature of the Republican State Convention was more clearly marked than the unanimity of sentiment which was manifested there for the Hon. Abraham Lincoln. The delegates from every part of the state vied with each other in exhibitions of their unabounded admiration for him.”

Medill and other Lincoln supporters’ strategy for the convention to generate overwhelming support for Lincoln worked successfully. Balloting for the Republican nominations began on May 18. Thousands of Seward’s supporters marched through downtown, waving banners, singing and shouting their support. When they arrived at the convention hall, they could not get into the Wigwam because Lincoln supporters had printed counterfeit tickets and packed the hall.

As expected by Lincoln supporters, Seward led the first ballot but did not take the majority to win. Whenever a speaker mentioned Lincoln’s name, the audience exploded into cheers that shook the Wigwam. “Uncommitted delegates were impressed. Honest Abe seemed to be the people’s choice!” The Seward delegates were in shock.

Lincoln’s people worked to persuade delegates that Lincoln was the right man. On the third ballot Lincoln was nominated.

A retrospective piece written by Kenan Heise, a *Tribune* staffer, recounted the events of the election from the perspective of the *Tribune*:

A large and noisy crowd had already filled the meeting hall to capacity by the time the supporters of William H. Seward showed up for the third day of the Republican convention. It was no accident that the crowd—which bellowed its backing for Illinois’ favorite son, Abraham Lincoln—had arrived early. In retrospect, the hand of destiny is easy to see in Lincoln’s nomination on this day, but fate received considerable help from local admirers of “Honest Abe.”

Heise wrote about how Lincoln gained national popularity

---
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following his debates against Douglas during the 1858 senatorial race. He also touched on the way the crowd at the convention had been manipulated so that it was filled with Lincoln supporters.

The eloquent, self-assured Seward, a U.S. senator from New York, was widely thought to have the nomination wrapped up; many deals had been cut, one of which put Chicago Mayor “Long John” Wentworth in the Seward camp. Lincoln had grown in national standing in the two years since his debates with Stephen A Douglas, but he was still seen as something of a provincial. Fortunately for him, Chicago, which was hosting its first national political convention, was the heart of Lincoln country. To make sure a friendly crown was on hand to out-shout the competition, batches of admission tickets were printed at the last moment and handed out to Lincoln supporters, who were told to show up early at the Wigwam, a rickety hall that held 10,000 people. And, for good measure, Illinois delegation chairman Norman Judd and Joseph Medill of the Chicago Daily Press and Tribune place the New York delegates off to one side, far from key swings states such as Pennsylvania.

The article then addressed how the election unfolded that day. It talked about how there was no candidate who had received a majority of the votes after two ballots. It was not until the third ballot that Lincoln secured the nomination.

No candidate had a majority after two ballots. During the third ballot, with Lincoln tantalizingly close to winning the nomination, Medill sat close to the chairman of the Ohio delegation, which had backed its favorite son, Salmon P. Chase. Swing your votes to Lincoln, Medill whispered, and your boy can have anything he wants. The Ohio chairman shot out of his chair and changed the state’s votes.

After a moment of stunned silence, the flimsy Wigwam began to shake with the stomping of feet and the shouting of the Lincoln backers who packed the hall and blocked
the streets outside. A cannon on the roof fired off a round, and boats on the Chicago River tooted in reply.

The courthouse bell rang out, and soon church bells around the city took up the peal. The Republicans had a candidate.\footnote{Ibid.}

The \textit{Tribune} announced the victory in the May 19 edition. The lead headline was the same as had been the previous days, but the disclaimer “Subject to the decision of the Chicago Convention” was removed.\footnote{Ibid.} The headline continued, “For Vice President, Hannibal Hamlin, of Maine.”\footnote{Ibid.}

The \textit{Tribune} continued to work on Lincoln’s behalf following his dramatic win at convention in May. The May 19 edition also contained an article, “Campaign Press and Tribune, for the Great Presidential Campaign!” The article began, “Republicans you have now selected your candidate for the Campaign of 1860. Abraham Lincoln of Illinois leads the column of the Friends of Freedom. During the six months that are before us the Press and Tribune will labor incessantly for his election.”\footnote{“Campaign Press and Tribune for the Great Presidential Campaign!” \textit{Chicago Press and Tribune,} May 19, 1860, p. 1.}

The \textit{Tribune}’s support included discrediting the other candidates and their supporters. A May 22 story mocked another paper’s article touting the patriotic acts of a Douglas supporter.

Patriotic - A young fellow named Wm. Hart got very patriotic over Lincoln’s nomination on Friday night and wanted to fight. He “squared the circle, “and challenged everybody to come in. The police accepted the invitation, and after a severe struggle, overpowered him and took him to the lockup. He was fined $8 and costs - \textit{Herald.}

The “patriotism” of the young man the \textit{Herald} should have added, consisted of yelling for Douglas, and offering to bet or fight any man who opposed him til his so-called “patriotism,” aided by whiskey, landed him in the Fremont alley, where he was arrested and escorted to the armory by
Officer Colburn and one of the merchant’s police.”

Headlines in the May 23 edition confirmed the Tribune’s commitment to Lincoln’s election. “Old Line Whig of New York for Lincoln,” was on page one. Also on the front page, “Fight for the Democratic Leaders,” which stated, “A panic has sized the Democratic Leaders in Washington. The nomination of Lincoln is an event for which they were not prepared.”

John Locke Scripps, a staff member of the Chicago Tribune, authored a 4,000-word biography entitled Life of Abraham Lincoln. The biography was to be used as a way to inform people of Lincoln’s character, political positions, and professional accomplishments. Medill oversaw the creation of the biography and was instrumental in its distribution. He used his connection to Horace Greeley to have copies of the biography printed with their presses. This was confirmed in a letter from Scripps to Lincolns dated July 11, 1860, “When I wrote you last, I informed you the Mr. Medill had gone to New York with the view of arrangements to get out the biography, in that city. He made such an arrangement with the Tribune people.”

Medill’s support included addressing concerns to Lincoln. Medill wrote a letter to Lincoln on August 30 expressing his concern at possible overconfident Pennsylvania. Lincoln replied on September 4, with the following:

PRIVATE
J. Medill, Esq Springfield

My dear Sir Sep. 4. 1860

Yours of Aug. 30th. for some cause, only reached me last night. As to Pennsylvania, I have a letter from Gen. Cameron, dated Aug. 29th. in which, among other things, he says:
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“You may as well be getting your inaugural address ready, so as to have plenty time to make it short. If possible we are daily becoming stronger in Pennsylvania, and in New-Jersey all is right.”

Last night, just as I had read your letter, Mr. David Taggart called upon me. He is a very intelligent gentleman, lately was Speaker of the Penn. Senate, and is now upon our electoral ticket, and residing at Northumberland. He left home Thursday the 30th.; and he is very confident that Penn. is abundantly safe, both for Curtin in Oct--- & the National ticket in Novr. This from Cameron & Taggart, constitute[s] my latest news from Penn.

I am more annoyed by what you write me of Maine. Long ago I had heard about danger of two members of congress there; but at least six weeks since Mr. Hamlin wrote me “all is safe in New-England[’]; and very recently Mr. Fog of N.H. wrote from N. York saying: “We are having a desperate fight in Maine; but it will end in a splendid triumph for us.” He had just come from Maine.

What you say about the Northern 30 counties of Illinois pleases me. Keep good your promise that they will give as much majority as they did for Fremont, and we will let you off. We cannot be beaten, nor even hard run, in the state, if that holds true.

Yours as ever A. LINCOLN.64

The Tribune continued following Lincoln on the campaign trail leading to the election. Some of reports included; “A. Lincoln Ratification Meeting in New Hampshire,”65 and “Lincoln and Hamlin in Delaware.”66 “We reckon that Indiana has a way of her own this time and will not “allow” herself to be carried for anybody but Lincoln and

Hamlin,” appeared on the front page on July 11.

On Election Day the Tribune urged readers to go the polls and vote, “The labor of six years centers on this day. Be sure to vote.” The response was great. “The Great Victory” was the headline of the Tribune, the following day, November 7, 1860.

Medill and the Tribune celebrated the victory. When Medill and the Tribune learned of how overwhelming Lincoln’s victory was, they held a fireworks display and a two hundred-gun salute over the river in celebration. The festivities also included a torchlight parade through the streets of the business district. Citizens joined in the celebrations with neighborhoods building bonfires all over the city.

The November 7 Tribune reported Lincoln’s win. Medill’s editorial said, “There is hope yet for freedom, for honesty, for purity. Let distrust and apprehension be banished forever....It is enough to say that the triumph is a glorious one -- that Abraham Lincoln is President elect of this great Republic. And let all the people say Amen!”

70 McKinney, Magnificent Medills, p. 27.
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The Bulgarian Horrors through the Eyes of an American Journalist: Januarius Aloysius MacGahan’s Role in the Liberation of Bulgaria from the Ottoman Empire, 1876 - 1878

Miglena Sandmeier

An American journalist of Irish descent, Januarius MacGahan, who became known as the “Liberator of Bulgaria.” Evidence presented in this article substantially restores MacGahan’s role in the liberation of Bulgaria from the Ottoman Empire. That accolade was deleted from Bulgarian history by Marxist revisionist historians during the Communist regimes in the 20th Century. This paper affirms that it was MacGahan’s resolve and passionate outcry against injustice and cruelty he witnessed, that changed the course of European diplomacy and ultimately led to a war that liberated Bulgaria.

J. A. MacGahan, The Liberator from New Lexington OH

On a hot 4th of July morning in 1911, the homecoming celebration in the small town of New Lexington, Ohio ended in the town cemetery for a commemorative ceremony honoring one of their most famous citizens, the journalist and war correspondent Januarius Aloysius MacGahan. The tombstone erected upon his grave read: Januarius Aloysius MacGahan, Liberator of Bulgaria.¹

What did an American journalist of Irish descent have to do with a small Balkan nation and its liberation? This paper examines this question, and traces evidence from primary sources that show the timeline of events leading up to the Russo-Turkish war and MacGahan’s dispatches at the beginning of this conflict. His resolve and passionate outcry against injustice and cruelty changed the discourse in the British Parliament, and consequently it altered the course of European diplomacy.

To call him “the Liberator of Bulgaria,” may be inaccurate, but he undeniably stirred up emotions in the readers of the London Daily News, and directed the world’s attention to the small enslaved nation. Significantly, in the 20th Century, Communist Bulgaria’s Marxist historians found it necessary to “forget” MacGahan entirely while suppressing the Western contribution to Bulgarian liberation.²

² Yannis Sygkelos, Nationalism from the Left: The Bulgarian Communist Party During the
The Fourth Estate and the House of Commons

The role of the media as an important factor in political decision-making process was well established by 1876. Already in 1850, the surgeon and journalist Frederick Knight Hunt proclaimed: “The newspaper press wields the power of a Fourth Estate.”

Press values and prejudices immediately and simultaneously acted upon many thousands of minds, possessing a power of such unprecedented magnitude that it was not surprising that the public generally could have no adequate conception of it, because it is so infinitely above and beyond any other popular medium of intelligence with which it may be compared. In 1876, the disturbing reports of carnage that were coming out of Bulgaria, initially as rumors and later as confirmed witness accounts, possessed that “power” and “magnitude.”

Dark rumours have been whispered about Constantinople during the last month of horrible atrocities committed in Bulgaria. The local newspapers have given mysterious hints about correspondence from the interior which they have been obliged to suppress. It is too soon yet to attempt to ascertain the number who have been killed. An intelligent Turk who has just arrived estimates it at 18,000. Bulgarians speak of 30,000 and the destruction of upwards of a hundred villages. I pass over stories of the burning of forty or fifty Bulgarian girls in a stable and the massacre of upwards of a hundred children in the village school house. They are repeated everywhere in Constantinople, I have no sufficient authority to enable to express an opinion on their truth.

This troubling and alarming report came from the resident correspondent of the *London Daily News* to Constantinople. He based his report on a number of sources, most of them from within Bulgaria. One, a famous Bulgarian artist of a long line of iconographers and painters, Stansilav Dospevski, was instrumental in bringing the reports about the atrocities to the attention of the world. Relentlessly, Dospevski sent

---
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letters to the Constantinople correspondents of the *Daily News* and the *London Times*. He also sent letters to at least four Russian newspapers: *Golos, Moskovskie Vedomosti, Sankt Petersburski Vedomosti* and *Novoe Vremya*.\(^5\)

The *London Daily News* took the lead, initially through its correspondents in Constantinople and later by sending to Bulgaria, the American freelance journalist, Januarius MacGahan. The subsequent press reports soon directly influenced discussions in the British Parliament about the alleged atrocities committed in the Ottoman Empire. Four days after the MacGahan’s story was published in the *Daily News*, in the House of Commons on June 27, 1876, the Earl of Derby called attention to the *Daily News* reports:

> The Earl of Derby said that he saw the other day the correspondence of the *Daily News*, a very startling series of statements as to the alleged massacre and other acts of violence stated to have been committed by the Bashibozouks and the Turkish Troops.\(^6\)

The role of the press thus was fundamental in stimulating Parliament to investigate what was apparently a horrible massacre. The issue became increasingly important in discussions in Parliament, especially after the *London Daily News* published MacGahan’s reports. As their stories were also noted by newspapers across Britain, among them W. T. Stead’s *Darlington Echo*, public indignation rose steadily. But the dispatches by MacGahan and another *London Daily News* correspondent, Edwyn Pears, dominated the coverage of the atrocities. Their passionate reporting gave the *Daily News* a central role in the events that were to unfold for several months.

Clearly, it was MacGahan’s dispatches and gut-wrenching descriptions of the horrid monstrosities that he witnessed that placed him front and center in Parliament’s debates and in a pamphlet published by the famous former leader of the Liberal Party, William Gladstone. Days before the publishing the pamphlet, titled “Bulgarian Horrors,” Gladstone in Parliament acknowledged the impact of all the news stories “In the matter of the Bulgarian outrages, you have led the people of England: and I am about to walk as best I can in your steps, by an immediate publication, in which I shall hope to pay the Daily News a just

\(^5\) Dr. Bogomil V. Kolev, “Stanislav Dospevski: 190 years of his Birth,” *Bulgaria Weekly* November 24, 2013
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Although some newspapers in Britain and the United States showed less sympathy regarding the reported suffering in Bulgaria, it was becoming impossible to stay impartial about the carnage in Batak and other Bulgarian towns, especially after the publication of further news stories and the release of the official documentation of the events by Eugene Schuyler and later by Walter Baring.

Walter Baring, who was a secretary of the British Embassy to the Ottoman Empire, and the American Consul General in Constantinople and a Secretary at the American Embassy, Eugene Schuyler, joined by The Daily News’ war correspondent Januarius MacGahan on his fact finding mission to Bulgaria. The three of them became the most authoritative English-speaking observers of the aftermath in Bulgaria.

**The Ottoman Empire and the “Eastern Question”**

The “horrors” in Bulgaria was a major episode concerning the decline of the Ottoman Empire and its governance of the Balkans in the 19th Century. “It is of now use. It is of no use to try to maintain the Turkish Empire.” Napoleon Bonaparte had predicted. “We shall witness its fall in our time.” Politicians and diplomats throughout Europe worried as one country or another gained from the decline. In the Russian war of 1768-74, for instance, Russia had won the right to freely navigate in and out of the Black Sea through the Bosphorus and the Dardanelles Straits.

The problem of the Ottoman became known as the “Eastern Question.” British governments supported the Ottomans, both to protect the British interests in the region and to prevent Russia especially from increasing influence or control. By 1876, realpolitik led the British to support the Ottomans without serious objections to their mode of governance.

Especially since Crimean War of 1855-56, the Eastern Question was a foremost issue in Britain. Distrust in Russia had become the main
factor in determining British foreign policy into the 1870s, so dominating that Britain would have been more prone to enter into an alliance with its century-old enemy France than to negotiate with Russia.  

This was the picture when the British Ambassador to Constantinople reported that Muslims had begun attacking Bulgarian Christians in 1875. 

**MacGahan and the Technological Improvements in the Press**

As Januarius MacGahan’s reports were published in the British press, people naturally wondered about this American whose revelations so disturbed them. By then, MacGahan was already one of the world’s most prolific war correspondents. In only six years since his debut for the *New York Herald* of James Gordon Bennet, Jr. MacGahan had managed to beat many seasoned reporters. In 1871, during the Franco-Prussian War, he had scored scoops by embedding with the French Army and then using the new communications technologies - the telegraph and the Atlantic cable - to publish his stories in New York before they were printed in England. MacGahan went on to cover the the Third Carlist War in Spain, The French Commune, the taking of Khiva in Asia by the Russians, and the Crimean War. The Khiva adventure led to his first book “Campaigning on the Oxus and the Fall of Khiva.”

James Gordon Bennett Jr. was quite pleased with MacGahan, whose bravado, style, and speed matched Bennett’s appetite for the sensational and timely reporting that his father had pioneered as the *Herald*’s staple.

Earlier in 1876, Bennett sponsored a sensational mission to the Arctic Sea aboard a barge called Pandora, and sent MacGahan to write about the journey. Bennett hoped they would discover a Northwest passage through the Arctic which had been sought since the time of John Cabot. Bennett had hoped they would find traces of the lost Franklin Expedition. Unfortunately, dangerous conditions in the Arctic Sea, forced Pandora to abandon its course and return.
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MacGahan had moved his family to Paris and now pleaded with Bennett to allow him to settle down to write a book about the failed expedition. Bennett accused him of ingratitude for all he and his paper had done to bring MacGahan to the fame that he was enjoying then. Bennett wanted him to attempt another trip to the Arctic. MacGahan refused. Bennett finally agreed to a three month leave. MacGahan finished the book, *Under the Northern Lights*. Barbara MacGahan, Januarius’ Russian-born wife, described this time in her diaries: “I felt he had achieved enough to do without the slavery of Mr. Bennett.\(^{15}\)

In the spring of 1876 the new book got a lukewarm welcome. One critic noted:

MacGahan writes in a graphic lively style, and carries his reader along with him. The only difficulty seems to have been that, having nothing to write about, he felt himself under the necessity of padding out a volume of old second-hand matter.\(^{16}\)

In the eve of his 1876 assignment in Bulgaria by the Daily News, MacGahan was already recognized as a modern journalist. He was “equipped with modern tools of the trade, notably, a penchant for speed.” One scholar of that journalistic era, credit MacGahan as quite exceptional:

MacGahan, who frequently wrote descriptively, in first person was motivated by a temperamentlal sympathy for the underdog[...:] MacGahan preferred speed to felicity of expression. [...] Customarily this meant, riding horseback to the nearest telegraph office, which was often a considerable distance, and in the case of the Turkish war, being able to surreptitiously bypass the intrusive and sometimes brutal Russian censorship. The resourceful MacGahan beat repeatedly Forbes during the Turkish war, which they jointly covered for the Daily News and the Herald. MacGahan devised clever shortcuts, such
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as hiring “gallopers” to carry segments of a story to the nearest telegraph every 20 minutes or so, while he was still in the process of composing it. In the opinion of Stephen Bonsal, an outstanding American special, “MacGahan has lightning flashes at his command!”

The Road to Batak

In the summer of 1876, MacGahan got a letter from Eugene Schuyler, whom he met during the Crimean War. A US diplomat, stationed in Constantinople, Schuyler invited him to join in investigating the rumors coming from Bulgaria, about atrocities committed by the Turkish army.

MacGahan immediately asked Gordon Bennett to send him to the Balkans. But Bennett still had his mind set on yet another Arctic voyage. In the London office of the *New York Herald*, the two men were heard quarreling. MacGahan walked out on the paper and its editor. Almost immediately, the *Daily News*, four doors down the street, hired him to go to Bulgaria.

MacGahan, Schuyler and Baring travelled together to Philippopolis and arrived on July 23, 1876. From there they made their way to southwest corner of Bulgaria, high in the Rhodopi mountains. Hundreds of Ottoman mercenaries called “bashi bouzouk” had entered the village of Batak and promised to grant mercy if the villagers surrendered. Along the road to Batak, they were accompanied by villagers who had escaped the massacre, and who walked alongside their horses telling them that after they surrendered, during the next three days, the villagers suffered torture and mutilation. MacGahan memorialized the carnage of Batak with the term “Bulgarian Horrors.” As they were approaching Batak, they witnessed the first evidence of the atrocities first hand.

Traveling on horseback, MacGahan found 60 to 70 villages burned to the ground and reported that 12,000 to 15,000 Bulgarian Christians had been slaughtered in four days. MacGahan wrote: “For my own part, once the enormous number of 15,000 killed in four days is admitted, I do not care to inquire any further. you cannot increase or diminish the horror of the thing by mere statements of round numbers.”

The London reactions to MacGahan’s dispatches propelled a

---
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grassroots movement of indignation and protest against the lack of action by the British government. The pathos in MacGahan’s writing, his vivid descriptions, mixed with his personal feelings of overpowering sadness and fury, mobilized the public and politicians.

With the British public so deeply moved, Prime Minister Benjamin Disraeli could no longer downplay the events in Bulgaria as a simple act of dealing with unruly local insurgents. “The great crime in the eyes of Mr. Disraeli and Sir Henry Elliot,” MacGahan stated, was “to have said there 30,000 killed when there were only 25,000.”

Gladstone’s famous pamphlet, and later, his “Lessons in Massacre,” clearly prove the influence MacGahan’s dispatches had on him. Gladstone wrote:

> The heaviest question of all is not what was suffered, in a given district at a given date, but what is the normal and habitual condition of eight or ten millions of the subjected races, who for fifteen generations of men have been in servitude to the Turk.

“I Am No Longer Impartial”

On August 2, 1876, MacGahan submitted the report that triggered much of the British public’s reaction. While the numbers were important, so was the magnitude of cruelty. MacGahan reported in detail every monstrosity that he witnessed first hand. He had looked at horror, and did not wish to spare his readers

> I fear I am no longer impartial, and I am certainly no longer cool. There are certain things that cannot be investigated in a judicial state of mind... There are things too horrible to allow anything like calm inquiry; things the vileness of which the eye refuses to look upon, and which the mind refuses to contemplate... I have already investigated enough to feel convinced that from a purely statistical point of view, further investigation is necessary. ...... When, in addition, you have the horrid details of the vilest outrages committed upon women;
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the hacking to pieces of helpless children and spitting them upon bayonets; and when you have these details repeated to you by the hundred, not by Bulgarians, but by different consuls at Philippopolis, and German officials on the railway, as well as Greeks, Armenians, priests, missionaries, and even Turks themselves, you begin to feel that further investigation is superfluous.  

MacGahan attempted to confirm the numbers – inhabitants, houses, victims, Turkish army – and he documented his efforts in his dispatches.

Batak was a place of 900 houses, and about 8,000 to 9,000 inhabitants. As there are no trustworthy statistics of any other kind in Turkey, it was impossible to tell exactly what number the population of any place is, or was. Edep Ephendi in his report states that there were only about 1,400 inhabitants in the village, all told. A more impudent falsehood was never uttered, even by a Turk.

Schuyler was equally outraged at what he witnessed in Batak. “I am burning with indignation and rage - can scarcely contain myself,” he wrote. “Lowest estimate of Christians killed 12,000... Highest estimate of Turks killed two hundred and thirty.”

MacGahan pointed fingers at the guilty. He singled out a few Ottoman leaders whom he described having “no pity, no compassion, no bowels. They have not even the generosity, the pity of wild beasts. Even a tiger will not slay the young of his own species.” Among the culprits he detailed Ahmet Aga’s role as the captain of a company of mercenary bashi bozouks, who burned Batak.

Ahmet Aga, a captain of a company of bashi bazouks, who likewise distinguished himself with his ferocity. This Ahmet Aga, is a low ignorant brute who can neither read nor write, and yet who has been promoted
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to the rank of Pasha, and with that exquisite mockery of European demand for justice, for which the Oriental mind is so distinguished, who has been named a member of the commission appointed to prosecute and punish the bashi-bazouks.\textsuperscript{26}

As the two Americans had ventured towards Batak, they stopped in Peshtera. They were received by a family of five and fed, despite the scarcity of food they observed everywhere they went. They had some difficulties with Turkish authorities who insisted on sending an officer to accompany them on the way to Batak. Both men refused the offer politely but firmly. As the Turkish authorities felt this was a lèse majesté not to be condoned, they forbade all Pestera inhabitants from helping the Americans in any way.

Despite the explicit order, villagers provided them with horses and food. They were also joined by dozens of Batak survivors who had escaped the bloodbath and moved to Peshtera. During the three hour uphill horse ride, the people walking beside them told MacGahan and Schuyler other horrific stories. MacGahan spoke fluent Russian and later told his wife “I could have fancied myself amongst peasants of the Volga.”\textsuperscript{27}

Despite such documentation, no one had been held responsible for the atrocities, a fact that fueled the rage at the many grassroots protests in Britain. One critic noted: “It is clear that it matters little if 3,000 or 10,000 were killed, if almost every ruffian guilty of the blood of children or women could evade all responsibility and penalty.”\textsuperscript{28}

MacGahan’s assigned guilt in his letters from Batak and region: “[all of] these massacres were committed by the order of the authorities, and that is why the men who committed them have been rewarded with decorations and promotions.”\textsuperscript{29} Despite MacGahan’s claims, the Sublime Porte and Disraeli, speaking for the Queen, refused to assign responsibility for the brutalities.

The stream of reports in the \textit{Daily News} and other publications, however, inflamed the British public even further. Protests and “letters to the Editor” were continuously sent to the \textit{Daily News}, which diligently printed each of them.
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\textsuperscript{27} MacGahan, 20.
\textsuperscript{28} Temperley, \textit{The Bulgarian and Other Atrocities, 1875-8}, 24.
\textsuperscript{29} MacGahan, 90
Some did seek to protect Christians in the Ottoman territories. Lord Derby wrote to Sir Henry Elliot: “You cannot urge too strongly upon the Porte, in bringing to their notice Mr. Baring’s statements, the necessity of taking effective measures to afford redress, execute justice and provide at once for protection of the Christians.”

However, correspondence between Elliot and Dupuis in Turkey, and the British Government, and what was made public by Disraeli and the Foreign Office in London, indicated that there was a total lack of communication and information between the British government, its Foreign Office and its representatives abroad.

Had it not been for the *Daily News* breaking the story, and for MacGahan insisting to have the *Daily News’* editor John Robinson dispatch him to Bulgaria, very likely the “Bulgarian Horrors” would have become just a record, a mere blurb, in the Foreign Office papers.

MacGahan’s incredibly fast writing, and his use of “gallopers” to deliver segments of his articles as he was still writing, enabled him to break story after story before the government had even prepared a report or a rebuttal. When his stories hit the press and then the streets the next day, the public was reading accounts of such inhumane and horrid occurrences, while as yet the government was silent. This in turn diminished the public’s trust in the government. While MacGahan was penning story after story and capturing the public’s hearts and minds, the government was just beginning to investigate.

The government had also other concerns about support for the Ottoman Empire. According to Baring’s report, the perpetrators tortured and raped and enslaved, and burned everything to the ground, including livestock, harvest, production facilities. The province they destroyed had been sending more than 800,000 Turkish pounds in tax revenues and it was one of the more lucrative lands of the Empire.

On August 1, MacGahan wrote that the Ottoman tax collectors came to the ravished villages demanding payments, “just as though

---
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nothing had happened.” His indignation and outrage streamed from the pages of the paper, as he retold tales of “women submitted to every species of degradation and infamy that the foul and debased imagination of a savage could invent. Nay more!” He kept bringing account after account of horror, rape, piled skulls, bodies that have been left unburied, with clothes still on, but no flesh, as wild dogs have picked them... “unbridled lust of a barbarous race.”

His reports also roused intellectuals from every corner of the continent, equally enraged by the the reports and the lack of action by governments. The roll included Victor Hugo, Fyodor Dostyevsky, Ivan Turgenev, Oscar Wilde and Charles Darwin. Wilde wrote a series of sonnets inspired by the horrors. Most famous of them is the “Sonnet-Massacre of the Christians in Bulgaria.”

CHRIST, dost thou live indeed? or are thy bones
Still straightened in their rock-hewn sepulchre?
And was thy Rising only dreamed by Her
Whose love of thee for all her sin atones?
For here the air is horrid with men’s groans,
The priests who call upon thy name are slain,
Dost thou not hear the bitter wail of pain
From those whose children lie upon the stones?
Come down, O Son of God! incestuous gloom
Curtains the land, and through the starless night
Over thy Cross the Crescent moon I see!
If thou in very truth didst burst the tomb
Come down, O Son of Man! and show thy might,
Lest Mahomet be crowned instead of Thee!

The World In Motion

As MacGahan’s reports from July 23 to August 22 increased the Daily News circulation, protests also increased. Britons sought reversal of the Crown’s policy towards Bulgaria.

Even as reports kept arriving from diplomats like Consul Reade, who was overseeing the Danube “villauyet” for the British Empire, and Lord Derby, they were dismissed by Disraeli as “utterly untrustworthy rubbish.” Disraeli argued that these “hear-say rumours” were created
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for party purposes, pointing his finger to the Liberal party and their leader, William Gladstone.

While the political power games in London continued, MacGahan’s daily descriptive dispatches kept the Bulgarian atrocities in the public’s mind. MacGahan’s cited Greek, Bulgarian and German leaders.

The Greek Consul, who is not friendly to the Bulgarians, tells me of 12,000 wretched women and children marched into Tatar Bazardjik, nearly all of whom suffered the vilest outrages. He tells me of Bulgarian fathers who killed their wives and children in order to put them out of reach of the ferocity of the Bashi-Bazouks. The German officials tell me of the bodies of men cut up and flung to the dogs in villages near their own railway stations; of little children of both sexes maltreated and brutalized until they died; of a priest, whose wife and children were outraged and slaughtered before his eyes, and who was then put to death, after the most fearful torture, the details of which are too abominable to be re-told.

He found many witnesses willing to recall the violence:

I have the story of a young and beautiful girl, who having found means to obtain the rudiments of an education, opened a school in her native village, and tried to do something for the education of the poor people about her, who is now lying in prison here sick and broken hearted, whose story is too sad for recital. The French Consul tells me of Bashi-Bazouks relating to circles of admiring listeners how they cut off the heads of little children, and how the dismembered trunks would leap and roll about like those of chickens; and I shut my ears and say, “This is enough; I do not want to hear any more; I do not care to investigate any further.” It does not matter to me that a few more or less have been committed. You cannot increase or diminish the horror of the thing by mere statements of round numbers. I shall leave the statistics to Mr. Schuyler and Mr. Baring, and shall be quite willing to
accept their estimates.\textsuperscript{38}

MacGahan’s reports were re-printed by the New York Times, and smaller newspapers across the United States, including the Inter Ocean in Chicago, the Galveston Daily News in Houston, Texas, The Daily Evening Bulletin in San Francisco, the St. Louis Globe Democrat and smaller publications like the \textit{Georgia Weekly Telegraph and Georgia Journal Messenger} in Macon, Georgia. Word traveled as far as Australia. The South Australian Register: “It is reported that the Emperor of Russia has addressed the Turkish Ambassador at St. Petersburg in the following terms: ‘The atrocities in Bulgaria have deprived Turkey of the sympathies of Europe.’” \textsuperscript{39}

\textbf{William Gladstone and the Eastern Question}

Amid intensive public activity in early September, Gladstone published his pamphlet “Bulgarian Horrors and the Question of the East.” He stressed the importance of Britain’s response and how it would be judged by history. He stressed that three actions were urgent:

\begin{quote}
It is urgent, in addition to the termination of the war, first to put an end to the anarchical misrule, plundering and murdering which still desolate Bulgaria; second to make effectual provisions against its recurrence by excluding the Ottoman government from administrative control not only in Bulgarian; Third, to redeem by these measures the honor of the British name, which in the deplorable events of the year has been more gravely compromised than I have known it in any former period. \textsuperscript{40}
\end{quote}

Some considered Gladstone’s pamphlet a “political move,” because he took so long (two months after he learned about the atrocities from the Daily News reports) his name and political gravitas furthered the discussions and public protests movement.\textsuperscript{41}
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Already since early August, MacGahan’s reports had inflamed British consciousness and the new technology of the telegraph was enabling reports sent by MacGahan to be reach even American audiences very quickly.

Eugene Schuyler, MacGahan’s companion on his investigative trip in Bulgaria, wrote the foreword to the book that combined all of MacGahan’s dispatches. But while MacGahan was reporting for the *Daily News*, Schuyler reported to the U.S. Minister in Constantinople, who in turn was reporting to President Ulysses S. Grant.

**Eugene Schuyler’s Preliminary Report to Minister Maynard**

Schuyler wanted to publicize the atrocities as soon as possible. So, on August 29th, through MacGahan’s paper, the *Daily News*, Schuyler published his “Preliminary Report to Minister Maynard.” In it he confirmed MacGahan’s counts: 65 Bulgarian Villages destroyed by the Turks, and 15,000 Bulgarian men, women and children, brutally slaughtered. Because it came from an American government official, it was regarded as credible.

MacGahan’s passionate and descriptive reporting, together with Schuyler’s official report brought the story into the forefront of politics, and inspired Gladstone to craft his pamphlet. Reports of the Turkish atrocities against Bulgarians continued streaming on the pages of the *Daily News*. Through this persistence, Bulgaria became one of the world’s first “fashionable causes.”

In some of his reports, MacGahan strayed from the main storyline, to reflect on the image of Bulgarians in the Western mind.

Most people in the west thought of Bulgaria and its inhabitants as rural uneducated, almost barbaric people. I think people in England and Europe generally have a very imperfect idea of what these Bulgarians are. I have always heard them spoken of as mere savages, who were in reality not much more civilized than the American Indians; and I confess that I myself was not far from entertaining the same opinion not very long ago. I was astonished, as I believe most of my readers will be, to learn that there is scarcely a Bulgarian village without
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its school; that these schools are, where they have not been burnt by the Turks, in a very flourishing condition’ that they are supported by a voluntary tax levied by the Bulgarians on themselves, not only without being forced to do it by the Government, but in spite of all sorts of obstacles thrown in their way by the perversity of the Turkish authorities; that the instruction given in these schools is gratuitous, and that all profit alike by it, poor as well as rich; that there is scarcely a Bulgarian child that cannot read and write; and finally that the percentage of people who can read and write is as great in Bulgaria as in England and France. Do people who speak of Bulgarians as savages happen to be aware of these facts?”

MacGahan presented the culture, history and habits of the Bulgarian people, bringing them out of obscurity, and contradicting the stereotype of a barbaric nation. He asserted that Bulgarians were an “educated, hardworking, industrious, honest, civilized and peaceful people,” who lived in “well-built towns with solid stone houses,... that would stand a not very unfavorable comparison with an English or a French village.”

Lord Beaconsfield, The Ottoman Empire and the Six Powers Conference

As public opinion mounted against the Turks, Disraeli’ persisted in his efforts to preserve the status quo in relations with the Ottoman empire. In August 1876, he gave his last speech at the House of Commons, and moved to the House of Lords as Lord Beaconsfield. Despite all the Royal support for Disraeli, Gladstone’s pamphlet had quickly sold over 200,000 copies and roused more public indignation.

Gladstone now rallied his influential supporters. They included John Thadeus Delane, editor of the Times; James Anthony Froude, later editor of Fraser’s Magazine; Edward Augustus Freeman, Oxford scholar, historian and contributor to the Saturday Review; the poet laureate Alfred Tennyson, Thomas Carlyle, Charles Darwin, John Ruskin, and the Duke
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of Argyll. The Ottoman Empire was going through a political crisis of its own. Diplomatic pressures caused Sultan Abdul Azis to be deposed and replaced by Sultan Murad V, who was replaced soon after by Abdul Hamid II.

The new Sultan announced his first foreign policy act soon after stepping in power. He arranged a conference of the Six Powers on November 20 in Constantinople. France, Germany, Italy, Austria, Russia and England sent delegates. They were to discuss the rest of the Balkans and the unstable relations they had with the countries. MacGahan’s editor, John Robinson, sent him to Constantinople to the conference. The delegation reached no agreements and made no official announcements on the issues in Bulgaria. Raising the possibility of a war between Russia and the Ottomans, MacGahan’s editor told him to go to St. Petersburg, and report on Russian preparations.

On the Eve of the Russo Turkish War

Russia’s last attempt to reach an agreement with the Porte was rejected. The new sultan Abdul Hamid firmly believed that the British Empire would stand behind the Sublime Porte’s decision and support them in any military conflict.

However, the political landscape in London had drastically changed. Largely because of the Bulgarian atrocities, MacGahan’s reports and Gladstone’s pamphlet, the British Empire was compelled to take a stance of neutrality.

On April 24, the Turkish charge d’affaires, Tavfek Bey, received a note from Prince Alexandr Gortchakov, Foreign Minister of Russia, which announced that “His Majesty, my August Master, sees himself compelled to his regret, to have recourse to force of arms. Be therefore so kind as to inform your Government that from today, Russia considers herself in a state of war with the Porte.”

J.A. MacGahan, so committed to the Bulgarian cause, joined the Russian Army in its advance to the Danube. Along the way through Romania, he stopped in Bucharest where he had left his wife and young son. He secured them in a hotel, and established a connection between
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Barbara (his wife) and the *Daily News* courier who would telegraph his
dispatches to London. Barbara was re-writing and translating his letters
in Russian and sending to Russian newspapers, putting MacGahan’s
name on the map of Europe, Russia, and America at once.

After a short stay with his family, MacGahan rejoined the Russian
Army at Kishinev and wrote his first review of the Czar’s troops on April
26. In his captivating manner of describing not only battlefields, but the
mood, the light, and the colors of the scenes, MacGahan’s description of
the beginning of the war, resembled a painting more than a war dispatch:

> The spot was well chosen, on a gentle undulating
> hillside, which enabled the spectators to see the
> whole army at once, as the lines rose behind each
> other higher and higher up the slope.
> It was a beautiful sunny morning and the bright
> colours of the uniforms, the glitter of bayonets
> flashing in the sunshine, and the broad blaze of
> light reflected from a long line of polished field-pieces.
> There was something strangely impressive and awful
> in this prolonged silence and immobility.
> The crowds looking upon the serried lines so
> silent and motionless, became themselves silent,
> and gazed with wonder and awe.⁴⁹

MacGahan stayed with the Russian Army throughout the year
of the war, despite renewed injuries to his leg and back. Ever a of action
he rode alongside his Khiva-days friend General Skobelev. MacGahan
continued reporting about the advances and defeats, and the thousands
of Russian, Turkish and Bulgarian men who perished in the war. Finally,
on March 3, 1878, with the Russian Army at the gates of Constantinople,
the Turks capitulated and the San Stefano treaty was signed, liberating
Bulgaria after more than 500 years of Turkish Yoke.

**Death in Constantinople**

The Eastern Question was finally solved by two men,
neither of whom was a soldier, the great work of
liberating enslaved Christians of the East from the vilest

---
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tyranny that ever cursed the world, owes, perhaps as much as to the legionaries of the Czar. One of those men was Mr. Gladstone, the other was Mr. J.A. MacGahan. Journalism has had many glorious triumphs; but the proudest achievement which brightens its annals is the salvation of a country by the pen of a special correspondent.⁵⁰

Januarius MacGahan died in Constantinople, on June 9, 1878, not in battle, but of typhus. His humanitarian calling had taken him by the bedside of his typhoid-stricken friend, Lt. Francis Greene, an American military observer. Despite his mother’s and his wife’s pleas to leave, he stayed and took care of Greene. Greene recovered, but MacGahan contracted the deadly typhus and died just three days before his 34th birthday. He was buried in Pera, a suburb of Constantinople, with correspondents, military officials, and diplomats in attendance. None was more affected by his death, than General Skobelev, who was said to have wept at MacGahan’s gravesite.

MacGahan’s remains were returned to the United States on the warship “Powhatan” in August 1884, and he was buried in Maplewood Cemetery in New Lexington, Ohio, on September 12, 1884. One of his friends, Gen. Phil Sheridan, was there to honor his memory.⁵¹ General Sheridan was the one who suggested MacGahan try journalism, and had introduced him to James Gordon Bennett Jr.

Bibliography

Primary Sources
“The Atrocities by Turkish Troops in Bulgaria, W.E. Forster speech at House of Commons” *The Daily News* June 24, 1876: 2
Barkley, Henry C. Bulgaria before the war during seven years’ experience of European Turkey and its inhabitants, London John Murray, Albemarle Street, 1877
“The Bulgarian Atrocities: Mr. Gladstone’s Pamphlet - Relief for the Sufferers Called for a Meeting of Protest in Plymouth” *The New York Times*, September 7, 1876 p. 5
Carlyle, T. “Mr. Carlyle and the Turkish Question” *The London Daily News*, November 28, 1876, p. 5
“A Catalogue of Horrors: Preliminary Report of Mr. Schuyler of the Bulgarian Atrocities” *Inter Ocean* (Chicago), September 13, 1876, p. 3
Sandmeier

_The Diplomatic Reminiscences of Lord Augustus Loftus_. 1862-1879: Volume 2; 1894

“Mr. Disraeli’s Elevation to the Peerage,” _The London Daily News_, August 15, 1876

“Distress in Bulgaria: Letters by American Missionaries in Turkey” _The London Daily News_, October 21, 1876, p. 6

“Eastern Affairs,” _The London Daily News_, May 11, 1876, p. 6

“Eastern Affairs,” _The London Daily News_, May 12, 1876, p. 6

“The Eastern Crisis” _Daily Evening Bulletin_, (San Francisco), Saturday, May 27, 1876; Issue 43; col E

“The Eastern Question,” _The London Daily News_, May 13, 1876

“The Eastern Question: The Speech of Count Andrassy” _The London Daily News_, May 22, 1876, p. 6


“The Eastern War” _The Daily Evening Bulletin_ (San Francisco), July 2, 1877

“Famine and Flame” _The Inter Ocean_ (Chicago), July 2, 1877, p.1

“The Financial Condition of Turkey,” _The London Daily News_, June 24, 1876, p. 2


Freeman, Edward A. “The Debate on Bulgaria,” _The London Daily News_, July 13, 1876, p. 6


“The Funeral of Mr. MacGahan: Mr. Archibald Forbes on Mr. MacGahan” _The Aberdeen Journal_, June 13, 1878, p. 3

“Further Details of the Turkish Atrocities in Bulgaria” _Lowell Daily Citizen_, (Lowell, MA), Wednesday, August 23, 1876; Issue 6313; col A

Gladstone, William. _Bulgarian Horrors and the Question of the East_. London: John Murray, 1876.

“The Immediate Future of Turkey” _The London Daily News_, February 22, 1876, p.6

“The Imperial Ottoman Loan of 1864,” _The London Daily News_, May
27, 1876
“Imperial Parliament,” The London Daily News, June 27, 1876, p. 2
“Imperial Parliament,” The London Daily News, July 11, 1876, p. 2
“The Insurrection in Turkey,” The London Daily News, April 22, 1876
“The Late Mr. MacGahan” The Western Daily Press, (Bristol), June 12, 1878 p. 7
“Letter from Our Constantinople Correspondent,” The London Daily News, June 27, 1876, p. 4
“Letter from the Front of Both Armies” The Daily Rocky Mountain News July 3, 1877 p.1
“Map of the Seat of War,” The London Daily News, July 7, 1876, p. 2
“Massacre of Christians” Inter Ocean (Chicago), August 23, 1876 Issue 130 col. F.
“The Panic at Constantinople” The London Daily News, May 18, 1876, p. 6
Peacocke, Gerald “To the Editor of the Daily News” The London Daily News, August 19, 1876, p.5
“Persecuting Christians: Terrible Outrages Committed by Turkish Soldiers in Bulgaria” St. Louis Daily Globe-Democrat, January 31, 1876
“The Rebellion in Turkey” Daily Evening Bulletin, (San Francisco), June 24, 1876; Issue 67; col C
“A Striking Trait of the Turkish Character” St. Louis Globe-Democrat, (St.
Louis), Wednesday, July 05, 1876; pg. 4; Issue 47; col A
“The Sufferers in Bulgaria” The London Daily News, October 30, 1876 p. 6
“The Sufferers in Bulgaria” The London Daily News, November 1, 1876, p. 5
“The Turkish Atrocities,” The Southern Australian Register, September 20, 1876
“The Turkish Empire Servia, Montenegro and Bulgaria Uniting in the War of Independence” The Galveston Daily News, (Houston, TX) Saturday, July 1, 1876; Issue 86; col E
“The Turkish Insurrection,” The London Daily News, May 10, 1876, p. 6
“The Turkish War- The Christians of Bulgaria,” Georgia Weekly Telegraph and Georgia Journal & Messenger, (Macon, GA) Tuesday, August 15, 1876; Issue 52; col B
“Twenty Thousand Victims,” Inter Ocean (Chicago), August 9, 1876, p. 5

Secondary Sources


Harris, Norman Dwight “The Effect of the Balkan Wars on European Alliances and the Future of the Ottoman Empire,” in *The American Political Science Review*, vol. 8, no. 1 (February 1914), 111


Howe, Henry. *Historical Collections of Ohio*. Columbus: H. Howe & Son, 1889.


Todorova, Maria Nikolaeva. *Imagining the Balkans*. New York Oxford
University Press, 1997