

FAIRMOUNT FOLIO

VOLUME 11 2009



PHI ALPHA THETA
GAMMA RHO CHAPTER
WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY

FAIRMOUNT FOLIO
JOURNAL OF HISTORY

VOLUME 11
2009

PUBLISHED BY WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY
GAMMA RHO CHAPTER
OF PHI ALPHA THETA

EDITORIAL BOARD

Dr. Ariel Loftus
Professor of History

Dr. Robert Owens
Professor of History

Dr. Helen Hundley
Faculty Editor and Professor of History

Mindy Wheeler
Student Editor

© 2009 Gamma Rho Chapter Phi Alpha Theta
All Rights Reserved
Cover Etching of Fiske Hall property of WSU
Printed by ADR, Wichita, KS

Fairmount Folio, Volume 11

CONTENTS

Editor's Note	1
The Influence of Paul's View of Women on the <i>Acts of Paul and Thecla</i> Alisa Cotter	2
Revelation Ignored: Newspapers and Eschatology in Colonial America, 1690-1775 Dan Papsdorf	9
Hearing All American Voices: Interpreting Little Bighorn Mark P. Schock	16
The Force of Evil Circumstances: The Apache Scouts at Cibecue Mark P. Schock	26
Politics and Religion in the Twentieth Century: Bob Jones University, the IRS, and the First Amendment Mindy Wheeler	34
The Invention and Reinvention in Modern South Korean Shamanism William Silcott	42
Interview with Dr. Michael Birkner Dr. Helen Hundley	49

Editor's Note

The *Fairmount Folio* is a student publication of the Phi Alpha Theta honorary society at Wichita State University. The journal is written and edited by WSU students, both undergraduate and graduate. Each volume is the result of the hard work of many people, including those students who submit papers for consideration; the authors selected for publication; the Editorial Board which consists of several History Department faculty members; the Faculty Editor, Dr. Helen Hundley; and the Student Editor. This year, I was asked to be the Student Editor. When I accepted, I knew the task would be educational and fun, but at times, frustrating and time consuming. My expectations were met, and the rewards are beyond quantitative measure. As with history itself, the publication of an academic journal is a collaborative effort. Of great importance to this undergraduate editor was the unique opportunity to engage in and observe peer review of scholarly work and to experience the complete process of journal publication.

Thank you to Dr. Helen Hundley. She has been the Faculty Editor of the *Folio* for over a decade, and it is a great asset to the University, the History Department, and the students that she has dedicated her time and expertise repeatedly to this publication. This year, Dr. Hundley contributed to the *Folio* not just behind-the-scenes, but also with a new segment- an interview with a working historian. For students of history, it is enlightening and necessary to understand the scope and impact of historical research.

Thank you to all those who submitted papers for consideration. The Editorial Board received a record number of papers this year and the process was made even more challenging by the quality of the papers submitted.

Thank you to the authors selected for publication, not only for supplying the journal with interesting and well-written papers, but for their continued patience and diligence throughout the editing and revising process.

Thank you to the Editorial Board and faculty advisors. Drs. Ariel Loftus, Robert Owen, and Helen Hundley each read through the record number of submissions and thoroughly considered each one. In addition to the members of the Editorial Board, several other History Department faculty members provided the authors selected for publication with suggestions and guidance during the revision process. Specifically, I would like to thank Dr. Robin Henry, not only for her assistance during this project, but for her excellent teaching, interesting courses, and engaged support of my educational endeavors.

This volume spans from ancient to modern history, from Asia to the Americas, from military and political to cultural and religious histories. Of particular interest to this editor is the variety of sources utilized by the student authors. For instance, the study of history has been enriched in recent years by the introduction of various electronic databases which allow students at WSU the access to engage in more thorough research than ever before. Several of the authors utilized contemporary newspapers to analyze the context of the topics being studied. Print media has played a unique role in enabling national discourse and disseminating information, and for just those reasons it is a primary tool for many historians.

The authors and editors thank you for reading the *Fairmount Folio* and sincerely hope you enjoy the product of so many people's efforts.

Mindy Wheeler
May 2009

The Influence of Paul's View of Women on the *Acts of Paul and Thecla*

Alisa Cotter

This paper examines the influence of Paul's letters on the *Acts of Paul and Thecla*, especially in terms of the portrayal of women.¹ Paul's views concerning women's status in relation to their male counterparts, including his restrictions against women teaching and preaching in the early church, strongly influenced later Christian apocryphal works, such as the late second century apocryphal text known as the *Acts of Paul and Thecla*.² This text focuses on Thecla's insistence on remaining celibate and her desire to be baptized by Paul. This paper will analyze specific passages in Paul's letters that may have influenced this apocryphal story. The paper concludes by tracing the rise of the cult of St. Thecla that flourished during the early part of the Middle Ages, subsequently encouraging many virgin women to become martyrs.

Before analyzing the *Acts of Paul and Thecla*, it is important to first look at passages within Paul's letters that have shaped interpreters' views concerning women's status, importance, and function in the early church. Women are believed by historians to have played a prominent role in the early Christian church. This is remarkable, considering the patriarchal society and traditions that prevailed at the time when Christianity was beginning to take root in towns across the Roman Empire. Galatians 3:28 is often cited for its inclusion of women in Christianity. In it, Paul attests to the equality of all, saying, "There is no Jew or Greek, slave or free, male and female; for you are all one in Christ Jesus."³ Charles Cousar takes this to mean that "God is one and that, since he is one, he must be the God of the Gentiles as well as the Jews (so also of slaves and free, of males and females)."⁴

However, in contrast to the apparent equality given to women in Galatians 3:28, many verses in Paul's other letters seem to imply a distinct level of inequality. For instance, Paul states in 1 Corinthians 11:3 "the man is the head of the woman." Similarly, in 1 Corinthians 14:34-35 there seems to be a certain intolerance pertaining to the way in which women were allowed to participate in Paul's developing Christian communities. Here Paul states, "women should be silent in the churches, for they are not permitted to speak, but should be submissive...and if they want to learn something, they should ask their own husbands at home, for it is disgraceful for a woman to speak in the church meeting."⁵ In Colossians 3:18 Paul demands, "Wives, be

¹ Biblical quotations in this paper are from the Holman Christian Standard Bible.

² Jan N. Bremmer, ed., *The Apocryphal Acts of Paul and Thecla* (Kampen: Kok Pharos Publishing House, 1996).

³ See also: 1 Corinthians 7:20-24 and Colossians 3:11 Holman Christian Standard Bible.

⁴ Charles B. Cousar, *Galatians*, Interpretation, A Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching, ed. James L. Mays (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1982), 85. Cole refers to this as "the concept of the collective whole of the Christian church." R. A. Cole, *The Letter of Paul to the Galatians: An Introduction and Commentary*, Tyndale New Testament Commentaries, no. 9 (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing, 1989), 156. See also: James D.G. Dunn, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to St Paul* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 70.

⁵ Lenski understands Paul to mean that "In many places woman may speak and teach even publicly, but in no place where she will exercise 'dominion over a man' by her teaching." R.C.H. Lenski, *The Interpretation of St. Paul's First and Second Epistles to the Corinthians* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing, 1963), 616. Harrisville believes that Paul is more specifically "referring to women who disturb the worship by talking." Roy A. Harrisville, *I Corinthians*, Augsburg Commentary on the New Testament (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing, 1987), 244. However,

submissive to your husbands, as is fitting in the Lord.”⁶ Likewise, in Ephesians 5:22-23 Paul says, “Wives submit to your own husbands as to the Lord, for the husband is the head of the wife as also Christ is the head of the church.” Paul states in 1 Timothy 2:11 “A woman should learn in silence with full submission” and goes on to affirm that he does “not allow a woman to teach or to have authority over a man; instead she is to be silent.”⁷

Despite such hostility against the involvement of women in these early congregations, throughout Paul’s letters women fill important roles. In addition, certain women are commended for their roles in the development of early Christian communities and are frequently identified with a special significance. The most frequently mentioned woman is Priscilla, the wife of Aquila.⁸ In Romans 16:3-5 Paul greets Priscilla and Aquila as his “co-workers in Christ Jesus” who “risked their own necks for my life”⁹ and commands the recipient of the letter to “Greet also the church that meets in their home.”¹⁰ Phoebe is also an important woman; however, unlike

Keener believes “Because the church met in homes, questions would arise as to whether women should comport themselves as if in the domestic or public sphere.” Craig S. Keener, *1-2 Corinthians*, New Cambridge Bible Commentary (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 118.

⁶ Bruce states, “the structure of the family was already in being” and that “structure, hierarchical as it was, was left unaltered, apart from the introduction of the new principle, ‘as is fitting in the Lord’.” F. F. Bruce, *The Epistles to the Colossians, to Philemon, and to the Ephesians*, The New International Commentary on the New Testament (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing, 1984), 163. However, Patzia concludes, “There is nothing in this verse to suggest that subordination is based on a hierarchical relationship.” Arthur G. Patzia, *Colossians, Philemon, Ephesians*, A Good News Commentary, ed. W. Ward Gasque (New York: Harper & Row, 1984), 73. See also: Dunn, *Cambridge Companion to St Paul*, 125-126.

⁷ In these verses, according to Fee, Paul is most likely denouncing “some kind of disruptive behavior, which perhaps included boisterous affirmation of the heresies, seems to lie behind these instructions.” Gordon T. Fee, *1 and 2 Timothy, Titus*, Good News Commentary, ed. W. Ward Gasque (New York: Harper & Row, 1984), 36. Debelius and Conzelmann conclude, “women should subordinate themselves to what the men in the congregation teach.” Martin Debelius and Hans Conzelmann, *The Pastoral Epistles*, ed. Helmut Koester, trans. Philip Buttolph (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1972), 47.

⁸ In some verses, Priscilla is alternately spelled: Prisca. Cf. 1 Corinth. 16:19, 2 Timothy 4:19, Acts 18:2, and Acts 18:18.

⁹ Romans 16:4. Jewett and Kotansky argue that “their ability to save Paul’s life in a threatening situation reveals a patronal capacity that derived from high social status.” Robert Jewett and Roy D. Kotansky, *Romans: A Commentary*, Hermeneia: A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible, ed. Eldon Jay Epp (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007), 957.

¹⁰ Romans 16:5. In Acts 18:26, Luke reports that Apollos, having an incomplete understanding of the Lord, is taken by Priscilla and her husband to their home and “explained the way of God more accurately” indicating that they were equally considered teachers. Thiselton believes that Priscilla and Aquila were most likely “freedpersons of Jewish origin” and that they had to have been wealthy in order to have “a house large enough to accommodate meetings for worship.” Anthony C. Thiselton, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians: A Commentary on the Greek Text*, The New International Greek Testament Commentary (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing, 2000), 1343-1344. Significantly, Priscilla’s name appears before that of her husband four of the six times that they are mentioned. Jewett and Kotansky state that “the fact that Prisca’s name is mentioned first indicated her higher status in the Roman context” and that “less plausible suggestion is that her precedence indicated that she was the more active partner in leading the house church.” Jewett and Kotansky, *Romans*, 955. Concerning Priscilla’s name being given before that of her husband, Fee concludes that it “is so highly unusual in antiquity that we may also assume that hers was a significant role in their ministry.” Fee, *1 and 2 Timothy, Titus*, 249-250. Whereas, Kelly says it is likely that “she belonged to a noble Roman family, or because she had a

Priscilla, she is mentioned without any connection to a husband. In Romans 16:1-2, Paul announces Phoebe to the Christian community in Rome. He states, "I commend to you our sister Phoebe, who is a servant of the church in Cenchræe so you should welcome her in the Lord in a manner worthy of the saints, and assist her in whatever matter she may require your help. For indeed she has been a benefactor of many and of me also."¹¹ According to commentator Brenden Byrne, "Paul's commendation of Phoebe is an important indication of the leadership roles exercised by women in the early communities."¹² Jewett and Kotansky add that "the Roman recipients of the letter would understand her to be recommended as the patroness of the Spanish mission, whom Paul had announced in the preceding chapter."¹³

A quick glance at passages in Paul's letters pertaining to women leaves a general reader with a distinctive difficulty in completely understanding the status of women in the early Christian communities in light of some apparent contradictions in Paul's attitude. Contradictions formed from, on the one hand, the way in which they are commanded to behave by Paul, and on the other, the commendation women seem to receive for their good works and dutiful service to their community churches. Such contradictions are remedied by looking at specific passages within the context of the letter, the community for which it was written, and the issues being addressed in the letter. For instance, when put in its proper context Galatians 3:28 does not eliminate social classes. According to Hans Dieter Betz, "The Church is the body of Christ, a unified structure in which each member has a part and function."¹⁴ Social classes still exist; however, every person, whether a slave or woman, once baptized has the same access to the salvation offered to believers. All Christians are united through faith in Jesus Christ. Paul's first letter to the Corinthian church addresses this same issue. While women are said to be subordinate to men, men are below Christ in the hierarchy of Church organization.

While such strict statements as those presented in Colossians 3:18 and Ephesians 5:22-23, demanding the complete submission of women, seem somewhat unjustified in light of Galatians 3:28, Paul makes the relationship between a husband and wife analogous to Christ's relationship and commitment to the church. As noted by Francis Foulkes, Paul believes "husband and wife are to see their relationship as following the patterns of the relationship between Christ and his church."¹⁵ Likewise, Bruce adds, "the wife's subordination to her husband

more forceful personality." J.N.D. Kelly, *The Pastoral Epistles: Timothy I & II, and Titus*, Harper's New Testament Commentaries, ed. Henry Chadwick (New York: Harper & Row, 1987), 221. See also: Luke Timothy Johnson, *The Acts of the Apostles*, Sacra Pagina 5, ed. Daniel J. Harrington (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1992), 322.

¹¹ Byrne believes Phoebe "is almost certainly the bearer of his letter to Rome." Of her being called 'deacon' Byrne states, "The title signals to the Roman community that the bearer of the letter is a personage of stature within the churches of the East." Of her being referred to as a patron, he concludes "The term designates wealthy women who acted as patrons for others." Brenden Byrne, *Romans*, Sacra Pagina 6, ed. Daniel J. Harrington (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1996), 447-448. Jewett and Kotansky say that "it appears that Phoebe was a Gentile Christian, probably a freed slave" that "functioned as the leader of the congregation." Jewett and Kotansky, *Romans*, 943-944. See also: Dunn, *Cambridge Companion to St Paul*, 91.

¹² Byrne, *Romans*, 448.

¹³ Jewett and Kotansky, *Romans*, 947.

¹⁴ Hans Dieter Betz, "Corinthians," in *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, vol. 1 (New York: Doubleday Anchor, 1992), 1147.

¹⁵ Foulkes goes on to add "The husband's commitment to his wife and to home responsibilities is certainly no less demanding than that asked of the wife but the two are different, and complementary." Francis Foulkes, *The Letter of Paul to the Ephesians: an Introduction and Commentary*, Tyndale New Testament Commentaries (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing, 1989), 162 and 164.

has as its counterpart the husband's obligation to love his wife."¹⁶ It is also important to note that scholars generally agree that Colossians and (especially) Ephesians were not written by Paul.¹⁷

At the opening of the *Acts of Paul and Thecla*, Paul has come to Iconium to teach. Thecla lives near the house in which Paul is preaching. She listens to Paul intently, ignoring both her mother and her betrothed. Because of her commitment to Paul's teaching she rejects her fiancée. Thamyris, Thecla's fiancé, goes to investigate Paul's teaching and finds Demas and Hermogenes outside arguing. They tell Thamyris, "he [Paul] takes away wives from young men and virgins from husbands." Thamyris himself believes he is "being robbed of marriage." At their instigation, Thamyris is convinced into prosecuting Paul, and he is sent to prison. Thecla continues to demonstrate her commitment to Paul by visiting him in prison. When she is found, both Paul and Thecla are brought before the governor. While Paul is banished from the city, Thecla is sentenced to be burned alive (instigated by her own mother).

God, however, intercedes and she is saved. Afterwards, she seeks out Paul, whom had been praying for her safety. She asks Paul to baptize her but he refuses. However, after initially rejecting her request to travel with him, the two travel together to Antioch. Upon arriving, Paul disappears and Thecla finds herself admired by yet another suitor, Alexander, a "leading member of the Antiochenes." We are told that she "ripped his cloak, took off the crown from his head, and made him a laughingstock." Humiliating Alexander she is thus sentenced to death a second time, this time to be fed to wild beasts. First she is tied to a lioness that refuses to harm her; the crowd is amazed, and she is taken from the amphitheater. When she is brought back she is set against both lions and bears. Again, a lioness prevents harm to Thecla by killing a charging bear. Thecla "saw a great ditch full of water" and decides to baptize herself. The pit of water is full of seals that are ready to eat her. God intercedes a second time, killing the seals with lightning and surrounds Thecla with "a cloud of fire," sparing Thecla another violent death.

Thecla goes to Myra in search of Paul, and upon finding him she explains her persecutions and baptism. We are told, "Paul marveled greatly and the hearers were confirmed." She is commanded by Paul to "Go and teach the word of God!" At the end of the story she leaves Paul in Myra, travels back to Iconium to visit with her mother and then on to Seleucia and "after enlightening many with the word of God she slept with a noble sleep."¹⁸

The central theme of the *Acts of Paul and Thecla* is certainly that celibacy is to be considered preferable to marriage. Thecla is specifically referred to as a "virgin" who listened "to the things concerning purity which were being said by Paul." She is said to have watched "many women and virgins going in to Paul" and "desired to be made worthy to stand in the presence of Paul." There are many passages in the letters of Paul that could easily be viewed as having promoted the celibate life for which Thecla was willing to be condemned. The most important is 1 Corinthians 7 where Paul focuses on sex within a marriage relationship, in contrast to those who have chosen to remain unmarried and live a celibate life.¹⁹

¹⁶ Bruce, *Epistles to the Colossians, to Philemon, and to the Ephesians*, 164. According to Patzia this is meant to describe "a relationship of mutual submission." Patzia, *Colossians, Philemon, Ephesians*, 73.

¹⁷ For a look at the arguments for and against the authenticity of Colossians see: Victor Paul Furnish, "Colossians," in *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, vol. 1 (New York: Doubleday Anchor, 1992), 1092-1095. For his treatment of Ephesians, see: Victor Paul Furnish, "Ephesians," in *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, vol. 2 (New York: Doubleday Anchor, 1992), 539-541.

¹⁸ In Acts 13:4 it is reported that Paul "came down to Seleucia." According to Hoppe, it is likely that Paul again passed through this port city, cf. Acts 14:26 and 15:39-41. Leslie J Hoppe, "Seleucia," in *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, vol. 5 (New York: Doubleday Anchor, 1992), 1076.

¹⁹ Dunn believes the problem that Paul is dealing with is centered on "whether married couples should have sex." Dunn, *Cambridge Companion to St Paul*, 71. Likewise, Harrisville states, "Paul will not allow the notion of marriage as surrogate for unchastity." Harrisville, *I Corinthians*, 107. See also: Keener, *1-2 Corinthians*, 62.

In verses 7-8, Paul specifically commends men and women who choose celibacy over marriage.²⁰ In v. 7 Paul wishes that everyone could live free from the flesh as he, but acknowledges that “each has his own gift from God, one this and another that.”²¹ In v. 8 he reinforces his previous statement, saying, “I say to the unmarried and to widows: It is good for them if they remain as I am.” In light of this verse, Craig Keener believes that Paul “recognizes that not all are endowed with the ability to endure indefinite abstinence.”²² Commenting on v. 9, which highlights the thesis of this chapter (conveyed in vv. 2-5), Keener goes on to conclude, “Paul accepts the value of celibacy for singles, but argues that it is better to marry than to be even more distracted by passion.” Most importantly to the Thecla stories are verses 34-35; Paul here states, “An unmarried woman or a virgin is concerned about the things of the Lord, so that she may be holy both in body and in spirit. But a married woman is concerned about the things of the world how she may please her husband. Now I am saying this for your own benefit, not to put a restraint on you, but because of what is proper, and so that you may be devoted to the Lord without distraction.”²³ Also of importance is 2 Corinthians 6:14 where Paul commands, “Do not be mismatched with unbelievers.” While this verse seems not to be often associated specifically with marriage relationships it is possible that it added to Thecla’s reluctance to get married and her insistence on remaining celibate.²⁴

The beatitudes given by Paul in the post-biblical *Acts of Paul and Thecla* are written in the same style as Jesus’ Sermon on the Mount reported in Matthew’s Gospel. A few of Paul’s beatitudes specifically highlight the most important reasons for remaining celibate and of these, several parallel commands given by Paul in his canonical letters. For instance, in 2 Corinthians 6:16 Paul states, “we are the sanctuary of the living God.” The second beatitude given by Paul in the *Acts of Paul and Thecla* states, “Blessed are they who have kept the flesh pure, for they shall

²⁰ Dunn concludes that in this chapter Paul, however, understands that “celibacy is not intrinsically better than marriage.” Dunn, *Cambridge Companion to St Paul*, 78.

²¹ Dunn notes that here “one’s social status is essentially irrelevant.” Dunn, *Cambridge Companion to St Paul*, 78. Harrisville adds, “the only activity which Paul will allow to interrupt cohabitation is that of prayer, meditation, contemplation.” Harrisville, *I Corinthians*, 107. While Lenski concludes, “The ideal is, therefore, not at all the cessation of marriage, or the abolition of the sexual side of marriage, or the celibate state for all.” Lenski, *St. Paul’s First and Second Epistles to the Corinthians*, 280. Likewise, Thiselton argues, “the parallel is not celibacy versus marriage, but the gift of a positive attitude which makes the most of the freedoms of celibacy without frustration, and the positive attitude which caringly provides the responsibilities, intimacies, love, and ‘dues’ of marriage.” Thiselton, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 513.

²² Keener goes on to conclude that “Paul accepted marriage as the best antidote for such passion” and “Paul’s articulation of the spiritual value of singleness provided support for later Christians impressed with the rise of sexual asceticism.” Keener, *1-2 Corinthians*, 62-63. Harrisville adds, “It is precisely because Paul regards as a gift from God what to others may simply appear as the natural order of things that he is forced to set down what he wishes as ‘counsel’ and not as command.” Harrisville, *I Corinthians*, 108.

²³ See also: 2 Cor. 11:2.

²⁴ 2 Cor. 6:14- 7:1 may not have been part of the original. Hans Dieter Betz, “Corinthians, Second Epistle,” in *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, vol. 1 (New York: Doubleday Anchor, 1992), 1139-1140, 1150. Lenski, who does not treat this as a reference to marriage, nonetheless states, “the believer has been cleansed, the unbeliever has refused to be cleansed.” Lenski, *St. Paul’s First and Second Epistles to the Corinthians*, 1078. He goes on to link this passage to Deut. 22:10, mentioned also by Danker, who concludes “the Corinthians should demonstrate their loyalty to Paul and to Jesus Christ by refusing to identify with the positions of those who challenge Paul’s apostolic authority and his counsels for growth in the faith.” Frederick W. Danker, *II Corinthians*, Augsburg Commentary on the New Testament (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing, 1989), 98. Keener, on the other hand, does conclude that this verse relates also to marriage relationships. Keener, *1-2 Corinthians*, 194.

become a temple of God.”²⁵ More important is 1 Corinthians 7:29 in which Paul stresses, “From now on those who have wives should be as though they had none.” Almost identical to this is the fifth beatitude which states, “Blessed are they who have wives as if they had them not, for they shall inherit God.”

There are many correlations that can be seen between the *Acts of Paul and Thecla* and the Pastoral Epistles, namely 2 Timothy, most likely in order to add some validity to the text. For instance, the names of the persons traveling with Paul and Onesiphorus, the man whose house Paul is welcomed into to preach, are names that appear in 2 Timothy.²⁶ At the beginning of the *Acts of Paul and Thecla* we are told that Paul is accompanied from Antioch by Demas and Hermogenes, men who also travel with Paul in 2 Timothy.²⁷

The apocryphal *Acts of Paul*, of which the *Acts of Paul and Thecla* comprises a large part, was most likely written at the end of the second century.²⁸ Once established as a part of the larger work, the *Acts of Paul and Thecla* began to circulate independently.²⁹ Early descriptions of the text can be found in Eusebius’ (240-309 C.E.) *History of the Church*³⁰ and in Jerome’s (347-420 C.E.) *Lives of Illustrious Men*.³¹ Jerome denounces the text’s authenticity based partially on evidence from Tertullian (160-220 C.E.), whose work *On Baptism* testifies that the *Acts of Paul* should be considered heretical. Tertullian writes, “the presbyter who composed that writing...after being convicted, and confessing that he had done it from love of Paul, was removed from his office. For how credible would it seem, that he who has not permitted a woman even to learn with overboldness, should give a female the power of teaching and of baptizing!”³²

The influence of Thecla’s story, as examined in the *Acts* and the *Letters* of Paul, is apparent well into the fourth century C.E. A significant example of the influence of Thecla’s story is found in Gregory of Nyssa’s (335-394 C.E.) description of his sister Macrina’s birth.³³ Gregory writes, “when her mother was giving birth to her, she dreamed three times that she was holding her child while a majestic figure, the virgin martyr Thecla, gave her the name Thecla.” Other positive references to Thecla include Gregory Nazianzen (329-389 C.E.), Egeria, the fourth century pilgrim, and Ambrose (338-397 C.E.). In his oration *On the Great Athanasius Bishop of*

²⁵ See also: 1 Cor. 3:16-17 and 6:19.

²⁶ 2 Tim. 1:16 and 4:19.

²⁷ For mention of Demas see: 2 Tim. 4:10; for mention of Hermogenes see: 2 Tim. 1:15 (cf. 4:14).

²⁸ Willis Barnstone, ed., *The Other Bible* (New York: HarperCollins, 1984), 445, and Edgar Hennecke, *New Testament Apocrypha*, vol. 2, ed. R. Wilson (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1991), 214 and 234-235.

²⁹ A. F. J. Klijn, “The Apocryphal Correspondence between Paul and the Corinthians,” *Vigiliae Christianae* 17 (March, 1963): 10-16.

³⁰ Philip Schaff and Henry Wace, eds., “The Church History of Eusebius,” in *Nicene and post-Nicene Fathers*, vol. 1 (Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers, 1994), 344, 347. According to the editors this early reference is not to be understood as the same Thecla, see: n. 4 p. 344. Hennecke, *New Testament Apocrypha*, 215-216.

³¹ Philip Schaff and Henry Wace, eds., “Jerome: Lives of Illustrious Men,” in *Nicene and post-Nicene Fathers*, vol. 3 (Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers, 1994), 363-364.

³² Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson, eds., “Tertullian: On Baptism,” in *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, vol. 3 (Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers, 1994), 677. Citing 1 Timothy 4:7, MacDonald believes, “the author of the Pastoral Epistles wrote in Paul’s name in order to counteract the image of Paul as given in stories told by women,” referring specifically to the *Acts of Paul*. Dennis R. MacDonald, *The Legend and the Apostle: The Battle for Paul in Story and Canon* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1983), 14.

³³ Peter Brown, *The Cult of Saints: Its Rise and Function in Latin Christianity* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981), 58. See also: Dennis R. MacDonald, “Thekla, Acts of,” in *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, vol. 6 (New York: Doubleday Anchor, 1992), 444.

Alexandria, Gregory Nazianzen writes in praise of the city of Seleucia.³⁴ Egeria, on her way back from the Holy Land records in her *Diary of a Pilgrimage* a visit she made to city of Seleucia, where Thecla was said to remained after leaving Iconium. After briefly describing the basilica and monastic cells devoted to Thecla she says, “Having arrived there in the name of God, a prayer was said at the shrine and the complete Acts of Saint Thecla was read. I then gave unceasing thanks to Christ our God, who granted me, an unworthy woman and in no way deserving, the fulfillment of my desires in all things.”³⁵ Finally, most striking is Ambrose who, in his *Concerning Virgins* praises Thecla’s commitment to virginity, going so far as to compare her to the Virgin Mary.³⁶

³⁴ Philip Schaff and Henry Wace, eds., “Gregory Nazianzen, Select Orations,” in *Nicene and post-Nicene Fathers*, vol. 7 (Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers, 1994), 275.

³⁵ George E. Gingras, trans., *Egeria: Diary of a Pilgrimage* (New York: Newman Press, 1970), 87-88.

³⁶ Philip Schaff and Henry Wace, eds., “Ambrose: Select Works and Letters,” in *Nicene and post-Nicene Fathers*, vol. 10 (Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers, 1994), 376, 461.

Revelation Ignored: Newspapers and Eschatology in Colonial America, 1690-1775

Dan Papsdorf

The Presbyterians of Scotland will look upon this as a most blessed event. Already they consider Wilkes as Antichrist; and without being so mystical as many of their deep Commentators, one may point out in Wilkes several of the characters of the scarlet whore of Babylon. If he is not metaphorically a whore, as being the prostituted tool of a party, he is literally a whoremonger.¹

Historians have often asserted that during the colonial era, prominent ministers and their congregations, especially those in New England, imagined themselves as living in a "city on a hill" or a "New Jerusalem." This belief, if true, placed colonists at the literal center of the spiritual universe. But, unlike ministers, colonial newspapers were not above using the imagery of the apocalypse for secular arguments, such as humorously linking radical English politician John Wilkes with the antichrist. Alan Heimert wrote in *Religion and the American Mind*, that, "Whether the millennial theory of post-Awakening Calvinism was intellectually respectable may be questioned, but what cannot be gainsaid is that the expectancy expressed in that theory controlled the mind of the period."² Heimert's thesis, controversial even at its birth, that the Great Awakening provided the impetus for the American Revolution, has since its publication been largely discarded as provocative but unpersuasive.³ Despite Heimert's discourse-provoking work, the understanding of how eschatology was approached by ministers and laymen has remained largely stagnant. If eschatology, broadly defined as the theology of the last things including judgment, death, heaven and hell, did not control the entire mind of the period, did it at least control religious thought? The record provided by religious texts appeared clear; Colonial Americans believed in and feared the imminent destruction of the earth and the thousand-year reign of Christ, though not necessarily in that order. However, an examination of colonial newspapers suggests that millennial theory did not control religious thought and that furthermore, newspapers deliberately declined to publish discourse related to the serious study of eschatology.⁴

¹ "The Following Humorous Piece is Taken from the London Chronicle," *Essex Gazette* (Salem, MA), 25 July to 1 August, 1769.

² Alan Heimert, *Religion and the American Mind: From the Great Awakening to the Revolution* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1966), 66.

³ Heimert's methods and thesis were attacked by Edmund S. Morgan and Bernard Bailyn. Both were, like Heimert, students of Perry Miller, and both went on to achieve remarkable success. Morgan distrusted Heimert's tendency not just to read between the lines but to read beyond the lines and argued that Heimert had ignored records that contradicted his thesis. Bailyn, in his 1970 essay, "Religion and Revolution: Three Biographical Studies," documented three cases that contradicted Heimert's ideas. For a detailed account of the controversy surrounding Heimert's, *Religion and the American Mind*, see Philip Goff and Alan Heimert, "Revivals and Revolution: Historiographic Turns since Alan Heimert's 'Religion and the American Mind,'" *Church History* 67, no. 4 (1998): 695-721.

⁴ Eschatology in this essay is defined simply and broadly, in line with the Oxford English Dictionary definition, in order to separate the theology of the era from the later theology

Given the concern with eschatology and that colonial newspapers filled their pages with religious news, newspapers of the era should logically be filled with articles concerning sermons, books, and opinions related to the millennium. Reality does not agree with this assumption. By taking Jonathan Edwards as an example, and by examining instances in which newspapers addressed eschatology or used the peculiar vocabulary of Revelation, it becomes apparent that newspapers steered clear of seriously addressing eschatology and prophecy.

From the beginning, ministers in North America wrote volumes dealing with the end of days. Expositions of the prophecies of Revelation and the Book of Daniel were some of the first books printed in New England, and sermons and lectures dealing with eschatology proved very popular. The first bestseller in the colonies, written in North America, was in fact, Michael Wigglesworth's, *The Day of Doom*. The poem offered up a stark contrast between heaven and hell in the final judgment. Perry Miller has argued that Puritan children delighted in these scenes of the apocalypse. A small extract reveals the author's focus:

With dismal chains, and strongest reins,
like Prisoners of Hell,
They're held in place before Christ's face,
till He their Doom shall tell.
These void of tears, but fill'd with fears,
and dreadful expectation
Of endless pains and scalding flames,
stand waiting for Damnation.⁵

Colonial American ministers ranged widely in their eschatological views. Premillennialism, the belief that the Second Coming of Christ would precede the millennium was less common at the time than it would later become. Postmillennialism, subscribed to by Jonathan Edwards, substituted the literal reign of Christ on earth for a golden age of the church, after which would follow the Second Coming. Amillennialism rejected the literal reign of Christ and posited that the church was either operating in or would at some point in the future operate within the spiritual reign of Christ. A complete overview of the contrasting beliefs would require a lengthy book, but it is sufficient to summarize that most ministers believed either that they were living in or near the millennium and that Christ would at some time in history arrive to literally judge the living and the dead. The serious implications of the end of the world moved ministers and believers to devote energy to deciphering the book of Revelation and to advocate prayer and fasting to bring about the second coming of Christ. Given the preoccupation with religion in general, and the millennium specifically, one would expect to find discourses and debates on eschatology throughout colonial society. But the record shows, that eschatology was confined strictly to the pulpit and to books and pamphlets written by ministers. In the more secular realm of the newspaper, eschatology rarely presented itself, and when it did, the last judgment and the

of "realized eschatology" which focuses on the imminent return of Christ and which views everyday actions as imbued with an eschatological importance; see Heimert, *Religion and the American Mind*, 66. The NewsBank database, *America's Historical Newspapers*, was utilized as the primary method for searches. Though this database is quite large, it is not exhaustive. The search results are however representative of a comprehensive search. Further, the lack of eschatological discourse in newspapers does not necessarily indicate a lack of representation within the popular press. An examination of pamphlets in the era may well reveal that eschatology was better received in pamphlet form.

⁵ Perry Miller, "The End of the World," *The William and Mary Quarterly*, Third Series, 8, no. 2 (1951): 172. See Ira V. Brown, "Watchers for the Second Coming: The Millenarian Tradition in America," *The Mississippi Valley Historical Review* 39, no. 3 (1952): 445; Michael Wigglesworth, A. M., *The Day of Doom or a Poetical Description of the Great and Last Judgment with Other Poems*, From the Sixth Edition 1715 (New York: American New Company, 1867), 31.

antichrist were often used for political, not religious reasons. Curiously, scholars have for the most part accepted the writings and claims of religious texts at face value, believing that millennialism was a powerful force in the colonies.

In the middle of the 1900s historians came to view millennial belief as a vital ingredient in the American Revolution. Reiner Smolinski, advocating a revisionist interpretation that refuted this view, wrote:

Vernon Louis Parrington, H. Richard Niebuhr, Perry Miller, Alan Heimert... and a whole host of their disciples demonstrate that the appropriation of the New Jerusalem to the American hemisphere instilled in the colonists a sense of purpose that came to fruition during the First Great Awakening [and] the War of Independence.⁶

Smolinski argued that this group, which included some notable historians, suffered from a simplistic reading of apocalyptic texts from the leading religious voices of the era. Smolinski noted that there were numerous sermons and religious texts like Cotton Mather's *Theopolis Americana* that equated Boston or other New England cities with the New Jerusalem of Revelation. However, several important caveats remained unexamined. First, most religious writers, including Cotton Mather and Jonathan Edwards, at least in their early years behind the pulpit, preached and wrote that the kingdom of God could not be realized until the Jewish people were converted en masse. The reticence of the Jewish people to convert dulled excitement for the imminent coming of Christ, and even single Jewish conversions were seen as auspicious omens. Smolinski writes, "Both Increase and Cotton Mather joyfully recorded each report of conversion, for with every Jew snatched 'as a Bird out of the Snare of the Fowler,' the annus mirabilis had come one step closer toward consummation." Because of the dearth of snared birds, Christian writers resorted to miracles or redefinition in order to clear the way for the apocalypse. Some recanted and claimed that many Jews had been converted in the early days of Christianity and were thus assimilated into the church, which itself was the New Jerusalem in the book of Revelation. Others, like Judge Samuel Sewall, posited that once the Jews returned to their homeland that they would all be miraculously converted in the manner in which Paul had been on the Damascus road.⁷

The texts of Cotton and Increase Mather, as well as those of Edwards further call into question the assertion that Christians of the era believed in the literal conversion of Boston or Hartford into the city of New Jerusalem. Cotton Mather wrote that the New Jerusalem would be a physical cube floating above the earthly city of Jerusalem. Repeatedly, the writings of notable theologians envisioned the New Jerusalem as a corporeal city located in or above the Holy Land. The problem is not inconsistency in the writing, but rather that, "New Jerusalem," possessed several meanings and could thus exist in more than one location. The Protestant Church or pious enclaves were deemed the New Jerusalem in a figurative sense.⁸

At the same time that definitions of the "New Jerusalem" changed, and as Christian writers came to the realization that mass conversion of the Jews would prove difficult within the near future, a growing sense of religious optimism spread throughout the colonies and changed how the end of days would appear. *The Day of Doom* and the Mathers' predictions of cataclysmic tragedies lost traction and were replaced by the eschatology of Jonathan Edwards which largely rejected a literal interpretation of prophecy. Heimert phrased this transition succinctly:

Cataclysm, providential judgment, a personal second coming—all were contrary to the high cosmic optimism of Edward's historical vision. They represented dramatic

⁶ Reiner Smolinski, "Israel Redivivus: The Eschatological Limits of Puritan Typology in New England," *The New England Quarterly* 63, no. 3 (1990): 358.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 363, 382.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 376, 380.

interference in the course of history, abrupt reversals of flow. Edwards was certain that the progress of humanity was largely consistent and continuous.⁹

The writings of Edwards and other spiritual leaders of the era reveal that the date and the makeup of the millennium were of great concern. But, the debates and vacillations of these writers constructed the millennium not as a unified certainty, but as a malleable and dateless entity that served immediate purposes. Oddly, historians have often ignored the society in which these texts were created. That a sermon or book existed provides little information as to its impact. If, as Heimert and others argue, millennial concerns occupied center stage, then eschatology should pervade colonial discourse. Religion in general was covered extensively in colonial newspapers. David A. Copeland estimates that, "colonial newspapers ran more religious news than any other news types studied except news of the sea and crime reporting, both of which contained numerous religious allusions."¹⁰

Colonial newspapers often made mention of Jonathan Edwards, the prominent Massachusetts minister. Furthermore, Edwards devoted much time to the study of the book of Revelation. It was in fact the only book of the Bible for which he wrote a separate commentary. In addition, Edwards produced and preserved at least sixty-six sermons on the Revelation. Edwards was a prominent man in his lifetime, and considering this body of work, Edwards' writing and preaching on Revelation should have received coverage, at least in local newspapers. But, despite the attention given to Revelation, and despite Edwards' notoriety, newspapers largely ignored his eschatological sermons and works. Instead, it was Edwards who scoured newspapers in order to find events that he believed were of significance to the end times. Conspicuously absent from the clippings that Edwards saved are any sermons or religious discourses in the newspapers themselves. Edwards found, instead of theological debates and musings, news of wars, natural disasters, and shipping.¹¹

Edwards' scrapbook contained a curious collection of news, little of which was of a magnitude commensurate with the seriousness of the apocalypse. For instance, Edwards recorded the *Evening-Post*, March 14, 1748 from London:

There are accounts from several parts of France, that the vintage has failed this year, as well as their harvest; that the edicts, lately published from Holland, have prevented their receiving supplies of corn from the Baltic.¹²

Similarly, Edwards recorded the news on October 27, 1747:

The St. Joseph and the St. John, a register ship from Maraca Goa, last from the Havana, having on board a great quantity of cocoa, and 60,000 dollars; and a tartan, from the Canaries for Cadíz with cocoa, are both taken by the Spence sloop, and carried into Gibraltar.¹³

This eclectic mix fit well with Edwards' beliefs concerning the apocalypse. He was an opportunist with newspaper articles, using localized events as testament to changes in the world, such as when he postulated that the sign of the beast was the exclusion of the Waldenses, a small French sect of dissenters, from Catholic trade hundreds of years before his time.¹⁴

⁹ Heimert, *Religion and the American Mind*, 65.

¹⁰ David A. Copeland, *Colonial American Newspapers: Character and Content* (Newark and London: University of Delaware Press, 1997), 199.

¹¹ Jonathan Edwards, *Apocalyptic Writings: "Notes on the Apocalypse," "An Humble Attempt,"* ed. Stephen J. Stein (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1977), 1, 15.

¹² *Ibid.*, 262.

¹³ *Ibid.*, 261.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 113.

Millennial coverage was varied in the press during the colonial era. Four broad categories of eschatological writing appeared in newspapers. The first, and most common, articles using the imagery and vocabulary of Revelation were anti-papist, anti-Methodist, or anti-Presbyterian pieces, with the anti-papist variety being by far the most common. These rarely addressed the millennium seriously, but rather arrogated colorful Biblical vocabulary in order to vilify Catholics and Catholic governments. Because a number of prominent ministers wrote eschatological works, advertisements for these books were also common. However, no special reverence was shown to these works and they were often sandwiched between advertisements for fishing tackle and children's books. Serious discussions of apocalyptic sermons or theology were much less common in colonial newspapers. These discussions were most often limited to refuting the attacks of deists or moderate Christians who discounted personal revelations or literal interpretations of the Bible. The final category of articles related to the apocalypse consisted of writing which either used apocalyptic imagery for political discussion or used this imagery to mock serious chiliasts.

Colonial newspapers demonstrated a strong and consistent hatred of Catholics. A colorfully named 1746 article in the *American Weekly Mercury* of Philadelphia, "If Ye Set a Papish on the Coach Box, He Will Drive to the Devil," reveals the prevailing attitude:

The Church of Rome is the great Whore, and Mother of all Abominations; and the Pope is that Antichrist and Son of Perdition, that should come, whom the Lord will destroy by the Brightness of his Coming. Additions to Christianity is the Essence of Popery, and Perversion of Scripture is the real Mark of the Beast.¹⁵

Few anti-Catholic articles developed or maintained this level of seriousness and hatred, and many, despite their vehemence, were stated in a manner-of-fact way and situated between or beside common fare. For instance, in *The Newport Mercury's* news from London, an entry proclaiming that "It is now said that the wild beast in France is the very same that has long been prophesied in the Apocalypse of St. John, whereon the scarlet whore was mounted" was grouped in with news that "They write from Pensacola, that a little to the northward of that place the mahogany trees is found in such plenty, that 100 ships loads might easily be procured." Catholics were the most common victims of apocalyptic appropriation, but some protestant groups were likewise targeted. Legislation in New York in 1755 contained, "An Act for Demolishing the Dove, and taking away all the Rags of the Whore of Babylon, that had been set up and used in the Presbyterian Meeting." The legislation further forbade citizens to, "entertain any Quaker, Ranter, Adamite, or any other Heretic, upon Penalty of Five Pounds."¹⁶

Advertisements for apocalyptic texts were neither conspicuous nor overly creative, but rather conformed to the conventions of the day for advertising books. Most advertisements consisted of a brief description followed by information on where to purchase the book. The *Boston Gazette's* advertisement for Rev. Dr. John Gill's book is typical:

Here are considered the spiritual Reign of Christ, and his personal Reign, which two are very distinct Things, more particularly, the Destruction of Antichrist by the pouring out the Vials... the Time's being near at Hand, according to the Face of Things in Providence, the Signs of the Times, &c.&c.¹⁷

Less typical was the advertisement for *Poor Richard's Almanack* in 1750, which contained a section dedicated to "Mr. Whiston's Predictions... of the sudden Destruction of the Turkish Empire, and Popes of Rome, with several other great Revolutions, and the Beginning of the

¹⁵ "If Ye Set a Papish on the Coach Box, He Will Drive to the Devil," *American Weekly Mercury*, (Philadelphia), 1 May to 8 May, 1746.

¹⁶ "London," *The Newport (RI) Mercury*, 24 June 1765; *New-York Mercury*, 3 March 1755.

¹⁷ *Boston Gazette*, 31 May 1756.

Millennium or 1000 Years Reign of Christ, all to be within these 16 Years." These advertisements, because they were in line with those for secular or other religious works, show little other than that there was a market for apocalyptic texts.¹⁸

Serious discussion of the millennium was most often limited to attacks and defenses of direct revelation and literal interpretation of the scriptures. Searches for key terms related to the apocalypse, such as antichrist, whore of Babylon, New Jerusalem, and Armageddon, bring up dozens of hits, not hundreds. Between 1690 and 1775, only a handful of articles, probably fewer than twenty-five, directly addressed eschatology. Long explications of Revelation, the book of Daniel, or related sermons, are similarly rare. The contribution of the anonymous *Philopsyche* in 1772 contains one of the longest passages dedicated to eschatology:

We are approaching, after we have discovered and civilized all the barbarous nations upon the globe, and made them capable of understanding the revelation of the mystery of their redemption... at which time we shall become as perfect as we can expect fallible beings to be upon this globe; when the happy millennium will commence, and our Saviour's being our Messiah and King, will be acknowledged over the whole earth.¹⁹

A handful of similar articles, usually written as letters to editors, are found interspersed in the pages of colonial newspapers. Most were written defenses in response to local attacks against fringe groups of believers. And some, though serious, bordered on unintentional blasphemy, such as a 1770 article which tied events in the book of Revelation with an ancient Turkish prophecy and used aspects of both texts to predict the date of the demise of the Turkish Empire. The piece showed an absence of knowledge or willful disregard for the book of Revelation itself which states that, "For I testify unto every man that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book, If any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book."²⁰

Conspicuously absent from colonial newspapers were the sixty-six sermons by Edwards on the apocalypse or coverage of similar sermons or texts. Articles using the language of the apocalypse for political or humorous purposes were more common in colonial newspapers than were thoughtful discourses on the matter. In 1766 the *Boston Gazette* gave its readers a tongue-in-cheek interpretation of the thirteenth chapter of Revelations as being represented by the Stamp Act. The unnamed contributor wrote:

By his causing all, both small and great rich and poor, free and bond, to receive A Mark -- and that no Man might buy or sell, save he that had THE MARK OF THE BEAST, is undoubtedly they say, meant his being the immediate Father of the accursed Stamp Act; by which people of all Ranks in North America are in Danger of being involved in greatest Tribulation.²¹

¹⁸ *Pennsylvania Gazette*, 29 November 1750. Searching key terms in the *America's Historical Newspapers* database reveals that advertisements for eschatological texts were much more common than opinion pieces seriously discussing theological issues. Between 1690 and 1775 the word "millennium" is found twenty eight times with twenty two of those representing advertisements. Of those twenty two, roughly half pertain to Millennium Hall, not to the theological idea of the reign of Christ. A search for the words "prophecy" and "Revelation" returns around five hundred hits with twenty to twenty five percent of those being advertisements.

¹⁹ "From the Virginia Gazette, to the Printers," *Essex Gazette* (Salem, MA), 17 March 1772.

²⁰ "From the New-London Gazette. To the Public," *Massachusetts Spy*, 31 December 1770; Rev. 22:18, King James Version.

²¹ "Attleboro," *Boston Gazette*, 2 January 1766.

The *Boston Post-Boy*, in 1741, used humorous references to Revelation and to prophecy to mock a Rev. Davenport's animated visions:

Only one of the Brethren was Inspired; the other had not then any Impulse, though by his own Confession, he had Gaped and Prayed seven Years for the Spirit, and served a long apprenticeship to the Art of Trembling. But he waited with great Faith and Patience for the happy Hour of being delivered a Revelation or two. In the mean time, he professed himself much edified to see the Preacher shake his Ears, make wry Faces, and utter Oracles.²²

Eschatology figured prominently in the pulpits and on the bookshelves during the colonial era. However, the popular press in the form of newspapers declined to participate in millennial debate, or it used the imagery of the apocalypse to mock, or as a political tool. The vocabulary and imagery of Revelation was consistently used only to denigrate Catholics and Catholic France. The evidence suggests that eschatology was willingly confined to churches, books and private correspondence. Stephen J. Stein, editor of Edwards' *Apocalyptic Writings*, suggested that his work on prophecy and Revelation caused, "His detractors in every age [to] make them the object of ridicule and derision." The reticence to publish millennial discussions or sermons in newspapers indicates that eschatology occupied a unique place in religious discourse. Editors, deist or Christian, seem to have been unwilling to publish articles which seriously addressed the apocalypse. Furthermore, newspapers declined even to participate in theoretical debates as to the meaning of Revelation. Jonathan Edwards provides a notable example of silence regarding publication of eschatological writing. Though he published books of theology concerning the millennium, he never sought to print the more concrete details of his personal notebook on Revelation. Even the executors of his estate and the generations of historians to whom his works were passed rarely took notice of his "Notes on the Apocalypse." This work, which he considered among his most important endeavors, was not printed until 1977.²³

The end of the world made for powerful sermons and powerful images, but writing about it seriously in public was a risk that few colonial newspapers took. Further study would be required in order to determine what aspect or aspects of eschatology proved unpalatable to newspaper publishers. The embarrassment that surrounded Edwards' work on Revelation, as well as the informal manner in which the vocabulary of Revelation was appropriated, both suggest that outside of the pulpit, discussion of eschatology was limited to persons and groups located at the fringes of society.

²² "To the Author of the Boston Weekly Post-Boy," *Boston Post-Boy*, 12 October 1741.

²³ Stephen J. Stein, "A Notebook on the Apocalypse by Jonathan Edwards," *The William and Mary Quarterly*, Third Series, 29, no. 4 (Oct., 1972): 623.

Hearing All American Voices: Interpreting the Little Bighorn

Mark Schock

The true nature of the events of June 25, 1876, continues to elude us. To this day Custer buffs, Native Americans, and professional historians alike debate what actually transpired beside a certain Montana river which witnessed so much bloodshed and so little clarity. Was it a horrible massacre, or a great victory? As a multi-racial and multi-ethnic nation, we have failed to reach any consensus. We cannot even agree if that meandering river should be called the Greasy Grass or the Little Bighorn.

How then do historians search for the particulars of the events that unfolded there? What tools and sources should be employed? Historians are especially fond of primary sources. In any military encounter there are at least two sides and usually at least two versions of the events. In this case one side, the white American, has left behind many written documents detailing a number of different versions of what transpired. There are official reports, personal correspondences, inquiry proceedings, and newspaper accounts. It is these sources which have been the backbone of most of the histories written. There are also oral accounts left by the Arikara and Crow scouts who participated in the battle on the side of the whites. These accounts have unfortunately, until recently, been largely dismissed or ignored.

The Lakota and Cheyenne accounts have also, until recently, been dismissed and ignored with rare exceptions to certain details. These accounts, being oral in nature and the product of a different cultural perspective from that of the American mainstream have been viewed with suspicion and incredulity. Are not these primary sources also worthy of the historian's attention? The purpose of this paper is to demonstrate that these accounts, once correctly interpreted, are indeed potentially as valid as the usual primary sources employed by the historian and that along with those usual sources are essential to any comprehensive examination of Custer's last battle.

The practice of military historiography is fraught with peril. The stakes are high. National honor and prestige are involved, as well as the legacy and reputation of the individual military personnel involved, especially commanding officers. Reports and statistics compiled from military sources should be viewed with caution.

Less than two weeks before Custer's defeat on the Little Bighorn another famous Indian fighter, General George Crook, clashed with the Lakota and Cheyenne on Rosebud Creek. Crook officially reported his casualties as ten killed and twenty-one wounded. Though the true numbers are in dispute, it is generally believed that Chief Scout Frank Grouard's figures of twenty-eight killed and fifty-six wounded are more reliable. Crook claimed that his retention of the field of battle constituted victory, but the truth is that he subsequently retreated to his supply base and refused to advance again until reinforced, effectively removing his column from the rest of the campaign. Eminent Western historian, Robert Utley, offered this opinion of Crook at the Rosebud. "In truth, he had been badly worsted."²⁴

Just as a nation's military personnel are expected to uphold the finest traditions of their service, the historian writing military history is also expected to protect the reputations and honor of those who serve. The recent controversy over the death of pro- football player turned Army Ranger Pat Tillman in Afghanistan is a fitting example of how protective the military can be of its own reputation and to what lengths it will go to protect that reputation and the reputations and careers of its people.

²⁴ Robert Utley, *Frontier Regulars: The United States Army and the Indian, 1866-1891*, The Wars of the United States (New York: Macmillan, 1973; Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1977), 256.

Politics and politicians are prime players. Clausewitz's dictum that "war is not merely an act of policy but a true political instrument,"²⁵ certainly held true for early accounts of Custer's defeat. Republican President Ulysses S. Grant was running for reelection and "the Custer tragedy dropped as from heaven into the arms of Democrats struggling against Republican campaign orators seeking to clothe them in the bloody shirt of treason and disunion. The Little Bighorn disaster, laid on a backdrop of corruption in high places and scandalous frontier fraud, instantly became a pawn on the political chessboard."²⁶

Newspapers, a favorite primary source for historians, were unabashedly politically partisan in the nineteenth century. Newspaper accounts of Bighorn were hampered by the fact that only one reporter, Mark Kellogg, had accompanied Custer's command on the expedition. Kellogg, an assistant of *Bismarck Tribune* editor Clement A. Lounsbury, sent reports back to the *Tribune* to also be forwarded to the *New York Herald*. Kellogg perished alongside the soldiers he was covering.²⁷ Kellogg's last dispatch before the expedition set out proved prophetic, though probably not as he intended. "I go with Custer and will be at the death."²⁸

As news of the Seventh Cavalry's defeat spread to the East, Democratic newspaper editors launched vitriolic assaults on the Grant administration. On July 16 the *New York Herald* posited the question, "Who Slew Custer?" The *Herald* was ready with the answer. "The celebrated peace policy of General Grant, which feeds, clothes and takes care of their noncombatant force while the men are killing our troops-that is what killed Custer."²⁹

Southern newspapers joined their colleagues from the North in denouncing Grant. The *Galveston Daily News* declared, "The deplorable truth is that President Grant is chiefly responsible for the appalling miscarriages which have attended this disastrous campaign against the Sioux."³⁰ The *Raleigh News* laid "the blood of Custer, of Canby, and hundreds of United States soldiers" on the hands of the Grant administration.³¹

Western newspapers slammed Grant's Indian policy. The Yankton *Dakotaian* headline of July 7 screamed CUSTER AND HIS ENTIRE COMMAND SWEEPED OUT OF EXISTENCE BY THE WARDS OF THE NATION AND SPECIAL PETS OF EASTERN ORATORS.³² Some in the East agreed. In Connecticut, the *Hartford Daily Courant* crowed, "But when will the government deal with these ferocious Indian tribes as they deserve? When will a policy be adopted that shall prevent such murders as those of Canby and Custer, and give peace to our frontier settlers?"³³

Controversy and the need to find an explanation that would not offend public sensibilities raged within Army circles also. George Armstrong Custer and his President and Commander in Chief Ulysses Grant were not mutual admirers. Custer had written articles for the periodical *Galaxy* critical of Grant's Indian policy. He had testified before the Clymer committee

²⁵Carl von Clausewitz, *On War*, ed. and trans. Michael Howard and Peter Paret (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1982), 87; quoted in Eliot A. Cohen, *Supreme Command: Soldiers, Statesmen, and Leadership in Wartime* (New York: Free Press, 2002; Anchor Books, 2003), 7.

²⁶Robert M. Utley, *Custer and the Great Controversy: Origin and Development of a Legend* (Pasadena, CA: Westernlore Press, 1962), 39.

²⁷*Ibid.*, 30-31.

²⁸Louise Barnett, *Touched by Fire: The Life, Death, and Mythic Afterlife of George Armstrong Custer* (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1996; Owl Books, 1997), 335.

²⁹Utley, *Custer*, 39.

³⁰*Galveston Daily News*, 16 July 1876, <http://www.newspaperarchive.com>, accessed February 24, 2009.

³¹Utley, *Custer*, 39.

³²*Ibid.*

³³*Hartford Daily Courant*, 6 July 1876, <http://www.infoweb.newsbank.com.proxy.wichita.edu/>, accessed February 22, 2009.

investigating Secretary of War William W. Belknap in the spring of 1876 and had linked Grant's brother, Orvil, with corruption in the War Department in that testimony.³⁴

At the conclusion of his testimony, Custer attempted on several occasions to meet with Grant and was repeatedly rebuffed. Grant did, however, order Custer to remain in Washington. Custer was originally designated to command the Dakota column of the planned three-pronged 1876 expedition against the Lakota and Cheyenne, and ignoring Grant's order to remain in Washington boarded a train to the West. When the train stopped in Chicago a member of General Philip Sheridan's staff arrested Custer on the order of the President. Furthermore, Grant had ordered that Custer be barred from participating in the Sioux expedition.³⁵

General Alfred Terry was given overall command of the Sioux expedition by Grant. Custer, considered being still technically under arrest, continued by train to St. Paul, Minnesota, to meet with Terry. Generals Sheridan and William T. Sherman, each being politically astute, refused to intercede for Custer with Grant. Custer turned to Terry and literally took to his knees to ask Terry to intercede with Grant. Grant, under attack from the Democratic press for ordering Custer's arrest, eventually relented, and Custer was allowed to accompany the expedition as commander of the Seventh Cavalry, not the Dakota column commander.³⁶

Still, Custer was extremely popular with the American people. Rumor and innuendo persist to this day that Custer's close friend James Gordon Bennett, the powerful Democratic editor of the *New York Herald*, was secretly encouraging Custer to seek the presidency himself on the Democrat ticket, evidencing his popular support.³⁷ Any effort to focus blame on him for the disaster could incite a public firestorm. Terry, himself now under attack from the press and Custer's adherents inside the Army, wrote two reports of the disaster. Terry's first "official" report of Custer's defeat, written at the battle site on June 27, only recounted Custer's movements leading to the battle. But on July 2, at the mouth of the Bighorn, Terry penned a confidential report to Sherman and Sheridan. In this report, Terry explained his plan to trap the hostiles between Custer's column and another under Colonel John Gibbon. He summed up this report by stating, "I feel that our plan must have been successful had it been carried out [by Custer]."³⁸ Terry had briefed Gibbon and Custer on his plan aboard the steamer *Far West* on June 21.³⁹

Sherman had received this confidential report prior to the official one because of the routes the two reports had traveled to reach him. Sherman then handed the confidential report to a man who claimed to be a messenger to be forwarded to the Secretary of War. The "messenger" was in fact a reporter for the *Philadelphia Enquirer*, and this report splashed across newspapers on July 7, two days before the "official" Terry report was printed in newspapers. Thus, while attempting to avoid a public firestorm, Terry was now in the center of a huge one. Democratic newspaper editors now focused their wrath on the hapless Terry.⁴⁰

Grant and a number of high level officers rushed to Terry's defense. Grant told the *New York Herald* that, "I regard Custer's Massacre as a sacrifice of troops, brought on by Custer himself, that was wholly unnecessary--wholly unnecessary."⁴¹ General Samuel D. Sturgis, the actual commander of the Seventh Cavalry, was absent from the expedition on a long tour of detached service and had lost his son in the battle. Sturgis commented that Custer "was a brave man, but also a very selfish man. He was insanely ambitious of glory ... tyrannical and had no regard for the soldiers under him."⁴²

³⁴ Stephen E. Ambrose, *Crazy Horse and Custer: The Parallel Lives of Two American Warriors* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1975; Meridian, 1986), 397-403.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, 403.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, 404-405.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, 399-400.

³⁸ Utley, *Custer*, 42.

³⁹ Utley, *Frontier Regulars*, 257.

⁴⁰ Utley, *Custer*, 43.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 44.

⁴² *Ibid.*, 45.

As the controversy continued to play out in the press, newspapers even sought the opinions of former Confederate officers. Ex-Confederate John McCausland, interviewed by Bennett's *New York Herald* stated that, "The only way to fight with cavalry is with a dash--to charge." Confederate General Thomas L. Rosser had opposed Custer in the Shenandoah campaign. Responding to charges of recklessness on Custer's part in the *Philadelphia Enquirer*, Rosser placed the blame on Major Marcus A. Reno. "I fail to see anything very rash in the planning of it, or recklessness in its attempted execution. On the contrary, I feel that Custer would have succeeded had Reno with all the reserve of seven companies passed through and joined Custer after the first repulse."⁴³

The search for a scapegoat would eventually focus on Reno. In an effort to clear his name and resurrect his floundering military career, Reno requested and was granted an official court of inquiry. The court convened in Chicago on January 13, 1879.⁴⁴

Custer had divided his command before attacking the village at the Little Bighorn. Captain Frederick Benteen with three companies was to sweep south of the village to prevent any Indians from escaping in that direction. Major Reno was to take three companies and attack the village from the south. Custer, with five companies was to parallel Reno's advance behind a ridge to the east and attack the village at the far end.⁴⁵

Reno attacked across the Little Bighorn into the village, but was repelled and his command retreated back across the river in disorder, eventually to a position now known as Reno Hill. There appears to be no doubt that Reno lost his nerve after being splashed with blood and brain matter when the Arikara scout Bloody Knife was killed at his side during the retreat.⁴⁶ But that was not what made Reno a prime scapegoat in the Custer debacle.

Benteen's contingent joined Reno's at Reno Hill late in the afternoon. Benteen showed Reno a note from Custer ordering Benteen to come join him and bring ammunition. Reno outranked Benteen, but he did not have the authority to overrule Custer's order.⁴⁷ Despite Custer's note, Reno and Benteen stayed on Reno Hill until relieved by Terry and Gibbon's column on June 27.⁴⁸ The fact that they made no attempt to reach Custer is what made Reno scapegoat fodder. Whether such an attempt would have been successful or would have only served to compound the disaster is still being debated today.

The Reno Court of Inquiry of 1879 was summed up by Rutgers University professor Louise Barnett this way in her biography of Custer, *Touched by Fire*:

It has commonly been held that after the Battle of the Little Bighorn the army closed ranks at the court proceedings to preclude criticism damaging to itself: Further scrutiny of the campaign-which had been a waste of time, money, and men- could only reinforce the public's antimilitary sentiments. In interviews with Walter Camp, the interpreter Frederic F. Gerard said that "the general understanding among all whom he talked with confidentially was that any officer who made himself obnoxious to the defense would incur the wrath of certain officers in pretty high authority."⁴⁹

⁴³ *Philadelphia Enquirer*, 11 July 1876, <http://infoweb.newsbank.com.proxy.wichita.edu/>, accessed February 22, 2009.

⁴⁴ Barnett, 310.

⁴⁵ James Welch with Paul Stekler, *Killing Custer: The Battle of the Little Bighorn and the Fate of the Plains Indians* (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc., 1994; New York: Norton, 2007), 149.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, 158.

⁴⁷ John S. Gray, *Custer's Last Campaign: Mitch Boyer and the Little Bighorn Reconstructed*, with a foreword by Robert M. Utley (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 1991; Bison Books, 1993), 308.

⁴⁸ Utley, *Custer*, 27.

⁴⁹ Barnett, 311. Gerard quote from, Walter Camp, *Custer in '76: Walter Camp's Notes on the Custer Fight*, ed. Kenneth Hammer (Provo, UT: Brigham Young University Press, 1976), 238.

Reno was officially cleared of any dereliction of duty by the inquiry.⁵⁰ Though the Army cleared him, Reno remains a favorite target of many in the popular mind as well as among scholars.

The nature of any nation's collective military memory demands some degree of protection for the reputation of that nation's military heroes. George Armstrong Custer was certainly no exception. As a man who fostered and won wide public acclaim, especially in the print press, he was also assured that the defense of his fame and reputation would be quick, if not sure. Quick, in that it would begin immediately upon his demise. Not sure, though, in that much of that defense would be based in myth and rumor, and also that his polarizing nature would leave room for many detractors.

So much myth, rumor, and renunciation would follow in the wake of that June day's events that preeminent historian of the American West Robert M. Utley would write a book dedicated not to the event or the man, but instead to the controversy surrounding both. In that work Utley wrote, "Before the professional historian even entered the picture, most of the common fallacies of the Little Bighorn had been introduced and had won widespread acceptance."⁵¹ Utley would single out the press for special mention. "To the press must be assigned a large share of the responsibility for spreading the errors, myths, and legends that clutter the history of the Little Bighorn."⁵²

The press was far from alone in distorting the historical record of the man and the event. Nineteenth century partisan politics, especially virulent in an election year, influenced the debate. In addition, the "official" Army record of correspondence and proceedings was significantly colored by attempts to deflect blame and responsibility, seemingly motivated by the desire to protect individual and institutional reputations.

The above cacophony of voices provided the majority of source material for most, if not all, histories of Custer's last battle for the first century after the event. Glaring in its absence is the voice of the Indian participants in those events. That voice is finally being heard, long after the actual participants themselves have died. Their memories were indeed recorded in the years following the battle. "Their statements were obtained by Army personnel, newspaper correspondents, anthropologists, historians, and others who were genuinely interested in our frontier."⁵³ Yet, their accounts were certainly under utilized, if not flatly ignored by white historians for most of a century. Why?

Utley, who made extensive use of Indian memories in his 1993 biography of Sitting Bull, *The Lance and the Shield*, provided us with a general overview of the difficulties white historians and readers have with Indian accounts.

Indian testimony is difficult to use. It is personal, episodic, and maddeningly detached from time and space, or sequence and topography. It also suffers from a language barrier often aggravated by incompetent interpreters, from the cultural gulf between questioner and respondent, and from assumptions of the interviewer not always in accord with reality.⁵⁴

As Utley points out, Indian accounts, especially of battle, are often individual in nature. Plains Indian warriors fought as individuals, not as members of companies, regiments, or columns. The Cheyenne historian, John Stands in Timber, explained the individual nature of

⁵⁰ Ibid., 312.

⁵¹ Utley, *Custer*, 29.

⁵² Ibid., 47.

⁵³ Richard G. Hardorff, ed., *Indian Views of the Custer Fight: A Source Book* (Spokane, WA: Arthur H. Clark Company, 2004; Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 2005), 12.

⁵⁴ Robert M. Utley, foreword to John S. Gray, *Custer's Last Campaign: Mitch Boyer and the Little Bighorn Reconstructed* (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 1991; Bison Books, 1993), x.

Cheyenne combat in his book, *Cheyenne Memories*: “The Cheyenne rule was for each member of a warrior band not to wait for orders or try to do like the rest. He should do all he could for himself, and fight privately.”⁵⁵ The Lakota and Cheyenne had no “official” reports or “official” spokespersons to prepare or present an “official” account of the battle.

The Indian combatants of the Custer fight were members of a warrior culture that allowed for the exaggeration of battlefield exploits. It must be understood that by the time most of their accounts were recorded by white interviewers they were virtual prisoners of war confined to government reservations, often garrisoned with soldiers.⁵⁶ Their accounts are those of individual human beings with individual personalities. Some accounts would be laced with braggadocio, while others, perhaps fearful of retribution, would be more inclined to tell a white interviewer whatever they thought the “white man” would want to hear. They may not have known that they had killed the famous Custer on the day of the battle. But by the time they surrendered they not only knew that they had defeated a white hero, they knew that much of white America was bent on vengeance.

Richard G. Hardorff is the author or editor of a number of books about Custer, the Little Bighorn battle, and the Plains Indians, including: *Indian Views of the Custer Fight*, *Cheyenne Memories of the Custer Fight*, *Lakota Recollections of the Custer Fight*, *Hokabey! A Good Day to Die and Camp, Custer and the Little Bighorn*.⁵⁷ Highlighting Lakota and Cheyenne interpretations of nineteenth century history, he described the difficulties with interviews of Native Americans. Such interviews “involved the interaction of three individuals: a narrator, a translator, and an interviewer. More often than not, these combined efforts were marred by the distortions of the narrator, the improficiencies of the interpreter, and the lack of objectivity of the interviewer.”⁵⁸

Utley would no doubt agree with Hardorff’s assessment of translation difficulties. He cited the “failure of white interrogator and red witness to achieve a meeting of the minds, especially when, as was usually the case, a third mind, that of an interpreter, intervened.”⁵⁹ As a result, many early historians of the battle were inclined to simply overlook these sources. Others attempted to incorporate these accounts, but in Utley’s opinion, “only a few, a very few indeed, have succeeded in doing more than make themselves look silly to all but the uninformed.”⁶⁰

Difficulties in translation could prove disastrous. It is commonly believed that in a meeting with Lieutenant William Philo Clark after his surrender, the words of Crazy Horse were misinterpreted by Frank Grouard. Grouard may have deliberately altered Crazy Horse’s intentions for motives involving inter-Lakota politics.⁶¹ Clark met with Crazy Horse to ask his assistance against Chief Joseph’s Nez Perce. Crazy Horse was not enthusiastic, but according to most accounts, replied that he would fight until there were no Nez Perce left. Grouard translated to Clark that Crazy Horse had said he would fight until there were no *white* men left. The misinterpretation, intentional or not, led to Crazy Horse being bayoneted by a soldier a few days later when Indian police, scouts, and troops attempted to arrest him. Crazy Horse died of his wound that night.⁶²

⁵⁵ John Stands in Timber and Margot Liberty, *Cheyenne Memories*, with assistance from Robert M. Utley (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1967; Lincoln, NE: Bison Books, 1972), 172.

⁵⁶ Hardorff, *Indian Views*, 12.

⁵⁷ Hardorff, *Indian Views*, back cover. Also Richard G. Hardorff, *Hokabey! A Good Day to Die: The Indian Casualties of the Custer Fight* (Spokane, WA: Arthur H. Clark Company, 1993; Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 1999), back cover.

⁵⁸ Hardorff, *Indian Views*, 11-12.

⁵⁹ Utley, *Custer*, 86.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*

⁶¹ Robert A. Clark, ed., *The Killing of Chief Crazy Horse*, with a commentary by Carroll Friswold (Glendale, CA: Arthur H. Clark Company, 1976; Lincoln, NE: Bison Books, 1988), 29.

⁶² *Ibid.*, 29-36.

Misinterpretation of Indian intentions took forms other than language. Private Charles Windolph, who spent the night of the battle on Reno Hill, wrote later about seeing “great fires and hear[ing] the steady rhythm of Indian tomtoms beating for their wild victory dances.”⁶³ Given that Windolph was a Prussian immigrant,⁶⁴ and that he now found himself surrounded and besieged, it is easy to understand his impressions. Nonetheless, Trooper Windolph’s impressions of what he heard that night were mistaken. According to the Cheyenne Wooden Leg, who was a young warrior that day, what Windolph actually heard were Lakota and Cheyenne women singing their mourning songs for their lost sons and husbands. “There was no dancing or celebrating in any of the camps that night. Too many people were in mourning. Too many Cheyenne and Sioux women had gashed their arms and legs to show their grief.”⁶⁵

There have been histories of the battle and its Indian participants written in recent years that have made extensive use of Indian accounts. Utley’s *Sitting Bull* biography makes use of interviews conducted by Stanley Vestal, pen name for Walter Stanley Campbell, of elderly Lakota living on reservations in the Dakotas in the 1920s and 1930s. Utley describes Vestal’s biography of *Sitting Bull* as a literary exercise while his is of a historical nature. Utley describes his methodology this way:

I have tried hard to look at *Sitting Bull* in terms of his cultural norms, not mine. Where whites drew false conclusions because of ignorance of his culture, I have sought to stress his perfectly rational underlying motives. Where I could not fathom his motives, I have tried to avoid pronouncing judgments according to my culture when his, if only I understood it better, might have supplied a logical explanation.⁶⁶

Given Utley’s previous work, indications are that he considered the Lakota whom Vestal interviewed with the same lens with which he viewed *Sitting Bull*. He used his extensive background knowledge and internal evidence to determine when and where their accounts fit into his narrative.

James Welch is part Blackfoot Indian and was born on the Blackfeet Reservation.⁶⁷ He is not a professional historian, but rather a “fiction writer and sometimes poet.”⁶⁸ His book, *Killing Custer*, grew from his collaboration with filmmaker Paul Stekler, for a PBS documentary about the battle. Welch’s sympathies lie with the Lakota and Cheyenne. He not only used the testimonials of the battles’ Indian participants, but also spoke with their descendants to uncover the stories that have been passed from generation to generation. As a Native American storyteller, he is cognizant of the importance of utilizing Native American points of view via oral histories for Indian culture and understanding of history. The Dakota (Eastern Sioux) historian Angela Cavender Wilson explained that importance with these words. “These stories, much more so than the written documents by non-Indians, provide detailed descriptions about our historical players ... Consequently, ours are not merely interesting stories or a simple dissemination of historical facts, but more importantly, they are transmissions of culture upon which our survival as a people depends.”⁶⁹

Welch is also able to uncover a rational explanation, as alluded to by Utley, for at least one supposed incongruity in the young Crow scout Curley’s account of the battle. Curley, who

⁶³ Welch, 289.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, 287.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, 289.

⁶⁶ Utley, *Lance*, xv-xvi.

⁶⁷ Welch, 39.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, 18.

⁶⁹ Angela Cavender Wilson, “Power of the Spoken Word: Native Oral Traditions in American Indian History,” in Donald L. Fixico, ed., *Rethinking American Indian History* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1997), 111.

was only seventeen years old on that day, claimed to have left Custer's side only after the Métis scout Mitch Boyer urged him to save himself when it became obvious that Custer's luck was not going to carry this day. Hiding in ravines and coulees until he had made his escape, Curley claimed to have found a pony standing over a dead Lakota warrior. Taking the pony and the Lakota's Winchester and red blanket he continued on to a ridge a safe distance away, from where he claimed to have watched much of the battle through binoculars.⁷⁰

Some of Curley's detractors have seized on the supposedly irrational claim that a warrior would have carried a blanket on such a blistering hot day. To meet this criticism, Welch quotes historian Mardell Plainfeather:

It was not unusual for Curley, or a Sioux, to have a blanket. In fact, Plains Indian people relied upon blankets for a variety of reasons and always had one on hand, no matter what the temperature was, especially in traveling. Blankets were used for saddle padding, for sudden rainstorms, for chilly summer nights, and for signaling the village as they returned home. During the Battle of the Little Bighorn, the Sioux waved blankets to frighten the horses of Custer's men.⁷¹

Welch asserts that much of the other information Curley supplied has been validated in recent years and quotes Utley to back up his assertion. "Curley's testimony is a prime example of the blind interviewer leading the seeing witness ... The results, distorted by the interviewers rather than Curley, have baffled students ever since and earned Curley low marks as a witness."⁷²

Dr. John S. Gray, who died in 1991,⁷³ is another example of one of those people who found themselves captivated by the events along the Little Bighorn in June of 1876. A retired physician and professor of physiology at Northwestern University,⁷⁴ he could not escape his fascination with Custer's last battle and the Métis scout Mitch Boyer who perished alongside the Seventh Cavalry's troopers that fateful day.⁷⁵ Gray's book, *Custer's Last Campaign* was the end product of that fascination.

Part I of the book is a narrative of Mitch Boyer's life up to his assignment as scout to the Seventh Cavalry on June 10, 1876.⁷⁶ Part II employs "the systematic use of time-motion analysis."⁷⁷ Gray explained this method in his *Preface*: "An essential element of time-motion analysis is speed of motion, which provides a feasibility check that exposes impossibilities. When an account contains blatant contradictions, one version usually proves feasible and the other impossible."⁷⁸

Gray used interviews with survivors of Reno's and Benteen's commands to construct events up until the time the Seventh separated. However, for most of his information pertaining to events after the columns lost sight of each other he relies primarily on the accounts of Custer's Crow and Arikara scouts. After tracking the troopers' movements between geographical

⁷⁰ Welch, 162.

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, 164.

⁷² Robert M. Utley, in foreword to John S. Gray, *Custer's Last Campaign: Mitch Boyer and the Little Bighorn Reconstructed* (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 1991; Bison Books, 1993), x; quoted in Welch, 164.

⁷³ Gray, back cover.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, Utley foreword in Gray, *Custer's Last Campaign: Mitch Boyer and the Little Bighorn Reconstructed* x. John S. Gray, *Centennial Campaign: The Sioux War of 1876* (Fort Collins, CO: The Old Army Press, 1976), preface.

⁷⁵ Gray, *Custer's Last Campaign*, xiii.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, xiv.

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, xv.

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*

landmarks at reasonable speeds “the interviews with Indian scouts suddenly blossomed into lucidity and contributed mightily.”⁷⁹

Along with Curley’s aforementioned account and those of other Crow scouts, Gray made use of Orin G. Libby’s 1912 interviews with nine of the forty Arikara scouts who accompanied the Seventh on the expedition.⁸⁰ Libby’s *Arikara Narrative* is itself a compelling and informative presentation of the Arikara’s view of Custer, his final battle, and their role in the Army’s 1876 expedition. The Arikara scouts met together at one of their number’s home on the Fort Berthold Reservation in 1912 to tell their stories. Each scout related his account in his own language. The stories were translated into English by Peter Beauchamp, an Arikara who had attended Hampton Institute, the forerunner to the Carlisle Indian School. Beauchamp read his written English account back to the scouts in Arikara to insure accuracy.⁸¹ As an Arikara educated in white schools Beauchamp may possibly have been able to translate Indian stories into syntax comprehensible to a white audience.

The Arikara scout Red Star’s assertion that Custer had told another scout, Bob-tailed Bull, that a victory against the hostiles would catapult him to the presidency was seized upon by white critics of Custer,⁸² thereby adding to the whole Custer controversy.⁸³ Bob-tailed Bull perished at the Little Bighorn.⁸⁴ Red Star’s assertion was not corroborated by the other scouts in the 1912 interviews, and if Custer did indeed say as much to Bob-tailed Bull, we can only speculate about his reasons for doing so.

An interesting addition to the Arikara lore of the battle is presented in John Stands in Timber’s *Cheyenne Memories*. Bob-tailed Bull’s horse was twice wounded in the battle but survived. The horse eluded the victorious Lakota and Cheyenne and made its lonely way all the way back to his owner’s village some 300 miles away. The Arikara honored the horse with the name Famous War Horse and a song. The Arikaras used the song to honor returning veterans of the two world wars.⁸⁵ Bob-tailed Bull’s Famous War Horse certainly deserves recognition alongside his much more famous contemporary, Captain Myles Keogh’s Commanche. Another interesting anecdote related in *Cheyenne Memories* deserves at least a brief mention. As previously addressed, Major Marcus Reno remains even today in many corners a target of scorn for failing to come to Custer’s aid. Coming from a totally different perspective, some Cheyenne wondered why Custer had not retreated to Reno’s position.⁸⁶

All of the above examples of Indian accounts are presented as an argument that the story of what happened beside that Montana river on June 25, 1876, cannot be complete without the inclusion of all participants’ points of view. As demonstrated, the availability of rich sources and new scholarship within the last half century has provided for a more complex, yet satisfying, understanding of the events at the Little Bighorn. Indian accounts of the events are just as important as the traditional white accounts to ascertaining the truth. The research into Native American testimonials has augmented the body of available evidence enormously and enriched our understanding of the Little Bighorn.

In 1926 the body of an unidentified cavalryman was given a ceremonial burial on the battlefield grounds during the battle’s semi-centennial celebration. A Lakota veteran of the battle

⁷⁹ Ibid.

⁸⁰ Orin G. Libby, ed., *The Arikara Narrative of Custer’s Campaign and the Battle of the Little Bighorn*, with a foreword by Jerome A. Greene, with a preface by Dee Brown, with an introduction by D’Arcy McNickle. Originally published in 1920 under the title: *The Arikara narrative of the campaign against the hostile Dakotas, June, 1876*. (Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 1998), back cover.

⁸¹ D’Arcy McNickle introduction to Libby, 3.

⁸² Libby, 58.

⁸³ Jerome A. Greene foreword to Libby, ix.

⁸⁴ Libby, 102.

⁸⁵ Stands in Timber, 210.

⁸⁶ Ibid., 202-203.

attended the ceremony and was told through an interpreter that the whites considered the unidentified white soldier to be a hero. The old warrior asked to address the assembled crowd. Given permission to do so, he told the crowd that the Indians had lost brave men that day too. "After a short pause, he added reflectively that the families of these slain men had cried for the loss of their sons, brothers, and fathers, and that these slain Indians were also considered heroes among the Lakotas and the Cheyennes."⁸⁷ The Lakota and Cheyenne heroes of that day were not only Indian heroes, they were American heroes, and America owes them the honor of hearing their story as seen through their peoples' eyes.

⁸⁷ Hardorff, *Hokahoy! A Good Day to Die*, 14.

The Force of Evil Circumstances: The Apache Scouts at Cibecue

Mark Schock

Led from their cells to the waiting gallows, the three Apache scouts walked past the assembled witnesses: three troops of cavalry, a single infantry company, and two companies of their fellow Indian scouts.¹ Upon surrendering themselves they had protested their innocence, but were now resigned to their fate. They refused to beg for their lives. That would not be the Apache way. Addressing the onlookers for a last statement, one stated that to beg would only bring laughter and ridicule.²

The three men had served as American soldiers, but this day they would die like true Apache warriors. Decisions made by their U.S. governmental and military masters had conspired to put them in a situation that ultimately challenged their allegiance to their tribal, familial, and religious loyalties. In attempting to serve two diametrically opposed masters, they had been thrust into a maelstrom of circumstances which forced them to choose one master or the other. The helplessness of their position and their corresponding decision contributed to a disaster not of their own making, and these three men would pay the steepest price for the ensuing debacle at Cibecue Creek.

From the beginning it was an event misreported, misinterpreted, and misunderstood. Its execution and reportage suffered from bad planning and bad timing. What was first reported as a military disaster on the scale of Custer's defeat at the Little Bighorn evolved into an event involving a much smaller casualty list, still a military defeat, but multiplied in scope by the element of alleged treachery on a large scale.

On Monday, August 29, 1881, General Eugene A. Carr left Fort Apache, Arizona Territory with 117 men, including five officers, seventy-nine soldiers, a surgeon, a guide, an interpreter with five assistants, nine civilians, Carr's fifteen-year-old son, Clark, and twenty-three Apache scouts.³ Carr was acting on orders from his department commander, Brevet Major General Orlando B. Willcox. Willcox, in turn, had issued the orders at the request of the San Carlos Reservation agent, J. C. Tiffany.⁴ Tiffany had become alarmed at the activities of a medicine man named Noch-ay-del-klinne and had telegraphed Carr that he wanted the Apache mystic, now called Prophet by his followers, "arrested or killed or both."⁵

Tiffany had become concerned over the tone of Noch-ay-del-klinne's teachings. The Prophet had managed to foment a religious revival among his adherents, teaching them rituals, a new dance, and promising to raise from the dead two recently murdered chiefs of opposing Apache sub-tribes. It had also been reported that the new teachings would ultimately result in the disappearance of the whites from Apacheria.⁶

Carr and his force located the Prophet at his village on Cibecue Creek, forty-six miles from Fort Apache, on August 30. The slender, five foot, six inch, 125 pound holy man⁷ offered no resistance and agreed to return to Fort Apache with the soldiers.⁸ As the column started back

¹ Charles Collins, *Apache Nightmare: The Battle at Cibecue Creek*, The Civilization of the American Indian Series (Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 1999), 201.

² *Ibid.*

³ Dan L. Thrapp, *The Conquest of Apacheria* (Norman, Oklahoma: University of Oklahoma Press, 1967), 221.

⁴ Robert M. Utley, *Frontier Regulars: The United States Army and the Indians, 1866-1891*, The Wars of the United States Series (New York: Macmillan, 1973; Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1977), 372.

⁵ Thrapp, 220-221.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 218.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 217.

to Fort Apache large numbers of the Prophet's Apache adherents followed. When the soldiers stopped to camp for the night, the Apaches, many painted for war, drew closer. Carr ordered them back.⁹ Determining what exactly happened next depends upon sorting through a variety of sources. Someone opened fire, and each Apache scout was forced to make an immediate individual decision as to where his loyalty lay. Early reports of the Cibecue battle were confused and contradictory. Who had fired the opening shots? What role had the scouts played in the fight and why?

What is certain is that the early reports were grossly inaccurate. The *Daily News* of Denver reported "That so gallant and experienced an officer as General Carr, colonel of the Sixth Regiment of cavalry, has fallen a victim to the Apache whirlwind, is sad news indeed."¹⁰ Even the venerable *New York Times* reported "... Gen. Carr and his command have all been massacred by the White Mountain Indians ... There were 110 men and 7 officers killed."¹¹ Under the page one headline BETRAYED BY HIS SCOUTS, the *New York Times* reported on September 5, 1881, "There can be no doubt that the massacre was the direct result of a conspiracy between the scouts and the hostile Apaches, and that Col. Carr and his men were deliberately led to the slaughter-pen by the scouts."¹² Denver's *Daily News* of September 6 echoed this early version of the Cibecue battle stating that Carr's command had been "so surprised by the sudden treachery of the Indian scouts that they were actually murdered, the common chances of battle being out of the case."¹³

However, only one day after blaring BETRAYED, the *New York Times*, on September 6, this time on page four, offered a very different account. Declaring, "To the credit of the Apache race, by common consent ranked among the most implacable and treacherous of all Indian people, it may be said that great surprise and incredulity were manifested among persons ... familiar with Indian warfare when it was said that these useful scouts had deliberately betrayed their employers." The *Times* contradicted its own previous day's headline, positing that, "It does not now appear that they have done anything of the kind."¹⁴

In fairness to the *Times* it should be pointed out that while the article of the fifth condemning the scouts appeared on page one, and the article of the sixth casting doubt on that condemnation which appeared on page four does not necessarily constitute a deliberate slight. The *Times*, like most newspapers and the nation as a whole, was consumed by the melodrama attached to President James Garfield's agonizingly slow dance with death that had begun with his wounding by Charles Guiteau on July 12, 1881, and finally ended with his death on September 19.¹⁵ Garfield's condition and the political ramifications of his assassination dominated newspaper coverage during this time period.

After the definitely not deceased Carr and his command made their harried return to Fort Apache on August 31, it was determined that the column had, in fact, only five killed, four wounded, two of whom would perish from their wounds,¹⁶ and that Noch-ay-del-kinne and six

⁸ Rein Vanderpot and Teresita Majewski, *The Forgotten Soldiers: Historical and Archaeological Investigations of the Apache Scouts at Fort Huachuca, Arizona*, Technical Series 71, prepared for the Department of the Army (Tucson, AZ: Statistical Research, Inc., 1998), 16.

⁹ Thomas W. Dunlay, *Wolves for the Blue Soldiers: Indian Scouts and Auxiliaries with the United States Army, 1860-1890* (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 1982), 171.

¹⁰ *Daily News* (Denver, Colorado), 6 September 1881.

¹¹ *New York Times*, 4 September 1881.

¹² *New York Times*, 5 September 1881.

¹³ *Daily News* (Denver, Colorado), 6 September 1881.

¹⁴ *New York Times*, 6 September 1881.

¹⁵ Sean Dennis Cashman, *America in the Gilded Age: From the Death of Lincoln to the Rise of Theodore Roosevelt*, 3d ed. (New York: New York University Press, 1993), 255-256.

¹⁶ Utley, 372.

Apache scouts were among the eighteen Apache dead.¹⁷ The Battle of Cibecue proved to be, in terms of military losses, the costliest battle between American soldiers and Apaches in Arizona's history. But what made the incident unique was the fact that at least some of the twenty-three Apache scouts had indeed participated in the battle on the side of Noch-ay-del-klinne's followers. This was the only reported incident of mutiny by Indian scouts in the long history of their employment beside American troops.¹⁸

The reaction to and the impression of the scouts' betrayal was, and remains, mixed. This new Apache "war" or "outbreak" proved to be short-lived. By late September most organized Apache resistance had already ceased.¹⁹ Five of the scouts accused of firing on their soldier allies surrendered on September 20. These five were court-martialed by the army at Fort Grant under charges of mutiny, desertion, and murder.²⁰ Some of the mutinous scouts remained at large for the present,²¹ and no other scouts were ever punished for their role at Cibecue.²²

Of the five who surrendered, two were dishonorably discharged from the army and sentenced to long prison terms at Alcatraz. The other three, Sergeant Dandy Jim, Sergeant Dead Shot, and Private Skippy, were sentenced to death. The sentence was carried out on March 3, 1882, at 12:30 in the afternoon. Ranks of soldiers stood to attention before the gallows, gathered both as witnesses and as protection against any Apache retaliation. That retaliation was limited to the suicide, by hanging, of Dead Shot's wife.²³

Modern historians have also adopted a number of different versions of the Cibecue affair. In their 1998 history of the Fort Huachuca Apache scouts prepared for the Department of the Army, Rein Vanderpot and Teresita Majewski claim that it was Noch-ay-del-klinne's followers, led by a former scout named Sanchez, who initiated the battle and were then joined by the scouts.²⁴ The Fort Huachuca history is not footnoted, but in their acknowledgements the authors state that the majority of the sources for their history are contemporary members of the Apache tribe. The reader can only surmise that their interpretation of the Cibecue affair's flashpoint is based on Apache oral tradition.

In *The Conquest of Apacheria*, Donald Thrapp cites General Carr as writing that it was Dead Shot who initiated the combat. As the column, with Noch-ay-del-klinne secured as a prisoner, began to set up camp for the evening, the scouts complained that the area was unsuitable due to the presence of anthills. When told to move beyond the anthills, "... the scouts dropped their guns in the position of load, and loaded; an Indian at the head of those mounted and armed, also one of the scouts, Dead Shot, gave war whoops, and the scouts and all commenced firing."²⁵

Robert Utley, arguably the twentieth-century's preeminent historian of the American West, in *Frontier Regulars* claims it was Noch-ay-del-klinne's followers who fired first and were instantly reinforced by the scouts. In Utley's account the attack followed directly after the column, dogged by the Prophet's closely-following adherents, had set up camp. "As the command bivouacked for the night, they suddenly attacked. At the same moment the scouts mutinied."²⁶ Utley did not footnote his source for this information.

¹⁷ William B. Kessel, "The Battle of Cibecue and its Aftermath: A White Mountain Apache's Account," *Ethnohistory* 21, no. 2 (1974): 127.

¹⁸ Victoria A. O. Smith, review of *Apache Nightmare: The Battle at Cibecue Creek*, by Charles Collins, *Journal of Military History* 64, no. 1 (January 2000): 210.

¹⁹ Utley, 373.

²⁰ Vanderpot and Majewski, 16.

²¹ Thrapp, 230.

²² Utley, 373.

²³ Thrapp, 230.

²⁴ Vanderpot and Majewski, 16.

²⁵ Thrapp, 224.

²⁶ Utley, 372.

In his introduction to *Lt. Charles Gatewood & His Apache Wars Memoir*, Louis Kraft does not identify who fired the first shot. “Carr’s arrival at Noch-ay-del-kinne’s village ... and his subsequent arrest ... ignited a firefight that resulted in a revolt by native scouts (White Mountain and Cibecue Apaches).”²⁷ Kraft’s source is a letter written in 1926 by Lieutenant Thomas Cruse to Charles Gatewood, Jr., the son of Lieutenant Charles Gatewood who usually commanded this company of scouts, but was absent due to illness on this occasion. Cruse was a West Point graduate and had been assigned to Arizona in 1879 with the expressed duty of command of Indian scouts.²⁸

In his own book, *Apache Days and After*, originally published in 1941, Cruse mentions the encroaching Apaches being ordered back. “Sanchez was one of these and with three or four others lifted rifles and fired. Instantly, at least a hundred other shots roared.”²⁹ Cruse singles out one scout as firing on the troopers. “Dandy Jim the Sergeant shot Captain Hentig, killing him instantly.”³⁰ As to the other scouts, “... I had my back to them, arranging for a herd guard. I knew of their part in the fight only afterward.”³¹

Citing General Carr’s report as his source, Charles Collins in his book, *Apache Nightmare*, claims that Dead Shot said something in Apache to the scouts after a couple of shots had been fired in the soldiers’ direction from the Prophet’s followers. Lieutenant William Harding Carter saw the scouts raise and fire their weapons in the direction of Troop D. “Some scouts knelt; others stood up when they fired. They fired at approximately the same time.”³²

Thomas Dunlay of the University of Nebraska’s Center of Great Plains Studies expanded on Cruse’s version of events in his book, *Wolves for the Blue Soldiers*. Dunlay states that Cruse believed that the scouts had no preconceived plan to fire on the soldiers. Cruse, in Dunlay’s opinion, was “sure that the man who began the firing was a former scout called Sanchez, the only man Cruse thought should hang for his connection with the affair.”³³ Ironically, Sanchez received no punishment and later served as a scout again under General George Crook.³⁴

Conspicuous in its absence from all of the above historians’ accounts is Crook’s interview of several of the scouts present that day at Cibecue. While not the first officer to employ Apache scouts, Crook was the one officer most associated with their use and had deployed them in his campaigns against hostile Apaches from 1872-1875.³⁵ Crook had been sent north to participate in the campaign against the Sioux in March 1875.³⁶ Crook returned to Arizona in 1882³⁷ and on September 23, 1882 he met with a number of the scouts from the Cibecue column and recorded their version of events.³⁸

According to the scout Kulo, as camp was being set up, “The cook fired a shot at us, and we all started to run away from him and ran to the pack train... As we ran there, the white

²⁷ Louis Kraft, introduction to *Lt. Charles Gatewood & His Apache Wars Memoir* (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 2005), xxxvi.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, 186, footnote 43.

²⁹ Thomas Cruse, *Apache Days and After* (Caldwell, ID: Caxton Printers, 1941; reprint, Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 1987), 111.

³⁰ *Ibid.*

³¹ *Ibid.*, 111-112.

³² Collins, 52.

³³ Dunlay, 171.

³⁴ *Ibid.*

³⁵ *Ibid.*, 167-168.

³⁶ John G. Bourke, *On the Border with Crook* (New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1891; Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 1971), 239.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, 433.

³⁸ Peter Cozzens, ed., *Eyewitness to the Indian Wars 1865-1890*, vol. 1, “John G. Bourke Diary 60: 21-63, United States Military Academy Library” (Mechanicsburg, PA: Stackpole Books, 2001), 295.

soldiers opened fire upon us.”³⁹ The scout, Charlie, claimed he was making bread when the firing began. “I don’t know who commenced the firing. I ran off with the other Indian scouts when they scattered.”⁴⁰

Also missing from the Anglo-American histories cited above is the version of the Cibecue event as related by Dead Shot’s own son, Tom Friday. In 1938 Mr. Friday’s account was written down by the local missionary to the White Mountain Apaches.⁴¹ Friday admitted that he himself was not present and that he was told of these events only afterward.⁴² In Friday’s account, the first shots at Cibecue were fired by a soldier acting under orders. In this description of the battle, Noch-ay-del-kinne’s brother approached the tent where the medicine man was being held under guard, only to be ordered back by the “commanding officer.” When the brother continued towards the tent, the “commanding officer” ordered the guard, “Shoot that man.”⁴³

There are valid questions and concerns regarding the use and veracity of oral histories, and Native American and Euro-American worldviews are certainly influenced by cultural and language differences, but this is a topic beyond the scope of this paper. It is apparent, though, that the interviewees would have had a number of concerns. The scouts interviewed by Crook may very well have been motivated by fear of retribution. Tom Friday may have wished to protect his father’s name and memory. They may also have been, as was common among Indians of the Indian Wars and early Reservation periods, desirous of telling their trusted white interviewer what they thought he wanted to hear. It is also quite possible that their versions hold every bit as much truth as the versions presented by the white historians. Whatever the “truth” or “truths” of Cibecue be, it appears more than a little ethno-centric that the white historians cited above choose not to give any mention at all of the Apache version of the Cibecue event.

Who fired the first shot may never be known. The person who did so may not even be aware himself. It is clear that tensions were high and the potential for armed confrontation was palpable. It does appear certain that the scouts had no preset plan to ambush their soldier companions. It is equally certain that some of the scouts did indeed mutiny and fire on the soldiers. The pertinent question is not who fired the first shot, but rather why did the scouts open fire on the soldiers?

Notably, General Carr was, unlike many other military commanders at the time, experienced in the use of Indian scouts. In 1869 he had completed a successful campaign in Nebraska against the Cheyenne in which he had employed 150 Pawnee scouts.⁴⁴ When ordered by Willcox to arrest Noch-ay-del-kinne, Carr, according to Collins, “did not feel comfortable” about employing his Apache scouts for this particular operation.⁴⁵ Dunlay writes that Carr “was uncertain whether his scout company ... could be depended upon,” if trouble erupted with the Prophet’s followers, many of whom were relatives of the scouts.⁴⁶ Thrapp reports that Agent Tiffany had once sent his Apache police to arrest the medicine man, but they had returned to the agency sulking and without their arms.⁴⁷

Vanderpot and Majewski repeated Thrapp’s report of the Apache police’s refusal to act against the Prophet and agreed with Utley that a number of the scouts had themselves come under Noch-ay-del-kinne’s influence.⁴⁸ Cruse wrote that each of his scouts had asked for passes

³⁹ Ibid., 299-300.

⁴⁰ Ibid., 300.

⁴¹ Kessel, 123.

⁴² Ibid., 132.

⁴³ Ibid., 131.

⁴⁴ George Bird Grinnell, *Two Great Scouts and Their Pawnee Battalion: The Experiences of Frank J. North and Luther H. North* (Cleveland: Arthur H. Clark Company, 1928; Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 1971), 202.

⁴⁵ Collins, 33.

⁴⁶ Dunlay, 170-171.

⁴⁷ Thrapp, 220.

⁴⁸ Vanderpot and Majewski, 16; Utley, 371.

to attend the Prophet's ceremonies. Given passes, the scouts overstayed their allotted time and returned from the dances angry and exhausted. "Dozens of small incidents showed that something, or someone, was giving them new thoughts."⁴⁹

Everyone involved in the actual "boots on the ground" execution of the Cibecue operation was conflicted. Carr was not on good terms with his commander, Willcox, and personally felt that the mission assigned to him was unnecessary and fraught with risk.⁵⁰ When Carr questioned Cruse about using the scouts for the upcoming operation, Cruse told him that he felt the scouts wanted to be loyal but that their own families were adherents of the Prophet. He suggested using Yuma, Mojave, and Chiricahua scouts instead.⁵¹ Most of the officers and the post's civilian interpreter, Sam Bowman, agreed with Cruse.⁵² Carr telegraphed Departmental Headquarters on August 13, seeking permission to discharge his own scouts and use others for the Cibecue mission. But, in a case of tragic bad timing, the telegraph lines were down and Carr did not receive an affirmative reply to his request until after the operation was over.⁵³

In the 1882 interviews with Crook, the scouts told of their own misgivings. They complained that Carr had not understood them the way that Crook had. Alchisay stated that when they had served under Crook, "We were all content; everything was in peace."⁵⁴ But when Crook went north and he and his officers were replaced with new men, "We couldn't make out what they wanted: one day they seemed to want one thing; the next day, something else."⁵⁵ The scout Pedro related that the Apaches had danced before. "I have never heard that there was any harm in that, but that campaign was made just because the Indians over on the Cibecue were dancing."⁵⁶

Thus, the scouts were marching to arrest a man whom some of them had followed. They were to assist in the detaining of a man who in their eyes had committed no crime and who posed no threat to their white officers. Noch-ay-del-kinne had been an army scout; he had traveled to Washington to see the president. He had attended a white man's school in Santa Fe and been introduced to Christian beliefs while there.⁵⁷ Given his close connections to white American culture, it is unclear why the military officials feared him as they did.

He was also a man that the Apache scouts' family members and friends admired. Following the orders of their white officers was leading them into direct confrontation with their own families, as well as their fellow tribesmen. Once that confrontation escalated to violence the scouts were placed in a no-win situation.

The aftermath of the Cibecue battle was messy for the high-ranking army officers involved. Willcox pursued formal charges against Carr for exceeding his orders and thereby precipitating the battle. A court of inquiry investigated the charges and cleared Carr of any major wrongdoing and cited him only for minor errors in the disposition of his forces during the battle.⁵⁸ Utley argues that the court could have come down harder on Carr. "Carr seemed to ignore highly visible evidence of the volatile disposition of the Apaches ... Also, even though he knew the scouts to be under Nakaidoklini's spell, he failed to guard against their disaffection."⁵⁹

Perhaps this charge is a little harsh. Carr had discussed the scouts' disposition with Cruse and had requested their discharge from his superiors. Failing to receive that permission, due to the downed telegraph, Carr felt that he must use the forces at his disposal, including the scouts.

⁴⁹ Cruse, 96.

⁵⁰ Utley, 372.

⁵¹ Cruse, 100.

⁵² Collins, 32-33.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, 33.

⁵⁴ Cozzens, 295.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, 297.

⁵⁷ Cruse, 93-94; Thrapp, 217.

⁵⁸ Utley, 374.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*

“They were enlisted soldiers of my command for duty; and I could not have found the Medicine man without them. I deemed it better also that if they should prove unfaithful it should not occur at the Post.”⁶⁰

Carr called the scouts together before departing Fort Apache and explained that his goal was to bring Noch-ay-del-klinne back to the fort, in order that the Prophet may offer the military an explication of his teachings. Carr reassured the scouts, “That I was not going to hurt him.”⁶¹ It is also quite possible that Carr hoped that the scouts’ very presence would help to calm those very “volatile dispositions” that Utley made note of. Perhaps the fact that some of the scouts themselves had participated in the ceremonies at Cibecue would calm the fears of the Prophet and his followers. One scout, Sergeant Mose, asked for and was given permission to travel ahead and notify Noch-ay-del-klinne of the column’s approach and of its mission.⁶²

Utley reserves his harshest criticism for Willcox. This conclusion appears to be quite justified. It was Willcox who, at Tiffany’s behest, ordered the Prophet’s arrest.⁶³ Utley describes Willcox’s post-battle charges against Carr as “a petty maneuver to evade responsibility that the record plainly shows to have been his.”⁶⁴ General of the Army, William T. Sherman, criticized Willcox’s handling of the entire affair and ordered Crook’s return to Arizona to replace him.⁶⁵

The entire episode had turned out to be a black eye for the U.S. Army. General Irvin McDowell, who directed army operations in Arizona from San Francisco,⁶⁶ admitted that the decision to arrest Noch-ay-del-klinne, which had set in motion the entire affair, was a mistake. In unspoken recognition of that mistake, no Apache “civilians” were pursued or punished by the army for their participation in the Cibecue battle.⁶⁷

Most of the mutinous scouts were casualties in the hostilities that followed the battle.⁶⁸ It would also appear that the army was less than totally committed to punishing all the scouts who had mutinied at Cibecue. It is only necessary to point out that Sanchez, while not a scout, but a former scout at the time of the battle, was identified by some as the one who fired the first shot. Yet Crook saw fit to later reenlist his services as a scout.⁶⁹

The U.S. Army would continue to employ Apache scouts against their fellow tribesmen and other enemies. They would aid in the final surrender of Geronimo and in the pursuit of the outlaw Apache Kid. They served alongside American soldiers in Mexico during Pershing’s Punitive Expedition of 1916.⁷⁰ The last four Apache scouts would not be retired from U.S. service until 1947.⁷¹

The five unfortunates who were punished for the Cibecue incident may have been as much victims of their own decisions to surrender as of the army’s desire to revenge its Cibecue dead. As Carr had said, they were in fact, enlisted soldiers under his command.⁷² Three of the men, Sergeants Dead Shot, Dandy Jim and Private Skippy were tried in mid-November 1881 and were quickly found guilty of violating a number of Articles of War and sentenced to death by hanging.⁷³ Private Mucheco was sentenced to life imprisonment at Alcatraz and another scout,

⁶⁰ Thrapp, 221.

⁶¹ Ibid.

⁶² Ibid.

⁶³ Utley, 372.

⁶⁴ Utley, 374.

⁶⁵ Ibid., 377.

⁶⁶ Ibid., 171.

⁶⁷ Ibid., 374.

⁶⁸ Dunlay, 172.

⁶⁹ Ibid., 171.

⁷⁰ Vanderpot and Majewski, back cover.

⁷¹ Ibid., 43.

⁷² Thrapp, 221.

⁷³ Collins, 183.

identified only as Scout 11,⁷⁴ was sentenced to eight years, also at Alcatraz.⁷⁵ Both of these men were released and returned to their people by executive order on June 29, 1884.⁷⁶

Once the accused scouts had placed themselves in army custody, the army had no choice but to act. Still, there were those in the ranks who were reluctant to see the scouts punished. In his book about his days with the Apache, Lieutenant Cruse wrote, "I have always regretted the fate of Dead Shot and Skippy ... It seemed to me that they were swept into the fight by excitement and the force of evil circumstances."⁷⁷ Such a statement could well be used to sum up the actions of all the Apache scouts at Cibecue.

⁷⁴ Ibid., 183, 204.

⁷⁵ Cruse, 139.

⁷⁶ Ibid.

⁷⁷ Ibid.

was the result of conflict between public policy regarding civil rights and whether the First Amendment rights of a private, religious school precluded the federal government from revoking its tax-exemption privilege.

Bob Jones College was founded in 1927 as a fundamentalist Christian college in Florida by Bob Jones Sr. After an interim move to Tennessee, it became Bob Jones University of Greenville, South Carolina in 1947.³ Until 1971, the school's admissions policy specifically excluded black applicants.⁴ At that time, BJU changed its policy to exclude only *unmarried* blacks largely in response to the notification received from the IRS: on July 10, 1970, the IRS had announced its intention to cease granting tax exemptions to organizations with racially discriminatory policies;⁵ in a letter to BJU dated November 30, 1970, the IRS formally notified the University of the change in policy.⁶ The IRS's policy change came in response to *Green v. Connally* (1971),⁷ in which Mississippi parents of public school minors had petitioned that segregated private schools should not be eligible for tax-exempt status, as they perpetuated *de facto* segregation. The Court found in favor of the petitioners; a preliminary injunction against granting tax-exempt status to racially discriminatory schools was issued in January 1970. The IRS's policy change was supported by the Court's re-characterization in *Green* of "charitable" (26 U.S.C. § 170) organizations in the IRS Code of 1954 § 501(c)(3) list of tax-exempt eligible entities to preclude those which have racially discriminatory policies. In 1971, the IRS formalized the policy by explicating that any organization, educational or otherwise, that accepted charitable donations would be governed by this policy.⁸ BJU fell into this category.

The first suit involving the university and the IRS was actually adjudicated by the Supreme Court in 1974: *Bob Jones University v. Simon*.⁹ BJU, having been notified of the IRS's change in policy and intent to revoke BJU's tax-exempt status, filed suit to enjoin the IRS, claiming First and Fifth Amendment violations. BJU argued that the IRS's actions represented government influence in the practice of faith and would impinge on the university's free exercise of their religiously based policies regarding racial separation. The District Court granted the injunction;¹⁰ the Court of Appeals overturned, relying on a portion of the IRS Code that prevented petitioners from enjoining the IRS until it had actually assessed the taxes. The Supreme Court upheld the Appeals Court finding. The ruling in *Simon* demonstrated a statutory reliance on procedural law. Not until *BJU v. U.S.*, though, would the substantive content of the constitutional issues be ruled upon. To appreciate the confluence of issues, it is important to set the stage.

The Religious Right political constituency, variably referred to as Christian, Fundamentalist, or Evangelical Conservatives, was not fully apparent until the late 1970's, when they coalesced, briefly, around the born-again Baptist Presidential candidate Jimmy Carter, and more permanently, the Republican party of Ronald Reagan. It is important to note the distinction between "evangelical" and "mainline Protestants." The political movement that is commonly referred to as the Religious Right is largely comprised of socially conservative Protestant denominations including the Southern Baptist Convention, Churches of Christ, and Assemblies

³ <http://www.bju.edu/about/history/>; <http://www.bju.edu/about/history/gville.html>, accessed May 2008.

⁴ 461 U.S. 574 (1983), 580.

⁵ Steven C. Schroer, "Applicability of Prohibition of Suits to Restrain Assessment and Collection of Taxes to Revocation of Tax Exemptions under Section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code," *Columbia Law Review*, 73, no. 7 (Nov 1973): 1502.

⁶ 461 U.S. 574 (1983), 581.

⁷ 330 F. Supp. 1150

⁸ Mayer G. Freed and Daniel Polsby, "Race, Religion and Public Policy." *The Supreme Court Review*. Vol. 1983 (1983): 5.

⁹ 416 U.S. 725 (1974)

¹⁰ Schroer, 1502.

of God.¹¹ The impetus for the convergence was, broadly speaking, a general sense among socially conservative Protestants that they were being attacked by an increasingly secularized culture. The Christian Conservative political movement claimed that the state was denying its “Christian heritage” by legislating or adjudicating in a manner that, they argued, violated their First Amendment protections. The sense of secularization was reinforced by numerous Court challenges to religious practices, the cultural ramifications of desegregation and the civil rights movement, censorship by the Federal Communications Commission of religious programming,¹² the well-documented abortion debate, and finally, what was perceived as a direct affront upon the freedom to practice religion in the *BJU v. U.S.* case.

The first notable challenge to the religion clauses of the First Amendment came in *Everson v. Board of Education*,¹³ (1947). In this case the Supreme Court upheld a New Jersey state statute authorizing the use of public taxpayer money to bus school children to Catholic schools. Justice Hugo Black’s opinion was restrained, though, “The First Amendment has erected a wall between church and state...We could not approve the slightest breach. New Jersey has not breached it here.”¹⁴ The dissent used this very restraint to argue that the opinion should have been just the opposite, indicating the precarious nature of resolving First Amendment religious debates. Fifteen years later, the Court succeeded in “nationalizing” the First Amendment by overturning New York and Pennsylvania state laws implementing prayers in public schools.¹⁵ In *Engel v. Vitale*,¹⁶ (1962) and *School District of Abington Township, Pennsylvania v. Schempp*,¹⁷ (1963) the Court found school sanctioned prayers unconstitutional by incorporating the First Amendment by the Fourteenth Amendment. State sponsored Christian prayer in the public school seemed an obvious violation of the separation between church and state.

The Court was not engaging in an outright attack on religious protections, though. For instance, in *Sherbert v. Verner*¹⁸ (1963), which was decided during the same session as *Schempp*, the Court ruled that the state could not deny the petitioner’s unemployment claim as she had left her job because it required her to work on Saturdays, and her Seventh-Day Adventist faith observed Saturdays as the Sabbath.¹⁹ The Court’s early decisions involving the establishment and free-exercise clauses were carefully carving out the delicate balance between religious freedoms and state control.

After the *Brown v. Board of Education* decision in 1954, many southerners had begun to privatize the education of their children to circumvent the mandated desegregation of the public school system. Court rulings regarding school prayer, bussing, evolution, and the general cultural liberalization of the 1960s, furthered the trend toward private, especially Christian, schools into the 1970s.²⁰ Contrary to popular history, Protestants did not overwhelmingly coalesce against *Roe v. Wade* (1973). In fact, the highly conservative Southern Baptist Convention in 1971 passed, and in 1974 and 1976 affirmed, a resolution that approved abortion under certain conditions: rape, incest, fetal deformity, or the well-being of the mother,²¹ a position contrary to other Protestants

¹¹ Frank Lambert, *Religion in American Politics* (Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2008), 185.

¹² Moen, 23-25.

¹³ 330 U.S. 1 (1947)

¹⁴ Hall, *Problems*, 471.

¹⁵ Kermit L. Hall, Paul Finkleman, and James W. Ely, Jr., eds., *American Legal History: Cases and Materials* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), 542.

¹⁶ 370 U.S. 421 (1962)

¹⁷ 374 U.S. 203 (1963)

¹⁸ 374 U.S. 398 (1963)

¹⁹ Freed, 21.

²⁰ Moen, 26.

²¹ Randall Balmer, *God in the White House: A History: How Faith Shaped the Presidency from John F. Kennedy to George W. Bush* (New York, New York: Harper One, 2008), 94.

groups, but in line with the smaller segment of socially liberal Protestants. The abortion debate did not unify all Christians in opposition. The issues that unified Christian political interests were broader and not motivated by protecting specific religious doctrines; rather it seemed that the Religious Right became unified against this perceived secularization of America and the Court's encroachment on religious practices in private institutions.

Arguably, it was in fact the IRS's attack on BJU that commenced the unified politicization of the Christian Right.²² Bob Billings, founder of Christian School Action, remarked in regards to the IRS's actions against BJU, "The IRS ignited the dynamite [within the fundamentalist community] that had been lying around for years."²³ Social changes and Court decisions had formalized the secular nature of public schools, forcing Christians to seek private institutions to inculcate their moral and religious beliefs, and now the government via the IRS was directly attacking the private, religious educational institutions they had created to provide refuge by attempting to revoke the financially beneficial tax-exempt status of their religious schools.

On April 16, 1975, the IRS formally notified BJU of the pending revocation of its tax-exempt status, and on January 19, 1976, the exemption was officially revoked. In the meantime, on May 29, 1975, BJU updated its admissions policy to allow married *and* unmarried black applicants. However, the university maintained a disciplinary rule that prohibited any interracial dating or marriage, or advocacy thereof, on penalty of expulsion.²⁴ To surpass the procedural arguments addressed in *Simon*, BJU paid \$21 in taxes and then promptly filed a refund request. The denial of this request, due to BJU's new, non-exempt status, triggered a counterclaim from the IRS and associated Constitutional arguments.

BJU argued that the IRS did not have the Constitutional authority to revoke tax-exemption based on the literal reading of § 501(c)(3); that authority was reserved to the Congress to specifically legislate and delegate to the IRS to enforce. Any interpretation by the IRS of Congressional intent not explicitly stated was influenced not by legal standards, but rather by social standards. Also, as argued in *Simon*, BJU claimed that the revocation actually violated the university's rights under the religion clauses of the First Amendment. Because BJU's rules and teachings regarding the segregation of races were rooted in their interpretations of biblical text, the university argued that the IRS's policy violated their First Amendment rights to freedom of religious expression. Furthermore, BJU claimed that the IRS's actions represented an attempt to control the specific policies of a religious institution, an action prohibited by the establishment clause.

BJU did not attempt to defend their racially discriminatory policies. Efforts to excuse the interracial dating ban by claiming it affected both white and black students equally could be easily defeated: first, the school had only changed its admissions policy in response to the IRS's notification of its new tax-exemption policy; and second, inherent in their reasoning against interracial relationships, underscored by their only recently amended total exclusion, was that black students were considered less desirable or unworthy of association in their white, fundamentalist Christian school. In fact, Bob Jones III is quoted as saying, "The question is not whether we are discriminatory. We are, and we have never tried to hide the fact."²⁵ Asked for a reference to support the school's racial separatism, a BJU student offered, "It is in the Bible. It says you should not be unequally yoked."²⁶ The verse referenced by this student reads in entirety "Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers: for what fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness? and what communion hath light with darkness?"²⁷ It appears, then, that

²² Lambert, 197.

²³ Moen, 27.

²⁴ 461 U.S. 574 (1983), 580-581.

²⁵ "Religious School is in Tax Battle over Policy of Racial Separatism," *New York Times*, January 26, 1981, Monday, Late City Final Edition, sec. A, p. 18.

²⁶ *Ibid.*

²⁷ 2 Corinthians 6:14, The Holy Bible, Authorized King James Version.

the university's doctrine equated black students with "unbelievers." The student's justification expressed an attitude, not a legal defense, but clearly indicates the religious underpinnings of BJU's policies and why the university argued that the IRS was infringing upon their free-exercise rights.

The government's position was complicated by the Reagan administration's changing opinions. Part of Reagan's Republican Party Platform in 1980 had been the promise to do away with the "unconstitutional regulatory vendetta launched by Mr. Carter's IRS commissioner against independent schools."²⁸ In January 1982, the Reagan Administration made good on its campaign promise and announced that it had shifted its support in this matter to BJU's claim: the IRS did not have the authority to enforce "social law" without Congressional legislation specifically to that intent.²⁹ The President had been influenced by conservative Republicans Presidential Advisor Edwin Meese III, Senator Strom Thurmond, and Representative Trent Lott,³⁰ representatives of the Christian Right that had been Reagan's strongest constituency in his recent election. O. Jack Taylor, Jr., an attorney for BJU, was, unsurprisingly, happy with the Administration's new position. The policy change complemented BJU's argument that the tax laws were not intended to enforce unspecified public policy.³¹

In a letter protesting the Administration's new stance, over 200 lawyers and members of the Justice Department's own civil rights division admonished the President, "Many of these schools were established for the purpose of perpetuating racial segregation in communities which were in the process of desegregating their schools pursuant to the requirements of Federal law."³² Congressional and community civil rights leaders saw the Reagan Administration's move as an affront to the successes of the Civil Rights Movement of the previous three decades.³³ President Reagan reacted quickly. On January 18, 1982, he sent a bill to Congress that would deny tax-exemptions to private schools that racially discriminate.³⁴ In forwarding a bill for Congressional review and approval, President Reagan did not contradict his recent change in position, but rather bolstered his claim that clarifying the meaning and intent of the IRS code was a Congressional matter, not an IRS authority, while acting quickly to assuage critics that saw his previous move as wrong-headed in regards to civil rights.

William T. Coleman, Jr. was appointed by the Supreme Court in April 1982 to argue the government's position, since the Administration no longer represented the IRS in the matter.³⁵ The main argument offered by Coleman was that the racially discriminatory policies of BJU violated public policy and law. Where the IRS code was not explicit, the intent could be inferred

²⁸ Martin Schram and Charles R. Babcock, "Reagan Advisors Missed School Case Sensitivity," *The Washington Post*, January 17, 1982, Sunday, Final Edition, sec. A1.

²⁹ Ibid; Freed, 1; Aric Press and Diane Camper, "Religion, Race and Taxes," *Newsweek*, October 25, 1982, United States Edition, sec. "Justice," p. 102; and, Walter Shapiro and Diane Camper, "Reagan's Civil Rights Woes," *Newsweek*, June 6, 1983, United States Edition, sec. "National Affairs," p. 38.

³⁰ Schram, *The Washington Post*, January, 17, 1982; Howell Raines, "President Shifts View on Tax Rule in Race Bias Case," *New York Times*, January 13, 1982, Wednesday, Late City Final Edition, sec. A, p. 1.

³¹ "U.S. Tax Rule Shift Applauded and Attacked," *New York Times*, January 9, 1982, Saturday, Late City Final Edition, sec. 1, p. 10.

³² "Text of Letter on Exemptions," *New York Times*, February 3, 1982, Wednesday, Late City Final Edition, sec. A, p. 21.

³³ Raines, *New York Times*, January, 13, 1982.

³⁴ Lee Lescaze, "Reagan Submits Bill on Schools," *The Washington Post*, January 19, 1982, Tuesday, Final Edition, sec. A1; Steven R. Weisman, "Reagan Acts to Bar Tax Break to Schools in Racial Bias Cases," *New York Times*, January 19, 1982, Tuesday, Late City Final Edition, sec. A, p. 1.

³⁵ Stuart Taylor, Jr., "Reagan is Opposed in Racial Bias Case," *New York Times*, August 26, 1982, Thursday, Late City Final Edition, sec. B, p. 9.

from other Congressional actions; the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Voting Rights Act of 1965, and the Federal Housing Act³⁶ revealed a legislative commitment to civil rights and racial nondiscrimination. As was argued in *Brown*, there was also recognition of the keen importance of nondiscrimination in education. In a friend of the court brief, Harry K. Mansfield of the National Association of Independent Schools wrote, "Racial discrimination is not only socially inadmissible but also educationally deleterious."³⁷

The implicit conclusion drawn by the IRS from such legislative acts was bolstered by case precedent. *Green* had established an expanded definition of "charitable" that encompassed BJU, and supported the argument that racially discriminatory policies precluded the university, since it accepted charitable donations, from tax-exemption. In *Norwood v. Harrison*³⁸ (1973) the Court found that offering free textbooks to segregated Mississippi private schools amounted to tangible financial assistance that violated the State's constitutional requirements to prohibit racially segregated schools. Racially discriminatory admissions policies in education were directly confronted in *Runyon v. McCrary*³⁹ (1976). Two Virginia private schools were found to be in violation of a federal statute protecting the rights of all persons within the U.S., regardless of race, to make and enforce contracts. *Runyon* effectively illegalized racially discriminatory policies in nonsectarian private schools.⁴⁰ It was during the litigation of this matter that BJU opened its admissions policy regarding blacks, but maintained the prohibition of interracial relationships.⁴¹

To make the above decisions applicable against BJU, though, the First Amendment claims would have to be addressed. The IRS rebutted the charge that revocation of tax-exempt status prevented or prohibited BJU's religious beliefs or practice thereof; it merely removed a government sanctioned tax privilege because of the organization's failure to comply with law and social policy. The need to protect civil rights and prevent racial discrimination in society outweighed BJU's claim to entitlement of a special tax status.

The decision in *Bob Jones University v. United States*⁴² was announced on May 24, 1983. The Court ruled in favor of the IRS's revocation of the tax exemptions. The 8-1 majority opinion was written by Chief Justice Warren Burger. The basic premises for the conclusion are faithful to Coleman's arguments for the IRS: an organization's eligibility for tax exemption cannot contradict "common community conscience" or "established public policy;" regardless of whether the organization's rationale is religiously based, racial discrimination contradicts public policy; the IRS acted within its authority and properly applied it to both petitioners in the case; and, the "compelling government interest" in "eradicating racial discrimination in education" outweighs the First Amendment free-exercise claims of the petitioners.⁴³

The concurring opinion of Justice Powell and the dissent of Justice Rehnquist are especially enlightening to the struggle between social policy and religious liberties. Justice Powell agreed with the ultimate outcome of the majority opinion: eliminating racial discrimination in education was an imperative concern to be weighed heavily. However, relying on "the common community conscience" to sanction the IRS's authority to interpret tax code based on social norms set a dangerously broad precedent. Tax-exempt organizations serve a public purpose by encouraging diverse viewpoints to the public discourse. For the Court to rule that the government has the authority to enforce social policy without explicit Congressional instruction weakens the legislative representation of a diverse American population.⁴⁴ Senator Jesse Helms

³⁶ Freed, 9.

³⁷ Taylor, *New York Times*, August 26, 1982.

³⁸ 413 U.S. 455 (1973)

³⁹ 427 U.S. 160 (1976)

⁴⁰ 427 U.S. 160 (1976), 163.

⁴¹ Freed, 4.

⁴² 461 U.S. 574 (1983)

⁴³ 461 U.S. 574 (1983), 575.

⁴⁴ 461 U.S. 574 (1983), 609.

represented the dissent to Congress with this very point: the Supreme Court had circumscribed legislative authority by effectively amending the IRS code with the *BJU v. US* decision.⁴⁵

Justice Rehnquist's dissent was quite similar to Justice Powell's concurrence. He also expressed agreement that eliminating racial discrimination in education was a necessary goal. His similar reasoning led him to a different result. The Supreme Court was not "constitutionally empowered"⁴⁶ to circumvent Congressional authority and effectively legislate on a social policy. The Court's reliance on "public policy" and common-law readings of "charitable contributions" signaled not an opportunity for the Court to act, but rather as a directive to Congress to address the conflict between civil rights, religious liberties, and tax codes.

The public reaction to the decision was equally nuanced. Bob Jones III offered an extreme warning to his students, "We're in a bad fix in America when eight evil old men and one vain and foolish woman can speak a verdict on American liberties...You no longer live in a nation that is religiously free."⁴⁷ President Reagan simply said, "We will obey the law."⁴⁸ In a brief filed with the ACLU, the American Jewish Committee argued that the constitutional mandate to eliminate "government-supported race discrimination in education" far outweighed any First Amendment claims of the schools involved,⁴⁹ and therefore validated the Court's ruling. Protestant Church officials were divided by the opinion. Most, like William P. Thompson, CEO of the United Presbyterian Church, agreed that the decision upheld "the principle of a nonracist culture" but worried what the ruling would mean for the First Amendment protected "free exercise" clause, specifically the separation between church and state when religious beliefs differ from public policy in areas other than racial discrimination.⁵⁰

The fine distinctions in the analysis of the official decision are reflected by the conflicted concerns expressed by religious leaders: the Court's ultimate result, to deny tax benefits to racially discriminatory organizations, is positive. However, as Justice Powell's concurring opinion and Justice Rehnquist's dissent illustrate, the rationale offered in the majority opinion set a potentially dangerous precedent for replacing proper Congressional legislative remedies with Judicial jurisdiction over, albeit in this case, valid, social or public concerns, threatening the Constitutional guarantees for the protection of religious freedoms. The IRS Tax Code has since been modified to reflect the sentiment of the ruling. Private educational organizations, regardless of religious or secular affiliation, are required to comply with the "Racially Nondiscriminatory Policy" in order to obtain and maintain a tax exempt status.⁵¹

The long legal battle that culminated in *BJU v. U.S.* had significantly contributed to the unification of a large constituency of Protestant Christian conservatives in the Republican campaign of 1980, a demographic that has maintained considerable political influence since. In 1993, Congress responded to the concerns of Christians by passing the Religious Freedom Restoration Act [RFRA]. The act strengthened the "compelling interest" test in favor of First Amendment guaranteed religious freedoms, maintaining that the government must have a distinct interest in the general law to override an individual's religious practices that disagree with that law.⁵² The inspiration for the act had been the ongoing conflict between religious liberties, government interest, and public policy illustrated in the *BJU v. U.S.* case. The direct impetus, however, was the Court's ruling in *Employment Division v. Smith* (1990),⁵³ in which Oregon's

⁴⁵ Hall, *Problems*, 491.

⁴⁶ 461 U.S. 574 (1983), 612

⁴⁷ Phil Gailey, "Bob Jones, in Sermon, Assails Supreme Court," *New York Times*, May 25, 1983, Wednesday, Late City Final Edition, sec. A, p. 23.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*

⁴⁹ Marjorie Hyer, "Many Church Leaders are Torn by Supreme Court's Tax Ruling," *The Washington Post*, May, 28, 1983, Saturday, Final Edition, sec. C14.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*

⁵¹ <http://www.irs.gov/publications/p557/ch03.html>, accessed May 2008.

⁵² Hall, *Cases*, 548.

⁵³ 494 U.S. 872 (1990)

jurisdiction to outlaw the religious use of peyote was upheld. RFRA was not the end of the debate, though, as it was overturned in 1997 by *City of Boerne v. Flores*.⁵⁴ In *Flores*, the Court held that RFRA's incorporation of the First Amendment over state law by the Fourteenth Amendment represented an overextension of Congressional enforcement powers because it attempted to *define* First Amendment guarantees rather than simply protect them.

The political potency of the case was apparent again in the presidential campaign of 2000. George W. Bush accepted an invitation to speak at Bob Jones University and was criticized in the media and by his Republican opponent, John McCain, for endorsing an institution that still maintained a prohibition against interracial relationships. Bush claimed he was not aware of the policies of the university. In response to the media attention surrounding the campaign controversy, BJU's president, Bob Jones III, announced during a March 3, 2000, appearance on the Larry King Live show, that effective immediately the interracial dating policy would end.⁵⁵ BJU now has a "Nondiscriminatory Policy" on the Admissions page of its website.⁵⁶ On November 21, 2008, the Associated Press reported that BJU's president, Stephen Jones, grandson of founder Bob Jones, had issued an official apology for the university's past policies regarding race.⁵⁷ The school's website now includes a page explaining the university's new position.⁵⁸ In the statement, the previous policies regarding race are repudiated as un-Christlike and are blamed on the heritage of "the segregationist ethos of American culture" at large. The major organization is still not tax-exempt.

The debate surrounding *Bob Jones Univ. v. United States* can be seen as a transition to an active Christian constituency in American politics. But more importantly, the case represents a national discussion about how to balance civil rights and the religious freedoms protected by the First Amendment. The decision itself reflects the influences of the past wrongs of racial discrimination in the United States and the Supreme Court's efforts to reconcile civil rights with religious liberties. The reactions to it reveal the rise of a Religious Right, conservative movement in U.S. party politics. Within it are apparent long standing concerns regarding the balance of powers between the three branches of government, and how to appropriately balance and define the Constitutional rights of American citizens.

⁵⁴ 521 U.S. 507 (1997)

⁵⁵ Gustav Niebuhr, "The 2000 Campaign: The Religion Issue; Interracial Dating Ban to End," *New York Times*, March 4, 2000, Saturday, Late Edition – Final, sec. A, p. 11.

⁵⁶ <http://www.bju.edu/admissions/nondiscrim.html>, accessed May 2008.

⁵⁷ <http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/27845030/>, accessed November 2008.

⁵⁸ <http://www.bju.edu/about/race.html>, accessed May 2008.

Invention and Reinvention in Modern South Korean Shamanism

William Silcott

The historical records of Korean spiritual life establishes an essential trinity of faiths that have built the nation's religious experiences while wrestling and negotiating with each other in relative peace. Buddhism and Confucianism have long been seen the two stalwarts of the spirits and moral reinforcement, while the recent introduction of Christianity has become a symbol of modernity. However, one of the most overlooked features of Korea's pre-history, history, and current reality has been the function of Shamans within the cultural and religious backdrop of the longest unified state. With the fracturing of the Korean peninsula and the sudden and nearly all-penetrating influence of globalization, the Shamanic traditions have shown the historical ability to adapt to change in their rituals and their social roles while continuing to today.

The historical role of Shamanism was one that could not be separated easily from the everyday lives of Koreans. As a belief set, Shamanism was a relatively non-dogmatic practice set, with the enforcement of moral behavior secondary to the benefit of living humans through communication with ancestors, gods, and natural spirits. The roles filled by the Shaman were, and remain, diverse and intermingling. As one with the ability to both contact and placate the supernatural, a Shaman was a fortune-teller, healer, architectural planner, mediator, advisor, and lore-keeper. Even the line between those who were Shamans and those who were not blurred, as the distinction between the ideas of the mundane and divine were nearly absent. Just as the Shaman would know a horoscope, so too may many other individuals. Yet, those seen as truly able to understand and influence the spiritual realm were often placed in positions of reverence and authority.

In the past, Korean Shamanism has been a relatively fluid faith, adapting to the influences and dictates of power groups, both foreign and domestic. In fact, the common belief is that Korean Shamanism is itself a semi-imported idea from the belief set in Siberia, reworked for the people of Korea. The most prominent influences after the establishment in the past have been the religions imported from China, namely China's own trinity consisting of Buddhism, Taoism and Confucianism. Within Shamanic rites today can be seen obvious sources of foreign influence. Within the household-spirit appeasing rite of *kut*, Laurel Kendall notes the summoning of Buddhas into the *mansin's*, or female shaman's, body.⁵⁹ She also notes that the traditional social position of the *mansin* is one set in the Confucianistic structure prominent in the Yi Dynasty of Choson. This hierarchal structure placed the *mansin* on a level alongside female entertainers, a rather low tier. As a way of establishing fortunes and spiritual vulnerabilities, the usage of the Chinese horoscope is key, as it is also used to set the ideal dates for rituals and celebrations. The adaptations of Korean Shamanism should not be seen as a weakening of itself to foreign entities, however. Quite the contrary, the fact that the tradition continues to exist is a marvel considering the historical influences within the country and proves the flexibility and syncretism that allows its existence today.

Women and the Community of Ritual

In Kris Yi's examination of a woman of Korean descent named Anna, she finds that the woman has been chosen as a Shaman by her ancestors, the normal path for the non-hereditary *mansin*. Anna's reaction was incredulous: "Anna was frightened of this prospect and

⁵⁹ Laurel Kendall, *Shamans, Housewives, and Other Restless Spirits: Women in Korean Ritual Life* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1985), 12.

protested against it.”⁶⁰ The role of a *mansin* is not one taken with pride, and one not seen in line with the modern example Koreans wish to set. Kenji Hidemura claims that the post-Imperial world of Korea sees Christianity as an example of modernity and anti-Imperial sentiment.⁶¹ In order to become part of the new world, the Christian faith has been embraced and, with that, the old is transformed or, within conservative Church views, heretical. Why, then, would the traditions of Shamanism continue? Perhaps crossing the line between the past and present is the casting of Shamanism in the realm of the female. Indeed, over 70% of Shamans within South Korea are female.⁶² Of this percentage, a number must be considered to be part of the Cheju islands, where, as Halla Pai Huhm notes, both men and women are considered Shaman.⁶³ It should be taken into consideration that she makes no note of men in other areas being Shamans. Historical evidence of male Shamanism has been recorded in the mainland, as well. In the Gaya region of Korea, which populated the southern edge of Korea, evidence of Shamanic items are buried with the male dead, such as items to aid in the transportation of the soul to the spirit realm.⁶⁴ The very foundation of Korea was possible, according to myth, by Tan’gun, the divine king and shaman himself. This shift has been pointed as being one of historical importance, again with the establishment and displacement of women during the Confucianistic dominance during the Yi Dynasty. The trend continues today.

Within the Christian and Buddhist hierarchies, the tradition remains with male dominance. The Confucianist offerings to ancestors also continue to be held by the male house leader. With little else offered to women in the spiritual realm, it seems the reasonable conclusion that women turned to the marginalized Shamanism. However, the strict place of women outside the religious sphere also allows escape through the rituals, or *kut*. As documented through ethnographies, the assumed role of the Korean woman is broken down while rituals are enacted. Kendall’s portrayal of *kut* speaks multiple times of the reluctance of women engaged in the ritual to dance. Public dancing by women is strictly amoral in Confucianistic thought, yet the prodding of her peers and the need to placate and channel the spirits overrides the sense of morality. Kendall then goes on to describe the fervor with which the women dance in men’s robes or the disapproval by those who are not fully thrust within the spirit role. Within the framework of the ritual, women are allowed to open themselves to social taboo. Even as the role of *mansin* is frowned upon, society has allowed the argument that a woman has fought against the descending spirit. As the denial of a descending spirit can prove to be fatal, it is accepted that the woman has fought against the low rank in order to keep her good name but gave in at the threat of death.

Indeed, the realm of the Shamanistic world is one seemingly dominated by women. It is, more often than not, the woman who sees the *mansin*, seeking yearly divinations and asking for the performance of rituals. In Kendall’s observations, men were usually dragged into the rites and women found the presence of a man in line for a divination unusual at best:

A neighbor woman and her husband brought (a young man) to Yongsu’s Mother, everyone giggling a little at the incongruity of a man visiting a *mansin*’s house. It was as though he had cooked his family’s evening rice or pickled the winter kimche. Korean men are not inherently unqualified for these tasks, but

⁶⁰ Kris Yongmi Yi, “SHIN-BYUNG (DIVINE ILLNESS) IN A KOREAN WOMAN,” *Culture, Medicine and Psychiatry*, 24 (2000): 473.

⁶¹ Kenji Hidemura, *The Anthropology of Korea: East Asian Perspectives*, eds. Mutsuhiko Shima and Roger L. Janelli (Osaka: National Museum of Ethnology, 1998): 111-127.

⁶² Andrew Eungi Kim, “Nonofficial Religion in South Korea: Prevalence of Fortunetelling and Other Forms of Divination,” *Review of Religious Research*, 3, no. 46 (2005): 296.

⁶³ Halla Pat Huhm, *Kut: Korean Shamanist Rituals* (Elizabeth, New Jersey: Hollym International Corp, 1980), 11.

⁶⁴ Young-sik Lee, *Gaya: A Collection of Research Summaries Related to Gaya*, ed. The Gaya History Policy Committee (Korea: NEWWORDSA Press, 2004): 147-156.

it is the women who perform them, save in exceptional circumstances.⁶⁵

As tradition and modernity negotiate through South Korea, the world view remains one governed by men. In this, women have found networking and a spiritual role in a sphere isolated nearly specifically for them.

Korean Shamanism and Western Medicine

Traditionally, physical ailments were considered in the realm of the metaphysical, the manifestation of displeasure from the spirits. With the influence of both western and Chinese medicine, the role spirits and, by association, shamans play has been altered. The most famous *keuts*, or rituals, performed by the *mansin* are those of exorcism, cleansing, or healing. In these, the shaman rids the body of spirits and bad energies while soothing the anger of protective spirits. However, nowadays the shaman stresses the importance of modern medicine. Kendall relays from her informant:

Far from being hostile to cosmopolitan medicine, Yongsu's Mother urged her patient's wife to consult the pharmacist immediately and faulted her patient for neglecting his health. The *mansin* assume that when their clients fall ill, they will consult pharmacists, herbalists, acupuncturists, and hospitals. The *mansin* themselves patronize pharmacists, herbalists, acupuncturists, and hospitals.⁶⁶

The role of pure illness no longer falls into the realm of the spiritual. Causalities are not denied and the blame for sickness may rest on old age or overall weakness. The acceptance of one source has not resulted in the abandonment of another. While bacteria may be the physical cause of any given ailment, the reason the individual was able to be overcome by the bacteria may very well rest with ignored ancestors. With this new role, the need to hold *keut* becomes more a matter of finance and faith in the cure, leading it to become another option in a list of possible solutions. Despite this choice, it is seen to be beneficial, if possible, for those with an ailment of considerable length to consider holding the exorcism. In this web of multiple health options, there is a sense of responsibility by those who frequent a shaman to be sure that the possibility of spiritual hurts is handled by appropriate authorities. When it comes to the health of a loved one, the weight of expending all available options still rests upon the family. Yet, with this also seems to come a loophole. If the cures offered by more modern authorities take too long or the continuing care becomes a financial burden, the holding of *keut* can provide an escape in the expense of time and money.

The negotiation between medicine and Shamanism has, indeed, been a back and forth. In South Korea, it is not uncommon for the terminally ill to be released from hospital care in order to pass surrounded by family. This is a call to the traditional belief that the spirit of a family member that has died away from home or alone is a dangerous entity to the rest of the household. This movement may have an indirect effect on the organ donation rate of Shamanic Koreans, yet, the precepts of the afterlife seems to impact this far more greatly. According to Shamanic belief, the body must be whole when traveling into the afterlife.⁶⁷ Again, we see the influence of the globalized mindset impacting the religion, as the thought of removing organs from the body, especially a brain dead individual with a pulse, would have been seen a dangerous act under more traditional circumstances.

⁶⁵ Kendall, *Shamans, Housewives, and Other Restless Spirits*, 82.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, 92.

⁶⁷ Jung Ran (Therese) Kim, Doug Elliot, and Cheryl Hyde, "The Influence of Sociocultural Factors on Organ Donation and Transplantation in Korea: Findings From Key Informant Interviews," *Journal of Transcultural Nursing* (April 2004): 147-154.

Revisiting the subject of *shin-byung*, or Divine Illness, the concept of psychological illness has, perhaps, been the most difficult for Shamanism to adapt. As the key of becoming a *mansin* is seen within the culture as a religious event and outside the culture as a disorder, it is quite understandable that a line has been drawn. Often, the descent of a psychological disorder is perceived as the anger of spirits and ancestors.⁶⁸ Such an ailment must be handled with placation, turning what is recognized in western medicine as an individual imbalance into one that afflicts the community. As to why a certain individual is claimed, the explanation is offered by the individual horoscopes and the vulnerability caused by it. Interestingly enough, in refusing to accept the diagnosis of western psychoanalysis, the field of psychology has turned to the works of Shamanism. Yi's own work with Anna ends in her ceasing the treatment in lieu of Shamanic rituals. By the end of her immersion into the *kut*, Anna's complaints of both emotional and physical pains had stopped. Yi then goes on to analyze the benefits and reasons the *kut* worked for her patient. In the end, Yi offers that the western approach may have to yield to the culturally specific approach offered by traditional rites. This widening approach may offer a new place for Shamanism to adapt and fulfill its role on a larger field; however, the full effects are yet to be seen.

Growth from Marginalization

Today, most Shamanic practices recognized by the South Korean government fall into the role of folklore and cultural property. Rituals are re-enacted during cultural festivals, the performers given stipends for being keepers of this knowledge. After attempts to remove the practices by the government, some rituals began to be considered "intangible cultural assets" and a link to the cultural and historical past of Korea. This movement created a unique set of circumstances in which the presentation of materials to the government would dictate the relevance of a ritual and its inclusion as an asset. In order to appeal to the senses of government officials, shamans would alter the original rituals, contextualize the songs and order of performances, and emphasize historical characters while avoiding overtly religious contexts.⁶⁹ This is a conscious reinvention of tradition as certain aspects are emphasized while others are marginalized. In the act of reinventing traditions, special considerations are given to historical figures. Walraven makes note of a festival held for General Nam I, a guardian of Seoul. This festival, resurrected after being discarded and reinstated in the 1980s, became an annual celebration instead of one held every three years and added a parade representing his military feat.⁷⁰

Knowing that there is a potential for profit and a chance to spread the faith, Korean Shamanism has actively increased its presence in the cultural sphere while remaining partially within a Divine realm. As a stage is available for once-banned rituals and a national outlet to spread the faith, Shamanism has been able to pick and choose ritualistic elements and emphasis to appeal to the larger community. For example, the wood carver Kim Jong-Heung, a master craftsman in traditional arts known first for his *haboe*, wooden masks used in a traditional play, and later for his *changseung*, met with Queen Elizabeth during her visit to South Korea. His case is interesting on two levels. On one level, the religion has adapted itself seamlessly with the modern culture beneath which it continues undetected. On another, though, the true impact of the *changseung* has been abandoned, for both modern and logistical reasons. The *changseung* are traditional Korean totems formed from a solid log to appear as a divine entity within Shamanism and used to ward away evil spirits and disease. After the Japanese occupation of Korea, only a few were left standing. The rebuilding of these would be impractical with the ensuing war and the ban instituted by the newly established government. As the option now presents itself to recreate the old icon of Korean Shamanism, it becomes again a matter of practicality and focus. Under

⁶⁸ Yi.

⁶⁹ Boudewijn Walraven, "Our Shamanistic Past: The Korean Government, Shamans and Shamanism," *Copenhagen Papers in East and Southeast Asian Studies* (1993): 5-25.

⁷⁰ Ibid.

modern eyes, the totems can be considered odd looking at best, and convincing the government to re-establish their prominent place would be a difficult task indeed. In this light, the tradition has been all but abandoned in favor of placing it as a cultural aspect with a dying religious context. Like many aspects of Shamanism, replacing these totems has been weighed and measured against the current needs and consciously abandoned.

The popularity of these reworked rites enables a trend of migration of rituals and shamans to the urban centers. This is not surprising as Korea's rural population has been cut in half since 1960. Yet, what is surprising is the way that the shamanic *kut* has gained a place, albeit somewhat hidden, in the urban areas. In Kendall's 1996 research, her *mansin* informants tell her of the rise in *chesu kut*, the good fortune ritual.⁷¹ The cost of a *kut* was once seen as a major investment, and in a way it still is. Because of this, traditionally a *kut* would be reserved for healing and placating house ancestors. The rise in wealth, especially in cities like Seoul, has allowed for the increased use of the costly luxury practices. The Shamanic ability to adapt is seen even within the rituals. For instance, shamans now recognize wood imps that sneak in with the wood of a television or the spirits of new cars.⁷²

The movement from healing to wealth rituals is also evident in the practice of modern medicine. The recent ability for an individual to earn surplus income, especially with its traditional association to nobility, has led to a new source of illness:

If, as the shaman Yongsu's Mother sees it, anxiety over money ultimately makes people ill, then the antics of the spirits are therapeutic insofar as they parody the very ambitions they extol, injecting a capacity for laughter into the serious business of finance.⁷³

Here, the old roles take up a new context. The spirits and characters conjured in traditional rites and plays are often used as a form of social commentary, portraying the greed of government officials, monks, nobles, and scholars. To placate these in *kut*, a gift of money and/or food is demanded, often repeatedly. The exceptions are the truly divine and honorable beings, which do not beg, plead, or demand, but rather know that they deserve such high treatment. Today, the greed is seen as a caricature of the actual client. Though known for their insatiable appetites and love of wealth, the spirits bow down to the wealthy who channel them for more wealth. "The portrayal of greedy spirits in *kut* becomes a fun-house mirror of client (and also shaman) aspirations as the spirits proclaim, 'Your greed is even greater than my own.'"⁷⁴ No longer are the officials channeled by the spirits a mockery of the establishment, but a mockery of the client trying to raise their status and wealth through any means.

With the urban setting and the acceptance of Shamanism as a cultural element come new opportunities for those seen as in tune with the world beyond most. Along with the increase of the *chesu kut*, geomancy and divination are apparent in modern Korea. Geomancy has long been a tradition in the placement of buildings and, more importantly, grave sites. The use of the earth's energies in conjunction with the spirits of ancestors to gain fortune is not new at all, nor has it ever been permanent, as the bodies of the deceased may be later moved to a more amiable location. The reasons for this have adapted in modern times, as former president Kim Dae-jung reportedly moved his own parents' graves to a position believed to be better for, specifically, winning a presidential election. The use of geomancy goes beyond grave-site selection, however. In Shamanism, certain directions are considered more beneficial than others. As mentioned with the *chesu kut*, the rituals and ideas have been reworked and utilized in order to benefit the community as a whole. For instance:

⁷¹ Laurel Kendall, "Korean Shamans and the Spirits of Capitalism," *American Anthropologist*, 98, no.3 (1996): 512-527.

⁷² Information on these spirits is found in both referenced works from Kendall.

⁷³ Kendall, "Korean Shamans and the Spirit of Capitalism," 521.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, 520.

As mentioned above, an important principle of geomancy involves direction. The most auspicious direction is the south, which is why an inordinate number of houses, apartment complexes and commercial buildings in Korea face that direction. Similarly, many government complexes, including the Presidential Mansion, as well as university campuses face the south or at least avoid facing the north, the least favorable direction. One of the most compelling examples is found along the Han River, the river that cuts across the nation's capital. Most apartment buildings along the southern bank of the river face the south, thereby forsaking one of the most picturesque views in Seoul- i.e., scenic view of the river and panoramic view of the buildings across the river- for what amounts to emotional security. Such preference for south-facing houses is so prevalent that even the housing price varies depending on the direction of the house.⁷⁵

The usage of geomancy in the modern world has seen marked changes in context while remaining, overall, the same in practice. The need for geomancy is not seen so much as preventing the downfall of households, but rather the benefit. This change in context has also left behind some of the old reasons, now out-dated by the new governmental position. No longer is it possible for an individual to be chosen as an official minister, as the roles are elected, and so this specific purpose has been let go. With shifting ideas and ideals within South Korea on a greater level, geomancy, like most other Shamanic elements, has adapted and reworked itself to be both applicable and in growing demand in a modern context.

Conclusion

Inevitably, cultures change through developing, removing and acquiring new ideas and technologies. South Korea has been in a very unique place, as the mass influence of the modern, globalized world has swept over the country only within the last fifty years. Through that time, the country has developed from a village-centric, agricultural community into an industrialized nation with an urban center about the size of Tokyo. However, despite the push to throw South Korea into the global scene, a negotiation has been silently struck between the old ways of life and the new. Within Seoul's streets, evidence of the old kingdom's center is still seen, surrounded by blurs of cars and businesses. The Old South Gate, *mandamun*, is considered a primary national treasure and has been developed around by the mass growth of Seoul. After it was burned in February 2008, South Koreans everywhere flocked to the precious historical site, claiming their failure at protecting such a monument. This example is simply one of many in which South Koreans today work to both preserve themselves while developing in a western mold. With such a poignant display in response to the fire tragedy, it is apparent that the Korean people harbor great respect for their traditional identity. Shamanism holds a unique place in this light. As a true example of the ancient way of life, it is vulnerable to abandonment, a dam to the modernizing world. However, it remains rooted in the nation's mindset. The aged are to be respected, the dead to be placated and thanked. The core ideas of Shamanism are, in many ways, the core ideas of the Korean worldview. It manifests itself in city planning, diet, national festivals, art, and the religious life of non-Shamans.

This, however, has not protected Shamanism from the rigors of economic growth. During the Yi Dynasty and the rise of the Confucianism and *yangban*, or nobles, Shamanism was seen not only as archaic but amoral. From the start of Japanese

⁷⁵ A. Kim, 294.

occupation, the physical symbols of the religion were attacked to diminish their influence on Koreans. In the 1970s, the Shamanic rituals were considered an impediment in the movement for modernization. In order to stay relevant, or perhaps because it was relevant to the performers, the Shamans moved from role to role. As a bastion to those under the officials' rule during the Yi Dynasty, as a symbol of Korea's independence and spirit, or even as a base for economic strikes, Shamanism remains in a place between Divine and Worldly. Today, the attempt to strictly divide the two spheres has been met with mixed success. Indeed, the three major religions remain Catholicism, Protestantism, and Buddhism. However, beliefs in spirits, charms, divination, and geomancy remain even among those within other religions.⁷⁶ Even as Shamanism has been marginalized religiously and emphasized culturally, there are increases in both the number of potential *mansin* and the fame of some of the better known, almost to "superstar" status.⁷⁷ The negative social stigma attached has been reduced by the government's support of the cultural aspects.⁷⁸

If history can account for anything, it is that South Korea's traditional ties to its spirits will perpetuate. Shamans will be seen on the New Years for divinations, and the ancestors will be beseeched for success. The fluidity of the religion has allowed for it to not be isolated as a separate, irrelevant realm. The spirits do not dwell only within a church or temple, but saturate everything. Shamans are not a category separate from the rest of the population, but one's neighbor or sister. The shame once associated with admitting one's relation with the spirit realm is ebbing, adding glamour to the position. Rites are no longer limited to the small villages in the hills, but have filtered into the urban centers. Medicine and hospital care allows elements of Shamanism, as illustrated earlier regarding the release policy of the terminally ill, while Shamanism pushes for the use of modern technology in health. Arts and crafts, festivals and presentations of culture catered to the frequent foreign visitors are small symbols of once-religious import. Even the symbols used to represent the government or pepper political rhetoric summons up the traditions of old. All the while, Shamanism is being slowly canonized, establishing itself with sets of solid performances and texts in order to be presented as a true cultural entity. And, as it solidifies, it morphs, introducing new spirits and adapting old rituals to keep in pace with growth while treating it all as if it always has been. When it comes to the syncretic core of Korean Shamanism, perhaps it truly always has been.

⁷⁶ For statistical information, see A. Kim, 2005.

⁷⁷ Walraven.

⁷⁸ Ibid.

INTERVIEW WITH DR. MICHAEL BIRKNER

In this, our eleventh volume of the *Fairmount Folio*, I am inaugurating a new segment of the journal, an interview with an established historian. It will mirror a concept begun in our sister publication, *The Historian*, the journal of the national history honorary, Phi Alpha Theta. This segment is meant to provide wider understanding of the variety of experiences and scholarship found among historians. We hope you will enjoy these interviews.

The first interviewee, Dr. Michael Birkner, is an excellent example of the many scholarly interests and activities in which historians engage. In this season of presidential politics, he is of special interest with his connections to Kansas and the Eisenhower Presidential Library.

Dr. Helen Hundley

INTRODUCTION

Dr. Michael J. Birkner, Benjamin Franklin Professor of Liberal Arts at Gettysburg College in Gettysburg, Pennsylvania, earned his Ph.D. in American History at the University of Virginia. As a graduate of Jefferson's university, it is unsurprising that his research has concentrated on presidential politics. He is the author, co-author and editor of six books. His work includes two books specifically focusing on presidents, *Dwight D. Eisenhower*, in 2005, and an edited volume on *James Buchanan and the Political Crisis of the 1850s* in 1996. A third, titled *Disrupted Democracy: James Buchanan and the Coming of the Civil War*, will be published by the University Press of Florida in 2010. In 2006, he chaired the Pulitzer Prize in History jury. Birkner is currently serving as a fellow of the Eisenhower World Affairs Institute. He is a consultant to the Dwight D. Eisenhower Memorial Commission, which is spearheading the creation of a national monument to the former president on the Mall in Washington, D.C. Most recently, on February 12, 2009, he delivered a keynote address commemorating President Lincoln's birthday to a special joint session of the New Hampshire legislature.

Dr. Helen Hundley
Faculty Editor

INTERVIEW WITH DR. BIRKNER

DR. BIRKNER, YOU TRAINED AS AN AMERICAN HISTORIAN AT THE UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA. WHAT OR WHO ENCOURAGED YOU TO STUDY POLITICS, AND ESPECIALLY PRESIDENTIAL POLITICS?

My interest in politics and presidential history in particular dates back to my childhood. I was not quite old enough to be inspired by John F. Kennedy's eloquence, but I was impressed by his vigor and pizzazz. By the mid-1960s, Civil Rights and the Vietnam War were front page concerns, and as a high school student I followed them closely in the press and on television. I enjoyed reading biographies from an early age, and it was natural for me to gravitate over time to more sophisticated political books and political history.

IN ADDITION TO ALL OF YOUR SCHOLARLY WORK, YOU HAVE ACTUALLY WORKED AS A COLUMNIST AND EDITOR ON A HIGHLY RESPECTED

NEWSPAPER. WHAT DID THIS DO TO ADD TO YOUR UNDERSTANDING OF PRESIDENTIAL POLITICS?

Working as editorial page editor of the *Concord Monitor* in New Hampshire offered a special window into our political culture because every four years presidential candidates fanned out across the state to make their case. Seeing politicians up close and asking them anything that you think is reasonable and pertinent highlights the human element of our political system and the fact that fallible women and men ultimately direct our affairs. I cannot claim that this experience changed my outlook on American politics aside from underscoring the importance of citizens taking the time and effort to inform themselves about issues and meet candidates whenever possible. The New Hampshire experience reinforced my belief that democracy benefits more when candidates are exposed to voters one on one and in smaller groups, than through the veneer of staged media events.

HOW DOES A JOURNALIST VIEW POLITICS VERSUS AN HISTORIAN?

It depends on whether the journalist is an opinion writer, as I was. There, a distinctive point of view is an asset. I learned early on that you should always give the position you opposed the best argument it could make before offering your own. That is congruent with the work of a historian, who triangulates evidence and then offers as strong and convincing an argument about the past that he or she can make. The difference, I think, is that the editorial writer has no obligation to be detached in evaluating evidence. The historian has to take all extant evidence into account in a way that an editorial writer does not.

GIVEN YOUR YEARS OF EXPERIENCE WITH THE COVERAGE OF PRESIDENTIAL ELECTIONS, IN WHAT WAY DID TECHNOLOGY CHANGE THIS ELECTION FOR NEWSPAPERS?

It's clear that the print media has lost much of its influence, though that does not mean that it is not an important factor in a presidential campaign. Clearly, the internet, notably through YouTube and blogosphere has changed the dynamic of campaigns. Politicians cannot assume that anything they say or do is really going to be private. The paradox of the present situation is that we have more information at our fingertips than ever before in trying to make sense of presidential politics, yet it is hard to argue that we have an elevated discourse on politics. Indeed, people seem increasingly inclined to gravitate to sources, both on television and the internet, that feed and reinforce their biases, rather than offer real food for thought.

WHAT LED YOU TO THE STUDY OF PRESIDENT BUCHANAN, GIVEN THE FACT THAT THIS PRESIDENT IS SEEN IN CONTRAST TO THAT OF PRES. EISENHOWER?

Very simple: I lived in Lancaster, Pennsylvania for a decade. Lancaster was Buchanan's home town, and as a student of nineteenth century political history at that time I felt obligated to offer an alternative to home town filiopietism about Buchanan. Opportunities to speak and write about Buchanan led to my work on my first book on Buchanan. I'm currently co-editing yet another book on Buchanan and the Coming of the Civil War. Amazingly enough, the literature on this president (and several others) remains scanty. There is a lot we still do not know about Buchanan as a political leader. I would add that there is always room for another good book on any subject.

WHAT HAS LED YOU TO THE STUDY OF SHERMAN ADAMS?

As with Buchanan, sheer coincidence of home towns had much to do with it. I was based at Dartmouth College for two years in the early 1980s as an editor of Daniel Webster's papers. Adams-the irascible, forceful and notably efficient chief of staff for President Dwight D. Eisenhower- was a Dartmouth graduate and his papers were in Dartmouth's library. When I moved to Concord to work at the *Monitor*, I heard many stories about Adams, was intrigued, and wound up returning to Dartmouth to work on his papers. I've since written many articles about Adams- a fascinating character- but have not yet completed my book on his role in the Eisenhower administration.

HOW DID BOTH EISENHOWER AND BUCHANAN USE THE MEDIA?

That's a big question. Buchanan used the media the way presidents did in those days- by providing patronage to sympathetic editors so that his administration's story could get out. Eisenhower, by contrast, tended to be aloof from the media. As one prominent journalist for ABC News once told me, "Ike treated us journalists like enlisted men or junior officers, and of course he did not socialize with men of such rank." Because Ike did not wine and dine or otherwise court the media, he tended to get less thoughtful coverage because leading writers did not understand his approach to leadership, which as the Princeton scholar Fred Greenstein would later observe, often took on a "hidden hand" aspect. We are now in an age of full-blown Eisenhower revisionism, with scholars disagreeing about the virtues of his policies but in general agreement that Ike was an effective political leader.

WHAT DOES THE EISENHOWER PRESIDENTIAL LIBRARY OFFER YOU AS A SCHOLAR?

The Eisenhower Library is mecca for anyone interested in public policy in the 1950s. It houses an enormous number of original materials which are the bedrock for any serious study of Eisenhower and his times. That, and great archivists who help scholars find what they're looking for and help in interpreting the documents they use. I cannot get there enough!

HAVE YOU USED ANY OTHER PRESIDENTIAL LIBRARIES?

Yes, I've worked at several other libraries: FDR, LBJ, and Herbert Hoover. The presidential libraries are jewels in the crown of the National Archives system. All provide immensely valuable source material for scholars, without trying to steer scholars to a particular interpretation of the president in question.

DO YOU HAVE ANY FINAL ADVICE FOR ASPIRING HISTORIANS?

Go to the source- the original materials in any given field. They may be pieces of material culture, they may be diaries, government documents, or correspondence, but the original sources are the raw materials for fresh historical interpretation. There are few experiences more meaningful for the aspiring historian than the "aha" moment of finding something new and interesting in an archive!