NORTHERN KENTUCKY UNIVERSITY

Perspectives in HISTORY

VOL. 29, NO. 1, 2013-2014
United States Edition

PHI ALPHA THETA
ALPHA BETA PHI CHAPTER

VOL. 29, NO. 1, 2013-2014 PERSPECTIVES IN HISTORY - PHI ALPHA THETA

JOURNAL OF ALPHA BETA PHI
CHAPTER OF PHI ALPHA THETA

Perspectives in History

Perspectives in History is an annual scholarly publication of the Department of History and Geography. Opinions expressed by contributors do not necessarily reflect the views of the NKU Board of Regents, the faculty of the university, or the student editors of the journal. Manuscripts are welcome from students and faculty.

Send all articles, essays, and reviews to:
Editor, Perspectives in History
Department of History and Geography
Nunn Drive
Highland Heights, KY 41099

Cover Art: James Wyld's map of The British Possessions in North America (1846) Courtesy of the David Rumsey Map Collection

Officers
Alpha Beta Phi Chapter
2013-2014

President	Anthony Baker
Co-Vice President/Secretary	Katie McDonald
Co-Vice President	Danny Hagedorn
Treasurer	James McManus
Historian	Eric Kelso
Wellness Officer	Brandi Cunningham
Editor	Andrew Boehringer
Assistant Editor	Sheryn Labate
Assistant Editor	Lincoln Meltebrink

This publication was prepared by Northern Kentucky University and printed with state funds (KRS 57.375). Northern Kentucky University is committed to building a diverse faculty and staff for employment and promotion to ensure the highest quality of workforce and to foster an environment that embraces the broad range of human diversity.

The university is committed to equal employment opportunity, affirmative action, and eliminating discrimination. This commitment is consistent with an intellectual community that celebrates individual differences and diversity as well as being a matter of law.

Discrimination against any individual based upon protected status, which is defined as age, color, disability, gender, national origin, race, religion, sexual orientation, or veteran status, is prohibited. The university will provide equal opportunity to all employees in regard to salaries, promotions, benefits, and working conditions and will monitor these areas to ensure that any differences that may exist are the result of bona fide policies and procedures and are not the result of illegal discrimination. 40942/40943

Contents

Perspectives in History - U.S. Edition
Vol. 29, No. 1, 2013-2014

Letter from the President

This journal, the 29th volume of *Perspectives in History* is the result of 29 years of hard work done by the Alpha Beta Phi chapter of Phi Alpha Theta. This journal is a collection of the some of the finest historical research done by students at Northern Kentucky University this past year, but some of the work comes from around the United States as our journal editor, Andrew Boehringer, kept an eye open for great papers at the 2014 Phi Alpha Theta National Conference.

The authors of the articles and book reviews within this volume have put a great deal of time and effort into these papers. They are not just the result of class work; these papers were also forged in the fires of conferences. Many of the authors went to multiple conferences this term to present their work, and from responses to their work they strengthened their final product. This year the position of journal editor was held by Andrew Boehringer who has thrown himself into the task of creating the best journal our chapter could possibly produce, his long hours of work are greatly appreciated. He was aided in this task by our journal adviser, Dr. Christopher Teters, whose Phi Alpha Theta Career has come full circle as he was president of our Chapter many years ago. We greatly appreciate his hard work and the guidance he has given our chapter with this journal.

I would also like to thank our chapter advisor, Dr. Jonathan Reynolds, who not only helped guide us in producing a great journal this year, but also served as a guiding light in all matters for our chapter. I would also thank Sheyrn Labate and Lincoln Meltebrink and for their help in the editing of this work. Jan Rachford and Lou Stuntz also deserve our thanks, as we are forever in their debt for the many services they have provided our chapter. Dr. Landon as Chair of the History and Geography Department deserves a special thanks as a great supporter of our chapter. I would also like to thank Professor Bonnie May our assistant adviser for the chapter. Without her help we would not have our continued success.

This year, like all the years previously, was a full one for our chapter. We helped the Drop-in center, a homeless shelter in Cincinnati Ohio, by raising donations of money and domestic goods for them. Alpha Beta Phi made a strong showing at conference this year showing up to three conferences in one term. These conferences included the 2014 National Phi Alpha Theta national conference in Albuquerque New Mexico, Eastern Kentucky University's regional conference, and the University of Southern Indiana's regional conference. We also had a movie night, and two field trips this year: to the Ohio Renaissance Festival and to the underground brewery tunnels of Cincinnati.

I would also like to thank the officers of the 2013-20014 academic year.

These include: Katie McDonald, who served as both Vice-President and Secretary, Danny Hagedorn, Vice-President, James McManus our Treasurer, Eric Kelso our Historian, and Brandi Cummingham our Wellness Officer. I would also like to thank each and every member who helped at our events this year.

This journal, *Perspectives in History,* and the NKU Alpha Beta Phi, chapter of Phi Alpha Theta serve as a source of comfort, community and inspiration for the students of the History and Geography department. Please enjoy the articles and book reviews of this volume as much as we enjoyed writing them.

Anthony Baker
President of Alpha Beta Phi chapter of Phi Alpha Theta, 2013-2014

Foreword

Two years ago, I submitted a review to *Perspectives* that I wrote in Doc R's Ancient Africa survey. I never thought I would end up being the editor of the same journal. I would like to thank all those who spent countless hours writing papers to submit to this journal for I stand on your shoulders. Dr. Kris Teters and Dr. Jonathan Reynolds were a tremendous help in the pre-production process. I don't believe in making appointments, or sending email. Despite this, they never turned me away from their doors when I had a query. My assistant editors Sheryn and Lincoln were also instrumental in editing papers in the second round of drafts and reading over 20 papers during our most arduous blind peer review ever.

A special thanks to JoAnn Fincken in University Printing for answering all of my production questions and assisting me with the whole process. She was also instrumental in getting all back issues of *Perspectives in History* scanned so they could be uploaded to the web for the first time.

This year we have over a dozen articles and reviews from Northern Kentucky University and across the country on topics ranging from local political history to international political, economic, and legal history. Due to the diverse range of papers, we were able to create two journals; one with US history and one with World history. In reality, the world history journal is the "rest of the world", not to quote Niall Ferguson. In many aspects local interests and US nationalism are positive, however we often lose sight that there is life beyond our borders.

But "complicated" doesn't make the news. That's why we have historians. We sift through it all searching for truth, or the best we can muster.[1] More often than not, what people study is a reflection of what they want to change in the world today.

As a species on earth, we view this galaxy with wonder while simultaneously being a part of it. This is an allegory for the temporal problem, part of what being a historian is about as our perspective is influencing our writing. While we cannot touch the histories we attempt to interpret, we observe and feel the effects. Though events and actions of those in the past do not change, our perceptions do with our individual biases, cultural schemas, and knowledge of the past.

Our perspective of this past impacts us every day.

Andrew J. Boehringer
Editor of Perspectives in History, 2013-2014

1 John 14:6

A Southern State and a Union One: A Study on Southern Unionsim in Kentucky

Ethan Morris

With the clap of political thunder, a crisis struck the nation in what was typically the most joyous time of the year. Across the state of Kentucky, families were preparing for the new year of 1861. In his home in Brandenburg, Doctor R.M. Fairleigh was spending the holidays busily reading the latest news. However, the physician did not find the comfort he expected in the papers of the day. Rather than announce a joyous New Year, the newspapers focused on the sectional crisis that had rocked the last days of the year before. On December 20, 1860, South Carolina had left the United States of America. Pondering over the matter at his desk, Fairleigh vented his frustration in a letter to a friend:[1]

> It is hard for me to repress an exclamation of indignation when I think of such a pusillanimous, stinking, contemptible upstart of a state as South Carolina which has forever been a Grumbling, snarling prep and a dead tax to the Union destroying the peace and harmony of the greatest nation that ever existed. I would that I had a foot as big as half the universe and the strength of two thousand giants and I would kick her [South Carolina] into a million fragments and scatter them through non entity so that omnipotence could never put them together again. I would cast her into a burning blast that would hurl her into perdition—curse her—she will ever be a curse and a reproach to any nation that may claim her and no Southern Confederacy can ever exist with such a foul fiend in her midst on account of her accursed rebellion…. I do believe that all the inhabitants of South Carolina have Hydrophobia. I think if the

1 R. M. Fairleigh to Galt W. Booth, Jan. 14, 1861, Beall-Booth Family Papers, The Filson Historical Society, Louisville, KY (hereafter FHS); Alan Brinkley, *The Unfinished Nation: A Concise History of the American People*, vol. 1, *To 1877*, 6th ed. (New York: McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc., 2010), 338.

> United States could take a hogshead of Croton oil she could purge herself of that loathsome state and then perhaps peace would reign once more. It makes one mad to talk on this subject so I will quit it.[2]

Fairleigh's opinion of the sectional crisis expresses what many historians regard as Kentucky's position prior to the Civil War. Fairleigh's zealous disapproval of southern secession appears to reflect Bluegrass northern sympathies. To be sure, Kentucky did remain in the Union during the Civil War, and when heads are counted a majority of Kentuckians can be found to have fought for the Union. However, the notion that fighting for the Union necessarily meant that Kentuckians also held fast to northern political, economic, and social ideas is a presumption that most scholars have made in their characterizations of Kentucky majoritarian opinion during the Civil War. What this presumption fails to take into account are the complexities of a conflict fought primarily amongst civilian, citizen soldiers from diverse walks-of-life and various parts of the country. In the years leading up the breakdown of compromise, Union Kentucky was at the same time part of the antebellum Old South, often articulating and manifesting southern interests, politics, and economic preferences. When the Civil War erupted in 1861, Kentuckians voiced their disgust for the dissolution of the Union as well as their support for southern political and economic aims. While these conflicting political positions may seem difficult to reconcile, Kentuckians saw no need to reconcile them. More simply put: Kentucky was both a southern state and a Union one. To understand the Commonwealth's complex political position during the Civil War era, one must reckon with its strong ties to the south and its concomitant devotion to the Union. In doing so, one may then comprehend why the majority of Kentuckians took up arms with the Union but never gave up their commitments to slavery and their pro-Southern attitudes.[3]

The Kentuckians who marched off to war in 1861 were the heirs of a rich, southern political heritage. Noted Kentucky historian Lowell Harrison has argued that southern political ties existed from the moment of statehood. The Commonwealth had been formed in 1792 out of the westernmost population of the southern state of Virginia. Six years later, Kentucky secured its position in southern political history by approving Thomas Jefferson's Kentucky Resolutions. The Resolutions had been designed to combat the Federalists' Alien and Sedition Acts. Jefferson and his party had interpreted the Acts as the Federalists' attempt to stifle political opposition, and rightly so. In writing the Kentucky Resolutions, Jefferson argued for states' rights: the idea that the

2 R. M. Fairleigh to Galt W. Booth, Jan. 14, 1861, Beall-Booth Family Papers, FHS.

3 Clement Eaton, *A History of the Old South* (New York: Macmillan Company, 1949), 2.

United States was a union of separate, sovereign states and not a group of states united under the control of an all-powerful, all-encompassing central government. States' rights decreed that the federal government must answer to the state governments that had created it. Thus, for Americans like Jefferson who promulgated this constitutional interpretation, states could thus claim the legal right to challenge and veto government laws they considered to be noxious to their own interests or to the citizens who lived within their borders. Ever the political opportunist, Jefferson was well aware of the political support his party maintained in the southern states, where Federalists were few in number and the idea of states' rights was already popular. If the southern states would rally behind state's rights, and particularly behind the Kentucky Resolutions, those states would then be empowered to veto decisions made by the rival party then in control of the federal government. Combined with James Madison's similar Virginia Resolutions, the Kentucky Resolutions served as a bold states' rights manifesto—a political policy that would later serve as a flash point in the sectional conflict that erupted in the 1830s as the Nullification Crisis during the presidency of Andrew Jackson.[4]

In 1832, South Carolina looked to the Virginia and Kentucky Resolutions in its effort to nullify the 1828 "Tariff of Abominations." John C. Calhoun, first as vice president and later as a U. S. senator from South Carolina, put forth the concept of nullification as a means to offset the potential financial loss South Carolina could incur by a national, high tariff passed to discourage foreign imports and protect domestic markets. Using Jefferson's arguments, Calhoun claimed that states could nullify, or veto, any federal policy they found unacceptable. In Calhoun's case, states' rights enabled southern states—and particularly South Carolina—to nullify the tariff. Unfortunately for Calhoun, he pressed his point too vigorously with President Jackson, one of the most determined political figures of the day and a man whose loyalty to the Union was formidable and unshakeable. Adamantly opposed to states' rights, Jackson argued that the federal government had the constitutional power to trump state governments, since those states held no true constitutional authority to void federal laws. Smelling treason, Jackson believed that Calhoun would use states' rights to rip the union apart if South Carolina did not get its way, and subsequently the President threatened to send troops to South Carolina to quell any signs of rebellion. Fortunately, Kentucky statesman Henry Clay was able to calm Jackson, appease Calhoun, and avoid possible hostilities with a compromise. The nullification crisis between Jackson and Calhoun had tested the political muscles of states' rights and reinterpreted the original manifesto. After 1832, states' rights came to represent a state's ability to not only veto an

4 Lowell H. Harrison, *The Civil War in Kentucky* (Lexington, KY: University Press of Kentucky, 1975), 2; Brinkley, *Unfinished Nation*, 158-159, 220.

unacceptable law but, as Jefferson had implied in the Kentucky Resolutions, sever ties with the federal government if a compromise could not be found. While not the first state to toy with the idea of secession, South Carolina would eventually use states' rights to legitimize its departure from the Union in December 1860, which resulted in the founding of the Confederate States of America and the outbreak of the Civil War. [5]

States' rights would become a cornerstone of the south's justification of the Civil War. Even among the ranks of Kentucky's Unionists, many understood that the war was fought over the idea of states' rights. In a letter to his sister in Hancock County, cavalryman Robert Winn remarked that a fellow soldier believed the war had stemmed from "an old sore dating back to 1832[,] the time of the nullification in South Carolina under Jackson." Similarly, Josie Underwood of Warren County referred to Southern sympathizers as the "secesh," an abbreviated nickname for secessionists who supported the Confederacy and the right of disunion. In Kentucky, Jefferson's Kentucky Resolutions of 1798, which had been adopted by the Commonwealth's legislature, became the foundation of both Southern secession and the wellspring of support for disunionist sentiments among many of the state's citizens. By adopting Jefferson's resolutions, Kentucky provided the south with the intellectual footing for the development of a political policy that would help expand the southern economic system of slave labor and preserve southern political dominance against a growing northern economic and political rival. The policy of states' rights would prove to be an invaluable asset to southerners in the preservation of the Old South. Kentucky's role in promulgating a states' rights manifesto tied the commonwealth to southern states and interests. Indeed, one might argue that secessionism might not have occurred to southerners who were discontent with the rising tide of northern politics if Jefferson had not written—and if Kentucky had not adopted—the Resolutions of 1798. Although the Commonwealth was, in many respects, the proud participant in southern, states' rights politics, the Commonwealth's soldiers would have to decide for themselves, after war became a stinging reality in April 1861, how they would interpret Kentucky's peculiar political position as a Unionist slave state. [6]

If voting records in the presidential election of 1860 can be used to determine a population's location in political geography, Kentucky admittedly chose to accept their southern heritage. In the decade before the Civil War, Kentucky

5 Brinkley, *Unfinished Nation*, 181, 219-221, 338; Harrison, *Civil War in Kentucky*, 2.

6 Robert Winn to Martha Winn-Cook, July 12, 1862, Winn-Cook Family Papers: 1861-1875, FHS; Josie Underwood, *Josie Underwood's Civil War Diary*, ed. Nancy Baird (Lexington, KY: University Press of Kentucky, 2009), 78; Brinkley, *Unfinished Nation*, 158-159; Harrison, *Civil War in Kentucky*, 2.

would have been listed as a bastion of Whig Party politics. However, the adoption of Illinois Senator Stephan A. Douglas' Kansas-Nebraska Act in 1854 dealt the death blow to the Whig Party. Douglas was embroiled in a conflict with southern politicians concerning the route of the transcontinental railroad. The railroad would unquestionably bring economic and political benefits to the states it ran through, and consequently a bitter political struggle broke out over the railroad's route. Douglas understood that in order to gain southern support for a northern track through Illinois, he was going to have to give the south a political concession equal to the political and economic benefits of the railroad they would be giving up. The senator chose to appeal to southern sympathies for an expansion of slavery into the western territories beyond the confines dictated by the Missouri Compromise of 1820. In the Kansas-Nebraska Act, Douglas proposed to establish two new western territories: Kansas and Nebraska, which could separately choose whether or not they would permit slavery within their borders. Knowing that Kansas would decide to become a slave territory and give southerners more political support in Congress after the territory became a state, the south agreed to Douglas' northern railroad, and the Kansas-Nebraska Act was passed—much to the chagrin of the northern states. Although a keen political player, Douglas had chosen to ignore the political ramifications of pushing a law through Congress that clearly hinged on a sectional issue. Many northerners supported an economic system based on free, wage labor and staunchly opposed giving more power to southern slavery interests. Nearing its end as a national political entity, the Whig Party soon began ripping apart at the seams as northern Whigs voiced their opposition to the Kansas-Nebraska Act, which seemed to benefit only the slave power by resorting to the device of popular sovereignty, a political device that enabled the citizens of a territory or state to decide for themselves whether slavery would exist where they lived. When the Whig Party finally collapsed, Kentuckians were compelled to find a new party that would serve their best interests: backing southern slavery or supporting northern free-labor. When Kentuckians went to the polls in 1860, a majority voiced their support for southern slavery.[7]

In the turmoil that ensued following the adoption of the Kansas-Nebraska Act, old political parties died or were reorganized and new parties appeared on the scene. Kentucky threw its electoral weight and 66,051 popular votes behind John Bell and the Constitutional Union Party in the presidential race of 1860. The newly formed Constitutional Union Party advocated keeping the Union together despite the southern and northern sectional differences that might tear the nation apart. Furthermore, the party supported an

7 Harrison, *Civil War in Kentucky,* 3; Brinkley, *Unfinished Nation*, 321-327.

interpretation of the Constitution as the supreme law of the land, which included an acceptance of the pro-slavery Dred Scott decision of 1857. Aside from Kentucky, Bell received his only other electoral victories, interestingly enough, in the southern states of Virginia and Tennessee. After Bell, the remainder of Kentuckians divided their loyalties among the Democratic Party. Some 53,143 Kentuckians cast their votes for John C. Breckinridge, a native son who carried the banner of Southern Democrats, most of whom supported the idea of secession. Southern Democrats also backed states' rights and the guaranteed expansion of slavery into the territories west of the Mississippi. Another 25,638 Kentucky popular votes went to Douglas and Northern Democrats who supported popular sovereignty. Douglas' northern wing of the Democratic Party refused to alienate southern interests. While popular sovereignty appeased northerners, it also left the door open for southern slaveholders. Representing the remaining 1,364 ballots cast in the presidential election, a small number of Kentuckians voted for Abraham Lincoln of the newly formed Republican Party, a northern sectional party resolved to resist the expansion of slavery into the west. Because southern electoral votes were divided among three parties, it became nearly impossible for a southerner (either Bell or Breckinridge) to win the presidency; voters had to choose among four candidates, and Lincoln alone was able to win the necessary electoral votes for victory. Although Kentuckians had mixed feelings about which presidential candidate would best serve the interests of the Commonwealth, the choice of Bell by a majority of Kentuckians represented their support for a continuance of the institution of slavery and their acceptance of its expansion westward. Significantly, a majority of Kentuckians—those who voted for either Bell or Breckenridge—made a decision to sustain their southern proclivities and vote in support of slavery. By 1860, Kentucky had fully embraced its southern political heritage. [8]

Outside the political circles of Kentucky, the state's agriculture served to connect the state's economy to the south. The Commonwealth provided the south with a significant portion of its livestock. In the three decades preceding the Civil War, mules became the favored work animal among southerners. Mules did not require large amounts of feed, could bear the burden of constant work, showed indifference to the scorching heat, and lived longer than most other draft animals. Taking advantage of the growing market for work animals, Kentucky raised more mules in 1859 than any other state in the south. Furthermore, in 1859, Kentucky produced more horses than any other southern state and ranked in the top five out of fifteen southern states in production

8 Harrison, *Civil War in Kentucky,* 4-5; Eaton, *History of Old South*, 570-574; Brinkley, *Unfinished Nation*, 321, 326-327, 333-335; Glenn W. LaFantasie, interview by author, Sept. 28, 2012.

of sheep, hogs, and cattle. Kentuckians also employed significant acreage in the production of useful cash crops. When planters in the Deep South packed their cotton into bales for market, laborers wrapped the cotton in coarse hemp fabric and hemp rope. Besides numerous foreign suppliers, Kentucky was one of the largest hemp producers of the south. Records for 1859 reveal that Kentucky was also the second largest southern producer of tobacco. Moreover, the Commonwealth continued to play an important role in southern agriculture and economy with its prodigious production of food crops. Planted on a scale greater than "King Cotton," corn was the most important food crop of the south. Corn could be used to make bread, grits, liquor, and numerous other foodstuffs; it could also feed the plentiful livestock raised by Kentuckians. While wheat did not grow as abundantly as corn in the south, it was nevertheless considered a staple food crop by southerners. In the two years prior to the outbreak of war, Kentucky had become the second largest producer of corn and wheat in the south. Without Kentucky, the south would have had to look elsewhere for a significant amount of their livestock and quite possibly a portion of their cash and food crops. Moreover, without a southern market for mules and hemp, Kentucky's own economy would have suffered. The 83,689 farms spread across the Bluegrass State in 1860 played a pivotal part in the southern economy and resulted in a strong nexus between Kentucky's farmers and farms and plantations to the south. [9]

While agricultural products visibly revealed Kentucky's economic connection to the south, another noticeable sign of a working southern economy was the presence of slaves. Southern historian Clement Eaton concluded that historians could best determine the northern or southern identity of states by discerning a state's official stand on slavery. If the state declared slavery legal within its borders, said Eaton, it was invariably southern in its sympathies. Although Kentucky did not have as many slaves as states like Mississippi or South Carolina, the Commonwealth counted more slaveholders in 1860 than any other southern state except Virginia and Georgia. Furthermore, Kentucky's economy relied on a profitable slave market. The advent of "King Cotton" and similar cash crops in the Deep South required numerous slaves to work the rapidly expanding fields. While Kentucky had a naturally-increasing slave population, the state was losing the few internal markets that required such a large populace of chattel slaves. Taking advantage of a budding market, Kentuckians sold slaves to southerners in the Deep South. In the three decades prior to the Civil War, Kentuckians sold an estimated seventy-seven thousand slaves. To answer Eaton's categorical question: Kentucky was clearly southern.

9 Brinkley, *Unfinished Nation*, 237; Lowell H. Harrison and James C. Klotter, *A New History of Kentucky* (Lexington, KY: University Press of Kentucky, 1997), 138; Eaton, *History of Old South*, 234-235, 237, 246-247.

While the number of slaves per county in Kentucky varied, several of Kentucky's Union soldiers came from slaveholding families. [10]

Following the Battle of Perryville in October 1862, Hopkinsville slaveholder Samuel McDowell Starling recorded the death of his commanding officer, Kentuckian James S. Jackson. A member of Jackson's staff, Starling recalled that when the general died on the field "his black man was also killed." In typical southern fashion, Jackson had brought his slave along with him. Though an ardent Unionist, Captain James W. Tuttle's father owned a slave at the family's home in Mill Springs. Even those who did not own slaves had no qualms about looking after the slaves of friends. Colonel Absalom Yarbrough Johnson, who has served as Louisville's Fire Chief before the war, recorded in his diary that he watched a friend's slave for three months, from December 1860 to February 1861. Most Kentuckians, however, did not own slaves. In 1850, only 28 percent of Kentucky families owned chattel slaves. [11]

Many southern states experienced these same conditions. The majority of slaves were owned by a small class of planters and other wealthy individuals, and a minute percentage of the slave population was held by moderately well-off families. As for the bulk of white southerners, they lived for the day when they could purchase slaves. The economic system of the south centered on slave labor and, consequently, southerners believed economic success came from entering the slaveholding class. Owning slaves was the economic objective of many southerners and as a result, they defended the system of slavery despite not owning any slaves themselves. Furthermore, the hope of one day owning slaves predisposed white southerners to accept the idea of white supremacy over African-Americans. Ulrich B. Phillips, a historian of the Old South who flourished in the early decades of the twentieth century, determined that the white effort to subordinate black people was a bond that held southerners together in the several decades leading up to the Civil War. Many of Kentucky's Union soldiers revealed a deep-rooted belief in the inferiority of African-Americans. Again, as in so many other ways, Kentuckians met the necessary criteria of a southern state. In their personal correspondence, many Kentuckians disclosed their support of slavery and their unfailing belief in white supremacy.

---

10 Eaton, *History of Old South*, 2; Harrison and Klotter, *New History of Kentucky*, 143.

11 Samuel M. Starling to Mary and Anna Starling, Nov. 16, 1862, Lewis & Starling Families' Papers, Western Kentucky University Special Collections Library, Bowling Green, Kentucky (hereafter WKUSCL); Samuel M. Starling to Mary and Anna Starling, Oct. 10, 1862 and Nov. 16, 1862, Lewis & Starling Families' Papers, WKUSCL; James Lee McDonough, *War in Kentucky: From Shiloh to Perryville* (Knoxville, TN: University of Tennessee Press, 1994), 236, 252; Hambleton Tapp and James C. Klotter, introduction to *The Union, the Civil War, and John W. Tuttle: A Kentucky Captain's Account*, ed. Hambleton Tapp and James C. Klotter (Frankfort, KY: Kentucky Historical Society, 1980), 1-2, 4; Absalom Y. Johnson, Dec. 18, 1860, Diary of Absalom Yarbrough Johnson (1821-1907), 1860-1864, FHS; Harrison and Klotter, *New History of Kentucky*, 168.

As a case in point, the federal government's decision in 1863-1864 to enlist African-Americans and potentially place them on equal terms with whites stirred up a virulent debate among Union soldiers from Kentucky. [12]

Articulating their southern racial attitudes, many Kentuckians were outraged by efforts to enlist black soldiers within the Commonwealth. In letters home, a good number of Kentucky's Union soldiers expressed their disapproval of the recruitment of black soldiers and of any attempt to allow African-American soldiers to fight alongside whites. Yet few combatants took the time to explain their ire. Historian Lowell Harrison argues that many Kentuckians saw black enlistment as a political move by the federal government to end slavery, which, in fact, it was, seeing as the Emancipation Proclamation, issued on January 1, 1863, officially allowed the recruiting of African-American soldiers. As a strong southern slave state, Kentucky would not support the Lincoln administration's enlistment program. Voicing the complaints of his constituency, Kentucky Governor Thomas E. Bramlette remarked that "if the president does not, upon my demand, stop the negro enrollment, I will." In a letter to Colonel John Mason Brown of the 45th Kentucky Mounted Infantry, a friend brought humor to the enlistment outrage in Kentucky. Referencing Adjutant General Lorenzo Thomas's efforts on behalf of African-Americans, the friend predicted that "our worthy Governor [Bramlette] would put Genl Thomas in the Penitentiary." Similarly, Brigadier General Jeremiah Tilford Boyle of Mercer County mused that an effort to enlist blacks would "revolutionize the State and do infinite and inconceivable harm…." Revealing his own opinion in private, Colonel Thomas Brooks Fairleigh wrote in his diary that "the policy of recruiting negroes is all wrong."[13]

Unlike Fairleigh, some soldiers made no effort to hide their contempt for black enlistees. Barren County Unionist Benjamin Smith Jones reported to his brother that he had seen a sight he "did not want to See…a regiment of negros...[and] it is Something that I dont want to See any more if I Can help my Self." Jones did not hesitate to criticize the federal government's program of black enlistment and wrote that he hoped "Lincoln will be Satisfied[.] I wish that he had to Sleep with a negro every night as long as he lives and kiss

12 Harrison and Klotter, *New History of Kentucky*, 168; Clement Eaton, preface to *A History of the Old South* (New York: Macmillan Company, 1949), vii; Harrison, *Civil War in Kentucky*, 89-90..

13 Thomas E. Bramlette, quoted in Lowell H. Harrison, *The Civil War in Kentucky* (Lexington, KY: University Press of Kentucky, 1975), 90; Anonymous Kentuckian to John M. Brown, June 2, 1864, John Mason Brown Papers, 1862-1864, FHS; Jeremiah T. Boyle, quoted in Lowell H. Harrison, *The Civil War in Kentucky* (Lexington, KY: University Press of Kentucky, 1975), 89; Thomas B. Fairleigh, 18 Apr. 18, 1864, Diary of Col. Thomas Brooks Fairleigh, 1864, FHS; Harrison, *Civil War in Kentucky*, 89-91, 117; Robert Winn to Martha Winn-Cook, Oct. 24, 1863, Winn-Cook Family Papers: 1861-1875, FHS; LaFantasie, interview by author.

ones a** twice a day…." Benjamin's brother William agreed with him, writing back to the family: "I herd to day they Was enrolling the negros in Barren Co[.] if they Want mee to fight they had Better keep the negroes Back." Noting the outcry against black enlistment, Winn remarked that "The Negro Enlistment Act is suffered to be a dead letter as far as Kentucky is concerned…." In a letter to his sister, Winn estimated that in 1863 about ninety-nine percent of Kentucky's Union soldiers opposed African-American enlistment. Yet, Winn estimated that by 1864 only seventy-five percent of Bluegrass soldiers remained opposed to black enlistments or to fighting shoulder-to-shoulder with African-American troops. By recording what he assumed to be a reduced opposition to black soldiers, Winn signified a slowly growing movement of Kentucky support for the federal enlistment program. This movement, however, did not necessarily denote a slackening of Kentucky support for the "peculiar institution." [14]

Many Kentuckians who supported African-American enlistment did so for selfish reasons. When two soldiers in Winn's unit requested commissions in black regiments, he observed that while their decision "gripes some of their comrades hard," the rising number of requests for transfers to black regiments—most of which indicated a desire by white enlisted personnel to become commissioned officers—had become "passable." Winn makes no mention of the motives of the two men in applying for a transfer, but if they thought along the same lines as Ohio County resident Frank Wise, they would be transferring for the money and the possibility of promotion. Wise wrote to his wife that "me and two of our boys is got sumting [something] on hand that I think will pay me if it meets your approbation…." Wise had decided to put in an application to become a second lieutenant in a black regiment where he could "draw one hundred and five dollars a month…." Although Wise does not mention his former salary as a private in the 26th Kentucky Infantry, the typical private earned a monthly salary of $13—significantly less than that of a commissioned officer. Similarly, Brigadier General William T. Ward of Green County supported African-American enlistment for selfish motives. When his son Colonel John Hardin Ward refused to follow orders to command a black regiment, the elder Ward advised him to reconsider. William rationalized that enlisting blacks would bring the war to a quick close. If slaves were enlisted, the Confederacy would be deprived of its primary labor

14 Benjamin S. Jones to William C. Jones, Feb. 12, 1864, Union Soldier's Letters, 1861-1865, FHS; William C. Jones to Moses P. and Sarah Jones, n. d., Union Soldier's Letters, 1861-1865, FHS; Robert Winn to Martha Winn-Cook, Oct. 24, 1863, Winn-Cook Family Papers: 1861-1875, FHS; Thomas B. Fairleigh, Apr. 18, 1864, Diary of Col. Thomas Brooks Fairleigh, 1864, FHS; Robert Winn to Martha Winn-Cook, Apr. 3, 1864, Winn-Cook Family Papers: 1861-1875, FHS.

force, which was largely employed in supplying the southern war effort, and the enlistment of blacks as potential Union laborers would free white, Union soldiers from a variety of menial tasks, like digging trenches and making earthen fortifications. With the slaves freed and enlisted in the Union Army, "this war ends without killing any more whites." Clearly, Ward was concerned with the mounting white casualties of the Civil War. Calculating the potential death toll of white Americans in this war that seemed to have no end, Ward feared that the conflict would rage on for another six years if the Union did not rely on blacks to assist the white war effort. [15]

It is safe to assume that Ward dreaded the day far off in the future when blacks might potentially outnumber whites in Kentucky and elsewhere. However, he cast aside those anxieties and concluded his letter on a practical note: "I would prefer using them [African-Americans] as labourers and keeping the whites for the drill & fighting, and never making the white soldier do any fatigue duty." Not only did Ward doubt the ability of blacks to fight effectively or to become good soldiers, but he also saw an opportunity to relieve whites of the discomforts of physical labor in the long time periods between battles. Despite such rationalizations, Kentuckians had not turned their backs on slavery. As the Civil War approached its final year in April 1864, many Kentuckians reaffirmed the commitment to the peculiar institution. At the very least, the outrage over federal enlistment of African Americans by Kentuckians from nearly every walk of life reveals that southern economic assumptions and racial prejudices held a firm grip on the Commonwealth's citizenry. [16]

By all lights, Kentucky should have seceded from the Union with its neighbors to the south during the disunion winter of 1860-1861. The Commonwealth was the birthplace of states' rights. Furthermore, in the presidential election of 1860, Kentuckians had cast their votes with candidates supportive of slavery and the south. While the Commonwealth initially chose to declare neutrality in the hopes that the conflict would subside and leave the state unscathed, Kentucky's secession that winter was considered inevitable. Musing over the implications of Kentucky's withdrawal from the Union, Lincoln famously remarked: "I think to lose Kentucky is nearly the same as

15 Robert Winn to Martha Winn-Cook, Apr. 3, 1864, Winn-Cook Family Papers: 1861-1875, Filson Historical Society, Louisville; Frank Wise to Fannie Wise, Apr. 1, 1864, Wise Family Papers, 1860-1865, WKUSCL; William T. Ward to John H. Ward, Feb. 6, 1864, Speed Family Papers-Farmington Collection, 1816-1961, FHS; LaFantasie, interview by author; Jennie Cole, interview by author, June 26, 2012; William T. Ward to John H. Ward, Feb. 3, 1864, Speed Family Papers-Farmington Collection, 1816-1961, FHS.

16 William T. Ward to John H. Ward, Feb. 6, 1864, Speed Family Papers-Farmington Collection, 1816-1961, FHS

to lose the whole game." Fortunately for the President, his predication never came to pass: Kentucky would never officially secede. Even more significantly, the majority of Kentucky's Civil War soldiers decided to take up arms for the Union. Expressing the convictions of many other Kentuckians, Warren County resident Benjamin Grider fumed when his brother-in-law announced his decision to fight for the Confederacy: "All right Bill—I don't reckon Kentucky can stay neutral now—and I'll raise a regiment to fight against you and whip you back into the Union." Not surprisingly, Grider did just that. The question remains, however, as to why the southern state of Kentucky chose to fight for the United States. The answer centers on a perceived separation between state interests in questions of political policy and national interests in a time of crisis. [17]

Kentuckians viewed the sectional crisis prior to 1861 as a means to decide government policy. The citizen of a democracy has the legal ability to voice his opinion on how the government should operate. As is the common nature of man, American citizens usually voice an opinion favorable to themselves, their state, and their section or region. Kentuckians supported the expansion of slavery and the states' rights manifesto because it benefitted Kentuckians and their southern interests. During the Civil War, citizens of the Commonwealth continued to expostulate southern sympathies, including the ones that called for a federal policy favorable to the Bluegrass State and to slavery. Yet, when the shadow of war loomed over the country, a sectional policy dispute turned into a potential national dispute. The issue of war pushed interstate difficulties aside so that the federal government focused on the national, and possibly international, ramifications of a diplomatic disaster. Thus, Kentuckians believed it was their duty to relegate sectional matters to the sideline if the country became embroiled in a national civil war. Yet, until war became a reality, Kentuckians would continue to support southern sectional policies. The electoral victory of John Bell and the Constitutional Union Party in the 1860 presidential election serves to explain Kentucky's seemingly dual political personality. Bell's party supported a strict interpretation of the Constitution. As of 1860, while legislation threatened to ban slavery's expansion, the Constitution had yet to make the "peculiar institution" illegal; indeed, the Dred Scott decision validated slavery under the Constitution. Consequently, the Constitutional Union Party supported slavery, even if that support was more

17 Abraham Lincoln, quoted in Lowell H. Harrison, *The Civil War in Kentucky* (Lexington, KY: University Press of Kentucky, 1975), 3; Benjamin Grider, quoted in Josie Underwood, *Josie Underwood's Civil War Diary*, ed. Nancy D. Baird (Lexington, KY: University Press of Kentucky, 2009), 75; Harrison, *Civil War in Kentucky*, 8-9; Eaton, *History of Old South*, 2; Nancy Baird, appendix to *Josie Underwood's Civil War Diary*, ed. Nancy D. Baird (Lexington, KY: University Press of Kentucky, 2009), 209.

implied than explicit. If Bell was elected president and war never came, Kentuckians would have voted into office a candidate who supported the politics and economy of their state and section. On the other hand, Bell supported the preservation of the Union and opposed secession, thus emphasizing a strict loyalty to the United States. If war did break out after the election, Kentuckians had also voted for a party—Bell's party—that clearly represented the Commonwealth's support of the Unites States government in a national crisis. [18]

As the state headed into 1861, it continued to uphold this dual position. While war seemed imminent, Kentuckians declared neutrality: refusing to take an official stand against their southern compatriots in policy issues while at the same time refusing to sever ties with the United States. However, when war did break out in April of 1861, Kentucky's Unionists did not hesitate to stand by the Union government when the sectional crisis moved rapidly from a policy debate to a national crisis between two nations: the United States and the Confederate States. Josie Underwood, an ardent Unionist who had relatives in the Union Army and in the Lincoln administration, insightfully elucidated the duality of Kentucky's political position before the Civil War:[19]

> The hardship of the position of the Unionists in...Ky., like Pa, Uncle Joe and others is that they are just as opposed to Lincoln and his policy as the secessionists are and Pa was a Bell and Everett [Bell's vice presidential candidate] Elector and did all in his power—to prevent Lincoln's election—but he is no less a lover of his country because a party he regards untrue to the constitution were successful. He thinks that for that very reason all true patriots should stand true to the old flag and to the whole country he says—he opposes secession most—out of his love for the South, for disunion will be her ruin—for if there is war—it will surely be in the South and the whole land desolated and laid in waste and slavery will certainly go if the Union is dissolved. The only way, he thinks, is for the South to remain in the Union if she would maintain any of the "Southern rights" she is clamoring for.[20]

Underwood's perspicacity displays what seems to be a political confusion on the part of Kentucky's Unionists. She expresses both Unionist support of southern interests in policy decisions and an indelible loyalty

18 Eaton, *History of Old South*, 572; LaFantasie, interview by author.

19 Harrison, *Civil War in Kentucky*, 8-9, 13; Baird, appendix to *Josie Underwood's Diary*, 205, 209..

20 Underwood, *Josie Underwood's Diary*, 38-39.

to the United States. Unwittingly she portrayed a Kentucky straddling a fence in a vain attempt to support two irreconcilable political positions. Yet Kentuckians in 1861 rationalized the situation much differently. Possibly contemplating the confusion future generations would express concerning the motives of Kentucky's Unionists, John Tuttle wrote an essay after the war that sought to explain why Kentuckians, like himself, had fought for the Union. A trained lawyer, Tuttle argued his point well: [21]

> [Slaveholders] thought their slaves were in a better condition as they were than if freed and thrown upon their own resources. They had been reared and educated in the belief that there was no moral wrong in holding slaves as they did. The slaves had descended to them from past generations and no original wrong lay at their door.... Slaves were as much their property under the law as anything else they owned. They were jealous of their rights with respect to them and vehemently resented every proposed interference with them. But the preservation of the Union was quite [a] different and wholly independent matter with a large majority of them. They were for the Union first, last, and all the time without proviso or condition.[22]

In Tuttle's estimate, Kentucky's support for southern policy did not have to be reconciled with loyalty to the United States. Bluegrass Unionists perceived interstate politics and a national war as two distinct and separate issues. Not surprisingly, many Unionists revealed their conflicting views in their personal correspondence. Richard Shocklee scribbled off a heated letter to his brother-in-law back home in Muhlenberg County: "I say les [let's] whip the rebels with [the] bayonett and whip the abolitionist at the balet box...." Similarly, Robert Winn declared: "Death to Abolitionist and Secessionist alike...." Sounding similar ideas, newspaper editor Orlando Brown, Senior, informed his son of the positive political situation in Frankfort, the state capital:

> "[T]he Rebellion will be suppressed & the abolitionists will be driven from power." On a more passionate note, Benjamin Jones scrawled

21 Hambleton Tapp and James C. Klotter, notes to *The Union, the Civil War, and John W. Tuttle: A Kentucky Captain's Account*, ed. Hambleton Tapp and James C. Klotter (Frankfort, KY: Kentucky Historical Society, 1980), 27; Tapp and Klotter, introduction to *Union, War, and Tuttle*, 1-2.

22 John W. Tuttle, *The Union, the Civil War, and John W. Tuttle: A Kentucky Captain's Account*, ed. Hambleton Tapp and James C. Klotter (Frankfort, KY: Kentucky Historical Society, 1980), 27.

off a terse note to a relative: "[If] I had my way with the abolitionist party I would kill every one of them[.] I would not let one of them live in the world[.] lemuel I am a Strait out Union and Constitutional man[.] I am not for freeing the negroes[,] and I have no use for any man that is in for any Sutch a thing...." [23]

Likewise, one Kentucky soldier remarked: "Our National Capital is in the hands of a set of Abolition fanatics & political demagogues." Although a professed supporter of the preservation of the Union, the soldier admitted that southerners "are now defending in the cause of right and justice...they only asked to be guaranteed a right that they have always exercised since the founding of the government." All in all, Kentuckians sustained a strong disgust for both abolitionism and secession. They saw no flaw, no inconsistency, in voicing their disdain for both. The majority of the Commonwealth's Union soldiers strongly supported the preservation of the Union and southern political interests before, during, and after the war. [24]

While Kentuckians proclaimed their southern sympathies, their support for preserving the Union never faltered. For many Bluegrass Unionists, their loyalty was rooted in the perceived morality of the Union cause and the belief that Unionism was the fulfillment of the wishes of the Founding Fathers. Kentuckians believed that they were morally justified in fighting for the preservation of the Union and their enemies, far from fighting for the moral right, were despicable. Assigned to guard Confederate property in northern Georgia, Robert Winn wrote of his contempt for southern civilians: "I consider them next to the Devil only worse." In the song "On Lincoln's Election," a Union lyricist remarked that God had favored the United States and that all Union soldiers were fighting with "gods great might" behind them. Similarly, other songs begged for God to aid the Union cause: "[S]weet union…god help you stand." As Kentuckians called on God to preserve the Union, they also denigrated the Confederate immorality of secession. One Kentucky martial hymn argued that the devil was responsible for disunion and that the Confederates would "share his [the Devil's] portion" in hell when their lives came to a close. Clearly, Bluegrass Unionists saw their fight in religious and

23 Orlando Brown, Sr. to son, Mar. 3, 1863, Orlando Brown Family Papers, FHS

24 Richard Shocklee to John D. Cosby, Feb. 6, 1863, Cosby Family Papers, 1845-1938, WKUSCL; Robert Winn to Martha Winn-Cook, Aug. 17, 1862, Winn-Cook Family Papers: 1861-1875, FHS; Benjamin S. Jones to Lemuel Jones, Mar. 9, 1864, Union Soldier's Letters, 1861-1865, FHS; Anonymous Kentuckian to a friend, n. d., Thomas Pack Letters, FHS; Frank F. Mathias, "Orlando Brown," in *The Kentucky Encyclopedia*, ed. John E. Kleber et al. (Lexington, KY: University Press of Kentucky, 1992), 130-131.

righteous terms. [25]

Having placed their war aims on a moral pedestal, it was no surprise that Kentucky Unionists continued to cite higher authority in their justifications for staying in the Union. To counteract Confederate claims to be the true inheritors of the Founding Fathers' legacy, Kentuckians claimed that legacy for themselves alone. In a letter to a friend, one anonymous soldier described "the glorious old Stars & Stripes as our Emblim of 'Bunker hill, 'Lexington, &c &c.'" The solider continued to invoke the imagery of the American Revolution in his closing, signing-off under the title: "Union of '76…." Songs continued to support Unionist sentiments. The very title of the hymn: "[O] n the trials of our forefathers" emphasizes Kentucky's tight bond with the nation's founders. The song describes the harrowing experiences of the patriots of the American Revolution and proclaims the hope that the country will be guided "by the flag general Washington raised in our land." Another song entitled "For lutenant John Burton" called Union soldiers the "brave sons of Washington…." In another echo of the Revolutionary War, Bluegrass Unionists equated Confederates with the tyrannical British. One Kentucky song even referred to Confederates as Tories. [26]

Many Kentuckians thus remained dedicated to the Union cause during the Civil War. Nevertheless, some Bluegrass Unionists voiced support for southern interests as the war raged on. Kentucky's official stand to remain in the Union did not change the fact that the Commonwealth remained a southern, slaveholding state with vastly different political and economic goals than northern states in the Northeast or the Old Northwest. With the eventual departure of secessionist southerners from Congress, northern interests overwhelmingly dominated Washington politics. Kentuckians soon realized that they were the voice of an ever decreasing minority of Union slave states that wished to defend what otherwise were perceived to be southern interests. For Kentuckians, the battleground in Washington centered on preserving the Constitution and keeping slavery alive.

For many of the Commonwealth's Unionists, throwing their support behind a strict interpretation of the Constitution seemed the only logical plan of action.

---

25 Robert Winn to Martha Winn-Cook, August 1862, Winn-Cook Family Papers: 1861-1875, FHS; Anonymous, "On Lincoln's election," n. d., Civil War, 1861-1865—Poetry, [1862?], WKUSCL; Anonymous, "On the trials of our forefathers," n. d., Civil War, 1861-1865—Poetry, [1862?], WKUSCL; Anonymous, "On Lincoln's election," n. d., Civil War, 1861-1865—Poetry, [1862?], WKUSCL.

26 Anonymous Kentuckian to a friend, n. d., Thomas Pack Letters, FHS; Anonymous, "On the trials of our forefathers," n. d., Civil War, 1861-1865—Poetry, [1862?], WKUSCL; Anonymous, "For lutenant John Burton," n. d., Civil War, 1861-1865—Poetry, [1862?], WKUSCL; Anonymous, "On the evil caused by the rebels rebellion," n. d., Civil War, 1861-1865—Poetry, [1862?], WKUSCL.

Before the war, southern states had vied for political power against their northern counterparts on equal terms. With secession of its fellow southern states, Kentucky realized it was largely alone in the political power struggle. For one thing, the other northern slave states—Maryland, Missouri, and Delaware—did not necessarily come together politically because of their shared desire to perpetuate slavery within their respective borders although Lincoln considered the border states a particular, if peculiar, voting bloc. As part of a conspicuous minority, Kentucky could not hope to secure the passage of new laws protecting slavery. The Commonwealth's only hope was to support the antebellum status quo that previously had split political favor between the north and the south. Furthermore, the antebellum status quo acknowledged that the Constitution had yet to put an end to slavery. If slave labor was preserved, the southern economy and society could survive the war largely unaffected. With the support of other border states, Kentuckians hoped to stave off any efforts to topple slavery or ram through Congress the Republican Party's agenda of high tariffs, homestead legislation, and the creation of a strong, centralized government. They also worked to prevent any changes to the Constitution during wartime.[27]

But unlike the days when Henry Clay stood among the giants in the Senate, Kentucky could no longer play a pivotal role in Congress or in determining national policy. Unfortunately for Kentuckians, the first controversial actions of the Lincoln administration concerned ignoring constitutional rights and bypassing the constitutionally-established legislative process. Hoping to subvert secession in slaveholding Maryland, Lincoln had authorized his military commanders to ignore writs of habeas corpus or pleas for a speedy trial. Under the president's order, several of Maryland's leading secessionists ended up in prison, one arrested in his own bed in the middle of the night. Aside from suspending the writ of habeas corpus, Lincoln issued a call for 75,000 troops from the loyal states without the express approval of Congress and, more significantly, with no legitimate declaration of war. As a result of Lincoln's actions, an intense feeling of discontent rose up among southern sympathizers who remained loyal to the Union. Not surprisingly, the feeling was especially strong in Kentucky. [28]

The personal correspondence of Kentucky's Union soldiers reveals that many took issue with the President's decisions. Robert Winn announced his surprise over Lincoln's actions in a note to his sister: "This you must know is

27 LaFantasie, interview by author.

28 LaFantasie, interview by author; Brinkley, *Unfinished Nation*, 342-343; Carl Sandburg, *Abraham Lincoln: The War Years*, 4 vols. (New York: Harcourt, Brace, & Company, Inc., 1939), 1:273, 275-276, 279-281; Robert Winn to Martha Winn-Cook, Aug. 17, 1862, Winn-Cook Family Papers: 1861-1875, FHS.

contrary to the letter and spirit of the Constitution." Although the coal miner did not want to cast aspersions on the president's character, Winn remarked in another letter: "I consider Mr. Lincoln has gone beyond the powers [conferred] upon him by the Constitution, necessarily so—but none the less so." Furthermore, Winn predicted that the Constitution would not survive the war in its present form: "The Rebellion could not be put down by using only Constitutional means, so as a consequence the rebels have revolutionized the Government." [29]

Other Bluegrass Unionists were of the same opinion. Interestingly, the administrative decision to avoid constitutional provisions served to nurture worries among Kentuckians that fundamental law would continually be ignored. In a sophisticated discussion with his son in 1864, William T. Ward remarked that while he considered Lincoln a trustworthy individual, he believed the President was "doing things my judgment does not approve." While he at first avoided naming the offensive actions of the President, he revealed his qualms in a letter written three days later: "The power in any Government to use all means to sustain it self is not to be denied—the policy of the use of some mean[s] is another question; questions of policy must be settled by the executive and Congress…." As a brigadier general, Ward understood his obligation to obey the rules, but his disgust with Lincoln's policy decisions was cleverly masked behind his official opinion. Other soldiers were not so subtle. Richard Shocklee lashed out at the president in a letter to a friend: "I say let lincon go to the devl [devil,] he is knot [not] the government[.] I say the peoples is the government...I say never give up the government for nothing.... I say stand up for the old Constitution...." Frank Wise crossed into the ridiculous: "Well I must tell you another thing that is there is an act passed by Congress that all the Ky soldiers shall vote for the president." Wise, however, assured his parents that the government would not be able to force him to vote for Lincoln, and that he would cast his vote for 1864 Democratic candidate General George B. McClellan, "if my mind don't change." [30]

During the four, long years of war, Kentuckians repeatedly asserted that Lincoln was violating the law and the sacred Constitution. And they increased their protests when Lincoln issued the Emancipation Proclamation, and later,

---

29 Robert Winn to Martha Winn-Cook, Aug. 17, 1862, Winn-Cook Family Papers: 1861-1875, FHS; Robert Winn to Martha Winn-Cook, Aug. 12, 1862, Winn-Cook Family Papers: 1861-1875, FHS.

30 William T. Ward to John H. Ward, Feb. 3, 1864, Speed Family Papers-Farmington Collection, 1816-1961, FHS; William T. Ward to John H. Ward, Feb. 6, 1864, Speed Family Papers-Farmington Collection, 1816-1961, FHS; Richard Shocklee to John D. Cosby, Feb. 6, 1863, Cosby Family Papers, 1845-1938, WKUSCL; Frank Wise to Levi L. and Elizabeth Wise, Apr. 20, 1864, Wise Family Papers, 1860-1865, WKUSCL; Brinkley, *Unfinished Nation*, 343.

in December 1865, when the Northern states ratified the Thirteenth Amendment to the Constitution. Robert Winn's prediction proved to be right: the Constitution as it had been did not survive the war. With slavery gone, and the Union restored, Kentucky could only find comfort in abandoning its earlier duality and embracing instead a southern identity that resembled the die-hard ideology of the Deep South rather than the values of a border state that cherished its commercial ties to the North.[31]

Ethan Morris received his BA from Western Kentucky University in December 2013 where he was an active member of the Eta Pi Chapter of Phi Alpha Theta. As one extremely interested in public history, he served as both a research assistant at WKU's Institute for Civil War Studies and an interpreter and exhibits intern at Louisville's Frazier History Museum. He is currently the education coordinator at Louisville's Farmington Historic Plantation. Ethan's paper "A Southern State and a Union One: A Study on Southern Unionism in Kentucky" received the national Phi Alpha Theta - Ben H. Proctor Research Award in United States History.

31 LaFantasie, interview by author; Robert Winn to Martha Winn-Cook, Aug. 12, 1862, Winn-Cook Family Papers: 1861-1875, FHS.

Ammendum by author: I would like to thank Dr. Glenn W. LaFantasie of Western Kentucky University for serving as a wise, patient, and knowledgeable mentor during the writing of this article. Dr. LaFantasie suggested areas where I could improve and strengthen the article with additional facts he kindly provided. Aside from taking on the extra task of reviewing the article, he encouraged me to take on new research related to the article's topic. I cannot thank him enough. I would also like the take the time to thank the wonderful Special Collections staff at the Filson Historical Society in Louisville, Kentucky: Jim Holmberg, Jennie Cole, Sarah-Jane Poindexter, Shirley Harmon, and Mike Veach for their dedication to seeing me through my various troubles. They did background research, served as sounding boards for further study, and, most importantly, always knew which collections would help me most in my research. Also, a special thanks to Nancy Baird in tandem with the helpful staff of the Special Collections Library at Western Kentucky University—I only wish I could have stayed and researched longer.

Upgrading the Closet: Pulp Fiction and the Gay Man's Quest for Space in American Society, 1940-1969

Franklin Howard

"[E]ntertainment in its broadest sense – popular ballads, vaudeville films, sculptures, plays, paintings, pornography, pulp novels – has not only been a primary mode of expression of LGBT identity, but one of the most effective means of social change."[1] Michael Bronski, a prominent queer historian, validates this claim in his novel, *Pulp Friction: Uncovering the Golden Age of Gay Male Pulps*. This work wrote a new chapter for LGBT history by legitimizing pulp fiction as a credible source of cultural information. In the course of his novel, Bronski explains how gay pulp fiction secured their place in the "heterosexual imagination," which created a "through-the-looking-glass effect."[2] Homosexual readers turned to these novels to understand their own feelings and to discover the shadowy world of gay culture. Bronski makes this roadmap and traveler relationship clear, but does not explain the meaning of the symbols on the map to any great length. Pulp fiction published for gay men between 1940 and 1969 created space for gay men in American society. Initially, they worked to promote emotional intimacy between two men, changing the definition of homosexuality from a series of acts to a personal identity. As the novels evolved, they taught gay men how to navigate between the greater American culture and the gay subculture to form romantic relationships and to present homosexuality as a positive social identity.

The United States military introduced homosexuality to the American people. Whether they did so to protect the integrity of the American armed forces or to validate their growing field or not, psychologists actively sought out the homosexual military recruit and denied him the ability to serve. Examiners asked loaded questions, used aggressive interview techniques, and

1 Michael Bronski, *A Queer History of the United States* (Boston: Beacon Press, 2011), 19.

2 Michael Bronski, ed., *Pulp Friction: Uncovering the Golden Age of Gay Male Pulps* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 2003), 9.

even resorted to body cavity searches to detect the slightest possibility of homosexuality. Because of the draft, homosexual men had to subject themselves to this persecution or face criminal charges. The compulsory nature of military service extended into the social sphere by stigmatizing the rejects. Military psychiatrists published articles in magazines and newspapers like the *Saturday Evening Post*, *Time*, and the *Washington Sunday Star* to explain the necessity of homosexual exclusion in the armed forces.[3] Discretion was paramount for the homosexual in the 1940s, especially if they passed as straight during the military's screening process. Despite the military's best efforts, as few as 650,00 and as many as 1.6 million gay men served in World War II.[4] While serving, soldiers developed close relationships with each other platonically, emotionally, and sexually.

In the early 1940s, Gay pulps typically avoided direct mention of a character's sexual orientation. In fact, an openly homosexual protagonist was not seen until later in the decade. The few characters that were declared homosexual possessed negative qualities, and, on occasion, came to unfortunate ends. Richard Brooks demonstrates this in *The Brick Foxhole* as his protagonist, Jeff, describes to the reader a man labeled by his traveling companions as "queer."[5] Brooks reinforces the claim by mentioning the man's career as an interior decorator, his appreciation of Broadway musicals, and his rejection from the military, all of which were gay stereotypes of the era.[6] Later in the novel, the reader learns that one of the members of Jeff's company bludgeoned the man to death in his own home.[7] The incident speaks to the importance of discretion. Authors needed to alert younger homosexual readers to their potential danger.

Pulp fiction in the 1940s did much more for the gay men of the era than just create an atmosphere of caution. During this period, novels sexualized the male form. This was the most obvious way to let a reader know that they were reading a gay novel without openly revealing a character's sexual orientation. To maintain discretion, authors included sensuous descriptions of the male body in non-sexual situations. In "Reflections in a Golden Eye," Carson McCullers connects sensuality to a Captain's hatred of a soldier.

Captain Penderton first notices the enlisted soldier when he falls from his horse. He opens his eyes to find the man standing over him. The Captain

3 Carl Binger, M.D., "How We Screen Out Psychological 4-Fs," *Saturday Evening Post*, January 8, 1944, 19, 75-76; Miriam Ottenberg, "How the Navy's 'Mind Detectives' Seek Men of Sound Nerve for Warfare," *Sunday Star*, Washington D.C., January 10, 1943, B5; Uniform and Their Right Minds," *Time*, June 1, 1942, 36-38..

4 Alan Bérubé, *Coming Out Under Fire: The History of Gay Men and Women in World War Two* (New York: Free Press, 1990), 3.

5 Richard Brooks, *The Brick Foxhole* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1945), 89.

6 Richard Brooks, *Brick Foxhole*, 86-91.

7 Richard Brooks, *Brick Foxhole*,165.

immediately notices the man's nudity, having just come from swim, and could not help but notice the way the soldier's "slim body glistened in the late sun."[8] He also notes that the soldier's foot is "slim" and "delicately built."[9] The Captain masks his feeling in hatred. He does not like the enlisted man, but cannot explain why. At first, Penderton's obsession only affected his interaction with that particular soldier. The author writes: "He looked at the fine, skillful hands and the tender roundness of the soldier's neck. The Captain was overcome by a feeling that both repelled and fascinated him – it was as though he and the young soldier were wrestling together naked, body to body, in a fight to the death."[10] Again, the Captain expresses one emotion, but his homoerotic descriptions lead the reader to another conclusion. Especially when one considers how the Captain obsesses about the soldier's "sensual" lips and how the soldier's voice continually "meanders" into the Captain's mind.[11] The captain felt himself "grow dizzy" when he knew he would meet the soldier.[12] The thought of the soldier distracts the captain so much that he cannot complete speeches and lectures.[13]

In a way, Captain Penderton acts as a metaphor for the internal struggle of a man coming to terms with his own sexuality. He plays a game of attract and repel with his emotions with which homosexual readers could identify. The true message of early 1940s gay pulps lies in the sexualization of the male form. This process sought to legitimize same-sex attraction by exposing readers to the attractive qualities of a man. It is no secret that heterosexual men know the attractive features of a woman. A newly discovered homosexual, however, would not have known which features were culturally acceptable to admire. Here, one must come to terms with the differences between straight and gay sexual education. A straight man learns from his father, from interacting with his peers. Gay men do not have that luxury. Pulp fiction provided an opportunity for gay men to touch the gay community, to experience the gay male culture while maintaining discretion. The war brought homosexual men together, which allowed them to form communal bonds. Through the literature of the early 1940s, gay men created their own wedge in the pie chart of the greater American culture.

In 1949, Michael De Forest published his novel, *The Gay Year*. In the book, he asks the reader this question: "Did you hear the Southern belle's definition

8 Richard Brooks, *Brick Foxhole*, 356.
9 Richard Brooks, *Brick Foxhole*, 356.
10 Richard Brooks, *Brick Foxhole*, 359.
11 Richard Brooks, *Brick Foxhole*, 370.
12 Ibid..
13 Ibid.

of a fairy?"[14] De Forest answers his riddle with the word "Homo-sex-you-all!"[15] While crude, the riddle begs discussion. On its surface, this piece of classless humor should strike a nerve with contemporary gay man. De Forest's novel does not contribute to the myths of a gay man's libido, however. When examined in context, the quote is supposed to offend. It advocates the exact opposite of the character's words. The author's message reminded the gay community to maintain a positive social image. It needed to fight against the stigmatization of the dishonorable discharges from World War II and the country's strong pull toward normalcy in the post-war period.

Michael De Forest's novel promotes community building and the pursuit of long-term romantic relationships. The novel stars Joe, a lonely man in New York, and his pursuit for love and fame in the Big Apple. Joe's journey into himself speaks to the gay men of the era. First, the man could identify with Joe's quest for a place to belong. Joe left his rural home to move to Greenwich Village. He dreamed about becoming a Broadway star in hopes that his family could ignore his homosexuality for his fame.[16] Along Joe's journey, he meets many successful, openly homosexual men. De Forest's account of Joe's experiences told his reader where gay men could go to thrive and the industries that would promote their success. The gay characters lived in Greenwich Village. They all had careers in the arts, especially theater.[17] These men accepted Joe and helped him discover his potential. Here, De Forest reinforced his message of community. Gay men needed to support one another to advance the homosexual course and spread the values of the American gay culture.

De Forest sent other messages in the novel too. He told his readers to follow their hearts in their lives and in their relationships. To get a position in a show, Joe began a sexual relationship with Reggie, the show's producer. Joe ends the relationship shortly after its inception, stressing the need for an emotionally fulfilling relationship. De Forest allows loving couples to survive the end of the novel. Emotionally bankrupt relationships, however, end in bitterness. De Forest wanted to ensure that his young readers understood the value of a romantic relationship that extended beyond physical attraction.

At the end of the novel, Joe realizes that he is not gay. Even though the protagonist ended the story as heterosexual, the novel still has importance for the gay community. Joe needed to do what was best for him, a lesson for De Forest's readers to internalize. He explains it best in the quote: "Well, some people, who discover themselves to be what one commonly called 'inverts' are merely following a natural or conditioned bent. It is the only valid way of

14 Michael De Forest, *The Gay Year* (New York: Woodford Press, 1949), 235.

15 De Forest, *The Gay Year*, 235

16 De Forest, *The Gay Year*, 109.

17 De Forest, *The Gay Year*, 24-40.

life for them while it presents certain problems, I imagine, still, anything else would amount to actual inversion for them, while others, who are not really like that, who try to adjust to such a life, find it no life at all."[18] For the times, this concept was radical. The author makes the claim, nature and nurture aside, that a person who identifies as gay should be who they are. De Forest made sure that his readers accepted themselves for who they are and that by doing so, they could help the gay community in America. A community cannot succeed without people to exercise its values. In order to advance the cause, gay men needed to proudly proclaim membership and positively represent the community identity.

In the course of one decade, the gay narrative changed in a positive way. They started by showing military themes and promoted discretion. An individual needed to develop their own sense of their sexual identity. They evolved to advocate for a gay community that possessed its own culture and values. In the latter half of the 1940s, gay pulps began to distribute the idea of a gay community and to circulate its potential values and behaviors.

While the novels of the 1940s reflected a period of positive growth and development, the novels of the early 1950s showed a step back for the gay community. America desperately wanted to return to a sense of normalcy after the turmoil of World War II. The shake up created a passive permissiveness that allowed the gay community to advance. To recover from the shock of war, American society snapped back on itself, cutting off the circulation to these progressive movements. This phenomenon is best represented by the rhetoric of Senator Joseph McCarthy's "Lavender Scare" that added homosexuals to the growing list of dangers to the American Republic.[19] Psychologists and psychiatrists added to the onslaught with their Freudian analysis of the gay male. Ironically, Freud had little to say about male homosexuality. He did connect it to an overwhelming attachment to the mother during childhood, but found no evidence to conclude it was a mental illness.[20] In a letter to a concerned mother, Freud explained that homosexuality is "nothing to be ashamed of, no vice, no degradation, it cannot be classified as an illness."[21] Sandor Rado, a psychologist trained in Freudian analysis, first declared the unnatural nature of same-sex attraction, citing environmental

18 De Forest, *The Gay Year*, 173.

19 For more on McCarthy and homosexuality, see David Johnson, *The Lavender Scare: The Cold War Persecution of Gays and Lesbians in the Federal Government* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004).

20 Robert M. Friedman, "The Psychoanalytic Model of Male Homosexuality: A Historical and Theoretical Critique," *The Psychoanalytic Review* 73, no. 4 (1986): 66.

21 Sigmund Freud, "Letter to An American Mother," qtd. in Robert M. Friedman, "The Psychoanalytic Model of Male Homosexuality: A Historical and Theoretical Critique," *The Psychoanalytic Review* 73, no. 4 (1986): 66.

factors as the cause.[22]

The novels of the early 1950s possessed a psychoanalytic element, using clear symbols of Freudian analysis in the texts. In 1952, Jay Little published *Maybe – Tomorrow*. Gaylord Le Claire, the novel's protagonist tries to attract the attention of Robert Blake. At first, Le Claire does not understand his attraction, but as the novel progresses, he discovers and accepts his homosexuality. The author gives Le Claire certain "feminine symbolisms."[23] He wishes he could wear dresses all of the time and sees himself in a highly effeminate light. Le Claire's mother encourages his atypical behavior.

Using Freudian symbols, Little feeds into the contemporary psychological theory that gay men had an innate desire to be a woman. Consider the following passage from Little's book.

"He closed his eyes and thought of himself as a girl. A beautiful girl. The thought was not a strange one. It was the playing over, over, and over again of events in which he was the star figure."[24] The psychoanalytic novels did not discuss the morality of homosexuality, but rather its scientific causes. Gay readers learned their minds did not function properly, that there was something wrong with them. On a social front, the novels of the 1950s reflected an overall positive message. They portrayed successful men in happy, healthy relationships. They were now recognized as a group of people through a common denominator. Unfortunately, the biggest commonality has yet to be addressed in the literature. Before the 1960s, gay pulp fiction did not address the physical components of homosexual relationships. Noqwvels admitted that their characters engaged in sexual intercourse with other men, but neglected the details. Sexual attraction is such a large part of the individual's homosexual identity that the novels could not help but begin to explore that aspect of the community.

"Ephraim stood up and began to unbutton his breeches. He hesitated, knowing that his cock was swollen. The breeches hung at his hips below the silky, copper-shining hair of his lower belly. Quickly, he pulled his breeches off and threw them on the ground by his boots. Singing Heron gazed casually at Ephraim's cock, thick and muscular like an oak tree."[25] In 1966, Richard Amory published this passage in *Song of the Loon*. The 1960s brought an explosion of pornographic novels onto the market. Gay pulps from prior decades occasionally revealed a sculpted chest or a well-muscled thigh, but never came anywhere close to the exposure of '60s pulps. MANual Enterprises, Inc. V. Day, a Supreme Court case decided in 1962, contributed to this phenomenon. The Post Office seized gay male publications as obscene material and the

22 Friedman, *Psychoanalytic Model*, 68.

23 Jay Little, *Maybe – Tomorrow* (New York: Pageant Press, 1952), 3.

24 Little, *Maybe – Tomorrow*, 8.

25 Richard Amory, *Song of the Loon* (San Diego, CA: Greenleaf, 1966), 12.

publisher sued. The Supreme Court determined that gay men had the legal right to represent their community and their community's interests in print.[26] Before MANual v. Day, gay males were a minority in their own novels. The gay characters searched for men like themselves, wandering about in the heterosexually dominated world. Once the influence of the Supreme Court decision spread, gay pulp fiction took on another shape. Using Amory's passage as a prime example, gay novels explored the sexual aspects of homosexuality with unforeseen passion. The legal recognition of the homosexual identity gave gay authors the force of will to publicize gay sex. Also important to note, gay men became the majority of their own novels, a symbol of their sense of empowerment. The protagonists easily found other gay men with whom they pursued both sexual and romantic relationships.

Gay authors reveled in their new sexual freedom. Even an analysis of the titles, cover art, and flavor text portray the liberation the gay community found in socially accepting their sexual natures. The cover of *Gay Whore* by Jack Love show two young, athletic men on the beach. They gaze into each other's eyes and exchange happy smiles. Immediately, the reader can identify that this is a gay novel. The title and the clothing of the men on the cover lend the novel its initial sexual aspects. The term "whore" promotes a sense of sexual promiscuity as does the bathing suits of the two men. The bathing suits are high and tight, exposing the outlines of the men's sexual organs.[27] Authors have finally stopped shying away from truly homosexual content. They openly and proudly write about gay men and the gay community. During the latter half of the 1960s, gay pulp fiction told readers that the gay community embraced its identity, lived its ideals, and stood firm against the acquiescing nature of the greater American society.

The novels began in the 1940s, reflecting the influence of World War II on American art and society. They sought to define homosexuality as an identity rather than a series of actions. Authors in the '40s staked out the gay community's claim in the cultural landscape of post-war America. Once they secured the space and created their culture, the gay community defined the reasons for their beliefs, identities, and actions. The psychoanalytic novels of the 1950s helped to explain the origins of homosexuality. By this point, gay pulp fiction had defined who a homosexual was and explained how they got to be that way. The liberation and sexual freedom of the 1960s finalized the narrative by teaching gay men what to do with their newfound knowledge. More importantly, the novels radiated a sense of unforeseen homosexual pride.

The gay community started in a broom cupboard of a closet. With the aid

26 MANual Enterprises, Inc. v. Day, 370 U.S. 478 (1962).

27 Jack Love, *Gay Whore* (San Diego, CA: Publisher's Export Co., 1967).

of pulp fiction and the changes in the American culture, the gay community expanded and upgraded their space to a walk-in closet. They had room to move around, which allowed them to walk close to the door. They then threw that door wide open, taking in their new expansive surroundings, using literature to present themselves to their new cultural neighbors. The Stonewall Inn Riots blew the door off the closet of the gay community, thrusting it American society and culture. The community's evolution and use of pulp fiction put it in a place to withstand the blast and emerge triumphantly from the smoke.

Franklin Howard received his BA in history from Ohio Northern University in 2014. He calls Akron, Ohio home but has moved out West to pursue higher education. Currently, he is pursuing an MA in history from the University of Nevada Las Vegas. While a member of the Nu Kappa Chapter of Phi Alpha Theta, he presented at several conferences and hosted one at his alma mater. His historical interests include American LGBT history and culture, social history, and the history of gender and sexuality.

BP and the Oil Spill in the Gulf of Mexico

Christina McGee

Introduction

On April 20, 2010, at 9:30 p.m., an explosion rocked the drilling rig *Deepwater Horizon.* Drilling for oil in Mississippi Canyon block 252 in the Gulf of Mexico, the rig was owned by Transocean, leased by BP, and had a crew of 130.[1] It had been put in place only three months before to drill for oil in water almost a mile deep. It had passed inspection by the Mineral Management Service, or MMS, only a few days before. [2] The explosion left 17 crewmembers seriously injured and 11 dead. *Deepwater Horizon* collapsed and sank 36 hours later on April 22, 2010. The date was ironic as it was the fortieth anniversary of Earth Day – a day dedicated to the environment inspired by the 1969 oil spill off the coast of Santa Barbara, California.[3] After the *Horizon* collapsed, the well being drilled, named the Macondo well, began to spew oil into the Gulf of Mexico. There were many unsuccessful attempts to stop the flow, but it was finally capped on July 15th; 85 days after the leak began.[4] The well was not finally sealed and considered "dead" until September, almost five months after the initial explosion. Scientists working for the U.S. government have estimated the total amount of oil spilled into the Gulf of Mexico by the Macondo well to be almost five million barrels.[5]

How did this happen? This paper will discuss the accident and its consequences. Beginning with a brief history of BP, this paper will emphasize its long history of violations and the decisions officials made that led to the spill. It will also discuss the failure of governmental regulatory agencies to

1 William R. Freudenburg and Robert Gramling, *Blowout in the Gulf: The BP Oil Spill Disaster and the Future of Energy in America* (Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 2011), 10.

2 Freudenburg and Gramling, *Blowout in the Gulf*, 16, 33.

3 Freudenburg and Gramling, *Blowout in the Gulf*, 10, 12.

4 Charles W. Schmidt, "Between the Devil and the Deep Blue Sea: Dispersants in the Gulf of Mexico," *Environmental Health Perspectives* 118, no. 8 (August 2010): A339.

5 "Gulf of Mexico Oil Spill (2010)." *New York Times* (website), accessed February 20, 2012, http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/o/gulf_of_mexico_2010/index.html.

adequately regulate offshore drilling. In addition, this paper will discuss the impact the oil spill had – and will continue to have – on the Gulf of Mexico. Finally, this paper will consider the process of damage assessment for such a disaster, the assignment of liability for the parties involved, and will render conclusions about the spill.

Is BP an Environmental Criminal? A History of Violations

In 1901, British-born William Knox D'Arcy, who had made his fortune in Australian mining, negotiated for exclusive oil rights for 60 years in a large area that includes most of present-day Iran. In 1908, the first significant oil deposit was found, and the Anglo-Persian Oil Company was born a year later. It was renamed British Petroleum in 1954 and was shortened to BP in 2001 after announcing its intention to go "Beyond Petroleum."[6] Then-CEO John Browne did something the other oil companies would not: he admitted to a possible link between carbon emissions and global warming. Tony Hayward, who would be CEO during the spill in the Gulf, took the top spot when Browne stepped down in 2007.[7]

Unfortunately, during this time, BP was saying one thing and doing another. Between the years 2007 and 2010, BP alone accounted for almost half of all safety violations in the oil industry recorded by the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA). BP had 862 citations, while second place went to Sunoco with 127, and third place went to ConocoPhillips with 118.[8] A total of 69 of BP's citations were for "intentional disregard for employee safety and health," which was triple the number of citations given to the rest of the refining companies combined.[9] "Most spectacularly, though, BP received 760 citations – out of a grand total of 761 for the entire industry – for 'egregious willful' violations, or the worst violations of all, reflecting 'willful and flagrant' violations of health and safety laws."[10] These are not just numbers; they represent real lives harmed or lost and real environmental damage done.

In 2005, a refinery owned by BP in Texas City, Texas, exploded. Fifteen people were killed and 170 injured.[11] The U.S. Chemical Safety Board investigated the explosion and cited cuts in the refinery's budget that made the refinery vulnerable to safety problems. All of the fifteen people killed were near a blowdown drum when it "…spewed a geyser of flammable liquid…" onto

6 Freudenburg and Gramling, *Blowout in the Gulf*, 102.
7 Freudenburg and Gramling, *Blowout in the Gulf*, 40.
8 Freudenburg and Gramling, *Blowout in the Gulf*, 42.
9 Ibid.
10 Ibid.
11 Freudenburg and Gramling, *Blowout in the Gulf*, 41.

them.[12] Plant managers had been discouraged from replacing the drum. BP was fined $21 million dollars by OSHA, the largest OSHA penalty to that date.[13] But in 2009, OSHA beat that record by fining BP another $50.6 million dollars for failing to make the necessary safety upgrades at the refinery.[14] In December of 2011, BP was fined another $50 million for violations of the Texas Clean Air Act as a result of pollutant emissions stemming from the Texas City explosion and repeated violations at the refinery since the explosion. All told, BP paid $100 million in fines to safety and environmental regulators and around $2 billion to settle accident claims.[15] Some of those violations, like burning 500,000 pounds of toxic chemicals and releasing benzene into the air without notifying nearby residents, happened while the Macondo well in the Gulf was still leaking.[16]

In 2006, a six-mile stretch of corroded pipeline located in Alaska opened up and spilled 200,000 gallons of oil. BP had been warned about the pipeline several years earlier but effectively ignored the warnings. They were fined $12 million for violating the Water Pollution Control Act.[17] This record of violations and accidents shows that BP has little interest in the safety of its workers or the safety of the communities located near its operations, much less the health of the environment in which it operates. But before we look at what happened leading up to the oil spill in the Gulf, we must look at how BP has been able to continue to operate despite this outright criminal behavior.

What Went Wrong – Governmental Regulatory Failures

In 1953, shortly after President Dwight Eisenhower was inaugurated, Congress passed two important pieces of legislation that still have impacts for offshore oil drilling today. The first was the Submerged Lands Act, which extended ownership of submerged land up to three miles from the shoreline to individual states in the Gulf, with special exceptions for Texas and Florida. The second was the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act, stating that the sea-bottom lands beyond the states' jurisdictions could be given up as oil and gas leases to be authorized and administered by the Secretary of the Interior.[18] In the Gulf of Mexico, for example, companies are allowed to remove the oil and profit from

12 Edward Iwata, "Report Slams BP, Cites Organization, Safety Deficiencies," *USA Today,* March 21, 2007.

13 Iwata, "Report Slams BP."

14 Freudenburg, *Blowout in the Gulf*, 41-42.

15 "BP Fined $50 Million." *Hydrocarbon Processing* 90, no. 12 (December 2011): 7, accessed March 9, 2012, *Academic Search Premier,* EBSCO*host.*

16 Freudenburg and Gramling, *Blowout in the Gulf*, 41.

17 Ibid.

18 Freudenburg and Gramling, *Blowout in the Gulf*, 101.

it while paying the U.S. government royalties and other types of lease fees.[19] Unfortunately, the resource in question belongs to the people of the United States, and our government gets less for it (in leases, royalties, income taxes) than almost any other nation – and less than some of our states do. "For deepwater leases such as the one where the *Deepwater Horizon* was working, U.S. taxpayers get about 40 percent of the 'take.' Norway charges almost twice that much – about 75 percent. Vietnam and Tunisia get an even higher share – 80 percent or more. So do Angola, Kazakstan, and Brunei."[20]The Mineral Management Service, or MMS, was established during the Reagan administration and was part of the U.S. Department of the Interior. Before the spill, it was the main agency responsible for the regulation of offshore oil operations.[21] The agency's close ties to the industry it was charged with regulating were troubling. It was not only responsible for enforcing regulation covering offshore operations, but it was also responsible for the leasing program allowing companies to drill in federal waters.[22] The agency had to regulate "…an industry engaged in highly risky activity, but not with such a heavy hand as to adversely impact the revenue stream associated with the agency's multibillion dollar offshore drilling lease and royalty program."[23] Another conflict arose out of the fact that the MMS relied heavily on standards set by industry trade associations and other industry representatives – suggesting the agency lacked its own expertise. MMS lacked sufficient personnel as well as proper training for its inspectors.[24] On top of the agency's inadequacies, its relationships with the companies it was regulating were suspect. An Inspector General report in 2008 discovered MMS employees accepting improper gifts, trips, drugs, and even sex, from industry officials – and this included the former director of the oil royalty program.[25] After the spill, MMS was split into three separate agencies: the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, Regulation and Enforcement (BOEMRE), the Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement and the Bureau of Natural Resources Revenue. These new organizations will split the responsibilities of overseeing and regulating the resources, royalties, and safety concerns around offshore drilling.[26]

Other government agencies were also lax in their oversight. When the U.S.

19 Freudenburg and Gramling, *Blowout in the Gulf*, 18.

20 Ibid.

21 Freudenburg and Gramling, *Blowout in the Gulf*, 51.

22 Mark A. Latham, "Five Thousand Feet and Below: The Failure to Adequately Regulate Deepwater Oil Production Technology," *Boston College Environmental Affairs Law Review* 38, no. 2 (2011): 356.

23 Latham, "Five Thousand Feet and Below," 356.

24 Latham, "Five Thousand Feet and Below," 359, 361.

25 Freudenburg and Gramling, 51-52.

26 Latham, "Five Thousand Feet and Below," 355.

Chemical Safety Board investigated the Texas City refinery explosion, it put some of the blame onto OSHA. The investigation showed "…the agency had inspected the refinery only once, despite many complaints, accidents and deaths from 1985 to 2005."[27] Investigators with the Environmental Protection Agency, or EPA, wanted to pursue charges against top officers of BP after the explosion, but officials within the Justice Department's environmental-crimes division denied their request.[28] Another investigation was launched by the EPA following the oil leaks from the corroded Alaskan pipeline, but was eventually closed and "wrapped up" by a request from federal prosecutors in Alaska. It seems BP's legal team – headed up by Carol Dinkins, who had served as chief of the Justice Department's environmental division, as well as deputy attorney general under George H.W. Bush – had won the day.[29]

What Went Wrong – BP's Actions at the Well Site

In an interview with Anderson Cooper from CNN, several BP workers who were on *Deepwater Horizon* when it exploded stated that, "…by the time the rig blew up on April 20, drilling was five weeks behind schedule and more than $20 million over the budgeted cost."[30] There were warning signs before the explosion, including a series of kicks, or powerful spurts of natural gas under high pressure. A BP drilling engineer called the well a "nightmare" a mere five days before the explosion.[31] During an early investigation of the spill, Henry Waxman, the chair of the House Committee on Energy and Commerce, and Bart Stupak, chair of its Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, sent a lengthy letter to Tony Hayward with a summary of BP's questionable decisions about drilling the Maconda well.[32] The most noteworthy decisions all involved the "cementing in" of the final casing of the well. In order to save time and money, BP officials went against standard practice and even against the advice of Haliburton, the contractor hired to handle the cementing of the well, by using less than the advised and standard materials. For example, centralizers are used to hold the cement casing in the center of the well. Haliburton advised using 21, but there were only 6 on board the rig. Obtaining the correct number would have meant a delay – so the 6 were the only ones used.[33] Some other decisions they made were not a part of BP's

27 Iwata, "Report Slams BP."
28 Michael Isikoff and Michael Hirsh, "Slick Operator," *Newsweek*, May 17, 2010.
29 Isikoff. "Slick Operator."
30 Freudenburg and Gramling, *Blowout in the Gulf*, 34.
31 Freudenburg and Gramling, *Blowout in the Gulf*, 47.
32 Freudenburg and Gramling, *Blowout in the Gulf*, 46-47.
33 Freudenburg and Gramling, *Blowout in the Gulf*, 47-48.

original permits for the well. Amended permits were requested from MMS and were approved the same day.[34] This is an example of the too-cosy relationship between MMS and the industry it was tasked to regulate. Another questionable decision that was made was in regards to well integrity. Normally, after the casing is cemented in, the integrity of the well is tested. This test can take anywhere from 9 to 12 hours. A crew from an oil-field contractor was on board *Deepwater Horizon* on April 20th to run the test, but was told they were not needed. They left about ten hours before the blowout.[35]

Oil in the Gulf of Mexico

There are 1,631 miles of U.S. coastline in the Gulf of Mexico spread over the five states of Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana and Texas. Along this coastline, there are 15.6 million acres of saltwater and freshwater wetlands already threatened by erosion and climate change.[36] The oil only adds to the environmental burden in the Gulf. Wetlands are transition zones; marshes and swamps not considered dry or wet. Their importance to the ecosystem of the Gulf is invaluable: they help water quality by acting as water filters; they provide flood protection by holding in floodwaters as well as erosion protection by stabilizing the land near the shore; they provide habitat for plants and algae, grasses and salt-tolerant trees like the Bald Cypress and Tupelo Gum.[37] Wetlands also act as nurseries for fish and shellfish, including the blue crab, several species of shrimp and oyster, flounder and striped mullet. In 2007, commercial fishing in the Gulf contributed more than $630 million to the nation's economy.[38]

The Gulf of Mexico also provides habitat for many species of birds. Migrating waterfowl like Canada Geese and ducks overwinter in the Gulf. Gulls, terns, egrets, herons, pelicans, and hawks are present in the spring and fall.[39] The Bryde's whale and the Sperm whale (protected under the Endangered Species Act and the Marine Mammal Protection Act) are residents of the Gulf. There are numerous species of dolphins and whales currently protected under the Marine Mammal Protection Act that inhabit the Gulf as well. Five species of sea turtles are present. The Kemp's Ridley sea turtle nests in only one place

34 Freudenburg and Gramling, *Blowout in the Gulf*, 48.

35 Freudenburg and Gramling, *Blowout in the Gulf*, 49.

36 United States Library of Congress, Congressional Research Service, *The Deepwater Horizon Oil Spill: Coastal Wetland and Wildlife Impacts and Response,* by M. Lynne Corn and Claudia Copeland, CRS R41311 (Washington, D.C.: Congressional Research Service, Library of Congress, October 15, 2010), 3, 5, http://assets.opencrs.com/rpts/R41311_20101015.pdf.

37 Corn and Copeland, *Wetland and Wildlife Impacts*, 2, 7.

38 Corn and Copeland, *Wetland and Wildlife Impacts*, 2-3.

39 Corn and Copeland, *Wetland and Wildlife Impacts*, 7.

in the world – the western Gulf of Mexico.[40] The Gulf is home to national wildlife refuges, national and state parks, national seashores, and public beaches. It also provides tourism dollars and a strong cultural influence for the generations of people who live there.[41] The type of oil discharged from the Maconda well was a light crude which is moderately volatile, but with a potential to cause long-term problems. Over time exposure to air, sun, wave and tidal action, and the presence of certain organisms reduces the oil's toxicity – a process called weathering. The length of this process cannot be predicted because it depends on the environment (even the season) in which the spill takes place.[42] Oil causes harm in several ways, such as physical contact, ingestion, and inhalation. For example, birds are exposed to oil when they land on the surface of the water, or on the shore. Oil interferes with water repellency and thus prevents them from flying, from diving for food or from floating on the surface of the water, which leads to drowning.[43] If they groom themselves, they can ingest or inhale the oil, which can result in instant death or to organ damage that leads to death. If they sit on their nests, their eggs can be damaged. Scavenger birds are affected when they feed on the oiled carcasses of contaminated fish or other wildlife.[44] Oil can also impact bird populations from as far away as Alaska, Canada, the Caribbean, and South America because the birds impacted often rest in the Gulf before migrating to these areas.[45] Although these examples focus on the impacts to bird populations, habitat loss, contamination of the food chain, sustained illness, reproduction problems, and death are issues that face all wildlife exposed to the oil in the Gulf.

Unfortunately, the damage to the environment of the Gulf can be exacerbated by the cleanup techniques. Oil is often removed by hand with rakes and shovels or even mopping. This is difficult in marsh areas where the trampling of plants by human volunteers is a problem.[46] Hard boom is used to contain oil on the water. It consists of inflated chambers of plastic-type material that floats on the water with a "skirt" that hangs down in the water. There are different types of boom for different conditions, but not all areas can be

40 United States Department of Commerce, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, "Gulf of Mexico Oil Spill," April 2010, accessed March 9, 2012, http://www.education.noaa.gov/Special_Topics/Hands_On_Activities/Oil_Spill_Responders/NOAA_Oil_Spill_Fact_Sheets.pdf.

41 Corn and Copeland, *Wetland and Wildlife Impacts*, 3, 5.

42 United States Fish and Wildlife Service, "Effects of Oil on Wildlife and Habitat," June 2010, accessed February 20, 2012, http://www.fws.gov/home/dhoilspill/pdfs/DHJICFWSOilimpactsWildlifeFactSheet.pdf.

43 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, "Effects of Oil on Wildlife and Habitat."

44 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, "Effects of Oil on Wildlife and Habitat."

45 Corn and Copeland, *Wetland and Wildlife Impacts*, 8.

46 Corn and Copeland, *Wetland and Wildlife Impacts*, 14.

protected by boom, so it is used in conjunction with other methods.[47] Burning the oil can be effective, but must be limited in sensitive areas. This method can also be difficult to control, and oil that has weathered (in this case exposed to air) does not burn well.[48]One method that has been controversial is the use of dispersants. Dispersants are chemicals used to enhance the process of weatherization of the oil and break it up into smaller droplets. Dispersants must be used early, as they are most effective within the first 48 hours of a spill.[49] The use of such chemicals is not without controversy and "environmental tradeoffs." On one hand, oil that has not been chemically dispersed and is on the water's surface is a danger to birds, mammals, and coastline. On the other, oil that has been dispersed and is in the water, not just on the surface, can be transported throughout the water column and be a danger to other marine life.[50] Some scientists even argue that doing nothing at all – allowing nature to take care of the oil with little human intervention – might be the best for natural recovery and to avoid the added harm done by the various cleanup techniques.[51]

Aftermath of the Spill: Damage Assessment

How does a society estimate the damage done to an ecosystem? Losses to businesses and tourism can be calculated, but how does one determine the monetary value of an ecosystem that doesn't clearly affect human consumption or the economy?[52] The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service seek to make an assessment under the umbrella of the federal Natural Resource Damage Assessment (NRDA) process. Their job is to calculate the cost of restoration. This is hampered by other problems in the Gulf such as overfishing, climate change, and the dead zone that has already been created by toxic runoff from the Mississippi River.[53] Assessment is even more difficult because the full effects on plant life and wildlife will not be known for years.

Due to the difficulty of restoring marshland, the idea of substitution has

47 United States Department of Commerce, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, "Using Boom in Response to Oil Spills," May 18, 2010, http://www.education.noaa.gov/Special_Topics/Hands_On_Activities/Oil_Spill_Responders/NOAA_Oil_Spill_Fact_Sheets.pdf.

48 Corn and Copeland, *Wetland and Wildlife Impacts*, 15.

49 Schmidt, *Dispersants in the Gulf*, A340.

50 Schmidt, *Dispersants in the Gulf*, A340.

51 Corn and Copeland, *Wetland and Wildlife Impacts*, 16-17.

52 Steve Nash, "Oil and Water, Economics and Ecology in the Gulf of Mexico," *BioScience* 61, no. 4 (April 2011): 259.

53 Nash, "Oil and Water," 259-260.

come into play. Habitat can be created or protected somewhere else to compensate for habitat loss due to a spill.[54] Of course, NOAA prefers to restore "in kind, in place" but that is not always possible. Jeremy Jackson, director of the Scripps Institution's Center for Marine Biodiversity and Conservation, sums up the process: "The greatest scientific challenge we face in the ocean is that we do not know how to put Humpty Dumpty back together again. It's ten or a hundred or a thousand times harder to put back together again than is was to break it."[55]

Aftermath of the Spill: Liability

In March of 2012, nearly two years after the spill, BP settled its liability lawsuit before it went to trial in New Orleans. The settlement is estimated to be $7.8 billion and will be paid from the $20 billion BP had already set aside in a trust fund during the spill itself.[56] Individual plaintiffs in the lawsuit numbered in the thousands. The seafood industry will receive $2.3 billion dollars to compensate for their losses. The rest will go for economic and medical claims, which will be supervised by the courts.[57] BP will pay $105 million for health care improvements in communities of the Gulf and will provide health consultations for the next 21 years to those with health claims.[58] A minority investor in the Macondo well, MOEX Offshore 2007 LLC, settled its liability lawsuit for $90 million. In that settlement, the civil penalties for violations of the Clean Water Act alone are $70 million.[59] The Justice Department is still determining the penalties for BP for violations of the Clean Water Act and the Oil Pollution Act. It is also deciding on possible criminal charges as well.[60] Despite these penalties, BP announced profits for the fourth quarter of 2011 at $7.7 billion dollars – a 38 percent increase from the year before – and raised its dividends to shareholders. It has also announced its expected cash flow in 2014 to be 50 percent higher than in 2011.[61] They have invested in television

54 Nash, "Oil and Water," 260.

55 Nash, "Oil and Water," 261.

56 Steven Mufson, "BP, Plaintiffs Reach Gulf of Mexico Oil Spill Settlement," *Washington Post*, March 2, 2012.

57 Mufson, "BP, Plaintiffs Reach Settlement."

58 Mufson, "BP, Plaintiffs Reach Settlement."

59 United States Environmental Protection Agency, "MOEX Offshore Agrees to $90 Million Partial Settlement of Liability in Deepwater Horizon Oil Spill/$70 Million Penalty is Largest Under the Clean Water Act; MOEX Also to Perform Gulf Conservation Projects Worth at Least $20 Million," February 17, 2012, http://www.yosemite.epa.gov/opa/admpress.nsf.

60 Mufson, "BP, Plaintiffs Reach Settlement."

61 Clifford Krauss and Julia Werdigier, "Two Years After Spill, BP Profits and Plans." *New York Times*), February 8, 2012.

and print advertising in order to improve the company's image and plan a marketing campaign to improve sales at its gas stations over the next two years.[62]

Conclusions

There is never a good place to spill oil. If there were a uniquely bad place to spill oil, however, it would be the ecologically sensitive Gulf of Mexico. The Gulf is an area residents depend on for their livelihood, but the Gulf is more valuable than just its economic contribution. In 2010, the Census on Marine Life "…named the Gulf of Mexico as the fifth-most-diverse marine setting in the world for known species."[63] Unfortunately, the things an ecosystem provides are often taken for granted. The failure of government agencies to regulate offshore drilling is a prime example. Lax oversight of precious resources does not make sense for any government, financially or otherwise. It is also questionable to allow a company such as BP to continue to operate in the Gulf and in places like Texas City, Texas, despite evidence of egregious violations of safety going back many years. The company's actions leading up to the spill were negligent and downright criminal, but the profitability of the company has rebounded despite the numerous fines and penalties levied on them. The technology used for drilling for oil in these locations is complicated and accidents will inevitably happen. There must be stronger regulation in order to prevent what can be prevented and stronger penalties to deter companies from ignoring the safety of their workers and the environment.

Christina McGee graduated *summa cum laude* from Northern Kentucky University in December 2013 with a BA in history. As an undergraduate, she also minored in political science. She is a member of the Alpha Beta Phi Chapter of Phi Alpha Theta and Alpha Chi National College Honor Society. She is the recipient of the W. Frank Steely History Scholarship and the NKU Alumni Family Scholarship. Christina presented her research on the Gulf Oil Spill at the Celebration of Student Research and Creativity sponsored by NKU, and as a student lecturer through the Six @ Six 2.0 Lecture series, sponsored by the Scripps Howard Center for Civic Engagement.

62 Krauss and Werdigier, "Two Years After Spill."

63 Freudenburg and Gramling, *Blowout in the Gulf*, 11.

Henry Kissinger's Approach to China During the Nixon Administration

Jennifer Kaiser

Amidst the political struggles of the Cold War, negotiations and concessions were made that effectively changed the relationship between the United States and China. Though a significant effort was made on both sides of the conference table, no push was stronger than that of President Richard M. Nixon's National Security Adviser, Henry Kissinger. To have an idea for change is one thing, to put that idea into action is something entirely different. Henry Kissinger helped to promote workable relations with China by re-usage of back channels, secret meetings with foreign diplomats, and bargaining concessions on the behalf of others. His methods in dealing with leaders, both of his country and abroad, have set a precedent for how foreign policy is developed and executed in the United States.

Upon coming into office, President Richard Nixon needed someone by his side that he could trust to help him achieve foreign policy goals. To do so, he appointed Henry Kissinger as National Security Adviser in January of 1969.[1] Henry Kissinger was well known for his ability to play off the insecurities of others and manipulate strained situations to achieve what he felt needed to be done.[2] His natural skill of secrecy and flattery came to good use in the development of foreign policy involving China. Before President Nixon had even entered into office, he had expressed a desire to change the relationship between the United States and China. Previously, Sino-American relations had been strained over China's support of North Korea, while the U.S. sided with the United Nations and South Korea. Tensions rose further after the 1959 Tibetan Uprising in which thousands of people die and the United States once again sided with the United Nations, this time condemning Beijing for human

1 Jean A. Garrison, *Making China Policy: From Nixon to G.W. Bush* (Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2005), 22.

2 Walter Isaacson, *Kissinger: A Biography* (London: Faber and Faber Limited, 1992), 334.

rights violations.[3]

Opening up this front presented a potential and much needed advantage in the situation involving the Cold War with the Soviets at the time.[4] The United States and the Soviet Union had been at odds over the past three decades following the end of World War II. Upon entering the Cold War both countries also entered into a nuclear and missiles arms race.[5] China had no better luck with the Soviet Union. After a series of conflicts including border disputes and severe ideological differences, the Chinese Communist Party officially broke off ties with the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in 1966.[6] Nixon wanted to use the already shaky Sino-Soviet relationship to his advantage. Rapprochement with China meant the United States could possibly get access to the Soviet Union as the two countries shared a border.[7]

President Nixon's National Security Advisor, Henry Kissinger, was a self-made man. Born in *Fürth*, Germany in 1923, Henry Alfred Kissinger came to the United States in 1938. After serving in the United States Army from 1943 to 1946, he graduated summa cum laude from Harvard College in 1950, going on to earn his Master of Arts and Ph.D. degrees from there as well.[8] These accomplishments were just the beginning for Dr. Kissinger. Before becoming National Security Advisor, Kissinger was a member of Harvard's faculty in the Department of Government as well as in the Center for International Affairs from 1954 (the year he received his doctorate) until 1969. During this time Dr. Kissinger was also the Director of Harvard International Seminar.[9] From there, Kissinger took his expertise to Washington and became Nixon's second in command.

Kissinger was what Nixon needed to kick-start his plans for developing a China policy. Nixon felt the need to "centralize" decision making. He put Kissinger up front because he knew that Kissinger would side with him and he would have more control over what was going on with policy issues. Henry

3 Council on Foreign Relations, "Timeline: U.S. Relations with China," *U.S. Relations With China (1949-Present)*, http://www.cfr.org/china/us-relations-china-1949---present/p17698 (accessed April 3, 2013).

4 William Burr, ed., "The Beijing-Washington Back-Channel and Henry Kissinger's Secret Trip to China," *National Security Archive Briefing Book No. 66* (February 2002) http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/NSAEBB/NSAEBB66/ (accessed December 3, 2013).

5 Library of Congress, "The Soviet Union and the United States," *Revelations from the Russian Archives*, http://www.loc.gov/exhibits/archives/sovi.html (accessed on April 3, 2013).

6 Robert L. Worden, Andrea Matles Savada, and Ronald E. Dolan, eds., *China: A Country Study* (Washington DC: GPO for the Library of Congress, 1987).

7 Burr, "Beijing-Washington."

8 "Henry A. Kissinger Biography," http://www.henryakissinger.com/biography.html (accessed on April 3, 2013).

9 "Henry A. Kissinger Biography."

Kissinger was put into a position that gave him the power to control the policy agenda, giving him an advantage on what kind of foreign policy would be discussed and the shape it would take on.[10] Nixon became the dependent party, relying on Kissinger for any and all information coming in involving what was going on with the status on their plans. Barely two months into his position as the National Security Adviser, Kissinger moved forward and assigned Undersecretary of State Elliot Richardson to piece together a package that would relax the blockade the United States had on China, steering away from the old China policy.[11] By starting off small and slowly changing the policy publicly, more changes could be made behind the curtain.

One approach used to gain support for the Sino-American cause was the separation of associations between the Soviets and the Chinese. This separation held benefits on two fronts. On one hand, disassociation between the Soviet Union and China was better for the public image surrounding the policy efforts. During a phone conversation dated April 14, 1971, Nixon relayed to Kissinger that he was aware that the American people were still against Communist China and that he is knew that he may lose votes over the plan to normalize relations with China.[12] It was a highly held belief of Kissinger's that removing the Communism bond between the two and presenting them as two different entities towards the American people would garner more support in the long run.[13] After all, as much as Americans disliked the idea of being associated with Communist China, they had stronger feelings still towards the Soviet Union. Kissinger felt that a new-found relationship with China, "…would lead to tougher relations between us and the Soviets, rather than easier," but he also believed that it was still the best course of action. [14] There were other benefits for both sides of this new relationship. The United States government harbored hopes of China's support in its conflict with Vietnam while the government of China was seeking assistance in reigning in the "rogue" state of Taiwan. [15] In a 1971 memorandum for the Chairman of the National Security Council Senior Review Group, a series of proposed issues and alternatives were addressed in regards to future proceedings with the People's Republic of China. While the first alternative proposed would not involve any official negotiations with China, and instead just focused on the opening of trade between the countries. The second and third proposals involved significant

10 Garrison, *Making China Policy*, 22.

11 Garrison, *Making China Policy*, 23.

12 Henry A. Kissinger Telephone Conversation Transcripts, *Nixon Presidential Materials Project*, National Archives II: box 29 (April 14, 1971).

13 Garrison, *Making China Policy*, 29.

14 Henry A. Kissinger Telephone Conversation Transcripts.

15 Garrison, *Making China Policy*, 31.

changes such as the withdrawal of American forces from Vietnam or the willingness of the United States to regard Taiwan as a part of mainland China. [16] With the proposals out there the only remaining question was which course should be taken, the modest route or the more rapid. On one hand, limiting any involvement to just the opening of Chinese ports helped with trade but did nothing for official negotiations. The more severe choices would certainly encourage the pending relationship, but at some cost to the US. Each option had the potential to deepen our issues with Taiwan and the Soviet Union. In addition to the issues of Taiwan or the Soviet Union, the US had to keep in mind what options could be pursued without upsetting Japan. At the time, Japan was the United States' foremost national interest in Asia and not considering them in the long-term negotiations could have been regarded as a terrible mistake.[17]

Further on in the memorandum was a list of US objectives and long term goals. While making a connection with China was important, Kissinger had to remain mindful of the delicate balance at stake. The memorandum stated that, "Early contacts at a governmental level, if attainable without crucial concessions on the Taiwan issue, would strengthen the Administration's position domestically and internationally, and provide the opportunity to commence a dialogue on fundamental problems." [18] Kissinger needed to make some sort of headway in negotiations with China without giving anything away up front. If he gave in to the PRC's demands on Taiwan too quickly, he would have nothing to bargain with and anger the conservative right in U.S. politics.

Indeed, Taiwan would be the key in Kissinger's negotiations regarding foreign policy (and its manipulation) towards China. One such example of policy manipulation involved Kissinger's juggling of United Nations seats. While in talks with Zhou Enlai, the first Premier of the People's Republic of China and a fundamental part of the Chinese Communist Party, Kissinger avoided discussing his stance on Taiwan's return to China until after he had Zhou's confirmation that his decision would not affect future efforts to strengthen the bond between the United States and China.[19] This delayed the People's Republic of China from entering the United Nations as the Secretary of State did not want there to be conflict between mainland China and another

16 Memorandum for the Chairman, NSC Senior Review Group from Winthrop G. Brown, Acting Chairman of the NSC Interdepartmental Group for East Asia and the Pacific, "NSSM 124: Next Steps Toward the People's Republic of China (PRC)," (1971), 2-3. Department of State, *The National Security Archive*, George Washington University, http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/NSAEBB/NSAEBB19/docs/doc03.pdf (accessed March 8, 2013).

17 Ibid, 3-4.

18 Ibid, 4.

19 Garrison, *Making China Policy*, 26.

seat holder, Taiwan.

Though Kissinger and Nixon met little resistance in policy propositions involving China they still needed a way to communicate with China's leaders without the knowledge of the State Department. Kissinger believed that the indelicate matter in which the State Department had been handling communications through the Warsaw office could seriously jeopardize the plan for China.[20] After the decision was made to use back-channels instead of the State Department, it was all a matter of which channel would be used and who would select it. At first, Kissinger believed the only channel that would be successful would be one set up through a contact in Paris.[21] In the end however, the choice of the channel was left up to the Chinese leadership. Their leaders opted for the channel out of Pakistan and a series of notes were passed back and forth over a period of several weeks.[22] It was through one of these notes that the Chinese government extended an invitation to President Nixon or "Mr. Kissinger" for a public visit with the added notation that any additional travel plans be made through the offices of President Yahya Kahn.[23]

The decision of who to send fell to President Nixon. There were an abundance of worthy candidates, including Nixon himself; he yet again relied on Henry Kissinger's opinion before making a final decision. In a phone call dated April 27, 1971, taking place just two hours after the message inviting an American envoy was received, Nixon and Kissinger readily discussed who would be the best representative to send.[24] As the candidates were bounced around, one of the defining characteristics that they were judged upon was Kissinger's confidence in his ability to control them. When Nixon was about to discard Nelson Rockefeller, the Governor of New York and former Undersecretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, as a probable candidate Kissinger reeled him back by stating, "I think for one operation I could keep him under control."[25] Other candidates such as George H.W. Bush, the United

20 Isaacson, *Kissinger*, 337.

21 Memorandum for the President from Henry A. Kissinger, "Contact with the Chinese," (September 12, 1970), *Chronology of Exchange with PRC February 1969-April 1971. The National Security Archive*, George Washington University, http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/NSAEBB/NSAEBB66/ch-01.pdf (accessed March 8, 2013).

22 Isaacson, *Kissinger*, 338.

23 Message from Premier Chou En Lai dated April 21, 1971 (Delivered to Mr. Kissinger-6:15 P.M., April 27, 1971), *Nixon Presidential Materials Project*, NSC files: box 1031, Exchanges leading up to HAK Trip to China- December 1969-July 1971. *The National Security Archive*, George Washington University.

24 Telephone Conversation between the President and Henry A. Kissinger, 8:18 P.M., April 27, 1971. Record Group 59, Department of State Records, Subject files of the office of People's Republic of China and Mongolian Affairs, 1969-78, box 4. 1969-71: Chinese Initiative-Third Party Messages. *The National Security Archive*, George Washington University.

25 Ibid.

States Ambassador to the United Nations, and Alexander Haig, the Deputy National Security Advisor, were cast aside as either being "too weak" or a risk due to "high visibility."[26] Eventually Nixon made the decision to send Kissinger; there would be no need to control a third party and a feeling of trust had already been established with him.

During this time of attempted negotiations, there was an abundance of wishful thinking by Pakistani leaders that the United States and possibly Beijing would back them up if a conflict presented itself. For this reason they were motivated to help Kissinger and the US government to establish a better relationship with the leaders in Beijing. Pakistani leaders (such as Sultan Khan, Pakistan's new foreign minister), "explained to Kissinger that they had worked out a scenario wherein he could travel to China incognito."[27] Khan also proposed the abandonment of the previously projected "hunting story" that was to be used for the press. He instead offered an alternative play to use. It was decided that the press would be told that Kissinger went to Nathiagali to rest up from a slight stomach "indisposition" while in reality Kissinger would be in Muree as the Pakistani government had found a less used and shorter route to China from that location. Sultan Khan personally escorted Kissinger's body double to Nathiagali to appease the press and keep the attention away from Kissinger as he traveled.[28] Kissinger himself never went to Nathiagali, but was instead put on a plane from the Islamabad airport with his two Secret Service agents and three aides.[29]

The President had a few guidelines for Henry Kissinger's trip to Beijing. After all, this meeting was the preliminary for a public trip for Nixon himself to go to China and hopefully arrange for this new potential superpower of the world to open its doors. As stated previously, the leaders of China wanted the United States to support the mission of putting Taiwan back under the control of mainland China. Nixon stressed to Kissinger to not make any definitive statements regarding the United States' position on the Taiwan issue.[30] Instead of going at the issue head on, Kissinger was instructed to stress the Nixon Doctrine and its goal of helping Asian countries help themselves.[31] This way, Kissinger could avoid addressing the issue in full and buy the time needed for a decision to be made. However, it was noted that during his talks with Zhou Enlai on July 9, 1971, Kissinger stated that the American government was not

26 Ibid.

27 Chris Tudda, *A Cold War Turning Point: Nixon and China, 1969-1972* (Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana State University Press, 2012), 87.

28 Tudda, *Nixon and China*, 87.

29 Isaacson, *Kissinger*, 343.

30 Tudda, *Nixon and China*, 83.

31 Tudda, *Nixon and China*, 83.

advocating a "two-Chinas" policy; this was the declaration that Zhou had been waiting for.[32]

Over the next two days, Kissinger and Zhou Enlai had, in total, seventeen hours of talks, some of which would last seven hours at a time.[33] These extended talks did have a purpose. Kissinger's one "practical" goal during his first trip to Beijing was to secure President Nixon an invitation to a summit in Beijing the following year. Although he was successful, the small victory came with a slight speed bump. The summit that Zhou had invited Nixon to was exclusively for the discussion of Taiwan. While going over the proposal with Chinese diplomat, Huang Hua, Kissinger came up with a list of America's wants and needs and presented it back to the opposing side. In finality, the proposal was changed to an invitation for a summit with the purpose of seeking normalization of relations and the exchange of views on questions of concern for either side.[34] Henry Kissinger's first trip to China had been a success.

After the success of Kissinger's secret July 1971 trip to Beijing, Nixon was finally able to make his intentions of visiting China public.[35] After Nixon had publicly announced Kissinger's trip to Beijing, a short celebration was warranted before getting back to business. Governments around the world had been rocked by the reveal of a secret trip. This was especially true for the Soviet Union. Quick to action, an ambassador from the Soviet Union came to the White House and proposed a summit in Moscow to take place before the one in Beijing. It was, of course, moved to take place three months after the one in Beijing.[36] The stir caused by Kissinger's secret visit was mostly a positive one. The Administration was receiving praise for its bold move into the future, even with some on the American political right were upset, and the discomfort it was causing the Soviets was an added bonus. Moving forward was essential. The next step for Kissinger was to take a public trip to Beijing and hopefully continue the progress.

Though Kissinger's initial visit that July had truly been a cause for celebration his arrival on October 20th was considered by many as a landmark event. Kissinger was a high profile policy maker and his presence caused a stir in the politically active China. There were three reasons why Henry Kissinger's public trip to Beijing was important.[37] First, it deepened the relationship of trust and negotiations between Kissinger and Zhou Enlai, regardless of the issues both sides took involving Taiwan and China's possible assistance with the Vietnam

32 Burr, "Beijing-Washington."

33 Isaacson, *Kissinger*, 344.

34 Isaacson, *Kissinger*, 346.

35 Garrison, *Making China Policy*, 32.

36 Isaacson, *Kissinger*, 349.

37 Tudda, *Nixon and China*, 126.

War. Both sides wanted the other party to make some kind of concession. Second, the meetings provided a level of evidence that Nixon's administration was attempting to swing China into an anti-Soviet alliance. If China were to support the US in an anti-Soviet campaign it would undoubtedly make the relationship between the US and China more popular to the American people. Third, Kissinger's October visit would serve as a dress rehearsal for the Beijing Summit as "lower levels of the Chinese leadership were slowly introduced to the American way of diplomacy."[38]

Upon the meeting's commencement, Kissinger declared that President Nixon was looking forward to his own meeting with the Chairman and the Prime Minister. This message was meant to signal a feeling of good faith towards the future between the United States and China. There were three key issues that Kissinger wanted to discuss at this meeting: major substantive issues (similar to what he and Zhou had discussed in July), secondary issues that had been discussed in the Paris channel, and the technical arrangements of Nixon's visit. It was also stated in this meeting by Kissinger that the US and PRC must "agree on a general direction and process of revolution (Taiwan)" and then "there will remain no fundamental obstacle to our relations."[39]

President Nixon's 1972 trip to the People's Republic of China ended the twenty-five year period of isolation between the two countries. After several days and many consultations, an agreement was reached. The Shanghai Communique, issued February 28, 1972, was built upon the agreement that both sides would continue to conduct state-to-state relations towards normalization and this union was in the interest of all countries.[40] China reaffirmed its position involving Taiwan. The PRC wanted the United States to recognize that there but one China and that no country, including the US, had the right to interfere with that business. On the US side of the Communique, there was an acknowledgement of China's position and an agreement that Taiwan belonged to China. In addition, the US affirmed its objective to withdraw all US military forces and instillations from Taiwan.[41] This agreement between the US and China was the groundwork for the prosperous and fruitful relationship that the two countries still share today.

Henry Kissinger played the hand he was dealt when faced with organizing a new relationship between the United States and the People's Republic of

38 Tudda, *Nixon and China*, 126.

39 Tudda, *Nixon and China*, 127.

40 Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China, "Nixon's China Visit and the 'Sino-U.S. Joint Communique,'" http://www.fmprc.gov.cn/eng/ziliao/3602/3604/t18006.htm (accessed on April 4, 2013).

41 Ibid.

China. Rising to the occasion, Kissinger helped one president reach his once far-away hopes and excelled on behalf of a country that needed the extra push. Many people saw Kissinger as the puppet under President Nixon's control, jumping at his every word and whim. This was never the case. Kissinger was the frontrunner in the beginning of normalizations between the US and China; he operated on his agenda while bringing the rest of the world along with him. Because of his efforts to strengthen the relationship between the two countries, the United States and China were able to emerge from their respective isolation and form an anti-Soviet allegiance, all to place pressure on the Soviet Union. Henry Kissinger altered the way the United States handled foreign policy by pinning two countries against each other to get the result he desired. If he had not made the moves he did and operate with his own agenda, relations between the United States and China would not be as strong as they are today.

Jennifer Kaiser recently graduated *magna cum laude* from Austin Peay State University with a BA in history. She is returning in the fall to pursue a MA in military history while serving as vice president of the Theta-Delta Chapter of Phi Alpha Theta. This past spring, Jennifer was also inducted into Phi Kappa Phi and intends to continue representing Austin Peay State University in the best light possible.

Deadly Immigration Issues

Alexander Glazer

Immigration is an intricate part of American history. The United States was explored, and developed by immigrants from many nations. Interestingly enough immigration has always been a heated issue in the United States. The mid-19th century was a time of intense immigration issues with the emergence of the American, or Know-Nothing, party and the increase in foreign peoples coming into the United States. This intense issue eventually led to violent rioting. Louisville was one such city where fighting took place and in fact would become known as one of the deadliest rioting places of the time. These riots would eventually cost the city a lot more than civilian lives. The increase of immigration and the arrival of the American Party made Louisville Kentucky a city of tension that eventually erupted into the Bloody Monday riots of 1855.

The Bloody Monday riots were not spontaneous acts by a mindless rabble of unprovoked citizens. Theses riots were the tipping point of a long period of tension developing in the city of Louisville. The riots main components were the American Party and the German and Irish immigrants of the city. In order to understand the discontent between the two it is important to understand how the two parties came to reside in Louisville.

The American Party came out of division in the Whig Party. The Whig Party was largely Protestant and Puritan whose agenda was to "make the people better". The party was known to be prejudice against Catholics and immigrants. This was due to Lyman Beecher, a leader in the Whig Party and a frontrunner in the evangelical movement of the 19th century.[1] Beecher reached out to Calvinists and Presbyterians which created a broad spectrum of protestant support. The supporters of Beecher's evangelical movement perceived Catholics as a threat after the Roman Catholic population rapidly expanded in the United States. The Whig's reputation of having prejudice towards immigrants was a

1 Doug Cantrell, *Kentucky Through the Centuries: A Collection of Documents and Essays* (Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt Pub. Co., 2005), 129.

result of Protestant nativist work with Whigs during the evangelical movement.[2] The Whig part was made up of southern Whigs who were pro-slavery, and northern Whigs who were Anti-slavery. The fugitive slave laws brought about debate between Whigs on whether or not to support the laws. The Whig party came to an uncompromising point at the passing of the Kansas Nebraska Act in 1854. Disagreement on the slavery issue was causing the Whigs to lose elections and power. A uniting force was needed if the Whigs were to hold influence in government. The formation of the American party was created under the uniting force of immigration concerns. Most southern Whigs joined the newly formed American Party and many northern Whigs did as well. Other old Whigs went to join the Democratic Party and the future Republican Party.[3]

Before the American Party came to the national scene, it was an organization known as the Secret Order of the Star-Spangled Banner. It was founded by Charles B. Allen in 1849 and became the American Party in 1854.[4] Although the newly founded party was small, it rapidly grew in popularity and began winning elections.[5] Formally known as the American Party, it received its more popular name "The Know-Nothing Party" from the stereotype that it was a secretive political faction made up of members who always answered, "I don't know" to questions about their party.[6] The main concerns of the party were immigration, political corruption, and sectional extremism.[7] It was these concerns that people shared with the party and as a result declared their allegiance. The immigration concern was the most publicized and it stemmed from the increase in immigrants from 1845-1854 when 3 million immigrants came into the United States. This sent a fear through Americans that foreign influence would become overwhelming. People were also afraid of radical foreigners from European revolutions starting an uprising in America. The party made declarations to promote their cause.[8] One such declaration read,

> Like a clap of thunder from a brilliant sky, it (the American Party) has waked up millions of native-born citizens from their slumbers, to contemplate the dangers which threaten their alters and their hearths. Startled from the repose of security which a conscious integrity of purpose and action inspire, they look with horror upon

2 Daniel Howe, *The Political Culture of American Whigs* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1979), 163.

3 Michael Kazin, ed., *The Princeton Encyclopedia of American Political History* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2010), 2:883.

4 Cantrell, *Kentucky Documents and Essays*, 129-130.

5 Kazin, *American Political History*, 24.

6 Cantrell, *Kentucky Documents and Essays,* 130.

7 Kazin, *American Political History*, 23.

8 Kazin, *American Political History*, 23.

> the uncovered snares which a stealthy foreign hand has framed to strangle the foster mother that shelters and nourishes those outcasts who fled to her bosom protection.[9]

The American Party's response to this fluctuation of potentially radical immigrants was promoting things such as voting restrictions for foreigners. The Whig style prejudice of Catholics carried over and was a part of the American party politics. American party members also wanted to keep Catholics out of office because they feared the influence of Catholicism and the pope.[10] They believed Americans were threatened by the Roman Catholic Church and called Catholic people, "Vatican foot soldiers in a plot to subvert American liberty".[11] This prejudice was only magnified throughout the existence of the American Party due to the fact that in 1840 there were 660,000 Roman Catholics in the United States, and in the next decade that number tripled.[12] The party came to Louisville Kentucky when the Know-Nothing convention, led by Theodore O'Hara, was held there in 1852.[13]

The Democratic Party was the opposing party to the old Whigs and that held true with the rise of the American Party. Unlike Whigs and Know-Nothings, the democrats welcomed Catholic immigrants.[14] Many Catholic Irish supported and joined the Democratic Party simply in opposition to the Whigs and their policies. Democrats were inclined to tolerate cultural differences because of the new immigrants joining their party. The foreign population brought support and national influence to Democratic Party which in turn brought more hatred by Whig nativists.[15] Joining the Democratic Party was not the only reason animosity towards foreign peoples was growing. The rapid growth of foreign population was enough to raise prejudice. In the 1830s there were approximately 60,000 immigrants coming into the states every year and that number grew in the 1840s.[16] This increase was the result of the 1848 year of revolution in Europe. Refugees fled and sought sanctuary in the United States. At first there was sympathy for the foreigners but then fear and distrust began to arise.[17] Louisville and surrounding areas became a popular settling spot. In the Ohio Valley alone (consisting of northern Kentucky, southern Indiana, and southern

9 Cantrell, *Kentucky Documents and Essays,* 130.

10 Cantrell, *Kentucky Documents and Essays,* 130.

11 Kazin, *American Political History*, 24.

12 Kazin, *American Political History*, 53.

13 Agnes Geraldine McGann, *Nativism in Kentucky in 1860* (Washington, D.C., Catholic University of America, 1944), 69.

14 Kazin, *American Political History*, 228.

15 Howe, *American Whigs*, 164.

16 Kazin, *American Political History*, 53.

17 Cantrell, *Kentucky Documents and Essays*, 130.

Ohio) there were approximately 7,500 Germans and 3,100 Irish.[18] In an 1850 census 4 percent of Kentucky was foreign born; however, in that same census Louisville had roughly 30 percent foreign population with 12,461 out of 43,000. Out of those approximate 12,500 foreign born in Louisville, 7,357 of them were Germans, 3,105 were Irish, and approximately 2,000 were from other countries.[19] With the population increase in Louisville set up a ward or sectional system in 1851. The city was divided into 8 Wards. Most Irish ended up in the eighth ward while Germans tended to live in the first and second wards.[20] The geographical location of the rioting in 1855 would be centered around this ward system.

Even with both immigrants and the American party in Louisville, the rioting did not start immediately. There was a period of time where both parties actions would increase the tension in the city. With a significant amount of Germans in the city coming from the failed revolution there was opportunity to unite. Wilhelm Weitling was the first to take advantage of this by starting the German Labor Movement. This state wide movement was aimed at Germans wanting reform in America. Many native born Kentuckians were skeptical and believed the Germans that were a part of that movement were going to try to start a socialist republic.[21] However, outrage was not publicly expressed towards Germans until the Louisville Platform was created. The platform was drawn up by a group of Germans known as the Forty-Eighters, also known as the Bund Frier Manner (League of free men).[22] They were a well-educated group of liberal radical leaders that took part in the unsuccessful German revolution of 1848.[23] The group was originally formed by Carl Heinzen who hoped it would act as a foundation for a new political party.[24] The platform itself was originally given in German at Apollo Hall on February 19, 1854. It pointed out flaws in American society that did not follow the Constitution or the Declaration of Independence.[25] The Forty-Eighters believed there was a privileged race and class system that the government represented leaving the majority of citizens without a voice.[26] The platform they created was made up of many key points over an array of issues. They believed distribution of land

18 George H. Yater, *Two Hundred Years at the Falls of the Ohio: A History of Louisville and Jefferson County* (Louisville, KY: Heritage Corp., 1979), 62.

19 Yater, *Falls of the Ohio*, 128.

20 John E. Kleber, ed., *The Encyclopedia of Louisville* (Lexington, KY: University Press of Kentucky, 2001), 922.

21 McGann, *Nativism in Kentucky*, 61.

22 Yater, *Falls of the Ohio*, 62.

23 Kleber, *Encyclopedia of Louisville*, 564.

24 Kleber, *Encyclopedia of Louisville*, 565

25 McGann, *Nativism in Kentucky*, 60.

26 McGann, *Nativism in Kentucky*, 61.

was unfair and wanted it given to German settlers.[27] The platform called for other things such as: Abolition of slavery, direct elections, gender equality, religious laws to be outlawed, and the establishment of free trade. The Forty-Eighters proposed an alliance between Germans and progressive Americans since their ideals and goals aligned.[28] The Platform rallied German support locally and throughout the eastern United States after it was translated to English and published in the periodicals of Kentucky, Indiana, Missouri, Michigan, Texas, and Wisconsin. Although this brought support from Germans, it also outraged many Americans that Germans were trying to rule America.[29] The Know-Nothing Party was especially disturbed by the platform and also saw an opportunity to gain support. They proclaimed that the platform was threatening democracy and Protestantism.[30]

The American Party in Louisville was also a contributing factor to the animosity leading up to the August riots of 1855. As mentioned earlier, the start of the American Party in Louisville was the Know-Nothing convention in 1852 led by Theodore O'Hara. Following the German Louisville Platform, the Know-Nothing Party came out with its own Platform which was printed in the local paper known as the *Louisville Daily Journal*.[31] Like the Germans and the Louisville Platform, the American party caused public outrage and disagreement. This came at the election of Mayor John Barbee.[32] The mayor in office before Barbee was James Speed. He was a Whig who served in the House of Representatives which made him very influential throughout Kentucky. However, when Speed converted to Catholicism the Know-Nothing party turned against him and sought to get Barbee in office. Speed refused to campaign claiming he was not up for re-election until the following year. James Speed's decision and interpretation of his term of office was criticized in an edition of the *Louisville Daily Courier* which read, "according to Mr. Speed's interpretation of the charter, he is the Mayor of Louisville for all time to come. His term of office never can expire. Louisville is under the rule, not of a mayor, but of a dictator."[33] The American Party ignored Speed's opinion and held the elections anyway.[34] With the promotion of Know-Nothings and Speed not running, John Barbee was elected mayor on April 7, 1855.[35] The voting on April 7 could be seen as foreshadowing of the deadly riots to come due to the

27 McGann, *Nativism in Kentucky*, 62.
28 Kleber, *Encyclopedia of Louisville*, 565.
29 McGann, *Nativism in Kentucky*, 65.
30 Kleber, *Encyclopedia of Louisville,* 565.
31 McGann, *Nativism in Kentucky*, 77.
32 Yater, *Falls of the Ohio*, 66-67.
33 *Louisville Daily Courier*, April 7, 1855.
34 Yater, *Falls of the Ohio*, 66-67.
35 Cantrell, *Kentucky Documents and Essays*, 131.

fact that there was some fighting during Election Day. The *Louisville Daily Journal* reported,

> The election of Saturday, as we have said elsewhere, was generally a very peaceable one. We have heard, that, for a short time, there was some hustling at the polls in the Second ward by which certain foreign-born citizens were delayed in their efforts to get to the ballot box, and that a few of them were roughly handled, and that a very few Germans were maltreated in the upper division of the Eighth ward.[36]

After the results were out Speed filed suit against the Jefferson county circuit and won. The American party took the case to the state court of appeals where the decision was over-turned.[37] The *Louisville Daily Journal* reported the outcome of the case when they said, "We learn by telegraph dispatch that the Court of Appeals made its decision on Saturday in the case of Mr. Speed, reversing that of the Jefferson county court. Mr. Barbee is, therefore, Mayor."[38] With Barbee as mayor the American Party had influence in Louisville government and the foreign population was not content.

The immigrants in Louisville and the members of the American Party also came into conflict regarding the Catholic Church. With the number of Catholic immigrants coming to the city the Catholic population in Louisville grew as well. From 1845 to 1852 there were only approximately 10,000 Catholics in the city. In the following four years the Catholic number grew by 6,000. By 1855 Louisville had a Catholic population of 20,000, most of which were German and Irish.[39] The increase in Catholics and the American parties prejudice towards them brought attacks on Catholicism. Giovanni Aclilli, an Italian renegade who associated with know-nothings, publicly attacked and renounced the Catholic Church with his series of lectures one such titled, "Popery unmasked and revealed to American Youth". The Church's response to the attacks came from Archbishop Joseph Spalding who countered Aclilli's speeches with his series of lectures called "Popular prejudice against the Catholic Church." These lectures were advertised in the local *Louisville Daily Courier* promoting, "The Eighth Lecture of Course, by Bishop Spalding on 'Popular Prejudices against the Catholic Church' will be delivered at the Cathedral, Fifth street, on Sunday evening at 7 o'clock…the public are invited."[40]

36 *Louisville Daily Journal*, April 9, 1855.
37 Yater, *Falls of the Ohio*, 66-67.
38 *Louisville Daily Journal*, July 9, 1855.
39 McGann, *Nativism in Kentucky*, 57
40 *Louisville Daily Courier*, January 5, 1855.

With the Catholicism being criticized by Know-Nothing supporters and defended by the majority of immigrants, it added a significant amount of bitterness between the two groups.

Another contribution to the conflict of 1855 was the Louisville periodicals of the time. Each paper had their political faction for which they supported and did so rather openly. The *Louisville Daily Journal* was originally a Whig supporter and changed parties at the emergence of the American Party in Louisville. The *Louisville Daily Courier*, the main competitor of the Journal, was a Democratic Party supporter. Other smaller news print at the time was the *Louisville Times* which was also in support of the Democrats and *The Anzeiger* which was a German paper printed for the immigrants that did not necessarily support the democrats but was a clear opponent of the American Party because of their policies on immigration. *The Anzeiger,* although small, created a lot of anger on its own. Originally founded by George Phillip Doenn and Otto Schaefer, the paper was printed in German, meant to update the Germans on the 1848 Revolution, and keep culture and language alive in children.[41] Know-Nothings were opposed to *The Anzeiger* believing it was going to start a revolution in the first and second wards. The main media cause of tension between the American Party and the immigrants was the conflict between the *Louisville Daily Journal* and the *Louisville Daily Courier*. Both papers pushed for their political party and encouraged stubborn and endangering behavior from its readers. They also used propaganda to create hatred between the parties and the people. Often times the two papers would openly attack each other. One such instance was printed in the *Louisville Daily Journal* reporting a false accusation brought on them by the Courier,

> There is not a resemblance or shadow of justice or fairness in the comment of the Democrat upon a paragraph in our article Monday… here it is: It is an unquestionable truth that a large majority of our political opponents in this canvass in the city of Louisville are Germans, Irishmen, and other foreign-born citizens…If they had the requisite courage and strength, they would drive forth into the wilderness every native that refuses to allow them to step on their necks.

This article was in response to an attack by the Courier discrediting the article in question. The Journal reprinted the article and defended it, "The editor of the Democrat himself does not deny and cannot with truth deny the notorious fact that a large majority of our political opponents in Louisville in

41 McGann, *Nativism in Kentucky*, 60.

this canvass are Germans, Irish, and other foreign-born citizens."[42]

There are countless articles of these two periodicals attacking each other and publishing their arguments. Not only did the two papers argue, but they also heavily and biasedly campaigned. An article printed by the *Louisville Daily Courier* discredits Know-Nothings and encouraged a vote against them in the gubernatorial elections of August when they wrote,

> One fact is worthy of notice: All the Know-Nothing candidates in this city, with possibly one exception, are lawyers. The new order seems to have an utter contempt for merchants and mechanics. To be sure, they want their votes, but they cannot consent to give up any of their chances for the honors or emoluments of office. Merchants and mechanics! If you have freemen's souls in your bones, give the wire-working old stagers such a rebuke today as they will never forget.[43]

In another article printed by the it, the paper takes a very clear stance in the gubernatorial elections when they print, "Vote for Preston! Col. Wm. Preston is a man for whom every good citizen can vote with a hearty good will. He is eminently one of the nature's noblemen. He is tried, true, and trusts he has the best interests of the city."[44]

With the Germans frustrating the American Party, who in turn persecuted immigrants, the Catholic Church under attack, and the local news fueling the situation the stage was set for all-out war. All that was needed was a spark to ignite the fighting which would come on August 6, 1855.

The election ticket was decided after some surprise and confusion. The democrats were prepared to give Charles Slaughter Morehead the nomination. Morehead had served in congress and was an old fashioned Whig who opposed the know-nothing platform. He was married to a Catholic and was not expected to be supported by the American Party being that Article II of the Know-Nothing party forbade it: "A person to become a member of any subordinate council must be a Protestant, born of Protestant parents, reared under Protestant influence, and not united in marriage with a Roman Catholic."[45] To everyone's surprise Morehead joined the Know-Nothings and they chose him as their candidate for governor. The Democrats ended up choosing Beverly Clarke as their candidate. [46]

42 *Louisville Daily Journal*, July 11, 1855.
43 *Louisville Daily Courier*, July 11, 1855.
44 *Louisville Daily Courier*, August 6, 1855.
45 McGann, *Nativism in Kentucky*, 87.
46 McGann, *Nativism in Kentucky*, 88.

The polls were set up the night before the elections and many preparations were made. Barbee, foreseeing arguments and fighting, sent out extra police and tried to pass a resolution to approve the dispatch of 50 extra officers in the first, second, and eighth wards where the majority of Germans and Irish would vote. The proposal however, was rejected.[47] The police squads that were sent to the polls as security were, by no surprise, American Party members.[48] *The Anzeiger* did not hesitate to point this out and complain when it read, "The police believe only Germans are subject to the law."[49] *The Anzeiger* was not the only one to notice and point out biased behavior. The democratic paper *The Louisville Times* accused the recently elected know- nothing attorney-general John Harlan and the Louisville council of foul play because they did not set up additional voting places in the heavily immigrant populated first, second, and eighth wards. This became a problem for many voters who would not have time to cast their ballot in the long lines.[50] Although this accusation can be debated, it is true that there was an element of biased behavior at the polls because almost all election officials were a part of the American Party due to the fact that at this time there was no law that forced election officials to be from all parties running.[51]

The morning of the election was comparable to the eve of battle. Neither the *Louisville Daily Journal* nor the *Louisville Daily Courier* held back. The Courier aimed their articles at the immigrants and reminded voters to prepare their tickets, take their naturalization papers, and to vote early. They called everyone to vote declaring, "It is the duty of every good citizen to vote." The Courier sounded like a general speaking to an army when their headlines read "The Day of Battle". That same morning they told their readers to "Stick by the polls, If there be any delay or obstruction in depositing your vote, we beg that you be not discouraged and go away, without voting…if necessary stick by the polls all day." They continued with, "No Danger – Let no timid or hesitating voter be deterred from visiting the polls to-day through fear of violence."[52] The *Louisville Daily Journal* rallied its troops as well when it said "Americans, are you all ready? We think we hear you shout 'Ready!' Well, fire! and may heaven have mercy on the foe." They continue in another article which read, "American citizens, one word in your ears. Let every eye be steady, every nerve well-strung, every heart resolute, and every man at the post of duty." The Journal called its readers, "soldiers of American liberty and union!" and told

47 McGann, *Nativism in Kentucky*, 90.

48 Cantrell, *Kentucky Documents and Essays*, 133.

49 *The Anzeiger* August 4, 1855, quoted in: McGann, 92.

50 *The Louisville Times,* August 5, 1855, quoted in: McGann, *Nativism in Kentucky,* 92.

51 Cantrell, *Kentucky Documents and Essays*, 132.

52 *Louisville Daily Courier*, August 6, 1855.

voters of their noble cause reminding them, "It is a moral battle you fight this day for the American Constitution and the American people."[53]

The polls were a battle themselves with long lines and intense summer heat. The Know-Nothings brought their "yellow ticket" to get into the side door while all other voters had to wait in long slow moving lines. At the end of the day the German majority in the first and second wards only got in 10 percent of potential voters' ballots. The Irish were much more persistent in the eighth ward and got 33 percent of voters counted.[54]

The riots of August 6, 1855, are hard to describe accurately. Only a close approximation can be recorded with the biased newspapers being the main source of reports and having conflicting views on the day's occurrences. The first to die in the riots was George Berg at nine o'clock that morning. Although there is no agreement on who attacked him, it was said he was beaten to death by an angry Irish mob. The start to the rioting that day began just before noon in the first ward.[55] Both the Courier and the Journal account for the violence starting at eleven o'clock that morning on Campbell and Green streets when a German man fired at a carriage with Americans in it. The driver and one person inside the carriage were hurt.[56] Officer Ed Williams was the first to the scene quickly followed by Joseph Salvage and John Latte who were all fired at and injured.[57]American Party mobs began forming in the first ward and at this point stormed up Shelby Street attacking houses where Germans barricaded inside and shot from. The next recorded incident that was printed in several papers was at the intersection of Walnut Street and Shelby Street where the mob attacked German immigrant Conrad Kizzler's grocery store.[58] The building was destroyed and Conrad was threatened but not harmed.[59]

Another mob had formed at around 3 in the afternoon and, believing ammunition was in church basements, broke into St. Martin's church.[60] Mayor Barbee stepped in and tried to subdue the mob by assuring them that the American Party had already won the election. Barbee was able to convince the mob to leave the church, but they do not disperse. Instead at around four o'clock they assembled in the first ward at ArmBruster's Brewery on the corner of Liberty Street and Baxter Avenue and burned it down after being fired upon in the area.[61] Armbruster's Brewery was the first tragedy of the day because

53 *Louisville Daily Journal*, August 6, 1855.

54 Yater, *Falls of the Ohio*, 69.

55 Cantrell, *Kentucky Documents and Essays*, 133.

56 *Louisville Daily Courier*, August 7, 1855.

57 *Louisville Daily Journal*, August 8, 1855.

58 *Louisville Daily Journal*, August 7, 1855.

59 *Louisville Daily Courier*, August 7, 1855.

60 *The Louisville Times,* August 8, 1855, quoted in: McGann, *Nativism in Kentucky,* 94.

61 Cantrell, *Kentucky Documents and Essays,* 133.

nearly ten people were burned alive in the building.[62] After the brewery burned down it appears that the mob died down because no more violence is reported in the first ward.[63]

Around the same time as the brewery was burning, yet another mob moved to attack the newly constructed Cathedral of the Assumption.[64] Bishop Spalding gave Mayor Barbee the keys to the church and held him responsible for any damages done. Under this pressure, Barbee was able to save the Cathedral of the Assumption and made a decree that was published in the Courier,

> TO THE PUBLIC. We, the undersigned, have in person carefully examined the Cathedral, and do assure the community that there are neither men nor arms concealed therein, and further, that the keys of said Cathedral…are in the hands of the city authorities.[65]

The more deadly and severe rioting occurred in the heavily Irish populated eighth ward from six in the afternoon to about midnight. The fighting broke out after the Murder of Theodore Rhodes who was attacked by two Irishmen whose names vary in sources.[66] This happened on Chapel Street which was around the corner of Quinn's Row.[67] Quinn's Row was a part of Main Street between 10th and 11th streets that was made up of houses owned by Francis Quinn.[68] The homes were built by Francis Quinn from the fortune he inherited from his father John Quinn who was an investment banker. Francis invested in real estate that became known as Quinn's Row which was occupied by several Irish tenants.[69] According to eye witness Captain Thomas, Rhodes was accompanied by a Mr. Graham and was chasing two Irishmen after severely beating a third.[70] After the news of Rhodes being killed and Graham being severely wounded spread, a large mob accompanied by the court house cannon that had been removed from the lawn and pushed down Main Street arrived at Quinn's row at approximately seven o'clock in the evening. When the mob arrived there were several shots were fired from the homes. The mob in turn decided to burn down the homes with the ultimate result of twelve houses being burnt down and an unknown number of people being trapped in homes

62 Yater, *Falls of the Ohio*, 69.
63 Cantrell, *Kentucky Documents and Essays*, 133.
64 *The Lousiville Daily Journal,* August 8, 1855, quoted in: McGann, *Nativism in Kentucky,* 94.
65 *Louisville Daily Courier*, August 8, 1855.
66 Cantrell, *Kentucky Documents and Essays*, 134.
67 *Louisville Daily Courier*, August 8, 1855.
68 McGann, *Nativism in Kentucky*, 95.
69 Kleber, *Encyclopedia of Louisville,* 741.
70 *Louisville Daily Courier*, August 9, 1855.

and burnt alive.[71] Some people attempted to run out of the burning buildings but ran back into the flames after being confronted by the mob and gunfire. Many men tried to escape in blankets and dressed as women in hopes of being spared.[72] Francis Quinn came out and tried to plea with the mob but was stabbed, shot, and thrown back into the flaming building.[73] A gruesome first-hand account that was verified by several sources was the story of the Long Boys on Quinn's Row. The boys were sons of Robert Long, an Irish grocery owner.[74] Mary Carroll was a young girl during the riots and recalls what she saw from her father's house.

> Not much attention was paid to me and I remember running to the different windows to watch the crowd and the fires. The Know-Nothings wore masks and were running hither and thither through the middle of the street. Mrs. Long, mother of Denis Long, saw her two sons hanged to the banister of her home, and the house burned down over them.[75]

The Courier confirms the tragic story of the Long boys and added that two were killed but that one escaped.[76] Mary Carroll's account tells more than just the Long family incident. She was the daughter of John Carroll who had a store in the eighth ward where principal Irishmen met which made his store a target for mobs. Mary Carroll describes the attack,

> The Know-Nothings brought their cannon and placed it before our house, shouting 'Blow down John Carroll's castle of a house, at that time the largest building in that section. Mr. Dupont, owner of the paper mills and one of themselves, stood with his negro servant in the middle door of the store and told them they would blow down over his dead body. They would not dare hurt him, so they moved the cannon three doors above, in front of Denis Long's house.[77]

Mobs were interviewed that day about what they were seeing in the eighth ward and it was truly shown just how segregated the people were when one

71 Cantrell, *Kentucky Documents and Essays,* 134.
72 *Louisville Daily Courier*, August 9, 1855.
73 *Louisville Daily Journal*, August 8, 1855.
74 McGann, *Nativism in Kentucky*, 95.
75 McGann, *Nativism in Kentucky*, 96.
76 *Louisville Daily Courier*, August 8, 1855.
77 McGann, *Nativism in Kentucky*, 96.

man replied, "not many whites, just Irish."[78]

A fair question while picturing the violence that took place would be, where were the authorities? Although present at the scenes of rioting, there was little they could do. The fire department came to stop the flames at Quinn's Row but received threats from the mob and had no choice but to let the houses burn.[79] The police simply did not have enough force to control the mobs especially since many were busy working the polls and breaking up fights there. Even medical help was attempted but denied. Dr. D Riley tried to go to the jail and tend to the wounded rioters and immigrants but was denied entrance.[80] Even the Catholic Church tried to help when Reverend Karl Boeswald went to visit a dying parishioner to bless him but was killed by a mob throwing stones. Although there is no evidence he was targeted, the reverend was unable to assist parishioners as he intended.[81]

The last reported incident of the Bloody Monday riots was when the mobs attacked the newspapers. Being that the mob was made up of mostly Know-Nothing party members, the Journal was left alone. The mobs turned towards the *Louisville Daily Courier* and the *Louisville Times* at approximately midnight. There was no major damage done to the buildings aside from windows that were broken and the front sign of the Times that was burned. Although the mobs did not destroy the building, the workers were trapped inside for fear of confronting the mob and could not get its reporters in or out. This affected the output of the news which the Courier apologized for, "Threats repeatedly made during yesterday evening and last night that the mob would attack our office…we are consequently unable to give all the news we have edited."[82]

In the aftermath of the riots people began to wonder who was to blame. The *Louisville Daily Journal* and the *Louisville Daily Courier* had opposing views on where the blame lay. The Courier said, "We repeat the foreigners were so freighted made against them so early in the morning that they did not even attempt to go to the polls." They continue the same article, "The most ridiculous and exaggerated reports of the election riots on Monday are flying through the country."[83] Clearly the Courier believed the blame was on the members of the mobs that roamed the streets. The Journal believes the exact opposite when it expressed that, "There is a terrible responsibility somewhere and the proper parties, let them be who they may, must bear it. One thing at least is now known. The foreigners in this city, more especially the Catholic Irish…

78 Cantrell, *Kentucky Documents and Essays*, 134.
79 Cantrell, *Kentucky Documents and Essays,* 134.
80 *Louisville Daily Courier*, August 9, 1855.
81 Yater, *Falls of the Ohio*, 69.
82 *Louisville Daily Courier*, August 9, 1855.
83 Louisville Daily Courier, August 10, 1855.

were armed to the teeth."[84]

Regardless how real the blame was, the fear was very real for the people of Louisville. The city was worried for the revival of riots for many days following Bloody Monday and most businesses were closed.[85] The deaths were also very real. Both the Courier and the Journal published the coroner's report with the listed names: William Graham, Theodore Rhoades, John Hudson, Powell Rothhopt, and Joseph Allison.[86] The next day Dennis Diordan, John Chevers, and two others that were indistinguishable from burns were named in the Courier.[87] The Journal published the Coroner's list of names that included similar names to the Courier's article along with the Irishman Pat Murphy.[88] The total death count is most accurately placed at 19-22 but no one is certain.[89]

When the chaos had ended, the election results were released. The imbalance of the vote is portrayed through the number of voter outcome. Out of the 1,600 registered voters in the heavily German populated first and second wards, only 173 votes were cast, not even eleven percent. The eighth ward, with the stubborn Irish, had a turnout of thirty-five percent with 218 votes cast out of 620 registered voters.[90] Know- Nothing candidate Charles Morehead would win the governor's seat by almost 2,000 votes along with Know-Nothing Humphrey Marshall being elected to the senate by nearly the same margin.[91]

The immediate effect on the city of Louisville as a result of the riots was a change in immigration trends. There was a drastic drop in immigrants that settled in Louisville along with many foreigners who left the city. Many Irish went to Cincinnati under a promise from the Mayor that they would be protected. Many German families migrated to Kansas. Germans also formed emigration societies and moved in groups to cities like Chicago, Milwaukee, and New Orleans. According to the Courier, as early as two days after the riots, immigrants were leaving the city. After Bloody Monday, there were not many future immigrants that came to Louisville. The result was that Cincinnati prospered with the growing population which allowed Louisville to fall behind.[92]

Like much of history, it is hard to depict the exact truth of what really occurred that Monday in 1855. However there is a slight glimpse caught in this description. Louisville was unfortunately the breeding ground for contempt between political parties, and the city acted too late to prevent the massacre.

84 Louisville Daily Journal, August 7, 1855.
85 McGann, *Nativism in Kentucky*, 60.
86 Louisville Daily Courier, August 8, 1855.
87 Louisville Daily Courier, August 9, 1855.
88 Louisville Daily Journal, August 8, 1855.
89 Cantrell, *Kentucky Documents and Essays*, 135.
90 McGann, *Nativism in Kentucky*, 101.
91 Louisville Daily Courier, August 8, 1855.
92 McGann, *Nativism in Kentucky*, 110.

The Bloody Monday riots certainly impacted Louisville negatively seeing as how all the cities to which the immigrants originally from Louisville migrated to continued to grow in size while Louisville's rapid population growth prior to the election all but diminished. Much is open to speculation and interpretation, but in the end the unnecessary tragedy brought forth from the political differences of the time cannot be overlooked.

Alexander "A.J." Glaser is a junior history major at Murray State University. A.J. is an active member of the Xi Lambda Chapter of Phi Alpha Theta and plans to continue his historical studies after receiving his undergraduate degree. This is his first undergraduate publication.

Reviews

Kentucky Bourbon Whiskey: An American Heritage. By Michael R. Veach. (Lexington, KY: University Press of Kentucky, 2013. 141 pp. $24.95.)

Review by J. Michael Johnson

A new wave of bourbon mania has swept through the Bluegrass State in the past several years. With the development of the famed Bourbon Trail by the Kentucky Distillers' Association in 1999, bourbon has been an active part of Kentucky's cultural heritage tourism scene. While the popular spirit has brought new attention to the heritage and history of the Commonwealth, the history of bourbon itself has rarely been presented in a survey format accessible to readers with various levels of interest in the story of the Kentucky treasure. Michael R. Veach, Associate Curator of Special Collections at Louisville's Filson Historical Society, has provided a remedy for this deficiency in bourbon historical literature. His book, Kentucky Bourbon Whiskey: An American Heritage, provides amateur enthusiasts and aficionados alike with a solid survey text that addresses the primary themes of the history of Kentucky bourbon.

Perhaps central to any scholarly discussion of bourbon history is a comment on the very origin of bourbon whiskey. Veach tackles this very point by refuting the widespread myth that Elijah Craig was the first distiller of the signature spirit (22). While Veach explains that a view exempting Craig as the first bourbon distiller was accepted prior to his book, he is the first author to offer a new plausible explanation for bourbon's origin which focuses on a Kentucky mill (28). Enter two brothers – Louis and John Tarascon of France. Veach offers a string of plausible logic to support his deduction. Due to the Tarascon's origins in the Cognac region, they would have been familiar with aging wine in toasted and charred oak barrels, the very characteristic that distinguishes Kentucky bourbon whiskey. Given their shipping company's location in Shippingport, Kentucky, the Tarascons "were in the perfect position to purchase whiskey coming down the river, age it, ship the better-tasting product to New Orleans, and sell it" (29). Veach is quick to observe that his

is not the definitive explanation, however it is a stimulating new possibility in the ongoing saga of the elusive first bourbon maker.

In addition to his contribution to perhaps the most prominent missing piece of the bourbon puzzle, Veach also offers an extensive discourse on the long and complex relationship between bourbon and taxation, as well as regulation. Beginning with the first permanent excise tax levied on distilled spirits in 1862, the federal government began to develop an increasingly visible role in regulating distilleries in the United States. As Veach points out, however, the larger distilleries were not totally opposed to such governmental involvement. "The distillers were not in principle opposed to regulations and taxes…In fact, in some instances they even encouraged increased regulation" (66). However, with increased regulation and taxation came new opportunities for larger distilleries to flex their economic and political muscle, as well as find ways around the new taxes. The infamous Whiskey Ring scandal of 1875 demonstrated that the burgeoning industry was no stranger to graft. The scam worked by distillers arranging deals with regulators to measure only half of the amount of whiskey distilled daily; the remaining whiskey would then be sold for equal market value as the taxed whiskey, and the profits were split between the distillers and the regulators (65). Sixteen distilleries were seized and 240 arrests were made when authorities became aware of the illicit activities (66). Even President Grant was implicated in the affair, as his personal secretary, O. E. Babcock was arrested and tried for tax fraud, though he was later acquitted (66).

Though the scandal demonstrated that the distilleries were not impervious to graft and corruption, as the years went on they focused their efforts on legitimate lobbying efforts such as their numerous successful attempts to protect distilleries from 'rectifiers' – "wholesale merchants…who would purchase cheap whiskey, "rectify" (i.e., purify and/or flavor) it, and then resell it" (p. 45). Those efforts were realized in the Bottled-in-Bond Act of 1897, which established legal stipulations as to the conditions under which whiskey could be produced and labeled (70). Additionally, bourbon distillers successfully pressured Congress numerous times to alter the bonding periods established by law. These periods represented a sort of grace period for the whiskey to be distilled and aged in the barrel – the longer the bonding period, the more whiskey could be absorbed into the wood and lost to evaporation, thus lowering the amount of whiskey subject to taxation (67).

Aside from the popular intrigue that typically surrounds corruption and political dealing, Veach offers other valuable points to demonstrate that distilleries were not interested in producing spirits often attributed with a societal burden. For instance, after Prohibition was lifted, distillers worked together to establish a self-regulating Code of Responsible Practices in 1934.

The Code's six tenets included not advertising in Sunday newspapers, and not utilizing radio or images of women and children in advertisements (p. 92). This attention to ethical practices was an exercise both in self-interest with regard to public image as well as proactive positioning to avoid a prohibition-style backlash in the future. Adherence to the Code continued informally until 1973, when the Distilled Spirits Council of the United States utilized the Code as the basis for its own list of responsible practices (92).

Such tidbits that are widely unknown to the general public demonstrate the important contribution of Veach's book to the collection of bourbon historical texts. Complete with small, trivia-style informational text boxes scattered throughout the book, Kentucky Bourbon Whiskey is a somewhat deceptive wealth of knowledge when one considers its relatively short length of 141 pages. Perhaps the most important aspect of Veach's work is the plethora of primary source material it incorporates, including historical recipes for various bourbons and blended whiskeys from throughout the nineteenth century. With extensive endnotes for each chapter and a well organized index, Kentucky Bourbon Whiskey is sure to be a valuable resource for anyone seeking to advance their knowledge or begin searching for valuable primary sources on bourbon history as well as history of Kentucky and the distilling industry in the United States.

J. Michael Johnson is a graduate student in the Master of Arts in Public History program at Northern Kentucky University. He graduated from NKU with a Bachelor of Arts in History and was inducted into Phi Alpha Theta in 2011.