THE MICHIGAN JOURNAL OF HISTORY

VOLUME XIX

2022-2023

A LETTER FROM THE EDITOR IN CHIEF

Dear Reader,

On behalf of our 2022-2023 MJH Editorial Team, I am delighted to reveal the nineteenth issue of the Michigan Journal of History. In the past year, our team received almost sixty submissions from university students across the United States and abroad. During the Winter 2023 semester, our team shouldered two intensive rounds of edits to narrow down a vast field of quality papers. The following five finalists each had an eye for overlooked and underappreciated history and demonstrated their aptitude in crafting engaging historical arguments.

I would like to give thanks to our editorial team. Thank you to Bella, our managing editor, for your frequent and consistent support: next year's journal staff is in good hands. Thank you to our senior editors, Aniket, Maddie L., and Nicolas, for your commitment to leading your teams. Thank you to our associate editors: Buck, Chris, Connor, Gabi, Helena, Jes, John, Maddie R., Olivia, Skyler, Vince, and Will. For many of you, this was your first year, and you all stepped up. I was very impressed by the initiative that each of you displayed during the past semester and I am excited to see what more you can accomplish in the next few years. Working with all of our editors was a pleasure, and I wish each of you the best of luck with your future endeavors. Thank you to my predecessor Sundus Al Ameen: your guidance was crucial to our success this year. A special thanks to our faculty advisor Professor Perrin Selcer for helping our team navigate the publication process. Congratulations again to all of our finalists. We thank you again for choosing to work with us, and we encourage you to continue to write and submit your work.

Best regards,

Drew Meinecke

Editor-in-Chief, Michigan Journal of History

EDITORIAL TEAM

TABLE OF CONTENTS

The Many Personas of Yukio Mishima: From Success to Suicide

Jane Cohen

The College of William and Mary

On November 25th, 1970, five men stormed the Ichigaya headquarters of the Japanese Self-Defense Forces, took General Kanetoshi Mashida hostage, and forced the men stationed there to listen to a litany of shocking assertions and demands for the defensive military forces to perform a coup d'etat on the Japanese government. Yukio Mishima, one of the most acclaimed authors of post-war Japan, was the individual giving this speech. By the end of the day, Yukio Mishima would be dead after committing ritual *seppuku* inside the general's office.[1]

In the following days, many questioned why one of the most crucial authors of post-war Japan would commit such a violent act. Although many were shocked, others praised Mishima for achieving the pinnacle of the aesthetic he had built throughout his career, even through his final action. His suicide forced many to reconsider his literary works in a new light, while others were so disgusted by his actions that they argued his final moments were a threat to democracy itself.[2] This essay chronologically considers Mishima's persona as a novelist, playwright, actor, and eventually political activist, and how he utilized the media in Japan and the United States to further his popularity and spark controversy. Mishima's appearance in both Japanese and United States media, his presentation of himself in two of his most famous works: *Confessions of a Mask* (1949) and *Sun and Steel* (1968), his personal explorations into cinema, photography, and eventually organized militia served to separate him from other Japanese authors of the time. His exploration of multi-media apart from his literary works, something that had not been explored by either Mishima's predecessors or peers, established a personal legacy of pushing against Japan's societal boundaries.

Mishima experienced tumultuous relationships with fellow novelists and literary critics throughout his career, due to his forceful right-wing politics and personal explorations into his

[1] *Seppuku* is the Japanese method of ritual suicide, involving self-disembowelment and then beheading by a second; Henry Scott Stokes, *The Life and Death of Yukio Mishima* (New York: Cooper Square Press, 2000), 11-34.
[2] "Mishima's End Evokes Variety of Reactions," *Japan Times* (Tokyo, Japan), Nov. 26, 1970.

own aesthetic: the ideological and visual motifs in his works.[3] The aesthetics of fascism in Japan are the foundation of Mishima and are what surrounded the writer's upbringing. Religious glorification of the Emperor and the military characterized fascism in Japan.[4] With a family with high social standing and a father in service of the government, Mishima learned at a young age to support the Japanese empire wholeheartedly.[5] He showed an obsession with ritualistic suicide, religious faith in the Emperor, and the achievement of both an ideal mind and body through literary excellence and intense military-style bodybuilding.[6] In contrast to his religious obsession with military service, in one of the most pivotal moments of his life, Mishima feigned having a Tubercular infection during his draft examination to avoid the front lines during World War II.[7] This allowed the young Mishima to intensely romanticize the war as it stayed within his imagination.[8] When the war finally ended, Mishima described an existential dread that took hold of him and began his search for his own military strength in his post-war works and political actions.[9] The world of media Mishima grew up surrounded by allows for a further understanding of Mishima's career, successes, and persona.

Mishima grew up in a rapidly changing Japan, with incredible political and economic developments of the early twentieth century defining his early childhood. For hundreds of years before the Meiji Restoration, Japan remained isolated from the rest of the world. However, this all changed when Japan opened its borders during the late nineteenth century, modernizing at a

---

[3] Stokes, *The Life and Death of Yukio Mishima*, 87, 90, 130, 131.
[4] Alan Tansman, *The Aesthetics of Japanese Fascism*, 1st ed., vol. 1 (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2009), 7, 11, 18.
[5] Stokes, *The Life and Death of Yukio Mishima*, 37.
[6] Stokes, *The Life and Death of Yukio Mishima*, 37, 39, 74, 75; Yukio Mishima, *Sun and Steel*, trans. John Bester (Medina: Medina University Press International, 1982), 15, 25, 82; Ian Gorman, "Book Review: Mishima's Guide to Manliness," *Japan Times* (Tokyo, Japan), Sept. 8, 1970; Herbert Mitgang, "Prophetic Stories From Mishima," *New York Times* (New York, New York), Nov. 25, 1989.
[7] Stokes, *The Life and Death of Yukio Mishima*, 80, 81.
[8] Yukio Mishima, *Confessions of a Mask*, trans. Meredith Weatherby (New York: New Directions Publishing Corporation, 1958), 24.
[9] Mishima, *Confessions of a Mask*, trans. Meredith Weatherby, 218.

rapid pace in all industries, one of which was journalism. In 1888 the first press agency was founded in Japan, beginning Japan's relationship with national news coverage through the medium of newspapers.[10] As the grip of the fascist regime within Japan tightened, the number of press agencies grew, allowing the government to use the media as a tool of propaganda. During World War II, articles in newspapers aimed to heighten nationalism among Japanese citizens and attempted to achieve unanimous support for the war effort.[11] Finally, in 1945, Japan surrendered to the Allied powers, allowing the United States to occupy Japan. By 1946, popular news sources from the United States, such as *Reader's Digest* hit newsstands in Japan, exposing Japanese audiences to Western media.[12]

Yukio Mishima's persona was formed in a Japan increasingly absorbed in its militarism and nationalism as international conflict increased in intensity. His middle magazine, *Hōjinkai asshi*, presented him with his first experience in publication.[13] When his father discovered his writing, he violently tore it up, believing that no career could come from being an author.[14] In high school, Mishima's experience in the literary world deepened as he became obsessed with the *Roman-ha* style of writing, a romantic form that is classically Japanese. However, Mishima's focus on his writing declined as the war grew more serious and he was called to work in a military factory in aid of the war effort.[15] Finally, in 1946, Mishima contacted several personal connections at monthly magazines in hopes of getting his literary career back on track. The

---

[10] William de Lange, *A History of Japanese Journalism: Japan's Press Club as the Last Obstacle to a Mature Press* (Surrey: Japan Library, 1998), 33; "PACIFIC RIM," *Communication Booknotes Quarterly* 30, no. 1 (1999): 19, accessed July 21, 2022, https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&AuthType=cookie,ip,url,shib&db=ufh&AN=3349330&site=ehost-live&scope=site.
[11] Tansman, *The Aesthetics of Japanese Fascism*, 4, 5.
[12] Barak Kushner and Sato Masaharu, "Digesting Postwar Japanese Media," *Diplomatic History* 29, no. 1 (2005): 17-48, accessed July 21, 2022, doi:10.1111/j.1467-7709.2005.00458.x.
[13] Stokes, *The Life and Death of Yukio Mishima*, 55.
[14] Stokes, 55.
[15] Stokes, 70, 71, 75.

editor of *Bungei* magazine recognized Mishima's literary talent but also feared that the young author was enveloped by an "evil narcissism."[16] Even so, Mishima was introduced to renowned writer Yasunari Kawabata in 1947, who took Mishima on in a sponsorship, something extremely helpful in jump-starting the ambitious young Mishima's career. One year later, he began to write a novel that would define his early career, *Confessions of a Mask*.[17]

Heavy in metaphor, brutally honest, and critically acclaimed in the United States and Japan, *Confessions of a Mask* tells the coming-of-age story of a young Japanese man during the 1930s and 40s. The work is in the style of an I-novel, which grew in popularity and developed in Japan in the early 20th century after the Meiji Restoration. The narrator closely resembles Mishima and shares a similar childhood, however, there is no proof as to whether the actions and experiences of the narrator are shared with Mishima himself.[18] The text describes the narrator's "confessions" of homosexuality, trauma, and suicidal ideation. A common theme of the novel is that of internalized violence and personal struggle, from an upbringing by an overbearing grandmother to his sexual fantasies regarding injuring imagined partners. These elements reflect elements of Mishima's own life experiences, revealing that other elements of the novel may have held some truth to them as well, such as the narrator's struggle with his sexual desire for men and its conflict with society's expectations.[19] The text, even in translation, is filled with elaborate descriptions and self-reflections. One example of this is when the narrator describes his homosexuality through an obsessive fascination with a knight in one of his childhood picture books who he "believed would be killed the next instant." When a sick nurse reveals to the narrator that this figure is a woman, Joan of Arc, he feels "a repugnance."[20] In describing his

[16] Stokes, *The Life and Death of Yukio Mishima*, 87.
[17] Stokes, 88, 89.
[18] Michael Cronin, "The 'Eye' Novel" (seminar, William & Mary, Williamsburg, VA, July 22, 2022).
[19] Mishima, *Confessions of a Mask*, trans. Meredith Weatherby, 15, 40, 61.
[20] Mishima, *Confessions of a Mask*, trans. Meredith Weatherby, 11-13.

horror at a crossdressing woman, one can suppose that the narrator reveals his feelings toward men in battle and his attraction toward them.

During this early period in Mishima's career, Japanese literary critics were excited by a new, young author with a unique writing style and content matter. On January 24, 1950, Mishima's name was first mentioned in the *Asahi Shimbun*, in an article taking a general look at the world of publication in Japan.[21] By the following year, a review of Mishima's novel *Forbidden Colors* described the work as "a novel that all other novelists need to read," an astoundingly positive review in one of the largest publications in the country.[22] Within two years he was mentioned quite frequently in headlines, reviews, and profiles as a unique author and personality. In fact, his first *Collected Works* was published in 1953, an incredible accomplishment for an author of such a young age.[23] Mishima began to hyper-fixate on immense praise from both the public and literary critics and to shape his persona to increase media attention. For instance, in 1956, he took a second trip to the United States, drawing attention to himself with the extravagance of his trip prompting his first mention in the *New York Times*.[24] Although his actions reflected that he wished to impress as many people as possible, they also showed that he aimed to surprise and shock them.

In 1958, Mishima's mother was diagnosed with cancer and told that she had little time before the disease would kill her.[25] At this point, Mishima was in his thirties, and questions had arisen regarding his sexuality as there had been several witnesses to homosexual behavior, his use of homosexual themes in both *Confessions of a Mask* and *Forbidden Colors*, and his lack of

---

[21] *Shimbun* here can be translated as "newspaper", the *Asahi Shimbun* was one of the more prominent newspapers in Japan in the mid-twentieth century; "Diagnosing the Publishing World in 1950," *Asahi Shimbun* (Osaka, Japan), Jan. 24, 1950.
[22] "Review of *Forbidden Colors*," *Asahi Shimbun*, trans. Masako Heffernen (Osaka, Japan), Dec. 15, 1951.
[23] Stokes, *The Life and Death of Yukio Mishima*, 108.
[24] "Some Visitors From Abroad," *New York Times* (New York, New York), Jun. 03, 1956.
[25] Stokes, *The Life and Death of Yukio Mishima*, 119, 120.

relationships with women.[26] To set his dying mother at ease, Yukio Mishima married Yoko Sugiyama the same year as his mother's diagnosis.[27] Although he was conforming to societal norms in his marriage to Sugiyama, his house with his wife was anything but conforming. It was boisterous, modern, and grandiose– the very opposite of Japanese norms.[28] This both drew attention to the author and disturbed Japanese audiences with its garishness. At this point in his life, Mishima began to test the boundaries of Japanese society not only through his writing but also through his personal activities.[29]

The first difficulties in Mishima's literary career began to appear in 1960 after his publication of the novel *Kyoko no Ie*, which was largely unsuccessful among the Japanese public. After over a decade of success and exponential growth in popularity as both a novelist and playwright, this was his first serious professional obstacle. That same year he decided to act in the cheesily written *yakuza* film *Karakkaze Yarō*, which brought forth further criticism as Japanese literary critics saw his exploration into the world of acting as both immature and distasteful.[30] However, the most publicized of Mishima's complications that year regarded his work entitled *After the Banquet*, which, although received favorably by critics, was clearly based on former foreign minister Hachiro Arita's adultery.[31] In response, Arita sued Mishima in 1961, bringing forth Mishima's first serious controversy widely discussed in the press. From 1961 until 1963, when Arita won the lawsuit, the drama-filled headlines of both the *Japan Times* and *Asahi Shimbun* drew attention to Mishima and his works in an entirely different manner. No longer was

[26] Stokes, *The Life and Death of Yukio Mishima*, 91.
[27] Stokes, 119, 120.
[28] Stokes, 121, 122.
[29] Stokes, 121, 122.
[30] Stokes, 124, 125, 128, 129.
[31] Stokes, 129.

Mishima the unproblematic young author with unique opinions; rather, for the first time he was facing serious professional repercussions for his behavior.[32]

1960 also saw great amounts of political upheaval as the Japanese government renewed the US-Japan Security Treaty, continuing a close military alliance between the two nations and allowing United States troops to continue to be stationed within Japan.[33] This decision brought forth opposition, especially amongst Japanese students, against continued American influence and control over Japan militarily.[34] This piqued Mishima's interest in Japanese politics for the first time since the end of the war, which quickly influenced his writing. Mishima published *Patriotism* in 1960, which tells the story of one of the lieutenants during the *Ni Ni Roku* Incident in 1936, an uprising against the imperial army, in which the main character commits *seppuku.*[35] No longer were Mishima's literary endeavors merely personal reflections and poetic prose, but now aimed at making political commentary, reflecting on one of the most controversial events to occur during World War II in support of imperialism.[36]

Feeling dejected by both the Japanese media and his peers in the literary world, Mishima began to focus on exploring ways in which he could draw even further attention to himself, even if it meant facing harsh criticism from elites in the world of Japanese literature. In 1963, the collection of photographs published as *Ordeal by Roses* featured Mishima in various poses, often erotic, amongst roses and thorns.[37] In most photographs, he is almost completely in the nude, and

---

[32] Stokes, *The Life and Death of Yukio Mishima*, 127-130; "Ex-Minister Sues Novelist Mishima," *Japan Times* (Tokyo, Japan), Mar. 16, 1961*;* "'Infringement of Privacy' Mr. Arita suing Mr. Mishima, Legal Controversy Attracting Attention," *Asahi Shimbun* (Osaka, Japan), Mar. 16, 1961; "'Privacy Trial' to Full Fledged Trial," *Asahi Shimbun* (Osaka, Japan), Jan. 12, 1962.
[33] Stokes, *The Life and Death of Yukio Mishima*, 132.
[34] Stokes, 132.
[35] Stokes, 132, 133, 195-200.
[36] Stokes, 132.
[37] Eikoh Hosoe, *Ordeal by Roses #33*, 1961-1962, gelatin-silver photograph, Tokyo, Japan, https://www.theguardian.com/artanddesign/gallery/2016/nov/03/yukio-mishima-erotic-portraits-eikoh-hosoe-ordeal-by-roses-in-pictures; Eikoh Hosoe, *Ordeal by Roses #32*, 1961-1962, gelatin-silver photograph, Tokyo, Japan, https://www.theguardian.com/artanddesign/gallery/2016/nov/03/yukio-mishima-erotic-portraits-eikoh-hosoe-ordeal-by-roses-in-pictures; Eikoh Hosoe, *Ordeal by Roses #06*, 1961-1962, gelatin-silver photograph, Tokyo, Japan,

in several, he is tied up, images which would have shocked the Japanese public. Neither the Japan Times nor the *Asahi Shimbun* acknowledged this collection, viewing these photographs as Mishima merely being eccentric. By this point in his career, Mishima was no longer looking towards the critics for praise and approval; instead, he went about any means necessary to bring attention to himself.

In 1965, the first volume of Mishima's final work, considered by many as the literary accumulation of his career, was published with the title *Spring Snow*. The four-part novel tells a story of reincarnation, love, and friendship. Many common themes found in his other works such as premature death and suicide also appear.[38] This work quickly drew the attention of the media, receiving relatively positive reviews from critics. Not long after this publication, rumors began to spread that the Nobel Prize for Literature would soon pick a Japanese author as its winner. At the time Mishima was on a tour of Europe to increase his international fame and continue to bathe in the reputation that he had created for himself internationally. Asking around at Japanese embassies in Europe, Mishima discovered that the rumors were correct and that the prize would soon be awarded to a Japanese author, which he quickly relayed to friends and family.[39] As rumors spread, headlines quickly insinuated that Mishima was one of the finalists for the literary prize, one in the *Asahi Shimbun* reading, "Is Mr. Mishima Too Young?"[40] By furthering the gossip surrounding the prize, Mishima created media buzz, leading those who read the newspapers to be more interested in his literary accomplishments. His love of attention and shock fed off of the awe at someone being considered for an internationally renowned prize at such a young age. In 1968, acclaimed Japanese author Kawabata won the award instead.[41] Even

---

https://www.theguardian.com/artanddesign/gallery/2016/nov/03/yukio-mishima-erotic-portraits-eikoh-hosoe-ordeal-by-roses-in-pictures.

[38] Stokes, *The Life and Death of Yukio Mishima*, 139, 140.

[39] Stokes, 140, 141.

[40] "Is Mr. Mishima Too Young?," *Asahi Shimbun* (Osaka, Japan), Sept. 27, 1965.

[41] Stokes, *The Life and Death of Yukio Mishima*, 160.

so, until Mishima's death, rumors continued to circulate regarding him being awarded the prize, such as a 1970 *New York Times* article that described him as a "maybe soon Nobel Prize winner."[42]

As Mishima's popularity surged internationally throughout the 1960s, his interest in politics continued to define his persona. He took up bodybuilding, something that American and Japanese audiences alike found curious.[43] He also began to share his opinions of the Emperor and military, solidifying his right-wing political views in the public eye. By 1968, the belief that he must achieve the perfect body in order to achieve his true potential – the ability to commit ritual seppuku – had fully cemented itself in his psyche, and was revealed in his essay: *Sun and Steel.*[44]

Sun and Steel presents a Mishima that is incredibly self-aware and narcissistic in his obsession with his own mind and body. In one part of the essay, he acknowledges his contradictory writing that appears throughout this text, writing, "cynics—well aware that there is nobody who despises the imagination so thoroughly as the dreamer, whose dreams are a process of the imagination—will, I am sure, scoff at my confession in their own minds."[45] Here, he implies that his own shift in how he views the world (focusing more on the active, present body, than the imagined) is contradictory to his past identity as a writer. In fact, there is pretension in this particular work, as Mishima formulates increasingly complex metaphors that often become tangential arguments that are incredibly difficult to comprehend, even in translation. Mishima's essay has a condescending tone when describing his own journey in bodybuilding and the impacts it had on his outlook on the world, utilizing descriptions that are hard to follow and looking down on anyone who has not reached his same conclusions about the mind and body.

---

[42] Philip Shabecoff, "You've Heard of Yukio Mishima, novelist, general, swordsman, karate student, movie star, lecturer, bon vivant and maybe soon Nobel Prize Winner?," *New York Times* (New York, New York), Aug. 2, 1970.
[43] Stokes, *The Life and Death of Yukio Mishima*, 203-205.
[44] Mishima, *Sun and Steel*, trans. John Bester.
[45] Mishima, *Sun and Steel*, trans. John Bester, 41.

His condescension became clear as he described having a bulging belly or flat chest as "shameless indecency."[46] compares his own suicidal ideation, interestingly, to an apple, and even writes that an early death was "a sign of the love of the Gods" according to the Greeks.[47] In each of these examples, he holds himself on a pedestal because he has achieved his new muscular form, a trait that puts him above his peers. The distance Mishima created between fellow Japanese writers and himself was only further extended by his focus on his physical form, something that he managed to intellectualize as a separate entity from his mind.[48]

1968 was also the year in which Mishima formed his *Tatenokai*, a small militia that consisted almost entirely of college-age rightists. Mishima funded and trained these young men, running them through military exercises with the aid of the Self Defense Forces.[49] Henry Scott Stokes, journalist and author of *The Life and Death of Yukio Mishima*, met with Mishima's *Tatenokai* and remarked on the way that the young men viewed Mishima as a God-like figure, sharing their belief in the divinity of the Emperor and also making comparisons between the Emperor and Mishima himself.[50] There were no mentions of the militia's existence in either the *Japan Times* or the *Asahi Shimbun* until Mishima's suicide in November of 1970, while the *New York Times* published an extensive article on Mishima as a writer and nonconformist and his *Tatenokai* covered on the first page.[51] Mishima's divergent portrayals in each country reveal the vastly divergent legacy of Mishima in Japan and in the United States. The United States was particularly interested in Mishima as a personality, while Japanese media outlets focused on his literary contributions.

---

[46] Mishima, *Sun and Steel*, trans. John Bester, 15.
[47] Mishima, *Sun and Steel*, trans. John Bester, 62, 65.
[48] Mishima, *Sun and Steel*, trans. John Bester, 14-16.
[49] Stokes, *The Life and Death of Yukio Mishima*, 158, 205-207, 211.
[50] Stokes, *The Life and Death of Yukio Mishima*, 220, 221.
[51] Shabecoff, "You've heard of Yukio Mishima…," *New York Times* (New York, New York), Aug. 2, 1970.

Mishima performed his last and most impactful act on November 25, 1970, when Mishima and three of his compatriots took a general hostage and Mishima sliced open his own stomach, committing *seppuku*. He left the world with a final action, horrifying audiences around the world. The United States, countries across Europe, and China were incredibly disturbed by this display of nationalism, sharing fears of Japanese militarism which they believed Mishima's actions to be a sign of.[52] The Liberal Democratic Party, the most powerful political party in Japan, described the coup attempt as "madness against democracy," even after acknowledging their previous support of Mishima's artistry.[53] Headlines questioned Mishima's motives, wondering if his actions were a result of his philosophy or an underlying personality disorder.[54] Japan's Prime Minister Eisaku Sato stated that Mishima "must have gone crazy" and one *New York Times* article described the Tatenokai uniform as "Nazi-style".[55] Meanwhile, the Japanese public showed an array of reactions, some praising Mishima in his final action, impressed by his pursuit of his beliefs, even in death.[56] One twenty-two-year-old student, expelled from college for campus violence, even showed admiration for Mishima in an interview with the *Japan Times*.[57]

Yukio Mishima was a brilliant man and artist, fully aware of the impacts that his death would have on the world. More importantly, to him, he was well aware of the lasting effects that his ritual suicide would leave on his legacy, making him an author that was unforgettable both

---

[52] "Japanese on Military Path Again: Senator," *Japan Times* (Tokyo, Japan), Nov. 27, 1970; "London Times Notes Suspicion of Japan," *Japan Times* (Tokyo, Japan), Nov. 28, 1970; "The Mishima Incident Shocks Both at Home and Abroad, Heightened Wariness of Japan, Responses from Various Countries, Unforgivable Acts of Terrorism, Government and Liberal Democratic Party in Crisis of Constitutional Order," *Asahi Shimbun*, trans. Masako Heffernen (Osaka, Japan), Nov. 26, 1970.
[53] "The Mishima Incident Shocks Both at Home and Abroad…," *Asahi Shimbun*, trans. Masako Heffernen (Osaka, Japan), Nov. 27, 1970.
[54] "The Mishima Incident: Philosophy Towards Life or Purely Madness?," *Asahi Shimbun*, trans. Masako Heffernen (Osaka, Japan), Nov. 25, 1970.
[55] "Japanese Novelist Kills Self in Protest," *New York Times* (New York, New York), Nov. 25. 1970.
[56] "Mishima's End Evokes Variety of Reactions," *Japan Times* (Tokyo, Japan), Nov. 26, 1970.
[57] "Mishima's End Evokes Variety of Reactions," *Japan Times* (Tokyo, Japan), Nov. 26, 1970.

through his literary accomplishments and his personal actions. In forming his final persona and how he would be remembered, he ensured that he not only shocked the world and filled international headlines, but would continue to be an intellectual curiosity for decades to come. Today, educational Mishima conferences are held every year and many consider him to be an iconic figure of the LGBTQ+ community. His novels continue to sell out, and many still question the motives of his demise.[58] Mishima's works are still being translated, including some of his earlier articles published in women's magazines during the 1940s.[59] He accomplished exactly what he wanted and described in many of his works throughout his life, early death in a young and beautiful body, continuing his aesthetic even in death.

[58] Irmela Hijiya-Kirschnereit, "Mishima in the World: 50 Years Later," Nippon.com, Digimarc, Nov. 2, 2020, https://www.nippon.com/en/japan-topics/g00961/; Laura Darling, "Oct 1: Yukio Mishima," Making Queer History, Making Queer History, Oct. 1, 2017, https://www.makingqueerhistory.com/articles/2017/10/1/yukio-mishima.
[59] Michael Cronin, "Translation of Yukio Mishima's works at the Present" (seminar, William & Mary, Williamsburg, VA, July 22, 2022).

“A Whale of a lot Better”: A Critical Reevaluation of the Role of Race in American Foreign Policy in El Salvador

Frances England

The University of Victoria

Located in the military town of Fort Benning, Georgia is the vaguely titled Western Hemisphere Institute for Security Cooperation. It is a name that exudes an air of diplomacy and legitimacy, chosen to invoke recollections of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.[60] Yet this so-called institute is really the newest incarnation of the Army School of the Americas - a school known across Latin America for training the region's most lethal dictators and death squad leaders. The school was originally created as the Latin American Training Center-Ground Division before being changed to the U.S. Army Caribbean School in 1949. Then, in 1963, amidst an escalation of anti-Communist rhetoric and fears of the Cuban revolution spreading, the school was renamed the School of the Americas.[61] The school was formed to educate Latin American military personnel, with the curriculum quickly evolving to focus specifically on combating communist militias. Specifically, the programs placed an emphasis on counterinsurgency tactics and included the dissemination of materials that advocated for extortion, torture, and assassinations.[62] Between the 1960s and 1990s, the School of the Americas would educate hundreds of torturers, secret policemen, assassins, death squad leaders, and even dictators across Latin America.[63] As Congressman Joseph Kennedy II put it in 1997, the School of the Americas blackened the memory of the United States in "hundreds of villages throughout Latin America."[64]

Given the complexity and breadth of existing scholarship on the School of the Americas (both in English and Spanish), this paper will deal with a specific issue relating to American

---

[60] Selina Gallo-Cruz, "Protest and public relations: The reinvention of the US Army School of the Americas," *Interface* 7, no. 1 (May 2015): 323, https://www.interfacejournal.net/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/2015/06/Issue-7-1-Gallo-Cruz.pdf.

[61] Gallo-Cruz, "Protest and public relations," 323.

[62] Gallo-Cruz, "Protest and public relations," 323.

[63] "CLOSE THE ARMY SCHOOL OF THE AMERICAS," United States Congressional Record, Vol. 142, No. 138, 30 September 1996, 269, Retrieved from: https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/CREC-1996-09-30/pdf/CREC-1996-09-30.pdf.

[64] United States Congressional Record, Vol. 143, No. 115, 2, 4 September 1997, Retrieved from: https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/CREC-1997-09-04/pdf/CREC-1997-09-04.pdf.

policy surrounding the School of the Americas. It will seek to answer the question of how the legacy of white supremacist ideology impacted American political and military defenses of the School of the Americas. While there has been considerable research on the sociopolitical effects of the School of the Americas in Latin American nations as well as analysis on the ethics of continued operations (see "The Case for Closing the School of the Americas," by Bill Quigley), inquiries into American motivations and defenses for the School's existence and continuation are more scarce.[65] In particular, there is little research on the ways the continuation of 'White Man's Burden' rhetoric contributed to the language and arguments wielded by American politicians in defense of the Schools of the Americas.

Race in the United States and the racialization of Latin Americans themselves are extraordinarily complex topics, in addition to being rife with regional complexities and nuances. To mitigate this, this paper will narrow the focus further to examine the Salvadoran Civil War. This thirteen-year Civil War was punctuated by acts of brutality by School of the Americas graduates and was further stained by grotesque American coverups. Atrocities such as the 1980 assassination of Archbishop Oscar Romero, the 1981 El Mozote Massacre, the 1982 murder and rape of four American missionaries, and the 1989 murder of six Jesuit priests all count School of the Americas graduates among their perpetrators or conspirators.[66] These are merely some of the most researched and documented events, as accounts of the Salvadoran Civil War are littered

[65] Gallo-Cruz, "Protest and public relations," 322-350; Bill Quigley, "The Case for Closing the School of the Americas," *BYU Journal of Public Law* 20, no. 1 (2005): 1-34, https://heinonline.org/HOL/Page?handle=hein.journals/byujpl20&id=7&collection=journals&index=#.
[66] Lesley Gill, *The School of the Americas: Military Training and Political Violence in the Americas* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2004), 137; 198.

with stories of rape, torture, kidnapping, and murder.[67] Despite this, El Salvador continues to be cited by American politicians as a model for United States military interventions.[68]

To better make sense of these events we must turn to sociological theories of race, particularly those examining the entwinement of race and democracy. This means drawing primarily from the theories of the brilliant sociologist Stuart Hall, most importantly his idea of race as a social construct and "floating signifier" rather than a biological fact.[69] In the words of anthropologist Audrey Smedly, this framework demonstrates that while race does exist (and thus, is a variable worth studying and examining), it is a "cultural creation" and "sociocultural phenomena" rather than a tangible biological classification.[70] More recent writings, such as *Race, Racism and Development: Interrogating History, Discourse and Practice* by Kalpana Wilson and "An Agenda for thinking about 'race' in development" by Uma Kothari, re-center the role of race around international development and democracy.[71] These works are vital, given that American intervention in El Salvador was continuously influenced by nascent discourses on humanitarianism and human rights.

Within this historical context and theoretical framework in mind, this paper will re-examine many American politicians' statements from the nexus of the Salvadoran Civil War to the decade following its conclusion, as more complex narratives around United States involvement began to emerge. Through an analysis of speeches, telegrams, congressional statements, and even online publications, it becomes evident that American explanations for their

---

[67] Irina Carlota, *Everyday Revolutionaries: Gender, Violence, and Disillusionment in Postwar El Salvador* (New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 2011), 37.
[68] Rahul Mahajan, "Cheney Cites El Salvador Civil War That Killed 75,000 As Model for Afghanistan," *Democracy Now* (October 6th 2004), https://www.democracynow.org/2004/10/6/cheney_cites_el_salvador_civil_war.
[69] *Stuart Hall: Race- the Floating Signifier*, DVD, directed by Joanna Hughes, Make Spencer & Sut Jhally (Media Education Foundation: 1997).
[70] Audry Smedly, *Race in North America: Origin and Evolution of a Worldview* (London: Routledge, 1993), 4.
[71] Kalpana Wilson, *Race, Racism and Development: Interrogating History, Discourse and Practice* (New York: Zed, 2012); Uma Kothari, "An agenda for thinking about 'race' in development," *Progress in Development Studies* 6, no. 1 (2006): 9-23, https://doi.org/10.1191/1464993406ps124oa.

involvement in the Salvadoran Civil War, and their justifications of the violence committed by men they trained, were the most recent iterations of hundreds of years of racial ideology. The microcosm of School of the Americas' graduates' involvement in the Salvadoran Civil War, demonstrates how coded racial rhetoric continues to inform and legitimize American intervention in Latin America, as expressed and articulated through the continued operation of the School of the Americas.

The School of the Americas and the Salvadoran Civil War

The School of the Americas, and the wider American imperial apparatus, created bullet holes in the landscape of 1980s El Salvador. The School of the Americas had been in existence since the late 1940s, although it came to increased prominence in the 1960s after the Cuban Revolution.[72] It was created consciously as a mechanism to avoid sending American foot soldiers to Latin America, both to save money and to allow the United States to maintain the facade of prioritizing human rights.[73] In relation, its student body continuously changed to reflect patterns of American intervention and subversion in Latin America. In 1959 almost half of all trainees hailed from small, often impoverished, Central American nations, including El Salvador as well as Honduras, Nicaragua, and Guatemala.[74] By the 1970s El Salvador had risen to one of the top three nations represented in the School of the Americas, despite its population of under six million.[75] School of the Americas graduate Juan Ricardo, interviewed by Lesley Gill, stated that by the 1980s Salvadorans had formed a privileged segment within the academy. He recounted their close relationship with instructors and intimate ties to the United States: in his words, "the School of the Americas was for Salvadorans."[76]

---

[72] Gill, *The School of the Americas*, 23.
[73] Gill, *The School of the Americas,* 28.
[74] Gill, *The School of the Americas*, 72.
[75] Gill, *The School of the Americas*, 83.
[76] Gill, *The School of the Americas*, 107.

This intimacy reflected the socioeconomic background of most Salvadoran students, as well as the sustained efforts at cultural indoctrination. In El Salvador, the military-security apparatus was viewed as a powerful vehicle for middle-class men to gain wealth and, in particular, the consumerist American lifestyle it promised was tantalizing.[77] Thus, by the 1980s the Salvadoran military acted decisively in service of the oligarchy, both local and international.[78] Also worth noting is the entwinement of race and class in conceptions of Salvadoran social identity. Often the Salvadoran wealthy could trace their lineage directly to colonial-era immigration, contrasting the majority poor population who tended to self-identify as 'mestizo'.[79] Influenced by this socio-economic context, there was a persistent attempt to teach students supposed American cultural values and introduce them to an American way of life.[80] As Gill points out, this American way of life was implicitly constructed as white, heterosexual, and middle-class.[81]

These proselytizing efforts extended beyond the wealthier School of the Americas graduates. As early as the 1960s it had become customary for Salvadoran cadets to receive a few months of School of the Americas training.[82] In addition, similar training materials to those described above were also provided to the Salvadoran army itself, allowing for the dissemination of propaganda down the ranks from corporal to foot soldier.[83] Efforts like this were vital for political radicalization, as the framing of communists as inhuman terrorists and foreign invaders primed soldiers to feel no remorse when carrying out atrocities against them.[84] When analyzing

---

[77] Gill, *The School of the Americas*, 234; 235.
[78] Leigh Binford, *The El Mozote Massacre: Anthropology and Human Rights* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1996), 34.
[79] Binford, *The El Mozote Massacre*, 37.
[80] Binford, *The El Mozote Massacre*, 29.
[81] Gill, *The School of the Americas*, 30.
[82] Binford, *The El Mozote Massacre*, 47
[83] Gill, *The School of the Americas,* 49.
[84] Binford, *The El Mozote Massacre*, 55.

the violence of the Salvadoran Civil War, the conscious dehumanization of communists - sponsored and sanctified by the United States - cannot be discounted as an aggravating factor.

School of the Americas graduates can also be found in the conspirator list of nearly every infamous Salvadoran Civil War atrocity. In particular, the 1981 El Mozote Massacre is emblematic of the most disturbing elements of American culpability and complicity. It occurred in the region of North Morázon, a region of key strategic importance for the Farabundo Martí National Liberation Front (FMLN) and the Salvadoran state. North Morázon was largely agricultural and impoverished; however, its civilians were well-integrated into capitalist systems of production — North Morázon is a major coffee exporter — and knowledgeable about liberation theology.[85] While peasants in Morázon regularly experienced violence and extrajudicial assassinations, the El Mozote Massacre is unique for the coordinated planning by the United States-trained Atlacatl Battalion.[86] On December 10th, 1981, soldiers gathered inhabitants of El Mozote in the town center and forced them to lie facedown on the ground where they were left for hours, some blindfolded or tied up.[87] Then the soldiers systematically slaughtered the civilians, shooting most of them multiple times in the head, and decapitating others. The soldiers raped women and girls, killed infants, mutilated bodies, burned homes, and slaughtered cattle.[88] They performed a Scorched Earth operation on a defenseless peasant village.

The El Mozote Massacre is only one of countless human rights abuses committed by School of the Americas graduates during the Civil War. According to Tutela Legal, as cited by Binford, in 1981 the Salvadoran "army, security forces, and paramilitaries" murdered 13,353 citizens."[89] Smaller injustices, such as embezzlement and fraud, were also rampant among

[85] Binford, *The El Mozote Massacre*, 18.
[86] Binford, *The El Mozote Massacre*, 18.
[87] Binford, *The El Mozote Massacre*, 21.
[88] Binford, *The El Mozote Massacre*, 28.
[89] Binford, *The El Mozote Massacre*, 60.

graduates as many prioritized appropriating funds (frequently coming from the United States) over adequately performing their assigned tasks.[90] These graduates often engaged in inconspicuous consumption and lavish displays of wealth, greatly contrasting the extreme economic precarity most Salvadorans experienced.[91] This scale of violence, ranging from the systematic slaughter in El Mozote to the daily extra-judicial assassinations and torture, cannot be considered a mere accident arising from some 'bad apples' in the School of the Americas. Rather, it is an actualization and execution of the theory and methods core to the institution's operation.[92]

Race in United States Foreign Policy in Latin America

In addition to being informed by Cold War anti-communism, American foreign policy towards Latin America, and the School of the Americas specifically, was colored by racialized perceptions of Latin America and of the United States itself. Utilizing the theories of Stuart Hall, race can be conceptualized as a "sliding signifier."[93] It is indicative of humanity's desire for categorizations, and, more specifically, a reflection of the power classification needed to ensure hierarchy and order. Hall argues that there is nothing natural, biological, or permanent about race- rather it is a continuously evolving social construct.[94] As Audrey Smedly brilliantly synthesizes, race became "a mechanism for the hierarchical structuring of society…a rationalisation for imposed inequalities."[95] Once race is signified, many characterizations can become fixed in place because people have been racially categorized in a specific way.[96]

---

[90] Gill, *The School of the Americas*, 91.
[91] Gill, *The School of the Americas*, 91.
[92] Binford, *The El Mozote Massacre*, 55.
[93] *Stuart Hall: Race- the Floating Signifier*, DVD, directed by Joanna Hughes, Make Spencer & Sut Jhally (Media Education Foundation: 1997).
[94] *Stuart Hall: Race - the Floating Signifier*, DVD.
[95] Smedly, *Race in North America*, 251.
[96] *Stuart Hall: Race- the Floating Signifier*, DVD.

In the case of the Americas, European colonists cast indigenous Latin Americans as less intelligent and capable and stigmatized indigenous cultural traditions. These views date back to the beginning of Spanish colonization. Figures such asBartolomé de Las Casas, although generally renowned for his harsh condemnation of the Spanish conquest of the Caribbean, marked the nascence of a paternalistic view of indigenous Latin Americans. In his famous sixteenth-century work "The Tears of the Indians" Las Casas described the indigenous inhabitants of what is now Cuba as "delicate and tender", "neither proud nor ambitious," and ultimately analogized them to "quiet Lambs."[97] Although this framing may seem soft compared to the dehumanizing rhetoric peddled by his contemporary historians, it still displays the assumption that the Taíno require the guidance of Europeans to achieve complete personhood (then signified by acceptance of Christ). In addition, while Las Casas's racial hierarchy is informed by a Christian worldview, the rise of Darwinism and biological inquiry would lead to a replication of the same prejudices - this time, thinly veiled under the pretext of scientific theory.[98]

American attitudes towards Latin America have long reflected this racialized assertion of dominion. The Monroe Doctrine, articulated by President James Monroe in 1823, is perhaps the most famous early example. Within it, Monroe declared that Latin America is off-limits for any "future colonisation by European powers."[99] He justifies this by citing Spain's "comparative strength and resources" and its distance from the new governments of Central and South America.[100] Embedded in this is the assumption that the United States, due to its economic prosperity and advantageous geographic position, is the optimal choice to civilize Latin America.

---

[97] Bartolomé de Las Casas 1474-1566, *The Tears of the Indians* (London: Printed by J.C. for Nath. Brooks, 1656), 1;2.
[98] Smedly, *Race in North America*, 244.
[99] James Monroe, *The Monroe Doctrine: President Monroe's Message At the Commencement of the First Session of the Eighteenth Congress, December 2, 1823.* (Boston, 1895), Retrieved from: https://www.archives.gov/milestone-documents/monroe-doctrine#:~:text=The%20Monroe%20Doctrine%20is%20the,further%20colonization%20or%20puppet%20monarchs.
[100] Monroe, *The Monroe Doctrine*.

The Monroe Doctrine was not created in a vacuum; rather, it was informed by the rise of so-called 'scientific racism' and the expansion of American racial ideology beyond the previous binary of black and white. As Smedly details, this hierarchy was first applied to the more heterogeneous populations of Central America and the Caribbean where rigid American racial norms (best illustrated by the "one drop rule") clashed with more fluid Latin American conceptions.[101] Said rigidity of late-nineteenth and early-twentieth-century racial ideology was so absolute that it even produced laughable explanations for non-European innovations.[102] For instance, then-famed scholar Dr. John Van Eurie explained the architectural mastery and grandeur of ancient Mayan civilization as a product of shipwrecked Spanish adventurers-adventurers that, curiously, no European nation had any record of.[103]

Similar views continued to be spread by influential Americans (or American-adjacent European intellectuals) into the twentieth century. In 1899, British novelist Rudyard Kipling published his famous poem "The White Man's Burden," which laid the groundwork for paternalistic narratives in which the United States needed to intervene in Global South countries, ostensibly in order to civilize and educate them. Kipling wrote that it was the "burden" of Europeans to take up arms and educate the "half devil and half child" peoples of the world.[104] While Kipling was writing specifically about the United State's newfound dominion over the Philippines, he was certainly also considering its other recently acquired colonial possessions-notably Cuba and Puerto Rico, the latter of which the United States still controls.[105]

---

[101] Smedly, *Race in North America*, 247.
[102] Smedly, *Race in North America*, 244.
[103] Smedly, *Race in North America*, 244.
[104] Rudyard Kipling, "The White Man's Burden: The United States & The Philippine Islands, 1899," *Rudyard Kipling's Verse: Definitive Edition* (New York: Doubleday, 1929). Retrieved from: http://historymatters.gmu.edu/d/5478/.
[105] Daniel Immerwahr, "The Greater United States: Territory and Empire in U.S. History," *Diplomatic History* 40, no. 3 (June 2016): 377, https://doi.org/10.1093/dh/dhw009.

Early Cold War political speeches and discourses demonstrate similar underlying assumptions, although overt racial language had been shed. Consider the foundational "Truman Doctrine," dictated by President Harry Truman in 1947 as a response to the conflict in Turkey and Greece. Truman stated that it was the United State's duty to "help free peoples to maintain their free institutions" and pledged American assistance, both economic and military, to any "democratic" government fighting communist insurrection.[106] He claimed that his nation "must assist free peoples to work out their destinies in their own way" and the United States would intervene to protect other countries' "national integrity against aggressive movements."[107] Embedded in this is the assertion that American military intervention could never violate national sovereignty, an implication that sounds remarkably similar to Kipling's conception of benevolent colonialism. A more material example is the 1959 Dispatch from the Cuban Embassy to the Department of State. Written in the immediate aftermath of the Cuban Revolution, Daniel Braddock's telegram initially appears a classic case of Red Scare paranoia. However, in his advocacy for various strategies of soft power influence (such as developing ties with friendly government figures, isolating Castro, strengthening existing anti-communist forces, and, most notably, helping anti-communists get U.S. Visas), Braddock reveals an assumption that America understands better than Cubans what is right for their nation - and that this justifies American intervention.[108]

After the successes of the Civil Rights Movement, and at the dawn of the Salvadoran Civil War, racial rhetoric gradually began to veil itself further in more insidious discourses around development. Kalpana Wilson, in her recent book *Race, Racism and Development*,

---

[106] Harry Truman, "Truman Doctrine," *80th Congress: 1st Session* (March 12th 1947). Retrieved from: https://www.archives.gov/milestone-documents/truman-doctrine.
[107] Truman, "Truman Doctrine."
[108] Daniel Braddock, "Despatch From the Embassy in Cuba to the Department of State," *Foreign Relations of the United States, 1958-1960, Cuba, Vol. VI*, no. 278. 14 April 1959. Retrieved from: https://history.state.gov/historicaldocuments/frus1958-60v06/d278.

investigates these connections and brings to light the hidden racial coding of contemporary development policies. While Wilson similarly notes the disappearance of explicit references to race in the 1970s, these were replaced by the continuous invocation of "racialised and colonial tropes" (many of these tropes are examined in detail above).[109] Reliance on these tropes formed the intellectual justification for many 'rights-based' foreign interventions, beginning in the Carter era and increasing exponentially after the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991.[110] Kothari also places contemporary approaches to development and human rights-based foreign interventions within the broader context of colonial conceptions of race. As she writes, while references towards biological race effectively vanished, they were replaced by arguments citing 'culture' or 'tradition' and, thus, the underlying assumption- that Global South nations require guidance from Europe and America to fully develop- continued unchanged.[111] It is this rhetoric, itself an evolution of centuries of racialized assumptions, which informed the United State's policy towards the School of the Americas' graduates in El Salvador- as the ensuing evidence demonstrates.

American Foreign Policy During and After the Salvadoran Civil War

American documents from the Salvadoran Civil War, and their subsequent defenses of it, display an internalization of this racial ideology and a sustained belief in the hierarchy of civilizations. A dossier from the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) in 1984 entitled "El Salvador: Significant Political Actors and Their Interactions" demonstrates many of the internal thought processes which informed governmental decision-making. It warned of the political weakness of the Salvadoran center and recommended strengthening them through "additional

[109] Wilson, *Race, Racism and Development*, 126.
[110] Wilson, *Race, Racism and Development*, 126.
[111] Kothari, "An agenda for thinking about 'race' in development," 11.

exposure to US and European politicians and the media."[112] There is the underlying assumption that the political center, which was cultivated to emulate American party politics, is the segment that ought to rule. The question of Salvadoran popular will becomes secondary to ensuring the growth of a liberal-democratic state apparatus.

This document also includes a brief section on Major Roberto D'Aubuisson Arrieta, a Salvadoran graduate of the School of the Americas who would go on to become the head of the notorious White Warriors Union (a death squad that participated in the wide-scale tortures and killings of suspected leftists).[113] Although the document noted of D'Aubuisson's "unrealistic sense of confidence" concerning his connections to American officials, it also confirmed his ties to the United States military-security complex, including D'Aubuisson's time at the School of Americas and a lesser publicized Green Beret tour in Panama.[114] As much as later United States Army publications would claim otherwise, the CIA evidently did not view D'Aubuisson's actions as contrary to their curriculum.

The Salvadoran Civil War spanned across the terms of three American Presidents: Jimmy Carter, Ronald Reagan, and George H. W. Bush. While there were slightly different approaches to El Salvador—for instance, Carter favored an emphasis on human rights while Reagan preferred hardline anti-communist policies—their administrations all viewed El Salvador through the same paternalistic lens.[115] For instance, in a reply to a letter from Archbishop Romero criticizing United States support for the Salvadoran military, Secretary of State Cyrus Vance replied that the Revolutionary Junta government was "moderate and reformist" and

---

[112] "El Salvador: Significant Political Actors and Their Interaction." Central Intelligence Agency. April 1984. Sanitised Copy Approved for Release, 3 March 2017: pg 16. Retrieved from: https://web.archive.org/web/20170123172358/https://www.cia.gov/library/readingroom/docs/CIA-RDP04T00367R000100090001-3.pdf.

[113] Russell Crandall, *The Salvador Option* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016): 189.

[114] "El Salvador: Significant Political Actors and Their Interaction," 15.

[115] Irina Carlota, *Everyday Revolutionaries*, 37.

determined to "promote respect for democratic procedure and the rights of the individual."[116] However, history demonstrates that Vance was foolish to brush off Romero's concerns. Twenty-three days later Romero was assassinated by members of a death squad headed by D'Aubuisson, with ties to the School of the Americas and the Salvadoran security-military apparatus.[117]

A speech made by Ronald Reagan in 1984 shows a continuation of much of the same rhetoric. In addition to promoting paranoid conspiracies surrounding Soviet infiltration and subversion, he propagated a view of United States foreign policy grounded firmly in principles of American exceptionalism. In his words, the United States "does not start wars. We will never be the aggressor… We help our friends defend themselves;" however, the situation in El Salvador necessitates "long-term American support for democratic development… and strong-willed diplomacy."[118] He stated that the United States "can and must help Central America."[119] These sentiments, while draped in the veneer of American values and morals, ultimately reaffirmed the idea that El Salvador required the guidance of the United States to lead it on the path towards free-market capitalist development - in other words, the United States remained a necessary civilizing presence.

This recurring claim of moral legitimacy, although substantially disproven already by the conduct of the Salvadoran military-security apparatus, is also contrary to accounts from Salvadoran peasants. Irina Carlota, in her recent book *Everyday Revolutionaries: Gender, Violence, and Disillusionment in Postwar El Salvador*, includes many interviews with Salvadorans. One ex-FMLN man mentioned that growing up in the Civil War era, he had few

---

[116] Cyrus Vance, "Reply to Archbishop's Letter to President Carter," (Confidential Cable, 1 March 1980), Retrieved from: https://nsarchive2.gwu.edu/NSAEBB/NSAEBB339/doc05.pdf.
[117] Gill, *The School of the Americas*, 137.
[118] Ronald Reagan, "Address to the Nation on United States Policy in Central America," (9 May 1984), Retrieved from: https://www.reaganlibrary.gov/archives/speech/address-nation-united-states-policy-central-america.
[119] Reagan, "Address to the Nation on United States Policy in Central America."

options but ultimately chose to join the FMLN because they "did not order the killing of children."[120] Even American officials frequently worried that they were losing ethical legitimacy. A United States Embassy cable from 1990, reporting in the aftermath of the 1989 murder of six Jesuits, stated "our policy is in peril" if the accusations of a deliberate conspiracy "at the highest levels of the El Salvador Armed Forces" were founded.[121] It is worth noting that these accusations were founded and, in addition, twenty-one soldiers implicated in the planning, execution, and coverup were School of the Americas graduates.[122]

This domineering, racially-coded approach to the Salvadoran Civil War led to the coverup, or in many cases justification, of horrific acts of violence. Although there are many instances of coverups and vile misrepresentations - for example, Binford comprehensively investigates the American effort to downplay the El Mozote Massacre - a 1987 release of a 1984 document on death squad activity paints a particularly damning picture. The document is two-and-a-half pages long with only two sentences not excised. Of the two sentences remaining, one contained the already well-known fact that "death threats and other forces of intimidation…are commonplace and often are carried out," while the other stated that Salvadoran military and governmental leaders condemn these death squads.[123] However, the second version of the document, released to the United Nations as a part of their 1993 Truth Commission, shows that the CIA excised portions where they reported that these condemnations were largely performative and no substantial changes had occurred.[124]

---

[120] Irina Carlota, *Everyday Revolutionaries*, 51.
[121] William Walker, "The Jesuit Case, Another Big Jolt," United States Embassy Cable (13 August 1990), Retrieved from: https://nsarchive.gwu.edu/document/20456-national-security-archive-doc-5-u-s-embassy.
[122] Gill, *The School of the Americas*, 198.
[123] "El Salvador: Dealing with Death Squads," Central Intelligence Agency (20 January 1984), Excised Version Variant B, 1987, Retrieved from: https://nsarchive2.gwu.edu/NSAEBB/NSAEBB90/dubious-17b.pdf.
[124] "El Salvador: Dealing with Death Squads," Central Intelligence Agency (20 January 1984), Excised Version Variant A, 1993, Retrieved from: https://nsarchive2.gwu.edu/NSAEBB/NSAEBB90/dubious-17a.pdf.

The racist, paternalistic view of El Salvador needing American intervention to modernize and develop 'correctly' (naturally, correctly in material terms means the adoption of Western-style democracy and free-market capitalism) continues to be reflected in more recent American statements. In 1997, Democratic Party Congressman Sanford Bishop defended the School of the Americas by claiming it had been overall effective in promoting democracy, more specifically citing the "extensive indoctrination in the principles of human rights and representative democracy" as evidence to his claims.[125] While the use of 'indoctrination' was likely tongue-in-cheek, it does indicate a degree of American propaganda- acceptance that hinges upon principles of American exceptionalism. For Bishop, the School of the Americas was needed to instill American values in Latin Americans. The official "Frequently Asked Questions" section of the old Fort Benning U.S. Army website displays similar justifications. It stated that the School of the Americas was a "mechanism which assisted in promoting and maintaining democratic ideals" and sought to "enhance understanding" of democracy, again giving the United States pedagogical authority over Latin Americans.[126]

In an October 2004 Vice Presidential Debate, Dick Cheney stated that El Salvador, in the early 2000s, was "a whale of a lot better because we held free elections."[127] Although somewhat subtle, Cheney's use of "we" is vital. By utilizing "we," as opposed to the standard "it" or more archaic "she," Cheney is consciously admitting that the United States meddled in El Salvador to the extent of even orchestrating and overseeing an election. The (questionable) veracity of the actual claim is secondary to Cheney's willingness to boast overtly about American intervention

---

[125] United States Congressional Record, Vol. 143, No. 115. (4 September 1997): 6. Retrieved from: https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/CREC-1997-09-04/pdf/CREC-1997-09-04.pdf

[126] "U.S. Army School of the Americas Frequently Asked Questions." Fort Benning Army Official Website. Orig URL: http://www.benning.army.mil/usarsa/FAQ/FAQ.htm (28 April 1999). Archived URL & Accessed From: https://web.archive.org/web/19990428095558/http://www.benning.army.mil/usarsa/FAQ/FAQ.htm.

[127] Rahul Mahajan, "Cheney Cites El Salvador Civil War That Killed 75,000 As Model for Afghanistan," *Democracy Now* (October 6th 2004), https://www.democracynow.org/2004/10/6/cheney_cites_el_salvador_civil_war.

in foreign elections. Otto Reich, a former American diplomat who worked in the governments of Ronald Reagan, George H. W. Bush, and George W. Bush, demonstrated this further in his scathing 2014 National Review article entitled "El Salvador in Peril." Reich wrote in response to the possibility of an FMLN electoral victory, and reformist Sánchez Cerén becoming President. Reich, in addition to engaging in thirty-years outdated Cold War conspiracy theories (such as warning that "Castro's Cubans will arrive"), exalted the American intervention in the Salvadoran Civil War.[128] He stated that American foreign policy defeated "violent extremists on both right and left" - an interesting claim, given that CIA documents demonstrate substantive American support **for** the extremist right - and "safeguarded democracy."[129] Yet again, American politicians, drunk off the delusions of imperial grandeur, show an assumption that they know better than Salvadorans how their country ought to be run.

While American politicians invoked racist tropes in their defense of the School of the Americas, they also relied upon subconscious racial bias in the American public to overlook well-publicized atrocities. Binford incorporates this into her study of the El Mozote Massacre, writing that the understated American media response is illustrative of the heightened value placed on the lives of those who look and act like us. She posits a hypothetical of a sole survivor named "Patricia Waddel…instead of Rufina Amaya," wondering if this would have garnered the national outcry the massacre deserved.[130] An article from the Fort Scott Tribune, a local newspaper in Kansas, is indicative of this. Although this paper may seem irrelevant, utilizing a lesser-known local publication is more demonstrative of common journalism - as opposed to national papers which tend to be written for a more educated, politically aware audience. The

---

[128] Otto Reich, "El Salvador in Peril," *National Review* (31 January 2014), Retrieved from: https://www.nationalreview.com/2014/01/el-salvador-peril-otto-reich/.
[129] Reich, "El Salvador in Peril."
[130] Binford, *The El Mozote Massacre*, 78.

article spanned approximately half a column and offered a brief synopsis of recent brutalities before it concluded that this may "provide ammunition" to Reagan's opponents.[131] Most tellingly, however, the article is overshadowed by an ad for Walmart's new price-matching guarantee.

Today over 2 million Salvadorans live in the United States, many of whom are undocumented and face the constant threat of carceral punishment, family separation, and deportation.[132] Despite the supposed extraordinary success of the "Salvadoran Option," much of this migration was driven by El Salvador's most marginalized fleeing from continued violence and brutal economic structural adjustment policies.[133] Yet, most Americans have little recollection of the Salvadoran Civil War and even less knowledge of the extent of the American military apparatus' permeation into the conflict. Similarly, there has been no American-sponsored reckoning or inquiry into the violence wreaked by students their military trained- if anything, there has been a celebration of it. In 1985, five years after he orchestrated the murder of four American churchwomen, the head of the Salvadoran National Guard Vides Casanova was invited as an honored guest speaker to the School of the Americas.[134] Meanwhile, right-wing American politicians continue to peddle vicious rhetoric which paints Salvadoran asylum seekers as criminals, drug dealers, human traffickers, and rapists - racist stereotypes which belie an analysis devoid of historical understanding.[135]

---

[131] "Salvadoran Troops 'massacre' civilians," *The Fort Scott Tribune* (29 January 1982), Retrieved from: https://news.google.com/newspapers?nid=1906&dat=19820129&id=C88fAAAAIBAJ&sjid=BNkEAAAAIBAJ&pg=1340,2087981.

[132] "Undocumented Migration from the Northern Triangle of Central America," *International Crisis Group* (25 October 2017), https://www.crisisgroup.org/latin-america-caribbean/central-america/el-salvador/undocumented-migration-northern-triangle-central-america.

[133] Carlota, *Everyday Revolutionaries*, 11.

[134] Gill, *The School of the Americas*, 12.

[135] Donald Trump, "Remarks by President Trump on the Illegal Immigration Crisis and Border Security," (1 November 2018), Retrieved from: https://trumpwhitehouse.archives.gov/briefings-statements/remarks-president-trump-illegal-immigration-crisis-border-security/.

Thus, a recontextualization of America's involvement, and in particular a reevaluation of the extent of the School of the Americas' influence, could not be more timely. By tracing the roots of American racial ideology, from the nineteenth-century roots of Social Darwinism to the 1990s rehash of colonial rhetoric, it becomes evident that perceptions of racial superiority and paternalism consistently informed the United State's actions in El Salvador. Operating under the guise of a new-era 'White Man's Burden' allowed American Presidents and Politicians to frame the horrific violence and civil repression enacted by the Junta Government as mere growing pains on El Salvador's path toward representative democracy. Under this ideological framework, American military power, and the institutions embodying it such as the School of the Americas, is constructed as an ethical tool for the civilizing of the Global South. The blood and bodies it leaves behind become incidental to the triumph of liberalism- and after all, American politicians know which type of names spark outcry when they are splashed across newspapers.

The Sabbath Inquiry: Religious Freedom and the Intersections of Capitalism, the Temperance Movement, and Suburbanization

Andrea Kennedy

The University of Michigan

Introduction:

In the 1880s, the U.S. experienced a large surge in immigration primarily from people from Western and Eastern European countries like Germany, Ireland, and England. With large waves of migration came a diversity of religions and religious denominations, such as Orthodox Christianity, Protestant Christianity, and Catholicism. The large rise of religious communities resulting from the Christian Schism from the Protestant Reformation, created tension between the 'Protestant America' of the time and those who did not conform to traditional Christian practices, like the Sabbath

In the University of Michigan's Clements Library is a magazine called *The Carrier Dove*, a contemporary brown sheepskin over stiff boards and rebacked with brown leather, decorated endpapers, and a spine and cover blocked in gold. The magazine is filled with spiritualist and unorthodox views in the 1880s and specifically an address written by Hugh Pentecost titled "The Sunday Question". The entire magazine is a rather rare collection as it contains entirely radical notions that went against the Protestant Church's ideals. Pentecost generates the argument of religious infringement concerning mainly Protestant people irritating others of no or different faiths to follow the Sabbath. He argues that no one should be ridiculed to be told how to perform on a single faith's 'Holy Day'. Along with this, he briefly mentions how both capitalism and the temperance movement are changing both the Sabbath and religious life in general.

The economic state and capitalist structure of the U.S. in the 19th century promoted binge drinking on the Christian 'Holy Day', eventually leading to religious intolerance. The changing ideals of the Sabbath create friction between the Protestant majority and others advancing the temperance movement. The growth in opposition to a religious majority gave way to

suburbanization, as people of faith were left wanting centralized religious communities and a return to the nuclear family.

1. Hugh O. Pentecost: The Minister Turned Radical

To start, Hugh O. Pentecost started as a Baptist minister in New York where he found success in rather radical spaces at the time.[136] Later down the road, he began to study law to promote an anti-poverty agenda and created more following for socialism. Although he does not publicly denote his faith, he shifts his work to law rather than ministry and continues to become more radical as he sympathizes with anarchism. Pentecost finds himself in the middle of contention in both the Christian and Spiritualist world. He begins popping up in newspapers across the east coast about his journey as a minister and polarizing ideas. In *The New Jersey Association* he is mentioned, " Rev. Hugh O. Pentecost, whom the newspapers have been trying for the George heresy, but who thrives under martyrdom, and who believes in a European Sunday to a degree offensive to not a few.."[137]. It is clear that Pentecost becomes a source of gossip for his progressive views. However, his writing may seem hypocritical considering he is a minister and quotes the Sabbath as not special, and refers to God as "your God". *The Carrier Dove*, the magazine in which Pentecost's address is published, printed spiritualist papers and authors who were known to be part of either no-faith or minority faiths. The magazine editors were also two women, Elizabeth Lowe Watson and Julia Schlesinger, so the editorial was fairly radical at the time, something Pentecost could get behind. It allowed him to create a discussion about a religious tradition in which he had taken part, however, he sides with the idea of religious

---

[136] "The Rev. Hugh O. Pentecost Resigns." *The New York Times.* June 5, 1883. https://www.nytimes.com/1883/06/05/archives/the-rev-hugh-o-pentecost-resigns.html?searchResultPosition=4.

[137] Jeremiah E., Rankin. "The New Jersey Association." *Congregationalist*, May 19, 1887. *Nineteenth Century U.S. Newspapers* (accessed April 19, 2023). https://link-gale-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/apps/doc/GT3004445431/NCNP?u=umuser&sid=bookmark-NCNP&xid=76848b0f.

freedom and continues to express his 'extreme' views while talking about the burden of capitalism.

Pentecost's main argument from his address titled "The Sunday Question", is that no one should be able to enforce religious traditions on others just because they are the majority and those who do should be held accountable. As a man of potential-no faith, he thinks of Sunday as "exactly like any other day. It is not better or worse".[138] Due to his religious orientation and his previous affiliations, it is understandable that he faced a large amount of discrimination as someone who does not practice common religious traditions, like the Sabbath. He believes that the large majority of Protestant Christians within the U.S. are promoting 'Christian America' and thus accosting those who are not participating in the mainstream traditions of Christianity. Pentecost goes on to share, "If Sunday is God's day let him take care of it. If he does not wish men to work on Sunday let him strike the man blind who attempts to work on Sunday, and keep him blind till Monday morning".[139] Pentecost's 'let your God take care of it' attitude displays his belief that everyone should be able to freely adhere to their beliefs without fear of being tormented by others. The idea that Protestants were trying to force dissenters into the mainstream religion is not new to history. Dr. David Sehat, a current professor at Georgia State, writes in his book *The Myth of American Religious Freedom*, "Protestant Chrisitan influence in U.S. history was long-standing, widespread, and, from the perspective of dissenters, coercive".[140] Sehat explains that reform movements not only had to fight against the law, but also against the dominating religion: Christianity. Sehat has a strong belief like Pentecost that the idea of

---

[138] Hugh O, Pentecost. "The Sunday Question".*The Carrier Dove* 6, 35th ed., 6:546. New York, NY: Schlesinger, 1889

[139] Hugh O, Pentecost. "The Sunday Question". *The Carrier Dove* 6, 35th ed., 6:547. New York, NY: Schlesinger, 1889

[140] David, Sehat, "Introduction," in The Myth of American Religious Freedom, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 2.

religious freedom in the US has been veiled by the underlying religious majority. Minority religions were facing prejudice as they did not conform to the Christian majority. This idea of religious freedom is only applied to different denominations of Christianity, which reinforces systems like the workforce giving Sundays off to the public for the Sabbath but not Saturdays for the Shabbos.

2. Religious Freedom during the Christian Schism

Immigration in cities like New York pitted new religions against the already dominant Christian denominations. However, at the time it was not the Christian Church but rather a mix of Protestants, Baptists, and Methodists. These denominations held the highest position in religious life at the time and used their power to discriminate against minority religions. Immigrants faced religious prejudice but were eventually met with legal discrimination.

Religious freedom is traditionally believed to be set in stone by law, not only in the First Amendment but also by individual state laws. Virginia notes their clause for religious freedom as a state, "No man Shall be compelled to frequent or support any religious worship, place, or ministry whatsoever, nor shall be enforced, restrained, molested, or burthened in his body or goods, nor shall otherwise suffer on account of his religious opinions or belief, but that all men shall be free to profess, and by argument to maintain, their opinions in matters of Religion…".[141] Pentecost would agree with this law as stated due to the idea that no one should suffer for their differing religious opinions. However, Jefferson, who wrote this, also held the ideal that a single God created the world and gave freedoms to man. The idea of Christian undertones being intentionally constructed within our legal framework is debated, but the idea that a single God bestowed freedom of religion is consistent. Christians used their previously bestowed power to

[141] "Transcript For: Statute Of Virginia For Religious Freedom." The Monticello Classroom. Monticello Classroom. Accessed April 4, 2022. https://classroom.monticello.org/view/74418/.

coerce dissenters into following their religious ideal and challenge the idea of creating a legal basis for their beliefs. The Church then pitched the Temperance Movement as a public safety notion rather than becoming steeped in Christian convictions.

3. Capitalism and Binge Drinking

Another system in the US that was forcing Protestant ideals and changing religious life was the capitalistic workforce. During the Industrial Revolution, people worked in factories 10 to 12 hours a day from Monday to Saturday, giving Sunday off for the Sabbath. The rise of industrialization had just finished its peak and allowed for the drive in factory life and having all individuals in the family be part of the workforce.[142] As the whole family was out working for the day, it was expected to take part in the Sabbath on their one day off, as a family structure. A majority of immigrant families are trying to pull themselves out of poverty and all of the family was working in order to build wealth. Instead of the connected religious nuclear family, the US was seeing a rise in 'sinning' behavior due to the harsh and grueling working conditions. There was a shift in binge drinking on Sundays in bars rather than drinking throughout the week at home. The Sabbath was no longer the 'Holy Day' like traditionally practiced, but a break time from the long work week and allowed people to unleash and unwind.

Pentecost challenged how industrialization has forced people to fall out of enacting the Sabbath and stated, "Why have one day in the week in which we have to shut up all our saloons and make laws and call out the police to keep the populace in order? Because men and women who are overworked for six days will break loose and go to extremes on the seventh".[143] Capitalism has forced people out of the home and religious center, and created a need to "go to

---

[142]Charles, Hirschman, and Elizabeth, Mogford. "Immigration and the American Industrial Revolution from 1880 to 1920." Social science research. *U.S. National Library of Medicine,* December 2009. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2760060/.

[143] Hugh O, Pentecost. "The Sunday Question". *The Carrier Dove* 6, 35th ed., 6:547. New York, NY: Schlesinger, 1889

extremes" on the original 'Holy Day'. This focus on industrialization and maintaining capital diverts attention from religion. Walter Rauschenbusch, a theologian in the 1880s, observes this, "Christian men have a stouter reason for turning against it because it slays human character and denies human brotherhood. If money dominates, the ideal cannot dominate. If we serve mammon, we cannot serve the Christ…."[144] He notes in his 'Social Gospel' that the industrial revolution has created a focus on monetary capital that has diverted attention from religious values. As a pastor, he wants to focus back on Christian values like many temperance reformists. However, unlike the temperance reformists, Rauschenbusch criticizes capitalism similar to Pentecost, and how an economic shift could bring religion back to the forefront.

This indirect push from capitalism to binge drinking on the Sabbath promotes the temperance movement from many religious leaders, which in turn creates more religious persecution. The temperance movement started as early as the 1800s and peaked in the 1900s right before prohibition in the 1920s. As religious figures began identifying alcohol as the reason that crime and sinful behaviors increased within cities, the temperance movement started to pick up and get religious individuals back on track. During the industrial revolution, there was an increase in the use of pubs and bars, as many workers went out for drinks after work or on the Sabbath. One of the only ways to get people off the streets and back into the home is to promote the abolition of alcohol. Pentecost references that he does not oppose liquor, but notes its effect on behavior and even describes his opposition to Jonathon Edwards, a prominent theologian at the time, "I believe in allowing liquor to be sold freely as long as men want to drink it, but I also believe the use of liquors beyond the bounds of the *strictest temperance* is a very great evil".[145]

---

[144]Walter, Rauschenbusch. "Christianity and the Social Crisis". Public Paper, December 31, 1907. From *Teaching American History.* https://teachingamericanhistory.org/document/christianity-and-the-social-crisis/ (accessed April 4, 2022).

[145] Hugh O, Pentecost. "The Sunday Question". *The Carrier Dove* 6, 35th ed., 6:548. New York, NY: Schlesinger, 1889

Edwards promoted the idea of 'strictest temperance' and that one should complete total abstinence from alcohol to please God. Pentecost puts it in italics in his essay to mock him, as if to say that total abstinence is extreme and overboard. He then notes that the temperance movement might be effective in slowing 'bad' behavior, but that everyone should have a choice in whether they want to drink. The temperance movement creates a focus on those partaking in legal behavior that opposes religious ideals. This creates friction and religious intolerance as there is now a public split between whether the prohibition should occur and if it is for the betterment of public safety or religious morals. The temperance movement promoted the notion that the U.S. population needs to adhere to majority Protestant values as those same ideals promoted 'public safety'. The temperance movement created a problem of religious freedom for dissenters, but it also eventually led to an economic disaster. Although the contention of religious freedom will always be debated, the temperance movement created a clear distinction in what religious members can so-call 'govern'. The veil of religious freedom was pulled back as the Church was able to place its beliefs into actual law using a system that had been built by Protestant peoples: politics.

4. Sabbath v. Urbanized Capitalism

Once Pentecost outlined problems of religious freedom and the harsh working state in the 1880s, there was a cycle of sin and religious prejudice created that needed solving. Pentecost talks about modifications to the capitalist system that could benefit the temperance movement, but his ideas still needed more development. He notes, "I'll tell you when I think Sunday will become a true Lord's Day. When every man and woman by working a few hours during the week can live in comfort".[146] For the Sabbath's restoration to its conservative tradition, there needed to

[146] Hugh O. Pentecost, "The Sunday Question". *The Carrier Dove* 6, 35th ed., 6:548. New York, NY: Schlesinger, 1889

be a shift in leisure for Americans. Being forced to have only a single day off after 6 days of long grueling hours, religion becomes put on the back-burner as American families want the day to relax and in some cases, fulfill their 'sinful' desires. Yet, if Protestants want to create a family-centered Sunday, there needs to be leisure time with shorter hours and higher pay. This helps people decrease their immoral behaviors on the Sabbath and creates time and space for drinking on other days. More leisure time also means more at-home time with family, which we have come to know as a core of religious life since most religious teaching is between people. In all, the rapid transfer into factory life and the corresponding loss of religious core values forced religious communities to make a decision.

5. Suburbanization for the Family

Religious communities reached success with prohibition in the 1920s, but the success only lasted until the 21st amendment was ratified in 1933, thereby reversing prohibition. The religious majority lost the upper hand and was left picking up pieces of their forgotten temperance movement. The Church still faced the issue of trying to bring religious teachings back to the forefront of a capitalistic urbanized environment. With the rise and fall of the temperance movement, a decrease in religious ideals, and the eventual end of World War II, there is a shift into the suburbs. The ultimate solution to Pentecost's later notion, "can live in comfort"[147] , was moving religious communities out of the city to build up the nuclear family and provide populations a space in which they can practice religion in private.

Suburbanization allowed religious leaders to rebuild their congregations centered around the family home life again. What Pentecost failed to mention was that capitalism, and a few other factors, caused the need for restructuring to keep religious life afloat in families. The said

[147]Hugh O, Pentecost. "The Sunday Question". *The Carrier Dove* 6, 35th ed., 6:548. New York, NY: Schlesinger, 1889

restructuring needed: the suburbs. By moving out of the city, families were held in a central location with the father going to the city to work and the mother taking primary responsibility for teaching and caring for children. The traditional nuclear family has proven an effective way to refocus religion. In the modern world, many think that the only entity that is holding onto the nuclear family is the Church.[148] The nuclear family allows families to practice the Sabbath together and keep people out of the bars, which was the focus of the temperance movement. Without the heavy burden of alcohol and factory life, families can take part in religious traditions in the privacy of their suburban homes to decrease religious intolerance. The cycle is ended by a simple move into the country. Suburbanization solved Pentecost's original argument that religious people should not be able to accost those not participating in majority religious traditions like the Sabbath. Religious freedom becomes promoted in private homes and Americans become rewarded with more leisure, allowing for more money flowing through the Church itself. Although many churches disagreed with moving into the suburbs due to difficulty transplanting the actual religious institution, it allowed for the survival of the nuclear family and religious traditions.

Conclusion

Pentecost starts his argument with religious freedom but brings out many other interesting ideas that require further investigation. He mentions how the shift in religious life due to the Industrial Revolution created space for the temperance movement. His original argument holds value, but the real religious shift occurs with Capitalism causing Suburbia to maintain religious values. Suburban life allows for the re-emergence of the nuclear family and the privatization of religion. What started as an original address about religious freedom from an

[148]Rod, Dreher. "David Brooks Is Right-the Nuclear Family Was Destined to Die ." *Institute for Family Studies,* February 10, 2020. https://ifstudies.org/blog/david-brooks-is-right-the-nuclear-family-was-destined-to-die-.

ex-minister, turns into a discussion about differing economic systems and how prohibition could cause economic damage. Pentecost's address almost mirrors his career path as he turns away from religion and into politics and law. “The Sunday Question” explores how religion has to adapt to economic systems, social culture, and different demographics.

Pentecost writes in *The Carrier Dove* an amalgamation of his thoughts on religious culture at the time, which provides insight into a perspective rarely voiced in history, the minority. His ideas of religious freedom reflect the present time as he faces prejudice from removing himself from the church. His thoughts on the temperance movement provide an understanding of how Protestants and other Christians garnered support for their religion and tried to claim legal action for their religious beliefs of prohibition. Towards the end, Pentecost decides to attack capitalism and the idea that the urban city is not providing freedom and relaxation for people. Pentecost then stumbles upon the next move for the church: suburbanization. A tactic that brings religion back to the forefront of people’s minds and allows the Church to hide from the failings of the temperance movement. Although not a complete solution to religious intolerance and temperance, suburbanization becomes the next step in the Protestant Christian fight for a ‘Christian America’.

Shivaji: Maratha King during the Colonial Period 1818 - 1919

Akhil Mulgaonker

University of Houston

Introduction

"It has gradually become clear to me what every great philosophy up till now has consisted of – namely, the confession of its originator, and a species of involuntary and unconscious autobiography; and moreover, that the moral (or immoral) purpose in every philosophy has constituted the true vital germ out of which the entire plant has always grown."

- Friedrich Nietzsche, *Beyond Good and Evil* (1886)

Reminders of a glorious past are omnipresent in modern-day Maharashtra. Merely moving about in Mumbai inevitably brings one into contact with symbols of Shivaji. The large international airport, the second busiest in India, is named after him. The historic train station in the heart of the city, previously known as the Victoria Terminus, is now the Chhatrapati Shivaji Maharaj Terminus. Shiv Sena, the region's dominant Hindu nationalist political party, literally means 'Shiv's army,' an invocation of the god and the king. What do these reminders represent? What does Shivaji represent? A clue lies in the way modern commemorations invoke him. The titles 'Chhatrapati' and 'Maharaj' invariably accompany his name, emphasizing his Hindu-ness and kingly ruler pretensions, respectively. Reminders of a nation's premodernity cast its symbols of modernity – modern monuments connecting space in much the same way a king would have in the seventeenth century.

Political purpose complements these commemorations, goading a form of politics. People identify with this storied figure, upon whom they are called and brought together for a common purpose. In the colonial period, the aim was to present a symbol of anticolonial resistance, under which many conflicting currents existed. Shivaji represented a struggle for the right over destiny. In postcolonial India, he is adapted as a symbol of rejuvenation, expressing common futures only

intimated in colonial struggles. Postcolonial Indians use him to signify what the nation could be in a world where independence was not just a promise but a fully realized reality. Most potently, national rediscovery falls along the lines of Hindu-ness, summoning Shivaji's political project as a rule wholly unlike his Muslim predecessors and a resurrection of a past seemingly lost to foreign dominion. Indians embarking on this path wish to shed their colonial legacy's contrivances and bring back a Hindu history lost to years of secularist politics.

Nevertheless, contemporary Indians of many political persuasions imagine him as a symbol of higher purpose, of political destiny. He imbued a sullen people with patriotism, enlisted and cohered them for the political doings of war, administration, and diplomacy. In the process, the Marathas spread across the subcontinent and brought about the early decline of their imperial overlords. How can a subjugated people, newly in control of life or at least beginning to regain it, not see an inspiring story in Shivaji? People do not passively imbibe history; they leverage, shape, and, most importantly, *use it*. Therefore, Shivaji has signified various political designs, social aims, and cultural programs as a reminder of destiny. This paper aims to trace and understand how historians have retailed Shivaji in that manner. Echoing Nietzsche, history grows from the historian, his historical circumstances and interpretive vision. History does not happen on a whim or idly; it is an unconscious yet concerted effort to find meaning in the past and therefore has a meaning from people, even if submerged in their consciousness.

James Grant Duff: Immoral Shivaji in the Colonial Mind

James Grant Duff's *History of the Mahrattas* (1826) grew out of his central participation in the English East India Company's (EIC) final subjugation of the Maratha state eight years prior. The work is an account of the "rise, progress, and decline of our immediate predecessors in

conquest."[149] He investigates how the Marathas acquired their territory in hopes of revealing more about the English's "own vast empire in that quarter."[150] Knowledge of the Marathas followed their incorporation into the expanding British Empire on the subcontinent. To familiarize the English, Grant Duff grasps for a "civilizational explanation" that anchors Shivaji's rise within the broader category of Marathas as "a people and a nation."[151] He connects the arc of Maratha history to their ensuing twilight by explaining Shivaji in terms of an essential Maratha character measured against "the progress of human civilization," sealing their place in the dustbin of history with a conqueror's pronunciations.[152]

Grant Duff refashions Maratha historical knowledge along the lines of colonial rule, birthing a new historiographical tradition. He qualifies his credentials as a historian but reasons that members of his military service must write history about those they subjugate, for how else would "materials for the future historian…be derived."[153] Mountstuart Elphinstone, the official charged with the settlement of the Deccan, guided Grant Duff as he blazed a path for future colonialists. Grant Duff researched papers in the overthrown Peshwa's palace and did his writing in Satara, where he was the Company's political agent to the puppet Maratha king, Pratapsingh. Grant Duff's research coincided with and reinforced a drive to stabilize the Maratha people and their territory in Company officialdom.

Newfound power in a foreign part of the world confronted Company men, like Grant Duff, with the challenge of rule. As an Orientalist, he responded to power with a keen awareness of the accompanying responsibility and with a paternalistic view of his subjects' quaint virtues

---

[149] James Grant Duff, *A History of the Mahrattas, vol. I* (Calcutta: R. Cambray & Co., 1912), a.
[150] Grant Duff, *A History of the Mahrattas, vol. I,* a.
[151] Prachi Deshpande, *Creative Pasts: Historical Memory and Identity in Western India 1700 – 1960* (Ranikhet: Permanent Black, 2007), 76, 75.
[152] Deshpande, *Creative Pasts*, 74.
[153] Grant Duff, *A History of the Mahrattas, vol. I,* d.

and persistent vices. He imparts his paternalism to English readers by enlisting historical knowledge to close the gap between foreign rulers and indigenous subjects for the ostensible benefit of both. Young colonialists should experience and learn about India for themselves by pursuing their duty as "servant[s] of the public."[154] Moralistic overtones infiltrate this duty and are the reason for probing the history of the Marathas. By appreciating the "many virtues and great qualities" of the natives, the colonial mind is more adept at correcting for the "vices… [that] originated in the corrupt, oppressive government" preceding it.[155] Grant Duff moralizes Maratha history for the stated purpose of stamping out the vices nurtured under the Maratha state and bringing out the intrinsic virtues hidden beneath the "corruption, meanness, and every debasing passion."[156] Grant Duff apprehends the Maratha public on moral terms and thus subordinates them in order to advance colonial rule. He seeks a complete history of the Marathas with "the good and the bad," understanding the "people, their predilections, and their achievements."[157]

Despite preaching a closeness with his Maratha subjects, a teleology skews the account of Shivaji's rise with a need to justify the English conquest. He needed to delegitimize the sovereignty of the newly subjugated Maratha state by establishing that its rise was morally dubious and did not originate from the honorable conduct of Shivaji, who had supposedly imbued Marathas with a capacity to rule. Grant Duff narrates the Marathas' actions by tracing the instability of their rule and the drive to settle it, sublimating a colonial preoccupation with control in his history. A desire to hold onto and acquire power outlines the context within which the Marathas assert and reveal themselves as a people. He narrates the rise of Shivaji in the wider

[154] Grant Duff, *A History of the Mahrattas, vol. I,* 18.
[155] Grant Duff, *A History of the Mahrattas, vol. I,* 18.
[156] Grant Duff, *A History of the Mahrattas, vol. I,* 18.
[157] Deshpande, *Creative Pasts*, 75, 74.

frame of a Maratha character, reasoning that a "true Mahratta policy" enticed him duplicitously to seize "an opportunity of throwing off…allegiance."[158] Grant Duff terms Shivaji's band of warriors "Deccanees," showing their innate, rapacious disposition as the bane of a civilized power.[159] They were "[adept] at intrigue and negotiation where force was ineffectual" and "were always found particularly serviceable in stopping roads and intercepting supplies, in hanging on the rear of a flying enemy, and in plundering and devastating a country."[160] He defines the essence of being Maratha through their destructive role in the machinations and campaigns of power.

The Marathas went from "nameless" to "fast rising into consequence" due to their predatory, greedy participation in rulership.[161] According to Grant Duff, civilized, Muslim states "stirred those latent embers" of the "turbulent predatory spirit"[162] of the Marathas. He goes on to claim that "the contention of their conquerors…kindled [them] amid the forests of the Syhadree mountains, they burst forth in spreading flame, and men afar off wondered at the conflagration."[163] Grant Duff reduces the political agency of the Marathas to an unthinking, monstrous natural phenomenon, a forest fire, instigated, conversely, by the pronominal agency of the Muslim conquerors. In this metaphor, Muslims are the subject that forces the destructive action of the direct object, the Marathas. By situating their rise within a tempest of destruction, deceit, and depravity, the author characterizes the rapid extension of their power as the result of immoral, illicit methods, which were not civilized, and emblemized by animalistic and natural metaphors. When Grant Duff exhorts English readers to discover India's "virtues and great

---

[158] Grant Duff, *A History of the Mahrattas, vol. I,* 42, 44.
[159] Grant Duff, *A History of the Mahrattas, vol. I,* 38.
[160] Grant Duff, *A History of the Mahrattas, vol. I,* 84, 64.
[161] Grant Duff, *A History of the Mahrattas, vol. I,* 77.
[162] Grant Duff, *A History of the Mahrattas, vol. I,* 51.
[163] Grant Duff, *A History of the Mahrattas, vol. I,* 51.

qualities," what he truly wants is for them to rule Maharashtra and overlay the "superstition, cruelty, and treachery…justly alleged against [Shivaji]" with an imperial benevolence that comes from studying the people.[164]

Grant Duff relates Shivaji's establishment of rule to its eventual decline by representing a static Maratha character as fateful. To apprehend their history and, in turn, to know them as subjects, he reads the history backward, fixing them within a story paved by their inevitable subjugation. Colonial domination sealed the Marathas' present, signaling to Grant Duff the truth about the past and the Marathas themselves. He argues that Shivaji mustered a deviousness to cohere a Maratha people lacking "a more exalted patriotism."[165] Each Maratha had an independent, narrow selfishness that kept them "poised against each other."[166] However, Shivaji, "watching and crouching like the wily tiger," "secretly, but actively, employed in very extensive plans" to obtain allegiance from the various Maratha holders of jagirs and forts.[167] Throughout the text, Grant Duff is careful to frame Shivaji's success as an accident originating from "the confusion of other states" and hinging solely on a genius that "none of his successors inherited."[168] Depicting the rest of his people as “wild” and only temporarily “tamed,” he contextualizes their early successes and greatest hero, Shivaji, as exceptional aberrations in the overarching category of Marathas. [169] Grant Duff characterizes the rise of the Company's predecessors in a way that implicitly prefigures their decline. Marathas' achievement is a fleeting outcome not due to their innate agency but that of an exceptional man and the diverted attention of their rulers. Even when they are in power, he consigns the Marathas to the position of

---

[164] Grant Duff, *A History of the Mahrattas, vol. I,* 18, 239.
[165] Grant Duff, *A History of the Mahrattas, vol. I,* 100, 65.
[166] Grant Duff, *A History of the Mahrattas, vol. I,* 65.
[167] Grant Duff, *A History of the Mahrattas, vol. I,* 107, 110.
[168] Grant Duff, *A History of the Mahrattas, vol. I,* d, 242.
[169] Grant Duff, *A History of the Mahrattas, vol. I,* 240, 239, 242.

subjects, lacking the inherent social ability to rule themselves. They were merely a people who "took advantage of the weakness" and "distractions which prevailed" in the government of Bijapur.[170]

With the first complete history of the Marathas produced for the colonial mind, a new historiographical discourse was born that signaled the dusk of the Maratha political world and the dawn of "new perceptions and practices of history among Indians."[171] New, European histories of recently conquered territories heralded a takeover of even the epistemological independence of India, tying knowledge, including self-knowledge among Indians, to colonial power. With an eye toward future historians, Grant Duff justified himself as a conqueror writing the history of the conquered. Conquest had furnished the materials of history for a new colonial society. It removed the 'obstacles' and 'dubious' networks of information that had been undergirded by indigenous power, clearing the way for the "grand object [that] was the TRUTH."[172] From the conquest onwards, truth in colonial India existed within a framework and discursive field created by Grant Duff and his soldier-historian contemporaries. Endowed by prestige and the purpose of power, Grant Duff displaces Shivaji from his role as a moral touchstone. He debases the Maratha people by insinuating vices and superstitions predominated and animated the country before the English arrival. Thus, Grant Duff's history grounds the Maratha state's destruction and the English ascendence in civilizational and moral terms.

Mahadev Govind Ranade: A 'Catholic' Reformation for Maharashtra

Mahadev Govind Ranade in *Rise of the Maratha Power* (1900) elevates the reputation of the Marathas so debased in colonial thought. Successive generations of Maharashtrians came to

[170] Grant Duff, *A History of the Mahrattas, vol. I,* 59, 207.
[171] Deshpande, *Creative Pasts*, 71.
[172] Grant Duff, *A History of the Mahrattas, vol. I,* iii.

understand themselves as subjects through the power and prestige of their conqueror, James Grant Duff, alternatively accepting or challenging his premises. Ranade repeatedly references only one historian, Grant Duff himself, whom he calls the "authority" and even anoints "*the* historian of the Marathas."[173] At the nineteenth century's close, as Maharashtrians increasingly identified with a Maratha past and regional ethnicity, Ranade formulated a heritage and defended it from an antagonism at the dawn of the century. A jurist employed by the colonial state, he lived, worked, and was esteemed in an environment reverberating with Macaulay's dismissive tone. Even a sympathetic voice like Grant Duff wrote a history of Ranade's forebears steeped in a portrayal of depravity and riven rule. Therefore, Ranade writes from a sort of "double consciousness," whereby a Maharashtrian and a Macaulayist voice pull at his sense of self.[174] Speaking to that Macaulayist "internalized external audience,"[175] he enlists the "sympathy of the representatives of the conquering British power in the fortunes of its worsted rival [the Maratha Confederacy]."[176] Simultaneously, he proves, through an incipient Maharashtrian self-confidence, that the Maratha state's "underlying principles had stronger vitality," premised on a movement of nation-building that offered a "moral significance" to contemporary Maharashtrians.[177]

Ranade's objective is at once ambitious and moderate. He inverts the negative moral meaning Grant Duff assigned to the rise of Shivaji and the Maratha state more broadly. Moderate in the sense, he still fits his effort "to remove many misapprehensions" in an imperial paradigm, understanding Maratha greatness as the 'nation's' comparability and similarity to Europe.[178] He

---

[173] Mahadev Govind Ranade, *The Rise of the Maratha Power* (Bombay: Punalekar & Co., 1900), ii.
[174] James W. Laine, *Shivaji: Hindu King in Islamic India* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2003), 76
[175] Laine, *Shivaji*, 75.
[176] Ranade, *Maratha Power*, ii.
[177] Ranade, *Maratha Power*, 2, 4.
[178] Ranade, *Maratha Power*, ii.

begins his narrative by uttering Britain and the Maratha Confederacy within the same breath as "two mighty powers" competing for "supremacy in India," situating them on equal footing.[179] Ranade posits the Marathas' greatness in their vanquishers' own distinct experiences of the Reformation and Enlightenment. He wants to prove a "moral interest and political lesson" in the rise of Maratha power that too often is read exclusively in the ascendance of British power.[180] To him, Shivaji symbolizes the rise of a power more properly attributed to the "gifts of body and mind and aspiring ambition of the men of his times."[181] Grant Duff situated Shivaji within the overarching category of Marathas to illustrate the dubious character of the whole Maratha project. Conversely, Ranade does so to integrate the 'nation' with its "higher" symbol, Shivaji, who inspired them to "feel unabated confidence."[182] While centering the category of Maratha, he flips Grant Duff's characterization, arguing that Shivaji was not exceptional but was rather a seed "watered by capable men in all ranks of life."[183] He retrieves the category from its negative clumping to reclaim a regional identity with Shivaji as its manifestation and exemplar. Indeed, "the history of the power associated with the name of Shivaji is very properly called the History of the Marathas."[184]

He infuses a moral and political meaning to the story by interchanging Maratha and British history. In quick succession, in his chapter, "Saints and Prophets of Maharashtra," he explains how Maharashtra followed the same "spirit of protest" that had recast Europe.[185] Intercalating an Anglican-style religion with the "galaxy of saints and prophets" flowing "full tide" in seventeenth-century Maharashtra, he reads a "spiritual emancipation" in the political

[179] Ranade, *Maratha Power*, i.
[180] Ranade, *Maratha Power*, ii.
[181] Ranade, *Maratha Power*, 60.
[182] Ranade, *Maratha Power*, 79-80.
[183] Ranade, *Maratha Power*, 60.
[184] Ranade, *Maratha Power*, 9.
[185] Ranade, *Maratha Power*, 10, 146.

upheaval of the people.[186] With the "ebb" of the "religious development" of which the "political movement was itself only a reflection," Maratha political dominance necessarily became a "thing of the past," exchanged for the supremacy of the British, who had retained the effects of a reformation.[187]

Ranade convinces his English and Maharashtrian audiences that Maharashtra had undergone an identical spiritual and social reformation as Britain's prior to its singular conquests. To him, the region shared a similar, civil character marked by "a vernacular language, tolerant, inclusive national religion, and a common patriotism that overcame class divisions."[188] For on the one hand, he presents the Marathas to his English audience in a way "palatable to a liberal British protestant"[189] in order to refute a lack of "a more exalted patriotism" among Marathas to which, according to Grant Duff, Shivaji was a categorical exception.[190] Ranade illustrates that "what Protestantism did for Western Europe" occurred in Maharashtra as "white heat" of religious revival "animated [the Marathas] by a common purpose."[191] Whereas Grant Duff used a conflagration metaphor to signify Marathas' power as unthinking and accidental, destroying and preying on civilization, Ranade uses it here to show a constructive, active feeling, how they "caught this fire" and made a worthy nation.[192] Indeed, by mobilizing Maratha warriors from the "middle classes of the society," who Ranade calls, "fellow-workers," almost analogous to twentieth-century nationalist political 'workers,' Shivaji was a "representative man of the age."[193] He styles Maratha heritage in a way reminiscent of the proselytizing rhetoric that

---

[186] Ranade, *Maratha Power*, 145, 144.
[187] Ranade, *Maratha Power*, 146.
[188] Ranade, *Maratha Power*, ii.
[189] Laine, *Shivaji*, 75.
[190] Grant Duff, *A History of the Mahrattas, vol. I,* 100.
[191] Ranade, *Maratha Power*, 11, 57.
[192] Ranade, *Maratha Power*, 69, 52.
[193] Ranade, *Maratha Power*, 57, 49.

underlined the colonial superiors' pedigree. While on the other hand, for his countrymen, he speaks to the influence of contemporary social reformers who married religion and politics, committing Indians to learn the fundamentals of nation-building and the modern, 'catholic' faith that would underpin it. To Ranade, the Maratha past was a model and instructive for this education. '*Swaraj'* or self-rule had imbued the Marathas with a "higher…self-confidence" which endured because of the "schooling and discipline" they had acquired under a religious revival.[194] Perhaps Maharashtrians in Ranade's time could gain a similar confidence if they underwent needed social penance and a consequent religious rejuvenation. Colonial rule interlaced British and Maharashtrian self-knowledge. Ranade remarkably grafts the explanation of superior historical development often given to justify the British's place as rulers onto the history of the Marathas, recovering an image of Maharashtrian *swaraj* negotiated from the rhetoric of those who took it away.

A Macaulay-influenced education system, steeped in an imperial repertoire of literature and history had instilled in him Britain's heroism and superior morality and his own native literature and history's baseness. The Anglicist view prevailed as a physical force in his life, following him everywhere and shaping a discursive regime with which he inevitably had to engage. Therefore, he provides his "special study" of the Maratha past as "a matter of absorbing interest to the British Rulers of India."[195] Since historical knowledge was tasked and governed by colonialists, he furnishes Maratha history's "moral import" for the epistemological needs of imperial power.[196] Like Grant Duff, he grasps for the Maratha past because they were "the immediate predecessors" of British imperialism.[197] While he approaches his study under the same

[194] Ranade, *Maratha Power*, 79.
[195] Ranade, *Maratha Power*, 8, 5.
[196] Ranade, *Maratha Power*, 1.
[197] Ranade, *Maratha Power*, 4.

framework to 'better understand the current (British) empire,' Ranade tacks a different approach, centering the Marathas as "first place" among powers that "made or unmade" the Emperors of Delhi and ascribing a definite, glowing importance to its central role in pre-British India.[198] Consequently, he relocates the Maratha past as a moral touchstone within a framework made relevant to British imperialism. Ranade imagines the lessons derived from this endeavor might open "the possibilities…to a Federated India, distributed according to nationalities, and subjected to a common bond of connection with the Imperial Power of the Queen-Empress of India."[199] To him, Maratha history deserves special attention for a united India, reconstituted and bound together as imperial subjects. He explicitly states the following about the Maratha 'national' movement of the seventeenth century, "the attempt failed; but even the failure was itself an education in the highest virtues, and possibly intended to be a preparatory discipline to cement the union of Indian races under British guidance."[200] Ranade's moral of the story is that while the 'national' movement envisioned by Shivaji and the men of his time cohered Marathas together, it was a "disorganized" effort, which "was wanting," and achieved "on a smaller scale."[201] Ultimately, a colonial power completed the national experiment by supplying a unified state and guidance for Indians. Thus, because he simultaneously recovers a moralistic national history and encloses it with imperial authority and 'guidance,' Ranade's history is a discursive reversal that ritualistically upholds the relationships underpinning colonial society instead of disrupting them.

Ranade cloaks Maratha history in the moral pretensions of the British to claim a fraction of the confidence he saw in those who had pronounced the twilight of the Maratha political world in 1818. Grant Duff had imprinted a relationship of dominance and subordination by

[198] Ranade, *Maratha Power*, 5.
[199] Ranade, *Maratha Power*, 16.
[200] Ranade, *Maratha Power*, iv.
[201] Ranade, *Maratha Power*, i, 7, 11.

ripping morality, civilization, and heroism from his native sources and predicating himself and his English readers on a higher plane of moral judgment. To counter the demeaning discourse, Ranade adopts the moral prestige of the imperial rulers as his own, ensuring the continuity in the reversed form of the British's moral rightness. His self-searching is that of a subject not aimed at postcolonial citizenship. He appeals to his fellow Maharashtrians for a reformed, united, and confident subjecthood molded off the religion of "pure heart" and "law of love," which upswelled their Maratha ancestors.[202] His intervention tries to establish a moral equivalency from a putative common experience of Reformation that had supposedly forged both the Marathas and British into united nations and poised them for dominance in their respective political projects for India.

K.A Keluskar: A Mythic Hero for Low Caste Honor

Nationalists of all stripes saw Shivaji as an ideal for *swaraj*, seldom questioning its implicit patriotic reading. However, divergent dreams for independence contested and pluralized the particular meaning assigned to his life. Shivaji's heroism and inherent nobility were rarely up for debate, but who or what such heroism stood for was hotly debated. Depending on one's social location, embracing or eschewing mythicized qualities of the story gleaned specific ideas about resistance, independence, and identity. K.A. Keluskar wrote with a different social location in mind than Ranade. Keluskar was a social reformer from the marginal Saraswat caste. Chitapavan brahmins, who monopolized government jobs and Western education in colonial Maharashtra, questioned his varna status. He dedicates his book to the Maratha prince, Shahu of Kolhapur, who was also denied Vedic rituals and whose sovereignty as a kshatriya was in doubt. As a descendant of Shivaji, similar Brahmin reservations regarding his right to rule plagued Shahu.

[202] Ranade, *Maratha Power*, 10.

He did not forget that the British restored the rule of the Bhonsle lineage after deposing the Brahmin Peshwas, whom Grant Duff had portrayed as unjustly seizing the Maratha state from them. Ranade was a Chitapavan. He tended to ascribe the success of Shivaji to a broader religious and social movement mediated and guided by Brahmins and saints. For him, unburdened as he was by caste, the heroism stood for a regional identity lifted by a dharma that had united "all who are Marathas together."[203] Caste had "no place" in a regional awakening.[204] Ranade posits the political movement as a reflection of the region's widespread dharmic feeling, one that denies caste inequalities and transcends the religious logic of Shivaji's *swaraj*. In the process, he downplays Shivaji's mythic heroism. Ranade saw Shivaji as stitched in with the social upheaval of seventeenth-century Maharashtra, someone conditioned by his times rather than its ordained hero. As such, he was heroic insofar as the movement was heroic: the great body of Marathas that upswelled in a national "experiment."[205]

The social quality of Ranade's Maharashtrian dharma contrasts sharply with the mythic dharma lionizing Shivaji in Keluskar. The biography's title reflects his conception of dharma, *The Biography of Chatrapati Shivaji Maharaj, Ornament of the Kshatriya Race* (1907). The complete invocation of Shivaji's royal title emphasizes Shivaji's indisputable sovereignty, which allowed the people to "breathe freely the spirit of liberty and independence."[206] Keluskar premises the establishment of "a new era," or the restoration of Hindu liberties and religion, on Shivaji as an "idol of the people," restoring the sources of his heroism and kingship.[207] He endows a mythic tale to Shivaji's personage. He was born into a family whose loss of power

[203] Ranade, *Maratha Power*, 143.
[204] Ranade, *Maratha Power*, 155.
[205] Ranade, *Maratha Power*, 7.
[206] K.A. Keluskar, *The Biography of Chatrapati Shivaji Maharaj, Ornament of the Kshatriya Race* (Bombay: Manoranjan Press, 1907), 105.
[207] Keluskar, *The Biography of Chatrapati Shivaji Maharaj,* 207, 105.

supposedly coincided with Islam's atrocities sweeping the land. Keluskar retails miraculous appearances of the Goddess Bhavani which herald Shivaji as an "invincible hero" ordained with divine favor, destined to "rid the world of such an abomination" and whose chivalry and valor emulate that of the Puranas.[208] To Keluskar, *swaraj*, in Shivaji's time and his present, did not need Brahmin sanction, disputing Ranade, who centered the influence of Dadaji. In fact, Brahmins often threw difficulties and would have chilled Shivaji if he was a "common man" – *swaraj* "would have been stopped forever."[209] Keluskar ties *swaraj* to Shivaji's person as a mythic embodiment of a kshatriya resistance to evil. Countering a "militant Mahomedan creed"[210] was not a religious movement but a single man who "fought so nobly and strenuously in the cause of his country's gods and religion."[211] God's grace came in the form of Shivaji, unmediated and independent, an emblem of Hindu rule counteracting Muslim rule. But more importantly, for Keluskar, he represented a patently kshatriya vision of *swaraj*, fighting with a warrior's pride and thus earning "the name of Kshatriya more than those who masqueraded under it."[212]

The honorable name was evident to the humble people Shivaji protected. Independence was an "enduring compact between sovereign and his subjects" as he planted a "puissant Hindu monarchy."[213] Keluskar attributes national liberation to a martial ethos inherent in Shivaji, whose power and protection exalted the lower castes. Thus, his heroism presented an ideal of *swaraj* in which caste did not merely disappear, as Ranade argues, but was rather a positive indication of bravery and capability. In other words, kshatriya had a meaning more than serving Brahmins. It

---

[208] Keluskar, *The Biography of Chatrapati Shivaji Maharaj,* 10, 230.
[209] Keluskar, *The Biography of Chatrapati Shivaji Maharaj,* 80.
[210] Ranade, *Maratha Power*, 50.
[211] Keluskar, *The Biography of Chatrapati Shivaji Maharaj,* 352.
[212] Keluskar, *The Biography of Chatrapati Shivaji Maharaj,* 368.
[213] Keluskar, *The Biography of Chatrapati Shivaji Maharaj,* 367, 368.

meant doing what Brahmins could not, something "too audacious" as they lacked a "wide outlook of vision."[214] While Brahmins wavered, Shivaji converted the Mavalis, "rude and semi-civilized people," into "efficient instruments of the great cause looming before him," making them his own as "most faithful and upright of followers."[215] Keluskar, an exponent of the non-brahmin movement, tapped Shivaji to inspire a vision for India in which lower castes were central to the nation's work. His glory became their glory; Shivaji folded their lives with his own as they spilled and sacrificed blood for and with him. Keluskar portrays Shivaji as never missing an opportunity to entrust the "right duty to the right man," often of modest background.[216] Ranade had subsumed the humble men within a mass upheaval, stationary components in a moving regional story. Instead, Keluskar positions them as the engine that drives the story and the first people "in his [Shivaji's] confidence and the repository of the most secret of his plans."[217]

Listening to "their tales of sorrow and anguish," Shivaji brought their "burnt hearts" into his midst as warriors *par excellence* for the religion.[218] At the same time, their supposed superiors and professed exponents of religion make "ten thousand speeches."[219] Keluskar imparts glory to the trusty Mavalis by dint of service as loyal subjects and warriors to the "sovereign lord."[220] The mutual bond with the sovereign gloriously goading low caste followers against the enemy is shown as Keluskar quotes a Mavali leader exclaiming in death, "I am a true servant to Shivaji and will not hear of terms of surrender. Sooner, will I die than yield!"[221] The call of duty

---

[214] Keluskar, *The Biography of Chatrapati Shivaji Maharaj,* 78, 77.
[215] Keluskar, *The Biography of Chatrapati Shivaji Maharaj,* 86, 106.
[216] Keluskar, *The Biography of Chatrapati Shivaji Maharaj,* 106.
[217] Keluskar, *The Biography of Chatrapati Shivaji Maharaj,* 118.
[218] Keluskar, *The Biography of Chatrapati Shivaji Maharaj,* 86, 86.
[219] Keluskar, *The Biography of Chatrapati Shivaji Maharaj,* 80.
[220] Keluskar, *The Biography of Chatrapati Shivaji Maharaj,* 257.
[221] Keluskar, *The Biography of Chatrapati Shivaji Maharaj,* 258.

is his *raison d'être*: binding his sword to Shivaji's provides meaning in life and death. Thus, Keluskar blends lowly Mavali identity, which colonial authorities later marked as criminal, with a story of courage and self-sacrifice for the whole nation, a nation that ungratefully still considers them as wayward and "habitual offenders."[222] In his narrative, they are not only a part of the country's story but central and heroes in it. Indeed, with each advance of Shivaji's righteous rule, each territory lifted by freedom and independence was "retrenched…and kept in a state of high efficiency under a garrison of his faithful Mavalis."[223]

Keluskar recovers the idea of caste as central to the story of Shivaji, not merely as a function of Brahmin direction but as a matter of lower caste agency. For him, Shivaji stood for independence premised and developing from his nonbrahmin identity. But what about the religious logic inherent in the myth he regales? What explains Keluskar's positioning of Shivaji's heroism, which freed common people, in opposition to and indeed "hatred of" Islam?[224] An implicit religious logic is present in Ranade's narrative, too, even without the mythos of Keluskar. Whether Shivaji is heroic or the movement he represents is heroic, the underlying significance for all of India remains the same. It still presupposes resistance against and independence won from surrounding Muslim states. If Shivaji or his movement should serve as inspiration for India, apparently motivated as they were by patriotism, the logic of a hero battling Muslims is inherently religious, even if someone like Ranade tries to shed the religious mythification.

---

[222] The Mavalis belong to the Koli caste which was designated as a ‘Criminal Tribe’ under the Criminal Tribes Act. Upon independence, the Indian government replaced the designation with the Habitual Offenders Act, recognizing certain tribes, like the Kolis, as dangers to society. The irony is clear here. A group of people who feature prominently in Keluskar’s account of the Indian nation’s supposed independence struggle are at present relegated to the margins of the same nation.
[223] Keluskar, *The Biography of Chatrapati Shivaji Maharaj,* 105.
[224] Keluskar, *The Biography of Chatrapati Shivaji Maharaj,* 67.

However, a key difference exists. While Ranade tries, albeit half-heartedly, to include Muslims in a vision for Maharashtra, usually as reformed universalists, Keluskar paints Muslims as enemies in a cosmic battle for supremacy, articulated in Shivaji's status as a hero for the lower castes. In the narrative, the author often ventriloquizes Shivaji; whether such dialogue is authentic is uncertain. At one point, Shivaji explains his desire to fight Islamic rule, "The worth of a manly life, what is it to be found in, if not in a life of toil? Do you not see how the Mahomedan domination has crushed the life out of Hindu society and religion, kine and Brahmans, gods and shrines have been polluted and desecrated in all the land, and no champion has sprung forth from the groaning soil."[225] The second sentence clearly describes Muslim rule as following the trope of the Kali Yuga, the final and current age in Indian cosmology. It is when Hindu dharma degenerates and human affairs are oppressive, polluted with sin and blood. Keluskar interpolates Islam as the evil upending the world. In this scheme, Shivaji is the champion who can restore the world. Compare the previous description of Muslim rule's cosmic imbalance with Keluskar's picture of administration under Shivaji,

> The reformed system of revenue was speedily introduced here, and the ryots oppressed under Mahomedan misrule now breathed a new atmosphere of hope and confidence. The old village organizations and institutions that had disappeared during years of confusion and anarchy were revived. The annual grants once conceded to temples and Brahmans were restored, and those which had remained despite the adverse circumstances were confirmed. The poor Hindu subjects were gratified at this beneficent and auspicious commencement of Shivaji's regime, and his fame as a merciful and benignant ruler spread far and wide. This was the beginning of Shivaji's great triumphs. A spirit of noble exaltation and emulation now entirely possessed the hearts of his followers.[226]

[225] Keluskar, *The Biography of Chatrapati Shivaji Maharaj,* 78.
[226] Keluskar, *The Biography of Chatrapati Shivaji Maharaj,* 114.

Shivaji's kshatriya mythology is useful here. Keluskar presents Shivaji as a hero to the lower classes – those seemingly most affected by the disorder under the Muslims. Thus, Islam becomes a representation of the domination experienced by the lowly 'ryots,' an imagined Other set up for a cosmic battle on their behalf. For their part, he shows Shivaji's followers recognizing their leader's cosmic role. They are healed of their quarrels, lifted from brigandage, and now "shine by the reflected light of" Shivaji.[227] In Keluskar's retelling, a significant victory in the cosmic struggle is often accompanied by the unearthing of miraculous treasure, which only multiplies the "enthusiasm of the multitude" and inspires hope among them.[228] The recurring discovery of treasure connects a Providential, divine quality of Shivaji's struggle to its earthly manifestation, riches and ammunition flowing from miracles. Islam is the dark background on which Shivaji's kshatriya chivalry and valor shine. Keluskar models caste resistance on an earthly salvation from evil.

While Indian cultural contestants during the colonial period agreed that the Maratha past should inspire the nation, they turned the story of Shivaji to suit their needs. Historians' disparate social locations complicated the task of resurrecting the tale's morality evacuated by Grant Duff. They wanted morality to serve different purposes and advance not always coincidental dreams for India. Ranade returned morality to an imagined regional community in which caste and differences were subsumed under a spiritual movement of reformation. Sovereignty belonged to a normative regional conception. To someone like Ranade, an elite of Maharashtrian society, a judge no less, that normativity did not pose a problem; his place was secure and presumed. However, to nonnormative people, those denied rituals and whose place in Brahmin-dominated Maharashtra seemed in question, such a conception threatened to swallow or deny their identity.

---

[227] Keluskar, *The Biography of Chatrapati Shivaji Maharaj,* 89.
[228] Keluskar, *The Biography of Chatrapati Shivaji Maharaj,* 96.

Ranade dismisses the lived experiences and much of what made the story heroic to low-caste people. Ranade believed forthrightly that social conditions were reformed enough for a liberal, encompassing *swaraj* to emerge – a hero prefigured. On the other hand, Keluskar, knowing full well the enduring reality of difference, heralds a hero who fights against that reality; indeed, *he* prefigures *swaraj* as an idol of the people. What came first and was responsible for *swaraj*, the chicken or egg (Shivaji or a religious movement), signifies what the narrative inspires – a reformation or restoration, a movement or an identity, the nation or another.

Jadunath Sarkar: Tragedy and Modernity

The last two historians wrote during the early decades of the twentieth century, a crucible for churning mass politics, with every quarter of Indian society claiming and wanting consequence. Ranade and Keluskar foregrounded a heroic narrative to inspire particular identity politics, respectively regional and caste-based narratives. In *Shivaji and His Times* (1919), Jadunath Sarkar, a Bengali historian, unlike the last two Maharashtrians, withheld a prideful reading from Shivaji until the 'facts' could speak for themselves. He deemed much of the history written in his midst as 'false patriotism,' literally false – a history's normative wrongness originating from its methodological unsoundness.[229] For Ranade and Keluskar, the mobilization of public opinion superseded a commitment to facts and truth. Conversely, Sarkar harmonized patriotic and positivist thought, fighting to wrest Indian history away from his contemporaries, for whom scientific history merely existed as a cloak for identity politics.

Since Grant Duff, Indian historians, while differing on the specifics, generally premised their histories on restoring Shivaji as a moral touchstone, as a figure who induced pride and

[229] Dipesh Chakrabarty, *The Calling of History: Sir Jadunath Sarkar and His Empire of Truth* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2015), 149.

warmed the soul with glory and idealism. To them, Shivaji was the last echo of indigenous rule prevailing against foreign rule. While Sarkar indeed agrees that Shivaji was a "great constructive genius," he does not assign a straightforward glorious meaning to his construction.[230] Instead, he laments at the "canker" which brought about the "ruin" of the Maratha state.[231] Brought up within the horizons of the British Empire, Sarkar, like Ranade, encountered constant scorn from colonialists portraying India as backward and Indian historical knowledge as inferior. Ranade responded by appropriating the British's moral smugness and reading it as equally present in the Maratha past. He leveraged incipient Maharashtrian confidence to counter negative portrayals in the British imagination. By contrast, Sarkar read tragedy in Maratha India, with the "full stature of their growth" lost once Shivaji passed.[232] British depredations made Sarkar defensive and drove him to read civilization in Indian history – to prove himself as civilized and assess India's past on the notions of civilization he imbibed. Whereas Ranade finds lessons in Marathas' success and growth, Sarkar derives equal teaching from their defects and failures. He saw the British as providential paragons of civilization. Had the Marathas "also possessed the organising skill, the power of co-operation, the tact in the management of instruments and colleagues, the foresight, and the saving common sense of the Anglo-Saxon race," their political aim might have reached fruition.[233]

Sarkar forged a national history from the moral capability and civilization that dressed the British Empire in colonial rhetoric. Unlike Keluskar, he depicts the Mughals not as evil but simply incapable and the Marathas as heroic insofar as they are capable in war and politics. Mistakes and incompetence drive the narrative with a revolving array of Mughal generals and

[230] Jadunath Sarkar, *Shivaji and His Times* (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1920), 441.
[231] Sarkar, *Shivaji and His Times,* 429.
[232] Sarkar, *Shivaji and His Times,* 443.
[233] Sarkar, *Shivaji and His Times,* 18.

viceroys, each as "weak and indolent" as the next.[234] Echoing Grant Duff, Sarkar frames Maratha successes as contingent on "discord in the Mughal army."[235] Nonetheless, success belongs to Shivaji, who "made the most of this golden opportunity," infusing a spirit in his men.[236] Thus, at the right moment, "the faithful servant did his appointed duty…[and] defended his post with tireless energy."[237] The Muslims' discord had a different meaning to Sarkar than to Grant Duff. It cast in sharp relief a mixed national capability in precolonial India. For Sarkar, capability was a measure of civilization and agency that outweighed mythicized or heroic qualities of the story. Sarkar idealized governmental duty, reminiscent of the kind of civilizing mission which Grant Duff had exhorted his countrymen to undertake on Indians' behalf. Sarkar evinces an idealization or romanticization of the English colonialists' valor, boldly bringing peace and order to India, in how he portrays Shivaji's raid on Surat, a sea trading outpost for English and other Europeans. While the townspeople and Mughal governor shrank, fled, and hid, the English Company's men made a "gallant stand and saved not only the Company's property, but also the quarter of the town situated round the English factory."[238] The "manly spirit" of the foreigners emphasized a feeling of "shame," a shame that should resonate with his Indian audiences.[239] Sarkar, like many Indians, was humiliated by condescending rhetoric from their colonial overlords. To remedy this "wounded psychology," they turned to history.[240] Ranade and Keluskar, like most of those who enlisted history to "aid public life," wanted to compensate for the depredations and raise India's "lowered heads."[241] By contrast, Sarkar imbibed European standards and sought to emulate and transform that shame into an impetus for modernity instead of rebelling or compensating. Hence,

---

[234] Sarkar, *Shivaji and His Times,* 180.
[235] Sarkar, *Shivaji and His Times,* 181.
[236] Sarkar, *Shivaji and His Times,* 197.
[237] Sarkar, *Shivaji and His Times,* 84.
[238] Sarkar, *Shivaji and His Times,* 108.
[239] Sarkar, *Shivaji and His Times,* 100.
[240] Chakrabarty, *The Calling of History*, 42.
[241] Chakrabarty, *The Calling of History*, 42.

he devotes a chapter illustrating this incident to his readers so they could take notice of the British defending their own against foreign forces. He saw in his own time the British securing their interests and imposing their will, often at the expense of Indians.

Sarkar forged a national history with an endpoint in mind – the eventual subjugation of the Marathas and India. Whereas Ranade and Keluskar wanted the Maratha past to be inspiring, something that was great by itself, Sarkar did not want to ignore the elephant in the room. Thus, he shows that "the man of action, the soldier-statesman, always triumphs over the mere scheming Machiavel."[242] He projected action as bereft among the Mughals, present but unrealized in the Marathas, and perfectly exemplified in the British, who were bystanders until "the mailed fist of Wellesley was thrust into" India.[243] While Shivaji's "practical ability" taught Indians they could be "rulers of men, and even a king of kings," its "laboured but flimsy tissue of statecraft" could not withstand the pure force of the British.[244]

Sarkar's narrative is almost bland, a one-thing-after-another narration of political machinations and military actions. Most of the volume is focused on assessing the sequence of events, following Ranke's prescription to relate "the way it happened." As an intelligent Indian scholar operating in an arena dominated by Europeans, he adapted to their rules, beating them at their own game – a bedrock of unquestionable facts determined his nationalist claims. Sarkar aimed to mold the national mind along the "right lines," based on European standards of scholarship, which formed an idealized "republic of letters" in his imagination.[245] He premised patriotism on 'truth' so that the 'right' lessons could be derived for the nation. Throughout the text, Sarkar purposefully refrains from attaching the 'Ji' suffix to Shivaji's name, which normally

[242] Sarkar, *Shivaji and His Times,* 436.
[243] Sarkar, *Shivaji and His Times,* 436.
[244] Sarkar, *Shivaji and His Times,* 440, 443, 436.
[245] Chakrabarty, *The Calling of History*, 43.

denotes reverence. He is skeptical of the almost blind veneration paid to Shivaji and his political movement. To him, such idealization of the Maratha endeavor was dubious and obscured the lessons pertinent to contemporary India. He tempers the passionate heat that incited historians to be cavalier with evidence, debunking the Maratha past as a time of unabashed moral righteousness and ambitious vision. Sifting through the sources, Sarkar concludes that temple destruction likely did not cause pure indignation from Shivaji and thus a rupture with the Mughals.[246] He impartially appraises the rhetoric espoused by Shivaji as skewed depictions, "boasting" about divine inspiration and being unable to justify "his spoilation of his neighbours" morally.[247]

Most of all, Sarkar qualifies the political ambition of swaraj as something "we cannot confidently deduce."[248] Shivaji "never posed as the liberator of the Hindus in general, at all events until long afterward."[249] For Sarkar, swaraj was not a glorious triumph but an ideal that was incipient and beleaguered during Shivaji's time – "a period of preparation and not of fruition."[250] While for his religious movement, which Ranade had said made the nation "more prone to hold together,"[251] Sarkar argues that the evidence of Ramdas' influence on the political ideal was inadequate.[252] Moreover, the movement, "teaching the sanctity of conduct rather than mere birth," did not negate what Sarkar saw as evident, that "caste has always remained a disintegrating force."[253] Parroting the colonial line portraying India as inherently divided, he sees this enduring reality in the "social war" waged by fellow historians as they turned Shivaji's story

[246] Sarkar, *Shivaji and His Times,* 186.
[247] Sarkar, *Shivaji and His Times,* 97, 423.
[248] Sarkar, *Shivaji and His Times,* 439.
[249] Sarkar, *Shivaji and His Times,* 29.
[250] Sarkar, *Shivaji and His Times,* 438.
[251] Ranade, *Maratha Power,* 172.
[252] Sarkar, *Shivaji and His Times,* 422.
[253] Sarkar, *Shivaji and His Times,* 11, 12.

to suit their caste biases.[254] He doubts the historical authenticity of Shivaji's political vision for swaraj, certainly emphasizing it as unrealized. A singular hero introduced swaraj as an early, underdeveloped simile of modernity for a land unprepared for it, lacking as it did a "high level of education, civilisation and national spirit."[255] Swaraj "contained within itself the seed of its own death," solely dependent "on the ruler's extraordinary personality and disappeared when the country ceased to produce supermen."[256]

Sarkar appropriated the colonial line when he claimed swaraj was "not organic but artificial, accidental, and therefore precarious."[257] Indeed, he echoes Grant Duff's marginalization of Maratha power as an aberration and fleeting outcome. However, to him, it was a matter of modernity, or a lack thereof, that prefigured Maratha decline, not what Grant Duff claimed were essential elements of the national character. Herein lies the complexity of his appropriation. For Sarkar, Shivaji was not condemned to the dustbin of history. Instead, he could serve as a reminder of what was possible if Indians went about "peacefully building up a well-planned political edifice."[258] India had a learning curve, one that Shivaji neglected. He was too preoccupied with daily struggles "in the teeth of the opposition of four mighty Powers" to "attempt at well-thought-out organised communal improvement, spread of education, or unification of the people."[259] Whereas Duff read abject agency in Maratha failure, Sarkar saw failure as instructive, as a way for Indians to reach their full capability and realize the faults that prevented the "final accomplishment of their union."[260] Sarkar is a throwback to Grant Duff in that he employs a standard of civilization to portray the Marathas' legacy negatively. However,

---

[254] Sarkar, *Shivaji and His Times,* 430.
[255] Sarkar, *Shivaji and His Times,* 433.
[256] Sarkar, *Shivaji and His Times,* 430, 432.
[257] Sarkar, *Shivaji and His Times,* 432.
[258] Sarkar, *Shivaji and His Times,* 438.
[259] Sarkar, *Shivaji and His Times,* 442, 432.
[260] Sarkar, *Shivaji and His Times,* 429.

Sarkar premises his conception of civilization on modernity rather than racial capacity. Definitionally, a country *attains* modernity, a product of progress. A lack of it in the past is not indicative of the future. In Sarkar's story, Shivaji points the nation to a modern future precisely because he failed. Perhaps, because Sarkar was Bengali, he could write Maratha history with a dispassionate voice, looking more for causes and explanations of their subjugation instead of imbuing affective glory.

A narrativization process in the early twentieth century transformed Shivaji into a nationalist icon. For Shivaji to be a father of the nation, it was untenable that he might have had an unhappy family life. Despite evidence indicating otherwise, he needed to be a pious son and loving father. Sarkar and Keluskar's differences on this point show the tension in the historiography at the time as nationalist discourse fought to suppress the 'thought' that Shahji abandoned his son. Ultimately, the 'false' patriotism represented by Keluskar, which Sarkar had resisted, prevailed. Hence, in modern-day India, few consciously contemplate anything less than Shivaji as the obedient son of a loving father. Keluskar offered defenses and carefully contrived arguments to counter Sarkar's claim that "authentic history" indicated that Shahji "abandoned Jijabai and her newborn son" for a "younger and more beautiful wife."[261] For Keluskar, Shivaji's "mysterious hatred" of Islam is what separates father and son.[262] The hero's religious passions, "not in a spirit of rebellion and disobedience," meant that if Shahji's "love to his son…should keep him any longer, there was risk of his fortune and reputation being ruined."[263] Shahji *had* to love his son. Shivaji *could not* be defiant. Indeed, Keluskar conjures a claim that Shahji himself, while still retaining a loyal appearance to Muslims, had "secret approval of his son's designs" for

[261] Sarkar, *Shivaji and His Times,* 20.
[262] Keluskar, *The Biography of Chatrapati Shivaji Maharaj,* 65.
[263] Keluskar, *The Biography of Chatrapati Shivaji Maharaj,* 65.

his "love and affection for Shivaji… [could not be] any way less."[264] For Shivaji to be someone looked upon not only "as their king, but almost as their father," Keluskar had to keep at bay thoughts that threatened the stability of that meaning.[265] While entertaining ideas eventually steamrolled by popular politics, even Sarkar tried to integrate an 'unthinkable' thought into some semblance of a coherent heroic narrative. Shahji's neglect "deepened her [Jijabai's] natural religious spirit, which she imparted to her son."[266] Covering up a crack in the story, Sarkar transformed a shameful fact of Shivaji's life into an impetus for the religious disposition that made him a hero. Any history, even one committed to empiricism like Sarkar's, is fundamentally a story with a plot, characters, and a "commitment to narrative, to telling a grand story, a story about a hero."[267]

Conclusion

Grant Duff's pronunciations were considered authoritative throughout the nineteenth century until burgeoning nationalism in the twentieth century set in motion an evolving discourse of history. Indians began to use history for purposes that conflicted with Grant Duff. Nevertheless, they retailed Shivaji's story within his epistemological paradigm, obsessing over sources to claim the same legitimacy as their conqueror. From 1826, the modern historical biography became the hegemonic form of historical knowledge of Shivaji. Historians wrote in this established and tried configuration to suit their specific needs. Because twentieth-century Shivaji histories followed similar discursive rules, interpretations dialogued and formed an inter-textual tradition in which there was not a singular work that determined the conversation, like it had been for nearly a century after Grant Duff's publication. To wade into the inter-textual

[264]Keluskar, *The Biography of Chatrapati Shivaji Maharaj,* 93, 67.
[265] Keluskar, *The Biography of Chatrapati Shivaji Maharaj,* 106.
[266] Sarkar, *Shivaji and His Times,* 21.
[267] Laine, "Resisting My Attackers; Resisting My Defenders," 156.

discussion, one's history had to fit what was expected – arguments as a function of the same evidentiary base. The motivations for writing history were also implicitly agreed upon – interpretations had to serve a glorious political purpose. Despite the stasis of basic assumptions, the conversation had rippling textures that evinced convergences and divergences in the dreams of their authors. While launching from the same platform, they aimed the story at different political constellations, sometimes close together, other times far apart, but still in the same bounded night sky. Shivaji does not have a singular meaning in India. In the preceding pages, I have examined a body of history writing exemplifying how authors used him with moral purposes in mind. Moral purpose is the *raison d'être* for history, accounting for both a shared desire for a heroic narrative and its divergent retellings.

Roman Viewpoints on Law as Explained in the *Satyricon*

Ilan B. Werblow

Tufts University

From mythical creatures and magic to stories of daring adventures and lavish lifestyles, fanciful tales dominate literature and the imagination. The Romans were no different in their love of literature, and the *Satyricon* is a prime example. At its base, *Satyricon* is a story about a man named Encolpius and his slave, Giton, as they traverse Roman society. They go from dinner party to dinner party, orgy to orgy, getting in trouble each step of the way. Eventually, they run away, only to be shipwrecked and washed ashore. They quickly form wethe idea to swindle the local population, many of whom are legacy hunters, out of their money making for an exciting read full of adventure, romance, and drinking.

The book reveals a lot more about Roman society. Many scholars have talked in-depth about the relationship between Giton and Encolpius and the representation of Roman elite society; however, the book also reveals a lot about the law and the views of law among Romans. As part of the adventure, romance, and drinking in the book, there are many laws broken or used by the characters for their gain. From the theft of property to sexual assault to violence, lawbreaking is a central characteristic of the book. However, the legal system is often ignored and only used in situations where it is the most beneficial for one of the characters while the rest ignore it. Not only is the legal system not used, but it is also actively avoided through payments and other acts. The *Satyricon* shows that the Romans viewed laws as necessary, but often declined to pursue criminals through the legal system, using it only as a last resort.

The views of the Roman legal system present in the *Satyricon* are subtle, as Petronius does not explicitly state how any of the characters feel about the laws or the government; he only hints at their thoughts through their actions and speeches. The longest speech in the *Satyricon* is when Eumolpus recites almost 300 lines about the Civil War between Caesar and Pompey.[268] A poetic description of a historical event may not seem the obvious place to discuss

[268] Petronius, *Satyricon*, 119-124.

Roman law, but Eumolpus' speech contains a wealth of information in what it does not include. Both during and after the Civil Wars, Roman theorists grappled with how internal conflict could happen. Romans thought wars should only be fought when there is a just cause—when the other side has offended the gods irreversibly. By that logic, a civil war would mean one-half of Rome is wrong and has offended the gods, or the leaders are only fighting for themselves and not respecting the idea of a just war. Either option was problematic for Roman theorists to face, so they created excuses. Most ancient authors blamed the moral decadence of Rome during the Late Republic. Lucan highlights the excess of wealth, bribery, electoral and debt crises, as well as the prevalence of crime.[269] While Petronius lists a similar string of complaints in Eumolpus' poem, he includes no mention of crime.[270] While crime is not the most major cause listed by Lucan, for Petronius to leave it out is a major omission. There could be several reasons why Petronius neglected the mention. He may have thought of crime as not as large of a problem during the Late Republic, or he may have seen crime as an issue, but not a cause for the Civil War. However, paired with the rest of the text, Petronius implies that crime was not a major issue at the time because it was dealt with mostly outside the official legal system and government actions. As all legal issues in the *Satyricon* are resolved by agreements between the private citizens involved, and never involve a magistrate or jury, Petronius shows Romans did not significantly use the legal system. As a result, it did not matter as much (in terms of punishments for a crime) who was in charge of the Republic or if one of the triumvirs died. Eumolpus omitting mentions of crime is not an oversight or mistake, but rather evidence of the private nature of crime and punishment in Rome.

---

[269] Lucan, *Pharsalia*, 1.158-1.182.
[270] Connors, Catherine M. *Petronius the Poet: Verse and Literary Tradition in the Satyricon*, 109. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998. doi:10.1017/CBO9780511585272.006.

One of the most prominent examples in the *Satyricon* of criminal matters being settled outside of the official legal system is the death of the goose. Encolpius was in the house of the priestess Oenothea to get her help for his impotence and to make amends with the god, Priapus. Sitting alone in the room while the others are away, he is attacked by three geese, and he kills one. He quickly finds out they were sacred geese belonging to Priapus.[271] This is a major crime on several counts. The first is normal property damage: he killed a goose belonging to someone else. While property damage is a serious crime in Rome, it is not life-threatening. However, because the geese were sacred, this is now a religious crime. The goose is not only the priestess's property but the god's, with Oenothea referring to the goose as "'the darling of Priapus.'"[272] This elevated status of the goose is significant and not just for the narrative's stake. The goose is not just a religious object, but a highly treasured one that belongs and is blessed by the god himself. It is not simply an offering, which, while quite offensive to destroy, is not at the same level as the darling bird of a god. The killing of the bird is significant because it disrupts the Pax Deorum, the peace treaty with the gods that ensures that Roman society is protected and the gods are worshiped. The agreement is reciprocal, so it is beneficial for both sides to take part. What matters is that all the stipulations are followed to the letter. Killing a sacred goose is explicitly against appropriate Roman behavior, and therefore a major issue, not just for Encolpius, but for Roman society as a whole. The agreement between man and the gods is broken and the Roman state needs to respond to fix the wrong as soon as possible. This is because the gods would be justified in ending their protection of Rome and its citizens.

As a result, the punishment is harsh and quick. Oenothea warns that Encolpius will be crucified if the magistrate finds out.[273] This quick, heavy-handed approach to dealing with crime

[271] Petronius, *Satyricon* 136.
[272] Petronius, *Satyricon* 137.
[273] Petronius, *Satyricon* 137.

is a centerpiece of Roman law. However, in the *Satyricon*, the crime and punishment are dealt with quickly, just not by the magistrate or by killing Encolpius. Instead, Encolpius's first instinct is to pay for a new bird, an ostrich specifically. When Oenothea does not take him up on the offer, he gives her two gold coins, which she accepts. Oenothea drops the issue, simply wishing the gods to take mercy on Encolpius.[274] This quick transition from threatening crucifixion to accepting two gold pieces is a major downgrade in punishment.

This implies that Romans avoided the formal legal process when they could. As scholars such as Dennis Kehoe describe, many Romans would avoid the official legal system in favor of more economically beneficial methods.[275] Even though telling the magistrate about the killing and having Encolpius crucified would have restored the Pax Deorum, quickly accepting two gold coins was quick and easy, constituting a reasonable punishment to Oenothea. In addition to being a much easier and quicker process, accepting the gold coins is more beneficial for the priestess than crucifixion. If she turned him into the magistrate, she might not have received any money in return. In addition, she would have to pay for the whole legal process, including hiring someone as an advocate since women were not able to bring forth charges.[276] With definite costs and only a possibility of recouping losses, receiving two gold coins immediately is an incentivizing proposition. There is no surprise from any of the characters in the scene around Oenothea's choice to accept the money; it is anticipated by all. This shows that all three considered payoffs the approach that any proper Roman would choose, further evidence that most non-wealthy Romans avoided the legal system in most circumstances.

---

[274] Petronius, *Satyricon* 137.
[275] Kehoe, Dennis P. "Agency, Roman Law, and Roman Social Values." In *Ancient Law, Ancient Society*, ed. Dennis P. Kehoe and Thomas A. J. McGinn, (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2017), 109.
[276] Bruce Friar Thomas A. J. McGinn. *A Casebook on Roman Family Law.* (Oxford ; Oxford University Press, 2004) 453.

In addition to bypassing the official legal system, Oenothea's decision to accept the two gold coins is proof of another pillar of the Roman criminal process: operating outside the official legal system to avoid rigid punishments. Roman punishments were very strict and followed the letter of the law. This leads to very detailed and carefully worded legal codes, but it can also lead to unjust decisions. If the law says that someone should be crucified for killing a sacred goose, as Oenothea implies, then that is what will happen. This, however, does not lead to any shift in the circumstances. The official written law that would persecute Encolpius does not differentiate the intentional or unintentional killing of a sacred animal. All that matters to the official law and court is that a sacred animal was killed. However, most Romans—as evidenced by this passage and the prevalence of negotiated settlements outside the legal system— would consider the difference. If it was a premeditated killing of a sacred animal, then that would be considered much worse than an accidental death. While Encolpius intended to kill the goose, he did not know it was sacred when he committed the crime. Encolpius describes his struggle against the attacking geese as an act worthy of praise and is surprised when the priestess is so upset.[277] He was alone in a new house in an unknown city and three geese came up to him, started to bite him, and tore his clothes. Faced in that position, anyone would reasonably fight back. Some may not go all the way and kill a goose, but most people would wave their arms and try to hit them and would understand if one is killed in the commotion. In addition, it is unlikely Encolpius knew they were sacred geese.[278] Because he did not know they were sacred and he was attacked first, killing one of the birds is almost reasonable. Owing to this, crucifixion seems unjust as a punishment. While Roman laws were supposedly based on justice, the more just action, in this

[277] Petronius, *Satyricon* 136.
[278] Richardson, T. Wade. "The Sacred Geese of Priapus? (Satyricon 136, 4f.)." *Museum Helveticum* 37, no. 2 (1980): 98–103. http://www.jstor.org/stable/24815529. 98

case, is to not follow the laws. With avoiding the legal system being the most morally just and beneficial action for Encolpius, it makes sense for Oenothea to accept the gold coins.

While most situations in the *Satyricon* bypass the legal system, there are several places where characters use the official paths when it benefits them.When Encolpius makes up with Giton after he is taken by Ascyltos, they leave Ascyltos's property. Because Giton is a slave under the ownership of Ascyltos at that moment, Encolpius committed theft. As Giton is young and very sought after, he is worth quite a lot of money, intensifying the crime. Given the fact that this is a major crime, Ascyltos first thinks through his options on how to proceed and decides to go through the official process. He contacts the local magistrate and gets a municipal slave to assist him in spreading the word and searching for Giton.[279] This is the only time a member of the municipal government is present in the entire extant text. The slave is barely mentioned, existing only in the background. There is a town crier who shares the news, with the municipal slave and Ascyltos accompanying him. While the town crier is giving the news, Ascyltos is holding out money to show the reward for helping. Even though the town crier is the one announcing it, and the municipal slave is there to make it official, Ascyltos is the one pushing everything. He is funding not only the reward but also the slave and town crier. As he is rich and powerful, he can demand the local government to send out two people to help him recover lost property. This demonstrates that to enlist the support of the government to deal with crime, a wronged party has to be wealthy. Ascyltos can offer a reward, but if he were not able to afford a bounty, no one would help him. This shows how the Roman legal system was designed by the rich, for the rich. Most people cannot offer ten gold pieces as a reward, but Ascyltos does. As only the wealthy could properly participate in the official legal process, the majority of people

[279] Petronius, *Satyricon* 97.

had to deal with crime and punishment differently: most commonly, with the paying and bargaining that Encolpius does with Oenothea.

Several other places in the *Satyricon* highlight the role of wealth in official legal matters. When Encolpius meets with the priestesses to deal with his impotence, he changes his mind and escapes. He runs down the street, barefoot and most likely naked, while Oemothea and her assistant follow. They shout "*Prende, furem*!" (Stop, thief!) to gather support from others, but they fail to attract them to their cause.[280] This phrasing is very important primarily because Encolpius never stole anything from them. He stole Giton from Ascytos and killed Priapus's goose, but he never stole anything from Oenothea or her assistant— they continue to shout "thief" at him.

There are a couple of reasons for this. The first is that the phrasing highlights Roman views on crimes. Oenothea needs to get support to catch Encolpius, but instead of shouting something broad like "*nocens*" (someone doing harm, a criminal) or something specific like "he killed a sacred goose," she shouts "thief." This implies thieves' crimes are considered egregious, rendering them worthy of being caught on the spot. If she shouted something broad like "*nocens*," bystanders may not have been inclined to catch Encolpius because he might have been falsely accused, or might have been guilty of a minor crime. There is no context with just a shout of "*nocens*" which, as stated earlier, was a major factor in Romans' views on crime. If the call was too specific, it risked confusing people. While killing a sacred goose is a very serious crime, it is a long phrase, and people may not hear it all. Because Oenothea needs people to respond quickly, she shouts a pithy yell.

Oenothea also did not yell that Encolpius killed a sacred goose because the issue was resolved. Even though Encolpius killed the goose, he negotiated a generous settlement for his

[280] Petronius, *Satyricon* 138.

crime, and could not be punished further for his crime. He paid for his action, and Oenothea accepted the payment. Once the punishment was administered, no matter what the punishment was, the matter is considered resolved. This is also important because this shows that Romans believed processes that operated outside the official legal system were just as legitimate. While all the previous examples depict paying money in order to circumvent the official legal process, none show the legitimacy of these acts. While common, this method of personal agreement opens the door for blackmail and other nefarious actions. Calling Encolpius a thief shows the unwritten rules commanding this process. Written law is just one aspect of the whole system, with unwritten laws and social norms dictating action. The act of paying a settlement outside of a court was a common unwritten practice, but because it was unwritten, there were no standard rules applied. One could easily change the terms of the agreement to their liking and drag out the process. However, this passage shows that there was an unsaid understanding that if an agreement was made it was to be respected.

While one could not be punished multiple times for the same crime, if convicted, the damage stayed with the person. The Roman legal system is based on the reputation of those involved in the trial, meaning that a previous conviction can become very negative later on. This is seen in Cicero's *Pro-Caelio,* where spends most of the speech defending Caelius's character and attacking the character of the prosecution.[281] If Caelius had a serious prior conviction, such as the murder of a sacred goose, that would have become a major point in the prosecution's attack. Oenothea had this in mind when she yelled out "thief!" because it would have been easy to prosecute Encolpius if he was already a criminal. The theft may not have been real, but it would be hard to defend himself if a magistrate believed he had already committed such a serious crime.

[281] Cicero, *Pro-Caelio* 18, 31.

Oenothea decides the only way to get Encolpius is to have someone grab him immediately, or he would get away forever. This shows she does not have the resources necessary to get the municipal government to prosecute Encolpius as a criminal. She needed to catch him because she would not have been able to find him later to prosecute him. Unlike Ascyltos, she can not offer ten gold pieces to get information from others or hire two municipal slaves to assist her in catching him. If she caught him that night, she could demand payment right there as she did with the situation with the dead goose. As Encolpius ran away, Oenothea would need to pursue formal accusations and present corroborating evidence in order to have him indicted and face trial before a jury. This was expensive and beyond the means of most ordinary Romans.

Money was not just essential in starting a court trial, but also in getting the desired result from a court case. This can be seen in the *Satyricon* when Eumolpus frames his success by boasting that he and his friends could get out of any crime.[282] This little detail is important because it states outright that wealth can get people out of crimes. Conventional wisdom dictates that wealth helps people get out of legal troubles–for instance, alterations of legal codes by wealthy people for their own gain. However, it is rarely stated in such blunt terms. In the *Satyricon*, Petronius not only states it but uses it as the baseline to show how much wealth Eumolpus has.

While there is a trove of information on the legal practices of Rome in the *Satyricon*, one could question the validity of the source. The main point of criticism is the purpose of the *Satyricon* and the accuracy of the details. The *Satyricon* was written during Nero's reign. Nero was notorious for his public disputes with many of the prominent authors at the time and the execution of Lucan and other prominent figures. Because of this, much of Roman literature from

[282] Petronius, *Satyricon* 125.

Nero's reign and afterward is highly critical of him. Much of the literature presented Nero in a bad light by exaggerating descriptions of him and his lifestyle. One of the more prominent characteristics of Nero was his show of wealth through partying. Through that lens, the bulk of the *Satyricon* about parties and the damaging actions of rich Romans can be seen as a criticism of Nero. Especially considering that Pliny the Elder records that Petronius was executed by Nero, it seems probable that Petronius was making negative allusions to Nero.[283] While the jury is still out on whether this work is a criticism of Nero or not, the idea has to be taken into consideration, which in turn means that the events and attitudes of the *Satyricon* may be exaggerated and not reflective of the views and actions of the Romans.

I disagree. Even if some events and attitudes are exaggerated, the sections detailing the praxis of law are not. Each of the examples included in this paper comes from the Latin denotations present in word choice, or comprises minor details concealed within larger sections. This means that Petronius may have exaggerated the large points to get his negative views of Nero across to the reader, but he would not bother with minor details concerning the law. The minor details are too small to include veiled criticism of the emperor. In addition, if too much of the story is unfamiliar to the audience, they would not understand the writing, meaning that there has to be some truth contained in the book. For the criticism to be properly received, the actions have to exist in a system similar to the real Roman system. Petronius may be writing against the lifestyle of Nero, but the laws that are broken would have to be real laws and practices in Rome for readers to recognize the world depicted in the book. As such, it is reasonable to believe that even if the attitudes and actions of the characters are exaggerated and not reflective of Roman norms, the legal system in the background is correct.

---

[283] Vasily Rudich, *Political Dissidence Under Nero: The Price of Dissimulation* (London: Routledge, 1993), 155.

The escapades of Encolpius and Giton throughout their journey sheds light onto elite Roman life during the first century AD/CE. The emphasis on the hedonism of the elites shows a certain level of comfort in circumventing the legal system. Law was viewed as a mechanism to keep people in line, but the enforcement of the law was largely accomplished outside of court. Laws were meant to be followed, but when they were inevitably broken punishment was dealt outside the official legal system in some cases. Given the high costs and a large amount of time associated with a trial, only the wealthy, such as Ascyltos, were able to participate in most circumstances. In addition, the easier option many times was to solve a dispute immediately, with a payment or other punishment agreed upon by the parties involved, as is the case with the sacred goose and the whipping of Encolpius by Circe.