

Antonio de la Cova

**2. Analyze the role of Southern desire for United States expansion into Central America and the Caribbean in intensifying sectional conflict in the 1840s and 1850s. While you can concentrate on the actions of the Southerners, do not forget to discuss the role of opposition to expansion in the turmoil within and final breakdown of the Second Party System in the North.**

The idea of American expansionism goes as far back as the birth of the nation, when some of the founding fathers saw the need for expanding west of the Appalachian mountains and north into Canada. The Jeffersonians believed that acquiring new land would allow citizens to flee the congestion and vices of eastern cities, and give up the commercial competition that became an obsession and turned citizens against each other. The creation of additional western states would strengthen Republican political control and weaken the Federalists.

This motivated President Jefferson to obtain the Louisiana purchase in 1803, doubling the size of the United States. Westward expansion forced Native Americans off their lands, and the armed support Tecumseh received from the British led to the War of 1812. Five years later, Seminole Indian raids from Spanish Florida prompted General Andrew Jackson to respond with a punitive raid against Spanish settlements. When President John Quincy Adams gave Spain an ultimatum to keep order in the region or cede it to the United States, the Treaty of 1819 was signed. Florida was given to the U.S., which agreed to rescind its claim to Texas as part of the Louisiana Purchase. The acquisition of these vast territories created controversy over the issue of slavery expansion into the new lands, a conflict that would intensify for over forty years, but was temporarily solved with the Missouri Compromise of 1821.

Expansionism began as a party issue and ended in sectional conflict. By 1844, Congressional voting had well established that most Democrats favored expansionism, while the majority of Whigs opposed it. Within the next fifteen years, the major division over Caribbean expansion shifted from political parties to an issue between North and South. In the summer of 1844, the Senate voted against the Texas annexation treaty because Secretary of State John Calhoun had declared that Texas annexation was essential to the safety of the South in the Union and to the survival of slavery.

In November, James Polk was elected President on an expansionist platform, calling for the annexation of Texas and Oregon. Texas was finally brought into the Union the day before President John Tyler left office when a joint resolution of Congress, which only required a simple majority vote, barely passed in the Senate.

The idea of Manifest Destiny was launched in the summer of 1845 by New Yorker John L. O'Sullivan, editor of "U.S. Magazine and Democratic Review." Its main ideas were: That American expansionism had the support of God; that the extension of American institutions would enlarge the area of freedom; that population growth required new land, or a lack of opportunities would cause social and economic turmoil as was occurring in Europe. Annexation generally

received favorable coverage in the Democratic press, like the "Washington Union," the "New York Sun," and the "New York Herald," while Whig papers such as the Washington "Daily National Intelligencer" and the "New York Tribune" were bitter critics of the Mexican War, expansionism and filibusters.

Historians have viewed Manifest Destiny from three different perspectives:

- 1- As a national sentiment, espoused mostly by writers and editors. An important aspect of American intellectual history, but not a guide for government policy.

- 2- Public opinion does not influence national decisions. This analysis is limited to negotiations between rival governments on questions of American expansionism.

- 3- A Relation between territorial objectives of the Manifest Destiny doctrine to the formulation of American diplomatic policy.

The topic of Southern expansionism in the 1850s has been sporadically addressed by a handful of scholars during this century. The most renowned works have been William Scroggs, "Filibusters and Financiers" (1916); Albert Weinberg, "Manifest Destiny" (1935); Robert May, "The Southern Dream of a Caribbean Empire" (1973); and Charles Brown, "Agents of Manifest Destiny" (1980). Presently, May is the only scholar working in this field.

The annexation of Texas prompted Mexico to break diplomatic relations with the U.S. and a border incident led to war. As the war raged, the issue of slavery was again linked to expansionism. In the summer of 1846, Congressman David Wilmot (D-Penn.) attached the Wilmot Proviso to the military appropriations bill, that would have banned slavery from any territory acquired from Mexico. The bill passed in the House, where the North had more seats, but was defeated in the Senate, where Southern interests still had influence with northern Democrats. The Wilmot Proviso was again defeated the following year.

Some prominent pro-slavery Southerners, like John Calhoun and Robert Toombs, spoke out against acquiring Mexican territory. They feared that the vast extension of new territory would entice the South to secede to form a large Confederacy with all of Mexico, and that the Mexican mestizo race was incompatible with Americans. In contrast, these Congressmen favored the annexation of Cuba, a colony of Spain without an Indian population, where black slavery existed. The Polk Diaries reveal that in the summer of 1848, O'Sullivan informed Polk of a plot by wealthy Cuban planters, members of the Havana Club, to revolt against Spain and seek U.S. annexation, following the Texas model. The Cubans feared that Spain would submit to British pressure and abolish slavery and they viewed the entry of Cuba into the Union as safeguarding the institution of slavery. Although O'Sullivan was a Barnburner and a Freesoiler, his enthusiasm for expansionism prompted his alliance with southern slaveholders. His sister was married to Cristobal Madan, a wealthy Cuban planter and leader of the annexationist conspiracy. Polk replied to O'Sullivan that Cuba should be acquired through purchase, and nothing should be done to support a rebellion. This would remain U.S. policy toward Cuba during the Pierce and Buchanan administrations. The Polk Administration moved against the Cuban plotters when Buchanan informed the Spanish

minister in Washington of the conspiracy and the American consul in Havana gave the details to the captain general of Cuba. Buchanan assumed this would strengthen his bargaining hand when he authorized the American Minister to Spain to offer \$100 million for Cuba, which Spain quickly rejected as an insult to national honor.

General Zachary Taylor, the Whig candidate without political background, won the presidency in 1848 on account of his heroics during the Mexican War. Although he did not oppose slavery, he was against expansionism, and initially considered California and Oregon too far away to be significant. The purchase of Cuba became a dead issue for the Taylor Administration, and expansionists then backed filibuster expeditions to acquire the island. The first of these expeditions was organized in 1849 by Cuban expatriates in the U.S. led by General Narciso Lopez. After failing to entice General William Worth, a Mexican War hero, into the venture with a \$3 million offer to lead the expedition, the Cubans turned to other volunteers in New Orleans who managed to gather 800 filibusters at Round Island, Miss. The Taylor Administration then seized the filibuster ships, had the navy blockade Round Island and disbanded the recruits.

Lopez and his assistant, Ambrosio Gonzales, sought help from other Mexican War heroes, Jefferson Davis and Robert E. Lee, but were turned down. They then sought out a brother freemason and Mexican War hero, Mississippi Governor John A. Quitman, who helped them organize a second expedition and agreed to lead a reinforcement contingent two weeks after Lopez would achieve a successful landing. On 19 May 1850, Lopez and Gonzales landed in Cuba with about 500 men from Ohio, Kentucky and Louisiana. They held the city of Cardenas for twenty-four hours, raised the Cuban flag, but fled after the populace refused to join the insurrection and massive Spanish reinforcements arrived. Upon their return to the U.S., Lopez, Gonzales, O'Sullivan, Quitman, John Henderson and other leaders were charged in New Orleans federal court with violation of the U.S. Neutrality Law. Special prosecutor Judah Benjamin tried Henderson first, but after three hung juries favoring acquittal, charges were dismissed for all.

When an annexationist uprising occurred in Cuba on July 4, 1851, led by Joaquin de Agüero, Lopez disembarked on the island with a hastily organized expedition that was quickly defeated. Over fifty Americans were executed and others jailed, creating a tense situation between the U.S. and Spain. This incident was one of the reasons that destroyed President Fillmore's bid for reelection in 1852. The expansionists, who had coalesced into a movement called Young America, headed by Stephen Douglas, denounced the Old Fogies of the Democratic Party who opposed Manifest Destiny. Although the Young Americans were unable to make Douglas the Democratic nominee, they blocked the aspirations of Old Fogies like Lewis Cass, and the election was won by their dark-horse candidate Franklin Pierce.

Immediately after the election, Congress again took up the issue of Cuban acquisition, sparking a series of debates. In his inaugural address, Pierce became the first U.S. president in history to proclaim territorial expansion as an aim of the incoming administration. He also realized that the greatest danger to this policy was the strife over the question of slavery. Pierce, a

northerner, tried to balance his cabinet with pro-slavery men like Jefferson Davis, James Buchanan and Caleb Cushing, and opponents like William Marcy and others.

The Cuban expatriates believed the election of Pierce was the green light they needed from the government to enhance their filibuster plans. They again turned to Quitman, who accepted the leadership of the planned invasion. Meanwhile, a new captain-general arrived in Cuba who prohibited the importation of slaves, and gave citizenship to slaves illegally imported before 1835. Frightened Cuban slaveholders sent appeals to Pierce to send U.S. troops to prevent emancipation, which they referred to as the "Africanization" of Cuba. The news created hysteria in the South, and Southern Senators presented a resolution asking Pierce to suspend by proclamation the Neutrality Law so that it would not hinder U.S. efforts to aid Cuba. Pierce instead issued a proclamation against filibustering. It seems that he was hoping that this would strengthen his position in proposed negotiations with Spain to purchase the island. Spain rejected the proposal and ordered the captain general of Cuba that if an invasion occurred, the slaves were to be armed to fight them. This only heightened the fears of Southerners, who insisted on American intervention to prevent "another Haiti."

In October 1854, the Ostend Manifesto was drawn up by the pro-expansionist American ministers in Europe, Pierre Soule, James Buchanan and John Mason. They recommended that the United States attempt to buy Cuba from Spain and should the offer be refused, the law of self-preservation justified wresting Cuba from Spain. Soule claimed that the time was right, since England and France were involved in the Crimean War and would be unable to intervene in the Caribbean. The resulting storm of protest over slavery expansionism forced Pierce to abandon the Ostend Manifesto. Buchanan benefitted from his role by showing he stood with the South on the need for Cuba and his expansionist policy helped him win the next Democratic presidential nomination.

Meanwhile, the Kansas-Nebraska Act sponsored by Illinois Senator Stephen Douglas passed in Congress. Douglas wanted these territories quickly into the Union so that the transcontinental railroad to California would be built out of Chicago instead of in the South through the newly acquired Gadsden Purchase. To solve the issue of slavery in Kansas and Nebraska, Douglas proposed the formula of "popular sovereignty," where the state legislature would be responsible for voting for or against instituting slavery. When the Act was passed, Northern politicians believed that it invalidated the Missouri Compromise, which prohibited slavery above the southern border of Missouri. As a result, the Democratic Party was shattered in the free states and deprived of the strength needed for the acquisition of Cuba. The Whigs were also split as many rallied to the new Republican Party. They were adamant to allow the entry of Cuba as a slave state into the Union nor to approve the funds needed to buy the island. Southerners, in contrast, renewed filibuster efforts to extend slavery into Nicaragua, Mexico and annex Cuba. New slave states, with their additional congressmen, would allow the South to protect the institution of slavery. New soil would also offer and escape from

lands depleted by one-crop agriculture.

The Quitman expedition was scheduled to land in Cuba in March 1855, but Spanish spies had infiltrated the movement, and Spain was keeping the Pierce Administration aware of every move. In February, Ramon Pinto and the leaders of the Quitman conspiracy in Cuba were arrested. President Pierce then called Quitman to the White House and seems to have told him that he no longer had supporters in Cuba, that the British and the Spanish navy were awaiting his arrival, that the slaves would be armed once he landed, and that he would not receive help from the United States. Faced with such overwhelming odds, Quitman resigned as expedition leader in April. Many of his followers, and those who had fought with Lopez, including Theodore O'Hara, Roberdeau Wheat, Domingo de Goicuria and Callender Fayssoux, joined William Walker's expedition to Nicaragua in June 1855.

Walker's true intentions are still a subject of debate among historians. Robert May points out that Americans who joined Walker were mostly adventurers without the ideological commitment to slavery expansion that motivated Quitman's followers. More than half of Walker's filibusters were young adventurers and recently arrived immigrants from the North. I concur with May that Walker wanted to take over Central America and Cuba to establish his own empire, and not for the purpose of annexation to the United States. Since Pierce had already taken a stand against filibustering, he initially refused to recognize the Nicaraguan government after Walker became president in a partial and rigged election. Walker lasted while he had the support of the Accessory Transit Company, the Cornelius Vanderbilt enterprise that ferried Americans across Nicaragua on their way to California. The company provided filibusters free passage to Nicaragua. Walker made the mistake of revoking the company's charter, and seizing its ships and assets in Nicaragua. Vanderbilt then sided with Costa Rica, Honduras, El Salvador and Guatemala, which banded to overthrow Walker.

Cuban revolutionary Domingo de Goicuria had raised recruits and joined Walker with the understanding that he would later use Nicaragua as a base to invade Cuba (A century later, the Kennedy Administration would launch the Cuban exile Bay of Pigs invasion from Nicaragua). Walker appointed Goicuria as his Minister to England, where the Cuban had previously resided. To achieve British recognition, Walker instructed Goicuria to tell the British that he had no intention of seeking U.S. annexation and would help prevent American expansion into the Caribbean. On his way to London through New York, Goicuria attempted a reconciliation with Vanderbilt. When he has rebuked and fired by Walker, Goicuria published the anti-annexationist letter in a New York paper, which caused Walker's popularity in the U.S. to considerably decline. Walker tried to gain the political offensive in September 1856 by legalizing slavery in Nicaragua after a visit from Pierre Soule. This desperate measure to gain southern support never took effect. Not a single slave was ever taken to Nicaragua and within six months, superior allied forces and a sweeping cholera epidemic decimated Walker's army, which surrendered to the U.S. Navy.

Walker put together another expedition in the U.S. under the banner of slavery expansion, but the U.S. Navy blocked him from

landing in Nicaragua a second time and returned him to the United States in December 1857. Southern legislators, especially Jefferson Davis and Toombs, criticized the Buchanan Administration for intervening with Walker. Walker gathered a third expedition in 1860 and intended to enter Nicaragua through Honduras, which was in the middle of a civil war. When his forces were quickly decimated after landing, Walker surrendered to the British Navy with the understanding he would not be turned over to his Honduran enemies. But that is just what a British captain did, and Walker was immediately executed by the Hondurans in September 1860. Having converted to Catholicism in Nicaragua, he was buried in the Catholic cemetery of the town of Trujillo (which I visited), and his name was misspelled on his grave stone.

The failure of the Caribbean and Central America expansionist movement paralleled other southern declines in national policy. After the Civil War started, the Confederacy could not spare resources for Caribbean expansion. Expansionism, which had started out as a political movement, failed when it became a sectional issue.

Antonio de la Cova

**3. Keeping your focus as much as possible on the 19th century, account for slavery's role in the establishment of racism in American culture and explain why Emancipation failed to end it.**

The growing influx of African slaves coming to America in the 17th century transformed the labor force in the Southern colonies. Labor-intensive crops, like sugar, tobacco, rice and cotton, which could not grow in the North, required a greater slave population in the South. In some southern states, blacks constituted a larger percentage than whites, where in the North, slaves made up less than ten percent of the population and tended to be house servants, or employed as coachmen, bakers, blacksmiths, etc. The early northern economy also depended on the slave trade, and a great part of the New England merchant fleet was used in the Atlantic Triangle. Northern cities also profited by building and outfitting slave ships. This concentration of slavery in the south is what eventually split the nation into a sectional crisis that culminated in the Civil War.

Historians have argued whether slavery promoted racism or racism encouraged promoting slavery. Some historians indicate that beliefs of white supremacy and black inferiority and the institution of slavery were synonymous. The curtailment of black rights began after the 1740 Negro Act, immediately after the Stono Rebellion, which laid the foundations for the slave codes. It was during this period that Southern slavery acquired its distinctive features. Legal codes described the authority of the master, emphasized distinctions of race and color, and placed heavy restrictions on the slaves.

The first legal controversy of the new nation over slavery was settled with the Great Compromise of 1787, a precursor to other political compromises that would attempt to permanently settle the slavery imbroglio. At the Constitutional Convention it was decided that three-fifths of the slaves would be counted to determine the basis for representation and taxation. Northern delegates with commercial interests, whose regions had an insignificant black population, did not want blacks included in the census because small southern states with a large slave population, like South Carolina, would then have a greater voice in government. Although the slaves were not given citizenship and suffrage, the three-fifths formula was assumed on the notion that a slave was on the average three-fifths as productive as a freeman. The constitutional convention rejected a proposal to abolish slavery and wrote into the Constitution a federal sanction for the capture and return of runaway slaves fleeing to another state. As part of the compromise, all states agreed to ban the slave trade in twenty years. Congress was also empowered to provide the military force to crush slave uprisings. The Constitution sanctioned slavery in the states where it existed, and Congress was prohibited from its abolition or regulation. Some historians, like Kenneth Stampp, believed that the American Revolution should have abolished slavery, but this was highly unlikely because of economic interests and racial attitudes already developed.

An unwritten agreement existed in Congress that the number of slaves states were to be kept equal to the number of free states. In 1819, slavery again became a national issue when territories carved out of the Louisiana Purchase were applying for admission to the Union. Southerners feared that if Missouri came in as a free state, it would increase the northern vote in Congress, which would eventually claim the power of abolition and millions of dollars in slave property would be lost by a single majority vote. After two years of bitter polemics, the Missouri Compromise was achieved by a narrow vote, allowing Missouri as a slave state, but prohibiting slavery above the southern boundary of Missouri.

By 1830, a distinct slave society existed in the South based on a social institution and a labor system. Europeans generally migrated to the north and refused to do the work of slaves in the South. Although only 25 percent of Southern families owned slaves, poor southern whites, sometimes worse off than the slaves, feared abolition because it would force them to compete with the freedmen. Slave ownership provided social mobility, and planters believed that abolition would result in the loss of their finances, social status and would lead to a white massacre, as occurred in Haiti.

The nation was further divided over the issue of slavery with the rise of the abolitionist movement emanating from the religious Second Great Awakening. A disciple of the Rev. Charles Finney, the printer William Lloyd Garrison, in 1831 founded the leading abolitionist journal, "The Liberator," and two years later established the American Anti-Slavery Society. The stronghold of abolition, in western New York and northern Ohio, were areas that had been swept by the Second Great Awakening. Yet, abolitionists often had to face angry northern mobs who feared that emancipation and black citizenship would take away their jobs and political power. Garrisonians also took up the cause of black civil rights in the north, where blacks faced discrimination in the churches, the courts and in voting.

Abolitionists began a massive campaign of mailing hundreds of thousands of antislavery pamphlets to prominent Southern citizens in 1835, which provoked a mob of Charlestonians into breaking in the post office and setting the material on fire in the street. Southerners claimed that these publications were meant to incite insurrection by northerners who violated the domestic tranquility of the South, as guaranteed by the Constitution. They saw the abolitionist campaign as a threat to their own liberties and honor, and as promoting miscegenation. Abolitionists also frequently petitioned Congress to abolish slavery, which led to the passage of the Gag Rule in 1836, restricting the right of petition by prohibiting debate on any slavery petition submitted.

Southerners feared that abolitionist agitation would inspire another slave revolt, like the one led by Nat Turner in Virginia in 1831. This insurrection, which resulted in the deaths of more than fifty white men, women and children, more than any other single factor, ended the Southern movement for gradual emancipation or emigration to Africa. Yet, the abolitionists continued to press their zealous crusade on the fringes of the slave states and organized the underground railroad to take escaped slaves to Canada. They condemned slavery for turning man into property, for

not recognizing marriage or paternity, for promoting illiteracy, and for forcing blacks to work without wages and depriving them of property.

A distinctive Southern ideology developed around the defense of slavery after the 1830s, in response to the abolitionist campaign that became an indictment of Southern culture and society. Abolitionists stressed that slavery was incompatible with American political ideas and with the Christian ideal that all men are equal before God. Among the defenders of slavery arose George Fitzhugh, Edmund Ruffin, James Henry Hammond, and others, who rationalized slavery not only in economic terms, but also on psychological, emotional and religious grounds. They claimed that slavery was not morally wrong since it was justified in the Bible with the Curse of Canaan, and that the right to own slave property was legal and constitutional. Defenders of slavery, like Fitzhugh in "Cannibals All," claimed that the Negro had been relieved from a far more cruel slavery in Africa, from cannibalism and idolatry, and that slaveowners had christianized, moralized and cared for them far better than the fate of free laborers in the North. They also stated that slaves could not take care of themselves and that masters had a Christian duty to do so. They said whites had to carry this burden because freedmen would never survive in a capitalist society and would starve to death. The pro-slavery ideologists reinforced their arguments with contemporary anthropological theories that placed human races into a ladder of inherent capabilities that were related to differences in color and other physical characteristics.

Despite these efforts against slavery, what made the institution proliferate was the expansion of cotton agriculture, especially after the invention of the cotton gin, and the demands of Northern and European cotton mills during the industrial revolution. Cotton and slavery became inextricably linked. The urban slaves employed in various service occupations had greater mobility, especially dealing with whites and free blacks, which led to greater enforcement of segregation in housing and job discrimination. Free blacks in the South generally lived in poverty, held menial jobs and suffered harassment from the authorities, although a few were slave holders and tried to emulate white society. Segregation was practiced in ante-bellum Southern cities on all blacks, free or slave, in hotels, restaurants, theaters and public conveyances. Yet, segregation also permeated all aspects of Negro life in the North before 1860 where, being less than two percent of the population, they were crowded into ghettos, such as Five Points in New York and Nigger Hill in Boston.

The legal system worked to instill racism, as blacks could not testify against whites, nor be a member of a jury, and the law offered them little or no protection. For example, the rape of a black woman was not sanctioned in the legal codes. This led most slaves to seek safety by accepting the paternalism of the masters.

The personality of the slave was also a factor in the establishment of racism in the American antebellum culture. Historians still argue this issue. Stanley Elkins stressed that the harshness of slavery crippled the slave personality and created a docile, lazy, superstitious and deceitful Sambo, who was loyal to

his master. Yet, slave behavior went from the occasional violent extreme to abject submission, with most slaves having a pattern of behavior somewhere in between. Eugene Genovese, in "Roll, Jordan, Roll," argued that slaves turned the dependency relationship to their own limited advantage, and that the notion that slaves were lazy and had to be compelled to work was a racist bias which for centuries had existed among the European upper class against their own laboring poor.

In reality, slaves had to cope with the absolute power of the master, nonrecognition of slave marriages, the breakup of families through sale, and sexual exploitation of women by the driver or white men. Some scholars, like Daniel Patrick Moynahan, would later claim that the growing instability of black families in the modern era was derived from the slave experience. Historian Herbert Gutman opposed this by focusing on the autonomy of the slave family and culture. A strictly racial form of slavery is what fostered a separate black identity and a different way of life, that is still manifested today. Southern whites lived in two environments: one brought them in contact with slavery, and the other involved their social, economic and political relationships with their own white community. Even poor whites who did not own slaves dealt with them, hired as overseers, slave patrols, or traded for goods that slaves pilfered from the plantation. Many slaves, on the other hand, believed they were better off than the "poor white trash," also called "dirt eaters." These whites considered themselves superior to blacks because they could never fall to the level of being enslaved. Their hostility toward blacks prohibited an interracial solidarity that would have been a threat to the planter class.

Abolitionists warned of a "Slave Power" conspiracy (which never existed), where Southern planters and politicians were determined to convert the entire nation into one of masters and slaves. This assumed threat became one of the tenets of the Republicans and helped to consolidate Northern antislavery sentiment. After the Gag Rule was rescinded, the issue of slavery reentered politics. The Compromise of 1850 was an attempt to keep slavery out of politics. Instead, the new fugitive slave law made the conflict worse, as Northern states responded by passing "personal liberty" laws. The Kansas-Nebraska Act of 1854, which allowed the use of popular sovereignty in the organization of territories, meant that slavery could be voted in, violating the Missouri Compromise. The result was a split among Democrats, the demise of the Whigs and the rise of the Republican Party. The nation was further divided on the slavery issue over the constitutional crisis in Kansas and the Dred Scott decision of the Supreme Court in 1857. The court ruled that slaves could be taken into free territory, where slavery was banned, and would still remain slaves. As the nation became polarized over the issue of slavery, the John Brown raid on Harper's Ferry convinced southerners that abolitionists had abandoned propaganda for armed insurrection to achieve their goals. The election of Lincoln to the presidency made southerners believe they were no longer represented in the Executive branch, which would then cater to the desires of the abolitionists. This led to secession and civil war, primarily over the issue of slavery, although this is a point historians

continue to argue over.

When the Civil War ended, southerners attempted to reinstate their segregated way of life with the establishment of the Black Codes by the provisional legislatures. They tried to establish a labor system of peonage through laws dealing with vagrancy, labor contracts and apprenticeship that was virtually slavery without the shackles. Black freedom of movement was limited, and they were restricted in renting or buying property, or engaging in skilled urban jobs. Racial separation was also instituted, making some historians conclude that the Jim Crow system replaced slavery. After emancipation, slaveholders saw in their former slaves disloyalty and ingratitude when they walked off the plantation or joined Union soldiers in looting the master's property. According to Mary Boykin Chesnut, the use of the word "nigger" became predominant in 1865. The use of black occupying troops in the South during two years also led to sporadic rioting and growing racial tensions. The correspondence of the planters is filled with complaints of how the freedmen were lazy, worked only when necessary, and continued to steal just like during slavery. Most blacks emerged from slavery unable to buy land and facing a white community that refused to give them credit or sell them property.

Some Radical Republicans, led by Thadeus Stevens of Pennsylvania, wanted to reshape Southern society by confiscating the large plantations and parceling out the land to the freedmen. Yet, this was a plan that had very little support in Congress, which instead focused on black suffrage. When Congress passed a Civil Rights Bill, President Johnson vetoed it, and the legislature responded by passing the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments, granting blacks citizenship and the vote. When the Confederate states failed to ratify the Fourteenth Amendment, the Reconstruction Act of 1867 divided them up into military districts during what became known as Radical Reconstruction. New state Constitutional Conventions and elections brought blacks and carpetbaggers into power. Some whites in covert groups like the KKK responded with a reign of terror murdering Republican politicians. The races drifted further apart as separation, and not integration, dominated social relations during Reconstruction. The politics of Reconstruction were undermined by corruption. Blacks remained mired in poverty and the old ruling class, which retained its land, remained hostile to the new order.

White southerners did not get their political power back until after the Compromise of 1877, when the North gave up on the race issue. In the 1910s, the Redeemer school emerged in American universities, which stressed the evils and corruption of Black Reconstruction. This thesis was attacked in 1935 by W.E.B. Dubois, a Marxist scholar who went to the other extreme, and received little attention toward his history of reconstruction. Soon other black scholars emulated Dubois and were joined by a few Marxist white scholars like Herbert Apthaker. In 1949 C. Van Woodward challenged the redeemer thesis with his "Origins of the New South." Postrevisionist historians writing in the 1960s argued that persistent racism after emancipation failed to extend justice to blacks and that Southern land reform did not go far enough to achieve social and economic equality for the freedmen. These

historians claimed that the army and the Freedmen's Bureau, in combination with former slaveowners, forced the former slaves to return to plantation labor. Yet, the freedmen preferred religious segregation, according to Woodward's "The Strange Career of Jim Crow," when they voluntarily withdrew from the white-dominated Protestant churches. Woodward points out that segregation was a result of a series of Supreme Court decisions between 1873 and 1898 that weakened resistance to racism, such as the Plessy v. Ferguson case with its "separate but equal" doctrine. Southerners, fearing a return to Radical Reconstruction governments, used their Redeemer political power to enforce segregation with economic hegemony and strict voter restriction until the Civil Rights laws of 1964-1965.

Antonio de la Cova

**4. Assess the military strengths and weaknesses of the Confederacy at the start of the Civil War. Would you argue that Confederate defeat was inevitable? If it was not inevitable, what factors caused the defeat.**

This question continues to plague historians after more than 125 years, and still generates great interest, discussion and a veritable outpouring of written and cinematographic material, like the recently popular PBS documentary by Ken Burns. The causes of Confederate defeat have been dissected into political, military, geographic and economical questions. What most historians by now have agreed upon is a rejection of monocausation and point to a number of negative factors such as lack of resources, the naval blockade, inflation, malnutrition, desertion, inferior manpower and the lack of a system of political parties.

The balance sheet of North vs. South shows that in 1861 the Union had double the size of the southern population, which was 40 percent slave. The North greatly outnumbered the South in factories in bank deposits, and produced greater amounts of food than the Confederacy.

In pointing to military strengths, historian T. Harry Williams, author of "Lincoln and his Generals," claimed that it was the North and its superior military leadership and tactics that won the war. Other writers argue that the South had the best experienced and most capable generals, such as Albert Sidney Johnston, Thomas "Stonewall" Jackson, J.E.B. Stuart, Robert E. Lee, and the great cavalryman Nathan Bedford Forrest. The war got worse progressively for the Confederacy after the first three generals were mortally wounded in battle. They had provided the South with the early victories of the war. In contrast, during the first years of the conflict, the Union was plagued by such incompetent generals as General-in-Chief George McClellan, who after the disaster at First Manassas, the failure to take Richmond during the peninsula campaign, and the bloody draw at Antietam, was dismissed; Ambrose Burnside, who demonstrated lack of strategy and marched his men into a massacre at Antietam, Fredericksburg and the Crater at Petersburg; and Joseph Hooker, who suffered crushing defeats at Chancellorsville and Chicamauga, before resigning his command.

The Confederates also had their share of incompetent generals, especially John Pemberton, who got boxed in and surrendered at Vicksburg; Braxton Bragg, who led the abortive invasion of Kentucky in 1862, ending in defeat at Perryville, and subsequent retreat from Murfreesboro; John B. Hood, who destroyed his army at Nashville; Leonidas Polk, the bishop without military experience who was killed while recklessly exposing himself to enemy artillery; and Commissary-General Lucius Northrop, whose mismanagement made him lose the confidence of the southern people. These generals were close friends of Confederate President Jefferson Davis, who supported them in spite of their shortcomings.

The South was not very well prepared with armaments for the war. The state militias, from which came the bulk of the Confederate Army, at the start had flintlock muskets and shotguns

of many different calibers, making it difficult for the Confederacy to manufacture such a vast array of ammunition. The problem was mostly solved when large amounts of British 58-caliber Enfields were imported in 1862. The Confederate soldier was also ill-clad. Ironically, southern uniforms were made of wool, dyed with butternut, instead of using abundant cotton. There was a scarcity of shoes, which forced North Carolina to produce rudimentary wooden clog-type footwear. It was this lack of shoes that prompted Confederates to prematurely enter Gettysburg in July 1863. Southern troops also did not have good nourishment, lowering the body's immune system. Although hygiene was generally lacking on both sides, southerners were more affected by diseases such as measles and dysentery, which spread quickly through their camps, because they had lived in relative rural isolation and had not developed immunity to these illnesses, unlike northern city dwellers.

Geography and natural resources also played a strong factor in the war. The South had plenty of timber and access to saltpeter for gunpowder, and iron ore in the Cumberland Gap, but lacked the manpower for appropriate logging and mining, or the factories to process these resources. The Tredegar Iron Works had great demands for the production of artillery and ammunition, but low pig iron production had the plant working at one-third of its capacity throughout the war. Although some historians claim that no Confederate army lost a major engagement because of a lack of arms and ammunition, in some battles, such as the siege of Charleston, the Confederates had to use their shells sparingly because of a supply deficiency. During the 1863 Morris Island engagement, the Confederate chief of artillery ordered that due to the scarcity of explosive shells, it was best not to waste solid round-shot on enemy entrenchments and instead use it against a Union charge.

The southern economy was dominated by the production of cotton, geared toward trade with Europe. Cotton cultivation left the South short of food except in the Shennandoah Valley. Many planters were interested in making money, instead of supporting the war effort, and resisted shifting from cotton to food production. They would rather give up their sons to fight in the war easier than to provide their slave labor to the Confederacy. Since many cotton and tobacco regions hardly grew any food crops, they could not sustain large forces to remain long in one place.

The highways and railroads of the South also proved a hindrance to the war effort. Railroads had been built mostly from west to east, instead of south to north, to carry cotton to the seaports. The railroads were built with three different gauges, making it impossible to interchange locomotives, freight cars, or connect the various lines. In "Why the South Lost the Civil War," the decline of the railway system is called the most important economic factor in Confederate defeat. The North had more than twice the railroad mileage of the South for an almost equal area.

Another Confederate drawback at the start of the war was the lack of naval power. All of the important naval installations, except Norfolk and Pensacola, remained in Union hands. The North also had excellent naval commanders like David Farragut and the Potter brothers. The Confederacy lacked the industrial base to rapidly build ships. This allowed the Union to sail her powerful

warships into Cape Hatteras, N.C. and Port Royal, S.C., pulverize two coastal fortifications in each place and take over the area without opposition in 1861. The insignificant Confederate Navy was unable to break the blockade of major southern ports or to prohibit the Union from controlling the Mississippi River or the western rivers in the heartland of the Confederacy. In contrast, the Union Navy went from 90 warships to more than 700 by 1865, tightening the blockade that gradually eliminated the export of cotton to Europe and the import of war material and foodstuff. Some historians argue that the blockade was not a major factor in the Confederacy's economic exhaustion. In "Lifeline of the Confederacy" (1988) my friend Stephen Wise claims that as long as southern ports were not occupied by Union forces, blockade running kept Confederate soldiers armed, clothed and fed. This was an expanded theory of that proposed by Frank Owsley in the 1940s in "King Cotton Diplomacy," which had not been accepted by many historians.

One of the Confederate advantages on the battlefield was that their cavalry generally had better horses, better riders, and better marksmen, as compared to mounted northern city dwellers, unaccustomed to the saddle. Southern cavaliers had belonged to hunting clubs, which participated in fox hunts, and learned excellent equestrian maneuverability. This advantage was one of the factors that led to Southern victory at the June 1863 Battle of Brandy Station, Virginia, when 10,000 mounted Confederates, led by J.E.B. Stuart and Wade Hampton, were able to defeat superior Union forces, in the largest cavalry clash of the war.

Another Confederate advantage was that they were fighting on their own familiar territory, which gave them the benefit of knowing which mountain pass to guard or where a river could be forded. That is one of the reasons why General "Stonewall" Jackson was so successful fighting in his own territory of the Shennandoah Valley. Defending their own land also gave many southerners strong motivation to fight against whom they considered "abolitionist" invaders who used black troops and foreign Irish and German regiments. Fighting on their own land was also a great disadvantage because the large expansion of territory worked against them. The Confederacy was unable to adequately protect more than 3,500 miles of shoreline, and after the fall of Port Royal, South Carolina, in November 1861, the Union gained other coastal footholds which allowed them to carve up the South.

The impressment of animals, foodstuffs and slaves for the Confederacy had destabilizing effects. Slaveholders who had supported secession now resented the government interfering with their chattels, which they saw as an attack on private property rights. Impressment led to the scondering of cotton, wheat and horses, which created shortages for the army and the civilians. The ever-present threat of a slave revolt also kept troops and militias on stand-by. In one incident in South Carolina, a regiment of Confederate cavalry had to be detached from the front lines to chase down 76 slaves who had fled from their work camp the previous night when the guard fell asleep.

European neutrality has also been viewed as one of the factors that brought down the Confederacy. Secretary Seward threatened to go to war with England if they recognized the Confederacy. Great

Britain in 1863 then turned to Egypt and India to supply her cotton needs. Other reasons that motivated England and France not to support the Confederacy was Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation and the fact that General Lee had lost the battles of Antietam and Gettysburg, demonstrating he was unable to take the war to the North. The Emancipation Proclamation allowed for the eventual recruitment of 180,000 black troops into the Union ranks, which were already greater than those of the Confederacy. When as a last ditch effort the Confederacy approved the recruitment of blacks into their army in March 1865, it created great controversy from top to bottom among the armed forces, politicians and civilians in the South. The larger amount of Union troops is what in 1864 allowed generals Grant and Sherman to wage massive offensive campaigns with two-to-one casualties against the Confederates. The Union army was also able to employ over 100,000 troops just to keep open their lines of supplies and communication in Kentucky, Tennessee and the Mississippi River.

Immediately after the Civil War ended, the "War of the Reminiscences" began, while Davis was in prison facing treason charges. General Thomas Jordan fired the first salvo in October 1865 in "Harper's Magazine," censoring Davis for lacking organization and statesmanship, making him unfit for the administration of the Confederacy. Edward Pollard, editor of the "Richmond Examiner," which had criticized Davis throughout the war, published "The Lost Cause" in 1866, pointing out the failures of Davis. He claimed that Davis had too much confidence in his own military genius, that he interfered with his generals, and that he refused to promote competent officers (like Colonel Ambrosio Gonzales), whom he personally disliked or were his political enemies. Further criticism appeared in 1872 with the publication of General Joseph E. Johnston's memoirs. The Davis incompetent thesis was also promulgated by Woodrow Wilson in his "History of the American People." This assessment did not change for over a century, even after Davis published his lengthy memoirs "The Rise and Fall of the Confederate Government" in 1881, insisting that neither he nor the cause was wrong in any aspect. In 1886 Beauregard and Johnston continued to justify their own military actions and to show Davis wrong in a series of articles published in the "North American Review." More recently, Ballard's biography of Davis, "Jefferson Davis: The Man and His Times," and "Jefferson Davis and his Generals" (1990), indicate that Davis does not bear the sole responsibility for the South's defeat. Woodworth does point out some drawbacks, such as Davis' frail health and bad eyesight, insecurity, and overwork, his tendency to give importance to the Virginia theater and neglect of the western front, and favoritism toward his old friends. In spite of all this, the author concludes that Davis took on an enormous task and made many good decisions when a wrong one would have been fatal to the Confederacy. Yet, Davis was hesitant when he should have attacked Washington, D.C. after First Manassas, when he failed to concentrate the Confederacy's armies, or by not promoting younger officers and retiring older ones.

Blame for the loss of the war was also placed on the Confederate Congress by Pollard in "The Lost Cause," claiming that

it did not measure up to the standards needed for a revolutionary cause. The leadership had little concept for mobilizing civilian opinion. David Potter, in "The Impending Crisis," indicated that Confederate failure was due to its politicians and political system, which had no opposition, and saw Davis as a weak chief. When Davis refused someone a political or military favor, those affected would usually turn their rejection into bitter hate against him. David Donald, in "Why the North Won the Civil War," claimed that the Confederacy was too democratic, not repressive against a "Fifth Column," and that Southern soldiers were undisciplined. The North was able to suppress internal enemies by suspending the habeas corpus and jailing more than 10,000 suspected rebel sympathizers. Most resistance to Confederate authority in the South came from upcountry yeomen convinced the struggle had become "a rich man's war and a poor man's fight." This phrase had been created by William Holden, a North Carolina journalist, who founded a secret society to end the war. Confederates found that constitutional constraints and legal scruples generally prevented their authorities from taking drastic action against dissent.

States rights as a cause for Confederate defeat was promoted by historian Frank Owsley in the 1920s. He claimed that during the war, obstructionist state governors like Joseph Brown of Georgia and Zebulon Vance of North Carolina were a hindrance to the Confederate cause because of what they believed to be infringements on states' rights. This intransigence began early in the war when southern governors balked at sending men and arms to the Virginia front in order to protect their own seacoasts. Later, North Carolina state courts declared Confederate conscription unconstitutional. At the end of the war, Governor Vance had in warehouses 90,000 uniforms and thousands of shoes and blankets, for the use of state troops, while Lee's army lacked those necessities. Since Owsley's work lacked good documentation, many subsequent historians tried to dismember his thesis. Although states' rights was not a major cause of defeat, it did have a serious impact.

A recent study, "Why the South Lost the Civil War," looks at the issues of states rights, the blockade, the economy and the battlefields, dismissing them all in explaining the outcome of the war, which the four authors blame on the weakness of southern nationalism. They claim that the disintegrating economy and the deteriorating military situation created war weariness, destroyed morale, and created a fifty percent desertion rate by 1865. Kenneth Stampp agrees with this weakness in morale thesis, but he goes one step further to include Confederate guilt over slavery as one reason why the South lost. Another factor that undermined morale was religion, although it had served at first to sustain it. Confederates had made the will of God synonymous with their cause, and after the battlefield defeats of 1863, even Robert E. Lee felt that God was punishing the South for its past sins, which some people thought included slavery. God's will became a psychological bridge to the acceptance of defeat.

All of the issues, although not singularly responsible for defeat, contributed to inevitably destroy the Confederacy.

Antonio de la Cova

**1. Explain the strengths, weaknesses, successes and failures of the New Deal. Address pertinent historical debates as well as discussing relevant facts.**

The New Deal was the recovery program started by Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1933 as a response to the Great Depression. Roosevelt sorted out the major problems facing the nation and pragmatically tried to solve them with an assortment of legislative measures and new government programs. There seems to have been no master plan. Roosevelt's economic advice came from a group of professors dubbed the Brain Trust. Their recovery goals were oriented toward inflation, raising prices as a means of stimulating recovery, and government regulation and control of the economy.

The first problem to tackle was the banking panic that ensued a few weeks before Roosevelt was sworn in. The day after inauguration, the President called a special session of Congress and suspended all bank transactions, to give the government control over the money supply. An Emergency Banking Relief bill was drafted in the White House, rammed through Congress in one afternoon, and signed into law that evening. This set the legislative tempo during the next one hundred days, as bills were written by the executive branch and quickly passed through Congress with little debate. Opponents of Roosevelt criticized that the power to legislate is vested by the Constitution in the Congress, and not the presidency.

Roosevelt embarked on a course that would lead to inflation, increasing the money supply, providing credit expansion and devaluing the dollar. The new law called in all gold and gold certificates, the country went off the gold standard, and only sound banks were allowed to reopen. This was a positive measure, as it saved the banking system. To assure public confidence in banks, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC) was established by Congress, insuring bank accounts up to a certain amount. Interest rates were later lowered to encourage bank loans. Other measures were taken to refinance farm and home mortgages. Federal agencies were reorganized, government salaries were reduced and veteran's pensions were cut to save money. To increase tax revenues, the Twenty-First Amendment ended prohibition and taxed alcoholic beverages. To prevent another stock market crash and wild speculation, the Securities and Exchange Commission was created by Congress to federally supervise the stock exchanges.

Another urgent problem Roosevelt faced was to provide relief for millions of unemployed and homeless Americans. The Civil Works Administration (CWA) and the Public Works Administration (PWA) were established to provide jobs building and repairing roads and bridges, government buildings, schools and hospitals. One weakness of these programs was that they overlapped each other and were unable to stimulate the economy. Opponents charged it led to loafing and dependency on the government, as some jobs were as petty as leaf raking. Roosevelt agreed, and dismantled the CWA.

A similar but more successful program was the Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC), which provided work for unemployed young men, who lived in camps run by the U.S. Army, while building parks,

flood control and reforestation. Critics denounced the rigid military life in the camps and that the program did nothing for unemployed women. Although the program was successful for the era of the 1930s, recent suggestions by legislators that a similar program should be established for inner-city unemployed youths has created an outcry of opposition.

Another important government project was the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA), which built numerous dams on the Tennessee River, providing jobs, cheap electric power and flood control for various states. Opponents of TVA claimed that it was a socialist experiment of government ownership of electricity that drove all privately owned electricity distributors out of a large region. They allege that the project was obsolete when it was completed after a decade, as hydroelectric power was not sufficient for the growing regional demands, and TVA had to turn to coal and nuclear plants.

The Agricultural Adjustment Act (AAA) was established to solve the farming crisis. Secretary of Agriculture Henry Wallace limited farm production through government subsidies. To raise prices, millions of acres of cotton were destroyed, and millions of pigs and chickens were slaughtered, even though millions of Americans were in need of food and cotton clothes. The benefits failed to trickle down to tenant farmers and share croppers, who were fired and evicted when planting acreage was reduced. This stimulated a great migration to the already overburdened cities.

The National Industrial Recovery Act (NIRA) created the National Recovery Administration (NRA), to foment cooperation between the government and business with voluntary application of guidelines to benefit production and wages. Economic competition and antitrust laws were suspended as price and labor codes went into effect. Unions were allowed to organize and bargain collectively under the NIRA's Section 7a, while the government would settle disputes through the National Labor Board. While unions greatly benefitted from a dramatic rise in membership, the plan was not economically successful, as prices rose and consumer purchasing power dropped. While socialists denounced the NRA as being dominated by big business, conservative critics called the NRA an ambitious attempt at a nationally planned economy, like those running fascist and communist countries, which collectivized the control over the manufacture, pricing and distribution of goods and hourly labor wages. They charged that it was a virtual presidential dictatorship over American industry and that no other chief executive had ever received such a range of discretionary powers. The Supreme Court agreed, and declared the NIRA and the NRA code system unconstitutional. These measures were then superseded with the National Labor Relations Act (the Wagner Act), which provided government protection for the unions, outlawed unfair management practices, and established the National Labor Relations Board to act as arbitrator.

The two most vocal critics of the New Deal were Louisiana Senator Huey "Kingfish" Long and Detroit Catholic priest Charles Coughlin, who were not allies, and regarded each other with contempt. Coughlin had a national radio program which attracted a massive audience. He denounced the New Deal for favoring big business, which he said was run by unscrupulous Jews who also

controlled international banking. Similar accusations had been made during the 1890s by leaders of the Populist Movement. Coughlin formed the National Social Justice Union, which called for the nationalization of banks, utilities and natural resources, a guaranteed annual wage, and greater protection of organized labor. Coughlin's strident anti-Semitism and isolationism, plus a Roosevelt-sponsored reprimand from the Catholic Church hierarchy, proved his undoing.

Long, a populist demagogue, proposed a "Share Our Wealth Plan" that would limit the wealth a person could own or pass to his heirs. A gradually increasing tax would be placed on fortunes of over one million dollars. With this revenue, the government would provide a guaranteed yearly income of \$2,500 for all American families, but Long failed to define how this would be done, and all the accumulated wealth to be confiscated would not be sufficient for his plan. A similar program, to provide a monthly federal pension for people over sixty, had been proposed by California physician Frank Townsend, and was gathering nationwide support. The money had to be spent within the month they received it, but it was never settled how the program would be financed and administered.

When Long announced in 1935 that he would run for president as a third party candidate in 1936 and his Share Our Wealth Clubs were multiplying throughout the country, Roosevelt modified his programs toward greater social reform and distanced himself from the business community. The President also felt that big business had betrayed his recovery program and was trying to politically destroy the New Deal. Yet, the large corporations had greatly benefitted at the expense of small business from the relaxation of the antitrust laws. Roosevelt's change of policy has been referred to as the Second New Deal. There was a shift away from emergency programs to more permanent ones. Industrial planning was abandoned in favor of redistribution programs. Senator Long did not live to see it, as he was assassinated by a Louisiana physician outraged that Long had slandered his family as being tainted with Negro blood.

During the Second New Deal, the federal tax structure was changed, raising taxes on large corporations and wealthy individuals on a scale similar to the Share Our Wealth Program. Another law restricted the large utility companies, although they were not nationalized, as Coughlin suggested. The Social Security Act was passed to provide assistance to the destitute and the aged, who previously depended on private charity. It had some drawbacks, as it did not cover farm workers and retirement payments would not start for a number of years. To help the unemployed, Congress then created the Works Project Administration (WPA) to supplant direct relief. The WPA continued the public works projects of the CWA and PWA, and also provided employment for intellectuals, writers and artists. The National Housing Act provided local governments with loans to build housing projects for low income families.

The New Deal programs faced their strongest opposition from lower court judges, who issued hundreds of injunctions against them. When the Supreme Court ruled that AAA farm production regulation was illegal, the "Second AAA" was established by the government to continue cutting back production. Roosevelt waited until after the 1936 election to deal with the Supreme Court.

Roosevelt won reelection by a landslide, with massive support from the unions, from blacks, and from millions of people who felt their life had improved under Roosevelt. The White House then prepared a bill providing that if a Federal judge did not retire at the age of 70, an extra judge could be appointed. For the Supreme Court, an additional six judges could be appointed, raising the number on the bench to 15. This court packing scheme was not supported by Congress, but soon death and resignation had Roosevelt appointing seven liberal judges by 1941, some staying for over 30 years.

In spite of the early economic recovery, a recession developed in 1937. Although the national income was approaching 1929 levels, there was still massive unemployment. The recovery had come at the expense of a mounting national debt and deficit spending. Production dropped and millions more were left unemployed. An emergency congressional appropriation again poured large funds into public works and work relief programs, more than doubling government employment, which stimulated recovery. One of the last measures of the New Deal was the Fair Labor Standards Act, which established the 40-hour work week, a minimum wage, and outlawed child labor. The law did not apply to farm workers or domestic help. Most of the New Deal reforms had been enacted or rejected by 1939, leaving the foundations of the Welfare State well entrenched.

The New Deal created fundamental political, social and economic changes in the United States. The role of the federal government greatly expanded, as power was centralized in Washington and concentrated in the Executive Branch. The New Deal was a political success for the Democratic Party, which from 1932 to 1968 occupied the presidency, except for two terms, while the Congresses and state governors have been predominantly Democratic. The New Deal also introduced deficit spending, which has been the policy of every administration since then to the present.

The New Deal has been portrayed by some historians as either an evolutionary continuation of the progressive movement, or as a revolutionary change with the past. Scholars in the 1950s, including Richard Hofstadter and Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., saw in the New Deal a break with the past, a movement beyond progressivism, and hailed the changes as positive. Schlesinger depicted the New Deal as offering a liberal, humane solution to the problem of maintaining a balance in a complex industrial society.

By the early 1960s scholars like William Luchtenberg portrayed the New Deal as a half-way revolution, which accomplished many things but was inadequate and fumbled in others. They point out the strengthening of the presidency, sweeping legislation in favor of the working class, social programs, unemployment compensation, federal housing, bank reforms and security regulations. Roosevelt is described as idealist and paternalist. The New Left historians of the late 1960s and early 1970s, like Paul Conkin and Francis Piven, regarded the New Deal as insufficient because it failed to rebuild society, change the power structure, distribute the wealth, nationalize banks or replace corporate capitalism. They portray Roosevelt as a demagogue, Social Security as meager, the wealthy becoming secure, and claim that the New Deal largely neglected African-Americans, but do not explain why blacks largely abandoned the Republican Party and overwhelmingly supported Roosevelt.

Antonio de la Cova

**3. Discuss the origins and organizational development of the Civil Rights Movement from World War II to the 1970s. Evaluate the impact of demographic change, politics, intellectual and judicial currents as well as developments in the black community itself. What factors influenced the shifting strategies and factions within the movement?**

In the early 1940s there were two predominant black organizations in the United States, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) founded in 1910, and the Congress of Racial Equality (CORE), created in Chicago in 1942 by socialists and pacifists. The NAACP, led for many years by marxist W.E.B. DuBois, had been petitioning the government on disenfranchisement, anti-lynching laws and racial equality.

The American manpower required during World War II, in the armed forces and industry, forced President Roosevelt to issue an executive order against discriminatory practices by unions or companies receiving government contracts. Racial barriers started to fall in the armed forces as many opportunities were available to blacks, including pilot and officer training. New jobs in industry, and a decline in cotton agriculture, induced a massive migration of more than a million blacks to the North. This caused racial hostility which erupted during the 1943 Detroit riot and followed an increasing migration of whites to the suburbs.

During the 1940s, the Communist Party USA launched a black recruitment drive which heralded much publicity, but little success. The CP solution to African-American problems was to advocate for a separatist black nation in the South. DuBois encouraged this in his writings, along with voluntary segregation. Leftist unions within the CIO also launched a black recruitment drive in the South in the late 1940s, but failed after being pressured against it by white locals.

Truman abolished racial segregation in the armed forces in 1948 through executive order. His civil rights proposals, which failed in Congress, prompted Southern Democrats to secede from the party and form the States' Rights Party, called Dixiecrats, led by Senator Strom Thurmond, whose primary goal was racial segregation. The civil rights struggle was taken up by the legal division of the NAACP, headed by black attorney Thurgood Marshall, which proceeded with persistent federal suits that in May 1954 culminated with **Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka**. The Supreme Court in this decision unanimously overturned the 1896 "separate but equal" doctrine of **Plessy v. Ferguson** which allowed school segregation. President Eisenhower did not support the ruling, which produced a counterattack by White Citizens Councils, closing down many southern public schools and delaying integration.

Eighteen months after this judicial landmark, the NAACP seems to have instigated an incident in Montgomery, Alabama, which ignited the civil rights movement. Rosa Parks, a seamstress and NAACP secretary who had recently participated in a desegregation workshop at the socialist Highlander Folk School, refused to give up her bus seat to a white person. She was arrested for violating

a municipal public transport segregation law.

During the previous year there had been two other similar arrests, but the questionable background of those women halted black civic organizations from getting involved. E. D. Nixon, president of the NAACP in Alabama and member of A. Philip Randolph's Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters, decided to turn the Parks case into a **cause celebre** against segregation. Support immediately surged from a black female political group and Montgomery's black preachers, including Ralph Abernathy and the hesitant Martin Luther King, Jr. A successful one-day bus boycott was organized on the day Parks was tried, found guilty and sentenced to a \$10 fine. Black leaders then decided to continue the boycott against segregated transportation, under the auspices of the newly created Montgomery Improvement Association (MIA), which nominated King as its president.

A protracted boycott was sustained with the help of black taxi drivers, car pooling and two dozen station wagons bought by the MIA. Northern activists descended on Montgomery and sent donations to cover movement expenses of \$5,000 weekly. Among the volunteers was black bohemian pacifist Bayard Rustin, a former Communist Youth recruiter, imprisoned for draft resistance during World War II.

Segregationists accused the civil rights movement of being influenced and financed by Communists and Northern agitators. They easily stirred southern white hysteria with charges that their opponents pursued a return to Black Reconstruction and miscegenation. White fanatics responded by bombing the King home. Alabama Governor "Big Jim" Folsom then provided the King residence with state police protection, a fact left out by many civil rights historians. Montgomery city officials used police harassment against the car pool and judicial maneuvering in attempting to end the boycott. They almost succeeded, when at a crucial moment the U.S. Supreme Court handed down a decision on a petition by an MIA white lawyer, declaring Alabama's transportation segregation laws unconstitutional. The victory propelled King to international fame, making E. D. Nixon jealous. Rosa Parks became bitter with King after she lost her seamstress job and he refused to put her on the MIA payroll. Nixon then sided with Mrs. Parks and MIA was torn by rivalry. Although black women were the backbone of the African-American churches that supported the civil rights movement, King and other leaders excluded their wives and other women from participating in the decision-making process.

King abandoned Montgomery to preach at his father's church in Atlanta and founded the Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC) with Rustin, former Communist Party fund-raiser Stanley Levison, and southern black clergymen, to engage in massive nonviolent civil rights protests. Internal divisions, a lack of a clear strategy, and heavy opposition from the NAACP made the SCLC ineffective the first few years.

The slow pace of court-ordered school integration exploded in 1957 in Little Rock, Arkansas. Black students trying to enter Central High School were forced out by hostile mobs, while Governor Faubus refused to intervene. President Eisenhower ordered federal troops to Little Rock to escort black students to school. Federal forces would later be used by the Kennedy Administration to

integrate the universities of Mississippi and Alabama.

The civil rights movement took a new turn in 1960, when four black college students initiated a "sit-in" at a segregated store lunch counter in Greensboro, North Carolina. Soon the strategy was courageously repeated at other public facilities throughout the South, and thousands of students were arrested. King and his SCLC followers joined the protest in Atlanta, and were thrown in jail. While King sat for a week in jail, just prior to the 1960 presidential elections, Democratic candidate John Kennedy was goaded by his advisers into telephoning King's wife to express sympathy. This prompted political endorsements to the Kennedy campaign from King Sr. and other black preachers, which were printed into flyers and distributed in the hundreds of thousands in black precincts the Sunday before the election. Eisenhower later complained to reporters that the flyer campaign was one of the factors that defeated Richard Nixon.

Sit-in participants created the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC), which teamed up with CORE in 1961 to participate in the "freedom rides," to test segregation in interstate bus terminals. The black and white pacifist riders left Virginia, bound for New Orleans, and did not have trouble until they reached Alabama, where their Greyhound bus was burned by a mob. The activists, who did not fight back, were brutally assaulted, and the police failed to provide them protection.

The Kennedy Administration became concerned over its own prestige when the incident made international news. The President worked behind the scenes on behalf of the civil rights movement, fearing that public identification with blacks would alienate Southern democrats. An ICC ruling finally desegregated interstate transportation facilities. The Kennedy Administration then tried to influence CORE, SCLC and SNCC to channel their energies away from protest rides and marches and into voter registration in the South, knowing this would greatly benefit the Democratic Party for the 1964 elections. The SNCC was not about to be politically manipulated and instead created the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party (MFDP) which challenged the seating of the state's all-white delegation at the Democratic National Convention.

The government then helped create the Voter Education Project (VEP) as an umbrella group for the various civil rights organizations, and Attorney General Robert Kennedy got liberal foundations to donate more than a million dollars to it, to be distributed among all. Kennedy was concerned about Communist influence in the Civil Rights movement, as he and the President told King to get rid of Rustin and Levison, the latter classified as a top-ranking Soviet agent by CPUSA officials who were FBI informants. King misled the Kennedys regarding Levison's dismissal, which prompted the Attorney General to wiretap the telephones of King, Levison and Rustin. Black Congressman Adam Clayton Powell, himself a corrupt and controversial figure, also accused King and A. Philip Randolph of being "controlled" by socialist interests.

The VEP campaign in Mississippi had few results, as northerners helping to register blacks encountered violence and death, like the murders of NAACP leader Medgar Evers, three Northern student volunteers and Mrs. Viola Liuzzo, a white civil

rights activist from Detroit. Marchers in Birmingham encountered firehose blasts and the police dogs of chief "Bull" Connor. The non-violent civil rights demonstrations in the South, whose backbone was the membership of black Protestant churches, were having little effect on desegregation. It was evident that sweeping civil-rights legislation was needed, and the racist violence depicted in the media gained favorable Northern support.

In the summer of 1963 President Kennedy finally decided to address the nation on the racial issue with an emotional speech, and later asked Congress to legislate desegregation measures. Civil rights groups then organized a successful massive March on Washington to influence Congress. At the rally, King gave his eloquent "I Have a Dream Speech," in which he hoped that some day people would not be judged by the color of their skin but by the content of their character. Although the President turned down an invitation to assist to the rally, he later privately met with the black leaders at the White House. For his role in the civil rights movement, King was named *Time* magazine's 1963 "Man of the Year" and awarded the 1964 Nobel Peace Prize. When King insisted on giving away the large award money, it heightened his marital problems.

After Lyndon Johnson became President, he continued to promote Kennedy's civil rights bill, although during his first twenty years as Texas senator, Johnson had voted against every single civil rights measure. The Civil Rights Act of 1964 banned discrimination in job hiring or in public facilities, and the "Whites Only" and "Colored Entrance" signs, which I vividly remember as a child, became museum pieces. The following year, the Voting Rights Act annulled Southern obstructionist voter registration practices, and more than one million African-Americans became eligible to vote.

These measures, instead of placating backs, fomented a search for black identity that radicalized some civil rights groups and leaders. SNCC leadership passed to extremists Stokely Carmichael and H. Rap Brown, who expelled all white leaders from SNCC, and began carrying guns. After a trip to Cuba in 1965, Carmichael returned to the United States to preach Black Power and called for revolution in the streets. King favored the term "black equality" instead of "black power," but those who preached it opposed him. Another advocate of violent resistance was Nation of Islam leader Malcom X, a former street hustler. He preached racial hatred against the "white devils" until a trip to Mecca, where he met moslems of all colors, changed his attitude. This, in turn, provoked a split in the Nation of Islam, and Malcolm's religious adversaries assassinated him in 1965. Black ex-convicts Eldridge Cleaver, Huey Newton, and Bobby Seale, organized the Black Panthers in Oakland, California, calling for black community autonomy and the release of all African-Americans from U.S. prisons, since they had been "unjustly" convicted by a racist system. Black riots broke out in Los Angeles in 1965, and spread throughout other northern cities during the next three summers.

In 1965, King based his SCLC crusade in Chicago to promote better social conditions for blacks in northern cities. He openly criticized the government for its involvement in the Vietnam War and not recognizing Communist China, and denounced the capitalist system. "Bearing the Cross" shows that alleged Communist agent

Levison strongly influenced King in this change of tactics and even wrote his anti-war speeches. Moderate civil rights groups, like the NAACP, feuded with King over his new strategy, because it was alienating President Johnson from their movement. The government assumed that King was extremely ambitious and was searching for a constituency. By involving the SCLC in issues outside of the civil rights movement, King seemed to be trying to keep going the momentum that was generating over half-a-million dollars in annual contributions. The NAACP publicly denounced the attempt to merge the civil rights and peace movements. When radical black leaders became critical of Israel after the 1967 Arab-Israeli War, many liberal American Jews stopped supporting the civil rights movement.

King started "open housing" marches in northern white neighborhoods, which caused a white backlash against the civil rights movement. Alabama governor George Wallace, a third-party presidential candidate, gained a large working-class following in the North as a consequence of this. King then announced that he would go all out to defeat Johnson in the 1968 election. As part of this plan he began to organize a Poor People's Campaign to occupy Washington until the Johnson Administration changed its domestic and foreign policies. Meanwhile, King was asked by black leaders in Memphis to support a local sanitation strike. The first march he organized turned into a riot. A few days later, King was murdered by James Earl Ray, an assassin hired by two wealthy contributors of Wallace's American Independent Party, according to a 1979 Congressional investigation. Ray wrote a book last year claiming that he did not kill King, but had been set up as the fall guy.

After King's death, no other African-American leader emerged to fill his shoes. Abernathy carried out the Poor People's march to Washington, with thousands of blacks, hispanics and native americans, who built Resurrection City in the Capitol Mall, which became a fiasco and ended in a riot. By the mid 1970s, the SCLC, SNCC and CORE had folded due to infighting and a lack of funds.

Civil rights historiography enjoyed the support of liberal white academics like C. Van Woodward's "The Strange Career of Jim Crow" and Harvard Sitkoff's general survey "The Struggle for Black Equality." Some of the movement leaders wrote their memoirs, usually highlighting their own participation, while omitting controversies over missing movement funds or personality clashes. Leadership accounts were also compiled in "My Soul is Rested." The early historiography tended to enshrine King, much like the liberal academic glorification of John Kennedy immediately after his assassination. While the Kennedy image was tarnished in the 1980s with new biographies, professor David Garrow published "Bearing the Cross" in 1986, using former confidential government documents and FBI wiretap transcripts. He portrayed the inner King as very insecure, a heavy smoker, drinker and eater, a henpecked husband who insisted that his wife stay home to raise their children while he was gone most of the time, and had numerous black and white mistresses. Garrow also showed that King greatly depended on Stanley Levison for political advice, to write most of his major speeches and even to ghost-write some of his books. Evidence later surfaced that King had also plagiarized his Ph.D. dissertation at Boston University.

In 1988, Taylor Branch wrote "Parting the Waters," omitting most of King's weaknesses, and instead presented a charismatic, devoted, visionary leader fatalistically obsessed with his own violent death. In portraying King as a martyr, Branch neglected mentioning that in 1960 King was acquitted by an all-white jury in Alabama on charges of state income tax perjury. On that occasion, King praised white justice in Alabama. Branch instead exposed Ralph Abernathy, dedicating various pages to his philandering with a married teenager, which led to an armed incident with her husband that ended in a court scandal. When Abernathy wrote his memoirs the following year, he omitted this affair, but mentioned that King had slept with three women the night before he was murdered and got into a physical fight with one of them. Abernathy also depicted Jesse Jackson and other movement leaders as opportunists.

The complete story of the civil rights movement will not be known until the year 2029, fifty years after the Congressional investigation on the assassination of King. Most of the government documents given to Congress on King's private life were so sensitive, that a federal judge ordered them sealed for fifty years. Ironically, the Congressional Black Caucus insists they remain sealed from the public.

Antonio de la Cova

2. In recent essays, John Lewis Gaddis has written that despite what many diplomatic historians have argued the United States could never have "gotten along" with the Soviet Union for at its most basic level "the Cold War was really about the imposition of autocracy and the denial of freedom." With this statement the historiography of the origins of the Cold War appears to have come in full circle. Write an essay tracing the development of the historiography of the origins of the Cold War. What are the strengths and weaknesses of the various schools of thought? Also why has the debate come in full circle?

It has taken nearly half a century for Cold War historiography to complete a full-circle trajectory, from orthodox, to revisionist, to postrevisionist, and to a yet unnamed school of thought, which could be called reorthodox or orthovisionist.

The orthodox historians, notably Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., Adam Ulam, Robert Maddox and Walter Rostow, predominated during the period after World War II until the early 1960s. Their position was in response to conservative arguments that President Roosevelt, by naively trusting the Soviets, had sold out the cause of freedom in Eastern Europe and laid the groundwork for the Communist takeover of China with the Yalta secret agreements. Roosevelt left many loose ends at Yalta that benefitted Stalin. His main goal was obtaining Soviet support for the United Nations, in exchange for Stalin's demand for three Soviet seats in the General Assembly.

Orthodox portrayed the Cold War as the U.S. response to Soviet aggressive expansionism, indicating that the Kremlin was following the same continuity of territorial aggrandizement that had enlarged Russia since the days of the czars. Stalin was bent on dominating Eastern Europe even if it meant breaking his agreements with the Allies. Postrevisionist Vojtech Mastny, using limited Communist references, wrote that even before World War II ended, Stalin was planning on expanding East as far as the Allies would allow him. He blamed the West for being weak in the face of Soviet expansion and occupation of Poland. At Yalta, Stalin had agreed to Allied demands that there would be free elections in Poland. Instead, the Russians arrested Polish underground leaders and imposed a Communist regime. When Truman became president, he met with Soviet Foreign Minister Molotov in Washington, and insisted that Russia abide by the Yalta agreement on free elections in Poland. Revisionists claimed that Truman's "offensive" tone against Molotov is what started the Cold War.

Schlesinger differed, indicating that as soon as Yalta had concluded, Stalin fired the first shot in the Cold War when he authorized French Comintern leader Jacques Duclos to write an article attacking the Popular Front practices of the Communist Party USA and demanding a return to the traditional class struggle between Marxism and capitalism and world revolution. Revisionists alleged that Duclos was merely denouncing the CPUSA decision in 1944 to abandon electoral politics.

In February 1946 Stalin declared in his first major speech after the war that the Soviet Union had to be ready industrially to

survive in a world in which future wars were inevitable because of the existence of imperialism. Schlesinger claimed that this intransigent statement made the Cold War inevitable. Revisionists allege that the U.S. had the power to choose various options that could have been more conciliatory toward the Soviet Union.

One of the first revisionist works to appear was William Appleman Williams' "The Tragedy of American Diplomacy" in 1959. It indicated that American Cold War policy was a continuity of U.S. globalism that started with the Spanish-American War. Williams wrote that American capitalism needed expanding foreign markets in order to survive. This was a repeat of the accusation made by Soviet Foreign Minister Molotov in 1947 when he walked out of a conference in which the European Recovery Program, or Marshall Plan, was offered to all European nations, including the Communists. If this charge was true, that to avoid another depression America had to resort to the Marshall Plan, revisionists fail to explain why the U.S. then later on did not apply similar economic plans to other areas of the world. Some revisionist arguments at times parallel the Soviet government line.

The revisionist scholarship challenging the official U.S. explanations grew in the late 1960s and early 1970s with people like Gabriel Kolko, Walter LeFeber and David Horowitz, the latter of whom turned conservative a decade later. The majority of the revisionists belonged to the New Left, were active opponents of the Vietnam War, and some had studied in the Soviet Union. Most of them did not understand Russian, did not use Soviet sources and were limited to U.S. archive material. At times, the revisionists argued more amongst each other, like the followers of Stalin and Trotsky, than with their orthodox colleagues.

Revisionism portrayed the Stalinist era in a favorable light, praising its industrial modernization and "progressive" administration, overlooking the gulag prison camp system, mass executions, show trials, forced collectivization and violations of basic human rights. They depicted the United States government as an imperialist power, without concerns for Soviet security interests, imposing their economy and way of life on unwilling nations, while deceiving the American people into supporting this expansionist policy. The contempt that some revisionists had for U.S. institutions led Carl Oglesby to conclude that the Cold War would not end until the American "system" was destroyed. This turned out to be more wishful thinking than serious analysis.

On the other hand, some orthodox academics concluded that a disruption in the Communist Party would turn Russia from a strong country into a weak one. The Gorbachev reforms led to the breakdown of the party, without destroying the military, but doing away with the Soviet Union. Yet, orthodox academics erred in some on their conclusions. They assumed that the Soviet system would collapse after Stalin's death and saw no possibility for a change of policy. The orthodox perspective was unable to envision Khrushchev's denunciation of Stalin or that an era of detente was possible. They spent years analyzing the significance of the Kremlin "pecking order" and developed a whole theory on it, which later turned out to be totally without basis.

Revisionists argue that the Soviet Union emerged militarily

weak from the war because of heavy losses. The overlook that Russian occupation troops in East Europe outnumbered Allied forces three to one. Revisionists claim that this Soviet military "weakness" is what prompted Stalin not to help the Greek Communist guerrillas in 1947. Orthodox historians indicate that Yugoslavia's Marshall Tito was providing the supply base for the Greek insurgents in the hope of bringing Greece into a Balkans Federation that would have taken Bulgaria, Rumania and other Soviet satellites out of the Kremlin's orbit.

Revisionists claim that the Yalta agreements were very vague and allowed Russia a controlling influence in Eastern Europe. They say that American diplomats, after unleashing the power of the atomic bomb, tried to coerce from the Soviets what they had implicitly conceded at Yalta. William Chafe wrote that Russia did violate the Yalta agreements by imposing its hegemony on Poland and refusing to withdraw from Iran when the war ended. Postrevisionist historians point out that Stalin had shown no surprise at Potsdam when informed of the atomic bomb detonation because his spies working on the project since 1942, like scientist Klaus Fuchs, were furnishing all the details to construct a Soviet atom bomb. Diplomatic spies Guy Burgess and Don Mclean kept Stalin informed that the U.S. and Britain had no intentions of starting a war and that their atomic capacity was limited due to poor uranium mining.

The postrevisionists writing in the late 1970s and early 1980s, including John Lewis Gaddis and Thomas Wolfe, straddled the fence by blaming both sides for the Cold War. This easy position created little controversy, no spectacular revelations and was dubbed a "toothless" version. Postrevisionists borrowed from both the orthodox and the postrevisionist views to concoct their intellectual stew. They sided with the orthodox in claiming that the postwar U.S. government was more concerned with national security than with another depression, and that there was no intention to suppress socialism within its sphere of influence. Here they are overlooking Guatemala in 1954, Cuba in 1961 and Chile in 1973, but the U.S. was just as influential in overthrowing right-wing dictatorships by imposing arms embargoes like in Cuba 1958, Dominican Republic 1961, Nicaragua 1979 and denying exile to military despot Marcos Perez Jimenez and deporting him back to Venezuela to stand trial.

Postrevisionists agree with the revisionists that America was a "defensive empire" that employed economic measures to wrest political objectives. Yet, they failed to see Soviet imperialistic intentions to forcibly spread Communism beyond their sphere, which became evident in the 1970s with Russian involvement in Africa, Afghanistan and Central America. Gaddis later recanted that since that was the position of the Reagan Administration, they turned a blind eye to it, out of fear of becoming like Reagan themselves. Revisionists, generally harboring contempt for the postrevisionists, derided them as "orthodoxy with archives," because they used archival material to blame the Soviet Union for the Cold War while being apologists for U.S. expansionism.

The demise of the Soviet Union and the opening of Russian archives put the postrevisionist school to rest. Gaddis, who has written about the Cold War for more than twenty years, has recently

discovered that Stalin, in fact, was a psychotic mass killer and warmonger, even worse than Hitler. Gaddis also now agrees with Vojtech Mastny and Robert Daniels that Stalin's territorial acquisition ambitions followed those of the czars. His recent articles espousing these beliefs express a personal "mea culpa" for previously not taking seriously the voices of the oppressed. This academia "prodigal son" now regrets having allowed his vision to be clouded by the works of revisionists like Williams. Gaddis admits that his generation of academics was "traumatized" to the point that they easily dismissed Communist spying as right-wing figments of the imagination and scoffed at Ronald Reagan's denunciation of the "evil empire" a decade ago. Now the archives are showing and the Russian people are freely saying that the Soviet empire was truly evil. Cold War history will be rewritten again, by new scholars not personally affected by that era, who will use KGB archives to put to final rest the veracity of the Rosenberg atomic espionage case, the spy role of Alger Hiss in the New Deal and at Yalta, the extent of collaboration of Judith Coplon and other controversial figures, and give us a new perspective on events, the people involved, and their motives. Gaddis at least had the courage to admit he was wrong, while many other academics remain silent.

Antonio de la Cova

**Discuss the principal causes for the outbreak of the Cold War, focusing primarily on the Soviet road to the Cold War. Compare and contrast the interpretations of scholars of Russian/Soviet foreign policy , e.g., Robert Daniels and Vojtech Mastny, with the orthodox, revisionist and post-revisionist historians who have focused on the road of the U.S. to the Cold War. Finally, why did the Cold War continue for more than thirty years following the death of Stalin?**

The causes for the outbreak of the Cold War are still being debated today. From 1945 until the early 1960s, American Sovietologists embraced the orthodox view of the totalitarianism school in analyzing the Soviet Union during the Cold War. These writers included Adam Ulam, Walter Rostow, Robert Maddox and Arthur Schlesinger, Jr. They drew a straight line of continuity in Soviet history and politics, emphasizing that there was no difference between Bolshevism and Stalinism. Orthodox historians believed the Soviet system would have no fundamental changes unless a total collapse occurred. They left out the possibility for the era of detente which later followed. Some historians wrongfully surmised that the death of Stalin would bring about the disintegration of the system. They analyzed such things as the Kremlin "pecking order," which later turned out to be irrelevant. Other orthodox analysts rightly predicted that if party unity was disrupted, Russia would almost immediately change from a powerful nation to a weak one. This is what happened with the advent of the Gorbachev reforms, which led to the demise of the Soviet Union.

The generation of American scholars in the 1960s and 1970s who were vocal opponents of the Vietnam War and critics of Watergate political chicanery, took a revisionist view of the Soviet Union, that many times glossed over Stalinist crimes, frequent ineptitude, corruption and human rights abuses. These writers include Walter LeFeber, William A. Williams, Gabriel Kolko and David Horowitz, who later switched to conservatism. The Stalin era is romanticized for its modernization of industry, administration and mass culture, among other "progressive" developments. Many younger Sovietologists had studied in Russia under academic exchange programs, which led them to focus on the "achievements" of the Communist regime, which after 1991 turned out to be more imaginary than real. Since revisionists had little interest in Soviet history, they limited linking political and historical interpretation. Revisionists validated Soviet security concerns and claimed that the Soviets were provoked into taking a Cold War position by the Truman Administration. Had Roosevelt lived longer, they wrote, the situation would have been different. They omit that Roosevelt called the Soviet Union an absolute dictatorship after the invasion of Finland, and that at the time of his death he acknowledged to a friend that the Russians had repeatedly broken the Yalta agreement and that the policy toward the USSR was being reassessed.

The post-revisionists, like John Lewis Gaddis and Thomas Wolfe, took a middle-of-the-road position, blaming both sides for the inevitability Cold War. They portrayed the U.S. as responding to, rather than starting, challenges to the international order.

Gaddis has indicated that Comintern activity in the U.S. posed no threat to national security, overlooking the work of Comintern espionage networks established in America during the 1930s and 1940s, as denounced before HUAC by Elizabeth Bentley, Whittaker Chambers and other former spies.

Vojtech Mastny argued that the seeds of the Cold War were sown during World War II. He claimed that Stalin's obsession for security through territorial expansion was a historical continuity from the time of the czars. Robert Daniels also shared this belief, and regarded the USSR as an imperialist military regime. Orthodox historians like Ulam indicated that the Cold War began at Yalta, with Poland providing the cause of the conflict after Moscow refused to hold Polish elections, jailed Polish underground leaders and imposed its own Polish Communist regime. Mastny blamed the Soviet occupation of Poland on the weak diplomatic position of the British and the Americans at Yalta, who did not object to the Polish arrests and rushed through most of the agreements, but he also faulted Stalin for not being conciliatory with Soviet-occupied territory. Mastny does not believe that Roosevelt's bad health affected his negotiating performance, although he portrayed the president as naively optimistic toward the Russians. Gaddis defended Roosevelt from charges of being naive when dealing with Stalin. He claimed that Roosevelt did not give up anything at Yalta that Stalin already did not have or was about to acquire, skirting the issue that the specific agreement on free elections in Poland was violated by the Soviets.

Orthodox historians stressed that Roosevelt's judgement was impaired because of his fatal illness. They also indicated that one of the earliest shots in the Cold War was fired that same month by Jacques Duclos, a French Comintern leader, apparently obeying Kremlin orders when he wrote an article demanding a return to Marxist traditional class struggle against capitalism. Duclos denounced the Popular Front concept practiced by the CPUSA, which then proceeded to dump its leader, Earl Browder, and replaced him with hardliner William Foster. On this issue, Mastny sided with Duclos in claiming that the article did not have great significance and was a mere warning to the West not to reverse their alliance.

Some revisionists claimed that the Cold War started when Truman met in Washington with Soviet Foreign Minister Molotov in late April 1945, and "insultingly" demanded that Russia abide by the Yalta agreement. They also charged that President Truman's suspension of Lend-Lease after Germany surrendered was a pressure tactic, although Truman immediately countermanded what seemed to be a bureaucratic error. Ulam believed that Truman was acting on inexperience and conflicting counsels and that suspicion was inherent in Stalin. When Truman met with Stalin and Churchill at Potsdam, Germany was divided into four zones of occupation without a central government and each power would exact reparations from its own zone. Mastny again pointed to western weakness at Potsdam to do anything about Soviet abuses in Poland, and instead the West recognized the Warsaw puppet regime. He sums up that neither side got what they wanted at Potsdam and that both factions were to blame for the Cold War.

Post-revisionists see the Cold War not as an ideological

contest but as a series of misunderstandings and lost opportunities. Stalin's motives have been interpreted as opportunistic exploitation of the postwar situation on behalf of Soviet policy, and an emphasis on Soviet defensive security against future western threats. In fact, the Soviet Union was carving out a protective buffer, similar to what Israel would establish in southern Lebanon decades later. Russian expansionist plans in the Far East were demonstrated by the rapidity with which the Red Army took over the Kuriles islands after the atom bomb was dropped on Japan in August. The allies let the Soviets occupy Manchuria and North Korea, but not Japan, even though the Russians repeatedly requested a zone of occupation. Ulam indicated that Stalin was more concerned with internal convulsions in the Soviet Union than fear of Western aggression, which is why he drastically reduced and demobilized the Red Army, to incorporate the soldiers into the labor force. In his first major postwar foreign policy speech in February 1946, Stalin said that Russia had to be industrially prepared to live in a world where the existence of imperialism made future wars inevitable. Daniels wrote that the West's alarmist misinterpretation of this statement was a major cause of the Cold War. That same year, the Soviet republics of Armenia and Georgia made territorial claims against Turkey and Stalin withdrew from northern Iran only after a warning from Truman.

Stalin's outspoken belligerency prompted George Kennan's famous telegram to the Department of State, which outlined the basis of his containment theory. It divided the world into spheres of influence to maintain a balance of power in Europe and Asia. China and Korea were left out of the containment policy because they did not possess the industrial-military capability to upset the balance of power. Historians are still debating whether or not containment worked. Daniels pointed out that it stopped Soviet expansion into Western Europe and the Middle East. Gaddis also highly praised the accomplishments of containment during 30 years in Europe and Northeast Asia, but overlooked its failures during the same period in Southeast Asia, the Middle East, Africa and Latin America.

While the Americans were pursuing collective security, the Soviets were trying to divide the world into spheres of influence. Russia's main concerns were the management of their new territories and their relations with the U.S. By 1947 they had consolidated their control of Poland, Hungary, Rumania and Bulgaria.

In February 1947, a new socialist British government, facing economic difficulties and opposed to British involvement overseas, stated that they were no longer able to support Greece and Turkey against Communist aggression. This caused President Truman to respond the following month with what became known as the Truman Doctrine. It implied American assistance to any nation threatened by Communism.

The Truman Doctrine was succeeded by the European Recovery Program, or Marshall Plan, which, using Kennan's suggestion, proposed economic aid to all European countries who joined the program, including the Communists. Soviet Foreign Minister Molotov denounced the plan as an attempt by the Americans to use their credit to expand foreign markets, because capitalism was facing a

new depression. To some revisionist writers, this became the point of no return that started the Cold War, as Europe was divided into two hostile camps. Ulam believed that the real purpose of the Marshall Plan was to rearm Western Europe in a manner that would prohibit Russia from further expansion. Gaddis considered the program not as American economic expansionism but as a barrier to Soviet encroachment by rebuilding European industrial economies. The Soviets responded by creating the Communist Information Bureau, or Cominform, and the Council of Mutual Economic Assistance (COMECON) for the Eastern European countries. Cominform strategy included the launching of strikes and riots in France and Italy to disrupt the Marshall Plan. Cold War foreign policy then turned into an escalating upmanship carried out both sides.

Germany, according to Daniels, was one of the major problems of the Cold War. Russia feared that a united Germany would be a menace. The first conflict occurred when the Soviets refused to account for the reparations they were taking out of their zone. The western powers then stopped giving the Soviets industrial equipment from their zones. After the three western zones were united in 1948, the Russians responded with the Berlin blockade to deter the creation of a unified West Germany. When diplomatic efforts failed to end the crisis, an Anglo-American airlift was carried out for almost a year, until the situation was peacefully resolved. In 1949, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) was created, and Truman deployed nuclear bombers in Europe, to negotiate with Russia from a position of strength. The USSR responded with the creation of East Germany, exploded their first atomic bomb, developed a formidable submarine fleet, and tightened control of their satellites with show trials and purges. NATO was not considered a major threat by the Soviets, whose divisions in Eastern Europe, mostly deployed in East Germany, outnumbered the West by more than three to one. It was not until after a rearmed Germany entered NATO, as a result of the Korean War, that the Russians responded by organizing their satellites into the Warsaw Pact.

One satellite the Kremlin could not control was Yugoslavia, which had its own plans for a Balkan federation. The Soviet-Yugoslav split led to the collapse of the Greek Communist guerrillas, which had their supply base in Yugoslavia. Moscow then expelled Yugoslavia from Cominform. Marshall Tito eventually liberalized his policies and abandoned collectivization, which caused the Kremlin to denounce Tito as an imperialist agent. Within a few years the Yugoslavs turned to the West for aid, when they saw that Russia's aim was to destroy them. This played right into Kennan's strategy of fomenting division within international Communism, to be encouraged with other satellites.

The Soviets initially gained a new ally with Mao Zedong after the Communist victory in China in 1949. In the U.S. this caused great apprehension among conservatives and gave rise to McCarthyism. Russia boycotted the U.N. because it still recognized the Formosa Nationalists as the legitimate Chinese government. Due to their absence, in June 1950 the U.N. Security Council voted unanimously to militarily assist South Korea after they were invaded by North Korea. The attack was instigated by the Russians,

who saw that the U.S. had not intervened to save the Nationalist Chinese and that Secretary of State Dean Acheson had declared that South Korea was not included in America's containment policy. The U.S. toughened its Asia policy as a result, sent troops to South Korea, defended Formosa with a naval blockade, increased aid to the Philippines and dispatched a military mission to Indochina. The Truman Administration abandoned the containment policy of strategic defense points for the tougher NSC-68 resolution of perimeter defense, because Kennan's policy stressed that the Kremlin had no intention of starting a war. As a consequence of American rearmament, the USSR also increased their defense expenditures. The Chinese responded by sending "volunteers" into the conflict, which drove U.N. forces from their border back to the dividing 38th parallel. A Korean peace agreement was finally reached in the summer of 1953, a few months after Stalin's death.

The world became divided into superpower spheres of influence. When East Berlin workers revolted in 1953, they were crushed by the Soviets while the West did nothing. The following year, the Communist bloc failed to assist the leftist Guatemalan government of Colonel Jacobo Arbenz as it was being overthrown by a CIA-backed expatriate invasion. After the Korean War, the Eisenhower Administration unveiled their "New Look" policy. The U.S. would respond asymmetrically, applying full strength to the enemy's weakest point, even if it was on a different territory. Critics called it the doctrine of massive retaliation. The Soviet Union's reply to the New Look was to double the size of their armed forces.

After Russia launched Sputnik in 1957, Khrushchev began to use "nuclear diplomacy," or "rocket rattling," to frighten the West. Revisionist historians, using hindsight, have dismissed these threats as unbelievable, but it was taken very seriously by the President of the United States, who responded with the Eisenhower Doctrine. This doctrine promised military aid to Middle East nations under threat of aggression from Communist countries. A leftist revolution in Iraq in 1958 prompted the landing of U.S. Marines in Beirut as a show of force.

In 1958 Khrushchev again threatened the West to recognize East Germany within six months or leave Berlin and added that attempts to break a blockade would start a war. Daniels wrote that Khrushchev fabricated this conflict to prevent Germany from receiving nuclear weapons. Khrushchev later modified his position by withdrawing a time limit, and a summit meeting was arranged with Eisenhower. In the Middle East, the Kremlin agreed to finance the Aswan Dam project in Egypt, and backed the Nasser regime during the Suez Crisis. Russia also granted large economic and technological aid to China. Relations with Peiking soon soured when the Russians reneged on their promise to share the secrets of the atom bomb. Khrushchev then withdrew thousands of Soviet technicians from China, removing the blueprints of projects in progress.

The advent of the Kennedy Administration brought renewed political conflict between the superpowers as Khrushchev perceived that he could bully the young American President. In January 1961, Khrushchev made a commitment to wars of national liberation in the Third World, reverting to the Stalinist policy of expansionist Communism. The first incident occurred on April 17, 1961, when the

American-equipped Cuban exile Brigade 2506 landed 1,500 men in Cuba to overthrow Castro. The Cuban dictator immediately declared his revolution socialist, and Khrushchev warned Kennedy that the USSR would provide Cuba with military aid to repulse the invasion. Kennedy was so shaken by Khrushchev's threat that he cancelled all logistical support and air cover for the exiles stranded on the beach.

This Communist victory encouraged Khrushchev to keep pushing Kennedy at the Vienna summit on the issue of Berlin and East German recognition by the end of the year, which would perpetuate the division of Germany. In August 1961, the Berlin Wall was constructed and the Russians exploded the world's largest hydrogen bomb, ending their own nuclear test moratorium. As the German recognition deadline neared, Khrushchev again backed down from his ultimatum. In contrast to Stalin, Khrushchev was an irresponsible political gambler with the West. He took more risks and made more concessions than Stalin ever did.

The Kennedy Administration then developed the "Flexible Response" strategy to deal with Communism, which was continued by the Johnson Administration. Communist aggression would be countered with force, but without unnecessary escalation. Tensions between the U.S. and Russia were reduced after the installation of a communications "hot line," the sale of American wheat to the Soviets and a summit between President Johnson and Kosygin at Glassboro. The Brezhnev politburo decided to solve the German question through long-range diplomacy rather than the ultimatums meted out by Khrushchev. In response to Soviet inferiority at the time of the Cuban Missile Crisis, Russia began a rapid buildup of nuclear missiles, not only to catch up to America, but to also establish superiority over China, which had exploded an atom bomb in October 1964. By 1967, Vietnam and the Middle East became testing grounds between Russian and American military technology, as both sides became deeply committed to advancing their cause, while at the same time avoiding a nuclear war and promoting detente. Soviet-Chinese relations did not improve as Mao plunged his country into the Cultural Revolution. In Europe, the Soviets began courting DeGaulle after he led France out on NATO and blocked Britain's entry into the Common Market.

The Cold War grew hot again in January 1968 when Alexander Dubcek rose to power in Czechoslovakia and began liberal reforms, known as the "Prague Spring," which included ending press censorship. The Soviets responded by invading Czechoslovakia, and taking Dubcek and other liberal officials back to Moscow. When the Czechoslovak Communist Party refused to substitute their leaders, Dubcek and his collaborators were sent back to their posts in Prague, but eased out of power a year later. This intervention in the internal affairs of a Communist country when Soviet interests are threatened became known as the Brezhnev Doctrine, which was a throwback to the Stalinist era. It drove France back into NATO and solidified western resolve against Soviet expansionism.

Border clashes flared up on the Soviet-Chinese border in 1969. That year, the Nixon Administration initiated Kissinger's policy of detente, which started Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT) and allowed the USSR to buy large amounts of grain from the U.S.

Russia's perceived threat from West Germany ameliorated after 1969 when the socialist government of Willy Brandt was elected. Brandt sought detente and did not pursue a militant anti-Communist policy. Brandt even recognized East Germany and the status of Berlin was finally settled by the Four Powers in 1972.

Indochina continued to fester as the North Vietnamese launched an offensive into the south in May 1972, a few weeks before the scheduled final SALT summit. President Nixon responded by increasing the bombing of North Vietnam and mining its ports. A similar situation would have caused a grave incident with the Soviets during an earlier era. The Kremlin had other problems to worry about, like the closer U.S.-China relations after Nixon's recent visit to Peking, the grain deal with the U.S., and SALT hung in the balance after three years of negotiations. When the SALT accord was signed, both powers sought to put a cap on the growing arms race by fixing the amount of ICBM launchers. The Kremlin then increased weapons shipments to North Vietnam, which violated the terms of the peace agreement in mounting the offensive that led to the fall of Saigon in 1975. Daniels claimed that this is what started the period he described as the "New Cold War."

The confrontation soon extended to Africa, Afghanistan and the Western Hemisphere, as Russia seized each opportunity to expand her influence. The SALT II treaty was derailed in the U.S. Senate in the fall of 1979 as a result of Soviet expansionism. In December, the Soviets invaded Afghanistan and relations with the U.S. sank to their lowest point since the start of detente. The Carter Administration responded by imposing a grain embargo on the USSR and boycotting the Olympic Games in Moscow.

The Cold War continued into the 1980s because of the Soviet policy of aiding wars of national liberation. This ended during the Gorbachev era after the Soviets began pulling out of Afghanistan and Third World conflict areas, were instrumental in the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Africa, participated with the United States in the peace process in Angola and South West Africa, and stopped Soviet weapons shipments to Central America. In 1989, the Soviets identified the serial numbers on a group of missiles captured from Salvadoran FMLN guerrillas as part of a batch that had been given to the Sandinista government. When the Soviet weapons pipeline was closed to the FMLN, the guerrillas gave up the armed struggle and signed a peace accord with the Salvadoran government in February 1991. The last of Soviet combat brigade was withdrawn from Cuba this summer, putting an end to the Cold War.

Antonio de la Cova

**Discuss the Cuban missile crisis and its aftermath in the context of Soviet foreign policy goals in Latin America and, more generally, in the context of larger Soviet strategies in the Third World. Please note that I do not want you to focus on Cuba per se, but rather to provide a larger interpretative matrix for Soviet involvement in Cuba. (In other words, do not give me a reiteration of your research paper).**

In March 1962, Khrushchev decided to secretly install nuclear missiles in Cuba. When the missile sites were discovered by American U-2 planes in mid-October, the hawks and the doves of the Kennedy Administration were divided over how to resolve the matter. Some officials, like Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara and U.N. Ambassador Adlai Stevenson, advocated removing all U.S. nuclear missiles from Europe and giving back the Guantanamo naval base to Cuba in exchange for the withdrawal of the Soviet missiles from the island. President Kennedy, who had already been humiliated in 1961 with the Bay of Pigs fiasco and during the Vienna summit with Khrushchev, decided to publicly take a strong stand before the November Congressional elections. The same day he was given the reconnaissance photographs of the missiles, Kennedy met with Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko in the White House, but decided not to privately discuss the issue with him and instead make the revelation to the newsmedia.

On October 23, Kennedy addressed the American people to announce the discovery of the Soviet missiles within close striking distance of major U.S. cities, proclaimed a quarantine of military equipment going to Cuba (instead of a blockade on all shipping), and warned that America would retaliate against the Soviet Union for any missile launch from the island against the Western Hemisphere. Simultaneously, Kennedy sent a brief secret message to Khrushchev urging peaceful negotiations to defuse the crisis. A total of twenty-four, at times lengthy, secret letters were exchanged between both leaders between October 23 and December 14th, well after the immediate crisis had ended. Only two of the letters were released in 1962, and eight more a decade later. It was not until 1992, that all correspondence was made public by the U.S. Department of State, exposing the heart of the matter.

The letters show that it was Khrushchev who imposed a solution to the crisis, by telling Kennedy that if he publicly pledged not to invade Cuba, nor allow other Western Hemisphere nations to attack Castro, and removed U.S. nuclear missiles from Turkey, the Russian rockets would be withdrawn from the island. Kennedy informed his Executive Committee that he agreed with this proposal, but before taking action, he was informed that the Russians had shot down a U-2 plane over Cuba, killing the pilot, Colonel Rudolph Anderson. The Joint Chiefs of Staff wanted to retaliate against Cuba, which the ExComm had agreed to do in case an American plane was downed, but Kennedy did not act out of concern that the Russians would then attack Berlin or U.S. missile sites in Turkey. Instead, the President wrote another message to Khrushchev, agreeing to his earlier proposal. The letter was given by Robert

Kennedy to Soviet Ambassador Dobrynin, along with a pledge that the U.S. would remove all their missiles from Turkey in a few months.

President Kennedy went even further than stipulated in the agreement by removing all 109 land-based American missiles in Turkey, Italy and Great Britain. Kennedy apologists like Arthur Schlesinger, Jr. and James Nathan have claimed that the missiles in Turkey were worthless and obsolete, and do not mention the removal of missiles from Italy and Great Britain. Air Force Chief of Staff General Curtis LeMay later wrote in "America Is in Danger" that the Turkey missiles had become operational in 1961, and therefore were not obsolete. LeMay and other Air Force Generals afterward stated that the Kennedy Administration was incapable of adequately bargaining with the immense nuclear superiority possessed by the U.S., which had 5,000 nuclear warheads while the Soviets only had 300. Many writers have erroneously calculated American missile superiority during the crisis. Nathan claimed it was four to one, when it was really eighteen to one.

Historians are still arguing over Khrushchev's reasons for placing the missiles in Cuba, even though Khrushchev stated in his memoirs that his primary objective was protecting Cuba from another U.S.-sponsored invasion which was in the works. He wrote that he also saw the Cuban missile deployment as an opportunity to equalize the balance of power, since the U.S. had nuclear missiles surrounding the Soviet Union. Most historians made wrongful assumptions about the missile crisis because all of the secret Kennedy-Khrushchev letters were not revealed until 1992 and Kennedy Administration officials privy to the matter lied to Congress and wrote inaccurate accounts in their memoirs. For example, McGeorge Bundy, who edited Kennedy's correspondence and read all 24 letters, makes reference to only ten letters in his memoirs. McNamara, when questioned in 1963 before a Congressional defense appropriations committee, repeatedly stated that no secret agreement existed and that Khrushchev withdrew the missiles from Cuba because he feared American resolve.

The correspondence showed that Kennedy was desperate for a secret solution before the November elections and was willing to make big concessions to achieve it. Orthodox historian Adam Ulam wrote that Khrushchev installed the missiles in Cuba to negotiate them in exchange for Soviet conditions on East German recognition, and not to protect Cuba, as Khrushchev claimed in his memoirs. Robert Tucker assumed Khrushchev was taking a gamble to offset American strategic superiority. John Lewis Gaddis thought that America's 1961 refusal to rule out nuclear war is what forced the Soviets to place their medium-range nuclear rockets in Cuba. Gaddis also erroneously concluded that the Soviet missiles were withdrawn because Robert Kennedy "threatened" Dobrynin to remove them by force. He relies on Kennedy's memoirs, "Thirteen Days," to affirm this. The recently revealed secret correspondence shows that Khrushchev stressed on various occasions that the missiles were in Cuba to guarantee the security of the island and not for attacking the U.S.

Although the crisis was defused on October 28th, American and Soviet negotiators ironed out the details of the secret Kennedy-Khrushchev agreement until mid-January, when President Kennedy

reiterated to the Soviet U.N. Ambassador his pledge not to attack Cuba and allowed for the indefinite permanence on the island of a Soviet combat brigade, in violation of the spirit of the Monroe Doctrine. Confidential letters reveal that Kennedy tried to get assurances from Khrushchev that Castro would not export revolution to Latin America, but Khrushchev remained noncommittal.

Castro continued his earlier policy of exporting Communist revolution to Latin America. In 1963, a large shipment of army rifles emblazoned with the Cuban coat of arms were found at a guerrilla hideout in Venezuela. Kennedy did not take direct action against Castro and instead had Cuba voted out of the Organization of American States and sent an American counterinsurgency contingent to assist the Venezuelan military. The 1966 Tri-Continental Congress in Havana, a meeting of the heads of international guerrilla movements and Communist parties, out of which was formed the Organization of Latin American Solidarity (OLAS), espoused support for wars of national liberation. Although the Soviets attended the conference, they were hostile to the Latin American revolutionaries, many of whom professed Trotskyist ideology and were at odds with the Moscow-line Communists who worked openly. Leftist guerrilla activity and urban terrorism in Latin America only brought reprisals against pro-Soviet Communists, and provoked the military to overthrow reformist governments which had legitimized the Communist Party. The continuing terrorism of the Left during the Allende regime was one of the causes that brought about the Pinochet coup. After the Johnson Administration put down a leftist insurrection in the Dominican Republic in 1965 with 20,000 Marines and vowed that a "second Cuba" would not be established in the Western Hemisphere, the Kremlin believed Latin American guerrillas had little chance of success.

This proved to be true by 1967. The Nicaraguan Sandinista National Liberation Front (FSLN), headed by Carlos Fonseca Amador, was decimated by Somoza's National Guard after many of the peasants who joined the guerrillas quickly deserted. Fonseca Amador had studied at the Patrice Lumumba University in the Soviet Union and had written a booklet, "A Nicaraguan in Moscow," depicting the Soviet system as the future model for Latin America. He and a group of followers managed to flee to Cuba to await another opportunity. One not so lucky to escape was Argentine-born Cuban revolutionary Ernesto "Che" Guevara, who in 1966 established a guerrilla base in the Bolivian mountains, advocating a Maoist peasant revolution. The Kremlin ordered the Bolivian Communist Party, made up of the urban proletariat, not to provide assistance to Che, and even managed to infiltrate an East German KGB operative, Tania Burkhart, close to Guevara. In October 1967 Guevara was executed by U.S.-trained counterinsurgency Bolivian rangers. This was no loss to the Soviets, who within a few years had established diplomatic relations with all of the South American nations (except Paraguay) and were interested in buying Bolivian tin. Moscow also maintained normal relations with Mexico, although a number of Russian diplomats were expelled from that country in 1971 for supporting an anti-government guerrilla movement. The Soviet Union cultivated close relations with the Socialist Allende regime in Chile but refused to provide massive subsidies, as in the case of Cuba. By

1974 Russia was arming the Peruvian nationalist military regime of Velasco Alvarado with Migs and T-62 tanks, at a time when Peru had renewed an old border dispute with Chile. Velasco Alvarado was overthrown by a coup and the conflict was resolved peacefully.

In 1975, American failure to prevent the defeat of the South Vietnamese prompted the Kremlin to expand its political presence and its role as arms supplier in the Third World, regarding their interests as incompatible with those of the United States. Detente did not stop Soviet efforts to displace the U.S. in the world and to disregard the American sphere of influence in Latin America. Brezhnev decided he could bully President Jimmy Carter the same way Khrushchev had done with Kennedy. Feeble protests by the Carter Administration only served to embolden the Russians, who used more than 50,000 Cuban soldiers as proxies in the African nations of Angola, Ethiopia and Mozambique, and also in the Western Hemisphere in Grenada and Nicaragua. By the late 1970s, the Soviets were utilizing in Cuba modern docks and naval repair facilities; airports for Soviet reconnaissance planes; and the largest satellite station outside the USSR to monitor U.S. military and civilian communications. Soviet TU-95 "Bear" reconnaissance planes based in Cuba were frequently monitoring the eastern seaboard of the U.S.

After the 1979 leftist coup in Grenada headed by Maurice Bishop and the New Jewel Movement, and the leftist Sandinista revolutionary victory in Nicaragua, achieved after the Carter Administration imposed an arms embargo on the Somoza regime, the Soviets decided to back the Cuban plan of supplying weapons to Latin American guerrilla movements. The Russians were pleased that, unlike the 1960s, the growing urban proletariat of Latin America had joined the struggle. Soviet strategy was to provide military support that would help leftist anti-American revolutions achieve power. The Kremlin relied on the Cubans to coordinate their Latin American and Third World strategy. The American Department of the Cuban Communist Party was in charge of providing training and Soviet logistical support to a number of Marxist guerrillas, including the Sandinistas in Nicaragua, the FMLN in El Salvador, SWAPO in Southwest Africa and the ANC in South Africa. In the Kremlin, the International Department dealt with the national liberation movements and influenced Soviet foreign policy. Other recipients of Soviet military hardware included the M-19 in Colombia, the Macheteros in Puerto Rico, and limited insurgencies in Honduras, Guatemala and Costa Rica. By 1981, Soviet arms shipments to Cuba had reached their highest point since the missile crisis.

The Sandinistas declared in 1981 that their revolution was modeled on Marxism-Leninism and travelled to Moscow to negotiate massive military assistance. Nicaragua then received Soviet tanks, artillery, armored personnel carriers, attack helicopters, patrol boats, trucks, surface-to-air missiles and thousands of AK-47 rifles. The Cubans had 3,000 military advisers in Nicaragua and the Soviets about one hundred, as Nicaragua became the center for arms shipments to the Salvadoran guerrillas.

When the FMLN launched a "final offensive" in 1981, the Reagan Administration became concerned that Communism would spill across

Central America into Mexico and the Panama Canal. This threatened the disruption of American sea lanes in the Caribbean. The President responded with the Reagan Doctrine, which provided billions of dollars in economic and military assistance to countries facing Communist insurgency and began arming anti-Communist guerrillas in Nicaragua, Angola, Mozambique, Afghanistan and Cambodia, to "roll back" Communist expansionism. The Soviets responded to American OCEAN VENTURE military maneuvers in the Caribbean with their own BASTION air and naval maneuvers in conjunction with the Cuban armed forces. Soviet strategies in the Third World were radically transformed during the Gorbachev era, when they withdrew from Afghanistan and other trouble spots in the world.

Antonio de la Cova

**1. Compare and contrast the major domestic policy goals and styles of leadership of Stalin, Khrushchev, Brezhnev and Gorbachev. Be sure to frame your response within the context of the changing set of conditions inherited by and confronting each Soviet leader. And finally, what was left of Stalinism in the Soviet Union by the end of the Gorbachev era?**

At the end of the Civil War in 1921, the Soviet Union faced economic devastation as the country's industry was in ruins and famine swept many areas. To restore order, reforms were instituted under the New Economic Policy from 1921-1928. Private ownership was tolerated in trade and light industry, and agricultural requisition was terminated, allowing peasants to sell their produce after paying a tax. To achieve these goals, Russia required international peace, stability and foreign commerce. Foreign engineers and skilled workers were needed. The USSR began diplomatic, commercial and military relations with Germany that lasted for more than a decade. Russia gained a modern armaments industry with German technology while the German army trained on Soviet soil.

This was the situation inherited by Stalin when Lenin's stroke left the way open for him to make his bid for power. All political groups were prohibited in Russia except the Communist Party. Infighting broke out in the Politburo against the ambitious War Commissar Leon Trotsky, who opposed NEP policies and favored permanent world revolution, as espoused by the Communist International (Comintern). In contrast, Stalin and Bukharin advocated "socialism in one country." Historian Adam Ulam claims that this struggle was more significant in the lower echelons of the party than at the top. Trotsky and his supporters in the left wing of the party were gradually stripped of their power, expelled from the party and exiled.

Stalin eliminated the NEP in 1928 by introducing the Five-Year Plan. This is a centrally planned economy, without private enterprise, where priorities and allocations are designated by the State Planning Commission instead of by supply and demand. The main goal is the development of the material base of national power. A centralized economy is highly unsuited for farming, because of unpredictable weather conditions, or sufficient labor is lacking at a critical moment. Bukharin opposed this economic change and sided with the Right opposition of the party, due to their peasant incentive orientation. Expelled from the Politburo the following year, Bukharin was eventually executed a decade later after a show trial. When the Right opposition was neutralized, Stalin was solely in command. The Five Year plan was instituted for military-oriented industrialization and peasants were again forced into large-scale farming collectivization. To keep them on the land, the peasants were not issued internal passports when the system went into effect. Millions who resisted were deported to Siberian exile or to forced labor camps. The toll of collectivization was millions of lives, especially when it was partly responsible for the worst famine in Russian history.

Stalin achieved his grip on power through control and

organization. By 1930, he had instituted the "nomenclature" system, designating top positions in all sectors of Soviet society to his followers. These regional and local party secretaries in turn used a list of approved names to fill in the pyramid of party committees. All government agencies were purged of former Bolsheviks, including the Comintern and the diplomatic corps, and replaced with people of peasant background. Among the young beneficiaries were Khrushchev, Brezhnev and Kosygin. The annual Communist Party Congress became less frequent and ceased after 1939 as the rank and file became submissive to the cult of personality. Stalin even rewrote the 1918 Constitution to suit himself and revived nationalism and anti-semitism. Historians still argue whether this Stalin revolution was a new phenomenon or a return to the socialist ideals of 1917.

The 1934-1939 show trials and purges eliminated Bolsheviks from the Soviet Communist Party, the army and state security. Among those executed were Bukharin, the army chief-of-staff and the chief of the secret police. Millions of people were incarcerated or shot. In getting rid of all his real or imaginary enemies, the hand of the OGPU secret police reached Trotsky in Mexico City in August 1940, where he was murdered with a piolet by Jacques Monard. Stalin tightly controlled a new centralized, bureaucratic, military-industrial society divided into an elite managerial class, peasants, industrial workers and forced labor camp inmates. The Lenin cult was overshadowed by the glorification of Stalin's leadership. Historian Robert Tucker argues that this demonstrates a break with Leninism and a continuity with the tsarist past, including a similarity with the purge of Ivan the Terrible.

The German invasion of Poland prompted the Russians to occupy eastern Poland under the pretext of "protecting" the Ukrainians and Byelorussians in that region. Stalin's attempt to recover czarist lands motivated his invasion of Finland. Stalin then annexed the Baltic states in 1940 and demanded from Rumania the Russian territory lost in 1918, which was quickly ceded. Stalin's expansionism is what Tucker called a blend of Bolshevik revolutionism and tsarist imperialism. Tucker points to a continuity in Stalin's repressive measures against the peasants and border countries going back to the practices of Peter the Great.

The Soviet Union had the tables turned on its expansionist policy when the German invaded Russia in June 1941 with Operation Barbarossa. Stalin poorly guarded his frontiers and had no plan of defense against the German onslaught, because he believed it would never occur. When the Nazis were defeated, the toll on the Soviet Union was more than twenty million people dead and the devastation of its major cities, industrial base and agriculture. Stalin then decided to regain lost territory as soon as possible to prevent anti-Soviet organizations from taking hold. Stalin cracked down on the populations of the regions that had been occupied by Germans. Mass deportations and incarcerations ensued and even Soviet prisoners of war were sent to concentration camps out of fear that some of them could have been tainted with Western ideas. In February 1946 Stalin informed the USSR that the national goal was to rebuild the cities and their industrial base, which came at the expense of neglecting agriculture.

After Stalin died in March 1953, a struggle for power ensued in the Kremlin, which in a few months ended with the execution of security chief Beria. A collective leadership developed around premier Malenkov, foreign affairs secretary Molotov, and first secretary Khrushchev. Millions of victims of Stalinist repression, including Molotov's wife, were released from concentration camps within two years, and some returned to active political life.

The Kremlin pledged to better the agricultural situation and the standard of living by promoting light industry. Khrushchev reduced peasant taxes and passed other reforms which increased agricultural output. In 1954, Khrushchev reorganized agriculture by opening up virgin lands in the southeast and promoting corn as a major crop. New state farms were established, worked by hundreds of thousands of volunteers, with new tractors. Bad weather ruined the first crop, but the second year set a record for grain and corn. Khrushchev also expanded prefabricated low-rise housing construction in the Moscow suburbs, which the people later labeled "Khrushchoby." The secret police was restructured into the KGB, which responded to the Party instead of to the maximum leader. Khrushchev consolidated his position in 1955 after forcing out Malenkov and replacing him with Bulganin.

A new era of Soviet politics began in 1956 when Khrushchev denounced Stalinist terror and the cult of personality at the Twentieth Party Congress. Khrushchev also repudiated Stalin's "inevitable conflict" doctrine and proposed peaceful coexistence with the West. The Soviet situation was showing signs of improvement in 1957, and Khrushchev bragged that within a few years the USSR would surpass the U.S. in dairy production. Medvedev claimed that this irresponsible speech is what prompted Molotov, Malenkov and others in the Presidium to attempt to depose Khrushchev. The First Secretary refused to resign and called for a vote of the Central Committee. When the issue was brought before the Central Committee, they overwhelmingly backed Khrushchev. The Presidium was reorganized and expanded with Khrushchev supporters, who also appointed Khrushchev as premier. Those who tried to dismiss him were demoted. In contrast to Stalin, he did not execute nor jail those who attempted to overthrow him. The era of mass terror had ended. Khrushchev also had a woman appointed for the first time to the Presidium, something that never happened under Stalin. The regulations imposed on ethnic groups were relaxed. This contrasted Stalin's policy of uprooting nationalities after World War II, especially the Tatars.

By 1960, Khrushchev's internal policy was running into big problems. The virgin lands project was a failure and industrial expansion was falling. The following year, Khrushchev embarked on another grandiose scheme, which dissolved the ministerial bureaucracies into regional economic councils to decentralize the economy. To increment industrial output, especially of consumer goods, the Moscow ministries were decentralized, except defense and heavy industry. The final result was greater disruption in production plans as the bureaucracy that managed this industry almost tripled in size. To promote his ostentatious plans, Khrushchev travelled widely throughout the Soviet Union, in contrast to Stalin who led a reclusive life. His wife accompanied

him in public frequently, while Stalin's wife was hardly seen and her suicide was never acknowledged. Khrushchev was notorious for boorish behavior, unlike Stalin, even though both came from peasant families. Khrushchev once compared modern art to dog excrement. Although Stalin had not been as explicit, he had banned conceptual art in favor of "socialist realism." There was a great difference in their personalities: Khrushchev was boisterous, offensive, inconsistent, impulsive and impatient while Stalin was quiet, solitary, reserved and observant.

Khrushchev started massive cultivation of virgin lands in the southeast to produce grain and corn and the machine-tractor stations sold their equipment to the collectives. This put a great economic strain on the collectives that were forced to pay for the equipment, their upkeep, and service facilities. As planning became more centralized, with orders regulating planting and harvesting schedules, that did not account for weather conditions or natural disasters, there was a drop in agricultural productivity. Corn, which was also to be used as a fodder crop, became twice as expensive to harvest than the perennial grasses previously used. Corn also proved difficult to grow in Siberia.

Khrushchev responded to these setbacks by dividing the party machine into agricultural and industrial sections to solve production problems and relocated ministries and agricultural institutes in rural areas at great financial expense. Administration by territory was replaced with management of specific production. This reorganization of the Party system intensified bureaucratic opposition to Khrushchev, and was one of the causes of his downfall. Khrushchev had come to rely on an inner circle of advisers and generally neglected other official recommendations. In contrast, Stalin distrusted everyone. Khrushchev's constant reorganization of posts and personnel throughout his tenure weakened Soviet economic development. For example, during his ten years in power he appointed five different agriculture ministers. Khrushchev's failed agricultural ventures, which were unable to yield a surplus reserve for hard times, forced the Soviet Union for the first time to buy grain and meat from various nations. As his popularity was waning, Khrushchev used the Party Congress to publicly denounce the Stalin cult, and had Stalin's remains removed from Lenin's Tomb, and his name erased from all towns and monuments. Thousands of Stalinist purge victims were also exonerated. Khrushchev also authorized the publication of Solzhenitsyn's novel "One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich," describing the horrors of the Stalinist camps by a former prisoner. This high-paced de-Stalinization seems to have also led to Khrushchev's ouster. Khrushchev reduced the military budget and the size of the armed forces, except air defenses, to dedicate more resources to industry and agriculture, since he had been forced to buy surplus wheat from the U.S. in 1963. This created rumblings in the military, which later favored Khrushchev's dismissal. The final blow came in October 1964 after a meeting of the Presidium, while Khrushchev was on vacation. When the dismissal proposal was presented to the Central Committee Plenum, based on Khrushchev's agricultural and economic failures, it was unanimously accepted.

Khrushchev was replaced in October 1964 by Presidium members

Leonid Brezhnev and Alexei Kosygin. Collective leadership took over the tasks of Khrushchev's one-man showmanship, creating power blocs that included the military and the police to maintain order and stability. The KGB received greater authority and the army ranks and budget swelled to offset Khrushchev's cutbacks. The new regime sought to recover from the agricultural disasters brought on by Khrushchev's wild schemes and centralized the economic and agricultural ministries from top to bottom. The Khrushchoby blueprints were scrapped and tall apartment buildings cropped up in Moscow. Khrushchev became a non-person as his name disappeared from the press. Attempting to erase all vestiges of the Khrushchev era, the Presidium changed its name back to the Politburo and the title of first secretary became general secretary, names which reverted to the Stalinist period.

A buildup occurred in the party-state apparatus, which bulged with numerous departments and ministries that entrenched the ruling class nomenclature. They enjoyed special privileges for foreign consumer goods, food, residences, cars, travel abroad and other benefits not available to the masses. Graft and corruption became rampant and even Brezhnev's son-in-law and daughter were involved in a scandal. A Stalinist faction emerged in the Communist Party that dusted off Stalin's image, which had been tarnished by Khrushchev. Anti-Stalinists were demoted and censorship was tightened. Two prominent writers were sentenced to labor camps for anti-Stalinist writings in the West. This originated the modern dissident movement and samizdat (self-publishing) writings. Dissident intellectuals were jailed, placed in insane asylums or exiled, as in the cases of Solzhenitsyn, Sakharov the Medvedev brothers and Ginsburg. Since some of these people were Jews, their petition for the right to emigrate to Israel had been denied.

In 1969, the Brezhnev government was buying wheat and technology from the west to ease the domestic situation, which got worse over the next decade. Greater contacts with the west forced the government to strengthen internal controls and tighten ideological discipline. This caused the defections of prominent cultural and political figures. Brezhnev closed his grip on power in 1973 when he started removing his opponents from the Politburo. He added the KGB chief, the defense minister and the foreign minister to the Politburo. Brezhnev later retired President Podgorny and assumed the role. He then appointed himself army general and later raised his title to marshal of the Soviet Union.

The Brezhnev regime adopted and expanded many of Khrushchev's reforms especially in scientific management and higher investment in agriculture. On the other hand, the Brezhnev era failed to revive economic and agricultural performance, corruption reached unprecedented heights, and drug and alcohol abuse increased among the Soviet population.

When Mikhail Gorbachev assumed power in 1985, the two previous brief regimes of Andropov and Chernenko had failed to relieve the internal problems of the Brezhnev era. Gorbachev immediately began talking about reform in the form of "new thinking," **perestroika** (restructuring) and **glasnost** (openness). These were issues no other Soviet leader had previously addressed. At the age of 53, the highly-educated Gorbachev was the youngest ruler in power since

Stalin, and lacked the siege mentality and distrust of the west of his predecessors.

As a former Central Committee secretary of agriculture, Gorbachev started restructuring the agricultural administrative apparatus by grouping numerous agricultural ministries into one. A large turnover was instituted in the Central Committee within the first year, opening the democratic process within the party. At his first Party Congress, Gorbachev denounced the general stagnation of the country and called for changes, including a radical reform of the economy and a large reduction of the bloated bureaucracy. To stimulate agriculture, greater incentives would be given to workers, similar to those of the NEP. Incentives would also be provided for urban workers to improve their standard of living. New self-financing methods were introduced into industrial plants, which were allowed to elect their own plant directors and carry out joint enterprises with foreign corporations. Gorbachev called for greater public participation in the decision making process under glasnost. Official corruption would be rooted out with perestroika reforms as ministerial responsibilities would be redistributed. To combat work absenteeism and alcoholism, the legal age for drinking was raised from 18 to 21, liquor production was reduced and there was a crack-down on home brewers.

To carry out these anti-Stalinist reforms, Gorbachev surrounded himself with other officials who wanted change, like Boris Yeltsin, the head of the Moscow Party Committee. Gorbachev encountered opposition in the bureaucracy and the party, which he tried to still by claiming he would not install a multiparty system. Gorbachev also turned to the intellectuals for help in the drive for reform, a move previously unthought of by Soviet leaders, after replacing bureaucrats in the arts and the media. Sakharov was released from internal exile in Gorky and returned to Moscow. Other dissidents and religious activists started being released from work camps and psychiatric hospitals. Gorbachev met with Russian Orthodox Church leaders and the government returned some confiscated churches. Jewish immigration to Israel increased, among them dissident Ginsburg. Soon plays appeared criticizing the Stalinist era. Intellectuals began to voice environmental concerns that had been neglected previously and managed to halt a river-diversion project. Public issues began to be voiced openly once the populace lost their fear to speak out, especially to foreign journalists. Censorship was eased to the point that Cuba banned Soviet publications and films for being too critical of Communism. Western publications were allowed for sale in the USSR and the jamming of foreign broadcasts was lifted. Revisions of the criminal code were carried out. Greater autonomy was granted to the national republics, which led to the independence of the Baltics and finally to the dismemberment of the Soviet Union.

At the end of the Gorbachev era, perestroika had dismantled the Stalinist system, but there were still some vestiges left, mostly pensioners and former bureaucrats who longed for the "good old days" that insured them a secure retirement. This small group of people continue to write letters to the editor complaining of reform measures, and parade with the old red flags, banners and posters in Red Square during Communist anniversaries.

Define nationalism, and then describe the regimes of two nationalistic leaders in Latin America (excluding Cubans), concluding with an assessment of the meaning of nationalism for interpreting Latin American history.

Historians still argue the meaning, variance and significance of nationalism in Latin America. Nationalism, an identification with a country's interest or culture, has been used as a rallying cry by all political groups, from extreme left to extreme right. The nationalist banner is usually raised by governments facing real or imaginary foreign threats to create national unity. It has been stronger in countries like Mexico, Cuba, Panama, Argentina, and Nicaragua, than in Brazil or Ecuador. The 20th century produced economic nationalism against U.S. and other foreign interests that owned natural resources and millions of acres of land in Latin America. Wars tend to convert nationalism into patriotism. Examples are the Mexican War of 1846, which produced the **Ninos Heroes**; the Paraguayan War of 1865, which devastated the country's male population; and the Falklands War of 1982, in which Argentina's left rallied behind the military dictatorship that had waged a dirty war against them. Cuba's Fidel Castro frequently rallies the island against a purported U.S. invasion. School children dig trenches, the military and militia are placed on full alert and mock air raids are staged on Havana.

Nationalism emerged in Latin America during the wars of independence in defiance of royal authority. **Caudillos** used nationalism to bond scattered regions and legitimize their authority. Two Latin American leaders who exemplify nationalism are General Antonio Lopez de Santa Anna of 19th century Mexico and General Juan Domingo Peron of 20th century Argentina. Although they lived a century apart and at the two geographical extremes of Latin America, they shared a mercurial relationship with the U.S.

Santa Anna was born in Veracruz in the 1790s and joined the Spanish army as a teenager. He was promoted to lieutenant after years of fighting nomadic Indians and various independence uprisings. In 1821 Santa Anna defected from the royalist forces to adhere to Iturbide's **Plan de Iguala**, was promoted to brigadier general and later appointed governor of his native Veracruz. The Spanish invasion of Veracruz in 1828 gave him the opportunity to quickly rally a private army against a foreign invader and earn another promotion in rank. After the crisis was over he retired to his hacienda **Manga de Clavo**. This ability of quickly organizing an army during a crisis with hardly any assistance from the national government, and then retiring to his ranch when it was over, was a recurring pattern.

In 1832 Santa Anna, a conservative-centralist, led a revolt that overthrew the federalist president, and the Mexican Congress then elected Santa Anna to the presidency. When Texas independence was declared in 1836, Santa Anna led a large army north to suppress the revolt. He massacred Americans at the Alamo and Goliad before being defeated and captured at San Jacinto by a smaller force. Santa Anna exploited the masonic sign of distress with freemason Sam Houston so that his captors would not execute him. He was sent to confer with masonic President Andrew Jackson regarding the

purchase of California, by the Mexican Congress had already deposed Santa Anna and appointed someone else.

Santa Anna again retired to his hacienda until the 1838 French occupation of Veracruz during the "Pastry War" gave him the chance to raise a volunteer army under the banner of nationalism, defeat the foreign invader and lose his leg below the knee to a cannon ball during the battle. His national hero status provided the support he later used to lead a revolt and take the presidency. Santa Anna was unable to defeat an insurrection against him in 1845 as was exiled to Cuba. When war broke out with the U.S. the following year, Santa Anna was recalled by a new government to lead the military campaign and unite the nation. Congress again elected him president and he quickly raised an army of 20,000 that he marched north to the battle of Buena Vista. Although he was routed by a smaller enemy and lost half of his army, Santa Anna returned to Mexico City with a few captured field pieces and enemy flags and purported to have been victorious. He was unable to pull this same stunt a few months later when he fled from the battle of Buena Vista, abandoning his carriage and spare wooden leg, later to be displayed as a war trophy in the Illinois state capitol. Again defeated at Churubusco and Molino del Rey by the U.S., Santa Anna released the criminals in the Mexico City jails before fleeing to exile in the Caribbean.

Political instability and economic ruin led the conservative Mexican Congress in 1853 to elect Santa Anna to the presidency for a fifth and final time. Santa Anna returned from exile and soon signed the Gadsden Treaty with the U.S., by which Mexican territory was sold for \$15 million, most of which Santa Anna pocketed. To an astounded Congress he alleged that had he not sold the land, the U.S. would have taken it by force. Two years later he was again deposed by a liberal revolt and sent into exile.

In 1866, Santa Anna was living in New Jersey and organizing an expedition against Maximilian, which never took place. Returning to Mexico after the French were defeated, Juarez immediately jailed Santa Anna and sent him to exile in Cuba. The 1874 Mexican amnesty allowed Santa Anna to return to Mexico City and write his memoirs before dying two years later.

Santa Anna was undoubtedly the most influential and the most controversial figure in Mexican history from 1821 to 1855. He was a product of the caudillo era: monarchical, authoritarian, personalist, with little education and no interest to improve the lot of the masses. As a general, his numerous defeats by smaller forces prove he was not a good tactician. Santa Anna had greater skill at manipulating political forces and his hate/pragmatic relationship with the United States, depending on the circumstances of the moment. Although president five times, he never completed a term in office.

Another nationalist caudillo, emerging in the 20th century, was Juan Domingo Peron of Argentina. The product of a small-town middle-class family, Peron entered the military academy as a teenager and moved up the officer ranks. At the start of World War II he was military attache in Rome, where he developed admiration for Mussolini. Further travels in Germany, Spain and Portugal, before returning to Argentina in 1941, made him sympathetic to

fascism. The doctrine was anti-American, antidemocratic, anti-Communist, populist and nationalist. In 1943 Colonel Peron was part of a group of fascist army officers who successfully staged a coup in Argentina. The government gained the support of the church when they decreed compulsory religious education in the schools.

Peron was appointed Minister of Labor of the new regime and imposed decrees favoring the labor movement, which won him massive support. Within two years, his social advocacy made Peron the most powerful man in the military regime. Conservatives were opposed to Peron for giving such large concessions to the working class and army officers, fearing his clout, imprisoned him in 1945.

Peron's mistress Eva Duarte, a B-movie actress, showed leadership during this crucial moment by organizing a massive demonstration of workers, **los descamisados**, in downtown Buenos Aires, refusing to disband until Peron was released. The government soon obliged. Peron then married Evita and announced his candidacy for the 1946 presidential elections under a new party called **Justicialismo**, a "third position" between capitalism and communism. When U.S. Ambassador Spruille Braden (later Ambassador to Cuba) announced Washington's displeasure with Peron's fascist background, it gained Peron more popular votes. He won the presidency by a landslide and his party took a two-thirds majority in Congress.

Justicialismo, like fascism, was repressive. The famous daily *La Prensa* was confiscated and given to the unions. Government corruption was rampant. Peron, who was not an economist, pursued an economic nationalism that turned the treasury surplus into a deficit. He nationalized foreign-owned public services which soon became unproductive, subsidized consumption, and raised wages by decree without consideration of productivity, skyrocketing inflation and creating bankruptcies. The beef-exporting country confronted meat shortages. Production declined in most economic sectors while expenditures on social services increased. Although Peron gained the support of union workers and women who received the vote, the country began to slide into economic chaos. Peron began to lose his charisma after 33-year-old Evita died of cancer in 1952. When his economic policies collapsed, Peron tried to save the situation by giving oil-prospecting rights to foreign corporations, a move that antagonized the military. When the clergy opposed the canonization of Evita, Peron passed laws legalizing divorce and prostitution. After Peronists burned churches throughout the capital, the Vatican excommunicated Peron. He then had Congress approve a state of siege and toyed with the idea of creating a militia to counterbalance the army, which led to his overthrow by a military coup d'Etat in 1955.

Peron went into exile in various Latin American countries including Panama, where he met his future wife Isabel, with whom he settled in fascist Spain. In 1973 the Argentine military government decided to allow Peronists to participate in politics as a solution to the permanent political crisis. Peronist candidate Hector Campora won the presidential elections, allowing Peron to return from exile. Campora soon renounced and called for new elections in which Peron won the presidency with his wife Isabel as Vice President. When Peron died in office in 1974, Isabel replaced him until she was forced into exile by a military coup in March 1976.

**Discuss the major themes and sub-themes that you would develop in teaching introductory courses on colonial and modern Latin American history.**

**Pre-Conquest to the Conquest:** Numerous scattered tribes populated the Western Hemisphere prior to 1492. The most important were the Aztecs, the Mayas and the Incas. A common thread was their penchant for frequent warfare with neighboring tribes. They developed structured societies, were ruled by an emperor, and divided into nobles, priests, merchants, commoners and slaves. The Maya civilization disappeared by 900 A.D. The Aztecs were easily conquered in 1523 by Hernan Cortes due to the Quetzalcoatl legend and his alliances with neighboring tribes dominated by the Aztecs. The Inca empire fell to Francisco Pizarro because it was in the middle of a civil war and the **conquistadores** quickly advanced on Inca highways and acquired food from Inca roadside storehouses.

**Conquest to 1580:** Spanish colonial administration. The Council of the Indies reviewed legislative, judicial, economic, military and religious activity. The king appointed the **Viceroy**, who was responsible for the general administration: the collection of taxes and forwarding revenue to Spain on the **flotas**; support for the Church and protection of the Indians; maintaining public works and public order; and providing patronage. The local government was composed of the **Audiencia** and the **Cabildo** town council, which distributed lots, supervised public works, and kept law and order.

**Repartimiento** allocated a chief and a few hundred Indians to an **encomendero**, usually a conquistador, to work his land or mine, in exchange for providing religious instruction and seeing to their needs. The encomienda system, which was hereditary, had been used in Spain during the reconquest. The Aztecs and Incas had also used a compulsory labor system, and the Spanish system represented little change for the Indian laborer. The New Laws promoted by Bartolome de las Casas abolished Indian slavery and prohibited new encomiendas in 1542. The Pope declared that the Indians were people capable of Christianization and could possess property.

The Dominican priests established sugar plantations and large estates. The Franciscan vow of poverty inspired these missionaries in New Mexico to promote farming and handicrafts instead of acquiring vast tracts of lands. They shared the millenarian belief that massive conversions would prepare the way for the second coming of Christ. The Jesuits set up their missions in northwest Mexico, and with the Dominicans, were constantly at odds with colonists against native exploitation. Both orders also dominated education, until the Jesuits were expelled from the Spanish colonies in the 18th century.

**1580 to 1713:** After the Crown went bankrupt, colonial offices were sold. It started with the cabildo posts, then the audiencia, and by 1700 even the office of Viceroy was for sale. Most of the appointments were bought by creoles who through graft and corruption attempted to recover their investment. The nobles created **mayorazgos**, judicially entailing estates of an heir to perpetually preserve property. During this period, silver production fell in Mexico, and would not rise again until the Bourbon era. Mining became unprofitable after the crown, which held a monopoly on mercury used in amalgamation, increased the price.

Without silver, commercial shipping came to a halt and the flotas lost their importance. The monopoly of the Seville **consulado** merchants' guild on overseas trade, permitted by the **Casa de Contratacion**, declined after 1600 as the colonies began to produce previously imported products, there was an increase in contraband trade and enemy and pirate raids on the flotas.

**1713 to 1821:** When the Bourbons gained the Spanish throne, they sought to reverse Spain's decline with administrative and political reforms. The commercial policy was liberalized and tax reductions encouraged production. The Casa de Contratacion was transferred from Seville to Cadiz. Charles III introduced the **intendancy** system, replacing **corregidores**. The intendants, responding directly to the crown and not to the Viceroy, provided more efficient taxation, giving the cabildos increased revenues, which turned them into institutional bases of creole authority.

The Bourbon Administration became more efficient, commerce increased, contraband was suppressed, defenses were improved and government revenue increased. Charles III also promoted free trade between Spain and the colonies, but not with other nations. The flota system gave way to fast register ships. Immigration from Spain and African slavery increased in the colonies.

Colonial militias were established to guard against foreign and Indian attacks. By the 19th century, creole troops outnumbered Spanish army regulars four-to-one in the viceroyalty of New Spain. The militia became the base of the army that would later fight for independence. When the Spanish throne was usurped by France in 1808, it sparked a revolt in the colonies that culminated in independence. Major figures of the independence movements were Miguel Hidalgo, Jose Maria Morelos and Agustin de Iturbide in Mexico; Simon Bolivar and Jose Sucre in New Granada; Jose de San Martin in La Plata; and Bernardo O'Higgins in Chile.

**1821 to 1855:** Newly independent nations faced great economic problems, political instability and civil disorder. A vacuum created with the collapse of Spanish institutions gave rise to the era of the **caudillo**, such as Santa Anna in Mexico and Rosas in Argentina, both overthrown in 1855. Land remained in traditional families, who maintained control of trade. The oligarchy sought authoritarian rule to institute stability. **Criollos** of modest origins could only advance through the military, and from there to politics. When political power became important at the end of the 19th century, the hacendados took it over. The United States established the Monroe Doctrine and later took almost half of Mexico as a result of the 1846-1848 Mexican War. Manifest Destiny prompted American filibuster expeditions in the Caribbean, Mexico and Central America, which all ended in failures.

**1855 to 1898:** The era of the administrators replaced the caudillo era, as the main task became national unification. The new leaders improved Latin America's transportation networks of highways, railroads, canals and docks. Latin America provided the food and raw materials needed for the European Industrial Revolution. British investments in Latin America multiplied, especially in railroad construction. The rapid growth of export economies motivated **hacendados** to abandon subsistence operations and maximize profits. Landowners began to take interest in national

politics, and in Argentina and Chile they took control of the government. Another pattern during this era was that the landed elite supported dictators, like Porfirio Diaz in Mexico, who catered to their interests. In either case, the emphasis was on stability and social control through centralization, which would promote further economic development. The Paraguayan War and the War of the Pacific created much devastation.

**1898 to 1933:** The Spanish-American War renewed U.S. expansionist interests in Latin America. The Roosevelt Corollary opened a thirty-year era of frequent U.S. military intervention. Export-oriented Latin American economies gained major prosperity, which gave rise to a new middle class. In order to sustain export economy expansion, governments tried to import foreign labor, especially Argentina, Brazil to work in the coffee fields, Peru and Chile. Cuba imported thousands of Haitian and Jamaican cane cutters. This expansion also brought about the urbanization of Latin American society.

**1933 to 1961:** There was import-substituting industrialization. Within a year of the stock market crash, army officers took over many Latin American countries. The Chaco War was waged between Paraguay and Bolivia for two years, using tanks, airplanes and trench warfare. Argentina, Brazil and Mexico embarked on industrialization to be less dependent on the U.S. and Britain. This, in turn, provided employment for the urban working class. In promoting industrial expansion, tariffs were raised to facilitate local industrial competition; government established their own companies and provided contracts beneficial to local producers. During this period rose the nationalistic caudillos Juan Peron, Getulio Vargas, Lazaro Cardenas and Fidel Castro, who promoted economic nationalism. Military dictators Fulgencio Batista, Perez Jimenez and Rafael Trujillo were overthrown. The Kennedy Administration established the Alliance for Progress.

**1961 to the present:** American social scientists formulated the **modernization theory**. Latin American economic growth would create the social changes needed for democratization. A middle class would increase, promoting moderation and progressivism. Instead, the middle class identified with the ruling elite in opposing the masses. Income distribution became more unequal as domestic enterprises lost out to foreign corporations. There was stagnation in import-substituting growth. High-priced machinery had to be imported to run factories. World market prices of Latin America's principal exports (coffee, sugar, wheat, copper) steadily declined in purchasing power while there was growing unemployment. As social pressures or the threat of Communist insurgency mounted, the military took power in Brazil (1964), Argentina (1966), Panama (1968), Peru (1968), and Chile (1973). These regimes usurped power at a time when their national economy was affected by spiraling inflation, huge deficits, and international credit had been cancelled. The late 1970s and 1980s saw renewed leftist guerrilla warfare in Central America that failed to succeed. By the 1980s all of the Latin American nations, except Cuba, had embraced the democratic process and promoted free enterprise. During the 1990s, military governments took over in Peru and Haiti, but they probably will not last out this decade.

**Writing from the perspective of Latin American history rather than United States history, briefly survey the major features of United States-Latin American relations in the 19th and 20th century.**

During the Latin American colonial period, relations with the United States were profitable, especially after Spain's 1797 wartime emergency allowed her colonies to trade in raw goods, rum, molasses and slaves with the U.S. During the independence struggle, the U.S. did not openly support Latin America because it was involved in protracted negotiations with Spain over Florida.

In 1823, the Monroe Doctrine was announced to restrict European expansion in the Western Hemisphere. Latin American nations favorably viewed this, although the policy was unenforceable in 1833 when England occupied the Falkland Islands from Argentina and later Nicaragua's Mosquito Coast; when France seized Veracruz in 1838 and conquered Mexico 25 years later; and when Spain annexed the Dominican Republic in 1861.

Latin America began to view the United States with suspicion after the policy of Manifest Destiny became the banner of American expansionists. Texas was annexed to the U.S. and the Polk Administration went to war with Mexico desiring to obtain New Mexico and California. The gold rush to California created American interests in establishing transit lines across Tehuantepec, the isthmus of Panama and Nicaragua. In 1855 the Liberal government of Nicaragua, embroiled in a civil war with the Conservatives, asked William Walker and his filibusters for assistance. Within a year, Walker rigged partial elections to win the presidential elections. Other Central American nations banded together to accomplish his military defeat. Although Walker never received U.S. government support, and the Buchanan Administration frustrated a second Nicaragua filibuster expedition, Latin Americans continue to view Walker as an agent of American imperialism.

A similar situation occurred with Spanish colonial Cuba. The U.S. government disbanded and prosecuted those involved in Cuban filibuster expeditions in 1849, 1850, 1851 and 1855 for violation of the Neutrality Law. The Polk, Pierce and Buchanan governments wanted to acquire Cuba through purchase and not through force, as suggested in 1854 by three American ministers in Europe who wrote the Ostend Manifesto. Spain never agreed to sell the island and American sectional division over the slavery issue impeded further annexation efforts. During the Cuban Ten Year War of Independence (1868-1878), the U.S. continued to apply the Neutrality Law against emigrate armed expeditions. In contrast, when the French withdrawal from Mexico was in the interests of U.S. policy, the Johnson Administration aided the Juaristas and never enforced the Neutrality Law as tons of weapons and thousands of former Union soldiers crossed the border into Mexico.

When the First Pan-American Conference was organized in 1889, the United States was interested in expanding commerce with the hemisphere. Member nations would take joint action to increase trade and eliminate barriers, and peacefully settle hemispheric disputes. The goodwill created between the U.S. and Latin America was set back a decade later after the Spanish American War. Once the U.S. acquired the Spanish colonial possessions of Cuba and

Puerto Rico, it refused to recognize the Puerto Rican autonomous government and would not grant Cubans independence until they agreed to write the Platt Amendment into their 1901 Constitution. The amendment authorized American intervention in Cuba to protect U.S. citizens and their property.

The Roosevelt Administration then kindled its expansionist interests by buying the Panama Canal concession from a French company. When the Colombian Senate rejected the treaty because they wanted more money, the U.S. helped Panama secede from Colombia with a naval blockade and signed a new treaty of perpetual canal occupation. A new era of American intervention started with the 1904 Roosevelt corollary to the Monroe Doctrine as a response to German and British intervention in Venezuela in 1902. Roosevelt feared the Germans might try to acquire a naval base in exchange for debt payment. Roosevelt declared that if the Latin American nations could not meet their debts to outside creditors, the U.S. reluctantly would police them and collect debt payments from them in order to forestall European intervention.

The U.S. then seized Customs in Santo Domingo to prevent further European intervention for loan defaults. Half of the money went to pay off foreign bond holders, and the other half to build up a treasury surplus for public works projects. When European creditor nations threatened intervention in Haiti, the U.S. sent in the Marines to administer fiscal policy. The U.S. intervened in Caribbean basin nations twenty times during twenty years. Some times it was done at the request of a government in trouble, such as Cuba in 1905 or Nicaragua in 1911.

The Nicaraguan Conservative President asked for U.S. military assistance to put down a Liberal revolt. The Marines stayed until 1925, when they supervised the presidential elections, but had to be recalled in a few months after Liberal defeat prompted Augusto Sandino to revolt claiming that Americans had rigged the elections. Sandino proclaimed Indo-Hispanic nationalism and anti-imperialism while fighting a protracted guerrilla warfare. When the Liberals won the American-supervised 1932 elections and the Marines left Nicaragua, Sandino stopped fighting and received one fourth of the Nicaraguan territory to establish an agricultural cooperative. The following year, Sandino demanded that his forces, instead of the National Guard of General Anastasio Somoza, be recognized as the legal authority in the northern mountains. Somoza responded by setting a trap for Sandino and executed him.

In 1933 Franklin Roosevelt announced the Good Neighbor Policy. That same year, Secretary of State Cordell Hull supported the non-intervention proposal presented by Latin American delegates at the Interamerican Conference in Montevideo. In 1934, the U.S. abrogated the Platt Amendment and withdrew the Marines from Haiti. World War II provided an economic boom for Latin America, when the U.S. purchased massive amounts of strategic raw materials. All the Caribbean and Central American nations, except Panama, declared war on the Axis Powers as German submarines destroyed shipping in the Gulf of Mexico. Lend-Lease Agreements were made between the U.S. and all Latin American nations except Argentina and Panama. The Pan-American Highway was financed and supervised by the U.S.

In 1947 the threat of Communist aggression prompted the

Western Hemisphere nations to sign the Rio Pact as a permanent military alliance. An attack on any American nation, by either an American or foreign state, would be considered an attack on them all, and collective measures would be taken against the aggression. The following year, the Inter-American Conference met in Bogota and adopted the charter for the Organization of American States.

In 1954 the Eisenhower Administration decided to overthrow the leftist Guatemalan government of Jacobo Arbenz, which had expropriated 400,000 acres of land from the United Fruit Company, had received tons of Communist-bloc armaments and had been fomenting insurrection against Honduras, Nicaragua and the Dominican Republic with the Caribbean Legion. The CIA backed a small invasion led by exiled Guatemalan rebel officer Castillo Armas, while three American pilots dropped leaflets, bombed barracks, oil reserves, and the airport. Arbenz ordered the army to open their arsenals to the populace, but the army chief of staff refused and deposed Arbenz after negotiating with the American Ambassador. Castillo Armas then became president of Guatemala.

Although the U.S. was initially sympathetic to the 1959 Cuban Revolution, after imposing an arms embargo on the Batista regime, Fidel Castro soon launched armed expeditions against the Dominican Republic, Haiti, Panama and Nicaragua and expropriated all U.S. property on the island. The Kennedy Administration responded with the Bay of Pigs invasion, which failed when the president cancelled Brigade 2506 air strikes and supply flights after the exile forces established a beach head. The following year, Kennedy established a counterinsurgency program to fight leftist guerrillas in Latin America. The Johnson Administration continued the same policy of intervention when it landed 20,000 Marines in Santo Domingo to crush the leftist uprising of Colonel Francisco Caamano. Johnson affirmed that the U.S. would not permit a "second Cuba" in the western hemisphere. After the October 1967 capture and execution of Che Guevara in Bolivia, insurgency virtually ended for a decade.

The U.S. also launched the Alliance for Progress, an ambitious social reform project for Latin America. Capital and technical needs would be provided to promote political freedom and reforms. Twenty billion dollars was pledged over a ten-year period, but the obstacles were underestimated. Less than half of the Latin American nations submitted comprehensive development plans to qualify for aid. All of the original political, economic and social problems remained and hardly any gains were made.

The Carter Administration brought a change of policy toward Latin America which focused on human rights. As a result, an arms embargo was imposed on the Somoza regime in Nicaragua, which fell in July 1979. During the Reagan Administration, concern over Cuban and Sandinista intervention in the Salvadoran civil war prompted massive economic and military assistance to that country. By 1991, the demise of the Soviet Union, Cuban economic ruin and sweeping democracy throughout Latin America has almost ended insurgencies and American intervention. The U.S. appears to be moving toward closer economic ties with Latin America, as demonstrated with the North American Free Trade Agreement signed with Mexico. Other similar agreements with Latin America will probably follow.

**Analyze and interpret the Porfiriato in Mexican history. In your answer, emphasize economic and political trends, but do not neglect social and cultural patterns.**

The regime of Porfirio Diaz (1876-1911) brought Mexico out of fifty years of the lawlessness and instability of caudillismo and internecine warfare. In trying to rapidly industrialize his nation by turning over the economy, natural resources, and vast tracts of land to foreign interests, Diaz sowed the seeds of discontent that boiled over during the Mexican Revolution. A similar nationalistic process occurred in Iran in the 1970s when the Shah tried to rapidly westernize his country.

Diaz was raised in a modest Oaxaca family and although he studied for the priesthood, he later joined the army. Brigadier General Diaz gained fame in his Juarista victory against the French occupation army in the 1862 battle of **Cinco de Mayo**, a day which is still celebrated as a Mexican national holiday.

When the French were ousted, Benito Juarez was elected president for a third term, but when he again ran for office in 1872, Diaz and Lerdo opposed him. The election was decided by Congress in favor of Juarez after none of the candidates obtained a majority of votes. Diaz then resorted to the traditional caudillo tactic of making a **pronunciamiento** against the government, but his small rebel force was quickly defeated. Shortly thereafter, Juarez died and the presidency passed to Lerdo. Diaz later deposed him in 1876 after another pronunciamiento against reelection, but this time rebel forces won a victory that installed Diaz in power.

Diaz inherited a mostly rural and backward nation, bypassed by the industrial revolutions of Europe and the U.S., with mining production at a standstill, and with a large Indian population, many of whom did not speak Spanish. Mexico had a large foreign debt, could not get credit, and had an empty treasury. To set things in order, Diaz started with a pacification campaign with the newly organized **rurales**, who massacred all insurrectionists and bandits. He then worked out a payment plan for the debt to the United States, which won him recognition from Washington. When his term ended, Diaz abided by his no reelection policy. He continued to build up his party machine, which won him the election of 1884.

Diaz received advice from a group of young intellectual **cientificos**, influenced by contemporary Darwinist theories, who believed that modernization could only be achieved by the **criollo** class emulating foreign models, and disregarding the needs of the Indian masses whom they believed to be inferior, lazy, vicious and hopelessly irredeemable. The **cientificos**, the new bureaucratic class, emulated the French aristocracy in manner and fashion. They sought to promote European migration, but extremely low wages failed to entice the immigrants who were then pouring into the United States, or even those going to Argentina and Brazil. Some 100,000 immigrants went to Mexico during the Diaz regime, but most were single American adventurers desirous of easy living.

The **cientificos** restructured the national administration to obtain results. The bureaucracy was streamlined and tariffs were enforced. Although a liberal, Diaz became the darling of the conservatives. The Juarista anti-clerical laws were ignored, the

ranks of the priesthood swelled and the church acquired property again. A construction boom occurred in Mexico City, where public buildings multiplied, a new drainage system was built, streetcars, electrification, and a telephone system were installed. Schools were built in urban areas for the criollos, neglecting the rural Indian population. The government passed laws that favored foreign investment in mining, transportation and oil fields. About twenty percent of the national territory, mostly in the north and south, was sold to foreign interests. Thousands of miles of railroad track crisscrossed the country and linked up with the United States. Railroad shipping served to increase mining, manufacturing and port improvements. Some villages turned into towns and cities as the middle class expanded. Monterrey became a major industrial center producing a number of things, from cement to cigars. Mexico's foreign trade multiplied immensely.

By 1900, Mexico had paid off the foreign debt and its treasury had a surplus. Despotism had brought an end to civil wars, rampant banditry, major political struggles or conflict with the church. The cost of rapid industrialization made the wealthy richer and the masses poorer. Another contributing factor to poverty occurred after the Mexican Congress put the nation on the gold standard, due to devaluating silver prices, and this reduced the value of the peso by half, from its previous equivalent to the U.S. dollar. The Mexican economic structure had to be reorganized, creating a decline in real wages for workers, who were reduced to subsistence level. Mexicans began to identify foreign capital with oppression. Labor unrest in an American-owned mine erupted into violence. When two American managers were killed, the Mexican governor allowed U.S. troops to enter Mexico and suppress the riot. The Diaz regime responded to other industrial strikes by gunning down protesters. Peasants lived in virtual debt peonage and 95 percent of them did not own land, which was usurped by the oligarchy. Thousands had lost their small farms and worked for low wages on the land that had been theirs, creating bitter social resentments.

Mexico culturally stagnated during the Porfiriato due to a lack of freedom of expression, although it produced some notable writers and historians of the colonial era. Yet the overwhelming majority of the Mexicans remained illiterate. Modernization and communication facilities brought new ideas into the country. At the turn of the century a group of younger intellectuals opposed to the *cientificos*, including Francisco Madero and Jose Vasconcelos, began a campaign for democratization, economic nationalism and denounced the evils of the Diaz regime. Others, like the anarchist Flores Magon brothers, preached revolution.

In 1910, a near senile Diaz announced he would retire and allowed Madero to stage an opposition electoral campaign. Madero believed Mexico's problems were political and not social. When the election was rigged in favor of the Diaz candidate, an imprisoned Madero joined those calling for revolution, which was ignited at the end of the year. Rebel victories in the north persuaded Diaz to resign in 1911 and seek exile in France.