Both Swords and Ploughshares

Both Swords and Ploughshares:

Interactions of War, Peace, and Religion in America from the War of Independence to the Present

Edited by

Linda Martz and Ineke Bockting

Cambridge
Scholars
Publishing

Both Swords and Ploughshares: Interactions of War, Peace, and Religion in America from the War of Independence to the Present

Edited by Linda Martz and Ineke Bockting

This book first published 2015

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

Lady Stephenson Library, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2PA, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Copyright © 2015 by Linda Martz, Ineke Bockting and contributors

All rights for this book reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the copyright owner.

ISBN (10): 1-4438-8106-6
ISBN (13): 978-1-4438-8106-7

And he will judge between the nations, and will decide concerning many peoples; and they shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruning-hooks; nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more.

—Isaiah 2:4

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Illustrations ix

Introduction 1
Linda Martz

Part I: Communities

Chapter One 6
4th of July Orations: Civil Religion and the War against the "Other"
Ineke Bockting

Chapter Two 31
Catholic Sisters in the American Civil War: The "Nuns of the Battlefield" and the Changing Image of Catholicism
John Andreas Fuchs

Chapter Three 47
The Evangelical Left and War
Mokhtar Ben Barka and John Chandler

Chapter Four 72
From Tragedy to Catharsis: American Muslims in Theatre
Souleyma Haddaoui

Part II: Margins

Chapter Five 94
Buried Swords: The Shifting Interpretive Ground of a Book of Mormon Narrative
J. David Pulsipher

Chapter Six 128
The World's Unrest: War in the Religious Writings of Christabel Pankhurst, British Suffragette Turned American Fundamentalist
Linda Martz

Chapter Seven 142
American Artists in the 1960s: Representation and Desecration
of an American Civil Religion Icon
Eliane Elmaleh

Part III: Outward

Chapter Eight 158
Benjamin O. Flower's "War on War": "Spiritual idealism" and the
(Ambiguous) Quest for Peace at the Turn of the Twentieth Century
Jean-Louis Marin-Lamellet

Chapter Nine 186
Marching Towards Faith: Consequences of a Battlefield Epiphany
in Walter Percy's *The Moviegoer*
Gérald Préher

Chapter Ten 203
The Poisonwood Bible and the Perpetuation of Conflict:
A Representation of Excess
Amélie Moisy

Chapter Eleven 222
"The Trouble I See": Blurred Vision, Blindness and Spiritual Insight
in Anthony Grooms' *Bombingham*
Patrycja Kurjatto Renard

Chapter Twelve 242
Defending Freedom of Religion in Conflict-Torn Countries: A Brief
Analysis of American Strategies in Contemporary Egypt (1998-2013)
Dominique Cadinot

Contributors 256

Index 260

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

Figure 2.1: Highsmith, Carol M. (2010). The Civil War Nurses Memorial, aka *Nuns of the Battlefield*, in Washington, DC. Bas-relief depicting twelve nuns, guarded by the angel of Patriotism (left) and the Angel of Peace (right). Library of Congress Prints and Photographs Division Washington, http://hdl.loc.gov/loc.pnp/highsm.09888 32

Figure 5.1. Minerva Teichert (1888-1976), *Christian Converts*, 1949-1951, oil on board, 36 x 48 inches. Brigham Young University Museum of Art, 1969, used by permission 111

Figure 5.2. *The Anti-Nephi-Lehies Bury Their Swords* by Del Parson (1983). © by Intellectual Reserve, Inc., used by permission 115

Figure 8.1 *Benjamin Orange Flower* (1858-1918). Photo published before 1923 in the USA. Public domain. Reprinted in Regier 1932, iv. Additional digital editing by Tim Davenport for Wikipedia, no copyright claimed. Released to the public domain. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/File:Flower-Benjamin-Orange.jpg. Internet. Retrieved 10 April 2013 159

Figure 8.2 William O. Partridge, *Peace.* Source: "The soul of man in twentieth-century sculpture" (Flower 1908a, 13). Image courtesy of University of California. Public domain, Google-digitized. HathiTrust's digital library. Available from http://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=uc1.$b200211;view=1up;seq=23. Internet. Retrieved 24 November 2014..... 172

Cover illustration:
Marion Post Wolcott (1940). *Highway sign in Georgia*. US Farm Security Administration, Office of War Information. Library of Congress, Prints & Photographs Division, FSA/OWI Collection, [LC-USF34-056459-D].

INTRODUCTION

LINDA MARTZ

This collection of essays examines certain outcomes of the interaction of war/peace and religion since the nineteenth century in the United States, a country where religious faith was, and is, often deeply felt and widely held. The earliest history most American children learn about their country is the story of the late November feast of Thanksgiving, commemorating the survival of the nascent colony of Mayflower Pilgrims in the early 1620s—a feat usually presented as testament to their Puritan faith, hard work, and ability to make peace with their indigenous neighbors. The texts here reflect a later period, but one marked by a religious mythos that the Thanksgiving story presages: America as a peaceful place of religious freedom, but with a heavy presumption of Protestant dominance. In the mid- to late-19th century, however, the United States underwent both considerable population expansion with the arrival of increasing numbers of non-Protestant immigrants and a vast geographical expansion where Protestantism could further diversify and home-grown faiths such as Mormonism could thrive. During the 20th century, the country overcame its political isolationism to engage, often militarily, with the rest of the world; by then, its patriotic civil ceremonies and ideals had already begun to coalesce into what would become known as America's civic religion—another set of values to uphold with fervor or to transgress in protest. The United States even found itself contemplating military engagement with its own citizens, as first the Civil Rights and then anti-Vietnam War Movements produced widespread public dissent if not open rebellion, with religion called upon to legitimize both armed violence and passive resistance. Later, 9/11 would reshape responses of the faiths brought to American shores in the hearts of yet other immigrants. The texts in this volume thus focus on a range of historical/chronological circumstances.

We particularly asked our contributors to consider what concrete, tangible outcomes, what artifacts, were produced by the interface of war/peace and religion—the swords and ploughshares of our title. They returned with a variety of often multifaceted responses, an outcome very much reflecting our interdisciplinary objectives. Some contributions refer

to fine art pieces, including statues, paintings, and murals, and others to works of literature, theology, or public speaking. Some of these interfaces were performed on stage or in film, while yet others were heard on the radio or read in newspapers or journals. Some of the outcomes analyzed here concern individuals working through the meaning of armed conflict in terms of their own, personal faith, while others examine their impact on a larger scale, as with whole faith communities or in the shaping of national or foreign policy. Thus there were a number of ways in which these texts could be grouped, but it seems most coherent to see them in terms of the relationship between the above interfaces and the larger community in which they were shaped or to whom they were addressed.

The first part, *Communities*, looks at interfaces that served to structure a whole community. For the earliest examples, Ineke Bockting looks at 19th century orations to mark the most important "holiday" of America's civic religion, the Fourth of July. Commemorations of the signing of the Declaration of Independence, an act that the signers knew would inevitably lead to war, were throughout the 19th century often connected to notions of armed conflict—but increasingly in defense of the new status quo. Although meant to unify citizens behind a foundational patriotic moment, the holiday, Bockting demonstrates, was often linked to the exclusion of different segments of the population, thus undermining their peaceful coexistence. John Andreas Fuchs' text on the response of Catholic nuns and sisters to the military's need for nurses during the Civil War illustrates how that conflict led, at least temporarily, to a shift away from anti-Catholic sentiment. Later, their example was memorialized not only to prevent their service from being forgotten, but also to help shape the image of Catholicism and further the integration of Catholics in American society. Mohktar Ben Barka and John Chandler move to a much more recent period to examine the diversity of American Evangelicalism, and particularly the ranges of opinion on the Evangelical Left. The movement emerged as a response to a conservative leadership that made social policy such as opposition to abortion and gay rights the overwhelming focus of their political action. The Evangelical Left, on the other hand, has turned away from "wedge politics" to a search for common ground, particularly as concerns questions of military intervention, and now attracts a third of those identifying as Evangelical. Souleyma Haddouai uses an Aristotelian framework to analyze how the mental and physical experience of the theatre has served to provide a measure of catharsis to the American Muslim community in a period marked by armed violence in the name of Islam. The two plays she examines, while very different in style, both create spaces for healing

within that community and for better understanding in the context of the larger American society.

The second part, *Margins*, examines instances where the interface between religion and war/peace has occupied a more marginal space within a faith community. The first chapter in this section discusses how an episode in the Book of Mormon of what we would today call passive resistance to war has been incorporated into Latter Day Saints faith practice. David Pulsipher situates interpretations of the episodes in church teaching as well as the larger context of American society, tracing its evolution from a potential basis for antimilitarism to a more widely accepted understanding as a metaphorical rejection of rebellion against God. Linda Martz' contribution on the writings of Christabel Pankhurst looks at this early Fundamentalist's use of war as a structuring device in her writings on Biblical prophecy in the decades following World War I. Pankhurst's distinctive voice was widely heard through her books, newspaper columns and radio program, but her place in Fundamentalism was increasingly marginalized; her references to war help trace her shift towards a more personal, individualized interpretation of scripture. Eliane Elmaleh examines representation and transgression in American civic religion, investigating how depictions of the Stars and Stripes were used by American artists to subvert propaganda and focus protest during the 1960s and 1970s. Invested with the status of sacred icon, the American flag was represented/reinterpreted by a number of artists who wanted to underline their exclusion from the community of values the flag was claimed to represent.

The texts in the third and final section turn this interface *Outward*, situating it other than on American soil or noting how foreign war shaped the spirituality of those returning. Jean-Louis Marin-Lamellet looks at the writings of Benjamin O. Flowers, a turn-of-the-20th-century editor and reformer, who used a variety of forums to demand an end to war. Although Flowers called for a spiritual idealism to replace domestic conflict, he also worked internationally to develop frameworks for negotiation to bring about world peace. Gérald Préher looks at Walker Percy's novel *The Moviegoer*, whose protagonist Binx Bolling experiences an epiphany when lying wounded on a battlefield in the Korean War. Préher demonstrates how Percy's influences of Catholicism, existentialism, and the American South interact to reshape both the protagonist's conception of soldier and his own spiritual identity. Amélie Moisy examines the novelist Barbara Kingsolver's *The Poisonwood Bible* to understand its discussion of entitlement, hubris, and imperialism in this story of American missionaries during the Congo Crisis. Moisy

demonstrates how the religious beliefs of the characters and their relationship to colonization are used to construct a stinging critique of American opposition to African self-determination couched in a religious mantle. Anthony Grooms' novel *Bombingham* is the focus of Patrycja Kurjatto Renard's contribution. Kurjatto Renard demonstrates how notions of vision and (in)sight shape the faith of a character caught up in the vortex of two historical events, the Vietnam War and the well-known 1963 bombing of an African American church in Birmingham, Alabama. Finally, Dominique Cadinot analyzes American diplomatic strategies to protect Egyptian Christians (Copts), initiated at the behest of the American Evangelical Right. He looks at the functioning of the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom, and particularly at its reports on Egypt in the final years of Mubarak, to demonstrate that Fundamentalist attempts to support Copts in fact led to their greater stigmatization and therefore marginalization.

The idea for this volume originated, like many such collaborative efforts, in a conference panel. In 2013, the *Association Française d'Etudes Américaines* had Religion and Spirituality as the theme for its annual congress and was therefore an obvious choice for several of us teaching in English Studies at the Catholic University of Paris. Jennifer Kilgore-Caradec was instrumental in planning the original panel, and Ineke Bockting and I wish to express our warmest thanks to her. We wish to extend our thanks as well to Sally Murray, librarian at the American University of Paris, for her very kind assistance. This project also received the support of the Catholic University of Paris, Unité de Recherche "Religion, Culture et Société," for which we are also grateful.

PART I:

COMMUNITIES

CHAPTER ONE

4TH OF JULY ORATIONS: CIVIL RELIGION AND THE WAR AGAINST THE "OTHER"

INEKE BOCKTING

Any account of United States history must acknowledge the fact that the nation has, to a large extent, been created by war and its aftermath, its very "birth," on the 4th of July, 1776, taking place in the middle of its War of Independence. Yet the history of this date shows that, as Peter de Bolla puts it, once we try to trace the origin of a political act, such as this "birthday" represents, it starts to "feel like sand in an outstretched hand." Indeed, for "most of those things we like to think of as 'historical events' [...] when we look at them closely we see that they have no singular moment of 'happening.'" In that sense, de Bolla argues, this birthday can be said to never have happened (de Bolla 2007, 16-17), and thus constitutes the first step in creating an artifact of American civil religion.

The history of the 4th of July tradition is not based not what actually happened on July 4th, 1776—which boils down to "an agreement to print and publish the Declaration of Independence,"[1] whose formulation had been presented two days earlier and had caused John Adams to write to his wife, Abigail, "the Second Day of July 1776, will be the most memorable Epocha, in the History of America. I am apt to believe that it will be celebrated, by succeeding Generations, as the great anniversary Festival" (quoted in de Bolla 2007, 19).[2] And even the date of July 2nd is not a clear milestone either, as on June 28th, already, the draft of the Declaration was read in Congress. This event, moreover, was preceded by a meeting on June 10th, when Congress agreed that "a committee be appointed to prepare a declaration to the effect of the said first resolution, which is in these words: 'That these United Colonies are, and of right ought to be, free and independent states'" (quoted in de Bolla, 22). But this event, again, was prepared three days earlier, on June 7th, when Congress was adjourned so that delegates could find the support of their respective colonies, which

means that we can assume they were already in favor of the move to independence. The first of the celebrations that are the outcome of this whole "time of enunciation" of the Declaration, finally, must itself be dated to July 8th, when John Dixon read the it out loud in front of a crowd of people gathered at the Philadelphia State House. According to John Adams, at this moment the crowd cheered loudly and "the bells rang all day and almost all night" (quoted in de Bolla, 23). Still, it is the date of July 4th that came to be designated as Independence Day, *the* point in history that marks the birthday of the Nation, with as its "birth certificate" being the Declaration of Independence. Commemorating a document drafted by men who felt themselves excluded from the British body politic as a response to that exclusion and that was consciously signed as the opening salvo a war of separation, the 4th of July as artifact/holiday would, however, come to be a moment to reiterate a message not of inclusion, but in defense of the new status quo—and a concomitant exclusion of those outside it.

The war continuing, the first celebration of the United States' birthday, on Friday, July 4th, 1777, obviously saw the future of the nation as still very uncertain. There was, in fact, not much to celebrate. Still, on July 2nd, the Second Continental Congress had posed itself the question of whether something ought to be done. They agreed one day later that on the 4th they would adjourn for the day. Religion entered the equation already, and there briefly was an idea that a special sermon should be held. But it was too late to organize it, so they decided just to have dinner together. Something more than dinner happened, however. From a letter John Adams sent to his daughter on the 5th, we know that 13 gunshots were fired from the frigate *The Delaware*, with Adams and others on board, to which 13 other ships answered. Adams writes that there was a cheering crowd, which caused "the utmost terror and dismay to every lurking tory" (quoted in de Bolla, 48), the utterance staging the almost animalistic "otherness" of those with Royalist sympathies.

Len Travers gives an interesting view from the other side of the war when he mentions a British immigrant who happened to be arriving at Boston Harbor on July 3rd, 1793. This man, someone by the name of Charles William Janson, reluctantly joined the celebrations the next day, together with another British immigrant. Indeed, both felt that they should avoid giving "cause of offense" to the people of Boston by not participating. Without knowing it, they thus witnessed the first public speech of the future President John Adams, both men disapproving of the fact that the speech Adams delivered "was abundantly interlarded with invective against England for her oppression before, and cruelties during

the revolutionary war" (Travers 1997, 23-26). We can imagine the "lurking" Tories to have agreed with this view.

As such personal testimony shows, birth date and celebration are not only shrouded in myth but also in conflict. Indeed, as de Bolla argues, the 4th of July, "far from celebrating the founding of the nation, [...] provided a locale and occasion for the continuing battle over the *history and future* of the confederation." According to him, it is this "sense of facing both the past and the future" that "provides the *structure* of the ritual of observance embedded in the Fourth to this day." The ritual both commemorates and instantiates, creating the liminal position of being "poised between a commemorative right that is widely understood to honour the *signing* of the Declaration and an enactment of independence in the vocal declaration of the words Congress published to the world" (de Bolla 2007, 48-49; italics in the text). This explains "the frequent exposition of 'the spirit of '76' and the almost obsessive reiteration of the virtues of the founders," which "gave rise to the sense that it was crucial to re-imagine, even re-experience, the state of bondage which had been the immediate cause of the revolution" (de Bolla 2007, 56).

Many scholars have shown the importance of such a punctual moment in history for the creation of the identity of a people. If, on the one hand, shared memories are essential, on the other hand, the great changes in the political arena caused by the revolution necessitate new symbols, new rituals and, indeed, new stories so as to solidify the moment; the 4th of July orations provided these symbols, rituals and stories. Delivered everywhere by respected members of the community, religious and political leaders mostly, the speeches form, to use Klaus Lubbers' words, "a mine of material about the ongoing process of the infant and adolescent Republic's collective self-definition," always climaxing in a "rhetorical rededication" of the speaker himself and of his audience to "the ideals proclaimed in the political text of texts"—the Declaration of Independence (Lubbers 1994).[3] According to Merle Curti, speeches like these epitomize "the whole pattern of American patriotic thought and feeling" (Curti 2001, 140-141), while Kurt Ritter and James Andrews argue that they form "a faithful guide to the convictions of a society" (Ritter and Andrews 1978, 16-17), in other words, that they reflect the opinions of the audience to which they were directed, the general public.

This view of things is, of course, highly questionable. Indeed, the 4th of July orations, dedicated to staging or performing the mental construct of *nationalism*, may be seen as "a belief in and, more important, an emotional response to, membership in a parent society" that, to use Travers's terms, "subordinates local and personal interests to those of the 'mother' country

[or] 'father' land" (Travers 1997, 9). This cannot, however, include those 'stepchildren' who, in order to be heard, must break this covenant. Travers uses the term "contested performances," calling for "a careful reading" of the same texts that allows the reader to "look past the apparent harmony to find ambiguity, anxiety, and even latent hostility over the interpretation of symbols and their use" (83). As a matter of fact, rather than exhibiting—or performing—an act of social and political identity, these "ritualized celebrations," as Travers calls them, "helped to mask disturbing ambiguities and contradictions in the New Republic, overlaying real social and political conflict with a conceptual veneer of shared ideology and elementary harmony" (7). By focusing on what and who is left out of these speeches, then, another story of America is told: a story of creation of "other"—of objectification and of exclusion, and the conflicts and actual warfare these involve.[4]

Indeed, despite Herman Melville's beautiful words, "Americans are not a narrow tribe, our blood is as the flood of the Amazon, made up of a thousand noble currents all pouring into one," with their masculine first names, their Anglo-Saxon last names, and their constant reference to their descent from the Pilgrim Fathers and the Founding Fathers, the "respected members of the community" who delivered the orations create a collective fiction of self-definition that leaves out whole groups of the population. These left-out groups include all property-less, and thus un-enfranchised, people, even if many orations glorified the "common man," especially if this common man was one of the "underappreciated soldiers of the Continental Army [...] destitute of the very necessities of life,—without even money enough to bear them in their long-left and earnestly wished-for homes," as a certain professor George Benedict expressed it in his 4th of July oration delivered at Burlington, Vt. on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of the Declaration, in 1826. But especially, such speeches, as they referred back time and again to the Declaration of Independence, redeclared a war against the inclusion of Native Americans, African Americans, female Americans and the so-called New Immigrants, the "others" that this chapter is concerned with. I am not saying, of course, that these groups of the population are necessarily all absent from the celebrations or the orations all the time, but—existing neither in the image of Founding Fathers nor of Pilgrim Fathers—they function as objects rather than as subjects, as foils, to the American collective self-definition.

This becomes especially clear in the second commemoration, voted on June 24th, 1778, which included the "divine worship" that had been impossible to organize the year before. This way, the commemoration became, hereafter, what de Bolla calls "a strange hybridisation of the

public and the private, the political and the devotional: a kind of sacralisation of the political" (50), expressing "the thought that the prosperity of the nation and its continuation as a free republic was in the hands of the divine creator" (153), who would decide on questions of war and peace and, at the same time, who would come under the umbrella of the Republic and its protection.

Much has been written on this twin foundation of the Nation. Robert N. Bellah introduced the term "civil religion," which he defined as "a set of beliefs, symbols, and rituals" that relate to "political society on the one hand and to private religious organization on the other" (Bellah 1991).[5] More recently, Lloyd Kramer has, in the same vein, shown how the churches functioned as "important nongovernmental gathering places for national messages and remembrances," and how by "linking religious duty to national duty, the clergy often helped the nationalist cause by adding theological justifications for national sacrifices, especially during times of war" (Kramer 2011, 94). Indeed, the War of Independence was presented by the clergy as "a divinely inspired event in which good patriots could serve God by joining the struggle against Britain." The same can be said about other wars, armed conflicts and violence against certain groups of the population—all could be seen as part of "the divine plan for justice and freedom on earth" (94). Indeed, "the nation's military struggles could be as dangerous and difficult as the Christian's struggle against evil, yet both the patriot and the believer could see the battle as a necessary sacrifice for the better world to come" (99). Kramer uses the term "nationalist-religious fusion," in which Biblical terms are "adapted to fit into stories" about the nation: "descriptions of a 'chosen people', belief in a distinctive moral mission, explanations of current sufferings as the path to a more harmonious future, and reverence for the life-giving sacrifice of blood and bodies" (100). Indeed, both Bellah's "civil religion" and Kramer's "nationalist-religious fusion" bring to the fore the twin reference to religion and war—to Pilgrim Fathers and Founding Fathers—found constantly in 4th of July orations. In what follows Kramer's term will be used.

A good example of nationalist-religious fusion is found in Charles Francis Adams's 4th of July oration, delivered in Boston's Faneuil Hall on the 67th anniversary of the *Declaration*, in 1843:

> Let us rather go on in the narrow path of our duty, rigidly adhering to the right and trusting that the same God who looked with favor upon the honest exertions of our forefathers to benefit their country, posterity, and mankind, will not withdraw the light of his countenance from us whilst laboring to continue worthy to be called their sons.

Even clearer is this fusion in the Reverend Richard Furman's sermon preached at the Baptist Church of Charleston, South Carolina on the 4th of July, 1802: "It can surely be no disgrace but a high honor to our patriots, to say 'They acted in the cause of God [...] and He smiled on their endeavours'." This, of course, is in perfect accordance with John Winthrop's "City on a Hill" imagery, based on Matthew 5:14, which reads: "You are the light of the world. A city that is set on a hill cannot be hidden." George Bethune, in 1835, went as far as to state: "Jesus Christ was a patriot" (de Bolla 2007, 154).[6] The issue of the "life-giving sacrifice" mentioned by Kramer—in the form of remembrance of veteran fighters and those who gave their lives to the cause—is a constant element as well. It is found, for instance, in the 4th of July speech delivered in Boston in 1786 by Jonathan Loring Austin, a wealthy businessman who had served as Benjamin Franklin's secret messenger to England and as John Adam's secretary: "Oh YE ILLUSTRIOUS DEAD! We revere your memories, and while honour, virtue, and patriotism are known in America, your name shall be handed down with glory and applause." The combination of secular and religious that Kramer's concept of nationalist-religious fusion describes—and that de Bolla presents through the liminal image *par excellence* of the "hinge" (52)—made it possible to see the birth of the nation as a "story of biblical proportions in which virtue, freedom and independence are fused together in a new dawn that almost has the capacity to rewrite the fall from grace undergone in the garden of Eden" (de Bolla, 55). This, obviously, makes the inclusion of many individuals and groups of the population impossible.

Native Americans, for one, could, obviously, not find their place in this type of narrative, their spiritual beliefs not even including the necessary ideas of paradise, sin and grace. This immediately implies the violence of extinction, of their being written out of the Nation's birthday celebrations. The 1791 4th of July oration by the Reverend William Linn, which takes its last lines from *Isaiah* 51:3, makes this abundantly clear:

> Less than two centuries ago, what was this now pleasant country? A dismal wilderness; the habitation of wild beasts, and of savage men. Where now the populous city lifts its spires, the solitary wigwam stood; where commerce spreads its sails, was seen the bark canoe; and where the sound of industry is heard, and all the arts of civilized life flourish, indolence, rudeness, and ignorance, held a gloomy reign. If our country has, so suddenly, risen into eminence, what may be expected when time has given it maturity, rendered its population complete, and called forth all its exertions? Then it will be rich, powerful, and happy. Then will *her wilderness* become *like Eden, and her desert like the garden of the Lord;*

> *joy and gladness shall be found therein, thanksgiving, and the voice of melody.* (10f.; italics in the text)

With the same return to the Pilgrim Fathers of the Reverend Linn's oration, and many like it,[7] the half-blood Native American, the Reverend William Apes, in a speech pronounced in Boston on January 8, 1836, provides the other side, replacing romantic racism by the vicious type that makes explicit the violence involved:

> Let the children of the Pilgrims blush, while the son of the forest drops a tear, and groans over the fate of his murdered and departed fathers. He would say to the sons of the Pilgrims, (as Job said about his birthday) let the day be dark, the 22d of December, 1622; let it be forgotten in your celebration, in your speeches, and by the burying of the Rock that your fathers first put their foot upon. For be it remembered, although the gospel is said to be glad tidings to all people, yet we poor Indians never have found those who brought it as messengers of mercy, but contrawise [*sic*]. We say therefore, let every man of color wrap himself in mourning, for the 22d of December and the 4th of July are days of mourning and not of joy. (20)

The type of narrative that Linn makes use of, and that Apes protests against, turns around an often-used contrast, that between "then" and "now"—Lubbers calls it the "'Where now' formula" (Lubbers 1994, 32)—a contrast between a dismal past and a glorious present (and an even better future), facilitating what Joseph Ellis calls the "consolidation of the continent," which, "from the Native American perspective [...] was a conquest" (Ellis 2001, 12), in other words, actual warfare, even if in the eyes of Americans it was a "life-giving sacrifice of blood and bodies."

In a speech from 1810 that answers to this threat to his people, the Shawnee Chief Tecumseh spoke to his people, saying:

> Brothers—When the first white men set foot on our grounds, they were hungry; they had no place on which to spread their blankets, or to kindle their fires. They were feeble; they could do nothing for themselves. Our fathers commiserated their distress, and shared freely with them whatever the Great Spirit had given his red children. They gave them food when hungry, medicine when sick, spread skins for them to sleep on, and gave them grounds, that they might hunt and raise corn.
>
> Brothers—The white people are like poisonous serpents: when chilled, they are feeble, and harmless, but invigorate them with warmth, and they sting their benefactors to death.

> The white people came among us feeble; and now we have made them strong, they wish to kill us, or drive us back, as they would wolves and panthers. (quoted in Hunter 1823, 43-48)

Tecumseh, interestingly, combines, here, the dehumanizing, animalistic imagery used by whites to depict his race—wolves and panthers that need to be driven back—with their own imagery for the treacherous and treasonous whites—poisonous serpents, harmless when cold but mortally dangerous when warmed up.

If Native Americans, then, are excluded from the symbolics of nationalist-religious fusion, created not as subjects but as foils to the American citizen—their very presence standing in the way of fulfilling the God-given task of turning the wilderness back into the Garden of Eden—their obtaining the power of oratorship is hard to imagine. And, indeed, if it is true that the Native American Blackhawk spoke at the 1838 celebrations at Fort Madison, Iowa—where he had been relocated after losing the Black Hawk War of 1832—he was only invited as an "illustrious guest" and just spoke a few sentimental words about his lost native lands (gurukul.american.edu/heintze/fourth.htm). Revealing is the poem "Address to Blackhawk" by the New York poet, essayist and Senator Edward Sanford, the subject of which is the Native American's previous capture; it contains the following verse:

> Dull night has closed upon thy bright career?
> Old forest lion, caught and caged at last,
> Dost pant to roam again thy native wild?
> To gloat upon the lifeblood flowing fast
> Of thy crush'd victims; and to slay the child,
> To dabble in the gore of wives and mothers,
> And kill, old Turk! thy harmless, pale-faced brothers.
> (Bryant 1860, 280)

Responding to the perceived threat that the Native American presented to these "harmless pale-faced brothers," Secretary of the Interior Henry Teller established the *Religious Crimes Code*, enforced by the Office of Indian Affairs, in the early 1880s. Under this code, Native American religious practices and ceremonial activities were prohibited until 1930, that is, for 50 years. Certain agents of this agency, however, allowed reservations to conduct their own ceremonies on July 4th, the idea being that this might teach them how to be patriotic. This way, Native Americans became subjects of an "other" 4th of July celebration rather than objects in the official one.

For African Americans, also, the continued references to the Declaration of Independence in 4th of July orations can be said to symbolize a repeated declaration of war. Like Native Americans—descendants neither of the Pilgrim Fathers nor of the Founding Fathers—African Americans, also, could not be included within the nationalist-religious fusion that characterizes the United States.[8] But 4th of July orations, obviously, could not avoid dealing with them either. The Declaration of Independence invariably being referred back to, in one way or another, it is important to remember that, as de Bolla reminds us, "the paragraph in Jefferson's draft concerning the iniquities of slavery was removed in the process of Congress's editing of the text" (131). Nevertheless, as de Bolla puts it, the presence of Black slaves as servants might cause some "small discomfort" during the celebrations, when the idea that "all men are created equal" would come up. And by the time the 50th celebration—the Jubilee of 1826—came around, mores had developed enough for orators to include a lament on the situation of the slaves, although, as Andrew Burstein writes, "on the subject of human liberty [...] rhetoric simplified understanding" (Burstein 2002, 238). Mostly, it was a question of transforming the sin of the "peculiar institution" into a personal one.

Still, certain 4th of July orators, by the time of the country's Jubilee in 1826, were starting to propose new solutions. The oration by George Benedict, for instance, works on the well-known comparison between then and now mentioned before, to argue that "our own happy colony [...] where formerly the slave-merchant received his victims" has now become a place where "the people, whom nature is said to have stamped with an imbecility incompatible with freedom, by one mighty effort burst their chains, and wrote in characters of blood and fire, their claims to the rights of men" (17-22). But he is talking of Liberia, not of the US. In the same way, William Halsey, of Newark, New Jersey, addressed his audience to say: "you have the assurance of nature that the next return of this Jubilee will be effectual to the emancipation of every descendent of Africa in this portion of our country," quickly adding that this would cause not the US but "Liberia to rejoice," and not the United States but "Africa to be glad, because of the restoration of her sons" (23-28). Obviously, the liberated race would have to disappear back to Africa, never to be included as the subject in any 4th of July oration. The Reverend Josiah Bent, in his oration at Braintree, goes further, addressing slave owners directly:

> Can America be glorious in freedom with such a number of human beings so degraded, so oppressed, so wronged, and so bleeding in her bosom? Sons of Columbia, are you not this day happy in your freedom? and does

> not Liberty ask an offering worthy of your Jubilee? [...] Offer then your slaves and it shall be a Jubilee indeed. (14-21)

But the Reverend's speech, for all its compassion, does not "effectively expose" what Burstein calls "the false hope of colonization" either.

Another example is formed by the oration pronounced by Nathaniel Prime, Pastor of the First Presbyterian Church of Cambridge, New York, at the occasion of the 49th anniversary of American Independence. The speech starts by firmly opposing the separation of church and state, holding that "the first and greatest commandment of the law is declared, by the divine savior to be this; 'Thou shall love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength.' Mark 12:30." It then poses within this framework the position of the "African":

> Could angels and redeemed souls have reasonably expected or believed, *if there is any sincerity in man*, that from the benefits of this solemn declaration, adopted under all the solemn circumstances just mentioned, and with the most solemn appeal to heaven, *every sixth man* was excluded, and *doomed to perpetual slavery*? (6; italics in the text).

This rhetorical question is followed by a second one, which brings in the celebration itself, thus linking up with the revolutionary war and the Declaration of Independence, establishing, once again, the nationalist-religious fusion that Kramer describes, this time seemingly including the African American:

> Could they [angels and redeemed souls] expect that this solemn declaration of Independence would be annually read the 50th time, accompanied with the roar of cannon, the display of banners, and shouts of joy, and that thousands and hundreds of thousands of dollars would be expended on every return of this anniversary in feasting and dissipation and tumult, and yet *no year of Jubilee* be proclaimed to the oppressed sons of Africa? (Kramer 2011, 7)

But before we can think that the speaker, on the basis of the declaration that "all men are created equal"—words that occur again and again in the oration—asks for a position of full American subject rather than object for Black Americans, the same solution is proposed: that of the American Colonization Society, founded in 1817, whose object was "the transportation to Africa of the free people of colour, who are willing to go, and the establishment of them in a colony, or colonies, under all the advantages of civil and religious privileges." (15). To this is added, as in

the speech by the Reverend Bent, a direct message to slave-owners that begins with a biblical text:

> "Proclaim liberty to thy captives; and to them that are in darkness, show yourselves." Isaiah 49:9. Restore them to "the land of their father's sepulchers," and let them once more peacefully enjoy the inheritance of their ancestors. Wherever they may have been born, Africa is their home. [...] In their own land, which God allotted to their progenitor, they shall stretch forth their hands to God, and under their own vine and fig-tree enjoy the fruit of their labours, without any to molest or make them afraid. (Bent 1826, 22)

A single known 19th century 4th of July oration delivered by an African American exists: the famous speech given to the *Rochester Ladies' Anti-Slavery Society* at Rochester's Corinthian Hall in 1842. This oration, however, amounts to an anti-4th of July speech, in which Frederick Douglass distances himself with the words:

> Fellow-citizens, pardon me, allow me to ask, why am I called upon to speak here to-day? What have I, or those I represent, to do with your national independence? [...] I am not included within the pale of glorious anniversary! Your high independence only reveals the immeasurable distance between us. The blessings in which you, this day, rejoice, are not enjoyed in common. The rich inheritance of justice, liberty, prosperity and independence, bequeathed by your fathers, is shared by you, not by me. The sunlight that brought light and healing to you, has brought stripes and death to me. This Fourth July is yours, not mine. You may rejoice, I must mourn. (freemaninstitute.com/douglass)

What strikes one here is the contrast between the pronouns *I*, *me* and *mine,* in a context of exclusion and negation in the first part, and the pronouns *you*, *your* and *yours*, in a context of inclusion and affirmation in the second, the two divided by the sentence "Your high independence only reveals the immeasurable distance between us," which is made more personal and emotional in the last sentence of this fragment: "You may rejoice, I must mourn." In his letter to William Lloyd Garrison,[9] Douglass makes this last aspect still more personal and thus more painful:

> In thinking of America I sometimes find myself admiring her bright blue sky—her grand old woods—her fertile fields—her beautiful rivers, her mighty lakes and star-crowned mountains. But my rapture is soon checked when I remember that all is cursed with the infernal spirit of slave-holding and wrong. When I remember that with the waters of her noblest rivers, the tears of my brethren are borne to the ocean, disregarded and forgotten; that

> her most fertile fields drink daily of the warm blood of my outraged sisters, I am filled with unutterable loathing. (quoted in Foner 1950, 125)

The period leading up to Civil War, obviously, creates another "hinge"—another liminal period—with regard to the position of "other," the African American this time. Indeed, on its brink, or threshold, to use the imagery of liminality, Jefferson Davis, future President of the Confederacy, in 1858 and on board a steamboat between Baltimore and Boston, pronounced a 4th of July oration. In it he declares: "this great country will continue united," while one year later the orator Robert Barnwell, in Grahamville, S.C., proposes the creation of a separate Southern nation (gurukul.american.edu/heintze/fourth). At the beginning of the Civil War, on the 4th of July, 1861, Galusha Grow's oration, called "This Hour of National Disaster" and published in the *National Reporter* of July 6th, 1861, ends by declaring:

> No flag alien to the sources of the Mississippi river will every float permanently over its mouths till its waters are crimsoned in human gore, and not one foot of American soil can ever be wrenched from the jurisdiction of the Constitution of the United States until it is baptised in fire and blood. [Vociferous applause upon the floor and in the galleries, which lasted for many minutes.]

In that year, 15 gun salutes were fired at Camp Jackson, close to Pigs Point, Virginia, to honor those Southern States that had already seceded or were declaring their secession. Then, during the war, on July 3rd, 1863, a so-called "flag of truce" boat full of "Secessionist women" left Annapolis to travel South for the 4th of July celebrations there. Several other important events took place on July 4th of that year: Robert E. Lee, Commanding General of the Confederate Army, retreated from Gettysburg after three days of fighting, while at the same time the city of Vicksburg surrendered to Union General Ulysses S. Grant, which caused 4th of July celebrations to be banned in the city for many years (historyinanhour.com/2011/07/04/fourth-july-and-the-american-civil-war).

If nationalist-religious fusion, then, still excluded the African American, imprisoning him or her within the position of object, still in 1865 a "Freedmen Celebration," one of the first, took place in Raleigh, North Carolina, and Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation was read in public in Warren, Ohio as well as Belpassi, Oregon and at Saratoga Springs, New York (this time by the son of Alexander Hamilton). Also, a first national celebration by Black Americans was held in Washington, D.C., organized by the Colored People's Educational Monument

Association, in memory of Abraham Lincoln. As with Native Americans, we seem to have moved from the African American as "other" within a national celebration, to an "other" celebration of Independence, this time on January 1st, the day of the implementation of the Emancipation Proclamation.[10]

As far as women are concerned, on March 31, 1776, Abigail Adams had playfully yet seriously warned her husband:

> I long to hear that you have declared an independency. And, by the way, in the new code of laws which I suppose it will be necessary for you to make, I desire you would remember the ladies and be more generous and favorable to them than your ancestors. [...] Do not put such unlimited power into the hands of the husbands. [...] Remember, all men would be tyrants if they could. If particular care and attention is not paid to the ladies, we are determined to foment a rebellion, and will not hold ourselves bound by any laws in which we have no voice or representation. (pbs.org/wgbh/amex/adams/filmmore/ps_ladies)

That rebellion was not forthcoming, but women might be asked to present banners and standards and would sometimes be allowed to give a small presentation, such as the following, pronounced by a woman called Sally Duane and addressed to the military regiment called *Macpherson's Blues* on July 4th, 1798, in Philadelphia:

> To General Macpherson: [...] Those composing your corps are among the first who, by their exemplary virtue, have entitled themselves to the gratitude of every heart warmed with the love of our common country; and from whom should they receive more sincere testimonies of our approbation than from those of our sex? On the bravery of yours, we depend for protection. We can only oppose with our prayers, or indignantly, though fruitlessly, bewail with our tears, national insults or misfortunes. By your spirit and prowess, under the protection of Heaven, you can avert or avenge them. (gurukul.american.edu/heintze/fourth)

The speech, of course, fits in perfectly with the patriarchal and religious atmosphere of the 4th of July orations, illustrating the position of object to be protected rather than active subject that women occupied. It was the same almost 30 years later, on July 4th, 1827, when a woman called Jane Hobbs presented a standard to the Rifle Company of Pelham, New Hampshire, commanded by Capt. Enoch Marsh, speaking the following words:

> Permit me, gentlemen officers of the Rifle company, in behalf of a number of respectable ladies of this place, to address you, and the brave soldiers under your command. More than half a century has passed away since this memorable fourth of July became an epoch in the history of these United States. Ill would it become me on any other occasion than the present, to call your attention by an allusion of mine, to the inestimable privileges we enjoy, which cost nothing less than the blood of the hero and the patriot. [...] This standard, a symbol of our dear bought rights, suffer not to be dishonoured or invaded by any. Tarnish not the achieved glory of an American soldier. (gurukul.american.edu/heintze/fourth)

As did official 4th of July speeches, this speech by a women also emphasized the link between anniversary and war, not seeming to notice that the celebrations endorse the "war" against them. Indeed, Hobbs's position of "other" is clear, here also, where she expresses a need to apologize for her speaking in public at this occasion, as this would normally have been unacceptable.

But often women organized their own festivities, replacing their position of "other" with regard to the official celebration by an "other" celebration, like Native Americans did with their tribal ceremonies, if these were permitted, and like African Americans did through their celebration of the Emancipation Proclamation rather than the Declaration of Independence. In New York on July 4th, 1800, for instance, "a group of ladies met 'to celebrate, in [their] own way, the glorious and ever memorable day'." At this occasion, as the *American Citizen and General Advertiser* of July 10th, 1800, reported, they "drank to their 'fathers, husbands, and brothers'"; if it did occur to them to also drink to their mothers and sisters, the newspaper did not record it. On July 4th, 1819, at Mossy Spring, near Frankfort, Kentucky, as the *Commentator* reported on July 30th:

> A large party of ladies met and seated themselves on the grass. At this time an oration was presented by Mrs. Mead, who commented, "our sex are constrained to forbear from a participation in political life. [...] We cannot be indifferent to whatever may be connected with the prosperity of our country."

Notwithstanding the force of this alternative celebration, in the official 4th of July orations, male power and lineage were always stressed. Jonathan Loring Austin's speech, for example, reminds the audience that they should behave like "faithful sons of genuine virtue," so that women are actually not even addressed at all. Likewise, Charles Francis Adams asks of his audience to make sure that they remain "worthy to be called

their [the Founding Fathers'] sons." Women, incapable of being "faithful sons," once more, were not included within the symbolics of nationalist-religious fusion. In accordance with this, women's roles are always limited to that of object. A good example is formed by the oration pronounced by Edwin A. Whire Esq. in Worchester, Massachusetts, on the 4th of July, 1814, in which the speaker gives women their traditional roles, alternatively of victim—both of the British and of the Natives—and of embodiment of virtue:

> To see these veteran bloodhounds, yet reeking with victory and slaughter from the battles of France and Spain. [...] Then were seen the perpetration of every crime, brutality or baseness, that British insolence, that cruelty flushed with triumph. [...] Then were heard the shrieks of the unprotected virgin. […] (6). [...] the innocent blood of women and children smoking on the frontier, testified that there had been the tomahawk of her [Britain's] skulking allies! And here, allow me to say, much depends on the American Mother—much on the female influence generally. I believe it to be a fact that female influence may, if properly exerted, add much to our national happiness and glory—and a fact which ought to be thought more of, and *made* more of than it ever yet has been. (7) (classicapologetics.com/special/4th ; italics in the text)

Again, the oration echoes the declaration of war of the original Declaration, but as a means of protecting women from the violence of "others" such as the British "bloodhounds" and their "skulking allies"—even though the text itself is a perpetrator of violence, the violence of objectification and exclusion.

On one of the rare occasions where a woman was given the honor of being "orator of the day," at Marlborough, Vermont in 1822, she remains unnamed. This oration, moreover, was followed by a reading of the Declaration of Independence by "a number of young ladies," about which the *Baltimore Morning Chronicle* of August 3rd reported: "we should think this almost equivalent to a declaration on the part of these ladies, that they were determined to live hereafter independent of mankind, or, in other words, to die old maids" (gurukul.american. edu/heintze/fourth.htm). Thus politically active females, again, are fictionalized as "other," linked to female virtue and, more specifically, to the idea of infertility, which accords well with social and medical views of the time: that if a woman used her brain for intellectual purposes, she was unfit for social and reproductive activities.

Almost 60 years later, at the Centennial celebrations of July 4th, 1876, Susan B. Anthony, of Quaker descent, was able, in the name of the National Woman Suffrage Association, to read aloud, to a large crowd