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16A: 051 Colloquium for History Majors
In 2008, Barack Obama won in a landslide election riding on a wave of fiery public support ending eight years of a Republican-held presidency. Two years later, the mid-term elections of 2010 presented a vastly different picture. The Republican Party was reborn and they rode a wave of strong public support back into power in the United States House of Representatives along with a number of wins in the Senate and other state races. Many political scientists have credited this resurgence to a large conservative movement called the Tea Party.\(^1\) How did this movement evolve, and why did it have such a large effect? Equally thought provoking is the question: what happened to the movement that catapulted Barack Obama and many other Democrats into power?

This situation has happened more than once in the history of American politics. During the election of 1980, Ronald Reagan won the election in an eerily similar way to Obama’s 2008 win. Just like the Tea Party, many liberal groups arose to fight against this new Republican leadership. One of these groups was the New Wave Party, a student group that formed on the University of Iowa campus in the spring of 1979. The group advocated for a number of social, economic, and political issues both on a university-wide and national scale until 1992 when they dissolved. They were also part of a larger national movement of progressive students called the Progressive Student Network. The New Wave Party and the Progressive Student Network show that in politics, anger and dissatisfaction create a perfect climate for action, whereas success breeds complacency.

America’s political climate of the 1970s was as tumultuous as its economic conditions. America was torn between multiple issues: Vietnam, nuclear warfare, Watergate, an economic

---

recession, Iran, the Soviet Union and the draft all had Americans, especially young people, on edge. It was under these conditions that the New Wave Party was founded.

As extremely liberal and progressive young people, the founding members of the New Wave Party were fed up with the leadership both nationally and at the University of Iowa. On a national level, the founders were alienated by their own party, the Democrats, because they were not fond of President Jimmy Carter. They were also the ideological opposites of the Republican Party, whom they would fight against throughout the 1980s and early 1990s. The progressive students who founded the New Wave Party were dissatisfied on a local level as well. The students were unhappy with the University of Iowa and its involvement with a number of issues they found objectionable. One of these was the universities’ involvement in weapons research for President Ronald Reagan’s “Star Wars” defense program. Other areas of disagreement with the university included educational rights in regards to tuition hikes and raising academic standards. The students also took issue with what they thought of as a serious lack of funding for affirmative action, minority student recruitment and retention, and African American Studies programs as well as the Student Senate, who used funds for purposes the founders thought had little merit.

The party formed in spring of 1979. The group established a constitution which outlined its structure and mission. The mission was, “(The) New Wave is a multi-issue progressive student group working for peace and justice. We seek to educate students on social issues which are pertinent.” The leader of the group was the Meeting Facilitator who acted as the president. It was this person’s job to draw up the agenda for meeting, reserve the room, and publicize the

---

3 Records of the New Wave Party. University of Iowa Archives, Iowa City, IA. RG 02.06.03, Box 1.
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meeting. Meetings were typically held on Wednesday night in the Iowa Memorial Union and were announced through The Daily Iowan. The group had no faculty advisor or staff member that would offer advice or help guide the group. This makes sense because the group intended to work against a variety of university-sponsored programs, so it would not seem likely that the members of the group would want a representative from the university to help advise them.

The New Wave Party stressed a very open and nonrestrictive membership. The original thought of the party was to connect all of the other progressive student organizations together under one banner. The party also worked with different minority groups including the black student union, women’s rights groups, and lesbian/gay/bisexual groups, among others. The reasoning behind this was if all of these groups joined together, they had a better chance of reaching their intended goals. Also the groups were all fighting against a common enemy, the new right-wing. One flyer printed by the New Wave Party states, “Blacks, women, gays, Chicanos, children, Jews, Asians, poor, unemployed, Native Americans, elderly, handicapped: All of these people have suffered because of the right wing. You are Next!” This flyer did more than just voice the political leanings of the New Wave Party. It showed how they were a complex group of people from many different backgrounds.

The first act of the New Wave Party was to run for office in the Student Senate at the University of Iowa. The group was upset that the $120,000 allocated to the Student Senate was used for what party members thought were frivolous ventures by representatives who were labeled as “socially unconscious politicos.” In its first contest, the party led a successful campaign and captured five seats and a large influence in the University’s Senate.

---
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In its second year of existence in 1980, the New Wave Party changed its focus from the Student Senate elections to more wide-reaching community activism. The main means of community activism the group participated in were protests of various issues.

Protesting was a large part of the New Wave Party’s activism because it was the best way to reach the public. The party created a manual they used in order to hold a good protest. The group sought endorsements for a protest from outside groups. They felt that this made their cause more legitimate. Endorsements often times provided the foundation for newspaper stories which created more attention for the group, and more importantly their issue of concern.

Protests were advertised in a variety of fashions. The most common form was handing out flyers. Many flyers were hand-drawn and contained eye catching designs or pictures. A flyer for a counter protest of a right to life rally showed a picture of a female gender sign with a crossed out coat hanger in the middle. The message read, “Keep abortion safe and legal! Rally on the pentacrest!” The pictures on the flyers, along with the protests themselves, were meant to convey strong messages. The New Wave Party staged sit-ins at university offices, candle light vigils at a rally for then Vice-President George H.W. Bush, and boycotts of the business college. The group also held less traditional functions such as the “Night against the right,” a dance party, fundraiser, and protest against the right-wing, which was billed as a “Wild party, super music, Beer!”

The New Wave Party was ready to spring into action at any moment. An emergency response plan was put in place in case of the outbreak of war. The plan was to gather at the
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7 Records of the New Wave Party. University Archives, Iowa City, IA. RG 02.06.03, Box 10.
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federal building one hour after the war broke out. The mission of these premeditated protests was simple: “Bring the war home.”

Protests led by the New Wave Party did not always end peacefully. Many protests resulted in conflicts with the police and led to the protestors being charged with a variety of crimes. Like the manual for how to successfully stage a protest, the group also had a manual for what would likely happen in the case of a protestor being arrested. The manual documented the various charges a protestor could be charged with and a detailed description of court room and trial procedures. The New Wave Party protestors took proactive measures to reduce the risk of being arrested, such as only bringing necessary items like leaflets, flyers, and identification and not unnecessary or illegal items like alcohol, drugs, or anything resembling a weapon. The group specifically singled out the Cedar Rapids Police Department as being specifically unwelcoming to their protests. In the manual that listed charges and trial procedure there was a page with helpful tips for dealing with the Cedar Rapid Police like “Be cautious, they can be rough,” “Watch for having your head banged into the squad car door,” and “Do not talk back to the police or insult them unless you are prepared to be hurt.” What New Wave Party protests show, is that they were a well organized force to be reckoned with.

The origins of the New Wave Party coincided with a very important time in American political history. 1980 was important because it was a presidential election year, and pitted the incumbent, Democrat Jimmy Carter, against his challenger, Republican Ronald Reagan, and Independent, John Anderson. Even though President Carter was a Democrat, liberal progressives, like the members of the New Wave Party, were not very fond of Carter and his policies. One flyer handed out by the New Wave Party during the 1980 election campaign categorized the
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choice between the three candidates, Carter, Anderson, and Reagan, as “the difference between a
slip, a slide, and a jump down a hill.” The reason for this was that Carter simply was not liberal
and progressive enough. Carter himself was elected because of a backlash towards the
Republican Party after Watergate and the subsequent pardoning of the indicted former President
Nixon by then President Gerald Ford. What really seemed to alienate Carter from the far left was
his suggestion to reinstate the draft which consistently created a large base of opposition,
especially in the younger demographic.

Although the liberal progressives did not like President Carter, they feared the possibility
of a conservative Republican president like Ronald Reagan. The view of the progressives is well
summarized in The Age of Reagan: The Conservative Counterrevolution by Steven Hayward.
Hayward says that to liberal progressives, Ronald Reagan was the equivalent of Hitler. Many
newspapers held the view that his election was similar to the reaction of Germany when they
elected the Nazi party into power amid their own economic turmoil in the early 1930s. In his
book, Hayward sums up the left’s position on Reagan by saying, “to the far left, Reagan’s
election meant only one thing: the dark night of American fascism was about to descend.”

Ronald Reagan won in a landslide election capturing 489 Electoral College votes. According to Hayward, the election of 1980 was different from the past because the Republicans not only captured the presidency but also the United States Senate which had previously been controlled by the Democrats for a number of years. Hayward also points out that just because Reagan won in a landslide in the Electoral College, it did not mean that he had the overwhelming approval of the nation. Hayward writes “Many Democrats and political analysts said that
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Reagan’s massive win reflected less support for his ideas than a rejection of Jimmy Carter.”¹⁶ Historically Reagan had the lowest approval rating of any incoming president at 51 percent.

What really scared progressive Americans was the ideology of the “New Right.” Reagan and the rest of the Republican Party stood against, and could act against, many things the New Wave Party advocated for. For example, the president has the power to nominate justices to the Supreme Court. In 1973, the Supreme Court decided on *Roe v. Wade* which allowed women the right to choose to terminate a pregnancy. A women’s right to choose is an issue of great importance to the New Wave Party. Because of the presidential power to nominate future justices, it created the possibility that *Roe v. Wade* would be overturned if enough pro-life justices were nominated. This possibility was a scary thought for progressives. Out of the three justices appointed by Reagan, two, Justice Antonin Scalia and Justice Anthony Kennedy, were pro-life and the third, Justice Sandra Day O’Connor, was in favor of more restrictions on a women’s right to choose.

This enormous power wielded by the President is just one of many ways liberal progressives felt threatened by a powerful new-right. The threat to progressives’ key issues made groups like the New Wave Party form reactionary stances towards conservatives and the new-right. This is because Reagan and other conservatives created an immediate threat rather than a possible conflict.

Reactionary is a strong adjective when describing a political group. Because the New Wave Party focused on protests, this characteristic fits quite well. Each protest came from a common source: anger, whether it be because of an action or the lack of an action. The group often led counter-protests like the “die-in” at a right to life rally. During this, groups of two would go out into the audience and perform mock “coat-hanger” abortions where the girl

¹⁶ Hayward, 33.
receiving the abortion would die. This theatric highlighted the group’s belief that safe and legal
abortions were needed, but more importantly created an instant response to the protest of the
opposite group. 17

The New Wave Party’s reactionary stance also helped it become a strong group. This
evolution is similar to what happened to the Tea Party when it was first started in late 2008, early
2009. In 2008, the Republican Party had just come off a thumping in two consecutive national
elections, and many far-right conservatives were appalled by the massive debt the Bush and
Obama administrations were piling up. In 2010, this led them to successfully challenge many of
the incumbent, established Republican candidates. There is no evidence to suggest the New
Wave Party had this large of a say in determining the candidates for a national election, but the
idea of organizing together to form a new group out of dissent is the same. What the Tea Party
can tell about the New Wave Party is that the dissenting attitude that the members of the party
held made them especially prone to creating a strong, effective group.

The New Wave Party operated in Iowa City until 1992 when it dissolved. The reason the
party ended was ironically because of the success of the group. There is little evidence specific to
the New Wave Party that supports this claim, but the actions of the national organization, The
Progressive Student Network, the party belonged to holds the answer.

The New Wave Party was not the only progressive student movement during the 1980s.
They were part of a larger movement called the Progressive Student Network which linked
together multiple progressive student organizations at different colleges. It acted almost like a
larger version of what the New Wave Party was trying to accomplish at the University of Iowa
when they connected all the liberal student groups under their banner.

17 Records of the New Wave Party. University Archives, Iowa City, IA. RG 02.06.03, Box 10.
The Progressive Student Network was started in 1980 and consisted of four regional networks of student groups with the mission to better coordinate their progressive efforts. The core area of support for the group was found in the Northeast and Midwest, but the South and West were also represented by a few groups. The network united a variety of liberal groups including women’s, anti-war, anti-draft, minority, and other progressive groups together. What this network seemed to create was a national party system for these independent student groups. Each student organization would send one representative to vote at regional meetings that were held at least once a semester. In addition to the regional meetings, an annual national meeting was also required. The first national meeting took place at Kent State University and coincided with the ten year anniversary of the Kent State Massacre, when National Guard troops fired upon a group of protestors wounding and killing some students. The meetings were held at different college campuses including the University of Iowa in 1986.18

The Progressive Student Network stressed communication and required the circulation of a newsletter. The newsletter was titled *The Progressive Student News* and published a variety of different articles, many of which were submitted by different organizations that belonged to the Progressive Student Network. The newsletter was the voice by which the network communicated with each other as well as the way they expressed many of their views.

After the first conference in 1980, the newsletter talked about the progress made at the event and the goals that the network should have for the future. It first started off by addressing some technical issues with the conference and the network itself. The letter then went on to state the theme of the next conference which would be anti-right wing. The group also stressed the urgency of what was happening. The members of the progressive group were very concerned
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18 Records of the New Wave Party. University Archives, Iowa City, IA. RG 02.06.03, Box 18.
with the direction the new right wing and the Reagan administration was turning the country
toward. Finally the newsletter stressed the need for a unified front against the conservative
movement. Through the newsletters, the parallels between the New Wave Party and the
Progressive Student Network become apparent. Both are reactionary groups that have deep
ideological differences with the right-wing.

The Progressive Student Network advocated and protested a number of issues during the
1980s and early 90s. The last major issue the network fought against was the Gulf War in 1991.
After this the network started to dwindle until the group faded away in 1994.19

To explain why this happened, it is important to analyze what was also happening in
American Politics around this time. The most important event of the early 1990s for liberals was
the election of Democrat Bill Clinton to the White House, which ended 12 years of Republican
rule in Washington. Also the Persian Gulf War was a relatively swift undertaking lasting a little
more than six months rather than the drawn out occupation feared by many liberals. These events,
although seemingly positive outcomes for the progressive groups like the Progressive Student
Network and the New Wave Party, spelled the end for the groups. The reason is these groups
were reactionary toward the right-wing and its policies that would have had a negative effect on
the issues the progressive groups were advocating for. The groups existed to fight an immediate
attack by the right wing rather than a possible conflict. Once there was little left to fight against,
there was little reason to continue to go on.

This may also explain the question proposed in the beginning of this paper. Like the New
Wave Party and the Progressive Student Network, the group that elected Barack Obama also
appears to have been reactionary. The group of people who voted Obama into office were also

19 Records of the New Wave Party. University Archives, Iowa City, IA. RG 02.06.03, Box 19.
rejecting then President George W. Bush and the rest of the Republican Party who had led America into two wars and took the country from balanced budgets under the Clinton Administration to gigantic budget deficits. The president’s approval ratings were some of the worst in history, much like that of Jimmy Carter’s in 1980. Two years after Obama’s win in 2008 that political landscape had changed. The enthusiasm the Democrats had just two years prior shifted to the Republicans who found themselves in a position of anger and a reactionary stance.

In the brief span of twelve years, the New Wave Party advocated for a number of social, economic, and political issues centering on their anger and disagreement with the election of Ronald Reagan, the new conservative movement, and a lack of adequate leadership within their own party. The great irony to the story of the progressive group is that its success led to the end of the movement. What can the story of the New Wave Party tell us about similar reactionary groups like the Tea Party? Simply put, success will likely be their downfall.
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16E:051 Colloquium for History Majors
The Turkish woman traveler, Zeyneb Hanoum, sought a life different from the traditional Ottoman lifestyle she had grown to know. She wanted a life free from typical gender roles, stereotypical attitudes towards Turkish woman, and cultural freedom. Hanoum hoped to change her path in life by immersing herself in Western European culture, especially in Paris. She was an unusual sort of traveler in the 19th century, as Reina Lewis notes in her introduction to, *A Turkish Woman’s European Impressions*. “When this book was printed in 1913, the idea that a Turkish woman—a woman that the Western reader would presume had been raised in a harem—could express herself at all would have been quite remarkable.” Hanoum’s spirit and soul could not be easily conquered and she would reach for what she thought she deserved—freedom. Hanoum’s desire for freedom and opportunity in France led her to overlook French stereotypes of Turkish women, but her hopes were disappointed when she discovered first-hand that France was more prejudiced against Turks and less liberating for women than she expected.

Zeyneb Hanoum was the pen name of Hadidjé Zennour, a Turkish woman who lived in the Constantinople area during the remaining years of the Ottoman Empire. Her family was part of the Ottoman Muslim elite because of her father’s job as Minister of Foreign Affairs for Sultan Abdülhamid II. While her father gave her and her sister a Western style education, he still expected his daughters to live as traditional secluded Turkish ladies, or *hanim*. Her father’s goal in exposing Hanoum and her sister to Western style education was not to create independent women but to create more suitable and desired women as wives, ones that would properly represent affluent households. Hanoum was not a woman who desired to live as a *hanim* and started to rebel against her father’s expectations. As soon as Hanoum was told of her father’s
plans for her to be married to his secretary and protégé, she would not let her voice be silenced. Hanoum wanted to be heard and her goal was “to attract Western sympathy for the problems of the educated Ottoman woman.”¹ By learning to speak five different languages, Hanoum became confident that the power of her writings would bring forth justice and truth. Hanoum and her sister met with French writer, Pierre Loti, in 1904 while he visited Istanbul and hoped to inspire him to write a book about the restrictions faced by Turkish women and the various situations of Muslim Ottoman women. The sisters enchanted Loti and he included them as heroines in his novel, Les Désenchantées, but under false names for their safety from the repressive regime of Sultan Abdülhamid II. This was not to be her last encounter with a French man or with adventure.

After their experiences with Loti and his book, Hanoum and her sister decided it was time to embark to France. Before the two sisters could leave though, Hanoum had to decide if she was ready to leave her Ottoman life behind. In her travel account, Hanoum discusses many incidents in her life that influenced her pursuit of freedom. She attributes many of her liberal attitudes to her disgust with the Hamidian regime that ruled Turkey during her childhood. She wrote, “But how can I be otherwise when the best years of my life have been poisoned by the horrors of the Hamidian regime?”² Even though Hanoum depicts the government as an abusive one, many people found the Hamidian regime appealing because it was one that was free from outside Western influences.³ The Hamidian regime was created to fix the past mistakes of the Tanzimat regime that ruled from 1839 until the First Constitutional Era of 1876. Those against the

² Zeyneb Hanoum, A Turkish Woman’s European Impressions (New Jersey: Gorgias Press LLC, 2004), 35.
Hamidian regime were typically the Young Turks who remained loyal to the Young Ottoman heritage of union and progress and “spoke out in the name of liberty and portrayed Abdülhamid as a tyrant.”\(^4\) Still, the Turks believed that the Hamidian regime would be a regime of their own doing—it was free from Western thought and influence. With that said, it is no wonder Hanoum was against the regime since she was an avid supporter of Western nations and was educated in the Western-style. Abdülhamid “fostered everything that preserved, glorified, and justified tradition.”\(^5\) Tradition was not what Hanoum was waiting for. She realized that she could not wait for change, but she must go out and find that change and forge forward with her life.

Hanoum and her sister Melek Hanoum decided they must flee Turkey in 1906, after their successful adventure in Loti’s book, *Les Désenchantées*. They were no longer safe from punishment under the Ottoman government once the book was released. The two women traveled to France in 1906 before the height of the book’s release, and Zeyneb Hanoum wrote letters to Grace Ellison, an English feminist, who would document the sisters’ experiences there. By the time the sisters arrived in France, the French men and women had heard of their trip. Their characters in Loti’s book had intrigued the country, especially the French women who wanted to host the real désenchantées in their home. “The fascination with their fictional alter egos was to continue as the image of the cultured but doomed désenchantée began to coalesce into an icon of oppressed, but elegant, Ottoman femininity.”\(^6\) The sisters began to adapt to French and Parisian life by wearing the fashions of the time as well as engaging in activities that other French women would perform—teatime, conversing, and immersing themselves into the culture. It was almost imperative that the sisters adapt, for their father had publicly disowned

\(^4\) Berkes, 253.
\(^5\) Berkes, 255.
\(^6\) Lewis, x.
them—orders of the sultan—after their fleeing of Turkey. Unfortunately their acceptance into the Western French society would be tainted with stereotypical questions and ignorance. Hanoum put great hope into creating a home in Western Europe and France, but her hope would not be enough to shield her from the reality.

In France, women were experiencing greater freedoms than in Turkey but by very little. The French feminist 19th century newspaper *La Citoyenne*, compared France’s gendered conditions with societal empires. The articles by founder Hubertine Auclert, “contrasted the circumstances of French women with those of women in Niger, Tonkin, and Tunisia, as well as in countries such as Italy, Ireland, Russia, and Turkey.” The articles concluded that French women had more advantages and there was an emphasis on the “uncivilized” aspects of women’s lives and status that related to those of Algeria and Turkey. Even though there was progression towards the women’s suffrage movement in France, the movement was still in the early stages of development when Hanoum visited in 1906. Since she had never witnessed a women’s movement in Turkey, her enthusiasm for more women’s suffrage in France was misguided. She was quickly awakened to reality after encountering various local residents whom had invited her to their homes. The people of Paris greeted Hanoum as the heroine of Loti’s book and with fascinated curiosity, bombarding her with questions about her life in Turkey and as a Muslim. France’s knowledge of Turkish women was very limited and stereotypical. *La Citoyenne* addressed one of the most common stereotypes associated with the Turks, stating that Turks find polygamy to be a good thing and should be a social institution. While this stereotype was typically seen with disgust by Western societies, *La Citoyenne* applauded the Turks for honestly
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embracing their polygamy. The loyalty that the Turks held with their convictions in comparison to the French, who are loyal to their “instincts and appetites,” was a fresh a loyalty that the French feminists hoped would catch on in French society. While the feminist paper applauded the Turks honesty, it was politically incorrect to say all Turks practice polygamy. The French ignored the corrections and Hanoum was frequently asked stereotypical questions to satisfy the French’s curiosity in understanding a Turkish woman’s impressions of Western Europe. Hanoum’s personal experience with stereotypes included an occurrence when a French woman asked, “How many wives has your father?” to which Hanoum replied, “as many as your husband, Madame.” The ongoing development of French society and women’s suffrage did not stop Hanoum from experiencing what it was to be a foreigner in a Western society.

Hanoum was very educated not only in her own history, religion, and culture but also in those of other nations. It is peculiar that Hanoum decided to leave out the history of France’s occupation and influence on the Ottoman Empire in her travel account, since it did influence her home country’s history. “The nineteenth century introduced a crucial shift in efforts to broaden knowledge which up to that time had been largely disinterested and reflective of a genuine warmth for the countries studied.” From this time onwards, interest in the Mediterranean Arab countries was inextricably linked to France's expansionist ambitions. The French’s presence in the Ottoman Empire during the 19th century was for developmental reasons—scientific and expansionist. During the years of the French “coup d’éventail” in Algeria, the Ottoman Empire was targeted. The turbulent history of those years and the French’s goals for the Ottoman Empire,
“led to experiments that gave some power to Arab leaders in the countryside,”\textsuperscript{14} which induced the barbaric behavior of the French to the Arabs. The French occupation of the Arab nations created a more miserable, ignorant, and barbaric Muslim society than in previous years. The French influence on Turkey in the 19\textsuperscript{th} century contributed to some of the hindrances that Hanoum despised so much in Istanbul. “It appears that the \textit{Sabah} columnist had been influenced by the agrarian colonies in France, Netherlands, and Switzerland, where hundreds of vagrants were re-educated through agricultural work.”\textsuperscript{15} Even though Sultan Abdülhamid II wished to prevent outside Western countries from interfering with his ruling of Turkey, the past influences of Western countries, especially France, already had made their mark.

Hanoum began to notice, little by little, that her evolution into a Western woman was faltering. In her letters to Ellison, she spends more time discussing how she still remembers the ways of Turkish life, what it is to be a Turkish woman, and her connection to Turkey. “There are habits, my dearest friend, which cannot be lost in the West any more than they can be acquired in the East,” Hanoum writes to Ellison in regards to her letter writing techniques.\textsuperscript{16} Soon, she begins to experience the negative aspects of Western life, including gambling. It is not long after this experience that Hanoum begins to end her letters with thoughts about her home in Turkey, “but in spite of all my efforts my thoughts wandered, and I was far away in Turkey.”\textsuperscript{17} Hanoum’s optimism begins to waver and her ailing health, poor financial status, and constant misunderstanding of the culture push her towards leaving Paris and returning to Turkey. She says, “I think—yes, I almost think I have had enough of the West now, and want to return to the East,

\textsuperscript{14} Zeynep Çelik, \textit{Empire, Architecture, and the City} (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2008), 11.
\textsuperscript{16} Hanoum, 147.
\textsuperscript{17} Hanoum, 150.
just to get back the old experience of calm.”\textsuperscript{18} Sadly for Hanoum, neither Paris nor Turkey felt like real homes to her, but in the end she did have to choose. “Yet here in the West what a difference! I have actually written to my father and begged him, should I die in Paris, to have me taken home and buried in a Turkish cemetery.”\textsuperscript{19}

It was a big risk for Hanoum and her sister to abandon their lives in Turkey in search of freedom, and unfortunately for Hanoum, it resulted in her return to Turkey, the very place in which she did not feel free. While in France, Hanoum became disillusioned with the life available to women in the West and found the rigors of trying to survive in a market economy insufficient compensation for the increased but still restricted freedoms of non-segregated society.\textsuperscript{20} Towards the conclusion of her travel account, Hanoum reflects on her previous expectations of France,

Do you remember with what delight I came to France, the country of Liberté, Egalité, and Fraternité? But now I have seen those three magic words in practice, how the whole course of my ideas have changed! Not only are my theories on the nature of governments no longer the same, but my confidence in the individual happiness that each can obtain from these governments is utterly shattered.\textsuperscript{21}

Hanoum doesn’t directly state that she overlooked the French stereotypes of Turkish women with her high hopes and unrealistic expectations but she does reveal that she has come face to face with reality and the question of what were her expectations of her travels? She retains her title as a désenchantée, but now her disappointment is in the West. As Hanoum returns home to Turkey on a ship, she does not return as a woman of Paris, she returns as, “Désenchantée I left

\textsuperscript{18} Hanoum, 155.
\textsuperscript{19} Hanoum, 161.
\textsuperscript{20} Lewis, x.
\textsuperscript{21} Hanoum, 237.
Turkey, désenchantée I have left Europe. Is that role to be mine ‘til the end of my days?—Your affectionate friend, Zeyneb.”

22 Hanoum, 246.
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From 1970-1977— for a total of 168 episodes— the *Mary Tyler Moore Show* thrilled, enticed, entertained, and amused audiences across the country. The show’s heroine, Mary Richards, was an over 30 career woman with wacky neighbors, an uptight but lovable boss, and a motley crew of newsmen that always kept her on her toes. Never a man-eater, nor a radical, Moore played a character everyday people could relate to. Unabashedly liberated, with old school charm, Mary was a woman of many seasons—seven to be exact.

She had over a dozen boyfriends during the show’s run— unheard of at the time. Issues that were discussed included sexism, being a single woman, job discrimination, ageism, having a difficult boss, problematic neighbors— and that was just the first episode. Birth control, infertility, self-esteem, diets, beauty contests, the economy, anti-Semitism, premarital sex, sexual IQ, assertiveness, union strikes, insomnia, adoption and child rearing were all topics that were discussed, but never browbeaten. Viewers were left to form their own opinions on where they stood with controversial issues.

On September 19, 1970 at 9:30pm EST, CBS viewers watched the former housewife on the *Dick Van Dyke Show* “make it on her own.” Not intended as a spin-off, but often mistaken as one, the *Mary Tyler Moore Show* informed a generation of independent women that they were going to make it after all. Mary’s hat thrown up in the air at the end of the show’s intro, forever frozen, symbolized the protagonist’s never-ending determination. During its run, the *MTM Show* won 29 Emmy Awards, a record not broken until the hit show *Frasier* (1993-2004,) and saw the inception of three spin-
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1 “Love is All Around,” *The Mary Tyler Moore Show* (CBS; first aired September 19, 1970. All episodes accessed on Hulu.com.)
offs, in addition to the numerous shows Moore’s production company turned out. Not since the 1930s had women comics been pushed to the forefront of entertainment, competing alongside their more established male counterparts.

Moore’s popularity playing Dick Van Dyke’s wife Laura on his self-titled show, (1961-1966) made her instantly recognizable, but also left her vulnerable to type-casting. The duo had been so popular that people believed they were married in real life. That was the key reason writers Burns and Brooks were dissuaded from writing Mary’s character as a divorcee. “Fellas,” began CBS programming vice-president Perry Laffery, “They’re going to think she divorced Dick Van Dyke. We can’t have that.” The compromise was creating a character that was newly single after breaking up with a long-time boyfriend. CBS feared that audiences wouldn’t believe that an appealing woman like Mary had never been married. “It tells you a little bit about our own lack of awareness of the women’s movement at the time…our feeling was that if a girl was over thirty and unmarried, there had to be an explanation for such a freak of nature as that,” commented writer Allan Burns. Mary Tyler Moore had reflected similar sentiments:

“We were lucky that our creative people were so tuned-in to what was happening in the world. It wasn't that Jim Brooks and Alan Burns created The Mary Tyler Moore Show because they were interested in polemics for women’s rights— it wasn't that kind of program. But they were interested in what was happening to women in our society and, like all good writers, they wrote about what was foremost in their minds…When our show went on, we were considered very radical— so radical that there were
prophecies of instant disaster. Mary Richards was not a widow…She was an ambitious career woman interested in her own work and making it on her own. Nothing like Mary Richards had happened in television before.”

Indeed, as Mary Ann Watson pointed out, “TV’s single women of the fifties and sixties were biding their time until matrimony would bring deliverance from the pressures of paid employment. But Mary Richards loved her job and grew into it.” Mary lived alone but wasn’t a lonely or sad person… There were many avenues besides procreation for a woman of the 1970s to leave her mark on the world.”

In the pilot episode, Mary Richards had just moved to Minneapolis and was now hunting for a job. She arrived at WJM-TV. Lou Grant, the station manager, asked Mary a series of pertinent questions including her religious affiliation.

Mary: “Mr. Grant, I don’t know quite how to say this, but you’re not allowed to ask that when someone is applying for a job. It’s against the law.”

Lou: “Wanna call a cop?”

Mary: “No.”

Lou: “Good. (In an intimidating manor,) Would you think I was violating your civil rights if I asked if you’re married?” Insecure about her single status, (a common theme throughout the early years of the show,) hilarious hijinks ensued as Mary tried to dodge his questions.
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Mary: “Presbyterian.”

Lou: “Huh?”

Mary: “Well, I decided I’d answer your religion question.” Lou then asked why she wasn’t married, as well as how many words a minute she could type.

Mary: “Fifty-five.”

Lou: “Fifty-five reasons why you aren’t married?”

Of course, she was answering the typing question, but her timing and nervous fidgeting created the comic relief. By this time Mary was quite flustered. “You’ve been asking a lot of very personal questions that don’t have a thing to do with my qualifications,” she finally retorted. After some awkward silence, Lou replied, “You know what? You’ve got spunk.” A beaming Mary murmured, “Well…”

“I hate spunk!” was his curt reply. But Mary’s persistence prevailed. The secretary position she wanted had been filled, but Lou Grant offered her another job. It paid $10 less and he made it clear he wanted a man for the job, but Mary accepted nonetheless. In this first episode, Mary Richards became the associate producer of the 6 o’clock news. Even at this stage in the series, the interplay between Mary and Lou, (and eventual attempt at a romance,) would turn awkward situations into slapstick comedy. Grant dryly offered her the job as head producer, for an even sharper pay cut, but Mary politely joked, “I can’t afford it.” All she may do in the first episode is sharpen pencils, but she would go on to write scripts, produce the news, and even have airtime alongside Ted Baxter, the self-absorbed idiotic news anchor for whom the crew always covered for.

Unlike the socially conscious and politically charged Norman Lear sitcoms of the
1970s, such as *All in the Family*, *Maude*, the *Jeffersons*, and *Good Times*, the *MTM Show* took a nuanced position of the issues. There was no doubt that Mary was a strong-willed woman who could take care of herself, but she rarely delivered the satirical lines on the show. Those were left to sidekick and neighbor Rhoda Morgenstern, played by Valerie Harper. She was everything Mary wasn’t: flamboyant, Jewish, slightly overweight, and from the Bronx. Rhoda was the yin to Mary’s yang.

Mary was constantly reminded of her privileged WASP upbringing in Northern Minnesota, and how her problems paled in comparison to everyone else’s. However, when a friend was in need, Mary was there. Her charm and wit transcended any jealousy that could be directed towards her. Unlike most female characters on television, Mary Richards was down to earth and eternally likable and relatable. Any time, day or night Mary’s door was open.”

Grant Tinker, Mary’s real-life husband at the time, (who also ran Mary’s company,) described the success of his wife stating, “The extraordinary thing about Mary is that she is so extraordinarily normal.” In the book “Love is All Around: the Making of the Mary Tyler Moore Show,” co-star Cloris Leachman related a story about an experience she had filming on location for a project and overhearing a conversation at a cafe about the upcoming debut of the *MTM Show*. Leachman, who played Mary’s landlady Phyllis Lindstrom, commented, “The men were laughing at the absurdity of Mary Tyler Moore going out on her own to develop a tv show. I was very aware then of how wives are
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perceived by others — you’re a role, you’re not a person with possibilities. And I think Mary’s show did a great deal to subtly but profoundly address that.”

The female characters introduced on the show were strikingly different from one another; Leachman played Phyllis as a woman who was vain and possessed a superiority complex. She desperately wanted to be hip; she even let her daughter Bess call her by her first name. Mary only put up with Phyllis’ self-absorbed behavior because they were former school chums. But Phyllis endured marital infidelity at the start of the show’s fourth season. Then after her husband Lars unexpectedly died, (a character never shown on camera,) mother and daughter left Minneapolis for a spin-off series set in San Francisco.

Rhoda embodied the white ethnic minority, albeit with a few stereotypes about Jewish mothers. Sue Ann Nivens, played by Betty White, entered the show as the host of the “Happy Homemaker” television segment at the station. However, the only thing domestic about Sue Ann was her gin. Ever on the prowl, no man was safe, including Phyllis’ husband. She wasn’t the first loose woman on screen, but definitely the first in a comedic setting. Unlike a woman in her 20s setting her sights on a swinging lifestyle, Sue Ann was a woman in her 50s who had raging hormones. Her banter with newsman Murray Slaughter, played by Galvin MacLeod, poked fun at her two-faced persona, but there was a deeper message of unapologetic sexual lust that women “past their prime” could relate to in Sue Ann Nivens.

Later, sweet as pie Georgette Franklin, played by Georgia Engel emerged on the scene. Her character was introduced at Rhoda’s going away party held at Mary’s
apartment. She was a co-worker of Rhoda’s at Hempel’s department store, (both women were window dressers.) Ted Baxter, played by Ted Knight, was the lovable, but daft anchor of the 6 o’clock news, who promptly courted Mary’s guest. He and Georgette would date off and on until they wed in a later season. Georgette spoke in a baby voice and was the epitome of a submissive homemaker, circa 1950. Rhoda and Mary observed how Ted would take advantage of the naïve woman and how he played with her emotions. They decided to help the young woman toughen up and build self-esteem. Mary even set her up on a few blind dates. Georgette finally recognized that she was “damn nice” and deserved the same treatment in return. After Georgette displayed Ted her newfound liberation, Ted in turn confronted Mary. “It’s like being with a different woman. It’s like being equal. I understand you’re responsible. As long as I live, I’ll never forgive you.”

Being the only woman in the newsroom, Mary’s soft demeanor was countered by that of her boss, Lou Grant, played by Ed Asner. He was tough, macho, and everything Mary was not. As head of the department he attempted to put everyone in their place. Mary’s respect for Mr. Grant was deep-seeded with romantic undertones one minute, and father/daughter dynamics the next. Murray Slaughter, Mary’s co-worker, shared the show’s funny one-liners along with Rhoda. His character developed through the season to include having marital problems that led to: a crush on Mary, a gambling addiction, and

an eventual adoption of a Vietnamese child. Gordy the weatherman at the station, played by *Roots* star John Amos was an on again off again cast member. Most notably, he was the only African-American man in the newsroom. He left WJM-TV, becoming a famous talk show host. Phyllis, upon meeting Gordy, wrongly assumed he was a sportscaster, with racist overtones present in her comment.

Initially, television reviewers were mixed. A random audience that had been assembled to view the pilot episode thought Mary was a loser, Rhoda was unlikable and a negative character, and Phyllis was unrealistic. Feminists complained that Mary was the token woman in the masculine newsroom. She was also the only character who called her employer Mr. Grant. Even her friends were on a first name basis with the boss.

Still, the plotline had potential, and some keen reviewers recognized the show’s innovation. John Leonard, a writer for *Life* magazine authored the 1970 article “The Subversive Mary Tyler Moore.” He lamented, “If women have a profession, it’s usually nursing, where they minister to men, (like the show *Julia.*) If they are superior to men, it’s because they have magical powers, (*Bewitched/ I Dream of Jeannie/The Flying Nun,*

“If they are over 30 years old, they’ve got to be widows, almost always with children, so that they can’t run around enjoying themselves like real people, (*the Brady Bunch/Partridge Family.*) And they’re guaranteed to be helpless once very fifteen minutes.” But of all the television women, Mr. Leonard praised Mary Richards. “If the *Mary Tyler Moore Show* ever goes into weekday reruns, vampirized homemakers may get their consciousness raised to the point where they will refuse to leave their brains in
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the sugar canister any longer.”

In “TV and the Single Girl,” a TV Guide article, Diane Rosen pointed out that Mary Richards may not have been the first career woman to live alone, but she was the first one to be self-sufficient, single (by choice) and over 30 and never married. Parallels can be drawn between Mary Richards and Marlo Thomas’ character Ann Marie of That Girl, (1966-1971.) But Ann Marie was a would-be actress, who had stereotypical ambitions of fame. Intrusive parents and a wholesome boyfriend took care of the young actress.12

People magazine in a special 2010 supplement edition “Celebrate the 70s”13 described the MTM Show, “Nearly 40 years later, it’s amazing to think that Mary Richards, The Mary Tyler Moore Show’s central character, was considered a daring creation. Her risk factors? She was a single woman in her 30s, had a job and was happy. Furthermore she had a sex life: An episode where she spent the night at her boyfriend’s house was much murmured about in kitchens and around water coolers across the nation.”

“I was never a militant women's libber,” Moore insisted. “Though I have been very vocal about some of the inequities we still have. There's a lot of Mary Richards in me—but there's also a lot of Laurie Petrie, the housewife I played on the Dick Van Dyke Show.”14

Mary dated, and often, but was the first person to kick out a date she felt was

becoming too fresh. When her parents came to visit Mary put her foot down over their noisiness. After staying out all night, her mother wanted to know what her daughter had been up to. A date that ended in sex was implied, but Mary merely said, “Mother, I’m not going to tell you… I am over 30 years old.” She pointed out that her parents never called to check up on her before, only now that they were in town. Her father casually replied, “It was long distance.”

In a later episode, Mary’s parents were again visiting. While leaving the room, her mother called out, “Don’t forget to take your pill!” to which father and daughter replied in unison, “I won’t.” It was that simple statement that made a nation of single women nod in agreement, and made men raise a few eyebrows.

By 1974 and 1975 the Rhoda and Phyllis characters had left the show for their own self-titled series. This occurred under the guide of Mary Tyler Moore’s production company, having been penned by the same writers, (Allan Burns and James L. Brooks.)

On October 28, 1974, stars Valerie Harper and Mary Tyler Moore appeared on the cover of *Time* magazine. The news publication was, and still is, known to cover economic, social, environmental, and political issues. Having two actresses interviewed as the cover story was a daring move. For example, the issue that ran the previous week of November 21 had Jerry Brown of California on the cover; the previous weeks saw Gerald Ford and a story on the trials and tribulations of political wives. The week of November 4 had the Shah of Iran, followed by Yasser Arafat. In the MTM feature, the

---
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interviewer wrote, “From the look of the ladies and the sound of their followers, TV ’74 has a glow that extends to viewers who may yet be witnessing television's true Golden Age of comedy—stronger and longer than the one in the ’50s. Indeed, Mary Tyler Moore and Valerie Harper are enough to make almost anyone forget the comedies of the past. And even the crustiest nostalgia buffs cannot ponder *Rhoda* or The *MTM Show* without admitting that on these long autumn evenings, all that glitters is not old.”

In 1977, after seven seasons, Moore decided that the show had become creatively exhausted. In the final episode of the show, Phyllis and Rhoda returned for one last goodbye. Mary and her co-workers were forced to seek new employment after the station came under new management and everyone in the office was fired—except for Ted. While the last moment the cast is assembled is rightfully somber, the tension was broken when the gang, huddled together in a group hug, shuffled over to Mary’s desk to grab some Kleenex.

*The Mary Tyler Moore Show* may not have been radical enough for some feminists, but in those seven years Mary grew as a woman not ashamed to “be a ma’am.” Still single, and now over 40, Mary didn’t let Rhoda’s marriage and move back home, or her friends’ growing families ever make her independence waiver. As she asked in the closing scene of that last episode, “What is a family anyway? They’re just people who make you feel less alone and really loved.” At that moment, Mary realized her newsroom family was just as comforting and fulfilling as that of a husband and children. For seven seasons, television viewers shared that love of her unconventional family—a family that could not have endured before the 1970s.

---

After the show ended, many of the cast members went on to have successful careers in film, television, and theatre. Ed Asner continued his character on the spin-off *Lou Grant* (1977-1982.) Despite the name, the *MTM Show* had never been solely about Mary. In fact, she personally only won four of the show’s 29 Emmys. Nevertheless, Mary was the center of the sitcom. In 2002, a statue of Moore was erected in Minneapolis near the spot the famous hat in the air scene was filmed.

Character dynamics made the show entertaining; the social commentary made the show relevant. But the warmth and grace of the star was the glue that bound those elements together. Mary wasn’t a man hating, bra-burning feminist. She wasn’t a member of the Black Panther Party or Weather Underground— but then again neither was the majority of society. She was a mainstream character who appealed to the general public. To some that may have been a missed opportunity to push an agenda; to others it was a brilliant way of surviving the backlash of the polarizing 1970s. Mary turned the world on with her smile, and never shut it off. “I'm an experienced woman,” Mary Richards once said. “I've been around...Well...all right, I might not've been around, but I've been...nearby.”
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16A:051 Colloquium for History Majors
In typical popular history, the American Civil War is told in fundamentally black and white terms. The North versus the South, Yankees versus Rebels—these are the phrases we so often hear, and all while following a strict geographical line of the Mason-Dixon, dividing the country in two. We also hear of the great, yet terrible battles that occurred during the war, with fantastic tales of bravery and cowardice, glory, and disgrace. However, there was more to one of the greatest wars in American history than such narrow lines of thought. The Iowa regiments’ involvement leading up to and through the Siege of Vicksburg, and their versatility during this time, shows an aspect of the Civil War that is normally lost in the popular histories of the conflict as a whole. By viewing the experiences of these men, we can see that all soldiers did so much more work during the course of the overall war than just fighting. These less romanticized efforts off the battlefield many times proved to be just as important as the work on the battlefield. These Iowa regiments and their experiences also show that the war was not so narrowly North versus South, but much more regional. All of these seemingly mundane aspects of versatility and regional issues of family and home are left out of the popular histories of today’s world. But we can use Vicksburg as an example to show how these aspects truly did apply to all soldiers during the entire war.

The Vicksburg Campaign was a series of battles between the Union and Confederate forces, beginning in December of 1862 and ending with the eventual capture of the city of Vicksburg itself on July 4, 1863. This was a massive victory for the Union, as it then controlled the entire Mississippi River, cutting the Confederacy in two. This also opened up the Mississippi for supply routes and transportation, both which were vital to the Union. The Union forces were led by Ulysses S. Grant, who would later be known as the hero of the war for his leadership and role in the Union victory. During this campaign, Grant controlled the Army of the Tennessee,
which was composed of almost completely of Midwestern regiments.\(^1\) Most of the soldiers in the regiments during this campaign, as well as most all regiments in the Civil War, were not just from the same state, but many from the same county and even the same town. During the siege of the city itself, conditions were harsh. As one soldier described his experience, “Ball and shell [come] into camp every day… shell has been bursting just at the top of the hill above us (we are in a hollow). Balls and pieces of shell fall into our camp every few moments…”\(^2\) Another soldiers wrote, “Bullets fly thick over our heads. The shells burst over us sometimes.”\(^3\) These are the experiences and events that we are accustomed to hearing about when it comes to Vicksburg: the two main assaults on the city on May 19\(^{th}\) and 22\(^{nd}\) and the forty-four day siege that immediately followed. But the two assaults and the siege itself could not have happened and would not have happened if not for the work of thousands of brave soldiers off the battlefield. By focusing on the Iowa regiments that participated in the campaign and the Siege of Vicksburg, one can see the impact of the less glorious tasks of war, carried out everyday by thousands of soldiers throughout the entire war, that were necessary for the great battles to even occur.

General Ulysses S. Grant and his Army of the Tennessee reached the city of Vicksburg and immediately began preparing for an assault. Grant believed that the Confederates “had been much demoralized by” their defeats in earlier battles in the campaign. Furthermore, he believed his forces could storm the Confederate works and take the city fairly easily.\(^4\) Even before the first assault began, the Iowa soldiers were helping secure the surrounding area for the assault force. General William T. Sherman, commander of the XV Corps of Grant’s army, was

\(^2\) William A. Russell to Juliet Russell, June 19, 1863, Russell Family Papers, Civil War Collection, Special Collections Dept., University of Iowa Libraries, Iowa City, IA.
\(^3\) Joseph Kohout to his father, June 4, 1863, Joseph Kohout Letters, Civil War Collection, Special Collections Dept, University of Iowa Libraries, 423 Iowa City, IA.
\(^4\) Bearss, 761.
concerned with the possibility of one of his divisions meeting harsh resistance from Confederate forces before reaching their attack point at Walnut Hills. On the morning of May 19th, he sent the third brigade of his third division, a brigade of three Iowa regiments, to scout out the area on a plantation road that split off to the west from Benton Road. Under General Matthies, the Iowa regiments advanced along the plantation road and accessed the River road to Yazoo City with no resistance. After hearing this, Sherman ordered the brigade to retrace its steps back to where it had originally started. By noon on the 19th, the brigade had returned after marching ten difficult miles.5

The first assault began and the Union army soon realized that it would not be easy to take Vicksburg. During the assault, Sherman was informed of a critical ammunition shortage for his forces on the front lines. Sherman quickly asked for volunteers from his rear forces to take the heavy boxes of ammunition to the front. Immediately, the men of Company C of the Iowa 12th Volunteer Regiment stepped forward. Soon, ammunition was flowing in great amounts to the front, “carried on the backs of the husky Iowans.”6 These Iowans risked their lives to get the ammunition to their fellow soldiers at the front lines, showing great courage and character.

Though the first assault would eventually fail, the effort and commitment that the Iowa regiments had towards seemingly boring and unglamorous tasks during the day of the 19th made the assault possible. Without the 12th Iowa, Sherman’s forces would have exhausted their ammunition, ending all chances of victory that day and causing many more casualties for the Union soldiers. Had Matthies’ brigade not marched ten rugged miles in a few short hours and scouted ahead that morning, Sherman would not have known what his attacking force was to face before reaching their launching point for the assault, which could have led to disaster for the
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Union if Confederate troops had actually occupied the area. Though the Iowa regiments’ casualties (killed, wounded and missing) as a whole that day were 52, which was low compared to many other regiments involved on this day, the Iowans proved that there is much more to any battle than just fighting it. Their grunt work and behind the scenes proved vital to the operations of the first assault, just as these efforts are to any and all battles.

After the failure of the first assault, the Union high command, including Grant, thought that a siege would be the best strategy for taking the city. Despite this belief, Grant decided to assault the city one final time, and set the date for May 22nd. Before the assault even began, Union artillery shelled the Confederate entrenchments. General Sherman believed that a main reason that his force’s first assault on Stockade Redan (the Confederate work they had been assigned to overtake) had failed was due to lack of artillery support and preparation. This time, Sherman sent orders to begin digging artillery entrenchments and roads for the transport of artillery in advance. Many Iowa regiments were involved, but Matthies’ brigade (8th, 12th and 35th Iowa regiments, under Tuttle’s 3rd Div.), along with the rest of their division, were so close to the enemy lines that they had to be protected by another division of sharpshooters and scouts (2nd Div.). These soldiers risked being shot at any time while they dug rifle-pits and constructed artillery parapets to prepare for the second assault. As a result, the artillery regiments had a significant impact on the Confederate positions, even before the assault began. The 2nd Iowa Battery was part of this group of artillery that backed up Sherman’s troops. Confederate General Shoup and his men were the Confederate forces defending the Stockade Redan area, and he complained to the commanding general at Vicksburg, General Pemberton, about the Union artillery barrage. Shoup claimed that his artillery was “all but useless” and that the enemy
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artillery was knocking his parapets apart faster than his men could repair them. Soon, however, the Union artillery began to wane and almost completely ceased firing – the Federals ran out of ammunition from firing so much, and had to wait until more could be brought up before they could continue the barrage.¹⁰

In another part of the battlefield, Iowa regiments in the XIII Corps, 14th Division, under General Carr, moved into position near the 2d Texas Lunette, another Confederate work. These regiments were sent to reinforce and relieve troops under General A.J. Smith, who had been moving forward to establish Union lines. On the night of the 20th, Carr’s men (with two Iowa regiments) began digging rifle-pits in preparation for the next-day’s assault. “Carr’s men dug like badgers all that night, and when dawn arrived on the 21st, the Texans in the Rebel works were astonished to find a line of rifle-pits extending almost continuously across their front.”¹¹

As these regiments worked on preparations for the assault, another group of Iowans were working to secure the rest of the area around Vicksburg. General Hall’s third brigade of the sixth division of the XVII Corps was originally ordered to reunite with the rest of its division located at Snyder’s Bluff. The Iowans loaded up onto steamboats and were transported to Bowers’ landing, where they unloaded and began a march across De Soto Point to Young’s Point; from there, on the morning of the 21st, they were transported to Snyder’s Bluff. As they pulled into Snyder’s Bluff landing, however, they received new orders to land at Warrenton and seal off the southern approaches to Vicksburg. Warrenton Road led directly into the city. They had to retrace their steps back to Bowers’ Landing, which did not sit well with most of the troops. The reason they were sent to Warrenton was to occupy the Confederate forces in the southern part of the city to prevent them from reinforcing the other Confederate units defending the works targeted by the

¹⁰Ibid, 794.
¹¹Ibid, 801
Union assault. If the Rebels did weaken their defenses in this southern part of the city, Hall’s brigade was to enter the city. This played a key role in containing more Confederate forces and putting more pressure in different places during the assault.

The Iowans reached their positions during the afternoon of the 21st, and on the 22nd began to advance towards South Fort, the southern fortifications of the city. Infantrymen from the 11th, 13th and 16th Iowa regiments were chosen as sharpshooters to protect the rest of the brigade as it moved forward. As they reached the South Fort area, they began to prepare to storm the enemy works. But before division commander General McArthur gave the order, a new order was received to reinforce General McClernand’s force, which was part of the main assault. The Iowans then began a very long march to reach their newly ordered positions, but would eventually get there too late to be of use. These Iowa soldiers role off the battlefield was pivotal, and they did whatever was asked of them, no matter how frustrating, to help protect and eventually reinforce the rest of the assaulting force.

These regiments all were vital in the preparations for the assault on Stockade Redan and the 2d Texas Lunette, as well as securing the southern area of the city; just as many of the other regiments’ participating in the assault did things beforehand that were vital to the assault as a whole. All of these preparations were absolutely necessary for the second attempt to take the city to even begin, let alone succeed. Similar preparations were necessary not just for the first and second assaults at Vicksburg, but also for every battle that occurred during the war. Different battles called for different preparations, of course, but the overall concept remains the same. The fighting was the end result, but the many and at times tedious preparations that had to be made before the fighting were just as important as the battle itself, if not more so. Without someone to dig artillery parapets, there can be no artillery support, and without someone to dig rifle-pits,  

12 Bearss, 805-06, 856-57.
there can be no protection for attacking troops. These seemingly small things, the labor and grunt work, too often go unrecognized by the traditional histories of the Civil War. But the fact is, there could be no battle, no glorious tales of fighting and dying without the numerous tasks that were completed before it, sometimes inviting the soldiers’ frustration. These brave men proved their worth as soldiers by doing what they were told, even if they found it useless or personally disagreed with the order. So many of these men would eventually fight and thousands of them died on the famous and infamous battlefields that spread across the southern terrain of the divided nation. But so many more men were the backbone of these operations, and too many times go unrecognized for their valiant efforts.

Another aspect of the war that traditional history fails to accurately grasp and describe is how regionally defined the war really was. It was not uncommon for a soldier to be fighting next to his neighbor or even his own brother during a battle, and this made each battle that much more significant to each and every soldier. Much of this can be seen in soldiers’ letters to and from home and in their diaries that many kept, some throughout the entire war. “The neighbor boys are all well,” one soldier wrote, reporting back to his family at home in Iowa, showing obvious care for those from his town and neighborhood.\(^\text{13}\) The war was also fought on American soil, making it unlike any other major American war other than the American Revolution. Many of these soldiers truly were defending their homes and homeland in the literal sense. These factors made the war much different than traditional history’s boundaries claim. Campaigns, such as Vicksburg, and individual battles were much more specific to regions, and therefore were much more complex than just North versus South. During Vicksburg, the Union forces were almost exclusively from Illinois, Ohio, Wisconsin, Missouri, Michigan, Minnesota, Indiana, and of

\(^{13}\) James Giauque to Alfred Giauque, June 23, 1863, Giauque Family Papers, Civil War Collection, Special Collections Dept., University of Iowa Libraries, Iowa City, IA.
The presence of these troops underscores that Vicksburg was a much more regional, Midwestern affair. For example, Missouri was divided in two, as it had regiments in both the Union and Confederacy. This meant that some soldiers could be fighting a person or even a family member from the same town. Fighting with your brother is one thing, but fighting against him is a whole different issue. This was common throughout the war in all different regions, and this is why each campaign and each battle was so regional. In each battle, soldiers represented their specific side, but they fought for their brother or neighbor next to them and for their family and friends back home.

The importance of the soldiers’ family and homes comes across in the letters soldiers received from family and friends. Many soldiers’ would spend vast amounts of the free time they had writing home to their mothers, fathers, children, or friends. And because of this, they expected, and even needed to receive letters back, informing them of how things were on the home front. These letters many times would get a soldier through the day, especially in regard to the terrible things most of the soldiers were forced to see and experience. “I haven’t had a letter from you and Sallie for a long time,” one Iowa soldier wrote home, “I want to hear from you and Sallie the worst kind.” Family and home were incredibly important to these soldiers, and letters played a key role in getting information back and forth. The significance of home was evident in other ways. As Asahel Mann, of the 4th Iowa Cavalry said in his letter to his eventual wife Jennie, “It looks very hard to see our friends buried so far from home in a strange country.” Soldiers cared very deeply about their hometown and home state, which led to them fighting more for that hometown and state, and the family and friends they left behind. The more
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broad issues of the Civil War, such as slavery, of course played a role, but more prominently in the South. For many of these soldiers, protecting those they loved and the land they loved was the main motivator and almost always on their minds.

Soldiers also showed their allegiance to their region by their love for their commanding officers. The officer in charge of a regiment or brigade was most likely much more popular with his specific soldiers than the commander of the division or the corps, because the regimental officer was almost always from the same place as the regiment. This was much more common in the Civil War than later on, because in subsequent wars regiments were filled with soldiers and officers from all over the country. Soldiers in all wars usually are more attached to regimental commanders due to those commanders being more familiar and being with them every day, but this was even more so since the officer was also from the same area if not same town as the rest of the troops. During the Siege of Vicksburg, Iowa regiments were often ordered to march somewhere or do something, only to get to that place and be ordered to turn around and go back to where they started. Matthies’ brigade and their scouting mission, along with Hall’s brigade and their sealing off the southern approaches to Vicksburg, which were both during the second assault, illustrate this. During these times, the soldiers would often question the ability of their commanding officers (the higher up ones, such as Grant) to “make up their minds,” but would still push on, following the lead of their own brigade or regiment commander.17 In some instances, higher-up commanders were very popular with the soldiers from their home state, again showing the importance of region. General Francis J. Herron moved to Dubuque, Iowa in 1855 from Pennsylvania. He eventually joined the Union army and was commissioned captain of the 1st Iowa regiment, then rose to lieutenant colonel in the 9th Iowa for his services at Wilson’s Creek. He then rose to brigadier general after the Battle of Pea Ridge in 1862, where he was

17 Bearss, 806.
taken prisoner. After returning to the Union army, he was confirmed as major general in March of 1863 and was the youngest officer of that rank in the U.S. Army at that time. Captain Richard McAllister wrote of Herron:

Major General Herron, with two Divisions of Infantry and several batteries leaves here to-day to join your army. You know Frank Herron well. He commands some of the best troops in the west and they have unbounded confidence in him. No man here [St. Louis, where many Midwestern troops moved through] or in Iowa is so popular as Herron.18

That “unbounded” confidence that the soldiers had in Herron in part came from fighting along side of him as he rose through the ranks, but also from the knowledge that he was from their state. The lower-level commanders were more popular than their higher-up counterparts (with the only exception possibly being Grant himself) because they were from the same place, and fought side-by side with their troops. The Civil War troops could relate to these commanders on multiple levels. It is for this reason, also, that the conflict as a whole was much more regionally based from battle to battle.

The issue of region comes to light even more with the camaraderie that sometimes existed between the troops of the Union and the troops of the Confederacy. This is common in the traditional histories of the war, as the war put brother against brother and friend against friend. But many times, this camaraderie came from soldiers who were from the same area, who could not only relate to each other because of their experiences on the battlefield, but also because they were from the same region. These soldiers were fighting to protect their homes, their way of life, as well as what they believed in. However, they also knew that their enemy was doing the same thing. “The boys went down to them [the Confederate troops] and shake hands and had quite a talk,” Joseph Kohout of the 31st Iowa wrote, “They gather the Rebels are quite
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good friends.”19 Outside of the war, many of these men could surely have been, if not possibly were, “good friends”, and they recognized this. Some of this camaraderie and identification with each other could not have happened between Confederate Midwestern soldiers and Union Northeastern soldiers, for example, as they did not share as much of an understanding of each other or the very close bond of being from the same region.

The Iowa regiments’ involvement during and around the Siege of Vicksburg is just one example of events that occurred on a more broad scale throughout the entire war. Soldiers during this Vicksburg campaign, as well as during the whole war, were incredibly versatile off the battlefield, and many unheard-of soldiers and regiments were the backbone of the war itself for the vital work they did other than fighting. No one can or will ever forget those hundreds of thousands of brave men who fought and died in those horrific and deadly battles. But history too easily forgets about those men who put in the dirty work, the less glamorous and therefore less noticed work, which was the motor that kept the war going. Without the tireless efforts of these men, like the many regiments from the state of Iowa during the Vicksburg Campaign, the war could not have occurred or continued. This was also a war of regions, just as much as it was North versus South. Oftentimes, people get lost in the generic ideas surrounding the war, like slavery and uniting the country, they become blind to the importance of family and home to many of these soldiers. Overall these soldiers fought for the Union or the Confederacy, but to many of them, the “Union” or “Confederacy” represented their way of life, those they loved, and those men fighting next to them. All of these aspects, which to many seem mundane or unimportant, combined to form a vital part of the Civil War for all soldiers and should not go unnoticed, as they do in many typical popular histories.
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