



2023

Front Matter

Follow this and additional works at: <https://cupola.gettysburg.edu/ghj>



Part of the [History Commons](#)

Share feedback about the accessibility of this item.

Recommended Citation

(2023) "Front Matter," *The Gettysburg Historical Journal*: Vol. 22, Article 2.

Available at: <https://cupola.gettysburg.edu/ghj/vol22/iss1/2>

This open access front matter is brought to you by The Cupola: Scholarship at Gettysburg College. It has been accepted for inclusion by an authorized administrator of The Cupola. For more information, please contact cupola@gettysburg.edu.

Front Matter

Abstract

Front Matter of the Gettysburg Historical Journal 2023

The Gettysburg Historical Journal
Volume XXII | Spring 2023

Co-Editors-in-Chief

Jordan Cerone

Carly Jensen

Assistant Editors

Ziv Carmi

Greer Garver

Stefany Kaminski

Lillian Kreiss

Lauren Letizia

Addison Lomax

Reilly McMullan

Emily Suter

Peter Wildgruber

Department of History

Dina Lowy, Chairperson and Associate Professor

Abou B. Bamba, Associate Professor

Michael J. Birkner, Professor

William D. Bowman, Professor

Peter S. Carmichael, Professor

Jim Downs, Professor

Hannah Greenwald, Visiting Assistant Professor

Kari Greenwalt, Academic Administrative Assistant

Scott Hancock, Associate Professor

Justus Grant Hartzok, Adjunct Associate Professor

Ian Andrew Isherwood, Associate Professor

James Stephen Krysiak, Adjunct Associate Professor

Karim Samji, Associate Professor

Magdalena Sofia Sanchez, Professor

Timothy J. Shannon, Professor

Jill Ogline Titus, Associate Director of Civil War Institute

Tiffany Weaver, Adjunct Assistant Professor

Table of Contents

Letter from the Editors.....	4
Acknowledgements.....	8
Featured Piece.....	9
<i>Huelgas en el Campo: Mexican Workers, Strikes and Political Radicalism in the US Southwest, 1920-1934</i> Patrick J. Artur.....	14
<i>To Bigotry No Sanction, To Persecution No Assistance: Jews in the American Revolutionary Period</i> Ziv R. Carmi.....	54
<i>A Historical and Philosophical Comparison: Joseph de Maistre & Edmund Burke</i> Carl J. DeMarco Jr.....	86
<i>Postcolonial Museums and National Identity in Vietnam</i> Reese W. Hollister.....	110
<i>The Reintegration of the Loyalists in Post-Revolutionary America</i> Marco J. Lloyd.....	129
Author Biographies.....	153

Letter from the Editors

We are proud to present this year's twenty-second edition of *The Gettysburg Historical Journal*. Having finally overcome the Covid-19 pandemic, the editors of the journal have had the opportunity to work together and with professors in person that we did not experience in the past two years. Coming out of the pandemic invigorated and ready to work, *The Gettysburg Historical Journal* received a plethora of submissions from both Gettysburg College students and other students around the country. The works accepted this semester offer a wide range of research spanning topics from Revolutionary America to postcolonial efforts in Vietnam.

The Gettysburg Historical Journal is a student-run organization, providing undergraduate students with an opportunity to gain valuable experience in reviewing, editing, and organizing academic articles for publication. In all cases, authors and editors have also had the opportunity to apply these skills to their future careers, or their work as graduate students. With the assistance of The Cupola, Gettysburg College's online research repository, and the distinguished college faculty, our authors' work has received both serious scholarly and national attention. Past authors have even published follow-up work in refereed journals and presented their work at undergraduate and professional conferences.

The following works we have selected for this year's edition of *The Gettysburg Historical Journal* demonstrate the varied interests and abilities of undergraduate historians, as well as their dedication to examining history from different perspectives:

Patrick J. Artur's paper, "Huelgas en el Campo: Mexican Workers, Strikes and Political Radicalism in the US Southwest, 1920-1934," aims to give a summary of the struggles and efforts towards self-organization of workers of Mexican ancestry in the US Southwest during the Interwar Period, or around 1920-1934. They were in a unique context, many of them having experienced first-hand or knowing people who lived through the tumultuous events of the Mexican Revolution from 1910-1920. The class battles on melon farms in the late 1920s and early 1930s between sometimes politicized and often undocumented Mexican workers and field-owners who employed violent strike-breaking tactics, all against the backdrop of a world economic crisis, are not only of value for historians, but they are also of value for the lessons which we may extract from them, in a world where such large-scale class battles appear on the horizon.

Ziv R. Carmi's paper, "To Bigotry No Sanction, To Persecution No Assistance: Jews in the American Revolutionary Period," aims to evaluate the role of Jewish people in the conflict, contextualizing the experiences of this small minority within the larger narrative of the American Revolution and establishing their importance in the development of religious freedom in the United

States. While Jews were a small minority in the American colonies, they nonetheless participated in the American Revolution on both sides. Through the examination of these topics, this paper aims to explore the Revolutionary period from the perspective of the Jewish-American, discussing their often-overlooked experiences in this watershed period within U.S. history.

Carl J. DeMarco Jr's paper, "A Historical and Philosophical Comparison: Joseph de Maistre & Edmund Burke," aims to show that Maistre was just as influential in the development of conservatism as Burke during the Revolutionary years in Europe. Most historians have focused on the British thinker and statesman Edmund Burke, when discussing the development of Conservatism. He is often considered the "Father of Conservatism" as his principal work *Reflections on the Revolution in France* inspired generations of conservative thinkers. The paper will also demonstrate that Joseph de Maistre developed conservative thought at the same time as Burke but has received little to no credit for the influence he held, and that he was not an extremist as many historians have portrayed him to be.

Reese W. Hollister's paper, "Postcolonial Museums and National Identity in Vietnam," investigates the colonial origins of Vietnam's museum landscape, stemming from French ethnographic museums in colonial Indochina. Benedict Anderson's *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origins and Spread of Nationalism* then serves as the theoretical framework to understand

the Vietnamese nation's collective, historical memory of the French and American Wars. This paper concludes that the Vietnamese national identity is based on the shared trauma and socialist solidarity that arise from anti-colonial resistance. Museums both construct and preserve this national identity, and it leads Vietnamese nationals to imagine a community between space and time with people they may never meet.

Marco J. Lloyd's paper, "The Reintegration of the Loyalists in Post-Revolutionary America," discusses how most White Loyalists were able to successfully reintegrate into society after the American Revolution. They made their case through decisions to stay and petition for amnesty, which was helped by demonstrating that they embodied republican civic virtues and by making amends with their community. Americans were willing to accept them back into society because of republican ideals, exhaustion from the war, the desire to repair community cohesion, and the social ties that prevailed between both sides throughout the war.

Jordan Cerone and Carly Jensen

Acknowledgments

The editors of *The Gettysburg Historical Journal* would like to thank all the professors of the History Department for encouraging our majors to produce excellent work. In particular, we would like to thank Professor Timothy J. Shannon for providing guidance to the journal staff as our faculty advisor. We also express our gratitude towards Mary Elmquist, Scholarly Communications Librarian at Musselman Library, and Kari Greenwalt, Administrative Assistant of the History Department, for helping the staff prepare this year's edition for publication. Additionally, we would like to thank Ziv Carmi '23, who gave us permission to use his photography for our cover photo.

Featured Piece

This year's featured piece was written by Timothy Shannon, a professor in the History department. Professor Shannon teaches early American, Native American, and British history at Gettysburg College and serves as the faculty adviser for the *Gettysburg Historical Journal*. His research focuses on Native American-European relations in eighteenth-century North America.

1619, 1776, 2023

Timothy Shannon, Professor of History, Gettysburg College

It is an honor to be asked to write an opening essay for the 2023 edition of the *Gettysburg Historical Journal*. As faculty adviser for the journal for the past several years, I have been consistently impressed by the caliber and range of essays published in it every year and by the care with which the editors-in-chief and editorial board conduct their work. This year's edition follows in that tradition, with authors from both within and beyond Gettysburg College.

* * *

Over the past year, the media has been telling us that these are tough times for the humanities. Enrollments in undergraduate History courses have been trending downward nationally, as has

the number of undergraduate History majors and minors. The same news applies at the graduate level, with declining applications to Ph.D. programs and fewer entry-level jobs advertised in the field. These circumstances suggest a self-perpetuating cycle that could be fatal to the academic discipline: fewer undergraduate enrollments means fewer jobs in teaching, which means budget reductions for graduate programs, which means fewer professional historians . . . and so on until the whole industry gets farmed out to AI chat bots and would-be historians instead become the shabby figures muttering to themselves in the back corners of coffee shops (okay, yes, some of us are already there).

Is it really all that bad? Are the groves of academe turning into the graves of academe? I like to tell students who are interested in graduate school that there may be fewer jobs out there in coming years, but as long as there are colleges and universities, there will be History Departments. Meanwhile, out in the real world, History remains a popular endeavor. People still enjoy visiting museums and historic sites, and historical tourism is big business among domestic and international audiences. Publishers still churn out History books, and biographies of historical figures occasionally become bestsellers (and maybe even a Broadway hit). Genealogy, once the pastime of WASPy retirees in local historical societies, has democratized with the advent of Ancestry.com and

similar online research services. History, in short, remains in high demand, regardless of the struggles within higher education.

Even more comforting, History has become downright controversial. While Americans have always fought over how they interpret the past, rarely have they been as attuned to how it is taught as they are now, thanks to the emergence of Critical Race Theory (CRT) in our public discourse. Developed by legal scholars during the 1970s as a way of analyzing how racism is embedded in social institutions, CRT became a focal point of right-wing criticism of K-12 education in the early 2020s. Suddenly, people who nodded off during their own History classes back in middle and high school took a keen interest in the curricula and textbooks of their children, convinced that teachers were using the past as cover for brainwashing the rising generation with left-wing ideology.

This controversy, like so much of our contemporary politics, has sparked more heat than light, but it has thus far had some very real consequences for teachers and students. Personally, I have enjoyed the pro-History memes making the rounds on social media, such as “If studying history doesn’t make you uncomfortable, you’re not doing it right” and “If I can indoctrinate students, why can’t I get them to use an apostrophe the right way?” But when teachers strike content from their lesson plans about slavery or the Civil Rights movement because of mandates about avoiding divisive topics or unpatriotic material, the

costs of such meddling becomes obvious. History without conflict—be it political debates, protests, or war—is inherently less interesting than History with all the nasty stuff left in.

In my field of early American history, the throw down over CRT has played out in the controversy surrounding the 1619 Project, an initiative by the *New York Times* to influence how our schools teach about slavery and racism in American History courses. Published in 2019 to commemorate the 400th anniversary of the arrival of the first Africans in Jamestown, the 1619 Project immediately drew criticism about its historical accuracy and focus, but its defenders have remained committed to their interpretation of America’s origins and have expanded their work into a book and television series. In 2020, conservatives responded with the 1776 Commission, sponsored by the Trump administration to promote a more traditional History curriculum based on the veneration of the Founders and American liberty. President Biden dissolved the 1776 Commission shortly after his inauguration, and its work faded quickly thereafter. However, the ideas embodied by its proposals remain central to right-wing criticisms of our educational institutions and the historical profession. The appropriation of Revolutionary War symbols such as the Gadsden flag (“Don’t Tread on Me”) by the January 6th insurrectionists and others on the far right is one example of how our current political polarization has reshaped the meaning of our shared past.

So where does that leave us in 2023? The teaching of History in America has never been more politicized and is likely to remain so for the foreseeable future. Students in higher education are studying History less, but everyone else seems to want more of it. Perhaps this is a good sign. Controversy sparks interest much more effectively than consensus, and for that reason, our current over 1619 v. 1776 may help revitalize the study of History in our colleges and universities. Students of all ages do not like being told what to think, and the brightest ones learn early on to question the knowledge imparted by their parents, teachers, and elders. Properly taught, History should encourage skepticism, not subservience, and that is a social good in its own right.