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As the University of Colorado’s *Historical Studies Journal* marks its thirty-sixth volume this year, we close one chapter and begin another in the Journal’s life and history. The editing staff has had the opportunity to reflect back on the incredible research that has been published in the *journal* over its thirty-six years of existence as well as the numerous students and faculty who have dedicated their time and hard work to this annual project. This year, we strived to maintain the high standards and quality of this publication by featuring four spectacular products of students’ assiduous research.

The first article, Mark Alexander Ortiz’s work *Cinematic Inclusivity*, focuses on a specific genre of film, the American Western. Ortiz argues that the quality and value of the genre of Westerns has been greatly increased by diversifying their subjects to include those of ethnically diverse backgrounds. Specifically, he looks at the Spanish–Mexican presence in Westerns between the 1960s and 2006 and how those movies aid in our understanding of the diverse, complex history of the American West. Emily Whitworth’s article *An Internal War* looks at the 10th Mountain Division from a new perspective, the two wars they were fighting: the one abroad and the one at home against their own compeer. Whitworth argues that while what the 10th was able to achieve during World War II was impressive, by looking at the trials and tribulations they were facing at home their achievements become truly extraordinary. “*Feelings Engendered*” by Lindsay La Balle takes an in-depth look at the very relevant topic of Confederate statue removal with a case study of the Robert E. Lee monument in New Orleans, Louisiana. La Balle critically looks at the relevancy of the statue to the area where it sat and how its presence affected the individuals of the city who gazed upon it daily. Lastly, Matthew Taylor’s piece *The Waif and the Wife* looks at gender roles in terms of vigilantism, particularly lynching, in nineteenth century Colorado by viewing it through the lens of a particular case: the death of a child, Mary Rose Matthews, and the subsequent lynching of her adopted mother. Taylor takes the reader on a journey of discovery through this tumultuous time in history to gain a deeper understanding of gender roles, how gender was manipulated through the press and other mediums in this case, as well as how individuals justified taking justice into their own hands.

Serving as Editor of the *Journal* this year has been an honor and privilege. This volume would not have been possible without the incredible work of my assistant editors Ali, Joe, Kaleigh, TJ, and Valerie. I am so grateful for their dedicated effort to this project. A huge thank you goes to Shannon Fluckey and Kristen Morrison as well for their creative vision designing this exquisitely attractive product. This publication would not be possible without the support of the faculty of the History Department. To all of you: thank you for allowing this publication to exist and for providing the opportunity for students to showcase their hard work on an elevated level. Lastly, I would like to thank the Journal’s faculty advisor, Tom Noel. Tom has been an incredible mentor for this project and countless others. His dedication to his students is above and beyond and I am sure I am not alone in stating that Tom has influenced my academic career as well as my career in History in so many positive ways. Tom, you will be greatly missed.

Shelby Carr | Editor
CINEMATIC INCLUSIVITY:

American Westerns Pertaining to Chicanos, Hispanics, and Mexican Americans

By Mark Alexander Ortiz

The Western movie is greatly enhanced by cinematic inclusivity. The films discussed in this paper widen the aperture of the American Western. Starting in the sixteenth century and onwards the seeds of Hispano-Mestizo and Indio-Mestizo cultures and identities germinated in the Southwest that later became part of the United States of America. For example, New Mexico, California, and Texas were long territories of the Viceroyalty of New Spain (Nueva España) and, after 1821, they became part of the northwestern frontier of the Republic of Mexico. Texas became the Lone Star Republic from 1836 to 1845 before annexation by the United States. New Mexico and Upper (Alta) California were acquired by the U.S. in a war against Mexico from 1846-1848.
The border between the two countries has changed by conquest, occupation, migration, and settlement. Crossing and transcending frontiers geographically, culturally, and temporally are evident in films about Chicanos, Hispanos, and Mexican Americans in the West. A heightened awareness about Mexican Hispanics in Westerns enriches our understanding of the West. Recognition of their presence in Westerns underscores their transnational dimension on the silver screen and acknowledges that the Latino legacy is integral to the rich heritage of the United States.

In this discussion of movies I have aimed to use specific terms appropriate to the time period and in the context of the history that a film presents. In history, the contexts of the times are crucial. The usage of terms varies, and selection of them differs according to the context of time and place. Words of identification have varying meanings and connotations. My approach at times uses identifiers interchangeably; however, as needed I use them selectively. Suitable terms are applied as appropriate to the historical period and to a particular place. Not all persons of Spanish and Mexican descent agree on a particular name. Some reject generic terms such as Hispanic and/or Latino; others find one category preferable to another; while many consider either suitably acceptable as inclusive categories. There are Mexican Americans who call themselves Chicanos, yet there are those who reject the word. The term came into vogue during the late 1960s and early 1970s. Others identify as Hispano while others prefer Mexican. No pejorative connotation is implied by any term; rather it is pride in identification and application that is intended by my use of ethnic designations. Hispanic, Hispano/a, Mexicano/a, Mexican Hispanic, Mexican American, Chicano/a, Latino/a, etc., denote cultural and ethnic awareness and preferences. Persons of mixed Spanish and Indian cultural and ethnic backgrounds, mainly Mexican Americans in the American West, are the focus of several compelling Westerns.

This paper considers films about Chicanos, Hispanos, Mexicanos, and Mexican Americans in the American West from 1969 to 2006. It is not intended as a comprehensive survey of movies on the subject of Mexican-Hispanic culture in American Westerns, rather it is selectively about the Spanish-Mexican presence in films set in the American West, which is the Hispano homeland. The Western from the perspective of Hispanicity is fascinating terrain worth exploration. Hispanics have culturally patterned the region from the early 1500s onwards with their arcs of encounters, frontier crossings, and cultural convergence with indigenous peoples. American Westerns reflect an amnesia in that they have rarely been about Hispanics. Motion pictures seldom presented the West as having been inhabited by Spanish-speaking peoples for centuries before the arrival of English-speaking cowboys. Yet there are certainly some significant feature films that have situated the experiences and cultural identities of Chicanos, Hispanos, Mexicanos, and Mexican Americans in the mosaic of the American West.

THE MEXICAN BACKDROP

Crossing the border between the United States of America and los Estados Unidos Mexicanos is a suitable place to begin with a film that draws the seminal Mexican Revolution into its narrative. A controversial Western film of the late 1960s that itself crossed the border between the traditional Hollywood Western and the revisionist Western is The Wild Bunch.
(1969) directed by Sam Peckinpah. Controversy over the movie’s violent scenes detracted from the director’s attempt at a meaningful interpretation of the Mexican Revolution. The Mexican Revolution that began in 1910 intensified the movement of Mexicans northward. It had a major impact on the American West as it stimulated the human flow of as many as 100,000 Mexican nationals to the U.S. by 1914.\(^1\) The majority went to Texas; perhaps 25,000 settled around San Antonio. As the revolution continued, refugees emigrated for political reasons and for safety. Many planned to return as soon as it was expedient.\(^2\) A larger wave multiplied the immigrant Hispanic population during World War I and continued through the 1920s.

*The Wild Bunch* was filmed on location in Parras, Coahuila, Mexico. The feature begins in Texas in 1913 as the Old West is in its death throes. Death of another kind is coming with the onset of World War One. An outlaw gang (the Wild Bunch) attempts to rob a bank but are ambushed by a posse of bounty hunters that are financed by a vengeful railroad owner. The remnant of the Bunch escapes to Mexico where they make their way to the village of one of their members whose name is Ángel, who was played by Jaime Sanchez, a Puerto Rican actor. There they are hired by Mapache, a renegade general who is in the pay of the brutal usurper Victoriano Huerta, who, as President Francisco Madero’s military chief of staff, led a military coup against the constitutional government having Madero arrested and killed then in turn becoming himself president, to rob a U.S. Army shipment of guns. The Bunch carries out the action, the result of which is that American soldiers commanded by General John J. Pershing are in pursuit of them along with the bounty hunters. The outlaw gang, upon Ángel’s entreaty, siphon off a case of guns and ammunition to give to the revolutionary Villista villagers (as rebels who supported Pancho Villa, the Villistas fought against the Huertistas of the Huerta dictatorship), with the rest taken to Mapache. Mapache finds out about the gang’s duplicity. Thus as a result of their actions the Bunch has three enemies. Like the “spaghetti Westerns” of Sergio Leone (e.g., *A Fistful of Dollars, The Good, the Bad, and the Ugly, and Once Upon a Time in the West*), *The Wild Bunch* showed much gratuitous violence. A member of the gang upon killing Mapache seizes his machine gun and mows down row after row of Mexican soldiers with Mexican villagers shot in the crossfire. Following the shoot-out, the bounty hunters arrive to finish off the few straggling members of the Wild Bunch. Caught unaware, the bounty hunters are ambushed by the rebel Villistas awaiting them in the hills.

The death of the Bunch at the end of the film connotes the death of the old West, and perhaps that of the traditional Hollywood Western. Peckinpah’s revisionist Western not only subverts the notion that the mythic West is a land of beauty, opportunity, and regeneration, but it uses traditional western images and characters in new ways to critique contemporary American society and culture. Ángel, as his name implies, is a redeeming messenger of the wayward Bunch’s fate. He is the catalyst for both the destruction and the expiation of the Wild Bunch. By awakening his fellow outlaws to the moral meaning of the revolution, he serves as their conscience.\(^3\) *The Wild Bunch* idealizes Ángel and his fellow peasants as revolutionary guerrillas fighting for liberty. The film depicts downtrodden, impoverished people caught in the crossfire between corrupt government forces, rebel insurgents, American outlaws, and outsider interests who profit from the fighting. The movie shares the anti-corporate attitudes held by many Americans in the sixties. The railroad company
is ruthless in its quest for profits and dispatches unscrupulous bounty hunters into another country to do its dirty work. Corporations and governments are corrupt, and military forces serve their venal interests. The Mexican peasant nationalists who battle the corrupt Huerta regime and the encroaching American bounty hunters are the only good people. The film evokes comparisons to Vietnam and the war that was raging in Indochina in the sixties.

In the 1960s Mexican American actors lacked movie screen exposure. There were fewer Hollywood Westerns during the decade due to overexposure of the genre in television series as well as diminished audience interest in them on movie screens. Moreover, the director of Italian Westerns Sergio Leone hired many bronzed Italians and Spaniards for parts in his pictures. By the late sixties, more Westerns were being made in Italy than in America. Another reason for the paucity of Mexican American actors in Hollywood was that in non-Western films at the time, Hispanic characters were often played by non-Hispanic actors such as Guy Williams who played Zorro. The World War II Hispanic hero Marine Private, Guy Gabaldon, who helped capture over 1,000 Japanese soldiers during the battles of Saipan and Tinian, was played by Jeffrey Hunter in *Hell to Eternity* (1960). Studios made paltry efforts recruiting, developing, or mentoring Mexican American actors and actresses. Neglect combined with latent racism and stereotyping impeded or squandered talent and thereby limited possibilities for stardom.

**OPPRESSION OF WORKING CLASS HISPANOS IN NEW MEXICO**

During the filming of *Salt of the Earth* (1954), Mexican actress Rosenda Revueltas was deported to Mexico by the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS). She was effectively barred from re-entry into the U.S. and blacklisted for her work on the film. The picture’s writer, director, and producer were members of the Blacklisted Hollywood Ten who had set up a separate production company to have the film made as they were banned in Hollywood at the time. These blacklisted filmmakers were prohibited from making movies because of their leftist leanings. The film, which depicted feminist activism during a year long zinc miners’ strike in Bayard, New Mexico in 1951, fell victim to excessive censorship. It was in 1951 that the House Un-American Activities Committee (HUAC) intensified its efforts to flush out alleged communists from Hollywood. McCarthyism unleashed
a wave of Hollywood censorship. *Salt of the Earth* has the distinction as the only U.S. film to nearly be banned from public audience viewing in the U.S. because of its pro-labor social message during the dark political age of the 1950s Red Scare. In an abuse of power the U.S. government sought to prevent the cinematic message of resistance by Hispano workers and their families. Against the odds, the film was made and shown in thirteen U.S. theaters, but it was smeared in dogmatic “red” paint by the federal government. The politics surrounding the production and release of the film revealed federal efforts to stymie worker dissent and to compel minorities to knuckle under to corporate interests. The film was shown in Europe to popular acclaim for its realism in depicting workers, many of them Hispano/a locals battling for rights and dignity. The film was re-discovered in the sixties. Over time, though, it became a cinematic obscurity in labor history. Incidentally, in the latter sixties, a Hispanic actress named Jo Raquel Tejada, whose father was Bolivian, became Raquel Welch. Starring in the 1966 films *One Million Years B.C.* and *Fantastic Voyage*, and in the 1968 Western *Bandolero!* And in *100 Rifles* in 1969, she became a celebrity sex symbol in American cinema at the time. It could only happen in Hollywood.

**EL MOVIMIENTO**

In the late 1960s and the 1970s, Chicanos pressed for social change. Although it is often a generational marker for many who came of age during the 1960s and 1970s, the term Chicano has been embraced by those who share in the political and educational ideas of the movement. Gains were made mainly in education, and demands for opportunity and equity accelerated. *El movimiento* (the Chicano/Mexican American civil rights movement) of the 1960s and 1970s continued to achieve incremental improvements in educational, economic, and social mobility. *El movimiento* had begun in reaction to Anglo discrimination; from its beginnings it demanded civil rights and equality of opportunity in a more pluralistic American society.

There was a gradual move from early protests against denial of civil rights to advocacy of a militant cultural nationalism that spoke of a separate national identity and a lost land of Aztlán in the American Southwest. Aztlán was the Edenic place of origin of the Mexica (Aztecs). Thus as some Chicanos claim descent from the Mexica, they view themselves as indigenous to the Southwest by ancestry, derivation, and inhabitation. The image of the Aztec homeland blended into a Native American one applied to the Southwest. Spanish explorers had sought to locate Aztlán in their explorations of the region. The Chicano image of the Southwest was grounded on the belief that Chicano ancestry originated with the initial *Indio* and subsequent Spanish and mestizo settlements in Aztlán. Features of origin, ancestry, discovery, exploration, migration, settlement, frontier outposts, borderlands of the descendants of Indio, Hispanic, and Mestizo inhabitants reinforced the image of the Southwest as the Chicano homeland. The linkage of Chicanos to southwestern Native Americans, whom the Spanish and Mexicans encountered and intermixed with, lent credibility to their indigenous identity and connection to the Southwest – their ancestral and contemporary homeland. Insufficient incremental reform in their homeland therefore did not suffice as Mexican American students demanded – what became a favorite expression of the movement – Chicano power. Focusing on ethnicity, self-identity, and activism,
student groups such as United Mexican American Students (UMAS), the Mexican American Youth Association (MAYA), the Mexican American Student Confederation (MASC), and Mexican American Student Association (MASA) used the idea of Chicanismo to interpret the Mexican American experience in terms of cultural awareness and pride as well as militant ethos of resistance to assimilation. According to the 1969 El Plan de Santa Barbara: A Chicano Plan for Higher Education, “Chicanismo reflects self-respect and pride in one's ethnic and cultural background...[T]he Chicano acts with confidence and with a range of alternatives in the political world.”12 Significantly, evidence of Chicanismo is revealed in The First Wave Chicano cinema that chronicled el movimiento as the genesis of Chicano cinema, culture, and the establishment of a training ground where Chicano filmmakers honed their cinematic skills. The assertive documentary impulse that precipitated the First Wave filmmaking, for example, the 1969 film Yo Soy Joaquín (I Am Joaquín) based on Rodolfo “Corky” Gonzales’ epic poem, stressed an ethno-national and separatist identity.

THE ETHNIC CONTESTATION OF HISPANIC CHARACTERIZATIONS DURING THE 1970S

As for commercial movies, the seventies saw the gradual decline of the spaghetti Western with its caricature banditos and cantineras (bar girls or camp followers). To the end, the genre retained its cliché of the Mexican as the vulgarian in hackneyed films such as: Two Mules for Sister Sara (1970), Valdez is Coming (1971), Adiós Sabata (1971), Return of Sabata (1972), Duck, You Sucker (1972), and The Revengers (1972). As these movies of the early 1970s had Mexican desperados as part of the Western setting, it is noticeable that the parts were, by and large, not played by Hispanics, but instead by actors such as Yul Brynner, Tony Musante, Telly Savalas, John Saxon, and Burt Lancaster.

The Second Wave Chicano cinema dates from 1977–1978 with Robert Young’s Alambrista! (The Illegal) and Jesús Salvador Treviño’s Raíces de Sangre (Roots of Blood), respectively. The Second Wave manifests social consciousness and expressions of resilience and resistance.13 Young made his directorial debut with Alambrista! The film’s story is that the birth of an additional child convinces Roberto, a young Mexican from Michoacán, that his family needs more than he can earn on a small farm. He crosses illegally into the United States. Each employment opportunity in the U.S. ultimately evolves into disappointment and despair due to the exploitative practices of the Alambrista’s employers.14 The movie follows Roberto on his illegal journey to Stockton, California where he discovers it is hardly the land of opportunity he anticipated. A theme in the history of the American West is that it is a place of opportunity and a new start, but the possibility of improved circumstances requires tremendous sacrifice and extraordinary tenacity. Roberto learns from another Mexican worker, Joe, who knows the ropes; for example, how to march into a café with confidence and order a “gringo’s breakfast” — ham and eggs and coffee, not tortillas y frijoles (beans). The film shows that the illegal farm worker can expect exploitation in America. Even though he does unwanted labor most Americans refuse to do, he will not be respected for it and will remain an unwelcome intruder on the run from the la migra (slang term for U.S. Immigration law enforcement). Roberto is shuttled here and there by sheer fate of the draw, and it is a slim draw indeed in this cinéma vérité presentation.
In the 1970s, Mexican immigration had not yet become the dominant concern of political and social discourse in the media. Young’s perceptive film inspired filmmakers and films such Gregory Nava who directed *El Norte* (1984) and Chris Weitz who directed *A Better Life* (2011). Both films explore the undocumented workers who come to the American West, particularly to California – “the Golden State” – from Guatemala and Mexico, respectively. From the decade of the 1970s, *Alambrista!* is a neorealist picture and a valuable depiction of migrant labor that has had a major impact on the American West.

Another ground breaking 1970s film pertaining to Chicanos is *Boulevard Nights* (1979) directed by Michael Pressman and starring Richard Yniguez. The movie was shot almost entirely in barrios of East Los Angeles, utilizing an almost all-Chicano film cast. *Boulevard Nights* presents an unvarnished look at East Los Angeles street gangs. The story concentrates on a hard-working Chicano youth, Raymond, who tries to resist the allure of street gangs in East Los Angeles. Raymond’s brother, Chuco, is less successful as he finds a sense of belonging by joining a gang. Raymond attempts to build himself a future, but that is thrown into jeopardy when gang war erupts. *Boulevard Nights* was the beginning of the Chicano “gang genre” film. It was followed by *Zoot Suit* (1981), *American Me* (1992), *Blood In, Blood Out* (1993), *Mi Vida Loca* (1993), and, to a certain extent, *End of Watch* (2012). Ethnic youth gang oriented movies undoubtedly have an allure. They were briefly popular in the 1970s, e.g., *TheWanderers* (1979) and *The Warriors* (1979). A critically acclaimed ethnic film about violence-prone youth was Martin Scorsese’s *Mean Streets* (1973) set in New York’s Little Italy. What *Boulevard Nights* overlooks is that the history of the Chicano youth movement is not primarily associated with street gangs. Instead, it emerged from the East Los Angeles high school walkouts and the numerous efforts of community organizations to promote education.
as a priority issue. *Boulevard Nights* also neglects the role of what is involved in repairing the damage done by gangs to the social fabric of a given community.

Gang violence in *Boulevard Nights* is presented as a reality of the characters’ lives. To label *Boulevard Nights* simply as a gang picture because its milieu is set in the streets of East L.A. does it a disservice. The main criticism leveled at the picture was not directed at the film’s efforts to bring the lives of “barrio boys” to the screen but rather at the fact that Hollywood rarely made films about Chicanos/Hispanics. When it infrequently did, it focused on stereotypical characteristics such as gang fights rather than positive qualities associated with chronicling the contributions of Mexican American police officers or Chicano attorneys or Hispanic teachers. In time the film *Stand and Deliver* (1988) did address the latter in its depiction of Bolivian teacher Jaime Escalante who taught at Garfield High School in East Los Angeles. A movie about the culture of an ethnic group that dwells on violence and crime is often criticized. Seeking to alter negative or even racist perceptions regarding Hispanics, the Chicano organization Nosotros (We/Us) contended that *Boulevard Nights* fell short by missing an opportunity to further emphasize alternative positive role models of hard working educated Hispanics.¹⁶

**THE GREAT CONTRAST IN THE TREATMENT OF NEW IMAGES OF THE CHICANO/HISPANIC DURING THE 1980S**

In the late seventies the Coors Brewing Corporation located in Golden, Colorado designated the 1980s as the “Decade of the Hispanic.”¹⁷ The 1980s at last saw the acknowledgement by Hollywood of the rapidly growing and viable Hispanic market. Filmmakers of the decade resurrected, reconstructed, and reclaimed Hispanic history. A rapidly growing population, particularly in California and Texas, had to be cultivated. With this realization Latino images grew in prominence in the mass communications media. Perhaps this was due in part to the Reagan administration’s focus on Central America with its interventions in Nicaragua, Guatemala, and El Salvador, and, by the late 1980s on South America, particularly Colombia. Maybe the sudden and “benevolent” interest in Latinos was sparked by the specter of revolution and insurgency with the backdrop of the Cold War that emerged in the forefront of inter-American relations. Just as in the sixties and early seventies, when Vietnam and Cambodia were on the minds of many Americans, Central America became a locus of attention in the U.S. during the 1980s. Perhaps the Cold War in Central America and the Caribbean had a cultural impact. The Chicano/Hispanic image was depicted more in an emerging body of work classified as Chicano/Hispanic films. Yet in the 1980s, the so-called “Decade of the Hispanic,” public funding sources, which had been the mainstay of Chicano-produced films, were reduced by the Reagan administration.¹⁸

Hollywood” was by no means guaranteed. It was, after all, in California in 1986 that an “English Is the Official Language” -- Proposition 63 was passed. Also, in the 1980s, Mexicans were accused of “stealing jobs,” and Congress passed the Immigration Reform and Control Act (IRCA), known as Simpson-Mazzoli, it was signed into law by President Ronald Reagan in 1986. The legislation sought to reform and re-assess the status of unauthorized immigrants. There would be a path to citizenship for existing undocumented immigrants coupled with tighter border enforcement. The reform did not work. The law was supposed to end illegal immigration into the U.S.; instead, the opposite occurred. The number of unauthorized immigrants living in the country soared from an estimated five million in 1986 to over 11 million in 2013. In exchange for amnesty for three million undocumented immigrants, the law aimed to secure the U.S.-Mexico border against illegal crossings. Lax enforcement measures failed to prevent border-crossings, but mainly what was unforeseen in the bill was the accelerated demand for immigrant labor in the United States. Employers wanted more workers in the years ahead. Given the high demand for labor, the end result was a boom in undocumented immigration.

Historically northern New Mexico was populated by Hispanics whose settlement and residency traced back to the sixteenth century. They are not recent immigrants. A film that depicts them is The Milagro Beanfield War, a pet project of actor Robert Redford. It emerged as a highly popular “Hispanic movie.” Beginning in the fictional small town of Milagro, New Mexico where local water is a premium resource, an obtrusive developer has plans to establish a glitzy resort and posh housing development that will siphon off the water from the crop fields and eventually displace the local residents. The developer and his business and political associates remain secure in their belief that they can expand their development
without effective resistance from the locals. No one could foresee though that handyman, Joe Mondragon, during a burst of anger, would accidentally break a water valve to a hidden sluice of a privatized water supply, and thereby provide water for his beanfield. In deciding to plant and irrigate his beanfield, Mondragon inadvertently sets off a small-scale water-rights war between farmers and developers. According to the law he has improperly and illegally diverted water from a main irrigation channel onto his own modest plot of land wherein he decides to start up a beanfield by irrigating it with the water earmarked for the developers. In *The Milagro Beanfield War* Mondragon’s simple act ultimately unifies the people of Milagro into an army of locals fighting to preserve their lifestyle and presence in the valley. The robber barons and the pork-barrelers fight back with everything they got; but Joe will not be broken.22 *The Milagro Beanfield War* is an engaging picture of rural life in *nuevomexicano*, and the struggle to preserve traditional Hispano ways in the face of Anglo intrusion. The movie was filmed is Truchas in northern New Mexico. Many of the town’s residents are in the film.

The town of Milagro draws from local traditions of magic realism. Though *milagro* means miracle in Spanish, the town does not seem to have a prayer against the powers-that-be. Most everyone there is not paying attention to the land-grabbing developers, except for Ruby Archuelta, a mechanic who owns Ruby’s Body Shop and Pipe Queen. She suspects that the state government is in league with the developers, and she tries without initial success to mobilize her neighbors. Joe Mondragon’s actions change the situation. *The Milagro Beanfield War* is a grass roots modern Western with real spirit figuratively and one literally, the ghost of Coyote Angel plays his faint concertina at times when it seems that the people do not have a ghost of a chance to stop the developers.23 Though the story has a quasi-mystical fable-like quality, it is built around weighty environmental issues concerning land and water access, the the preservation of cultural heritage, and the rights of citizens versus the might of money.

*The Milagro Beanfield War* is Redford’s endearing adaptation of John Nichols’s 1974 novel about New Mexican townsfolk defending their rights. In his second directoral effort, Redford celebrates the triumph of community over exploitation. He presents a conservationist message in the film. As the developers’ giant tractors tear up trees from Mother Earth, Redford cuts away to the tranquility of Mondragon’s nascent but growing beanfield. Redford’s ode to the traditions of the land turns into an indictment of outside power brokers intent on pushing their way around. It is also a story of how a man’s decision to cultivate his land that is coveted by developers, leads to a standoff between local Hispano townspeople and outside capitalist Anglo barons. Milagro, though quirky, is an archetypal small southwestern town, with mesquite instead of maples, adobe bricks instead of red bricks, and piñon and junipers rather than birch and elm. Unfortunately, Milagro is dying. As Ruby wonders, “What good is a home town if everyone you know is gone?” Yet for the moment in that particular time and place, a small act of defiance stirs up a handful of activists in the affected town, notably Archuleta, who recruits dropped out radical Anglo attorney and newspaper editor, Charley Bloom, to start to rally around the cause. They are eventually joined by many Hispano townspeople, farmers, and shepherders who rally to Mondragon’s beanfield. Their resilience
and resistance activated, the residents of the valley reclaim an identity with the land and thereby resurrect Milagro bringing to it salvation and redemption.

*The Ballad of Gregorio Cortez* was one of the first films to celebrate a historical Mexican American hero, sadly missing in Hollywood’s history of the American West. Unfortunately, it is also missing from discussion in historical works about Western movies, e.g., *Westerns: Films through History* (2001), *Hollywood’s West: The American Frontier in Film* (2005), and *The Sagebrush Trail: Western Movies and Twentieth-Century America* (2015). Directed by Robert M. Young, the movie is based on a *corrido* “The Ballad of Gregorio Cortez.” Set in 1901, the film tells the true story of Gregorio Cortez, a Mexican American tenant farmer living close to San Antonio, Texas. Based on a false accusation that Cortez had stolen a horse, he and his younger brother, Romaldo, were approached by an Anglo sheriff and his deputy, who speaks rudimentary Spanish, at best. Both of the Cortez brothers neither understood nor spoke English. The situation is susceptible to a tragic cultural and linguistic misunderstanding. The lawmen sought information from Gregorio Cortez about the sale of an allegedly stolen horse. They did not know that in Spanish there is a distinction between *caballo* (male horse/stallion) and *yegua* (female horse/mare). Cortez responded to their inquiry claiming that he had not traded a horse, making a distinction that it was not *un caballo* that he traded, rather it was *una yegua*. Sheriff Morris asks his deputy for a translation of Cortez’ response to his question. He informs him that Cortez is not going to tell him; however, that was not the case as Cortez had, but he made a distinction that it was not *un caballo* rather it was *una yegua*, but it is a word that the deputy does not understand and assumes has no relevance to the inquiry. He acts as if he comprehends concluding that Cortez is not compliant in responding the question. When he informs the sheriff that Cortez is unwilling to give him the answer about how he acquired a horse, Sheriff Morris assumes Cortez is being deceitful and decides to arrest him commanding his deputy to tell him that he is under arrest. Romaldo panics, gets in the way between his brother and Morris, which appears threatening to the sheriff. Morris shoots him and Gregorio responds by shooting and killing the sheriff in self-defense. Fearing for his life, the deputy hastily rides off. Cortez also escapes heading for the Mexican border. Cortez eluded pursuit by a large posse for ten days and some 500 miles in what was one of the largest manhunts in both Texas and U.S. history. He decided to turn himself in when he learned that his family had been imprisoned.

Cortez’ story represents misperceptions between Anglo Americans and Mexican Americans in southern Texas. Cortez became a folk hero to Mexicans and Mexican
Americans in the early 1900s. Racial enmity among Anglos toward Cortez provoked violence against Mexican American communities in southern Texas counties. In its binary opposition the southern Texas political environment precipitated social banditry. According to historian Robert J. Rosenbaum, “Mexicano social bandits ran the gamut from men like Gregorio Cortez... to hard-bitten killers and robbers who gained renown and community approval because they usually attacked Anglos.” Cortez was nearly lynched. A series of trials, lasting four years, followed his capture during which the Texas-Mexican (Tejano) population made Cortez a folk hero. An all-Anglo jury convicted Cortez, who was pardoned in 1913. Corridos immortalized Cortez and his opposition to los gringos. Such corridos developed along the border attesting to his resistance against Anglo injustice.

The film poster for The Ballad of Gregorio Cortez reads: “The true story of one man who made a difference. The crime, a simple misunderstanding. The pursuit, an American saga. The legacy, a triumph of spirit. The man, Gregorio Cortez.” Vilification or adulation aside, The Ballad of Gregorio Cortez is about an ordinary man, an American Joe as well as a Mexican José, that life dealt an unfair hand to and, worse, a low blow in a tragic confrontation not only for Gregorio, but for his brother and for Sheriff Morris. Neither Romaldo Cortez nor Sheriff Morris, two relatively young men, had to die in June of 1901, but did because nuance was lost in translation. Young presents Gregorio Cortez not as a romanticized hero, but as an ordinary man facing extraordinary and harrowing circumstances. Cortez resolutely dealt with life’s calamities, challenges, and sorrows. Particular scenes exemplify his plight. In one, the fugitive Cortez encounters a solitary Anglo cowboy. The cowboy, eager to dispel his loneliness, welcomes Cortez to share his fireside dinner with him. Famished and tired from fleeing from Texas Rangers, Cortez is heartened by the Anglo stranger who is kind to him. Though they share a moment in time and place they cannot have a conversation with the other nor dispel one another’s loneliness because they cannot communicate in the other’s language. The cowboy finally has someone to talk to and he does so in a monologue knowing that Cortez does not understand a word he is saying. Cortez realizes that the cowboy wants company, but that he cannot have a conversation with him. They are at a frontier divided by a linguistic border. In a poignant scene he offers the cowboy his knife as a gesture of appreciation. Though the cowboy appreciates the offer, he refuses to accept it trying to make Cortez understand that he should keep it. This memorable scene from the movie is an emblematic one as it shows two isolated men of the American West who come from distinct ethnic backgrounds, and who are strangers, yet they find themselves meeting trying to overcome a linguistic and cultural divide, respectably interacting close yet so far apart in the American West.

The Ballad of Gregorio Cortez reveals the “intrusive border,” namely the political apparatus, instituted after the Mexican War by Anglo authorities in the Southwest to police native Tejanos. The motion picture is a Western as early scenes depict a posse on horseback chasing after a “desperado.” As a revisionist Western the film reveals the West as contested space. As a major trope in Anglo culture, the train functions as a figurative border between the two cultures. Given the role of railroads as a powerful transformative technology that facilitated the expansion of capitalism and Anglo American dominance of the West, trains serve as a symbol of Anglo supremacy. The corrido is a trope for Mexicanos because lyrics became a regionally indigenous form of narrative resistance to that supremacy.
Cortez broke new ground in its depiction of the American West. Its cinemative inclusivity of an alternative perspective and a Tejano reality widened the aperture of the Western.

Jesus Salvador Treviño’s Seguín (1981), made for the Public Broadcasting Service (PBS), documents the Mexican side of the 1836 Texas insurrection. Seguín tells the story of Juan Nepomuceno Seguín, whose father, Juan José Maria Erasmo Seguín, had supported Stephen Austin’s efforts in 1821 to bring in the first Anglo settlers into the Mexican state of Coahuila y Tejas. In return for generous land grants at nominal cost, the settlers were supposed to incorporate themselves into the framework of laws and culture of the Mexican Republic. By 1836, Anglos outnumbered Mexicans in Texas. “Where others send invading armies,” warned Mexican secretary of state Lucas Alamán, in a suggestive precursor to the contemporary immigration debate in the U.S., “[the Americans] send their colonists...Texas will be lost for this Republic if adequate measures to save it are not taken.”

When General Antonio López de Santa Anna seized power in Mexico City in 1833, one of his first acts was to abolish the exemption from taxes and antislavery laws that prior Mexican governments had granted the Texans, providing them in essence the excuse they needed to break from Mexico City’s “tyranny.” Siding with the immigrants, Seguín fought against Santa Anna who led a Mexican army into Texas to squash the rebellion.

The Texas War of Independence with its legendary Battle of the Alamo in 1836 has a potent resonance of American nationalism and Texan patriotism. This question about how teachers impart this historical national identity to students is depicted in a scene where argumentative parents confront a high school teacher and principal in Lone Star (1996). Directed by John Sayles, it is significant movie about the modern American West. In the contemporary West public education can be a battleground of emotional issues related to history. In a scene of a hot and heavy teachers-and-parents meeting held at the local high school agitated Anglo American and Mexican American parents argue about the meaning of the Alamo and the Texas war for independence. A teacher, Pilar Cruz, is taking some heat from an Anglo mom that served on the textbook committee, who claims that, “she’s got everything switched around in her version, changing who did what to who.” An Anglo father charges faculty members at the meeting for calling their version, history; but he calls it propaganda.
Cruz tells the parents that she is “trying to get across some of the complexity of our situation here – in cultures coming together in both negative and positive ways.” A Chicano reporter contends that “the men who founded Texas broke from Mexico because they needed slavery to be legal to make a fortune in the cotton business.” He defends his opinion as just adding a little historical perspective. The Anglo mom asserts that “they are just tearing everything down. Tearing down our heritage and tearing down the memory of the people who fought and died for this land.” To which a Chicano father responds, “We fought and died for this land, too.” The principal adds that he thinks “it would be best not to put things in terms of winners and losers.” Another teacher chimes in, “We’re trying to present a more complete picture.” A parent responds, “And that’s what’s got to stop.” A teacher replies, “There’s enough ignorance in the world without us encouraging it in the classroom.” Taking it personally, the Anglo mother retorts, “Now who are you calling ignorant? A Chicano father asks, “We’re not going to get a resolution on this?” The principal wearily asks if they would like to form another committee. In their argument about whose view of Texas history is right, people are committed to what story should be told, how it should be told, who has rights to their story and how it will conveyed, and, ultimately, what version should prevail.

A more complete picture can perhaps feel threatening to some. For example, for 183 years, the Alamo’s siege has been a part of American history and mythology. Its martyrred defenders, among them Davy Crockett and Jim Bowie, have been immortalized as American and Texan heroes despite the fact that they openly defended slavery and usurped the rights of others, and that technically they were supposed to have become citizens of Mexico when they immigrated to the Mexican state. In rebelling they sought the citizenship of the Lone Star Republic. Bowie was a slave trader, and Crockett and Sam Houston were both veterans of Andrew Jackson’s grisly victory over the Creeks at the Battle of Horseshoe Bend (1814). Moreover, they shared Old Hickory’s racist and expansionist views toward Latin America. The film also recounts that there were Mexicano-Tejano defenders at the Alamo. Seguín was elected mayor of San Antonio, but the disenfranchisement of the Mexican population, the flourishing institution of slavery, and overt racism caused him deep disillusionment. Further, after Texas had gained its independence a continuous flow of Anglo migration into the republic reduced Tejanos to a minority of the population, and they lost the few prominent political positions that the pro-American elite like Seguín had once held. The political system favored the privileges of Anglo Americans. Texas Mexicans who had fought for Texas independence, like Seguín, were disenfranchised. In the Mexican War (1846–1848), Seguín sided with Mexico, and for many years thereafter, he resided in Mexico. Eventually he was granted a pardon by the U.S. government and returned to San Antonio. A town in Texas is named in his honor. Seguín was the first film about the Alamo and the 1836 Texas insurrection/revolt/revolution made in the U.S. that presented the alternative sides of the conflict, e.g., the Mexican and the Mexican Texans who either joined with the Anglos or opposed them in their rebellion. As Treviño claimed, “We’re not distorting history. This is history that until now only a few historians were aware of. Seguín and his family were likely among the first people to experience the dual nature of bicultural realities. Their conflicts and lives are prototypical of what Latinos in the U.S. face.” He contended, “My approach has been to go for the opportunities that exist within the system and try to make the best of them, at
times changing them, subverting them...” It seems probable that Seguín reflected on his actions that in fighting against the Santa Anna dictaroship and for an independent Texas Republic that he had inadvertently made it a place for those who discriminated against Tejanos. Treviño’s film is critical of the racism that excluded Tejanos from partaking in the nascent transformation of sociopolitical relations in Texas on the basis of equality.

The breakthrough Chicano film set in the modern American West broke through when Luis Valdez wrote and directed *Zoot Suit* (1981). The film presents relatively recent Chicano history set in Los Angeles – the Sleepy Lagoon murder mystery case of 1942 and the Zoot Suit Riots of the following year. According to Valdez, “History has different levels... from the personal to the cosmic...” He observed that, “We’re entering a period of... patriotic self-expression. I hope *Zoot Suit* will be a reaffirmation of America as a mix of many peoples.” The movie certainly was, as a mix of Anglo Americans, Irish Americans, African Americans, Mexican Americans, Chinese Americans, Jewish Americans, pachucos, sailors, leftists, right-wingers, etc. comprised the complex whole.

*Zoot Suit* recounts the events surrounding the “Sleepy Lagoon Case” when members of the 38th Street gang were tried and wrongfully convicted of murder. The prosecution in the murder trial put the Mexican American community on trial by portraying Mexicans...
as criminals, hoodlums, and gangsters, etc. When the jury convicted most of the defendants on a variety of charges, the Hispanic community was outraged and raised a defense. The pinup icon of World War II military personnel and arguably the most glamorous Hollywood screen star of the 1940s Margarita Carmen Cansino, famously known as Rita Hayworth, helped to raise money for the defendants through the Citizens’ Committee for the Defense of Mexican American Youth. Although higher courts later reversed the convictions and censured prejudicial conduct by the judge, the immediate result was increased racial tensions in the streets. In the summer of 1943, riots began in Los Angeles following a fight between sailors and pachucos (Mexican American youth perceived to be members of street gangs). The newspapers built up a sensationalist narrative of Mexicans and Chicanos as barrio Indians and violence-prone Aztec-types fascinated with bloodletting. The night after the initial confrontation, hundreds of servicemen invaded the East Los Angeles barrio and attacked pachucos and zooters. Servicemen made no distinction between zoot-suiters and gang members, and identified all Mexican Americans as un-American foreigners. The “Zoot Suit Riots” lasted a week. Dozens of pachucos and zooters were arrested. Between June 3rd and 13th of 1943, several thousand servicemen joined local Anglo civilians to attack the zoot-suiters. Whites were intent on humiliating and roughing up their victims. As such, they moved at will through the Mexican American community stripping and beating-up zooters. While these developments were transpiring, thousands of Mexican American servicemen, like Guy Gabaldon in Saipan, were fighting bravely and dying in a war against racism, fascism, and militarism. Many Hispanics were awarded service medals of valor including seventeen Medal of Honor recipients and 140 Distinguished Service Crosses. Mexico contributed fighting power to the Allied war effort allowing its nationals to join the U.S. military, and being one of two Latin American countries that sent troops to fight overseas during the war. It was ironic that while Anglos and Latinos were fighting side by side in the armed forces, military personnel roamed the streets of L.A. seeking out and attacking Mexican American zoot-suiters.

Urban vato street youth were distinguished by dress (zoot suits), ducktail haircuts and pompadours, and stylized affectations. Their appearance, which targeted them for state persecution, also made them symbols of marginalization and victimization. The conflict in Los Angeles became virtually an undeclared war on young Chicanos by roving bands of unrestrained servicemen. The conflict reached a peak on June 7th, when fleets of taxis filled with sailors cruised the streets of L.A. seeking victims. Time Magazine later called the Los Angeles violence “the ugliest brand of mob action since the Chinese coolie race riots of the 1870s.” Many zooters were assaulted and had their clothes ripped off. Zoot Suit contains a scene wherein the younger brother (his “carnal”) of the main character, Hank Reyna, is assaulted and stripped by sailors and marines.

The Zoot Suit riot revealed polarization between two youth groups within wartime American society: the gangs of predominately Mexican American youths who were at the forefront of the zoot-suit subculture, and the predominately white American servicemen stationed along the Pacific coast. The riots invariably had racial overtones, but the primary issue seems to have been patriotism and social attitudes toward war. In March of 1942, the War Production Board’s first rationing act had a direct effect on the manufacture of
suits. The Board’s regulations effectively forbade the manufacture of zoot-suits. However, the demand for them did not decline and a network of bootleg tailors based in Los Angeles and New York City continued to manufacture the garments. Thus the polarization between servicemen and *pachucos* was immediately visible. The chino shirt and khaki pants were uniforms viewed as American and patriotic, whereas the zoot-suit was viewed as odd, foreign, defiant, and unpatriotic; a deliberate public way of flouting the regulations of rationing. The zoot-suit was a social scandal in the eyes of the authorities and of servicemen because it snubbed the laws of rationing.46 In Los Angeles, the Mexican American “zoot-suiters” bore the brunt of this racial and cultural animosity. The city’s newspapers contributed to the hostility by exaggerating crime and juvenile delinquency among Mexican Americans. Then the police attacked them. Finally, the federal government intervened to quell the disturbances. The zoot-suited *pachucos* defied mainstream society by wearing the distinctive dress clothes style associated with their ethnic identity that was in vogue at the time. The zoot suit held social and cultural relevance as an emblem of ethnicity and as a way of asserting identity for many Mexican American youths as the stylized film that is fun to watch *Zoot Suit* reveals.

Cuban American Ramón Menéndez’ *Stand and Deliver*, released one year after the successes of *Born in East L.A.* and *La Bamba* in 1987, focuses on the important matter of education. It tells the true-life story of Bolivian-born Jaime Escalante, a math teacher at Garfield High School, in inner-city East Los Angeles. When he arrived at the school it was beset with a spiraling drop-out rate, drugs and gangs, and at the point of losing its accreditation.47 In 1982, he took a group of unmotivated students whose mathematical skills were problematic. He proceeded to badger, humor, and inspire them. As played by Edward James Olmos, Escalante told his students the fundamental requirement for achievement: “*Se Necesitan ganas*” – “You need desire.” He galvanized his students, encouraged them to take pride in themselves, and showed them how to earn it. Eighteen of his transmogrified students took the advanced placement (A.P.) calculus examination. All of them passed it, and six obtained perfect scores.48 However, the Educational Testing Service amazed at the results cried “foul,” and suspected cheating. The students were compelled to retake
the examination. When they did, they scored even higher. They had risen to the occasion; yet one wonders about the probability that the students’ scores would not have been questioned had they not all come from Garfield High School in East L.A.—with predominately Spanish surnames. Was institutional racism perhaps at play? *Stand and Deliver* is an inspirational story. The film was a commercial and critical success. It attracted attention to Hispanics and their education, heretofore nonexistent in films. Set in the contemporary West, *Stand and Deliver* stresses virtues associated with the American West: initiative, steadfastness, optimism, self-esteem, determination, and desire. With its emphasis on Chicano education, *Stand and Deliver* was overdue.

**CHICANO STUDENTS’ RESISTANCE AND PROTEST DEPICTED IN FILM**

In March 1968, Chicano students in East Los Angeles demonstrating against injustices staged a historic walkout in their high schools to protest academic prejudice and dire school conditions. The origin of Chicano movement can be traced to the walkouts when some 20,000 teenagers took to the streets. Directed by Edward James Olmos, *Walkout* (2006) reveals student resistance and rebellion against discrimination. Aided by a progressive young teacher, Sal Castro, Paula Crisostomo and a group of Chicano/a activists remonstrated against bureaucrats, public opinion, the police, and some teachers by asserting themselves expressing their dissent against oppression. Youth came together in the multi-school walkout that became part of the rising Chicano movement. The youth-led movement was inspired by the free speech movement that began in 1964 at the University of California, Berkeley, the civil rights movement, and what César Chávez and Dolores Huerta were doing to organize farm labor in the fields by the United Farm Workers (UFW). Students
insisted on implementation of a curriculum that included Latin American history, and the elimination of janitorial work as punishment. The walkouts were planned and carried out as peacefully but an overzealous and aggressive police force beat and arrested students. An outraged community was awakened and a struggle for justice was born.

School curriculum had largely ignored or denied Mexican American history. Additionally, Chicano students were steered away from college by counselors and school officials and toward manual labor. Overall, as Carlos Muñoz, Jr. argues in his book Youths, Identity, Power: The Chicano Movement (1989), “Youth protest led to the creation of student movements that helped to shape larger struggles for social and political equality.” During the first National Chicano Youth Liberation Conference that was held in Denver, Colorado in March 1969, activist Rodolfo “Corky” Gonzales, who had established the Crusade for Justice as the vanguard of the rapidly growing Chicano Power Movement, called for students and youth to play a revolutionary role in the movement. Resolutions as adopted by the conference were put together in a document entitled El Plan Espiritual de Aztlán or The Spiritual Plan of Aztlán which emphasized that “Chicano studies programs were needed to teach Chicanos their history and culture.”

Some of the students who participated in the walkouts went on to careers in politics, academia, and the arts. One of them was Antonio Villaraigosa, who served as mayor of Los Angeles from 2005-2013. Another was award winning Moctesuma Esparza, who produced The Ballad of Gregorio Cortez, The Milagro Beanfield War, Selena, and Walkout. In recalling that time, Esparza commented, “There was a feeling we could change the world. That’s what protected and motivated us.”

In protesting against anti-Mexican American educational bias and deficient educational conditions, the walkouts were acts of resistance in order to gain rights. There was a walkout of a group of some 150 students on March 19, 1969 at Denver West High School. Once outside, adult activists led by Corky Gonzales joined the student protestors. The students and adult civil-rights leaders who joined them on the steps of the school were met by helmeted police officers, a barrage of tear gas, and handcuffs. Holding a bullhorn, Gonzales tried to lead the protesters off school grounds and across the street to Sunken Garden Park when fifteen Denver police officers began hitting people with billy clubs and shoved others to the ground. The confrontation between protesters and police sparked a series of neighborhood protests in the days that followed. Overall, the Chicano student movement grew as dozens of organizations appeared on high school, college, and university campuses, including United Mexican American Students (UMAS) at the University of Colorado at Denver (CU Denver).
The Chicano movement produced visible changes, dramatically increasing Latino college enrollment by nearly 25 percent two years after the 1968 protest. Admission to higher education was a major achievement of the Chicanos’ struggle for justice and social equality. *El Movimiento Estudiantil Chicoano de Aztlán* (MEChA) was one of the most important student organizations of the 1960s and 1970s to address the issue of education. In a discussion of MEChA by the Chicano Coordinating Council on Higher Education, 1969, a call was made for tying student groups throughout the Southwest into a vibrant and responsive network of activists. Moreover, colleges and universities were called upon to be responsible and responsive to the communities in which they are located or whose members they served. Thus attempts must be made to take the university to the barrio, and the barrio must be brought to the campus. Higher education should not exist in an aura of infallibility. In Colorado, a MEChA chapter emerged at Metropolitan State College (MSC) campus. At the Denver and Boulder campuses of the University of Colorado, UMAS remained adamant that it would not change its name to MEChA despite strong advocacy from Gonzales and the Crusade for Justice. Essentially, *Walkout* recovers and reconstructs a contentious time in its depiction of student activism, social rebellion, resistance, civil rights advocacy, and dissent. In so doing it resurfaces, reconstructs, and reclaims Chicano history.

In a depiction of the modern West on film, John Sayles rewrote the typical Western story to highlight the intersections among racial, ethnic, and social groups, and placed it along the Rio Grande in a fictional Texas border town named Frontera. Sayles contends, “My feeling, basically, is that I’ve made a lot of movies about American culture and, as far as I’m concerned, it is not revisionism to include Mexican American culture. If you’re talking about the history of the U.S., you’re always talking about those things, from the get-go.” Sayles’s *Lone Star* (1996) is an example of *la frontera* in film. He strives to represent the West as a place of complexity and convergence, where people are individuals more than types, and where Mexican Americans, Anglo Americans, African Americans, American Indians, and soldiers and civilians are living intersecting lives. Ultimately, Sayles represents the history of the West as a dynamic process, one in which personal history is intermixed with and often-in conflict with “official” history. Frontera is a place where history, myth, identity, diversity, conflict, and coexistence intersect. Set in the present day
West, *Lone Star* embodies the crossing of intercultural borders and borders of time. The film’s story is about how people try to live together at this moment in the American West. *Lone Star* demonstrates the way the past haunts the present in the American West. The imbricated past before us that is shown on the movie screen metaphorically speaking is similar to a burrito that overfolds past with present with plenty of mixed content inside. As a modern Western it is about a frontier town and a society linked to its past as it from it. Chicanos, whites, blacks, and Indians, e.g., Kickapoo, view the past in different and often conflicting ways. Sayles’s central theme that history is a collection of highly subjective appraisals is evident throughout the film. Though racial tensions remain in the Texas town there is nonetheless a sense of a working and interrelating American community that is realized in Frontera, and, by extension, the contemporary United States. *Lone Star* is a richly textured, multidimensional, and an engrossing modern American Western.

**CINEMATIC INCLUSIVITY IN THE AMERICAN WESTERN**

The American West is a multifaceted blend of cultural interactions and interwoven strands of historical story lines that cross and intersect borders of place and time. Films form a tapestry that reveal the arcs of encounters and the intercultural character of the American West. They have situated the Chicano/Hispano presence specifically in New Mexico, California, and Texas. *The Wild Bunch, Salt of the Earth, The Alambrista!, Boulevard Nights, The Milagro Beanfield War, The Ballad of Gregorio Cortez, Seguin, Zoot Suit, Stand and Deliver, Walkout,* and *Lone Star* reveal that the Chicano, Hispano, Mexican American, and Mexicano experiences are integral to the cultural mosaic of the West. The stories and identities depicted in these movies widen the aperture of Westerns. Assuredly an understanding of the American West and an appreciation for the Western genre are enhanced by cinematic inclusivity.
On a crisp September day in 1942, Gerry Cunningham and his new wife, Ann, camped alongside the Hudson River in Upstate New York. Their camping trip was a celebration of their marriage, and as an avid outdoorsman, Gerry could think of no better way to spend a week with his new bride. Unbeknownst to Gerry and Ann, their honeymoon was soon to be cut short by Uncle Sam. Gerry’s father hastily trekked alongside the flooded Hudson, looking for his son and daughter-in-law, with a piece of paper in tow. Titled “Order to Report for Induction,” the letter addressed to Gerry contained general orders of when and where to report to duty, and a friendly reminder that the United States Army would seek him out if he decide to refuse their invitation. Gerry Cunningham was one of millions of American men to be drafted into the Second World War, but only one of a few thousand to be drafted into a special ski patrol unit deemed “The 10th Mountain Division.” Cunningham’s utter dismay at being pulled from his upscale East Coast life was shared by many new members of the division, and the bitterness towards the “higher-ups” who recruited him lasted longer than the war itself.
The United States Military operates in a structured and standardized fashion. As each branch represents a cog in what is called the greatest fighting force in the world, one skipped beat or slipped disk is, at the very least, unacceptable. Even during blatant pandemonium that engulfed the globe during the Second World War, the U.S. Army was a factory for cookie-cutter “perfect” soldiers. That being said, the 10th Mountain Division’s origins are traced by historical evidence back to a boozy conversation shared amongst friends around a campfire in Manchester, Vermont. At no other time in modern American military history has a division arisen out of such antithetical characteristics than with America’s first and only ski troops.

The formation of “The 10th Mountain Division”\(^1\) seems similar to that of other military divisions during the Second World War. Men from all regions of the nation were either recruited or conscripted into service, sent away to boot camp, and rapidly sent into war’s deadly grasp. Naturally some men became disgruntled at the thought of going to war, but a majority of soldiers saw it as their patriotic duty. From both volunteers and draftees, various first-hand accounts tell of pride and patriotism during the interwar years. Even in personal letters sent from the frontline war was romanticized by the men who fought in it. A desperate desire to return home safely united officers and infantrymen in a kind of a brotherhood in most cases.

The men of the 10th were vastly different from other conscripted men at the time. Educationally, most possessed four year degrees. Economically, average incomes far out-paced their military brethren. These variances are due to a number of determining factors. For the first time in American military history, the 10th was recruited and formed by an all civilian core. Regular men with no military experience oversaw the drafting of the first ever military mountain ski division because of their excellent skiing skills. Knowing that only men of wealth could afford frequent ski trips, the civilian recruiters looked to the “blue bloods” of the East Coast for draftees. Ivy League college students, country club ski team members, and distinguished mountaineers were amongst the ranks of the 10th. Ironically, many of their future commanders were men from rural areas that had worked their way up the military hierarchy to officer positions. Peter Shelton discusses this reverse composition in his book on the 10th: “The reality was, Army higher-ups knew nothing about mountain and skiing. They needed help - and they knew it.”\(^2\) Lacking college educations, but possessing the traditional Army swagger, these officers were determined to teach the Ivy-Leaguers their place in the United States Army infrastructure.

The most common scholarly portrayals of the 10th Mountain Division follow in suit of other historians who write about the Second World War. Often called the last “just war,” where the innately good met the inevitably evil on the battlefield, it is difficult to find articles that aren’t soaked in red, white and blue patriotism by their Nationalistic authors. “Many of these men seem now to have been endowed with the best qualities in the American character,” writes one author, “individualism and cooperation, independence and entrepreneurship, inventiveness and a need for freedom.”\(^3\) Academic articles and books alike are laden with similar sentiments and they fail to paint a complete picture of America’s first ski troops.

It is true that the men of the 10th were heroically exceptional, but it is also true that they faced intense internal strife that had the potential to destroy the unit from the inside. Conflict between enlisted men and officers was constant and many soldiers simply took it
upon themselves to command their unit. Analyzing new letters and oral histories, it is now evident that the men of the 10th were fighting two different wars: one against the Axis powers, and one against their very own comrades. Both proved to have deadly consequences.

This article focuses on a facet of war and “The Greatest Generation” that is often times overlooked, overshadowed by the dominance of the United States in post-war America. To truly understand the stories of their heroism and unmatched patriotism, one must understand the destruction, devastation, and animosity that existed amongst the men of these divisions, and inside the 10th Mountain Division in particular. Unfit living conditions at Camp Hale, a deadly maritime exercise known as D-Series, and continuous discontent between enlisted men and officers, challenged the men of the 10th long before their descent on the Italian mountainside. When viewing the unit from an internal perspective, their success on the Mediterranean Front of war becomes even more impressive.

AN UGLY START TO AN UGLY WAR

Camp Hale, Colorado became the headquarters for the 10th Mountain Division in the winter of 1942. Previously just an open area situated between Red Cliff and Leadville in the Eagle River Valley, engineers were given mere months to construct a military base large enough to house over 10,000 men. One short summer and 30 million dollars later, Camp Hale was complete, standing in stark contrast to the splendor of the mountains. White barracks were aligned straight as a pin, and an unknowing bystander could confuse the base for a small prison had it not been for the American flag hanging high overhead. The next step was the recruitment of men to fill the makeshift, cabin-style barracks, a task that hung over Camp Hale for almost a year.

The civilian ski patrol that acted as a catalyst for the 10th was also responsible for filling its ranks. Minnie Dole, the main advocate for an American ski patrol unit, scoured the nation for the best and brightest men. Mere weeks into his recruitment work, he found his ambition for a ski troop division to be widely unpopular amongst the college educated men he was seeking out. On top of that, the infamous attacks on Pearl Harbor made Dole’s job that much more arduous as information about military training exercises and/or maneuvers was ardently censored. Dole could barely send recruitment letters out, let alone advertise his 10th Mountain Division to the rest of the country. In the coldest months of 1942, only a small portion of the twin bunk beds at Camp Hale were accounted for. It is only fitting of the 10th Mountain Division to have addressed this issue in the theatrical, lights-out manner in which they did.

Enter a man named John Jay. Born in upstate New York to an incredibly wealthy, aristocratic family, it was believed he would become Supreme Court Justice like his great-great-great grandfather. Jay was groomed in finance and statesmanship his entire life. Only in a story like this would a man of Jay’s pedigree become a movie producing, self-proclaimed ski bum. Traveling from country to country, Jay became the original mind behind the romanticism of skiing in America. His first film Ski Here, Señor (filmed in the Chilean Mountains) was used as the 10th’s most prominent recruiting tool in their formative years. Robert Woody, a future 10th Mountain Division member, saw Jay’s film when he was only 16: “romance, the imagery of climbing and skiing, became part of my mindset,”
Woody recalled. “The romance is what got me into it, not noble thoughts about saving the world for democracy.”6 This sentiment was not isolated to John Woody. At the 10th’s 1992 reunion, W. John Tyler admits he and his buddies thought “all we had to do at Camp Hale was go skiing during the day and drink beer at night by the fireplace.”7 It would take less than a day at Camp Hale for the men to realize their perceptions far differed from one of John Jay’s cinematic works.

As would be expected of a town created in under three months, a plethora of issues surrounding Camp Hale arose between 1943 and 1945. The location of the camp alone posed immense problems for the men of the 10th Mountain Division. Centered in a deep valley rift, the smoke from large locomotives and camp fires hung in the air like a dark cloud. Twenty-four hours a day, seven days a week, soot riddled clouds filled the sky and soldier’s lungs. The poor air quality coupled with slow acclimation to the high altitude wreaked havoc on the men’s health, filling the camp infirmary with thousands of cases of Scarlet Fever and Tuberculosis.8 Soldiers began referring to the constant sickness as “Pando-heck,” named after Camp Hale’s sobriquet, Pando. Jay Fairvalley was one of many soldiers who couldn’t decide which was worse - Camp Hale or the Italian Mountainside. “Soot would just cover over the valley,” recalled Farivalley, “and then you would go to the hospital and it would cover that too.”9 Walled up in the infirmary during the same period in which Fairvalley was admitted laid Gerry Cunningham. In a letter written to his sweetheart back home, Gerry frequently referred to Camp Hale as uncivilized, and “nothing like he had pictured.” Gerry’s letters were sent from the infirmary on base. Struggling to overcome the Scarlet Fever he had contracted, Gerry was miserable. “Yes, I’m still in the clink, and maybe if I stay in long enough I’ll get a sick leave.”10 Cunningham did not care in what state he was sent home, just so long as it happened. Fairvalley, Cunningham, and thousands of others were rendered temporary casualties of war before even firing their weapons.

The situation at Camp Hale was intense in such a distinct fashion that it became an anomaly amongst other Army training posts during the Second World War. While all Army recruits were expected to push themselves to the utmost extremes, the unforeseeable environmental factors in Pando only added to the misery that the 10th Mountain Division faced before deploying overseas. While the men suffered greatly in the deep valley that camp sat in, not one man could predict the future that faced them at 11,700 feet in the surrounding mountains.
CONFUSION, CONFLICT, CONTENTION
— THE HOLY TRINITY OF DISASTER

When Gerry Cunningham fully recovered from his bout with Scarlet Fever he was immediately sent back to his unit at base camp. While the higher ups were still ironing out the paperwork portion of the division, anxious men sat idle in the mountains of Colorado. Cunningham was severely displeased with his life in the United States Army and at Camp Hale. Ripped away from his new wife, his letters were riddled with complaints and fatigue over the Army's lack of efficiency. “This is not the place for me sweetheart,” wrote Gerry, “I’ve got to do something constructive, and I’d like just one instructor who wouldn’t change his mind every other day.” Like many soldiers, Gerry was caught in the whirlwind of confusion that played out to be the 10th Mountain Division Ski Troops. Newly formed and often in disarray, the division was expected to entertain themselves until order were given at very short notice. It became clear to Gerry and soldiers alike that the traditional Army organizational structure would not be present for their time in the service. To make matters worse in an already tense situation, the soldiers that weren’t sick (or had recovered from their illness) were simply bored. Day in and day out consisted of the same training maneuvers and the same lessons, which many found inferior to their intellect. On January 15, 1943, Gerry, still exasperated by life at Camp Hale, wrote again to his sweetheart. Referencing his unit in the 10th Mountain Division, the letter reads, “Besides the 87th is not what you think it is - it’s the same great army that is fighting for our country but I’m ashamed to admit that the training we have received and are likely to continue to receive is a scandal.” It was as if the officers of the 10th had intercepted Gerry’s letter and decided to prove him wrong, because shortly after, a training maneuver dubbed “Homestake” was in the works.
Operation Homestake (now called the Homestake Fiasco) was created more out of a panicked necessity than it was out of intellectual planning. With the threat of Japan or Germany invading the U.S. mainland defunct, it became clear that the 10th would be better utilized offensively in the Mediterranean Theatre of War than as a defensive unit on the Homefront. Lamentably, the 10th had no training in offensive maneuvers of any kind. Officers of the division began to sense the shift in the 10th’s supposed purpose and sank into an all-out panic. In an effort to alleviate their stresses, Homestake was created to weed out the weak and to train the men who survived its danger.

In late February of 1943, an entire platoon of men headed to the top of Tennessee Pass. There, they would camp out at Homestake Lake. Temperatures were at times 30 degrees below zero, and Army equipment was not suited for the harsh climate. Tent material was non-insulated, and the condensation from men breathing inside of them created a snow-like effect. Canvas tents were ice cold and the men inside of them froze, far too often to death. Nature’s elements were absolutely unavoidable. Frostbite and altitude sickness plagued the “green” soldiers, and many were sent back to the infirmary before training’s end. Wilson Profit was a fresh-faced soldier in the 10th, and Homestake was his wake-up call to the realities of being a ski soldier. Profit reminisced about his experience at Homestake Lake at the 10th’s reunion in 1992: “Our tents froze up and we abandoned them. [To stay warm] we would dig our own ‘graves,’ holes with pine needles in the bottom.” Profit laughed about this memory in his interview, but was emphatic that it was anything but funny actually living through it.

The lack of preparation and experience dangled in the air alongside the fatal locomotive smog. Hundreds of troops sent out on the maneuver lacked even basic skiing skills, and hundreds more had never camped a day in their life. Looking to their officers for instruction only reenforced what they already knew - no one knew exactly what to do. While historically the Army approached training with a trial by fire method, the rugged terrain of Cooper Mountain far outmatched this ideology. Officers who had never even seen skis were in charge of men who had skied their entire lives, and their began to be the question of who was actually in charge of the 10th. After the disaster that was Homestake, desperation amongst the platoon demanded that solid leadership take hold.
THE HIERARCHY TURNED UPSIDE DOWN

The history of the relationships between officers and enlisted men is as old and complex as the military itself, and the strict division between the two types of soldier stretch across social, economic, and cultural boundaries. As early as the Civil War, the Army prided itself on groomed, well educated officers. World class academies in the United States like West Point and The Virginia Military Institute housed some of the world’s finest Colonels, Lieutenants, and Generals. In his book Northern Character, Kanisorn Wongsrichanalai fleshes out this unique hierarchy, focusing on college educated New Englanders. Dubbed “New Brahmins” of the Civil War, these men possessed an innate sense of nationalistic pride and presumptuous character. Universities such as Harvard, Yale, Bowdoin, and Williams provided (and still provide) young men with classical educations that shaped them as both men and military leaders.

For centuries, these “New Brahmin” men led their unit in times of war. In most accounts of the Second World War, enlisted men viewed their Commanding Officer through seraphic lenses, knowing that their fate largely depended upon him. The structure (or lack thereof) in the 10th Mountain Division created a far different sense of authority. Officers looked to enlisted men for assistance with skiing and mountaineering protocol which was contrary from the status quo. Their “East Coast” educations coupled with advanced outdoor skills put them leaps and bounds above their ranked superiors. This reversed hierarchy added an extra unique quality to the already uncommon 10th Mountain Division.

An instance where this odd power structure reared its ugly head was during the 10th’s infamous D-Series. In an attempt to make up for Operation Homestake, a different set of Army officers thought it time for another large exercise. D-Series was the first wide-sweeping tactical maneuver in the Colorado Mountains, differing from Homestake in that it was actual battle simulation. Wilson Profit remembered D-Series as his moment of “growing up,” when the young boy that he was “forced” to become a man. Stuck in their “old-school,” blue blood methods, the officers refused to learn from their mistakes in Homestake. Soldiers were yet again ill equipped, skiing equipment was rudimentary, and a massive storm struck the mountain ranges. Frostbite and hypothermia beleaguered the enlisted men. Hundreds of mules were utilized to haul equipment up and down the mountainside. During the historic storm of D-Series maneuvers, many of these mules (and boxes of equipment) were abandoned.
and higher-ups alike, lacking the empathy that the U.S. military had for officers. Hundreds of pack mules were abandoned high in the peaks, with the snow reaching breast height in under 24 hours. Copious amounts of equipment was thrown out to lighten the pack-out loads, and men deserted their cumbersome skis in order to walk back to camp. Tired of living through the same events with little to no change, the enlisted men took it upon themselves to alter their situation.

Gerry Cunningham was a participant of the D-Series maneuvers, and recalled the tension that existed between himself and certain officers. Men frequently disobeyed their commanding officer’s orders, not out of angst, but in an attempt to survive. In a later letter sent to his wife, Cunningham explained how he and his officers’ opinions on surviving the treacherous D-Series varied. He then drew an example of how the men were taught to measure trajectory lengths, and proceeded to explain how his method would have been far superior than that of his officers’. Instances like this were common. Men who had spent the last four years of their lives in elite institutions, recreationally skiing on holiday, were now property of the United States, a nation that had no time for personal preferences. Whether it was due to ego or a true hatred of the monotony, men of the 10th had significantly more conflict amongst themselves and their superiors than other mobilized military divisions of the Second World War.

While their story on the Homefront is vastly different than that of their counterparts, the events that played out overseas during battle began to fit the typical narrative of the Second World War. During the disastrous training maneuvers at Camp Hale, the men fought every urge they had to turn their backs on one another. Over 5,000 miles away from home, each other was all that they had. In the throes of battle, many officers relinquished their control (swallowed their pride) and allowed the more experienced men of the division to make judgment calls. After months at war with the Axis powers, the titles of Officer and Infantryman did not matter as much as they previously had. The man next to you was not your superior or vice-versa, he simply became your brother. At their reunion years after the war’s end, almost every single man of the 10th recalled the type of brotherhood that existed amongst the division after the war, attributing their loyalty to the uniqueness of the unit itself. An officer of the 10th, William Boddington reflected on the equality amongst the men during their time spent overseas: “We became equal…we carried the same equipment and often times skied behind the enlisted men.” Dire and desperate circumstances leveled the playing field for the men, and rankings became a trivial afterthought.
The success of the 10th Mountain Division in the Mediterranean Theater of War is now widely known, with books, movies, and documentaries on the division flooding mainstream media. Despite being the first and only wintertime ski troops in American military history, the 10th was rare from its very origins around that small campfire in Vermont. As trite as it may sound, to truly appreciate the success that these men had overseas, it is crucial to understand the many pitfalls and obstacles they faced before even deploying. Routinely breaking the cookie-cutter mold that the U.S. Army cultivated over hundreds of years, the 10th stamped their own place in America’s memory with decisive military victories and a self-pride that could only be found in a ski troop. The phrase “Semper Avanti,” or Always Forward in Latin, was coined as the 10th’s motto in 1941. Whether moving forward through unbearable living conditions, continuous strife with one’s peers, or a deadly war that seemed to ceaselessly drag on, the men of the 10th Mountain Division took the unusual and used it to their advantage. And within that idiosyncrasy lies their true success.
DON'T BUY! Where you can't work FIRST CLASS.
“FEELINGS ENGENDERED:”
Heritage, White Supremacy, and the Robert E. Lee Monument

By Lindsay La Balle

LEE CIRCLE

It is amazing the things we remember and forget from our childhoods. Born and raised in New Orleans, I must have viewed the Robert E. Lee Monument hundreds of times, whizzing around Lee Circle in my mother’s ‘eighty-one Buick LeSabre station wagon (complete with faux-wood paneling) as she hastily accomplished her weekly errands. As “Lee” was, coincidently, my mother’s first name, my sister and I would remark—unimaginatively, and every week—that we were passing, in fact, “Mom’s Circle,” which drew a polite, yet fatigued laugh from the helm. The implications of the monument never entered into my mind. Robert E. Lee was of no significance to me, and I disregarded the statue into the mental heap of sightings not understood to which most young children relegate the Dead White Men of History.

An American historian with specialties in gender, sexuality, and race, Lindsay La Balle holds a Bachelor of History degree with Honors from the University of Colorado Denver and is a recipient of the LGBT Colorado History Project Scholarship. Inspired by Dr. Tom Noel’s Heritage Tourism course, Lindsay, a Louisiana Creole, wrote this essay to explore further the complex and controversial arguments surrounding Confederate monuments in the context of the heritage and history of her hometown of New Orleans.

Lindsay is currently pursuing a Master of Political Science degree at UC Denver with a focus in Queer Theory. Her current work continues her study of gender and race in American society with ethnographic research in human trafficking and artificially-intelligent beings, focusing on the tensions between patriarchy and feminism and the relationship between slavery and the mechanization of labor.

Lindsay dedicates this publication to her mother, Lee Eila Stelly La Balle (1948-2015).
When Mayor Mitch Landrieu announced in 2015 that New Orleans was removing the Robert E. Lee statue, he had my full support. As a New Orleans Creole, Confederate statues do not elicit a sense of pride or heritage for me, and I was pleased that the Lee statue would be relocated. Two years later, in an intriguing discussion as an undergraduate in a History course at University of Colorado Denver, I was surprised to discover that I was in the minority. The group—graduate students of History—argued for Confederate monuments to stand to preserve memory and history, and compared them to memorials, such as Auschwitz. Intrigued, I realized that my position was based on a facile understanding of the Robert E. Lee Monument, and I welcomed the opportunity to educate my opinion on an issue that was very close to home. What is the history of the monument? What is the significance of Robert E. Lee to New Orleans? And, most importantly, is the Robert E. Lee Monument an appropriate and accurate representation of New Orleans heritage deserving of preservation?

A CREOLE SOCIETY

Founded as a French settlement in 1699, New Orleans achieved its status as the booming metropolis for which it is known during the Spanish Colonial Era, 1762-1802. In the spirit of Spanish colonization, New Orleans was a Creole society—a community of mixed ethnicities including European French and Spanish, First Nation Indian, African, and Mexican and Cuban Criollo, to name a few. Testaments to the inclusive nature of Colonial New Orleans appear in its icons, laws, and customs. One of the most celebrated and beloved figures of New Orleans History, Franciscan priest Antonio de Sedella (affectionately known as Père Antoine,) welcomed people of all races and ethnicities into his Catholic congregation, including the famed Voodoo Priestess Marie Laveau, a free person of color.
Laws were updated from the harsh Code Noir of the French occupation to recognize the servant class as human beings with basic rights: slaves could own property, keep earnings, and inherit; slaves could invoke coartación (the custom of negotiating legal contracts for buying their freedom); active assessments and enforcement of laws, along with a judicial forum to hear slave cases, protected against slave abuses; and owners could free their slaves without permission from the courts. Unlike other slave societies in which the condition of slavery was irrevocable, inherited, and innate, under Spanish Colonial rule, New Orleans experienced a more indentured-servitude approach to slavery, willing to integrate anyone into its society, regardless of origin or socioeconomic status. Slaves “could speak in their ancestral languages and play their drums; they had a past. With the right of self-purchase, they had a future. Enslaved people in English-speaking America were not permitted to have either one.” In the heart of the city, just a short walk south from the Vieux Carré, was Tivoli Circle, a place of amusement and hospitality. “There is an assembly held every Sunday evening at the bayou...where all the beauty of the country concentrates, without any regard to birth, wealth, or colour...I went to Tivoli and danced in a very brilliant assembly of ladies. The Spanish women excel in the waltz, and the French in cotillions. (Thomas Ashe, 1806).” New Orleans was a multicultural hub of reverie for all, and visitors marveled at its merriment and inclusivity.

When the United States incorporated New Orleans as part of the Louisiana Purchase in 1803, an influx of White slave owners infiltrated the diverse Creole society, and the cultures clashed. “When the Americans took over New Orleans in the early Nineteenth Century, there were conflicts and competitions between new Anglo-Saxon American settlers and the Creoles.” Protestant sentiments of divine right to subjugate the “Negro race” conflicted with the inclusive nature of colonial New Orleanian Catholicism. American slave owners and White supremacists attributed slavery to paternalism, as noted in retrospect by a Louisiana historian in 1895: “The institution of slavery, viewed under its most humanitarian aspect, had become one of the pillars of our prosperity and progress, fostered by a spirit of benevolence and patriarchal affection.” The supremacists asserted that Whites had saved the Negro race from savagery through exposure to Christianity, and, had they not intervened by subjecting Negros into perpetual servitude, the race would have gone extinct. American attitudes toward race and slavery took hold, and “by 1850, New Orleans was the South’s largest slave-trading center.” A power struggle engulfed Antebellum New Orleans, which battled to maintain its Creole heritage amid a wave of White supremacy.

**PATERFAMILIAS**

New Orleans’ participation in the Confederacy was brief. To preserve the institution of slavery in its plantation economy, Louisiana adopted the Ordinance of Secession on January 1, 1861, and the Republic of Louisiana joined the Confederacy on March 21st of that year. One month later, New Orleans surrendered to the Union. “New Orleans was the first Confederate city captured and occupied by Union troops. On April 26, 1861, Farragut and his marines raised the U.S. flag over the New Orleans Mint. Three days later he marched to city hall to take formal possession of the city.” As swiftly as it devolved, New Orleans was freed from White-supremacist control.
The reclaiming of New Orleans served as a significant coup for the Union. Stymying acquisition and distribution of supplies, Union control of New Orleans was a crushing blow to the Confederacy. New Orleans also operated as a microcosm to try new federal policies. The Louisiana Constitution abolished slavery in May 1864. “Experimental practices in Louisiana shaped presidential policy, influenced congressional legislation, and became heated points of debate...Occupied by Union forces early in the Civil War, New Orleans was the first Confederate city to undergo...Reconstruction. The Crescent City also served as a prime testing ground for race relations under the new order.”

New Orleans became a model for the American struggle between freedom and diversity and the subversion into fundamentalism and racism.

Amid the progress achieved through Union control and Reconstruction in New Orleans, the element of White supremacy continued to solidify, embittered by loss and invalidation. The Louisiana Code Noir, rewritten in 1866, discriminated against free Blacks with broad “vagrancy” laws enabling members of the Black community to be arrested for the most minor of infractions. In the fashion of the Ku Klux Klan (KKK,) the Knights of the White Camellia, a secret society dedicated to “defending white supremacy,” organized in New Orleans in 1867. Emerging from a misplaced sense of righteous indignation, the “The Lost Cause of the Confederacy” (coined from Historian Edward A. Pollard’s 1866 book, *The Lost Cause: A New Southern History of the War of the Confederates*) deified Confederate efforts in the Civil War as heroic and divinely ordained.

Slavery in the South was “really the mildest in the world,” he insisted, and “did not rest on acts of debasement and disenfranchisement, but elevated the African, and was in the interest of human improvement.” Pollard went on: “The South had an element in its society—a landed gentry—which the North envied, and for which its substitute was a coarse ostentatious aristocracy that smelt of the trade, and that, however it cleansed itself and aped the elegance of the South, and packed its houses with fine furniture, could never entirely subdue a sneaking sense of its inferiority.”

Once federal troops withdrew in April 1877, officially ending Reconstruction in New Orleans, White supremacists seized the opportunity to fill the power vacuum, and the “The Lost Cause of the Confederacy” pervaded society for the next decade. The U.S. Circuit
Court upheld New Orleans’ petition for the right to segregate schools in 1879. Post-Civil-War Historians infused historical records with arguments of Negro inferiority and White benevolence. Historian Henry C. Castellanos, in his 1895 book, *New Orleans As It Was: Episodes of Louisiana*, states: “Slavery was a social device...The system was patriarchal in character, not essentially tyrannical. The master was not unlike ‘pater familias’ of the Roman Commonwealth, but more restricted in power and domination,” and, “Without entering into any discussion on the abstract right and injustice of keeping in bondage a class of people, manifestly designed by the Creator to be ‘drawers of water and hewers of wood,’ it is obvious that the form of servitude under which they lived, regarded from the standpoint of practical philanthropy, was a vast improvement on their original condition.” White supremacists controlled post-Reconstruction New Orleans, suppressing its Creole culture.

**EIGHTY-FIVE FEET**

In one of the most puzzling and hotly-debated decisions in New Orleans history, this faction of White supremacists insisted upon celebrating the memory of Confederate General Robert E. Lee and did so in the form of a statue raised sixty feet in the heart of a beloved Creole social center. “The Robert E. Lee statue at Lee Circle was erected in 1884 in honor of Robert E. Lee, the Confederate General for the Army of Northern Virginia, at the site formerly known as ‘Tivoli Circle.’ Despite the fact that Lee has no significant ties to New Orleans, this monument was commissioned by The Robert E. Lee Monumental Association of New Orleans.” Fundraising for the statue began shortly after Lee’s death in 1870, and, by 1876, The Robert E. Lee Monumental Association had raised nearly $40,000 (the equivalent of about $900,000 by 2016 standards) from wealthy White supremacists. In July 1877, a New Orleans City Ordinance granted guardianship of the public area of Tivoli Circle to the Lee Monumental Association to improve the grounds and plan supports for the pending monument, and for the future tasks of maintaining the monument “to the memory of Robert E. Lee,” for a period of five years. After nearly a decade of construction, “the sixteen-and-a-half foot statue of Robert E. Lee,” perched upon an eight-foot base, “was unveiled atop a sixty-foot Doric column at Lee Circle” on February 2, 1884. In March, the City Council issued an ordinance awarding $1,000 (~$28,000 2016-equivalent) for the improvement of Tivoli, now called “Lee Circle.” Despite Lee being Virginian, having never fought or won a battle in New Orleans, and New Orleans’ minute and unremarkable stint as a Confederate city, the White-supremacist-run Robert E. Lee Monumental Association organized significant funding, private and municipal, to erect an eighty-five-foot monument in his honor.
RESISTANCE

As in many areas of the Jim Crow South, New Orleans experienced civil unrest as warring factions of White supremacy and civil rights movements contended for control of the city. In January 1950, racial tensions erupted around the mayoral race. “The white supremacist candidate for mayor, A. A. Cobb, along with a sympathetic crowd, demonstrated in the city against Mayor Morrison’s gift of the ‘keys to the city’ to a black, Dr. Ralph J. Bunche.”24 [a founder of the United Nations] The next day, “the New Orleans clergy made a unified plea to the city’s voters to reject bigotry when casting their votes in the mayoral election.”25 Two days later, “Mayor Morrison was re-elected with a record black vote supporting him.”26 Despite the outspokenness of White supremacists, Morrison was re-elected as mayor six times. The struggle continued after the announcement of Brown v. Board of Education.

Immediately following the May 1954 United States Supreme Court decision, a new organization was founded in New Orleans,...the White Citizens Council,...composed of relatively few, but extremely rabid white supremacists...The segregationists resurrected every fearful and despicable Negro stereotype in their efforts to influence the minds of white parents. Using every medium at their disposal, they pictured Negros as lazy and shiftless, mentally inferior, dirty, immoral, criminal, diseased, violent, savage, ‘pushy and uppity,’ conspicuous and boisterous in their behavior, and under the influence of communist-inspired leaders.27

Despite these sentiments, New Orleans continued toward an integrated, inclusive community, true to its heritage. In May 1958, New Orleans removed all signage reading “for colored patrons only” from its transit system. In 1960, the United States Circuit Court ordered the New Orleans school board to cooperate with integration, which had stymied due to White supremacist groups’ 1959 proposal to fund White students in private schools. Governor James "Jimmie" Davis, a member of the White Citizens Council, ordered state officials to take legal control of the state schools to prevent integration. Due to the hostility of White supremacy, New Orleans’ business and tourism suffered a severe decline. However, integration for the 1961 school year was without incident, and the Archbishop of the New Orleans diocese excommunicated three Catholics who attempted to oppose his order to integrate the Catholic schools.28 A 1961 report to the United States Commission on Civil Rights in Washington D.C. by the Louisiana State Advisory Committee recognized New Orleans leadership for its diversity. “As in
any other metropolis, leadership in New Orleans is diverse. The ‘leadership class’ is composed of every significant element of the city’s population.” However, the report also noted a leadership oversight:

Perhaps the most serious blunder made by white leaders in New Orleans is that they have failed to utilize the knowledge, wisdom, and insight of established Negro leaders in their attempt to achieve some orderly pattern in the public education controversy. At no time have the city or state officials sought the advice or counsel of informed Negro leaders, despite the fact that on numerous occasions Negro leaders have volunteered their services.

Incidences of Black protest, White conspiracy, and intervention by the federal government sustained the New Orleans 1960s.

Violence between New Orleans Police and the Black Panthers of the Desire neighborhood erupted in the early 1970s. The police, embroiled in bribery and illegal gambling scandals, invaded the Desire district and intimidated the Black Panthers with arrests, beatings, rape, and killings. In September 1970, “the New Orleans police were involved in a shoot-out with a group of blacks in the Desire section of the city near the headquarters of the National Committee to Combat Fascism, the arm of the Black Panther Party. The toll included one youth killed, three wounded, and fourteen arrested; all were blacks.” The police engaged in unscrupulous tactics to gain entry to the homes and businesses of the Desire community. “A group of sixteen New Orleans clergymen and other citizens protested the methods used during the incident at the Desire Housing Project, claiming that the police gained entry into the alleged Black Panther apartment by wearing clerical garb. Mayor [Moon] Landrieu pledged there would not be a repetition of the use of such tactics by the police.” Frustrations between the communities continued to grow.
At the pinnacle of racial hostility in New Orleans, in 1972, White supremacists hosted a celebration at the Robert E. Lee statue in honor of Lee’s birthday, January 19, to which Black Panthers protested by throwing bricks. It had been a very tense, very trying week for New Orleanians. The day before, upon the request of his neighbors, New Orleans police arrested future Grand Wizard of the KKK and convicted felon David Duke (and three others) for creating makeshift kerosene bombs. Duke claimed the firebombs were candles for a torch-lit White supremacist parade and rally in Jackson Square scheduled and advertised for that upcoming Friday, for which he had obtained an ordinance to host activities “dedicated to all Whites who have suffered from the black Terror in our schools and in our streets.” The birthday ceremony itself was not advertised in the *Times-Picayune*; instead there was a small announcement on January 18th that courts would be closed, conspicuously nestled on the weather page, adjacent to an article that was likely to be of interest to the Black community—an announcement that grant funding would benefit predominately-Black Chester and Phillips Elementary schools for a Home Start program for ages two to five, to address the “urban educational preschool problems.” On the day of the ceremony, *Times-Picayune* reported in a microscopic reminder (dwarfed further by giant advertisements for Woolco and Schwegmann’s) that the District Attorney’s office (coincidently under suspicion for bribery) and its courts were taking the day off for Lee’s birthday, insisting it was a “legal holiday.” Despite the lack of coverage, friends and foes to the cause attended the ceremony on January 19th. Black Panthers—James N. Smith and Russell Wyman—threw bricks at self-proclaimed Klansmen—Roswell Thompson, Imperial Wizard of the New Orleans branch of the KKK, and his long-time confidant, Imperial Kludd Rene LaCoste. Police arrested the brick-throwers for the municipal crime of disturbing the peace, and a cab driver (a colleague of Thompson, owner of the cab company) who fired two warning shots into the air, for the state crimes of illegal use and carrying of a weapon. The Klansmen, dressed in regalia, sustained very mild injuries. As racial tensions intensified, dividing the city and disturbing the laissez-faire nature of the community, the Robert E. Lee statue continued to serve, not as a remembrance of Lee, but as a monument to the subversive faction of White supremacy in New Orleans.
A statue of Confederate Gen. Robert E. Lee is removed Friday from Lee Circle in New Orleans. Lee’s was the last of four monuments to Confederate-era figures to be removed under a 2015 City Council vote on a proposal by Mayor Mitch Landrieu. Credit: Scott Trelkeld/AP

“LEE’S GOTTA GO!”

After decades of controversy, the beloved Mayor of New Orleans, Mitch Landrieu (son of former Mayor Moon Landrieu,) petitioned the City Council to remove and relocate the Robert E. Lee statue, along with three other Confederate monuments.

In 2015, Mayor Mitch Landrieu targeted four Crescent City monuments for removal, arguing that they represented a racist past no longer in keeping with the community’s progressive ideals:...a statue of Confederate Gen. Robert E. Lee that stands along a popular Mardi Gras parade route,...highly visible likenesses of fellow Confederates Jefferson Davis and Gen. P.G.T. Beauregard,...[and] a controversial monument honoring an 1874 rebellion against the city’s biracial Reconstruction government, an uprising aimed at restoring white rule.42

After months of heated debate, the City Council voted 6-1 in support of the petition, declaring, “the four Confederate monuments are nuisances pursuant to Section 146-611 of the Code of the City of New Orleans and should be removed from their prominent locations in New Orleans.”43 On May 18, 2017, city officials removed “the last remaining monument that prominently celebrates the ‘Lost Cause of the Confederacy.’”44 For White supremacists, it was a distressing day of angry protest, for supporters of the ordinance, a liberating and joyous celebration.
At Lee Circle May 7, white supremacist groups and monument supporters were separated from a massive group calling for the removal of Confederate-era monuments in New Orleans. Credit: photo by Alex Woodward.

HERITAGE ON TRIAL

Beyond the virulent claims by White supremacists that Confederate monuments should be allowed to stand, the removal of the Robert E. Lee statue in New Orleans sparked controversy on a national level regarding history, heritage, and remembrance. Columbia University Professor Jelani Cobb comments in the October 15, 2017 issue of The New Yorker: “There is another consideration, mostly left out the conversation about monuments to the redacted past, that, in removing those tributes, we are performing our own historical redaction.” Cobb explains that removing Confederate monuments erodes history and robs future generations of benchmarks to how far our society has advanced. In essence, they would be denied “the
important knowledge that earlier generations once thought this way, and history—in essence, a chronicle of evolution—would be diminished, again.” Cobb suggests that the monuments stand, with updated information to provide context, and augmented with additional monuments that reflect contemporary interests.

The wisest path is to leave the controversial monuments where they stand, while appending additional markers—a reflection of contemporary values—stating that, in a dimmer moment in our understanding, we erected tributes to causes and to citizens that were deeply compromised. Then follow those actions with the creation of tributes that reflect our contemporary understanding of the world and humanity.

Louisiana State University Professor Danny Heitman agrees. “The memorials of old could be complemented by new ones that attempt to explain—and rebut—the prejudices of the past. Public reminders of our ancestors, moral warts and all, invite us to consider the degree to which we, too, are ethical works in progress—a useful dose of humility in our age of smug political absolutism.” Scholars argue for the maintenance of history through the preservation of Confederate monuments, regardless of symbolism or origin, as symbols of progress.

The history of the Robert E. Lee Monument in New Orleans challenges the validity of this argument, and the flaw lies in associating redaction with removal, and preservation with progress. Mayor Landrieu recognizes that “symbols of white supremacy” do not represent the heritage or spirit of New Orleans: “Symbols really do matter and symbols should reflect who we really are as a people.” Removal-critic Jelani Cobb recognizes the difference between the intentions behind raising this monument to Robert E. Lee in New Orleans and those of other historical figures with checkered pasts:

When Donald Trump blustered about the activists who were intent on removing the Lee statue eventually going after Jefferson and Washington, too, he was, as is typical of him, eliding a great deal of nuance...The distinction...is that Jefferson and Washington’s defenders largely praise them despite their racial hypocrisies. The monument to Lee was erected precisely because of his actions to prolong and preserve those hypocrisies.

Comparing the monument of Robert E. Lee to other figures ignores the personal and historical connections of those figures to the communities in which they reside, and forgets the lack of connection of Robert E. Lee and the Confederacy to New Orleans. Wayne Curtis, contributing editor to The Atlantic, notes with respect to Andrew Jackson, hero of the Battle of New Orleans, and General Lee: “People grappled over questions such as, ‘Where does it end? Do we rename our streets and tear down the iconic statue of Andrew Jackson?’ But as I walked back a block and turned to look at Lee, another vexing question came to mind again: ‘Since when did those who lost a war get their own monuments?’ Landrieu recognizes that the Robert E. Lee Monument represented neither the fallen Confederate soldiers from New Orleans, nor General Lee himself, but a dedication to “The Lost Cause of the Confederacy”—a mythologized apotheosis of the Civil War perpetuated by White supremacists. The supremacists.
“had one goal—through monuments and through other means—to rewrite history to hide the truth.” As he saw it, the monuments represented hate, not heritage. Landrieu also said aloud what these monuments had silently denied for generations: “The Civil War is over, and the Confederacy lost and we are better for it”...

Keeping [Confederate monuments] upon their pedestals “is an affront to our present,” he said, “and it is a bad prescription for our future.”

New Orleans, from its inception to its present, is a Creole city, and at the heart of its rich, convivial, and unique culture is the Black community. “New Orleans has always celebrated its diversity, but the city’s culture is, at its core, African American. The music and the celebrations all look to the city’s old and storied African American communities for inspiration.”

Mike Ballard, member of the Louisiana Landmarks Society and co-host of WBOK’s “Core Hour” with Tilman Hardy argues, “We can choose to change, we can choose to be better...

The city of New Orleans has a 300-year history. The Confederate States of America only lasted for four years. So, for that one-and-a-half percent of our history, you get the monument there?” The Robert E. Lee Monument is not just a statue; it is an eighty-five-foot monstrosity in the heart of the city. Mayor Landrieu, like many New Orleanians, inured to the statue and the other Confederate monuments over time. “He, too, had passed by the monuments ‘a million times’ without giving them much thought until acquaintances, including musician Wynton Marsalis, asked him to view them through their eyes.” In an opinion piece for the Times-Picayune, Wynton Marsalis, a New Orleans native and trumpeter, composer, and artistic director of Jazz at Lincoln Center in New York City, articulates the hypocrisy of claiming Robert E. Lee as significant to the heritage and spirit of New Orleans:

When one surveys the accomplishments of our local heroes across time from Iberville and Bienville, to Andrew Jackson, from Mahalia Jackson, to Anne Rice and Fats Domino, from Wendell Pierce, to John Besh and Jonathan Batiste, what did Robert E. Lee do to merit his distinguished position? He fought for the enslavement of a people against our national army fighting for their freedom; killed more Americans than any opposing general in history; made no attempt to defend or protect this city; and even more absurdly, he never even set foot in Louisiana. In the heart of the most progressive and creative cultural city in America, why should we continue to commemorate this legacy?

The compromise of allowing the Robert E. Lee Monument to remain and to be surrounded by new monuments is insufficient and inappropriate. To force Mahalia Jackson and Wendell Pierce to be immortalized next to Robert E. Lee is to misrepresent and to elevate them wrongfully to the same status and importance. As Kenneth Foote notes in Shadowed Ground, post-Reconstruction, the Civil War assumed a new identity of an American shared experience rather than a brutal, bloody conflict, to justify its existence to the survivors. Confederate monuments are not records of history, but accolades to a misguided nostalgia, elevating the vulgar and ignoble to the heroic. White supremacists overemphasizing their importance and efficacy and elevating the Confederacy is a redaction of New Orleans history, and to preserve the Robert E. Lee statue would be a symbol of regress, not progress.
“FEELINGS ENGENDERED”

The Robert E. Lee Monument is neither an appropriate nor accurate representation of New Orleans heritage. Lee had no significant ties to New Orleans, and the statute was erected by an insignificant and subversive minority of White supremacists who briefly influenced post-Reconstruction culture. Since its admittance into the United States early in the Nineteenth Century, New Orleans experienced friction between those who control the wealth and those who represent the spirit of the city. It is easy to forget the inclusive, cosmopolitan nature of New Orleans, perhaps due to its Southern geography. Locked in a conservative Southern slave state, New Orleans joined the Confederacy with a willing Louisiana. However, New Orleans’ quick surrender to the Union speaks volumes. This pattern of resistance to regress permeates New Orleans history, from Creole heritage to a willingness to stand and fight for civil rights, and into the present day, rejecting symbols of White supremacy as unacceptable to glorify. The Robert E. Lee Monument does not belong as the pinnacle of New Orleans, and it never belonged. Its symbolism derides the foundations of the city, from its heritage to its character. Just as society would replace crumbling infrastructure, we should replace crumbling theories as well, protecting and preserving the history by removing historical elements to museums and heritage centers, and recommitting and adapting the space, with the best of modern knowledge and resources, to the present needs of the community. Removing Confederate monuments is a noble and honorable form of adaptive-reuse preservation, creating opportunities for growth and community, and reflecting the evolution of ideas within a city. In the words of Robert E. Lee himself, August 5, 1869: “I think it wiser...not to keep open the sores of war but to follow the examples of those nations who endeavored to obliterate the marks of civil strife, to commit to oblivion the feelings engendered.” I agree with New Orleans: “Lee’s gotta go.”
In early February 1884, the city of Denver displayed the body of young Mary Rose Matthews for public viewing, attracting thousands of onlookers. One of those morbidly curious spectators, B.S. Tedmon, wrote in a letter to the editor of the Fort Collins Courier about the feeling of seeing the bruises and cuts that marred Mary’s body. The sight led him to empathize with the young girl in an attempt to imagine the suffering she must have endured to die with such horrific signs of abuse left upon her body. Noting that the only people hanged in Colorado were those found guilty in the court of “Judge Lynch,” and pondering the sufferings of Mary, Tedmon was left with only one conclusion. Though he wrote that he was a firm believer in due process and in respecting the process of the criminal justice system, in the case of Mary, more extreme measures were “justified” in exacting punishment upon the “fiends” responsible for her death. Furthermore, Tedmon believed that for the Cuddigans, the adoptive parents and alleged murderers of Mary, their lynching was not punishment enough.

Matthew was born and raised in Colorado. He attended Metropolitan State University of Denver where he received a BA in History and his Secondary education license in social studies. After graduating from MSUD he began teaching at Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Early College in Denver Public Schools where he has taught History and Civics since 2012. Matthew is in his second year of graduate school where he’s studying Frontier and Borderlands history, with an emphasis on the Western US. He would like to acknowledge Dr. Marjorie Levine-Clark and Dr. Bill Wagner for their expert guidance and masterful instruction.
Elsewhere in the Colorado press, the Cuddigan lynching incensed Coloradans as much as the death of Mary had angered Tedmon. The Rocky Mountain News argued shortly after the lynching on January 20, 1884, that the vigilantism revealed the “cheapness of human life,” and that no matter how horrific the alleged crimes, the Cuddigans deserved a trial and due process. Adding to the outrage was the fact that the Ouray mob lynched a woman—Margaret Cuddigan, the adoptive mother of Mary.

At the crossroads of gender and mob-violence lay several uncomfortable questions that the people of Colorado had to contend with in the wake of the Cuddigan lynching. Was vigilantism a barbaric practice opposed to civil society, or was its presence evidence that the state was not responding to demands to serve due justice for vile crimes. Were these punishments applicable to women, or did women who committed severe crimes betray their supposed feminine nature and therefore become subject to the harsh justice applied to men? The answers to these questions reveal a divide among the public, both in the level to which they embraced acts of vigilantism and in their understanding of womanhood.

Historians have produced a rich discourse on vigilantism in the West, through which they have both drawn comparisons and distinctions between the causes and significance of western vigilantism and southern lynching. Michael Pfeifer, one of the leading scholars on lynching, argues that the decentralized nature of American politics and government meant that the state did not claim “an exclusive monopoly over violence,” which helped to foster a culture of “rough justice.” Stephen Leonard, in his book Lynching in Colorado, also draws a connection between vigilantism and suspected criminality of the lynched, which suggests that western lynching was distinct from racially associated southern lynching. The views presented by Pfeifer and Leonard are largely representative of the scholarship regarding western lynching in that they associate lynching with the decentralized nature of control, compared to the southern system which took on a distinctively racial element.

In addition to the discourse regarding the nature of Western lynching, historians have also discussed the relationship between gender and vigilantism in the West. In her essay, “Who Dares to Style This Female a Woman?” Helen McLure asserts that acts of vigilantism against women have been “shrouded by... historical amnesia” and argues that women have been largely invisible as both perpetrators and targets of mob violence. McLure argues that acts of vigilantism that targeted women often created such controversy that these incidents “forced” communities to “grapple with... mob violence beyond the borders of gender, race, and ethnicity.” McLure
and Leonard agree that, because mobs rarely lynched women, and because the practice “created cognitive dissonance” among the communities who were forced to reconcile the act of lynching with commonly accepted notions of womanhood, such instances called into question the ethics and practices of mob violence. Though McLure asserts that historians have overlooked the role of women as participants in vigilantism, she does little to explore this theme in her work. Linda Gordon, however, argues that, despite the obvious associations between masculinity and vigilantism, women also played a role in mob-violence. Within the field of western vigilantism, scholars agree that mob-violence targeting women caused tension in a society that was generally open to vigilantism but became disconcerted when the “gentler sex” became the target.

Beginning with the death of Mary Matthews, and culminating with her burial, the Cuddigan lynching reveals the negotiation of gender roles that occurred for both supporters and opponents of the lynching. Historical records indicate that women were not passive actors in the Cuddigan affair; Women who supported the lynching did so in order to distinguish themselves from Margaret Cuddigan and the horror of Mary’s death. The rhetoric employed by supporters of the lynching demonstrates two important points: to be feminine was to be pretty, passive, and dependent upon men. On the other, to be a woman was not the same as being feminine. In order to justify the lynching of Margaret, the pro-lynching press stripped Margaret of her femininity, and reconstructed her as a monster. In contrast, the anti-lynching press emphasized the horror of lynching a female by using language that promoted paternalistic attitudes toward women in their calls for due process and order. Taken together, these accounts share a common trait—in the face of a horrible series of events, the Colorado press reconstructed the language and norms of gender in ways that buttressed accepted perspectives of what it meant to be a woman.

THE “WAIF”:
THE LIFE AND DEATH OF MARY ROSE MATTHEWS

On July 28, 1883 Mary Matthews began a new chapter in her short and traumatic life. She did not leave diaries to record her hopes and fears, but it is not hard to imagine the complex feelings of anxiety and expectation she might have experienced as she entered her new home, nestled between high mountain peaks in the Uncompahgre valley.

Before her move to Ouray, Mary lived in Denver, where her experiences made her a sympathetic character for the Colorado press in their coverage of her death. Mary’s mother died when she was between six and nine years old. Following her mother’s
death, Mary was left in the custody of her father, Charles who seemed to simultaneously be a loving father and a man who was completely unprepared to care for a young daughter while grieving the loss of his wife. The Tribune’s coverage of Mary’s life with her parents portrayed her as a sympathetic character deserving of the utmost love and attention as she experienced loss at a young age. When juxtaposed with the treatment she would receive for the remainder of her life, this description captured and perhaps heightened the public’s indignation toward those who failed to look after her in her final year of life.

Despite the indication that Charles loved Mary, he was unable to deal with the weight of his responsibilities, so he left her in the care of the sisters of St. Vincent’s Orphan Asylum. By the time of Mary’s death, Charles was in the midst of a severe downward spiral that Denver’s Queen Bee attributed to alcohol abuse, the Tribune associated with a turn toward a life of crime and a relationship with a prostitute, and the Buena Vista Democrat reported resulted in his going to jail for larceny. While Mary lived at the orphanage Charles did not visit her because he did not want her to experience the pain of yet another separation from him. He planned to re-claim her once he got back on his feet, but the reunion of father and daughter would never happen. The Rocky Mountain News concluded that after her mother’s passing, “no one gave her love or care.” The same article calls Mary a “football of fate,” implying that she was passed around from one unloving caretaker to the next following the death of her mother. The Colorado press paired sympathetic descriptions of Mary, with gendered language that characterized Mary as “a bright, winsome little thing,” and as “extremely affectionable” with a “lovable disposition.” Mary was described as “comely,” and the most frequent description of her became “the little waif.” No one captured the sentiments of the press toward Mary’s dire life better than Caroline Churchill of the Queen Bee who said that the Denver community remembered Mary as “a nice looking little girl, with blond hair and blue eyes,” and that women, especially a young girl like Mary, were “without means of self-protection.” By contrasting the traumatic life of Mary, in which it seemed no adults offered her the protection a young child deserved, with descriptions of her that highlighted her burgeoning feminine qualities like a loving nature, physical beauty, and a gentle fragility the Colorado press constructed Mary in their own image as a young girl discarded by the father that should have nurtured this young little “waif.”

After Mary was adopted by the Cuddigans, her life changed drastically for the third time in her ten years of life, as she adapted to a new setting along the Uncompahgre river. The Rocky Mountain News published a letter by Robert Servant in which he stated that he conducted interviews with the Cuddigans prior to their adoption of Mary and found them to be suitable guardians for her. He visited the Cuddigan home on at least two occasions following the adoption of Mary and observed that she was responsible for caring for her young adoptive brother at times and she helped Michael and Margaret Cuddigan with managing the ranch. According to Servant, Mary had a bed in the Cuddigans’ room to herself, she seemed happy, and he reported she was in good hands. Servant even related asking Mary whether she was mistreated by the Cuddigans, to which he reported her answer to be “Oh, no father.” She said that she had fallen down the cellar stairs, accounting for her bruises, and that when she misbehaved Mrs. Cuddigan would “slap her on the hands and arms, but it was nothing.” Servant told Mary that if she was ever mistreated, she
could tell him, and he would bring her back to Denver. We do not know what Mary really thought about her living arrangements, daily routines, and the care provided to her by the Cuddigans, but it is not hard to imagine that she enjoyed playing with her new toddler brother and enjoyed being part of a family again, but was bored with the tedium of rural life. If Servant is to be believed, then life for Mary may have been boring, and it may have been hard, but she was still well cared for.

Other sources suggest that life with the Cuddigans was the polar opposite of the decent conditions described by Servant. The Rocky Mountain News described the Cuddigan ranch as a “hell home,” the New York based National Police Gazette reported that neighbors heard “cries of pain” from the Cuddigan ranch, the Queen Bee printed a likely false report that a stranger once had to stop Michael, her adoptive father, from killing her. While the National Police Gazette and Queen Bee reports both seem to be exaggerated, the Queen Bee is of particular note because the paper had a blatant anti-Irish, and particularly anti-Catholic bias. In one article about Mary’s death the Queen Bee presents, from a nativist perspective, the most damning evidence against the Cuddigans: that they “were farmers—and Roman Catholics.” Sensational as these reports may have been, they shed light on how far the press went to both villainize the Cuddigans, and to reinforce the tragic narrative that was constructed about the life of Mary.

Other papers produced much more believable accounts of abuse and neglect by the Cuddigans. The Solid Muldoon, for example, printed sworn statements from witnesses who testified to the Coroner’s Jury about Mary’s suffering. L.B. Montgomery, a nearby rancher, reported that he visited the Cuddigans about one month prior and observed Mary washing dishes bare-footed and acting “strangely.” Father Servant, the chief defender of the Cuddigans, reported that a neighbor told him on December 16, 1883 that “the Cuddigans were not taking care of little Mary as they had promised,” which prompted him to make the home visit in which he determined Mary was well cared for. C.R. Brandenbury, a nearby rancher, reported seeing an injured and delirious Mary huddled near a hay stack on a cold day, approximately one week before her death. W.W. Rowan, the doctor who examined Mary’s body post-mortem testified that there was evidence of frost-bite on her hands and feet, and several bruises on her body, including a cut on her skull that he attributed to blunt-force trauma. He examined her brain and found clotting, which he attributed to a blow to the head that he pinned as the cause of death. J.A. Talbot and George Charles Morrison reported visiting the Cuddigan ranch on Saturday, January 12, 1884 and seeing Mary’s dead body with bruises and scars. The Solid Muldoon published this article on Friday, January 18, 1884, and within two days the Cuddigans had been lynched. If one were to walk into an Ouray Saloon or eavesdrop on conversations held on the streets of Ouray during the last weekend of Michael and Margaret Cuddigan’s lives, it is not hard to imagine that two themes emerged. The first theme was likely the innocence, beauty, and defenselessness of Mary Rose Matthews that the Ouray and Colorado press had both emphasized in their coverage of her death. The second theme likely was the “barbarous cruelty” of her guardians and what ought to be done. The circumstances of Mary’s death and the narrative produced in public discourse, both in the press and in private conversation, created the perfect storm in which the unthinkable became likely: the lynching of a woman.
THE WIFE: THE LIFE AND DEATH OF MARGARET CUDDIGAN

Whereas Mary Rose Matthews was characterized by the press, without exception, as an adorable child who suffered a tragic death, her adoptive mother, Margaret Cuddigan, was portrayed as both a “she fiend” and a tragic victim of “rough justice.” The Fairplay Flume described Margaret as nearly six feet tall with “thick, sensuous lips, a brazen look, and a sharp tongue,” adding that she would be attractive to those who were “admirers of the Amazonian style.” Cuddigan, prior to moving to Colorado, had lived in Ottawa, IL, where she had a traumatic childhood. Her father committed suicide in an insane asylum when she was a child, and it is possible that she also experienced mental illness. She left town in a hurry after Michael, her first-cousin and future husband, broke his engagement to Margaret Costello. The two moved to the Ouray area, where Michael had lived previously and built a successful life. Margaret, The Rocky Mountain News reported, had an “excellent reputation” in the Ouray community, where she lived with her husband and her young son, Percival. Historian Stephen Leonard suggests that based on the date of Percival’s birth and the date of the Cuddigans’ marriage, that the union of Margaret and Michael was one of “necessity,” implying that the two cousins wed because Margaret was pregnant with Michael’s baby. Margaret was nineteen when she married and had Percival, and twenty-one at the time of her death. She was expecting another child, and was seven months pregnant in January of 1884. It is likely that the Cuddigans sought to adopt an older girl precisely because Margaret was pregnant, and a young adopted daughter could both help out on the ranch and provide childcare for the two young Cuddigans.

Following their arrest, the Cuddigans faced two possible scenarios: the first, a trial, which would likely have found them guilty and sentenced according to the law; the second, vigilante action resulting in their deaths. The investigation into Mary’s death began with Dr. W.W. Rowan performing a post-mortem examination, and the town of Ouray convening a Coroner’s jury to determine whether or not Mary had been murdered. On Tuesday, January 15, the jury met and concluded not only that the death was a homicide, but that Michael, Margaret, and her brother, James Carroll, were guilty. The lack of due-process was not lost on The Rocky Mountain News which asked, “by what law, human or divine, is a coroner’s jury authorized to bring in a verdict of murder against anybody?” There was supposed to be a preliminary hearing on Thursday, January 17, two days after the coroner’s jury convened. The Rocky Mountain News reported that the hearing was postponed, and dissatisfaction with the trial’s delay
escalated the calls for vigilante action. The Denver Tribune reported after the delay that, the townspeople of Ouray vowed that Michael “would never live to see his trial.” Stephen Leonard has suggested that high levels of confidence amongst the public in the justice system are one factor that influenced whether acts of vigilantism were likely to occur in a given community. The fact that the local and regional papers cited a delay in the court proceedings as one of the contributing factors to the lynching is significant. It suggests that the people of Ouray did not have confidence in the local courts because on the morning of Saturday, January 19, the people of Ouray made good on their promise to carry out mob violence against Michael and Margaret Cuddigan.

William Fay, an Ouray resident visiting Denver the week after Margaret’s death, told The Rocky Mountain News that on the morning of January 18, he was awakened by the screams of Margaret Cuddigan. The Denver Tribune reported that, despite the pledge made by some in the community that Michael would be lynched, few believed that his wife would share his fate. She was after all, seven months pregnant. Nevertheless, between midnight and one in the morning, Sheriff Rawles reported that David Day, the editor of The Solid Muldoon who had received the Congressional Medal of Honor for his service in the siege of Vicksburg during the Civil War, approached him and warned that everyone should leave the hotel where the Cuddigans were being kept. Sheriff Rawles allegedly responded by saying, “you can go back and tell your mob to go to hell!” The vigilantes initiated a brief shootout with Rawles, which led him to abandon his defense. The mob had their prize, and they led the Cuddigans out of town. The majority of the mob went to the home of Thomas Andrews, near the Cuddigans’ ranch, where they hanged Michael from the lodgepole of Andrews’s cabin, and Margaret from a tree. James Carroll was interrogated, and successfully pleaded for his life, citing that he had not been present at the time of Mary’s death. He knew about her death, but only after the fact, and kept quiet only to protect Margaret. The Leadville Daily Herald, quoting an unnamed paper in Silverton, CO, rhetorically asked, “who… would not do all in his power to save his sister’s life?” By employing the argument that he was acting in defense of a woman, Carroll found a line of reasoning that made him a member of the community. His would-be killers reasoned that they would likely have acted the same in his shoes. Leonard suggests that, in addition to confidence in the courts, another factor that influenced the likelihood of lynching was the level of alienation that the victim
experienced within the community. Carroll was able to establish a connection with his would-be lynchers that humanized him. For the Cuddigans, however, it appears that they were irreparably alienated from the community because of the heinous nature of the crime. No amount of pleading could have rehumanized them in the eyes of the mob.

It is possible that Margaret was alienated for multiple reasons. In addition to the inhumane treatment of which she was accused, Leonard cites a *Denver Tribune* article in which Michael claimed that Margaret would force him to sleep on a haystack when she was angry. Hearing her pleas for mercy, the mob would have seen a child abuser, a woman pleading insanity to excuse her inhumane treatment of Mary Rose, and a woman who dared to violate accepted gender norms by attempting to have dominion over her husband.

The lynching of Margaret was shocking, but it was not wholly unexpected. Lynching had gained a strong foothold in Colorado’s political culture. In the days leading up to the lynching the *Salida Mail* proclaimed that “a Cuddigan or two ought to be hung,” and even the *Rocky Mountain News*, the standard bearer of the anti-lynching press, speculated that only Michael would be lynched. The *Muldoon* stated the names of the lawyer who would defend the Cuddigans, “provided the Almighty or Judge Lynch does not visit justice before the case is called.” Furthermore, as has been argued by McLure, vigilantism targeting women tended to incite debates about the merits of vigilantism targeting anyone. This certainly happened in the Colorado press after Margaret’s death with the *Delores News* noting that the question of “mob law” was contentious throughout the state. Between 1859 and 1885, 162 acts of lynching occurred in Colorado. Thirty-five of those lynchings occurred between 1881 and 1885, filling the news with a consistent stream of stories. Coloradans had come to expect that the worst crimes would be dealt with through lynching, whether or not they believed that “judge lynch” had a place in a civilized society. Because Colorado had established a culture of “rough justice,” and the death of Mary Rose Matthews was both sensational and highly publicized, it is not surprising that Margaret’s status as a woman did not shield her from mob law.

Oddly enough, it is possible that one of the determining factors that transformed the lynching of Margaret Cuddigan from a possibility into a reality may have been the voices and agency of women. The *Denver Tribune* reported a Denver woman of saying that if Ouray’s men did not Lynch the Cuddigans then “the women should have turned out and taken the matter into hand.” This sentiment was an echo of the *Solid Muldoon*’s article entitled “Servant’s Slush,” in which it was reported that, “certain of the female members” of Servant’s church “informed him that if the men of Ouray had failed to hang them, they, the ladies, would themselves have cheerfully undertaken the task.” It seems plausible that some of the women who prepared Mary’s body for burial returned home feeling both incomprehensibly sad and angry, and urged their men to take action before the courts found pity on the pregnant woman responsible for the harm caused and the wounds they had just seen. It is not difficult to imagine that one of the factors that pushed the men of Ouray to form a mob, kidnap a woman from the sheriff’s custody, transport her pregnant body outside of
town for several miles, and hang her from a tree was the insistence of their wives and mothers that Margaret had violated women's gender roles by failing as a mother in a manner so offensive that waiting for a trial to play out was not swift enough justice.

Denver’s *Queen Bee* is perhaps the most interesting example of how women’s voices may have helped to make the lynching of Margaret Cuddigan possible, and served to justify it after the fact. Caroline Churchill, the editor of the *Queen Bee*, launched a viscous campaign against Servant and the Cuddigans, alleging that while she was at St. Vincent’s Orphan Asylum, Mary had either witnessed abuse or had been raped by Servant. In her conspiracy theory, Mary was sent far away from Denver to a pre-arranged family of a “depraved” nature to “be disposed of.” She suggested that Father Servant had sexually abused her at St. Vincent’s and that when he was allegedly assessing whether or not the Cuddigans would be a suitable home for Mary, Servant was actually looking for a family that would torture her to death. Churchill’s paper served two functions. It was a sounding board for feminist ideas and anti-Catholic rhetoric. The allegations of a conspiracy between Servant, St. Vincent’s and the Cuddigans are not repeated in any of the other papers, and while they were based on flimsy evidence and wild accusations it may reveal the *mentalité* of some of the Anglo women of Ouray. Women influenced by Churchill’s paper, or who had similar views regarding Catholicism and its role in society, may have called for the lynching of Margaret because of a staunch anti-Catholic bias.

Leonard suggests a third common factor in determining whether lynchings occurred in Colorado: race. While Margaret may have been white skinned, she was Irish and Catholic. Gordon’s work in *The Great Arizona Orphan Abduction* convincingly argues that racial categories in the West were malleable, especially for groups like the Irish and Italians, who shared enough cultural heritage with Anglos to be considered white, but because they were Catholic and historically marginalized by the English, were often pushed down the racial hierarchy. The fact that Ouray had a Catholic church and Irish community could actually have increased the anger directed toward Margaret if local Irish-Catholics were both embarrassed by the abuse Mary allegedly suffered at the hands of their congregant, and viewed acting with Anglo residents as a means of gaining a foothold to climb the flexible social hierarchy of the West.
JUSTIFYING THE LYNCHING OF MARGARET CUDDIGAN

About two weeks after the Cuddigans were lynched the body of Mary Rose Matthews was exhumed from its resting place in Ouray and moved to Denver to be put on public display. By seven in the morning on the day it was first displayed, the *Solid Muldoon* (quoting the *Denver Tribune*) reported that hundreds of people were lined up to see Mary’s lifeless body. Four women, of the estimated 12,000 people, who came to see the body are reported to have fainted at the sight. One of the people who viewed Mary’s body that day approached the table where she lay, and recognized her as a school-mate from when Mary lived in Denver. The little girl, accompanied by her grandmother, “broke into tears” at the sight of her former acquaintance’s body and “even some of the stalwart men were moved to tears” by the scene. The public display of Mary’s body was the most bizarre episode in a debate about lynching that swept through the pages of Colorado’s press in the aftermath of the tragedy of Mary and Margaret. Both sides utilized gendered language and relied upon gender norms to advance their cause. The anti-lynching press wondered why Colorado was so barbaric that even women were subject to rulings from the court of Judge Lynch. The pro-lynching press simultaneously relied on conventional notions of womanhood and girlhood to garner sympathy for Mary while also engaging in a concerted effort to “dewomanize” Margaret.

The public display of Mary’s body was intricately linked to efforts by the pro-lynching press to justify the lynching of Margaret. The *Rocky Mountain News* reported that W.H. Kelly, one of the men who was likely a member of the mob that lynched Margaret, was “instrumental” in organizing the public display of Mary’s body. That one of the men likely responsible for Margaret’s death helped to organize the display of Mary’s body suggests that the purpose of the display was to foster a sense of outrage directed toward Margaret. Whereas papers like the *Denver Tribune* and *Solid Muldoon* covered the dramatic scenes and visceral emotions experienced by the citizens of Denver who viewed the body, which further helped to create sympathy for Mary and direct anger toward Margaret, the *Rocky Mountain News* was emphatic that the only purpose in displaying the body was to convince the Denver public that “the lynching was justified.” The public display employed Mary’s body as a tool to portray Margaret as a monster and her killers as justified. Here, not only the Colorado press, but also W.H. Kelly and the other organizers of the display employed the public’s sentiments about gender in defense of vigilantism.
While Churchill of the *Queen Bee* was among the most surprising voices of the pro-lynching press, she was not alone in employing gendered language to justify the lynching. Many of the more traditional Colorado papers endorsed the lynching, and in order to reconcile the notion that women were the gentler sex who should be protected from violence with the fact that a woman had been lynched, they dewomanized Margaret Cuddigan. The *Denver Tribune*, quoted in the *Solid Muldoon*, suggested that “mothers, who would have suffered the greatest sacrifices and torture rather than have thought of their darlings enduring a tithe of the cruelties which poor little Mary Rose Matthews had been subjected” formed the largest portion of those who viewed the body. Language like this enabled the reader’s imagination to fill in the gaps as they contrasted the ideal mother—the one who would sacrifice herself—with Margaret, who was portrayed as negligent and abusive. Margaret became a non-woman because she did not meet the standards of a loving mother.

Elsewhere in the press, Margaret was similarly stripped of her womanhood, often in more fiery language. The *Queen Bee*, as has been mentioned, called Margaret a “she fiend” and a “human animal,” and the *Solid Muldoon* called the Cuddigans “brutes—worse than brutes—that have heretofore passed as humans.” The physical description of Margaret from the *Fairplay Flume* that compared her to an Amazon of Greek mythology alludes to a version of womanhood that is distinctly masculinized. The language used to dewomanize Margaret cut to the core of what it meant to be a woman—she was uncivilized, an animal, a devil, and a threat to the construct of masculinity. When contrasted with the weeping women of Denver who viewed Mary’s body, the press made a clear distinction between what women were supposed to be and what Margaret Cuddigan was. This characterization became the primary defense of the Ouray vigilantes.

The Colorado press was not unanimous in support of the lynching, but just as the pro-lynching press dewomanized Margaret, the anti-lynching press used gender in support of its stance. It constructed a narrative that emphasized Margaret’s womanhood and the gentle and defenseless perception of women. The *Leadville Daily Herald* reported that the Ouray mob had done the unthinkable: “they have lynched a woman!” The *Herald* suggested that any cruelty toward Mary was surely doled out by Michael and that Margaret could not have been the ringleader of Mary’s tormenters. By suggesting that Michael was the true villain, the *Herald* relied on the construct of masculinity, which
assigned men positions of power in the context of marriage. Margaret, on the other hand, was portrayed in this article as a true woman who was gentle and easily manipulated by her husband. The article goes on to state that, “it is the boast of Americans that a woman's weakness will shield her from violence at the hands of a true American, except it be commanded by the law,” and further laments that “a mob of strong men” subdued and lynched a “weak, defenseless woman.” This article, which was typical of the language used by the anti-lynching press, emphasized the masculine duty to protect women, to treat women gently, and the fragility of women. Just as Mary was portrayed as weak and defenseless, so too Margaret was portrayed by the anti-lynching press as a child-like figure too gentle to be subjected to mob-rule.

The gendered language used to shape the public's perception of Margaret was by far the most significant aspect of how gender constructs shaped the coverage of the Cuddigan lynching, but portrayals of masculinity also reveal how gender shaped the arguments made by both the anti-lynching and pro-lynching press. In describing the vigilantes as a “mob of strong men” that attacked a “weak, defenseless woman,” the Leadville Daily Herald not only relied upon constructions of femininity to denounce the lynching, but also used masculinity as a tool to denounce the actions of men who violated acceptable gender norms by using force against a woman. The pro-lynching press, notably the Denver Tribune, which stated that even the “stalwart” men who viewed Mary’s body while it was displayed in Denver were choked up at the sight, weaponized the construct of masculine toughness to emphasize the barbarity of the abuse Mary suffered. By suggesting that even the most stoic of men were moved to tears at the sight of Mary’s body, the pro-lynching press utilized masculinity to defend the lynching of Margaret Cuddigan.

The lynching of Margaret Cuddigan, due to its sensational qualities, helped lead the press toward a discourse about the role lynching should play in creating and maintaining law and order in Colorado. It should be noted that many of the anti-lynching papers focused more on reasoned arguments about the role that lynching should play in society rather than arguments centered on gender roles. The Rocky Mountain News, for example, argued that all of the reasons given to justify the lynching were the reasons why the courts should be given the chance to follow through with a verdict. Elsewhere The Rocky Mountain News contended that a mob which avenges a murder is “wholly made up of murderers.” Perhaps the best argument against vigilantism came from Judge M.B. Gerry, the judge who would have presided over the case had it gone to trial. Instructing the grand jury that was convened to determine if there was enough evidence to pursue charges against any of the lynching party (it did not), Gerry stated that they should disregard the alleged crimes of the Cuddigans and the well-publicized abuse of Mary Rose Matthews. If the Cuddigans indeed had killed her, Gerry stated, “their crime sleeps the sleep of death with them, and you cannot rob the grave of either.” Instead, he instructed, they should focus on the crimes of the lynchers whose actions amounted to “mob law” and “revolution.” Gerry also called into question why Ouray did not have a proper jail, suggesting that if the Cuddigans were housed in a jail cell rather than a hotel, the lynching might have been avoided. By removing the Cuddigans, particularly Margaret and Mary from the picture, Gerry asked the grand jury to do more than disregard the events that led to the lynching; he asked them to shed their expectations of how young girls ought to be treated, how mothers ought to
act, and whether women should be shielded from mob justice while men should not be. Unfortunately, either a lack of evidence or a lack of judgement on the part of the Grand Jury prevented further hearings and investigation. That does not diminish the contributions that people like Gerry made to bringing a more reasoned and sensible approach to criminal justice in Colorado.

The deaths of Mary and Margaret were about more than gender. They brought to the forefront a debate about the merits of lynching, and whether or not it should be tolerated regardless of the sex, race, or age of both the initial victim and perpetrator of the crime. While lynchings did not immediately stop in Colorado, as a result of this debate, they did decline. It is possible that the lynching of Margaret Cuddigan, a lynching that received a heightened level of press coverage, was one of the formative experiences that led the next generation of Coloradans not to engage in the practice. Of course, other factors such as improvements in the court system may have played a role, but a lively debate that called into question the practice of vigilantism was likely another contributing factor.

Ultimately, gender became a tool employed by the people of Ouray and the Colorado press to shape the public discourse regarding the death of Mary Matthews and the lynch-ing of Margaret Cuddigan. By calling men in the community to action, the women of Ouray likely played a larger role in creating the conditions that led to Margaret’s death than was acknowledged at the time. Doing so reinforced society’s expectations for mothers because it distinguished the ideal mother—one who is loving, caring, and nurturing—from the image of Margaret that the press created in their coverage of the lynching. The media also utilized the construct of the “waif” to strip Mary of her humanity and reduce her to a symbol for girlhood whose death warranted acts of vigilantism in an effort to avenge her. The episode, taken as a whole, reveals how the construct of gender shaped the expectations that men and women were expected to uphold in their roles as parents and as actors within the system of vigilantism that was central to Colorado’s application of justice in the late nineteenth century.
NOTES

Cinematic Inclusivity:
American Westerns Pertaining to Chicanos, Hispanos, and Mexican Americans
by Mark Alexander Ortiz

2. Meier and Ribera.
8. Marino, 1-5.
16. Fregoso, 23.
17. Fregoso, 22.


23. Kempley.


27. Fregoso, 70.


32. Meier and Ribera, 81.


38. *Los Angeles Times*.


41. White.

42. White.

43. Meier and Ribera, 164.

44. Meier and Ribera, 163-64.


46. Cosgrove.
An Internal War:
Hierarchy and Conflict in the 10th Mountain Division, 1942-1945
By Emily Whitworth

1. Herein referred to as The 10th
3. Ibid.


11. Ibid.


18. Ibid.


“Feelings Engendered:”
Heritage, White Supremacy, and the Robert E. Lee Monument

By Lindsay La Balle


Note: The argument for states' rights is unjustified, considering that Southern states expected the federal government to intervene and overrule laws passed by Northern states in reference to slavery, and that the Confederacy named the preservation of the institution of slavery as the “cornerstone” of the nation and wrote its legality permanently into the Constitution of Confederate States: “Our new government...foundations are laid, its cornerstone rests, upon the great truth that the negro is not equal to the white man; that slavery subordination to the superior race is his natural and normal condition. This, our new government, is the first, in the history of the world, based upon this great physical, philosophical, and moral truth.” Alexander H. Stephens, “Cornerstone Speech,” 21 March 1861, Savannah, GA. teachingamericanhistory.org/library/document/cornerstone-speech/; Article I, Section 9.4: “No bill of attainder, ex post facto law, or law denying or impairing the right of property in negro slaves shall be passed.” Constitution of Confederate States, 11 March 1861. avalon.law.yale.edu/19th_century/csa_csa.asp.

10. Siegel, New Orleans, 23.


Note: 16 Feb 1858: Authorized $1000 ($29,000 equivalent) to plant trees and upgrade walkways in Tivoli Circle and $1500 ($42,000 equivalent) the surrounding areas. New Orleans Council Ordinance No. 3439, 16 February 1858, Microfiche AB310, Roll 89-366, New Orleans (La) Common Council Ordinances & Resolutions, v.4 (#3677-5739) 1858-1861, Louisiana Division State Archive, New Orleans Public Library.

20. The Inflation Calculator. westegg.com/inflation/.


22. New Orleans City Council Ordinance No. 188 and 624 – Council Series, 18 March 1884, Microfiche AB311, Roll No 1238, City Council Ordinances, CS 1, December 2, 1882 – CS 1583, Dec. 28, 1885, Louisiana Division State Archive, New Orleans Public Library.  
   Note: Some high-ranking members: Judge Leander Perez, Governor Jimmy H. Davis, State Senator William Rainach, Emile Wagner (school board member), Attorney General Jack P. F. Gremillion, State Superintendent of Education Shelby M. Jackson, Dr. Emmett L. Irwin (President of WCC of NOLA.)
36. “Four Arrested in ‘Bombs” Case.”
   Note: Not the athlete.
41. “Bricks Thrown at Two Klansmen at Lee Circle; 3 Facing Charges.”


44. “City of New Orleans to Begin Removal of Final Confederate Monument Robert E. Lee Statue.”

45. Curtis, “Decommissioning Lee.”
   Note: “Three smaller Confederate monuments—statues of P. G. T. Beauregard and Jefferson Davis, and an obelisk marking the Battle of Liberty Place—had already recently come down. These unannounced removals had taken place late at night, with crews wearing bulletproof vests, helmets, and scarves or masks to hide their faces. Lee’s was the last of the monuments to be ‘decommissioned,’ and its removal was also the most controversial. Earlier attempts had resulted in death threats, along with the torching of a contractor’s sports car...So before arriving at Lee Circle on May 18, workers covered the names on their trucks with cardboard and tape. They had hoped to work in quiet anonymity.” Curtis, “Decommissioning Lee.”


51. Heitman, “Amid Toppled Confederate Statues.”


55. Curtis, “Decommissioning Lee.”

56. “Should New Orleans Remove Its Statue of Robert E. Lee?”

57. “Should New Orleans Remove Its Statue of Robert E. Lee?”

58. Curtis, “Decommissioning Lee.”


The Waif and the Wife:
Gender and Vigilantism in the American West
By Matthew Taylor

APPENDIX

— 1873: Mary is born.
— July 28, 1883: Mary is adopted by the Cuddigans.
— December 1883: Servant visits the Cuddigan home twice in response to complaints about the Cuddigans treatment of Mary—he finds that she is well cared for.
— January 12, 1884: Mary dies.
— January 15: Coroner’s jury rules Mary’s death a homicide, finds the Cuddigans guilty.
— January 18: Cuddigans are lynched.
— February 2: Mary’s body, after being exhumed from her gravesite in Ouray, is transported to Denver and displayed publicly.

NOTES
3. Vigilantism refers to citizen actions that supplant the responsibilities of law enforcement and the courts. Vigilantism can include lynching, but does not necessarily refer to action that results in death. For example, the use of force to coerce a suspected lawbreaker by a citizen would constitute vigilante action as much as lynching.
6. McLure, 44.
8. McLure, “Who Dares to Style This Female a Woman?,” 21. McLure suggests that women played a role in acts of vigilantism, but does not provide substantive examples. Linda Gordon, The Great Arizona Orphan Abduction (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1999), 313. Gordon writes at great length about the role of the women of Clifton-Morenci, Arizona in act of vigilantism that resulted not in lynching, but the abduction of several children from Mexican families who the white mothers presumed to be unfit to serve as adoptive mothers of white children.
9. B.S. Tedmon, “The Fiendish Cuddigan’s,” Fort Collins Courier, February 7, 1884, Volume 34; “The Lynching of a Man and His Wife at Ourary by a Mob, Yesterday Morning, Is Not an Agreeable Addition to the Long Record of Lawlessness in Colorado.” See Appendix A for a timeline of the important events related to the deaths of Mary Rose Matthews and Margaret Cuddigan.


13. In her work, The Great Arizona Orphan Abduction, Gordon examined this phenomena in New York City orphanages and reports that about 150 children a month were abandoned by parents and left either to fend for themselves or to the care of orphanages. One of the driving forces behind this tragically high number was immigrant mothers who were unable to care for their children, which suggests that the decision by Charles Matthews to leave Mary Rose in the care of a Catholic orphanage would have been seen as unfortunate, but not uncommon. Gordon, The Great Arizona Orphan Abduction, 8.


15. “Multiple News Items,” Rocky Mountain News, February 2, 1884, Vol. XXV, http://find.galegroup.com.auararia.library.idm.oclc.org/ncnp/newspaperRetrieve.do?sgHitCountType=None&sort=DateAscend&tabId=T003&prodId=NCNP&resultListType=RESULT_LIST&searchId=R1&searchType=AdvancedSearchForm&currentPosition=1&qrySerId=Locale%28en%2C%2C%29%3AFQE%3D%28tx%2CNone%2C%29Rose%3AAAnd%3ALQE%3D%28JN%2CNone%2C%29%25DYN%22%3AAnd%3ALQE%3D%28da%2CNone%2C%2902%2F02%2F1884%24&retrieveFormat=MULTIPAGE_DOCUMENT&userGroupName=auraria_main&i nPS=true&contentSet=LTO&docId=&docLevel=FASCIMILE&workId=&relevancePageBatch=GT3008729373&contentSet=UDVIN&callistoContentSet=UDVIN&docPage=article&hilite=y, Nineteenth Century U.S. Newspapers.


18. Servant, “The Cuddigans.” It is worth discussing here that Servant, the priest who helped arrange the adoption, transported Mary Rose to Ouray, and checked in on her is both the most reliable and least reliable source regarding her welfare. He likely formed an attachment to her and sincerely wanted for her to have the best possible quality of life, yet he had his reputation at stake. It is possible that he exaggerated her happiness and downplayed the hardships she faced under the protection of the Cuddigans in order to escape criticism for having placed her in a miserable home.
19. Regarding Mary’s perception of her treatment by the Cuddigans, the only evidence that Mary reported being well treated is Servant’s published letter in the *Rocky Mountain News*. It is possible this conversation never actually occurred, but it is also possible that Servant was telling the truth. If he was being forthright then, it seems distinctly possible that Mary was truly happy with the Cuddigans and that their use of force with Mary was typical of the time period, slapping her arms and hands when she misbehaved. Yet, it is possible that Mary was abused and covered it up. Was she so happy to have a consistent home that she did not want to risk losing it? Did she really believe that the nuns at St. Vincent’s treat her worse than the Cuddigans, so that the promise to return her to Denver was perceived by Mary as a threat? Was Charles possibly abusive, leading Mary to view the Cuddigans’ inappropriate treatment of her to seem normal? Did she have some form of Stockholm syndrome? It seems odd that given a way out of an abusive home that Mary would turn down the opportunity. Speculation about the truth behind this conversation and the reasons why Mary would have turned down the chance to escape the Cuddigans’ home if she were abused is beyond the scope of this paper, but it is an interesting avenue for further research.


21. Neither the reports that neighbors frequently heard screams from the Cuddigan home, nor the report that Michael attempted to kill Mary Rose in the presence of a man who stopped her are repeated elsewhere in the press. These reports are likely what might be termed today as “fake news.”

22. “The Rose Matthews Tragedy.” In *Lynching in Colorado*, Leonard corroborates the notion that Caroline Churchill, the publisher of the *Queen Bee* “hated Catholics.” Leonard, *Lynching in Colorado*, 88. “The Rose Matthews Tragedy” became the launching pad for a series of articles, discussed in greater detail later in this paper, in which the *Queen Bee* alleged that Mary’s death was part of a Catholic conspiracy to cover up sexual abuse at St. Vincent’s Orphan Asylum.


24. Servant, “The Cuddigans.” Servant did not name the neighbor who reported the possible abuse, but Montgomery recalled seeing Mary barefoot in cold weather about one day before a report was made to Servant, so it is likely that he was the unnamed reporter mentioned by Servant.

25. “Barbarous Cruelty: Mary Rose Matthews, An Orphan Child Tortured Unto Death, by Michael Cuddigan, His Unnatural Wife and Her Beastly Brother.”; “On Exhibition,” *Rocky Mountain News*, February 1, 1884, Vol. XXV edition, Nineteenth Century U.S. Newspapers. The statements made by these men indicate that Servant’s description of Mary’s life with the Cuddigans was not wholly accurate, or at least that the Cuddigans put on a good show when he was present. It is possible that Mary procured the cuts and bruises because she was a ten year old on a ranch who played too hard, was clumsy or fell down the cellar stairs. At worst, it seems the Cuddigans abused her physically in a manner so severe it caused her death. At best, it seems they neglected her and allowed her to go into the cold and snow without proper clothing, which given her frostbitten appendages seems to have caused or contributed to her death. The *Rocky Mountain News* article, “On Exhibition,” speculates that all of the wounds found on Mary’s body could be “the result of an accident.” So, it seems that both then and now, there was no consensus as to whether her wounds were the result of abuse or accident. The truth of what happened to Mary is beyond the scope of this paper, but it is interesting to consider the possibilities which lend themselves to interesting research in the future.


70
28. “Multiple News Items,” February 20, 1884; Servant, “The Cuddigans”; “Servant’s Slush,” Solid Muldoon Weekly, February 1, 1884, Volume VI, No. 5 edition, Colorado Historic Newspapers Collection; Leonard, Lynching in Colorado, 1859-1919, 77. Regarding mental illness, the Queen Bee noted that Margaret pleaded with her accusers that she was “insane,” and though the Solid Muldoon contested that Margaret’s father committed suicide after the lynching, both Servant (whose source was James Carroll, Margaret’s brother) and historian Stephen Leonard place the suicide during Margaret’s childhood. Given a history of mental illness in her family, it is possible that Margaret also experienced symptoms, especially given the tragic loss of her father.

29. “Cuddigan’s Career: A Faithless Lover Who Ran Away with His Cousi and Went West.”


31. “An Express Wagon.”

32. Gordon, The Great Arizona Orphan Abduction, 9–19. Gordon describes how many orphans from more populated cities were brought west to be adopted by families who viewed the adopted children as a supplement to the family economy as sources of labor.


36. “Child Murder Near Ouray. Lynching of the Perpetrators by Vigilantes.” This story was written by the Denver Tribune staff, and re-printed in the Delta Chief. The Denver Tribune is not archived in a location that I have been able to access, so the stories written by its staff and quoted are always from a reprinted source.


39. Leonard, Lynching in Colorado, 1859-1919, 76. For more on David Day, his Civil War record, and his connection to the Cuddigan lynching, see Chapter 4 in Lynching in Colorado.


42. Leonard, Lynching in Colorado, 1859-1919, 75-78.


45. McLure, “Who Dares to Style This Female a Woman?”


48. “Judge Gerry Has Announced His Intention to Exert Himself to the Utmost to Fully Investigate the Ouray Lynching and Have the Stranglers Indicted.”

49. Pfeifer, Lynching beyond Dixie, 3. Pfeifer uses the phrase “rough justice” to describe acts of vigilantism, including lynching.
50. “The Examination,” *Solid Muldoon Weekly*, February 8, 1884, Vol. XI, No. 6 edition, Colorado Historic Newspapers Collection. This article was originally printed in the *Denver Tribune*, but was reprinted in the *Solid Muldoon*.

51. “Servant’s Slush.” While it would be highly unethical, these two reports of women (printed in the same paper) are paraphrases of each other, which begs the question: did David Day make up one or both of these quotes?

52. Gordon, *The Great Arizona Orphan Abduction*, 313. Gordon’s arguments regarding a case of vigilante action in Arizona indicate that the speculations I have made here may have been a determining factor in why the Cuddigans were lynched.

53. “The Rose Matthews Tragedy, Again.” The *Queen Bee*’s slogans included calls for reason, and women’s political equality, which is ironic considering the unreasonable, fabricated, and anti-female nature of its coverage of Margaret Cuddigan’s death. Buena Vista is a town located in the Colorado mountains.

54. “Father Servant.” Churchill’s allegations of rape are not supported by other sources, especially Rowan’s testimony to the Coroner’s jury after his post-mortem in which he does not mention the possibility of rape.

55. Leonard, *Lynching in Colorado, 1859–1919*, 156–57. LaBode, it should also be noted, has emphasized the role of race in creating a culture of western vigilantism. While Michael and Margaret were “white” by modern conceptions of racial categories, nineteenth-century Americans perceived race differently. Irish-Americans in this time were, generally speaking, not covered under the umbrella of whiteness. For more about racial categories in the United States in the late nineteenth century and early twentieth century see Gordon, *The Great Arizona Orphan Abduction*, 12, 19, 96-106, 296
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58. “Around Town.”
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62. “The Ouray Horror.” Amazons, in Greek mythology, were warrior women who lived in seclusion and attacked men. McLure, “Who Dares to Style This Female a Woman?,” 40.


64. “The Ouray Murder.”

65. “The Examination.”

66. McLure, “Who Dares to Style This Female a Woman?,” 43. McLure has suggested that public debates about lynching and its connections to the social, economic, and political dynamics within a community were common in the aftermath of incidents where mobs lynched women.

67. “The Lynching of a Man and His Wife at Ourary by a Mob, Yesterday Morning, Is Not an Agreeable Addition to the Long Record of Lawlessness in Colorado.”

68. “THE Annals of Mob Violence in This Country Contain No Parallel to the Chapter Just Contributed by the Town of Ouray, in This State.”
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