ON QUESTS FOR INDEPENDENCE: EVOLUTIONS OF HAITI, IRELAND, AND COLONIALISM

A dissertation submitted to the Caspersen School of Graduate Studies

Drew University in partial fulfillment of

The requirements for the degree,

Doctor of Letters

Michael Keith Walters

Drew University

Madison, New Jersey

May 2017

On Quests for Independence: Evolutions of
Haiti, Ireland, and Colonialism

Doctor of Letters Dissertation by

Michael Keith Walters

The Caspersen School of Graduate Studies
Drew University May 2017

ABSTRACT

Oppression is a continuous historical phenomenon, yet why do some revolutions occur and others do not? Two cases displaying the unpredictable nature by which independence and colony status are either attained or solidified are Hispañiola, today consisting of Haiti and the Dominican Republic, and Ireland. Despite significant desire to remove it, English influence still pervades part of Ireland. Irish nationalists view any British presence as that of an occupier; Unionists stand with a flag close to the Union Jack, and often welcome British presence, albeit in only one portion of the island. Haiti achieved independence after a most improbable revolution.

The Irish were never chattel slaves; why then were Haitians able to form their nation, while Ireland was unable to expel an oppressive force? France was expelled from Saint Domingüe in 1804; however, this alleged freedom has not brought prosperity to the majority of revolutionary descendants.

Ireland's relationship with revolution is infinitely more complex than that of Haiti, and the neighboring Dominican Republic, which won freedom from Haiti first in 1844. Dominican revolutionaries took advantage of Haitian turmoil to form the Dominican

Republic. Indicating that no national boundary controversies are the same, the Irish border situation and that of Hispañiola radically diverge today.

While there are certainly commonalities between Haiti and Ireland regarding depth of subjugation by colonial power, importing African slaves from the same region is far different from the ebb and flow of a neighbor's influence. That diversity of reactions to a visitor, ranging from welcome, indifference, and scorn, dictate that expulsion of the guest, in the Irish case the English, would be far less likely.

Nationalists in Ireland can argue that the cause of unifying Ireland has amassed victories. However, the nationalist cause in Ireland has always advocated for all thirty-two counties of Ireland as one country ruled by one Dublin government, while Unionists claim right to a six county section in Ireland's northeast, referred to by all but nationalists as Northern Ireland. The nationalist struggle turned violent in Northern Ireland for decades in the late twentieth century[1]. Therefore, peace has been an obstacle to both an absolute nationalist victory and the eradication of Irish Republicanism, a political view significantly linked to violence.

In the late seventeenth century, Irish Catholics may have looked to King James as a possible savior, freeing them from the Protestant reign of William of Orange. However, James viewed his efforts against Protestant forces in Ireland more as a vehicle through which to reacquire power. Less than a decade later, in 1697, Spain and France agreed to the Treaty of Ryswick (Demangles 19), dictating that two thirds of Hispañola would be

[1] Ireland remains partitioned, albeit without a military presence on the border, since a peace process between northern nationalists and Unionists, those favoring alliance with the United Kingdom, passed in 1998.

Spanish, and the western third, Saint Domingüe, would be French (Clement 148). War preceded treaty; cessation of hostilities attracted French settlers to colonize with their slaves. In a land where prized products such as sugar and coffee were plentiful, the free labor of chattel slaves toiling in the fields established Saint Domingüe as a colonial jewel, to which French flocked. More than three centuries after the 1492 founding of the island colony, and a century after a treaty divided Hispañola into what today are two independent nations, slaves led a successful revolution.

Questions addressed will include:

- How did a desire for independence factor into the Haitian slave revolt and Irish nationalism?
- Specifically relating to the Irish, how did the European definition of race affect English views?
- Focusing primarily on the "Age of Revolution" and modern times, how did racial stereotypes affect how the world perceived Haiti?
- How did refugees from Haiti and Saint Domingüe affect their neighbors and the world, both during the "Age of Revolutions" and today?
- To what extent did eugenics, deriving from racial stereotyping, continue to affect Haiti as the nation evolved?
- To what extent is the Haitian Revolution still taking place, as the nation today combats economic and social obstacles?
- To what extent does the massive drop in the Irish population resulting from hunger and emigration contribute to the current state of Irish society?

- How well are the legacies of Toussaint Louverture and Wolfe Tone reflected respectively in the advanced histories of Haiti and Ireland?

This project seeks to demonstrate, through two instances of divided islands, that oppressive hierarchy does not necessarily spur revolution; the nature and intricacy of the subjugation, planned or otherwise, is the primary factor determining whether the marginalized will attain power. Simultaneously, the comparison and contrast of the two island experiences will facilitate growth in studies on how certain sociological phenomena – nationalism and racial and religious discrimination -- affect emerging and transitioning states. The United States does factor into this analysis because Americans have had interest in what has occurred in Ireland, especially since massive emigration, and America is Haiti's neighbor to the North. Haiti has often been described as isolated from the United States. In some ways this has been so, but in other instances Haiti has been the focus of American policy.

Consequently, stemming from the age of revolutions, analysis and investigation will reveal that no one factor can guarantee removal of an oppressive force. Instead it is a compilation of sociopolitical events, as occurred in Haiti in 1804, converting previous governmental structures to the new, that forms fledgling nations. Even when a revolution removes an entrenched power structure, such is no guarantee that freedom and prosperity will be the result, even for leaders of the cause and their most ardent adherents. Degree of individual freedom experienced by victors and future citizen followers depends upon many factors which can be out of the revolutionaries' control.

This work attempts to ascertain why certain oppressed populations revolt successfully and others do not. Once begun, why do some revolutions succeed? How do goals of a revolution alter, once objectives appear to have been achieved? Focus on new nations and those transformed by internal revolution will add to critique on the significance of successful revolts. Therefore, this work's purpose will be to begin analyzing revolutionary process through the lens of two cases with basic commonalities, yet different results. Both islands can argue that there have been successes and failures regarding their quests for Irish and Haitian notions of freedom.

Table of Contents

Michael Keith Walters

Doctors Addo and De Barra

Dissertation

1 May 2017

1

To Separation, or Freedom?

Referring to the Egyptian upheaval of 2011, Brecht de Smet quotes labor historian Joel Beinen: "The January 25 revolution is not over. Rather, it has not yet occurred" (De Smet 11). Revolutions supposedly change citizens' lives and remove oppressive forces; some historical analysis can lead readers to believe that a revolution occurs and immediately conditions improve for those previously most oppressed. However, in analyzing particular historical changes many deem revolutionary, not only can it be argued that events defined as revolutions may not be revolutions at all, but the appearance of counterrevolutionary forces often tends to dull the effectiveness of each attempted and alleged coup.

Therefore, revolution is a process – not an event. It is, however, often a process coveted by the subjugated masses. De Smet quotes Theda Skocpol's "consequentialist" definition of revolution stating that to call a successful rebellion a revolution, it must entail "class-based revolts from below," and "rapid, basic transformations of a society's state and class structures" (De Smet 12). Therefore, Skocpol claims, a change in power does not necessarily equal a revolution, unless the ascendants were the most oppressed in society. Given how many – some would argue all – governmental systems are designed to preserve class status, this would make successful revolution extremely difficult, if not impossible.

If it did occur, it would do so at a great cost. A less rigid view of revolutionary success is given by Diane Russell, in *Rebellion, Revolution, and Armed Force*. "A successful revolution may be said to have occurred when substantial social change follows a rebellion" (Weede 44).

The position of the military usually determines which side wins in a revolutionary struggle. Mark Katz's 2004 analysis of successful and unsuccessful attempts to transform societies from dictatorships to democracies by the masses indicates that if the military allies itself with society's aggrieved, victory for the oppressed is more likely. The unsuccessful attempted revolts Katz refers to are Burma, now known as Myanmar, China, whose youth uprising was violently suppressed in 1989, and Algeria (167-169). Katz's analysis even finds likely conflict with Skopcol's definition of revolution: "Whether or not Algeria was experiencing a Democratic revolution from 1988-92 is still open to debate" (168). On the successful side, Katz cites Serbia, Russia, and the Phillipines. On Serbia, "Without the protection of the security forces, which appeared to back him fully up to the end, Milosevic soon agreed to surrender power" (166). Therefore, encouraging the military to abandon its supervisor is vital to ensuring transition of power, if there are outside interests.

Divergent Histories

Centuries previous to Katz's analysis of transition to democracy and De Smet's reference to a classical definition of revolution, England, perhaps most progressive because of its "Glorious Revolution" in the seventeenth century, had a voting system which only allowed 4500 out of 2.6 million people to vote. "The British electoral system was unrepresentative and outdated" (National Archives, UK). Kings were never elected by the

masses, serving by supposed divine right. English subjects perceiving extreme subjugation by the crown could not find refuge in the remainder of Europe. “Absolute monarchies ruled in all functioning states of the European continent; those in which they did not rule fell apart into anarchy” (Hobsbawm 22). In retrospect, given there was no blueprint for anything close to an electoral or popular vote, the United States separation from England is no surprise. After the United States of America formed, some American newspapers referred to George Washington as “Your Highness,” “Your Magistracy,” or “His Highness the President of the United States of America and Protector of their Liberties.” While America’s first chief executive was content to be referred to as president, many of Washington’s admirers wanted him to be king. (Schwartz, 61; 89).

Thirteen years later, the process of revolution in France started: was the storming of the Bastille the beginning of the global society?

> France became involved in the American War for Independence. Victory over England was gained at the expense of total bankruptcy, and thus the American Revolution can claim to be the direct cause of the French… war and debt – the American War and its debt – broke the back of the monarchy (Hobsbawm 58).

Stemming from the economic and social ideology of the Enlightenment (Hobsbawm 21), glorifying individual economic success in lieu of state servitude, the French Revolution was led by a seemingly mismatched group of French artisans, businessmen, and philosophers, the ‘bourgeoisie.’ However divergent their backgrounds, they formed a “fairly coherent social group,” which “gave the revolutionary movement

effective unity" (Hobsbawm 58). From this movement comes the Declaration of the Rights of Man and Citizens, in 1789 (Hobsbawm 59).

The "Declaration of Independence" does not say, or even imply, "One Man; One Vote," to be interpreted today as "One Person; One Vote" (Jefferson 553-555). Similarly, the "Declaration of the Rights of Man and Citizens," which many historians argue changed the world, does not advocate an egalitarian society in which all have equal voice. The documented inspiration for the French Revolution, commonly known as the Rights of Man, "is a manifesto against the hierarchal society of noble privilege, but not one in favor of democratic or egalitarian society" (Hobsbawm 59).

Heart of the Tempest

In a society theoretically founded upon the Rights of Man, to be eligible to serve in the first National Assembly, designed to advise the monarch, one had to pay taxes on an average of 50 days of work per year. To vote, one had to have paid taxes on at least three days labor (Spiller 48). In a society devastated by both urban and rural poverty, this excluded large portions of the population, who theoretically should benefit from a revolt. Even among the upper classes who could vote, exclusions abounded. French women first voted in 1945 (France), and could serve as Assembly Deputies that same year, electing 33 women. In contrast, the United States granted women the right to vote through constitutional amendment in 1920. The first Congresswoman was elected in 1917, before women had the right to vote. The first female senator was elected in 1922 (Salmon).

Though incomplete in attaining class mobility, even the most critical historians see value in the French uprising. In a land where feudalism – de jure castes in landowning

society -- was still legal, 610 Assembly Deputies were elected to represent the "Third Estate," or, as the economic ruling classes, the first and second estates, of nobility and clergy, understood it to be representing, the "bourgeoisie." However,

> The 'Third Estate' succeeded, in the face of the united resistance of the king and the privileged orders, it represented not merely the view of an educated and militant minority, but of far more powerful forces: the laboring poor of the cities, and especially of Paris, and shortly, also the revolutionary peasantry (Hobsbawm 60).

The first and second estates, though, had only a tangential interest in the ascendancy of the "Third Estate," which consisted of huge swaths of impoverished struggling with food insecurity and disease. The Constitution of 1791 enabled some nobles to recreate a system similar to one they had before 1789, except with Louis' power minimized to only a veto. "The monarchy, though now strongly supported by a powerful, ex-revolutionary bourgeois faction, could not resign itself to the new regime" (Hobsbawm 64). Though the king did accept the 1791 Constitution, he vetoed a National Assembly decree declaring French emigrants who left their homeland from 1789-91 as traitors, increasing suspicion that the king, assisted by wealthy expatriate nobles, was an active participant in a rumored plot to restore France to its pre-revolutionary status. (Todd 130).

Internally, forces for a more egalitarian France began to wonder if their idealism could be exported to other lands. According to the Girondins, rulers of the Assembly, "The liberation of France was merely the first installment of the universal triumph of liberty; an attitude which led easily to the conviction that it was the duty of the fatherland of revolution to liberate all peoples groaning under oppression and tyranny" (Hobsbawm 65). In 1790

the Girondins ratified a civil constitution for the church, which Louis delayed signing, indicating his opposition. Fearing the monarch was next to lose power, Louis embarked on "a desperate, and as it proved suicidal, attempt to flee the country"(Hobsbawm 64; Todd 130). While it is likely that Louis XVI would have been tried, convicted, and beheaded anyway, even if he had not run, his fleeing certainly expediting the process.

In a prelude to future divisive issues in many revolts after the age of monarchy, the bourgeoisie lacked interest in improving the situation of those below them on the economic ladder (Hobsbawm 64). Without the French third estate's representation in an elected assembly, "The uncontrolled free enterprise economy of the moderates accentuated the fluctuations in the level of food prices, and consequently the militancy of the urban poor, especially in Paris" (Hobsbawm 64-65).

Witnessing the beginning of this historical phenomenon was Maxmilien Robespierre, elected Assembly Deputy for the Third Estate in 1789. A frequent historical villain, Robespierre began as an attorney. Before election, his speeches could be "tedious," but he was "best known for defending the poor." Robespierre is more oxymoronic than ideological, yet his start was an idealistic place. Known for executing thousands, he began as an opponent of the death penalty. Infamous for supporting a revolution that suppressed dissent, he started as a proponent of universal male suffrage, even for slaves. However, "The earlier years of the revolution were dominated by those who had no wish to see power in the hands of the propertyless" (Linton 24). Therefore, his early revolutionary views allied himself with the radical left, the Sansculottes in the cities and peasants in rural areas.

While the king allied himself with expatriate French nobles in an effort to retake

absolute power, factionalism was infecting an idealistic movement. The crusading Sansculottes, supporters of Robespierre, welcomed a government exporting revolution, because the ideals it would export would theoretically seek to attain social justice at home (Hobsbawm 67). However, Robespierre, in direct disagreement, said nobody welcomes "armed liberators" (Linton 24). In the first such feud among national revolutionary factions, armed struggle between the Sansculotte victors and the Girondins facilitated public safety director Robespierre's ascent to power (Linton 25).

Previously an opponent to the death penalty, Robespierre advocated the execution of Louis XVI. Historian Marisa Linton posits, though, that by late 1792, Robespierre had "not abandoned his libertarian convictions, but he was coming to the conclusion that the ends justified the means, and that in order to defend the Revolution against those who would destroy it, the shedding of blood was justified" (25). Subsequently, following the monarch's 1793 death, France ratified "The first genuinely democratic constitution proclaimed by a modern state." Subtly conveying how idealism labors to survive in conflict, Eric Hobsbawm describes this constitution as "noble but academic" (69). The attempt to create a more democratic society – still excluding women, however, from voting – could not be implemented because the nation's priorities were exporting the alleged revolutionary ideals it professed for the homeland. France was either exporting revolution to the oppressed masses, or allowing itself to justify expanding empire (Hobsbawm 67). To the ruling classes in other nations invaded by France, and to the ruled who had no desire for French help in their cause, this meant war.

Internally, the Sansculottes pressured the Jacobins, who controlled the Assembly, to fight counterrevolutionaries – which to the Sansculottes meant anybody who disregarded the needs of the urban working poor. This would include monarchists, constitutional monarchists, or even some bourgeoisie. In response, the Law of Suspects was passed on September 17, 1793, endowing the police with wide arrest powers. The French terror had begun. Girondin leader Jacque Pierre-Brissot and Marie Antoinette were executed in October. Between 1793 and July 28, 1794, when Robespierre "and his gang" (Weber 20) were executed, the total number of death sentences passed by the Jacobin governments in France was 16,594 (Linton 27). This number is undoubtedly less than the actual number of people who died during the three stages of the terror because street violence brought Jacobins to power; thus why would the Sansculottes be inclined to contact the law, when they knew vigilantism for their cause had worked previously?

The words chosen by historian Eugen Weber indicate how a reputation can morph. Robespierre was director of a government agency; the next year he was implicated in and dispatched into history's graveyard as a mass murderer. Not blameless to be sure, but Robespierre was "never the head of the government, nor the only terrorist." Both Linton and Hobsbawm place Robespierre in an untenable position. Linton implies that the corruption of public safety committee members caused the revolution to lose its chosen path (28). Robespierre, possibly a believer in the revolution and the Rights of Man, came to consider that in order to preserve the French Revolution's values, one had to be willing to eliminate opponents, and that fear of governmental authority must exist to maintain a nation (26).

Hobsbawm states that economics made the collapse of the revolution inevitable. “The [Jacobin] regime was an alliance between the middle class and the laboring masses” (70). The economic upheaval felt by the poor masses alienated much of their support for the government whose stated goal was to export liberty. Similarly, the moderate middle class, first aspiring to take power away from the monarch, had no desire to see the poor benefit from price controls used to benefit a military exporting perceived freedom to other colonies and nations. Enlightenment thinking emphasized individual liberty, not revolution for the oppressed masses. Eventually the term “Enemy of the revolution” became fungible. “By April 1794, both right and left had gone to the guillotine and the Robespierrists were politically isolated. Only the war crisis maintained them in power” (71). French killing sessions took multiple lives, and Robespierre’s execution was no exception. The former elected official was beheaded with two allies, Saint-Just and Couthon (Hobsbawm 72), and 71 followers (Brown 504). Days later 87 members of the Paris Commune, which advocated an economic system today most similar to either regulated capitalism or socialism (Hobsbawm 63), met the same fate (72), All were executed without trial (Brown 504). This might make an average Frenchman – or woman, as women were also guillotined, yearn for a stable government that had a strong rule of law. The French government convention, for whom Robespierre officially worked, thus executed him and his followers, allegedly following the path of the revolution. His faction was supposedly supported by the parliament, similarly engaging in the coup. In forming a new government, the Thermidorians, named thusly from the month when the coup took place in the revolutionary calendar, had to decide who else needed to be blamed for the terror, of which

Robespierre was the most dominant symbol. The goal, which many French hoped would be reached by the new parliamentary government, called the National Convention, was national reconciliation of justice and political stability. However, "Fulfilling both objectives inevitably leads to political distortions of criminal justice" (Brown 505). Responding to demands to alleviate repressive government, many imprisoned suspects were released after the beheadings of Robespierre and his closest allies. Regardless of politics, this angered those injured by the newly freed, and relatives of those who may have been murdered; accordingly, many prisoners wanted their persecutors punished, because many were singled out only for political alliances.

Briefly, in 1794, the convention contemplated taking responsibility for the terror collectively, but later decided to officially lay the blame on "The Robespierrists" (Brown 508). In 1794, the chief prosecutor of the "Revolutionary Tribunal," Fouquier-Tinville, and fifteen other court members were executed. The convention, in addressing excesses of street justice, had engaged in similar actions, albeit under a rule of law, after a trial. Part of Tinville's defense was that he was following orders given to him by the government, many of whom supported his prosecution and execution (510-11). The convention, begun by the monarch in 1792 (Dubois 145), ordered any fired officials from Paris back home to local provinces, where public relations on the part of the convention dictated that they would be targeted by violence, because of the lack of collective responsibility taken for the terror by the convention. In one province twenty-five Republicans[2] were thrown into a river; twenty-

[2] Republican came to mean supporters of the ideals of the French revolution. However, "the aspiration to create a regime in which the citizenry live free and equal lives, in fraternal solidarity with one another, was not fulfilled in the French revolution and has not been fulfilled since," writes James Livesey in "The

three more were burned in their jail cells. Mass killing abounded throughout France, even after the official "terror" (513).

The next French governmental structure to attempt reconciliation was the Directory, named for an executive board of five elected men. Since previous trials inspired more violence, however, resulting from both pre and post-revolutionary divisions, the only solution was general amnesty for perceived revolutionary activities, passed in October, 1795 (523). The National Convention closed its tenure with forgiveness. A new constitution ratified in 1795 (Dubois 196) created a governing body voted upon by "almost universal male suffrage," and included "a bicameral legislature" (Rapport 14). Directory officials were still referred to as "Thermidorians," after the month on the Republican calendar when the executions of Robespierre and his allies took place. However, they were largely ineffective at controlling the military, in which Napoleon was a rising star. "The revolutionary army was the most formidable child of the Jacobin Republic" (Hobsbawm 73).

French revolutionary activities differed sharply to those in the fledgling United States. Two major factors were leadership by George Washington, who expressed no desire to be royalty, and militia's major role in the successful quest for independence. Young America was a society "mobilized for war, but the experience had not militarized society" (Langley 60). France was not as fortunate in this regard, though France never had to fight a civil war over slavery.

Culture and History of French Republicanism: Terror or Utopia." It is no surprise that people were angry at believers in the revolution, given the preceding trend of execution, often without trial.

In Contrast?

No mass terror ever occurred in the young nation across the Atlantic, in which only designated electors would vote for the president. Remnants of this system remain in place in the United States, whose chief executive is still chosen by popular voting within states, which dictate to convention electors how to vote for the presidency. This was most controversial in 1876, 2000, and in 2016[3]. In 1876, Democratic candidate Samuel Tilden won the popular vote while Republican Rutherford B. Hayes squeaked out the electoral win by one vote. To prevent unrest, a bargain was reached in which Hayes' party, the Republicans, the party of Abraham Lincoln, who through legislation and agenda had pushed de jure freedom of African-Americans, would remove their troops from the American south. The purpose of these troops was to enforce reconstruction law, which prevented excessive discrimination against the newly freed slaves. Largely as a result of military departure, many gains of the Reconstruction era were lost.

In 2000, the winner of the state of Florida's electoral votes was disputed up to the Supreme Court; Democratic candidate Al Gore's choice to cease fighting an alleged presidential win by George W. Bush was followed by two wars, one of which, in Iraq, has proven to be totally baseless. When Bush left office, his polled approval rating was in the 20 per cent range, and this number may be shrinking as of 2014. Viewing the status of both Haiti and Ireland through a modern lens, the United States has a vital role, just as France did in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries.

On Governmental Success, Structure, and Leadership

[3]The 2016 election will be addressed in chapter 8, the conclusion.

Many world leaders had higher approval than the second American president Bush, as he left office. The French Thermidorians' Directory, headed by the named executive council of five, was no exception, though it was a centrist government supported by property owners and debt holders, and lacked a stable base of support (Rapport 13). Evidence of whose interests the government represents is the army being employed to suppress the Sansculotte food riots of May, 1795 (Brown 512; French Revolution: A Chronology). Having seemingly vanquished efforts of the impoverished to attain more wealth, the middle class faced a dilemma: "How to achieve political stability and economic advance on the basis of the original liberal programme of 1789-91" (Hobsbawm 72).

In 1795 a constitution was ratified, but it depended upon military support. In 1797, theoretically liberal France voted 182 royalists into their assembly, and royalist Francois de Barthelémy, into the Directory, the executive branch. In response, Republican forces were sent to arrest Barthelémy, Deputy Lazare Carnot, both described as moderate by historian Michael Rapport, and more than 50 right wing deputies. Napoleon, French appointed military commander since March 11, 1796 (Rapport 12), sent Gen. Augereau to ensure that the republicans would achieve their goal of preventing significant royalist infiltration into the Directory. If the military had as much power as Hobsbawm and Rapport indicate, then he could have refused, or sent people whom he knew would not achieve the Directory's goal of preventing royalist influence.

A month previous, on Feb. 2, 1796, William Theobald Wolfe Tone arrived at Le Havre, France, after a stormy passage from America. In America, his dreams of an independent Ireland never took hold among exiles, so he came to France to capitalize on

the supposed national urge to spread revolution worldwide. To Tone, “worldwide” began with Ireland. He would have his chance to attain a lifelong goal, while acclimating himself to the political turmoil of an adopted land (Elliott 278, 281; 330).

Meanwhile, it might seem that the people would be pleased by the suppression of a wave of elected officials who harkened back to the time of absolute monarchy. However, no connection could be made in the somewhat democratic country between preventing the infiltration of royalists and an improved society. Whether the two events were connected or not was irrelevant; either way peace negotiations with Britain immediately collapsed. Austria rejoined the European war against Frances purported export of freedom, which France’s enemies would claim was only a colonial power seeking to expand its empire.

The coup is evidence that French society needed a strong ruler to internally stabilize, because “the regime would not accept the results of elections.” In 1798, when 106 left wing deputies lost their seats, supporters of the Directory began to believe that if government lacked formidable central power, the revolution and its aims would be in jeopardy. Constitutional reform could address such matters, but that could take nine years. Meanwhile, the military’s authority was growing, under the ascendant Napoleon (Rapport 12; 14). In confirming Mark Katz’s thesis about internal revolutions, when Napoleon arrested the royalists, he was protecting the Directory. However, as commander of the military, “It was not certain that, in the future, their interests would coincide with those of the government” (14).

A Dictatorship Sprouts; a Dictator Rises

At first, it appeared, Napoleon lacked interest in taking power. However, in retrospect, even if he were interested, he could have concealed his actual desire, because when first approached by Talleyrand and Abbé Sieyés about a constitutional change to preserve the government, Napoleon declined to provide aid. However, at the time he was one of three possibilities to aid Sieyés in his takeover. Two years later, in 1799, Sieyés had been elected as a director, with Jacobin and moderate support. A Sieyés request of Bonaparte to join a coup around the same time as the Jacobins approached Gen. Bernadotte indicates that the Directory's days were numbered. Political views aside, to Bonaparte, the Jacobins chose the wrong general. Bernadotte disliked Napoleon (15).

From within Sieyés likely engineered to alter the executive council with help from the Council of Five Hundred, one of the two constitutionally prescribed houses, by forcing the resignation of Jean Reubell, disloyal to Sieyés, and replacing Reubell with Louis Gohier, a Jacobin, loyal to the insurrectionist. Two days later, on June 18, 1799, all five directors were loyal to Sieyés. Initially, Jacobins were pleased – dominance on the executive board enabled them to attain forced conscription. However, they also feared military dictatorship, meaning when three out of the five directors resigned on Nov. 18-19, 1799, the Jacobins became the most ardent defenders of a weak constitution, because they could envisage what was likely to occur after Napoleon led troops to address this political crisis. Whether dictatorship was a foregone conclusion at this point depends upon whom is asked the question. Responding to a void at the top in a somewhat democratically elected regime, Napoleon demanded that the Council of Elders – the Directory's second house of legislators – allow him to take whatever measures necessary to protect the republic. They

acquiesced, likely for two reasons: first, they were respectful of or intimidated by the military; second, they were scared of another terror. “It was from this moment that the plot ceased to be the parliamentary maneuver for which Sieyés had hoped, and became a military coup.” Napoleon’s speech to the council diverted from Sieyés’ plan, as the former director expected a power sharing arrangement (16).

No power sharing arrangement would exist. The plan designed by Sieyés called for ally Rogér-Ducos, former director alongside Sieyés, the lead conspirator himself, and Napoleon, to be three consuls. Rogér-Ducos, either inexplicably, ignorantly, or prophetically, proclaimed that the first consul, or ruler, was the general’s “by right:” “In recognition of the military force which rescued the coup from disaster, leadership of the [coup] had fallen from Sieyés to Napoleon.” Shortly after his anointment, twenty-five innocuous deputies were chosen to write a new constitution, to be overseen by General Bonaparte (17).

On Dictators and Monarchs

The monarchy, though, would not make an immediate comeback – not if the aspirant general had any voice. Napoleon prepared to take power himself, by arresting and exiling Jacobins. He was on the path to becoming dictator, ruler of a hand-picked senate. The man who first sought his help in overthrowing the Directory, Sieyés, would not accept Bonaparte’s offer to serve as second consul (19).

In analyzing the internal effects of the French Revolution, much analysis falls on the bourgeoisie, the growing middle class, yet Karl Marx “Recognizes that the revolutionaries of 1789 appear to have had no sense of themselves as champions of a

bourgeois revolution" (Heller 190). Therefore, when goals changed must be investigated. Analysis of revolutions of Theda Skopcol, and of Erich Weede and Edward Muller, all state that national change comes from an idealistic worldview. Subsequent 1790s events indicate that coercive power mobilized against those most in need of more equal distribution of wealth; examples include the Jacobin arrests in 1799 and the suppression of the Sansculottes riots in 1795. Originally, the Jacobins and Sansculottes had campaigned to put Robespierre in power. Associating violent revolutions, or poor street urchins with Robespierre had to limit support for the Jacobin and Sansculotte causes. While easy to censure by today's standards, the chaos of 1789-99 in France can be better understood first by accepting that the bourgeoisie did achieve a status previously attained only by inheritance, monarchy, elevated status of clergy, or landowning nobility and feudalism (Heller 202-203). While the bourgeoisie certainly did not ally themselves with the most deprived, the failure of the French revolution's ideals and consequent terror spared no one. The bourgeoisie, however small in a nation with more than 90% poverty, incurred tremendous bloodletting.

From a twenty-first century perspective, observers can exclaim why the few privileged French did not anticipate bloodshed. However, in 1790, the French middle class "Had not yet, like subsequent liberals, the awful memory of the French Revolution to be frightened of" (Hobsbawm 62). Clearly Theda Skopcol's definition of a successful revolution does not apply to France. However, Diane Russell's may, depending upon to what extent French life changed for those who survived the tumult of the terror.

The Directory, for a time, provided hope. However, even if French voters had elected more representatives from lower economic classes, it is unlikely this number would be large enough to have made a difference. The Directory could not adequately resolve revolutionary conflicts, which led to coups. Subsequently came Napoleon, who ensured The Directory's demise by implementing the military for political gain (Rapport 18-19).

To What Degree Revolution?

Across the Atlantic, the results of the American separation from England would create a debate as to whether what American students learn as the American Revolution was indeed a revolution at all. If it is to be named thusly, it too cannot be according to Theda Skocpol's definition of revolution, being that from below. However, according to Diane Russell, whose definition is less rigid, the degree to which social change occurred after 1776 would define whether or not George Washington and his brethren were revolutionary.

Postwar America, in the 1780s, had little opportunity for upward class mobility, and none for slaves unless they were freed, but Americans could migrate west, thereby beginning the legend of the rugged individualist American (Langley 62-63). Eight years after the first American governmental experiment, the Articles of Confederation, had failed, the new nation tried again, accurately assessing that a nation leaving too much power in states' hands under a feckless federal government was no nation at all. In the next attempt at establishing stable governments, twenty-five out of fifty-five delegates to the first 1789 Constitutional Convention owned slaves, who held the lowest rung in any society; some even brought human chattel to the convention. One, James Madison, later to

be president, had his manservant, Billy, recaptured after an escape (Beeman 309-310). George Washington owned between 250-300 slaves throughout his life, but freed them in his will (Beeman 309; G. Washington). Though he wrote a letter to a friend confiding in the friend that he disliked slavery, he did not speak out publicly (G. Washington).

John Adams, lamenting the lack of economic growth in his new nation in the 1780s (Langley 62) did advocate gradual ending of slavery, as did foremost eighteenth century American abolitionist Benjamin Rush (McCullogh 133). It was rare, though, even up to the Civil War, that an American would believe that truly all men were created equal, regardless of skin tone. Even founding fathers who were not slave owners "believed that large scale emancipation would cause significant social disruptions, including life-threatening poverty, theft, and violence" (Beeman 334). In young America, preserving the nation was prioritized over freeing enslaved Africans and their descendants, generationally to become African-Americans. These unpaid laborers had built many colonial and young national institutions with their bare hands and cared for many of its children. Northerners were unwilling to extract a price of morality from the South in the process of expediting a national experiment. The causes for this are both pragmatist and racist, but when historically viewing America's first century, was the Civil War worth the price of postponing addressing the great immoral institution of bondage exported from Europe?

Thus without expanded economic opportunity, and no deference to the national plight of slaves, if the American Revolution was such at all, it was a successful bourgeoisie struggle. Those most subjugated, slaves, did not attain freedom. The class category of slave in America would exist for most of the young nation's first century.

History: "It's not Possible." Could it Still Happen?

Shrouded in mystery were the ingredients for a revolution from below, but timeless and perpetual were struggles against oppressors, and the yearning for freedom against extreme subjugation. Such a revolt could start, both theoretically and practically, in a constructed nation, formed by a combination of servitude and bourgeoisie. If circumstances were precise, under a leader able to unify diverse factions, could it occur? The French Revolution, under the French National Convention, could facilitate such an insurgency, by emancipating French colonial slaves in 1794 (Dubois 167-170; James 138-140). Sprouting from the French Revolution and its aftermath, chaos in the old world would metastasize in the new. French instability coupled with Napoleon's arrogance, and a blistering insurgency, would radically alter social, political, and racial history.

2

From Colonial Roots of Servitude

Much of the nineteenth century was shaped by how the French National Convention addressed the colony of Saint Domingüe, by first sending commissioners there, and then by how the Republic received its representatives. The convention was designed to advise Louis XVI, beheaded on Jan. 21, 1793, had he kept any governmental authority. The French Republic, founded upon "The Rights of Man," having executed its king, two weeks later warred with Britain, still represented by a monarch (James 120; Bell 44). Therefore, France would gain allies in war with the English if they admitted that slaves and the nation allegedly overseeing their owners were fighting the same cause, against tyranny (Dubois 154). The French planters, however, leaned toward aristocracy and nobility: "White planters had made several overtures to the British Government, and some had aired the possibility of handing the colony to an imperial power whose commitment to maintaining slavery seemed much stronger than that of the French Republic" (153).

In the midst of an evolving military campaign undertaken by some of the most oppressed in world history, Parisian Jacobin commissioners Léger Félicité Sonthonax and Etienne Polverel (143) proclaimed that any slave who would take up arms for the French Republic in any battle against external enemies, would be entitled to "Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity," as per "The Rights of Man." Saint Domingüe slaves, some literate and many aware of world events, became daunting allies for the Republic (157-58), though they were still property of French aristocracy. Slaves, seeing freedom from bondage and

Republicanism as a system under which they could be equals with the French, rebelled in August of 1791, just months after the suppression of Saint Domingüe's 1790-91 mixed-race revolt. While Sonthonax and Polverel were Jacobins, practicality may have factored into Sonthanax's decision, undoubtedly approved by Polverel, to emancipate Saint Domingüe's armed slaves fighting for the Republic: one planter, Monsiur Artaud (Monticello.org), "who owned hundreds of slaves told Sonthonax it would be best to declare abolition" (James 128). In 1793, fifteen-thousand island votes were cast on August 24 to end de jure slavery, and Sonthanax decreed on August 29 that all slaves would henceforth be free. This was the end of one journey, and the beginning of an unexpected one to a new nation state: "The specter of liberty that had loomed over Saint Domingüe for years, haunting and taunting masters and slaves, had become a reality" (163).

A World Away?

On its own seemingly radical path, the French government was controlled by Girondins, who though having abolitionist tendencies, would not stand up to the bourgeoisie economically. Consequently, the French ruling party would not interfere with free labor. No legislation ending slavery was discussed for a year, and the internal combustion of factionalism within the revolution would bring Robespierrists to power (James 137). Robespierrists, defined by Caribbean historian C.L.R. James as a coalition of "servants, peasants," and "workers," believed all aristocracies must be ended, even the "aristocracy of the skin" (139).

The Twain Meet

It was to this France to which Saint Domingüe sent three representatives, to the French National Convention in February, 1794. This group was a cross-section of Saint Domingüe's French and Creole speaking population: Jean-Baptiste Belley, a former slave and current French soldier, Jean-Baptiste Mills, a mulatto, and Louis Dufay, a white man. They had journeyed to France via way of Philadelphia; in route Belley was besieged with racial taunts, spewed by white refugees fleeing Saint Domingüe. Epithets screamed by the crowd indicate fear of an unknown future, in which they could not legally subjugate. Belley's belongings were stolen – among them his sword. Dufay was almost murdered in Philadelphia; while disembarked his quarters were pillaged, with the justification, according to the crowd, that "Whites who sided with blacks were the guiltiest of all" (Dubois 169). Sonthonax had to worry about the ramifications of such directives: in 1792 he was told by the Saint Domingüe Assembly president that no black person should ever become a French citizen, and Saint Domingüe was still, and would remain for at least another decade, French territory (James 122).

Necessity, not Morality

From this moment through the end of the Directory Regime another victor of the French Revolution emerges – the triumph of a concept of equality in a nation state – albeit in a time of war, regardless of class and race. The February 3, 1794 Convention meeting greeted Belley, Mills, and Dufay with intermittent bursts of applause. Deputy La Croix, while successfully demanding the triumvirate receive the fraternal kiss from President

Marc-Guillaume Alexis-Vadier[4] (archontology.org; worldstatesmen.org), greeted the multiracial trio: "The Assembly has been anxious to have within it some of those men of colour who have suffered oppression for so many years. Today it has two of them."

On February 4, Belley spoke, "pledging the blacks to the cause of the revolution, and asking the Convention to declare slavery abolished." Deputy Levasseur apologized for ignoring the plight of blacks born into bondage, and urged that nary a word be spoken on this. "Posterity will bear us a great reproach for that. Let us repair the wrong – let us proclaim the liberty of the Negroes" (James 140). Applause ensued; a black woman who regularly attended Convention meetings fainted, but was ushered to sit next to President Alexis-Vadier once the business of legislating was set in motion. La Croix demanded that naval efforts be used to inform the colonies of the February 4, 1794 decree. "The National Convention declares slavery abolished in all the colonies. In consequence it declares that all men, without distinction of color, domiciled in the colonies, are French citizens, and enjoy all the rights assured under the Constitution" (141).

Political Change, Anomaly, and Irony

Sonthanax had either shifted ideologically, or revealed his true self when he proclaimed that slaves who would fight for France should attain freedom. As a white man aware of the racism of his time, he had to feel comfort in that on February 4, 1794, in Paris, Dufay, the white member of the contingent of Saint Domingüe representatives, addressed

[4]Alexis-Vadier is not named by James, but he was only president for two weeks, from Jan. 20 until Feb. 4, 1794. Though applauding Robespierre's downfall, factionalism under The Convention, The Terror, and The Directory forced him into exile, but eventually he was arrested for but acquitted in a suspected plot against the Directory. Since he advocated Louis XVI's execution, he was banned from France in 1816, fleeing to Brussels. World Statesmen.org verifies Vadier's two-week tenure.

the commission on the necessity to recruit slaves into the army to fight against the English, or any other enemy. Jacobinism, spreading the doctrine of breaking colonial chains, had propelled France into war throughout Europe, starting in 1793 (Hobsbawm 84). Spreading revolution was part of Jacobin doctrine, but unless taxes were raised to pay for war, internal economics would not improve. With Robespierre's execution and the turmoil preceding and during the early Directory, France was losing its idealistic vision stemming from the storming of the Bastille. Nevertheless, it had granted equal citizenship – seemingly a goal of the French Revolution -- to all Africans and African descendants living in French colonies. However, that granted equality, alongside internal politics of the population of Saint Domingüe, would take the island on an uncharted path.

Ironically, further complicating the relationship between freedom for slaves and the French Revolution is the following statement by C.L.R. James on Robespierre's relationship to the Feb. 4 decree: "Robespierre was not present at the session and did not approve of the step" (James 141). Georges Danton, Robespierre's ally on the Committee for Public Safety during the terrors, felt the Convention moved too quickly, yet saw that France would likely keep Saint Domingüe as a result of abolition. Once abolition occurred, no faction envisioned a new nation. While the French Convention saw them as equals, the Saint Domingüe planter class did not. Landlords of sprawling sugar, indigo, and coffee plantations "fumed, remaining shameless and obstinate" (James 142), when their property was usurped by just law, and people who previously were free labor could no longer be enslaved.

Rigid Free Labor Systems

Planters did not like to see their rights to have slaves and treat them as they saw fit infringed. Though the Negro Code of 1685 did legislate limits on slave discipline, nobody was there to enforce it. “The decisions embodied in the slave plantations were taken by merchants and planters, not by some democratic vote” (Blackburn., “The American Crucible” 93). For example, in 1788, two female slaves endured their feet and elbows being burned off because their owner, Nicholas Le Jeune, suspected them of attempting to poison animals on his plantation. Exercising their rights to complain on the behalf of these women were 14 other blacks. However, the result was Le Jeune’s acquittal of all charges, and the women dying soon after their torture ended (James 22-24). This case “laid bare the realities of slave law and justice in San Domingo” (22).

Saint Domingüe’s Internal Dynamics

As France outmaneuvered other powers to obtain majority control over Hispañiola, the island containing both the Dominican Republican and Haiti today, the number of sugar plantations grew almost exponentially from eighteen in 1700 to 288 in 1790. Immense profits were garnered first in making sugar, and then removing the molasses from it, giving it a brownish color. Other plantations produced indigo or coffee. By 1750, an “obsessively” and “deliberately” racialized workforce was the economic engine for a society consisting of 150,000 slaves and 14,000 whites (Dubois 19). By 1789, Saint Domingüe was producing about sixty per cent of the west’s coffee. By 1800, the colony led the world in sugar and coffee production in “the most profitable colony in the world” (Trouillot 37).

The brutality of Saint Domingüe slavery is infamous. While the wealth level enabled at least the majority of planters to leave overseers in charge of the slaves and their

production, who was supervising the forced workforce was irrelevant. More pertinent was how the landowners viewed their human property. C.L.R. James cites a 1789 memoir referring to "The Negroes," as "unjust, cruel, barbarous, half-human, treacherous, deceitful, thieves, drunkards, proud, lazy, unclean, shameless, jealous to fury, and cowards." Convinced that Africans and their descendants were subhuman, French planters and overseers rarely observed slaves' congregating after their nine to ten hour toils (James 17). Even if they had, the French would not have understood them, expectedly not speaking Creole or any African language. Aware oppressed people rarely will reveal their plans to break their chains, unless there is a distinct advantage to doing so.

Some argue that the brutality of the slave owning regime in Saint Domingüe would not have been so severe, had more of the planter class been present on the island. This assertion is refuted by Alex Dupuy's "French Merchant and Capital in Saint Domingue." Primitive farming methods, an obsessive desire to sate Europe's yearn for sugar, and a workforce viewed as subhuman ensured that regardless of which colonizer was supervising free labor, savagery would have been inflicted upon Saint Domingüe slaves (80-82). The theory that owners would be more benevolent toward slaves than overseers presupposes that landowners were not indoctrinated into the racist thinking of the eighteenth century.

With the slave trade flourishing, more slaves could be obtained, if any chattel were tortured to death, or could no longer work. However, slaves brought in to replace slaves who could no longer work due to death or disability were from Africa. Regardless of their birthplaces, some slaves ordered to work on Saint Domingüe committed suicide (James 15), in fear of torture and the intense work involved in cultivating sugar and other crops.

The humanity of the slaves, and the fact that slave replacements came from Africa would be the downfall of the Saint Domingüe planter class. “The creole Negro was more docile than the slave who was born in Africa” (17). When considering revolutionary prospects, at least slaves abducted overseas would not be as cooperative as the children of slaves taken from their homelands. At most they would always be a threat, especially if they could communicate effectively amongst themselves.

Saint Domingüe’s tortures of slaves were so common they were titled. Examples include: “The four-post:” tying a slave to four posts and having him or her face down, “the hammock,” having a slave tied similarly face up, the common whip, with many variations, and either the greatest or least feared, getting blown up with gunpowder and a spark in the anus. This was called either “making a nigger jump” (Bell 15), or “to burn a little powder in the arse of a nigger” (James 13), depending upon the source.

Supervision was intense. “The pitiless eye of the manager patrolled the gang and several foremen armed with long whips moved periodically between them, giving them stinging blows to all who, worn out by fatigue, were compelled to take a rest – men or women, young or old” (James 10). Thus it is hard to see many slaves cultivating their own plots (15) often enough to sell their cane, coffee, or indigo, and purchase their freedom, which could also be granted by owners for service. However, at least two slaves were freed; the first is Jean-Baptiste Bellay, who bought his freedom, likely from funds earned from his own crops. The second is Toussaint Louverture, who would become the leader in name of an unlikely revolt lasting a decade, but whose primary goal was never independence. It is unknown exactly how Louverture attained free status, but according to one of plantation

owner Bayon de Libertat's personal assistants, there was a special male slave owned by Libertat. The slave had incredible diplomatic skill and knowledge of veterinary medicine. In a letter to the French directory in 1797, Toussaint Louverture attributes attaining his freedom decades earlier to Libertat, recalling benevolent treatment on the plantation. "It was a very unusual thing for a valuable male slave to be freed at that relatively young age" (Bell 70).

The Powder Keg

A year after the French Revolution began, reports of the slave population in Saint Domingüe range from 465,000 to 500,000. This was 89 per cent of the island's population! The other two listed groups are whites and free blacks (Dubois 30, 39). Not all whites were wealthy landowners. The "Petit Blancs," translated directly to mean "Little Whites," comprised of landless whites, some of whom were overseers of slaves, looked to the overseas transformation in France as a way to attain greater economic status and political power in Saint Domingüe. In 1790, these whites were granted the right to vote in Assembly elections. Property owning free people of color – among them mixed-race people, called mulattoes – still could not vote, however, and thus whites who then could vote could use their votes to advocate policies. "It was a democratization based on racism" (Dubois 77-78).

Surrounded by the "Savage Other"

Such an ambience breeds fear of an uprising; possible attacks by maroons, runaway slaves in bands, imbued apprehensiveness to slave owner planters. One famous maroon was Francois Makandal, escapee from a northern Limbé plantation. A sugar mill accident

had amputated one of Makandal's arms, ensuring he was of little value because he could no longer labor in manufacturing. Minimally supervised, Makandal consequently absconded.

Penalties for running ranged from having to wear chains with spikes, though some ran away while still encumbered by them, to slicing hamstrings of repeat offenders, to death. Usually, instead of death captured runaways were subjected to incarceration in square stone cells, or in plantation hospitals: it was unwise economics to murder a valuable piece of property. A state of fear pervaded the white planter community: many landowners were scared of violent assaults by runaway slaves. Armed guards, however, could not combat poison, Makandal's weapon of choice. Successful poisonings by Makandal's northern network -- "set in motion a cycle of paranoia and violence that continued in Saint-Domingüe for decades" (Dubois 51-52). In a prelude to national politics, maroon targets were "livestock, slaves who were deemed enemies, and masters" (52). Makandal, rumored to possess supernatural powers, was captured and burned at the stake in January, 1758 (51).

An Exception

One incident indicating that the Negro Code did protect slaves responding to excessive treatment was a group of slaves in 1744 murdering an overseer who had killed a pregnant slave. The killers of the overseers were sentenced to death, but the governor intervened, justifying the attack and deeming the overseer's act excessive, and the slaves were returned to the owner's plantation (53).

The Fire Brews

In the twenty years following Makandal's execution, the treatment of slaves became more brutal, demanding French action to protect slaves. Though often seen as more animal than human, forced labor was an investment. Therefore, in 1784, a king's edict was proclaimed to limit punishments of blacks owned by the planter class. Demonstrating the planters felt total autonomy was their ignorance of this edict – clear because in 1793, Sonthonax issued a proclamation reiterating the 1784 edict, which, to the planters, told them that complaints about their treatment of slaves would be taken seriously for the first time. Therefore, in 1784 the planters ignored the king, to whom they supposedly were loyal. A stricter Negro Code, or slave code, limited punishments of slaves, yet slaves were still to be property, unless owners granted freedom, or liberty were purchased by slave earnings, accumulated by blacks selling their own crops. (155).

Previous planter disposition indicates that Saint Domingüe aristocracy would not adhere to Sonthonax's directives. Does this mean that if war did not necessitate mobilization of more troops, slavery would have continued in all the French colonies? Perhaps not, because the May 1794 decree protecting slaves was spoken aloud to slaves in Creole, the "language of revolution" (Chery), so slaves might have become aware that they were more valued, and that then their welfare was then more of a priority than under monarchy.

Colonizer in Turmoil Grants Liberty

While certainly no overt proponent of any new nation states in the west, Sonthonax wanted to end unrest, and simultaneously was seen as an ally to the blacks as they looked to ascend in Saint Domingüe society. In this respect, the French National Convention chose

the proper person to preserve Saint Domingüe for the republic, and to recruit fighters who would risk their lives for that end. Sonthonax accomplished this in the wake of a mulatto rebellion, which was easily crushed, and a burgeoning slave rebellion.

The commissioners sent from France, led by Sonthonax, thus knew when the planters decided upon a royalist governor, Francois Thomas Galbaud du Fort, in 1793 (Dubois 156-157), that his proclamation was not well received by Saint Domingüe's landed aristocracy. Galbaud, a Saint Domingüe landowner himself, was imprisoned on a ship by Sonthonax (James 126-127). That would not stop the royalist band, though their king was no more, from attacking the commissioners. Absolute chaos ensued, most importantly leading to Sonthonax and Polverel offering freedom to all slaves who fought against Galbaud's forces and all future French enemies (Dubois 157). James claims that Sonthonax only armed slaves and subsequently offered freedom to the enslaved because he was "facing defeat and extermination" (126). Laurent Dubois, author of *Avengers of the New World*, a less passionate and emotional analysis of the revolution, only writes: "The prisons were opened, releasing hundreds of slaves" (157). Since reporting violent pandemonium accurately is impossible, nobody will ever know the exact details of Galbaud's attack, which was fended off largely by armed slaves, but it is highly unlikely that royalists would have armed them. The final results were two-thirds of Le Cap burning to the ground, Galbaud throwing himself into the sea to save himself, and 10,000 royalists fleeing to America. "It was the end of white domination in San Domingo" (James 127). The premiere historian of the Haitian Revolution then refutes any argument that the end of slavery meant the end to Saint Domingüe.

Inflexibility, Irony, and Idealism

Royalists were fearful, but why did they fight, and not negotiate? They were not accustomed to negotiating, yet clearly Sonthonax was not a virulent hater of royalists. He did not appear to come to Saint Domingüe with a plan to free the slaves. Even if he had a greater desire to do so than future readers will ever know, he had no guarantee France was willing to grant emancipation. Sonthonax reorganized the government, "to concentrate power in the hands of the Commission and included in his council both Mulattoes and a free black" (James 122), stating post-revolutionary France would dictate to the planters. Prior to the French Revolution, the planters possessed the collective worldview that they were either dictating to the monarchy, or that the government cared not how planters carried on their business. Any attempt to address that would meet strong resistance on the part of royalists. "This is how white San Domingo destroyed itself" (James 127).

On Sonthonax, James states he "loved the blacks, said that he wished he was a black man, and lived openly with a mulatto woman" (174). Still, James argues that in 1793, granting emancipation, perhaps because he could not guarantee France would support him, was "his last card and he could not help himself" (129), implying that Sonthonax really wanted to emancipate all slaves from the start. Could this be why Robespierre ordered both Sonthanax and Polverel arrested and brought to France for trial, from 1794-95[5]? Though Robespierre ordered the warrant, he had been executed a year prior to the trials, and the Directory was much more predisposed to abolition, opposed by allegedly leftist Jacobin

---

5 Robespierre's position on abolition is debatable. James' reference implies that Robespierre did not favor freeing Saint Domingüe slaves on Feb. 4, 1794, but Alyssa Goldstein Sepinwall refers to Robespierre as a "Committed abolitionist," in "Robespierre, Old Regime Feminist? Gender, the Late Eighteenth Century, and the French Revolution Revisited."

Robespierre. Sonthonax was acquitted of all charges; Polverel died before the proceedings concluded (Bell 135). The planter class was so obstinate that they would not even cede island power to mulattoes. The mixed-race revolt resulted in the execution of its leaders, and only minimal changes in island social structure, bringing the slave revolt.

Lost Without the Slaves

Disputes on Saint Domingüe between allegedly pure blacks, and mulattoes, the children of French landowners and either slaves or freed blacks, stemmed from the privileges mulattoes would receive because their skin tone was usually lighter. The mulatto revolt of 1790, led by Vincent Ogé, was crushed by the French military presence in Saint Domingüe because it consisted of the mulattoes alone. Ogé's comrade, Jean-Baptiste Chavannes, seemed more willing to mobilize slaves for their cause (Dubois 88). The primary reason for their revolt was the lack of enforcement of a March 8, 1790 French law extending to them the vote (Bell 14).

A Fractured Society

As of 1791, slavery was still the rule of law in Saint Domingüe, indicating that the mulattoes for the most part were disinterested in abolition. Mulattoes did not recruit slaves into their rebellion, even though guns for the mulatto revolt were obtained from abolitionist Thomas Clarkson. Thus, as of 1791, Ogé wanted nothing to do with any slave revolution, to the extent that such doomed their engagement with the French (Dubois 87). Two questions stem from the mulatto rebellion: first, what if slaves would join the mulatto cause, or vice versa? Second: could divisions between slaves and mulattoes affect a young nation's history, and if so, to what extent? Ogé's lack of foresight regarding the power of

the slave majority disregarded the fact that some former slaves were most powerful. Examples included Jean-Baptiste Bellay, who had bought his freedom, and Toussaint Louverture, about whom facts on his early years are murky.

Larger Force Necessary

The victorious slaves would fare better than Ogé and his comrades. Upon capture they were subjected to a two-month trial, ending with February 25 executions. Torture by limb breaking on a wheel preceded death, finally taking Saint Domingüe's first military rebels under the torrid Caribbean sun. Ogé found support in Paris, though still not enough to advocate vociferously enough to gather slave support. With the goal of mixed race people possessing equal status in the Saint Domingüe franchise under the French republic, mulattoes were not even executed in the same town square region as whites convicted of Saint Domingüe capital crimes. Divisions between Saint Domingüe's two designations of people of color, slaves and mulattoes, would be remembered once revolution occurred. Simultaneously, the mulattoes would not forgive the French for killing their leaders. "The brilliant Ogé and his success in Paris had been the pride of all Mulatto San Domingo, and the malevolence of his trial and execution was a searing memory in Mulatto minds" (James 74-75).

Static Hierarchy; Insurrectionists Collaborate

Wealthy planters, whose government had executed mulatto revolt leaders, thought even less of slaves. They could not perceive of the reality of their day -- slaves left in charge of field slaves meeting every Sunday and plotting an insurrection of their own. At meetings through August 1791 were various slave representatives at the Lenormand de Mézy

plantation in Morne-Rouge; “All of the delegates were upper strata slaves in whom the masters had placed their confidence.” Since these slaves were in a supervisory position over the most subjugated, tending the fields, “Upon a given signal, the plantations would be systematically set aflame.” Two years before the king’s beheading, a false report was circulated among slaves that the whip would no longer be used to maintain work productivity. Though inaccurate, this report inspired slaves to expect more freedom (Fick 91), even if all did not aspire to equality.

Early Leaders; Early Struggle

Initially led by Boukman Dutty, Jeannot Bullet, Jean Francois, and Georges Biassou, on August 22, Dutty and Bullet would take the first stages of the slave revolt, while Francios and Biassou were to take command of the insurrectionist slave bands once underway. Fairly likely, given royalist foolishness in other matters, is that unbeknownst to planters, rebel slaves were discussing military strategy with surreptitious organizer Toussaint Louverture. That Toussaint could have mobilized slaves to the cause is unquestioned; to what extent he was engaging in revolutionary activity in 1791 is unknown.

Amidst rumors that slave work days would be reduced to three if the king reclaimed the throne from the bourgeoisie uprising class in France, monarchists calculated: “Once they had used the slave insurrection to defeat the rival patriot faction, once power was restored in royalist hands and the king securely on the throne of France, the blacks, they no doubt believed, could then be persuaded by their leaders to return to the plantations and be duped back into slavery” (92). France’s actions seemed to encourage revolt and display arrogance, even to free blacks. On May 15, 1791, the French national assembly decided,

against Robespierre's admonition that all free people of color in the colonies become citizens, that only people of color with two free parents would merit such extension of rights, "a conservative measure that enfranchised only a small minority of the mulattoes and free blacks in Saint Domingüe" (Fick 85).

On August 20, 1791, violent insurgence on Saint Domingüe began in the North, at the Flaville-Turpin Estate in Ocul. Next were the Tremes and Noé plantations. Any resistance on the part of whites would mean death, so in the beginning there were few prisoners, as plantations and mansions were burned. Slaves refusing to join the band were hacked to death, to the pleasure of Jeannot Bullet (Dubois 123). The first military resistance came on the 25th, at Plaisance (Fick 96-97). By November, royalists displayed Boukman Dutty's head on a stake, declaring that the "leader of the rebels" had been vanquished. One might expect this would have encouraged massive retribution against white prisoners. It did not (Fick 113-14).

However, Bullet's brutality toward slaves who would not join the cause and white prisoners, "pale and disfigured, attacked by vermin who were spread over all parts of our bodies, covered with blood and dust," would not be tolerated. Prisoners were treated more humanely after Jean-Francois had Bullet shot for his delight in performing and watching executions and mistreatment of prisoners (Dubois 123). Timing, however, was not on Jean-Francois' side. Since Boukman's death occurred nearly simultaneously as Bullet's execution, killing Bullet lost Francois standing among slave rebels. This was amplified when a cease fire was reached after negotiations with royalist whites. Francois' stated demands from negotiation, reluctantly agreed to by Biassou, were amnesty to all revolting

slaves and to fifty leaders, alongside an improvement to slave conditions. To many rank and file slaves, this was a betrayal, for the Rights of Man, written by the French government, promised them liberty from bondage altogether. Therefore, Biassou became the de facto leader of the budding insurgency. France's response was a September 28, 1791 decree giving amnesty to all free people of color involved in hostilities toward planters and French authority on Saint Domingüe. Since many slaves were tortured by memories of the whip and the four-post, and thus wanted to exterminate the white presence on the island, this was untenable to the majority. First to violate the cease fire was de Tozard, commander of the white troops at Fort Dauphin. In response, "Jean-Francois convoked his council, and it was unanimously decided to continue to war, to finish the destruction of what they had begun" (Fick 115-117).

Consequences of Avoiding Alliances

While the mulatto rebellion had little effect on the slaves, the opposite was not the case. The north consisted of far more slaves than the south and west, which had more free blacks and mulattoes than the north. Such somewhat oppressed groups were preoccupied with attaining rights first fought for violently by the January 1791 revolt of Ogé and Chavannes. Mulatto desire to maintain hierarchy above slaves brought about a May 15 decree granting them political rights, but it was not enforced by Gov. Blancheade, perhaps one of the least effective governors in world history. While the mulattoes were willing to negotiate, some white planters were not, and white armies attacked mulattoes at Port Au-Prince. This division in society, and news of slave revolts in the north, left mulattoes feeling unprotected from both slaves, if they attacked from the north, and whites, who might use

royalist military might against them. Whites had already implemented this tactic in Port Au-Prince (Fick 115-124). A white attack on mulatto businesses in Port Au-Prince by a group calling themselves "patriots," changed the mixed race view on revolution: "The mulattoes had acted with considerable moderation and restraint in their struggle for political rights, but this last betrayal by the patriots had broken the limits of their forbearance." A September 24 decree would replace the May 15 decree, relegating mulattoes to second class political citizens (Fick 127). Military leaders Andre Rigaud, born free and a goldsmith in France, where he was educated, and Bauvais, had to change strategy, though the aims of individuals in their army would diverge: "With rampant slave insurrection ravaging the North, and their own struggle pushed incessantly toward civil warfare, they actively engaged rebellious slaves in their own ranks" (131).

Though every source speculates that Toussaint Louverture was involved in the slave insurrection from the start, no documentation exists to support this assertion. However, around the time the cease fire with Biassou was violated by royalists, Toussaint made a speech that, if their leaders wanted them to, could have encouraged slaves to accept bondage again (Fick 116). He and Biassou then disappear from both the slave and mulatto struggle to fight with the Spanish, controlling the eastern third of Saint Domingüe.

Toussaint Louverture's Early Journey for Allies

While complicating the legacy of a worldwide legend, this move makes sense. In 1791, France was in chaos, and reports instructed Toussaint that royalists were controlling part of France. Why then could they not reassert control over the entire land? All guarantees are in retrospect; Spanish Saint Domingüe had only 15,000 slaves in a population of

125,000, and Spanish slavery was far less brutal than that of the French section of the island. Therefore, if Spain were to have defeated France for territory in the new world, Saint Domingüe, the entire island, would be possessed by a land which did not torture brethren. “Slaves in the Spanish colony were treated as members of the household and their work mainly consisted of swinging hammocks” (Korngold 98).

Biassou and Jean-Francois joined Toussaint; they were handed the title of generals, while Toussaint was named *maréchal du camp*. Toussaint’s military victories encouraged defections from French republican ranks to the Spanish. Indications of the massive demographic fissures on the island were: French republican Commissioner Polverel accused mulatto commander Vernet’s troops of cowardice after they retreated from a Toussaint attack. Vernet responded by taking his troops to serve with Toussaint’s Spanish unit (Bell 88).

Such leadership and military acumen made Toussaint Louverture a prize for any military organization, so French Saint Domingüe Governor General Laveaux campaigned to bring Toussaint back into fighting for the French cause to keep the territory of Saint Domingüe from Spanish and British invaders. Toussaint, however, does not switch loyalties until slavery is abolished on Saint Domingüe. This could not have happened at a more opportunistic time for Toussaint, given that he was feuding with Biassou, Jean-Francois, and the Spanish commanders. One source of this dispute had to be the truism that Spain had no intention of making all blacks full royal subjects, even if they won Saint Domingüe from the French (Korngold 99; Bell 100-101).

Laveaux chose wisely. As the nineteenth century dawned, the Spanish had been dispatched to their colony of Santo Domingo, likely because they needed black troops to defeat the French, and the ruling Spanish monarchy had made no effort to abolish slavery in its colonies. The British, on the other hand, still held a narrow strip of land near Port-Au Prince. Toussaint set about reclaiming that for colony residents (Korngold 140-41). British general Thomas Maitland had encouraged Toussaint to revolt against the French, promising recognition of Saint Domingüe as an independent state in return. However, all indications are that Toussaint remained loyal to France. Toussaint "would be faithful to France as long as France was faithful to the blacks" (James 212-213). On October 3, 1798, Toussaint achieved an unlikely victory against British troops that outnumbered him. British forces had underestimated the tactical skill of the freed slave, and the British left Saint Domingüe. C.L.R. James wrote that British general Thomas Maitland, was "a prejudiced Englishman," and that he "did not think Toussaint very intelligent" (211). Just as black troops fought for the Spanish, some black British troops – freed colonial slaves – defected to Toussaint's side, likely because they could predict the outcome (Dubois 216-217).

Ascension Solidified by Challenge

Toussaint Louverture may have been more powerful in his sphere than anybody in France's domain. He maintained power by forbidding his black soldiers from pillaging areas where they won battles – instead insisting that lands be returned to white and mulatto planters (201), and executing by firing squad blacks who incited revolt. One such case was the execution of his own adopted nephew, Moyse, and his rebels (Korngold 227-228). In 1798, this power began to be challenged by France, who allied themselves with Rigaud,

mulatto from the south. This alliance would ruin “himself, his caste, and his country for a generation” (James 207). A 1798 meeting with general Gabriel Marie Theodore Joseph de Hédouville convinced Rigaud, who had previously been wanted for arrest for a 1796 rebellion (Dubois 217) to attempt usurpation of Toussaint’s authority.

In 1799 civil war broke out between Rigaud’s troops and Toussaint’s. One attack in the north resulted in the massacring of eighteen white men Rigaud suspected of collaborating with Toussaint’s forces. As Hédouville promised rewards to Rigaud for betraying what Toussaint would call the cause of “Liberty and Equality” in Saint Domingüe, per the Rights of Man, Rigaud made promises to Toussaint’s generals to attempt to influence their betrayal of Toussiant. In a letter to American Secretary of State Thomas Pickering, Consul General Edward Stevens said Toussaint’s army had no provisions, implying they had little chance. However, Toussaint escaped an assassination attempt, and took the war to Rigaud in the south (Korngold 173-174). Rigaud’s campaign failed; he escaped to France in 1800. He would return in 1809 to govern the south, in a new nation (Cole 284).

A Colony Still

By 1800, the Directory had failed, Napoleon had come to power, and rumors began that slavery was to be reinstituted on their island. Furthermore, Toussaint’s policies encouraging agricultural practices akin to slavery -- asking freed slaves to again cultivate their lands on a strict schedule – did not assuage fears. If Toussaint’s plans were to be adopted, then these blacks, now theoretically subjects of France like their white brothers in Europe, would face “severe penalties if they wandered away or slacked in their work –

though now they were to be paid for their labors" (Bell 204). Therefore, the rebels whose comrades' deaths were ordered by Tousssaint – his nephew's included – had basis to be concerned about the future of their homeland. France became concerned about Toussaint's zeal for power when he arrested Philippe-Rose Roume, the last French civil commissioner, and ordered him deported to the republic (Cole 283).

It was the division with Rigaud, James would say, that was the most tragic, because a unified future nation would function best in a world that refused to acknowledge a state formed by a slave rebellion. However, most pressing for Toussaint was Napoleon's sending of general Victor Emmanuel Leclerc. "Toussaint himself had no difficulty in seeing the Leclerc expedition was Bonaparte's bid to crush black power in the Caribbean, though many black and mulatto commanders were at first misled by the French general's assurances" (Blackburn., "The American Crucible" 196).

A letter from Napoleon, translated badly into Creole, caused many misunderstandings. It promised Saint Domingüe blacks freedom, yet called anybody who disobeyed Leclerc a "traitor." Le Cap commander Henri Christophe, future ruler of Haiti, burned his domain rather than willingly cede soldiers and arms to the control of the French. As Robespierre said, nobody welcomes armed liberators, and when French troops tried to disembark, they were attacked by blacks who properly understood that according to the 1794 decree, they were as French as the military expedition allegedly coming to explain Leclerc's purpose. Direct conflict between colonizer and colony, a majority of which had been subject to the harshest plantation slavery in world history, began with Leclerc. Subsequently, General Donatien Marie Joseph de Rochambeau indicated what would

happen, under his watch, to blacks who disobeyed the French military, by killing hundreds of surrendered blacks, in response to Saint Domingüe soldiers killing sixty French (Dubois 263-265). Dispute ensues regarding whether Toussaint was in Le Cap when this occurred.

Leclerc's command yielded some victories, among them control of the previously Spanish portion of the island. The French general provided Toussaint's son, Isaac, with a letter from Bonaparte asking Louverture to submit to Leclerc's authority. No response meant war was declared on Saint Domingüe by France, though Toussaint still considered the land French territory, and freed slaves French subjects. Here fractures in the unity of Toussaint's army affected the future of Saint Domingüe and the world, as some of Louverture's officers defected to the French side and surrendered without a fight; two examples are Frenchman Pierre Agé in the north, and Laplume in the south (Dubois 266-267).

Previous habits reappeared, and assisted in damaging Haiti's youth. During the war with its primary colonizer, Louverture aide General Jean-Jacques Dessalines, a freed slave whose body was "scarred by the strokes of the whip, but a born soldier" (James 130), took "several hundred" (Dubois 270) whites prisoner. When he met with his leader, Toussaint, very few whites remained. Dessalines claimed they were taken back by the enemy, had been killed, or had escaped. Former hostage Dr. Michael Descourtilz refuted this claim. A colony resident since 1798, Descourtilz reported witnessing Dessalines and his band slaughtering white prisoners. The doctor added that he was spared because he could tend to the wounded and the sick. Accounts of the slaughtering were verified by French general

and Louverture supporter Pamphile La Croix, (Dubois 172) who reported 800 corpses of dead prisoners as Dessalines' band trekked toward independence (270-271).

Europeans, unfamiliar with Saint Domingüe's western mountainous terrain, were never capable of vanquishing a movement led by slaves. Leclerc did not have enough good shoes. Dessalines, the born soldier, knew: "The whites from France cannot hold out against us here in Saint-Domingüe. They will fight well at first, but soon they will fall sick and die like flies." He then promised to make his troops independent of France (Dubois 273). However, Toussaint's final military campaign, before appointing himself governor for life, was to invade Spanish Saint Domingüe, and annex it, not for a new nation, but for France (Cole 283)[6].

Henri Christophe was not present when Dessalines addressed his troops on attaining independence, which could explain why he surrendered to Leclerc. In a most unstable time, maybe he was just tired of fighting. Seeing his position undermined, Toussaint submitted to LeClerc, as did Dessalines (Cole 283; Dubois 276). To celebrate their allegiance to the French, Toussaint, Dessalines, and Christophe, met with Leclerc for dinner. Demonstrating his lack of trust in the French, Toussaint thought the French would poison him, so he barely ate (Dubois 275).

Trust was at a nadir. Reasons included rumors the French wanted to reinstitute slavery; fear on the part of Toussaint that the French wanted to murder him, and fear on the part of the French that Toussaint had not actually surrendered, and thus would plot

[6]The inherent conflict that Toussaint Louverture is seen as the leader for independence, though he wanted to increase French territory, is addressed in chapter 5.

against the French if he remained on Saint Domingüe. This ended with Toussaint's arrest in June, 1802. In November, Leclerc became one of many Europeans to die of yellow fever in Saint Domingüe. "It is probably no exaggeration to say that at least half of the supposed victims of yellow fever during the British and French invasions were killed in combat" (Korngold 140-41). Toussaint biographer Ralph Korngold asserts that both Christophe and Dessalines deserted Toussaint when a unified front was needed most to form a functioning nation, even suggesting the military could have arrested Leclerc and either exchanged him for Toussaint, or punished him for doing Napoleon's bidding against a loyal colony. Christophe had wanted to make amends for his misstep at Le Cap, but Toussaint "evidently had not counted on the defection of Dessalines" (297), who agreed to help Leclerc slaughter rebel soldiers to make himself indispensable to the French general.

Under Leclerc, it was not Toussaint who was to begin the process of nation creation, but Dessalines and Christophe. Bonaparte's plan was to bring surrendering colonial officers to France, but Leclerc said if such occurred, he would lose the colony to blacks loyal to soldiers dispatching royalists, and then the Spanish and British. If Leclerc had discovered Dessalines was disarming people, and then rearming then, he would not have been surprised. In the process, however, Dessalines would, periodically, murder hostages indiscriminately. One can only imagine how Dessalines, already vicious toward captives, felt when it was revealed that Napoleon had decided to reinstitute slavery in the colonies, Saint Domingüe included. A combination of arrogance and racism influenced Napoleon to disregard the possibility that Dessalines would again fortify slaves with weapons, in

response to any threat of reinstituting chattel slavery. “The disarmament process, meant to destroy the population’s capacity to defend itself, backfired” (Dubois 283)

As cold lay waste to Toussaint Louverture in a French prison, his last words to his captives before boarding a boat to France resonated then and still: “In overthrowing me, they have only felled the tree of Negro liberty in St. Domingo. It will shoot up again, for it is deeply rooted and its roots are many” (Korngold 301). Toussaint Louverture outlived LeClerc by six months, dying of “apoplexy and pneumonia,” (Dubois 297) in the French prison Fort de Jeux on April 8, 1803.

British abolitionist James Stephen knew what Napoleon’s purpose was, and thus was aware that once the newly freed blacks of Saint Domingüe recognized the French aspirations of enslavement, that “there would be no stopping the resistance against it” (Dubois 50; 284). Upon LeClerc’s death, such became more apparent, as the more overtly racist Rochambeau took over efforts to quell massive uprisings, after defections by Dessalines and Christophe. Rochambeau’s language indicates that he may have been a racialist, believing every human characteristic was determined by race. In explaining his failure to secure Saint Domingue’s prerevolutionary status, with slavery and wealthy planters, he wrote: “A superior race of blacks inhabits St. Domingo” (Korngold 142).

Rochambeau was only observing humanity. Extending rights to people who deserve them, as all humans do, and then subsequently retracting such rights can only lead to violent opposition. In this case, the cruelty implemented by Rochambeau only brought more vengeance against him. The general’s methods included mass drownings, burnings, hangings, crucifixions, and asphyxiations. These barbarities united even those who were

reluctant to support Toussaint Louverture, because Rochambeau, and to a lesser extent Leclerc, began questioning the loyalty of Saint Domingüe troops. Unification of the "indigenous army" was a challenge, because of feuding between Christophe and insurgent leader Sans-Souci, but eventually blacks and mulattoes became one against the French, the final barrier to an unplanned black republic. Some Polish troops joined Dessalines side, risking their lives to fight for black independence (Dubois 293-294). At this stage, women sacrificed their lives beside men. In one battle a group of Saint Domingüe women laid brush down to help men cross trenches; the women were massacred by French troops (295).

By November of 1803, Rochambeau, his nation again warring with Britain, had to surrender to Dessalines. Rochambeau, his remaining troops, and many white residents of Le Cap left for the seas, to be shortly taken hostage by British ships. The military battles were over, and a new nation was born. France was again embroiled in too many European conflicts to attempt recapture of the economic jewel of the Caribbean. More than 50,000 French had died (297-98).

Divided Colony; Divided Nation

A new nation was forming; diplomacy, however, was not the manner in which issues would be addressed. To some extent, this was unavoidable, having formed through fifteen years of war. Though he later would become an advocate for improving his new homeland, Christophe's decision to submit to Leclerc put him in a position where he had to eliminate his opposition, who never bowed to Saint Domingüe's oppressor. That opposition leader, African-born rebel leader Sans-Souci, refused to ally himself with Christophe, whom Sans-Souci's troops had fought when Christophe fought for the French.

Christophe's troops cornered Sans-Souci and his trusted allies, and only one advisor survived (Cole 130). It seems unlikely that Dessalines would have approved of Christophe killing Sans-Souci, as the rebel appears to have submitted to Dessalines' authority. However, upon Sans-Souci's execution in 1803, Dessalines moved his army against the deceased commander's remaining rebels, cementing his status as de facto leader of the revolt (Dubois 294).

Haitian independence was declared on Jan. 1, 1804; a new constitution stated that all citizens were legally black, and prohibited whites from owning land. The name "Hayti," in Creole, or Haiti, in English, was the original Arawak word, when the tribe ruled the island before European discovery (Fick 236). The spirit behind the nomenclature was that to remove all remnants of colonization. When independence was declared, French troops remained in the south (140-141). For twenty years, Haitian former slaves, freed by fighting the French, feared that the French would try to reclaim their territory. Reinstitution of de jure human bondage, legal slavery, was a perpetual fear. Though Dessalines by no means trusted the British, he used weapons obtained from the British to massacre whites in the south, and suppress black brigands in the north (140-141). While the level of Dessalines' sanguinity varies depending upon the source, nobody disputes that some of the new leader's early tenure involved indiscriminate murder of whites. Laurent Dubois wrote, however, that under Dessalines, whites who rejected slavery would be "under his personal protection." Within this subset were Poles who had defected to the slave side in the revolution, a German group who had lived on the island since before 1789, and white planter widows (300).

Dessalines' arms purchase from the British military caused suspicion among the British, who had previously negotiated a trade agreement with Toussaint. Dessalines would not renew the agreement, designating that only Le-Cap and Port-au Prince be used for British trade with young Haiti (Cole 58). Motivations for Dessalines' refusal to renew this agreement are unclear; likely years of slavery magnified Dessalines' distrust of any and all whites, even though sometimes it is wise to make agreements with adversaries or previous colonizers. In analyzing Dessalines' violence toward whites, C.L.R. James, who previously implied he supported Robespierre, states that the death of whites in young Haiti was not tragic for the whites who were killed, but was tragic for the Haitians. Upon forming a new nation with a constitution, a country must engage in politics; "The tragedy was for the blacks and the mulattoes. It was not policy but revenge, and revenge has no place in politics" (373).

Ruling and Succession

In October, 1804, five months after Napoleon was crowned French emperor, Dessalines followed suit in Haiti – a curious course of action for one who wanted to avenge the crimes of the old world against the new (Cole 284; Dubois 301). Perhaps he thought he could limit dissension by proclaiming a greater title, but this would not prove effective. Primarily a military leader, his credibility in such role declined when his attempt to annex the Spanish colony failed in March of 1805 (Cole 284). In his retreat Dessalines' murdered indiscriminately and stole livestock. Perhaps then to improve his standing, the emperor appointed Henri Christophe as military commander in chief (147-148).

Conflict and Hope

Henri Christophe was born on October 6, 1767, on Grenada, a Caribbean island ceded to Britain by France in 1763. Biographer Hubert Cole posits that Christophe was probably of mixed black and white parentage, and that he likely never was a slave (30-32). Therefore, it would stand to reason that if Christophe and Dessalines could collaborate effectively, a strong nation would evolve. This assertion is based upon the following: Dessalines was by all accounts descended from African stock, while Christophe, based upon his multicultural background of French, English, and exposure to the Haitian slave tongue of Creole, could likely have more easily formed alliances with foreign powers. Dessalines' reputation as a strong military leader could have been a force against insurgents both foreign and domestic. Their characteristics melded well to form the foundation of a new society. However, it is reasonable to believe that nobody could have ever worked effectively with Dessalines, based upon his reported demeanor.

While Christophe would prove to be a national leader of some competence, and Dessalines was emperor for life, after the failed annexation of the Spanish colony, "the question of his succession was already exercising the minds of the senior generals and officials." Dessalines' new government threatened violence if peasants did not grow their crops economically. Appearances dictate how leaders are viewed; "Dancing was Dessalines' passion, second only to bloodletting" (148). While Christophe was not entirely opposed to violence, he recognized that long term problems would result from Dessalines' strategies of subjugation of blacks who fought for freedom, alongside total distrust of outsiders.

Christophe referred to his superior and former military comrade as “That jumping jackass,” likely both commenting on his dancing skill and his policies for national improvement, or lack thereof. Meanwhile, Christophe would discuss long term prospects of Haitian improvement with those deemed outsiders by Dessalines. Christophe’s military advisors included whites, mulattoes, and blacks, much to the chagrin of the emperor. Dessalines’ guards had a signal by which they were to murder somebody on the emperor’s whim, without a word spoken. Upon hearing that Christophe had criticized his superior, Dessalines set in motion a plan to isolate his former ally and murder him. If the emperor’s chief of staff, Captain Dupuy, had not warned Christophe in handwriting on a written invitation, “Say that you are sick,” Dessalines may have stayed Haitian ruler a few more years. Dupuy’s warning, instructing the general not to attend, likely saved Christophe’s life. Dessalines either forgot all about it later (148-149), or reconsidered. The fact that he even considered murdering one so valuable to his rule and nation indicates, though, that: “The brilliant soldier proved to be a bad emperor” (148).

Whether Christophe actively plotted to overthrow Haiti’s first ruler remains a mystery. However, Dessalines did himself no favors. Perhaps paranoia was part of his nature, and it may have served him well at some point. The emperor became convinced that southern generals Nicolas Geffrard and Anne-Alexandre Pétion were attempting to bring Andre Rigaud back from France and install him has ruler of the south, bringing the mulattoes back into power, thereby rehashing a conflict from pre-revolutionary Saint Domingüe. While the accusation may have been true, in response to it, Dessalines proposed murdering both generals early in 1806. If these generals had heard this, how would they

have reacted? Would anybody want to work under such a suspicious military leader who would kill people for saying the wrong word at a perceived wrong time (150)?

In perhaps his first post-revolutionary act, Dessalines ordered audits of the south, where many residents had paid their taxes on promissory notes "which they had no intention of honouring" (151). Therefore, whether Christophe was involved in the October 1806 plot that assassinated Jean-Jacques Dessalines, revolutionary leader but failed emperor, is irrelevant. With that great a number of enemies around him in a militarized state, how he would lose his seat was fairly predictable.

Exaggerated Fear Based on Reality

Though Rigaud would not return to Haiti until 1809 (284), Dessalines set out with troops to find him. On the journey, a son whose mother had offended Dessalines was ordered to beat the woman who gave him life. Two of the emperor's staff members argued. Haiti's first ruler ordered that they duel to the death. Two battalions of Dessalines' troops found themselves surrounded by rebel troops supporting a coup. Neither Dessalines nor his allies knew how deep the rebellion within the military had become; thus the former slave was shocked when he was encircled by enemies who had battled with him to remove slavery. Rebellious officers ordered troops to open fire against their national leader. However, they did not do so until Dessalines shot one of them, and the first shot felled the emperor's horse. Then trapped underneath his horse, screaming, Haiti's first leader was shot dead. Hubert Cole writes that only one woman, thought of as insane, mourned (151-153). Maybe newly emancipated rural citizens expected more from their first leader, though documentation of their voices is scarce: "The island had been so ravaged – and

expectancy of a French return so strong – that even the families of the most influential people were living gypsy existences, sleeping on camp beds in derelict hotels, bereft of furniture and short of food and clothing" (146).

Window to Progress?

No matter how Henri Christophe is assessed, he is progressive when compared to Dessalines. As military leader, rebel generals granted to him, in writing, the authority to lead. He ordered elections held on Nov. 20, 1806, and called for a new constitution. Christophe thought about his nation's future: evidence is his issuance of an edict to all neutral nations that trade with Haiti would be welcomed and encouraged (155). Undoubtedly Christophe knew he would have an advantage in these elections, given that the military was still the most respected institution in Haiti, but their second leader later discovered that the mulatto rebel generals were conniving. Possible mulatto Christophe, from British and black descent, appointed known mulatto Juste Hugonin to ascertain if rebel generals Pétion and Etienne Elie-Gérin truly wanted Christophe to ascend to national executive. Christophe found that in all of Dessalines' paranoia, the emperor was not wrong. What Hugonin revealed to Christophe was that Pétion's and Gérin's objective was to set up a system in which a majority of power was held by the south, whose constituencies voted for the assembly, which would put the north, elector of the president, subject to the constitution and the assembly.

Division – The Haitian Block of Granite?

In 1807, Christophe was elected president of the State of Haiti in the north; Pétion was elected president of the Republic of Haiti, in the south (155-156; 284). Though not as

violent a time in Haitian history, addressing civil discontent was prioritized over economic development, resulting from prerevolutionary factionalism bleeding into national politics. Both sides attempted to use the British navy to their advantage in the civil war, but neither unification through mediation nor victory by either president's state occurred. By the end of 1808, resulting from both the British ending the slave trade and Christophe's openness to Britain, the United Kingdom removed all restrictions to trading with Haiti (284).

Christophe demonstrated a vision for long-term Haitian prosperity with his proposal to buy slaves still aboard British ships, with the plan of emancipation. Politically, if accepted, this would have cemented the northern Haitian state as more prominent. Eventually, Christophe theorized, Petión would cede authority of the south to the north. This proposal was rejected by Britain, largely because slavery was still legal in British colonies, and, as the French would attest to, after the 1790s, widespread liberty to slaves was contagious and can erupt into mass revolution (161), contrary to colonizers' interests. Mulatto control in the south dictated that they would more likely be aligned with Saint Domingüe colonizer France, which had reinstituted slavery in colonies on May 20, 1802 (Bell 285).

Returning from France in 1809 was Rigaud, who fled Saint Domingüe after failing to defeat Toussaint Louverture in a colonial civil war. Subsequently, the mulatto general had been imprisoned by Napoleon. Christophe then feared that Rigaud's purpose was to finish what he started, and failed to accomplish the previous decade. The northern ruler, born a British subject, also perceived a threat to the British colony of Jamaica if Rigaud attained power in the south (176). Therefore, he correctly surmised he could blockade

southern ports, without fear of repercussions from Britain (177). Since Haiti's independence was won largely on land, few Haitians were experienced in naval warfare. Therefore, naval efforts in the civil war were largely fought by white mercenaries, whose numbers grew as 1810 approached (173).

Christophe postulated that former Louverture opponent Rigaud, imprisoned in France by Bonaparte, would never had been released and sent to Haiti had he not promised Napoleon he would serve the emperor's interests. Meanwhile, Napoleon had inserted his brother Joseph on the Spanish throne, and had subsequently sent French garrisons to reclaim what once was Spanish Santo Domingo. The governor, Juan Sanchez, and the colonists, were attempting to expel the French. Pétion's stance was that Rigaud was an enemy of the French, because of his participation in the struggles of the revolution. Part of Pétion's argument was that Leclerc had expelled Rigaud from Saint Domingüe, unlikely given that Rigaud left Saint Domingüe in 1800, and Leclerc had not arrived there until 1802 (176; 283). While it is possible Leclerc ordered Rigaud back, Toussaint Louverture's dominance over Rigaud in battle contributed heavily, if not entirely, to Rigaud's return to Europe. Christophe's case to the British that he would protect Jamaica and other British possessions, in spite of periodic rumors Christophe was allied with the French himself, was bolstered in that the north was helping Sanchez fight off the French garrisons (158; 176-177).

In December of 1808, Britain decided its ships could trade with both sections of Haiti, but Christophe's navy implemented blockade on the south (183-184). This maneuver seized and sold $60,000 worth of cargo on the "Crown," in 1810. This ship had unloaded

first in the south, at Port-Au Prince, and then was seized by Christophe's navy as it embarked for Molé St. Nicolas in the north. Merchants Robert Windsor and Archibald Kane complained to British Jamaican naval commander Bartholomew Rowley first because of the loss; second, because another British ship did nothing when seeing Christophe's navy commandeering the merchandise, among it flour, beef, pork, and checks. Was Christophe now lord of the Caribbean sea? "The HMS Hyperion had stopped and boarded the Crown after her capture, but had allowed Christophe's fleet to proceed with her in custody" (177).

Hyperion Captain Thomas Brodie assured Rowley that Christophe had proper documentation indicating that all cargo was delivered according to orders; he advised Rowley to contact London if they wanted to proceed further with their grievance against the northern Haitian state. A forthcoming document, signed by twenty British merchants, stated that Christophe's ships were commanded by white "renegades" of all countries, while southern leader Pétion's navy "is commanded and manned by natives of his part of the island and has hitherto respected the British flag, and the flags of all other nations" (178).

In analyzing Christophe's decision to seize and sell British cargo, it is necessary to know that he offered to buy freedom for each colonial slave aboard a ship, after England ended the slave trade in 1807. Britain refused his offer. After the "Crown" affair, Christophe renamed Cap-Francois "Cap-Henry," the new capital. The British could not stand up to him in the northern waters, controlled by his navy (178). With autonomy comes risk; a captured ship under the legal custody of a British merchant was mistakenly fired

upon at Les Gonaïves on February 2, 1811. Three British seamen were killed. Christophe maintained the seizure was legal as his control over the island tightened (180-182). The killing of the seamen resulted in an apology by the general, Joseph Raphaël, who was following orders to stop all ships in search of a fugitive merchant. The cannon shot was aimed at the water, not the boat. Still, the officer who fired the shot was arrested. While the seamen were buried with full military honors, Admiral Rowley felt that the only satisfactory response was a written apology, and he and other British officers accused Haiti's military of constant disrespect of British seafaring rights. Ultimately, what began as a military accident, tragic but inevitable, transformed into a situation in which Christophe accused the fugitive merchant of bearing pamphlets detailing criminal accusations against the northern leader. Christophe did apologize directly to Commodore James Giles Vashon for the deaths, and continued the blockade. Historically, this was significant because a leader of color in a republic formed by freed slaves stood its ground against diplomatic threats by a European power. This nation with whom Christophe dialogued had ended its slave trade.

In the south, Pétion now potentially had two forces against him. One was Christophe from the north; military battle would occur both over land and sea. The other was Rigaud, whom Pétion perceived may have designs on his status as ruler of the south. The fear seems valid, given Rigaud had been a prerevolutionary military leader. The southern leader asked British merchant William Doran what it would take to get British support, fearing Christophe's naval power. In Doran's view, Pétion could have surrendered or unified, but Doran perceived Pétion believing that if he discussed either option, more

bloodletting would occur in the south, presumably at the hands of northern blacks (179). A letter from southern emissary André Langlade to Doran indicates that Pétion was so desperate to remain in power that he was willing to submit to British rule, if an agreement to mediate with Christophe could not be reached. Given that his power was increasing, it is impossible to believe Christophe would agree to any such talks (179-180).

Usurper in the South?

While Pétion was correct about Rigaud, the former exile had no chance of overtaking his president, because of mutinies by black troops under Rigaud's command. Their desire not to serve under the first enemy of Toussaint Louverture was so great that they would rather show loyalty to Pétion. Rigaud's first attempt at a coup against Pétion occurred without the president's knowledge, because upon being commanded to surrender by one of Pétion's generals, Rigaud and his dwindling supporting troops laid down their weapons and cheered for Pétion. Subsequently, Rigaud assured his commander that the whole incident was a misunderstanding. Probably learning his lesson from the mutinies, Rigaud returned to his position as governor (183).

Christophe's threats were not as grave; he had the upper hand in the internecine battle for Haitian supremacy. He was disturbed by how Commodore Vashon conveyed British policy to him – perhaps race was a factor in this. Somehow Pétion was re-elected in the south, even after Christophe had offered to end the war in return for southern submission. Possibilities of British rule still loomed, either for one or both sections of the world's first black republic. Christophe would hold true to the ideals of Dessalines' first constitution, that no white person could rule Haiti – he proclaimed himself king, of the

north, on March 28, 1811 (189-190). Rigaud, robbed of his immunity from his recall to France, died of yellow fever six months later. The role of mulatto insurgents in the south against Christophe in the north was assumed by Jérôme Maximilien-Borgella, the mulatto son of a former white advisor to Toussaint Louverture. Borgella, states Christophe Biographer Hubert Cole, was less likely to attack because he was not as popular as Rigaud among southern insurgents (194).

Having ascended to a fashioned throne, officially unrecognized by his chief trading partner, the British (199), Haiti's second self-proclaimed monarch became preoccupied with actions other than those promoting the well-being of his subjects. An early annoyance to "King Henri I" (191) was that a British ship carrying, for ceremonies, large mirrors," a "sword of state nearly eight feet long, several other swords, and a Herschelian telescope" (194-195), did not reach him in Cap-Henry because the ship lacked the proper permits (195). Upon obtaining them, the ship was allowed to bring the northern leader his merchandise. With much of the young republic poor, the disparity indicates a tremendous class divide between Christophe and those whom he at times was trying to assist. Meanwhile, Haitians, Christophe and the minority middle class and wealthy included, lived in perpetual trepidation of civil war or a French invasion.

Peoples Paranoia; a Leader Obsessed?

Rumors of Christophe's love for telescopes led some to believe not only that he was looking for French ships on Haitian shores every day, but that also the leader would use a spyglass to ensure that his perceived subjects were working diligently enough on their lands. King Henri I was viewed by some as omnipotent and vindictive. "He would send

soldiers to beat any man who was not working hard enough, and that in one instance he had trained a gun on an idler and blown off his head at a range of two miles" (195). Conquering his southern rival, Pétion, became Christophe's priority. While there is evidence that he was still thinking ahead about the Haitian people, how long can freed slaves wait before their nation provides them opportunities for economic advancement deprived to them because they were born into bondage?

On Freedom

Had Haitians left servitude? It can certainly be argued that emancipated slaves had gone from producers for French planters to servants of an agricultural dictatorship. Under Christophe, a rural code of laws patterned after that of Toussaint Louverture and Dessalines was strictly enforced (209). Part of this system, barely altered from the island's colonial days, included landowners paying a one-quarter tax on all their agricultural earnings. Dessalines added a ten per cent import and export tax (Trouillot 59-60). Civil war and prioritizing royal pageantry prevented development of northern urban centers where other work could be obtained. Therefore, the majority of the population would subsist on the quarter of plantation earnings landowners were obliged to pay the workers, many former slaves (Cole 209). Landowners were forfeiting half their income to the state.

While laboring nine to ten hour days for pay under the Caribbean sun certainly was not chattel slavery, rule violators and perceived indolent northern Haitians could get struck with canes and sticks, as the whip was illegal. Christophe's national justice council did not allow generals to sit on it, as did Dessalines', but he alone could appoint its members. "In a land where illiteracy was the rule, qualifications of the judges were seldom high." While

strictly enforcing discipline on former slaves, Haiti's northern leader became impatient with the United States continuing to maintain the slave trade.

Economics, Politics, and Morality

King Henri I traded with Americans, though "he was not happy" doing so. Meanwhile, Pétion, one of 12,000 southern mulattoes ruling 250,000 blacks (210), presided over "poverty and anarchy" (Baur 332), either because he had to compromise, given his constituency, or his predisposed inclination for a freer state. Regardless of the reason, development was impeded.

While certainly not at the level of Dessalines, Christophe's anger at law violators did cause him to hang two customs officers who allowed illegally imported rum and brandy into the north. The American merchant, Hall, who ordered the cargo, was told that he would either pay $20,000 or meet the same fate. Other merchants anted up and saved Hall's life. Another American who "uttered remarks that Christophe held to be seditious" had no options. He was tortured to death, with his hands tied to the back of a horse – his bedraggled body ripped by rocks (212-214).

Perpetual Division? Perpetual War?

Externally, looking southward in 1812, Christophe's next salvo in his clash with Pétion's south was to send three ships, the *Améthyste*, the *Athénais*, and the *Jason*, to capture any ships trading with the southern portion of the island. However, mulattos opposed to Christophe were aboard the ship, and moved ahead of its escorts and led it into the hands of Borgella, who then presided over a negotiation leading to the submission of all three ships to his command. When approached by a British ship, however, neither the

Améthyste nor the other two ships could properly identify themselves, because they had been taken by Pétion's southern forces from Christophe. A Pétion loyalist officer said that the ships were under command of Borgella, who was not allowed to lead naval expeditions, according to British sea law. Thus, British Captain Lucas Yeo threatened to sink the ships if they did not allow themselves to be commandeered to Jamaica. This did not end well for the Pétion loyalists, nor the reluctant Christophe supporters who remained on the ships. The Haitian ships suffered more than 200 dead and wounded. Survivors were taken to Port-au Prince, but disarmed. In response, Borgella ordered Guy-Joseph Bonnet to arrest any British merchants and imprison them. Bonnet implemented discretion – he declined to listen, fearing that merchants in jail would be executed (195-198). Though there is no evidence that the southern president ordered the action, "Christophe took the seizure of the Améthyste as a declaration of war by Pétion" (200).

Christophe's escalated attacks against the mulatto-ruled south were met with resistance by Pétion's closest ally and protégé, Jean Pierre Boyer, at Fort Cibert. Meanwhile, Pétion sought to quell Borgella's anglings on power. From March to June of 1812, violence again became normalized in the lives of many Haitians, as leaders looked to usurp one another in a battle for a fledgling nation. An unsuccessful Christophe siege of Port-au Prince in June necessitated British Vice Admiral Charles Stirling's offer of mediation, to end a standoff that might adversely affect British trading – and endanger British merchants -- on both portions of the island (200-203).

In approaching mediation, Christophe's declared terms of truce to Pétion were that the southern leader simply submit to Christophe's royalty. Stirling elected not to relay such

terms to the southern leader. “Christophe still maintained, and possibly believed, that he would eventually capture Port-au Prince” (203). Intelligence would then serve Christophe well, as his spies sniffed out a Pétion plan to have him assassinated by a group of northern traitor soldiers as he prayed at the Catholic altar before a parade. The northern leader, before entering the church, had an aide read a list of names – all were conspirators, subsequently shot outside the cathedral (203). Christophe would survive; however, parts of his army were deserting him.

Pétion did not expect the North to bow to him immediately, even if his plan to kill Henri I was successful. However, Christophe became obsessive about ensuring that his orders were followed, to ensure that he could remain in power in the north, perhaps ignorant of the possibility of compromise. While shorter than the convoluted process of the Haitian revolution, the Haitian conflict between north and south left scars for future generations. Hubert Cole theorizes that Pétion had a chance, but “He was incapable of following up on the plots he contrived so ingeniously” (204-206). Christophe was either aware of the weaknesses of Pétion and his state, or Henri I was envisioning a less militarized nation in the future, when he reduced the size of the northern army (215) to between 20,000 and 25,000 troops.

With his control in the north seemingly unquestioned, and Pétion apparently content in the south, Christophe was nonplussed by accusations that he was allied with the French. Therefore, in 1814 he sent the first feelers out to France to ascertain whether or not Haiti’s former colonizer would begin to recognize the divided nation. Knowing the nation was fractured, France sent emissary Jacques-Francois Dauxion Lavaysse to discuss terms

with mulatto Pétion in the South, and Agostino France de Medina, Spanish by birth, to discuss terms with Christophe. Lavaysse stayed in the Port au-Prince apartments of Pétion secretary Jean Pierre Boyer. Medina's rest stop on the way to meet Christophe was the Spanish part of the island, where his family owned land. Were the French plotting a takeover of the Spanish section? Likely suspecting this, the northern leader arrested Medina; upon checking his baggage, King Henri I discovered documentation supporting that France wanted to reinstitute slavery on Haiti. One French memo read that Haiti's field workers "should remain in, or return to, the condition in which they were before 1789" (217-219). Medina was tried and sentenced to death, but was spared by Christophe, probably learning from predecessors' miscalculations in imposing capital punishment. Lavaysse returned to France unsuccessful. Given the population ratio between mulattoes and blacks in the south (210), slavery could not return there either.

To Christophe, France was planning to reinstitute Haiti's worst enemy, slavery. Therefore, Henri I took this opportunity to offer his southern rival a gateway to become part of the Haitian Republic, under its first king. Christophe's overture, dictated to a secretary because Henri I was barely literate in either English or French (215), was met acrimoniously by Pétion, who would receive no compensation for losing his ruling title, part of Christophe's proposal. Perhaps negotiation could have produced reconciliation in the past, but no more. In June, 1816, Pétion pushed through a new constitution in the south declaring himself president for life (221-224). In response, Christophe celebrated the queen's patronal festival, in honor of Queen Marie-Louise Christophe, with regality perhaps surpassing that of Europe. Examples included gold fringe hems and satin trains on

the queen's dress, Te Deums sung by a choir of 400, toasts to world leaders, and hundred-gun salutes (224-226). The competition remained, through a lull in violent or even overt hostilities.

Internal Improvements?

Continuing the unfortunate tradition of illiteracy in a chief executive – following Dessalines (Clément 144), Christophe crusaded to improve Haitian education. In contrast, "Emperor Jean-Jacques did not encourage education" (162). At the queen's patron festival, English merchant John White gave a speech praising sovereign Haiti, specifically northern Haiti, under Christophe, socially and militarily, comparing it favorably to European nations. The northern leader had White's speech published and sent around the world to promote his land. Consequently and subsequently, Christophe asked British abolitionists William Wilberforce and John Clarkson for help in patterning Haitian schools after those in Europe. Wilberforce and Clarkson sent educated freed American black Prince Sanders to Haiti; Sanders returned to England, but later to Haiti with colleague T.B. Gulliver. In September, 1818 (Cole 285), Gulliver became the first foreign teacher to open a school in Haiti. The philosophy of such schooling – avoiding corporal punishment – conflicted with much of Christophe's means to keep order, so the king instituted corporal punishments for disciplinary infractions (229-230).

Any debate on to what extent corporal punishment in school would generate critical thinking in former slaves' descendants would have to be postponed. In October, Gulliver's quest, requested by Christophe in the North, was upstaged by a Francois Vicomte de Fontanges' French expedition to the southern Pétion, dictating that for "Saint Domingüe"

to enjoy future security, it should submit to French protection. Pétion at first appeared to be willing to negotiate. Christophe, on the other hand, never felt so inclined, interpreting Pétion's possibility of negotiation as the French "inciting the South to attack the North" (231-235). If Pétion wanted to appease the French, he could have given the appearance that he would talk, knowing how the northern king would react to even one French ship in Haitian waters. In Christophe's November 20, 1816, declaration against French intervention, he stated that Haitians were unified against their former colonizers. To what degree this is true is unknown. However, in the south, while perhaps not as much in the North, French presence was not welcome. As for Pétion himself, "How far he himself had been tempted to negotiate with the French remained obscure" (235).

Fontanges returned to France. In 1817, as schooling expanded in the north, Pétion paved the way for Methodists to offer schooling in southern Haiti (285). In 1804, there were zero schools in all of Haiti – understandable for a nation ravaged by war for fifteen years. By 1849 there were fifty four (Clément 160). Christophe, Haiti's only king, prioritized education with the creation of the Royal Chamber of Public Instruction in December, 1818. While education was segregated by gender, two private and public schools for girls were opened (Cole 256). By 1820, topics of instruction for women included English, French, composition, and drawing (257).

Succession and Consolidation

On March 29, 1818, Anne-Alexandre Pétion "died of disease and worry" (Baur 310). As per his created constitution, he could decide his successor, leaving his post to fellow mulatto Jean Pierre Boyer. Boyer had fought with Rigaud against Toussaint, and

had served under Leclerc during the French invasion of 1802 (Cole 244-245). Upon hearing of Pétion's death, Christophe again offered peace, or in the view of southerners, submission. They declined. Christophe could not imagine that "The entire realm was in mourning" (Baur 311). John Edward Baur states that Pétion's efforts to create a moderate state encouraged many to flout authority, thus weakening the leader's rule. "Even Pétion's mildest laws were violated, while in the North Henri Christophe's despotism appeared to be giving peace and prosperity." Nearing his end, Pétion transformed into a figure similar to that of Dessalines, without the anger to strike back. He stopped eating; "He construed every trifling event into a plot against his life. He then grew melancholy; objected to receive his usual visitors" (Baur 310). It seems possible that the southern leader became depressed in an economically depressed state. While people in the north feared their leader, Christophe, Pétion's "people loved him deeply, more than they have any ruler," but "He failed to fill their stomachs." In assessing national progress, however, when Pétion's post was passed to Boyer, no shots were fired (311).

Christophe began to realize that the Republic of Haiti's residents would never submit to him, even though he had loosened some of the rural code; an example was allowing sale of land to small farmers. However, these farmers would still have to work just as arduously as they had under the paid plantation system. On the other hand, a British observer observed that Pétion's south, then ruled by Boyer, encouraged everybody to work, but in its efforts to appease all, was left with an excess of "idleness" (Cole 245).

Though intent on maintaining authority and still dreading a French return, Christophe attempted to shrink the military more, but he needed Britain to recognize his

nation first. He was also aware that white presence on the island would increase Haitian prestige and economic opportunity. The king therefore decreed that interracial couples would be given full citizenship in Haiti's north, even offering to pay the fare of couples without a previous Haitian connection.

King Henri I asked the British to officially recognize Haiti (244-245), and expressed interest in a proposal by British abolitionist Clarkson calling for freed American blacks to populate the Haitian north. Clarkson even theorized wildly that the United States could be persuaded to annex the Spanish part of the island, and then it could be populated with such freed slaves, thereby ending slavery on the island. Christophe knew this could never happen (246), though he did hate bondage in all its forms, while unopposed to arduous working conditions obliged upon northern Haitian peasants.

Perhaps Christophe knew that the brigand leader Goman, whose real name was Jean-Baptiste Perrier, would never submit to either the northern or the southern state. However, Christophe used Goman's presence to annoy Pétion and his successor Boyer, rather than committing to endless war.

In August, 1818, a gunpowder magazine at munition storehouse Citadel-Henry was struck by lightning, killing 159 of King Henri's troops, and destroying vast weaponry. Goman could be a nuisance to both the north and the south, but to appease the brigand leader, who never directly allied himself with either Christophe or Boyer, the king anointed Goman count of southern city Jérémie. Instead of marching to the northern coast, wounded by the lighting strike, Boyer marched on Jérémie. Christophe launched a naval attack on Port au-Prince, the southern capital. Boyer withdrew. (Cole 247-248). Boyer perceived

that Goman was Christophe's ally, while the northern ruler used Perrier to his advantage in the king's territorial dispute with Boyer. "Boyer's greatest feats were not to be military" (Baur 310).

A divided nation still feared French invasion. To address both prospective obstacles, Christophe looked to Russia for foreign support, advocated by English abolitionist Thomas Clarkson. Clarkson, aware that Boyer had been discussing treaties with France – which had been ruled out by Christophe after the Fontagne expedition – asked the northern leader to discuss peace with the southern Boyer (Cole 250). Christophe appears to have been moving toward peace. When Boyer overtook Goman in 1820, the south did so without any interference from northern troops. Christophe had told friend Clarkson: "I assure you that I have no intention of committing any hostile act against Boyer" (255). Internal projects included appointing Dr. Duncan Stewart to run a civilian hospital, and introducing a plough to cultivate Haitian fields. Rocky and underdeveloped lands, and farmers' conservatism caused the latter to be a failing effort, though advocated by English Agricultural Board president Sir John Sinclair (255-256).

While Christophe had agreed to mediation between he and Boyer by British Admiral Sir Home Riggs Popham, Christophe's ceased protection of Goman increased Boyer's self-image of a seasoned warrior and leader. Boyer implied that Christophe had no control over his army, which would join the south, and that the king was "reduced to complete impotence" (259). In rejecting mediation, Boyer would not budge; Popham continued to try to reconcile the nation. The British admiral's "persistence merely confirmed Boyer's opinion that Christophe was enfeebled and even frightened" (260).

If not necessarily weakened, Christophe perhaps had reason to be frightened, as Boyer's continuation of Pétion's lax enforcement of laws in the south, alongside the north's shrunken military, put the king's rule in danger (259). While Hubert Cole praises Haiti's second ruler in many respects, he observes: "He was a tyrant and no matter how benevolent his intentions, his hand was heavy and often resented" (262). Though his rank was reinstated afterwards, mass anger likely resulted when Jean Pierre Richard, commissioned provincial governor Duc de la Marmelade, was sentenced to hard labor for four months, when he in fact did follow Christophe's orders, yet did so in a different manner from that ordered by the king (261).

The king's priority was to rebuild Citadel Henry after the explosion; in executing this task, he requested help of the military as manual laborers. Work was exhausting. When Christophe was dissatisfied with the speed with which Colonel Paulin's troops were bringing the king materials for the reconstruction, the northern leader ordered Paulin's superior, northern Haiti provincial Governor Jean Claude, to reprimand Paulin. However, Paulin did not accept the rebuke. Instead, the colonel defended his actions. Cole posits that Paulin may have already known he could take advantage of the king because his sister was Christophe's mistress. The king became resolute and incensed, ordering Paulin imprisoned after the colonel ripped his military awards off his own uniform (263).

On August 15, 1820, a mass to honor Haiti's first queen, Marie-Louise Christophe, was scheduled in Limonade. While seated in the pews, Marie-Louise's husband Henri, the northern leader, stated he was ill, and asked for his carriage to return him home. Doused in sweat, he labored to stand from his throne. In getting on his feet, he chose to lean on his

silver cane in lieu of assistance from his wife and children. “His arms refused to support him and he crumpled to the floor, kneeling, his head slumped on to his chest and his shoulder resting against the seat of his throne” (264). A stroke almost took Henri Christophe; three days later, however, he was awake. Dr. Duncan Stewart’s treatment likely saved the king, but the stroke cost the northern leader the use of the entire right side of his body (265; 285). Attempts to maintain secrecy of the king’s health status were unsuccessful, as travel accommodations had to be made for the State of Haiti’s leader, among them a carriage that doubled as an ambulance (265).

An increase in suspicion toward those around him had made the king angrier, and bedridden, he became difficult to bear, according to letter written by Stewart to Christophe ally Thomas Clarkson (252; 266). The king’s anger fomented his ordering the execution of twelve women who prayed for his death, likely unifying hatred of him in both Haitian states. (Baur 313). The infirm leader still would not consider a regency council that would help him rule, and possibly lessen the dictatorial effects of his reign on the people whom he depended upon for state stability. As chief executive, his survival was unlikely without an advisory board (266). While the king looked to rehabilitate himself, eventually learning to write his name with his left hand (269), in his enfeebled state: “This was the opportunity for those who had long feared or hated him” (265).

Though in 1819 Christophe had asked Clarkson to approach France about possible treaties between the northern state and its former colonizer, Paris’ awareness of Haitian current events was lacking – reports of Christophe’s death appeared in French newspapers. The king, however, saw “Boyer’s hand” in these rumors. Consequently, Christophe ordered

that his Saint-Marc regiment prepare for a long siege, should Boyer's troops attack. This troop regiment, however, was under the command of Colonel Paulin, who had been imprisoned in chains and sentenced to hard labor by the king. They mutinied (266-267). Awareness of the plot may have pervaded the entire island: "There were many in the king's council of state who suspected what was being plotted" (265).

Boyer would not have to attack with his own troops. He bought Christophe's troops, many of whom already disillusioned with their leader. The mutiny spread easily throughout the regiment. The only major military tactic Boyer employed with his own troops was sending three officers by sea to northern Saint-Marc to bribe more northern soldiers, already susceptible to bribes by northerners disloyal to Christophe. However, northerners who wanted the king removed were too impoverished to influence soldiers, so it took Boyer's maneuvering to bring an end to the first Haitian king's reign.

Delay in Promise

Leading the munity was Major Constant Paul; a symbol of their likely success became the severed head of Christophe loyalist Jean Claude. Christophe ally Paul Romain, anointed Prince of Limbé, battled mutineers spurred by Boyer from the south. He was awaiting aid, 6000 troops worth, led by Philippe Guerrier, Duc de l'Avancé (268-269).

The level of help Romain would receive was irrelevant, as the Duc de Marmelade, Jean Pierre Richard, was conspiring with other generals to take power nearly simultaneously with the conspirators of Saint-Marc, implying that support in a dictatorial militaristic state will inevitably face multiple oppositions. The generals had no objection to tyranny; they just wanted more power. The duke, in public, said he was no longer a duke,

but instead was “the General Richard you have always known” (270), meaning if Christophe were not deposed, the former duke would pay the ultimate price.

On Wednesday, October 4, Christophe first heard about the rebellion of the Saint-Marc regiment. Unaware of the generals’ plot, the king had had assigned Richard to help Guerrier in Romain’s campaign against the mutineers (269). The generals, opposing Christophe, and their loyal troops then recruited from Sans-Souci – named after the man Christophe had murdered – and waited with their supporters for Christophe to challenge them at Le Haut Du Cap, renamed by the king Cap-Henry (270-271). Shouts decrying slavery, royalty, and clamoring for liberty drowned out Haitian Grand Marshall Joachim’s attempted reading of a letter written by Christophe, and directed to the rebels. Joachim never fired the cannon manned by the king’s forces; the rebels let go one volley. Henri Christophe’s defeat was cemented when he saw his troops gallop over on horseback to the opposition’s lines. At that point, the ruler preoccupied with pageantry had but one option (271). He could not inform his family, or even Joachim, fearing they would stop him. Haiti’s second ruler, one of three, though he the most prominent, on October 8, 1820, “raised his left hand, holding the pistol that he had taken from beneath a cushion of his chair, and shot himself through the heart” (272).

Aftermath

Local peasants and royal servants looted palace apartments (272-273) – a sign of their poverty and intense dislike of Chrisophe’s tyrannical rule. Queen Marie-Louise and Christophe’s court were safe, as many of the king’s staff had intervened on behalf of other Haitians for leniency of the previous ruler’s hard hand (273).

The generals thought they had ascended to power, but by this time Boyer had marched up north and had seized enough of Christophe's former kingdom to prevent further destabilization. However, Christophe educational advocate Prince Sanders wrote to Thomas Clarkson that two months after Christophe's death "brigandage" was the rule throughout the island, formerly divided into territories controlled by Christophe and Boyer, and that the king's yearn for improved Haitian education was in jeopardy (275). However, Jób Clement's article on Haitian education indicates that the zeal to educate a nation founded by a slave rebellion survived Christophe's death (163-180).

On Politics and Courage

While Christophe biographer Hubert Cole describes Boyer as "an unheroic figure" (274), John Edward Bauer's article on unified Haiti's second ruler says Boyer was "ready, willing, and able to lead his country against the greatest obstacles any new nation had faced in modern times" (307). The early part of Boyer's rule included bayoneting to death soldiers still loyal to Christophe, and foiling an assassination plot in which Christophe loyalist Romain was implicated. Though his predecessor had made overtures to the French about a treaty, Romain had spread the rumor that Boyer, a mulatto, son of a white storekeeper of Saint Domingüe and a slave, was "selling Haiti to the French." Official reports said Romain was captured and killed attempting to escape (308; 315).

Boyer would retrace Toussaint Louverture's steps in attempting to annex the eastern portion of the island, where history dictated dominance of the Spanish language. Haiti's ruling class feared a visit from South American revolutionary Simón Bólivar would spur Haiti's eastern neighbors to assert themselves both culturally and militarily. Opinion

of the eastern population mixture of slaves, Spaniards, and mulattoes was divided on whether or not the colony would fare better ruled by a unified Haiti. Boyer, though, implemented policy on the Spanish lands to display appearance that the entire island wanted to exist as one nation. Therefore, when Boyer marched east to claim resources that "might well restore prosperity," and more prestige in the world (316), he "met no opposition… he was received in an enthusiastic manner." In February, 1822, Boyer was acknowledged as ruler of the entire island of Hispañola, entirely Haiti (Logan 32).

Uncompromising Confiscation, Abolition, and Theft

One of Boyer's first acts was to free the slaves. Critics said that would harm the island's economy, but no Haitian ruler would allow chattel slavery. Land was confiscated, if Spanish owners could not provide actual documentation proving they were the owners, and the majority lacked the required papers. Boyer's "Haitianization" of the East included transmitting all western laws into eastern courts, in French, despite the fact that few in the East could read or write French. Church property was taken; education in the east suffered as professors had to flee. Haitian soldiers stood guard, everywhere. "During its submission to Haiti, Santo Domingo was virtually a conquered territory" (Baur 319-320).

Monarchy Returns to Europe

Boyer had difficult choices to make, and one was whether to accept or decline a treaty offer from France in 1824. The treaty offer was not supportive to Haitian prosperity. Part called for Haiti to pay 150,000,000 francs to France for the injustices perpetrated upon the colonizers during the revolution. With monarchy restored in France, Louis XVIII essentially agreed not to invade Haiti, but "refused to recognize her external sovereignty"

(321). Skilled at island diplomacy and suspected of planting rumors of Christophe's death in France, the Machiavellian Boyer (307) had few retorts when three French warships arrived to have the treaty signed. The crestfallen Boyer submitted to the oppressive treaty, whose financial demand was reduced to 60,000,000 francs in 1838, but why should the freeing oppressed be forced to pay reparations to their oppressors, ever?

Renegotiation only came after a Haitian default, because tax levies could not be paid by Haitian poor -- and perhaps more importantly under a more liberal king, Louis Philippe (324). At the very least, the revolution's participants and their children were dismayed at the signing of the treaty. The worst internal disagreements with Christophe's responded to his somewhat exaggerated tyranny. Disparagement of Boyer accurately targeted a treaty he signed, albeit under duress.

Christophe had been obsessed about a French invasion; "Boyer had always hated violence" (323). Coincidentally, or not, on July 3, 1825, the day Haiti agreed to pay France for protection from a former colonizer's invasion, "Any defense would have failed. The capital, as its panicky populace now realized, was not impregnable, and neither was their president" (322). Was Christophe a prophet? "He had predicted that his rival, Boyer, would someday bow to French interests" (323). Perhaps the most positive aspect of the French treaty is that subsequently, in 1825, England did officially recognize Haiti, likely to get an edge in trade, knowing that Haitians would rather trade with a nation that was not robbing it blind (Padgett 269). European nations Netherlands, Denmark, and Sweden followed (Baur 329), but in 1822 no Latin American nation would recognize Haiti -- Bólivar's congress of nations recalling Boyer's actions in Santo Domingo (329). Haiti's northern

neighbor, the United States, would not entertain any discussion of recognizing the world's first black republic – President James Monroe justifying declination primarily on the fact that 1820s Haiti prohibited whites from owning land and working in the government (324). It is unlikely that Monroe knew that Boyer had once traveled on a captured French ship during the Quasi-War with France between 1798-1800, and that the white son of an American who helped him during his captivity was appointed mayor of Saint-Marc (308). He was the only white person to serve under Boyer. Compelled to suppress opposition, Boyer forced rebels against Haiti's treaty with France into exile (323).

Upon Predecessors' Building Blocks

Shortly before his death, Christophe began discussing with Prince Sanders the possibility of bringing American freed blacks to Haiti to live (Cole 269). Boyer took this plan further by sending mulatto Jonathan Granville to America; he returned with thirty free black families, whose voyages by sea were subsidized at $40 per family. Boyer and his senate, dominated by his "favored mulattoes" (323) believed that since many Haitians spoke and understood English, resulting from schooling efforts of Christophe and trade with Americans, transitioning would be no challenge for the former American slaves' families. Lifting a veil on colorism, Boyer "told a member of the Society for African Colonization in April, 1824, that it would be impractical to send civilized Negroes to barbaric Africa" (326). Racial and geographic views aside, the president did pay for the journey of fifty American blacks who worked on his estate. Six thousand freed slaves and their descendants from the United States had their journeys to Haiti subsidized through

April, 1825, until, Boyer said, an American paid to expedite the journeys stole Haitian money (326-327).

While the language barrier may not have been an issue, the lifestyle change was overbearing on many Americans. Two hundred returned to the United States as of 1825, meaning that some whose voyages had been paid with help from Haiti would rather return to a land in which many white citizens would prefer to see them enslaved. Economically, the Haitian dollar paled in power to that of the United States. The economic system was still one in which citizens worked on shares, and for people coming from a land where private ownership was more accessible, even though slavery dominated half of it, this was untenable for many freed blacks. While interest in the migration effort diminished, missionary Benjamin Lundy said that in 1827 there were still 8000 American blacks living in Haiti, meaning the level of success was debatable (327). Boyer's plan was not enough to attract more funding from American allies to emancipation and equality – who began sending their money to Liberia, an African nation founded by freed slaves (328).

On Stability

Stable states correlate with sound economies, and if foreign nations officially recognized Haiti, it had a chance to be self-sufficient, but "Haiti's socio-economic plight was worse than ever." War had destroyed much land, and while Christophe had ruled with an iron hand in the north, leading to some agricultural profits and a tax base, the south was "in virtual anarchy and poverty." Even the coffee and sugar plantations were in disrepair. Reported by European visitors: "Even the president's estates were described as only half-cultivated, and exhibiting signs of neglect" (332).

Pattern of State Discipline

Boyer reverted to tactics implemented by Louverture, Dessalines, and Christophe – forced labor: divergent from slavery, but to what extent? The Rural Code passed in 1826, severely restricting movement of people and punishing agricultural workers perceived by the military as lazy with a day in jail. "The Rural Code failed. It failed as all efforts to control totally the private life of the people have and always must fail" (334). Likely specific causes of failure include: the strictness of the code itself in light of historically lax government, the fact that owners had no incentive to ensure cultivators were rewarded, the lure of providing extra crop to military in return for favors, or no incentives on the owners to till all their fields. The financial burden was onerous, given how much Haiti agreed to pay the French. As Boyer was not a military leader, in the tradition of Louverture, Dessalines, and Christophe, "The standing army, equally disobedient and twice as lazy, failed to enforce it." Part called for workers, similar to sharecroppers in post-civil war America, to get a quarter of all crops. Without incentive to do more, for a greater share, worker competition and incentive were eliminated. Advanced farming techniques were not applied to Haitian farming because of ignorance often associated with poverty and the accompanying isolated nature of nineteenth century Haitian peasant life. However, expected sunny weather dictated that agriculture would not suffer as much as national unity (335).

Economically, Boyer revived forced labor by criminals to maintain highways, but public works could not modernize; no Haitian public roads existed as in Europe. In 1820, the year of Christophe's suicide, the northern Haitian state achieved economic stability. By

1826, six years after Boyer had marched north to unite two feuding states, a memo by British Consul-General Charles Mackenzie read: “the treasury was empty and the soldiers and civil servants unpaid” (336). By 1840, from exports and government thrift, 4,500,000 of the 60,000,000 francs owed France had been paid. Haiti had defaulted on the first agreement -- signed under threat of attack. Boyer had plans for a national bank, and in his quest to economically improve the island, he executed one money counterfeiter, and put a price on a second money forger’s head (338).

Omnipresent Haitian Military

Though lacking the military gravitas of his predecessors, “Boyer still used the army as a political weapon” (340). In 1840, Haitian Army funds paid 28,151 men, of whom 19,127 were soldiers, indicating the pervasiveness of patronage throughout Haitian society (Trouillot 79). Nearly four decades after attaining independence, though, military fortresses protected the nation from foreign invasion (341).

Shame Prevents Interaction? Secrecy Maintains Power?

Freed blacks from formerly British North America, if brought to Haiti en masse, might inspire Haitians to consider that they too could have more freedom on their own island – freedom similar to that of the United States. Since Boyer did not wish for many outside his land to be aware of his nation’s struggles, the purpose being to prolong his reign, he limited migration. Accordingly, education for the masses, encouraged by Christophe, was discouraged by Boyer. While advocating for more American freed slaves and their children arriving, nearly all the public school students in Port-au Prince under Boyer were mulatto. (326-327; 341) “The mulatto elite obviously monopolized education

to perpetuate its class and power." Without exposure to the outside world, working Haitian peasants would know nothing but the fields they were to till, at the tacit behest of Boyer's government (341).

Government Illusions

Though it had a senate, voting, and a House of Assembly, Haiti was not a democracy. Boyer manipulated assembly members to choose his senators; Boyer was president for life; succession had been granted him by Petión. An 1838 parliamentary revolt, suppressed by Boyer's army, ensured he could continue to have the senate of his choosing. When liberal reformer André Laudon got elected to the assembly in 1842, and subsequently assembly president, he was removed. Boyer would regularly disregard the constitution created by his predecessor to maintain power; Laudon would have fought him, so rather than have that dispute in public, Boyer prevented it from taking place (344).

Pervasive Disloyalty?

Silencing dissent will only serve a ruler for so long; Boyer's autocratic nature, alongside failed domestic policies, brought usurping from younger idealistic mulattoes, led by reformist Charles Hérard. An 1842 uprising was quelled by Boyer's 20,000 troops. Discontent spread to former slaves, who had no predisposition to be loyal to Boyer, a mulatto, as was Hérard. Baur credits Boyer for attempting to bridge the colorist divide, but "The Negroes wanted vengeance against the ruling minority" (346). Reformists wanted a fairer justice system, less subject to one man's word; under Boyer, "It had become the custom to dig the graves of those accused of treason before they were tried" (345). As distrust of Boyer grew, a May 7, 1842 earthquake brought massive looting, and Boyer's

allegedly strong government was powerless to restore order (347). The majority wanted change.

Misconception of Progress Evident

Open rebellion followed, led by Hérard, on January 27, 1843, taking up arms from his own plantation. Boyer's command to subdue the insurgency was ignored. Within two days, Hérard's troops had total control of the south. Two months later, the entire nation was under the reformists' control. Boyer resigned his post for life. On March 19, 1843, he fled first to Jamaica, and then to France, where he died in 1850 (349; 352). Haitians envisioning a strong future nation had reason to feel discontent. While the number of schools had grown in the nation's first three decades, the majority only housed students whose parents could pay tuition. By 1842 "sympathetic" French abolitionist Victor Schoelcher reported that there were only ten free schools on the entire island, serving only 1000 students (Logan 161).

Turnover

Hérard's rule would not last long, as would be so with Haiti's subsequent presidents Philippe Guerrier, Jean-Louis Piérrot, and Jean-Baptiste Riché, ruling for short tenures until Faustin Soulouque provided stability in 1847 (Leaders of Haiti; MacCorkle 40). Both Guerrier, a former Christophe ally who became president in his 80s, and Riché, died in office. Hérard fled to Jamaica, only after losing the east, what Boyer had gained for a united Haiti (MacCorkle 40). Riché is known for opening a boarding school for homeless boys during his one-year tenure (Leaders of Haiti).

Expansion Legacy Lost

As Boyer confronted internal troubles stemming from his Machiavellian nature, on eastern Santo Domingo, then occupied by Boyer's army, rebellion brewed in 1838. With different priorities, perhaps only existing in a transformed world, the word "Haitianization" could have signaled freedom to the Spanish, mestizo, black, and African-European residents of Santo Domingo. Without a culturally inclusive plan to unify the island, the spirit for independence grew to the east. A group of nine Santo Domingo men, "LaTrinitaria," implying religious significance, translating to "The Trinity," led military campaigns to take Santo Domingo City on February 27, 1844. The Haitian commander surrendered the next day. "Thus the Dominican Republic won its independence not from Spain, but from Haiti" (Logan 33).

Lost Causes?

Former Haitian general Faustin Soulouque desperately wanted to reacquire the Domincan Republic (Logan 34; Leaders of Haiti; MacCorkle 40). After Hérard deposed Boyer, Pierrot, Christophe's brother-in-law, overthrew Hérard. Pierrot's support for overtaking Hérard likely became sufficient once the eastern portion of Hispañiola declared independence (Logan 33; Leaders of Haiti), because losing the east made Hérard look weak. Educationally, in 1844 Haiti's first minister of education, Jacque Honoré-Féry, attempted to enact primary schools in each Haitian municipality, but finances dictated otherwise. Rayford Logan's study on Haiti and island neighbor the Dominican Republic states that Christophe's educational programs in the end "had little influence" (161). Analyzing literacy statistics from the late twentieth century, Logan is correct. In 1970, the illiteracy rate for Haitians over 15 was 78% (Jaramillo 329). In 1995, a journalist quoted

by Paul Farmer in *The Uses of Haiti* assessed the illiteracy rate as rising slightly to 80% (132).

Surprised and Qualified, or just Surprised?

John Edward Baur writes that Faustin Soulouque was surprised to hear that he was chosen to take Haiti's reigns in 1847, but once he had control, the path taken did not facilitate growth (131). Surprisingly, given his obsession with retaking the eastern portion of the island, he did pass a law requiring seven years of compulsory education, but military priorities of his preoccupation with Spanish-speaking neighbors prevented further educational development (Logan 161). Haiti could not escape effects of the European revolutionary fervor of 1848. Upon hearing of the liberal French Revolution of 1848, a group of mulattoes approached Soulouque and requested that he remove lifelong presidencies from the constitution. Soulouque responded by purging the senate of those who had chosen him, distrusting nearly everybody but a black general, Similien. Soulouque's most trusted confidant hated all mulattoes; therefore, the man who brought stability to Haitian leadership negated any progress Boyer made addressing Haitian colorism.

Soulouque created a terror reminiscent of France in the 1790s, executing thousands of unarmed mulattoes, and blacks who were willing to compromise to keep order. The purge of Soulouque's subjects, implemented by Similien, "was to open one of the bloodiest periods in Haitian history" (135). Similien wanted the mulattoes gone from Haiti one way or another. Illiterate, but religious largely in the African tradition, he feared the unknown. Religious fear and his experience of violence through military experience contributed to

Similien's dictatorially brutal tendencies (132). In no way should this imply or state that African religious influence on Haitian society is altogether negative, as will be revealed when detailing the roots of Haitian nationalism.

In 1849, a petition was circulated asking whether President Soulouque should be crowned emperor. Who would refuse to sign? Faustin Soulouque became Haiti's second emperor on August 26, 1849 (138). Under Haiti's ninth ruler, knighting government allies took precedence over feeding the nation's hungry. Christophe had knighted 77 people in 13 years; Soulouque knighted 400 in one week! With agricultural production down, the poor peasants' poverty intensified, because the fruits of their labor were the only manner to fund a noble class' pageantry. While this started with Christophe, Soulouque oversaw an exponential growth to this decadence (Trouillot 79-80). Politically and economically, one positive goal of Similien was to attempt to repudiate the alleged debt owed to France (Baur 136). Friends and families of Soulouque's and Similien's victims cheered in 1858 when General Nicolas Geffrard, who had helped save Soulouque on one of his unsuccessful expeditions east to retake Santo Domingo, marched into Port-au Prince. Little agreement exists as to how Geffrard engineered this, but Soulouque's reign was over, and he died in Jamaica in 1867 (Baur 157-158; Leaders of Haiti).

A Failing State?

In the early stages of what evolved into the Haitian revolution, leaders had no vision for a new nation forbidding human property. Toussaint Louverture never indicated he wanted independence; Dessalines did begin plotting it, in the face of France looking to

reinstitute slavery. Pre-revolutionary feuds dominated early Haitian politics. However, after Boyer:

> It can be argued that Haitian politics and government displayed every possible sign of degeneration. An essentially 'private' concept of the state took root, and the distinction between public and private funds became blurred. Politics became merely the infighting of various cliques in pursuit of the spoils which accrued to the holder of the presidential office and his followers, while the peasant masses remained entirely outside the political process except when called upon and/or hired to help one or another of the contending groups (Lundahl 8).

Victims and Change

The damage of such a consistently mercenary governing style by national hierarchy is immeasurable, given that Haitian peasants have always been and thus still are the nation, according to Haitian historian Michel-Rolph Trouillot (230). The poor Haitian life has been difficult since January 1, 1804. However, pitting factions of poor against each other worsened factionalism, and created new political divisions. Mats Lundahl writes that Haitian governments practiced "mafia" leadership style, from 1843 until 1915 (8). The evolving nation had no middle class to which peasants could ascend. Part of this, to be sure, can be blamed on the United States' refusal to officially recognize Haiti until 1862, during the American Civil War, though United States merchants had been trading with Haiti since Christophe's rule. Geffrard's more enlightened rule (Baur 161), compared to that of Soulouque, likely contributed to President Abraham Lincoln's decision to send Benjamin

F. Whidden to Haiti as America's first envoy (Padgett 270). While some may attribute Haiti's devolution to its founders, the "decline of Haitian government in the nineteenth century had its origins chiefly in the uncertain status of Haiti as a black former slave colony in the military and economic proximity of white superpowers" (Nelson 229).

An Early Diaspora

Those purged by Soulouque were not the first to leave Hispañiola. Some western refugees from the strife of the 1790s journeyed to the United States. Slaves were illegally imported from Saint Domingüe to the United States before Jean-Jacques Dessalines led a slave army to victory. ("A Crusade Against Slavery"). Spanish colonists fled to Spain during and after the Haitian Revolution, as Haiti sought total control of Hispañiola (Paulino 22). Two of the 20,000 who voluntarily left their homeland, then a colony split into Saint Domingüe and Spanish Saint Domingüe, were mulattoes Sévère and Joseph Courtois. Men of means, Joseph fought in the Napoleonic Wars in Europe; Sévère worked to overthrow the Spanish crown (Mongey 37-38), and allied himself with Colombia in 1822 (53).

Politically, the Courtois brothers were more aligned with rebel Vincent Ogé than Ogé's comrade in revolt -- Jean-Baptiste Chavannes: "Emancipation was not on their political and social agenda" (38). Sévère even bought and sold slaves, while simultaneously starting to question racial outlooks of his day. Mixed race slave trader Sévère "stood at a crossroads between the modern and early modern worlds" (55), fighting alongside Andrew Jackson in the American War of 1812 for a country whose southern half could enslave him if he lacked papers (57).

While serving under Napoleon, Joseph was captured by the British. Upon release, Bonaparte prohibited him from joining the French imperial guard. Until 1818, free men of color were prohibited from travel. Once the ban ended, husband and wife Joseph and Juliette Courtois returned to the southern portion of Haiti, ruled by Pétion. The Saint Domingüe citizen, turned Haitian expatriate, started a newspaper, critical of ascendant president Boyer. Joseph Courtois was jailed. During Joseph's brief incarceration, Juliette ran the paper. Juliette Courtois, formerly Juliette Bussièrre-LaForest, three-year-old refugee from Saint Domingüe in 1795 (42) "is often considered the first Haitian female journalist" (47). While dissent mounted against Boyer, Joseph rose politically from the assembly to the senate, but, when Soulouque rose to power, the second emperor's purge ensured no mulattoes could serve in government. Joseph Courtois was imprisoned again. When the French consul intervened on his behalf, he was released. His name probably saved him from execution; French advocates removed him from bondage and sent him into exile, until Geffrard assumed leadership in 1858 (47). Upon Juliette's death, while Joseph was in exile, their son took over the newspaper. By the time Joseph died, at 92, half his life was spent away from his birthplace (48).

The largely mixed race diaspora caused by fifteen years of war on Saint Domingüe was the first crisis of exiles in world history. Many stayed in contact with their previous social networks, though the Courtois family was limited in who they could communicate with on Saint Domingüe, having only an aunt in France (Mongey 37; 43). For refugee Joseph, there was purpose in staying in Haiti. To Saint Domingüe expatriate Sévère, greater purpose lay elsewhere. The linkage between the French storming the Bastille to the mixed

race diaspora is evident in Joseph's journalism, and Sévère's work promoting attempts to usurp colonial rule[7] (44).

However, the same cannot be said about elusive accounts of Haitian peasants, downtrodden first by slavery, and then by either overt despotism or ignorance of their needs. Such is the story of young Haiti. In assessing revolutionary success, analyzing the tremendous success of a slave army can lead to success by any definition, Skopcol's or Russell's. However, the world into which Haiti was born minimized the extent to which Skopcol's definition of success can be ascribed to Haiti. Russell's definition, stating that social change dictates a successful upheaval clearly applies. Slavery, in which one human being was legally owned by another, was gone. Even within systems that allowed corporal punishment, the whip was outlawed. Change had come, but did progress for the masses accompany that change? Early Haitian history indicates that mass improvement of life would have to wait. The successful, yet originally unplanned, removal of European colonizers from Haiti begs the question: can oppressed people expect and plan for forces to align, freeing them from bondage? As Haiti formed, and Dessalines ascended to military chief, all Saint Domingüe leaders wanted the French out. What if another faction, one supporting a foreign power, with no interest in removing the French, had been introduced onto the island? What if this faction openly supported the French? What if Rigaud had been

[7] Historians debate whether or not Jean Baptiste Point du Sable, declared "The First Chicagoan" by Thomas Meehan and other historians, was Saint Domingüe-born. Little is known about his early life, but while Meehan and the majority of historians before the early twentieth century claim Du Sable was born on Hispañiola before 1750, to a black woman mother and an aristocratic French father, or to two free black parents, early twentieth century historian Milo Quaife claims Du Sable's parentage was a French-Canadian, and a black woman living north of Chicago, in what now would be Canada. Source: "Jean Baptiste Point du Sable: The First Chicagoin."

able to overtake Toussaint? If any of these hypotheticals had been reality, then the nation of Haiti would not have formed on January 1, 1804. With none of these obstacles present, nationalism sprouted, under a torturous slave system. Was the spirit already present? If so, what caused this passion for freedom to resonate? What did colonizers and occupiers learn from Saint Domingüe's transformation into Haiti? What if a significant portion of a population wants to remove an unwanted presence, yet the zeal for independence is not as intense as that of Saint Domingüe slaves?

3

On Colonies and Neighbors

While Normans, to transform into the English and the British, had been present on Ireland since 1170, "The Ulster Plantation marked a significant development in bringing the whole of Ireland more completely under English control" ('A Death-Dealing Famine 18')[8]. Competing wealthy English applied to obtain "lands that had traditionally been held by Irish kings or chiefs" (Kinealy., "A New History of Ireland" 83). While the English crown rewarded land grants, financial problems for many native Irish persisted. New Irish money in the seventeenth century was either Presbyterian or Anglican, the name of King Henry's English church. The city of Derry was walled, as the pale had been. Regardless of how one viewed the relationship between the Irish and the Normans, English presence could not be ignored. "Scottish and English settlers were offered a pioneering opportunity, the consequences of which were long to outlive them" ('A Death Dealing Famine,'18).

Royal Politics; Internal Struggles

Queen Elizabeth had no children, so she chose James of Scotland as her heir. James' priorities were elsewhere, specifically Scotland, which he wished to unify peacefully with England. James only convened the Irish parliament twice: the last time in 1615. Working with his coreligionists, he continued to work to Anglicize Ireland through plantation ('A

[8] The plantation occurred almost immediately after the Nine Years War, led by Hugh O'Neill, (Irish name Aodh Mór Ó Néill) Earl of Tyrone. O'Neill fled in the face of likely defeat, in the "Flight of the Earls," causing the first wave of Irish emigration, largely from the northwest coast in what now is Donegal, where O'Neill's castle still stands. He had wanted to return, with Catholic troops funded by the Pope, but never did.

Death Dealing Famine' 18). Derry was the prize for English settlers wanting to claim lands previously held by Hugh O'Neill and his allies. Plantation hierarchy included Protestant landowners at the top, Protestant tenants in the middle, and Irish Catholic tenants below -- required to pay more rent (Kinealy., "A New History of Ireland" 84-85). Under James I, "Irish Catholics of all levels became the main losers from the changes" (87). Even wealthy Catholics objected to the king instituting such transformation without consulting parliament. The impoverished mass was not satisfied with a compromise to allocate twenty per cent of Ulster land to loyal Irish. Ulster Lord Chichester executed mercenaries hired by O'Neill factions during the Nine Years War, when their training and lack of remuneration from the settlement might dictate future threats against hierarchy. Therefore, from an Ulster perspective, given that the new landowners were unwelcome, only a "draconian approach" to prospective attackers (86-87) would suffice. With likely danger everywhere, walls were built, physically and socially. A de facto caste system had been placed into both practice and law in 1610; it would remain for centuries – relegating the northern Irish tenant into subservience. Plantations spread, and with greater animosity between Protestants and poor Irish Catholics, more fear and distrust pervaded the relationship between predecessors of future generations whom centuries later could not peacefully coexist. Simultaneously, however, the economy grew. It did so, though, "with little sensitivity to the Irish, who felt aggrieved at losing their lands" (89-91).

Attempted Unity Through Conciliation

Contrary to what the results indicate, James was a compromiser, a Protestant king who "based many of his policies on appeasing all factions" (91). Rare was the seventeenth

century marriage between a Catholic and a Protestant, but James' son Charles married a Catholic, French Princess Henrietta. In an age with widespread internecine conflict among Christian sects, Charles cared not what other Protestants thought about his nuptials. Though the Irish parliament was more Protestant than ever before, and thus would likely follow him unquestioningly, King Charles wanted to rule Ireland without them. The trend of Irish wielding no influence over their own future continued as Charles was undermined not by his disregard for anything Irish, but for his treatment of the Scottish. The prayer book he injected into the lives of Scottish Presbyterians was so poorly received that the Scots waged a two-year war against the crown. To save his throne, he had to recall both Irish and Scottish parliaments, and even agree to execute one of his closest confidants, Thomas Wentworth (93-94). This alienated many who supported Charles because of Wentworth's alliance, though the royal politico "immediately regretted this action" (93), because it cost him more allies.

In response to unification of English and Scottish opposition against him, Charles had to appease the Old English, many of whose descendants had moved to Ireland long before the Reformation[9]. Like his father James, Charles' policy indicated he largely favored coexistence between Protestants and Catholics. Such was not the case with the Scottish and English parliaments, who were mustering support for battle (94). The English money introduced in the north would lead to enormous wealth transfer over the next

[9] The sixteenth century European reformation, creating new sects of Christianity, was the root cause of many changes in Ireland.

century. By 1685, English-born landowners on Irish soil controlled almost eighty per cent of the land (Kinealy., "A Death-Dealing Famine" 18).

Charles' attempts to reconcile with Ireland, thirty years after plantation had started, proved unsuccessful as an Irish rebellion began in 1641. The proliferation of English plantations on Irish soil minimized Irish landowner voice in the parliament (Kinealy., "A New History of Ireland" 92). Effects of this displacement included Sir Phelim O'Neill and Rory O'More, descended from pre-plantation wealth, attacking Ulster, killing 4000 settlers. Proceeding south, they even controlled some of Dundalk. Some landowners were personally loyal to Charles; thus they were willing to negotiate for peace, having made their military statement against the most prominent plantation. However, English and Scottish parliamentary troops struck back and vanquished O'Neill and O'More. Land confiscations ensued (95).

Though Charles' throne was preserved, trouble still brewed, revealing itself when Charles argued with the English parliament regarding who would command the army sent to suppress O'More and Phelim O'Neill. Was he concerned about the level of brutality that some English would perpetrate upon the Irish? Perhaps, but of greater concern to Charles was an attack from the political and religious extremists from the Scottish; in 1642 came the English Civil War.

English Politics Impact Ireland

The uniqueness of the English Civil War is that it was fought among sects of Protestantism, a division itself of Christianity. A product of this brief internecine conflict was that for a time there were two active parliaments – one led by Charles, and the other

lacking royal leadership (Kinealy., "A New History of Ireland" 96; Dunn 172). One theory equates the English Civil War to the French Revolution, stating that it was forced by limiting opportunities of the middle class, inadvertently allying themselves with the poor, whose only chance at class ascendancy was to overthrow the monarch. Critics of this hypothesis say merchants and landlords would not have supported the militant parliamentarians because they had too much to lose (Dunn 171-72).

Charles became preoccupied with failed civil war endeavors, thus attempting to take over what he perceived as a disloyal House of Commons, but his foes had already left. (172) While English leadership was in turmoil, Irish Catholics mobilized, molding the Confederation of Kilkenny, designed to govern the historically Catholic portions of the island. Though the confederation was still loyal to Charles' England, this constructed government, a parliament in everything but name, "undertook many of the duties of an independent parliament, controlling the army, collecting taxes, minting money, and negotiating with foreign powers." Support to improve the segregated Irish Catholic economy was expected from mainland Europe, but was slow to come because of the Thirty Years War, sapping many nations fiscally. The Pope sent soldiers, including a nephew of Hugh O'Neill, but Rome would only have taken this journey to the end if Charles would reinstitute Catholicism to Ireland (Kinealy., "A New History of Ireland" 97).

Victors and Vanquished

The significant vanquished of the English Civil War were Charles and Irish Catholics. The individual victor was Oliver Cromwell, who captured Charles in 1646. Cromwell led the parliamentarians New Model Army, known as the "roundheads," against

the royalists, commonly known as “Cavaliers” (Dunn 172). A Puritan, Cromwell began the civil war on the parliamentary side, yet was critical of their command. He knew not how to sentence his prisoner, but as a devout Puritan he distrusted those in the parliamentary army who preached religious toleration. When Charles escaped and was recaptured, Cromwell knew the imprisoned king would never cede to Cromwell’s wishes of a Puritan state, of which Ireland would be part (Kinealy., “A New History of Ireland” 100). Cromwell became convinced, perhaps through prayer, that if Charles would not totally to submit to Cromwell on all state matters – Ireland included, that the king must die. A better soldier than Charles, Cromwell took over Parliament successfully as a loyal Colonel Pride implemented “Pride’s Purge,” only allowing members loyal to Cromwell’s army to enter. This entrance of MP’s loyal to Cromwell formed the “rump” parliament, named in jest because of size and function. In a position to execute his religious zealotry across Ireland first, and then Scotland, this subset of parliament erected a high court that voted to execute Charles as a “tyrant, traitor, murderer, and public enemy of the people of England” (Dunn 176). “Some of the judges signed with great reluctance, and one of them later alleged that Cromwell had forcibly guided his pen” (177).

Intricacies of the English Civil War aside, it does appear that Cromwell had an ulterior motive – to cleanse Ireland of Catholics. Cromwell was only in Ireland one year, coming ashore on August 15, 1649, but he made the most of it, “slaughtering Catholics much more freely than he had killed Cavaliers during the English war” (176). Catholics were slurred as “Papists” who practiced “popery.” Though he was never a member of any official religious institution, the army was where Cromwell implemented his religion. “He

saw his regiment as a kind of church, the Lord's humble instrument for rescuing England from popery and slavery" (173).

Supported by 20,000 English troops, Cromwell saw himself as "God's emissary and a liberator," the goal to extinguish Catholicism and Irishness. "His religious zeal was matched only by his English patriotism." His perception of the Irish as humans wavered – while negotiating surrender at Wexford, his army murdered thousands of civilians. While Cromwell was not present, he defended their actions. "He regarded the Irish as barbaric and deserving of such treatment," referencing the most recent rebellion by O'Neill and O'More as justification for brutal conquest. Cromwell lost 2500 men by ambush at Clonmel, but that was his biggest defeat on Irish soil. On to Scotland he proceeded, to prevent royalists from reinstituting a monarchy. Cromwell's expedition to Ireland was deemed a success by the majority of English. Named by parliament Lord Protector in 1653, he showed tolerance to other religious minorities throughout English territory, after authorizing the en masse murders of Irish Catholics. Perhaps he was part zealot; part politician: "Puritanism, however, was not popular with the public" (Kinealy., "A New History of Ireland" 101). While against monarchy, nepotism was acceptable: Cromwell appointed his son governor of Ireland before his death in 1658.

Like his father, Henry Cromwell allied himself with the Ulster Presbyterians, who joined Anglicans in collective hatred toward Irish Catholics. A 1652 land settlement punished participants in battles against Cromwell by seizing their lands, but those active in previous conflicts were allowed to emigrate. No Catholic was beyond suspicion, however, as even those who forwent armed hostility were transported to the six poorest Irish

counties. Punishing the innocent is not the path to curry favor. However, to some prosecutors of war and crime, guilt pervades all. Land previously in the hands of Catholic insurgents was rewarded to New Model Army soldiers choosing to stay in Ireland (101-102).

"Not a conscious dictator" (Dunn 177), the effects of Cromwell dictate that intentions are irrelevant. Not only did he exterminate many who were only responding to a conflict many of them never wanted, but he did it for the sake of an internecine religious conflict. Cromwell's religious and military campaign, implemented vigorously upon the Irish, expedited Catholic land loss. To Cromwell, all Irish Catholics could not be trusted. Yet, the goal of the Puritan state was attained; "only through violence and a systematic removal of the native population from the land." Cromwell, who when elected to parliament in 1640 was an "obscure, middle-aged country squire" (Dunn 173), though rejecting the title of king, "lived in increasing splendor until his death" ('A New History of Ireland' 101).

In contrast, many native Irish lived in poverty, impressed upon them by the Cattle Acts of 1666, preventing export of Irish cattle (Kinealy., "A Death-Dealing Famine" 20). Wealthy Irish and Old English were isolated. In response to previous land confiscation and the Cattle Acts, emanating from the English Parliament and enforced by the Irish Parliament, "The alienation of the Irish and Old English rulers led to rebellion; and defeat, in turn, led to further confiscation of land, and the transfer of these lands and of power to the hands of the New English" (18). "By 1775 only 5 per cent of land was in the hands of native Irish. Although some Catholic landowners retained their lands, they were the

exception; the majority of Catholics were reduced to the status of tenants and poor cottiers" (19).

Redressing Grievances?

However, the restoration of the monarchy upon Cromwell's death did improve the economy throughout English territory, of which Ireland was a part. Charles II, according to cavalier supporters, became king when his father was executed, and was able to fulfill his role in 1660, two years after Cromwell's death. ('A New History of Ireland' 104-105). A compromiser in the tradition of his father, Charles II even attempted to reassess land allocations from earlier rebellions. The result was returning lands to 500 Catholics, deemed loyal in the wars against Cromwell. Since prejudice pervaded many Protestants' views of Catholics, and defining innocence in an internecine guerilla war is impossible, "The new arrangement left everybody dissatisfied" (105).

Survivor Gains

Even after the Cromwellian onslaught, Catholics, labeled with the derogatory name "Papists," still were 75 per cent of the population. Though few owned their land, the fortunate who did assisted in forming "a Catholic gentry class and professional class." Oppression by the demographic minority Protestants had not been codified into statute (106).

Fear and Hatred Impede Compromise

The attempted land compromise lost Charles support among Catholics (105); more measures perceived as discriminatory by the Irish masses were the Act of Uniformity and the Test Act, ensuring that only Anglicans would serve in government. In response,

Charles' brother, James, in process of converting to Catholicism, resigned from his position of admiral. Charles II's lord lieutenant, the Earl of Ormand, who served with Charles I, advocated not only the first land settlement, but an agreement with Catholics in which religious toleration would be law, but Catholics would have to accept the state as ruler over the Pope. Catholics would not agree. Though it seems that conflict was the rule, and not the exception, for the most part, "Church and State in Ireland maintained an uncomfortable coexistence that only occasionally gave in to anti-Catholic hysteria" (106).

Justified Fear?

Protestant hysteria appears justified against the "Popish plot," first discovered by Titus Oates, described by Richard Dunn as a "shifty character." Oates revealed that with the Pope's blessing, Jesuits were plotting to assassinate Charles II (192). The plot was staved off by Charles II's administration, many of whose lord lieutenants "tolerated Catholic institutions and practices" (Kinealy., "A New History of Ireland" 106). Implicated in the conspiracy were two archbishops: Peter Talbot was imprisoned; Oliver Plunkett was executed in 1681 (106-107). Rigid Protestants – Cromwell followers – had motivation to enhance their distrust of any compromising Protestant. Charles had many advisors from the English Civil War period, but "of these, only the Catholics enjoyed the king's confidence" (Dunn 192). If a Protestant ruler trusting Catholics can result in a "Popish plot," then what reason would there be for any Protestant ruler to trust a Catholic? Similarly, if a Catholic ruler ascends, why should parliaments dominated by Protestants trust him?

Upon Charles II's death in 1685, having no "legitimate heirs," James II, Charles' Catholic brother, ascended to King of England and Ireland (Kinealy., "A New History of Ireland" 107; Dunn 193). English party politics caused James to rule without parliament, dictating that no figure like Cromwell could prevent James' eminence (Dunn 193). Perhaps James planned his ascension, fearing his brother's illegitimate son, the Duke of Monmouth. The duke could have attempted to take the throne, but James' forces executed him in July, 1685. Not only was the duke Charles' natural heir, he also had a religiously mixed group of 4000 supporters ('A New History of Ireland' 107).

With decades of anti-Catholic feeling pervading English and Irish thought, James could have been wiser politically, only water separating Ireland from a continent in which "Religion continued to be the basis for making alliances and going to war" (104). In a brief reign, he transformed the military, allowing and encouraging Catholics to serve in any capacity. However, the new king could not address the land conflict, though he did appoint a Protestant lord lieutenant, Lord Clarendon. In his direct advocacy for toleration of Catholics in an Anglican nation, England, James II "attempted single-handedly to reverse a whole century of history." Contrasting with Charles, James appointed many Catholics to positions of power, but there were few Catholics in England. Therefore, "James' appointees were generally untried and inferior men" (Dunn 194). On Ireland, it was unlikely James could have ever satisfied militant planters, and he did not legislate enough to help Catholics. "Approximately 2400 Protestant landowners fled from Ireland, while in Ulster a number of planters started to arm themselves" (Kinealy., "A New History of Ireland" 109).

No insurrection would occur, however, because angry Protestant and Presbyterian landowners could wait for succession. Should James cede his crown, or die, next on the throne would be his daughter Mary, a Protestant, and daughter of William of Orange. When the birth of James' son, John Francis Edward (Tudors and Stuarts), was announced, though, prominent Protestants, who had been writing to Protestant icon William for some time, invited him to come back to England. The purpose of such courting was to attract William to battle and prevent Catholic leadership. If James' son grew to ruling age, Protestant fears would come to fruition, disregarding any likely moderation displayed by James' son. Therefore, Protestants throughout England, Ireland, and Scotland were treasonous against James. (Kinealy., "A New History of Ireland" 109-110; Dunn 195). Rumors were circulated that the birth was false; examples of conspiracy theories were that it was smuggled into the queen's bed (Dunn 194) and that it was the child of a miller (Kinealy., "A New History of Ireland" 109). On Ireland, James had asked Protestant clergy to read declarations for Catholic toleration in their Protestant churches in June, 1688. When they refused, James had them arrested. To James' "amazement, the jury returned a verdict of not guilty" (Dunn 194). James had ruled all three kingdoms without parliament (Dunn 195). "Overall, James's actions lost him much support and demonstrated that he had misjudged the mood of the country" (Kinealy., "A New History of Ireland" 109).

English Revolution?

William's mobilization brought 20,000 troops to England; James fled for France. James' exodus opens England's Glorious Revolution, for William's nosebleed was the only bloodshed (Dunn 195). How does this insurrection, however bloodless, compare to that of

Haiti? The Haitian revolution is successful in that former slaves expelled colonizers. In England, "The Glorious Revolution had its inglorious aspects. It was carried out by and for the properties classes, who were determined to perpetuate their privileged status. To the unprivileged, servile, sectors of English society, the revolution brought no benefits" (Dunn 197). Thus, the poor English could be motivated to revolt in the future, even though one effect of the Glorious Revolution was a constitutional crisis reforming English government to constitutional monarchy. "No English King after James II tried to govern without parliament, or in defiance of parliament" (Dunn 195). Neither the Glorious Revolution nor any previous insurrection mentioned affecting Ireland can qualify as a successful revolution by Skopcol's definition. Perhaps an argument exists that the Glorious Revolution created social change, so Russell's definition may apply.

Irish Advocate Exiled; Down but not Out

James escaped to France -- both in self-preservation and to plan his next move. This tactic ceded the thrones of Scotland and England, while "He legally continued to be king of Ireland" (Kinealy., "A New History of Ireland" 111), dictating he could use Ireland as a base to retain what he had lost. James, the former English and Catholic king, had inspired Tories and Whigs, both English and Scottish, to rise against him. His only remaining base of support was Ireland.

The First Irish Nationalist?

In Irish Nationalist narrative, James begins a tradition of Irish leaders crusading against oppressive European forces[10]. In March, 1689, James sailed from France to

[10] Some nationalists may argue that this begins with Hugh O'Neill.

Kinsale, southwest Ireland, where he was met by 3000 French Catholic troops. Promised more soldiers from France, James then joined Richard Talbot's Irish army (Kinealy., "A New History of Ireland" 112). To muster this level of Catholic support, however, James had to agree to overturn the Cromwellian land settlement. Though this may have challenged his status if he had won, it was a deal he had to make: returning lands taken from Catholics by Protestant conquerors allied with Cromwell. James needed parliament to such a great extent, that the Irish legislators rewarded James by decreeing Catholicism and Anglicanism as equal faiths under the law. However, Protestants, concerned about their possible future under a Catholic monarch, had asked William to use military force to repel the perceived Catholic hordes. Therefore, James' Protestant subjects were inciting treason, but apparently William was not prepared to combat Catholic efforts, to be led by James, when early requests were made for intervention. A victorious James would have ruled over a recalcitrant Ireland, as one of James' Parliament's maneuvers, the 1689 Declaratory Act, granted veto power to the predominantly Protestant Irish Parliament over the English (Jacobite.ca). Thus, seeds for a fractured society were sewn, regardless of who would attain victory.

Quest for Independence

Aided by Irish leadership of Patrick Sarsfield and Neil O'Neill, James' first strike at Dromore was a resounding success; next came Enniskillen and Derry, where loyalties were divided, and some troops and civilians turned to William from James. Protestants from Ulster and Connacht unified at Enniskillen and Derry, to repel the Catholic ruler's forces (Kinealy., "A New History of Ireland" 112). A vital defection from James was

Robert Lundy, Protestant commander of a Catholic garrison. However, his legacy is that of a Protestant traitor, because after switching allegiances, he believed James' forces could penetrate Derry's walls. No Catholic soldiers entered Derry from 1689 to 1690, even though the Catholics besieged the city for 105 days. Many say loyalty to William caused thirteen Apprentice Boys to symbolically close the gates to Derry by closing windows on the wall.

Two accounts dispute this, however. Christine Kinealy asserts that a forged letter was circulated around Derry – stating that if Catholics took Derry, that every Protestant would be murdered (112-113). Mark McGovern states that the Apprentice Boys were nothing than more than a "cabal" of city youths, and that Derry leadership did fear James taking Derry, whether they had seen such letter or not. Furthermore, McGovern claims that the rebellious act of closing doors on gated walls was an act against conformity, in accordance with traditional seventeenth century European distrust of landowners by tenant farmers (6). At the cost of 20,000 lives both inside and outside the walls (7), the Catholic siege of Derry ultimately failed, because of inexperienced Irish soldiers scaling and attacking the wall, and two ships breaking through the Catholic blockade in July. Though the shuttering of gates became symbolic, the war continued. William's mercenary, Schomburg, however, would not risk defeat in Dundalk or Dublin, losing the soldier William's "respect and trust" (Kinealy., "A New History of Ireland" 113).

More than three-quarters of James' army was Irish, and he was losing faith in them, for they lacked the training and experience of much of William's forces. Prior to 1685, Catholics were prohibited from military service in Ireland, while "William's troops were

mostly well trained and well equipped." Protestant forces had four times as many guns as Catholics. Aiding William, James' Catholicism did not net him complete Papal support. "How much help was given by [Pope] Innocent XI to William and his allies has been a matter of controversy, complicated by some forgeries" (Simms 231). Though James was originally English, while representing Irish forces he was isolated. William, to become an English luminary throughout Europe, used his financial resources to command a diverse army of Europeans, both Catholic and Protestant (Kinealy., "A New History of Ireland" 114). Even today, some Protestants are hagiographic toward William.

Personality conflicts among James' generals and his increasing distrust for his own Irish troops limited his chances against William's 37,000 soldiers, as two kings would soon meet in battle at the River Boyne. In his goal to take Dublin, William's forces took the north side; James' Catholic army camped south. James' majority Irish army retreated before attacking, minimizing casualties – 500 for William and 1000 for James. James fled to France after the Battle of the Boyne, but "troops continued to fight, giving James more loyalty and support than he had earned or deserved in Ireland" (114-115).

First Irish Lost Cause?

The continued fighting of James' troops and the brief Battle of the Boyne hostilities dictates that few cared about William of Orange in 1690, though he and his troops would continue to grapple with James' and Talbot's troops for another year. The Irish repelled a Williamite siege at Limerick, led by Sarsfield. Perpetuating a historical cycle leaving an island in limbo, yet not at peace, William sees the Irish resolve at Limerick. His response, on Aug. 8, 1690, was to leave Ireland and never return.

Two Months' Images Persist Centuries Later

William had inflicted a blow against Irish Catholicism. He stayed on an island, where his image is still celebrated by some as a savior, for only ten weeks. William of Orange's priorities were transformed by events having no impact on Ireland; "He was anxious to return to his European wars" (116).

James died in France, in 1701 (monarchy.gov.uk). The War of Two Kings, however, between James and William, did not cease until July 21, 1691. In the climactic battle, nine days previous, William's General Ginkel presided over the killing of 7000 Catholic troops at Aughrim. Therefore, two kings' encounter on the battlefield was more symbolic than influential in ending the war, which ended when Sarsfeld submitted to Ginkel at Limerick. "For much of the 18th century, Aughrim got nearly as much attention as the Boyne" (Simms 233).

No Advocacy for Catholics; Protestant Fear Remains

The Treaty of Limerick was drawn up by Ginkel, accepted by the defeated Sarsfield, and signed by William, a mainland European king who recently had extended his realm to England. Both Presbyterians and Catholics were still outsiders in a society whose official religion was Anglicanism. Non-Catholics believed the treaty should have been more punitive toward James' supporters. If surrendering soldiers swore loyalty to William, they could keep their lands. Many defeated Irish soldiers moved to serve in the French army, alarming Irish Protestants, whose control over Ireland was unquestionable. With so many former supporters of James serving in France, and their allies left behind,

"They felt that the threat posed by James and by Irish Catholics had not been removed" (Kinealy., "A New History of Ireland" 116-117).

Appeasement of Hatred

The Irish people were not William's priority, but he did want to prevent further uprisings. Either tacitly or overtly, when the Anglican parliament desired further oppressive measures against Catholics and Presbyterians, William complied. The few laws passed in the early 1690s evolved into a "penal age." However, there was a hierarchy, placing Presbyterians above the Catholic masses. While prohibited from holding some public offices, Presbyterians could still "carry arms, practice their religion openly, and vote in elections." However, in response to discrimination to access more opportunity, Presbyterians began leaving the Irish north in the latter half of the eighteenth century. About 12,000 Presbyterians per year left Ireland, largely for British North America, in the 1770s. Catholics who could afford to leave did the same, yet fewer had the funds. Though Presbyterians were seen as a lesser threat, "the penal laws indicated that "Catholics and Presbyterians were both disliked and feared by the Anglican Church" (123). Catholics who could not or did not want to leave posed an existential threat to the Anglican parliament. Thus the penal laws "were justified on the grounds of security" (Kinealy., "A Death-Dealing Famine" 19).

Whether the laws had to be so harsh, however, is another question entirely. In effect for more than a century, in varying degrees, the penal laws effectively removed Irish Catholics from every part of civic life. Broadly, the laws:

> Barred Catholics from the army and navy, the law, commerce, and from every civic activity. No Catholic could vote, hold any office under the Crown, or purchase land, and Catholic estates were dismembered by an enactment directing that at the death of a Catholic owner his land was to be divided among all his sons, unless the eldest became a Protestant, when he would inherit the whole. Education was made almost impossible, since Catholics might not attend schools, nor keep schools, nor send their children to be educated abroad. The practice of the Catholic faith was proscribed; informing was encouraged as 'an honourable service' and priest-hunting treated as a sport (Woodham-Smith 27).

While conversion from Catholicism to Protestantism can somewhat explain this decrease in Catholic land ownership, devout Catholics saw their identity disregarded and disparaged by the state. While to the wealthiest landowners, the penal codes were necessary to squelch revolts, to the majority, penal laws countermanded the Treaty of Limerick (Kinealy., "A New History of Ireland" 121). Banditry, beginning when surrendering soldiers stayed in Ireland and landlords lost their land, increased (Kinealy. "A New History of Ireland" 118; Woodham-Smith 27-28). Catholics loyal to England, who never lifted a weapon against the English, were criminalized. The codes, also called "Anti-Popery" legislation, appeared to target the Catholic faith for extinction, as laws terminated Irish priest ordination. About 1000 Irish priests were allowed to stay in their parishes, and Catholics looked to France as a training ground for clergy. In the new Irish order, should

another revolt occur, where would Presbyterians stand? Would they align themselves with the masses below, or the alleged oppressors above?

Unlikely Exceptions

Leaderless after James' departure, the poor peasantry had two advocates, British dissenter Edmund Burke and to a lesser extent Jonathan Swift. Burke criticized the penal codes as "a machine as well fitted for the oppression, impoverishment, and degradation of a people, and the debasement in them of human nature itself, as ever proceeded from the perverted ingenuity of man" (Woodham-Smith 27). Burke was an eighteenth century anomaly: his mother was Catholic, and his father was Protestant. "Burke battled discrimination against Irish-Catholics throughout his life" (Constitutional Rights Foundation). Burke advocated relaxation of the penal laws from 1764 to 1782 (O'Flaherty 8). To give Burke complete credit for any lessening of enforcement would be to neglect the effect of the American Revolution.

Swift's advocacy, through "A Modest Proposal," focused on ending poverty through unity. However, at best this retrospective crusade for the Irish poor was unplanned. Acknowledging its satire, upon first read, Swift can be seen as a champion for the cause of the poor: "A Modest Proposal" grabs attention by exaggerating the author's supposed desire to eat poor Irish children. Readers inclined to hate the Irish might believe infanticide to be just; some may have thought it already took place. The immense detail as to how to cannibalize offspring inevitably encouraged advocacy on behalf of the Irish poor, and thus Irish society. Swift later implies that collaborative Irish investment in their own lands and labor could address eighteenth century woes, before returning to his allegedly essential, yet

"modest" proposal of eating children to cure poverty (692-699). "A Modest Proposal" was first published in 1729 (Jacek 100), the year Burke was born (Constitutional Rights Foundation).

The extent of Swift's true advocacy on the part of peasants, mired in poverty from the penal laws, is open to question. Swift was the son of English parents, born on November 30, 1667, in Dublin (Jokinen), thus categorizing him as "Anglo-Irish," placing him in on an isolated bridge between two cultures. Swift, Irish clergy for fifty years (McMinn 168-169), was aware of overt discriminatory language used by the English to describe the Irish (Zach 38). Therefore, he did not want to be seen as Irish at all. He wanted to be seen as an "Englishman born in Ireland." Though he clearly wrote a piece advocating for Irish economic unity, Swift's Anglican faith trumped tolerance, despising "both Catholics and Presbyterians" (Kinealy., "A Death-Dealing Famine" 20). Wanting to disassociate himself from the Irish portion of his identity must have been impossible, given that he published his satire in his early 60s, a decade before his death (Jokinen). Swift's views of the "Anti-Popery" laws can at best be categorized as conflicted. The writer of one of the world's greatest satires "shrinks from openly attacking" the penal laws, while conveying an understanding of the issues the Irish poor encountered daily. This systemic and structural discrimination was not genetically part of Irish birthright (Zach 39-40), as many English believed. The subjugation was a direct effect of the Penal Codes.

While Swift's groundbreaking satire exposed the depth of poverty ensured by oppressive law, he did so in an era in which statistics were implemented to study the Irish population, prolonging a seventeenth century trend traceable to eugenics of the late

nineteenth century (Wittkowski 77; 82). Swift's adherence to numbers is evident even as his main device is humor. "The number of souls in this kingdom being usually reckoned one million and a half, of these I calculate there may be about two hundred thousand couples whose wives are breeders" (693). Whether accidental or not, Swift avoided directly criticizing the English crown and the Irish church, while neglecting to directly write criticism of the penal laws. Though raising awareness of Irish poverty, the caste from which Swift writes is problematic. He "profited directly from the oppressive Protestant rule in Ireland," as a landlord (Zach 38).

Simultaneously, however, Swift did not want to see the level of poverty he described. Therefore, he subtly criticizes everybody. While he may have possessed the gravitas to directly denounce the English king and parliament, he might have been accused of treason had he included overt criticism of England. Were Swift's allegiances transforming to the Irish as he aged? If so, he was not direct conveying this change, and the Irish peasant Catholic masses needed more overt advocacy. From England, Burke tried, but Burke's and Swift's capabilities to unify starving or otherwise oppressed Catholics were limited. If the early eighteenth century Anglican plan was to create a purely Anglican state, success seemed a few generations away, assisted by discrimination transitioned into law. In Ireland, William's presence and Ginkel's military superiority had unified all Protestants on Ireland against a purported Catholic menace; a year previous, in England religious toleration became law. "No similar law was introduced in Ireland" (Kinealy., "A New History of Ireland" 122), implying that religious minorities such as Catholics and Jews in England faced far less discrimination than Irish Catholics. With examples of terms

used to describe the Irish “treacherous,” “barbarous,” “Savage Old Irish,” and “Wild Irish Papists” (Zach 38) accompanying no legal protection, fear of attempted genocide by the Protestant minority was justly perceived by the majority, who could not hold office. While Edmund Burke protested the Penal Codes, his writings did not show results until England saw colony British North America separate from the crown.

Education: A Civil Rights Issue

Of all the penal laws, some of whose purposes were simply to humiliate, such as codes prohibiting Catholics from carrying pistols, swords, or owning an expensive horse (Kinealy., “A New History of Ireland” 121), perhaps the most oppressive long term was proscribing Catholic education, which, as today, did not merely focus on religion. While the enforcement of all penal laws was “sporadic” (120), illegal Catholic schools limited willingness of some Irish Catholics to learn, inhibiting Irish Catholic intellectual and cultural development. Organized education continued to a certain extent in “hedge schools” (121), at first glance informal gatherings of people encircled by tall trees. Whether such meetings were classified as illegal schools would depend upon the mood of Protestant law enforcement.

A Way Out

Catholics seeking refuge from penal codes could shift Christian sects from Catholicism to Anglican Protestantism. Under the penal laws, even Trinity College in Dublin was prohibited from educating Catholics, closing off all professional careers from the middle class majority. However, “Becoming Protestant ended these restrictions” (121). Protestant schools sprung up in every parish, to ensure that Catholics could convert, and to

belittle Catholics clinging to their faith (Cashel 514). Further incentive to convert was that Catholics were compelled to pay tithes, akin to taxes, to the Anglican church, as later did sects of Protestants other than Anglicans (Kinealy., "A New History of Ireland" 120).

The crown's fear of an Irish rebellion motivated policy. However, some Protestants wondered if the penal codes' oppressive nature might be counterproductive for the entire region, of which Irish Catholics were a major part. English Lord Cloncurry believed that Catholics should be able to teach basic skills in their own schools, since schools to convert Catholics to Protestantism were primarily a religious instrument. Therefore, the Englishman said, "The children of the peasantry were, almost generally throughout the kingdom, left without any means of education except such that the peasants themselves could procure" (Cashel 514). Teachers at hedge schools prioritized a multifaceted education, states Graham Balfour. However, a lack of resources, without a functioning school system or church backing them, dictated that "a very scanty stock of reading, writing and ciphering was the utmost that was taught in them" (515).

On Language, Stereotype and Culture

Though the Irish language was maintained by poor Catholics, in the eighteenth century, "It had come to be regarded as the language of poverty rather than of a culturally rich civilization" (Kinealy., "A New History of Ireland" 128). Penury became epidemic first because of the Cattle Act of 1666, before the penal laws, and subsequently, with the Wool Act's 1699 passage, collectively restricting Irish trade of most valuable commodities (Kinealy., "A Death-Dealing Famine" 20). Control over Catholics, and thus subjugation, was incomplete, however. A law proposed against intermarriage between Protestants and

Catholics was rejected in 1743 (Magennis 99). Perhaps this would have passed, had famine not gripped Ireland from 1740-41.

Father Empire Saves Some Starving Subjects

Aided by frost and disease, this famine, part of an Irish cycle for centuries, cost Ireland anywhere between 300,000 and 500,000 people (Kinealy., "A Death-Dealing Famine 43"; "A New History of Ireland" 129), of a pre-famine population of 2.5 million, but the British government did close off exports, minimizing some effects. Perhaps publicizing the depth of the starvation problem did encourage England to somewhat protect Irish subjects. However, England could have actively prevented more suffering; the theme, as always, is priorities: "The British Parliament showed little interest in intervening. Britain was involved in fighting a war with France and was preoccupied with the possibility of another Jacobite insurrection. Financing social welfare was a low priority, and few suitable administrative structures existed even if such action had been seriously considered" (129). In eighteenth century Ireland local elites did show some allegiance to the poor, providing the frameworks of a "moral economy" (Kinealy., "A Death-Dealing Famine" 43-44).

Economy and Unrest Grow

With revolt's fire brewing for much of the eighteenth century, the Irish economy did not cease to grow, as population recovered from the frost and famine of 1740. With a majority of the population oppressed, development was uneven, however, focusing in Dublin and Belfast. Leisure and theatre developed in Dublin, as a wave of British writers became prominent in Belfast, among them Edmund Burke. The culturally displaced Catholic majority was not the intended audience: "They appealed to an educated middle-

class audience in both Ireland and Britain" (Kinealy., "A New History of Ireland" 128-129). By the 1790s, Protestant stronghold Belfast was booming; twenty-seven thousand people worked in eleven linen factories (Elliott 134). Meeting underground throughout Ireland, likely with the aid of Catholics in Britain was the Catholic Committee, advocating for repeal of the Penal Laws -- from 1760 forward (Elliott 113).

Legend is Born

One son of this middle class was William Theobald Wolfe Tone, born on June 20, 1763, in Dublin (9). Tone's exile to the United States appears to have been in the British government's best interest in preventing Irish unrest, though Tone, the ideological descendent of Burke, did not forgo his quest without paying the ultimate price.

Complexities of the Person, the Journey, and Politics

A writer, musician, and lawyer (53; 69), Tone's political career began in 1791 Belfast (257). A Protestant whose mother had converted from Catholicism in 1771 (3), Tone criticized the Irish Parliament's negation of a proposal for limited voting rights for Catholics in 1783. Religion decreased in importance regarding social interaction, and upper middle-class Protestants sometimes had Catholic friends, who Protestants wanted to have rights to join their organizations. The Irish Parliament, however, believed there was no interest in extending the franchise to Catholics (113). While the Irish Parliament was Protestant, as Tone, allowing Catholics to vote would likely change the governing body's religious composition. Separation from England, however, was yet to be discussed. "The new Irish patriots wanted only the right to government themselves, and not full independence" (Kinealy., "A New History of Ireland" 130).

With the support of aging Edmund Burke, his son, Richard (154-55), and confidants James Napper Tandy, usually referred to by his middle name, and Thomas Russell, Tone formed the United Irishmen. Tone is generally credited with writing "An Argument on Behalf of the Catholics of Ireland," published in August of 1791 (Elliott 126). From a British perspective, the publication is as controversial as it appears. From an Irish perspective, dating back to Cromwell, it might be too kind to the British. The pamphlet critiques the oppressive climate endured by eighteenth century Irish Catholics, and how such impedes the growing movement of Irish nationalism, because Irish Catholics were more loyal to Ireland than they would be to Rome. "Catholic emancipation is not a disease that we prepare for by inoculation. Liberty is the vital principle of man: he that is prepared to live is prepared for freedom" (126-127). The United Irishmen pamphlet garnered Catholic support for the Protestant Tone's ideas, and limited discrimination against Presbyterians (129-130). "An Argument on Behalf of the Catholics of Ireland" sold 6000 copies in 1791, and 10,000 more were printed in 1792 (129). In advocating for the United Irishmen's goal of Catholic emancipation and Irish independence, Richard Burke addressed liberal British MP Henry Dundas (Pakenham 51), who told Burke that the largest obstacle to Catholic emancipation and further goals of the United Irishmen was the Irish Parliament, indicating that the Ulster planter hold on Irish politics remained steadfast (Elliott 170). The United Irishmen's 1793 pamphlet, "Vindication of the Conduct and Principles of the Catholics of Ireland," restated many of the Catholic grievances, through an organization led by Protestants, because Catholics were excluded from positions of advocacy.

Stop Right There!

Petitioning England for redress progressively became more difficult. John Fane, Earl of Westmoreland, convinced British prime minister William Pitt "that Catholic emancipation could not be granted under the present system without destroying the Protestant interest," for doing so would endanger the connection between the British economic jewel of Belfast and England itself. "[The earl] hoped to see the union of the two parliaments as the only answer" (199).

Overt to Covert

While overt enforcement of the Penal Laws was at a wane, the convention from which rose the United Irishmen's second pamphlet, the Catholic Convention of 1792, "was regarded as subversive and dangerous because it effectively challenged the authority of both the Irish and British parliaments." Therefore, the year the second pamphlet attributed to Tone is released, the Gunpowder Act and the Convention Act were passed. Results were the United Irishmen moving underground, where the Catholic Committee operated politically for decades (Kinealy., "A New History of Ireland" 139).

In 1794, as the Terror ceased in France, forming the Directory, the export of revolution to the world's oppressed was still part of French foreign policy. On April 3, revolutionary Rev. William Jackson, imbued with rebellious intent from the American war and travels to France, met with United Irishmen at Hyde's Coffee House on Dame Street (Elliott 237). Wolfe Tone and Jackson agreed that seeking French assistance to remove British influence from Ireland should not be an option. Tone was concerned that French presence could cause the Jacobin nation to take over Ireland. Jackson, more willing to

implement violence to achieve what he deemed a worthy objective, agreed, but with different reasoning: too many on Ireland would not welcome armed invaders (238-239).

Though not yet taking direct action, Wolfe Tone was radicalizing against England, believing that if the British Parliament wanted to dictate to the Irish Parliament regarding Catholic emancipation, they could do so: "He now considered England, rather than the government of Dublin, the source of Ireland's troubles, 'the hatred of the English name resulting from the tyranny of nearly seven centuries.'" Either out of actual fear of French conquest, or a tenet that the oppressed must free themselves, Tone exhibited patience, perhaps unsure of how to proceed. Anglicans, Presbyterians, other Protestants, and Catholics would all "probably throw off the [English] yoke, if they saw any force in the country sufficiently strong to resort to for defence."

This curious ambiguity on Tone's part validates criticism that at least some of the writing attributed to Tone was written by other authors. Though he did not support armed invasion, the man who can easily be called Ireland's first nationalist did write a statement, polished by Dublin United Irishmen Archibald Rowan, reflecting Tone's direct dissatisfaction with England. "He believed that the document did not constitute treason" (239). England would have likely disagreed, however, and many United Irishmen, along with Rev. Jackson, were arrested. In a reflection of how Wolfe Tone's goal of one island nation ruled through Dublin was pervading Ireland, many arrested for treason were acquitted (246). Jackson preferred martyrdom, poisoning himself before the conclusion of his tribunal (250). Tone took no such risk, fleeing for America in August, 1795 (260).

If Wolfe Tone had been able to stay in America, and work toward social justice and emancipation of slaves in his adopted land, America might be a different place. However, "Tone was experiencing that inability to accept exile which was to characterize the history of Irish emigration" (274). One of the many reasons Tone became disenchanted with the United States was his inability to convince French Minister in Philadelphia Pierre Adet to support a French invasion of Ireland (262-264). Through letters, the Irish exile was informed that the Defenders, protecting poor Catholics since the United Irishmen's formation, endured an increase of violence. (275). While Tone was in exile, the Orange Order formed, beginning with a Protestant march honoring William of Orange on July 12, 1796 (Fraser 73). Radical Protestants resisting Tone's ideas perpetrated the Armagh outrages from 1795-96, forcibly evicting Irish Catholics from counties Armagh, Tyrone, Down, and Fermanagh. Victims relocated to Connacht, as did their memories (Bartlett., "Select Documents XXXVIII: Defenders and Defenderism in 1795." 375). The Orange Order, a source of Protestant judicial and extrajudicial violence toward Catholics for centuries, evolved from bands of "Peep O'Day Boys" (374), often duking it out with Catholic Defenders in the early 1790s.

Roaming in Exile

Wolfe Tone lived less than a year in America before moving to France on February 2, 1796 (281). Perhaps he would have moved sooner, given that France was the place allegedly exporting revolution, but how quickly Tone was radicalized is unknown. Uprooting oneself like he did is sure to create doubt in some worldviews. However, an

August 10 letter from the United States is the "first evidence of a developing nationalism sharpened by exile" (266).

Following the massive executions ensuring the French terror's infamy, France settled on the governmental Directory. Possibly Tone feared getting swept up in the chaos following the terror; thus he delayed his move to France. Domestically, French politics made proper redress from the Terror impossible to attain for any aggrieved party. The Directory inherited "an empty treasury, valueless paper money, a collapse in the social services, national divisions and an all-engrossing war" (281). Therefore, it could not stand up to Napoleon once he aspired to monarchy. From Tone's perspective, that of a middle class exile, "The weaknesses of the Directory are often exaggerated." Of course Tone had no reason to riot for food – such riots were squelched violently in 1795. Preferring exile celebrity status in France to his treatment in America (282), Tone dismissed reports of French famine as propaganda (283).

France's rivalry with England was undisputed; therefore, in February of 1796, while freed slaves on Saint Domingüe were fighting for France against the British and the Spanish, Wolfe Tone petitioned the Directory to invade Ireland with such a force to create "a revolution, rather than an insurrection" (291). Directory general Lazaro Hoche ceded to Tone's request that conquest be not an object of whatever limited occupation would follow a successful Irish landing (291-298). Without a chief executive, the Directory took five months to coordinate and agree to send 11,000 troops and 10,000 guns (297) to the English possession of Ireland solely for the purposes of liberation. On June 23, 1796, "his mission it seemed, had been entirely successful" (299). Optimism reigned, as Tone had convinced

the French what he knew of England's compromised military in Ireland. Partially a result of Britain's war over the colony of Saint Domingüe, in Ireland, "militia and fencibles were increasingly replacing regulars removed for war service overseas" (264).

Wolfe Tone had gained the trust of the French by the fall of 1796. As a result, French troops believed they were invading a "friendly country." As a result, "troops were ordered to behave," and troops predisposed not to, because of their previous records as deserters and malcontents, had their orders changed from Ireland to places more dangerous (315). Irish elite exile Arthur O'Connor informed Tone that the Catholic Defenders were well fortified to assist, with 15,000 militia on the Irish ground. Hoche would lead Irish exiles and French Jacobins, believing that Ireland did not need conquering. Even if an independent Ireland were only a French ally, Irish proximity to England made Ireland priceless for England's rival. The Directory wrote Hoche: "Detach Ireland from England, and she will be reduced to a second-rate power and deprived of her superiority over the seas. The advantages to France of an independent Ireland are so manifold that they need not be listed" (297).

Tone's aspirations to continue to bridge the gaps among all faiths in Ireland (308) appeared to coincide with Jacobite yearn to extend perceived freedom worldwide. However, financial issues paying troops and general military apprehension prevented a summer expedition. "All down the line Hoche was having to assume personal control" (316). Rumors of an Irish rebellion spurred Paris into action on December 13, 1796; two days later French ships sailed for Irish soil (315). William Theobald Wolfe Tone, Adjutant-General of the French Navy (313), boarded the speedy *Indomptable*, armed with 80 guns.

His voyage home would, in his mind and those of his allies, yield Irish independence (321). Gabriel Théodore Joseph Hédouville commanded the projected secondary wave of 17,000 troops. On April 20, 1798, less than two years later, Hédouville disembarked at Cap Francaise on Saint Domingüe as Toussaint Louverture was consolidating power on Hispañola (Bell 156). Hoche did not join Tone on his journey home; his troops had been ordered to Italy (Elliott 322).

The Bantry Bay expedition from France, regarded a most opportune moment for Irish independence, failed, resulting from a combination of weather and Hoche's departure from the mission. Of the 43 ships that traversed from Brest, only 17 positioned themselves to disembark at Bantry Bay. Turbulent storms sunk the *Séduisant*, killing more than ninety percent of the 1300 troops on board, and blew the *Fraternité* into the Atlantic. When the French navy was close enough so that sailors could throw bread on Ireland, disenchantment reigned in the native French, while Irish exiles retained optimism. As snow lay atop mountains above the bay, some French officers "became dispirited at no sign of welcome from the Irish people… Tone found most of the officers speaking as if the expedition had already failed" (325). Hoche's absence probably affected the likelihood of success because he was so secretive in his plans, though this can be explained because he had to do so much work himself. How did he know who to trust? Originally plans were to land at Galway, but the sealed packets left by the Directory for the commanders revealed the new destination of Bantry Bay. Upon leaving France, ships collided, inspiring distrust in the mission itself; this collective comedy and tragedy of errors dictated that Tone's ship, the *Indomptable*, first entered Bantry Bay alone. Dedication to the cause of Irish independence, however,

remained strong. Wolfe Tone, "was not alone in criticizing the defeatism of the second-in-command and their failure to adopt their instructions to the new situation." Explanations of the mission to be read to the Irish had to be recomposed, as Tone's drafts were lost aboard the *Fraternité* (324-325).

The lost correspondence was never missed, as no French soldier or Irish exile serving in the French navy ever reached land. Commander Emmanuel de Grouchy wrote to the Directory for reinforcements, perhaps justifiably reluctant to take risk. A landing could be reached on Christmas, but the storm intensified, prompting Commander Francois Joseph de Bouvet to order anchors up and return to France. On the voyage back, Tone got seasick, and feared death, either through British capture or drowning. Grouchy blamed Hoche for changing the orders, when the Directory changed Hoche's orders, ensuring that Tone's confidant would not join the expedition. Hope lasted until the decision was made to abort.

When Tone thought a landing would occur, likely in Sligo, he wrote: "I have a Merry Christmas, as of today." Only fifteen of the original forty-three ships that sailed made it back to France. The French had been ordered to introduce themselves as liberators of the Irish, had they landed. Wolfe Tone biographer Marianne Elliott, however, claims "it is unlikely that such instructions could have been obeyed."

Tone did prepare new correspondences, but they were never read. Historians' arguments that the expedition would have been successful had the weather not failed them are bolstered by the ships' sailing "to Ireland and back without encountering a single British ship." Tone feared he may never return to Ireland, but a month after the Bantry Bay

debacle, Gen. Hoche told Tone "those plans were merely suspended…Hoche was genuine in his assurances" (326-328; 334).

Upon viewing evidence of what Wolfe Tone called the biggest English escape since the Spanish Armada (328), the British and Irish parliaments collaborated to prevent recurrence. British general Gerard Lake supervised a "brutal attempt to suppress the United Irishmen." However, centuries of oppression by law against all but Anglicans, and the United Irishmen publications, facilitated Wolfe Tone's organization growing to 300,000 members by 1798 (Kinealy., "A New History of Ireland" 140-41). In response, Britain and Ireland suspended habeas corpus in 1796 (140), facilitating arrest and imprisonment of suspected traitors and crown critics.

Internal Uprising

In investigating 1798 in Ireland, Thomas Bartlett theorizes that not only did Ireland rebel against both the Irish and English governments, the rebellion can also be titled a civil war, a United Irish revolution, a peasant revolution, or a war of religion ("Why the History of the 1798 Rebellion has yet to be Written." 182). Generally agreed is that the revolt began on May 24, 1798, though acts of violence and legal repression had been intensifying since the aborted Bantry Bay expedition. Neither Catholics nor Protestants were unified. For example, British general Lake defeated a group of United Irishmen, both Catholics and Protestants, at Vinegar Hill.

However, sectarianism remained. Evidence is 200 Protestant prisoners of rebels killed at Scullabogue, though "the deaths may have been the result of indiscriminate violence or desperation." In the east, leaders were hanged, when all others were granted

amnesty. Leadership was diverse among all prominent sects of Christianity. Women fought alongside men; from France, Tone's ironic ally Napoleon sent help to the west, under French general Jean Joseph Humbert on August 22, 1798, but "the local support was uncoordinated and ill-prepared for their arrival." The commander who lost British North America, Lord Cornwallis, was charged with quelling the rebellion (Kinealy., "A New History of Ireland" 141-142). British and Irish military efforts were again aided by a delay in sending the French forces, which would have had a better chance of success had they been deployed in June, while the rebels were in better position (Elliott 380).

The rebellion justified the feeling held by the majority of the British Parliament, that Penal Law enforcement remain strict. Cabinet speaker John Foster did not want trials, given what occurred in the treason trials of Irish revolutionaries of the 1790s (Pakenham 42). An Irish tradition of informing became prominent in 1798; crown spy Thomas Reynolds informed against United Irishmen leader Edward Fitzgerald, who was killed after an attempted escape (Kinealy., "A New History of Ireland" 141).

Hope came in numbers of "a huge citizen army" of 4000 militia (Pakenham 79-80), and the possibility that Irish troops would side with the United Irishmen. Without centralized assistance from France, however, many rebels holding arms would surrender them to British generals promising no harm would come to Irish rebel weapons transporters. While not everybody would turn over stored arms, it is reasonable to do so, given the threat of "rigid severity," (85) if resident combatants did not do so. An example is Craig's ultimatum to fishermen storing 700 pounds of gunpowder at Arklow (84-85).

Many insurgents had little reason to trust the British offering amnesty, unattainable in Wicklow. Though it was a region "easy to disarm," the county government, aligning with England, believed in "prompt punishment" and "salutary shocks." The conqueror view forced rebels to flee for the hills (87), as runaway slaves had for a century in Saint Domingüe, before revolution. Running was the better option for the rebels at the Curragh in Kildare – murdered while attempting surrender on May 29, 1798. The insurrection claimed 30,000 Irish lives, many of whom "were noncombatants" (Kinealy., "A New History of Ireland" 143). In comparison, eleven thousand were killed by the French terror (144).

Witness by Correspondence

A year before "News of the Irish revolt took everyone, Tone included, by surprise" (Elliott 379), the French naval officer was awaiting a return mission to Ireland to free his countrymen from an oppressive climate created by the Penal Laws. Hoche was to lead the group of 13,544 French, Dutch, and Irish exiles on July 16, 1797. However, the erstwhile general was on the wrong side of a political feud within the Directory, feared arrest by French royalists, and fled to Germany. "For a general to whom reputation was everything, such an attack on his patriotism was devastating and Hoche went into immediate and permanent decline" (348). Disorganized rebellion is a desperate act; Jean-Jacques Dessalines knew this to be true. Haiti's first ruler executed a plan which he knew would succeed, given prescribed time and place. The 1798 Irish rebellion, on the other hand, had "little central coordination" (Kinealy., "A New History of Ireland" 141).

Obstacles Mushroom

In 1797, “Lack of information of French intentions was killing the home movement” (351). Though Tone did have differences with Napper Tandy, who would join him in France, and divisions developed within the United Irishmen, he never saw himself acting alone (Pakenham 302; Elliott 353). Upon Hoche’s return, Tone hatched another plan including a contingent of Dutch. Victory would be achieved by attacking Scotland, thereby diverting English forces; simultaneously a fleet would strike Ireland, attaining independence. On September 13, 1797, Hoche said that Tone’s strategy would easily be snuffed out by the British, now prepared, and thus capable of cutting off the Irish Sea from military enforcements, thereby preventing Tone’s goal of Irish independence. Tone countered with a plan to leave Ireland out of any attack, and just attack England alongside Scotland. While considering an attack on England, Lazaro Hoche died. Wolfe Tone biographer Marianne Elliott reports the cause of consumption, tuberculosis, but the press attacks had taken their toll, likely adding depression to the mix. Wolfe Tone wrote his wife Matilde: “We have lost our brave general, Hoche; he died this morning at four o’clock, I think of what we call a galloping decay – judge of the distress and confusion we are all in” (354-355).

Treatment of Irish rebel prisoners was brutal; as a result, to escape arrest in a draconian state, 50,000 Irish emigrated to England and Scotland in the few years following what Thomas Pakenham describes as *The Year of Liberty*. Incidents of maltreatment included chaining 120 convicts together on a boat, where fever spread. The Botany Bay penal colony governor complained that when a group of Irish arrived to serve their sentences, 127 out of the 320 on board were dead. Investigation revealed the captain

overloaded his cargo to increase profit. The captain had loaded the convicts "with heavy irons on their legs and one round the neck with a heavy padlock as an appendage. By 1802, four Irish priests were part of the Irish quarter of the Botany Bay population; the Irish spirit of revolt simmered. Eight prisoners were hanged for an alleged conspiracy in 1804. Relief for the inmates only came after Captain Bligh, of the *Bounty* infamy, took over the colony, but then was removed after further mistreatment, and incarcerated himself (349-350).

With Hoche dead, the Directory changed course. After the September 4 coup overthrowing the royalists, whom Hoche was accused of supporting, "Gone were those remnants of idealism and internationalism which had assisted Tone's negotiations in 1796" (Elliott 359). French politics had been tortuous in post-terror France. Unaware of political changes, Tone still thought he had allies in generals Hédouville and Herman Willem Daendels. However, Britain was then recovering stature as a naval power – defeating a Dutch fleet, thus limiting any assistance the Netherlands could provide for a second Irish campaign. Bonaparte only listened to Tone's advocacy on behalf of the United Irishmen, but conquest was his priority – not freeing Ireland and granting independence, as Tone had discussed with Hoche (359-363).

Divisions within the United Irishmen ensured Tone's predictable fate. Living largely under an alias, "James Smith" (278), Tone wished to continue to hide in France and await another opportunity to free Ireland from English influence. However, James Napper Tandy, fellow United Irishmen founder, much more flamboyant in personality and politics than Tone, came to France from America in June of 1797. Tone believed that as a result of Tandy's emigration, that Tone could be traced to France because Tandy's movements were

easily tracked. Tandy and escaped Botany Bay prisoner Thomas Muir attacked Tone in the press for making the Irish campaign more about Wolfe Tone the savior than a united Ireland. Such division probably delayed the rebellion (365-368). Personally, Tone avoided addressing a possible issue regarding French issuance of passports to the Irish, disenchanting him of his adopted land. "Tone disdained intrigue. If he could not confront and expose it, he tended to walk away from it" (370).

Internal divisions among the Directory, without Hoche's leadership beside that of the United Irishmen, influenced when and how the second fleet to Ireland would land. French Admiral Eustache Bruix was committed to helping the Irish, but Directory War Minister Barthélemy Louis Joseph Schérer, a rival of the deceased Hoche, was not. Still, plans were in place to sail to Donegal and Killala. Correspondences were prepared, reading that French ships escorted Irish exiles to "break the barbarous yoke under which you groan." However, Directory finances continued to interfere. No money was released to pay troops; "The enthusiastic rush of instructions for the expedition had not been translated into supplies and men" (382).

Humbert's successful aid to the Irish insurgents inspired the second landing with "an urgency that may have paid dividends two months earlier." Short on troops and weapons, General Jean Hardy and Adjutant-General Wolfe Tone boarded the *Hoche* on August 14, 1798. Nearly 2,500 people stuffed ten "grossly overcrowded" ships. The French ships packed with Irish exiles tried "sailing on a light breeze" a week later, but two frigates collided, forcing a return to port. Meanwhile, the British tightened their blockade (383).

Tone's correspondence to family and friends dated from the aborted expedition of August to the actual departure of September 6 "breathes a resignation to the inevitable" (384). Humbert, the French general sent by Napoleon in August, had already surrendered on Ireland. The British knew the attack was coming. Tone's pilgrimage, aboard ships commanded by Hardy and Contre-Admiral Jean Baptiste Francois Bompard, was "suicidal." Tone was captured; two hundred were killed or wounded (386). While certainly expecting to eventually die upon return, either in battle or after trial, William Theobald Wolfe Tone did not think the British would perceive him as a common traitor. Wolfe Tone was very perceptive in some ways; his understanding of the climate in Ireland to which he returned was not one of them. Given the depth of the rebellion and the 1798 appearance that Britain could not control Ireland, "Tone's expectations of being treated as a noble adversary were quite unrealistic" (388-389) Irish Lord Viceroy Cornwallis decided that Tone was to be arrested, tried, and sentenced to die by hanging, as if a traitor for life (397). The former American Revolutionary War general had lost one colony, and he was not going to lose a second.

Tragic Homecoming

Tone's trial was for show – little evidence was presented. Sent to Dublin in irons under heavy guard, he learned he would be hanged publicly, but his head would not be staked, denying requests by factions believing Cornwallis too lenient. In response, Tone tried to kill himself, slitting his own throat either with his own pen knife or a razor left by a visitor. He survived. Appeals for his life ensued; reports circulated that he was placed in a straitjacket to prevent another suicide attempt. Supporters and detractors of British

presence in Ireland would wait a week before Wolfe Tone was lost to history on November 19, 1798: his demise likely coming from an infected wound (397-399). Historians arguing that Bantry Bay was the only chance for Irish independence by force will state that upon returning to France, failure to unite Ireland was inevitable, largely "due to outside causes." Explanations include Hoche's death, changes in the Directory, and the demise of the Europe's revolutionary climate (365).

Ripple Effects

Two months later, twenty-six political prisoners from the rebellion spawned by Tone's organization were refused entry into the United States. "President Adams had regarded them too dangerous to admit. Shipped off to a Scottish fortress, the prisoners were permitted to relocate to France in 1802 by treaty (Pakenham 350).

Cornwallis' role in preventing Wolfe Tone's vision cannot be underestimated. Though Ireland is England's neighbor, it took six months in 1798 for the issue of the Irish rebellion to even be addressed in London. Although he was not granted great military power, Cornwallis deduced he would not need it. Engaging in conciliation, he knew that the more military power he used, the more the Irish people would realize that England was indeed their greatest oppressor, albeit indirectly. The British, however, had allocated their resources appropriately. Cornwallis was their best chance to maintain their control, but this task was "not an easy one, considering the known character of the Irish army and the unknown intentions of the French" (240-243).

The existence of the Irish parliament meant that the British could – to an extent -- escape blame for the disenfranchisement that festered into rebellion. Instead, fault could

be attributed to Irish politicians, some absentee (Elliott 136). If the Irish could not address their problems, then the only way these issues could theoretically be addressed was unification with England. Such was one argument for the Act of Union of 1801. However, to ensure that this could take place, Cornwallis had to see to it that the loyalists were punished for some of their activities, many previously ignored or tacitly endorsed by London. Therefore, Cornwallis' policy included prosecuting Protestants who had killed pardoned Catholic rebels. One example of such policy is his dismissing of a yeoman accused of such a crime, and dissolving the Irish court-martial, preventing those who served on it from doing so again (Pakenham 341). Actions like these indicate that the British government did care somewhat about Irish justice. Alongside, punishing some British, however, dismissing Irish court martials conveys that the Irish government is irrelevant, and perhaps can be declawed.

What Cornwallis thought is irrelevant; what he did is vital: "The rebellion, the result of gross misgovernance, had made the Union a matter of strategic necessity for both nations. But whatever form of payment he would have to use the Irish Parliament to accept it – and its members were expected to drive a hard bargain – he was not prepared to pay them in floggings and executions" (Pakenham 342).

On Forms of Persuasion

Bribery was used instead. Ireland, characterized as a nation, but sharing a king with Britain , was "compared to an heiress whose chambermaid and trustees have been bribed, while she herself is dragged, protesting, to the altar" (Woodham-Smith 16). Since support for unification between Ireland and Britain was nowhere near unanimous, duplicity was

needed to ensure passage. Deception, corruption, and party politics eventually made all susceptible to the idea of unification within one kingdom. The Act of Union passed in 1801, eliminating the Irish parliament. Politically, the proposal of union had been discussed for decades, yet getting a parliament to vote itself out of existence was quite a challenge. London's "The Daily Chronicle" argued that the Irish parliament, representing corruption and absentee landlords, was responsible for the rebellion.

English newspapers played a vital role convincing the British that unification of Ireland and Britain would benefit the Irish. With fear pervading the British that wealthy Irish could instigate another revolt, "The English press was almost wholly hostile to the English elite and largely supportive of the Union" (Jupp 218). Though some papers did convey "that the majority in Ireland did not support the measure," these same news sources simultaneously conveyed that the Irish parliament was imbued with massive corruption, justifying the proposed Irish parliamentary dissolution (217).

Nationalists, however, did not recognize the union. Perhaps Irish nationalism would not have been so fervent, had prime minister William Pitt achieved his goal of Catholic emancipation – repeal of all Penal Laws – alongside the Act of Union. Pitt had to resign over this insistence, indicating that some English understood the value of Irish religious freedom (Kinealy., "A Disunited Kingdom" 99). Irish people against the union could not comprehend why Dublin Castle administration remained on their island, after a union allegedly joining two lands as equals. "Complete integration, however, was never achieved or sought, as Ireland continued to be regarded as a colony" (Kinealy., "A New History of Ireland" 147).

In July, 1803, Robert Emmett, brother of exiled United Irish leader Thomas Emmett (Elliott 351), rebelled. Ending in "a scuffle in the streets of Dublin" (Pakenham 351), Emmett, Thomas Russell, and nineteen others were hanged. At the gallows, Emmett stated: "When my country takes her place among the nations of the earth, then and only then may my epitaph be written" (Kinealy., "A New History of Ireland" 144). Expecting French assistance, none came. Alongside Napoleon's yearn for conquest, France was struggling to hold its economic jewel, Saint Domingüe.

Potato Crop Provides Stability

While Britain was concerned about economic underdevelopment in Ireland, a Poor Law was not passed in Ireland until 1838. As poverty increased, the peasants were forced to share smaller and smaller land portions, which was sufficient, if the potato harvest were fruitful (148-149).

Catholic Advocate Against Penal Laws

Seeking repeal was Daniel O'Connell, a middle class Catholic lawyer who benefitted from an education, resulting from the relaxed enforcement of the penal laws in the late eighteenth century. O'Connell's campaign was peaceful, preferring to work with authorities, rather than against them (Kinealy., "Repeal and Revolution" 23). Though he had killed someone in a duel (39), he did not support violence to achieve political ends. The union was never repealed, but Catholic emancipation was achieved on April 13, 1829 (Kinealy., "A New History of Ireland" 156), enabling O'Connell's election to the British Parliament.

Christine Kinealy states the reason for British acquiescence was fear of another civil war (Kinealy., "Repeal and Revolution" 24). However, with the end of the Penal Laws came the fivefold increase of value to the franchise, effectively excluding from voting many poor Irish whom emancipation was designed to help (157). Still, in a world where Christian sects feuded openly, O'Connell's work on behalf of Irish Catholics brought him justifiable international acclaim (31).

O'Connell's 1835 political campaign focused on repealing the Act of Union, but he later changed his strategy resulting from a deal with the British Whigs, proposing that he would soften his message if Ireland were better treated. Engaging in compromise while the majority of Irish MP's supported the union appears too conciliatory. Revising tactics once again, in 1840, O'Connell started the "Loyal National Repeal Association," directly advocating for repeal. O'Connell is a contradictory hero in asserting Irish rights. "He wanted independence for Ireland within an imperial context and with links to the British monarchy being maintained" (25-26). If O'Connell had any loyalty at all, he had to adjust course – British Lord Stanley had just attempted to further limit Irish voting (26). However, O'Connell's political maneuvering had its limits – the attorney's new association could not garner interest, "privately admitting that the Repeal Association was suffering from apathy and needed to be energized" (27).

Division Among Activists

"The Nation" newspaper would both address O'Connell's frustrations, and simultaneously incur his ire. Founded by Protestant lawyer Thomas Davis, Catholic journalist Charles Gavan Duffy, and Catholic lawyer John Blake Dillon, it debuted on

October 15, 1842 in support of O'Connell's aims. Printed in English, "*The Nation"* promoted the Irish language, contrary to O'Connell's "utilitarian" view of working entirely in English, while serving in the British Parliament.

Since the newspaper – the first in Ireland to have women writers -- was advocacy journalism in favor of repeal, "'The Nation''s success alarmed conservative opinion and the unionist press alike" (29). Davis and Duffy were great admirers of O'Connell's movement for repeal, believing it "politically more sophisticated" than a similar Italian publication (31). Donations to O'Connell's association grew, but the sources of funds were skewed toward historically Catholic areas. "Although O'Connell frequently toured the country promoting Repeal, he rarely included Ulster in his schedule." In 1841, he did go, at the behest of the Belfast repealers, but still the majority of his audience was Catholic (33). Following 1798, "The demand for independence appeared to be moving closer to Catholicism." Militancy met O'Connell on his rare appearance in Belfast in the form of Rev. Dr. Henry Cooke, who challenged O'Connell to a debate on repeal. O'Connell responded by saying the exchange should take place in Dublin. "There was a new spirit of Protestant militancy that associated Repeal with Catholicism, and could tolerate neither" (32-33).

By 1845, the "*Nation"* founders, all under 30, were referring to themselves and their supporters as "Young Ireland," accurately delineating division between supporters of Davis, Duffy, and Dillon, and those of O'Connell. In 1843, Young Ireland distinguished themselves by fundraising in the north. Derry Protestants joined. "The inclusive methods of Young Ireland were working" (30; 35). O'Connell had proclaimed 1843 to be the year

of repeal, but conservative forces were much more dependent upon the union than they were on the penal laws. Thus, the campaign failed. “Opposition to Repeal had widespread support in the British parliament and among Irish Protestants” (37). Confrontations ensued at meetings, where British prime minister Robert Peel exercised arrest power over a group including Daniel O’Connell, son John O’Connell, and “*Nation”* founder Duffy (38). While O’Connell was imprisoned, funding and popular support for repeal grew under William Smith O’Brien (39). At age 70, O’Connell was released in 1844, by then in declining health and a broken spirit.

Though Young Irelanders and O’Connell were arrested together, the “*Nation”* founders continued to maintain their idealism, in contrast to the politically astute O’Connell, increasing divisions among advocates for more Irish self-determination. On a social level, O’Connell would often hold meetings on Sundays, a day much more solemn to many Protestants than to Catholics, thus inhibiting Protestant recruitment to the cause. In 1844 O’Brien told the elder O’Connell that Sunday meetings were offensive to devout Protestants (43). Chartism, the movement for one man, one vote, was attractive to the Young Irelanders, but not to O’Connell, at odds with Irish Chartist leader Fergus O’Connor. On repeal itself, American president John Tyler was a public supporter (45-46). New York state held a repeal convention in 1843; O’Connell took contributions from all who desired repeal, even slave owners – though O’Connell and his son both spoke like abolitionists (46-47). More divisions occurred when Peel legislated for more colleges, over which the Catholic Church would have no say. O’Connell opposed non-denominational education, while the Young Irelanders advocated school and church separation, the purpose

removing religious division. “O’Connell was reaffirming his role as defender of Catholic interests.” (51). Peel’s policy of conciliation toward Catholics did lessen the impact of the repeal movement, but in doing so, he “had alienated large sections of Protestant opinion” (52).

Death and Emigration Transform the World

No Irish event had more effect worldwide than the Famine, or Great Hunger, of 1845-1852. Effects of the hunger demonstrate “The primary object of the Union was not to assist and improve Ireland but to bring her more completely into subjection” (Woodham-Smith 15-16). The absence of a Dublin parliament meant nobody could protect the growing population of impoverished Irish continuing to depend on a bumper potato crop (Kinealy., “A Death-Dealing Famine” 6). After the Irish Poor Law in 1838, crop shortages followed, one almost immediately and the next in 1842 (40). the Peel administration supervised the 1843 Devon Commission, recommending financial help for landlords, to prevent disaster if the potato failed. Findings and recommendations were ignored (28; 43). Crop failure was expected by the Irish, but during the Great Hunger the English continued to export food while masses of starving watched Irish food shipped overseas (Woodham-Smith 77). During the frost and famine of 1740-41, whose population loss was comparable to that of the Great Hunger, exports were restricted (Kinealy., “A Death-Dealing Famine” 41).

The objective of much of the Irish population in the late 1840s and early 1850s was simply to feed themselves, resulting from a combination of natural, social, and political factors. The potato’s repeated failures, alongside the winter of 1847, caused a third to a

quarter of Ireland's population to die or emigrate. Attempted emigration often meant death at sea.

The descriptions of the dead from starvation are particularly gruesome. Anecdotes include mothers taking food that could be given to their children – thereby destroying the family structure -- alongside reports of Irish eating dead human flesh. While not all British wanted the Irish to starve, reports of cannibalism implied that the Irish were subhuman; in reality nobody knows how he or she will react when one is that hungry. Disease, though, is one factor that most humans react to similarly, and the British were no exception. Fear of sickness severely limited the number of privileged people willing to aid famine relief. "Not only were the Irish disliked: any hope that the misery of the destitute might evoke compassion was destroyed by fear of fever" (Woodham-Smith 282). All these factors convinced the majority of British that millions of Irish going hungry or leaving their land was either good for that small sister land of theirs, or something which they were unwilling to confront. Charity was not absent, but it tended to be political and thus insufficient: "Ultimately, philanthropy represented another form of political brokering among the elites, while reflecting their own socio-economic needs, not those of the poor" (Kinealy., "Charity and the Great Hunger in Ireland" 2).

If the mass starvation and emigration were indeed good for the Irish future, then the Irish that lived through the famine would have benefited. During and after the famine, more land was redistributed. Those able to rule the tillable lands left vacant from death and emigration were more likely British or Scottish elites, not fortunate surviving Irish (Jones 99) -- caused by the lack of previous industrialization of Irish lands before the hunger. Thus

it appears that because the Irish did not want to adopt the British way of life, not only were they not developed as a nation, but even those who survived were not blessed with training to exploit new opportunity.

Defenders of the British may cite Alexis Soyer's soup kitchens, which did feed millions of Irish, as an example of British efforts to prevent further Irish suffering. However, there are discrepancies between what they appeared to accomplish in preventing starvation and what actually occurred. For a few months, they did feed three million Irish. However, the nutrition in the soup was deficient (Woodham-Smith 294). Though many Irish felt demeaned by the process of waiting for charity, they still came. How could they not? "The choice was soup kitchen or death by starvation" (295). The soup kitchens were deemed an experiment. That description indicates that the Irish were seen as subjects on which to test things, not people that a mother government must feed (171-174).

When they closed, though, the problems that existed before relief began to mushroom. To the British, appearances and promotion took precedence over results in assisting Irish hungry. "The British chose to celebrate Soyer's success, not to scrutinize facts" (Strang 78-79). Evidence of this is not only in the nutritionally deficient soup kitchens, but the continued exporting of Irish food from a starving island. Socioeconomically, by the mid 1840s in England, "Poverty came to be thought of as the fault of the individual" (46). In such a sociopolitical climate, saying that a motherland has done all she could do for a part of her nation that does not industrialize itself would satisfy many politically prominent British, especially if the oppressed Irish were rebelling.

Revolutionary Spirit Lives

What began with rebellions against the price of food (Woodham-Smith 125) culminated with a most anemic uprising of the Young Irelanders. Uprising leaders understood the English governmental position on Ireland. Irish Comissary Edmund Routh was "asking too much" (Woodham-Smith 121), when Routh knew, before the winter of 1847, that the Irish would need much more food than the British would provide or purchase. The purpose of such procurements and donations would be simply to prevent starvation.

Aware of the predominant British government view toward Ireland, young nationalists, in the tradition of Wolfe Tone and Robert Emmett, had nothing to lose. Therefore, Young Irelanders William Smith O'Brien, Terence Bellew MacManus, Patrick O'Donoghoe, James Stephens, Thomas Francis Meagher, John Blake Dillon, and Michael Doheny led a military effort against English authority during the Great Hunger, at Balingarry. Given the starvation level of many, and Britain sending 6000 troops to Ireland to suppress prospective rebellions, chances of success were slim. Few had firearms; many had pikes. Young Ireland's military campaign began on July 28, and was defeated on the 29th (Kinealy., "Repeal and Revolution" 198-199). In the year of widespread revolutions throughout Europe, arrests of the Irish leaders drew worldwide criticism. Originally sentenced to death, the six were later resentenced to transportation to Van Dieman's Land, now Tasmania (217).

If Irish could eat, they could rise; "In 1849 there were signs of a resurgence of radical activities in the south-east of Ireland." This proposed social revolution, supported by Balingarry priest Father Kenyon, was the brainchild of James Finton Lalor, whose writings had influenced Young Irelander John Mitchell (223). For the most part, however,

the promising decade of the 1840s for Repealers ended with "both constitutional and physical force nationalism in tatters" (225). Escape from Van Dieman's land, though, was attainable. By the time pardons were granted to leaders of the 1848 revolt, O'Brien was the only one of the original six still there! Many relocated to the United States or Europe; O'Brien chose Brussels (247-57). MacManus died in the United States in 1861, but his body was buried in Dublin by San Francisco Fenians (254), also known as the Irish Republican Brotherhood. The IRB's descendant was the covert and illegal Irish Republican Army, most prominent during "The Troubles," of the late 20th century. Treatises of Young Irelanders would influence home rule, a 19th and early 20th century campaign for the Irish to rule over their own land. As of October, 2016, Ireland exists with a controversial partition, though no longer militarized. Therefore, nationalists can argue for a continuum from Tone, to O'Connell, to 1848, to an effort to remove partition. As with any historical argument for a current political cause, connections are often tenuous between distant events.

Unity and Public Opinion, in 1840

In the eyes of late 1840s public opinion, the spirit infusing Irish uprisings against perceived occupation reinforced the axiom that the Irish were not worth English aid (Woodham-Smith 359). A Rate-in-Aid Law passed by England in 1849 decreed that taxing wealthier Irish in the east would have to fund relief efforts in the ravaged west. This unpopular law divided a population in the midst of hunger by class. Rate-in-Aid "Implied that, despite the Act of Union and all that it signified, Ireland was to be left to her own resources" (Kinealy., "A Death-Dealing Famine" 135-136).

From a modern perspective, ending relief programs would indicate that there are no more problems to be relieved, or at least far fewer. Somewhat of the latter can be argued, considering 1847 was statistically and anecdotally the worst year of starvation between 1845 and 1852. British claims that more could not have been done to prevent Irish suffering during this time period have to be viewed with skepticism[11]. For example, after a British crown donation of £50,000 to the most impoverished and starving Irish regions, in 1849, England "simultaneously made it clear that no more public money would be forthcoming" (Kinealy., "Charity and the Great Hunger in Ireland" 39). The only explanation for such negligence by an allegedly benevolent mother nation is prejudice. Having become one with Great Britain in the United Kingdom, resulting from the Act of Union, in theory the British Empire's resources would be at Ireland's disposal, should disaster strike. However, "the resources of that Empire had not been deployed to mitigate the sufferings of the poor in Ireland" (40).

Advocate Lost

By 1847, Daniel O'Connell, his health failing, had embarked on a pilgrimage to meet the Pope (Kinealy., "Repeal and Revolution" 105); in doing so he had left his son John in charge of the Repeal Association. However, John "was ill equipped to lead such a movement and, compared to the dazzling array of talent of the emergent New Irelanders, appeared even more uncharismatic" (Kinealy., "A New History of Ireland" 159). In Genoa,

---

[11] In 1997, 150 years after the worst year of the Great Hunger, the Irish term for the Famine, British Prime Minister Tony Blair issued a public apology. "It has left deep scars…. Those who governed in London at the time failed their people."
Source: "The Independent": http://www.independent.co.uk/news/blair-issues-apology-for-irish-potato-famine-1253790.html

on his way to Rome, O'Connell died of "congestion of the brain," in May, 1847. Supporters expected him to continue repeal efforts upon return., Many Irish were simultaneously surprised and mournful that he died at age 71. Though no unifier like Wolfe Tone, he did attain Catholic emancipation. As a result, "He was mourned throughout Europe and the United States" ('Repeal and Revolution' 105).

Image in Decline

Discriminatory outlooks on the Irish mushroomed as a result of the Young Ireland revolt. Again using the press as their ally, the British government facilitated the impression that they had been extremely benevolent to the Irish in the past, and that in return for British generosity the Irish plotted rebellion (Woodham-Smith 366). As a result, even English previously sympathetic to Irish causes might have perceived the Irish Catholic mob as a dangerous bunch. Unfortunately, the rebellion minimized charity because the English controlled messaging about starving Irish, then left entirely to the devices of private philanthropy, or taxes from Rate-in-Aid.

Equality Throughout the Union?

The supposed goal of the Act of Union was to unify under a fair London government representing England, Scotland, and Ireland. While geographically close to Ireland, Scotland was socioeconomically worlds away. The Scottish were also adversely affected by the potato blight. However, a big difference between the Scots and the Irish was the economic health and responsibility of the landlord class, encouraged in Scotland more so to address the needs of the Scottish poor, in contrast with Irish landlords (Kinealy., "A Death-Dealing Famine" 89-90). As a result, starvation from potato failure had much

less of an effect on Scotland. The immense poverty in Ireland can be traced back to the penal laws, though Catholic emancipation had been achieved. Poverty often takes generations to overcome, and in a disaster caused by a fungus, which spread not only through the United Kingdom but through Europe, "it was the poor – those most dependent upon the potato – which suffered the greatest losses" (Kinealy., "A Death-Dealing Famine" 91). One theory of economic improvement involves investing more in an area's banks. This occurred in Scotland, but not in Ireland, during the late 1840s (O'Grada 81). Therefore, either Ireland was an afterthought, leaving it susceptible to cultural destruction from crop failure, or a plan was implemented to decimate the country.

While the most impoverished continued to starve in Ireland, disputes occurred in Britain regarding what was occurring there and to what extent the British should intervene. Charles Trevelyan, Director of the Treasury, championed laissez faire economics in Ireland. Working under the administration of Charles Wood, who "disliked and distrusted the Irish" (Woodham-Smith 306), the policies that ensued after prime minister Robert Peel's exit from office can be classified on the range between negligent and murderous. Trevelyan was not the person that Irish men or women would want deciding who deserved aid during hunger on Ireland. In 1847, Peel attempted to repeal the British corn laws, which would have made British corn more accessible to the Irish poor. He had to resign after an unsuccessful quest, alienating many previous political allies in the process. (Woodham-Smith 49-52).

If the statements of many British are to be believed, the starvation and emigration of millions of Irish would have ultimately benefited Ireland because the economy would

be restructured (‘A Death-Dealing Famine’ 33). This conveys condescension, disregard, and paternalism, held by many British toward the Irish. Even by early nineteenth century standards, the Irish Catholic majority could have lived more comfortably. Many were, however, satisfied with their status in their homeland, which would not have been interrupted or eradicated if not for the potato blight. Prevailing among the British was a lack of understanding of Irish life, leading the *London Times* to refer to the latter part of the 1840s as a “blessing” (Miller 186). Perhaps the *Times* agreed with Trevelyan in that Irish society’s permanent transformation was not a result of natural catastrophe or British policy, but because of “moral evil of the selfish perverse, and turbulent character of the people” (Mulcrone 219).

Outlooks such as Trevelyan’s explain why the findings of the Devon commission were ignored. It found, to no Irish person’s surprise, that the land in Ireland was getting divided and subdivided, to the point that individuals had smaller and smaller plots of land on which only one crop could grow – potatoes! Therefore, if the potato failed, those most dependent upon it – Ireland’s rural poor – would stand little chance of survival. Since many Irish were unaware of the effects of British policy, when conditions deteriorated in Ireland, those who could lash out did so against the visible force in their lives, the landlords. To some extent this was justified, but if the British had implemented the Devon commission’s recommendations, the level of transformation of the Irish land and society would not have been so tremendous. (Kinealy., “A Death-Dealing Famine” 35). A valid response to the question why many Irish consumed one crop and subsisted on the bottom rung of an agricultural society is: contentment with an oppressed state is a product of recycling

oppression over generations. Therefore, the perpetual world of the Irish cottier, over centuries, consisted of the family, the potato, and in some cases, the landlord. The Irish poor knew no alternatives. Therefore, the peasantry class cannot be blamed for being unprepared for the Great Hunger.

Landlords and Peasants

Many landlords could have ensured their tenants had better access to basics of survival. However, absenteeism was too common to mitigate effects of hunger. A caring landlord or lady checks in with tenants, but many illusory landlords – to the tillers of the land -- had little interest in the well-being of the Irish cottier. While some did genuinely care, that became irrelevant, because British economic policy or lack thereof forced the majority of Irish landlords into bankruptcy. (Woodham-Smith 283-284). Therefore, even well-intentioned landlords did force emigration when tenants could not pay rent, and did not care when troops executed evictions. Soldiers extracted people from homes and lands which in some cases had been in families for millennia. Effects were irreversible; even in areas that lacked dependence upon the potato for survival, togetherness of Irish brethren harvesting land would be gone forever. Transcending time and strife, both internal and external, Irish culture had been so, but not after this. Trust was gone. People were gone; their land and crop were gone. “The Famine killed everything” (Kinealy., “A Death-Dealing Famine” 155).

Measuring Effects

Therefore, what resulted from the potato failure and accompanying British policies of the 1840s and early 1850s was a restructuring of the Irish society, which still could not

industrialize because too many people had died or emigrated. Stating that the great hunger, or famine, is attempted genocide is an exaggeration. However, it would be inaccurate to say that British policy had no part in the Irish catastrophe from 1845 to 1852, which transformed the world. Effects of millions of starving Irish in the nineteenth century are difficult to measure socially and psychologically, yet much easier to see demographically.

Emphasizing Tragedy Negates Revolutionary Zeal

Though hunger largely negated Ireland's ability to revolt in 1848, the "Irish Famine" is often the first aspect of Irish history learned worldwide. With food plentiful again, a hollowed out population no longer faced consistent blight. The goal of removal of British influence from Ireland returned a few decades later, indicating the depth of desire for separation from the United Kingdom.

The Haitian revolutionary journey demonstrates that among the most oppressed in world history could remove a colonizing influence. The Protestant Ascendancy's targeted subjugation of all but Anglicans, including a majority Catholic Irish population, was uniquely onerous, sociologically and politically. Though considered a European nation, no attempts at extracting England and Britain from Ireland, from either external or internal sources, were even remotely successful, while a wave of revolutions transformed much of Europe in the middle nineteenth century. Instead of the Irish, or an outside nation, improving Ireland, the land of Wolfe Tone, Daniel O'Connell, and the Young Irelanders, was decimated by hunger. The detail that slaves had to remain somewhat healthy, and fed, to till the lands partly explains what is most ironic about assessing Ireland's and Haiti's

relationships to revolution: Ireland could not expel their perceived colonizer, while tortured human property could.

With the seeds of modern Unionism sewn through the Ulster Plantation, divisions formed on Ireland, ensuring that there would not be enough unified force implemented against a neighbor to remove British presence from Ireland. British oppression over the Irish did not encompass all on Ireland. It was focused on a portion of the population, and England was geographically closer to Ireland than France was to Saint Domingüe, the colony name of Hispañiola. Furthermore, the dissolution of the Irish parliament resulting from the Act of Union ensured that the famine, or great hunger, would decimate the Irish population. Seeds of the division within Irish society, which to an extent cooperated with the Act of Union, were evident in the 1798 rebellion, whose root causes and goals are still studied today. Collectively, these factors dictated that the contentious relationship between England and Ireland continue, as the European Age of Revolutions faded. In Haiti's case, a colonizer was removed. A comparison and contrast of these two historical processes follows.

4

Nationalism, Unity, and Rebellion

Without the United Irishmen, the impetus for the rebellion of 1798 would not have existed. Toussaint Louverture was the governing force unifying Saint Domingüe revolutionaries before his arrest by Napoleon. Wolfe Tone, recognized leader of the United Irishmen, is called the *Prophet of Irish Independence* by biographer Marianne Elliott. Therefore, both Toussaint Louverture and Wolfe Tone directed transformational campaigns against empire. Through the middle of the nineteenth century, one vision appeared to have been lost, while another had limited success.

Toussaint Louverture is revered and mythologized as Haiti's heroic founder. Before his arrest Toussaint's vision for the island of Saint Domingüe appeared to be a French colony without slavery. Though he did not envision a new nation, his unification strategies and victories in the early part of the revolution allowed Jean-Jacques Dessalines to take the final steps toward Haitian independence. If slavery had been reinstated, per Napoleon's plans, it is impossible to believe Toussaint would not have mobilized the former slave army for independence.

Though surprised by the 1798 rebellion in Ireland, William Theobald Wolfe Tone can be called Ireland's first nationalist. Tone's advocacy on behalf of Catholics conveyed "that improvements to their social and political position could be made in addressing the national question" (Nutt 7). The Enlightenment had given rise to the French storming the Bastille, and the United Irishmen's brand of nationalism, which "drew substantial support

from Catholics and Protestants." Recruitment efforts attracted all religions. "The Belfast society of United Irishmen was comprised largely of young Presbyterians" (8).

Defining Nations

The two definitions of nationalism, "Devotions to the interest or culture of a particular nation," and "Aspirations for national independence" (American Heritage Dictionary 564), demonstrate that Tone's status applies to both the controversial word's primary and secondary interpretations. The United Irishmen aspired to create one Irish culture. Tone's planned attack on England near the time of his final return indicates that he was considering a path taken by future Irish nationalists, who indeed were seeking an independent country.

John Hall's analysis of nationalism details distinct historical phenomena including "Revolution from Above," citing Napoleon seizing power by using the army's allegiance (7), and "Desire and Fear Blessed by Opportunity," in which Toussaint Louverture's struggle to unify Saint Domingüe factions is acknowledged. Though Toussaint and Creole planters figure in Hall's argument (9), the Haitian Revolution is not a direct focus of his article. While this could occur because Hall's subject matter is a general study of nationalism, slavery scholar Robin Blackburn states otherwise:

> The first major breach in the hugely important systems of slavery in the Americas was opened not by English or American abolitionists but by Jacobin revolutionaries and the black peasantry of Saint Domingüe (later Haiti). This fact has not been a comfortable one for the traditional national historiography in the United States or Britain and has become awkward even in France as the Jacobin period has been

viewed with increasing distaste and embarrassment (Blackburn., "Haiti, Slavery, and the Age of Democratic Revolution" 643-644).

Fervent nationalism under either allegedly or actually oppressive governments can form fledgling nations represented by new flags[12]. Within nations people should "share a culture" (Hall 3). An industrial society "depends upon a common culture and language, and certainly upon sharing an extended cultural code" (3-4). Here cracks in the unification of Ireland become evident, as Protestants were unlikely to speak Irish, thus inhibiting them from understanding Irish Catholic ritual. However, Haitian nationalism is somewhat based upon resistance to human bondage – the basis of a cultural code.

Religion and Politics

Many sources report that the religion of Saint Domingüe slaves was displayed at Boïs Caïman, an August 14, 1791 event viewed by historians as the spark of the Saint Domingüe uprising, which eventually led to the second western nation of Haiti. Either shortly before, during, or shortly after Boïs Caïman, slaves entrusted by absentee planters to supervise their brethren in bondage, "*commandeurs*" in French, hatched the first plans to attack Saint Domingüe plantations (Bell 20).

Sources disagree on what happened at Boïs Caïman. Carolyn Fick's 1990 book "The Making of Haiti" states that voodoo rites were performed (94), but a book appendix raises doubt as to whether it was a religious ceremony, meaning it could have been to at least some extent a military planning session (264). Ralph Korngold's "Citizen Toussaint,"

[12] Complicating this further is that six counties in the North of Ireland have their own flag, similar to but not exactly like the British flag.

published in 1944, says "Boukmans" (68), referred to by Fick as "Boukman Dutty" (92), was a voodoo priest who "led the delegates" at Boïs Caïman to a liturgy including stabbing a pig tied to a post by a priestess (Korngold 69). Fick too states that Boukman Dutty was a priest, but she refrains from detailing minutia that the author may have learned did not take place.

Mystery regarding exact events at Boïs Caïman will outlive all readers, but no source disputes the reputation of Toussaint a Bréda at the time of Boïs Caïman. Historians agree that the future Toussaint Louverture – previously carrying the last name of the plantation where he toiled – possessed enough status to attend. However, whether the future unifier of all Saint Domingüe people of color against European colonists attended "has never been known for sure" (Bell 21). If it was politically beneficial for him to be there, he would have been.[13]

Much of voodoo philosophy is reflected in proverbs, displaying resiliency and acknowledging oppression. Examples include statements that an ant will survive when a sack of sugar appears to crush the insect, and that a rich person's apology to a pauper is empty penance (Desmangles 58). While resiliency can lead to acceptance of oppression, a revolution overseas will light a yearning flame for equal rights, as occurred in 1791. Simultaneously inspirational and heroic, the ubiquitous presence of voodoo in Haiti has facilitated negative interpretations of Haitian culture[14].

---

[13] Louverture biographer Madison Smartt Bell is one of many scholars to ascribe to Toussaint acute political savvy: "He would have been well aware of which way the winds were blowing and that an insurrection was being planned" (21).

[14] In the first two pages of Leslie G. Desmangles' "Faces of the Gods," the author cites a fictionalized incident in Haiti causing rumors to circulate accusing voudouanists of casting spells to kill a young girl. After an investigation, six people were shot for their alleged participation in her murder, but worldwide

Many religious people think of religion as believing in one or more than one deity. However, voudouanists believe that "lwas," pervade adherents' lives, assisting them with sustenance through challenges – an extremely helpful philosophy in a land where poverty is the rule. Examples of lwas include "Ezili, the Virgin Mother," ensuring procreation (131-132), "Legba," the sun lwa, "who ensures the florescence and nurture of all living things" (131), and "Ogou, the Suffering General," praised as a leader in war, but also seen as the one who protects humans in interactions with gods. Ogou appears on Haiti's coat of arms (145-148).

The recipe for the Haitian Revolution consisted of voodoo structures, proverbs, and the French Rights of Man. Usurpation was not immediate, and was facilitated by French absenteeism reflecting arrogance. "In real time, it had taken a century of slavery in Saint Domingüe to consolidate the religions of various African tribes (along with a dusting of the Catholicism to which all slaves were theoretically supposed to be converted) into a single religion which all slaves could share" (Bell 20). While many Haitians even today practice both voodoo and Catholicism (Desmangles 5-6), periodically Haitian authorities have embarked on campaigns to stamp out voodoo from the nation – an impossible task. However, such attempted religious pogroms, involving sacking temples and burning symbols representing lwas, have only forced voodoo practices underground, further shrouding the rituals which breathed the fire of independence. Haiti's Catholicism is

---

public opinion blamed the dominant religion of Haiti, voodoo. Desmangles noted, before mentioning the young girl's death: "Thanks to Hollywood and the film industry, what average persons conjure up in their minds when they think of Voodoo is a picture of witches and sorcerers who, filled with hatred, attempt to inflict diseases or even death on other persons by making wax or wooden representations of them, and perforating them with pins."

somewhat influenced by the nation's religious roots (5-7), just as Irish Catholicism deviated in many ways from Roman Catholicism, due to Ireland's isolation from the rest of Europe during the Dark Ages. Examples of Irish deviations from Rome included priests marrying for a few centuries into the second modern millennium, and abbots' closeness to the people during Ireland's "Golden Age."

Nearly a thousand years after Ireland's "Golden Age," Irish Catholics suffered under British penal codes in the eighteenth century, while French slave traders were ensuring their own system would eventually be overthrown. Not only were Saint Domingüe overseers cruel and many plantation owners absentee, but French slave traders did not realize that the African region from which they abducted many of their slaves, Dahomey, had a highly structured form of voodoo, a word derived from awkward translation of the Dahomean word for "spirit," "vodu" (Desmangles 4). The complexities of Dahomean voodoo provided "an existing substructure in Saint Domingüe within which the religious, cultural, and linguistic traditions of the diverse African nations successively found a place and effectively contributed to its evolution" (Fick 58).

Communication and understanding among maroons was often facilitated because many were Congolese (59). At the very least fear of coordinated maroon attacks inconvenienced landowners and overseers; occasionally runaways would coordinate attacks on plantations before the 1790 mulatto uprising, following the tradition of the executed Mackandal.

On State Formation

John Hall wrote on nationalism in industrial societies: “Massive social engineering is required because nationalism is not the awakening of nations to self-consciousness; it invents nations where they do not exist” (4). While Saint Domingüe society was not industrial in the sense that there were factories, it was agricultural: slaves cultivated natural crops into potable coffee, and edible sugar. Therefore, the collective servitude in agricultural slavery alongside intense will for freedom formed the Haitian nation at Boïs Caïman, according to the second definition of nationalism. The Haitian trek to independence indicates that when nations are formed is not always clear, until such revolutionary movements are deemed successful. Thus, Irish nationalism attained a victory upon the formation of the free state, and if the northeastern six counties ever form their own nation, as some want, Unionist nationalism will have achieved a goal never envisioned before Brexit.

Previous to Haiti’s birth, the mixing of various African languages merged with influence from the French of their colonizers, transitioning slaves’ languages into Creole, the “language of revolution,” declared such by Haitian-American journalist Dady Chery. Communication divides between monolingual Creole speaking Haitian masses and bilingual or multilingual elite, likely speaking French and English, or both, date back to Saint Domingüe under Napoleon. Before territory was won by former chattel slaves, a letter sent by Napoleon to the French colony was poorly translated into Creole, and thus misinterpreted. Resulting from collective misunderstanding, and Napoleon’s plan to reinstitute slavery, Toussaint Louverture had some success uniting previously disputatious factions, who continued to feud, even after independence.

In 1504, more than three centuries after the first Norman arrived on Ireland, the battle between earls Fitzgerald and Burke included Irish battling on both sides. Internecine Irish combat representing English gentry dictated that English presence was cementing itself. Both Fitzgerald and Burke were supported by Gaelic and Anglo-Irish interests (Kinealy., "A New History of Ireland" 62). Unionists, who share power with nationalists in Northern Ireland today, can thus argue that Ireland was never united, implying that nationalist goals are unattainable myths.

In the 1790s, the United Irishmen's rise increased awareness of English oppression of the Irish. However, under Wolfe Tone's presumptive leadership, the United Irishmen did not inspire a successful rebellion. During the 1798 revolt, factionalism predominated over paving a road to national growth. With motivation still unclear for some 1798 violence on Ireland, followers of each Christian sect would kill adherents of the two other Christian groups. Irish nationalism in the 1790s was "never free of tensions over religion" (Nutt 8). Therefore, to what extent Wolfe Tone unified Ireland against England is debatable. Tone's prosecution and the subsequent Act of Union indicate that Great Britain feared more rebellion, but does not scream that the British fretted an independent neighbor.

Wolfe Tone may have attained liberator status, if a storm had not prevented his landing at Bantry Bay in 1796. However, Marianne Elliott believes that Tone was somewhat oblivious to the intricacies of Catholic life, and that not only did it affect the 1790s, but also future struggles. "Tone's total lack of understanding of the Catholic peasantry was to cause problems for later generations of Catholic nationalists" (Elliott 129).

On Divided Islands

Residents of Northern Ireland, usually referred to as the "six counties" by Irish nationalists, would argue that they have a country of their own. The splitting of the island which Wolfe Tone hoped to unify across sectarian boundaries occurred more than a century after his death. However, nationalists partial to Wolfe Tone's vision can connect the vision of modern nationalism to Tone's zeal for a religiously united island. Certainly, the religious unity of the slave population of Saint Domingüe, given their common regional African ancestry, bolstered the Haitian struggle, while religious division in Ireland impeded Wolfe Tone's quest.

On Forcing Ethnicity

On the former slave colony of Saint Domingüe, Haiti's Jean-Pierre Boyer implemented "Haitianization," attempting to convert a population largely of freed slaves and their descendants into Boyer's vision of Haitians. As a result, in 1844, "La Trinitaria" formed, leading the Dominican Republic to independence. Though 1807 through 1820 were years when Haiti was divided into two states, Toussaint Louverture had been able to unite the entire island against a group of colonizers. The splitting of Haiti and the formation of the Dominican Republican mitigate Toussaint Louverture's success as unifier of the Haitian people. The Haitian north and south display the divisions in Haitian nationalism that Toussaint successfully fused, enabling Dessalines to achieve victory. Young Haiti is predominated by a nationalism that was "racist in nature," passing laws to protect itself from an invasion of their previous possessor, France, and regulating economic influence of foreign merchants. "It was a unique expression of nationalism for the period because since

it was directed not only at France, but at all white men." By invoking protectionism, in the face of a world of empire, and a northern neighbor with legal bondage of Africans and their descendants, Haiti damaged its early prospects (Nelson 230). Whether or not this extreme stance was justified, Haiti feared an actual obstacle to national progress.

Newly Formed States and World Powers

Therefore, Boyer's expression of Haitian nationalism inspired Dominican nationalism, since the Spanish-speaking population of Hispañola's east felt a neighbor's weight upon them. It was far easier for the Dominican Republic to form than it was for the Irish to revolt successfully, however, because of the disparities in power between the Haitian and British states. "The fundamental Haitian problems of poverty and illiteracy were never touched," (Nelson 230) while Britain was a world power. Therefore, Dominican unity, against what was perceived as Haitian dominance over the Spanish-speaking former slaves and descendants, flourished as Boyer's administration weakened.

Fifty years previous to the Dominican Republic's formation, any effort to unite all Irish against the English would have been monumental, given the Ulster Plantation and how Britain could use law to suppress Irish dissent. One effect of such legislation was Wolfe Tone's exile. While in the United States and in France, Wolfe Tone's idea of one Ireland remained. In that future, Irish culture would equally include people all faiths. Tone's vision of all on Ireland in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries becoming one Irish society reflects a melting pot theory of immigration. Given how divergent and how segregated Ireland was, such appears unrealistic (Coakley 120). However, a culturally pluralistic Ireland, one in which each group retains parts of a culture while contributing to

a national identity, may be possible, whether or not partition fades into memory. Such an Ireland may already exist.

Divergent Results; Similar Goals?

Three years previous to Haiti expelling all prospective military colonizers, England passed the Act of Union, after which, however, Ireland was still a de facto colony (Kinealy., "A New History of Ireland" 147). Before and during the Great Hunger of 1845-1852, Daniel O'Connell, an early beneficiary of the relaxation of the Penal Laws, could not work with the Young Irelanders. In the late nineteenth century the Home Rule movement began, failing because it did not appeal to the six counties of Northern Ireland. Subsequently, the Easter Rising of 1916 and civil war brought a limited nationalist victory with the Irish free state. Fewer eras in any region's history were more divisive than "The Troubles," the early 1970s until the 1990s, primarily occurring in the six northeastern counties on Ireland. If outside forces did not intervene, both Catholics and Protestants still might be dying from explosions and locally planned assassinations[15]. During "The Troubles," religious background often correlated with allegiances. However, the dispute was political, beginning when Catholics in Northern Ireland began campaigning for more rights, vehemently opposed by powerful Unionist Protestants.

Betrayal, Choice, and Power

Early Catholic protesters in the Troubles knew who their enemies were, the Derry elite, who oppressed both poor Protestants and Catholics. However, the fortunate literate

[15]Outside forces did intervene. Thanks to many other nations, the United States included, an agreement was signed in 1998 on Good Friday calling for a cease fire between Irish republicans and loyalists based in the northeastern six counties. This cease fire has been upheld by both sides, ending "The Troubles."

and economic upper classes of Haiti no doubt felt betrayed when Boyer signed a treaty agreeing to pay France 150,000,000 francs for their independence. Both the national economy and spirit were damaged. Forced by circumstances and lack of military acumen to accept the oppressive treaty with France, the former vice-president of the south was attacked for returning Haiti to French colony status – in practice if not in name.

A Pivotal Year

In 1848, four years after the Dominican Republic broke away from Haiti, liberal Haitian mulattoes petitioned for more freedoms, and a small group of Irish rebels against Britain attacked at Balingarry. The great Irish hunger partially condemned the Irish uprising to failure, and resultant emigration would prevent transformative change on Ireland for another seven decades. Haitian self-proclaimed Emperor Soulouque's extermination of opposition was more direct, murdering subjects, and purging opposition forces from the government.

European revolutions occurred in France, the Hapsburg Empire, German states, and Italian states. Long term effects varied. In France, a national desire to form working class movements formed. In the Hapsburg Empire, oppression of the masses reigned after authorities quelled the uprising. In German states, the middle class collapsed, which, after World War I, can be traced to Nazism's evolution. Italian rulers, though, conceded that modernizing governmental structures might benefit both governing and the governed long term (Todd 114-116).

Ireland and Haiti could not participate in the revolutionary transformation: Ireland was prevented from doing so because of longtime English cultural and military presence.

Haiti's situation of political isolation was maintained by both internal and external factors, stemming from the founding of the country by triumphant slaves, and mixed race free people who joined the slave cause.

Discrimination, Subjugation, and Attempted Genocide?

The majority tending to the roots of successful revolution in Haiti were slaves, seen by French owners at birth in Saint Domingüe, or by slavers in their African homelands, more as economic machinery than human beings. Therefore, to many planters, their enslaved laborers lacked the intellectual capacity to form the plots devised at Boïs Caïman. The economics of slavery dictated that free labor was required; poor whites – *petit blancs* – in Saint Domingüe, would not engage in any cane or coffee plantation labor. "P*etit blancs"* would have to be paid, because they were viewed as human. In contrast, "Africans, or those of African descent, were like dangerous animals who required permanent restraint if they were to be useful to their owners, themselves, or the wider community." In "The American Crucible," documenting the history and eventual success of abolishing worldwide slavery, Robin Blackburn states that slaves were "feared as wild beasts, and used as beasts of burden, slaves were less than human" ("The American Crucible" 94-95). This justifies owners giving slaves one name, as if pets (95), and torturing them if they did not produce enough, documented in many sources on Saint Domingüe. Irony destroyed colonial Saint Domingüe because many whites in Europe had no idea that slaves were human at all, and their humanity and cooperation, even with future adversaries, separated economic jewel colony from colonizer.

In 1817, thirteen years after Haitian independence, French zoologist Baron Georges Cuvier dissected the corpse of "a Hottentot Venus," Saartjie Baartman, likely a slave from what is now South Africa. Cuvier wrote about curvy dark-skinned women, descendants of those categorized as black or African-American: "Their colour is black, their hair crimped, their heads squashed and their noses flat. Their protruding mouths and think lips are strikingly similar to those of the apes" (Washington 85). Therefore, if the learned in society needed any excuse to discriminate against blacks, slaves or not, they had it – just by reading science. Students and readers of Cuvier had already been conditioned. In the zoologist's 1797 essay "The race from which we descended has been called Caucasian… the handsomest on earth," he first wrote, as a European, that "the Negro race was confined to the south." This he could likely prove. The next statement shifts from observation to conclusion, without proof. "The projection of the lower parts of the face, and the thick lips, evidently approximate it to the monkey tribe; the hordes of which it consists have always remained in the most complete state of utter barbarism" (Cuvier 105). Speculation that science can be political is validated by such conclusions: a group of former slaves had just freed themselves from French colonial status less than twenty years before Cuvier wrote his sociologically biological assessment of Africans.

Today, when race is predominantly based upon appearance of skin tone, it may take effort to visualize a time when light skinned residents of a certain island, Ireland, were deemed as savage and barbarous, simply because of where they lived. "By the late sixteenth century, the ascription of subhuman or barbaric behavior had become, however, a pretext for ruthless suppression of the entire native Irish population." Cannibalism and incest were

only attributed to the native Irish Catholic, occupied, in the Irish view, by the Protestant English (Doan 86).

Therefore, when understanding anti-Irish discrimination in European history, the axiom that race was conceived within the realm of whiteness, based upon geography, must be considered. The European concept of race became so ingrained across the Atlantic, and so divisive, that World War I was seen by many of its combatants as a struggle "between two opposing 'races'" (Audoin-Rozeau 154). During and after World War I, a coalition of Irish was assembling against English influence. The Irish Easter Rising of 1916 and subsequent civil war brought partition, leaving a twenty six county Irish free state in the south and northwest of the island, and six counties of the northeast.

Haiti's first internal border dispute was destined to cease after Henri Chrisophe's suicide, but centuries transpired before Irish could expel England from any part of Ireland. In 1926, following the 1916 Rising, and two wars on Irish soil, a partition was agreed upon dividing the Irish island into twenty-six counties in the south and northwest, and the six northeastern counties, Northern Island. Considering British penal laws stratified Irish Catholics as an "oppressed race" for the entire eighteenth century (Ignatiev 35), the modern partition was progress.

Reports of cannibalism appeared in English newspapers during what Irish scholars usually call the "Great Hunger," because at least once – one too many times – food was seen leaving Ireland by boat, exported by Britain (Woodham-Smith 282). The British magazine "Punch" regularly reinforced stereotypes of the Irish. Irish likeness "frequently promoted ideas of racial inferiority, especially after the 1848 uprising when the Irish were

given simian features." The Times of London joined "Punch" in conveying Irish racial inferiority, as many were either starving to death or leaving, ensuring that nationalism would either wait or evaporate (Kinealy., "A Death-Dealing Famine" 133). The rising proved oppression's response can only be suppressed so long. Discrimination will persist, however, as evidenced by this quote appearing in Sir James O'Connor's 1926 book *A History of Ireland*:

> The contrast between the Irishman's quick-witted intelligence, impulsiveness, indiscipline, easy good nature, emotionalism, indolence where any job not completely to his liking is concerned, with the Englishman's slower and more stolid habits of thought, speech, and action, his sense of order and duty, his subordination of good nature to a sense of justice, and his bottomless common sense constitute no reason why, politically, they should not cheerfully pull together in double harness. But one Irish characteristic presents a formidable barrier. There is, in Ireland, an inordinate pride of race (139).

Perhaps "race," according to O'Connor, is knowledge that Irish deserve the right of self-determination and their own identity, free of English paternalism or dictates. The stereotype of the "wild Irish" is implied therein. Thus, the worldwide perspective of both the Haitian nation and the Irish diaspora was informed by discrimination perpetrated by empire.

While the British did not do enough to save starving in the 1840s and 1850s, previous to Feb. 4, 1794, slave owners and overseers in Saint Domingüe were working Africans and their descendants to death, after the slaves or their ancestors were abducted

from their continental homeland. According to slave traders and landowners, Africans and their children were destined only to build colonial wealth. Therefore, functional slaves could not starve. Saint Domingüe planters needed hundreds of thousands of human workhorses, because colonial agriculture could not exist without free labor to cultivate sugar and coffee. French planter needs became the army that overthrew their economic system. In contrast, English policy and proximity to Ireland played major roles in preventing any Irish nation, before 1926.

The United States had a very different view of early Haiti from that of starving Ireland. The new nation to which Wolfe Tone and other United Irishmen exiled themselves donated $242,042.79 in food to the Irish by February of 1848. The cold winter, however, prevented the food's delivery until the spring. American efforts to assist starving Irish were overseen by Dutch businessman Myndert Van Schaick, who had no connection to Ireland (Kinealy., "Charity and the Great Hunger in Ireland" 85, 89). Publicly, discussions were held in Washington regarding the constitutionality of using public funds to aid starving Irish. A bill was proposed, but never passed (119-122).

Though Haitian laws regulated foreign merchant activity, and an official US emissary did not visit Haiti until Abraham Lincoln's presidency, "the United States quickly consolidated its position as her chief trading partner," from 1804-1806. Nearing twenty years in existence, forty-five percent of imports to Haiti came from its northern neighbor; thirty percent were British; twenty-one percent were from previous colonizer France (Farmer 68), dictating Christophe's conflicts with American merchants were the exception. What did independence mean in the nineteenth century? In "The Uses of Haiti," Paul

Farmer addresses these questions, citing an 1805 US newspaper editorial stating that, even after the French were expelled from Saint Domingüe and Haiti formed, the United States "might in the future be a greater threat to Haitian independence than were the countries of Europe."

The United States would not consider officially recognizing Haiti, given that half the country still allowed chattel slavery, targeted for destruction by Toussaint Louverture in prerevolutionary Saint Domingüe. South Carolina Senator Robert Hayne even proclaimed that Haiti had to be exempted from the Monroe Doctrine on foreign policy: "We never can acknowledge [Haitian] independence. The peace and safety of a large portion of our union forbids us even to discuss it" (69).

The economic necessity of slavery to the South was so great that secession was implemented before anybody in the North proposed emancipation. American southern aristocracy feared "emancipation as a state policy," but Lincoln signed the Emancipation Proclamation when he needed more American northern support for the Civil War ('The American Crucible' 247-249)[16]. Whether Lincoln wanted to abolish slavery previous to 1863 is a debate. Not debatable is that many in the northern United States had no desire to see Haitians discussing their revolution with Americans, many subtly or overtly racist. America has not yet formally condemned slavery, more than 150 years after its prohibition. Therefore, Haiti was not officially recognized by the United States until 1862, a year before

[16] The Emancipation Proclamation barely freed any slaves, because the Confederacy had seceded. If slave owners in the border states were inclined to listen to Lincoln, they might free their human property, but that was unlikely. The proclamation was a wartime executive order, which would not stand once war ceased; chattel slavery ended in the US in 1865, upon passage of the 13th Amendment and northern victory in the Civil War.

the Emancipation Proclamation. For decades, newspapers marketed toward free blacks had advocated for the United States officially recognizing Haiti, to no avail. *The Colored American* stated on Nov. 10, 1838: "Every patriotic and philanthropic citizen should petition Congress for the recognition of Haitian Independence." Texas was a diplomatically recognized independent nation; the United States imported $1.4 million of goods from Haiti, and only $160,000 from Texas. The US exported $3 million more to Haiti than to Texas, both totals slightly over $1 million. "Ought there not to be some stronger reasons for not acknowledging Haitian independence than the people were once slaves, and gained their nationality and independence in the same way that our own fathers did" ('The Colored American')?

South Carolina senator Hayne, like many other southern American officials, feared intermittent slave rebellions in the Louisiana territory, bought by President Thomas Jefferson from the French in 1803. The New Orleans area, 1400 miles from Haiti, was a frequent source of both rumored and actual slave uprising plots. If Haiti had been officially recognized, then more interaction would ensue between Haitians and Americans in both young nations. Word of how Haiti attained independence would spread to more slaves, if Haiti was deemed by the US government a legitimate trading partner, creating serious problems for those invested in maintaining the southern economic structure and hierarchy.

Slave policy differed between the French and Spanish, who shared control of Louisiana as of 1790. French policies were very restrictive on slaves, but Spanish governor Governor-General Francisco Luis Hector, Baron de Carondelet, aware of a 1791 plot devised by slaves in subhuman conditions, suggested that in 1792 French planters relax

rules, so that slaves would have enough to eat, and requisite shelter in which to sleep. The French were wary of rebellion, based upon what happened in Saint Domingüe in 1791 (Holmes 341-343). Southern American aristocracy guarded their free labor policy with their cultural existence. Point Coupée slaves, influenced by their Caribbean brethren, plotted insurrection. Louisiana authorities, however, learned from Saint Domingüe planters' missteps. Blacks suspected of plotting were arrested; between twenty three and twenty six were executed (354). After the Louisiana Purchase, in 1804, rumors of another cabal surfaced, causing slave owners to request arms from governor William C.C. Claiborne. As some Haitians could travel to the United States, no talk of slaves attaining their freedom would be allowed in the new American territory. In 1806, the American Louisiana territory banned Haitian blacks (358-359). No such restriction was ever placed upon Irish emigrants to the United States, though many Irish had engaged in rebellion in their homeland.

American slave owners, clinging to an economic and allegedly scientific racism, could not envision that "the only way to avoid slave revolts was to eliminate the system of slavery which bred them" (359). Behind the times and encapsulated by their own system of cruel, barbarous free labor, tactics implemented to prevent rebellions varied from selling slaves to other areas to prevent conspiracy to "domesticating" slaves by providing better for human property. The first western nation could not honor the second western country's independence, because to America and many Americans, Haiti was indeed just a group of "rebel slaves" (Farmer 69). Since the United States was not ready to end the practice of de jure slavery, Haiti can be argued to have been independent in name only, because of two

factors: Boyer's 1824 submission to the French demands for reparations, under threat of French military attack, and America's refusal to diplomatically recognize Haiti. Many obstacles to early Haitian development were so because of how the world viewed the revolutionary republic, but the closest nation to young Haiti was the United States, which did not assist Haiti in overcoming poverty and illiteracy.

When Ireland endured a major crisis, the American government discussed the possibility of official aid. While Haiti was independent under a flag, official allies were lacking because of the predominance of empire in the world – from which Saint Domingüe had separated. Ireland, however, had been deceived and manipulated into an Act of Union, which would contribute to the depths of the hunger's effect on the Irish population. If there had been an Irish parliament in the 1840s and 1850s, aid alleviating starvation would have been more forthcoming.

Conquered Peoples

Thirty years later after Boyer signed away Haiti's financial future to France, a massive emigration to the United States would occur from Ireland. Those who left, for survival, were likely to face religious and ethnic discrimination, alongside health problems from malnutrition. The Irish who stayed behind were plagued by religious guilt, and land policy favoring outsiders over hunger survivors. Blight and policy temporarily suppressed the urge to rebel.

Therefore, France was able to vanquish Haiti financially, after former slaves had led a separation in 1804. The conquest of Ireland, however, occurred because whenever the English or British were on Ireland, purposes were to control land and transfer control

from the native Irish to the English. The Ulster Plantation was the most extreme example, leading to the War of Two Kings, and James' flight to France. Though the Act of Union legislated equality among all parts of the United Kingdom, many Irish knew this was fiction. Thus it is possible that Robert Emmett began modern Irish nationalism, and not Wolfe Tone's United Irishmen, because Emmett's brief skirmish with British authorities occurred after the Act of Union.

Any hope for the cultural aspirations of the United Irishmen had dispersed by 1852. While periodic hunger from potato failure preceded 1845:

> The years of the Famine, of the bad life and the hunger, arrived and broke the spirit and strength of the community. People simply wanted to survive. Their spirit of comradeship was lost. It didn't matter what ties or relations you had; you considered that person to be your friend who gave you food to put in your mouth. Recreation and leisure ceased. Poetry, music, and dancing died. These things were lost and completely forgotten. When life improved in other ways, these pursuits never returned as they had been. The Famine killed everything (Kinealy., "A Death-Dealing Famine" 155).

Within Christine Kinealy's closing quote of her analysis of the Great Hunger is the correct implication that the Irish culture was largely oral; thus the effects of massive emigration and starvation would cause some aspects of Ireland's history to vanish with its purveyors. Many emigrants, however, carry culture through diaspora, as slaves brought African religions and traditions to the west. Part of this phenomenon created the Haitian Revolution. The African diaspora populates much more of the west than Hispañiola,

resulting from the slave trade. The Irish diaspora's greatest effect was on the United States, but other places to which many famine emigrants relocated included Australia and England.

Abduction Yields Revolution

After referencing Martin Luther King's recollections of his parents and grandparents fearing that he stray under the eye of American whites in the south, author Anne C. Bailey writes: "In terms of the social impact of the slave trade and slavery in general, we do not yet know how this fear affected then and now the psyches of Africans on the continent and in the Diaspora" (155). Some can state that the slave trade was genocide. However, in doing so the implication is that Africans are all one people, feeding into stereotypes and to an extent amplifying intellectual deficiency of some white politicians.[17] To accurately measure the effects on African culture resulting from the slave trade is impossible, given first and foremost how many nations were involved. For their part, French slave traders imported 1.2 million slaves on more than 3000 voyages during the eighteenth century (Stein 518). Omnipresent in Bailey's "African Voices of the Atlantic Slave Trade" is the oral tradition of African societies, whose sites become "fodder for tourists and fiction writers alike" (7). Therefore, the extent to which specific African cultures were impacted by removing members and tradition conveyance will never be known. The cultures of Africa before the European slave trade and Irish oral traditions were both irreparably damaged by colonization.

[17]On July 8, 2003, American president George W. Bush said: "Africa is a nation that suffers from incredible disease." Source: http://abcnews.go.com/WNT/story?id=129596

Struggles and their Residue

Defeating the French colonial army and navy were Saint Domingüe slaves and their descendants, many with roots in Dahomey and the Congo. Since many came from the same west African region, slaves could speak the same languages; many shared the same religion, thus appreciating similar traditions. In an adopted and at first torturous homeland, slaves formed alliances. Eventually, sprouting from the Rights of Man and internal politics, a majority slave force extirpated de jure slavery from Haiti, by both gun and pen[18]. However, education, which can uplift poor societies, could not make the appropriate advances early, maintaining the military as the only institution of value to whose membership people aspired. Since formation, the Haitian state has represented a commercial class restricting peasants from selling goods throughout the island (Farmer 71-72). Though trade with Europe and the United States was constant in young Haiti, it occurred under the watchful eye of a Haitian upper class suppressing the majority poor peasantry. Paul Farmer attempts to dispel the meme that the nineteenth century was a "century of isolation" for Haiti, but economically, for the peasantry, perhaps the assessment is accurate (71).

Economically, educationally, and militarily, the Irish penal laws ensured that rebellion would be nearly impossible. The codes told Catholics that if they converted to

---

[18] Toussaint Louverture's first public proclamation: "I want liberty and equality to reign in Saint Domingüe." Source: "Toussaint Louverture," Madison Smartt Bell, p. 18. The Jan. 1, 1804 Haitian Declaration of Independence states: "We have dared to be free, let us be thus by ourselves and for ourselves." Source: http://www.nathanielturner.com/haitiandeclarationofindependence1804.htm
The Haitian Constitution of 1805, produced under former slave Jean-Jacques Dessalines, was an attempt to create a Haitian nation "by focusing on citizenship, political organization, and culture… Haiti became a symbol of black equality and freedom in this period." Source: "Complexities of Imagining Haiti: A Study of National Constitutions, 1801-1807," Julia Gaffield.

Protestantism, that their oppression would cease – one such case was Wolfe Tone's mother, converting to Protestantism in 1771. Penal laws made Catholic schools illegal, so learning could only occur in the open air, which made winter instruction impossible. With limitations on career choice intrinsic to the codes, Catholics could not earn enough money to buy books needed to teach. Prohibited from enlisting in the military, Irish Catholics could not learn how to implement violence against perceived or actual occupation. The rebellion of 1798, therefore, is testament to the intense desire for freedom, since it occurred during the penal age.

Today, Ireland remains partitioned, a historic result directly of the 1916 Rising and more indirectly the Ulster Plantation. Haiti, the land of successful revolution wherein since 1804 chattel slavery could not exist, suffered an earthquake in 2010, from which recovery is slow, because of both the quake's severity and long standing economic malaise. Haiti's economic issues result from many factors, some of which have been referenced previously, and some yet to be explored.

Some residents of Ireland want the island to hold two nations; those who do not recognize partition crusade for one thirty-two county Ireland. Since the 1920 partition, British, many worldwide, and unionists have called the six northeastern counties "Northern Ireland." "The Troubles," rooted in sociopolitical border conflict, left many participants in economic and psychological disarray. As of early 2017, the only political party campaigning through all thirty-two counties, Sinn Féin, aspires to eliminate partition.

Legends' Legacies

Both Toussaint Louverture and Wolfe Tone are praised for accomplishments beyond those achieved. Toussaint is generally viewed as the founder of Haiti, over which he never ruled, but is correctly assessed as he who united Saint Domingüe against empire. However, he did not complete the task of revolution, because of his arrest. If Toussaint Louverture had not been captured, would he have failed his legend? As demanding governor of French Saint Domingüe, he was already losing support. While he would not have succumbed to reinstituting slavery, how fast would he have been to take up arms against Napoleon's France? In Ireland, Wolfe Tone's vision only applied in a populous nation; he envisioned Irish religious diversity, without British presence. Thus, decades after his death, the great Irish Hunger eliminated any possibility of Tone's prescribed future for Ireland.

Toussaint Louverture and Wolfe Tone both died incarcerated by empire, before witnessing any of their objectives reached. Toussaint Louverture's goal of a state without chattel slavery was attained, though Haiti did become divided for a time and lost territory. The United Irishmen's definition of unity was never achieved. However, the Irish "free state" did form in 1926, inspiring some nationalists to connect Wolfe Tone to the modern political quest to end partition. Tone's Bantry Bay expedition can be viewed as Ireland's best hope for an independent nation. However, given how divided Ireland was in 1798, there is reason to doubt whether Tone could have united enough Irish against the British in 1796.

In 2017, world maps show a border, the partition between Ireland and Northern Ireland, though some in both regions refuse to use the words "Northern Ireland," for

political reasons. Hunger and poverty are not major issues on Ireland, but the politically aware wonder how the peace process will evolve.

In 1994, four years before the Good Friday Agreement was signed, Queen's University research fellow Kathleen Nutt and Downing College fellow Peter Gray began "Re-thinking Irish Nationalism: Identity, Difference and the Northern Conflict," by emphasizing that nationalism can be both positive and negative (7). When some in the northeastern six Irish counties hear about Irish nationalism, they tremble and think of the Troubles, when anybody could be murdered by a bomb, just for being in the wrong place at the wrong time. Could a burgeoning nationalism of unionists evolve, if Britain cuts ties with North Ireland?

Former Spanish Saint Domingüe is no longer part of Haiti, as its founders desired, but what is their relationship? Is it indicative of a neighbor, or an adversary? What is the state of Haitian nationalism? Haitian nationalism was a positive force in that it spurred expulsion of France, but current Haitian obstacles to growth include poverty, disease, and both earned disrespect and disregard for the electoral process.

To what extent is nationalism a beneficial or detrimental aspect in modern Haiti? Can Haiti be more than a land which expelled colonizers invested in the world's harshest plantation slavery? Michel-Rolph Trouillot's 2003 book, *State Against Nation*, states that Haiti's historical problems stem from the government oppressing the peasantry, which are the nation. Can that change? If so, who can do it? Can a positive form of nationalism pervade Haitian society, as transpired in Saint Domingüe, from 1791 until 1803?

The subsequent chapter will assess modern Hispañola, commenting on to what extent Toussaint Louverture's vision has been achieved on Haiti. Chapter six will discuss Wolfe Tone's legacy on Ireland. The work's concluding chapters will connect modern Hispañola and Ireland to each respective history, centering on to what extent freedom has been attained, in the face of transformed empire.

5

Struggle, Resilience, and Eternal Hope

Toussaint Louverture's goal was to unite the island of Hispañiola. The nation whose seeds he sewed, the west's second republic, would never allow chattel slavery, as had been rule of law in Saint Domingüe. However, independence does not necessary correlate with freedom. Viewed as the icon of Haiti, a land over which he never presided, Toussaint's legacy lies among activists who aspire today to remove divisions among Hispañiola peoples. Two prominent groups aiming to unify the island, as Toussaint Louverture did, are "Isleño Colectivo" and "Dominicans Love Haitians."

I was totally unaware of groups like these when I traveled to Hispañiola in December of 2015, but my trip projected to provide me a unique opportunity to see both sides of the island. I thought this to be a simple journey – I would stay at a resort in Puerto Plata in the Dominican Republican, rent a car, and then drive into Haiti to stay for a few days. Then I planned on returning to the "DR," as many call it, and go back to Haiti. My border crossing experience had most recently been driving across the border from the United States to Canada at a small crossover point in Maine. What could possibly go wrong? "Wrong" is a relative assessment, of course, coming from the perspective of an American graduate student simply, in my view, looking to speak to people in Haiti about their lives and national history.

In retrospect, clues were available that things might not be so simple. When I first looked for an interpreter, I was convinced that people regularly cross the border, and that

large portions of the Haitian population speak Spanish, and that large portions of the Dominican population speak Haitian Creole[19]. My inquiries indicated that such is not the case, though I could not envision the depth of division between the two nation states. I was aware of tensions between Dominicans and Haitians over citizenship for Dominicans of Haitian descent, but in no way did I expect to see the tumultuous border scene through which I entered Haiti on Monday, Dec. 28, 2015.

The day before my crossing, as a time share exchange guest, I was subjected to a sales pitch to buy into an all-inclusive Dominican resort. I went on this jaunt for two reasons: first, my rental car was not ready for me at the airport, even though I prepaid. Second, I knew a stellar and scrumptious breakfast was on the menu. At the time I wondered whether or not the goal of my voyage, primarily to see Haiti, would be entirely diverted. I also knew that seeing this resort had little to nothing to do with conventional Dominican culture on the island. Tony Savino, spokesman for Isleño Colectivo, a New York-based organization uniting Dominicans and Haitians for common goals, said the Dominican government does not want tourists seeing the Dominican culture. Instead, Savino said, Dominican authorities would prefer that tourists get drunk and sunbathe in the former Spanish Saint Domingüe. Many tourists thus fail to see that "Dominicans are also a victimized people," said Carlito Rovira, a former Young Lord[20], and panelist at the July 15, 2016, Isleño Colectivo discussion in New York City.

[19] Edward Paulino writes, in *Dividing Hispañiola*, that a unique form of Creole is spoken in border regions.
[20] The "Young Lords" were an activist group of Latinos and a major part of the Civil Rights Movements in many US cities in the 1960s and 1970s.

When the rental car company brought me my car on Sunday, Dec. 27, I believed I could accomplish all my research in a few days in Haiti. I even planned on returning to my resort for a day or so, and then going back to Haiti for New Year's, Haitian Independence Day. Hours previous to my finally receiving the rental car, I went on a taxi tour of Puerto Plata. I asked the taxi driver his thoughts about Toussaint Louverture. He seemed unaware of Louverture's vision to bring the island together. However, he had harsh words for Jean-Jacques Dessalines' sanctioned violence against previous residents of Spanish Saint-Domingüe, some of whom had fought with Louverture before his arrest.

Another taxi driver who had chauffeured resort guests to the sales pitches offered to let me follow him to the border that Monday. I waited for him the next morning at the resort. I was told it would take three to four hours to get from the northwest portion of the Dominican Republic to the northernmost border to Haiti – how could that be? Either way, I started early, and, as an experienced driver in many parts of the United States, thought I would have no problems. I had found a Creole interpreter through Facebook; his name was Wildy. I looked forward to meeting him at the border. Yes, I had paid him before I left for the island. My $50 deposit was supposed to be followed by $300 more. Months later, I do not recall how I planned to distribute the remaining payments. I can say that the drive to the border did, however, take between three and four hours. I thought about taking a picture of the sign reading "Haíti," with the arrow pointing right, but I was too glad just to see it[21].

[21] I momentarily lost the highway in Monte Cristi, the last major city on the road to border city Dajabón. Highways in the Northwest of the Dominican Republic are one lane each way, but some roads just do not appear like highways at all, so I knew I needed to ask for directions to Dajabón, gladly provided by two Monte Cristi residents.

Our cultural experience dictates expectation. I was thinking that I would just present my American passport, and would be allowed into the land whose de facto founder I was studying and legacy I was assessing. Wildy told me so as well, proving that island residents can also be unfamiliar with this process. This attempt to directly analyze, if seen by others more familiar with island life near Dajabón, exposes my own deficiencies in attaining profound conclusions.

Finding Wildy

Wildy, a Haitian college student, was the first person to respond to my Facebook post asking for an interpreter. While he did not speak Spanish, he did speak Creole, and I was willing to compromise and work with him. I had hoped he could make it to the resort where I was staying in Puerto Plata. He had offered to try to travel illegally on a relative's passport, but I told him that he should not take any such risks for me. In retrospect, that would have been a more relaxing experience, but it would have been less authentic. I thought I would drive my rented Kia Sportage, as island residents had recommended I rent a four-wheel drive vehicle for Haiti, across the border into Haiti with other cars, while pedestrians would walk in their own path, clearly delineated by border officers. I imagined that's how things are at the United States-Mexico border, and I had already seen a Canadian border crossing.

Broader Reality for the Masses – Border Reality on Hispañiola

Well, this is not how things are at Dajabón, especially on Mondays and Fridays, which are "no passport" days for Dominicans and Haitians, meaning that any Dominican and any Haitian can sell goods at the market, with or without a passport. As of 2011,

Dominican passports cost about forty dollars[22], and first time adult applicants must provide multiple forms of identification, and prove their taxes are paid (Nuñez). A Haitian passport costs Haitians $250, Wildy said, making the cost out of reach for the Haitian majority. Regarding process, a November, 2013 question on "The Haitian Internet Newsletter" depicts the struggles of diaspora Haitians attempting to see loved ones who wish to leave Haiti for the first time. I encountered issues navigating Haiti, where many residents feel they are geographically incarcerated. Getting a passport "is beyond [complicated.] Nothing is simple in Haiti," wrote Parisien Salvant Lagrand (Haitian Internet Newsletter). The difficulties of some Dominicans and more Haitians in obtaining passports significantly enlarge the Monday and Friday crowds at "La Frontera," (the border, in English) market in Dajabón. On "no-passport" days, the three block crowd is like New Year's Eve in Times Square, except the people are desperate to sell whatever they can to ensure their families' economic survival.

This market, what Americans would call a giant flea market, is what I saw when I first made that right turn. Shortly thereafter, a soldier directed me left, to customs. I had been messaging Wildy all morning, and thought he would be waiting for me on the other side of the border. I was expecting to see a waiting area for Haitian pedestrians, where Wildy held a sign with my name on it. That, on a border crossing on Monday or Friday, is like a pet unicorn. Since I did not see Wildy, I was unsure how to proceed.

[22]According to the International Fund for Agricultural Development, in 2014, a third of rural Dominicans were living in poverty, making obtaining passports a dream.
http://www.ruralpovertyportal.org/country/home/tags/dominican_republic

Entz, a customs worker, said he would help me find Wildy across the border, but there are no parking lots in customs, so I had to park my car at a Dajabón hotel. This cost a few hundred Dominican Pesos. I was concerned that I may have to keep the car there for a long period of time. Of greater concern was that I would have to pay $250 to drive the car across the border[23]. Since my purpose was to get into Haiti, where Wildy had agreed to host me, I was willing to walk across and meet Wildy, and address these complications later.

Entz spoke Creole, Spanish, and English, though he did not seem very fluent in English. I clearly understood "Watch your pockets," as he and I walked on the footbridge over the Artibonite River, hoping to find Wildy. If we had not found him, I would have had to return to Puerto Plata, and return home to the United States without seeing Haitian daily life at all. That was unacceptable, but looking like a possibility by then. When we did not find Wildy, after walking across and back, I got the car. I believe the only reason why I had to return to customs with Entz, after we failed to locate Wildy, was that I had to get my car registration. That detail is a bit hazy; however, the next images are indelible. I am preparing to drive away, in defeat, and I hear, "Michael!" Yes, it was Wildy, who took advantage of the "no passport" day to walk across from Haiti to the Dominican Republic, and find me. Some Dominicans, but little to no Haitians, have skin as light as mine. Even fewer at the border spoke English fluently. I was easy to locate.

Sometimes it is about the Money

[23]The rental car company had said that driving to the border was complicated. I discovered later, that if I had told them I was going to do this, I could have saved seventy United States dollars. As will be revealed later, since this is a trip that few make, few know the details.

I had told the customs officials I did not have the $250 necessary to cross the border. I had lied. I did have it, but I was not going to pay that, unless I had an interpreter for the other side. I speak Spanish fluently, resulting primarily from an undergraduate Spanish major, but I do not speak Creole. I do not believe there are very many fluently trilingual in English, Spanish, and Creole, though those that are do work at the Haitian-Dominican border. Entz's trilingualism makes him an anomaly, but nets him a good job working with Haitian customs.

When Entz and I had first walked across the border together, I had paid ten dollars to cross. I had seen quite a few people with handfuls of cash near customs. Who were these people? I had planned to get across the border, and then exchange some money at a currency exchange house or at a bank. This is what I had done on every other overseas trip, except one: when in Kenya, Diana, one of my hostesses had helped me get a better rate on Kenyan schillings for dollars in the "black market." The transaction included Diana being introduced to a man outside an open air market, and then discussing how many schillings I would get for my dollars. Since my hostess spoke Swahili, Kenya's first language, I did make this exchange. However, upon walking across the Dominican border with Haiti, I did not know who to trust. Therefore, I made no such transaction. Additionally, I believe I speak for many Americans in saying black market financial exchanges make us uncomfortable, regardless of the country. My experience instructed me to wait to cross the border and go to a currency house, or a bank. Once Wildy and I finally met in person, I was confident I would be able to find a cash machine or a bank that would assist me in spending multiple days in the land for which Toussaint Louverture is best remembered.

With my first objective reached. I was going to drive into Haiti, with Wildy in the passenger's seat. At a moment, however, before we set out through the masses of Dajabón market customers, sellers, and transients, Entz was sitting beside me, and asked me to pay him. I did, which Wildy said was not necessary. Twenty more American dollars and a hundred Dominican pesos were gone. Did he need the money more than me? Yes. Did I still need it? Yes. Apparently Entz, who walked with a limp resulting from what he said was a motorcycle accident, was just doing his job, and had asked for a bribe. I complied with a custom that occurs much more often in impoverished countries than in developed nations. It is likely that as a white man surrounded by people of color, speaking with a clear American accent, race played a part in how I was viewed at the border. In all the commotion, however, and in all the trekking through masses on the sidewalk, on foot and on a motorcycle with Entz, I never felt my life was in danger. It just felt like chaos like that I have never observed at any border, or anywhere. Our car may have been a cause of disarray, as soldiers had to escort our car across the border, while pedestrians tapped my rented vehicle. When I had the window open, in ninety-plus degree heat sans humidity, another soldier asked for a bribe. A few border walkers asked for a dollar or two. I had to refuse, because I wanted to stay in Haiti for a few days, and lack of cultural communication and understanding ensures that many Haitians and Dominicans believe all Americans are wealthy. Perhaps the majority of Americans is wealthy compared to the majority of Hispañiola residents, but ranking wealth is subjective according to national economies. In my view, an American standard, I am not close to wealthy. However, this scene did inform me as to why and how wealthy philanthropists do not want to interact with poor masses.

Instead, such wealth donated to poor nations, Haiti and the Dominican Republic two examples, is focused on specific projects. In Haiti, many projects are focused on healthcare.

After I gave Wildy a muffin I had bought at the last gas station I went to before arriving at the border, Wildy told me that his phone had run out of power, so he had never gotten any of my messages. We were now scheduled to go back to his home at Fort Liberté, a few minutes from the Dajabón border, on what my map of the island said was Route 111. I do not know if we were on the highway immediately, but our first step on the journey included us in a sport utility vehicle, and perhaps another car or two going up a hill, along with hundreds of people either on motorcycles, or walking. Some walkers, it appeared, were carrying their lives with them. I clearly was wealthy compared to all of them; I may have had ten times the wealth of fifty others on that road, but personally, that became less relevant, as a police officer pulled us off the road. I of course could not speak to him, but Wildy did. I pulled off the road, with "off" meaning to the side, as hundreds of walkers passed us by. Wildy came back to the car about ten minutes later, and said I would have to pay sixty American dollars to drive in Haiti. I was very disappointed that I had to give my last two twenty-dollar bills and twenty singles for the right to drive. However, I paid. Wildy later said that if I had not paid, Haitian authorities had the right to confiscate the car[24]. Wildy had asked me to bring singles because, my interpreter said, it was very likely that Haitian children would randomly ask me for a dollar, if we were walking around Fort Liberté, or anywhere else on Haiti. Wildy had suggested that I be prepared to give dollars,

[24]Former president Michel Martelly had wanted to promote tourism. With fees like these, tourism by ground did not appear to be encouraged.

because one dollar at that time was close to fifty Haitian Gourde.[25] The fifty dollars I sent Wildy before I traveled went a long way towards his college tuition, and a few months after I returned, he said he had no more need for payment.

When the decision was made to go to Cap-Haitien I do not recall. However, we took a tour, and driving in a Haitian city is preparation to drive anywhere. In the Dominican Republic, drivers have to take care not to hit the motorcycles. This is true in Haiti as well, but the cities are more densely populated, and just as in the island's eastern neighbor, traffic laws are only suggestions. Perhaps we went to Cap-Haitien to find the automatic teller machine, so I could obtain some gourde. It was out of order. I had plans to see a few Haitian landmarks, early Haitian historical sites Sans-Souci, and the Citadel, but at that time I had to tell Wildy that without gourde, the only currency accepted at gas stations, I would have to return to the Dominican Republic the following day.

We drove under an arch welcoming us to Fort Liberté, but before settling in for the night, Wildy ushered me to Fort Saint Joseph. First we moved through an area with tree lined streets and pristine architecture. Wildy said the block was maintained by the Catholic Church. I asked if it was middle class, and he said yes. Then the roads and housing deteriorated as we approached the fort, adjacent to the Caribbean Sea, below a rocky cliff. In the United States, this might be designated national park space. I thankfully remembered friends saying I should drive an SUV. Before we got out of the car on the northern coast, I saw a young man and woman kissing under a tree, in the heat. Since I would not get the

[25]After I returned in January, the gourde weakened, to sixty-one to the dollar. However, 2016 reports are that inflation is slowing in Haiti, meaning that the gourde may stabilize.

chance to see Citadel or Sans-Souci, this would be the best sightseeing Haiti would provide me. While Haitians fortunate enough to be able to relax at Fort Saint Joseph can do so, I thought, “This could be so much more.” When we were enveloped by the traffic in Cap-Haitien, Wildy said, “This is Haiti.” On our ride from Cap-Haitien to the water, I mentioned that the Haitian people are very resilient. Wildy: “We have no choice.”

One Night in Haiti

I hesitated to say anything when we arrived at Fort Liberté, but I was starving. However, I still wanted to present Wildy with gifts. First was a “Mamajuana” drink mix given to me at the previous day’s timeshare sales presentation. I do not know if Wildy’s family had ever heard of “Mamajuana,” but it is part of Dominican tradition. I had more muffins, specifically corn muffins. Given the dearth of roadside establishments to buy food in Haiti, I suspect they were in demand. They were eaten quickly. One gift I forgot to give was swim goggles, because I had envisioned us going to the beach together, a shore visit that would have to wait. I did not want to ask about food, knowing how starvation is an issue more in Haiti than in any other nation, but I did not need to do so. Wildy and his family offered me dinner, “Gratsinee,” a mixture of noodles, vegetables, and meat that looked like ham. This may translate to au gratin, but Haitian cooking, like Haitian culture, is a unique mix which is difficult to classify. I was not disappointed with the size of the plate nor the contents, but it certainly was not something to which I was accustomed. It did not matter. I was famished, after hours at the border, and subsequent hours navigating a country, collectively challenging residents and visitors alike. Water we drank was bought purified, in bags. Travel advisories inform tourists not to drink Haitian tap water. Unlike

in Mexico, however, where native Mexicans can drink their water, but American tourists are advised not to, in Haiti, many residents do not even consume water from their own faucets.[26]

After dinner I met houseguest Dennis, business owner from Chicago, who said he was born in Haiti, ran his business in the United States, and had returned. I asked him about the people of his homeland. He said that Haitians tend to be selfish, always trying to surpass each other in wealth and power. Did that mean my rental car might be damaged or stolen, impeding my journey back to the Dominican Republic? Wildy was concerned. Therefore, after dark he suggested that I park my car down the steps, in a stone encasement around the corner from my accommodations, owned by Wildy's aunt Leonid. I thought he knew best, but the car got stuck in the mud down the incline. In my neighborhood, in the United States, there are tow trucks accessible during the day, and even one all day service.

What could we do? How would I get back to the Dominican Republic if we could not extract the car from the mud? I could not see myself riding a "Tap-tap," a hybrid between a bus and a scooter, on which people stand, from Wildy's family's enclave to the border, but I would do that if necessary. In a flash, however, ten neighbors came and helped get the car out of the mud. Fifteen minutes later I parked it again on the street. Tony Savino, Isleño Colectivo spokesman, responded to my personal Haitian narrative: Compared to the Dominican Republic, "More of a communal nature" exists in Haiti.

[26]Seventy percent of Haiti's eight million people have no access to safe drinking water at home. Diseases can be transmitted through tainted water use: https://thewaterproject.org/water-crisis/water-in-crisis-haiti.

Since my hosts expected me to be accompanied by my wife, a full-size bed was accorded me, in what Wildy said was a typical middle class Haitian home. Eight people lived in five rooms. On Dec. 28, 2015, I was their guest. Wildy, his sister Daphnée, and I shared the bedroom that night. Before going to sleep, lights flickered intermittently[27]. I had brought insect repellent to protect me from mosquitoes, but brother and sister hosts burned incense to further ensure safety[28].I slept on the question of whether a culture be divided such that people compete for limited opportunity, yet simultaneously feel kinship.

His plan to hide the car unsuccessful, Wildy was still wary of possible damage or theft of the car, so he awoke very early and watched it, until I was ready to leave. Theft was unlikely, based upon what Wildy told me about driving cars in Haiti: if parents or guardians do not own an automobile, children they raise are unlikely to ever drive anything bigger than a motorcycle.

I remember awakening early as well, because of a woman preaching outside. Wildy said she was attempting to recruit followers to her sect of Christianity, though I do not recall the specifics. Having observed the extraordinary hospitality of my hosts, and fellow Fort Liberté residents, my introduction to Haitian daily life would soon be over. Before leaving, I washed myself as my hosts always did, using a bucket and cloth, demonstrating a major difference between the middle classes of Haiti and most other nations. I am most appreciative of all the benefits of seeing a developing nation. However, my own American

---

[27] In November, 2014, Fort Liberté resident marched in the streets against government failure to consistently provide the Cap-Haitien suburb electricity. In quelling the unrest, rubber bullets were employed, and a child was killed: http://www.satellitemagazine.ca/2015/07/everything-you-touch-is-a-problem/

[28]Some mosquitoes carry malaria, but risk in Haiti is very low in most areas, according to the American Center for Disease Control.

middle class cultural background clearly affected my ability to observe in and participate in such a culture.

While accompanying me to the border for my exit on December 29, I asked Wildy whether or not a people competing for limited opportunities can share function as a nation. He said yes. Perhaps whether this would be true about other countries would depend upon the nation in question. Upon leaving Haiti, I had to pay $10 again. Some doubted that was legal, but the border guards had asked for even more. I told the bilingual people at the border how much I had already spent, and they let me pay the ten. I exchanged my last few dollars for Dominican money in Dajabón, at a bank, and I had more money for the rest of the week.

Who Goes There? Why Would You?

I had been warned not to drive to Haiti by the owner of the resort where I stayed, but he did not give details as to any danger I might encounter. Not once, in my week on Hispañiola, did I never felt that my life was in danger. The French-Canadian born resort owner said that he had been to Haiti only once, to meet with the owner of both supermarkets in Haitian capital Port au-Prince, adding that he traveled with a diplomat. Such travel would have shielded him from many problems of daily Haitian life. The vegetables sold to the markets for resale were of inferior quality, he said, and the prices were too high. Yet, they continued to be sold. Comparing Port au-Prince to the packed Cap-Haitien is like juxtaposing the traffic of Manhattan in rush hour with similar travel in Jersey City, New Jersey. How difficult is it to live in Port au-Prince, unless wealthy? Can the wealthy and upper middle class escape seeing poverty every day in Haiti? I suspect not.

Misconceptions; Stereotypes, or Jumping to Conclusions?

The views of Haitian culture, however, are distributed freely in the Dominican Republic. "There's nothing there," I was told by the resort owner. The resort owner's wife waited until their employee of Haitian descent left the office before saying that Haitians are brutes, and that they cut down all their trees for no reason[29].

Benefits of Egress

With so little experience on actual Haiti, upon my return to the United Sates I sought out perspective on Haitian culture from the diaspora perspective, only to first find that Dominicans are often in discussion with Haitians regarding efforts for Haiti's progress. I attended panels on Haiti at New York City's Left Forum, a Haitian Flag Day celebration, a Haitian Mother's Day celebration, a discussion of Haitian literature hosted by Yanick Lahens, and "Sin Fronteras: the Struggle for Workers' Rights in Haiti, the Dominican Republic, and New York City." "Sin Fronteras," included activists from "Isleño Colectivo," "Dominicans Love Haitians," founded by Dominican-American New Yorker Clarivel Ruiz, "Black Lives Matter in the Dominican Republic," begun by Queens labor organizer Ray LaForest, and New York Dominican labor organizer Virgilio Aran. Also on the July 15, 2016 panel were Jackie, a Haitian-American labor organizer, non-gender conforming Haitian-American Noah Richard, and Dominican translator Ama Üry.

Referring to racial hierarchy borne of eugenics, Ruiz said of all Hispañiola residents: "We're all black," saying that Dominicans too often fall victim to "the disease

[29]In October of 2016, during Hurricane Matthew, a Weather Channel meteorologist in the United States said there are few trees in Haiti because Haitians eat the trees. This was roundly criticized as discriminatory, but it still was said.

of racism." LaForest, whose skin tone resembles that of Barack Obama, said he has been referred to as white by fellow Dominicans. On Haiti, Wildy said that former Haitian president Jean-Bertrand Aristide ended colorism, the divide between mixed race people and those perceived as purely of African descent. However, Isleño Colectivo's Jackie said that colorism in Haiti is still a factor[30].

Two Nations

Before discovering the depths of cooperation among activists in New York City and Hispañiola, I attended a Haitian Flag Day celebration, a Haitian Mother's Day commemoration, and a discussion by Haitian writer Yanick Lahens, on the significance of Haitian literature to Haiti and the diaspora.[31] These celebrations and a free breakfast at New York City Hall were among the many events held in May, traditionally Haitian Heritage Month in US cities. The Haitian Flag Day celebration honored five Haitian-Americans for their contributions to the arts: fields included choreography, acting, and music production. The congressman sponsoring the event indicated general appreciation for the diaspora, and a desire for Haitian-American votes. Lahens' Queens Museum forum presented panelists speaking majority Haitian Creole. Audience members who spoke neither French nor Creole could not understand, though Lahens did respond to one Haitian-American woman in English, after the questioner said she spoke neither desired language. While the lack of Dominican presence at these events does not necessarily dictate Dominican discrimination

[30]David Nicholls' 1979 book *From Dessalines to Duvalier* states that two competing ideologies of Haiti's early history fostered these divisions. The mulatto version of early Haiti puts mixed race people at the head of the revolution and attributes discrimination against them to Toussaint Louverture.

[31]According to migrationpolicy.org, (http://www.migrationpolicy.org/article/haitian-immigrants-united-states) as of 2013, 158,000 Haitian migrants lived in the New York Metropolitan Area, second only to Miami in places to which Haitians emigrate.

against Haitian culture, it does indicate that divisions targeted for elimination by "Isleño Colectivo," and "Dominicans Love Haitians" are formidable.

The task of activist organizations in unification is monumental, according to Silvio Torres-Saillant, who in 1998 analyzed the relationship between Dominican identity and blackness: "Dominicans commemorate the War of Restoration, fought against white Spaniards, with as much patriotic fervor as they do the War of Independence, fought against black Haitians" (131). The Toussaint Louverture Airport is in Haiti, not in the Dominican Republic, thereby indicating for whom Louverture is a hero, contradictory to his undiscovered vision for both French and Spanish Saint Domingüe, all of which Toussaint viewed as his homeland. Though the Dominican Republic's wealth is far from that of a world power, Dominican per capita income more than tripled from 1965 to 2005[32]. In contrast, Haiti's poverty worsened over the past fifty years. In 2008, per household incomes in Haiti were two-thirds what they were in 1960 (Eberstadt). The average wealth disparity could explain why some Dominicans want to sociologically distance themselves from Haitians. In class solidarity, poor Dominicans are more likely to support efforts to unite both nations against economic subjugation. Fewer than twenty attended the "Sin Fronteras" meeting, and the most impoverished, both Haitian and Dominican, are not in New York City. The poorest are geographically and economically incarcerated on Hispañiola.

[32]One cause of this average increase could be fewer people in the Dominican Republic. Dominican immigration to the United States began en masse under dictator Rafael Trujillo, reached nearly a million by 2012. (http://www.migrationpolicy.org/article/foreign-born-dominican-republic-united-states)

The boundary of an unlocked fence through which thick masses walk, and a few drive in Dajabón, define two distinct nations. Both, however, are affected by colonialism's diverse yet consistently oppressive history. The distinct atmosphere of Haiti, compared to that of the Dominican Republic, is reflective of the legacy of harsh plantation slavery -- more than two centuries after such removal was effected by the Haitian Revolution.[33]

On Legacy

Though Toussaint Louverture saw the former Saint Domingüe, now Hispañiola, as one land, into which he aspired to bring "liberty and equality," his arrest by Napoleon and Haiti's national history complicate assessment of his legacy. Early leadership in Haiti was ineffective for a myriad of reasons, outlined in chapter two. Thus, what was once Haiti, one state, has been divided into Haiti and the Dominican Republic. Efforts by Haiti to reclaim the eastern section of Hispañiola were unsuccessful. Today the two cultures are extremely distinct, ensuring one island nation an impossible goal. However, the cultural divisions do not dictate that more economic stability is unattainable for both nations. I walked over the Artibonite River from a country which few associate with Toussaint Louverture to the land in which he is seen as a vehicle who drove to independence. However, Toussaint never ruled Haiti, a truth which confounds assessment of a revolutionary icon's historical place.

Toussaint Louverture's ability to unite disparate factions demonstrates that the Dominican Republic is a product of Napoleon Bonaparte's arresting Toussaint Louverture.

[33]Slavery in the Spanish part of Saint Domingüe, though still bondage, was not as harsh as that in the French part of the island. As stated in chapter two, tortures of slaves in the French portion were given names, they were so commonly used.

Before Jean-Jacques Dessalines led Haiti to independence, Toussaint had envisioned a French colony free of slavery. Toussaint had fused diverse interests, but without him, Haiti was born into a nineteenth century world unwilling to cultivate Haiti's growth. Thus, Toussaint Louverture's legacy is limited geographically. However, activist groups seeking to unite common interests, mostly economic, of Haiti and the Dominican Republic, are Toussaint's revolutionary descendants.

Chapter seven will connect Haiti's more recent past to the present and future, proposing solutions to ending Michel Rolph-Trouillot's assessment of "State Against Nation." Suggestions have come from journalists, activists, and Jacques, a forty-something Long Island resident, and native of Cap-Haitien.

6

On Unity, Uprising, and Revolutionary Success

The specifics of a quest for national identity can change with the times. Wolfe Tone's vision of unity, and that of current Irish nationalists, have the same geographic goal. Since Wolfe Tone never saw partition, he only saw Ireland as a diverse group of different faiths, which needed unity to prosper in their home. Nationalists today, however, are working to remove partition. Stemming from history of politically based sectarian conflict, immense barriers exist to realizing both visions of unity. While the basic goals of Wolfe Tone's unity and the objective of today's nationalists differ, the ultimate goal of one nation under one government on one island reconvenes them. Accordingly, supporters of modern nationalism will employ Tone's doctrine in their rhetoric, adding to Tone's legend.

Fifty years after Wolfe Tone's death, Ireland endured the Great Hunger, severely inhibiting the chances of successful rebellion. After the mass exodus from Ireland, mostly to the United States, but also to other English-speaking parts of the world, any desire to revolt became suppressed either by religious survivor's guilt or the fact that no revolt in a population that small could succeed. More than a century after Tone's death, the rising, and two subsequent wars on Irish soil, led to the partition of Ireland, with twenty-six counties to the south and northwest, while the six northeastern counties, Northern Ireland, retained a relationship with the United Kingdom. Eight decades later, the peace process began on Good Friday, 1998, ending The Troubles, a politically based conflict fought largely over sectarian lines in the Irish northeast.

If delayed success is achievement nonetheless, then to what extent does the peace process evolve from Wolfe Tone's original vision of Ireland as one nation, under one government? "The peace process is not a legacy of Wolfe Tone," said retired Irish language teacher Sean O'Tuath, at a Derry pub. However, in a bar where the "N-word" is "Northern Ireland," the implication was that the Republic's formation may be a partial accomplishment of Wolfe Tone's vision. With twenty-six out of thirty-two counties free, by Irish republican standards, "Have you failed, or what?" O'Tuath asked.

Wolfe Tone concluded that the only way to remove English influence from Ireland was through violence. Tone's advocacy for attacking England to accomplish this end connects him to the IRA, whose bombing campaign in England targeted prime minister Margaret Thatcher and killed her best friend, Airey Neave. As of the summer of 2016, British officials had not said that the IRA bombings in England pushed the peace process forward. However, both Michael, a business owner in Belfast who recalled knowing many IRA members, and James Brennan, a history degree holder from University College in Dublin, said that the IRA's English bombings pressured England to push militant unionists to sit down and discuss truce. However, this view minimizes the role of foreign influences facilitating peace, and totally negates that in response to the IRA attacking England, loyalists attacked Catholics. Therefore, both sides can effectively argue that violence was effective in achieving piece.

Michael said he was once a republican, but "it wore me down." When asked about the peace process, he praised Bill Clinton for his role in taking the time to get to know the people of the North, which paved the way toward peace, alongside aid of other nations.

Regarding the conflict in which he knew many who participated, he recalled a Catholic bishop's quote from the 1970s that, he felt, forced many to take up arms against governments he deemed illegitimate. To Michael and many nationalists, political solutions did not exist under those elected by northern Irish Protestants. Referring to both the past and the present, Michael said: "There is no such thing as a moderate unionist politician."

James Brennan, recent history major graduate from University College in Dublin, disagreed: "The peace process would not have passed without moderate Unionist politicians." Sometimes necessity forces moderation. Michael suggested that the British told unionists that if they did not negotiate and help bring peace, that the United Kingdom might have stopped funding the high percentage of civil service jobs available in the northeastern six counties. Therefore, Michael implied, today counties Antrim, Armagh, Down, Fermanagh, Derry, and Tyrone, need Great Britain more than their founding nation needs them. A loss of this funding could cause the populous of the North to vote for unification, if the government were not providing jobs[34]. Brennan said English living in Britain still hold a sense of pride in its connection with the northeastern six counties, part of an "empire." Therefore, Brennan says, the United Kingdom would be unlikely to allow the realization of Irish nationalist vision. Michael, who knew IRA members who would be dead if not for the Good Friday Agreement, was even harsher on unionists: "They're more British than the British themselves."

[34]Various parts of the Good Friday agreement called for more equitable distribution of Catholics and Protestants in civil service jobs. Still, however, many neighborhoods in Belfast are segregated according to interpretations of Christianity, meaning that people will work together, but will only speak to people from the previous "other side" of the conflict while at work.

Caroline Redmond, of Ballycastle, Northern Ireland, identifying herself as an Ulster-Scot, has a view unique to her geographic area and historical background. Redmond, who knows of family members first coming to the North in the nineteenth century, said she would prefer that the six northeastern counties, known to many as Northern Ireland, form their own nation, rather than become part of one island country. In part inspiration for this view must be Britain's Brexit vote, which proved that to many British voters, staying in the United Kingdom is not a high priority. Could the northeastern six counties vote to secede from the United Kingdom? No vote on this has ever been taken, but if this vote does form a second nation adjacent to the Irish republic, such would be an expression of nationalism.

Fergal O'Rourke, thirty-two, of Dublin, born in eastern border city Newry, said Redmond's aspiration of a twenty-six county nation and a six county nation is more likely than that of Irish nationalists, one thirty-two county Ireland. O'Rourke's view of the 1998 Good Friday represents that of many around the border, once laden with military outposts, and now decorated by peace statues and monuments: "I wanted to stop people being killed."

Regarding the peace negotiations, Michael, the Belfast native and 2016 business owner, feels the party to which he was once loyal, Sinn Féin, gave away too much, and should be campaigning more toward one nation under one government. Two decades after the Good Friday Agreement was signed by both unionists and nationalists, Michael was critical of Sinn Féin candidates agreeing to share power with unionists on councils in the six northeastern counties, believing that the former political arm of the IRA ceded too much

ground. “Sinn Féin shares; unionists don’t,” he said. Devoted unionists share Michael’s skepticism over the peace process. Three years after the Good Friday Agreement was ratified, fear reigned that hostilities would again erupt. Within Northern Ireland, in a sluggish 2001 economy, “some working class Protestants felt they had got nothing from the Good Friday Agreement” (Kinealy., “War and Peace: Ireland Since the 1960s” 305).

Redmond said that while Wolfe Tone “didn’t achieve very much,” there were places in Ballycastle, among the northernmost points in all of Northern Ireland, where the United Irishmen met. Wolfe Tone, however, had forsaken talking, because he knew British authorities targeted him for arrest in 1795. Today organizations like Corrymeela, out of Antrim, referred to by Redmond, and Greenhat, founded by Bryony May in Fermanagh, bring former guerrilla war foes and their supporters together in efforts to move the peace process forward.

The peace process is “not going very far very fast,” said Derry’s Eamon Melaugh. Though Wolfe Tone had decided that military means were the only way to achieve his goal, Melaugh, 83, a Derry native and world traveler, said Tone was his “political hero.” Melaugh recalled organizing the first northern Irish civil rights march in Derry in 1968: the beginning of a campaign which started for housing rights, and evolved into a quest for equal voting rights, and an end to gerrymandering. Both Michael, of Belfast, and the older Melaugh, from Derry, assailed today’s Irish republicans. Michael, 57, said that upon the dissolution of the IRA, Sinn Féin leaders’ compromises left those willing to die for causes without a party. Melaugh, identifying himself as a socialist, said that the only true

republicans are members of a workers' party, denouncing the levels of violence by the IRA during the Troubles. "The Workers' Party are real republicans."

Melaugh said that even if Wolfe Tone had successfully reached Irish shores in 1796, that Ireland would not have been able to attain victory against Britain in the form of separation. Perhaps fortified with understanding of 1798 strife as justification, Melaugh believes that Irish division would have prevented Wolfe Tone from achieving his goal, even if French ships had found shore. "I don't think they ever had a chance," Melaugh said of Tone's first expedition. Stephen Howe, author of "Speaking of 98: History, Politics and Memory in the Bicentenary of the 1798 United Irish Uprising," echoes Melaugh's skepticism:

> Ulster Protestant radicalism remained imbued with religious, and at least latently sectarian, elements, as did that of Catholic Leinster. Had the United Irishmen succeeded - and in the even more unlikely event of their having been able to consolidate their success, rather than being overwhelmed by new British reinforcements - it must be doubted whether they would have remained United, or introduced a secular democratic state (228).

Melaugh said efforts to unify working class people from both Catholic and Protestant backgrounds were perennially thwarted by the Protestant Orange Order, founded in the 1790s, after Wolfe Tone's exile. "I am not non-sectarian. I am anti-sectarian," said Melaugh, indicating staying out of conflict is not enough to transform a society. Being against the conflict itself is how to effect new narratives.

A July 29, 2016 Irish Journal article reported results of an Irish republic survey on one Irish island nation, and political parties' popularities. Data compiled by the Irish independent polling company Red C. revealed that two-thirds of those surveyed only months previously would have voted to accept what many call "Northern Ireland" as part of their nation.

For decades, Sinn Feín has been the only political party to campaign in all thirty-two counties comprising both Ireland and Northern Ireland, controversial to some due to its mere existence. However, either in response to, or with previous understanding of the survey figures, Fíanna Fáil, the most popular party as per the survey, at twenty-eight percent, announced that it too would begin to campaign in Northern Ireland, targeting 2019 as a date to win elections (McNamee; Kevin Doyle) Sinn Feín, polls in third place at fifteen percent, and may always face problems with voters because of well-publicized historical roots with the IRA.

Fíanna Faíl was formed by Rising leader Eamonn de Valera, Ireland's first president, spared by the British because of his American birth. In second place with twenty-seven percent favorability is Fíne Gael (McNamee), begun by William Cosgrave, Ireland's first prime minister, or in Irish, Taoiseach. Cosgrave and de Valera disagreed as to whether Michael Collins should have signed the treaty that led to the modern borders separating Northern Ireland from Ireland, referred to early in its history as the "Free State." Cosgrave disagreed with De Valera's sending of Collins to sign the Anglo-Irish treaty. Nationalists eventually surrendered the northeastern six counties' Catholics to what was for nearly fifty

years “A Protestant state for a Protestant people,” as stated by Northern Ireland prime ministers.

Nearly a century later, below the article revealing poll data, comments indicate a spirited debate as to whether a united Ireland, thirty-two counties under one government, is feasible. Politics, history, and economics all are casually cited as obstacles. Perhaps the best analysis of what one Irish island nation would be is: “A united Ireland is a bit like watching two blokes throwing insults at each other out on the street and then going out and inviting the two randomers into your home to continue their argument, and the icing on the cake is you get to pay for their keep also” (Macdonagh). Tommy Macdonagh’s online comment echoes the sentiment of Dublin taxi driver Thomas Maher, who said the nationalist vision of a united Ireland works great “in theory,” but economic issues prevent this transformation from happening “with one stroke of a pen,” as Sinn Féin President Gerry Adams said at Drew University on November 5, 2009.

Economic barriers blend with historically rooted political oppositions, from the Troubles and beyond, preventing productive dialogue in the Stormont government. Michael, the northern Irish restauranteur who knew IRA members, said: “They can’t even go to the toilet together,” referring to the Northern Irish Assembly, implicating both unionists and nationalists in governmental gridlock. Maher’s exaggerated comment that the people of the North pay “no taxes” is indicative of the fear that many Irish politicians may have of an obligation to fund an economically weak North, if Britain stops funding the northeastern six counties. In response to Michael’s theory that a united Ireland could occur if Great Britain stopped funding civil service jobs in the North, leading to mass

migration on the part of Unionist Protestants, Brennan said, “I don’t think they’ll abandon their home.”

Both Northern Irelanders, and residents of the Irish Republic, or the “twenty-six counties” as usually stated by Sinn Feín and their supporters, would have to vote by referendum for Ireland to become one nation under one Dublin government.

Both O’Rourke, holder of a degree in law and economics, of Dublin, and Brennan, of Bundoran, said a border culture can influence people into expecting benefits from one side or the other. Examples include going to the hospital in the North, or collecting better unemployment benefits in the republic. “It’s a different time,” said Sean O’Tuath, the retired Irish language instructor, recalling young men being taken off buses by British soldiers during the Troubles. Michael, the Belfast business owner, said the availability of benefits in the North enables massive fraud, stalling the peace process at partition, for those that yearn for evolution. One person’s fraud can be interpreted as just working within the system that allows collection of or access to benefits, Brennan said.

If politics is war by other means, then the border city of Derry can still be considered a “war zone,” as several pub patrons believe[35]. However, the current hostilities are regulated by an agreement prohibiting violence. While nearly all agree that eighteen years of peace is better than a quarter century of guerrilla war, the evolution of the peace process, or lack thereof, is a source of tension for those who participated in or were affected

[35]A few blocks from the pub is a cloistered Protestant neighborhood, with a unionist flag, protected by barbed wire on the flagpole. Surrounded by Catholic areas, a sign, white written on black, says they are “under siege.” Still there is peace – just no interaction except at work.

by Troubles violence. In the North, that was everywhere, even in northernmost Antrim, said Redmond.

Violence at the hands of the IRA is no longer a daily fear of British politicians, as it was when the IRA attacked England. Nor do border residents, a majority of whom are still either Catholic or Protestant, fear bombings. However, attaining milestones in reconciliation takes effort by more than just a few select organizations. “For the most part, people would rather have peace than confront the partition issue,” Brennan said. Even Belfast restauranteur Michael, who said he understood why some in the IRA resorted to violence, did not fear a total deconstruction of the peace process. However, he added that political progress of peace is not a priority of the young in the North. Using an expletive, Michael, whose business lies in a mixed area near a college, said that younger people only care about economic opportunity, and thus are less likely to want to die for any political cause. To an extent, this is a landmark development, but it is a blow for any political ideal, one of which Wolfe Tone represents, centuries after his death.

Though Michael agrees with Melaugh that many republicans do not adhere to actual Irish republican values, he does not equate socialism with republicanism. Instead, he believes that Sinn Féin wants “pure socialism,” which, he believes, minimizes the value of business competition and work. When asked hypothetically if Sinn Féin control over all of Ireland would lead to socialism, Melaugh said: “I don’t think you’d see a socialist Ireland. We’d see a more divided Ireland.” Though they disagree in characterizations and methods, Melaugh and Michael agree more than they disagree regarding who impedes better unification, however that may be defined. Wealthy unionists, Melaugh said, saw

themselves in the late 1960s and early 1970s as “lords of the manor,” and that mentality remains.

On Struggle, Despair, and Memory, in a Mobil World

More and more immigrants are coming to Ireland, specifically to Dublin and Belfast. A native Hungarian couple living two blocks from Michael’s business knew little of Irish history. A native Brazilian who never heard the name “Wolfe Tone” works in a sandwich shop blocks from the world renowned O’Connell Street. Unsurprisingly, many new arrivals to Ireland know little to nothing about 1798 or the Rising, just as many in the Irish diaspora who emigrated to the United States knew nothing about American history when they began to form Irish-American communities. However, many Americans would not expect Dublin and Belfast to be as diverse as they are. In the smaller city of Derry, however, native Irish sisters Avril and Denise Gibbons also knew very little of Wolfe Tone. “I didn’t learn that in school,” Denise Gibbons said.

The curricula of the three levels of Irish schooling before college indicates that very few students learn about Wolfe Tone. “Children should study the domestic and social history of women, men and children as well as their technological, scientific, cultural, artistic and leisure activities in the past,” reads the primary school curriculum, which “seeks to provide flexibility for schools and teachers” (Primary School Curriculum: History 8).

The junior certificate does call for lessons on France and Ireland in the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. In a section entitled “Studies of Change,” this official state curriculum, which not every country has, requires study of “one revolutionary in America, France, or Ireland.” “One” is underlined in the document, dictating that while

some could study Thomas Jefferson, others could study Robespierre, and perhaps some could study Wolfe Tone (The Junior Certificate – History Syllabus 7).

Irish high schools' "Leaving Certificate" syllabus requires that students either study "Early Modern" history, from 1492-1815, or "Later Modern" history, from 1815 to 1993. However, each of these categories is divided into six topics each, and students study only two in either the early or later time period (Leaving Certificate History Syllabus 7). The only subtopic in which Wolfe Tone even receives mention is "The end of the Irish kingdom and the establishment of the union, 1770-1815." One "generally viewed as a founding father of Irish nationalism and republicanism," according to James Brennan, is on a list of ten figures about whom "students should be aware of the contribution" to their nation (23).

The first justification for minimizing the need for Irish students to learn about Wolfe tone could be, as Northern Irelander Caroline Redmond said, Tone's failure to achieve his goal. However, United Irishmen did at least somewhat inspire the 1798 rebellion, though Tone himself was in France at the time. Thus the connection between Tone and the rebellion is tenuous. If documentation is any indication to what extent 1798 was remembered after the Act of Union, then memory was "repressed," because the most famous ballad honoring the 1798 rebels against Britain was not published until 1843, more than forty years after the uprising (Foster 67). The first famous line of poetry on 1798, published in "The Nation," was "Who Fears to Speak of '98.'" Since no renowned memorials had previously been written, many did not discuss the rebellion. Therefore, many recollections of the rebellion and Wolfe Tone's influence over Irish thought were condemned to eternity.

If memories die with people, then myth can replace actual events. “It is a truism that historical understanding and suppressed or re-edited memory are interwoven” (67-68). Many do not desire remembrance of a chaotic time which did not improve their own lives or lead to future success. However, modern analysis sometimes calls for “the wished-for association with the evident heroism of the United Irishmen and their admirable, and still relevant, principles” (68). After all who remembered 1798 firsthand were gone, those Tone would have been proud to inspire turned against him. Perhaps because Daniel O’Connell had caused many to link Catholicism with nationalism, late nineteenth century Irish activists before the Rising, Fenians and constitutionalists, did not unite around the expressed principles of the United Irishmen. Further limiting interpretation of Wolfe Tone as an important contributor to the Irish struggle was early twentieth century nationalist D.P. Moran. Moran “liked to deny that Wolfe Tone was Irish at all, since he was born of English parents, became a Frenchman, and was an atheist to boot” (83).

A month previous to the 1998 bicentennial of 1798, the Good Friday Agreement had been signed. On April 10, 1997, Taoiseach John Bruton’s office passed six directives on how 1798 should be remembered. Examples of excerpts included: to commemorate “fellowship of freedom,” as implemented for unity by the United Irishmen; recognizing the 1798 uprising as “forward looking,” “popular,” and “aspiring to unity,” and advice to focus more on the principles of democracy and pluralism, than military actions (83-85).

“Remembering 1798” author Roy Foster asserts that blunt instructions would have read: “Don’t talk about the war” (85). As a peace signing neared, emphasis on political violence waned. Though Wolfe Tone was prepared to perpetrate violence, had he reached

shore at Bantry Bay, he never got the chance. More importantly, Wolfe Tone was not involved in the 1798 rebellion, so he did not participate in what many may see as chaos that ultimately did not push Ireland forward to a new nation or toward peace.

In 1997, with Sinn Féin and unionist political parties in negotiations which would lead to the Good Friday Agreement, did the Irish government want to avoid any discussions of extremism in pursuit of the republican cause? Irish history student James Brennan said about the Dublin government: “I think they don’t want to feed a republican mantra.”

Foremost republican Gerry Adams said at a 2014 Wolfe Tone celebration speech: “What we are committed is the radical republican politics of Theobald Wolfe Tone brought to bear one the conditions of our time” (Adams). Wolfe Tone created a vision clouded by politics and economics; to some nationalists, his ideal was only prevented by erratic yet unsurprising weather off the western Irish coast. A letter to the editor by Tadhg O’Leighin in the November 21, 1998 edition of Southern Star somewhat resembles James Brennan’s assessment of Wolfe Tone: “Tone was the unacknowledged leader of the United Irishmen, and his life and death inspired succeeding Irish generations to struggle for Irish independence, a republican form of government, and a just social order” (4).

Specifics of Delayed Influence?

The 1916 Rising began at the Dublin GPO, which still operates as a post office, while housing a somewhat interactive museum exhibit on the Rising. After the exhibit, patrons are asked questions on computer screens on their interpretations of history. On August 14, 2016, more than three fifths of those asked about whether the Rising had

achieved its goals for the twenty-six county state said yes, it had[36]. Perhaps the Rising has more of a direct connection to Wolfe Tone, because Rising leaders wanted democratic reforms for all counties of Ireland, and removal of the British[37]. Past IRA and present Sinn Féin leaders have that same goal, but they must compromise, or risk losing the gains of peace. Thus they alienate some of their formerly loyal members. Having traveled to the North and a few parts of the Republic, it seems unreasonable to tell people their flags are no longer welcome, though Britain's plan to first grant land rights to those perceived as loyal to the crown for religious reasons is questionable, at best. The results of this include many Protestant marches commemorating victories over Irish Catholics, one the siege of 1689, prompting a Catholic joke about the Protestant calendar that it has only three months – "January, February, and March, March, March[38]."

A philosophical descendant of Wolfe Tone is SDLP co-founder Ivan Cooper, who perhaps had better success attracting Protestant working class within the Northern Ireland Civil Rights Association because he himself was Protestant. Cooper is commemorated on murals with Catholic activists in Derry today. In a similar gesture, on March 31, 1934 the

---

[36]"The Rising" brought together socialists, represented by James Connolly, who had to be propped up to be executed because of an ankle injury incurred while fighting the British, and, among other interests, those of the Irish Republican Brotherhood. Fifteen were executed for their roles. As a result they became martyrs, fostering support for the movement bringing about the Republic. Another question at the GPO is whether the leaders knew they would fail. Sometimes failure can mean future success. Meluagh said he knew his first civil rights would be met with police opposition, because of where he and fellow organizer Eamonn McCann planned it.

[37]From the 1918 elections, however, "Partition would've happened anyway," according to University College Dublin Dr. Michael Laffan.

[38]The fact that this joke is told on a Derry tour of murals and the Bloody Sunday Memorial, commemorating when fifteen peacefully protesting Derry Catholics were killed by British troops, over whom their commanding officer had lost control, indicates how unlikely it is that a Derry Protestant will go on such a tour. Nearly forty years after the shootings, British Prime Minister apologized for Bloody Sunday, whose first report was clearly an attempt to exculpate Britain of any wrongdoing. Witnesses, starting with Don Mullan, author of "Bloody Sunday Revisited," would not let it go.

Galway City Council celebrated the opening of the "Wolfe Tone Bridge." Needing a polish eight decades later, the declaration is written only in Irish, a language to which Wolfe Tone had little exposure. In 1934, council president Eamonn Corbett said the bridge was "named after one of the greatest Irishmen of all time, Wolfe Tone, a hero whose memory will live forever in the hearts of the liberty loving people of Ireland" (3). Resolving to temporarily work with France to achieve his goals, Wolfe Tone's mark on Irish history is not often written in Ireland, except on his statue at St. Stephen's Green in Dublin and on the Galway Bridge[39]. Since he felt he had to leave Irish soil to achieve his prospective vision, one that would have required violence, interpretations of him can be mythological, but seldom hypercritical. With perpetual retelling and reimagining of 1798 events, the year of rebellion before the Act of Union "has now become part of historical memory, and has become fictionalised and poeticised" (Foster 93).

Modern Ireland's founding fathers are De Valera and Michael Collins. Collins signed the treaty ratifying the current island borders, intended to be temporary, and was assassinated shortly thereafter. Undoubtedly his assassins blamed him for signing a treaty essentially compromising on the vision of one Ireland under one government, stated by the executed rising leaders.

Wolfe Tone represents the perspective that all of Ireland can unite, though he interpreted the island as one people, regardless of religion. Though largely attributable to

[39]When the Wolfe Tone statue was brought to St. Stephen's Green, on August 15, 1898, "The streets of Dublin were crowded to a great extent throughout the day." The processional to the park was led by horsemen, and included delegates from multiple countries, including England – The Kildare Journal, August 20, 1898.

Catholic Church scandals[40], fewer and fewer Irish outside of Northern Ireland consider themselves religious today than decades ago. In 1991, more than ninety-two percent of the Irish population self-identified as Catholic. By 2012, out of fifty-seven countries surveyed, Ireland ranked seventh in number of atheist residents (Dochara; McKittrick). Many areas of Northern Ireland are still segregated based upon Christian sect; walls partitioning neighborhoods pervade Belfast. Belfasters, however, prefer the walls around them to soldiers and explosions.

DoChara's "Fast Facts about Religion in Ireland" blog provides statistics indicating that Wolfe Tone's vision on religion is coming to fruition in the twenty-six counties governed by Dublin. The numbers show religion is becoming less and less important to the Irish. However, a 2014 comment on the same blog, which includes links to information on many aspects of Irish life, reads: "These 'facts' are seriously out of date and also somewhat misleading. The 'religion' breakdown at the top does not reflect the later census and it totally excludes all those who either refused to answer the census religion question or ticked 'no religion.' That group are the second largest on the table that opens this piece but are excluded from it. This makes the 'facts' misleading" (Andrew Doyle).

In July of 2004, the New York Times reported: "For the first time, there are not enough priests in Ireland – a country forged in Catholicism," citing figures dictating that this number was not likely to rise soon: close to 200 priests were ordained in 1990; the number shrunk to eight in 2004, and many current priests were in their sixties, meaning

[40]Catholic priests abusing children was a worldwide scandal, while Ireland's early free state government enabled Catholic "Magdalene Laundries," which punished unwed mothers and their children – lasting for decades.

they are likely retired today. However, the church claimed they were adjusting. A declining number of priests "is changing the way people worship and the way the Catholic church operates." The process, said priests who sometimes served multiple diocese, would include forgoing authoritarianism from the pulpit. The priority of Irish Catholic clergy, was to "modernize, or risk irrelevance" (Alvarez). Twelve years later, Dr. Richard O'Leary wrote how the eighty-four percent of Irish who self-identified as Catholic in 2011 did so, even though they rarely attend services.

Diversity has come to Irish cities: "The census is especially prone to underestimate the numbers of religious minorities of immigrant origin," wrote O'Leary, a former religion lecturer at Queen's University, Belfast. The question on religion was "compulsory," O'Leary wrote, possibly indicating that many were forced to choose a religion that they barely practice. If this is the case, then religion is in decline on Ireland. However, with immigrants coming to Ireland like never before, their faith backgrounds must be investigated further before making any claim about today's Ireland and religion. Obtaining accurate information on such a personal matter is challenging. O'Leary connects the survey to how many schools and hospitals the government needs, an argument for public schools free of any religious affiliation (O'Leary). Rigid Catholicism, a result of an early Irish free state resembling theocracy, dictates all abortions are illegal, a most controversial stance for any modern government.

The majority of the Irish population believes that the Rising's ideals permeate Irish society. Therefore, nationalists can quote Wolfe Tone and argue that today's Ireland reflects Tone's vision. However, William Theobald Wofe Tone's vision of a nation in

which Catholics, Protestants, and Presbyterians see themselves as Irish first is largely inapplicable today. The concept of unification, though, has taken another form: the quest by nationalists to end partition. While devotion to faith can be questioned, Ireland still is a majority Catholic nation. Given that Tone was not Catholic, the significant remembrances of him in Ireland, excluding northeast of partition, is testament not only to his force as a symbol, but the power of mythology surrounding him.

Just as the Dominican Republic's formation complicates Toussaint Louverture's legacy, Northern Ireland's existence, to some, nullifies Wolfe Tone's significance to modern Ireland. As the first Irish political leader to advocate military action to effect Irish sovereignty, to an extent Wolfe Tone remains controversial during the peace process. Nobody wants to go back to The Troubles[41], so violence as a political tool appears to be history.

Assessment of to what extent Wolfe Tone is a vital component of the Irish story depends upon whom is asked. In comparison to De Valera and Collins, "Wolfe Tone is more symbolic," Fergal O'Rourke said. Symbols cannot disappoint, because circumstances beyond their control prevent them from achieving goals. Those that ascribe importance to

[41]At Drew University's Transatlantic Connections Conference in 2015, Dr. Christine Kinealy said: "We know the peace process isn't perfect, but we know the war is over."

Wolfe Tone's legacy say that notions of unity and nationalism under a flag outlive their creators. The connection of politics to religion may be shrinking in Ireland, but sectarian segregation in Northern Ireland indicates that more issues remain northeast of partition. Optimists about peace process evolution might say that Wolfe Tone's legacy is incomplete. "There is one," said O'Rourke, recalling his experience as a teenager around the border in Newry. "It's just not finished."

7

Confluence, Divergence, Race, and Empire

Though both a significant portion of Ireland, and Saint Domingüe and later Hispañiola, would share a common goal of breaking oppressors' chains, their distinct paths in the nineteenth century indicate that independence does not necessarily correlate with socioeconomic success, and that emigration to a new land can assist those left behind. Early twentieth century developments solidified division on Hispañiola, while creating more schism on Ireland. Most ironically, a significant portion of the Irish population saw the split between Ireland and Northern Ireland an improvement over de facto colony status. Few, if any, Haitians, see the early twentieth century as a time either when unifying the island was more possible, or when internal or external forces facilitated Haitian development. Even though Ireland achieved independence more than a century after Haiti, the early free state grew into a nation that for the most part can stand on its own economically and socially. Meanwhile Haiti, independent for more than two centuries under a flag, is still a developing nation.

Decades before the rising, Frederick Douglass, former United States' ambassador to Haiti, stated on Jan. 2, 1893: "It was once said by the great Daniel O'Connell that the history of Ireland might be traced, like a wounded man through a crowd, by the blood." However, the first voice of black America accurately described Haiti, perhaps both then and now: "Her liberty was born in blood, cradled in misfortune, and has lived more or less in a storm of revolutionary turbulence" (119). Today a statue of Douglass stands in the Irish city of Cork, honoring the escaped slave's devotion to Irish struggle against British

oppression. The Troubles and the current partition in Ireland are formidable obstacles to achieving the nationalist goal of Irish unity; Hispañiola too appears inevitably divided, as a result of tragic events occurring after Douglass' death.

Nicolas Geffrard, the leader under whom Abraham Lincoln officially recognized Haiti, fell in 1867 to General Silvain Salnave, who represented the blacks from the north of Haiti against Geffrard's "mulatto elite." "That Salnave had enjoyed popular support from the urban poor was generally agreed." In *From Dessalines to Duvalier*, a study of how Haiti evolved from its first ruler to a despotic dynasty, author David Nicholls implies that Salnave was killed by "guerrilla opposition" of the north. First, Nicholls mentions that through Salnave's two-year reign he was besieged by attacks by anti-government black fighters from the north. Subsequently, writes Nicholls, Salnave "was eventually taken from Port au-Prince and executed" (Nicholls 108-109). The violent turnover of leadership verifies to an extent Mats Lundahl's assessment of Haitian politics from the 1840s until 1915. However, both Douglass and Nicholls indicate Florvil Hyppolite was an exception.

Douglass referred to President Hyppolite, who died in office of a heart attack (Leaders of Haiti), as a "gentleman and a scholar," praising Haiti for opening 500 schools under his rule, from 1889-1896 (124). Though Hyppolite, a lifelong soldier (Leaders of Haiti), had attained power by overthrowing another general, Douglass reported the transition was nonviolent, and thus a positive sign in Haiti's development. "He was inaugurated in a manner as orderly as that inducting into office any president of the United States" (123).

The United States, Hispañiola's northern neighbor, had designs on becoming more militaristic in the Caribbean beginning in the 1890s, but Hyppolite's secretary of state, Anténor Firmin, anthropologist author of *The Equality of the Races*, successfully warded off American efforts to attain Haitian territory,. Upon Hyppolite's death at sixty-eight, a power struggle ensued, enabling Germans to temporarily increase influence in Haitian affairs. By 1910 General Antoine Simon was Haitian president. Simon's decision to allow an American railroad company to build train tracks and cultivate land on both sides of the Dominican-Haitian border was his downfall. Rebels forced his exit in 1911 (Nicholls 112).

To the East

The repeated attempts by Haitian military to realize Toussaint L'Ouverture's vision of one island state, in Toussaint's time under French authority, radicalized Dominican society such that the Dominican Republic asked Spain to annex it in 1860, to repel efforts of the perceived Haitian hordes from the west. Part of this was justified in that Haiti was attempting to conquer the Dominican Republic. Part, however, was racial, in that the Dominicans saw themselves as whiter than Haitians. By 1874, the Dominican Republic again was independent from Spain, and both Hispañiola nations "signed an anticolonial treaty of sovereignty and mutual friendship in the face of European and, soon, American Imperialism" (Paulino 27-29).

Irish to the North

Ireland had not yet effectively revolted as of 1893, and Irish immigration to the United States had begun before American independence. Given Ireland's colonial history, Alan O'Day's analysis of how Irish saw themselves in their new home is unsurprisingly

divided. First O'Day quotes nationalist Isaac Butt, who in 1866 believed that Irish emigrants to America all had a hatred for "British power." Emigrants who brought nationalism with them to America funded the Irish rising.

In the 1890s, Patrick Ford discussed Irish emigres who wanted to leave nationalism behind: "These [Irish-American] men, as a class, must not be expected to do anything that will not repay themselves" (O'Day 399-406). Ford's quote reveals a sense of individualism among Irish, and many immigrants, in America, echoed in Noel Ignatiev's *How the Irish Became White*, and Joan Walsh's *What's the Matter with White People?* Ignatiev's book is a comprehensive look at Irish integration into nineteenth century American life, without ever demonstrating a process by which the Irish evolved from another alleged racial group to white. Perhaps this is the case because race in Europe has been categorized somewhat differently: World War I was viewed by many Europeans as a war among different European races, with similar skin tones, while race in America has been more based on color. Harvard historian Ignatiev condemns nineteenth century Irish Americans' capitalization on racial divisions in America, for the purposes of benefiting from whiteness. "In this struggle the Irish threw their weight on the scales, and not, it may be said, on the side of the angels" (165). Irish-American journalist Walsh, however, a descendant of a diaspora family split among American political lines, quotes historian Kevin Kenny: "The American Irish did not create the social and racial hierarchy into which they came, and to expect them to have overturned this hierarchy in the course of putting food on their tables is surely unrealistic" (48).

A Budding Empire?

The United States did not yet have the military might to annex parts of Hispañiola in the 1860s and 1870s, but it did have designs on Molé St. Nicolas as a site for a military base, and "a group of Americans tried unsuccessfully to take over the small Dominican island of Alta Vela" in 1860 (Paulino 37). By 1915, however, the American west was cleared of the people whom the majority of Americans would call outsiders, and those who accepted the doctrine of "manifest destiny" looked southward to the Caribbean.

The United States occupied Haiti from 1915 until 1934, and the Dominican Republic from 1916 until 1924. After referencing the MacDonald railroad decision as a reason for Americans to "invade," David Nicholls continues: "The United States wanted neighbours who were stable, orderly and prosperous, and was prepared to take steps to ensure that such was the case, both for American strategic and economic interests and also for the good of those countries themselves" (144-145). Future United States president Franklin Delano Roosevelt wrote a new constitution for Haiti, allowing foreign ownership of land (147). Opposition was significant to American occupation, more so journalistically than militarily. As Haitians sacrificed their lives to force American withdrawal, discontent with the occupation grew (Nicholls 149-151). President Louis Borno supported the Americans, while his presidency was only upheld by the marines. Shortly after Stenio Vincent replaced Borno, Vincent joined the nationalists, opposing the occupation. Five years later, the American military had left Haiti (Nicholls 151).

Looking at United States occupation globally, eight decades later, Dominican-American Edward Paulino analyzes American foreign policy more broadly, relating American military action to manifest destiny and the Monroe Doctrine. "The United States

had gone directly from fighting Indians in the American West to occupation in the Phillipines, the Caribbean, and Latin America, and saw its adversaries as a racial Other" (41). Evidence of the accuracy of Paulino's assertion, in contrast to Nicholls' assessment of United States foreign policy, is the way racism proliferated on both sides of Hispañiola under American presence. On the Haitian side, the ease with which Americans called all Haitians "nigger" unified Haitians against Americans, perhaps generationally (Nicholls 142). Paulino writes that American marines would call Dominicans "spigs" or "nigger."[42]

The Dominican sugar industry was foreign owned. When companies acquired land on which cane was cultivated, Dominican peasants were forced from their homes, forming the resistance to the American occupation. American lumber companies coveted Dominican woodlands, sometimes crossing over the contested Haitian border, as stated in corporate claims. A permanent effect of the occupation was the loss of both Haitian and Dominican communal lands on which American companies could farm, after military departure (43). Major highways were constructed on both sides of the island. In the Dominican Republic, "The highways permitted faster access as the U.S. military authorities moved their soldiers across the island but particularly to curtail unofficial cross-border migration by insurgents and bringing them into daily contact with ordinary Dominicans" (41). To the west, Nicholls states that Haiti benefited some from societal improvements such as roads, medicine, and technology, but: "the policy of the occupation was largely guided by the need to make Haiti an attractive country for private investment."

[42]Though black soldiers had fought in segregated units in the Civil War, the United States military did not integrate until President Harry Truman ordered so for the Korean War, meaning all marines on Hispañiola were white.

The “mafia style” of governing attributed to Haiti by Lundahl returned after American forces stayed there for eight more years than they did in the Dominican Republic. “Ensuing governments in Haiti practiced only rent-seeking behavior without efforts to maintain public infrastructure and social services” (Jaramillo 330). American occupation financial advisor Arthur Millspaugh called Haiti a “unique laboratory for social, economic, political, and administrative paternalism” (Nicholls 148).

Race and the Border

In July 1921, a letter from American state department official Ferdinand Mayor to Secretary of State Charles Evans Hughes suggested that Haiti needed to be occupied longer than the Dominican Republic because Dominicans have a “preponderance of white blood and culture” (Paulino 48).American general Eli Cole, in a letter to naval secretary Josephus Daniels, wrote that the Haitian mulatto elite are proud to be Haitian, yet, “under strain, however, they are almost sure to revert to the black type of characteristics” (Paulino 47).

Though some groups today wish to emphasize the communal nature of the island, the division is rooted first in Boyer’s failed attempt at “Haitianization” of the east. In the early years of the Dominican Republic, border lines were somewhat inconsequential. However, customs houses were first built around 1907, and territorial lines began to develop under United States occupation (43). While both occupations were implemented for financial interests, differences were evident in how Dominicans and Haitians were perceived in print. Travel books said Dominicans could “pass for white,” while Haitians were described by writers of the early twentieth century as “savages” similar to “animals” (46).

No individual is more responsible for the sociological division of Hispañiola than Rafael Trujillo, Dominican ruler from 1930 to 1961. Still controversial – enough Dominicans still revere him so that a "pro-Trujillo biography never mentions Trujillo's black Haitian ancestry, only his Spanish heritage," in Trujillo's ascendancy he would capitalize on his Haitian background for political gain. Thus he would unite Dominicans, whose skin tones reflect those of Spanish descent, slave descent, and everything in between. His political journey began as a cattle thief, transformed into one of national guardsman under American occupation, and ended as dictator for life. His humble beginnings, from poverty, attracted some public support early in his career, inspiring some to still back his legacy. Trujillo appears to have learned racial hierarchy ranking Dominicans over Haitians from how Americans differed in their occupations of Haiti and the Dominican Republic. However, to what extent the Dominican dictator directly learned racism from the United States is unknown.

Trujillo's border campaign included not only enhanced security, but extermination based upon an interpretation of race that outlived him. The American model of perceived superior whiteness, combined with previous animosity between Haitians and Dominicans fixed Trujillo in a position to perpetuate supremacy. "Though his ascendancy challenged traditional elite notions of race and class, he strove to project a white image of *gente de primera* (first class people)" (49).

In 1935, one Dominican newspaper wrote that the results of border negotiations between Trujillo and Haitian President Stenio Vincent should merit Trujillo consideration for the Nobel Peace Prize. However, these negotiations yielded more than 600,000 hectares

of land back to Haiti, a land to which many Trujillo enemies had fled. Though praised throughout the Dominican Republic for seemingly coming to an agreement with a brother nation, Trujillo was not pleased. The current "porous, autonomous" border, "a multicultural and bilingual zone more oriented toward Haiti than Santo Domingo" would not shield the dictator from opposition from the west (54). What could intimidate Trujillo's opposition from returning to oust him? Violence toward Haitians could certainly achieve that goal.

In 1937, reports first came that thousands of Haitians were murdered along the increasingly defined Haitian border with the Dominican Republic. Dajabón, where I crossed in late 2015, was one city where Trujillo had targeted Haitians for murder by knife or bayonet. As the border was more amorphous, "El corte," the cutting, in English, also occurred further away from today's militarized border, in Monte Cristi (65). Previous to prospective executions, Dominican soldiers would ask people to say how they pronounced the word for parsley to determine whether they were Haitian or Dominican, naming the killing fields of Hispañiola "The Parsley Massacre" (Fieser; Davis). Spanish speakers were spared. Paulino, who spoke with perpetrators, survivors and witnesses, reports firearms were used. "Many victims were stripped of their belongings before they were killed" (65). Some former killers, sixty years later, had regrets. Others did not. "Saying no to the military was tantamount to treason and marked you as Trujillo's enemy." Some resistors were imprisoned and tortured. Some Dominicans helped save Haitians. "The story of ordinary urban Dominicans helping refugees to escape the killing is not part of the literature" (67).

At first Trujillo denied responsibility, maintaining that a predetermined genocide was in fact border skirmishes "between Dominican farmers and Haitian thieves" (74). War

on Hispañiola seemed possible, but Papal Nuncio Maurilio Silvani wrote, “Vincent still fears Trujillo” (79). An agreement between Haiti and Trujillo’s land stated that the Dominican Republic “accepts no responsibility” for the massacre. Though Trujillo tightly controlled the press, word escaped. In late 1937, human rights advocates spurred representatives of the Dominican Republic, the United States, Mexico, Cuba, and Haiti to come to Hispañiola. In response, preventing the external investigation and meddling in dictatorial affairs, Trujillo launched an investigation “and ordered several men from the border region to pose as perpetrators of the massacre.”

Paulino interviewed a grandson of one of the alleged perpetrators, who was freed the day of the supposed guilty verdict, and paid 50 to 100 pesos. The inquiry cleared Trujillo, who paid a small price, by not officially running for president in 1938, yet he still controlled national affairs (Paulino 74-76; Biography.com).

Largely a result of Salvani’s intervention, Trujillo agreed to pay $500,000 to Haiti, and the Catholic Church added $250,000 (Paulino 73; 79-81). Regardless of the small price Trujillo had to pay for the massacre, which went to the Haitian government, not the victims’ families, “Official Dominican propaganda demonizing Haitians emerged in political discourse” (82). Fortunate survivors and their descendants are unlikely to ever see compensation for the murders of their family members nearly a century ago. “Trujillo and his subordinates were never legally punished for crimes against humanity” (83).

On silent accomplices: “The real third-party witness on the ground was the United States.” In quoting and paraphrasing Silvani’s correspondence, since America controlled both national customs offices through loans to nations east and west, the Papal Nuncio

wrote that the United States "is able to know exactly what is going on through its agents who are dispersed all over" (77). Debts owed to the United States, Haiti's previous debt to France, and the collective, yet conflicted history of the Dominican Republic and Haiti are reason why, Jacques, a Haitian immigrant from Cap-Haitien said of Haitians at the 2015 Haitian Mother's Day Celebration: "We were never really independent."

Unified Struggle?

In the early 1910s, black nationalists considered themselves part of a struggle for freedom, encompassing all oppressed peoples. Under the distinct views of W.E.B. Dubois and Marcus Garvey, Dubois approving of integration, which Garvey opposed: "Anticolonialism and African American political culture had, it seemed, been drawn together permanently after the Great War" (Guterl 345).

One reason why the Irish rising could occur was Britain's forces were drawn into World War I, referred to above as the "Great War." Given the history of Irish struggle against the British Empire, the resultant partition and the early free state meant that the Irish under British rule could be viewed as compatriots of black nationalists: "There was a persistent tendency to see the Irish as an "in-between" people, who had more in common with the 'darker races' than they did with the full-fledged whites of Europe" (Nelson 185).

On the Fit and Unfit

Eugenic thought peaked in the early twentieth century. Though best known for fueling Nazi extermination of Jews in Europe, eugenics had significant presence in the United States, leading to hierarchy among whites of European descent and racism toward African-Americans, demonstrated most harshly through lynchings, and xenophobia.

Germans learned how to oppress Jews, before the concentration camps, based upon how the United States subjugated African-Americans. The book, *The Myth of Race: The Troubling Persistence of an Unscientific Idea*, investigates racial thought paving the way toward eugenics. Author Robert Wald Sussman assails Renaissance scholars Johann Friedrich Blumenbach, Isaac La Peyrére, and notable philosopher Immanuel Kant, for their collective view that the European white groups of people had "pre-Adamite" origins, meaning whites were created before the Biblical figures Adam and Eve. Creating distinctions which still pervade the world, the predominance of early ethnic and racial analysis decided that "Other 'races' had separate origins and were not fully 'human'" (Byrnes 154). Africans, enslaved by Europeans and then imported to replace natives in the Caribbean, were thus seen as closer to animals than human, justifying the barbarity bringing about the Haitian Revolution.

Empire's Perceived Superiority

"Wild Irish" and "Indian savages" of British North America were placed side by side in the European racial hierarchy as early as the 1560s. Before the American Declaration of Independence, "Images of Ireland and America, as portrayed to potential colonists, were strikingly similar" (Doan 80). Therefore, a significant portion of British transplants to both British North America, later the United States, and Ireland, both saw the natives as subhuman.

Centuries later in the United States, eugenics' appeal was a sociopolitical response to the massive wave of immigration. In Europe, "Race-suicide" theories developed. One English socialist, Sidney Webb, referencing research of eugenicist Karl Pearson, believed

that due to an excess of "inferior" people in the United Kingdom, British culture could fall to "the Irish and the Jews" (Leonard 212), indicating where some British categorized Irish in ethnic and racial hierarchy.

Still the Irish Rise

In the United States, the first Irish-American presidential candidate, New York's Al Smith, ran in 1928, losing to Herbert Hoover. Smith undoubtedly lost votes because he opposed prohibition, enabling his opposition to label him an "Irish drunk" (Walsh 52). That and other stereotypically Irish habits of "garrulity, laziness, violence, and stupidity" (Soper 264) were not politically abandoned by the American electorate until John F. Kennedy became president in 1960.

Many Irish-American families saw their political capital grow from the 1930s to the 1990s, when their collective will inspired both Republican and Democratic support for the Irish peace process.

Control, Stability, and Foreign Support

Meanwhile, Jean-Claude Duvalier, son of Francois Duvalier, left Haiti in 1986, for France. Jean-Claude and his father were both traditional strongmen, crushing dissent by any means, and incurring wrath of many human rights groups, but both were anti-communist as well. Therefore, they attracted United States support during the Cold War.

Haitian immigration to the United States did not grow significantly, until the late 1980s, a good measure of how much control the Duvaliers possessed. Chaos followed Duvalierism, the term coined for the hereditary dynasty. From 1960 to 2012, Haitian immigration to the United States grew from 5,000 to 606,000 (Nwosu).

Fifty years after the American military had left Haiti, Col. Stephen Butler told investigative journalist Allen Nairn that the younger Duvalier had to be "eased out," to prevent massive uprisings. "The United States has long demonstrated its aversion to mass politics in Haiti." However, the Clinton administration was placed in a difficult situation, because in the wake of Duvalierism, Jean-Bertrand Aristide became the first democratically elected president (Leaders of Haiti), with seventy percent of the vote, though he too had been driven into exile. "Even if the United States formally has to back the man, there is nothing that compels it to tolerate his constituents, much less the radical ideas that drew them to him" (Nairn 1).

Part of Aristide's agenda was to double the Haitian minimum wage from two to four dollars, per day! A contractor working for the state department told Nairn that no United States administration would tolerate that because Haiti needs to be a place for "cheap labor." Aristide's original political goal, to help the Haitian poor, meant he could not assist the other Haitian classes, who historically benefited from governments' disregard for the needy (2). If more Haitians were empowered to create lasting institutions to employ fellow Haitians, then perhaps poverty would cease to be as great a burden on Haitian life.

At a 2016 appearance at the *Haiti Liberte* newspaper office in Brooklyn, Nairn said that when the United States facilitated Aristide's return, in 1994, the Haitian president had to abandon his economic plans. In the early 1900s, the United States trained Haitian and Dominican soldiers. As the twenty-first century approached, America encouraged the formation of the Revolutionary Front for the Advancement and Progress in Haiti, commonly known as FRAPH, a "right-wing paramilitary hit squad," of which some

members were again trained by the United States. American officials told Nairn that upon his return, Aristide would not really be in control of Haiti. “Aristide has had a program, and constituency, fundamentally at odds with U.S. goals” (3). Nairn said that Aristitide could have encouraged an uprising of the people against United States prospective exploitation of desperation and cheap labor, by disregarding instructions from the American government. However, said Nairn, such an action may have had more drastic immediate consequences: “The people united get defeated all the time,” the award-winning journalist said. “They wind up in mass graves.”

Two Decades Later

Before taking office in 2011, former singer Michel Martelly finished third in a Nov. 28, 2010 Haitian election, but voter turnout “was the lowest for a presidential election in the hemisphere for 60 years.” The Organization of American states, led by the United States, Canada, and France used the low poll numbers to “change the results of the election” (Weisbrot 68), putting Martelly in a runoff, from which he emerged victorious.

In 2016, Martelly left office without a successor in place, in a nation making little progress overcoming the effects of a horrific earthquake. The *Workers World* reported that his 2011 inauguration cost $4.5 million, while many Haitians still survived on less than two dollars per day. After Martelly’s 2011 victory, he flew to the United States for pictures with then Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, and her husband, Bill, who was president while Aristide was brought back to power. Previous to his pictures with a former American president, and future American presidential candidate, Martelly had visited the International Monetary Fund, and the World Bank. As he took office, the *Workers World*

wrote of Martelly, reflecting the leftist assessment of United States' Latin-American foreign policy: "As long as Martelly suits their needs, they will back him. When he doesn't, they'll dump him" (Dunkel).

On Racial Psychology?

Psychiatrist and philosopher Frantz Fanon, born on the Caribbean island of Martinique, theorized that Caribbean slaves' descendants are in a constant place of attempting to whiten themselves because of the ideal of whiteness, in contrast to the perceived evil of blackness. Subconscious adherence to Fanon's view could at least partially explain how Haitian leaders create corrupt governments and cater to the United States (110; 211-213). Fanon died in 1961, so he did not live to see Haitians assist in toppling Duvalierism, though clearly Haitian politics has not achieved a state sought by Kim Ives, publisher of the newspaper *Haiti Liberte.* "The one crying need is for a revolutionary party in Haiti," said Ives, whose publication has offices in both Brooklyn and Port au-Prince.

Political Challenges

At the 2016 Left Forum's "Haiti Rising: Dessalines Fights Back," including Ives, broadcaster Charles Pitts, and union organizer Ray LaForest, Pitts said to understand why Haiti has not progressed in the new century, the United States must be seen as an obstacle to Haitian freedom. Subsequently, Ives, who recalled that his mother was married to Haiti's communist party leader, said the then-Haitian president, Jocelyn Privert, was weak "because he tries to please everybody." Privert had been awarded the presidency temporarily because earlier elections had been deemed fraudulent and thrown out. Though

Haiti has direct democracy for all offices, a lack of technology and a history of political inefficiency and factionalism create distrustfulness among the people toward any electoral process. American involvement, beginning with occupation in 1915, only worsens this climate. Haitians had protested in the streets, nullifying earlier 2016 elections, causing the United States to cease what it called monitoring of the Haitian electoral process. Ives had not "seen a demonstration like that since the 1990s," recalling the days of the popular Aristide, who caved to demands placed on him by American authorities, in exchange for a return from exile.

On Non-Profits

Not only has American interference in elections been exposed, but world renowned non-profit efforts do not seem to be as effective in Haiti, compared to other places. For example, Red Cross efforts to build homes after the 2010 Haitian earthquake cost $500 million, resulting in only six constructed. *The Washington Post* reported that the money distribution was "grossly mismanaged." A significant contribution to the massive failure was an overreliance on foreigners who spoke neither French nor Creole. Investigative journalism group Pro Publica revealed that the Red Cross, primarily a social services organization, attempted to recruit Haitians in the process of rebuilding, but "few Haitians have reached leadership positions within the Red Cross." Thus, the projects were given to outside organizations, who either squandered the money, or were overtly corrupt. However, the Red Cross still made outrageous claims about their own success in Haiti, such as that it helped more than four million Haitians "get back on their feet" (Holley). More recently, in 2016, Hurricane Matthew ravaged Haiti's south, laying waste to the city of Jerémie. On

Dec. 1, 2016, the United Nations admitted responsibility for a 2010 cholera outbreak, and agreed to pay $400 million to treat the infected. Cholera had not been present in Haiti for decades (Beaubien).

Therefore, as neighborly colonialism, from England and later the United Kingdom, viciously infected Ireland, the United States has both directly and subtly impeded growth of both nations on Hispañiola. Border tensions existed between Haiti and the Dominican Republic from Jan. 1, 1804. However, America's twentieth century occupation began a process that solidified division between Haiti and the Dominican Republic, aided by Rafael Trujillo's brutality.

Dominican LaForest, who had Haitian family killed in opposition to Duvalierism, founded "Black Lives Matter in the Dominican Republic." When asked for a solution to current crises of Dominicans of Haitian descent and their citizenship, LaForest suggested that they all be granted Dominican citizenship, whether they can provide the required identification or not.

Though many observers might think that Haitian reconstruction, improvement, and elections need some type of oversight, consensus among activists and scholars is that other nations should stay out of Haitian affairs, meaning that those yearning for a better Haitian future now wish their nation to be isolated from foreign intrusion. Organizations hiring Haitians, and seeking to build institutions that will withstand corrupt politicians and natural disasters, however, are welcomed by activists. Examples include "Nova Hope,", and the Institute for Justice and Democracy in Haiti, founded by Boston attorney Brian Concannon.

When I first met Isleño Colectivo spokesman Tony Savino, who is white, I wondered how Haiti can develop into a more functional state without oversight, and he immediately asked, in coarser language, if I felt that the Haitians were savages who needed monitoring by we white Americans. I said that I did not think in that manner at all, but I clearly understood the perspective of his harsh language and his question. Many white Americans like to say they are helping poor Haitians, and might just donate some money to an organization which is either corrupt or ineffective.

Scapegoat, Philantropist, or Occupier?

During her recent presidential campaign, many accusations were made of Hillary Clinton in relation to the Clinton Foundation's development projects in Haiti. Via e-mail, I asked Concannon to what extent these charges were true. He said there was no evidence of the most serious charges, including theft . According to a September report from Slate on failed efforts to reconstruct Haiti after the 2010 earthquake: "Haiti would be a major example of 'economic statecraft,' as [Secretary of State Hillary Clinton] called it, where business and government partner to address natural disasters, poverty, and disease, neutralizing threats while generating money and power for the United States." Organizations supervised by the Clintons ignored "recommendations to hire Haitian contractors." However, validating claims of Haitian activists that business occupation replaced that of the military in 1934, Jonathan Katz wrote that Hillary Clinton was promoting "standard U.S. foreign policy for more than a century" (Katz).

My interpreter, Wildy, stayed in housing built by the Clinton Foundation last year, but his doing so does not mean he thinks the Clintons are necessarily good for Haiti. What

can one group of wealthy, promoting less than empowering policy for the masses, do for a nation ravaged by centuries of discrimination, internal neglect, and corruption?

On Solutions

More of the world must have concern for Haitian national development, and must incorporate Haitians or Haitian-Americans to execute improvement plans. Perhaps Haiti needs something similar to the Marshall Plan, taking into account that Hispañiola, and most especially Haiti, has been bombed out not by air power and guns, but by both domestic and foreign policy and neglect.

When I asked *Haiti Liberte* publisher Kim Ives in person what Haiti needs, he said American withdrawal from all Haitian affairs. I followed up online, asking him what that would mean in a globalized economy in which America reigns supreme. I got no response. Writer Yanick Lahens said that cooperation with the United States would be possible, but not if America were interfering with elections. Wildy wrote that a "conspiracy theory" was circulating in Haiti that the United States controlled the Organization of American States – a theory buttressed by Mark Weisbrot's commentary on the 2011 Haitian elections. Haitian-American immigrant Jacques, now of Long Island, whom I met at Haitian Mother's Day in Brooklyn, said, referring to Haitians, that Americans "don't treat us like partners." Healthcare and fair elections are priorities of organizations working in Haiti because healthy people can create lasting institutions, which theoretically can work with a beneficial political system, and against politics' sometimes damaging effects.

President Barack Obama was the ultimate supervisor over Hillary Clinton's state department, which interfered with Haiti's 2011 election. America's first non-white

president, called black by many African-Americans and other immigrants, and seen as half-white by many white supporters, presided over a continuation of colonial policies. Empire will function as such, regardless of the chief executive's skin tone. "It's all about race," said Jacques, adding that if the United States really cared about Haitian development, schools and better infrastructure would have been left behind in 1934. Wildy, who did not believe the United States controlled the OAS, said that when a big country like the United States asks for something, a smaller country like Haiti must comply, because of economic dominance of the world's lone superpower.

Economically, Irish Bloody Sunday witness and survivor Don Mullan believes France should return to Haiti the 150,000,000 franc debt eventually paid to France – the price for independence. However, the result of such a financial return to the Haitian government would only be effective if the Haitian government could be trusted. Haiti is one of fourteen Caribbean nations suing Britain, Holland, and France for the slave trade. Attorneys have "not specified how much money they are seeking but senior officials have pointed out that Britain paid slave owners £20 million when it abolished slavery in 1834. That sum would be the equivalent of £200 billion today" (Leonard). Many Haitians do not trust their government, to such an extent that the current president, Jovenel Moyse, nicknamed the "Banana Man," because he ran a fruit business, only received ten per cent of the country's vote. Thus, many Haitians do not have faith in governmental systems, and Haitian governments lack societal institutions from which they can draw strength – a recipe for consistent economic weakness.

On Unity and Borders

Socioeconomic malaise continues to plague Haiti, which Frederick Douglass historically connected to the Irish struggle in 1893, while the Irish peace process is stalled at partition. Advocates for a more united Hispañiola note and display integration between Haitians and Dominicans. Even though Trujillo ruled the Dominican Republic for more than thirty years, some harmony exists between the nations. Creole mass is given in Dominican churches, Haitian students attend college in the Dominican Republic, and Creole classes are offered in Santo Domingo, the Dominican capital. Dominican-American author Edward Paulino: island vision "must balance and respect the sovereignty of both nations, where elites and ordinary citizens of Hispañiola are unified in their commitment to a more equitable, sustainable, and livable Hispañiola" (166; 168). Improved cultural relations between Haiti and the Dominican Republic, the land united by Toussaint Louverture, would facilitate growth on both sides of the border.

Near the once militarized borders between Ireland and Northern Ireland, many cannot envision an island without division between twenty-six counties and six to the northeast. However, both Irish states fare better economically than the two nations of Hispañiola. The complex histories both necessitate the borders, but twenty-first century Ireland has escaped the worst of colonialism.

8

Epilogue: Transfer of History's Grip

European kingdoms were subjugating Ireland and Saint Domingüe, when leaders began battling for removal of an unwanted presence, or for freedom from bondage. Centuries later, to an extent progress has been attained. While the degree of progress is debatable, the powers from which separation was demanded, militarily and politically, no longer engage in old world colonialism. The disappearance of de jure colonies, however, does not necessarily correlate with freedom and de facto independence.

On Evolution Over Time

Though some Irish nationalists will argue that the movement began before the Ulster Plantation, the rising's spirit can more accurately be traced to either Wolfe Tone or Robert Emmett. Therefore, it took more than a century for Irish nationalism to free twenty-six Irish counties from the British. Across the ocean, 300 years after Christopher Columbus landed on the northeast of Hispañiola, slaves successfully led a rebellion to the treasured goal of independence.

Though the often brutal Haitian army is no more, replaced by national police, the island which Toussaint Louverture united against colonialism is now divided into two nations. With chattel slavery a memory, economic servitude remains on Hispañiola, both to Haitian and Dominican authorities, and to more powerful nations.

A result of Ireland's status as England's first de facto colony, commemorations of British presence – alternating between coexistence and conquest – pervade Ireland. Famine graveyards and monuments to nationalist heroes adorn streets of the republic; murals decorate the North. Border city Derry includes homages to both the 1689 siege and to the Northern Ireland Civil Rights Association. In Belfast, where the Troubles struck fear into both Catholic and Protestant neighborhoods for decades, both warring factions depicted scenes honoring victories in their struggles. Murals change, however, and today many more promote peace and the arts.

On Geographic Transfer of Power

Both de jure colony Saint Domingüe and de facto colony Ireland suffered under empire. Activists advocating for better relations between Haiti and the Dominican Republic maintain that such struggle continues, against perceived United States occupation through the United Nations and American monitoring of island affairs. America's elction of a non-white president for the first time in 2008 in no way can negate centuries of overt and covert discrimination, brought to Hispañiola in the early twentieth century. Early racial theory birthed racism, brought to British North America by refugees and migrants from the English portion of empire. More than a century after the American nation was founded, United States military melded their discrimination with that already possessed by descendants of Spanish and French colonists in Hispañiola, cementing the perception of Haitians as inferior to Dominicans.

Thus, Ray LaForest and other Dominicans of Haitian descent say, "Haitian," though a nationality, is often seen as an insult. Former president Bill Clinton, who

advocated to help Haiti after the 2010 earthquake with former president George W. Bush and then president Barack Obama, continued a policy of Bush's father preventing Haitian refugees from reaching American soil among fear Haitians were infected with AIDS (Sciolino). Regarding Ireland, Clinton was vital in continuing the peace process, when talks were deteriorating over decommissioning (de Bréadún 258-259). Policies toward Haitians leaving home in distress, alongside documented interference in Haitian elections, indicate that while the United States has encouraged Irish peace since the 1990s, America has not done enough to address Haitian poverty. If history supersedes race, then the first western nation should assist the second in overcoming all obstacles. Activists for a harmonious Hispañiola, however, are not surprised when American policy does not assist class mobility of Haitian masses. Noah Richard, at "Sin Fronteras," on July 15, 2016, said the history of America, prosperous because of slave labor in youth, is the present: "Anti-blackness is the fulcrum of white supremacy."

A Career Ends; Questions Remain

Martin McGuinness, former IRA commander and Northern Irish education minister, resigned as second minister of the northern Irish Stormont Assembly on Jan. 10, 2017. His stated reason for leaving his post, held since 2007, was first minister Arlene Foster's failure to leave over her disastrous plan to have government pay people to burn wooden pellets. However, those subsidized would make sixty percent more than what they were paid. Multiple Irish political parties called out the "Cash for Ash" scandal, stemming from a 2012 clean energy directive. Foster even refused to resign after a no confidence vote (MacDonald; Moriarty). "Under the complex rules of power-sharing in the region, if either

the first minister or the deputy resigns the coalition government between unionists and nationalists falls" (MacDonald). New elections came March 2: coverage of the resignation indicates no fear of a return to The Troubles.

Though few are currently concerned about street violence, concern reigns. The day of McGuinness' resignation, Irish minister for foreign affairs Charles Flanagan said that the former guerrilla leader's departure was "a great concern to all of us." Though in Fíne Gael, a rival party of McGuinness' Sinn Féin, Flanagan complimented McGuinness for "his personal commitment" to peace. Since 2014 Drew University has given a yearly peace award in Dublin; in 2017 Patricia Hume, wife of Nobel Peace Prize winner John Home, was recognized. Before even addressing the McGuinness resignation, Flanagan asked to what extent people in the audience and around Ireland remember what their divided nation was like before the Good Friday Agreement.

Survival Before Prosperity

Northern Irish elections took place in March; Haitian elections decided 5000 seats on Jan. 29, 2017. More than 31,000 candidates ran. The elected must prove they can be trusted by the Haitian people, many of whom have become totally disinterested in the voting process (Charles).

Many Haitians and the diaspora were encouraged by the January, 2017, arrest of Guy Philippe. Philippe, wanted by the United States for drug trafficking since 2005, had led a coup against popular Haitian president Jean-Bertrand Aristide in 2004. Philippe had just been elected to the Haitian senate. Following his detention by national police, Philippe was transferred to American authorities. Haitian human rights advocate Pierre Esperance

told the Miami Herald that while Philippe's removal from the Haitian political scene is good news, others who cut their teeth overthrowing popular candidates continue to safely function within Haitian politics. Philippe's arrest "is a good small step in the battle against corruption and impunity in the country," Esperance said. However, said Esperance, "Philippe's arrest was also a reminder of the problems plaguing Haiti's justice system," adding that the Haitian government always knew he was a drug trafficker, and did not impede his political career (Charles and Weaver). Based upon mixed feelings toward the United States in Haiti, it is reasonable to believe that many Haitians may not have wanted to assist American authorities in Philippe's apprehension.

On Foreign Policy, Immigration, and Diaspora

In 2016, many Americans envisioned a second president Clinton coming into the White House. Though the Clinton relationship with Haiti and thus Haitian-Americans was somewhat controversial, few political analysts could imagine an experienced politician like Clinton losing the presidency to a businessman who first made the news resulting from a lawsuit -- accusing him and his father of housing discrimination.

Donald Trump visited Little Haiti in Miami; Hillary Clinton met with Haitian-Americans in Coral Springs, and was asked to visit Little Haiti, but did not. As a result, Haitian lawyers leadership network's Ezili Dantó said many Haitian-Americans abstained, or voted for Donald Trump, who had no association with any American foreign policy over the past three decades. Trump won Florida, which paved the way, Dantó said, to the presidency. Though the majority of non-white Americans did vote for Hillary Clinton, she

did not do as well with black Americans at the polls as Donald Trump's predecessor, Barack Obama (Charles; Nienaber).

With the Irish "comfortably white within American culture," as Gabriel Ertsgaard said at the 2015 Transatlantic Connections Conference, the Irish-American vote fit into the only group that went majority for Trump. The fact that Hillary Clinton's husband had been instrumental in bringing peace to Northern Ireland, and she accompanied him on state visits, was irrelevant to many Trump voters. Donald Trump became president-elect of the United States on Nov. 9, 2016, instilling fear in not only the United States, in which he did not win the popular vote, but also the rest of the world, who viewed the real estate developer as more uniquely dangerous than many Americans.

A Nation in Decline?

Over the past decade, various reports have stated that the United States is no longer a functioning democracy. Four days into Donald Trump's presidency, the Economist labeled the United States a "flawed democracy," striking a blow to the concept of "American exceptionalism." Abstaining from voting, voter suppression in some states, and American incarceration rates have decreased American voting. Proliferation of lying by the media and a campaign finance system ripe for corruption have dictated that trust in the American electoral process is at an all-time low. Donald Trump's candidacy and victory are products of, but not causes for, the "long term trend" (Shen). With citizens having very little say in foreign policy, to what extent the United States, or many other nations, are true democracies is questionable: one of Barack Obama's more controversial policies was drone strikes, which killed civilians overseas, while eliminating foreign terror targets.

The People Respond

The minority of voters that voted for Donald Trump are not those protesting his hiring of a known white nationalist as his chief adviser. The majority took to the streets, in cities across the country, and compatriots joined them worldwide, protesting the Trump presidency. Called Women's Marches, they were organized by women, whom Donald Trump has bragged about sexually assaulting, but many men marched with them. In what supporters would call keeping a promise, the American president, who won only forty-six percent of the vote, instituted a ban on refugees from seven middle eastern countries, while excluding those nearby in which the Trump organization has hotels and other business interests.

Trump had campaigned on instituting a "Muslim ban." On Jan. 29, former New York mayor Rudy Giuliani told Fox News that Trump had asked Giuliani how to legally write a ban that would exclude Muslims from entering the United States. Giuliani said that the way to do it was by nationality, and not religion, because limiting access to the United States according to religion is unconstitutional. In response to Trump's order, Irish labour party leader Brendan Howlin and Green Party leader Eamon Ryan asked Teaosich Enda Kenny not to meet with Donald Trump in Washington on March 17. A petition calling for Kenny to avoid President Trump's America attracted 10,000 signatures in one day. Charles Flanagan: "While US immigration policy is a matter for US authorities, it is clear that the most recent decisions could have far-reaching implications – both on humanitarian grounds, and on relations between the US and the global Muslim community" (Belfast telegraph). Trump supporters pointed to the fact that the order only lasts ninety days.

Trump detractors, the majority of Americans, however, think the president might manufacture cause justifying an extension.

Unplanned Presidency; Unplanned Executive Orders

Much speculation is that Donald Trump did not expect to win the presidency, though he did emphasize winning in much of his bluster in debates and speeches. A tendency to say what was on his mind is what encouraged many of his supporters to vote for him, and not the infinitely more politically experienced Hillary Clinton. Trump's order to limit refugees from seven countries, leaving out the nations of the Sept. 11 hijackers, caused citizens and green card holders to be stranded at airports. Protests resumed on Jan. 28 throughout the United States. Republicans were constant critics of President Obama using executive orders whenever possible, in the face of monumental obstruction begun the night of Obama's inauguration. Trump's order, blocked by federal judges appointed by President Obama, caused chaos, indicating Trump's lack of preparedness for the office. Consensus is that Russia, under authoritarian Vladimir Putin, influenced the election to ensure a Trump win, and a Clinton loss. If America becomes weaker under Trump, Russia may be in a position to reassert itself internationally.

Many Trump critics believe he will not last his full term. Lawsuits are pending; legal scholars say he is already in violation of the American "Emoluments Clause," meaning a president cannot profit from the office, or take gifts from foreign diplomats. Trump likely violates this whenever a foreign emissary stays at a Trump hotel, or plays golf at a Trump golf course. It is possible, but unlikely, that Republicans, the party Trump joined to run, will impeach him. However, if the opposition party, the Democrats, take the

House of Representatives in 2018, impeachment is a certainty. Currently, though, the majority of Americans are in "a state of constant low level dread," as author Masha Gessen told Chris Hayes on Friday, Jan. 27, 2017. On the immigration executive order, New York Times reporter Yamiche Alcindor said: "People see this as racist and discriminatory."

Divergent Fears; Distinct Nations

The United States was not the focus of this work, but it is vital, because America was the first western nation. Contrary to the second, Haiti, in 1804 consisting of all of Hispañiola, the United States was not founded by some of the most oppressed, as was Haiti. Therefore, the American revolution cannot be a revolution according to Theda Skopcol's definition. However, it could be defined as triumphant according to Diane Russell, whose definition includes social change. With little to no British presence in the young nation, clearly social change predominated early American life.

America has often represented, though, an experiment in multicultural democracy. With class a factor in every society, often recent arrivals to a nation will discriminate against and oppose a new group of immigrants, explaining xenophobic support for Donald Trump. Thus, to an extent the election of Trump, although not the winner by popular vote, is a revolt by those who do not wish to see a more integrated America, after the age of Barack Obama. Given the current American president's inexperience governing, and the American cache of nuclear weapons, many fear Trump's erratic and irresponsible actions could lead to World War III.

Trump compares to Michel Martelly, former Haitian president, and current Guatemalan president Jimmy Morales, a former comedian, in that all three were more

popular as entertainers before election. The countries of former president Martelly and president Morales have never had nuclear weapons, but the Trump administration does, though a president cannot launch a nuclear weapon without authorization of the defense department.

In response to a fear of a more multicultural nation, some voted for Donald Trump. Estimates to when white Americans will no longer be a majority vary from between 2040 and 2050, and Barack Obama's presidency indicates that white supremacy is in decline. Yet the last gasps of a monster can be the fiercest, explaining both Trump's election and the ensuing opposition.

To the South

While few Haitians had reason to be optimistic about January elections, long term, as the government of the United States becomes more diverse, perhaps more assistance to Haiti will be forthcoming. Given Donald Trump had no foreign policy experience, and the history of racism attributed to him, he is unlikely to see improving Haiti as a priority. My interpreter Wildy knew this, though he barely, if at all, supported the Clintons. Foreign policy is complex, and a leader with no governmental experience, even if he endeavored heavily to do so, has little chance of improving conditions in the poorest nation in the world.

From Founders' Divergence

The United States' president is challenging American political conventions. Some Trump critics say he is putting the nation in jeopardy, an extreme claim, given the size of America, and how government power is shared on many levels. However, "the Haitian

Revolution is ongoing," said Noah Richard at Sin Fronteras, emphasizing the need for revolutionary politics, centuries after slavery was terminated by gun and bayonet.

On Flags and Freedom

The Haitian flag signifies that no human being should own another, and that the most oppressed can attain independence. Does freedom from chattel slavery indicate independence? Jacques, whom I met at the Haitian Mother's Day celebration, said it did not, and many impoverished Haitians would agree. Many privileged Americans are unaware that parts of the United States resemble developing nations. For example, Haiti residents are told not to drink tap water because of contamination. In the United States, for more than two years, the majority black population of Flint, Michigan, was told not to drink the water because of toxic levels of lead. Poverty in the Appalachian Mountains has been increasing for decades, since the start of coal's decline as an energy source. In response to candidate Donald Trump saying he would reopen the coal mines, many in coal country voted for the president.

In Ireland, many Unionists will be reluctant to give up their flag, desiring a continued connection to the United Kingdom. However, the Brexit vote, Britain authorizing removal from the coalition of Britain, Scotland, Wales, and Northern Ireland, complicates the future and presents many socioeconomic questions about what could occur if Britain were an independent nation. If Britain left, could Northern Ireland also leave? Journalist Natasha Lennard said such would be Sinn Féin's "dream," Brexit inspiring a united Ireland, was unlikely. More likely than one Ireland may be an independent six

county nation, alongside the Irish republic, a sentiment indicated by Ballycastle's Caroline Redmond.

Ireland, Haiti, and Empire – Past and Present

Ireland has evolved into a nation that prides itself on acceptance, tolerance, and human rights. Haiti distrusted France after winning independence, and under Henri Christophe built alliances, but because of official economic isolation placed upon them, society could not evolve beyond a militaristic state. Race played a role in Haiti's devolution; to what extent is debatable. Frantz Fanon's theory on Caribbean children of Africans must also be considered. Still, it is undeniable that if an aspiring American empire had not been paternalistic and racist toward Haiti, and to a lesser extent the Dominican Republic, that both nations would be on better economic ground today. Based upon how the United States has interacted with Haiti, Haitian society would have stronger institutions if America had followed southern Senator Hayne's advice, and not included it in the Monroe Doctrine.

Conclusions

When the United States proclaimed independence, and successfully separated itself from England, the world was exponentially unprepared for slaves to lead a path to an independent nation. Early racial notions became tinged with fear, except when nations needed Haiti in alliances for their economic successes and military battles across Europe. Ireland, infused with Norman presence since the twelfth century, never entirely saw Normans, and subsequently English and British, as a threat. Though some will argue that Wolfe Tone's first mission could have started a revolution, whether such a revolution

would have effectively freed the poor masses is debatable, since no consensus exists on the causes of the 1798 rebellion.

Centuries later, Ireland's republic is a functional and sometimes prosperous state, in which religion has far less meaning, part of Wolfe Tone's vision. However, Haiti, independent under a flag since 1804, still grapples with intense poverty and more disease than most nations. Financial maneuvers that could assist Haiti include France returning the 150,000,000 franc separation tax imposed by the French military in 1824, and a victory or settlement of the lawsuit against slave trading nations. With governmental improvements ensuring that money returned or won in court goes to Haitian citizens, the future for the land on which Toussaint Louverture is best remembered could improve dramatically.

Thus, whether independence from an oppressive force facilitates long-term prosperity depends upon the intricacies of the situation at hand. Ireland would have benefitted from a revolutionary leader earlier in the eighteenth century, and one did not arrive until the 1790s. Haiti had several leaders before Toussaint Louverture, but Toussaint was the unifying figure, enabling independence, though he never ruled an independent nation. Ireland was able to free twenty-six counties from British rule, but only with significant help from Irish-Americans. While transforming the Haitian state would face more obstacles, given the intransigence of racism, that Haiti could rise is not open to debate.

When asked via Facebook by a Haitian friend what I think Haiti needs to improve itself, I said that Haitian-Americans must lead the way – similar to how Irish-Americans funded the Irish rising. A military coup is not necessary; Haiti has pure democracy. However, investing in institutions and job creation for Haitians is required so that leaders

cease dependency upon foreign nations who may or may not highly regard Haitian interests. At that point, Haiti could establish institutions and political norms, the basis for a prosperous nation.

Works Cited

Adams, Gerry. “Gerry Adams speaking at 2014 Wolfe Tone Commemoration.” *YouTube*. YouTube. 16. June. 2014. Web. 22. Oct. 2016.

Alvarez, Lisette. “Once an Exporter of Priests, Ireland now has too few.” *New York Times*. 11 July 2004. *ProQuest*. Web. 24 Oct. 2016.

Archontology.org. “Marc-Guillaume-Alexis Vadier.” *Archontology.org – A Guide for the Study of Historical Offices*. Project History. 4 Feb. 2017. Web. 21 March 2014.

Audoin-Rozeau, Stéphanie, and Annette Becker. *14-18, Understanding the Great War.* New York: Hill and Wang, 2002. Print.

Bailey, Anne C. *African Voices of the Atlantic Slave Trade.* Boston, MA: Beacon Press, 2005. Print.

Bartlett, Thomas. “Select Documents XXXVIII: Defenders and Defenderism in 1795.” *Irish Historical Studies* 24.95 (May, 1985) *JSTOR* Web. 11 May 2014.

“Why the History of the 1798 Rebellion has yet to be Written.” *18th Century Ireland* 15 (2000) *JSTOR* Web. 11 May 2014.

Baur, John Edward. “Faustin Soulouque: Emperor of Haiti, his Character and his Reign.” *The Americas* 6.2 (October 1949). *JSTOR*. Web. 13 April 2014.

Baur, John Edward. “Mulatto Machiavelli, Jean Pierre Boyer, and the Haiti of His Day.” *The Journal of Negro History* 32.3 (July 1947). *JSTOR*. Web. 6 April 2014.

Beaubien, Jason. “U.N. Finally Apologizes for Cholera in Haite…. But Omits One Point.”

National Public Radio. 2 Dec. 2016. Web. 25 Dec. 2016.

Beeman, Richard. *Plain, Honest Men: The Making of the American Constitution.* New York: Random House, 2009. Print.

Bell, Madison Smartt. *Toussaint Louverture.* New York: Random House, 2007. Print.

Biography.com Editors. "Rafael Trujillo." *Biography.com*. 28 Jan. 2017. Web.

Blackburn, Robin. *The American Crucible.* London: Verso Press, 2011. Print.

Blackburn, Robin. "Haiti, Slavery, and the Age of Democratic Revolition." *William and Mary Quarterly* 63.4 (Oct. 2006). *JSTOR*. Web 21 March 2014.

Brown, Gregory. "French Revolution: A Chronology." *UNLV History Resources*. UNLV 2017. Web. 13 Sept. 2016.

Brown, Harold. "Robespierre's Tail: The Possibilities of Justice After the Terror." *Canadian Journal of History* (Winter 2010) 503-535. *Academic Search Premiere* Web 18 March 2014.

Byrnes, W. Malcolm. "Review: Racial Thought and Racist Thinking: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives." *Journal of American-American History*. 101. 1-2 (Winter-Spring 2016). 150-163. Web.

Cahoon, Ben. *World Statesmen.org: A World of Knowledge at Your Fingertips*. 2017. Web. 21 March 2014.

Cashel, Alice M. "Education in Ireland in the 18th Century." *The Irish Monthly* 53.628 (October, 1925) *JSTOR* Web. 11 May. 2014.

Charles, Jacqueline. "Haitian Election Cycle Nears End, with Sunday vote, and more than 5,000 seats up for grabs." *MiamiHerald.com*. 27 Jan. 2017. Web. 29 Jan. 2017.

Charles, Jacqueline, and Jay Weaver. “Former Haiti coup leader Guy Philippe arrested.” *Miamiherald.com*. 5 Jan. 2017. Web. 29 Jan. 2017.

Charles, Jacqueline. “In Miami, Haitian-American voters grapple with mixed feelings About Clinton.” *Miamiherald.com*. 29 Oct. 2016. Web. 29 Jan. 2017.

Chery, Dady. “Haiti’s Creole: The Language of Revolution.” *Newsjunkiepost.com*. News Junkie Post. 18 Dec. 2013. Web. 14 Jan. 2014.

Coakley, John. “Patrick Pearse and the ‘Noble Lie’ of Irish Nationalism.” *An Irish Quarterly Review*. 72.286 (Summer 1983). *JSTOR*. Web 14 August 2014.

Clément, Job B. “History of Education in Haiti: 1804-1915 (First Part).” *Revista de Historia de América* 87 (Jan.-June 1979). *JSTOR*. Web 6 April 2014.

Cole, Hubert. *Christophe: King of Haiti.* New York: The Viking Press, 1967. Print.

“Haiti.” Editorial. *The Colored American*. 10 Nov. 1838. *African-American Newspapers*. Web. 16 Aug. 2014.

Constitutional Rights Foundation. *Edmund Burke: The Father of Conservatism.* Constitutional Rights Foundation, 2014. Web. 17 May. 2014.

Cuvier, Georges Leopold. “Varieties of the Human Species.” *Race and the En-Lightenment – A Reader.* Ed. Emmanuel Eze. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 1997. 104-109. Print.

Davis, Nick. “The Massacre that marked Haiti-Dominical Republic Ties.” *BBC*. BBC. 13 Oct. 2012. Web. 25 Dec. 2016.

De Bréadún, Deaglán. *The Far Side of Revenge*. Cork: New Collins Press, 2008. Print.

Demangles, Leslie G. *The Faces of the Gods*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North

Carolina Press, 1992. Print.

De Smet, Brecht. "Revolution and Counter-revolution in Egypt." *Science and Society* 78.1 (Jan 2014) 11-40. *Academic Search Premiere*. Web. 2 March 2014.

Doan, James E. "'An Island in the Virginian Sea:' Native Americans and the Irish in English Discourse, 1585-1640." *New Hibernia Review* (1.1) Spring, 1997. *JSTOR*. Web 16 August 2014.

Douglass, Frederick. "Lecture on Haiti." *Great Speeches by Frederick Douglass*. Ed. James Daley. Mineola, N.Y.: Dover Publications. 2013. Print.

Doyle, Andrew. "Fast Facts about Religion in Ireland." *DoChara*. DoChara, 3 Feb. 2014. Web. 22 Oct. 2016.

Doyle, Kevin. "Fianna Fail to Stand for Elections in Northern Ireland." *Belfast Telegraph*. 12 Sept. 2016. Web. 22 Oct. 2016.

Dubois, Laurent. *Avengers of the New World.* Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press, 2004. Print.

Dunkel, G. "U.S. Backed President Installed in Haiti." *Workers World*. 19 May 2011. Web. 25 Dec. 2016.

Dunn, Richard S. *The Age of Religious Wars, 1559-1715*. New York: W.W. Norton, 1979. Print.

Dupuy, Alex. "French Merchant Capital and Slavery in Saint Domingue." Latin-American Perspectives 12.3 (Summer 1985). J Stor. Web 15 September 2016.

Eberstadt, Nicholas. "The Global Poverty Paradox." *Commentary* 130.3 (Oct. 2010): 16-23. *Academic Search Premiere*. Web. 9 Oct. 2016.

Elliott, Marianne. *Wolfe Tone: Prophet of Irish Independence*. New Haven, CT: Yale

University Press, 1989. Print.

Fanon, Frantz. *Black Skin: White Masks.* New York: Grove Press, 1967. Print.

Farmer, Paul. *The Uses of Haiti.* Monroe, ME: Common Courage Press, 2003. Print.

"Fast Facts about Religion in Ireland." Dochara. *Dochara*. 2015. Web. 22 Oct. 2016.

Fick, Carolyn. *The Making of Haiti.* Knoxville, TN: University of Tennessee Press, 2000. Print.

Fieser, Ezra. "Haitians and Dominicans Remember Parsley Massacre, 75 Years Later." *Miami Herald* 5 Oct. 2012. Web.

Foster, Roy. "Remembering 1798." History and Memory in Modern Ireland. (2001): 67-94. Web. 22. Oct. 2016.

Fraser, Thomas G. "Orangeism, Parading, and the Northern Ireland Peace Process." *New Hibernia Review* 2.2 (Summer, 1998) *JSTOR* Web. 11 May 2014.

"Galway Bridge Opened." *City Tribune*. 3 April 1934: 3. *Irish Newspaper Archives*. Web. 2 Sept. 2016.

Green, Michael. "Wolfe Tone." *Ireland Information*. 2014. Web. 30 May 2014.

Gribben, Arthur. *The Great Famine and the Irish Diaspora to America*. Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press, 1999. Print.

Jones, David. "The Transfer of Land and the Emergence of the Graziers During the Famine Period." Gribben 85-103.

Mulcrone, Mick. "The Famine and Collective Memory: The Role of the Irish-American Press in the early Twentiety Century." Gribben 219-238.

Strang, Jillian, and Joyce Toomre. “Alexis Soyer and the Irish Famine: ‘Splendid Promises and Abortive Measures’.” Gribben 66-84.

Guterl, Matthew Pratt. “The New Race Consciousness: Race, Nation, and Empire in American Culture, 1910-1925.” *Journal of World History*. 10.2 (Fall 1999). 307-352. Web. 15 Sept. 2016.

Hall, John A. “Nationalisms: Classified and Explained.” *Daedylus* 122.3 (Summer, 1993) *JSTOR*. Web. 14 August 2014.

Heller, Henry. “Marx, the French Revolution, and the Spectre of the Bourgeoisie.” *Science and Society* 74.2 (April 2010) 184-214. *Academic Search Premiere*. Web. 18 March 2014.

Hobsbawm, Eric. *The Age of Revolution*. New York: Vintage Books, 1996. Print.

Holley, Peter. “The Red Cross had $500 million in relief money, but it built just six houses.” *Washington Post*. 4 June. 2015. Web. 25 Dec. 2016.

Holmes, Jack D.L. The Abortive Slave Revolt at Point Coupée, Louisiana, 1795.” *Louisiana History: The Journal of the Louisiana Historical Association* 1.1 (Autumn 1970) *JSTOR*. Web. 16 August 2014.

Hougansydney.com. *Leaders of Haiti*. Web. 13 April 2014.

“How to Apply for a Haitian Passport for the First Time in Haiti.” *Haitian Internet Newsletter*. n.d. Web. 30. July. 2016.

Howe, Stephen. “Speaking of '98: History, Politics and Memory in the Bicentenary of the 1798 Irish Uprising.” *History Workshop Journal* 47 (Spring 1999): 222-239. *JSTOR*. Web. 24. Aug. 2016.

Ignatiev, Noel. *How the Irish Became White.* New York: Routledge, 1995. Print.

Ireland. Department of Education and Skills. *Junior Certificate History Syllabus*. Department of Education and Skills. Government of Ireland, n.d. Web. 22 Oct. 2016.

Ireland. Deaprtment of Education and Skills. *Leaving Certificate History Syllabus*. Department of Education and Skills. Government of Ireland, n.d. Web. 22 Oct. 2016.

Ireland. Department of Education and Skills. *Primary School Curriculum*. Department of Education and Skills. Government of Ireland, 1999. Web. 22 Oct. 2016.

Jacek, Eva. "Schemers and Squanderers: Jonathan Swift's 'A Modest Proposal' and Flann O'Brien's 'Slattery's Sago Saga.'" *New Hibernia Review* 2.2 (Summer, 1998). *JSTOR*. Web. 18 May 2014.

James, C.L.R. *The Black Jacobins.* New York: Random House, 1963. Print.

Jaramillo, Laura, and Cemile Sancak. "Why has the Grass Been Greener on One Side of Hispañola? A Comparative Growth Analysis of the Dominican Republic and Haiti." . *IMF Staff Papers*. 56. 2 (2009). *JSTOR*. Web 18 July 2014.

Jefferson, Thomas. "The Declaration of Independence." *Patterns for College Writing*. Ed, Laurie Kirszner. New York: Bedford/St. Martin's. 553-555. Print.

Jokinen, Anniina. *The Life of Jonathan Swift.* Anniina Jokinen, 2007. Web. 18 May. 2014.

Jupp, Peter. "Britain and the Union, 1797-1801." *Transactions of the Royal Historical*

Society, Sixth Series 10 (2000), *JSTOR* Web. 11 May. 2014.

Katz, Jonathan M. "The Clintons didn't Screw Up Haiti Alone. You Helped." *Slate*. 22 Sept. 2016. Web. 27 Dec. 2016.

Katz, Mark N. "Democratic Revolutions." *World Affairs* 166.3 (Winter 2004) 163-170. *Academic Search Premiere*. Web. 2 March 2014.

Kinealy, Christine. *Charity and the Great Hunger in Ireland*. London: Bloombsbury Academic, 2013. Print.

A Death-Dealing Famine. London, UK: Pluto Press, 1997. Print.

A Disunited Kingdom. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1999. Print.

A New History of Ireland. Gloucestshire, UK: Tempus Publishing, 2008. Print.

Repeal and Revolution. New York: Manchester University Press, 2009. Print.

War and Peace: Ireland Since the 1960s. London: Reaktion Books, 2010. Print.

Korngold, Ralph. *Citizen Toussaint.* New York: Hill and Wang, 1944. Print.

Langley, Lester D. *The Americas in the Age of Revolution.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1996. Print.

Leonard, Thomas C. "Retrospectives: Eugenics and Economics in the Progressive Era." *The Journal of Economic Perspectives*. 19.4 (Autumn, 2005): 207-224. Web. 25 Dec. 2016.

Leonard, Tom, and Simon Tomlinson. "Fourteen Caribbean nations sue Britain, Holland and France for slavery reparation that could cost hundreds of billions of pounds." *Daily Mail.com*. 11 Oct. 2013. Web. 29 Jan. 2017.

Levine-Gronningsater, Sarah. "A Crusade Against Slavery – Session One: Antislavery in

The Revolutionary and Early National Periods." City University of New York. The Graduate Center. New York. 18 Oct. 2014. Lecture.

Linton, Marisa. "Robespierre and the Terror." *History Today* 56.8 (August 2006) 23-29. *Academic Search Premiere*. Web. 14 March 2014.

Logan, Rayford W. *Haiti and the Dominican Republic*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1968. Print.

Lundahl, Mats. "History as an Obstacle to Change: the Case of Haiti." Journal of Interamerican Studies and World Affairs 37. ½ (Spring-Summer 1989). *JSTOR*. Web 13 April 2014.

MacCorkle, William A. "The Monroe Doctrine and its Application to Haiti." Annals of the American Academy of Social and Political Science: International Relations of the United States, Vol. 54 (July 1914). *JSTOR*. Web 13 April 2014.

Macdonagh, Tommy. "Two-thirds would back a united Ireland, if a referendum were held today, poll finds." By Michael Sheils McNamee. TheJournal.ie. *TheJournal.ie*. 29 July. 2016. Web 22. Oct. 2016.

Magennis, Eoin. "A 'Beleagured Protestant'?: Walter Harris and the writing of "Fiction Unmasked" in Mid-18th Century Ireland." *18th Century Ireland* 13 (1998). *JSTOR*. Web. 11 May. 2014.

McCullough, David. *John Adams.* New York: Touchstone, 2001. Print.

McDonald, Henry. "Martin McGuinness resigns as deputy first minister of Northern Ireland." *Theguardian.com*. 10 Jan. 2017. Web. 29 Jan. 2017.

McGovern, Mark. "Myths and Marches: History, Class, and the Siege of Derry, 1689."

History, Ireland 5.4 (Winter 1997), Web. 11 May. 2014.

McKittrick, David. "Republic of Ireland abandoning religion faster than any almost any other country in the world." *Independent*. 8 Aug. 2012. Web. 22 Oct. 2016.

McMinn, Joseph. "Jonathan Swift and the Church of Ireland, 1710-1724, by Christopher J. Fauske." *Eighteenth Century Ireland* 18 (2003), Web. 18 May. 2014.

McNamee, Michael Sheils. "Two-thirds would back a united Ireland, if a referendum were held today, poll finds." *TheJournal.ie*. 29 July. 2016. Web. 22 Oct. 2016.

Mongey, Vanessa. "A Tale of Two Brothers: Haiti's Other Revolutions." *The Americas* 69.1 (July 2012). 37-60. Web. 13 April 2014.

Moriarty, Gerry. "What is the Northern Ireland cash for ash scheme?" *Irishtimes.com*. 19. Dec. 2016. Web. 29 Jan. 2017.

Nairn, Allen. "The Eagle is Landing." *The Nation*. 3 Oct. 1994. Print.

The National Archives. *The National Archives*. Gov. UK 2014. Web. 2 Mar 2014.

"Nationalism." *The American Heritage Dictionary*. July, 2000. Print.

Nelson, Bruce. *Irish nationalists and the making of the Irish Race*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2012. Print.

Nelson, William Javier. "The Haitian Political Situation and its Effects on the Dominican Republic: 1849-1877." *The Americas* 45.2 (October 1988). 227-235. Web. 26 Sept. 2016.

Nicholls, David. *From Dessalines to Duvalier*. Melbourne: Press Syndicate of the University of Cambridge, 1979. Print.

Nienaber, Georgianne. "Did Trump's visit to little Haiti help him win Florida?"

Huffingtonpost.com.12 Nov. 2016. Web. 29 Jan. 2017.

Nuñez, Laura. "Requisitos para solicitor un pasaparte dominicano." *Connectate.com.do*. 11 May 2011. Web. 9 Oct. 2016.

Nutt, Kathleen, and Peter Gray. "Re-thinking Irish Nationalism: Identity, Difference and the Northern Conflict." *Studies: An Irish Quarterly Review* 83.329 (1990) *JSTOR*. Web. 29 September 2016.

Nwosu, Chiamaka, and Jeanne Batalova. "Haitian Immigrants in the United States." *Migration Policy.org*. Web. 25 Dec. 2016.

O'Connor, Sir James. *History of Ireland, Volume I*. New York: George H. Doran Co., 1926. Print.

O'Day, Alan. "Imagined Irish Communities: Networks of Social Communication of the Irish Diaspora in the United States and Britain in the Late Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries." *Immigrants and Minorities*. Vol. 23 (July-Nov. 2005): 399-424. Web. 25 July. 2016.

France. *The Official Website of France*. 2017. Web. 16 Mar 2014.

O'Flaherty, Eamonn. "Burke and the Catholic Question." *18th Century Ireland* 12 (1997) Web. 11 May. 2014.

O'Grada, Cormac. Black 47 and Beyond: *The Great Irish Famine in History, Economy, and Memory*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1999. Print.

O'Leary, Richard. "Census 2016 will get religion all wrong." Letter. *Irish Times* 18 Apr. 2016: Web. 24 Oct. 2016.

O'Leighin, Tadhg. "Wolfe Tone Ceremony." Letter. *Southern Star* 14 Nov. 1998: 4.

Irish Newspaper Archives. Web. 2 Sept. 2016.

Padgett, James A. "Diplomats to Haiti and their Diplomacy." *The Journal of Negro History* (July 1940). *JSTOR*. Web 13 April 2014.

"Party leaders call on Enda Kenny to reject Donald Trump White House invite." *Belfasttelegraph.co.uk*. 29 Jan. 2017. Web. 29 Jan. 2017.

Pakenham, Thomas. *The Year of Liberty: The History of the Great Irish Rebellion of 1798*. New York: Random House, 1969. Print.

Paulino, Edward. *Dividing Hispañiola*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2016. Print.

Rapport, Michael. "Napoleon's Rise to Power." *History Today* 43.1 (Jan. 98) 12-19. *Academic Search Premiere*. Web 14 March 2014.

Salmon, Stephanie. "Milestones in U.S. Political History: African-Americans and Women in Politics." *US News and World Report*. 5 November 2008. Web.

Schwartz, Barry. *George Washington: the Making of an American Symbol*. New York: The Free Press, 1987. Print.

Sciolino, Elaine. "Clinton Says U.S. will continue ban on Haitian Exodus." *Nytimes.com*. 15. Jan. 1993. Web. 29 Jan. 2017.

Shen, Lucinda. "The U.S. was just downgraded from a 'full' to a 'flawed' democracy." *Fortune.com*. 25 Jan. 2017. 29 Jan. 2017.

Simms, J.G. "Remembering 1690." *Studies: An Irish Quarterly Review* 63.251 (Autumn, 1974). *JSTOR*. Web. 11 May. 2014.

Soper, Kerry. "From Swarthy Ape to Sympathetic Everyman and Subversive Trickster:

The Development of Irish Caricature in American Comic Strips between 1890 and 1920." *Journal of American Studies*. 39.2 (Aug. 2005). 257-296. Web. 22 Dec. 2016.

Spiller, John. "Talking Points: Reform and Revolution." *History Review* 41.45 (December 2001) 45-50. Academic Search Premiere. Web. 16 March 2014.

Stein, Robert. "Measuring the French Slave Trade, 1713-1792/3." *Journal of African History* 19.4 (1978). *JSTOR*. Web. 18 March 2014.

Swift, Jonathan. "A Modest Proposal." *Patterns for College Writing.* Ed. Laurie Kirszner. New York: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2012, 692-699. Print.

Thomas Jefferson Monticello. *Timeline of key events in the French and Haitian Revolutions, and American Politics*. Web. 23 March 2014.

Todd, Allan. *Revolutions, 1789-1917.* New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004. Print.

Torres-Saillant, Silvio. "The Stages of Blackness: Stages in Dominican Racial Identity." *Latin American Perspectives* 25.3 (1998): 126-146. JSTOR. Web. 30 July. 2016.

Trouillot, Michel-Rolph. *Haiti: State Against Nation – the Origins and Legacy of Duvalierism.* New York: Monthly Review Press, 1990. Print.

TudorsandStuarts.com. *Tudors and Stuarts.* 25 June 2015. Web.

The United Kingdom. *The Official Website of the British Monarchy.* 2017. 17 May 2014. Web.

Walsh, Joan. *What's the Matter with White People?* New York: Simon and Schuster, 2013. Print.

Washington, George. "George Washington on the abolition of slavery, 1786." *The Gilder*

Lehrman Institute of American History. Gilderlehrman.org. 2014. Web. 18 March 2014.

Washington, Harriet A. *Medical Apartheid.* New York: Random House, 2006. Print.

Weber, Eugen. "When Virtue Wed Terror." *New Leader* 88.6 (Nov./Dec. 2005) 19-21. *Academic Search Premiere*. Web. 16 March 2014.

Weede, Erich, and Muller, Edward N. "Rebellion, Violence and Revolution: a Rational Choice Perspective." *Journal of Peace Studies* 35.1 (Jan 1998) 43-59. *JSTOR*. Web.13 Sept. 2016.

Weisbrot, Mark. "Obama and Latin America." *Latin American Perspectives*. 38.4 (July 2011). 63-72. Web. 25 Dec. 2016.

Wittkowsky, George. "Swift's Modest Proposal: The Biography of an Early Georgian Pamphlet." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 4.1 (Jan. 1943). *JSTOR*. Web. 18 May 2014.

Woodham-Smith, Cecil. *The Great Hunger.* New York: Harper and Row, 1962. Print.

Zach, Wolfgang. "Jonathan Swift and Colonialism." *The Canadian Journal of Irish Studies* 26.1 (Spring 2000). Web. 18 May 2014.

VITA

Full Name: Michael Keith Walters

Place of Birth: Queens, New York

Parents: Mark and Cynthia Walters

Educational Institutions:

School	Place	Degree	Date
Secondary: Morris Hills	Rockaway, NJ	Diploma	6/89
Collegiate: Rutgers Unviersity	New Brunswick, NJ	B.A. Spanish	5/93
Graduate: New York University	New York, NY	M.A. Journalism	5/98
Doctorate: Drew University	Madison, NJ	D. Litt	5/17