



LAKE SUPERIOR STATE UNIVERSITY

Sabbatical Leave Report
Spring 2018
James J. Schaefer, Professor of History

I would like to thank the Sabbatical Committee and to Lake Superior State University for the opportunity to focus solely on my research during the Spring 2018 semester. The purpose behind the sabbatical was to begin work on a manuscript studying masculinity in the Great Lakes in North America between 1600 and 1800. It is one of my professional goals to publish a historical manuscript that offers fresh light on the topic of masculinity in early America.

General Overview of Sabbatical Activity

I began the sabbatical with an evidentiary base that was a collection of previously published journal articles, conference papers, a stack of secondary outlines, and a mound of primary documentation. Shortly into the start of the sabbatical, I realized that my initial proposal was seriously flawed and quickly realized that it was completely unwieldy. With the basic concept of masculinity in mind, I re-envisioned my work. However, I was able to reshape certain aspect of the original proposal and use those to great advantage. The largest portion, however, has been reshaped into investigating that a basic tenet of a “citizen army” is that its membership does not come from a military heritage, but are willing to momentarily suspend what they knew as civilians while adhering to the behavioral attitudes of a patriarchal military language. Men who fought in the American Revolution were not professionals; they were amateur combatants without a strong military tradition, separated by regional differences and any semblance of cohesiveness. The following provides a representation of the work completed.

Research Activity during Sabbatical

My work examines the American soldiers’ acclimation to the American interpretation of the military ethos, the accompanying military sub-culture, and its authority. It argues that American interpretations of contemporary, European military thought shaped the American military code of behavior, maintaining and transplanting virtues reserved for upper-class distinction onto those of the lower sort within the rank-and-file. Although men in militias and the Continental Army became part of a subculture of the greater American society, in which wealth, education, and civil authority were not significant variables for inclusion into the rank-and-file, the solidarity and uniformity created through the military ethos helped soldiers move through military rites of passages. Enlisted soldiers trained together, stood guard together, suffered the elements together, stood inspection together, went to war together; and even united against officers together. Motives for enlistment and willingness to submit to hierarchy and discipline

were integral, and the level of familiarity with the military subculture (hierarchy, discipline, and the trappings of parade and formations) was not only dependent upon the formality of training but also on forms of authority.

My research reflects theories and analytical viewpoints from sociology, psychology, philosophy, gender studies, military studies, and political science to define interactions of men during the American Revolution, and promotes an understanding of an individual's adoption, rejection, and blending of the military ethos. It adds to the historical discussion on the broad historical analysis of different masculine ideals within local militias and the Continental Army. It also complements the limited historiography of Common Law and the military, in which the former is silent on how martial authority is to be put into practice. My research continues examination into how Common Law set behavioral standards for society as a whole and the military subculture policed its own behavior, defining the warrior code that not only fit social expectations but that met the standards of the military. In addition, it furthers investigation into the merging the warrior ethic with republican virtue challenged professional and citizen-soldier alike, imparting on them the military dogma of acceptable behavior.

The research completed for a manuscript currently holds eight chapters. Chapter 1, "The *Rage Militaire*: Influences of Military Treatises on the American Warrior Code," examines how military treatises became popularized during the American passion for arms in 1775. These treatises contained much needed information on organizational regimental practices and the evolution of the eighteenth-century drill manual. Officers who read these treatises found the military dogma of acceptable behavior interspersed with military strategy and tactics. Predominant in military treatises were words like politeness, honor, self-esteem, fortitude, and trustworthiness; words that helped instruct officers in proper social and professional behavior, all for the good of class distinction. The interpretations of the treatises were filtered from literate officers to illiterate enlisted soldiers. Chapter 2, "The Military Subculture: A Revolutionary Warrior Code," explores constructed military codes of behavior and how they are self-imposed from inside the military micro-society rather than outside, based on the emphasis of a man's conscious choice of willingness to endure shared adversity. The early American military micro-culture's understanding of the warrior code grew from the *rage militaire* of 1775 and was interpreted differently by local militias and the Continental Army, exacerbating intercontinental and intercultural differences, often with differing levels of appreciation. In many ways, the menagerie of military thought in which the accusation of effeminate behavior or belittling of military prowess was based more on religious, political, or social reasons than military effectiveness. Chapter 3, "A Military Education," illustrates how time and opportunity were lacking for the fledgling American military forces. Peacetime training was relegated to local militia musters, which left them ill-trained and ill-prepared. Regularity and uniformity of drill regulations did not have the deepest cognitive impact before the Revolutionary War. The informal nature of militia musters emboldened individual autonomy: it illustrated individual willingness, a less threatening environment of learning, and the incorporation of life experiences. The more formal education of State and Continental soldiers encouraged cohesiveness; it demonstrated a quicker learning curve from instruction to performance. More important, formal introduction into soldiering played a de-individualizing role for the individual soldier, following in-step with changes in Western military affairs. These different forms of education were intended to create some semblance of a professional army, yet, republican enough not to be considered a standing army. Merging the warrior ethic with republican virtue challenged

professional and citizen-soldier alike, imparting on them the military dogma of acceptable behavior.

In Chapter 4, "Military Authority: Militias vs. the Continental Army," the legitimization of sub-cultural education and its employment through forms authority is examined. For the purposes of this chapter, there are two main forms of authority considered: charismatic and legal authority. Charismatic authority is an emotional form of communal influence, in which members are not technically trained, legitimized through the personal charisma of a chosen or elected leader. The informal nature of local militias is more susceptible to legitimize this form of authority; its decentralized influence diminishes when it is absorbed into more traditional, power-oriented institutions within a community. Legal authority is the anti-thesis. Every-day routine and action is controlled when a patriarchal leader establishes the legitimacy of the order. Organizational rules, spheres of competence, principles of hierarchy, regulation of conduct and written rules are all integral to centralized, legal authority; they are the basis for the Continental Army's ability to absorb men who enlisted for a variety of reasons and interests, and to make them adhere to a tradition of military legality. Chapter 5, "Politics of Masculinity in Militias," examines how citizen-soldiers, both patriot and loyalist, from any number of social backgrounds, but with common community origin, joined the ranks of local militias, in which they were obligated to accept a certain masculine code that professional soldiers readily adopted. Short-term enlistments hindered the militiaman's complete acceptance of the code, which was what ultimately led the Continental command to question their battlefield effectiveness. While militiamen were noted for their individualism in the coastal communities, militiamen on the fringes of civilization found identity in the primarily unregulated frontier. Militiamen found that the unregulated frontier had norms in which constructions of masculinity and the warrior code were more flexible, less constrained societal stereotypes of appropriate behavior. The frontier lifestyle encouraged expression through individuality and, spurred through their understanding of the Native American warrior ethic, readily discarded the imposed beliefs and perceptions of formal etiquette, patriarchal authority, or preoccupation with class-distinction.

Chapter 6, "Politics of Masculinity in the Continental Army," illustrates that soldiers in the Continental Army were much like militiamen in that they experienced masculine rites of passage that differed from their typical civilian experiences as farmers, artisans, blacksmiths, laborers, or slaves. However, they did not have the same frequency of interaction as their short-term counterparts. Enlistment terms of three years or more all but ensured masculine military conformity, though limited in social organization, and created interpersonal-relationships in a de-individualized organization. Assisting in forging soldiers were English, French, German, Polish, and Spanish regulars; all professional soldiers who were already intimately trained in similar warrior codes. Chapter 7, "Under the Articles of War: Martial Crime and Punishment," argues that subordination to the military code and its authority had little to no value without discipline. Considerable variation in the nature and extent of service between militiamen and Continental soldiers existed; this complicated disciplinary enforcement. Militiamen served as a compulsory function of community protection. Continental soldiers served voluntarily, willing to offer service and forego certain civil rights and privileges. State and national Articles of War reveal malleable jurisdictions. What did and what did not violate the Articles of War were often unknown, misunderstood, or ignored by typical, illiterate soldiers. It was no small measure of willingness for Anglo-Americans to temporarily suspend their civilian rights, as militiamen could serve one day or six months, making the chances of them understanding military expectations minimal. Chapter 8, the final chapter, "Understanding and Behavior while

Campaigning,” delves into ways the military code of conduct, or the warrior code, impacted the individual soldiers’ psyche. Warrior codes not only created a military bond between men who were possibly breaking social constraints, but were intended to help reduce the effect of psychological and sensory experiences. Mental stress or discomfort experienced by soldiers varied: performing actions contrary to one or more beliefs; managing their situational awareness during battle; dealing with injuries or death; and self-justification of actions that are consistent with personal ideology. Sensory experiences of the above stressors made the experience feel tangible: poor battlefield visibility; new sights and smells of unfamiliar environments; visualization of linear formations on the battlefield; sounds of cannon fire; being within audible range of screaming Native American warriors; or complete silence before or after a skirmish or battle.

The sociological study by Shannon French, *The Code of the Warrior* (2003), Nancy Sherman’s philosophical *Stoic Warriors* (2005), and the psychological and gender study of military masculinity by Leo Braudy, *From Chivalry to Terrorism* (2003), are all vital sources for my research. These works help show how virtues for society and the military have slight variations, distinctions that are important to show that soldiers are willing to suffer for ideological reasons. Boys in their young teens or men in their early twenties find there is a moral significance placed upon them that is particularly unique to the military subculture: soldiers are ordered or led into actions that may cause death, convey the power to take lives, or transfer the awesome responsibility of saving lives. These concepts fit well with recent New Military histories, with particular note to John Ruddiman’s *Becoming Men of Some Consequence* (2014), and Ricardo Herrera’s *For Liberty and the Republic* (2015). Ruddiman guides the reader through the life of a Revolutionary soldier, from enlistment to reentering civilian life. Revolutionary military life offered young men opportunities of growth in gender, family, economic, and political goals, all the while examining masculine expectations of respectable manhood. Rather than following a man’s progression of service, Herrera examines Republicanism as a conduit of continuity in maintaining an American military ethos. He notes five broad republican principles important to maintaining this conduit: virtue, legitimacy, self-governance, God’s will, and glory and fame.

More classic New Military histories referenced in my research include Don Higginbotham, *The War of American Independence: Military Attitudes, Policies, and Practice, 1763-1789* (1971), Charles Royster’s *A Revolutionary People at War* (1979), and Charles Patrick Niemeyer’s *America Goes to War: A Social History of the Continental Army* (1996). Higginbotham argues that the American army was a mirror image of the society from which it arose, and that the military and civil institutions of America are affected by the connection between warfare and society. Royster’s reveals that there was a coherent relationship between the Continental Army and patriotic Americans, articulated through their emotions, attitudes, and actions. This relationship forged a bond among the people and in the creation of a new nation. Whereas Royster argues that the people who fought in the Revolution had a particular reason for joining into the fight for freedom, Neimeyer gives clear and precise reasons why some Americans had very little choice as to becoming a soldier and that those soldiers might not look at themselves with the same national character as other soldiers. He argues that the Continental Line consisted of ethnic groups that do not fit the traditional image of soldiers during the Revolutionary War, and that the true heroes of the Revolution are not the well-to-do or those with political power.

Citizenship, military service, and masculinity are explored effectively in R. Claire Snyder's *Citizen-Soldiers and Manly Warriors* (1999). She argues that the citizen-soldier followed a prescriptive ideal of masculinity in civic and martial practices. Although Snyder's examination of how these practices undermined female participation is not investigated further in my work, her challenge to gender construction is important for the creation of the martial subculture within civil society. Gregory Knouff takes on the task of identity-making during the Revolution in *The Soldiers' Revolution* (Penn State Press, 2004). In one of his main themes, Knouff argues that military service was an advantage of citizenship for white males. Membership was denied to those of different ideologies, race, or gender. General concepts of masculinity during the Revolutionary era in Mark E Kann's *A Republic of Men* (1998) and Michael Kimmel's *Manhood in America: A Cultural History* (1996) are the most utilized. The preponderance of writings on military masculinity is either concerned with early and colonial forms of martial-manliness or spanned over a greater period of time. Armstrong Starkey's *European and Native American Warfare, 1675-1815* (1998) and John Grenier's *The First Way of War* ((2005) are examples of this type of generalization, as both are more concerned with technologies, tactics, and customs.

Post-Sabbatical Results

New information unveiled during sabbatical resulted in my submission of a journal article to *Early American Studies: An Interdisciplinary Journal* and a manuscript proposal to the University of Kansas Press. Unfortunately, the latter submission was recently rejected, though I was encouraged to remain working on the project. I am also finishing work on one journal article that will be ready for submission the end of December once Fall 2018 semester is complete. Furthermore, I am in the middle of finishing a chapter for an Anthology on the making of the Midwest. This chapter examines Frontiersmen in the Ohio Valley, 1787-1830 and includes data collected during the sabbatical.

In my first semester back from sabbatical I have found opportunities to incorporate some of my research into class preparation. For example, my discussion on Authority has been incorporated into HIST231, Natives and Newcomers. This is an excellent inclusion into my discussion on how French and Native Americans viewed each other politically, socially, and diplomatically. I have also been able to offer questions that I propose into HIST131, U.S. History I, especially the aspect on why men fought during the American Revolution and what they may or may not have experienced.