

RECONSTRUCTING THE SELF AND THE
AMERICAN: CIVIL WAR VETERANS IN
KHEDIVAL EGYPT

A Ph.D. Dissertation

by
TARIK TANSU YIĞİT

Department of History
İhsan Doğramacı Bilkent University
Ankara
August 2020

TARIK TANSU YIĞİT

RECONSTRUCTING THE SELF AND THE AMERICAN:
CIVIL WAR VETERANS IN KHEDIVAL EGYPT

Bilkent University 2020

To my grandmother/babaanneme.

RECONSTRUCTING THE SELF AND THE AMERICAN:
CIVIL WAR VETERANS IN KHEDIVAL EGYPT

The Graduate School of Economics and Social Sciences
of
İhsan Doğramacı Bilkent University

by

TARIK TANSU YİĞİT

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY IN HISTORY

THE DEPARTMENT OF
HISTORY
İHSAN DOĞRAMACI BİLKENT UNIVERSITY
ANKARA

August 2020

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in History.

Asst. Prof. Dr. Kenneth Weisbrode
Supervisor

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in History.

Prof. Dr. Tanfer Emin Tunç
Examining Committee Member

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in History.

Asst. Prof. Dr. Owen Miller
Examining Committee Member

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in History.

Asst. Prof. Dr. Bahar Gürsel
Examining Committee Member

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in History.

Asst. Prof. Dr. Daniel Johnson
Examining Committee Member

Approval of the Graduate School of Economics and Social Sciences

Prof. Dr. Halime Demirkan
Director

ABSTRACT

RECONSTRUCTING THE SELF AND THE AMERICAN: CIVIL WAR VETERANS IN KHEDIVAL EGYPT

Yiğit, Tarık Tansu

Ph.D., Department of History

Supervisor: Asst. Prof. Dr. Kenneth Weisbrode

August 2020

Between 1869 and 1878, American officers from both sides of the Civil War were recruited into the Egyptian Army. The former foes collaborated in reforming the khedival military by reorganizing the units and professional training, building up defenses, exploring territories down to Equatorial Provinces, and mapping the peripheries. As an earlier example of ex-Confederate-Union amalgamation, the Egyptian experience provided the veterans, whom post-war economic and political conditions in the United States pushed for new quests to restore their professional and economic dignity. This dissertation narrates the story of their sojourn in Egypt, their activities, how they were able to reconcile in a profoundly foreign setting, and the sense of alienation in the host society, which contributed to this (re)constructed national identity.

Keywords: American Civil War, Egypt, Honor, Reconciliation, Veterans.

ÖZET

İTİBAR VE AMERİKALI KİMLİĞİNİN YENİDEN İNŞASI: AMERİKAN İÇ SAVAŞI VETERANLARININ MİSİR DENEYİMİ

Yiğit, Tarık Tansu

Doktora, Tarih Bölümü

Tez Danışmanı: Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Kenneth Weisbrode

Ağustos 2020

1869-1878 yılları arasında Amerikan İç Savaşı'nın her iki tarafından yaklaşık elli subay Mısır ordusunda görev almıştır. Konfederasyon-Birlik veteranları arasındaki uzlaşının erken bir örneği olan Amerikan "misyonu," Mısır askeri teşkilatının yeniden düzenlenmesi, savunma yapılarının istihkam edilmesi, Ekvator kuşağına uzanan keşifler ve çevre bölgelerin haritalandırılmasında işbirliği yapmışlardır. Mısır deneyimi, savaş sonrası ekonomik ve politik koşulların yeni arayışlara ittiği veteranlara, mesleki ve ekonomik itibarlarını yeniden tesis edebilecekleri bir restorasyon olanağı sunmuştur. Amerikalı subayların kişisel arayışları ve Mısır'daki faaliyetlerine odaklanan bu çalışma, ayrıca, veteranların kültürel açıdan oldukça yabancı bir ortamda nasıl bir araya gelebildiklerini ve tecrübe ettikleri yabancılık hissinin grup içinde Amerikan kimliğinin yeniden inşasına nasıl katkıda bulunduğunu incelemektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Amerikan İç Savaşı, İtibar, Mısır, Uzlaşma, Veteranlar.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

When “two roads diverge in a wood,” you either take “the one less traveled by” or the one many followed before you. One is exciting with the allure of the unknown, and the other is safe with the comfort of familiarity. I have undertaken the challenging yet exhilarating task of following both, namely academia and professional life, sometimes simultaneously, sometimes returning to the start after running through one. Perhaps it was not the best decision. Still, it made all the difference.

It was a long journey, during which my road has crossed with some excellent mentors who made valuable contributions at each level. My advisor Kenneth Weisbrode, Tanfer E. Tunç, Owen Miller, and Edward Kohn have always been a great help during the painful writing process and became my role models with their kindness to share their wisdom throughout my doctoral study. Without their scholarly guidance, friendly advice, patience, and everlasting motivation, this degree would not be earned. I owe special thanks to Akif Kireççi and Bahar Gürsel for their kind reviews, feedback, and joyful cooperation to make this dissertation stronger as well as their ever-growing support in general.

As a student with converging interests in American Studies, I am glad to be a “seasoned” member of Bilkent History and Hacettepe American Culture and Literature families. I sincerely thank my professors in both departments for a decade of guidance, which made me what I am today. I am also grateful to The Turkish

Fulbright Commission for supporting my research in the United States; Cemal Kafadar for his boundless inspiration and for sponsoring my fellowship at the Harvard History Department; cohorts from whom I learned a lot at the loveliest Yard; the helpful staff of NARA, Library of Congress, UNC Wilson Library, Madison Historical Society Library and Harvard libraries who altogether fascinated me with their courtesy; editors of *The Journal of the Civil War Era* for their review of my article which is an offspring of this broader text; Fisun, Ali, and Raul for kindly tolerating my class/teaching days out of office and early morning drinks; Nil Tekgöl for her encouragement during the coffee breaks at lovely Lamont Library; Berrak Burçak, Abdi, Can, Burcu, Ayşegül, Murat, Doğuş, Turaç, Mert, Sena, and Merve for all the great memories as well as petty miseries on AZ, HZ corridors; Watchmen for keeping me in the club although I still haven't watched *The Wire*; Josh for his meticulous reading of my article draft; Franze, Konrad and little Leyla for opening the study-terrace; Line, Tim, and Adelle for threshold talks at midnight; Cem and Aytaç for the muse of music both in Cambridge and on the narrow lanes of Eastern Turkey; Polat, Burak and Eda for making things more accessible; Burçak, İpek, Pelin, Esin, Eda, Gizem, Duygu, Emel and Cagla for their lifelong friendship.

My sister has looked at me with some sort of admiration in her words, but she proved to be more influential on her students in a small town not far from where the land meets Lake Van. I admire her diligence, while her tendency to minimize her abilities drive me crazy. My parents do not understand what I am doing –it seems they gave up! According to mom, I should have retired from studying long before and had a night of better sleep, instead. Nevertheless, it is always relieving to know that the family members would do everything in their best capacity to make you cheerful. Mine have done so. I dedicate this humble work to the memory of my beloved

grandma, who passed away recently, leaving me in unmatched despair. Still, I am relieved to know she knew that I loved her with all my heart.

Thanks, in all languages, spoken and dead.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	iii
ÖZET	iv
ACKNOWLEDGMENT	v
TABLE OF CONTENTS	viii
CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION	1
1.1. Literature Review	6
1.2. Terminology: Honor	20
1.3. Terminology: The Nature of Absence	24
1.4. Outline	26
CHAPTER II: CALLING OF THE “ARABIAN NIGHTS” ON THE NILE.....	35
2.1. “People Ready to Hop:” Pushing Factors	38
2.2. Khedive’s Interest in the American Expertise	45
2.3. Recruitment, Responses, and Characteristics of the American Group ..	49
2.4. Conclusion	60
CHAPTER III: AMERICAN PHOENIX IN THE LAND OF THE PHARAOHS: CHARLES POMEROY STONE.....	62
3.1. A Career Destroyed by a “Great Wrong”	64
3.2. Stone in Egypt: A Promise of Rebirth	67
3.3. A Pasha of his Own: Reforms in the Army	75
3.4. Conclusion	87
CHAPTER IV: THE EASTERN FRONTIER: AMERICANS MAPPING THE OLD CONTINENT	89
4.1. Following the Nile: Charles Chaillé-Long in Central Africa	91
4.2. Duty-Bound: Raleigh Edward Colston’s Desert Days	102
4.3. Samuel Henry Lockett: “A Man the Place Needed:”	109
4.4. Other Surveys and Nature of the Expeditions	116
4.5. Conclusion	118

CHAPTER V: “THE TORPEDO AND THE WHALE:” AMERICANS IN THE ABYSSINIAN VALLEY	120
5.1. The Egyptian-Abyssinian Conflict: Defeat in Gundet.....	122
5.2. Searching for Glory in Gura: An Ineffective Cooperation	124
5.3. Defeat through the American Lens.....	127
5.4. End of the Campaign: Reflections.....	135
5.5. Conclusion	141
CHAPTER VI: “EGYPTIAN CORN FOR GEORGIAN BREAD:” CHARLES IVERSON GRAVES’S SOJOURN	143
6.1. A “Manifest Destiny:” Graves’s Early Career and Egyptian Sojourn.	145
6.2. Graves in Massawa, Charkeyeh, and Cape Guardafui	148
6.3. Financial Success out of Sacrifices	155
6.4. A Father far from Home: Graves’s Paternal Concerns.....	160
6.5. An Honorable Discharge	168
6.6. Conclusion	175
CHAPTER VII: RECONSTRUCTING THE AMERICAN IN EGYPT	177
7.1. Psychological and Cultural Foundations of Reconciliation	179
7.2. Reflections about Abolition.....	186
7.3. Empathy among the Former Foes.....	190
7.4. Echoes of the Civil War in a Distant Land.....	192
7.5. Veterans’ Relations to the Past and Present	200
7.6. “The Black Sheep:” Concern for the National Reputation.....	202
7.7. Conclusion	205
CHAPTER VIII: “STRANGERS IN A STRANGE LAND:” THE CULTURAL GAP AND VOLUNTARY ISOLATION	207
8.1. The Language Barrier	209
8.2. Disparities in Manners and Work Ethics	212
8.3. The Fellah and His Soldierly Conduct	221
8.4. Oriental Religion and Women in the Mercenary Accounts.....	225
8.5. Voluntary Isolation and Veterans’ Views of the Khedive.....	234
8.6. Conclusion	238
CHAPTER IX: ENTANGLEMENT IN THE “TIDY, LITTLE WAR” OF 1882: ENGAGEMENT, POLEMICS, AND OBSERVATIONS.....	240
9.1. Stone’s Observations and an American Polemic.....	243
9.2. Stone Ladies in the Midst of Turmoil.....	253
9.3. Another Card for Chaillé-Long	255
9.4. Americans’ Views of the Arab Nationalism and Future of Egypt.....	260
9.5. Conclusion	266

CHAPTER X: CONCLUSION	268
BIBLIOGRAPHY	276
APPENDICES	293
American Mercenaries in the Egyptian Service (1869-1882)	293
Photo Album: American Officers in Egyptian Uniforms	301
Great Map of Africa	306
American Consulate after the Bombardment of Alexandria	307

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

“It was my fortune, good or bad –it is hard to say which– to have been an officer in the Egyptian Army.” – Samuel Henry Lockett¹

“The American Mission to Egypt added prestige to the American name in Egypt and Africa. The Mission has had no historian and its achievements have been methodically ignored.” – Charles Chaillé-Long²

On the morning of November 6, 2000, a group of American expatriates, diplomatic staff along with Ambassador Daniel C. Kurtzer, Major General Robert Wilson, the highest-ranking American military officer in Egypt, the United States Marines Honor Guard, and Egyptian officials gathered in Old Cairo’s brick-walled Protestant (American) cemetery to honor a long-forgotten Civil War veteran who died in the

¹ Samuel Henry Lockett, “Notes on the Abyssinian Campaign of the Egyptian Army” (Notebook 1875-1876), Samuel Henry Lockett Papers, Southern Historical Collection, Wilson Library, The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (hereafter cited as Lockett Papers). Lockett recurrently expressed his doubts concerning the Egypt adventure in slightly differing wording: “Arabi and His Army,” newspaper clipping, September 15, 1882; “Recent War in Egypt,” unpublished manuscript, February 1881; “Recent Military Operation of the Egyptians,” unpublished manuscript, undated, all in Lockett Papers.

² Charles Chaillé-Long, “The Forgotten American Mission,” Charles Chaillé-Long Papers, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C. (hereafter cited as Chaillé-Long Papers).

khedival capital more than a hundred years ago. A trumpeter played taps, and the guard dipped flags next to a recently built obelisk amidst the cobblestoned alley shaded by palm fronds and colossal eucalyptuses.³ Today, the somewhat withered tombstone, placed on the obelisk's one side reads: "Né dans l'état de New York en 1838; Expédition de Colorado 1857-60; Darfur el Hofra el Nahass 1874-76; Décédé au Caire, le 21 Juin 1881." It presents "Yankee" lieutenant Erastus Sparrow Purdy's life story in a nutshell, which included a blood-stained war at home with the highest death toll in the history of the nation as well as his unprecedented service with his "rebel" countrymen in an unimaginable setting: Khedival Egypt which was then a nominal part of the declining Ottoman Empire.

Remembered by his devotion to La Société Khédivale de Géographie, as inscribed onto the reverse side of the tombstone, Purdy *Bey's* post-war experience was typical of other Civil War veterans who sailed from the United States to Egypt during Reconstruction when the country was going through a phase of distinctive rebuilding. The story of these men as post-Civil War *expats*, *self-exiles* or *sojourners*, presents a collective trauma, especially for the former Confederates — the *last causes* of personal lives that followed the mythicized "Lost Cause." Following the defeat, thousands of Confederates left their homelands to reconstruct "other Souths" in the Americas, instead of welcoming the hegemony of what Peter Kolchin called "un-South." Similarly, Matthew P. Guterl emphasizes the desire to maintain the slave system, which would allow the emigrants to transplant the old South into the Southern hemisphere and the political humiliation of the "self-

³ Based on Susan Sachs, "Cairo Journal, American Headstones Tugging at Egypt's Memory," *The New York Times*, November 8, 2000. The restoration of the obelisk-topped monument was funded by United States Agency for International Development. *Oriental Institute (University of Chicago) Staff Newsletter* (December 2000), 7.

appointed guardians of a way of life” during Reconstruction.⁴ In this respect, the role of “fear of harassment” in the new South should be noted, following the historical precedent of the Loyalist diaspora after the Revolutionary War. Confronting uncertainties about their future in the United States, thousands of Loyalists had also left their native soils. For them, as Maya Jasanoff asserts, other locations would be asylums, “offering land, relief, and financial incentives to help them start over.”⁵ On the other hand, pointing out that the “migration fevers” swept through the postbellum South as a general phenomenon not limited to slaveholder or the affluent community, Daniel E. Sutherland argues economic hardships and “some vague instinct for survival” –rather than an exclusively ideological reaction against the emancipation– played a more significant role in this mobility.⁶ The presence of Civil War veterans in Egypt, however, reflects another layer of this postbellum expatriation, for it did not replicate common patterns of earlier relocations like destination, instant nature of the departures (most left the country soon after Republican rule in the South), ideological homogeneity, collective action of small communities under an idealist leadership, and diasporic engagements in their new social milieu.

Specifically, the veterans in Egypt were driven by mostly economic factors and corresponding concerns in selecting an expatriate life, as Sutherland argues. In this

⁴ Peter Kolchin, *A Sphinx on the American Land: The Nineteenth-Century South in Comparative Perspective* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2003); Matthew Pratt Guterl, *American Mediterranean: Southern Slaveholders in the Age of Emancipation* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2008), 8, 81. Referring to the North as “un-South,” Kolchin explores three elements comprising “many Souths:” Divergence within the region, change over time, and variations among groups of Southerners.

⁵ Maya Jasanoff, *Liberty’s Exiles: American Loyalists in the Revolutionary World* (New York: Vintage Books, 2013), 44.

⁶ Daniel E. Sutherland, “Exiles, Emigrants, and Sojourners: The Post-Civil War Confederate Exodus in Perspective,” *Civil War History* 31, no. 3 (September 1985): 237, 238.

context, almost fifty Americans engaged in mercenary work, army reformation, logistical activities, engineering, and the expeditions in the African inland between 1869 and 1878. The size of the mercenary group in Egypt was quite representative of the reunited nation with men of various military records and ranks (from major generals to captains), skill sets (commanding troops, conducting expeditions on the American frontier, civil engineering, map-making, naval service), professional affiliations, origins, and ages (see the appendices for a list of American mercenaries in Egypt). Indeed, many other discontented Civil War veterans sought a new military career in Mexico, Chile, Peru, and Venezuela as mercenaries or military advisors. Navy commander John Randolph Tucker, for example, was hired as a rear admiral in the Peruvian Navy and recruited a group of his fellow ex-Confederate expatriates. Henry Price, who served in the Confederate medical corps during the Civil War, also took another group into Venezuela. However, Egypt was the only place where former foes served together, and race or the Southern nostalgia were not concerns in this expatriation, unlike the other destinations, which became racial retreats only for the Confederates who rejected adjusting themselves to the new conditions.⁷ In other words, the essence of Egyptian expatriation was not a dedication to nostalgically idealized “Old South,” which was a product of post-war “national imaginary.”

⁷ See David P. Werlich, *Admiral of the Amazon: John Randolph Tucker, his Confederate Colleagues, and Peru* (Charlottesville, University Press of Virginia, 1990); Alfred Jackson Hanna and Kathryn Abbey Hanna, *Confederate Exiles in Venezuela* (Tuscaloosa: Confederate Publishing Company, Inc., 1960); Andrew F. Rolle, *The Lost Cause: The Confederate Exodus to Mexico* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1965). Apart from the military service, many Confederate colonies flourished in Brazil, Cuba and Mexico as racial retreats: *The Confederados: Old South Immigrants in Brazil*, eds., Cyrus B. Dawsey and James M. Dawsey (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1995); Eugene C. Harter, *The Lost Colony of Confederacy* (Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 1985). Theses and journal articles on the emigration to Brazil include Douglas A. Grier, “Confederate Emigration to Brazil, 1865-1879” (Ph.D. diss., University Michigan, 1968); William C. Davis, “Confederate Exiles,” *American History Illustrated*, 5 (June 1970): 30-43; Blanche Henry Clark Weaver, “Confederate Emigration to Brazil,” *Southern History Journal*, 37 (1961): 33-53. To put the problem of Southern expansion in a historical perspective, see Robert E. May, *The Southern Dream of a Caribbean Empire, 1854-1861* (Baton Rouge and London, 1973).

Nostalgia, as a form of memory, was not integral to their daily practice or social interactions, unlike the *Confederados* in Brazil or Confederate mercenary groups in Latin America who embraced this concept “to form a self-perception” or as “an emotional register” to feel Southerner.⁸

The American version of the “Arabian Nights” provides a window into the network of Civil War veterans in the East during this period, illuminating their search for dignity. Telling the story of a forgotten/ignored American engagement in the Eastern hemisphere, this dissertation mainly argues that veterans’ quest for honor represented not only reclaiming their self-worth in professional or masculine terms but also a revitalized American fraternity/national dignity in a distant land with ex-Confederate-Union solidarity. It communicates between two different geographical and temporal settings by focusing predominantly on the veterans’ individual or collective experiences within the respective contexts. In this respect, it addresses the social world of the American expatriate community, which historians usually omitted from discussions of the Civil War Era’s transatlantic dimensions, as Stephen Tuffnell complains in regard to post-war expatriates in Britain.⁹ Accordingly, throughout the dissertation, I put their engagements into the context of the domestic background as well as the nineteenth-century Western approach to the East, rather than valuing them merely as agents of Egyptian modernization. Therefore, this survey is not a comprehensive look into the Egyptian military history or contemporary Egyptian

⁸ David Anderson, “Down Memory Lane: Nostalgia for the Old South in Post-Civil War Plantation Reminiscences,” *The Journal of Southern History* 71, no. 1 (2005): 105; Tara McPherson, *Reconstructing Dixie Race, Gender, and Nostalgia in the Imagined South* (Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2003).

⁹ Stephen Tuffnell, “Expatriate Foreign Relations: Britain’s American Community and Transnational Approaches to the U.S. Civil War,” *Diplomatic History* 40, no. 4 (September 2016): 635.

affairs. Yet, it simultaneously benefits from the general political-military context of the period and contributes to both with a particular American insight. That is, it is an *American story* in an Egyptian setting.

Starting with the historical conjuncture that brought recent foes to Egypt, the expatriation story demonstrates how the internal mechanisms in the mercenary group operated, and how the American cooperation contributed to the modernization of the Egyptian forces as well as dissemination of geographical information globally. It also provides a general retrospective context of how they were able to reconcile in a deeply foreign setting and their sense of alienation in Egypt, which undoubtedly contributed to this (re)constructed national identity. Overall, the story of American expats in Egypt represents a three-fold journey for the honor: reclaiming their masculinity as fathers or husbands who sacrificed for the family welfare, proving their worth as soldiers who longed for recognition or fame, and reenacting the national dignity as “the American.”

1.1. Literature Review

Despite being a significant aspect in our understanding of the Civil War Era’s (roughly extending from the 1840s to the late 1870s) transnational dimensions as well as Americans’ early global activities, there are only a few monographs about the *Amerikani* who served in the khedival forces. Although they should be revised in light of the recently organized/found materials, *Americans in the Egyptian Army* and *The Blue and Gray on the Nile*, are still the two most-cited monographs on the

“mission.”¹⁰ These highly celebratory works provide anecdotal and episodic accounts largely based upon Egyptian archives and expedition notes. Such sourcing, however, constitutes the major drawback limiting the mercenary experience to the context of the Egyptian military modernization and imperialistic endeavors in the 1870s when Ismail’s forces fought to expand the khedival authority down to Sudan. Providing a partial picture, the substantially Egypt-based treatments rely on the state publications, which were usually censored and inevitably served for certain political agendas or personal interests. Reflecting the tendencies in history-writing of their time, the accounts are also limited to the official voice to a large extent, and professional accomplishments or failures as a group overshadow the individual drives and interpretations. Even though Pierre Crabitès, a member of the International Court at Cairo in the 1920s, had an “unrestraint access” to Foreign Office and War Office records by courtesy of King Fuad, who provided “every possible facility” for the research, his treatment of the subject is loose and almost three-fourth of the monograph deals with the military explorations or land surveys in Central Africa. These expedition notes are largely compiled from the bulletins of the Khedival (then Royal) Geographical Society, staff reports, and published memoirs of the participated officers. In his master’s thesis under the supervision of Frederick J. Cox, Robin J. L. Buxton made use of United States consular dispatches and Crabitès’s work to a considerable extent.¹¹ Having visited Egypt as a Fulbright scholar in the 1950s, Cox’s himself also wrote anecdotal essays concerning the

¹⁰ Pierre Crabitès, *Americans in the Egyptian Army* (London: George Routledge and Sons, 1938); William B. Hesseltine and Hazel C. Wolf, *The Blue and the Gray on the Nile* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961).

¹¹ Robin Joy Love Buxton, “American Efforts to Modernize the Egyptian Army under Khedive Ismail” (Master’s thesis, Portland State University, 1978).

American mercenary experience in the region, which are basically edited versions of the diplomatic and personal correspondence without the author's commentary.¹²

John P. Dunn's *Khedive Ismail's Army* involves the most extensive historical framework, reaching an analytical base instead of a simple registration of what happened during that period of time. Placing the American "mercenaries" as the focal point, Dunn discusses the introduction of foreign expertise in eighteenth/nineteenth century Egypt and presents a highly critical view, portraying them as poor investments due to the unfortunate defeats in Gundet and Gura valleys against the Abyssinians in 1875-6. Yet, his military history survey, which is rich in original Egyptian material and military literature, mostly revolves around the topics regarding field experience and the arms industry rather than the social and emotional world of the American expatriate community. That said, this dissertation benefits much from his bibliographical survey in the initial phase of sourcing.¹³

A recent monograph by Eric Dean Covey examines "mercenary figures'" roles in the United States-Ottoman Empire relations by focusing on several encounters through military, literature, geography, and diplomacy lenses.¹⁴ In one of the two successive chapters about Egypt, the author asserts that the American exploration narratives racialized Central Africa, which helped shape background for "American

¹² Frederick J. Cox, "The American Naval Mission in Egypt," *Journal of Modern History* 26, no. 2 (June 1954): 173-178; "Arabi and Stone: Egypt's First Military Rebellion, 1882," *Cahiers d'Histoire Egyptienne* 8 (1956): 155-175; "Khedive Ismail and America, 1870: A Diplomatic Incident: L'Affair Butler," *Cahiers d'Histoire Egyptienne* 3 (1951): 374-381.

¹³ John P. Dunn, *Khedive Ismail's Army* (New York: Routledge, 2005); "Americans in the Nineteenth Century Egyptian Army: A Selected Bibliography," *Journal of Military History* 70, no. 1 (2006): 123-136. Dunn's monograph matured from his Ph.D. dissertation: "Neo-Mamluks. Mercenary Talent and the Failure of Leadership in the Army of Khedive Ismail (1863-1879), Florida State University, 1996.

¹⁴ Eric Dean Covey, *Americans at War in the Ottoman Empire: US Mercenary Force in the Middle East* (London and New York: I. B. Tauris, 2019).

imperialism” in the continent. However, being essentially text analyses of Charles Chaillé-Long’s two published accounts, Covey’s treatment does not provide any concrete link between the narratives and their influence on shaping the public opinion or official attitude.

This dissertation, on the other hand, contributes to that limited body of literature about American mercenaries in Egypt by drawing a broader picture exclusively with the war-time and post-war realities, and by making use of seldomly used archival material (especially Graves, Derrick, and Lockett papers) to provide a fuller account of the “encounters” in Egypt. With a more individual-oriented focus, it attempts to fill the human gap in the previous works by capturing the physical and psychological experience that have been omitted in favor of the conventional military, geographical or diplomatic histories. The personal aspects vividly demonstrate why/how they served in this project, how they interacted with each other as well as with others, and how some of them were able to benefit from the dislocation.

Additionally, works on the American influence in the Middle East, such as *Pioneers in the East* by David H. Finnie and *America and the Mediterranean World* by James A. Field offer colorful narratives of Americans working, traveling, and preaching in the area in the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.¹⁵ Passing the American recruits of Ismail superficially in the respective chapters, Michael B. Oren’s *Power, Faith, and Fantasy* also looks at the United States’ extended engagement with the Middle Eastern peoples and governments. In this scheme, “power” represents American interests in the region through military, economic, and diplomatic means

¹⁵ David H. Finnie, *Pioneers East: The Early American Experience in the Middle East* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1967); James A. Field, *America and the Mediterranean World, 1776-1882* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1969).

while “faith” denotes the influence of Evangelism in determining the American attitudes towards Muslim geography. Fantasy, the third ring of Oren’s formula, embodies the “Orient” with both imagined and true representations of the Eastern silhouettes, fauna, and flora. Although the chapter titled “Rebs and Yanks on the Nile” reiterates the exhausted knowledge about the Civil War veterans, his account of George Bethune English, as the first American “mercenary” in Egypt, represents a continuation in terms of American know-how supply to Egypt.¹⁶ Yet, a recent master’s thesis under Dunn’s supervision provides a fuller picture of the controversial Bostonian who participated in Egyptian campaigns into Sudan in the 1820s, mostly utilizing his correspondence stored in Massachusetts Historical Society archives.¹⁷

Similar to Field and Oren’s organizations, Cassandra Vivian’s *Americans in Egypt* presents the experiences of fifteen American citizens (including English and several of Ismail’s American officers) who worked or traveled in Egypt between the first years of the American Revolution and the early twentieth century. With the stories of explorers, consular staff, mercenaries, missionaries, and visitors, Vivian offers American perspectives on Egyptian life and important contemporary events. Mostly depending on factual information and very extensive quotes from the primary sources (like her chapters about Fanny Stone’s diary or Chaillé-Long’s activities, which are basically reprints of the original texts), the author does not employ an analytic and interpretive method regarding her subjects and often brings the overused

¹⁶ Michael B. Oren, *Power, Faith, and Fantasy, America in the Middle East, 1776 to the Present* (New York: W. W. Norton & Company Inc., 2007).

¹⁷ William Austin English, “Adventures of a 19th Century American Muslim: The Strange Tale of George Bethune English” (Master’s thesis, Valdosta State University, 2015).

accounts together.¹⁸ Being the third volume in a series investigating American involvement in Africa, *Americans in Africa 1865–1900* also provides details on American activities in the continent, with a specific focus on political, economic, and missionary engagements. However, like the previously mentioned works, American mercenaries do not have any specific attention in this work, and their story is passed by in the context of Africa explorations (with more reference to British activities).¹⁹ Speaking of the missionary activities, Heather J. Sharkey's *American Evangelicals in Egypt* should be mentioned as it portrays many aspects of missionary encounters in Egypt. Following the missionary-initiated transformations after the mid-nineteenth century, Sharkey demonstrates the transforming potential of the educational and health institutions, and rural development projects. According to her, missionaries broadly presented new models for civil involvement in the region.²⁰ In this scheme, the difference between the mercenary and missionary integration/participation is remarkable. Unlike the missionary communities, which were autonomous organizations to some extent, the American mercenaries in Egypt did not sustain mechanisms including local social institutions (except for polyglot semi-official institutions like the Geographical Society) that provided a venue for the integration of them into the texture of the local population. They were not deeply engaged with promoting civic initiatives and were not concerned with the missionary establishments' long-term strategies. Stone family was the only exception with Mrs. Stone who raised money for the Red Crescent campaigns and participated in local

¹⁸ Cassandra Vivian, *Americans in Egypt, 1770-1915: Explorers, Consuls, Travelers, Soldiers, Missionaries, Writers and Scientists* (Jefferson, NC: McFarland & Company, 2012).

¹⁹ *Americans in Africa: 1865-1900*, eds. Clarence Clendenen, Robert Collins and Peter Dugan (Stanford: Hoover Institution on War, Revolution and Peace, 1966).

²⁰ Heather J. Sharkey, *American Evangelicals in Egypt: Missionary Encounters in an Age of Empire* (Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2008).

philanthropic activities. In his dissertation examining American policies toward Egypt between the 1830s and the First World War (under the Ottoman rule and British control), Lenoir Chamber Wright reserved fifteen-pages for the export of American know-how to Egypt, mostly referring to Crabitès and consular reports. Presenting the Powers and the Ottoman government's responses, Wright could demonstrate the political ramifications of the American recruitments at the beginning of the 1870s.²¹

This dissertation contributes to this broad literature of American engagements in the Middle East by arguing that the mercenaries in Egypt were not marginal characters but were pivotal in early military cooperation even though the recruitment process was not conducted in official terms. Hence, they constitute another body of early American-Egyptian relations along with other topics, like the Civil War diplomacy, the Egyptian battalion which reinforced the French troops in Mexico (1863-67), post-war arms sales, increasing American commercial activity in the region, and the missionary activities. It shows these men were the forerunners of American military existence in the region, which comes to today in different guises.

While the Civil War veterans' service in the khedival army has been neglected in American scholarship except for a few original contributions, it is still almost a totally unknown territory in Ottoman/Turkish studies. Even though military historians have broadly explored the exportation of foreign military and technical expertise to the Ottoman Empire in the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, this

²¹ Lenoir Chamber Wright, "United States Policy toward Egypt, 1830-1914" (Ph.D. dissertation, Columbia University, 1957).

peripheral practice is still alien to the Turkish scholars. This is mainly because the Egyptian modernization is often regarded as external to the Ottoman experience. Undoubtedly, the scarcity of Turkish archival materials also plays a significant role in this neglect. Within this context, Hayrettin Pınar's monograph mentions the American group in a section reserved for the foreign expertise in Egypt. Pınar indicates Powers' displeasure towards the modernization efforts in the Egyptian Army, but he does not give any specific attention to the recruits as a whole body or individuals, except for a few sentences referring to Crabitès's work.²²

The historical accounts of the Ottoman/Turkish-American relations in broader scopes also ignore the American mercenary experience in Egypt, although they generally tend to cover a long period with many interconnected and independent subjects. However, this is not limited to the Civil War veterans in Egypt. Historiography of the mutual relations with Egyptian aspects mainly focuses on American missionary activities and commercial relations in the region with a specific interest in the cotton industry. Nevertheless, these generally lack a proper treatment of the Civil War cotton production shift (from American South to Egypt and India), and does not put the increase in the Egyptian national production into a global context, as Sven Beckert does in his *Empire of Cotton*, which has recently been translated into Turkish.²³

Memoirs, autobiographies, and staff reports are also indispensable sources providing colorful, yet often-biased, observations about the local culture, replete with

²² Hayrettin Pınar, *Tanzimat Döneminde İktidarın Sınırları: Babıali ve Hıdiv İsmail* (İstanbul: Kitap Yayınları, 2012).

²³ Sven Beckert, *Empire of Cotton: A Global History* (New York: Alfred Knopf, 2015).

Orientalist flair and western-supremacist snobbery. Charles Chaillé-Long was the most prolific one in writing, with three books published in two decades, which demonstrates his concern for fame and recognition (or not being forgotten in his own words). *Central Africa* is a combination of a military report, a travelogue, and an autobiographical text derived from his explorations around Khartoum (modern capital of Sudan), Gondokoro (in South Sudan), and Uganda. Details of his expeditions can also be found in several issues of American Geographical Society bulletins. Giving complete accounts of the successive events culminated in the British control in Egypt and his role as the acting consul during the most tumultuous times, *The Three Prophets* includes Chaillé-Long's views on the three influential men of their time and thoughts about emerging Arab nationalism. *My Life in Four Continents* is his complete autobiography, from Maryland and Union service during the Civil War to the Korean consular service. However, the Egyptian material in this book is considerably a reproduction of the accounts written in the earlier works.²⁴

The memoirs of William Wing Loring, William McEntyre Dye, James Morris Morgan, and Dr. Edward Warren also provide invaluable insiders' views on the local life, landscape, race, gender, practices, traditions, and historical events, as well as interesting anecdotes about their comrades. Moreover, Loring and Dye gave extensive accounts of the Abyssinian Campaign in 1876, even though several discrepancies exist between the two versions.²⁵ The differences are basically about

²⁴ Charles Chaillé-Long, *Central Africa: Naked Truths of Naked People* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1877); *The Three Prophets: Chinese Gordon, Mohammed Ahmed (El Mahdi), Arabi Pasha* (New York: D. Appleton and Co, 1884); *My Life in Four Continents* (London: Hutchinson and Co., 1912).

²⁵ William Wing Loring, *A Confederate Soldier in Egypt* (New York: Dodd, Mead & Co. 1884); William McEntyre Dye, *Moslem Egypt and Christian Abyssinia or Military Service Under the Khedive in His Provinces and Beyond Their Borders as Experienced by American Staff* (New York: Atkin & Prout, 1880); James Morris Morgan, *Recollections of a Rebel Reefer* (New York: Houghton

Loring's appointment as the chief of staff (in fact, Stone's initial choice for second in command was Dye as other Americans confirmed) and the conduct in Gura Valley (Dye blamed Loring for his "independent views"). Indeed, Dunn reports that George Douin, an authority in modern Egyptian archives, asserted that almost all primary sources from the Egyptian side, including Loring, Dye, and several other foreign mercenaries, are contradictory.²⁶

As Covey argues, the efforts to communicate the meaning of their Egypt experience to the American readers, these men produced texts in which they utilized both a national narrative of the post-war United States and an Eastern "fantasy." However, contrary to the information widely spread in the United States with a focus on exotic allure and interest in the antiquity during the so-called Egyptomania, the "fantasy" in the mercenary narratives serve more as contemporary critical commentaries on the modernization of Egypt since the late eighteenth century, and did not promote regional peculiarities at the expense of nostalgia for the primitivity. These memoirs can also be seen in what David W. Blight called "the reminiscence industry" of the 1880s, which promoted a kind of "democratization of the memory" with many who were inspired to tell their stories and thus produced "a vernacular form of autobiography."²⁷

These autobiographical texts were supplemented with only a few proper biographical surveys which mostly fail in objective descriptions. Blaine Lamb's biography of

Mifflin Company, 1917); Edward Warren, *A Doctor's Experiences in Three Continents* (Baltimore: Cushings & Bailey, 1885).

²⁶ Dunn, *Khedive Ismail's*, 215.

²⁷ David W. Blight, *Race and Reunion: The Civil War in American Memory* (Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2002), 179.

Charles Pomeroy Stone is a recent contribution, depicting the controversial General as an important figure in early American-Egyptian relations. However, in twenty pages for twelve years, Lamb does not uncover any new material regarding the Egypt experience, mainly because Stone's papers "kept in good strong boxes" has never shown up and still await discovery, perhaps in one of those "iron safes" which his daughter mentioned in her diary.²⁸ Such discovery would enable the researchers to see the Egyptian experience with all the aspects, providing the most valuable sources to understand the inner dynamics of the American group and Egyptian affairs from an American perspective. In addition, James W. Raab, Herman M. Katz, Jerry Thompson, and Weymouth Jordan's biographical works, respectively of Loring, Dye, Henry Hopkins Sibley, and Alexander Welch Reynolds are limited in scope and similarly do not add much to our knowledge about the Egyptian service. Raab's treatment of the "Florida's Forgotten General" is highly celebratory and uncritical, portraying Loring "a man of unflinching honor and integrity," contrary to Thompson's picture of the "mediocre" and "inept" officer who was thrust into great responsibility during the Civil War.²⁹ Katz's work, on the other hand, is more like a pamphlet with forty-four pages focusing on Dye's activities in his late years. Likewise, Jordon provides more information about his subject's Civil War career rather than the individual struggles during Reconstruction or his Egyptian service.

²⁸ Blaine Lamb, *The Extraordinary Life of Charles Pomeroy Stone* (Yardley: Westholme Publishing, 2016); Fanny Stone, "Diary of an American Girl in Cairo during the War of 1882," *Century*, June 1884, 298. Fanny's notes show the Stone family's experience and how they were able to transport "papa's papers" during the Cairo riots of 1882.

²⁹ James W. Raab, *W. W. Loring: Florida's Forgotten General: Old Blizzards* (Sunflower University Press, 1996); Herman M. Katz, *Brigadier General William McEntire Dye: A Pioneer of US Military Contributions to Korea* (Headquarters, United States Forces, Korea, 1982); Jerry Thompson, *Henry Hopkins Sibley: Confederate General of the West* (Natchitoches, LA: Northwestern State University Press, 1987); Weymouth Jordan, et al, *Soldier of Misfortune: Alexander Welch Reynolds of the U.S., Confederate and Egyptian Armies* (Lewisburg: Greenbrier Historical Society, 2001).

As such, very little original piece has been written about most of the veterans who served in Egypt, except for their Civil War engagements, which were partly published in the *Nation* or *Century* series. Only by including their full stories will our understanding of the global nature of the Civil War Era and early American experience in the Middle East become more complete. In this respect, Henry Clay Derrick, Charles Iverson Graves, and Samuel Henry Lockett's papers are extensively included in this dissertation to provide a fuller picture of the mercenaries' activities, observations, and personal lives.

Derrick recorded the three-year Egyptian sojourn in his journals (October 11, 1875-July 23, 1878). The first journal begins in medias res; therefore, the letters to his wife, Martha Derrick, give an interesting account of the journey and first months in Cairo. However, finding writing "to be quite a job," Derrick apparently kept a personal record of what happened rather than what he thought. Accordingly, the journals set down events briefly (probably) as an aid to memory, and he developed them later in several unpublished manuscripts or anonymous reports to local press at home. He wrote with a rhetorical style in such pieces and expressed his sentiments rather than merely registering the daily activities. In the extensive collection of correspondence, the letters dated October 10, 1875-January 15, 1876, are missing because of the Abyssinian Campaign when Derrick was stationed in Massawa and Gura Valley. Unfortunately, Derrick destroyed all the letters from home. It is a great loss because Martha's letters would have provided information about life in Halifax and how a woman in the latter half of the 1870s coped with the absence of her husband. Derrick was probably uncomfortable with placing many burdens on his wife, and the letters may have reminded him of the situation – or in the future, he did not want them to be known.

Likewise, Graves's 302 letters and journals are not concerned with public policy, and there is little about politics. Instead, they are personal notes revealing the life, struggles, and interests of a cultured gentleman. His correspondence demonstrates he had a taste for literature, a graceful writing style, sense of humor, great devotion to his family, a high sense of duty and personal integrity. In the collection, the Egyptian letters are complete, lengthy, and detailed. On the other hand, Graves's papers differ from that of Derrick, with its invaluable Georgian sidelights thanks to Margaret Lea Graves. Elegantly written, his wife's letters are mostly about personal and family matters, but there are several items of broader interests like local politics in the South. Thus, this collection is also significant in the post-bellum Southern studies, illustrating how one ex-Confederate achieved rehabilitation in the last days of Reconstruction and representing a Georgian who used his talents on a foreign shore and contributed to the general good of humankind.

These men, both as able soldiers, passionate fathers, and dissatisfied Southerners during Reconstruction, deserve broader inquiries for their own. Such a survey will be a contribution to the questions about the relationship between the veteran and post-war society, between those who had fought and those who constructed the memory of the fighting, between the veteran and the nation – some questions only recently asked of the Civil War veterans, as Susan Mary Grant points out.³⁰ In this dissertation, the personal papers answer these issues to some extent, giving references, especially to Derrick's ever-growing antagonism towards the reunified

³⁰ David Armitage, et al, "Interchange: Nationalism and Internationalism in the Era of the Civil War," *Journal of American History* 98, no. 2 (2011): 462. See also "Civil War Veterans," ed. William Blair, special issue, *The Journal of the Civil War Era* 5, no. 4 (December 2015) and Susannah J. Ural, "Reconsidering Civil War Veterans," *The Journal of the Civil War Era* 9, no. 1 (March 2019).

country, Lockett and Colston's cherishing the Confederate memory as well as their willingness to adjust themselves to the new conditions. Altogether, their papers give valuable insights into the emotional consequences of the sojourn and coping with the departure and relocation.

This dissertation makes some allowances for subjectivity and bias found in most of the correspondence or diaries to reconstruct the individual journeys. Undoubtedly, the personal interpretations of the incentives could be refined in retrospect, and some of the texts were (re)produced for some agendas, like almost every kind of personal writing. Moreover, personal accounts written later on, like Margaret Lea Graves's reminiscences, could be distorted by aging or mental deficiencies; hence, no sources of this kind are completely objective. However, how people describe their experiences (being selective or misrepresenting the facts for the sake of self-image, etc.) can tell the reader much about their era and the way they thought. In this respect, I usually referred to such remarks *reportedly* or quoted them with the dissenting opinions, instead of taking all the observations for granted.

A closer look into the bibliography section, readers will recognize that the language barrier limited the scope of original research in this study. Throughout the dissertation, primary Arabic sources are quoted from the secondary literature published in English. Yet, given citations are not referring to the original documents, because the previous works which made use of Egyptian archives (Crabitès, Hesseltine and Wolf, Dunn) cited different archival codes for the same set of materials, which reflect the fluctuating political developments in Egypt and subsequent reorganization of the Royal/State archives in the last century. Using different classifications, some of which are not available today, would be misleading.

Still, as previously mentioned, the scarcity of the Arabic material is mostly because the Egyptian affairs do not constitute a focal point in this work.

The Ottoman-Turkish material that has been examined in the online catalogues of State Archives of Turkey, on the other hand, does not provide a meaningful contribution to the story of the American mercenaries in Egypt. The somewhat relevant documents include official correspondence about General Mott's later employment in Constantinople, his father's gratification for his medical service to the sultan two decades earlier, and a few dispatches from the Ottoman consulate in Washington, D.C. which reported the press coverage of generals Stone and Loring's interviews or public talks. Such material has been used to give additional information instead of starting new discussions regarding the mercenary experience.

1.2. Terminology: Honor

A part of veteran studies, this dissertation benefits from the controversial literature of honor. As I argue that the veterans sought to reclaim their honor in Egypt in the broadest sense, it is important to describe what this term stands for. Indeed, literature of honor lacks precision in its theoretical development. In *Honor: A Phenomenology*, Robert L. Oprisko combines various mechanisms of social control, including prestige, shame, esteem, glory, affiliated honor, and rejection of these structures by "dignified" individuals (rebels). Showing that honor incorporates many processes operating together, the author differentiates between external honor (social intercourse between individuals and groups) and internal honor.³¹ Likewise, one of

³¹ Robert L. Oprisko, *Honor: A Phenomenology* (New York: Routledge, 2012).

the most influential anthropologists who shaped honor studies, Julian Pitt-Rivers, argues that honor is the value of individuals both in their own eyes (with a “sentiment” or “a manifestation of this sentiment in conduct”), and in the eyes of society (recognition or evaluation of their conducts by others).³² Distinguishing between honor and dignity, Peter Berger provides a quasi-definition. According to him, dignity relates to “the intrinsic humanity divested of all socially imposed rules,” and it pertains to the self notwithstanding the status, while honor is external to the self.³³ Conveying that honor is a single thing with different aspects, Frank H. Stewart refers to several earlier works which respectively defined the notion in anthropological/sociological terms, as esteem, respect, prestige, the moral worth in the eyes of society or “a culturally instilled conception of self as a sacred social object.”³⁴

In my examination of the veterans’ conducts, expectations, and observations I mainly follow the definitions given by Stewart and Oprisko. Within this context, “dignity” means a process whereby individuals inscribe them with social values, establishing personal honor codes. In the broadest sense, I take the notion of honor as a multiphenomenal concept, as Stewart does, which structures society by inscribing

³² Julian Pitt-Rivers, “Honour and Social Status,” in *Honour and Shame: The Values of Mediterranean Society*, ed. J. G. Peristiany (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1966), 19-77; Julian Pitt-Rivers “Honor,” in *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*, vol. 6, ed. David Sills (N.p.: Macmillan, Free Press, 1968), 503-11.

³³ Peter Berger, “On the Obsolescence of the Concept of Honor,” in *Revisions: Changing Perspectives in Moral Philosophy*, eds. Stanley Hauerwas and Alasdair Macintyre (Notre Dame, IN: Notre Dame University Press, 1983), 174-175.

³⁴ Frank Henderson Stewart, *Honor* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1994); Stanley Brandes, “Reflections on Honor and Shame in the Mediterranean,” in *Honor and Shame and the Unity of the Mediterranean*, ed. David Denny Gilmore (Washington, D.C.: American Anthropological Association, 1987), 121-34; Charles P. Flynn, *Insult and Society* (New York and London: Kennikat Press, 1977); Edward Westermarck, *The Origin and Development of Moral Ideas*, (London: Macmillan and Co., 1912-17).

value onto an individual by an *Other* as well as valuing a promise, principle, commitments or ideal – that is, integrity in manners/actions. Borrowing from Pitts-Rivers, I present honor as the individuals’ estimation of their own worth, as well as the “excellence recognized by society,” – all leading their “right to pride.” These notions are categorized by the abovementioned scholars as affiliated honor, bestowed honor, commitment honor, conferred honor or trust honor, which define certain cases throughout the dissertation. Representing other aspects of honor, I also refer to the terms glory and prestige. A combination of fame and honor, glory elevates an individual to be a transcendent exemplar par excellence. A prestigious person, on the other hand, gains social value for qualities or actions that are deemed excellent. Both external types of honor elevate one’s hierarchical position in their group. This is closer to Francis Fukuyama’s Hegelian assertion that human history was driven by a struggle for recognition, but an internal sense of self-worth is not enough if others do not overtly acknowledge it. Hence, “self-respect arises out of appreciation by others.”³⁵

In the nineteenth century United States context, the definition of honor is not monolithic, and divergence between the Southern and Northern codes present different aspects of the honorable conduct. According to Bratt H. McKay, the Northern codes emphasized emotional control and financial accomplishment while the Southern type had more parallels with the medieval European codes, “combining the reflexive, violent honor of man with the public virtue, and chivalry.” In this regard, Southern men required having a name for bravery, self-reliance, and mastery, which was generally defined as male dominion over a household and an inclination

³⁵ Francis Fukuyama, *Identity. The Demand for Dignity and the Politics of Resentment* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2018), xvi, 10.

to use force. This form of traditional honor survived in the South longer than North, mostly because of the cultural differences between their first settlers as well as their differing economies.³⁶ Moreover, Northerners supposedly became more guided by an internalized sense of integrity while “Southerners’ actions were governed more by the opinions and expectations of the society.”³⁷ However, in the military realm, variances of the honor codes in sectional terms are indistinct. In this respect, American mercenaries in Egypt were mostly alike in their conduct regardless of their origins, notwithstanding the sectional stereotypes. From this viewpoint, I assume that soldierly honor (not “martial honor”) is similar to the traditional Southern type. Duel offers of New Yorker General Mott, the gunfight between ex-Confederate officers and the Northerner consular staff, ex-Union volunteer Dye’s slapping a local officer without restraining his temper as well as their condemning alcoholic fellows as a threat to group honor, rather than finding excessive alcohol consumption “manly,” demonstrate the similarities in their notions of decent manner.

The literature of honor with all aspects and opposites is far beyond the limit of these introductory paragraphs, which present the basic definitions to build a general frame for the American veterans’ honor quest in Egypt. This frame contains certain aspects of honor – namely, financial honor, paternal honor with references to manly value, fame/prestige, professional honor (duty-bound and value of the promise), and national (group) honor. They present both shared and individual aspirations (like

³⁶ Bratt H. McKay, “A Man’s Life, Featured, Honor, On Manhood,” *Art of Manliness*, <https://www.artofmanliness.com/articles/manly-honor-part-v-honor-in-the-american-south/> (retrieved June 26, 2020).

³⁷ Joe L. Coker, *Liquor in the Land of the Lost Cause: Southern White Evangelicals and the Prohibition Movement* (Lexington: The University Press of Kentucky, 2005), 180.

assuring an honorable life for the family, proving professional worth, and winning recognition).

1.3. Terminology: The Nature of Absence

The previous surveys about the American service in Egypt utilized various terms to define the veterans' absence from home but did not specify their motivations for using such certain terms. In this dissertation, the terms *self (imposed)/voluntary exile*, *expatriate*, and *sojourn* describe their relocation instead of *exile*, *migrant* or *émigré*. To understand the nature of the Americans' spatial experience in Egypt, these terms should be differentiated briefly at the very beginning. Mary McCarthy notes that exile refers to an unintentional exit, while expatriation describes voluntary departure.³⁸ In his semantic and historical study, Paul Tabori argues that exiles are compelled to move due to fear of persecution, their identity (racial, religious, national) or political views. They hope to return when the circumstances get better, which distinguishes it from migration/émigré.³⁹ Accordingly, I avoid using the term *exile* that refers to people who are *unwillingly* detached from their place of origin and *cannot* return because the circumstances that led to this *obligatory* separation still persists. Yet, the definition lines between both terms are blurred, and, as John D.

³⁸ Mary McCarthy, "A Guide to Exiles, Expatriates, and Internal Émigrés," *New York Times Book Review*, March 9, 1972 (<https://www.nybooks.com/articles/1972/03/09/a-guide-to-exiles-expatriates-and-internal-emigres/>).

³⁹ Paul Tabori, *The Anatomy of Exile: A Semantic and Historical Study* (London: George G. Harrap, 1972), 27.

Barbour and Susan Winnett put, they are used interchangeably to refer to the displaced even when people move willingly.⁴⁰

Moreover, arguing that “what both the exile and the expatriate feel in common is this apprehension of being cast out from their group,”⁴¹ Martin Tucker underlines the parallel socio-psychological reflections. According to Edward Said, exile comes with banishment. In this context, he argues, the exile lives “with the stigma of being an outsider” while the member of any expat community “voluntarily lives in an alien country” for various reasons. He asserts that expatriates may undergo the isolation of exile, but they do not necessarily suffer under its rigid prohibitions. Finding such distinction reductionist, Ahmad R. Qabaha contends that Said does not consider the different situations or affairs encouraging expatriates, and imposing exiles, to leave their homes.⁴² In line with Qabaha’s definition, I argue that exile differs from expatriation by being more political and often about forced removal. Whereas, as mentioned above, they both imply forcing, the former is precisely defined “as a condition of imposed departure and lack of choice.” Therefore, I prefer expatriation to define American veterans’ stay in Egypt, as their departure did not suggest punitive reasons. From this aspect, as one of the expats stated in a letter back home, I also define this experience as a sojourn and them as sojourners, which broadly refer to the temporary expatriation for a particular purpose. This is also in accordance with

⁴⁰ John D. Barbour, “Edward Said and the Space of Exile,” *Literature & Theology*, 21 (2007), 293; Susan Winnett, *Writing Back: American Expatriates and Narratives of Return* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2013), 32.

⁴¹ Martin Tucker, *Literary Exile in the Twentieth Century: An Analysis and Biographical Dictionary* (London: Greenwood Press, 1991), xv.

⁴² Edward W. Said, *Reflections on Exile: And Other Literary and Cultural Essays* (London: Granta, 2001), 181; Ahmad Rasmi Qabaha, *Exile and Expatriation in Modern American and Palestinian Writing* (Cham, Switzerland: Palgrave MacMillan, 2018), 2.

Peter Burke's definition. In his work questioning the contribution of those groups to our knowledge since the fifteenth century, the British historian argues, expatriation (in the sense of voluntary migration) is about being "pulled" toward another country rather than "pushed" from their origins."⁴³ For him, exile involves trauma of displacement (insecurity problems) and loss of an individual's former identity. In this respect, the American veteran's experience in Egypt does not resonate with such trauma (except for the nostalgia of the home or homesick), and their case indicates the opposite, as it represents reclaiming their social/honorable identity, which was seen at stake at home. Therefore, it was a positive form of absence, making the best of the particular situation. Egypt presented the best solution to their respective troubles, and it offered a suitable terrain for their abilities, needs, and individual aspirations. Hence, in Burke's definition, Egyptian sojourn can be seen more about pulling factors rather than pushing ones in terms of the destination.

1.4. Outline

Americans' story in "the land of pharaohs" starts with a look at historical crosswinds in both countries which made this sojourn possible. While the United States passed through Reconstruction, Egypt, on the other side of the Atlantic Ocean, was striving to reconstruct its own prestige and wealth, partially thanks to the Civil War cotton production shift. That is, American waves already had an impact on the south-eastern shores of the Mediterranean in the previous decade. The opening chapter draws a

⁴³ Peter Burke, *Exiles and Expatriates in the History of Knowledge, 1500-2000* (Waltham, MA: Brandeis University Press, 2017), 3-4. Burke also contends that, like others, the distinction between voluntary and forced movement is not always clear. Giving examples of the German Jewish scholars in Turkey in the 1930s, he describes some of them both as exiles ("they were virtually forced to leave their homelands") and as expatriates ("they were invited elsewhere").

broad picture of factors pushing Americans from their homelands and pulling them towards a foreign soil by referring to certain contemporary political and social developments. Following the background information, it narrates the initial recruitment process and international responses to the Civil War veterans' employment in Egypt, which made the American existence a source of a triangular diplomatic crisis between the Powers, Ottoman government, and khedival capital. In this chapter, I argue economic, ideological, and professional concerns compelled the veterans to serve under the Egyptian banner. These concerns, especially in post-bellum Southern context, are attached to maintain the financial stability and reclaim their pride/dignity, because the poverty in the life-battle at home, which followed the defeat on the actual battlefields, was seen a failure and a direct assault one's manhood. Furthermore, reaction to Reconstruction policies speaks to Confederate pride/loyalty, which demonstrates the rebellious character (or "dignity") of the defeated.

Focusing on the initiation of the American mercenary efforts and the conduct of General Charles Pomeroy Stone, the third chapter accounts how Stone ascended to the leadership of the American group. Despite many predicted that he would make his mark in the American military scene, Stone was scapegoated for a Federal defeat and imprisoned during the Civil War. Failures in business followed in the post-war years, which added to his financial embarrassment. Hence, the Egyptian sojourn was a golden opportunity for him to prove his professional capabilities and integrity as a loyal and duty-bound gentleman. Accordingly, he reorganized the Egyptian Army with various reforms and became one of the Khedive's favored men. His activities and status in the Egyptian Army provide a window into the mercenary group's

internal dynamics and present a solid example of a veteran's reclaiming honor on a foreign land with esteem and prestige.

The fourth chapter, titled "Eastern Frontier: Americans Mapping the Old Continent" focuses on Americans' activities as explorers and cartographers under the supervision of Third Bureau of the General Staff, which was created by General Stone. Samuel Henry Lockett, Charles Chaillé-Long, and Raleigh Edward Colston's achievements both in African inland and on the Red Sea shores speak for the expansion of Egyptian prestige as well as their quest for personal fame/glory, which is another aspect of honor presenting a high degree of courage and duty concern. Their collaboration also demonstrates a remarkable aspect of reconciliation between the former foes, manifesting the foundations of American national dignity in Egypt. Furthermore, the expedition notes and memoirs present striking domestic parallels about the race and frontier reality. Overall, this chapter shows the American efforts were important in extending the khedival sovereignty/influence towards the neighboring regions as well as in disseminating the geographical and, to some extent, anthropological knowledge. In this part, I preferred a simplified narration, avoiding registering all specific names, military orders, encounters with tribes, surveys on tiny settlements or other geographical/topographical details, and cited all the original reports for further readings.

Covering the "inglorious" Abyssinian Campaigns in 1875-76, the fifth chapter specifically focuses on the Americans' role in the Gura defeat and their observations about the command, enemy lines, and the Egyptian military organization in general. The defeat against the highly condescended enemy was a "black chapter in Americans annals" in Egypt and signaled the end of the American mission. Making

use of the ignored archival materials extensively (Derrick Papers) and published accounts of the participants, this part shows how the Americans were confident in the beginning and how they had to deal with the defeat (as another disappointment for the ex-Confederates). It also shows the clashes between officer ranks as a product of mutual distrust as well as the Americans' comments about the military conduct and psyche of the native troops. In line with the connecting theme, the chapter demonstrates Americans' concern for display/re-maintenance of professional value (honor), which were denied at home after the war, as well as their approach to native African people reflecting the colonialist rhetoric, as seen in the previous chapter.

Chapter six, whose title I borrowed from Professor Hesseltine's denied monograph proposal to Georgia University Press dated 1965, is a case study representing the general aspects of the veterans' "Arabian Nights" through the intimate accounts of Charles Iverson Graves. The Annapolis graduate naval officer is a perfect example of ex-Confederate sojourners in Egypt, who fled financial troubles at home during Reconstruction and sought for an honorable return to their native soils. His accounts and extensive correspondence with "Chichi," Margaret Lea Graves, plainly present how hard the 37-year-old man managed to save up enough money to cover his farm mortgage and how he controlled his household affairs in Egypt, demonstrating his success at securing his manly honor via professional/financial success and utmost paternal care. This chapter is built upon archival materials heretofore unused, either because the military/diplomatic historians ignored the social and personal character of the story or they were not fully aware of the rich material in the University of North Carolina (Wilson Library) and Wisconsin Historical Society archives, except for Hesseltine and Wolf who partially included Graves family letters in their book. Graves's eloquent writing style combined with detailed descriptions, also provide a

wider picture of the American group's conduct with a concern of payments, discharges, economy, and even regional politics.

Ex-Confederate-Union cooperation in the Citadel or vast deserts down to the Equatorial region were not the only factors in the reconciliation of the former enemies under the Egyptian banner. Accordingly, focusing firstly on the psychological/cultural foundations of the solidarity among the veterans and reconstructing the American identity under this "unimaginable setting," chapter seven examines their pre-war positions, the importance of duty-bound in their decision-making, and how they managed to reconcile or "forget" the scars later on with references to the domestic parallels during Reconstruction. In this chapter, which carries the mercenary experience to an independent temporal territory, I mainly argue that the Confederate members of the American group mostly took action due to social impositions and already valued the heroic deeds of the soldiers on both sides. Reclaiming the "national honor" in Egypt was also consolidated by their West Point connections, and, as one of them put, the time they spent abroad helped them remake the "American." This chapter, which places the mercenaries' experience into a broader space and period, distinguishes itself from the previous works with its retrospective examination of the veterans' motives for fighting a decade ago as well as their views about secession, abolitionism, and sectional reconciliation.

Concentrating on veterans' experiences as strangers in a strange land, chapter eight argues that not only their cooperation and the pre-war positions but also the sense of alienation (or self-isolation) contributed to the American solidarity in Egypt. As a continuation of the previous chapter, it demonstrates that Orientalist prejudices and

their voluntary isolation from the native elements solidified their unity abroad while white supremacy brought former foes together in the United States in the domestic parallel. The mercenary narratives present that they shared the Western preconceptions over Eastern work ethics, gender relations, sense of discipline, religion, and fatalism as well as their admiration for Khedive Ismail who was regarded as thoroughly Western-oriented. The chapter, which shows the reaffirmation of an “us” identity against a “them,” proves the American veterans failed to study the culture they were interacted with for several years and avoided being integrated into their host society.

The last chapter, which is partially titled after William Wright’s definition of the British invasion of Egypt, examines a short period when the American mercenary group was already dissolved, except for Charles P. Stone.⁴⁴ Mostly bringing the published historical accounts together, it narrates Stone and Chaillé-Long’s engagements during the Nationalists riots in Alexandria (1882) and the subsequent British bombardment as well as Americans’ diverging opinions of the recent incidents and Egyptian nationalism. Seeking for an original interpretation of exhausted materials, I present Stone’s case as a display of loyalty (conferred honor in Oprisko’s terms) as he never waived his official duties even though his family was under a considerable threat. Having served as acting-consul, Chaillé-Long’s efforts to rescue foreign refugees and maintain control in the city after the bombardment speak for the American prestige abroad. Moreover, it was another path for his personal recognition. Mrs. Stone’s handling of the situation in Cairo during the tumultuous weeks, on the other hand, shows how she managed to arrange the safe

⁴⁴ William Wright, *A Tidy Little War: The British Invasion of Egypt 1882* (Stroud: The History Press, 2011).

conduct of the family, displaying a high degree of courage and dignity. This part is limited to the American involvement and polemics rather than indulging in Egyptian nationalism in general, which is far beyond the scope of the chapter.

Overall, woven together in an interdependent organization, all chapters cumulatively prove that the experience of the “forgotten American mission” in Egypt is significant. Altogether they speak to three threads of research: The Civil War veterans’ adjustment to the post-war period and their search for reclaiming honor, Reconstruction’s transnational dimensions, and the United States’ engagement in the Middle East at an early stage.

In terms of post-war adjustment, these officers found common cause and reforged a common identity far from home as military veterans and men concerned about their self-worth. The dissertation demonstrates the Egyptian sojourn provided them redemption with some sort of financial stability, opportunity to restore their professional honor and recognition. In this respect, Stone, Graves, and Derrick’s experience were most representative. Their sojourn ended in financial stability, which they were deprived of at home, and they were able to practice their profession, thus proved their capabilities – the decorations were solid symbols of their relief when they returned to the United States.

In terms of Reconstruction/Civil War Era, this thesis speaks to two important minor threads. The veterans’ story makes a strong case that the military melodramas in Egypt drew ex-Union and Confederate soldiers alike, and this service was an early proving ground for the sectional rapprochement that would dominate the American scene for the next several decades. The first concerns the cultural foundations of reconciliation. That is to say, Northerners and Southerners were able to reunite

because they were not really that different from each other. In this, it places itself in the long-running series of arguments about whether two sides fought because they were different from each other (for example, James McPherson and Michael Holt), whether they fought the war in the same way (for example, David Donald's *Liberty and Union*) and how much of an adjustment they had to make to get along after the war (for example, Mark Summers's *The Ordeal of the Reunion*). On the other hand, their early years in service show sectional antagonism reached beyond the American borders with the Northerner consul in Alexandria who labeled the Southern officers "rebels" and opposed hiring Southern mercenaries to the Egyptian service. The second sub-thread addresses the place of the Civil War Era in a global context, a topic that is currently among the most important in the field. Yet few scholars with transnational approaches take the time to really delve into the considerable cultural gulf that existed among Americans and other people. The two threads mentioned, on the other hand, both pertain to culture and perceptions—how Northerners and Southerners interacted with and understood each other and how they did likewise with different groups of people in Egypt. As such, these two points can be brought into dialog with each other. For example, considering the Northerners and Southerners had similarly negative reactions to Islam as practiced in Egypt, it speaks to their similarities as Americans or Westerners – showing a fairly shallow measure of national/cultural cohesiveness. Moreover, they were remarkably similar in their concerns with money-making, efficiency, and their lack of concern over customs. Then again, some of the Americans in this story also seem similar to their Egyptian counterparts, concerned, for example, with status and public displays of rank.

In view of the third main thread, their story is significant because it demonstrates how widespread American participation actually was in terms of military and

cultural encounters during that period. In this respect, particularly interesting was the idea of the United States being seen as a non-imperial broker, vis-à-vis the French or British, towards whom there was more suspicion. Their experiences show this was also a time when Americans were actually looking outward in a more general sense. In other words, the Civil War veterans on the Nile were part of the spreading and enlarged interest of Americans, which was also stimulated by the Evangelical interest in going to the Holy Land (Grant, Sherman, and Seward were among the many who visited Egypt). Even though it was not an official mission, the focus on American transnational exploits and the interest generated in this American work abroad demonstrate how the United States was globally extending its influence long before 1898 with a more internationalist outlook towards the region. In this regard, they were among the first representatives of American exporting military and civil engineering know-how as a group in the region, which started a long tradition. As Ronald Reagan stated in a White House reception given to his Egyptian counterpart's honor, General Stone and his friends were important figures in the establishment of the mutual relations, serving in the region for a decade in the most tumultuous times. As an irony of fate, another Charles P. Stone would come to the region (then Turkey), as the Chief of the Army Section of Joint United States Military Mission for Aid to Turkey almost a century after the Civil War General had served in Egypt with the same rank.

After all, the mercenary narratives deserve to be told not only because these Americans seldom received attention. They captured particular human aspects that are usually left out of conventional histories. This survey appreciates how transformations and new exploits affected them, how they served as agents in a broad project or interacted with an unusual context, and how they were able to cope

with the burden of dislocation. Such aspects of the mercenary experience would provide new avenues of thought in the very broad literature of the Civil War Era.

CHAPTER II

CALLING OF THE “ARABIAN NIGHTS” ON THE NILE

“A veteran, no more. But nay:
Brown eyes, what reveries they keep
Sad woods they be, where wild things sleep.”
– Herman Melville

Ungar, the brown-eyed ex-Confederate officer, who wanders with pilgrims on their way to Bethlehem, is one of the central figures in Herman Melville’s epic poem *Clarel*. Introduced as a “plain-clad soldier,” the half-English and half-Cherokee veteran self-exiled to Palestine after the Civil War had ruined him financially and he finally was “enlisted for sad fight/upon some desperate dark shore” as a mercenary in the Ottoman Army. A scar on his neck and the “temple pitted with strange blue/of powder burn” were reminders of the “chimney-stacks that reign war-burn upon the houseless plains.”⁴⁵ A noteworthy projection from the contemporary American scene, Melville’s dark character is very close to American expats in Egypt, given

⁴⁵ Herman Melville, *Clarel. A Poem and Pilgrimage in the Holy Land*, eds. Harrison Hayford, Hershel Parker, Alma M. Reising, G. Thomas Tanselle (Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1991), 478, 401, 385.

their anguish and disappointment of the post-bellum conditions in the reunified country.

American military service in Egypt in the late nineteenth century was the result of specific historical crosswinds, which Melville probably drew his inspiration for creating his “wandering Ishmael from the West.”⁴⁶ The end of the Civil War brought a new set of problems for the nation. It left the United States with a vast pool of disbanded veterans of both armies, and whether the soldiers would successfully be able to assimilate back into civilian life was an important question awaiting an answer. Left with limited options, men from both sides of the conflict either had to earn their livelihoods as civilians or seek new adventures as soldiers of fortune. For ex-Confederates who were largely barred from the official positions unless their injuries were removed, financial problems served as the primary motive.

This chapter focuses on the veterans’ sojourn with a particular interest in their motivations to relocate, referring to both pushing and pulling factors as well as the mechanism of the recruitment. It argues that economic, ideological and professional concerns compelled the veterans to serve under a foreign banner. These concerns, especially in post-bellum Southern context, are attached to a quest for economic redemption and thus reclaiming self-esteem, which was at stake in the financially ruined South. Furthermore, the reaction to Reconstruction speaks to the Confederate pride/loyalty. However, the former foes of the Civil War found common ground in Egyptian promise as many Northerner veterans were dissatisfied with post-war regulations. In this regard, the first question should be who they were and why they left – a question with different answers as the men. Hence, the chapter is organized

⁴⁶ Melville, 419.

around a collection of veterans who could capture some distinct varieties of the mercenary experience. Together they provide an intimate reflection of what their “sojourn” meant and why Egypt served as an “asylum” even though it was not geographically and culturally the closest destination. It also accounts the initial recruitment process with internal dynamics of the mercenary group, which would bring a power shift in the American leadership (Mott to Stone), international reactions to the veterans’ employment in Egypt, and the senior officer’s propensity in arm-sales business as well as the role of the United States’ image in the Khedive’s selection of American citizens to modernize his army – all representing an interesting aspect of the American exploits abroad in the nineteenth century.

2.1. “People Ready to Hop:” Pushing Factors

On May 29, 1865, President Andrew Johnson issued his Proclamation of Amnesty and Reconstruction, which laid out provisions for the restoration of Confederates’ rights. It excluded the members of the Confederate military (above the rank of colonel in the army or lieutenant in the navy), all who had left the United States military, and the military/naval academies graduates in the rebel service. Uncertain about what their rights would include, many had walked “empty handed with doubts concerning any hope for the future,” and there waited for them leavings of a conquering army as two former Confederate officers complained.⁴⁷

Not seeking a “bubble reputation,” according to Pierre Crabitès, most of the veterans who sailed to Egypt were also spurred on by their families and the desire to lead an

⁴⁷ William B. Holberton, “Confederate Demobilization,” in *The Civil War Veteran: A Historical Reader*, eds. Larry M. Logue and Michael Barton (New York and London: New York University Press, 2006), 23-24.

honorable life, finding that the military occupation of the South was “causing more bitter feeling than the war itself.”⁴⁸ Perhaps the most striking truth about these mercenaries was how corresponding incentives they had in their decision-making. Though some, like Derrick, expressed his ideological resentment, for most, it was undeniable that the new South left them without financial stability. Indeed, many tried to overcome the annoyances and sought after an opportunity to build a better reputation for themselves in their native soils, unlike the Loyalists or outraged antebellum landowners who left their native lands immediately after the defeats.

Samuel Henry Lockett was one of those who took a chance in Egypt. As he explained, it was awful to be poor, especially for a man who had to support a large family. Having taught at Louisiana State Seminary of Learning and Military Academy after the war, Lockett saw life getting “harder and tighter,” claiming money had become “as scarce as good men.”⁴⁹ In a letter to the superintendent of the Seminary, the Alabaman veteran complained that the “great trials and sore afflictions” accompanied the “distant mutterings of the thunders of war,” and bemoaned that corruption and misrule weighed upon the South like “a terrible incubus.” He concluded all the evils brought them to the verge of ruin without any industry and enterprise. In another letter, he mentioned his troubles with uncertainties, complaining his mind was full of doubts and told he was tired of “the miserable little petty annoyances of keeping school.”⁵⁰ A few months later, being

⁴⁸ Raleigh Edward Colston, “Address Before the Ladies Memorial Association at Wilmington,” unpublished manuscript, May 10, 1870, Raleigh Edward Colston Papers 1842-1906, Southern Historical Collection, Wilson Library, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (hereafter cited as Colston Papers).

⁴⁹ Samuel H. Lockett to David F. Boyd, December 2, 1873, David French Boyd Papers 1833-1934, Hill Memorial Library, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge (hereafter cited as Boyd Papers).

⁵⁰ Samuel H. Lockett to David F. Boyd, February 12, 1875, Boyd Papers.

“very much tempted,” for the proposed 2,500 dollars per annum, Lockett would finally accept that pursuing his efforts in the United States would be an injustice to his family even though he “would be willing to fight” were he by himself.⁵¹

Undoubtedly, Charles P. Stone’s flattering invitation to Egypt played a role in this decision, addressing to his sense of honor and military capabilities. The General wrote to the Vicksburg hero that Egypt needed “solid, serious, earnest soldiers” like him to aid the present sovereign in his magnificent efforts to restore its former glory.⁵² Furthermore, his wife Cornelia was “all in the notion of going across the water,” and finally, on July 17, 1875, Lockett family boarded a steamer and sailed to Alexandria.⁵³ Demonstrating the poverty that he had faced in the last years, Lockett had to borrow money from several associates and sell his telescope to bring his household to New York harbor.⁵⁴ After a month, they were in their new home, and his little daughter Jeanie plainly noted their enthusiasm in her childish poem: “We reached our distant shore/In the cool of the evening at four/You never saw people more ready to hop/than when they let the anchor drop.”⁵⁵ However, she was aware of the awaiting difficulties when she wrote, “far from our native shore/to never return any more/we left with deep sorrow/thinking of the lonely morrow.”⁵⁶

⁵¹ Samuel H. Lockett to David F. Boyd, December 17, 1873, July 4, 1874, and August 22, 1874, Boyd Papers.

⁵² Charles P. Stone to Samuel H. Lockett, February 23, 1875, Lockett Papers.

⁵³ Samuel H. Lockett to David F. Boyd, January 17, 1875, Boyd Papers.

⁵⁴ Samuel H. Lockett to David F. Boyd, July 7-16, 1875, Boyd Papers, *cited in* Hesseltine and Wolf, 96.

⁵⁵ Jeanie Lockett, “Edith and Jeanie,” undated manuscript, Lockett Papers. Jeanie kept a journal of their voyage from home to Egypt and recorded her observations at every stop: Jean[ie] Lockett, *Journal of a Visit to Cairo, Egypt*, unpublished manuscript, July-August 1875, Lockett Papers.

⁵⁶ Jeanie Lockett, “My Second Attempt – Our Trip Across the Ocean,” May 1, 1876, Lockett Papers.

For his part, Charles Iverson Graves from Georgia compared himself and his comrades to Abraham and Lot who sojourned in Egypt when famine was grievous in their lands. Following the war, Graves tried cotton farming as cotton prices remained high. Yet, in the spring of 1874, a flood wiped out his hopes for a comfortable life. After the “unfortunate circumstances beyond [their] control,” when they “had many disasters to farm and garden,” the former Confederate naval officer had to accept “Egyptian corn” to feed his family of five children.⁵⁷

Likewise, Henry Clay Derrick of Virginia joined the Egyptian service to get rid of financial troubles. Having served four years as a captain of engineers in the Confederate States Army, Derrick engaged in the railroad construction business after the war. When his efforts proved to be temporary and not profitable to sustain their life in Halifax, he saw Egypt as an opportunity to change the course of his finances and boarded the steamer *Spain* to Alexandria to enter the Egyptian service in 1875 summer. Derrick’s letters to his wife, Martha in Halifax, often included instructions about the family budget and recounted their many misfortunes. In a letter dated 1876, written during his first year of service, he bluntly expressed his dissatisfaction: “It sounds very well to say, ‘I’d rather live with you on a crust than to have everything desirable without you.’ It won’t do when it comes to be put in practice.”⁵⁸

Undoubtedly the absence from home was not desirable but may have been necessary to provide a “nest egg” for future use. Derrick put this patrimonial concern in a long

⁵⁷ Charles Iverson Graves, “An Address on Egypt and Egyptians,” unpublished manuscript; William B. Hesseltine, “Egyptian Corn for Georgia,” private notes [copy], 1; Margaret Lea Graves, “Reminiscences of Margaret Lea Graves,” unpublished manuscript. All in Charles Iverson Graves Papers, Southern Historical Collection, Wilson Library, The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (hereafter cited as Graves Papers).

⁵⁸ Henry C. Derrick to Martha Derrick, June 25, 1876, Henry Clay Derrick Papers, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C. (hereafter cited as Derrick Papers).

letter, telling all his restlessness at home was solely on account of not having any steady employment which would enable him to provide his family with basic needs and to “have the pleasure of seeing them enjoy every comfort.”⁵⁹ An earlier letter he posted in Paris on his way to Egypt was just another expression of this usually discreet man’s grief and his justification for the transatlantic sojourn, stating it was “actually sickening to a poor man.” He was mesmerized to be in the French capital with splendid stores and windows. For him, these explained that France had so many revolutions and “blood-thirsty mobs,” for the exhibitions in the windows are enough to stir up people struggling with poverty like himself “to acts of plunder and robbery.”⁶⁰ Distinguishing him from the many in their plight, Derrick also escaped what he firmly called “the cursed tyranny of the United States.”⁶¹ In a letter he penned just on board the steamer which carried him across the Atlantic Ocean, he expressed his relief to get rid of the American flag which, he claimed, floated over “fraud and tyranny” as well as “many blind patriots.”⁶²

Others’ motives to take a month-long voyage were not different. A man of experience and distinction, Confederate General William Wing Loring, for example, would face the bitter post-bellum reality that there was no career for a defeated hero in Florida. Following the surrender of the Confederate Army, the one-armed “Old Blizzards” had moved to New York where he found a consulting job dealing with

⁵⁹ Henry C. Derrick to Martha Derrick, July 7, 1876, Derrick Papers.

⁶⁰ Henry C. Derrick to Martha Derrick, August 3, 1875, Derrick Papers.

⁶¹ Henry C. Derrick to Samuel H. Lockett, July 7, 1878, Lockett Papers; Henry C. Derrick to S. L. Merchant, July 12, 1875, Derrick Papers.

⁶² Henry C. Derrick to Martha Derrick, July 26, 1875, Derrick Papers.

minor Southern investments.⁶³ South Carolinian Willburn Briggs Hall sank in debt, James Morris Morgan failed as a cotton planter and farmer, and Charles W. Field's business in Baltimore proved to be unprofitable.⁶⁴ Obviously, these men who had another lost cause in their personal conduct saw Egyptian service not only a way to get rid of economic troubles but also a chance to return to their military profession. The foreign soil, therefore, was an opportunity to earn the prestige which was denied them in their native lands.

The personal notes and correspondence demonstrate how hard these men tried to sustain an honorable life without begging help from family networks or local mechanisms. Indeed, it was a hard task to perform in both personal and social terms. Poverty deeply disturbed these men not only because it meant material needs, but also it raised questions about their manliness and morals. According to the prevailing assumptions of the period, a man should accumulate wealth with age. Southerners gave great importance to the property as an essential component of personality and honor.⁶⁵ Being dependent on others or accepting charity appeared as a weakness which would lower the Confederate veteran "from that high standard of honorable distinction."⁶⁶ In short, former Confederates invoked discourses of chivalry, masculinity, and patriarchal responsibility as driving forces behind their decisions to seek new lives in Egypt.

⁶³ Hesseltine and Wolf, 18.

⁶⁴ Hesseltine and Wolf, 73, 20, 21.

⁶⁵ Bertram Wyatt-Brown, *Southern Honor: Ethics and Behavior in the Old South* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1982), 72.

⁶⁶ R. B. Rosenburg, "Southern Poor Boys," in Logue and Barton, *The Civil War Veteran*, 96.

While not barred from careers in the new Federal Army or state offices, many ex-Union officers also found post-war military service unpromising. Due to the new regulations, promotions were slow and commonly seen largely dependent on connections in Washington. Hence, some “Yankees,” including William McEntyre Dye of Pennsylvania and Charles Pomeroy Stone of Massachusetts, were also drawn to Egypt for money and careers. Unsatisfied with his lower post-war rank of major, former colonel in the regular army and brigadier general of volunteers, Dye resigned from the Federal Army and tried farming. Upon failing in his efforts after the Great Fire (1871) in Chicago where he had settled in and invested, he sailed to Egypt in 1873.⁶⁷ On Stone’s part, the sojourn was more meaningful. After being ostracized in the Northern army circles due to his alleged treason at the Battle of Ball’s Bluff (1861) and subsequent business failures, he saw mercenary service as a golden opportunity to prove his professional capabilities and reclaim his dignity.

The memoirs show, however, the allure of the exotic East or the prevailing Evangelical interest in the Holy Lands in the second half of the century played a relatively small role in their decisions, and it can be claimed that these could be confirming factors rather than key reasons for most of the veterans in their sojourn. For instance, Charles Chaillé-Long of Maryland expressed his initial interest in the “Orient” and adventure, finding his life after the war unfulfilling. After failed attempts at authorship, he “finally withdrew in disgust” and understood his “vocation lay with neither of the Muses [...] but with Mars.”⁶⁸ It was General Albin Francisco

⁶⁷ Donald M. Bishop, “Shared Failure: American Military Advisors in Korea, 1888-1896,” *Transactions of the Royal Asiatic Society* 58, no. 1 (1983): 60.

⁶⁸ Chaillé-Long, *My Life in Four Continents*, 12-14.

Schoepf's colorful stories of the Oriental life in Aleppo that awakened in him desire to visit the Orient (the Polish-American general served in the Ottoman Army against the insurgents in Syria and taught artillery in the military schools). Chaillé-Long's interest, coincidentally, was realized when he set sail for Egypt on the steamer named *Aleppo*.⁶⁹ That said, the veterans would be a part of the Egyptian interest later on, yet, not as passive admirers but self-acclaimed authorities.

2.2. Khedive's Interest in the American Expertise

To an unexpected extent, the pursuit of the American veterans coincided with that of Khedive Ismail. Ismail, who became viceroy in 1863 and earned the title of khedive in 1867 with an imperial decree, planned to utilize Western expertise to modernize his army as a means of dominating the Horn of Africa, an economically strategic point which extends into the Gulf of Aden. The Khedive re-envisioned his grandfather Governor Mehmed Ali's (the nominal vassal of the Ottoman sultan, Mahmud II, in the early nineteenth century) expansionist policies into the tribal lands of East and Central Africa, as well as the rival kingdoms. Having recruited European officers to his army, the powerful Albanian governor not only challenged the Ottoman government in the 1820s but also strengthened Egypt's autonomy with remarkable territorial gains down to Sudan.

However, the source of the expertise in the Egyptian army became highly controversial by the end of the 1860s when Ismail indulged in a passion for public works and military campaigns as he supplemented a large income from the "Civil War cotton prosperity," and enormous foreign loans. Often protesting the European

⁶⁹ Charles Chaillé-Long, "The Forgotten American Mission," 3, Chaillé-Long Papers.

influence in his army in the last decades, the Khedive was disappointed with his foreign officers, especially the French, as they lobbied for the bankers or other creditors, Quai d'Orsay, and armament manufacturers. He complained openly that they were under the control of the French War Ministry.⁷⁰ Yet, disloyalty and intrigues were not the only problems bothering him; more serious was the French government's arbitrary settlement between the Suez Canal Company owned by French diplomat Ferdinand de Lesseps and the Egyptian government.⁷¹

Ultimately, Ismail dismissed most of his foreign staff and inquired about American military expertise. After all, Americans had recently experienced a four-year-long land and naval war in which they were exposed to new military and logistical tactics, training, and equipment. Consequently, they were among the most ideal candidates for an army, which would be reorganized as a modern force. While observing the Civil War, the Khedive was also amazed by the efficacy of the Northern industry. Noting the quick recovery from the national rupture, Ismail thought the United States would play a prominent role in world affairs and could assist Egypt in its quest for independence. In this scheme, American advisors would not only reform the Egyptian forces, but also, the Khedive believed, "strengthen the bonds which unite [two peoples]."⁷² Thus, sharing the ideas of self-determination and advancement, the

⁷⁰ Stanton to Foreign Office, February 4, 1870, quoted in Dunn, *Khedive Ismail's*, 53; Pınar, *Tanzimat Döneminde İktidarın Sınırları*, 54.

⁷¹ *The New Cambridge History of Islam*, vol. 5, ed. Francis Robinson (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 94.

⁷² Oren, 196; George H. Butler to Hamilton Fish, June 3, 1870, DUSCA (Despatches from United States Consuls in Alexandria, Egypt, 1835-1873), T45, National Archives, Washington, D.C.

call upon “the youngest, freest, and most progressive” nation to help lift “the most enslaved of peoples” could provide a human bridge between two lands.⁷³

Moreover, unlike the British and French governments, the United States was usually believed to have no colonial plans in Egypt, and Ismail knew that Americans were “in no [way] compromised by any of the political corruption of Europe.”⁷⁴ The Khedive reportedly told the American officers that “lack of selfish interest in Egypt” on the part of their country was one the reasons of their selection for the proposed service.⁷⁵ This was a common view shared by many contemporaries, including the French-born Raleigh Edward Colston, who expressed the Khedive “found that he could not count upon the European officers in his service,” because the imperial governments might recall them in any political complication, but “he knew he would not be so with Americans.”⁷⁶ Indeed, Ismail’s concern would prove to be a self-fulfilling prophecy. During the British bombardment of Alexandria in 1882, Baron de Kusel, an Englishman having served in the khedival customs office, would hide Egyptian naval weapons that could have played potentially an important role in the defense of the harbor.⁷⁷ In this context, it is interesting to think about the number of times Americans benefited from this “anti-imperialist” reputation beginning in the nineteenth century but accelerating in the twentieth century and how this belief

⁷³ Charles P. Stone, “Military Affairs in Egypt,” *Journal of the Military Service Institution of the United States* 5, no. 17 (1884): 167-68.

⁷⁴ Dye, *Moslem Egypt and Christian Abyssinia*, 1.

⁷⁵ Chaillé-Long, *My Life in Four Continents*, 32.

⁷⁶ Raleigh Edward Colston, “Modern Egypt and Its People,” *Journal of the American Geographical Society of New York* 13 (1881): 150.

⁷⁷ (Baron) Samuel Selig de Kusel, *An Englishman’s Recollections of Egypt, 1863 to 1887* (New York: John Lane, 1915), 180-183; Frederick J. Cox, “Colonel John Lay’s Naval Mission in Egypt,” *Cahier D’histoire Egyptienne*, 5 (1953): 36-46.

(often encouraged by Americans) was increasingly leveraged to expand American commercial or strategic interests in the Middle East. It is particularly thought-provoking to think of Confederates participating in such narratives, given the short-lived Confederate States of America's desire to expand the "American Empire" to Latin America.

Indeed, the history of American mercenary service in Egypt reaches back to the Mehmed Ali period. George Bethune English, a Harvard College graduate who shared with Edward Everett the prestigious Bowdoin Prize for his dissertation, had once attended an Egyptian mission to subdue brigands disrupting trade in the African inlands and to expand the Egyptian influence into Sudan. After studying theology, the Bostonian served as a marine officer in Mediterranean Squadron and visited the Ottoman Empire. English arrived in Egypt in 1818 and obtained an interview with Ismail Pasha (the son of Mehmed Ali) in 1820 through the British consul. Though he had served in the navy and never risen above the rank of lieutenant, English was assigned *topji bashi* in command of Egyptian artillery. Having converted to Islam and adopted a Muslim name (Muhammed), the American officer participated in the Egyptian invasion of Sudan in 1820 and published an account of his trip up the River Nile in 1822 before returning to the United States.⁷⁸ Pierre Crabitès described him as a soldier of fortune and a mercenary, who would be a forerunner of American mission half a century later, while Lenoir Chamber Wright claimed he was a "secret agent" supported by President John Quincy Adams. David Finnie, on the other hand,

⁷⁸ Oren, 101-5; Andrew Oliver, *American Travelers on the Nile: Early US Visitors to Egypt, 1774-1839* (Cairo and New York: The American University in Cairo Press, 2014), 76; George Bethune English, *A Narrative of the Expedition to Dongola and Sennaar: Under the Command of His Excellence Ismael Pasha, Undertaken by Order of His Highness Mehemmed Ali Pasha, Viceroy of Egypt* (Boston: Wells and Lilly, 1823).

labeled the adventurer Bostonian a representative of “a sort of early-American awkward squad.”⁷⁹

2.3. Recruitment, Responses, and Characteristics of the American Group

The first missionary contact years after English arrived in the ancient lands was Thaddeus Phelps Mott, the son of a prominent New York surgeon. Known as the “fighting general” who “was covered with decorations,” Mott took part in the Italian Revolutionary War with Garibaldi and Reform War in Mexico. During the Civil War, he served as a lieutenant colonel of cavalry and led regiments in the New York Draft Riots. After the Appomattox, he declined a ministry nomination to Costa Rica, and travelled to Constantinople in 1868.⁸⁰ Without diplomatic representation in the United States, Ismail had to rely on independent agents, and Mott was an ideal candidate given his mercenary background and family connections within the Ottoman government. His father Valentine Mott, who toured Europe and the Middle East in the 1840s, maintained close relations with the Sublime Porte after he had performed a cranial operation on the august head of the Ottoman Sultan Abdulmecid and was decorated Order of Medjidie for his outstanding service.⁸¹ Brother-in-law Edouard Blacque Bey also served as the first Ottoman minister to the United States

⁷⁹ Finnie, 53, 271; Wright, 94-95.

⁸⁰ “A Soldier of Fortune Dead. General Thaddeus P. Mott and His Battles for Several Nations,” *Paterson Daily Press*, November 24, 1894; “Obituary-General Thaddeus Phelps Mott,” *The New York Times*, November 27, 1894.

⁸¹ BOA, I.H.R. Amerikalı Meşhur Cerrahlardan Doktor Mut’a Nişan Verilmesi Hususunun Meclise Havalesi, BOA, A. AMD. Amerikalı Cerrah Doktor Mut’a bir Kıta Nişan Verilmesi.

between 1866 and 1873.⁸² Moreover, Mott was fluent in Turkish and established a place at the court. There, during an imperial reception in Constantinople, the visiting Khedive offered him a job of enlisting former American officers in his army. A decree dated September 24, 1869, granted Mott the ranks of *farik* (equivalent of major general) and khedival chamberlain, along with a commission to recruit American mercenaries to serve in the Egyptian forces. His brother Henry A. Mott, a New Yorker merchant, and General Fitz John Porter would assist him in this task.⁸³

Meanwhile, generals Pierre Gustave T. Beauregard, George Pickett, Joseph E. Johnston and Fitz John Porter's himself were also said to have been offered the command of the Egyptian Army. However, George H. Butler, the United States Consul General to Egypt opposed ex-Confederate Beauregard, stating in retrospect that "there wasn't room in Egypt for Beauregard and [himself] at the same time." Pickett's widow LaSalle Corbell Pickett also wrote in her memoirs that "her soldier" declined the offer, stating proudly, "I fight only for my country. Nothing would induce me to enter a foreign war."⁸⁴ As Hesseltine and Wolf note, she would later become an enthusiastic biographer of her husband, although many of her claims about Pickett's career have been proven to be fabrications. Furthermore, American papers would fill their pages with sensational reports about these men in the

⁸² Samuel D. Gross, *Memoir of Valentine Mott, M.D., LL. D: Professor of Surgery in the University of the City of New York; Member of the Institute of France* (New York: Appleton, 1868), 24; Sinan Kuneralp, "Ottoman Diplomatic and Consular Personnel in the United States of America, 1867-1917," in *American Turkish Encounters: Politics and Culture, 1830-1989*, eds. Nur Bilge Criss, Selçuk Esenbel, Tony Greenwood, and Louis Mazzari (Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2011), 72-73.

⁸³ Hale to Secretary of State, April 14, 1869, and January 27, 1870, DUSCA; Crabitès, 7-8; Hesseltine and Wolf, 20; Field, 390.

⁸⁴ "Beauregard and the Khedive," *The New York Times*, July 21, 1882; LaSalle Corbell Pickett, *What Happened to Me?* (New York: Brentanos, 1917), 276.

following years. One was General Johnston's appointment as the commander-in-chief of the Egyptian Army "with a salary of 60,000 dollars per annum and an outfit of 400,000 dollars." Another was that Confederate General Fitzhugh Lee had received a letter from the Khedive asking him if he could reorganize the Black Horse Cavalry and bring them over to Egypt to act as his bodyguard. Some of these reports were presumably fabricated to exalt the value of given names or address to the readers' prevailing interest in Egyptian affairs at that time. In one of his long letters, Charles Iverson Graves asked his wife not to pay attention to such reports from Egypt as "not one hundredth part of" what she saw in the papers about Egypt was true.⁸⁵

After the first recruitment mission to the United States in 1869, Henry Hopkins Sibley of Louisiana—the inventor of the Sibley Tent, which was used by both armies during the Civil War—and William Wing Loring of Florida accompanied Mott during the one-month voyage from New York harbor to Alexandria. Indeed, the one-armed "Old Blizzards" was no stranger to the Middle East, having worked with the United States Army's camel corps at Fort Defiance, Arizona, and then toured the Ottoman Empire shortly before the Confederate shelling of Fort Sumter in 1861. The agreements they signed before arrival fixed a service period of five years. The second article in their contract obliged them "to make, wage and vigorously prosecute war against any and all enemies [...] wheresoever they may be." However, a further clause made it clear that the veterans would not wage against the United States, the only exception.⁸⁶ Following in the footsteps of the first group, some

⁸⁵ Charles I. Graves to Margaret L. Graves, October 8, 1875; November 13, 1875; July 7, 1876, Graves Papers.

⁸⁶ Crabitès, 9; Chaillé-Long, *My Life in Four Continents*, 17.

twenty-five veterans and “interns,” many of whom were West Point and Annapolis Naval Academy graduates, took the New York-Liverpool-Brindisi-Alexandria-Cairo route.

Their salaries for mercenary service, the strongest pull factor, were generous with an additional twenty percent bonus for serving in the distant provinces. If a soldier died in service, his heirs would receive a full year’s pay, and if he were killed in battle, his widow would be granted benefits until her youngest child came of age.

Moreover, transportation costs, which were around 100 pounds, would be covered by the Khedive.⁸⁷ Interestingly, there was much compensation to death from climate change rather than fighting because battlefield loss was seen as a natural fate in soldiering, but climate change meant assignment in peripheries for public works. In the first group, Mott’s salary was the highest one with 2,600 francs. Brigadier generals, colonels and majors would be paid according to their ranks respectively in the amount of 1,800, 1,000-1,200 and 900 francs. Most signed their contracts while they were in the United States. Only Lockett, a later recruit, would have signed his five years contract in Egypt. The conditions in his proposed contract were stated in a lengthy letter by General Stone, who would supervise the American employment after Mott retired to Turkey. In this letter, Stone gave not only financial details of the proposed engineering post, but also informed him about the plans and potential tasks that the prospective colonel could be assigned, like the topographical works or water

⁸⁷ Dye, *Moslem Egypt and Christian Abyssinia*, 2; Hesseltine and Wolf, 20; Henry C. Derrick to S. L. Merchant, July 12, 1875, Derrick Papers; “Agreement (April 20, 1870),” James Morris Morgan Papers, Southern Historical Collection, Wilson Library, The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. For the respective salaries and other benefits, see, “American Officers in the Service of the Khedive,” *The New York Times*, August 26, 1870.

surveys.⁸⁸ Colonel Dye was the only American officer who had a clause in his contract that he could only be charged under United States law; that is why he was never court-martialed by the Egyptian authorities after striking a native officer in 1876.⁸⁹ Of course, there were many uncertainties, as the group's existence actually depended on Ismail's personal favor and his political fate. Colonel Derrick, another late recruit, would state his doubts in a letter to his wife that there was "no telling what a man will do if the Khedive should die." He plainly answered his own question, stating they did not know anything but that they probably would all be sent home.⁹⁰

Having signed five-year contracts, most of the veterans did not bring their families with them, and no records imply that any planned to settle on this foreign soil. However, for some, their temporary employment terminated even earlier than they could have possibly anticipated. Walter H. Jenifer from Maryland, the inventor of a cavalry saddle used by both armies in the Civil War and the commander of the Confederate troops in Ball's Bluff against Stone's forces, for example, resigned after his first year due to his deteriorating health in Egypt, like his fellow soldier Horatio B. Reed, who left Egypt with a leave of absence in 1875 but never returned. Carrol Tevis, a soldier of fortune who served in the Ottoman Army during the Crimean War, also spent only one year (1872) in the khedival service. Captain David Essex Porter, son of Admiral David D. Porter who helped General Mott in the initial recruitment process, arrived in 1875, but his Egyptian service would be

⁸⁸ Charles P. Stone to Samuel H. Lockett, February 23, 1875, Lockett Papers.

⁸⁹ Henry C. Derrick to Martha Derrick, August 29, 1875, Derrick Papers.

⁹⁰ Henry C. Derrick to Martha Derrick, September 12, 1875, Derrick Papers.

similarly short-lived. Like some other American officers, his excessive drinking habit and frequent complaints about the service in the East annoyed the Egyptian officials; thus, he was asked to leave the post in 1876. Major D.G. White's unexpected departure in his first year, however, would "disgust" all the American officers. After having received orders for an expedition, the alcoholic Georgian deserted the country during his first year in service, giving "disgrace to all there," as his fellow Georgian complained.⁹¹

The temporary employment, on the other hand, meant separation and sacrifice for both the men and the families behind. Graves, for example, entrusted his family of six to his wife's parents in Rome, Georgia. For him, the only resolution in his absence was a strong belief that their sacrifice would be rewarded. Believing the separation was bearable only with his "Christian resignation and fortitude," he assured Margaret that they needed "a little moral courage" to endure his absence.⁹² Likewise, Derrick's letters to Halifax, Virginia, demonstrate the Colonel had some guilt feelings about putting his wife into challenging circumstances, but he could see no satisfactory solutions to the dilemma he had confronted. He constantly attempted to rationalize his sojourn alone, often mentioning that undertaking the trip altogether would be "horrid" as was in Colonel Lockett's case. Indeed, Lockett himself would admit that the unexpected costs, as well as the absence of proper education to his little ones, made their Egypt days onerous. Derrick was also concerned about his

⁹¹ Charles I. Graves to Margaret L. Graves, November 19, 1875, November 27, 1875, and July 8, 1877, Graves Papers.

⁹² Charles I. Graves to Margaret L. Graves, July 15, 1875, September 21, 1875, and October 15, 1875, Graves Papers.

family's comfort in Cairo in case he was assigned to the frontier works.⁹³ However, the separation was undeniably a source of great melancholy, as he penned on March 23, 1877:

I can never forget the day I left, and how I felt at the thought of little Annie's distress when she should find that I was gone and did not return as the days glided by and glancing back at you as I drive away, where you were standing on the lawn, to steal one parting look, I saw the almost hopeless and despairing expression upon your countenance as though life itself were parting. It haunts me still [...] The fact is, it was a great deal harder for me to go than appeared on the surface, and I wanted to go off with a rush, like a man swallowing a dose of nauseating medicine, and have it over.⁹⁴

Bringing families was "a very delicate matter on which to advise," told General Stone in a letter to the prospective colonel engineer Lockett. According to the Chief of Staff it was hard when men were separated from family, on the one hand, but he needed to underline "with perfect frankness" that the climate was not good for young children like his little ones. Stone recommended him to come first alone and then arrange the family's passage after setting everything for them (accordingly, Colonel Dye and Dr. William H. Wilson had left their wives in Switzerland and Ireland).⁹⁵

That said, a few of the Americans moved to Egypt with their families, including Lockett, despite Stone's advice. Yet, the ladies (Mrs. Lockett, Dye, Field, Dennison, Martin, and Hall), with the exception of Mrs. Stone, were not good at adjusting their new surroundings. They did not have any connection with the natives beyond some petty services they had asked for. Cornelia Lockett, for example, spent most of the days homeschooling her children because there were no appropriate schools for

⁹³ Henry C. Derrick to Martha Derrick, July 26, 1875, and October 1, 1875, Derrick Papers; Samuel Henry Lockett, "Our Life in Egypt," unpublished manuscript, undated, Lockett Papers.

⁹⁴ Henry C. Derrick, diary entry, March 23, 1877 (copy of his letter to Martha Derrick), Derrick Papers.

⁹⁵ Charles P. Stone to Samuel H. Lockett, February 23, 1875, Lockett Papers; Henry C. Derrick to Martha Derrick, June 25, 1876, Derrick Papers.

them. Mrs. Stone was the mother figure of the American contingent, inviting them to cheerful dinners, organizing excursions around the city, or corresponding with the wives back home. Indeed, the Egyptian bond linked some of the ladies in the United States. Martha Derrick, Margaret Lea Graves, and M. Fairfax Field corresponded for three years, either planning to visit Egypt together or informing each other when their men were on the frontier and unable to send word home.⁹⁶

Stone was the only American officer whose family expanded in Egypt, with his daughter “Egypta” born in 1871, at the beginning of the General’s career in their host country. Her elder brother John, who was only one year old when they arrived in Cairo, also spent his childhood in Egypt. Later known for his works in developing radio technology in the United States, John spoke Arabic fluently and had the title “bey” due to his father’s high rank in the army.⁹⁷ Besides, there were two fathers and sons in the American contingent, Reynolds and Sibleys, even though Sidney Johnston Sibley (aged 20) was cited only in a *New York Herald* report.⁹⁸ To our knowledge, Derrick was the only one who lost a child during the Egyptian service. Dabney Cosby Derrick, aged four, the youngest of three Derrick children, died of diphtheria on January 2, 1878. Interestingly, Derrick never mentioned his little son’s death to his companions, as he “never spoke of his family unless in answers to some direct questions.” Indeed, the Colonel was “a mystery” which was difficult to solve and perhaps the “most undemonstrative man,” as one of his closest friends in Cairo

⁹⁶ Henry C. Derrick to Martha Derrick, August 17, 1875, and August 20, 1875, Derrick Papers.

⁹⁷ G. H. Clark, *The Life of John Stone Stone: Mathematician, Physicist, Electrical Engineer and Great Inventor* (San Diego, California: Frye & Smith, Ltd. 1946), 14, 16.

⁹⁸ “American Army Officers in the Service of Egypt. Who They Are and What Have Been Their Performances in the Past—Union and Confederate Soldiers Fighting Under the Same Flag,” *New York Herald*, September 22, 1871.

wrote.⁹⁹ Moreover, his correspondence does not provide any information about how he handled the situation far from home.

It should be noted that the United States government emphasized those men in the khedival service did not constitute an official American mission to avoid suspicions of Britain and France. Washington also had to consider the sensibilities of the Sublime Porte, the Ottoman government, that would have regarded this scheme as provocative. The attitude of the United States would be clearly expressed in a diplomatic instruction dated 1875, warning the Consul Richard Beardsley against referring those men “who accepted service as officers of the Egyptian Army” as American officers. The State Department clearly stated these gentlemen were natives of the United States but could not be so designated as American officers in official communications.¹⁰⁰ Although having displayed such diplomatic proprieties, the State Department did not block the enlistments, which is another example of the more outward-looking attitude of the United States after the 1860s. Moreover, the United States government applied diplomatic pressure to secure favorable resolutions in a number of cases, such as payments of the officers or estate settlements of the deceased ones (including that of Alexander W. Reynolds and Charles Loshe who passed away respectively in Alexandria and Suakim) even though an earlier dispatch from the Department stated in 1871 that the consular service would not employ the customary good offices towards them.¹⁰¹

⁹⁹ Charles I. Graves to Margaret L. Graves, February 27, 1878, and October 2, 1876, Graves Papers.

¹⁰⁰ Instruction to Beardsley, November 29, 1875, DUSCC (Despatches from United States Consuls in Cairo, Egypt, 1864-1906, T41, National Archives, Washington, D.C.); Instruction to Butler, October 5, 1871, *cited in* Wright, 75.

¹⁰¹ Farman to State Department, April 19, 1879, DUSCC; Consular Agent to State Department, November 10, 1878, DUSCC; Instruction to Butler, October 5, 1871.

However, the British and French governments had objected to American enlistments immediately. Concerned about the loss of their influence in the region, both powers saw Egyptian ambitions as a threat to their investments. Obviously, the integrity of the Ottoman Empire or limited autonomy in Egypt was more advantageous in terms of their greater political and economic strategies.¹⁰² Accordingly, the British Ambassador warned the Egyptian Foreign Minister of the serious costs if the Khedive persisted “to excite the suspicions of the Porte and raise the apprehension of the Powers.”¹⁰³ The French also intimated the Minister that “America would be far away” in any trouble.¹⁰⁴ The Ottoman authorities, on the other hand, reacted against the American recruitments with much suspicion, because the Sublime Porte claimed that the American officers would replace the Turkish-Circassian-Albanian hierarchy in the army. The army was always a leverage of central control; therefore, American employment in the Egyptian army could ironically be a means of transforming and nationalizing it, which was enough to alert the centralist reflexes in Constantinople. Indeed, Governor Mehmed Ali once stated that as long as the army remained under the control of the Ottomans, Egyptians would not be able to claim that they own the country.¹⁰⁵

Threats did not deter Ismail, who would convey his gratitude to President Ulysses S. Grant through the Consul Butler, “for permitting so many distinguished officers to leave their country for the service of Egypt,” and new recruitments followed the first

¹⁰² Wright, 72; *The New Cambridge History of Islam*, 91.

¹⁰³ Edward Joy Morris to Hamilton Fish, July 1, 1870, DUSMT (Despatches from the United States Ministers to Turkey, 1818-1906), M46, National Archives, Washington, D.C.

¹⁰⁴ Crabitès, 44.

¹⁰⁵ Pinar, 54; Afaf Lutfi al-Sayyid Marsot, *A Short History of Modern Egypt* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1986), 59.

groups.¹⁰⁶ However, the cooperation through securing leaves of absence for the officers in active duty in the United States Army (thus enabling them to serve in Egypt) was not made public until 1876, when the House of Representatives passed a resolution requesting information on regular Army officers who were in the foreign military service. Regarding the Egyptian recruitments, Secretary of War William W. Belknap reported that Oscar Eugene Fechet, Robert M. Rogers, Charles Loshe, and Surgeon William H. Wilson were on ordinary leave, and they were not granted leaves for the purpose of enabling them to enter foreign service.¹⁰⁷

Furthermore, the Khedive inquired about the purchase of American weapons, with Mott lobbying for Winchester Company and Stone pushing for Remington rifles as agents. Mott's business partner was Massachusetts Senator Benjamin F. Butler. The appointment of his nephew George H. Butler to Alexandria as the consul, was also found related to this scheme as the British suspected.¹⁰⁸ Frank Reynolds, a West Pointer and son of Alexander Welch Reynolds, died in Ilion, New York, where he was negotiating the purchase of arms with Remington Company on behalf of Stone. His assignment was another evidence to establish a direct link between applications for leave and military service in Egypt. Stone had personally requested leave be granted to the young officer to authorize him for inspecting arms manufactured for the Egyptian government.¹⁰⁹ Another Civil War veteran, Francis Gustave Skinner of Virginia, also visited Egypt as an arms sales agent at that time. Although he did not

¹⁰⁶ George H. Butler to Hamilton Fish, May 28, 1870, DUSCA.

¹⁰⁷ Wright, 76.

¹⁰⁸ Hesseltine and Wolf, 77; Pinar, 123.

¹⁰⁹ Henry C. Derrick to Martha Derrick, August 13, 1875, Derrick Papers; Department of the Army, Registers of Letters. Received, vol. 185, War Office, No. 8175, October 14, 1875, referring to the request of Charles P. Stone. *Cited in* Wright, 76.

serve in the Egyptian Army, “the defeated Confederate of broken fortunes” reportedly had close relations with the Khedive and accompanied former Secretary of State William H. Seward during his Giza tour in 1872.¹¹⁰

The senior officers’ involvement in the arms sales competition was the only example of the American mercenaries’ propensity for business in Egypt. There is no evidence whether Stone received financial benefits while Mott was said to lose “commissions” after Winchester was denied.¹¹¹ The arms sales agreements correspondingly show that utilizing American military expertise in Egypt was not only limited to human resources but also included technology transfer, thus enhancing trade relations between two countries.¹¹² Moreover, relations with the Remington Company exceeded a short-term trade intention, that Mr. Remington had a mansion in Egypt where he hosted many outstanding guests for a period.

2.4. Conclusion

The initiation of American mercenary service in Egypt with Civil War veterans and a few officers in-active-duty in the United States Army was a result of the specific conditions in two countries, having personal and political implications on both sides. To summarize, American veterans were in search of new careers in the military profession, and Egypt could provide the conditions to realize their objectives, even

¹¹⁰ H. Worcester Smith and F. Gustavus Skinner, *A Sporting Family of the Old South* (Albany: J. B. Lyon Company, 1936), 337.

¹¹¹ John P. Dunn, “An American Fracas in Egypt: The Butler Affair of 1872,” *Journal of the American Research Center in Egypt* 42 (2005/2006), 157.

¹¹² Pınar, 122. See also, Oral Sander and Kurthan Fişek, *ABD Dışişleri Belgeleriyle Türk-ABD Silah Ticaretinin İlk Yüzyılı: 1829-1929* (İstanbul: Çağdaş Yayınları, 1972).

though it was not one of the first destinations they would think of. Specifically, the ex-Confederates' arrival to the ancient lands cannot be separated from Reconstruction's financial realities, which forced many other Southerners to relocate in the United States with a westward mobilization. Many who wore gray during the war had difficulties in adjusting themselves to civilian life due to the misfortunes during the "carpetbagger rule" and political injuries that avoided them from assuming official employment. Therefore, eliminating the "discredit" of financial embarrassment by providing some sort of comfort for the household was regarded as a test of manhood. On the other hand, the khedival government saw the disbanded qualified officer pool in the United States as another opportunity to balance European intrigue in the army ranks. The process of expertise transfer, which was initiated in 1869, proved to be effective; thus Ismail would employ more Americans in the coming years through General Stone's mediation, instead of General Mott, in a more systematic scheme.

CHAPTER III

AMERICAN PHOENIX IN THE LAND OF THE PHARAOHS:

CHARLES POMEROY STONE

On the last day of January 1862, war-weary Brigadier General Charles Pomeroy Stone entered a big room in the Capitol. The atmosphere was tense in the Joint Committee on the Conduct of the War's new session. The men investigating the recent Federal defeat on the Potomac were not from military ranks but were to judge a military man. Stone was seen responsible for the loss at the Battle of Ball's Bluff (Virginia) in which Union Army suffered a humiliating defeat on October 21, 1861. The chief accusations against him were mainly about his orders to former Senator Edward Baker, who was killed at the battle, his disposition of fugitive slaves to their secessionist owners, and his alleged "treasonous fraternization" with the enemies.¹¹³ Chairman of the Committee, the "Jacobin" Senator Benjamin Wade broke the silence, saying he was not sure if he could enumerate all the points that might be enough to impeach Stone, and asked in the very beginning if the General ordered his

¹¹³ Rick Beard, "Disunion: The Scapegoat of Battle of Ball's Bluff," *The New York Times*, January 15, 2012 (retrieved June 20, 2020).

forces without sufficient means of transportation thus endangering the army in Ball's Bluff. This sudden opening led to many other questions touching the General's loyalty in his own words, as a disgrace to an officer who displayed outstanding service for many years. Stone replied the accusations with reproach, telling the Committee's conduct was indeed a humiliation which he should have never been subject to and concluded plainly: "I have been as faithful as I can be, and I am exceedingly sore at this outrageous charge."¹¹⁴ However, his case was prejudged, as observers noted, and the General was imprisoned upon the suspicion of treason. He was released months later, but this winter day would change the wheel of fate on Stone's side. After being scapegoated for the Federal losses and had to carry a disgrace upon his shoulders, he disinclined to serve in the military and resigned from his posts during the last phase of the war. It would take almost two decades to reclaim his honor in his native soils, only after he returned from Egypt as a *pasha* who was celebrated in that foreign land for his utmost fidelity.

Stone's Egypt experience is noteworthy because he was the ultimate example of a "reconstructed self" in Egypt: An esteemed man who was able to reclaim his honor in terms of loyalty/commitment, prove professional abilities and maintain financial relief. His twelve years of service in his adopted country encompassed promise, frustration, internal strife, passion, and reward. He represented his nation with pride and became one of the forces behind the Civil War veterans' collective recovery in Egypt as the leader of the American contingent.

¹¹⁴ *Report of the Joint Committee on the Conduct of the War, Part II, Bull Run-Ball's Bluff* (Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1863), 429.

3.1. A Career Destroyed by a “Great Wrong”

Stone was born in Greenfield, Massachusetts, into a Roman Catholic family. He entered West Point in 1841 and graduated standing seventh in the class of 1845. After serving with distinction in the Mexican War, he worked as an army engineer, banker, and surveyor until the eve of the Civil War.¹¹⁵ He moved to Washington in 1860 winter and was appointed by his former commander in Mexico, General Winfield Scott, as the inspector general of the District of Columbia Militia. Reportedly the first volunteer to enlist in the Union Army, Stone made his name while he secured the conduct of President-elect Abraham Lincoln’s inaugural ceremony.¹¹⁶ However, for Stone, it was a soldier’s natural task and also a national duty “to insure the regular inauguration of the constitutionally elected President” rather than his sympathy for the Republican candidate. Indeed, he had opposed to Lincoln’s election believing “it would bring on what is evidently coming, a fearful war.” According to General Fitz John Porter, his classmate at West Point, Washington residents esteemed him for his indefatigable energy in the Union cause.¹¹⁷ Yet, Stone would complain years later that the country never appreciated troubles surmounted in their organization. He believed that the volunteers under his

¹¹⁵ George Washington Cullum, *Biographical Register of the Officers and Graduates of the U.S. Military Academy, at West Point, N.Y., from its Establishment, 1902, to 1890: With the Early History of the United States Military Academy* (Boston: Houghton, Mifflin and Company, 1891), 60.

¹¹⁶ John H. Eicher and David J. Eicher, *Civil War High Commands* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2001), 513; Frederick Hatch, *Protecting President Lincoln: The Security Effort, the Thwarted Plots and the Disaster at Ford’s Theatre* (Jefferson, NC: McFarland and Company, 2011), 20.

¹¹⁷ Fitz John Porter, “In memory of Gen. Chas. P. Stone,” (Harvard College Library Collection), 1887.

command rendered excellent service before Sumter's shelling, giving confidence to the Union supporters and the government bodies in Washington.¹¹⁸

During the Civil War, Stone served under generals Robert Patterson and George McClellan, who promoted him to brigadier general. What would bring a downfall in his career that he had built for almost two decades came after the infamous Battle of Ball's Bluff, during which Confederates drove the Union forces into the Potomac, where many drowned and hundreds surrendered rather than having escaped into the river. While the defeat was not that important in regard to the losses on both sides, as General Porter suggested, the significance was exaggerated as it was one of the early battles near the Capitol.¹¹⁹ Another reason was the death of Edward Baker, the former Oregon senator, and Lincoln's friend. Afterward, a Joint Committee on the Conduct of the War inquired about the disaster and questioned Stone's orders, his disposition of fugitive slaves, and suspected interactions with the enemy. Being already unpopular among the Republicans, Stone was caught in "a perfect storm of political intrigue," as Rick Beard points out. According to Beard, Radical Republicans' distrust of McClellan's Democratic politics as well as the paranoia that many West Pointers sympathized with the Southerners created treason presumptions; thus the members of what Lincoln's secretary John Hay called the "Jacobin Club," tried to strike at General McClellan through his subordinate Stone.¹²⁰

¹¹⁸ Charles Pomeroy Stone, "Memoir of Charles Pomeroy Stone," in *The Century War Series: Battles and Leaders of the Civil War*, vol. 1 (New York, NY: Century Co., 1887), 23.

¹¹⁹ Porter, 49.

¹²⁰ Beard, "Disunion: The Scapegoat of Ball's Bluff," *Letters of John Hay and Extracts from Diary* (Washington D.C.: private typescript, 1908), 48.

In the end, the Committee accused Stone of treason and imprisoned him at Fort Lafayette without a trial. The choice of the location was also humiliating as it was where the secessionist were sent, which prompted Stone to protest, saying he had been “as true a soldier to the Government as any in service.”¹²¹ Confinement without any concrete accusation was brought to President Lincoln’s attention, and hundreds of Massachusetts citizens petitioned for securing their fellow General an immediate trial.¹²² Stone was released six months later, yet not pardoned. Afterward he managed to return active service in the military only to be scapegoated for further Union setbacks and finally had to resign from the army before the surrender of the Confederates.¹²³

Describing the case as a mystery, his friend and future president Ulysses S. Grant regarded Stone “as very able and perfectly loyal man,” and recalled that he would have made his mark in the war “if his military career was not destroyed by a great wrong.”¹²⁴ General Porter also stated “mystery surrounded” the incident, questioning in retrospective, “why should the first to volunteer in defense of the Union, who had labored so assiduously to preserve that Union [...] seized as a traitor and incarcerated?” Perhaps the most robust support came from General Scott, who announced if Stone was a traitor, “I am a traitor, and we are all traitors.”¹²⁵ Likewise,

¹²¹ Hesseltine and Wolf, 7; H. Donald Winkler, *Civil War Goats and Scapegoats* (Nashville: Cumberland House Publishing, 2008), 53.

¹²² Abraham Lincoln Papers: Series 1. General Correspondence: *Massachusetts Citizens to Abraham Lincoln, List and Petitions on behalf of Gen. Charles P. Stone*. March 1862. Manuscript/Mixed Material. Retrieved from the Library of Congress, <https://www.loc.gov/item/mal1529300/>

¹²³ Eicher and Eicher, 513.

¹²⁴ *Papers of Ulysses S. Grant*, ed. John Simon, vol. 28 (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 2005), 422.

¹²⁵ Porter, 52; Scott quoted in Webb Jr. Garrison, *Strange Battles of the Civil War* (Nashville: Cumberland House Publishing, 2001), 122.

finding him an honest, brave, and a good soldier, General McClellan thought the Committee was hungry for a scapegoat, and it was Stone who was not far from him. Military historian Ezra J. Warner held Stone's case as a shame, claiming his confinement was without parallel in the annals of the American military. Likewise, a contemporary *The New York Times* correspondent wrote the unfortunate General had sustained "a most flagrant wrong," which would stand "as the very worst blot" on the North's fight.¹²⁶ Indeed, his disgrace was seen as the result of a century earlier version of McCarthyism that swept the Northern circles during the war.¹²⁷ Scorned as a "soldier of misfortune" and emotionally broken with the humiliation as well as the loss of his first wife during the War, Stone returned to civilian life. He managed a Virginia mine, which proved to be unprofitable until 1869, when General William Tecumseh Sherman, then the Commanding General of the United States Army, sponsored him to serve in Khedive Ismail's army. Taking the journey would enable him to restore what he had been deprived of recently: his good name and profession.

3.2. Stone in Egypt: A Promise of Rebirth

Sources do not provide much information about when Sherman offered the mercenary employment to his friend and how the former army officer reached at a final decision to set sail; what we know is that Stone arrived in Egypt in 1870, following the first American group. Settled in the khedival capital along with his family, Stone was appointed as Chief of General Staff of the Egyptian Army. His

¹²⁶ Michael McHugh, *George McClellan: The Disposable Patriot* (Illinois: Christian Liberty Press, 2007), 77; Ezra J. Warner, *Generals in Blue: Lives of the Union Commanders* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1964), 663; Quoted in Winkler, 55.

¹²⁷ David Icenogle, "The Khedive's Cartographers," *Saudi Aramco World*, September-October 1984, 18.

headquarters was stationed in the Citadel overlooking Cairo's old quarters, an appropriate symbol for his fluctuating career, with both the bemoaned and celebrated past of the ancient complex. Unfortunately, as discussed in the introduction chapter, there is no record of his first days or the initial signs of the rivalry with General Mott.

Stone's ascendance to the leadership of the American group resulted from his assertive character and inevitable internal conflicts. With General Mott nominally at the top position, some veterans coalesced into cliques around him, which American Consul George H. Butler blamed on the intrigues of former Confederate West Pointers who, according to him, "objected to serve under an officer of the Union Army who is not a graduate of the Academy."¹²⁸ However, a more precise reason for these factions were the reduced salaries and lesser ranks they faced upon arrival in Egypt, to which Mott did not find a proper solution. For example, the original agreements of Alexander W. Reynolds of Virginia and Thomas G. Rhett of South Carolina (also a classmate of Stone at West Point), which were signed in the United States, were rewritten upon "the satisfactory reasons therefore having been given by General Mott," and Rhett's proposed grade of brigadier-general was replaced by the grade of colonel in the new contract, dated May 23, 1870.¹²⁹

After waiting "impatiently and losing his temper," the annoyed officer wrote a letter to the Minister of War and demanded his discharge. This reprimand, interestingly, was seen as disrespectful by one of his fellows, because when Rhett demanded his

¹²⁸ George H. Butler to Hamilton Fish, July 7, 1870, DUSCA.

¹²⁹ Crabitès, 11.

discharge, the promotion reportedly had already been ordered by the Khedive.¹³⁰ Obviously, they had to take the consequence, for there was no alternative rather than taking the costly and long passage back home as well as the disappointment and disgrace. For them, it would be just another failure which would bring further humiliation in their own consideration. Therefore, enraged but also desperate, some would wait to be promoted to the ranks which they had been originally supposed to hold. Not surprisingly, this would be a paramount concern among the next recruits. A particular clause in Henry Clay Derrick's contract dated July 12, 1875, for example, stated that upon his arrival, he would be subjected to assignment not below the rank selected for him in the United States.¹³¹ Perhaps Derrick was informed of such surprises as he knew the unfortunate officer Reynolds in person, through his son, Frank, who studied at West Point with Clarence, Derrick's younger brother.¹³²

Another source of division in the recently formed American contingent was the placements, or misplacements, in a better description. The new-comers found out that their efforts were mostly to be diffused into public works programs or supervision of logistical investments that Khedive Ismail had provisioned for his modernization projects rather than active soldiering or commanding troops. Indeed, this demonstrated what Lysle E. Meyer called "traditional cronyism and bureaucratic obstructionism" in Egypt by the Turkish-Circassian element which occupied the high

¹³⁰ Charles I. Graves to Margaret L. Graves, February 10, 1877, Graves Papers.

¹³¹ Henry C. Derrick to S. L. Merchant, July 12, 1875, Derrick Papers.

¹³² Derrick tried to convince his younger brother to join him in the Egyptian Army. Indeed, family notes demonstrate Clarence had assisted Henry in applying for a position in Egypt. Clarence had a mercenary network there, and Henry was not a career army officer, but a civil engineer. A family note on the diary: Henry C. Derrick, diary entry, October 28, 1876, Derrick Papers.

ranks in the army.¹³³ For example, Navy officers were assigned to army units or postal service between Alexandria and Constantinople because there was no Egyptian Navy. The ex-Confederate artillery major Thomas Rhimke was also placed in charge of the powder mills around Cairo. According to James A. Field, on the other hand, the main problem was that the majority of the Americans were assigned tasks in a commission for frontier and coastal defense. Beverley Kennon of New York was one of those disappointed ones. Having served in the Confederate Navy during the Civil War, he came to Egypt as a colonel of ordnance and conducted water and land surveys. “Full of energy and ability,” in General Loring’s words, the dissatisfied Colonel left Egypt in 1874 “wearied of monotony of a life of ease.”¹³⁴ Dunn suspects that General Mott and his brother Henry were responsible for this dispute by contracting more mercenaries than they were authorized.¹³⁵ Such a policy of placement was especially unacceptable for the young regular American officers who were on leave from their service in the United States Army to have field experience abroad, like Eugene Fechet and Charles Loshe. As a result of this discontent, some like Lieutenant Colonel James Morris Morgan of New Orleans requested War Minister to permit they could study their profession on the battlefields during the Franco-Prussian War of 1870-71. However, the French government responded to the offer that “it would be pleased to receive native Egyptian officers, but not Americans.”¹³⁶

¹³³ Lysle E. Meyer, *The Farther Frontier: Six Case Studies of Americans and Africa: 1848-1936* (Selinsgrove: Susquehanna University Press, 1992), 68.

¹³⁴ Field, 392; Beverly Kennon to Bob, August 13, 1870, *cited in* Dunn, “An American Fracas in Egypt,” 158.

¹³⁵ *Ibid.*

¹³⁶ Morgan, 310.

On the other hand, some of the American officers, like Lockett, who was known for being hypercritical, acknowledged that such an arrangement was necessary. Indeed, the Alabaman Colonel was already notified before he set sail to Egypt by Stone, who told the new recruit that he might be called upon to aid in the public work of the country.¹³⁷ According to Lockett, one reason for diverting talent from military to civil service was that Egypt had been “cursed with some of the worst Americans that could be found [...] so much drunkenness and inefficiency.”¹³⁸ This would be one of Stone’s biggest concerns, as the Chief of the General Staff, in the coming years.

All these initial problems inevitably helped Stone to strive for the leading position in the mercenary group. Describing Stone, a “quiet and politic[al] American,” Morgan noted that the Chief of the General Staff was not only “accomplished in his profession” but also “a born manipulator of men.” Lockett’s opinions were not different from that of his comrade. For him, Stone was a kind gentleman, but he had “so much dealing with slipperiness in Egypt [and] he has become slippery himself.” According to him, his superior was a man of duty “full of schemes” in his head. However, he warned an old friend in Knoxville, who was planning to apply for a position in the Egyptian Army, that the General often “starts a new nest of eggs before the last one is hatched, and the second sitting causes the complete neglect of the first.”¹³⁹ Portraying a “thoroughly selfish” picture of Stone and questioning his sincerity, the Colonel concluded the Chief of the General Staff was “a batch of

¹³⁷ Charles P. Stone to Samuel H. Lockett, February 23, 1875, Lockett Papers.

¹³⁸ Samuel H. Lockett to David F. Boyd, October 8, 1876, Boyd Papers.

¹³⁹ Samuel H. Lockett to David F. Boyd, November 4, 1877, Boyd Papers.

contradictions, seeming always to be one thing and universally believed to be the opposite.”¹⁴⁰

The Northerners, Chaillé-Long and Dye, also criticized Stone’s conduct publicly in their memoirs published in the following decade. Horatio B. Reed’s statements were the most unpleasant. Describing Stone “a failure as a soldier,” the New Yorker who served as a colonel in the Egyptian Army (1874-75) reported, the General got everything on his own way and manipulated the department that he had “all the Americans in the service under his thumb through his perfect knowledge of French and his servility to the Khedive, and he used his power disgracefully.” According to him, American officers had to resign rather than stand the abuse and tyranny of Stone and left the country “disgusted not with the Khedive, who [was] a high-toned gentleman, but with Charles P. Stone, their fellow countryman.”¹⁴¹

On the other hand, many others found the General “a very pleasant and polite gentleman” contrary to these fierce attacks on both his personality and management. While some of the officers complain of “stiffness, coldness, and formality,” Graves, for example, wrote to his wife that he had “never yet experienced it in the slightest degree.”¹⁴² An old acquaintance of Stone, General Porter, also endorsed his character in a favorable manner which highly contrasted with Stone’s critics, expressing “he was ambitious, [...] and irreproachable in conduct; indomitable in adversity; modest when success crowned his efforts; undepressed and energetic in adversity; so

¹⁴⁰ Quoted in Hesseltine and Wolf, 230.

¹⁴¹ “American Officers in Egypt. General Stone’s Command and its Alleged Abuses – An Interview with Colonel Horatio B. Reed,” *Daily Graphic*, January 29, 1879.

¹⁴² Charles I. Graves to Margaret L. Graves, August 7, 1875, and November 19, 1877, Graves Papers.

courteous to his associates and dignified in bearing as always to command respect and to furnish a model for imitation.”¹⁴³

Indeed, this dual image on the eyes of his fellows was a predictable result of Stone’s unique and ambivalent position. Basically, he had two guiding concerns in Egypt: the khedival authority and the American way of life, which he and the other veterans represented under Muslim sovereignty. Thus, the General had to be an interpreter, an advocator, and an apologist for his countrymen in a foreign land. He was a buffer between Egyptians and his fellows with all animosity, trying to please both at the expense of confronting to both reversely.¹⁴⁴ Even his opponent, Colonel Dye, would acknowledge the “real difficulties encountered by Stone” in the art of balancing two opposites when he was appointed to a similar position in the Korean Army in the 1880s.¹⁴⁵

In the end, even though senior officers who came to Egypt earlier (including Mott, Loring, and Sibley) had formed a faction against him, the experienced General handled the problem “as though they were so many naughty children” in Lieutenant Colonel Morgan’s words. Morgan observed that before Stone got through with other senior officers “they were tame enough to eat out of his hand and beg for his

¹⁴³ Porter, 60.

¹⁴⁴ Hesseltine and Wolf, 107.

¹⁴⁵ Dye, *Moslem Egypt and Christian Abyssinia*, 155. Also see, Allan R. Millett, “Captain James H. Hausman and the Formation of the Korean Army, 1945– 1950,” *Armed Forces and Society* 23 (1997): 503–504.

influence” when they asked any favor from the Egyptian authorities or Khedive’s himself.¹⁴⁶

Having lost his influence against Stone, Mott did not renew his contract after four years of service and returned to Constantinople to take part in the Russo-Turkish War. Colonel Reed thought Mott departed because Stone began a systematic underground attack upon him even though the former was “his benefactor.” Reed claimed that his fellow New Yorker invited Stone to Egypt upon a letter, in which the Bostonian reportedly said, “he was all but starving and offered service in any rank” so that he could support his family and wife.¹⁴⁷ In Constantinople, Mott became an active member of an-anti Ismail clique at the Sublime Porte. In his decision to leave, Ismail’s choice in the arms sales contracts must have played a significant role, as the Khedive favored the Remington Company which Stone pushed for.¹⁴⁸ Another reason was Mott’s close relations with the Consul George H. Butler, who bothered the Egyptian government in several cases, creating diplomatic crises. One of them was during an official reception when he referred to Egypt and the United States as two “nations,” which was enough to annoy the Ottoman minister. Having been instructed not to provoke Ottoman tendencies, the Consul defended himself, claiming that he had said “peoples,” and his words were mistakenly translated in French.¹⁴⁹ Butler’s display of hatred towards Khedive’s ex-

¹⁴⁶ Morgan, 300-302.

¹⁴⁷ “American Officers in Egypt,” undated newspaper clipping, Lockett Papers.

¹⁴⁸ Dunn, “An American Fracas in Egypt,” 156.

¹⁴⁹ Davis to George H. Butler, August 16, 1870; George H. Butler to Hamilton Fish, *cited in* Cox, “Khedive Ismail and America 1870,” 379-80.

Confederate officers, and, finally, a gunfight in Alexandria caused his removal from the consular office.

3.3. A Pasha of his Own: Reforms in the Army

With Stone at the helm, a more organized system developed for recruiting mercenaries. The Chief of the General Staff turned to his friend and sponsor General Sherman for prospective mercenaries. Stone stressed the need for men who “are devoted to a task under a thousand difficulties and vexations,” and “above all, who possess patience, for without that quality, they can never succeed.” He also asked for West Point graduates who were strictly non-drinkers.¹⁵⁰ His emphasis on “non-drinkers” shows Stone paid attention to the local concerns (alcohol consumption was unacceptable among the devout Muslims) as well as his status and the representation of the true American manhood –thus, he wanted to avoid any embarrassment on his part. Having similar concerns, Derrick wrote to his wife he would not recommend anyone who “had a disposition to indulge too much intoxicating drink, because he might commence” in Egypt, thus bringing shame on them as a group.¹⁵¹ Indeed, drinking was seen as “masculine” by those who thought manliness required a degree of roughness. Yet, in American upper and middle classes, which valued austere self-control, heavy consumption was not compatible with “gentility.” Gentility was regarded as a part of the Victorian honor code with an emphasis on the manner, taste, refinement, and formal rules of conduct. Gentlemen indulged in such “vices” should

¹⁵⁰ Charles P. Stone to William T. Sherman, May 29, 1872, and August 31, 1872, William T. Sherman Papers: General Correspondence. Manuscript/Mixed Material. Retrieved from the Library of Congress, <https://www.loc.gov/item/mss398000006/> (hereafter cited as Sherman Papers).

¹⁵¹ Henry C. Derrick to Martha Derrick, October 3, 1875, Derrick Papers.

have balanced themselves with more refined qualities. In military terms, on the other hand, this abstract concern was crystallized into a concrete one, as drinking and lack of discipline would prevent the soldiers from being efficient. Adherents to such an honor code believed the “roughs” would drag their fellows down with them because morals and bravery were believed to be linked.¹⁵²

Sherman not only recommended future candidates but also provided leaves of absence for officers on active-duty so that they could serve in the Egyptian Army.¹⁵³ Sherman’s motives for supporting Egyptian enlistments through personal recommendations are not clear. Andrew J. McGregor claims that the Commander’s cooperation was likely designed to get rid of some officers of suspect loyalty.¹⁵⁴ This assumption, however, is definitely an unlikely one. Because, the enlisted officers who had worn gray during the Civil War were few in numbers for such a design, and they were not hardline figures to provoke further tensions in their respective states. Sherman knew many of them in person, and most of them arrived in Egypt almost ten years after the surrender at Appomattox. Moreover, the recommendations were not limited to ex-Confederates who could be of suspect.

Two of the mercenaries also speculated about this question in their memoirs. According to Chaillé-Long, the main motive was Sherman’s sympathy for Ismail’s ambitions to achieve the independence of Egypt. The service of Americans in the ancient lands, he claimed, had a serious purpose which attracted active support

¹⁵² Bratt H. McKay, “A Man’s Life, Featured, Honor, On Manhood,” *Art of Manliness*, <https://www.artofmanliness.com/articles/manly-honor-part-v-honor-in-the-american-south/> (retrieved June 26, 2020).

¹⁵³ Dye, *Moslem Egypt and Christian Abyssinia*, 4; Chaillé-Long, *My Life in Four Continents*, 17, 38.

¹⁵⁴ Andrew James McGregor, *A Military History of Modern Egypt: From the Ottoman Conquest to the Ramadan War* (Connecticut and London: Praeger, 2006), 139.

through the intermediary of General Stone. But Chaillé-Long's claim was highly speculative and contrasted with his later implications of the Commander's personal favor for his West Point cadets.¹⁵⁵ On the other hand, Morgan implied the role of self-interest in the recruitment process, reminding Sherman's visit to Egypt in 1872, when the Khedive gave a cordial reception with some "handsome presents."¹⁵⁶ That said, the General was in the best position to know the capabilities and current needs of his comrades as well as the former foes who had fought for the Stars and Stripes before secession. Thus, the enlistments were rather a product of personal networks, and Sherman was eager to find employment for the many demobilized but experienced officers who had once served in the United States Army.

Reporting General Sherman's objective in this organization was contributing to the decent representation of the United States in Egypt, his assistant in engineer staff, Colonel Orlando Metcalfe Poe wrote in a letter to Lockett that the General took "great pride in the fact that Americans are preferred by the Khedive to the soldier of European nations."¹⁵⁷ Lockett candidly appreciated the personal favors from him and wrote Sherman had indeed a big heart, which was "brimful of kindness" to them whose lives had been tough because they were on the other side of the recent fight. Expressing "the greatest admiration and respect," the Colonel added plainly, "I know that he is straightforward, honest, and upright in all that he says and does."¹⁵⁸

¹⁵⁵ Charles Chaillé-Long, "Egypt under the Viceroys," *The Era Magazine* 11, no. 3 (March 1903), 259; Chaillé-Long, *My Life in Four Continents*, 231.

¹⁵⁶ Morgan, 266.

¹⁵⁷ Orlando M. Poe to Samuel H. Lockett, January 11, 1875, Lockett Papers

¹⁵⁸ Samuel Henry Lockett, "West Pointers of the Confederate States Army," *Nation*, January 29, 1885, 95.

Meanwhile, with the sensational press coverage and personal communication, the applications to serve in the Egyptian Army poured in. As Colonel Graves observed, there were “thousands of applications from the United States for positions in the army” “from major generals down to privates” and from “some of the best men in the country.”¹⁵⁹ Lockett also told Derrick, his companion on their way to Egypt, applicants for service under the Khedive were numberless, and he already had twenty applications in his pocket to present General Stone.¹⁶⁰ Feeling fortunate as he “stroke an opening just in time” as no more Americans could be recruited, Graves reported an interesting anecdote in one of his lengthy letters to his wife.¹⁶¹ According to the story, a fellow from Nashville applied to the War Department, stating his religious sentiments convinced him that he was “more Mohammedan than Christian” from what he learned of the former!” Graves mocked him, saying he must have heard of “the woman part of the religion – four wives and concubines without limit,” and concluded confidently, “every fool can’t get a position” in the Egyptian Army.¹⁶² On the other hand, the Egyptian promise would be manipulated with some corrupt souls in the United States. In April 1875, a doctor in New York met a self-proclaimed agent of the Khedive, who assured him that a hundred dollars deposit would ensure the proper arrangements for his assignment in the khedival service as many brothers did then. Receiving a letter from the agent saying he had been accepted, the

¹⁵⁹ Charles I. Graves to Margaret L. Graves, October 1, 1875, Graves Papers.

¹⁶⁰ Henry C. Derrick to Martha Derrick, July 26, 1875, Derrick Papers.

¹⁶¹ Charles I. Graves to Margaret L. Graves, November 19, 1875, Graves Papers.

¹⁶² Charles I. Graves to Margaret L. Graves, November 13, 1875, Graves Papers.

unfortunate doctor took his bride to Cairo and reported for duty before he learned he had been swindled.¹⁶³

Stone's efforts were not limited to the recruitment process. By the time he established his authority, the Egyptian General Staff was on the verge of dissolving, the size of the cavalry was limited, and the forts were in a decrepit condition. The army, which Loring described as medieval, was composed of disorganized peasants, or fellahs, instructed by equally ill-trained superiors.¹⁶⁴ The infantry class was the backbone of the military establishment, but training methods were old fashioned and insufficient. Moreover, many of the officers were illiterate, thus relying on Coptic clerks who, in return, had a privileged status in their professional conducts. After a comprehensive study of the khedival military potential, Stone reported to the Ministry of War that an immediate improvement was essential as the components in the army were not organized in an effective way, resembling the Egyptian military to a full body without nerves. The Chief of the General Staff also stressed the necessity of reorganizing the command and control features as well as transforming traditional troops into a modern force.¹⁶⁵ Initially, the Egyptian treasury was able to meet the financial burden of these transformative plans. Moreover, Stone had both the Khedive and Minister of War's personal favors, which enhanced his authority over not only his American fellows but also native groups.

¹⁶³ "A Remarkable Swindle: A Sharper Selling Commissions in the Egyptian Service. The Story of a Dupe," *The New York Times*, April 15, 1875.

¹⁶⁴ Morgan, 273; Oren, 197.

¹⁶⁵ Dunn, *Khedive Ismail's*, 59; Lamb, 185.

As “a man of great versatility of talent and an indefatigable worker,”¹⁶⁶ Stone started his reforms by establishing a proper General Staff. Assisting him were former Confederate officers Alexander W. Reynolds and his son, Frank Reynolds, who had graduated second in West Point class of 1861. Other “rebel” commanders Loring, and Sibley took charge of coastal defenses and artillery in Alexandria.¹⁶⁷ These two men had fought together in New Mexico during the Civil War. Sibley wrote to then-Colonel Loring in June 1862 that they were “at last under the glorious banner of the Confederate States of America” which was a “glorious sensation of protection, hope, and pride.” The Egyptian employment meant a similar sensation for him, but it would cast another disappointment because Sibley’s contract was terminated in 1873 before due time. Stone and his staff sectioned the army into regiments and divisions, providing it with paymaster and quartermaster corps, and planned the construction of small-scale mills for manufacturing arms. Egypt’s military training was also in a shamble during the 1860s, with military schools opening and closing in line with the country’s fluctuating finances. The Chief of General Staff reported that the poorly trained officers were a major stumbling block, preventing the proposed army reforms. He attempted to fix this mess by initiating an education program in 1873 not only for the officers but also for their sons who were prospective officers to the army ranks. According to the General, it was not generosity, but a demonstration of “the express right of a soldier to have his son educated.”¹⁶⁸

¹⁶⁶ Raleigh Edward Colston, “Stone Pasha’s Work in Geography,” *Journal of the American Geographical Society of New York* 19 (1887): 48.

¹⁶⁷ Francis Stanley, *The Civil War in New Mexico* (Santa Fe: Sunstone Press. 2011), 127.

¹⁶⁸ Stone, “Military Affairs in Egypt,” 168.

Stone also recommended the establishment of a school in each battalion, where soldiers were to be taught reading and writing in addition to the regular duties. Moreover, a noncommissioned officers' school was founded under his supervision, drawing a sergeant and a corporal from each company. Having been established in the barracks next to the War Office, this school of nearly 1,500 participants provided the Egyptian officers with training in learning, reading, writing, and arithmetic as well as military techniques, which Americans believed Egyptian troops were mostly unaware of. Additionally, a military library in the Intelligence Bureau of the War Department, an arms museum, and a map collection were established under the supervision of Stone. In three years, nearly three out of four of the troops were reported literate, thus making the mercenary group a conveyor of American civic faith abroad, and the Egyptian Army the "great civilizer" in Lockett's words. Believing that the new military schools were "a great improvement upon the pig-tailed turbaned little rascals of the streets," the Alabaman officer championed generals Stone and Loring as the "teachers" who brought progress to the Egyptian corps.¹⁶⁹ Sharing his fellow's observations, Colonel Colston would also trace the motivation for later revolts to the schools where Americans served as instructors. According to him, the army had been submissive, but with Stone's general and professional education reforms, it was transformed into a "school of instruction," and "military education had encouraged the yearning of freedom" in the Muslim lands.¹⁷⁰ In this respect, authors Hesselstine and Wolf went even further, making use of a very subtle Orientalist rhetoric. Suggesting that the American mission brought the ancient

¹⁶⁹ Hesselstine and Wolf, 86-87; Colston, "Modern Egypt," 143-148.

¹⁷⁰ Raleigh Edward Colston, "False Prophet of the Sudan," *Nation*, February 15, 1884, clipping, Lockett Papers.

lands virtues more important than what they were remembered for (forts, railroads, or explorations), they argued those men “brought a spirit of personal honesty and integrity to a land where bribery, *bahksis*, and corruption were the normal accompaniment of government employment.”¹⁷¹

It should be emphasized that the comments about Americans’ “direct” influence in the “awakening” of Arab nationalism are generous interpretations. However, these reform efforts, particularly in military education, could potentially contribute to the diffusion of national sentiments among the lesser lines, which would forge the Egyptian nationalist modernization. Nevertheless, the American initiative would be short-lived. By 1878 when Egypt’s European financial overseers recommended far-reaching cutbacks in the national budget, these schools were dismantled, which Loring lamented “a crime against humanity which no words can properly stigmatize.”¹⁷²

In addition to these reforms regarding the organization of the army, Stone supervised a series of expeditions into modern Sudan and Uganda as well as the Ethiopian borderlands. The official staff reports published by his efforts in the Citadel are still highly significant because they represent some of the earliest scientific and topographic accounts of that period/regions. Undoubtedly, these expeditions would prove far more important than retraining an army and contributed to the general knowledge of humanity about the until then unknown territories and peoples of the continent. Accordingly, the Chief of the General Staff was also instrumental in the establishment of the Khedival Geographical Society in May 1875. This institution,

¹⁷¹ Hesselstine and Wolf, 236.

¹⁷² Quoted in Oren, 207.

which disseminated geographical information about the Nile Basin and further into the continent, scholarly supplemented the knowledge gained from the expeditions, and carried the missions' accomplishments out of a purely military context by opening the discussions to a more professional audience, including botanists, ethnologists, and geographers.¹⁷³ The society, which played a prominent part in a court-sponsored cultural revival as Donald M. Reid points out, was seen as a response to the development of ethnographic studies in Europe and functioned as a channel for promoting these disciplines in Egypt. However, the club also legitimated and promoted Ismail's empire in the region, as Western geographical societies were doing for their countries' overseas empires. The society whose name was changed several times, showing the historical shifts in the country (Royal Geographical Society and then Egyptian Geographical Society), lost its royal benefactors, and thus its influence on the national cultural scene in the latter half of the twentieth century.¹⁷⁴

Stone's most challenging problem in his grand-scale initiatives was the so-called pasha system, which centered on a cycle of high-ranked officers. In the "corrupted" pasha system, Americans observed, senior officers saw their staff as personal property, which made innovation difficult and limited the effective combination of units into brigades or divisions.¹⁷⁵ Portraying the subordinate native officers as "hardly a shade better than the men," one of the veterans claimed the pashas in the

¹⁷³ Icenogle, "The Khedive's Cartographers," 18.

¹⁷⁴ Donald Malcolm Reid, "The Egyptian Geographical Society: From Foreign Laymen's Society to Indigenous Professional Association," *Poetics Today* 14, no. 3 (1993): 539-72.

¹⁷⁵ Dunn, *Khedive Ismail's*, 49. 189.

Egyptian army thought only of their ease and personal safety.¹⁷⁶ Moreover, favoritism undercut merit or talent and created cliques of incompetents who protected each other. As expected, this also made it challenging to integrate new officers into the service. For example, Ratib Pasha, the Commander of the Egyptian Army who resented foreign interference in his chain-of-command, tried to fend off reform as long as possible, informing his newly appointed chief of staff Chaillé-Long that he had no headquarters or staff and that he would telegram him when they were necessary.¹⁷⁷

Nevertheless, Stone tried to convince the Ministry of War to carry out institutional reforms, since he thought that “Egypt’s fine regiments could be defeated by well-organized and directed enemies of half their number.”¹⁷⁸ He was able to overcome the resistance to some extent, because, as Morgan observed, “he did not announce himself with a blare of trumpets,” and few of the commanders were aware that an imported power “which had to be reckoned with” had arisen in their army.¹⁷⁹ Indeed, appreciating that a direct assault on the infamous system required a long brawl, Stone began an implicit attack, targeting its central element. He believed the crucial component in this establishment was the Coptic clerk class with the immense authority that the literacy and secretarial abilities enabled them. After his preliminary investigations (based on the details penned by his fellow Americans), Stone reported to the Khedive that dependence of the all organization on these civilian clerks was

¹⁷⁶ Colston, “Modern Egypt,” 145.

¹⁷⁷ Dye, *Moslem Egypt and Christian Abyssinia*, 71; Chaillé-Long, *The Three Prophets*, 85-86.

¹⁷⁸ Quoted in Dunn, *Khedive Ismail’s*, 49.

¹⁷⁹ Morgan, 302.

not acceptable in military terms. Stone believed that the noncommissioned officers and the privates must have been literate to eliminate civilian company clerks.¹⁸⁰

Thus, his initiative in military education earned another motive.

In his Egyptian sojourn, Stone worked discreetly. Yet, in this context, the Khedive's favor undoubtedly contributed to his final accomplishments. Obviously, Ismail appreciated the zealous American pasha's commitment and respected his advice on many occasions. Exemplifying a display of "conferred honor," which means esteem by the granting group (generally in the form of "tokens"),¹⁸¹ the General was elevated to the rank of *ferik* and decorated with the prestigious medals, including Commander of the Order of Osmanieh, Grand Officer of the Order of Medjidie and Grand Officer of the Order of Osmanieh, for his outstanding service "in command, organization and administration." He also received the Order of the Star of Egypt.¹⁸² All these accomplishments enabled the rise of an imported power among the Muslim pashas. Thus, in a foreign land, he incontestably was able to prove his talent, judgment, and leadership skills, which were denied or condescended by his own fellow statesmen a decade earlier. Ironically, though, open support to Stone made the mercenary efforts centered around his persona, thus creating another *pasha* figure among his fellow Americans, which was seen as a new component of the prevailing pasha system.

Stone's position weakened after 1878 when the European overseers forced dismissals and cutbacks in the army, along with the other financial/political

¹⁸⁰ Hesseltine and Wolf, 85.

¹⁸¹ Oprisko, 23, 64.

¹⁸² Clark, 12.

arrangements in the government. Moreover, with the British and French pressure, the Ottoman Sultan Abdulhamid II removed Ismail from the “office” in June 1879, and Tewfik Pasha, under the control of the Powers, succeeded him. Ismail’s deposition left Stone crippled. “Egyptian glory” for the General who received upmost esteem in a foreign land, came to a definite end after the British control established in the country, and Stone resigned from the office in late 1882. *Boston Daily Globe* reported from the local press that “departure of no foreigner from Egypt had ever caused more regret among the foreign and native residents of Cairo than has that of Stone, who for twelve years has served Egypt with a fidelity rarely to be seen in the Orient.” In the farewell dinner organized by the Khedival Geographical Society, two ex-prime ministers and many high-ranked army officers were present. In accepting Stone’s resignation, both the Khedive and the Prime Minister addressed to “the most cherished counselor” letters written in exceptionally complimentary terms.¹⁸³ Indeed, Khedive had observed in as early as 1872, his American pasha could administrate any army in the world as he was not only a “learned gentleman and a soldier,” but he was an honorable gentleman and honorable soldier.”¹⁸⁴

After returning to the United States, Stone worked for the Florida Ship Canal Company for a while. In 1884 he was hired to supervise the construction of the Statue of Liberty as the chief engineer. In this project, which Sherman obtained for him, Stone oversaw the construction of the pedestal and reassembly of the Bartholdi’s famous statue, which had been originally designed for Egypt where he

¹⁸³ “Egypt’s American Leader. General Stone’s Departure - His Reason for Resigning Valuable Paper Destroyed,” *Boston Globe*, February 6, 1883, 6; “Why an American Counselor of the Khedive Resigned his Office,” *Egyptian Gazette*, January 8, 1883.

¹⁸⁴ Quoted in Field, 395-6.

and his fellow veterans sojourned for more than a decade. He would also act as the ceremony leader during the dedication parade in Manhattan two years later.¹⁸⁵ In this connection, cherishing Stone's character and his service to the American nation, the public press underlined the irony of fate, regarding the statue's location, which stood across from the prison forts where his own liberty had been restricted in 1862:

His appointment to this position, for which his experience specially qualified him, was an honorable welcome on his return to his native land, and was fully appreciated by him, as indeed it deserved to be. It is a remarkable instance of poetic justice that almost within the very shadow of Forts Lafayette and Hamilton, where he was so arbitrarily and unjustly confined in 1862, he should, through his scientific knowledge and skill, crown with undying distinction a name and career already honorably enshrined in the history of the country.¹⁸⁶

3.4. Conclusion

Stone passed away on January 24, 1887, in New York, at the age of 62. His friends, generals Sherman, John M. Schofield, and Fitz John Porter escorted his body to its final resting place at the West Point national cemetery. Military rites were an appropriate homage to a soldier's restored honor. Stone, as an individual and professional soldier, proved that he was a man of duty, committed to his work, and was "incapable of disloyalty," as Hesseltine and Wolf accurately state.¹⁸⁷ His popularity in Egypt was once more demonstrated at a memorial meeting of the Geographical Society. In a touching speech, one of the staff school graduates praised

¹⁸⁵ Jonathan Harris, *A Statue for America: The First 100 Years of the Statue of Liberty* (New York: Four Winds Press, 1985), 71-72; Yasmin Sabina Khan, *Enlightening the World: The Creation of the Statue of Liberty* (Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 2010), 177-178; John F. Marszalek, *Sherman, a Soldiers Passion for Order* (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 2007), 439.

¹⁸⁶ Quoted in Porter, 59.

¹⁸⁷ Hesseltine and Wolf, 244, 251.

their American pasha, referring to his “fatherly interest, his generosity in time of crisis” and his “devotion to the highest forms of duty.” Describing Stone, a “man of battle, the prince of mathematicians, the protector of science and the champion of civilization,” the speaker concluded his speech, crying out, “Stone! Stone! My distress is inconsolable; my tears will not cease.”¹⁸⁸

Stone is a neglected figure in American military history, generally remembered as a victim of the political intrigue that forced him out of his career during the Civil War. Yet, his early record in the United States, as well as his later accomplishments, suggest he was among the notable military men of his time. His sojourn in Egypt was remarkable because, as one of the Khedive’s favored men, Stone’s undertakings in his adopted country provides a distinctive window into the mercenary experience and presents a solid example of a veterans’ quest for reclaiming their honor in a foreign land with esteem and prestige. Having been charged with disloyalty and military failure back home, he proved his loyalty as a soldier and served as a bridge between two peoples for a decade. Still, the detractors in the Committee on the Conduct of the War were ultimately refuted when President Reagan mentioned Stone’s name in the White House with respect and acknowledged his honorable legacy in the early American-Egyptian military collaboration.

¹⁸⁸ Quoted in Field, 434.

CHAPTER IV

THE EASTERN *FRONTIER*: AMERICANS MAPPING THE OLD CONTINENT

“An ocean of sand, whose pale yellow hue is lost in the blue of the heavens; a vast mirror reflecting in fantastic mirages; a host of phantom caravans; a silence as profound as that which envelops the sea, broken only at times by the sudden roar of the *kamsin* or simoon winds, such is the desert.” – Charles Chaillé-Long¹⁸⁹

“Let us suppose now that you are leaving Cairo with me bound on an expedition to the eastern desert,” asked Raleigh Edward Colston, in his comprehensive Egypt account dated 1879, and requested his readers to embark on an imaginary khedival steamer in mid-September when harvests bloomed and cotton whitened their sight. He invited the audience to “sip the Arabian coffee and inhale the fragrance of Turkish tobacco” with him when the valley expanded “like a green carpet” on either side of the Nile. Now, he suggested, they were ready to explore the heart of darkness through the lenses of an American who represented the “civilization.” The offer to

¹⁸⁹ Charles Chaillé-Long, “The Desert,” *The Cosmopolitan: A Monthly Illustrated Magazine* (March 1890) in *American Periodicals*, 572.

join him in such a retrospective journey was appealing to most of the fellow Americans who packed the conference rooms to listen to the ex-Confederate officer who spent months in the wilderness. However, Colston was not the only American in the Egyptian service, who had happened to pass the African deserts or whose paths had crossed with the native Africans. “The varied kaleidoscope of the Nile” would soon be unfolded by several others who experienced an Eastern frontier adventure under the khedival orders, while thousands at home were pushing towards the Western frontier with the individual aspirations.¹⁹⁰

As discussed in the previous chapter, Stone was an influential leader, but his explorer-cartographer compatriots also showed a great sense of mission and duty-bound in Egypt. The American-conducted expeditionary missions into Sudan, Uganda, and on the Red Sea coasts contributed to introducing the old continent to the West, reflecting another frontier fantasy for the Americans. According to Dunn, Stone, who found some sort of melancholy to “behold the conquest of the civilization by savages,” believed less advanced peoples, whether Native Americans or African tribes, were “barbarians” and must have been forced to end their primitive way of life. Referring to the similarities between the frontier drive in two continents, James A. Field claims that thrusting frontiers outward through arid and unmapped areas populated by “disposed” natives, Egyptian exploits had an apparent resemblance to an earlier American experience.¹⁹¹ Similarly, the frontier in the African context referred to the patterns of adventure, “savage” encounters, rough

¹⁹⁰ Colston, “Life in the Egyptian Deserts,” 304.

¹⁹¹ Dunn, *Khedive Ismail's Army*, 82; Field, 391.

conditions in the region, and, more importantly, the fact that exploration and expansion of Egyptian influence went hand in hand.

The expedition reports published by the General Staff provide insight into the American/Egyptian-British pendulum in the equatorial region, thus reflecting the politicization of geographical knowledge. Moreover, these soldier-explorers, who were assigned to “diplomatic” missions, served as the earlier representatives of unofficial American mediation abroad. These were veterans’ path to fame and recognition –aspects of honor– through which they could demonstrate a prestigious comeback and maintain a turn in their devastated careers.

4.1. Following the Nile: Charles Chaillé-Long in Central Africa

Among the most accomplished—and perhaps the most controversial—explorers in the American contingent was Charles Chaillé-Long. Born on a Maryland plantation in 1842, he enlisted in the Federal Army in the Civil War, fought at Gettysburg, and rose to the rank of captain. After the war, he worked for a textile firm in New York and earned his life through writing. “Seeking adventure,” he applied to the Khedive’s representatives to be recruited in the recently created American officer corps in the Egyptian Army. Having followed the first mercenary group stationed on this foreign shore for a year, Chaillé-Long entered the khedival service in 1870 as a lieutenant-colonel. During the first years of his Egyptian tenure, he was assigned to assist planning the fortifications between the Nile Delta and Suez Canal for the defense of Cairo, taught French at the military school in Abbasieh district, and served in Ratib

Pasha's (commander of the Egyptian Army) staff, which the officer would find "more ornamental than useful."¹⁹²

In fact, he sought in these passive assignments an opportunity for adventure, and therefore, fame. The appointment of famous Englishman Charles George Gordon as governor-general of the Equatorial Provinces (today South Sudan and Northern Uganda) after Samuel Baker, another English, would provide Chaillé-Long a much-anticipated opportunity in his fourth year of mercenary service. The lieutenant-colonel recurrently stated in his memoirs that "Chinese" Gordon wanted him to join his staff. On the other hand, the superior wrote in a letter to his sister, "an American named Long," asked to go with him.¹⁹³ The discrepancy between two accounts reflects a concern for displaying personal worth on Chaillé-Long's part, which would not be limited to this simple anecdote. Whatever the actual case, the young American was designated as chief of staff to Gordon and they departed the khedival capital in February 1874 to Khartoum and later Gondokoro. Reportedly, Khedive Ismail sent his relatively unexperienced officer with the famous Englishman, as he never trusted Gordon and knew this American officer shared the general suspicion of the British designs held by other Americans in the army.¹⁹⁴

After the Egyptian caravans arrived in Gondokoro, the center of the Equatorial Provinces which is almost 4,000 kilometers from Cairo, Chaillé-Long set out on a mission to negotiate a treaty with Mutesa I, King of Buganda (around modern

¹⁹² "Men of Maryland Specially Honored by the State or the United States," *Maryland Historical Magazine* 12, no. 3 (September 1917): 206; David Icenogle, "The Expeditions of Chaillé-Long," *Saudi Aramco World*, November-December 1978, 2-7.

¹⁹³ Charles George Gordon, *Colonel Gordon in Central Africa, 1874-1879. From Original Letters and Documents*, ed. Birkbeck Hill (London: Thos. de la Rue & Co., 1881), 3.

¹⁹⁴ Hesseltine and Wolf, 152.

Uganda), to extend Egyptian influence towards this country which historian Jürgen Osterhammel describes as a nineteenth century embryonic African empire.¹⁹⁵ In his memoirs, Chaillé-Long explained that the main aim of this mission was to halt the British political activity in the region in the guise of exploration by the Anglo-American explorer Henry Morton Stanley.¹⁹⁶ However, “fiction reigned at the expense of fact” in Chaillé-Long’s account because Stanley was in Asante (in modern Ghana) as a war correspondent to *New York Herald* at the time.¹⁹⁷ Chaillé-Long contrasted his expedition narrative with the earlier ones penned by “enthusiastic” travelers. He only referred to Ibn Battuta, the medieval Arab traveler, whose “uncertain histories” served as a model for the successors desiring reputation, because “the naked truth would perhaps have been coldly received” by the readers.¹⁹⁸ Disparaging the romantic accounts for misrepresenting the reality through sentimentalizing, Chaillé-Long styled this excursion as an ultimate test of manhood or courage, as many in Cairo believed it was “a path of glory that led but to the grave.”¹⁹⁹

Accompanied by “civilization” in the form of fancy gifts, including a music box that played Civil War songs, Chaillé-Long “negotiated the Egyptian protectorate” with the *kabaka* (king) who was said to honor the visiting mission by sacrificing a dozen

¹⁹⁵ Jürgen Osterhammel, *The Transformation of the World: A Global History of the Nineteenth Century*, trans. Patrick Camiller (Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2015), 445.

¹⁹⁶ Chaillé-Long, *My Life in Four Continents*, 62.

¹⁹⁷ Dorothy Middleton, “Henry Morton Stanley,” *Encyclopedia Britannica*, <https://www.britannica.com/biography/Henry-Morton-Stanley>, retrieved March 2, 2020; Edward A. Alpers, “Charles Chaillé-Long’s Mission to Mutesa of Buganda,” *The Uganda Journal* 29, no. 1 (1965): 4.

¹⁹⁸ Chaillé-Long, *Central Africa*, 125.

¹⁹⁹ Chaillé-Long, *Central Africa*, 2.

of captives.²⁰⁰ Obviously, the account of the reception borrows much from the common colonial rhetoric, which emphasizes the stark contrast between the “civilized” and “uncivilized.” Distancing himself as the “great white prince,” Chaillé-Long personified the African violence through his subject’s expressions, stating “a gleam of fierce brutality beamed out” from the King’s eyes. As Covey also stressed, the portrayal of the Bugandan King and his entourage as savage/brutal derived from the racial logic in the antebellum United States.²⁰¹ However, representing the “civilized” world, the young officer seemed he did not have any concern about the executions—possibly because sacrificing in honor of him would exalt his position and it meant an honorable welcome. It is noteworthy that the Lieutenant Colonel portrayed a more agreeable king with civilized manners in his official report to General Stone, and had not mentioned any of the sensational savage accounts regarding the court that he would include in his later books.²⁰²

The “treaty” that Chaillé-Long drew up with the King, was —reportedly— the basis of the annexation of the entire Nile basin by Egypt. The pretentious officer never missed the opportunity to make a bold stroke about the mission’s results, describing his visit as “Central African diplomacy.”²⁰³ However, this proclamation was rather

²⁰⁰ “Egypt, Africa, and Africans,” *The New York Times*, May 29, 1878.

²⁰¹ Chaillé-Long, *Central Africa*, 103, 106. Covey compares the language Chaillé-Long “used to racialize Africans” and George Bethune English’s accounts. Typical with the contemporaries in the transatlantic commerce, English described the natives in the slave market in a capitalist approach, concerning with their value as commodities rather than applying an ethnological theory. Covey, 134-35.

²⁰² Charles Chaillé-Long to Charles P. Stone, December 16, 1875, in “Itinerary of Lieut. Colonel Long. Expedition from Gondokoro to Lake Victoria and the Discovery of Lake Ibrahim,” in *Provinces of the Equator. Summary of Letters and Reports of the Governor-General [C. G. G.] Part I, 1874* (Cairo: Printing Office of the General-Staff, 1877).

²⁰³ Charles Chaillé-Long, “Chaillé-Long’s Work on the Nile,” *Bulletin of the American Geographical Society* 36, no. 6 (1904): 347; Charles Chaillé-Long, “The Uganda Protectorate and the Nile Quest,”

an exaggeration as Edward A. Alpers, the former president of the African Studies Association, explained in his critical treatment of Chaillé-Long's expeditions into the heart of the continent. According to him, the agreement, indeed, left Egypt with an empty promise and did not make her position in Buganda more influential than before.²⁰⁴ Still, even if the result was limited to a settlement that ivory export from the region would be shifted to Egypt, James A. Field suggested this mission had been impressive because economic penetrations of this sort could have important political results later on.²⁰⁵ Stone, in his final assessment, which was compiled from Gordon and Chaillé-Long's reports, also asserted that the missions' outcome of opening communication with Mutesa I was important.²⁰⁶

After the Buganda mission was accomplished, Chaillé-Long determined to map the sources of the Nile, a dilemma that was troubling geographers for centuries. Upon his return to Sudan, he traveled northeast until he struck the Nile, near Lake Victoria, a region that had been explored by John H. Speke in 1862. Chaillé-Long descended the river until entering a large unknown lake, which the Egyptian government would name Ibrahim, honoring the Khedive's father. The Lieutenant Colonel also navigated a previously unexplored section of the White Nile, thus supposedly discovering the main feeders of the great river. Not satisfied with this, Chaillé-Long speculated that the thick vegetation on the lake, when it dried out, could not hold the Nile, thus

Bulletin of the American Geographical Society 36, no. 1 (1904): 53; Chaillé-Long, *My Life in Four Continents*, 90-97; Hesselstine and Wolf, 156, 158, 161.

²⁰⁴ Alpers, 8.

²⁰⁵ Field, 405.

²⁰⁶ *Provinces of the Equator*, 34.

causing the river's annual flooding.²⁰⁷ Fortunately, this flawed assumption, which was another example of his tendency to dramatize, did not overshadow his achievements. General Gordon endorsed his efforts, stating the information collected in Chaillé-Long's expedition, along with earlier explorations by Speke and Baker, helped map the Nile's course.²⁰⁸ In fact, the British General was highly pleased with his American officer's performance, that he asked the Khedive through General Stone to consider the promotion of Chaillé-Long to the grade of colonel. "The officer has suffered much and encountered many difficulties," the experienced soldier stated, thus he felt confident that "His Highness would reward him for his work [was] an important one." According to Gordon, the presence of these officers, who were highly instructed, left him free to attend to Provinces' administration. He even asked for an extension for Chaillé-Long's service under his command as "he rendered great service" to him.²⁰⁹

In his second mission, Chaillé-Long was assigned to open a road southwest of Lado towards Makraka Niam-Niam (Azande country; the northeastern part of modern Congo and the southwestern tip of South Sudan) in 1875. Even though it was not equal to the earlier mission in importance, this expedition resulted in broadening Ismail's influence into the Nile-Congo division. More importantly, it was instrumental in collecting valuable information about the region and its inhabitants.²¹⁰ In his account of the expedition, the so-called "ethnologist" not only

²⁰⁷ Chaillé-Long to Richard Beardsley, November 7, 1874, DUSCC; Meyer, 79.

²⁰⁸ Charles G. Gordon, "To the Editor of Herald," *New York Herald*, January 23, 1880.

²⁰⁹ *Provinces of the Equator*, 26-28.

²¹⁰ Alice Moore-Harell, *Egypt's African Empire: Samuel Baker, Charles Gordon and the Creation of Equatoria* (Brighton: Sussex Academic Press, 2010), 154.

portrayed tribal people from a colonialist perspective as savage, cannibal or heathen—utilizing the same rhetoric found in earlier reports—but also brought back with him a pygmy “specimen” from the Ticki-Ticki tribe whose existence was a mystery for centuries.²¹¹ However, the later literature on the pygmy tribes ignored Chaillé-Long and instead highlighted Stanley and the following explorers.

Esteemed for his display of courage and having survived “pitiless rain, mud misery, malaria and the dread fevers of the jungle,” these duties would win the Marylander promotion to the rank of full colonel as his superior requested, and decoration of Medjidie Order upon his return to Cairo in 1875, which became a solid symbol for his search of fame and honor in Egypt.²¹² “Bringing what had been fiction or romance into the realm of reality,” Chaillé-Long would also be recognized as an Africanist in the United States after his frontier experience. Oric Bates, the first curator Harvard Peabody Museum’s African Ethnology department, for example, described him as a pioneer in African exploration and asked him to contribute to the African exploration collection in the museum, in a letter dated 1915.²¹³

On the other hand, Charles Gordon would somewhat diminish his staff’s self-acclaimed accomplishments in the official expedition report submitted to General Stone, informing the Chief of the General Staff that he ordered the mission to depart for Buganda, notwithstanding the American’s account that he left with his own will. The British officer also asserted that the explored lake was no more than flooded

²¹¹ Chaillé-Long, “Chaillé-Long’s Work,” 350; Chaillé-Long, *My Life in Four Continents*, 126-130; Edwin Swift Balch, “American Explorers of Africa,” *Geographical Review* 5, no. 4 (1918): 277.

²¹² Chaillé-Long, *Central Africa*, 294.

²¹³ Oric Bates to Charles Chaillé-Long, June 2, 1915, Chaillé-Long Papers.

lowlands, minimizing his subordinate's achievements when Chaillé-Long himself probably exaggerated them.²¹⁴ Indeed, the two men were alike in their manners and ambitions—both were romantically determined, jealous of fame/glory, or self-publicist. Thus, it is not surprising that each “belittled the other's accomplishments” as both sought for a heroic role for themselves as another aspect of honor. These characteristics made their personal relations inconsistent. In the beginning, for example, Gordon found Chaillé-Long as a sharp fellow, but, later he would say “self is the best officer to do anything for you.”²¹⁵ Chaillé-Long's portrayal of Gordon was also not sympathetic. Such that, the statements in his book were found “very egotistic, and full of a certain tone of dislike and resentment” toward the Englishman by a literary critic.²¹⁶

Historian Leslie Meyer, who dedicated a chapter for the Marylander colonel, concluded that it was unfortunate that Chaillé-Long was merely remembered for his attacks on Gordon. According to her, the world ignored his achievements because Chaillé-Long was an instrument of Egyptian expansionism on the eve of the European colonial partition. That said, Duignan and Gann note, in the footnotes section to their comprehensive account of the United States and Africa, that the reason for his achievements were not recognized was perhaps because of his “egotism, arrogance and belligerence.”²¹⁷

²¹⁴ *Provinces of the Equator*, 5.

²¹⁵ Charles H. Allen, *The Life of “Chinese” Gordon, R.E., C.B.* (Toronto: William Briggs, 1884), 13; Hesselstine and Wolf, 153-154, 165.

²¹⁶ “Briefer Notice,” *Overland Monthly and Out West Magazine*, February 1885, 222, quoted in Covey, 128.

²¹⁷ Meyer, 102; Peter Duignan and L. H. Gann, *The United States and Africa. A History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984), 397.

In accordance with Meyer's claim about the European response, the discovery of Lake Ibrahim would become an issue of conflict in the 1880s. After the British control established in the region down to Sudan, "Ibrahim" began to disappear from maps and was replaced by native names, such as Kodja or Choga, while earlier British discoveries nearby, Lake Albert and Lake Victoria, retained their English names. Chaillé-Long protested this arbitrary suppression of the name bestowed upon "his lake" by corresponding with national geographical societies, as well as the map departments of the French and British armies. *London Times* wrote that the lake discovered by him was not important because he had no reliable instruments to measure or show the exact coordinates. Interestingly enough, some American papers also threw doubt on his accomplishments by merely reiterating the British reports.²¹⁸ Chaillé-Long's protests worked to some extent, and the French Geographical Service assured that this name would be adopted for subsequent editions.²¹⁹

Although the British did not publicize the discoveries, Chaillé-Long's contributions had been much celebrated in Egypt. Claiming the "courage, constancy and temerity manifested by him [were] unique in the history of discovery," German ethnologist and botanist Georg A. Schweinfurth, the first president of the Khedival Geographical Society and a fellow explorer, reported, "the voyage of Colonel Long Bey has a marked place in the [...] glorious voyages to Central Africa."²²⁰ In recognition of his contributions to geographical knowledge with the explorations, Chaillé-Long would

²¹⁸ *London Times*, March 27, 1875; *New York Semi-Weekly Times*, February 19, 1875; *New York Herald*, January 15, 1875.

²¹⁹ Charles Chaillé-Long, "Lake Ibrahim: A Protest and a Decision," *Bulletin of the American Geographical Society* 40, no. 1 (1908): 17-18; Chaillé-Long, "The Uganda Protectorate," 52.

²²⁰ Charles Chaillé-Long, "Correspondence: The Part of the Nile Which Colonel Chaillé-Long Discovered," *Bulletin of the American Geographical Society* 41, no. 4 (1909): 223.

be awarded the prestigious Charles P. Daly Medal by the American Geographical Society in 1910 as well as honorary memberships by French and Italian organizations.²²¹ That said, he could not escape the recurrent portrayal of him as an eccentric, colorful character who tended to give greater credits to himself. Indeed, this inclination was known to many; Graves, for example, labeled his fellow as “a great humbug,” or “a perfect gas-bag,” stating the Marylander blew his own trumpet pretty loudly. On the other hand, Graves believed Chaillé-Long was only one of those sensationalist African explorers who were, according to him, “the biggest liars in the world.” The Anglo-American explorer Stanley, for instance, also made “a hero of himself by telling of the wonderful escape and great sufferings of the expedition,” but, in Graves’s eyes, he was “a great gas-bag,” as well.²²²

As stated earlier, Chaillé-Long was not impressed by the natives, even though the Sudanese in the khedival service were much appreciated for their physical superiority by the Americans. In an account of the Equatorial Provinces, he concluded this exotic land was not a paradise as falsely reported, but “a plague spot” or “pestilent region,” and its native population was simply a “miserable wretch.” Thinking “civilization has done little for the Negro,” he claimed Central Africa was “the evolutionary home” of the black people in the United States, but he did not demonstrate any specific cultural/traditional link that connected them, except to state that African dance figures and entertainment was similar to the “hysterical” performances of the former slaves at home. In this respect, the Colonel claimed that the assumed link between the two people could work for Africa’s sake, suggesting

²²¹ “Tardy Recognition for Nile Explorer: Geographers Present a Medal after 36 Years to Col. Chaillé-Long,” *The New York Times*, February 16, 1910.

²²² Charles I. Graves to Margaret L. Graves, October 2, 1876, and December 28, 1876, Graves Papers.

only “intelligent colored people” of the United States could have brought “civilizing influences” to the heart of Africa. They could, he believed, keep communications accessible, introduce commerce and train the native peoples in “habits of systematic industry.”²²³

With this idea in his mind, Chaillé-Long wrote a letter to the King of Belgium, who was the leader of the “principal European society for exploring and civilizing Africa” in his own description. In this letter dated 1873, he proposed that the King should have stimulated a movement to take a large body of the discontented blacks from the Southern States and settle them in Central Africa. The Colonel believed that the “thousands of the most industrious and best-educated colored men in the Gulf States could be induced” to resettle in their descendants’ soils. Disappointed with the indifference to his letter, he firmly predicted that the region would never be civilized by white men.²²⁴ Not surprisingly, Chaillé-Long was not the only one who could think of relocating African Americans in Africa following the notorious Liberian precedent. Colonel Alexander Macomb Mason also suggested African-Americans’ “repatriation” in Sudan where he worked in civil service during the early 1880s. However, both men had no consideration of how the Baptists would get along with Muslims in Africa or how the relocation should be conducted.²²⁵

Driven by their ethnic perception preoccupied with the legacy of the racial order of antebellum, as Covey accurately points out in the case of Chaillé-Long’s encounters, many veterans reiterated such a racial typology and designated a space of

²²³ Hesselstine and Wolf, 155; Covey, 151; Chaillé-Long, *My Life*, 133.

²²⁴ “A Retired Explorer. Colonel Long and his Adventures,” *New York Tribune*, December 3, 1879.

²²⁵ Betty Patchin Greene, “The Bey from Virginia,” *Saudi Aramco World*, March-April 1974, 25

representation in the continent. From this respect, native Africans (described categorically as “monsters of iniquity” by Colonel Derrick) were repeatedly associated with degeneration, immorality or violence, thus even outlawing the slavery in Egypt was interpreted “as a license to laziness,” as many anti-abolitionist voiced in the domestic parallel.²²⁶ As seen, such accounts often harnessed a set of stereotypes tailored for the white audience, representing or reaffirming contemporary approaches to Africa and the former slaves in the United States. However, Covey’s bold claim that Chaillé-Long’s exploration narrative influenced the contemporary American treatment of Africa —referring especially to his public talks which harnessed the power of the new technology of photography— and, therefore helped to shape the backdrop for the American “imperialism” in the continent, is an overstatement, because the author’s treatment does not specify any link between Chaillé-Long’s narratives and their assumed impact on helping to shape the public opinion or official attitude in the United States.

4.2. Duty-Bound: Raleigh Edward Colston’s Desert Expeditions

Unlike Chaillé-Long, Raleigh Edward Colston made “no claim to being a great African discoverer.” However, his accomplishments made him one of the “most honorable and charitable” of all the adventurers who passed through Sudan in the nineteenth century, according to David Icenogle.²²⁷ Born in France of American parents, Colston was a graduate of and professor at Virginia Military Institute and served as brigadier general in Confederate States Army during the Civil War. After

²²⁶ Covey, 126; Derrick, “A Military Picnic,” 19; Chaillé-Long, *My Life in Four Continents*, 124.

²²⁷ Raleigh Edward Colston, “Life in the Egyptian Deserts,” *Journal of the American Geographical Society of New York* 11 (1879): 304; Icenogle, “The Khedive’s Cartographers,” 22.

the war, he worked at military schools in Hillsboro and Wilmington, North Carolina, until he took his way to Egypt in 1873.²²⁸

Having conducted two topographic expeditions in East Africa, the ex-Confederate officer returned home with a vast store of information about the distant lands he visited, “not as a mere tourist, but as an explorer, student, and observer.”²²⁹ In these expeditions, he spotted and reported details about local commercial networks, people, surface features, mines, fauna and flora, water sources (springs, subterranean water, wells or reservoirs), and temperature. The Colonel traveled all the principal caravan routes and spent almost two years in tiny towns and among rival tribes.²³⁰ Skilled in drawing, he also sketched scenes from the life of the native people and landscape. These detailed images were published in the final reports of the expeditions with his name.

During the first expedition in 1874, Colston surveyed the Nubian Desert between Kenneh on the Nile (about 400 miles south of Cairo) and the ancient Roman city of Berenice on the Red Sea. In this mission, two former Union officers (Oscar Eugene Fechet of Michigan and Erastus Sparrow Purdy of New York) accompanied him as the staff members.²³¹ In the second expedition in the following year, his group ascended the Nile to Debbeh (North Sudan) to explore the Eastern Desert and mapped the route from that point on to El Obeid, the capital of Kordofan province

²²⁸ “Description. Biographical Information,” Colston Papers.

²²⁹ Colston, “Life in the Egyptian Deserts,” 301.

²³⁰ Colston, “The Land of the False Prophet,” 643-662.

²³¹ Purdy, Colston, and Mason also made a water survey of the gulf and Berenice harbor in 1874. They mapped the Ababdeh and Bishareen deserts between Berenice and Berber on the Nile. “Letter from Egypt,” *The Daily Journal* (Wilmington, NC), August 10, 1873 (letter from Colston dated July 12, 1873), Colston Papers.

(modern central Sudan).²³² As expected, this was a challenging mission, which

Colston depicted in a speech to fellow geographers dramatically:

No one can realize the combination of complete silence, solitude and infinite space, who has not been in those deserts. [...] Thus we travel the weary days, longing for night to come, while the sun, our fierce enemy, not only drinks our blood, burns our flesh and blisters our tongues. [...] The air that blows is literally like blasts from a furnace or a brick-kiln.²³³

These depictions indicated not only his expressive ability to picture what he experienced or witnessed but the fortitude and physical endurance, which enabled him to traverse the deserts, as he stated in another short article published in *Chambers' Journal*.²³⁴ On the way to Kordofan, Colston was seriously injured and had sunstroke. Johannes D.C. Pfund, the German doctor and botanist who traveled with the expedition staff, warned that he would certainly die if he went into the desert, and instructed him to return to Cairo on a boat. However, the proud Colonel ignored the advice, stating, "I prefer dying on the desert to abandoning this work."²³⁵ Colston believed if he left the expedition in charge of the native officers, "they would never budge one mile from the Nile," and the expedition would be a complete failure, "reflecting much discredit upon the American staff." Seeing the natives untrustworthy, he tried to secure the American dignity against the self-observed "lies, misconduct, and laziness of the Arab staff." Considering it was "one of those cases in which a soldier must prefer his duty to his life," Colston reached El Obeid on a sedan.²³⁶ Even in such conditions, he did not cease from surveying the desert,

²³² Colston, "Stone Pasha's Work," 48-50.

²³³ Colston, "Life in the Egyptian Deserts," 329.

²³⁴ "In the Egyptian Desert," *Chambers Journal*, no. 904, April 23, 1881, Colston Papers.

²³⁵ Quoted in Hesselstine and Wolf, 141.

²³⁶ Colston, "Modern Egypt," 151-152.

taking barometric measures, collecting specimens, and supervising the works on the water wells.

El Obeid was a fascinating sight for Colston, with the people clad in blue or white cotton robes and turbans, riding on donkeys; men and women on camels' back; Beggeras [sic] mounted on bullocks with their hands full of lances. Particularly interesting were native women venders with baskets of fruits piled upon their heads, "apparently defying all the laws of gravitation," yet held up by "that astonishing gift of equilibrium common to all African women."²³⁷ One specific sight, however, shocked his senses. It was the burial ground where the soil was covered with shreds of the robes in which the dead were wrapped for burial. He noted that the graves were lightly covered with stones and thorns, inviting the hyenas which would come in and dig up the bodies that had been buried and leave exposed to view the remnants of their feast. "No imagination," Colston cried, "can realize the horror of this Golgotha."²³⁸ It came like a premonition to him, for he expected his death in this vast desert.

Thinking that he was going to die in the Sudanese desert, Colston wrote to the American Consul Charles Beardsley, "by the time this reaches you, my mortal remains will be entombed in a lonely grave in the desert" and stated it also grieved him much that he would be unable to serve further to the Khedive.²³⁹ In another letter, he informed General Stone that he desired to do his duty until the last moment, although he was "prostrate as a result of a grave illness [...] which appears to be

²³⁷ Colston, "The Land of the False Prophet," 662.

²³⁸ Ibid.

²³⁹ Icenogle, "The Khedive's Cartographers," 22.

mortal.”²⁴⁰ Looking at the “approaching death” calmly, as he plainly described in his camp diary, the Colonel was frustrated to see all his hopes blasted and to die in such suffering in a “god-forsaken country” in his words.²⁴¹ His determination and correspondence show that he felt an honor/duty-bound to put through his task, regarding the failure dishonorable and a disgrace upon him and the people he represented. From this perspective, his concern of discredit for his fellow countrymen speaks to the national pride and the American fraternity in Egypt, as seen in his concern of reflecting discredit upon the American staff in case of failure.

Colston finally had to give up his fight of honor at the expense of his life, which, for him, was “harder to bear than the physical pain,” and relinquished command to Henry (Gosalee) Prout, who joined him after surveying the Suakim-Berber route (from the Red Sea to the Nile through northern Sudan) in 1875.²⁴² In his order to Prout, General Stone mentioned Colston’s sense of honor and appreciation of the Khedive, stating that Ismail expressed sympathy for their determined fellow, and “great satisfaction with the high sense of duty displayed by him continuing, as he had done, to advance his command under such adverse conditions of health.” Stone also instructed the new mission leader to do his best for the “comfortable return of” Colston to Khartoum.²⁴³ This appointment relieved the Colonel in pains, as he believed his comrade from Massachusetts was “a most able engineer” and would

²⁴⁰ Quoted in Crabitès, 74.

²⁴¹ Raleigh E. Colston, diary entry, June 13, 1874, Colston Papers; Hesseltine and Wolf, 142.

²⁴² Cited in Hesseltine and Wolf, 141, 142; Colston, “Stone Pasha’s,” 49; Henry G. Prout, *General Report on the Province of Kordofan* (Cairo: Printing Office of the General Staff, 1877), ix, Colston Papers. Suakim-Berber route was one of the main routes connecting Suakim to the interior. Prout later explored the province of Kordofan as well as a portion of Darfour.

²⁴³ Quoted in Frederick C. Thomas, *Slavery and Jihad in the Sudan: A Narrative of the Slave Trade, Gordon and Mahdism, and its Legacy Today* (Bloomington and New York: iUniverse Inc., 2005), 59.

continue his mission as instructed.²⁴⁴ Not disappointed his superiors and Colston, Prout would explore the region from where his fellow left off and report the nine-month expedition in great detail.

Describing Colston as “plucky,” Prout felt they were fortunate because “there was a man” among them.²⁴⁵ He would also be generous in recognizing the ex-Confederate fellow’s character and efforts in the final report submitted to the General Staff.

Appreciated by the Khedive’s himself and General Stone, the report’s primary interests were geology and geography with wadies, streams, and wells in the surveyed region. Indeed, the expeditionary team did not make any discovery in the previously unknown territories, as Chaillé-Long claimed for his explorations, but it was invaluable as they prepared the first comprehensive report on the vicinity.²⁴⁶ This report also demonstrated, in Prout’s words, evidence of how much could be done by “an able, instructed and honest-minded officer” when that officer thought “less of the risks and discomforts around him than of the accomplishment of duty for duty’s sake.”²⁴⁷ Stone would also exalt his comrade’s honor and ability, stating the “able and accomplished officer’s” struggle against the disease and the rough conditions was heroic.²⁴⁸ Accordingly, indicating the esteem Colston held, Khedive

²⁴⁴ Raleigh Edward Colston, “The British Campaign in the Soudan for the Rescue of Gordon,” *Journal of the American Geographical Society of New York*, 1885, 17 (1885): 201.

²⁴⁵ Quoted in Hesseltine and Wolf, 143.

²⁴⁶ Hesseltine and Wolf, 143, 128-129.

²⁴⁷ H(enry) G(osalee) Prout, “Report of Colonel H. G. Prout on his Reconnaissance from Khartoum to El Obeid,” *Journal of the American Geographical Society of New York* 9 (1877): 157-58.

²⁴⁸ Charles P. Stone, “Preface,” in Prout, *General Report on the Province of Kordofan*, vii.

Ismail awarded his Virginian officer the Imperial Order of the Osmanieh, a distinction granted for his outstanding and praiseworthy services.²⁴⁹

After six months of intense suffering in El Obeid where Catholic mission looked after him in an “Arab house with nothing to drink but the tepid and ill-tasting water,” Colston was transported in a camel litter across two deserts to the Red Sea, and a steamer took him back to Alexandria.²⁵⁰ Soon after his return, he went to Europe on six months leave of absence. Colonel Graves’s correspondence shows that the khedival government paid him almost 5,000 dollars on account of his health lost in the expedition in accordance with the contract articles regarding service in peripheries and injuries from the climate changes. Yet, some in the khedival capital would spread rumors that his ailments were all imaginary, reflecting distrust toward foreign elements in the country and the rivalries among the staff. Opposing to such allegations, Americans were in cahoots and declared that their “old fellow was perfectly sincere in thinking he was a very sick man,” as Graves wrote to his wife.²⁵¹

In 1878 Colston returned to the United States where he had difficulty in finding stable employment. He lectured in many cities, penned essays on his Egypt experience even though they were mostly identical to his earlier texts, served at a military academy in New York, translated novels from French, and eventually secured a position in the War Department.²⁵² The tenacious American did not die in

²⁴⁹ “Gen. Colston’s Military Career: Honors Gained in the Service of the Khedive,” *The New York Times*, August 3, 1896.

²⁵⁰ Colston, “Life in the Egyptian Deserts,” 304, 308; Colston, “The Land of the False Prophet,” 661.

²⁵¹ Charles I. Graves to Margaret L. Graves, July 20, 1878, Graves Papers.

²⁵² Colston’s “idiomatic translation” of an Eastern-themed juvenile novel is one of these works. Confident of adding explanatory notes throughout the book, he asserted that the reader would find in this story one of the “most faithful and graphic delineations of Muslim society.” Adriana Delcambre

the Sudanese desert as he had anticipated, but in a Confederate soldiers' home (R.E. Lee Camp) almost two decades later, in 1896, and his remains were entombed in the Hollywood Cemetery rather than "in a lonely grave in the desert" as he had expected in despair.²⁵³

4.3. Samuel Henry Lockett: "A Man the Place Needed"

David Icenogle claimed once, if Colston was the most "indefatigable worker" of the American mercenary group under the Egyptian banner, Samuel Henry Lockett was unquestionably the best cartographer.²⁵⁴ Born in 1837, Lockett graduated from West Point in 1859, second in his class, and gained fame in gray uniform during the Civil War for constructing the defenses of Vicksburg that resisted Ulysses S. Grant's siege (1863). He made his name in the annals of the war with his gallant service while Confederate troops held the position for fifty days against "tremendous odds" and through terrific bombardments with balls "rained upon them like gail from heavens," as he stated in his dramatic account of the battle.²⁵⁵

After the war, Lockett taught mathematics and natural science in Marion, Alabama, and Alexandria, Louisiana. During his professorship at the Louisiana State Seminary of Learning, where he served as the chair of mechanics and engineering, he supervised the state's first topographical survey and map—an accomplishment which

Piazzini (or Leila Hanoum), *A Tragedy in the Imperial Harem at Constantinople*, trans. Raleigh Edward Colston (New York: W.S. Gottsberge, 1883).

²⁵³ "Lynchburg Letters from Confederate General Raleigh Edward Colston (1825-1896)," <http://www.lyncburgmuseum.org/blog/colston>; undated newspaper clipping, file 38, Colston Papers.

²⁵⁴ Icenogle, "The Khedive's Cartographers," 23.

²⁵⁵ Samuel Henry Lockett, "The Contrast of the War," unpublished manuscript, undated, 14-15, Lockett Papers.

made him a fitting candidate for General Stone's surveyor team in Egypt.²⁵⁶ Lockett had to leave the Seminary in 1873 because Louisiana had been unable to pay the salaries due to "eight years of carpetbag misrule" in the state.²⁵⁷ Before his sojourn to Egypt, he toured as a lecturer on popular science along with his wife, who was supporting her family with music lessons. Despite the unsatisfactory profit, these lectures were popular, and the "fleet[ing] manner" in which the Colonel delivered made them more attractive to the audience, as one of them publicly appreciated in the local press.²⁵⁸

Lockett's successful military career and engineering skills were known to generals Sherman and Stone, who would enthusiastically facilitate his passage to Egypt in 1875 summer. Lockett's acquaintance with Sherman went back to the Vicksburg siege, where the two officers with different ranks had a humorous and gentlemanly conversation during a short truce.²⁵⁹ Colonel Poe, who forwarded Sherman's recommendation letter to Stone, believed Lockett deserved the greatest pay in view of the exceptional experience and qualifications, and his contract should have contained conditions as favorable as these granted to any other officer in Egypt. According to Poe, it was a case wherein the man did not need the place, "but the place, the man."²⁶⁰ In fact, when he offered a position to the Alabaman, Stone would

²⁵⁶ Samuel Henry Lockett, *Louisiana as It Is, a Geographical and Topographical Description of the State*, ed. Lauren C. Post (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1970).

²⁵⁷ Ethel Hudson, "Samuel Henry Lockett," *Louisiana State University Quarterly* 6, no. 3 (1911): 124.

²⁵⁸ "Calhoun College," *Citizen*, undated newspaper clipping, Lockett Papers.

²⁵⁹ Samuel Henry Lockett, "The Defense of Vicksburg," *Battles and Leaders of the Civil War III: Being for the Most Part Contributions by Union and Confederate Officers*, eds. Robert Underwood Johnson and Clarence Clough Buel (New York: Century Co., 1888), 482-92; Post, 424.

²⁶⁰ Orlando M. Poe to William T. Sherman, January 11, 1875, Lockett Papers.

regret that the pay was not brilliant and he was not able to offer him “something more worthy of the talent and energy displayed in the defense of Port Hudson and Vicksburg.” The General told him frankly, Egypt needed soldiers like him while a foreign service could “never be a bed of roses.” He found great sacrifice in assisting “the magnificent effort” of the Khedive to restore Egypt to its ancient glory. “Of course, there are many obstacles,” said Stone, but he believed Egypt needed Lockett as a “first-rate, even self-sacrificing men” who could push the country forward.²⁶¹

Lockett’s first tasks in Egypt included planning and constructing fortifications, one of which would be crucial during the Egyptian retreat in Gura Valley in 1876 spring. Later on, he surveyed the territories of modern Eritrea between Massawa and the escarpment of the Ethiopian Plateau. He also fortified Massawa to put the town “in condition to stand a siege.” Another principal task was searching and reporting the water supplies around the region. The observations of this nine-month survey were compiled in a report submitted to the General Staff. Lockett divided this lengthy report into six divisions and included details of settlements and landscape features with housing patterns, demographical estimations, vegetation, water sources, and geological characteristics. His descriptions, in which he “did not give any scientific classifications” as he was not a botanist, in his own words, are vivid and easy to visualize. The Colonel contributed to the account with drawings of the places he visited like his explorer fellow Colston did for illustrating other parts of the continent. In general, the report demonstrated the duality of the landscape with Ailet Valley, which was suitable for farming on the one hand, and Yangus country, which he found barren, on the other. According to him, the greater portions of the inland

²⁶¹ Charles P. Stone to Samuel H. Lockett, February 23, 1875, Lockett Papers.

was not susceptible of improvement by manpower. “Unless nature herself brings about a great revolution,” he plainly stated, that this country would remain a barren tract, therefore, not profitable in terms of future endeavors by the government.²⁶² He also noted machinery for raising water was vital to initiate any industry for cultivation in these lands, and the region was not rich in minerals of economic value.

Lockett stayed in Massawa and its vicinity almost alone among the natives. His observations about the native elements, however, differs strikingly from other mercenaries. The Colonel, for example, found the tribal people in greater Massawa region “kind, trustworthy, brave, hardy, simple and honest,” notwithstanding the “monster-like” portrayals of Chaillé-Long and Derrick. Though “their skins [were] black” and “he was reared in of the slave states,” the Colonel stated that he took pleasure in saying he had “as true friends among these dark hued denizens of the deserts as he ever had or expected to” have in his own country.²⁶³ As seen in this note, Americans often described Africans in terms of some nuances in their skin colors and tended to compare their “darkness” to that of the former slaves in the United States. Colonel Graves, for example, was astonished when he saw the “perfect black color” for the first time in Massawa. He usually referred their skin as “blue-black,” which would make their Juliette (possibly a former slave in Georgia) cream-colored in Ethiopian standards. He wrote to his wife that Americans were accustomed to classify all black people as “negroes,” but the African races were

²⁶² Samuel Henry Lockett, *The Topography and Geography of the Country Between the Coast of Red Sea and the Abyssinian Plateau. Report Submitted to Gen. Stone Pasha* (Cairo: Printing Office of the General Staff, 1878), 20, 32.

²⁶³ Samuel Henry Lockett, “The Red Sea Littoral,” *Globe-Democrat*, undated newspaper clipping, Lockett Papers.

blacker than the “average Southern darkie” that did not bear “the slightest resemblance” to the Africans.” Recognizing that a “dark skin” was as “good as a fair one” in Egypt except in the case of a female slave, he also stated, blackness was seen a “very fair complexion being considered a great beauty “in spite of many other serious defects” while white was still the “fashionable color.”²⁶⁴

Lockett’s Massawa notes filled a gap in the accumulated body of expedition narratives produced by the American mercenaries. The Alabaman Colonel mainly followed the shores on the Red Sea; thus, his report presented a detailed and unique nautical account with information about sea life. In an article titled “The Red Sea Littoral,” he summarized the extensive notes of a trip down to the Red Sea, which was “not always a pleasant one,” because he believed the African and Asiatic shores rivaled each other in uninviting barrenness. In this account, he depicted the scenery through Suakim on the Red Sea, a town, which, according to him, caught the eyes with almost a dazzling effect as it “strongly contrasted with the dark background of distant hills” to Massawa, which was “a mightily mixed agglomeration of nationalities.”²⁶⁵

Lockett’s greatest accomplishment, however, was the preparation of the “Great Map of Africa” in 1877, on which he worked for six months “to make the most complete map that [had] ever been drawn to the present time.”²⁶⁶ With a scale of approximately 1:3,000,000, this grandiose masterpiece was reported to be the most accurate map of the continent at the time as the Colonel had expected, and won

²⁶⁴ Charles I. Graves to Margaret L. Graves, December 10, 1875, and April 16, 1878, Graves Papers.

²⁶⁵ Lockett, “The Red Sea Littoral,” Lockett Papers.

²⁶⁶ Samuel H. Lockett, diary entry, June 27, 1877, Lockett Papers.

grand prize at the Paris International Exposition of 1878. On the left side of the colored map, colonels Chaillé-Long, Lockett, (William H.) Ward, Purdy, Colston, Derrick, and majors Mason, Fechet, (William P. A.) Campbell, Prout, and Dennison were listed under the Egyptian authorities, rather than the following group of “foreign explorations” category.²⁶⁷ Lockett’s name is also recognized at the top of the drawings credits, and his signature as “Chief of the Third Section” is just below the frames. General Stone’s signature as the Chief of the General Staff, on the other hand, adorns the whole exploration index placed under a refined illustration of Egyptian coat of arms. The original map in French, which had been displayed in Abdine Palace, was reproduced in four panels by the order of King Fuad, displaying the continent in a northeast/west and southeast/west partition (see the Appendices). Lockett’s map, which was matured from all the expeditions after 1871, was a solid symbol of the Egyptian territorial ambitions with greater details of the regions down to Equatorial Provinces. Besides, this was among the earliest displays of ex-Confederate and Union cooperation on an international occasion. Visitors to the Paris Exhibition also saw two other “very pretty maps, in colors,” titled “Cairo in 1800” and “Cairo in 1845” prepared by Colonel Graves. Graves informed his wife that there were four other maps showing Egypt at different periods.²⁶⁸

Lockett was popular in Egypt both for his accomplishments and personality. Hence, it was not surprising that his achievements took the attention of Charles G. Gordon, who was searching for an able officer to his staff in Khartoum. After Chaillé-Long

²⁶⁷ Samuel Henry Lockett, *Carte générale de l’Afrique* (Cairo: Administration de l’arpentage de gouvernement égyptien, 1934), American Geographical Society Library, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee Libraries; Charles I. Graves to Margaret L. Graves, February 11, 1878, Graves Papers.

²⁶⁸ Charles I. Graves to Margaret L. Graves, February 11, 1878, Graves Papers.

departed Equatorial Provinces, the Governor-General asked Lockett to join him in Sudan, saying “wish I had some of you fellows with me,” but changed his mind after he learned that Lockett’s family stationed in Cairo, because such an endeavor would not be good for the family.²⁶⁹ Undoubtedly, should he had been assigned to that post, there would be many supplementing accounts of the region and the peoples, and the readers would be able to comment on Chaillé-Long’s assertions regarding Central Africa with much confidence by applying a comparative reading.

However, contrasting to the appreciation in the professional realm, Lockett’s Egyptian sojourn proved to be a financial failure. As his fellow Americans observed, a family of seven in Cairo would not enable him to save up enough money and clear the debts, unlike those who practiced a simple bachelor life in Egypt with less expenditure. Fortunately, in 1877, he was offered a professorship of applied mathematics and mechanics in Knoxville, Tennessee. Having been honored by the Khedive with a decoration, he was given an honorable discharge, and left Egypt on good terms. However, his path would cross with General Stone again in 1884, when he was hired as Stone’s chief assistant in constructing the Statue of Liberty’s pedestal. Another Civil War veteran who served in Egypt in the early 1870s, James Morris Morgan, also joined this former mercenary team. Lockett died in Bogota, Colombia, while he was supervising a grand-scale engineering project. His bravery in the Civil War has been immortalized in Vicksburg National Military Park with a bronze plate today, which is an act of posthumous rehabilitation.

²⁶⁹ Charles G. Gordon to Samuel H. Lockett, March 7, 1877, Lockett Papers.

4.4. Other Surveys and Nature of the Expeditions

In addition to Chaillé-Long, Colston, and Lockett's expeditions and cartographic endeavors, which were more publicized in the United States, Colonel Purdy mapped the region between Cairo and Suez, as well as the route between Kenneh on the Nile (near the ancient settlement of Luxor) and Quseer on the Red Sea in 1871. Next year, Alexander McComb Mason, a descendant of the Virginian statesman George Mason, who is known as one of the fathers of "Bill of Rights," explored Fayoum (100 kilometers southwest of Cairo) and the Siwa Oasis (near the Libyan border). In 1874-76, both officers ascended the River Nile to New Dongola (in North Sudan) and reconnoitered the route from that point to El Fasher, the capital of Darfour region (in Western Sudan). The mission surveyed hundred square miles of previously unmapped terrain, measured rainfall, followed possible routes for railway construction, and acquired scientific information. However, Mason was furious that Purdy took the credit for their mutual effort in the African hinterlands. To avoid further problems between the mercenaries, General Stone sent him with Colonel Prout to serve under General Gordon in Khartoum in 1876 after Chaillé-Long had departed the Equatorial Provinces.²⁷⁰ Being stationed in the heart of Africa, Mason navigated around Lake Albert (on the border between modern Uganda and Congo) in 1878. In this expedition, he discovered Semliki River flowing northward from Lake Edward to the previously circumnavigated lake and determined the extent of the latter correctly by charting the precise configuration.²⁷¹ In the end, Mason, an Annapolis Naval Academy graduate and ex-Confederate naval officer who was

²⁷⁰ Greene, "The Bey from Virginia," 25.

²⁷¹ Alexander McComb Mason, "Report of a Reconnaissance of Lake Albert Nyanza," published as *Proceedings of the Royal Geographical Society* 22 (1878).

initially charged with the postal steamers on the Red Sea and the Mediterranean, found a suitable terrain in which he was able to utilize his professional expertise. When the American mercenary group was dissolved in 1878, Mason was one of the three Civil War veterans who accepted civilian employment in the Egyptian government along with his fellow explorers Purdy and Prout. In civilian career, he served as Massawa governor and director of the public lands until he died in the United States when he was on leave, but “still,” as the *Washington Post* obituary puts it, “in the service of the Khedive.”²⁷²

As Hesseltine and Wolf argue, the nature of the American led expeditions differed essentially in terms of their routes, objectives, and outcomes. The scientific surveys of Purdy, Colston, and Prout in Sudan, for example, covered already-known territories where the limits of the land were loosely charted as well as the ancient routes where slaves and ivory had been traded for decades. However, Chaillé-Long carried out explorations in mostly unknown parts of Central Africa. Having both military and political implications, his contributions were seen as instrumental in Egyptian expansionism. However, all the exploits in Africa extended the khedival authority and proved to be logistically important by opening new routes for trade or military transfer. Obviously, the American officers drew up their utmost success in the old continent from their own frontier experiences in the United States.²⁷³ Yet, they found that the commercial potential of the surveyed areas was not assuring because of the limitations put by the topographical features, climate and demography. The expedition narratives assert the native tribes could excite interest

²⁷² Greene, “The Bey from Virginia,” 25.

²⁷³ Hesseltine and Wolf, 149, 235.

in the missionary aspects, but they would not contribute to the wealth of the khedival administration as subjects of Egypt, as overtly seen in Chaillé-Long's statement that there were not enough resources around Lower Sudan to make a costly effort for the future benefits.²⁷⁴

4.5. Conclusion

Even though they had been somewhat ignored in the following decades, the ambitious explorers had been generously praised for their accomplishments by the contemporary observers and the Khedive. They returned home with an honorable professional record solidified by the decorations on their chests, and their expertise was highly appreciated, which was proved by the interest in their public talks. As David W. Blight describes in the context of Civil War veterans' seminars and writings in the 1880s, Africa adventures of Ismail's Americans served as "a path to recognition" for their individual and collective bravery. The veterans' clubs or local organizations (like Virginia Ladies Memorial Association, American Geographical Society in New York, or issues of the *Confederate Veteran*) provided these men an outlet for reminiscence of their struggles both in the Civil War and Egyptian sojourn. This enabled them to demonstrate their worth as soldiers who gained prestige in a foreign land for their loyalty and high standards of service.²⁷⁵ Furthermore, the expeditions into Central Africa added to Khedive's own prestige and expanded his authority in the region. As Stone expressed concerning Darfour, for example, troops followed the surveys carried out by staff officers, and when the expeditions

²⁷⁴ "A Retired Explorer. Colonel Long and his Adventures," *New York Tribune*, December 3, 1879; Hesseltine and Wolf, 147.

²⁷⁵ Blight, 180-189.

conducted by Americans finished, the Khedive could include the Nile valley and most of Darfour, Kordofan, and Uganda as parts of his influence zone.²⁷⁶

²⁷⁶ Charles P. Stone, "A Political Geography of Egypt," *Journal of the American Geographical Society of New York* 15 (1883): 368; Vivian, *Americans in Egypt*, 172.

CHAPTER V

“THE TORPEDO AND THE WHALE:”

AMERICANS IN THE ABYSSINIAN VALLEY

“As I set here, a solitary Christian, surrounded by strange African scenery and Mohammedan soldiery, and as the long column of camels with their slow, solemn and noiseless tread filled by, I felt as I were in some fanciful dream of Eastern story and sank into a reverie from which I was only aroused by the sound of the bugle calling the soldiers to resume their labors.” – Henry Clay Derrick²⁷⁷

By the end of 1875, increasing pressure mounted on Ismail to resolve the national debt crisis, and he sought for a military victory that would bolster the country’s position against the European creditors. Having established Egyptian control over the southern regions to a great extent, Ismail now could turn his attention to Abyssinia (Ethiopia). A victory would not only restore confidence in reforms’ efficiency and

²⁷⁷ Henry C. Derrick, diary entry, January 22, 1876, Derrick Papers.

legitimate the Egyptian claims in the Nile basin but also conclude the long-lasting disputes over its borders with Abyssinia.²⁷⁸

The Abyssinian Campaign is essentially a topic of Egyptian expansionism and African affairs in the broader sense. Still, American participation in the battle and veterans' observations are noteworthy in two respects. First, it was an earlier example of ex-Confederate-Union fighting on the same side, even if it was not under the Stars and Stripes yet. Second, it provided the American veterans another opportunity to fight actively and hence (re)prove their military worth in the field, which they were devoid of in the Citadel bureaucracy in Cairo. Frank H. Stewart points out that victory in a battle was essential for the maintenance of honor, and such a victory against the Abyssinians would provide them another means of recovering, especially for the ex-Confederates whose martial honor was damaged a decade ago.²⁷⁹ Therefore, it was an ideal setting for heroic action feeding their concerns for recognition, as Colonel Derrick plainly stated in a letter that they were looking for decorations. These two aspects contribute to dissertation's Reconstruction thread at a micro-level. Mainly relying on Derrick's unpublished notes, the chapter charts the battles through an American lens, national distrust between the Egyptian and foreign staff, mercenaries' observations about the conduct, and psyche of the native troops. In this respect, denunciation of the "uncivilized" enemy speaks to the racial stereotypes and presents a biased viewpoint regardless of the sectional differences among Americans. Derrick's intimate notes about loss and violence show, on the other hand, how he reflected about death/courage or martial

²⁷⁸ Crabitès, 187-88; "Egypt and Abyssinia," *Times* (London), 25 May 1877; Dye, *Moslem Egypt and Christian Abyssinia*, 124.

²⁷⁹ Stewart, 35.

honor (even with much bias) – which, in line with the dissertation’s contribution to the literature, provides a less-heard individual voice in this much-studied military affair. Moreover, the Abyssinian Campaign signaled the end of the American mission in Egypt because of the alleged responsibility in defeat and the financial burden it imposed on the Egyptian treasury.

5.1. The Egyptian-Abyssinian Conflict: Defeat in Gundet

According to Jonas Kauffeldt, Cairo “felt compelled to manufacture a justification for war by alleging that forces from Abyssinia provoked the conflict,” and reports in international press accused the Abyssinians stirring up troubles in the border or committing atrocities.²⁸⁰ In accordance with the Egyptian claims, an “anonymous” American officer in the Egyptian Army (later attributed to Dye), stated two years later that, having acted “only to enforce peace” the khedival forces responded to “the incessant raids made by the nomadic and warlike Abyssinians upon the peaceful and timid Egyptian fellahs.” The officer described Abyssinian lands as ravaged by anarchy and fanaticism. According to him, the country was ruled by a “savage warrior” whose sovereignty would allow no hopes for civilization or progress, reiterating what he or his fellows thought in the context of their encounters with native Africans.²⁸¹ However, it is remarkable that the Americans drew a line between the “uncivilized” and “backward” in their accounts. In this case, even though they

²⁸⁰ Jonas Kauffeldt, “Danes, Orientalism and the Modern Middle East: Perspectives from the Nordic Periphery” (Ph.D. diss., Florida State University, 2006), 19; “Egypt—A Threatened Abyssinian Invasion,” *The New York Times*, August 13, 1875; “Egypt and Abyssinia,” *Times (London)*, August 26, 1875.

²⁸¹ William McEntyre Dye, “The Egyptian Campaign in Abyssinia,” *Living Age* 134 (1877): 278, 286-87.

believed Egypt was a relic from the past and *fellahin* were living in the medieval ages, they claimed Egyptian forces could have brought some sort of civilization in the hinterlands.

The first Egyptian-Abyssinian encounter took place on November 16, 1875, when the Egyptian troops under the command of Danish mercenary Søren Adolph Arendrup (entered the khedival service in 1874) invaded Abyssinia from its coastal possessions in modern-day Eritrea. The army of King Yohannes IV and Egyptian forces met at Gundet Valley. The only American officer who joined Arendrup's staff was Major James Alfred Dennison, an Indiana citizen and West Point graduate (1870). According to the American accounts, the Commander rejected younger Dennison's advice to not descend into a valley where they might be trapped. This proved to be disastrous, and the Egyptian forces were completely destroyed. Among those killed were Arendrup and the nephew of Prime Minister Nubar Pasha. Even though only one had joined the campaign, Americans blamed Arendrup for not listening to the American know-how. Graves and Loring, for example, found the Danish mercenary devoid of battlefield experience and "a very rash and impudent man," which, they believed, brought the disgrace upon the Egyptian Army.²⁸² On the other hand, Lockett blamed the troops, writing in a *Nation* article that great masses of Egyptian troops were "coward to fight and too stupid to run" in the Gundet Valley.²⁸³ Portraying the horrid scenes, the Colonel noted in another article that only

²⁸² Charles I. Graves to Margaret L. Graves, December 10, 1875, Graves Papers.

²⁸³ Samuel Henry Lockett, "The Egyptian Disaster," undated clipping from *Nation* magazine, Lockett Papers.

“a few desperately wounded, maimed, and mutilated men who were left as dead by their ruthless foes, were the survivors of the bloody fight.”²⁸⁴

5.2. Searching for Glory in Gura: An Ineffective Cooperation

Following Arendrup’s defeat, the Egyptian government decided to send a retaliatory force, as the country’s prestige and the credit of the Khedive necessitated a complete revenge of the shameful defeat against a condescended enemy. Initially, an American commander was to be appointed to lead the troops. However, nationalism and competence came into conflict again, and the government—concerned about the political repercussions of a Christian leading a Muslim army against a Christian force—finally appointed Ratib Pasha as the commander.²⁸⁵ Interestingly enough, as a side note, some Americans never saw it as a fight against Christians. For Derrick, for example, Abyssinians were only nominal Christians. His conclusion was grounded on their rejection of family concepts, such as following free love, polygamy, and the idea of temporal punishment rather than that of eternal misery hereafter. The Colonel believed they claimed to be Christian in theory or profession, but “in practice they [were] heathens of the worst sort.”²⁸⁶ Indeed, Derrick’s assessment of Christianity in the region reflected Priest Timotheus’s narration. Likewise, compiled from what he had read, Charles Dudley Warner, Mark Twain’s friend and co-author of *The Gilded Age* (1873), asserted Abyssinian religion was an unusual combination of Judaism,

²⁸⁴ Samuel Henry Lockett, “The Letters of Chinese Gordon,” *The Evening Post*, undated newspaper clipping, Lockett Papers.

²⁸⁵ Field, 414-415; McGregor, 147; Loring, 330.

²⁸⁶ Derrick, “A Military Picnic,” 17, Derrick Papers.

fetishism, or Christian dogmas, and their ethics reproduced the pre-flood morals, with many vices and “disease of barbarism.”²⁸⁷

Before the appointment of Ratib Pasha, General Stone suggested Colonel Dye to be the chief of staff of the expedition as the second in command. However, Dye refused to serve under an Egyptian commander, and thought General Loring, who was “accustomed to mountain warfare with savage tribes” (referring to his fights against the Native Americans in Florida) a better choice.²⁸⁸ The reason why Stone approached Dye instead of Loring, who had much field experience, is not known. Probably he thought the proposed status was not appropriate for the “Old Blizzards.” Lieutenant Colonel Morgan wrote that Loring was “immensely delighted” when the “command” was given to him, for Ratib Pasha, he believed, was only supposed to be an observer rather than practically commanding the army in the field. However, Ratib “had a goodly share of Oriental cunning and was familiar with all the subtle workings of Egyptian ways of bringing about results.” When facing enemy lines, he presented a decree granting him the commanding authority “if it was necessary.” Clearly, the word necessity was a plastic notion in the absence of certain instructions and could easily be exploited. Morgan was not surprised, telling “Oriental gentlemen who knew the ways of the country and also felt kindly disposed toward Loring shook their heads knowingly, but did not dare to warn him.”²⁸⁹

²⁸⁷ Charles Dudley Warner, *In the Levant* (Boston: Houghton, Mifflin and Company, 1876), 120.

²⁸⁸ Dye, *Moslem Egypt and Christian Abyssinia*, 152; Loring, 330.

²⁸⁹ Morgan, 305.

Among the other American officers who participated in the second campaign were colonels Dye, Field, Derrick, Graves, majors Charles Loshe, Robert S. Lamson, William H. Wilson, and captains David E. Porter, and Henry Irgens.²⁹⁰ This campaign was one of the most inclusive American engagements in Egypt. However, from the beginning, there were signs that Americans would be given limited input in the campaign, for their communication with General Stone in Cairo was restricted. Other commands, such as an order to the sentries to stop saluting General Loring clearly demonstrated the discontent on both sides.²⁹¹ Recognizing the hostility between Egyptians and Americans, Lockett reported that there were “no harmony, no concert of action, no confidence” in the army whose staff fought with each other instead of fighting against the mutual enemy in solidarity.²⁹²

These problems, which made effective cooperation impossible, were mostly due to mutual distrust and antagonism as well as status/power concerns. Ratib, who thought the campaign would result in an easy victory, wanted to reassert his authority over the foreigners and did not want to share the potential glory. Indeed, many Americans thought the same, as seen in Derrick’s letter to his wife, assuring her “Abyssinians were not well armed and not able to cope with the military power of Egypt.”²⁹³ He would also state in retrospective that they had officers “who had made fighting a

²⁹⁰ The tasks were as followed: Loring, chief of staff; Dye, chief of the first section; Field, inspector general; Graves, water transportation in Massawa; Derrick, chief engineer; Loshe, quartermaster and commissary of staff; Wilson, surgeon of the staff; Porter, assistant to chief engineer; Irgens, assistant to chief engineer. Crabitès, 191; “Americans in Egypt—The Abyssinian Expedition,” *New York Tribune*, February 26, 1876; Dye, *Moslem Egypt and Christian Abyssinia*, 172-3; Hesselstine and Wolf, 253-260.

²⁹¹ McGregor, 149.

²⁹² Hesselstine and Wolf, 195.

²⁹³ Henry C. Derrick to Martha Derrick, August 22, 1875, Derrick Papers.

trade,” implying that it would be an easy victory, with an “army well drilled and equipped, armed with the most approved breech loaders, splendid batteries and magnificent field pieces.” According to him, his comrades felt as if the Egyptian government had kindly prepared for them a delightful picnic to the mountains, they would come covered with glory, with increased rank and emoluments and with those “gorgeous decorations for which men barter life itself.”²⁹⁴ Seeing it as an opportunity to prove his loyalty to his promises and to reclaim his dignity on foreign shores, he resembled themselves to the “children who had visions of sugar plums dance through their heads on the night before Christmas.”²⁹⁵ Apparently, decorations were as sweet to the soldier as were sugar plums to children.

5.3. Defeat through the American Lens

Following the route Arendrup had taken, the Egyptian forces invaded Abyssinian lands from the north. Indeed, Americans observed the campaign began with problems and complained that the comfort of Prince Hassan, who joined the troops upon Ismail’s order, gave Ratib far more concern than the Abyssinian movements. Moreover, despite his relative inexperience in the field, the Commander ignored Loring’s counsel and insisted on fortifying the Gura Valley, waiting for Abyssinian attack, while the “Old Blizzards” had suggested marching on the Abyssinian capital directly. Indeed, this attitude clearly contradicted the Khedive’s expectation for a “brotherly concord between them” to earn a victory in this ragged territory.

²⁹⁴ Derrick, “A Military Picnic,” 1.

²⁹⁵ Derrick, “A Military Picnic,” 5.

Reportedly, Ismail instructed Ratib that he was to follow Loring's advice and joined their hands symbolically.²⁹⁶

Derrick's unpublished manuscript, titled "A Military Picnic in Abyssinia" reports the tension, preparations and his works, namely building a fort in Gura Valley and connecting roads, on a daily basis. The March 6 entry in his journal describes a critical conference among the commanding members. Showing the national rivalries and conflicts in tactical provisions once more, this meeting was said to change the course of the campaign's fate. Briefly, the members of the American staff (Loring, Dye, Derrick) reportedly recommended that the forces at Camp Gura be moved to a position where they would be able to make a junction with the forces in a near station and thus prevent the enemy from getting between these two forces.²⁹⁷

Unsurprisingly, their advice was ignored again, which practically left Egyptian troops without connection to each other. The result was a total defeat: one wing of the Egyptian forces collapsed, and the Abyssinians surrounded their victims "like an envelope" in Derrick's words. However, the Gura fort built under Derrick's supervision proved to be vital, avoiding a total extermination with "thousands of men" running back and sheltering in there. Resembling the enemy to the wild beast and themselves as preys, the Colonel conveyed the tragic scene with such dramatic details:

In vain our shells and rockets ploughed through their dense masses, making frightful carcasses of what were before lithe and active savages; in vain the continuous roar of our breech-loaders swelled the diapason of death for many a brave; twice or thrice repulsed by the withering fire on their front, they again pressed forward dark and dreadful as one of Africa's storms – cruel, relentless and blood thirsty as the wild beasts that roam the jungles, and

²⁹⁶ Hesseltine and Wolf, 185.

²⁹⁷ Loring asked Derrick to write a report of the consultation at this meeting. Henry C. Derrick, diary entries March 6, 1876, and April 11, 1876, Derrick Papers.

having finally overwhelmed and broken our right and turned our position, they soon enveloped us like a cloud and swept us back before them towards the Fort, like dry leaves in an autumn blast. Our batteries of beautiful rifled howitzers were cut off, and the enemy fell like tigers upon the artillery men and butchered them at their guns.²⁹⁸

Marking “a black chapter in the annals of the Americans in Egypt,” the defeat proved that the Egyptian military was capable of fighting small native groups in Sudanese deserts as Chaillé-Long and Gordon’s attempts demonstrated, but when faced a more serious conflict, “it was too timid to fight, and too stupid to run” in Lockett’s words.²⁹⁹ The carnage in Gura Valley was terrifying. Derrick, who had set out on a reconnaissance of the battlefield the day after, strongly condemned the barbarity in his manuscript, with the mutilated and “atrociously butchered” men, dead or begging for a quick death:

I shall never forget the sickening sights that greeted our eyes. The ground was covered with the dead and wounded victims [...] stripped and violated with every conceivable indignity; their bodies burned with fire, and stoned, and clubbed, and hacked with swords and pierced with lances. The supplicating cries of the wounded for help [...] were enough to appal [sic] to the stoutest heart.³⁰⁰

The Colonel said that he withheld the horrid details of the carnage as the scene was “indelibly stamped upon his sight and memory,” and the recital of it would be sickening. He concluded simply, saying “let it rest untold with all the unwritten horrors of other wars.”³⁰¹

²⁹⁸ Derrick, “A Military Picnic,” 10-11, Derrick Papers.

²⁹⁹ Lamb, 187; Dye, *Moslem Egypt and Christian Abyssinia*, 428; Lockett, “Notes on the Abyssinian Campaign,” Lockett Papers.

³⁰⁰ Derrick, “A Military Picnic,” 15, Derrick Papers.

³⁰¹ Derrick, “A Military Picnic,” 13-14, Derrick Papers.

Derrick also marked the details of the battle in his journal in which he expressed the site was “dreadful beyond the power of language to describe.” After he and his assistant Irgens (a Union volunteer during the Civil War) examined the plain, the Colonel presented their condition to his superiors and begged help for the wounded. Finally, Prince Hassan agreed to send some cavalry.³⁰² Derrick wrote he would never forget the “pleading looks of one dying soldier” as they gave him some water and tried to lift him from the ground to the horses. However, when the wounded were unable to bear transportation in that way, the relief mission had to leave them behind. Asked to imagine, “what a dreadful time a wounded man must have here when unable to move,” he continued:

[H]e is scorched by the sun’s rays during the day, and frozen by the cold atmosphere of the night in this mountain region; add to this the agonies of the thirst and hunger and the torture of the dreadful wounds and the mental anguish as he lies alone, neglected and listen to the howls of savage beasts more pitiful than his comrades or his foes, and you have a sum of misery so intense and great that one who hears your tale regards you with incredulity and silently asserts that human nature could not bear such a trial.³⁰³

One would think the Civil War veterans would find those battlefield scenes unremarkable as a reality of warfare. However, despite all the horrors, the desecration of corpses in the Civil War was relatively rare. Derrick’s powerful portrayal in such scenes reflects the notion of a “Good Death,” that is, having a body intact for a family to mourn, and to be treated with charity. Obviously, “bloated forms of those dead and left without burial for the beasts of prey” was not compatible with the mid-nineteenth century American culture, which treated “dying

³⁰² Henry C. Derrick, diary entry, March 9, 1876, Derrick Papers.

³⁰³ Henry C. Derrick, diary entry, March 9, 1876, Derrick Papers.

as an art” and the “Good Death” as a goal all people would struggle to reach.³⁰⁴ His astonishment also speaks to the notion of “civilized” warfare, an ironic concept against what was thought to be complete barbarism. Indeed, Derrick described the cruelty of leaving the wounded in such horrible conditions unchivalrous as well as barbaric and resembled it to a cat playing with a mouse rather than humane conduct:

Under this arrangement even the inconsiderable amenities of civilized warfare, which somewhat mitigate its horrors, are unrecognized and the captor generally commences by stripping his prisoner to the skin and after playing with him awhile, as a cat plays with a mouse, closes the scene by mercifully killing him outright; or, is much more frequently the case, first mutilates in some fiendish and unmentionable manner and finally gives him a coup-de-grace when his sufferings have rendered him insensible.³⁰⁵

This is another aspect of honor for the Victorian man because evidence of moral virtues like fidelity, mercy to the vanquished, courtesy was seen as a source of honor as Wyatt-Brown points out. “In the language of honor,” he asserts, whites found the best means to contrast their values against their foes’ offenses.³⁰⁶ On the other hand, Hesseltine and Wolf report that Egyptian forces also went out to kill the wounded, slashing and mutilating some, burning others alive by throwing flaming branches on them.³⁰⁷

Derrick’s portrayal of the Abyssinians reminds Chaillé-Long’s accounts of the African barbarity. Giving them credit for hardihood, endurance, and courage,

³⁰⁴ Derrick, “A Military Picnic,” 15; Drew Gilpin Faust, “The Civil War Soldier and the Art of Dying,” *The Journal of Southern History* 67, no. 1 (2001): 6. *See also*, Drew Gilpin Faust, *This Republic of Suffering: Death and the American Civil War* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2008).

³⁰⁵ Derrick, “A Military Picnic,” 14-17, Derrick Papers. For a comprehensive account of the Abyssinian Campaign from the American perspective, *see* Loring (chapters 10-11) and Dye (chapters 30-50).

³⁰⁶ Stewart, 20; Bertram Wyatt-Brown, “Honour, Irony, And Humiliation in the Era of American Civil War,” in *Social Alternatives* (Special Issue: “Humiliation and History in Global Perspectives”) 25, no. 1 (First Quarter, 2006): 23.

³⁰⁷ Hesseltine and Wolf, 208.

Derrick stated that the men in the enemy line were naturally brave as they engaged continually in internecine wars and exposed almost daily to the dangers of natural life. However, he believed, “the list of their virtues was not long.” According to him, those people, without exception, had no sentiment of pity for the stranger or unfortunate. “Cold, cruel, blood-thirsty and callous as rocks,” he claimed, they thought only of their own advantage and never offered hospitality without some expectation of reward or “some evil design.” The Colonel described lying and stealing as national traits, asserting that the Abyssinians were the most “adroit thieves” as well as the “most unblushing liars” in the world, and concluded his assaults quoting from Priest Timotheus: “There are no vices to man that they did not have as a nation. They acknowledge no duties as they have no virtues.”³⁰⁸

Those remarks, like Chaillé-Long’s interpretations, represented the familiar bias through marginalization of the other or portraying it in full contrast with what he thought as the ethical and social norm. It should be emphasized that, unlike Lockett, for example, Derrick knew the Abyssinians only on the battlefield where he could observe their less admirable traits; thus, he accepted uncritically the opinions of the Priest whose observations were biased. Derrick’s colonialist flair in these statements was made clear when the Italian troops landed in Ethiopia replacing the Egyptian forces in the late 1880s as an attempt for Italian imperialism. In this context, he wrote if the Italian government could succeed in taking possession of the region and bringing “those monsters of iniquity into some degree of civilization,” it would have accomplished “a good deed for the whole world.”³⁰⁹

³⁰⁸ Derrick, “A Military Picnic,” 18-19, Derrick Papers.

³⁰⁹ Derrick, “A Military Picnic,” 19, Derrick Papers.

Following the assaults and subsequent retreats, King Yohannes IV sent an envoy to the Egyptian camp, who was reported “as black as the ace of spades and dressed fancifully in gaudy colors” to discuss peace.³¹⁰ According to Derrick, it was “really dreadful” waiting there with nothing to do and they were “cooped up in this fort mid the sick, the wounded and the dying,” with the dreadful heat, horrid smells, and awfully penetrating dust. There were no letters coming from home and none going beyond Massawa. Moreover, the rainy season approached and there was no transportation for the wounded, “over 600 of whom still groan and toss in pain in the hospital tents.” Thus, peace would save the troops from despair in these lands. Asking himself, “which are better off? Shall we have peace,” the Colonel thought it was impossible to aggressively continue the campaign and gave his opinions upon the course to be pursued in the future.³¹¹ Believing they had “lost heavily in men, ammunition, arms, guns, and means of transportation, and their troops were thoroughly demoralized,” he concluded it would be utterly hopeless to “expect them to stand in the open field against the enemy even under the most favorable circumstances; and to attempt to march to Adua [the capital of Abyssinia] would be to march to certain destruction and further disgrace.”³¹² Derrick recommended the decision must be prompt and action vigorous. Telling things were very uncertain and very unsatisfactory, he found the suspense in the meantime “simply dreadful” and hoped “the happy days of leaving this horrid place” would come soon.³¹³

³¹⁰ Henry C. Derrick, diary entry, March 26, 1876, Derrick Papers.

³¹¹ Henry C. Derrick, diary entry, March 31, 1876, Derrick Papers.

³¹² Henry C. Derrick, diary entry, March 17, 1876, Derrick Papers.

³¹³ Henry C. Derrick, diary entries, April 15, 1876, and April 17, 1876, Derrick Papers.

In such uncertainty, one of the biggest sources of distress in Abyssinia was the lack of communication with the families, when there were many false reports in the United States press. American officers were shocked by the reports and spent much effort to assure the family members at home that they were doing well or even trying to prove they were alive! Graves, for example, protested a leading London paper which reported “the complete shattering of the military power of Egypt” with a loss of 25,000 men. He wrote to his wife, contrary to the reports, about 16,000 men had been sent to Abyssinia, and he himself furnished transportation for about nine-ten thousand to return to Suez, and there were some three-four thousands left in the interior to guard the territory.³¹⁴ Likewise, upon an American paper’s report that “Massawa was captured and everybody massacred by the Abyssinians on the ninth of September,” he hoped his wife would “not be foolish enough to believe it,” for he was there at that date. Graves mentioned some other false reports including death of Lockett and Loring, and simply asked the anxious wife to “put no faith in such stories.”³¹⁵ However, the newspapers occasionally reported the opposite. For example, a report from Alexandria dated March 19, 1876 claimed the Egyptian troops had lately gained a decisive victory over the Abyssinians, and the war ended. According to the correspondent, the campaign was “brilliant but bloody” and the battle closed by the enemy’s complete rout. Probably relying on official news, the correspondent even claimed Yohannes IV had written a letter to Hassan Pasha asking for peace while naming his conditions.³¹⁶

³¹⁴ Charles I. Graves to Margaret L. Graves, October 2, 1876, Graves Papers.

³¹⁵ Charles I. Graves to Margaret L. Graves, October 6, 1876, Graves Papers.

³¹⁶ J. L. M. Curry, “The American Officers in Egypt. Note from Rev. Dr. Curry,” newspaper clipping, March 26, 1876, Lockett Papers.

5.4. End of the Campaign: Reflections

The Abyssinian Campaign finally ended with an order from the Ottoman sultan to furnish soldiers for a war against the Russian Empire, which provided a pretext for an unquestioned and honorable withdrawal. Even though the Sublime Porte did not ask for any American officers for the new campaign, the rumors became another source of anxiety for the families at home; thus, the men who were still on the frontier struggled to ease their worries. Assuring his wife once more, Graves, for example, constantly repeated that there was not “the slightest danger” of any of them being sent to fight against the Russians. “Even if the Khedive sends some,” he declared, “we would not go; at least I would not, and I suppose the other American officers feel the same way about it.” Interestingly for a mercenary who earned a life upon the contracted service, Graves said his sword was not for sale and firmly stated, “wherever it is drawn my heart and my conscience must approve.”³¹⁷

Derrick, on the other hand, strongly opposed his fellow and emphasized the value of their promise to serve. Indeed, it was not that the Colonel cared any sides of this conflict, as he declared, but that he had “a high regard for [his] honor as a soldier and for [his] agreement and promises,” exemplifying the “trust” or “commitment” aspect of honor, as William L. Sessions termed.³¹⁸ Describing the reports of American officers refusing to bear arms against Russia, a “base slander,” he also stated his fellows knew their duty to obey, and made it clear that he “would have gratified at

³¹⁷ Charles I. Graves to Margaret L. Graves, August 18, 1876, Graves Papers.

³¹⁸ Henry C. Derrick, diary entry, January 1877, Derrick Papers. Sessions examines commitment as a particular form of honor that relates an individual to “something more abstract-directly to principles and propositions, as well as to [...] promises and agreements.” William Lad Sessions, *Honor for Us: A Philosophical Analysis, Interpretation and Defense* (New York: Continuum, 2010), 20; Oprisko, 114.

having the opportunity of striking a blow at Russia” as a power that sympathized “the Yankee government in its infamous and heinous crimes and outrages against the South.”³¹⁹ This was another reflection of his emotional disconnection with the Union at another level. Derrick also commented on the ongoing conflict in his letters briefly. Asserting “one was just as good as the other,” the Colonel believed that great barbarities and outrages perpetrated by the Russian supported forces upon the Muslims, which was, he claimed, equal in the Ottoman atrocity upon the Christians. Moreover, he thought the “so-called Christians,” in the conflict region were not different than Turks, “with their habits of life, customs, manners and morality.”³²⁰

In Abyssinia, Morgan said, Egypt was cast for the part of the whale in French composer Edmond Audran’s popular operetta *Torpedo and the Whale*.³²¹ Like the unfortunate marine mammal that swallowed a torpedo as if it were a poor fish, Egyptian shortsightedness about the Abyssinians and the self-confidence exposed them to a “torpedo” which would soon explode, bringing dire consequences. In the end, as expected, the cliques in the army ranks blamed each other for this debacle. Americans, for instance, unanimously accused Egyptian commanding of cowardice and ineffective leadership. Pointing out that the high-ranked officers in Abyssinia “led the flight before the fight had fairly begun,” Colonel Colston recalled an Egyptian soldier crying, “why should we stay here? Look yonder-see our colonels galloping away into the fort!” when an American (Colonel Dye) severely wounded

³¹⁹ Henry C. Derrick to Martha Derrick, June 22, 1877, Derrick Papers.

³²⁰ Henry C. Derrick to Martha Derrick, August 10, 1877, Derrick Papers.

³²¹ Morgan, 305.

and attempted to stem the tide of withdrawing forces.³²² Graves also observed majors, colonels, and generals “all ran at the approach of the Abyssinians” at Gura Battle, leaving their commands intact upon the field. It was in vain, he complained, that the Americans tried to induce the troops to stand when they saw “all their officers flying from the field with whip and spur.” According to him, the American officers were much “tickled with the way things were going over there.”³²³ Derrick would also be appalled to witness the soldiers “marching calmly under the murderous attacks of a savage foe,” while their superiors “safely viewed through their field glasses the massacre of their comrades” from their entrenchments without any movement towards their assistance. These men, the Colonel protested resentfully, even congratulated themselves afterward that they were not in the same unfortunate predicament. He simply found it unacceptable to the eyes of his American fellows, most of whom had participated in the stubborn fighting in their home country under either Lee or Grant.³²⁴

Derrick insisted that Ratib Pasha had led them into the Abyssinian trap. According to him, the pasha’s “insane jealousy and intolerance of foreigners” and his equally intolerant subordinates provoked him to disregard the Americans’ advice. The Colonel was astonished to see, even at this supreme moment of peril, “when the honor of his flag, the lives of his soldiers, the success of his campaign and his own reputation were all trembling in the balance,” Ratib could not rise above his own “petty national and religious prejudices to take some decisive action.” Witnessing

³²² Colston, “Modern Egypt,” 145; McGregor, 153.

³²³ Charles I. Graves to Margaret L. Graves, October 20, 1877, Graves Papers.

³²⁴ Derrick, “A Military Picnic,” 11, Derrick Papers.

this “fatal exhibition of weakness and indecision,” Derrick claimed if the troops had been properly handled, they ought to have routed the enemy on the first day with less than half of the loss incurred:

If he had only heeded the warning message of Colonel Dye and promptly moved two or three battalions from the extreme left, where they were comparatively disengaged, to support the heroic men who were holding the right [...], he would undoubtedly have gained a signal victory for the arms of Egypt and for himself the favor, rewards and commendation of his royal master.³²⁵

Derrick asserted that it was a shameful termination to what might have been rendered “a glorious victory” rather than a “inglorious defeat” if there was an ordinary amount of firmness in the troops and efficiency in the officers. For him, it was heart-sickening to remember the opportunities “recklessly sacrificed” in Abyssinia, and the humiliation of the American officers who would remain true to their oaths of allegiance at the expense of their lives. He believed they would have “freely given their lives, if necessary, to maintain untarnished the infidel banner under which they served.” However, it should be noted that his idea of loyalty to the Egyptian banner was not a product of sympathy or shared ideals, but rather self-respect or “a point of honor” in his words.³²⁶

Meanwhile, the Egyptians did not accept responsibility and blamed the Americans for providing inadequate advice. Khedive Ismail thought, “the bloom was definitely off the American rose,” and Americans’ status in the Egyptian Army became more tenuous. Hence, Colonel Lockett noted, “Americans were below par” in Egypt then,

³²⁵ Derrick, “A Military Picnic,” 11, Derrick Papers.

³²⁶ Derrick, “A Military Picnic,” 10-11, 12, Derrick Papers.

and “they had lost what esteem they had” after the defeat in Abyssinia.³²⁷ According to Graves, however, Prince Hassan, “the great enemy of the Americans” was responsible for the disgrace, but he cunningly accused Grave’s fellow countrymen. Claiming that the international rivalry played an important role in this scheme, the Colonel believed the officers of other nationalities, including lieutenant colonels Van Plutz (Prussian), Magri (French), Pee (Belgian), Major Thurnhozen (Austrian), and Captain Sormany (Italian), sustained the Prince in his assertion that the Americans were responsible for the downfall of the Egyptian campaign in Gura.³²⁸ Derrick would also mention the rivalry or hostility between the foreign elements a year later in his diary, and stated that there was always a heap of intriguing in Egypt “to put out those who are in, by those who are out.” According to him, having great influence in the army circles, the English, French, Italian, and German officers had their cliques, and all “would be glad to see the few American officers displaced.”³²⁹

Dye’s letter to Derrick reveals the Colonel’s opinion of Loring and the frustrations the American staff had in their dealings with the Egyptians. The letter dated 1887, when Loring and Dye had already published their autobiographies with some discrepancies regarding the battles, reiterates that the local officers did not act upon the American advice. For example, he reminded, the fort at Gura was built on a site favored by the Egyptians against the objections of the American officers who thought the disaster substantiated their judgment. Dye believed there was fighting in Cairo as well as in Abyssinia during the campaign, and the fighting in their rear and

³²⁷ Quoted in Hesseltine and Wolf, 213.

³²⁸ Charles I. Graves to Margaret L. Graves, October 14, 1877, Graves Papers.

³²⁹ Henry C. Derrick to Martha Derrick, February 23, 1877, Derrick Papers.

among themselves in the field had more to do with the defeat. “In the field the Arabs wished to make use of us as scapegoats,” he noted, but Loring also got his share from Dye’s criticisms. According to him, Loring’s peculiarities were not fatal to harmony among themselves, but his “seeming determination to quarrel with the members of the staff was not the least of his anxieties,” and much valuable time was spent in toning down or trying to tone down his passions and prejudices.³³⁰

Lockett’s final judgment about whom to blame, however, provides a look at the racial contrasts. Believing that the foreign component in the army brought weakness rather than the assumed strength in the end, he stated the Americans had shown “ability, zeal and devotion to the duty,” but their way of doing things, understanding of the professional discipline or “of military honor and of all the requirements of soldierly duty” were totally different from that of their comrades in Egypt. The Colonel used the symbols of oil and water or a racehorse and an ox in his argument to emphasize the incompatibility between the two elements in the battlefield. Claiming his fellow countrymen from both the Southern and Northern states were “bold, impetuous, straightforward” while the Arabs were “slow, timid, cautious, crafty,” he confidently concluded that the Americans had come to defeat Yohannes of Abyssinia and they wanted to “be done with the business,” but Egyptians preferred to “use bribery and treachery” rather than to risk losses.³³¹

³³⁰ William McEntyre Dye to Henry C. Derrick, April 3, 1887, Derrick Papers.

³³¹ Quoted in Hesselstine and Wolf, 210-211.

5.5. Conclusion

As Derrick expressed, he went to Abyssinia to win some distinction in the campaign, hoping to receive a reward or recognition of his services. This “tardy recognition in the shape of a decoration” came, however, for an “act of humanity which their own officers were too heartless to perform.” The enthusiastic Colonel was disappointed that General Stone’s letter to him surprisingly overlooked his military services.

Instead, his humane act (to seek out wounded officers and soldiers left on the field of battle and the rescue butchered and mutilated prisoners in the camp of the enemy) was selected for reward even though he frequently claimed “his fort” at Gura saved the whole Egyptian forces in Abyssinia from an “utter and complete annihilation.”³³² In this respect, Derrick also complained many officers who, he believed, “were not worth shucks” were promoted, but not an American received any advancement.

Derrick attributed this to the unfortunate disagreement between Ratib Pasha and the second in command General Loring, as well as to other causes such as “jealousy on the part of the native officers and the ill will of other foreign officers.” However, he was proud and asked his wife Martha to let their mother know of this once, as she would “be highly delighted to know that the Baron von Diedrich has at least won some distinction although in a foreign land.”³³³ This accomplishment, according to him, recognized the appreciation that he was denied in his native soil. In addition to Derrick, Field, Loring, Irgens, and Dr. Johnson had been awarded the Medjidie Order for their service in the campaign. Only Colonel Dye rejected the decoration.

³³² Derrick, “A Military Picnic,” 9, Derrick Papers.

³³³ Henry C. Derrick to Martha Derrick, June 1, 1877, Derrick Papers.

Indeed, he had announced that if he had been rewarded a decoration without promotion, he would have rejected it; therefore, Loring reported, the General did not include his name in the proposed list.³³⁴ On the other hand, showing how the works were done in Egypt, Graves would be disappointed when his and Lockett's decorations were forgotten!³³⁵

Overall, the Abyssinian Campaign was an earlier example of ex-Confederate-Union fighting on the same side and provided the veterans another opportunity to (re)prove their military worth in the field. It was another failure for the Confederate veterans, but the official recognition for their deeds, which came in the form of long-sought decorations, speak to their professional redemption in Egypt. The mercenary narratives present American veterans' (particularly Derrick's) intimate feelings about the carnage and their psychology with initial overconfidence and utmost frustration in the end. They also demonstrate the almost monolithic American view of the native forces and the African people, making use of a racist lexicon with traditional stereotypes.

³³⁴ Henry C. Derrick, diary entry, September 10, 1877, Derrick Papers; Loring, 449.

³³⁵ Charles I. Graves to Margaret L. Graves, May 18, 1877, Graves Papers.

CHAPTER VI

“EGYPTIAN CORN FOR GEORGIAN BREAD:”

CHARLES IVERSON GRAVES’S SOJOURN

“My God, my Father, while I stray
Far from my home on life’s rough way
Oh, teach me from my heart to say
‘Thy will be done.’”³³⁶

“Here he lies where he longed to be;
Home is the sailor, home from sea.”³³⁷

“Egypt had always been a place for refuge for the hungry and persecuted. Abraham and Lot sojourned there when the famine was grievous in their own country; Jacob sent his ten sons down thither [...] to buy corn for his household that they all might live and not die,” wrote Charles Iverson Graves to his “Chichi” in 1875 summer. The thirty-seven years old hard-bitten man had enough time in his Egyptian “mission” to reflect upon Lord’s “instruction” bestowed upon him. He believed that he was in

³³⁶ Charlotte Elliot, *The Invalid’s Hymn Book* (Dublin: Simpkin, Marshall, and Co., 1834), 193.

³³⁷ Robert Louis Stevenson, “O Come Quickly Requiem,” in *The Book of Sorrow*, ed. Andrew Macphail (London, New York: Oxford University Press, 1916), Bartleby.com (retrieved July 25, 2020).

these ancient lands for the same reason that Joseph's brothers left the Land of Canaan: to get corn for his wife and little ones. For him, he and his fellow Confederates were no different from the unfortunate Israelites in their plight to Egypt: they were "hungry and disfranchised."³³⁸ For the next three years, Graves would serve as a lieutenant colonel in the Egyptian Army, participate in the Abyssinian Campaign, conduct topographic surveys in Somali and work on mapping/registration the vicinity. He had bid farewell to his beloveds in Rome, Georgia as a debt-crippled man in July 1875, but returned with 5,000 dollars in gold, cleared his farm mortgage, and re-established himself as a proud planter in August 1878. Decorations and appreciation would make him reconcile with the defeat a decade earlier and the "financial embarrassment" following the war.

Graves's Egypt experience is significant in several respects. First, it shows how one ex-Confederate achieved rehabilitation in the last days of Reconstruction using his talents on a foreign shore. He was the perfect example of the *Amerikani* in Egypt: A man seeking to reclaim/prove his honor in terms of paternal responsibilities (economic, household conduct, sacrifice, family dignity) and professional skills. A cultured and educated man, he had a great devotion to his family, a Christian conscience, a high sense of duty, and personal integrity. His concern for national pride/honor as an American was another aspect that makes his story remarkable. Furthermore, his notes complete the general picture of the American mission's life in Egypt, all giving a more accurate picture of the Civil War veterans' network and their reconciliation in a strange land, among strangers.

³³⁸ Graves, "An Address on Egypt and Egyptians," Graves Papers.

6.1. “A Manifest Destiny:” Graves’s Early Career and Egyptian Sojourn

Graves, a native of Georgia, was born in 1838. Sponsored by Alexander H. Stephens, the future vice president of the Confederacy, he entered Annapolis Naval Academy and graduated fourth in his class in 1857. He was a lieutenant on board the *Iroquois* when the war broke out and resigned his commission to enter the Confederate service. During the course of the war, Graves involved in an international complication when he was compelled to run the blockade to get a vessel then being built at France, which resulted in an assault by a United States cruiser, and his detainment in France for eighteen months. On his return, President Jefferson Davis appointed him to select a site for the Confederate naval academy, but the rapid decline of the Confederacy forced the navy officer to take the field. Graves took part in another spectacular event surrounding the close of the Civil War, when Richmond, capital of the short-lived government, was on the verge of falling. Orders had been given the government officers to flee South, and Graves was appointed as one of the executive officers on the train, which carried the Davis Family to Washington, Georgia. The last cabinet meeting would be held there, making the Confederate States pass into history.

After the war, banned from his profession, Graves managed a high school for boys for a short period and tried farming in his home state.³³⁹ The extensive destruction of

³³⁹ Margaret Nola Burkley, “Floyd County, Georgia, During the Civil War Era” (Ph.D. Dissertation, Florida State University, 1998), 322; Margaret Lea Graves, “Reminiscences of Margaret Lea Graves,” 2; Office of the Chief of Naval Operations to Margariute B. Graves, July 9, 1957; “A Splendid Career was Ended in the Death of Colonel Graves,” *Rome Tribune*, November 5, 1896; “Soldier for Glory. Georgian Educated for War Follows it in Two Countries. Fighting was His Calling. Colonel Charles Iverson Graves, who Served under Three Flags, Dead,” undated newspaper clipping; Montgomery M.

the recent war dropped many small cultivators into debt and destitution in the South and led many to grow cotton. As cotton prices declined, many lost their farming lands and could not obtain the cash to survive, a problem which did not pass over the Graves family.³⁴⁰ Adding to the general difficulties prevailed in post-war Southern agriculture for some years, a spring freshet washed out Graves's crop, making the mortgage payments impossible (he bought a 40-acre farm near Oostanaula River in 1872). Finally, he applied for the Egyptian Army with a strong reference letter written to General Stone, stating that the former navy officer stood high in the Academy and would serve well in Egypt.³⁴¹ His contract, signed by Colonel Poe and S.L. Merchant in New York, was similar to the earlier recruits. Like Derrick's, in his contract, it was clearly affirmed that he would have no lesser rank in arrival to avoid any arbitrary rearrangements that bothered the former American mercenaries. However, upon his arrival in Egypt, he entered into a new "more favorable" contract with the Egyptian government.³⁴²

According to Graves, his sojourn was a "manifest destiny." He saw "the hand of God in this affair," for what purpose, only he may know in his infinite wisdom. The Colonel believed the road for his Egyptian trip was prepared "in so marvelous a manner." He was already convinced that God had "something for him to do" and the family would be granted a happy reunion when his assigned mission was

Folsom, "Soldier of Fortune. Late Colonel Charles Iverson Graves was Fond of Battle," undated newspaper clipping, all in Graves Papers.

³⁴⁰ Eric Foner and Olivia Mahoney, *America's Reconstruction: People and Politics After the Civil War* (Louisiana: Louisiana State University Press, 1999).

³⁴¹ Charles I. Graves to Margaret L. Graves, August 7, 1875, Graves Papers.

³⁴² "Copy of Contract Entered into Before Sailing for Egypt," July 1, 1875, and "Copy of Contract," (in French), Charles I. Graves, diary entry, August 18, 1875, Graves Papers.

performed.³⁴³ Assuring his wife, Graves offered submission instead of trying to “pierce the darkness ahead” and let “the heavenly pilot” bring them safely into the port.³⁴⁴ Yet, it was still a challenging task to Margaret, who did not leave his husband even during the war when Graves was stationed in Mobile. “I felt it my bounden duty to uphold my husband’s hands,” she said years later, but no one would know the battle she fought with tears and on her knees, as she put in the words sensationally. The only consolation she could find was that the family would join their father in Cairo in a few months, which was, indeed, never realized.³⁴⁵

Graves sailed from New York on steamship *Egypt* National Line July 3, 1875, and reached Cairo on August 3.³⁴⁶ The first impressions of his new home repeated the dual character of the khedival capital. Finding the modern Cairo a splendid city, he compared it to Paris with gardens surrounded by handsome buildings where mostly an international community resided. In striking contrast was the native part of the city. Old quarters astonished him with narrow streets crowded with “all sorts of people in all sorts of costumes” and the veiled women peeping out from behind their veils at the men, giving the Orientalist flair in the first encounters.³⁴⁷ Indeed, his contrasts and portrayals were similar to the narrations of other Americans. Cornelia Clark Lockett, wife of Colonel Lockett, for example, stated there were two different Cairos. Though occupying adjacent areas, she observed, they were separated from

³⁴³ Charles I. Graves to Margaret L. Graves, August 14, 1875, and November 27, 1875, Graves Papers.

³⁴⁴ Charles I. Graves to Margaret L. Graves, January 12, 1876, Graves Papers.

³⁴⁵ Margaret Lea Graves, “Reminiscences of Margaret Lea Graves,” 16, Graves Papers.

³⁴⁶ Charles I. Graves to Harry Graves, August 12, 1875, and diary entry, December 21, 1875, Graves Papers.

³⁴⁷ Charles I. Graves to Margaret L. Graves, October 23, 1875, Graves Papers.

each other by characteristics as distinctly different as if “the two towns were on opposite sides of the ocean.” According to her, the old quarters represented a typical Eastern city in all respects, with narrow streets, projecting houses, filthy alleys, and dark corners. It was “a labyrinthian commingling” of densely packed gardens and open courts, tumble down hovels and stately palaces in intimate juxtaposition, as well as mosques and bazars which was a *sine qua non* in Oriental depictions.³⁴⁸

6.2. Graves in Massawa, Charkeyeh and Cape Guardafui

Graves’s first assignments in the General Staff under Stone’s leadership were limited to office work. Like Derrick and others in the Third Section (Topographical Bureau), he worked on plans of fortifications at different locations. However, the second Abyssinian Campaign in January 1876 brought an end to his Citadel days. In this regard, the Colonel was assigned to supervise the supply transport at Massawa harbor. According to General Stone’s order, which underlined the strong faith in his “well-known professional skill,” he would be stationed in the region as sort of port admiral with evidently important duties.³⁴⁹ “I hope therefore you will feel no uneasiness,” Graves assured his wife, for, he believed, there was no more danger in Massawa than he could face in Cairo.³⁵⁰

³⁴⁸ Cornelia Lockett, “House Keeping in Cairo, Egypt or a few Pages from my Diary,” unpublished manuscript, c. 1878, 2, Lockett Papers.

³⁴⁹ Charles I. Graves to Margaret L. Graves, December 20, 1875; Graves, diary entry, December 20, 1875 (copy of the order from General Stone to Graves), Graves Papers.

³⁵⁰ Charles I. Graves to Margaret L. Graves, August 26, 1875, and December 16, 1875, Graves Papers.

Graves left Cairo for Massawa on December 21, 1875 and arrived at his station after a week-long voyage.³⁵¹ His account of the landscape en route is exciting. He vividly portrayed the scenes through the railroad to Suez, which carried them back to the “distant centuries” of Joseph’s times, until they were “rudely brought back to the nineteenth century” by the scream of the locomotive and the sight of the telegraph:

The scene was highly interesting. It was so strange and yet so familiar; so different from anything I had ever seen in all my wanderings, and yet so like the descriptions of the pictured we find in the Bible. It was tropical and Oriental, but more than all, it was Egyptian. These three adjectives will continue outlive in the scene; and the liveliest imagination can scarcely fill up with details too picturesque or too highly colored.³⁵²

Yet, his tone would change as the landscape’s colors gradually changed, with picturing the desolate farming areas, barrenness, and the Great Desert. The desert which stretched from the Atlantic Ocean to the Persian Gulf, was a dreadful waste of sand and rock, where the desolation was silent, hopeless, and complete. “As one never forgets his first sight of the Ocean,” he wrote, “he will never forget his emotions when he finds himself for the first time in the dismal of the Great Desert.”

The expedition turned out to be “a long sojourn,” and Graves stayed in Massawa for six months until June 25, 1876, which General Stone found a “pleasant episode.”³⁵³ Unfortunately, his correspondence has no material regarding his military activities because of the censor and limited communication. During this time, he constantly assured Margaret that he was provided with everything to make him comfortable at

³⁵¹ Charles I. Graves to Harry Graves, August 12, 1875, and Graves, diary entry, December 21, 1875, Graves Papers.

³⁵² Charles I. Graves, diary entry, April 8, 1876 (extract from Charles I. Graves to Margaret L. Graves, April 8, 1876), Graves Papers.

³⁵³ Charles I. Graves to Margaret L. Graves, December 19, 1875, Graves Papers.

Massawa, and his duties would be such as he “shall be able to take care of himself,” as seen in a letter dated January 8, 1875:

I speak truthfully and candidly when I tell you that there is no more cause for anxiety than if I were stationed in Rome [...] The usual southern complaints, intermittent fevers and dysentery do not prevail here. [...] There is as little danger here on score of climate as there is in Floyd; so make yourself easy and comfortable on this account and always remember that I will keep my promise.³⁵⁴

However, the news was not good in Abyssinia, which made “Chichi” more uncomfortable. “You must not believe what you see in the papers,” he would write in response to her constant questions, stating it distressed him much to know she was anxious by those fabricated reports, some of which mentioned in the previous chapter.³⁵⁵ Indeed, Graves was right. While other Americans in Abyssinia were slightly saved from death, he tented on a small coral island, with the clear blue waters of the Red Sea “singing [him] to sleep at night, and awaking [him] in the morning with the same ceaseless, restless but pleasantly familiar sound,” in his own words. Moreover, Graves was not entirely deprived of society, as there were several missionaries with their families besides the French consul and merchants.³⁵⁶ With the retreat from the Abyssinian lands, he furnished transportation of the troops back to Alexandria, and returned to Cairo.

Grave’s second field assignment was measuring boundaries in Charkeyeh province between April 4 and July 9, 1877, which meant visiting villages, meeting sheiks, and working with the local men. It was a critical task because the measures of lands determined the taxation in the region. He was pleased with the assignment as an

³⁵⁴ Charles I. Graves to Margaret L. Graves, January 8, 1876, Graves Papers.

³⁵⁵ Charles I. Graves to Margaret L. Graves, October 8, 1875, Graves Papers.

³⁵⁶ Charles I. Graves to Margaret L. Graves, January 1, 1876, Graves Papers.

enthusiastic farmer who was fond of outdoor life. “You can imagine how I enjoy running lines and measuring angles through these old bible lands,” he cheered and found himself fortunate to watch the farm operations like harvesting, treading out of the grain or watering of the crops.³⁵⁷ Astonished by the backwardness in the region, on the other hand, he observed that the Egyptians were “not suited to the nineteenth century,” and the native population was “a relic of the past, of the days when men dwelt in huts.”³⁵⁸ Colonel Lockett also spotted the agricultural backwardness of Massawa and was struck by the crude methods of agriculture, witnessing the typical sights of “wooden ploughs drawn by sleepy looking buffalo oxen, or an ox and a camel [...] or even a woman and a donkey yoked together.” He was further amused by the crude well sweeps, and “the creaking original water engines of forty centuries ago.”³⁵⁹

The Charkeyeh mission started with problems. In the town of Zagazig, fifty miles north of Cairo, the *moudin* (local authority) was not informed of the mission’s visit as well as their objective and concluded it would be best to report to the General Inspector of the Lower Egypt.³⁶⁰ Graves had to wait two days for instructions. According to the orders, he would find the contents of the land cultivated by six villages, and then in each, measure the different sections owned by each fellah. Adjoining to these villages was a small elevated but not cultivated plateau. Graves was ordered to find its contents because it could be made tillable later on. As

³⁵⁷ Charles I. Graves, diary entry, June 1877 (copy of the letter to Diwinell), Graves Papers.

³⁵⁸ Charles Iverson Graves, “Lecture on Egypt,” unpublished manuscript, 24, Graves Papers.

³⁵⁹ Lockett, “Our Life in Egypt,” 11, Lockett Papers

³⁶⁰ Charles I. Graves, diary entry, April 6, 1877, Graves Papers.

mentioned, measures would shape the taxation standard. Thus, unsurprisingly, there were constant disputes about the boundaries among the sheiks who claimed more land. If the parties were still in dispute, the *moudin* assigned other sheiks to decide as mediators. Despite his discreetness about such anecdotes in his notes, Graves observed many examples of local corruption in the villages. One of them was when, for example, the *moudin* asked him to “resurvey” a disputed boundary because the native surveyor did not show the boundary that he wanted to be shown. The unfortunate surveyor received 200 lashes, Graves noted.³⁶¹

Graves’s rise to fame came after his last assignment in Egypt in 1878, which was a reconnaissance to Cape Guardafui, the tip of the African Horn in modern Somali. General Stone told him the object of the reconnaissance was spotting the most suitable location for constructing a lighthouse that would add to the security of ships entering the Gulf of Aden from the Indian Ocean, making the endeavor receive international support. Graves would also make a preliminary survey of the place once the first stage was over. He was the only American in this expedition and worked only with local staff.³⁶² Interestingly, Graves was no stranger to the shores, as he was on duty in the same region in 1858 when he was serving in the United States Navy. He, once more, had to assure his wife that it was a pretty well-known area, and his fellows in Cairo congratulated him in going on such a pleasant little expedition.³⁶³

³⁶¹ Ibid.

³⁶² Pierre Crabitès, *Ismail: The Maligned Khedive* (London: George Routledge and Sons, 1933), 140.

³⁶³ Charles I. Graves, diary entry, March 31, 1878, Graves Papers.

However, the expedition started in despair as Graves learned his little Annie was seriously sick, and there would be no communication with home to inquire about her health. The Colonel “never suffered to think anything was to happen to his family,” thanks to Margaret’s diligence, but she informed her husband that “he might be prepared for the painful result” which indeed threatened to overwhelm the family. Opening all the mails in fear, as he told honestly, and “trembling not knowing what news he would have” from his dear little Annie, the distance, thus not being able to help and waiting for letters one month behind was the most formidable task. Fortunately, General Stone, who had received letters from Georgia, relieved Graves in a telegraph stating Annie got well. Finding it very difficult to express the relief that she recovered, the nervous father hoped she would have “fully recovered her health, strength, and beauty” when he would arrive home next summer.³⁶⁴

The mission had some other troubles. Firstly, the intensely hot weather, hot winds, and dust storms of almost daily occurrence made the working and living conditions unbearable. Still, Graves noted that, notwithstanding the heat, the surveying parties worked hard to accomplish their duties. However, hostilities and threats from the local population were more critical problems. As General Stone reminded Graves before sailing southward, the inhabitants of the region were aggressive and mostly earned their lives on pillaging the vessels or shipwrecks on the shores. According to the General, these people would be hostile to the Egyptian mission and would not permit the construction of the proposed lighthouse because it would deprive them of their biggest revenue. Indeed, Graves reported later, the people had accused him of measuring their land to take possession of it and urged him to leave, telling they did

³⁶⁴ Charles I. Graves to Margaret L. Graves, November 27, 1875; February 13, 1878; February 20, 1878; April 8, 1878, Graves Papers.

not fear Egyptian guns for they were not “as weak and cowardly as the people of Berber.” Graves also noted that parties of almost a dozen armed with spears and shields came out to the camp area and talked to him in a very threatening manner. These were followed by small armed groups that visited their spot regularly.³⁶⁵ The threats did not deter the mission as they were also guarded by armed men sent there with the orders from Cairo. After explaining the routes followed by the vessels around Socotra island (between the Arabian Sea and Guardafui Channel), and stating the seasons when hazard could be apprehended, Colonel Graves concluded that the opening of the Wadi Rohun was the most suitable location for the construction.³⁶⁶

The report titled “Lighting the Northeast Coast of Africa,” which was submitted after the mission, was comprehensive and was not limited to the geographical information. He presented a greater picture, including exports, imports, and even the genealogies in the region. But his tone was much more neutral than critical and contrary to his letters, he was content with simple portrayals and statistics regarding his subjects. General Stone and the Khedive appreciated Graves’s efforts to have the expedition without fighting a big battle with the natives, and found the final commentary reportedly the “best ever made by any expedition sent from Egypt.” The General was particularly pleased with the maps, which were ten in total. The report was in three parts: The first discussing the question of locating lighthouses on that coast; the second part was “Notes on the country of the M’jjertain Somalia”—one of the four principal families in Somalia, which was reportedly the most populous and uncivilized—and the last one was “Journal of the Expedition.” The first part was to

³⁶⁵ Charles I. Graves, diary entries, May 14 and May 18, and June 3-10, 1878, Graves Papers.

³⁶⁶ “Geographical Notes (Northern and Eastern Somaliland,” *Proceedings of the Royal Geographical Society and Monthly Record of Geography*, vol. 2 (London: Edward Stanford, 1880), 780.

be sent to the European and the United States governments, as the question of lighting that coast was in some particulars an international affair.³⁶⁷

6.3. Financial Success out of Sacrifices

Graves was favored in the army and khedival court. Yet, as previously mentioned, his Egyptian sojourn was chiefly a personal mission to secure economic security to save him from “financial embarrassment.” He was determined to get corn for his family, in his own words, and saw it always a priority, stating, “it would be very foolish to lose sight of the great object of” his Egyptian scheme. He “fortunately” had not sold his farm before sailing to Egypt and was looking forward to it be secured to him. “I am cheerful and hopeful and strong,” he wrote in a letter dated August 14, 1875, and assured Margaret that he felt his visit to Egypt would save their farm out of debt and, consequently, secure a competency for the whole family. His enthusiasm was evident in another letter demonstrating he was “making very close calculations about financial matters,” and determined to go back to their farm as soon as he could save up enough.³⁶⁸

Economizing was essential to Graves’s scheme, and he believed that the more they economized in the daily routines the sooner would they be reunited.³⁶⁹ According to Graves, it was the duty of every man to practice a rigid economy to provide for the support and education of his family. Emphasizing the noble character of self-denial,

³⁶⁷ “Geographical Notes (Northern and Eastern Somaliland,” 374-75; Charles I. Graves to Margaret L. Graves, July 8, 1878, Graves Papers.

³⁶⁸ Charles I. Graves to Margaret L. Graves, July 25, 1875; August 14, 1875; May 28, 1877, Graves Papers.

³⁶⁹ Charles I. Graves to Margaret L. Graves, August 14, 1875, Graves Papers.

he held that economy was “a great virtue when properly exercised” and with proper motives.³⁷⁰ For him, it was a masculine duty or a test of manhood; thus, failing would bring shame to his name. As a dedicated father and husband, he could be comfortable only when the family members “get along over there pleasantly.” “I feel I am doing my duty,” he wrote in his fourth month of service in Egypt, and there he found “a comfort in feeling so.”³⁷¹

This personal mission required much sacrifice, which was indeed beyond economizing or self-denial. Separation and homesickness were to be endured. Grave’s sole consolation in such a scheme was the firm belief that his sacrifice had not been without good fruit: “I am trying to bear this separation with all the Christian resignation and fortitude I can command,” he told Margaret, telling goodwill would end the separation; thus he would bear it “with-a stout heart.” Even though he repeatedly complained that being far away was painful, the lonely man still had to “cheerfully” endure it to obtain long-lasting benefits.³⁷² Graves believed that his sojourn only required on their part some moral courage “to bear bravely this separation, to take a cheerful view of the matter, and to deny many little gratifications of pride.”³⁷³ Indeed, even when he was trying to assure Margaret, himself was torn by homesickness, but the hope for “a successful and honored return” avoided the articulation of his genuine feelings. Dreams of paying his farm out of debt and returning to it “without the harrowing cares” gave the courage he

³⁷⁰ Charles I. Graves to Margaret L. Graves, June 28, 1877, Graves Papers.

³⁷¹ Charles I. Graves to Margaret L. Graves, November 13, 1875, Graves Papers.

³⁷² Charles I. Graves to Margaret L. Graves, July 15, 1875, and December 30, 1875, Graves Papers.

³⁷³ Charles I. Graves to Margaret L. Graves, October 15, 1875, Graves Papers.

asked for and kept him in good spirits.³⁷⁴ His motivation was acknowledged and appreciated by other fellows in the American contingent. Major William H. Ward, for example, once told him, “you hold on to that farm; wish I had one.”³⁷⁵ To justify and enable the reunion as early as possible, Graves lived in the edges in Cairo, counted every penny, welcomed the extra more-paid assignments, and basically spent a simple bachelor life in Egypt. Even during the first weeks, he noted that he was making “every edge cut,” and he was “very economical for every dollar” except for the necessities.³⁷⁶

Indeed, the Egyptian service proved to be a very fortunate move on his part financially, for he was able to pay off the debts and make money, as he noted his pleasure was beyond the “most sanguine expectation.”³⁷⁷ While being strict on his own conduct, he was also rigorous about household economy and management of the sources. He transferred the money through his agent Miller in New York, and he kept him fully posted on financial affairs. Graves asked his wife not to trouble herself about money and instructed her to call on Miller whenever she needed it. Money transfers worked efficiently but only with some occasional problems. In one of them, when Miller was not in town, Margaret had a tough week with “only three nickels in her purse, poorly supplied with necessities, no money and no credit in Leesburg.” Her difficulty, when there was no one to ask even for the smallest loan or the shortest time was certainly enough to make Graves nervous. Feeling weak and

³⁷⁴ Charles I. Graves to Margaret L. Graves, October 23, 1875, Graves Papers.

³⁷⁵ Charles I. Graves to Margaret L. Graves, September 24, 1875, Graves Papers.

³⁷⁶ Charles I. Graves to Margaret L. Graves, October 28, 1875, Graves Papers.

³⁷⁷ Charles I. Graves to Margaret L. Graves, December 16, 1875, and October 23, 1875, Graves Papers.

desperate, the only thing he could do was trusting Margaret's logic, saying, "I hope you have not hesitated to dispose of what silver we have even at any sacrifice to relieve the pressure."³⁷⁸

Graves's letters home showed he was always pleased with Margaret's conduct and trusted her management with a great deal of economy. Indeed, she informed him about all the expenditures and did not ask for more money than they had anticipated in the beginning. Not depending on associates' help in need made Graves relieved. However, he would worry about the equally strong self-denial on her side:

And my dear little Chichi, don't starve yourself or deny yourself the requisites for living comfortably. I do want to economize until 'we get out of the wilderness' but you must have what is necessary for your comfortable living. I don't want to save money for money's sake but in order that I may have it to spend for the benefit of the family. I would not care to own a dollar that could not be made to contribute to the comfort and happiness of you and the children.³⁷⁹

In another letter written a week later, he underlined that it was a pleasure for him to know that she was pleasantly situated, yet again reminded her that she should have bought what was necessary for the comfort and happiness of all.³⁸⁰

Graves's concerns were shared by Derrick, who also struggled hard to build up a "nest egg" for future use. The Colonel argued that this was his reason for going to Egypt for three years, and it did not make sense to bring his family with him since the cost would be excessive. However, for some Americans, serving in Egypt would not be as financially rewarding as it was for Graves and Derrick. Those who brought

³⁷⁸ Charles I. Graves to Margaret L. Graves, November 13, 1875, Graves Papers.

³⁷⁹ Charles I. Graves to Margaret L. Graves, November 13, 1875, Graves Papers.

³⁸⁰ Charles I. Graves to Margaret L. Graves, November 19, 1875, Graves Papers.

their families along with them were in debt and would be in trouble for some time.³⁸¹

In this respect, Major Wilburn Briggs Hall of South Carolina was seen as a melancholic and despondent man. Luckily, Graves said, Mrs. Hall managed all the finances for three years of his service because his fellow, who was also an Annapolis graduate, had no “more financial ability than a cat.” Dr. Thomas D. Johnson was another fellow who was financially dissatisfied in Egypt. However, his complaints, Graves commented, were not fair, as the doctor had spent almost all his income “entirely on himself” and obviously did not save any for his return.³⁸²

Likewise, having departed the United States for securing financial stability, Lockett could save no money in three years. Derrick and Graves noted their comrade did not do any better financially than when he arrived in Egypt, thus returning would be best for Locketts, a family of seven who lived in an apartment with their Arab servants. At least, Graves believed, their children would be “better educated at home and have stricter notions morally” in the United States.³⁸³ Observing that they were in a bad fix, with no way to get out of it, the Georgian thought his Alabaman fellow “jumped out of the frying pan into the fire.”³⁸⁴ Fortunately, as stated in the fourth chapter, Lockett was offered of a professorship in Knoxville, which Jeanie Lockett, the younger daughter of the Colonel, would describe “a lucky turn of the wheel of the Fate” bringing them back to their home.³⁸⁵

³⁸¹ Charles I. Graves to Margaret L. Graves, September 24, 1875, Graves Papers.

³⁸² Charles I. Graves to Margaret L. Graves, August 29, 1876, Graves Papers.

³⁸³ Henry C. Derrick to Martha Derrick, July 13, 1877, Derrick Papers; Charles I. Graves to Margaret L. Graves August 18, 1876, Graves Papers.

³⁸⁴ Charles I. Graves to Margaret L. Graves, September 17, 1875, Graves Papers.

³⁸⁵ Jean Lockett Fuller, “Katura or Reminiscent of an American Girl in the East,” unpublished manuscript, undated, 21, Lockett Papers.

Graves was not surprised to witness they were “dying to go,” and his comrade finally realized “very forcibly” that Egypt was not a good place to raise children.³⁸⁶ Indeed, Lockett himself would admit that the unexpected costs and the absence of proper education to his little ones, made their Egypt days onerous. The Alabaman accepted they recognized that “the whole social fabric was fouled and corrupt from the lowest to the highest rank,” and that “there were a thousand unwholesome influence” which they could neither avoid nor control. Thus, when the time came for them to return, they “could be gratified at the decrees of Providence.”³⁸⁷ That being said, as a side note here, the elder daughter of the family wrote before their departure from Cairo that, even though she did not attend formal schools in Egypt as most girls in the United States, she learned a great deal in this foreign land, which she would have never learned at home. “Although we are glad, yes too glad, to leave Cairo,” she told to uncle Pow in Alabama, she would never regret that they had the “advantage of seeing and learning things of this foreign and yet uncivilized country.”³⁸⁸

6.4. A Father far from Home: Graves’s Paternal Concerns

Graves’s paternal concern was not limited to saving enough money to provide comfort for his family. He displayed a high concern thousands of miles away to family affairs. In this context, he often stressed out the importance of education and told Margaret how to instruct their children. Wishing his little ones know “how best he [could] train them up to be good and useful and honorable,” Graves expected his

³⁸⁶ Charles I. Graves to Margaret L. Graves May 14, 1877, Graves Papers.

³⁸⁷ Lockett, “Our Life in Egypt,” 29-30, Lockett Papers.

³⁸⁸ Jeanie Lockett to Uncle Pow, September 2, 1877, Lockett Papers.

sons to be gentlemen, “in its truest sense, not in the sense it [was] now generally getting to be used,” and conveyed the importance of being neat and socially reputable.³⁸⁹ His concerns give many hints about his personality and intellectual tastes. For him, learning and being cultured reflected on dignity and manliness. Basically, he saw education as a way to improve one’s standards, and thus a status symbol in society. Talking about his son Iverson’s education, for example, he told if the young man was not fixed in habits of “industry, economy, integrity, and truth,” he would not maintain the social position which his forefathers had held, thus bringing a shame on himself. As a dedicated father, he often emphasized that he made “a great sacrifice in absenting himself” so long from all the endearments of home to have the means of educating his children; hence, clearly stated they would have “only themselves to blame” if they would not “become honorable, heightened, educated” while their parents were “so careful, so anxious, so devoted.”³⁹⁰

Indeed, Graves followed Alexander Stephens’s advice to him when he entered the navy. Stephens had warned the young navy cadet then that he must have applied himself closely, never felt satisfied, and recollected “that every man and is the architect of his own future.”³⁹¹ In this context, Margaret was a great help to Graves. Assuring her husband that she was striving “to make them love the truth, to govern their tempers, to be cheerful and happy and industrious,” she taught the little kids every morning and was busy with arranging a proper school for the elders, as there

³⁸⁹ Charles I. Graves to Margaret L. Graves, July 24, 1875, Graves Papers.

³⁹⁰ Charles I. Graves to Margaret L. Graves, February 1, 1878, Graves Papers.

³⁹¹ Alexander Stephens to Charles I. Graves, December 19, 1853, Graves Papers.

would be no school at Leesburg next session.³⁹² Because Graves was unable to make inquiries, he left the whole matter in Margaret's hands. His main concern was that they would be thoroughly taught rather than rapidly advanced or acquiring habits of study rather than mere information.³⁹³ Graves was happy that they all did well with their mother. Hoping that she would "keep them up to the mark," he strictly asked her to add moral values to them; for example, "not only helping people but also being quick to offer help."³⁹⁴

Graves was concerned about everything regarding his children, from what they read to how they were supposed to write. Listing and sending books to home, he believed fondness of reading was not only a source of "infinite enjoyment and of culture," but also a great safeguard to the young – and he was proud himself of having "very strongly marked literary tastes" when he was a little boy who often "wished to have money enough to buy a library."³⁹⁵ Upon having been informed about Iverson's improvement, he felt proud as a father. Speaking of the younger son, he predicted a creditable future if he would try to improve himself by going into a good society as well as writing and reading. According to him, while young, the taste for reading was easily cultivated, and others who had no taste for reading always sought "diversion in the houses of *les dames gallants*."³⁹⁶ Thus, it is not surprising that Graves was obsessive about the children's performance in reading and writing. He read letters

³⁹² Margaret L. Graves to Charles I. Graves, November 13, 1876, Graves Papers.

³⁹³ Charles I. Graves to Margaret L. Graves, August 27, 1876, and November 27, 1875, Graves Papers.

³⁹⁴ Charles I. Graves to Margaret L. Graves, December 10, 1875, Graves Papers.

³⁹⁵ Charles I. Graves to Margaret L. Graves, February 16, 1877, Graves Papers.

³⁹⁶ Charles I. Graves to Margaret L. Graves, August 2, 1876, Graves Papers.

from them with joy and critically revised them, marking all the mistakes to be fixed. For example, he found one of Iverson's letters "very creditable," while Willie's letter "was painfully careless" in his father's eyes. Then, the little Willie had to write an apology in which he said, "I am very sorry that the last letter I wrote you was not a neat one I will try to do better hereafter."³⁹⁷ In another letter, he expressed his delight with Iverson's penmanship and encouraged him to write more as "the only way to learn to write well and fluently is by practice."³⁹⁸ Accordingly, he instructed his wife to tell their little Lillie "never to marry a man who can't write a good long letter."³⁹⁹ These fatherly concerns and warnings were similar to his fellow Derrick's instructions to his children. For instance, warning his elder son aged 21, he clearly put that if a man failed in youth to prepare himself by learning, it would "behoove him to fight the harder." A man "may not often become a philosopher, a poet or a scholar," he believed, but he could become "equally as useful and much more profitable" with proper training.⁴⁰⁰

His paternal concerns and the distress due to distance made Graves reconsider his decision not to bring his family to Cairo. Yet, he always reminded himself their decision was right at the expense of his fears. Insisting there was no society that he would be willing for them to interact, he believed his children should have been in the United States for various reasons.⁴⁰¹ First, it was a dangerous climate for children, and there were no schools suitable for them. But most importantly,

³⁹⁷ Charles I. Graves to Margaret L. Graves, September 13, 1876, Graves Papers

³⁹⁸ Charles I. Graves to Margaret L. Graves, July 7, 1876, Graves Papers.

³⁹⁹ Charles I. Graves to Margaret L. Graves, November 19, 1875, Graves Papers.

⁴⁰⁰ Henry C. Derrick to Martha Derrick, September 15, 1876, Derrick Papers.

⁴⁰¹ Charles I. Graves to Margaret L. Graves, August 14, 1875, Graves Papers.

according to him, the moral atmosphere was bad. "I would not willingly let my children remain in a country where every man keeps from one to four women," he wrote to Margaret, trapping into the Orientalist clichés about the households.⁴⁰² Astonished to see Lockett's children were growing up with the words harem or eunuchs, and no sabbath keeping, he concluded that Egypt could have been a most delightful country to live in for adults, but it was not so for the little ones.⁴⁰³ Thus, instead of bringing the whole family to Cairo, Margaret and he planned to meet in Cairo, leaving the children in the United States. Their plan was leaving Iverson, Willie and Mary at Leesburg with their uncles, and Annie and Robbie with the grandparents. As Graves observed that ladies could travel alone on the ocean steamers, he assured his wife that she would have no difficulty in sailing by herself. The enthusiastic husband even documented and calculated all details of the proposed voyage, and envisioned traveling expenses would be about 200 dollars.⁴⁰⁴

However, Margaret was not hopeful as her husband was, and she would be disinclined by time. First, she was not sure about the idea of leaving children with their grandparents. "You know she would take them gladly," she wrote to her husband, but the grandfather was weak, and he would not be able to take care of them. Then Margaret's brother proposed to take three eldest children to board with him for about twelve dollars each a month.⁴⁰⁵ However, she felt uneasy that her voyage would necessitate a greater outlay than Graves could afford because the

⁴⁰² Charles I. Graves to Margaret L. Graves, October 27, 1876, Graves Papers.

⁴⁰³ Charles I. Graves to Margaret L. Graves, November 6, 1875, Graves Papers.

⁴⁰⁴ Charles I. Graves to Margaret L. Graves, October 1, 1875, and November 19, 1875, Graves Papers.

⁴⁰⁵ Margaret L. Graves to Charles I. Graves, August 17, 1876, Graves Papers.

children's expenses would be unavoidably more. Also, the transatlantic travel would render her items of expense considerably more.⁴⁰⁶ Indeed, maternal concerns were more at play in her reluctance like the Colonel had paternal ones. "Suppose you and I should die during the separation from our darling children," she asked, "what would become of them?" She answered her own question dramatically:

I think there are very few who would take cheerfully into their homes and hearts little orphans left as ours would be, homeless and dependent. This thought clings to me and I am almost ready to say I cannot leave our little ones — do not imagine I am gloomy or despondent. I am only very serious, anxious to do my duty alike to my husband and children [...] I earnestly pray that God will direct us to do our duty in this matter and enable us to sacrifice every selfish motive for the good of the precious children He has given us.⁴⁰⁷

Moreover, as she had maternal duties to her children, she was also responsible for her parents whose health had deteriorated recently. She reported that her father was not in good health, and both needed someone with them.⁴⁰⁸ Finally, she decided not to go to Egypt, thinking that it was "the wisest and the best." According to her, while it was "a severe, a grievous disappointment," they should not have hesitated when "the path of duty was so plain." Margaret asked his husband not to try convincing her as it would "require all her strength and determination not to obey the joyful summons," and she would shrink from such a test. "Am I getting rebellious?" she asked in a lengthy letter and explained her motivations: "I would suffer many [...] disappointments and trials to relieve you of the thorn of debt. I have thought a good deal lately about this matter and was fast coming to the conclusion that you were so anxious to give me a delightful trip that you had let that desire run ahead of your

⁴⁰⁶ Margaret L. Graves to Charles I. Graves, September 4, 1876, Graves Papers.

⁴⁰⁷ Margaret L. Graves to Charles I. Graves, September 11, 1876, Graves Papers.

⁴⁰⁸ Margaret L. Graves to Charles I. Graves, September 4, 1876, Graves Papers.

judgement.”⁴⁰⁹ Fighting inside, she told in a letter dated September 1876, how much she yearned for her husband’s presence, but pointed out simply that her love made her unselfish, and thus asked him not to think her “cold and indifferent” to his wishes. In the same letter she plainly described her longing without hiding anything:

How fully do I understand the depth of meaning in those words hungering, thirsting for I am lonely, darling, oh so lonely, and I so tired waiting for your coming. I cannot write all I would say – would I could whisper the sweet words, the tender thoughts which fill my heart tonight. Would that “with face answering to face” you could read the love I bear you – ah, you might see it on the cheek, on the lip, in the eye – but you would not need these to prove its intensity – but I must not dwell on this – for a great continent and a great ocean lie between us.⁴¹⁰

In another letter, Margaret again expressed her sentiments with a similar intensity. Praying for strength to cope with her weariness, she was mentally tormented between the idea of her husband’s loneliness and the conditions that did not allow her to sail to Egypt. “I strive to keep the thought of your lonely life out of my heart,” she told him, resembling her love to the light “stream in through prison bars” and themselves heart-hungry: “Let the tears which blister this page testify of my sympathy for you in your lonely life that thought can never come without sad tears. I weep not for myself as weep for you [...] May God help us to bear all this weariness.”⁴¹¹

After all, Graves abandoned all hopes of seeing his “Chichi” in Egypt, which stared him full in the face. Telling he had been taken up many obstacles in Egypt, he accepted that her decision might be for the best. Yet, he stressed touchingly that it was hard to bring his “heart to understand that eighteen months more must drag their weary length” before seeing his “Chichi.” He promised her not to think of such a

⁴⁰⁹ Margaret L. Graves to Charles I. Graves, September 14, 1876, Graves Papers.

⁴¹⁰ Margaret L. Graves to Charles I. Graves, September 7, 1876, Graves Papers.

⁴¹¹ Margaret L. Graves to Charles I. Graves, November 16, 1876, Graves Papers.

contingency, no matter “how sweet might be the thought, for such hopes, took deep a hold on (his) heart.” He feared, if such hopes could not be eradicated, they would take possession of his mind and distract him from his personal mission.⁴¹² At least, without a happy reunion in Cairo, Graves still relieved to know his family was surrounded by friends, and that children would have so many advantages for improvement.⁴¹³ According to him, Caswell was the very place where they could get assistance in any problem. However, he repeatedly instructed his wife to ignore their “corn-bread and butter-milk” relatives, for they thought he had deserted them. The Colonel also struggled to protect her family’s dignity and rights from Cairo. For example, after Margaret’s father died, her brother George tried to get the estate and told her she was living for years on their mother’s earnings. Being annoyed, Graves stated clearly that she would never put herself in her brother’s house. “If he supposes that he can presume upon any kinship [...] to insult you,” he said, “he will find himself fearfully mistaken.” He saw such conduct as cowardly and a direct assault to his own dignity:

I now warn him of his dangers if he heeds it not, let the consequences rest upon his own head [...] To force himself into my wife’s presence during my absence and to make such a speech as that to her, I consider a cowardly, dastardly act [...] He must remember not that he is my cousin nor you the step-daughter of his father, but that I am a man and you are my wife.⁴¹⁴

⁴¹² Charles I. Graves to Margaret L. Graves, December 12, 1876, Graves Papers.

⁴¹³ Charles I. Graves to Margaret L. Graves, July 10, 1875, Graves Papers.

⁴¹⁴ Charles I. Graves to Margaret L. Graves, August 30, 1877, Graves Papers.

6.5. An Honorable Discharge

Graves's path to economic triumph was not free from thorns and reflected similar problems as his fellows experienced. After the first year, for example, payments became a problem with Egypt's declining economy. His first account of "no pay" came just after the sending of troops to Turkey which "absorbed all the cash in the War Department."⁴¹⁵ Yet, he was still comfortable, as his payment was accumulating there and the advance that they took had not then expired. Writing "I have no fears about my pay," he acknowledged the financial problems during the wars and assured Margaret that "under these circumstances, money is tight, like it would be in any other country in the world."⁴¹⁶ He repeatedly asked her not to give herself any uneasiness about the payments, and secured her that he was cheerful over his affairs as he ever was.⁴¹⁷ Likewise, Derrick told his wife that the interest on the immense public debt and the great expenses attending the maintaining the Egyptian troops in Turkey absorbed "every dollar that can be raked or scraped together or extorted from the people" in Egypt, and, consequently, money was hard to get as it appeared to be in the United States. However, he was also hopeful that they would obtain all that was due them.⁴¹⁸ Nevertheless, for some Americans in the Khedive's service, the new situation was not bearable. Field, for example, "was exceedingly amazed at not

⁴¹⁵ Charles I. Graves to Margaret L. Graves, July 16, 1876, and August 23, 1876, Graves Papers.

⁴¹⁶ Charles I. Graves to Margaret L. Graves, August 23, 1876, Graves Papers.

⁴¹⁷ Charles I. Graves to Margaret L. Graves, October 6, 1876, Graves Papers.

⁴¹⁸ Henry C. Derrick to Martha Derrick, August 3, 1877, and September 21, 1877, Derrick Papers.

getting his money,” as Mrs. Field wrote, she was out of money and did not know what to do.⁴¹⁹

However, Graves’s patience was not infinite. After frequent delays and no payment on the horizon, he acknowledged that the Egyptian sojourn was coming to an end. In fact, most of the Americans in the army were already discharged by late 1877, and there were rumors that others would be dismissed because of the financial arrangements which had cut down the expenses, reduced the army, and made many native officers paid on half.⁴²⁰ Yet, Graves did not plan to resign even if he was not paid in time. “For several reasons I should like to remain till the expiration of my term” he explained, “I think it a duty that I owe to myself and to my family, a solemn duty, to remain, until every cent of debt is paid, and I have enough to start me at Maury.” He wanted Margaret to understand that a few months more in the service would make him entirely free from debt, with money to stock the farm, furnish the house, and to support the family for at least one year.⁴²¹ However, he would not be surprised if some of them were discharged in the reduction, even though, as Colonel Derrick put, the salaries of the few American officers were just “a drop in the bucket.”⁴²² Graves was confident for the six months extra pay would nearly put him “out of the wilderness.”⁴²³ If he were discharged, the Colonel would return to New York with almost 4,000 dollars in his pocket; hence, it would not be a misfortune for

⁴¹⁹ Charles I. Graves to Margaret L. Graves, November 21, 1876, Graves Papers.

⁴²⁰ Charles I. Graves to Margaret L. Graves, October 2, 1876, Graves Papers.

⁴²¹ Charles I. Graves to Margaret L. Graves, May 28, 1877, Graves Papers.

⁴²² Henry C. Derrick to Martha Derrick, February 23, 1877, Derrick Papers.

⁴²³ Charles I. Graves to Margaret L. Graves, October 6, 1876, Graves Papers.

him, as it could be for some Americans.⁴²⁴ Margaret supported her husband's plans, for she believed he was master of the situation and "made the greatest sacrifices to secure success."⁴²⁵ "It will all be right, whichever way it is," she said in another letter, assuring him that they ought to be cheerful and happy in the end.⁴²⁶

The discharge of American officers brought another point into consideration. It was a concern among the staff whether they would be discharged in an honorable way. For example, Field, then colonel, was discharged in late March "in consequence of the necessity of reducing Army."⁴²⁷ None in the American group knew why he was dismissed. Moreover, Graves asked, if it was to reduce the government's expenses, which was a very good reason according to him, why were others not discharged. Americans thought there was something behind the scenes that they did not see. In addition to the financial problems awaiting him at home, Fields's greater distress was, however, that it was seen "he was regarded as the least worthy" in the mercenary group. Graves reported that his fellow felt disgraced to go back home when all the rest were kept in Egypt. Americans wanted to urge the Khedive, through the consulate, to grant Field a leave of absence for six months, and to decorate him with an order so that he would tender his resignation at the end. In this way, he would have "tangible proof that he was not in disgrace and that he quitted the service by resignation."⁴²⁸

⁴²⁴ Charles I. Graves to Margaret L. Graves, October 11, 1876, Graves Papers.

⁴²⁵ Margaret L. Graves to Charles I. Graves, October 19, 1876, Graves Papers.

⁴²⁶ Margaret L. Graves to Charles I. Graves, October 23, 1876, Graves Papers.

⁴²⁷ Charles I. Graves to Margaret L. Graves, March 26, 1877, Graves Papers.

⁴²⁸ Charles I. Graves to Margaret L. Graves, March 31, 1877, Graves Papers.

In this case, Field blamed General Stone, complaining that he never “imagined such timidity in any man,” and he resembled the General to “a school boy who wants to tell the master something but is afraid to.”⁴²⁹ According to Field this was a “shameful outrage” put upon him.⁴³⁰ Graves also protested such a condescending attitude towards his fellow. “Look at the case of White,” he told Margaret, “continually drunk and disgracing himself [...] we all begged that he be discharged, for he was giving us all a bad name” but he was given absence while Field was not.⁴³¹ On the other hand, Graves suspected General Loring of that injustice, as Mrs. Stone reportedly told that Loring blamed him for being a “coward” for he failed to hurry up from Massawa until the Gura Battle was over. Graves found such secretly slandering mean as Loring had once stated in his official report that Field rendered a noble service. “If Field were to hear of it,” Graves predicted, “he would hold Loring to a very strict account and rightly too.”⁴³²

The discharges were not limited to Field. As of July 6, 1878, only Graves and Stone kept their positions in the army. Reportedly, Derrick and Dye were pleased with their discharge while Ward regretted, and Loshe was miserable, as it meant starvation to him. According to Graves, his extravagant fellow already had eaten his cake and then wished he had kept it. Graves added that Loring tried to be seen happy with the decision and asked everybody to congratulate him that he was out of the service, but he looked haggard, and all Americans knew that “he would do anything in the world

⁴²⁹ Charles W. Field to Charles I. Graves, April 10, 1877, Graves Papers.

⁴³⁰ Charles W. Field to Charles I. Graves, April 21, 1877, Graves Papers.

⁴³¹ Charles I. Graves to Margaret L. Graves, July 8, 1877, Graves Papers.

⁴³² Charles I. Graves to Margaret L. Graves, January 29, 1878, Graves Papers.

to get back.” When he saw there was no return, the General put a claim against the Khedive for 27,500 dollars for all the expenses, which people thought he lost his mind while his fellow Americans knew that he was “one forth crazy from the effects of his recent dissolute life and three-fourths scoundrel.”⁴³³

Graves thought his sojourn should have come to an end soon, even though Stone assured him he would not be discharged without consent. Finally, an official letter dated July 22 granted him an “honorable discharge.” As a mark of his “high degree of satisfaction” with the “loyal and distinguished services” of Colonel Graves, the Khedive, conferred upon him the decoration of the Order of the Medjidie. The decoration report also included Stone’s testimony to “the faithful, intelligent and valuable service” of the Georgian Colonel during his entire term of service in the Egyptian Army, namely serving in the Abyssinian Campaign in 1876, commanding the reconnaissance expedition to Cape Guardafui in 1878, and working as the Chief of the Third Section (Topographical Bureau) for a time.⁴³⁴ Extremely gratified that His Highness had publicly shown his appreciation, he was also granted an extra six months payment which was more than he was entitled to in his contract. Graves was proud of having a “very good opinion of everybody” in Egypt, “not only a very scientific officer but a gentleman of culture and a capital fellow.”⁴³⁵

Finally, Graves had a check in his pocket for all dues, including six months in advance and 75 pounds for traveling expenses. He wrote home cheerfully that he “he

⁴³³ Charles I. Graves to Margaret L. Graves, July 18, 1878, Graves Papers.

⁴³⁴ War Office Bureau of the General Staff Cairo to Charles I. Graves, 22 July 1878, Graves Papers.

⁴³⁵ Charles I. Graves to Margaret L. Graves, January 19, 1877, Graves Papers.

had in a satchel slung from my shoulder 514 golden sovereigns, 1,000 golden half-sovereigns and 500 Egyptian silver coins: equal to one thousand and nine teen pounds sterling” when he left the Egyptian Finance Ministry the for his payments.” This sum, he hoped, “by close economy and management” would enable him to pay off his debts after clearing the mortgage, to furnish their house and to buy some few essentials for farming. In other words, he would have one thousand dollars over “for future education of the children” when he arrived at Locust Hill, realizing the calculations which he had estimated almost a year earlier.⁴³⁶

Before his leave, General Stone assured Graves that he would always remember him with very great pleasure of their official and personal relations, adding that the younger fellow was “an officer whose conduct and service added reputation to the American name.” According to Graves, Stone’s emphasis on his deeds and the national image implied “that some other officers have not added reputation to the American name” in this foreign land. However, he would not like to “repeat anything of that nature told to [him] in confidence.”⁴³⁷ Graves perfectly summarized his Egyptian sojourn in one of the last letters stamped in Cairo. “I am very glad to come to you under such happy conditions,” he wrote, “having all my money and a right snug sum too; with a decoration and having in my possession two very complimentary letters—one from the Chief of the General Staff, and the other from the Secretary of the Khedive, and written by order of His Highness.” According to

⁴³⁶ Charles I. Graves to Margaret L. Graves, July 23, 1878, and May 5, 1877, Graves Papers.

⁴³⁷ Charles I. Graves to Margaret L. Graves, July 23, 1878, Graves Papers.

him, Derrick and himself were the only two really happy men in leaving Egypt, and there was “nothing but pleasant memories behind” him in Egypt.⁴³⁸

Graves sailed to New York on July 23 on the steamer *Meera* of Moss Line, with three loads of items.⁴³⁹ He sent a letter home from Malta where he had learned the bombardment of Fort Sumter onboard *Iraqiuous* years ago. The return then had brought devastation to his career, and his life changed dramatically. Now, however, it would bring hope and glory as he expressed confidently: “I often think what a different welcome I will receive on my return this time from the one in 1864!”⁴⁴⁰

This remark demonstrates, once more, that his self-assessment of worth relied on a watching public, as Wyatt-Brown has asserted in the context of earning or reclaiming honor.⁴⁴¹

“Chichi” met her husband in Jersey City in late August. It was a long-awaited and happy reunion, “the sacred joy” of which could not be conveyed with words, as she stated in her reminiscences. Their farm, Maury, was “comfortably arranged” for a living, making it a pleasant home. Being sure it would abundantly support his family and leave a surplus to accumulate, Graves often contrasted his condition with what it would have been had he not served in the ancient lands, and proudly congratulated themselves on the undertaking of the Egyptian sojourn while enjoying its fruits.⁴⁴²

Indeed, “with a master hand,” Margaret believed, the farm soon blossomed as the

⁴³⁸ Charles I. Graves to Margaret L. Graves, July 24, 1878, Graves Papers.

⁴³⁹ Charles I. Graves, diary entry, July 23, 1877, and undated list of “Freight for Georgia 1878” (probably last week of March 1878), Graves Papers.

⁴⁴⁰ Charles I. Graves to Margaret L. Graves, July 25, 1878, Graves Papers.

⁴⁴¹ Bertram Wyatt-Brown, “Honor’s History across the Academy,” *Historically Speaking* 3, no. 5 (June 2002): 13.

⁴⁴² Charles I. Graves to Margaret L. Graves, June 4, 1877, and July 1, 1877, Graves Papers.

rose and “the happiest years of [their] lives were spent at Maury,” with the children and grandchildren, who grew up to youthhood there.⁴⁴³ The railroad boom of the 1880s, however, would mean another short-distance sojourn for Graves when he was rewardingly employed. According to R. Scott Huffard, this new adventure was appropriate that Graves spent the bulk of the decade on the New South’s battleground of railroad construction as another form of fighting for his state.⁴⁴⁴

6.6. Conclusion

Charles Iverson Graves died on October 31, 1896, of heart trouble, which, according to his wife, was hastened by “the heat of the African sun.” He was one of the last prominent Southerners to apply for a pardon to remove the ban on official positions incurred by his participation in the war. However, as a local journalist friend put in a dramatic fashion, “the sturdy old soldier” was in failing health and was “completing his voyage across the gulf of time and the shores of eternity were almost in sight” when the pardon came. A local paper which reported on his health on a daily basis announced his death, stating Rome lost another of its best citizens and the country one of its most prominent figures.⁴⁴⁵

One can assuredly claim Graves’s Egyptian sojourn demonstrated a success story in getting rid of “financial embarrassment,” which the proud officer faced during

⁴⁴³ Margaret Lea Graves, “Reminiscences of Margaret Lea Graves,” 19, Graves Papers.

⁴⁴⁴ R. Scott Huffard, “Perilous Connections: Railroads, Capitalism and Mythmaking in the New South” (Ph.D Dissertation, University of Florida, 2013), 72.

⁴⁴⁵ Montgomery M. Folsom, “Soldier of Fortune. Late Colonel Charles Iverson Graves was Fond of Battle,” undated newspaper clipping; “A Splendid Career was Ended in the Death of Colonel Graves,” *Rome Tribune*, November 5, 1896, Graves Papers.

Reconstruction. He embraced his “manifest destiny,” in this scheme and managed to set up a new life for his family back in Georgia in the end, thus reclaiming his dignity in masculine and paternalistic terms. His Egyptian service, which completed a kaleidoscopic military career under three flags, also enabled him to reclaim his professional worth with a high degree of commitment and achievement. That is, with the three years absence from his beloveds, he accomplished what the society which equated wealth and honor would expect, carried out his familial obligations as a proud husband/father, and diligently proved his professional expertise, which was recognized by his superiors and authorities in this foreign land.

CHAPTER VII

RECONSTRUCTING THE *AMERICAN* IN EGYPT

“Each fought for what he deemed the people’s good,
And proved his bravery by his offered life,
And sealed his honor with his outpoured blood.”
– Richard Watson Gilder⁴⁴⁶

The entire story of Civil War veterans in Egypt came to a definite end with the British control in the country and the subsequent departure of Charles Stone in 1883. Their experience would later echo in lecture halls and daily papers reporting individual versions of the “Arabian nights,” over the course of the following decade. After the end of their Egyptian service, in most cases, their contributions to geographical societies continued to bond them together.⁴⁴⁷ However, not merely

⁴⁴⁶ Richard Watson Gilder, “To the Spirit of Abraham Lincoln,” *The Poems of Richard Watson Gilder* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1908), 163.

⁴⁴⁷ Besides the geographical, military, and scientific (but also sensational) accounts, the Egyptian sojourn of the Civil War veterans provided a charming setting for a few fictions. Richard Henry Savage of New York, for example, mixed the Oriental charm and his own experience in three works. “In the Esbekieyeh Gardens,” published in 1901 when his fellow Americans already “have folded their tents like the Arabs” is reminiscent of his life in “the land of lotus” while he served as a military secretary to the General Staff in 1872. Tracing the tragic death of Paul Villemont, a “gallant Louisianan” and a “chivalric veteran of Appomattox,” the detective story gives a glimpse of life

adventure chronicles tailored for an American audience, these accounts emphasize an important legacy for the American social history. They show how the ex-Confederate-Union solidarity in Egypt symbolized the reality that Reconstruction extended far beyond American borders—that collaboration, compassion, and cooperation between former enemies was possible under the most unimaginable conditions. Their records demonstrate that the American reconciliation in this micro-level included an extant sectional pride with occasional echoes of the recent war and a salient image of reestablished American fraternity. Focusing on the psychological and cultural foundations of this reconciliation, this chapter presents a transnational aspect of the veterans’ studies, contributing to the literature about their motivations to take arms, how they interpreted the notion of duty (to the country, state, army, or family) and how the emotional readiness (or empathy) worked in their rapprochement in Egypt. Including the pre-war reflections and dilemmas the Civil War veterans had opens a new window into the Egyptian sojourn, which provides a fuller picture to understand their experiences as individuals or a group. This broader examination of war-related themes distinguishes this dissertation from the earlier body of works concerning the American mercenary service.

during the “time of the fatuous Ismail Pasha” and mentions several American officers, with Colonel William H. Ward and Savage’s himself as two of the main characters. In *In the Shadow of the Pyramids*, the West Pointer officer, diplomat, and author used a “happy mixture of audacity and ignorance” untrammelled by facts. The novel’s main character was exposed to mortal danger daily, favoring a theatrical setting in Egypt, as a literary critic pointed out. Richard Henry Savage, *In the Esbekieyeh Gardens and Other Stories* (New York: Home Publishing Company, 1901); *An Egyptian Tragedy and Other Stories* (1901); *In the Shadow of the Pyramids. The Last Days of Ismail Khedive* (Chicago and New York: Rand, McNally and Co. Publishers, 1897); *The Literary World* 29, no. 10, ed. Edward Abbott (Boston: Samuel R. Crocker, May 14, 1898), 185.

7.1. Psychological and Cultural Foundations of Reconciliation

“Reconstructing the American” in Egypt could not be reduced only to the effective cooperation of former belligerents in the African deserts, Abyssinian plateaus or the offices of the Third Section (Topographical Bureau) of the General Staff. A closer look at the socio-cultural background and the individual/psychological foundations of this reconciliation provides a better understanding of how they were able to form a single body in Egypt.

In this context, West Point and Annapolis fraternities played a principal role. Many of the seniors in the mercenary group were professionally trained army/navy officers who had spent their formative years in the same physical and intellectual atmosphere, and many fought together for the same flag prior to the secession.⁴⁴⁸ They were nineteen in total, with sixteen West Point and three Annapolis graduates. Ten men fought for the Union, and nine wore gray during the Civil War. These numbers also reflect the sectional balance in the whole veteran group (twenty-one Confederates and twenty Union veterans). The academies had an important impact on the cadets’ lives because they nationalized the officer corps by bringing young men together from every state. The institutions also gave the cadets a continuous military ethos, which made all graduates absorb the same value system to some extent; therefore, the set of shared experiences forged friendships with fellow alumni and fostered loyalties to such fraternities.⁴⁴⁹ Indeed, West Point was a small

⁴⁴⁸ See Cullum for the individual entries, and Hesseltine and Wolf, 253-260.

⁴⁴⁹ Matthew Moten, *The Delafield Commission and the American Military Profession* (Texas: Texas A&M University Press, 2000), 44.

community in which most would know the reputation of the former graduates, and the senior West Pointers on both sides during the war most likely had more in common than their differences.

This fraternization was emphasized by the Academy members, including Robert E. Lee who was the superintendent of the institution in 1852. Lee often described the cadets as a “band of brothers” regardless of their origins.⁴⁵⁰ In 1824, the Board of Visitors had also reported, “cadets coming from every section of the country contribute much to the extirpation of local prejudices and sectional antipathies.”⁴⁵¹ Accordingly, the shared experience which brought a sense of solidarity and similar gestures of intersectional fraternity, made West Point the last establishment in the country to split, and one of the first ones to reunite.⁴⁵² Indeed, the majority of the Southerners did not go with the Confederacy when the states seceded: 168 graduates appointed from Southern states joined “rebellion,” while 162 defended the Union out of the 330 serving.⁴⁵³ Moreover, an alumni association composed of members from both armies was established in as early as 1869 for “fraternal fellowship,” proving the strong bonds that the academy members had.⁴⁵⁴

⁴⁵⁰ Paul Kensey, “West Point Classmates – Civil War Enemies,” https://www.americancivilwar.asn.au/meet/2002_10_mtg_westpt_classmates_enemies.pdf (retrieved June 25, 2020); See, Ellsworth Eliot Jr, *West Point in the Confederacy* (New York: G.A. Baker, 1941).

⁴⁵¹ “State Papers. Report of the Board of Visitors on the Last Examination.” *National Government Journal and Register of Official Papers* 1, no. 37 (July 17, 1824), 577.

⁴⁵² Stephen E. Ambrose, *Duty, Honor, Country: A History of West Point* (Baltimore and London: The John Hopkins University Press, 1999), 189.

⁴⁵³ James S. Robbins, *Last in Their Class: Custer, Pickett and the Goats of West Point* (New York: Encounter Books, 2017), 206.

⁴⁵⁴ David A. Pinder, “The Healing Years. West Point Association of Graduates,” *Assembly*, November 1994, 31.

Another point, which is also related to the academy impact, is not less significant than the mentioned bonds. War-time correspondence and later statements of several alumni demonstrate that their reaction after April 1861 could not be characterized by a certain ideological stance from the beginning. This initial position, however, would not amount to a disloyalty to their respective states, as these men were morally obliged to perform what they were supposed to. After all, the Confederacy was their country, and “they felt a sense of duty of this country that had called them to defend its very existence” like their fellowmen, as James McPherson points out.⁴⁵⁵

Annapolis graduate Graves, for example, expressed his dilemma in a letter to his aunt Mary, dated 1861: “I feel almost broken hearted at the sad condition of our country. If the two sections separate, peaceably even, they at once fall to third rate or fourth rate powers, whose voices [...] will be of scarcely more importance [sic] than that of Mexico.” Yet, he concluded the letter declaring he would never fight against the South despite his concerns and his oath to the United States. According to him, a young man could not reject the demand even though he disagreed with it. Graves would also ask his cousin “Maggie” (Margaret Lea) to destroy his “Union letters,” in which –presumably– he was critical of the crisis and maintained a pro-Union stance.⁴⁵⁶ The young naval officer would finally wear gray only after his future-wife Margaret, a self-described “hotheaded little Southern girl,” had declined to marry “a man who stayed on the other side and did not come to share his country’s weal and woe” when, without exception, “every male relative and friend” of hers was in the

⁴⁵⁵ James M. McPherson, *What They Fought For, 1861-1865* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1994), 11.

⁴⁵⁶ Charles I. Graves to Aunt Mary, March 16, 1861, and Charles I. Graves to Cousin Maggie, January 7, 1862, Graves Papers.

army.⁴⁵⁷ Urged to take quick action, Graves finally resigned from the United States Navy, even though he recollected that his admission to the naval service was the “most fortunate event in his career.”⁴⁵⁸ His note to the Georgia governor upon the secession was a strong demonstration of duty’s command on the individual aspirations: “Being a citizen of Georgia and knowing she has need of all her sons to enable her to maintain her independence,” he stated, “I respectfully tender her [...] my services in any capacity you may think proper to employ me.”⁴⁵⁹

On his part, Lockett remembered his own “terrible duty,” which he had to perform “with the deepest regret.” Calling it the saddest journey of his life, he wrote an article for *Nation*, demonstrating the dilemma he had abruptly faced:

I well remember the bitter, sleepless night in its contemplation before I could bring myself to its performance. My whole life’s dream of honor, usefulness, promotion, and perhaps fame as an officer of the Corps of Engineers was rudely dispelled. I saw perfectly clearly that all that I had toiled for at West Point for five long, hard years, and all the bright anticipations of an honorable career in the army [...] were gone forever. And yet the *duty* had to be done.⁴⁶⁰

In his response to the editor in regard to calling the Southerners “rebels,” Lockett strongly emphasized the loyalty, fidelity, and devotion in his decision to quit the United States Army to join “the rebellion,” telling the “truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth” in his words. According to him, it was a duty even though many did not desire to follow the verdict of their fate, which raises another motivation for their post-war search for honor, namely repressed or denied guilt:

Did I act like a traitor plotting treason and treachery? Was I a cruel conspirator engaged in a deep-laid scheme to destroy the United States

⁴⁵⁷ Margaret Lea Graves, “Reminiscences of Margaret Lea Graves,” 6, Graves Papers.

⁴⁵⁸ Charles I. Graves to Margaret L. Graves, December 16, 1875, Graves Papers.

⁴⁵⁹ Charles I. Graves to the Excellency Governor of Georgia, March 1861 (copy), Georgia Department of Archives and History to Margaurite B. Graves, November 25, 1959, Graves Papers.

⁴⁶⁰ Lockett, “West Pointers of the Confederate States Army,” 95.

Government? Was I ever false to my oath to support the Constitution of the United States, according to my understanding of it? I myself feel that none of these charges can be laid at my door [...] I can say today that I did nothing but what I conceived to be my duty. [...] It was a sacrifice of self from beginning to the end, from a sense of duty. And such I believe were the feelings and the sentiments of every West Pointer who left the Federal Army. [...] They left the army because their states seceded, and they believed it was their duty to do so. Many of them, like myself, may have doubted the policy of secession, many of them, I doubt not, were opposed to the secession; but when their states declared themselves out of the Union [...] nothing was left for most of the Southern officers.⁴⁶¹

Likewise, in an unpublished manuscript in which he presented “pen and ink pictures” from the life of soldiers, the Colonel refused the “rebel” label and asserted that in the very near future, “every true and generous-hearted American” would cheer with feeling of lofty pride and patriotism “the Star Spangled Banner/Long may it wave.” However, according to him, those would also be able to say, “without fear of tainting his loyalty” of the other banner, “furl that banner, softly, slowly [...] for it droops above the dead [...] Let it droop there, furled forever.”⁴⁶²

Speaking of his father, who was initially opposed to secession, Dr. Warren also stated, “the sacred soil of Virginia” was an object of supreme devotion, and his family members could never hesitate to take arms.⁴⁶³ After the war broke out, the doctor followed his father and returned to the South from Maryland, which rejected to join the Southern states, and held several positions in the medical service of the Confederacy, including surgeon general of North Carolina.⁴⁶⁴

⁴⁶¹ Ibid.

⁴⁶² Samuel Henry Lockett, “The Contrast of the War,” unpublished manuscript, undated, 16-17, Lockett Papers.

⁴⁶³ Warren, 15.

⁴⁶⁴ Roy T. Sawyer, “Dr. Edward Warren C.S.A Confederate Exile,” in *The Heritage of Tyrell County, North Carolina*, eds. Gwen A. White and Virginia C. Haire, vol. 1 (Tyrrell County Genealogical Society: Columbia, North Carolina, 2004), 119-120.

Graves's request of his letters to be cleared away, Lockett's reproaches, and Warren's objection raise the question, whether the ambiguity toward secession in the South was more common than the surviving evidence indicates, as Paul Quigley suggests. Quigley asserts it made sense for some Southerners to repress their Unionist inclinations and consent the unavoidable when secession became unquestionable.⁴⁶⁵ This "compromise" was also precisely what fell to those men's share, as unwilling soldiers, who embraced the duty as their watchword and tried never to fail to perform the same, as Lockett's sister told in regard to her unwilling brother.⁴⁶⁶ Yet, the sense of duty and accomplishment of the responsibilities was an aspect of honor, and in fact it overwhelmed the personal aspirations. In fact, as Wyatt-Brown points out, honor played a more significant role in the beginning of the Civil War than in any other fight.⁴⁶⁷

It should also be noted that these men's submission could be seen as a component of true masculine identity, as Margaret's sharp-tongued letter to his future husband Charles had implied. From this point, Lockett and Graves must have responded to prescriptions given to the Southern men. In other words, their "causes" were rather manifestations of loyalty, self-sacrifice, and courage like many other Civil War soldiers, which had less with the political ideology than social/traditional concerns.⁴⁶⁸ In this context, as an ultimate test for manhood, courage meant/was

⁴⁶⁵ Paul Quigley, *Shifting Grounds: Nationalism and the American South, 1848-1865* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), 124.

⁴⁶⁶ Hettie Lockett Marks, "Origin of the First Confederate Flag. A Sketch of Mrs. Napoleon Lockett," unpublished manuscript, 3, Lockett Papers.

⁴⁶⁷ Wyatt-Brown, "Honour, Irony, And Humiliation," 22-27.

⁴⁶⁸ Michael S. Kimmel, *Manhood in America: A Cultural History* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 7; Gerald F. Linderman, *Embattled Courage: The Experience of Combat in the American Civil War* (New York: The Free Press, 1987); Reid Mitchell, *Civil War Soldiers 1861-*

intertwined with bravery as well as manliness, godliness, duty, honor and knightliness—principles reflecting “a strong sense of idealism” embedded in a rural value system and transcending the particular issues involved in the war, as Linderman and Hess point out.⁴⁶⁹ That is, they felt an inevitable honor-bound, which made the individual embrace community judgments, avoiding any labeling of such as “Brave Stay-at-home-Light Guard,” which *Harpers Weekly* ridiculed those who refused to fight. In the drawing, the “stay-at-home” is armed with a broom, dustpan, and feather duster, while uniformed in a dress, hairbrush epaulets, and cooking-pot hat. By violating that social expectation for men, the “stay-at-home” was ridiculed as a coward hiding in the domestic role of a woman,⁴⁷⁰ at a time when the young girls on the home front “made flags of their party dresses, often bedewing them with their tears,” and when the women aided societies “sewing, knitting, and making lint of old linen, sending boxes of clothing and food to replenish the ever present needs” of their brothers on the battlefields.⁴⁷¹

In this regard, as Gaines M. Foster suggests, if women had turned against their men, Southern men’s concerns about their manhood would have been greater during the Civil War. Like Graves, Lockett had a dilemma about the manly conduct in this scheme. He had admitted that in war conditions, he became “very much tempted to become a desperado and prey upon the enemy in every possible way that a strong feeling of hate and vengeance could devise,” but he concluded that with his children

1865 (New York: Viking, 1988). However, in his classification of the motives, Pete Maslowksi regards the “duty to country” as an ideological motive. 315.

⁴⁶⁹ Linderman, 16; Hess, 473-74.

⁴⁷⁰ “Costume Suggested for the Brave Stay-at-Home ‘Light Guard,’” *Harper’s Weekly*, September 7, 1861, 576.

⁴⁷¹ Margaret Lea Graves, “Reminiscences of Margaret Lea Graves,” 5, Graves Papers.

who would look anxiously for their father's safe return, he had to take care of himself and protect them.⁴⁷² This also suggested a loss of shared purpose, which followed the disasters of the Confederates. In response to what her husband confessed were not "manly" opinions of desolation, Cornelia assured him in May 1865 that they could not repine, because he had graciously discharged his duty. Thus, he could "look any man in the face and call himself his equal." "I feel very much for you," she wrote in the final, "but know your proud and heart and clear conscience will need nothing from but loving sympathy and all our noble men will find that at home from our still nobler women."⁴⁷³ On the other hand, as a Northern born, Cornelia's sense of duty presented another big dilemma. She asked her husband dramatically if it was her duty to ignore her homeland, friends or many associations of her youth and adopt the South as her country because it was his. "It is my duty to forget habits contracted in my Northern home and become in every way a Southerner!" she cried, "tell me, how must I feel towards the Yankees!"⁴⁷⁴

7.2. Reflections about Abolition

Ex-Confederates in Egyptian service did not see the existence of slavery as their motivation to take arms, yet justified it as a "benevolent institution" as many contemporaries did. For example, in a forty-nine pages pre-war pamphlet titled *Problems of Free Society*, Colston had attempted to refute "one of the wildest

⁴⁷² Samuel H. Lockett to [Cornelia] Lockett, April 19, 1865 and [Cornelia] to Lockett, May 4, 1865), cited in Gaines M. Foster, *Ghosts of the Confederacy: Defeat, the Lost Cause, and the Emergence of the New South* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1987), 29, 12. Foster cited Lockett's wife's name Julia.

⁴⁷³ [Cornelia] Lockett to Samuel H. Lockett, May 4, 1865, cited in Foster, 29.

⁴⁷⁴ G. Ward Hubbs, *Guarding Greensboro: A Confederate Company in the Making of a Southern Community* (Athens and London: University of Georgia Press, 2003), 192.

assertions repeated with an assurance.” Claiming the free societies had been afflicted with several evils, he rejected the superiority of the free-labor systems to those slavery prevailed. According to him, opponents of slavery ignored “by a strange inconsistency” the high rates of unemployment, dwelling problems, child labor, inhumane conditions of many sorts. Giving the example of the peasant in England, who were “deprived of all instructions, all enjoyment of the sports, sleep etc.” and who grew up “without decency, without comfort, without hope,” he observed the English boasted of their liberty, but there was no liberty for the poor classes, stating “these men whom you call free because you don’t see their owner in a tangible shape slaves to a master are more remorseless than the most cruel of West India slave drivers and his home is *hunger*.” For him, the modern laborer was “a slave worse than a slave,” because he meant no value to anyone. Asserting “the great majority are free in name, but in reality slaves,” Colston continued: “This is the most fearful sense of the word; for they are always the slaves, not of men who are by their nature merciful, but of the things which cannot feel or exercise mercy [...] shall we free our colored slaves in order to make ourselves all slaves together?”⁴⁷⁵ These rhetorical remarks were common to many fellow Southerners who justified the peculiar institution with their own experience and observation or portrayed it as a patriarchal mechanism and a lesser evil.

Likewise, Dr. Warren would voice this approach in retrospect. Speaking of their former slave named William, Warren recollected that this guy was a gentleman of quality with the suavity of manner, freedom from guile, and great natural intelligence. On the other hand, the former master celebrated his submission and

⁴⁷⁵ Raleigh Edward Colston, *Problems of Free Society* (n.p: undated), 1, 6, 7, 10, 12-13, 20, 48, Colston Papers.

obedience, expressing proudly that he never forgot his place and neglected any duty, “which his lot in life imposed.” In his memoir, the doctor prided himself on being a friend of blacks, judging they possessed some excellent traits of character. He applauded the conduct of former slaves, which was “admirable beyond precedent or parallel,” as they remained apparently disinterested spectators of the scene, “laboring with their wonted fidelity and protecting the women and the children of their masters who were really fighting against their most essential interests.” He believed a “greater docility, devotion to duty and disregard of selfish considerations” were never chronicled before in the history. Warren emphasized that the abolition of slavery was not to be regretted even by those who had lost heavily in the premises. However, it was not because the evils attributed to this system, as told in the “pure inventions” in abolitionist romances such as Harriet Beecher Stowe’s *Uncle Tom’s Cabin* (1852) which were “concocted for party purposes,” and he asserted that the blacks in the pre-war South were certainly better fed, clothed and cared for than the laborers of any country; thus, their masters were, indeed, subjected to a heavier expense. Reminding Colston’s thoughts on the contrast between free labor and slavery, Warren also rejected the charges of cruelty in general and blamed the “bad advisors” in case of problems.⁴⁷⁶

Interestingly enough, the “unreconstructed rebel” Colonel Derrick wrote little about this topic even though he was critical of everything in the new South. His general discontent, however, can be read in between of lines, when he expressed, for example, “the humiliation and reconstruction of the South will have been completed

⁴⁷⁶ Warren, 121.

when the daughter of some distinguished Southern gentleman to marry a negro.”⁴⁷⁷ Still, he would make his position clear in his journal. Speaking of the North, he emphasized, “hypocritical Yankees” cried over *Uncle Tom’s Cabin*, while the Northern capital abused the workers in the factories “who were treated worse than slaves in the South.”⁴⁷⁸

Colston, Warren, and Derrick’s remarks show they had no problem both in the bondage seeing it a win-win formula and in subsequent abolition. Of course, their endorsement by silence could probably be a reflection of the zeitgeist. Chaillé-Long’s concerns about Egyptian abolition, however, give some concrete ideas regarding the domestic parallel without directly referring to it. When Khedive issued a decree outlawing slavery in Egypt, the American officer opposed the reform, asserting that the former slaves would interpret freedom as a license to idleness. Chaillé-Long predicted that the government’s attempt to care for freed slaves would be “a source of great expense to the Government of Egypt” when it became generally known that they were “emancipated.”⁴⁷⁹ At a banquet given before his departure from Khartoum to Gondokoro, the Colonel recalled he “stole away from the parental eye to Uncle Tom’s cabin, there to revel in childish delight in the dance, banjo, and plantation melodies of the happy Sambo.”⁴⁸⁰

As Covey points out, abolition appeared to represent a kind of loss in Chaillé-Long’s version of history, “both for himself (deprived of childish delight) and for African

⁴⁷⁷ Henry C. Derrick to Martha Derrick, January 4, 1878, Derrick Papers.

⁴⁷⁸ Henry C. Derrick to Martha Derrick, November 1876, Derrick Papers.

⁴⁷⁹ Chaillé-Long, *Central Africa*, 227, 313.

⁴⁸⁰ Chaillé-Long, *Central Africa*, 18.

Americans, who remained slaves; free, but less happy than they were under the paternal bonds of the peculiar institution.”⁴⁸¹ In his description of Khartoum, Chaillé-Long also mocked the abolitionists who would champion Africa and its inhabitants. He saw a racial lesson for abolitionists at the end of the rail line, saying Europe “brought unceremoniously to the front door of Central Africa, may then, face to face with the negro fresh from his African home, compare him with the picture of ‘Uncle Tom,’ or the sentimental portraits that have depicted him as he ought to be, and not as he is.”⁴⁸² With all these, no records imply that the Southerner veterans were affiliated with post-war racist groups like Ku Klux Klan.

7.3. Empathy among the Former Foes

The suppression of the individual aspirations and submission to duty, to some extent, helped a sense of empathy develop among belligerents. Colston, for example, stated he had already understood that Southern and Northern soldiers were same, and the enemies’ motives from their point of view were just as “honest, patriotic, and noble” as theirs.⁴⁸³ Indeed, this was another recognition of the irony that the Civil War soldiers had similar concerns and values, but translated them in different ways, as Colston’s remarks plainly demonstrate: “Tell them that those who lie here entombed were neither traitors nor rebels [...] who claimed nothing but their right under the Constitution of their fathers.”⁴⁸⁴ Likewise, having recognized the differences in

⁴⁸¹ Covey, 137.

⁴⁸² Chaillé-Long, *Central Africa*, 15.

⁴⁸³ Colston, “Address Before the Ladies Memorial Association at Wilmington,” 39.

⁴⁸⁴ McPherson, 7; Barton, 425.

interpretation, President Lincoln had stated in his Baltimore address in April 1864, that both sides cried for liberty, but they did not mean the same thing with the same word.⁴⁸⁵ Colston's statement also reminds Blight's conclusion that many veterans acknowledged a distinction between their motivations, but no difference in the moral virtue and courage in performing their duties.⁴⁸⁶ After all, even though they embraced different meanings of democracy, both sides "drew a nation-wide antebellum faith" that the United States was a model of self-government, which prompts that white Southerners "had been Americans for much longer than they were Confederates."⁴⁸⁷ Acknowledging what the Union and Confederate soldiers fought for, Lockett's words in a *Nation* article summarized this approach, with reference to Massachusetts Senator Daniel Webster's famous Senate speech:

I freely acknowledge that what they fought for was worth all the sacrifices they so freely and nobly made. They fought for the union, and strengths, and the perpetuity of our glorious republic. We fought for liberty, self-government, and the autonomy of the States. Both are foundations-stones of our government. Both are necessary for its preservation. Take either of them away from the foundation, and the grand structure erected by our fathers will topple and fall. "Liberty and Union one and inseparable" is the true motto of our country.⁴⁸⁸

This pre-existed sense of empathy would be one of the foundational elements in the remaking of "the American" in Egypt. In fact, the tributes to each other's prowess with an exaltation of the virility and chivalrous soldier image would also (and principally) help to reshape a new relationship between sections at home as Nina

⁴⁸⁵ "Something to Define Liberty." Address at Maryland Sanitary Commission Fair, Baltimore, April 18, 1864, in *Lincoln on War: Our Greatest Commander-in-Chief Speaks to America*, ed. Harold Holzer (Chapel Hill, North Carolina: Algonquin Books of Chapel Hill, 2011), 241.

⁴⁸⁶ Blight, 190.

⁴⁸⁷ Paul Quigley's remark, in "Interchange: Nationalism and Internationalism in the Era of the Civil War," 468-69.

⁴⁸⁸ Lockett, "West Pointers of the Confederate States Army," 95; Donald A. Rakestraw, *Daniel Webster. Defender of Peace* (New York: Rowman & Littlefield, 2018), 155.

Silber points out.⁴⁸⁹ This mutual exaltation, which Blight terms “reconciliationist vision,” on the other hand, ignored the ideological divisions of the war by focusing on common sacrifices, and thus became an element of the White Reconciliation narrative in the United States. The new solidarity at the expense of “marginalizing African Americans” was represented and consolidated by the image of Union-Confederate reunions in the following decades.⁴⁹⁰

7.4. Echoes of the Civil War in a Distant Land

The potential reconciliation at a micro-level would not be free from the ghosts of the war. Colonel Derrick, for example, would carry his resentment across the Atlantic Ocean. The self-described “unreconstructed American” often expressed in his letters a great hostility to the reunification of the United States, which he now described a “land of tyranny disguised in the flowing robes of Republicanism.”⁴⁹¹ Even en route to Alexandria, the Colonel felt relieved to be rid of “that horrid rag called the stars and stripes which floats over so much corruption and tyranny clad in the garb of liberty, and whose praises have been sung, ad nauseam by so many blind patriots.”⁴⁹² Claiming that the Republican government crammed Reconstruction down Southerners’ “throats at the point of a bayonet,” he often despised President Hayes as a “black Republican president who insistent on robbing [Southerners] of their

⁴⁸⁹ Nina Silber, *The Romance of Reunion: Northerners and the South, 1865-1900* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2002), 12.

⁴⁹⁰ Blight, 2, 361; *Reconciliation after Civil Wars: Global Perspectives*, eds. Paul Quigley, James Hawdon (New York: Routledge, 2018).

⁴⁹¹ Henry C. Derrick to Martha Derrick, August 8, 1875, Derrick Papers.

⁴⁹² Henry C. Derrick to Martha Derrick, July 26, 1875, Derrick Papers.

property.”⁴⁹³ Derrick saw the reunified country a “despotic republic” which he hoped to see ruined and sunk, and wrote in another letter that if he were a single man he would never again set his foot in the United States unless he came with an invading army and carried an avenging sword. His great consolidation, he concluded, was that “the national crimes, sooner or later, must meet their reward.”⁴⁹⁴ With these, Derrick epitomized the bitter feelings of some Confederates, who cheered, “Oh, I’m a Good ole Rebel, I won’t be reconstructed, and I don’t care a damn.”⁴⁹⁵

These reflections utilized the traditional American political lexicon and represented many fellow-Southerners’ opinions under the Republican “tyranny” back home. However, in his notes, Derrick never made any negative comments towards the ex-Union officers he worked with in Egypt, even though he was not “very sociable and pleasant with [other] Yankees” in general.⁴⁹⁶ Remarkably, his prejudices were directed to those he did not know personally or to individuals in the abstract. The vehemence of his views might stem from the highly politicized circle in which he grew up. Derrick’s father William Sharpless Derrick served in the State Department as a career officer under the prominent statesmen, including Henry Clay (he named his son after the Secretary) and as Acting Secretary; hence the Colonel could have had a more assertive political position compared to his comrades.⁴⁹⁷ Obviously, he

⁴⁹³ Henry C. Derrick, diary entry, October 19, 1877, Derrick Papers.

⁴⁹⁴ Henry C. Derrick to Martha Derrick, December 15, 1876, and December 22, 1876, Derrick Papers.

⁴⁹⁵ Silber, 256-7.

⁴⁹⁶ Henry C. Derrick to Martha Derrick, July 26, 1875, Derrick Papers.

⁴⁹⁷ Henry Clay wrote to the young Henry Clay Derrick, “I embrace the occasion to express my acknowledgment to your parents for the compliment of bestowing my name on you. And I sincerely hope that by your conduct and deportment in life, you may realize their fondest anticipations. That I am sure you will do, if you adopt the model of your father for emulation. A better example you could not have than is to be found in his steady, quiet, respectful and intelligent career.” Henry Clay to Henry C. Derrick, September 27, 1848, Derrick Papers.

followed his famous namesake's sectionalist views but not compromising qualities. From this point, Derrick was a good example of McPherson's "ideologically motivated" soldiers who were eager to fight for a political cause or a way of life during the Civil War. On the other hand, it is interesting to see that his complaint of "tyranny" at home was not an idealistic one, given the popular American Orientalist visions of the Middle East as steeped in political and religious despotism.

Derrick's self-reflective antagonism became concrete only when former President Grant visited Egypt in 1878. Exemplifying the before-mentioned hostility to abstract names, he wrote to his wife that he would not shed a tear if the vessel that bore Grant family would be wrecked, meeting "the fate of the Huron."⁴⁹⁸ However, his fellow Southerner Graves's position was different. "For myself," he declared, "I am very much gratified at the attention General Grant has received." According to him, Egyptians' hospitality was intended for the American people in the former President's persona. As Americans, he believed, they should not have failed to show the President proper respect when he came, saying even if they abused and belittled their public men among themselves, the veterans had to stop to it when abroad. Accordingly, Graves was happy that the ex-President of the "Great Republic" would have a warm welcome by the Khedive who would assign him one of the palaces and send him up the Nile in a special government steamer and spending much money to entertain him.⁴⁹⁹

Derrick, who could not keep his temper down, added that he would probably absent and "have the pleasure of refusing" to call on Grant or to join any demonstration of

⁴⁹⁸ Henry C. Derrick to Martha Derrick, June 4, 1878, Derrick Papers.

⁴⁹⁹ Charles I. Graves to Margaret L. Graves, October 29, 1877, Graves Papers.

regard which might be proposed by the Americans in honor of “the old whiskey barrel.”⁵⁰⁰ Not surprisingly, he declined General Stone’s invitation for dinner in “great tanner’s” honor. Derrick was pleased with his response, which was against the protocol, and protested the Southern officers who cheerfully attended to the gathering, expressing that he was proud that he did not “so far forget himself as to go.”⁵⁰¹ However, the participation was good with many Egyptian officials, a few American travelers, United States consular staff, General Loring, colonels Purdy, Graves, Dye, Colston, and several employees of the General Staff. The sincerity at the dinner would bother Derrick, as Graves reported, especially when Loring toasted to Grant, cheering “our friend, the illustrious warrior and statesman.” Indeed, Graves was displeased with Derrick’s absence, complaining that he played the role of an unreconstructed rebel ever since he had been in Egypt. The Georgian astonished to witness that his fellow “knew so little about etiquette,” given that it was so important to Southern gentlemen and their chivalric code, and did not reply to an invitation to dinner, saying other engagements or sickness prevented him.⁵⁰² Derrick, on the other hand, thought his response reflected his integrity—in this case, a direct challenge to the external assessment by valuing principles or establishing a personal honor code that was absolutely binding—as Oprisko explained in the definition of dignity.⁵⁰³

However, the uncompromising Colonel was not alone in muddying the waters. The open critics of Mary Custis Lee, daughter of General Robert Lee, called back some

⁵⁰⁰ Henry C. Derrick to Martha Derrick, November 19, 1877, in Henry Clay Derrick Papers.

⁵⁰¹ Derrick Diary (1875-78), February 4, 1878, Derrick Papers.

⁵⁰² Charles I. Graves to Margaret L. Graves, February 6, 1878, Graves Papers.

⁵⁰³ Oprisko, 7.

Civil War memories in this distant world. Having been in Cairo for travel, Lee refused to meet the Grant family, telling her attendant Graves that she “would not sit down at the same table with General Grant to save his life.” Finding her “openly and freely” expressed opinions disturbing, other Confederate officers professed only friendly feelings for their former enemy.⁵⁰⁴ Loring, for example, was delighted to welcome his old friend. He told a local journalist that the meeting with the former Union general under such different circumstances renewed everything in his memory and harked back the bygone days when both fought for the Stars and Stripes together.⁵⁰⁵ However, Graves’s letter dated February 18, 1878, shows Loring’s “boot-licking” “in the most disgusting manner,” and the following rage when he found out that Grant spoke of Stone to the Khedive in very high praise and did not mention the ex-Confederate General’s name. Graves told his wife that the “Old Blizzards” abused Grant “for all that was low and mean and vulgar.”⁵⁰⁶ Colonel Field implied the change in his attitude might be because the General was evidently serious notions of proposing to Miss Lee.⁵⁰⁷

Grant’s visit to the pyramids would demonstrate Loring’s enthusiasm once more. When Grant’s party and Stones went out to the pyramids, they found General Loring, Judge Victor C. Barringer, and his wife Maria there. As Graves listened from the parties, with astonishment, Grant was photographed at the base of the pyramid of Cheops, but somehow Loring and Mrs. Barringer were the two most prominent

⁵⁰⁴ Charles I. Graves to Margaret L. Graves, May 14, 1877, Graves Papers.

⁵⁰⁵ Mary P. Coulling, *The Lee Girls* (Winston-Salem: J. F. Blair, 1987), 188; Charles I. Graves to Margaret L. Graves, February 4, 1878, Graves Papers; “Loring Remembers Grant’s Visit to Egypt,” *The Tarborough Southerner*, August 19, 1880, 1.

⁵⁰⁶ Charles I. Graves to Margaret L. Graves, February 18, 1878, Graves Papers.

⁵⁰⁷ Charles I. Graves to Margaret L. Graves, March 7, 1878, Graves Papers.

figures in the picture. Mrs. Grant told George Sherman Batcheller, another American judge in the International Tribunal in Egypt, that Loring put himself right in front of her after the photographer had placed everybody. Moreover, when the Barringers stuck so close to the Grants, the former President turned on one occasion to the Consul, and reportedly said, “they are not going to force themselves on us when we go up the Nile, are they?”⁵⁰⁸

Arousing mixed feelings among the Americans in Egypt regarding the bygone days, Grant himself had to deal with an earlier scandal during his presidency, which had resounded the Civil War rhetoric in the ancient lands. Reported as the “American Fracas at Alexandria” by the *Times* (London), the embarrassing case involved the American consul and three ex-Confederate officers.⁵⁰⁹ Consul George H. Butler, who had never minced his words of the ex-Confederate mercenaries, was already infamous among the American expats in the region. From the beginning of his post, he referred the Southerner veterans as “overpaid former rebels,” and suggested that they be deprived of any diplomatic aid or treated as non-citizens.⁵¹⁰ He complained to General Mott that the American officers showed gross disrespect for their consulate and asked him to lay the whole story before Khedive Ismail.

Demonstrating his disgust with the ex-Confederates, Butler even tried to deter Ismail to award Vanderbilt Allen, another West Pointer, a decoration for his distinguished service. Allen, the grandson of Commodore Vanderbilt, served as a colonel of engineers in the Egyptian Army in 1870-72. The Consul notified the Khedive that

⁵⁰⁸ Charles I. Graves to Margaret L. Graves, February 27, 1878, Graves Papers.

⁵⁰⁹ “The American Fracas at Alexandria,” *Times*, July 15, 1872, 7 and July 17, 1872, 12.

⁵¹⁰ Dunn, “An American Fracas in Egypt,” 157; “Butler Trouble,” *The New York Times*, July 18, 1875.

recognition for Allen would incur his personal and political enmity. Secretary of State Hamilton Fish, acting on General Stone's complaint, warned the Consul against such meddling. Mott, then back in the United States, wrote a hasty note to the Secretary excusing his friend Butler and blaming his rival Stone.⁵¹¹

Such aggression often brought brickbats, dismissal demands, and, finally, a gunfight. On July 11, 1872, General Loring, Colonel Alexander W. Reynolds, and Major William Campbell encountered Butler and two other consular officers at the famous Hotel d'Europe in Alexandria. Having already tense relations, the Confederate veterans ignored the Consul, provoking him to attack them verbally. This humiliation soon amounted to firing pistols, which Butler described as "the culmination of two years of petty annoyances and hostility." Charif Pasha of the Egyptian government also stated in his letter to the American Minister in Constantinople that he was persuaded that the "misfortunate affair was the result of their hatred."⁵¹² Nobody died in the fight, but the scandal would bring an end to Butler's diplomacy career. The Consul sent a telegram to the State Department, noting that "rebel officers attempted [his] assassination, one assassin shot,"⁵¹³ and he left the country on a postal steamer. Telling his official position had always hampered him in his dealing with these "rebels," Butler claimed, they attempted to shot him "simply because [he] was a Federal officer" and a nephew of General Butler, the infamous Republican senator. General Benjamin F. Butler, also known as "the beast" or "the spoon", was

⁵¹¹ Hesseltine and Wolf, 116, 117.

⁵¹² George H. Butler to Benjamin F. Butler, July 24, 1872, Benjamin F. Butler Papers, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C; George Henry Boker to Hamilton Fish, July 18, 1872, DUSMT.

⁵¹³ George H. Butler to State Department, July 13, 1872, DUSCA; B. D. Whitney to Benjamin F. Butler, July 13, 1872, Benjamin F. Butler Papers (Whitney transmitted the telegram to uncle Butler, writing "one assassin killed").

notorious for his General Order No. 28, which came after the Union victory in New Orleans in early 1862 and proclaimed that if any women of the city by word, gesture or movement insulted United States officers, they should be regarded and treated as prostitutes. According to Stephanie McCurry, the order is far the best-known episode in women's history of the Civil War and breathed new life into the old Southern line about protecting womanhood.⁵¹⁴ The Consul rejected the accusations but refused to testify for he could "expect no justice from a court composed of their brother [Confederate] officers and especially a court manipulated by General Stone" with whom he was on very bad terms.⁵¹⁵ Moreover, having declared a "bitter war" against Stone, the Consul once blamed him of being "an avowed enemy of the United States and American interests in Egypt."⁵¹⁶

In the investigation, many ex-Union veterans sided with their ex-Confederate comrades, and the Khedive denounced the Consul's "exhibition of a collection of the worst kind of Americanisms!"⁵¹⁷ On July 23, 1872, President Grant suspended Butler from office, thus avoiding any further diplomatic scandal which would bother the two governments. The next Consul Richard Beardsley, however, was welcomed by the veteran group as he reportedly "made no difference between northern and southern men" in Egypt.⁵¹⁸ The Egyptian climate, which Graves described as having

⁵¹⁴ Stephany McCurry, *Confederate Reckoning, Power and Politics in the Civil War South* (Cambridge and London: Harvard University Press, 2010), 11; Michael T. Smith, "The Beast Unleashed: Benjamin F. Butler and Conceptions of Masculinity in the Civil War North." *The New England Quarterly* 79, no. 2 (2006): 248-76.

⁵¹⁵ George H. Butler to Benjamin F. Butler, July 24, 1872, Benjamin F. Butler Papers.

⁵¹⁶ Charles P. Stone to William T. Sherman, May 9, 1872, Sherman Papers; George H. Butler to State Department, June 23, 1872, DUSCA.

⁵¹⁷ Charles P. Stone to William T. Sherman, July 30, 1872, Sherman Papers.

⁵¹⁸ Charles I. Graves to Margaret L. Graves, October 1, 1875, Graves Papers.

“no north or south,” now metaphorically represented the political climate among the American community in the country.⁵¹⁹ The investigation in Egypt dropped after Beardsley took over the consular office and moved it to Cairo from Alexandria. Hesseltine and Wolf state, Mott’s fall started with these incidents when the Khedive lost confidence in his pasha, as Butler and Mott were on the friendliest terms.⁵²⁰

7.5. Veterans’ Relations to Past and Present

Despite these sporadic revivals of hatred and war rhetoric, Egyptian experience provided the veterans an opportunity to reflect on the past and their relation to the present. As mentioned, some of them were psychologically ready to acknowledge the new situation, but the Egyptian experience would surely be transformative, as well. Colston, for example, noted he was convinced several years later that the consolidation of the nation under one flag was an “inestimable blessing.” Pointing out his opinions were confirmed and intensified by seeing the conditions abroad, he concluded, there were “no better friends than those who fought each other in the blue and gray” even though they could not realize this while the “bitterness of defeat was still fresh in [their] hearts.” He even welcomed the Union victory as “an incommensurable blessing to the whole country and especially to the people of the South,” as the consequences would have been continual wars and fortifications on every frontier.⁵²¹ On the other hand, his idea of reconciliation did not necessarily

⁵¹⁹ Charles I. Graves to Margaret L. Graves, February 27, 1878, Graves Papers.

⁵²⁰ Hesseltine and Wolf, 77.

⁵²¹ Raleigh Edward Colston, manuscript or letter fragment, circa 1890, The Gilder Lehrman Collection, retrieved from The Gilder Lehrman Institute of American History, <https://www.gilderlehrman.org>.

mean rejection. Introducing himself a “brigadier general in the Confederate States Army,” Colston told they would continue cherishing the memories of the struggle, but “look to the future with one country and one flag” at the same time. According to him, the sacrifice should have been used as moral lessons, but not as a means of rivalry.⁵²² Following his comrade, Colonel Lockett also asserted that they should have looked backward calmly and for good purposes, for he believed they might profit from the past which, “tried men’s soul if it was done in the right spirit.”⁵²³ From this perspective, as Paul H. Buck suggested, the ex-Confederate “proceeded to rationalize the inconsistencies of his position until he arrived at a solution which enabled him to salute old glory” while retaining his devotion for “the southern cross.”⁵²⁴

All members of the veteran group were not as whole-hearted or communicative as Colston was in retrospect. Rather, it seems they believed their personal wounds would be healed only when they followed their own ways by accepting the fate’s verdict. From this point, being subject to multiple and changing interpretations, the micro reconciliation in Egypt was also “an air of the emotions and impulses.” It was an expression of harmony either by forgiving the offenses or keeping silent to not revoke the old injuries, just like the national reunion at home required a cessation of talk about causes and consequences.⁵²⁵ Lockett said, for example, the war with all of its horrors and animosities was buried in the eternal past and there, and asked “let it

⁵²² Edward Raleigh Colston, “Union Sentiment among Confederate Veterans,” *The Century* 40 (May-October 1887): 309.

⁵²³ Lockett, “The Contrast of the War,” 3, Lockett Papers.

⁵²⁴ Paul H. Buck, *The Road to Reunion 1865-1900* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1937), 241.

⁵²⁵ Caroline E. Janney, *Remembering the Civil War: Reunion and the Limits of Reconciliation* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2013), 6.

be buried,” telling that he would not willingly revive one of its dead issues or reopen a single wound then healed by nearly two decades of “blessed peace:” “I have hitherto avoided as much as possible talking, even with one-time Confederate comrades, concerning that terrible struggle. I have hardly been able to read anything written by others about it and have written almost nothing in regard to it.”⁵²⁶ Indeed, forgetfulness appears to be the dominant theme in the reunion ethos, and the struggle over memory greatly contributed to the process of reunion.⁵²⁷ However, forgetting the quarrel was a way to ignore its source, and the significance of the war was reduced to the soldiers’ sacrifices, which demonstrated the American form of forgetting, according to Paul Escott.⁵²⁸

7.6. “The Black Sheep:” Concern for the National Reputation

In the remaking of the “American” in Egypt, it should be noted that some were seen as “black sheep” and criticized for performing inappropriate behaviors, thus wounding the American reputation. Among the central concerns were excessive alcohol consumption and relations with the local population or comrades. Colonel Alexander W. Reynolds, for example, sought solace in alcohol, especially after his son Frank died. Graves observed that his old fellow was never sober, saying, “he was full all the time. Had been a hard, systematic drinker.”⁵²⁹ Reynolds’s superior

⁵²⁶ Lockett, “The Contrast of the War,” 3, Lockett Papers.

⁵²⁷ Silber, 4; Blight, 191.

⁵²⁸ Paul D. Escott, *Uncommonly Savage: Civil War and Remembrance in Spain and the United States* (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2014), 168.

⁵²⁹ Charles I. Graves to Margaret L. Graves, July 7, 1876, Graves Papers.

General Loring also expressed his desire to “get him off his staff as quietly as possible” yet “in such a manner as not to hurt his feelings.”⁵³⁰

Another alcohol victim was Major D.G. White. “Having little capacity and inclined to whiskey,” according to Derrick, the young West Pointer (a classmate of Derrick’s brother Clarence) had several sprees during his service.⁵³¹ “He is a disgrace to us all out here, and a Georgian too!”⁵³² said Graves, but he still sympathized with his comrade: “There are many things worse than death. [...] Poor fellow my sympathies are with him and his distant family. [...] He has ‘mania portia,’ –insane from drinking in the literal and true interpretation of the terms. He has been drunk for nearly three weeks; and now we have to guard him night and day.”⁵³³ According to the Americans, the Khedive pretended that he did not know the situation, for if he had noticed it, he would have discharged White at once.⁵³⁴ However, the final straw would come soon. After having received orders to start an expedition, “and worst of all, after having drawn six months’ pay in advance,” he deserted the country under an assumed name, writing back from Messina to have some of his baggage sent to him as Mr. Williams at Naples.⁵³⁵ Simply, Graves mentioned, all American officers there were very much disgusted with him.”⁵³⁶

⁵³⁰ Charles I. Graves to Margaret L. Graves, October 15, 1875, Graves Papers.

⁵³¹ Henry C. Derrick, diary entry, August 27, 1875, Derrick Papers.

⁵³² Charles I. Graves to Margaret L. Graves, November 19, 1875, Graves Papers.

⁵³³ Charles I. Graves to Margaret L. Graves, October 17, 1875, Graves Papers.

⁵³⁴ Charles I. Graves to Margaret L. Graves, October 23, 1875, Graves Papers.

⁵³⁵ Charles I. Graves to Margaret L. Graves, July 8, 1877, Graves Papers.

⁵³⁶ Charles I. Graves to Margaret L. Graves, November 19, 1875, Graves Papers.

Captain Porter's conduct was no less embarrassing for the Americans. The series of events bringing his dishonorable discharge included drunkenness, abusing the Egyptian government, and unprofessional behaviors, such as furnishing an English correspondent with a long string of lies concerning the recent war against the Abyssinians. Describing Porter "a low, unprincipled, drunken fellow,"⁵³⁷ Graves believed that he had been disgracing them ever since he came to Egypt because "he lied in every conceivable manner" and "shirked duty on all occasions." Moreover, he got money under false pretenses from the German consul at Suez, saying he was a colonel in the Egyptian service and frequented "the very lowest company in Cairo, the very scum of a very corrupt city." Indeed, Purdy, too, got his share from this concern and labeled as a "very black sheep" among the American group as he openly kept a mistress in his rooms.⁵³⁸

Dr. Warren's popularity was also low in Egypt. Like Porter, Americans thought Warren "spoiled the Egyptians" when he left the country. Describing the doctor a "great scamp," Graves explained that their fellow lost respect and confidence of everybody in Egypt and brought shame on the mercenary group.⁵³⁹ Indeed, the doctor was a man of pride for the Americans in the beginning. When he was appointed chief surgeon of the General Staff, the Virginian performed a successful operation on Kassim Pasha, the War Minister, that was beyond the ability or courage of the surgeons in Cairo. This success lifted him to the position of the chief surgeon

⁵³⁷ Charles I. Graves to Margaret L. Graves, October 2, 1876, Graves Papers.

⁵³⁸ Charles I. Graves to Margaret L. Graves, July 13, 1878, Graves Papers.

⁵³⁹ Charles I. Graves to Margaret L. Graves, December 16, 1875, and June 19, 1876, Graves Papers.

of the army, which was a rapid promotion, as *London Lancet* reported.⁵⁴⁰ That being said, American officers were not only displeased with their fellows' conduct for its own sake, but they were also concerned about their own fates, because those incidents inevitably gave birth to the reports that "all the American officers were to be discharged."⁵⁴¹

7.7. Conclusion

Overall, this chapter, which placed the American mercenary experience into a broader context, demonstrates that ex-Confederate and Union officers' collaboration was not the only factor in their reconciliation in Egypt. The memoirs, personal correspondence, and later writings show they were not uncompromising figures before or during the sectional conflict, and such a psychological foundation helped them reconstruct the American solidarity in this foreign soil. In other words, the story of how they managed to reconcile and cooperate in unity proves that reclaiming the "national honor" in Egypt was consolidated by their positions against the secession and the fact that they already had valued the heroic deeds of the soldiers on both sides. Furthermore, as one of them put, the time they spent abroad also helped to rebuild the "American," which was observed by many contemporaries, including Captain Stevens of the United States steamer *Guerriere*. The captain reported to the Navy Department his arrival at Alexandria on April 26, 1871, telling that he met many of the officers of the late Confederate government in Cairo, who took occasion to pay them every honor, and they "seemed to be thoroughly reconstructed and proud

⁵⁴⁰ John H. Wheeler, "Dr. Edward Warren Bey," *Reminiscences and Memoirs of North Carolina and Eminent North Carolinians* (Baltimore, Maryland: Genealogical Publishing Co., 1966), iv.

⁵⁴¹ Charles I. Graves to Margaret L. Graves, October 2, 1876, Graves Papers.

of the nationality they once fought to destroy.”⁵⁴² This micro reconciliation model represented the *American* together well before the 1898 Spanish-American War, which is seen as the domestic parallel. It would take decades for the nation to heal, but in distant lands, the recent enemies were proud of being a part of a group that maintained honorably their country’s reputation. Demonstrating an intense enthusiasm, Colston retrospectively manifested this solidarity: “No man whose heart is in the right place can fail to feel proud of being able to say in a foreign land, not ‘I am a Northerner, or a Southerner, or from the East or West,’ but ‘I AM AN AMERICAN CITIZEN!’”⁵⁴³

⁵⁴² “Visit of Captain Stevens of the *Guerriere*, Courtesy of the Viceroy, Confederates Reconstructed in Egypt,” *The New York Times*, June 22, 1871.

⁵⁴³ Colston, “Modern Egypt,” 150-152; Colston, “Life in the Egyptian Deserts,” 333 (author’s emphasis).

CHAPTER VIII

“STRANGERS IN A STRANGE LAND:” THE CULTURAL GAP AND VOLUNTARY ISOLATION

Mark Twain's *Innocents Abroad*, which humorously accounts his “Great Pleasure Excursion” on board the *Quaker City*, was published in 1867 and soon became a best seller in the United States, at a time when the “Orient” was a matter of high curiosity. Twain observed the various aspects of the cultures and societies he encountered and many travelers, including former President Grant, carried the book along as their guide to the Levant. Upon arriving in the North African shores after Christian lands, the author exclaimed that the Arab territories were “uncompromisingly foreign, foreign from top to bottom, foreign from center to circumference, foreign inside and outside and all around, nothing anywhere to dilute its foreignness.”⁵⁴⁴ In his depictions of this foreignness, however, Twain did not show much sympathy, and frequently drew similarities between Arabs and the

⁵⁴⁴ Mark Twain, *The Innocents Abroad or the New Pilgrims' Progress* (New York: Modern Library, 2003), 49, 341.

Native Americans for whom he had little affection. Overall, his perception of the locals was basically primitive, and the author confessed that he disliked Turks and Arabs whom he found “degraded.”

As Twain and other American passengers on board the *Quaker City* lost themselves in a foreign setting which they had looked forward initially but could not get along well in the end, most of the American mercenaries in Egypt saw the “land of lotus” strange to their senses as a set of curiosities with the incompatible characteristics. Hence, they lived in Egypt for several years but never became a part of it.

Considering the cultural gap which was difficult to get beyond and social distance built by the practical reasons as well as Western snobbery, this chapter asserts that American harmony in Egypt was not consolidated only by in-group dynamics like the former enemies’ mutual recognition of the other’s value or their celebration of the reunified nation. That is, all these manifestations of the Confederate-Union solidarity in the ancient lands cannot be separated from the reality of alienation they had experienced. The American mercenaries voluntarily alienated themselves from the locals, and did not study the religion or culture of their host society. Thus, the interaction was mostly limited to the males from the upper classes who had occupied state offices. Presenting a common Western bias, the mercenary narratives show Southerner and Northerner veterans were alike in their detachment from natives, representing the same set of values as well as prejudices in terms of daily life, belief, and professional manners. Their unwillingness to integrate into the Egyptian society proves the veterans saw Egypt as a short-term sojourn contrary to the Confederate diasporas in Latin America or missionary groups in the Middle East that embraced their host countries as the life-long retreats.

8.1. The Language Barrier

As expected, the encounter of Americans and locals with very divergent backgrounds and without clearly designated authority zones or responsibilities resulted in occasional clashes and misunderstandings. Competition and infighting were compounded by racial, cultural and religious differences. Thus, the absence of synthesis, according to Colonel Lockett, made the foreign element in the Egyptian Army a weakness rather than an advantage.⁵⁴⁵

The language barrier was a major roadblock in this scheme. Except for Mott and Chaillé-Long, who were said to speak Arabic with relative fluency, the American officers did not take the trouble of learning more than a few commands in the local language. Some, like Derrick who was educated in a French school, were fluent in French, the *lingua franca*, but those who were not simply refused to learn it and depended on fellow translators instead. One of those seniors was Lockett, who proclaimed, "I have no idea of learning to speak this slippery gibberish until I am compelled to by direct necessity."⁵⁴⁶ It was obvious that American officers could not get along in Egypt without an average competency in French, as Graves, who found his French "very useful," observed.⁵⁴⁷ Derrick also believed that it was almost impossible for them to carry out any order without speaking or understanding the language of the country. Dye reported his engineer fellow's astonishment when Derrick ordered an Arab lieutenant to pack an odometer, which he had planned to use in the Abyssinian Campaign but found a useless gimlet after he unwrapped the

⁵⁴⁵ Lockett "Notes on the Abyssinian Campaign," Lockett Papers.

⁵⁴⁶ Samuel H. Lockett to David F. Boyd, Cairo, December 25, 1875, Boyd Papers.

⁵⁴⁷ Charles I. Graves to Margaret L. Graves, October 8, 1875, and August 26, 1875, Graves Papers.

delicate package.⁵⁴⁸ This kind of misunderstandings would prove to be more serious in his supervisory work for the camp-fortification in Abyssinia. Although the Colonel was satisfied with the progress, he stated it was a “terrible job” as he was “compelled to get on with French and a little Arabic,” while his subordinates spoke “horrible French” and did not understand half he said to them.⁵⁴⁹ Yet, Graves’s anecdote about the difficulties in their conversations during the Charkeyeh mission in 1877 summer showed the language problem most vividly:

Lieutenant Magday reported for duty several days ago. He speaks English. When at the table, only two at a time can engage in any conversation. Lieutenant Ali-Cairi only speaking French and Arabic; when he talks to Magday in Arabic I don’t understand; when, he and I talk French, Magday does not understand, and when Magday and I speak in English, he does not understand.⁵⁵⁰

General Stone, on the other hand, tried to overcome this setback by insisting that Sherman’s recommendations would be fluent in French.⁵⁵¹ Former Confederate States officer and eminent Louisianan educator David French Boyd, for example, would be notified that his appointment was not accepted because of his incompetency in the *lingua franca*. His correspondence shows Sherman’s sincere efforts to secure a post for him at the Military Academy in Cairo. Indeed, the General had assured his friend that the things settled, and he ought to make travel arrangements.⁵⁵² However, Stone reported them the Khedive believed “speaking French was an absolute necessity” for the future recruits. Thus, Sherman had nothing

⁵⁴⁸ Henry C. Derrick, diary entry, January 28, 1876; Dye, *Moslem Egypt and Christian Abyssinia*, 175.

⁵⁴⁹ Henry C. Derrick, diary entries, February 19, 1876, and May 6, 1876, Derrick Papers.

⁵⁵⁰ Charles I. Graves to Margaret L. Graves, June 1, 1877, Graves Papers.

⁵⁵¹ Charles P. Stone to William T. Sherman, Cairo, August 31, 1872, Sherman Papers.

⁵⁵² William T. Sherman to David F. Boyd, July 10, 1875, Boyd Papers.

to do but telling Boyd to give up the Egypt scheme “whilst he had wanted to confer on him an honorable appointment.”⁵⁵³

Except for some high-ranking officers, the Egyptians’ communication skills were also not much better and certainly did not compensate for the Americans’ inadequacy in the local language.⁵⁵⁴ Not surprisingly, such problems prevented effective teamwork, for “the often-atrocious French of the Americans, and the courteous grammatical answers of the Egyptians thinly-veiled abysses of misunderstanding.”⁵⁵⁵ Moreover, this problem often imposed on junior officers the extra task of serving as translators to their superiors, which they regarded as degrading and not military. For instance, during a protocol crisis, Lieutenant Colonel Morgan was asked to join a group to translate for his superior, Loring, annoying the Major who complained that “I was indignant with General Loring for the excuse he made for wanting me beside him. I was neither an interpreter nor a valet [...] I was a gentleman at home, and I intended to be treated as one in Egypt.”⁵⁵⁶ Following a similar incident, Morgan had intended to sever his connection with the Khedive’s army at “the moment [he] could get hold of pen, ink, and paper.” After all, the young officer who had been the private bodyguard of Mrs. Davis back in the Civil War had been promoted as “the most attractive service which a foreigner could find” by Jefferson Davis—a reference which was definitely at odds with the task he was

⁵⁵³ William T. Sherman to David F. Boyd, September 22, 1875, Boyd Papers.

⁵⁵⁴ Derrick observed Prince Hassan spoke English very well. Although this would be seen for the Americans’ advantage in the Abyssinian Campaign, it did not work to stop Egyptian-American conflicts. Henry C. Derrick, diary entry, January 9, 1876, Derrick Papers.

⁵⁵⁵ Dunn, *Khedive Ismail’s*, 60.

⁵⁵⁶ Morgan, 355.

asked to perform (his other letter of recommendation was from General Robert E. Lee).⁵⁵⁷

In this case, youth, excitement, manhood concerns, and professional pride converged. Morgan's response also demonstrated another aspect of "reflexive honor," according to which a man's honor depends on his responding properly each time it is challenged in society, especially, where honor is viewed as more valuable than life itself.⁵⁵⁸ Hence, it would be intolerable if honor could continually be challenged in the military circles or such a patriarchal Eastern society. Playing the rebel role in this context, Morgan's reclaiming his dignity can be seen as a challenge/rebellion when he felt others inadequately valued him. Obviously, an office boy would not be respected in a society where, he believed, status was much equated with the respectability. Justifying Morgan's response, Graves found Loring "a very impulsive man" years later, saying he did not know what it was "to be mean or ungentlemanly."⁵⁵⁹

8.2. Disparities in Manners and Work Ethics

More important than the language barriers were the disparities in manners and work ethics, which deepened the emotional gap between the local and mercenary groups. To start with, it is safe to claim that Egyptian and American military notions of discipline were incompatible. Americans often criticized the extreme civility and familiarity between officer ranks that were seen as undermining authority. They

⁵⁵⁷ Morgan, 299, 272.

⁵⁵⁸ Stewart, 139.

⁵⁵⁹ Charles I. Graves to Margaret L. Graves, August 29, 1876, Graves Papers.

observed incompetence, a lack of initiative, and even cowardice among Egyptian officers, conveying that they were inclined to evasion and could not keep pace with the American energy. Nonchalance, fatalism, and procrastination—all seen as peculiar to the East—were parts of this undisciplined way of life and profession. When the Egyptians needed to perform a strenuous task, the reaction was usually *insallah* (god willing, hopefully) or *bukrah* (tomorrow). Describing Egypt as a land where everything was done slowly and leisurely, Graves asserted that the locals were against the haste and extremely indolent. The Colonel portrayed an ordinary Egyptian as one who simply “spends the day drinking coffee, smoking, sleeping, reading the Koran, and praying [...] protesting against the haste, saying life is too short to hurry through it.”⁵⁶⁰ The often-heard cry of *bukrah*, according to Loring, best captured Oriental ways, which centered on the tranquility of mind and the evasion of work.⁵⁶¹

Astonished to witness how things were done when she needed to furnish her new home in Cairo, Cornelia Lockett emphasized in her diary that only residents in Egypt could understand what “tomorrow” meant, telling it usually left a wide margin to perform a job, and it indeed referred “sometime in the future.” After a few months she would learn that “no one ever did anything without expecting backsheesh” to complete their tasks.⁵⁶² Showing the author was well-educated and capable of coping with the difficulties her family confronted, Cornelia’s account is valuable, because it

⁵⁶⁰ Graves, “Lecture on Egypt,” 21; Charles I. Graves to Margaret L. Graves, December 28, 1876, Graves Papers.

⁵⁶¹ Loring, 117.

⁵⁶² Cornelia Lockett, “House Keeping in Cairo, Egypt or A Few Pages from my Diary,” c.1878, 5-6, Lockett Papers.

completes the story of the American officers in the service of the Khedive that was not otherwise told. Likewise, Derrick was angered with the notion of *bukrah*: “I have been delayed again and again by the dilatoriness, procrastination and want of system in the manner of conducting business in this country,” he complained once, and told Egypt was a place where the people proverbially “slow bellies.”⁵⁶³ According to Major Fechet, Egyptian officers would only acquire common sense “when their steamer seemed to sink,” but, in this situation, they would be “first to abandon ship.”⁵⁶⁴ Lockett, too, was highly critical. He believed it was difficult to find honest, upright, and faithful man in the Egyptian service, claiming the “whole confounded thing” was a “miserable humbug—all show, all bunk, all make believe.”⁵⁶⁵ Yet, these concerns could not be conveyed to Khedive Ismail, since he was usually guarded by an “unprincipled set of scoundrels” who wanted to maintain the status quo.⁵⁶⁶

Upon his visit to a military school in the early days of his service, Lockett was shocked to see the lack of discipline for which American military schools were famous. He noted that the professors were sitting cross-legged on their divans to hear recitations, smoking all the time, and frequently having a cup of coffee brought to them during the classes. When one cadet recited, he observed, the others “wandered around, lounged, talked, and paid no attention.” The trouble in the whole concern, according to him, was that “everything is loose and slack twisted” in Egypt. The

⁵⁶³ Henry C. Derrick to Martha Derrick, November 22, 1877, Derrick Papers.

⁵⁶⁴ Dunn, *Khedive Ismail's*, 51.

⁵⁶⁵ Hesseltine and Wolf, 230

⁵⁶⁶ Morgan, 296.

Colonel believed, General Stone tried to persuade the natives to adopt the American system of military school discipline and to import teachers who would instill in the Egyptian academies the strict codes of American institutions, namely West Point, Annapolis, and the Virginia Military Institute.⁵⁶⁷ Indeed, Lockett's himself was known for his discipline as a teacher, and his observations should be read from his teaching career. "He was a very strict disciplinarian after the West Point type," a former engineering cadet expressed, yet his discipline was mingled with correction and students' admiration for him.⁵⁶⁸ The disparities in the notion of discipline would be manifested most visibly in the Abyssinian Campaign. When the soldiers reportedly descended on the market, stole produce, beat the villagers, abused the women, and plundered houses, the Americans proposed disciplinary measures, but they only got into more disputes with their Egyptian colleagues over sentries, guards, and punishments.⁵⁶⁹

It is remarkable that Americans often used an Orientalist lexicon and portrayed Arabs similar to how they portrayed African Americans back home, as inclined to be idle, lazy or undisciplined. Like the white supremacist tendencies contributed to the reconciliation in the United States as Blight emphasizes, this Orientalist look contributed much to their unity in certain ways. It was another example where the process of "othering" consolidated the opposite group, which proved the "race and reunion were trapped in a mutual dependence"⁵⁷⁰ even in a distant country thousands

⁵⁶⁷ Hesseltine and Wolf, 88.

⁵⁶⁸ Hudson, "Samuel Henry Lockett," 114.

⁵⁶⁹ Hesseltine and Wolf, 195.

⁵⁷⁰ Blight, 9.

of miles away. In this case, white American reconciliation ignoring the war's emancipatory legacy was replaced by western snobbery in general. This attitude was also demonstrated in former President Grant's statements about his trip through Egypt. Although he acknowledged that Egypt, as a country, was more interesting than all the other places, he found the native people far less favorable, telling that their "innate ugliness, slovenliness, filth and indolence" was only equal to "the lowest class of Digger Indians found on the Pacific Coast."⁵⁷¹

However, these stereotypical portrayals tend to be reductionist; hence, it is essential to differentiate between the landed proprietors or officeholders and the peasants who had no option but to work hard to sustain a moderate life. Lockett observed, those who occupied administrative posts sought their own pleasure, and "no disgrace would be so great to one of these proud beys or pashas as to be caught doing some actual work, either mental or physical." He was astonished to see they did not perform the simplest actions like dressing, writing their own letters or even lighting their pipes. Hence, the Colonel concluded, the gap between the *nabobs* and the lower classes in Egypt was broader than that once separated the Southern master from his slaves. Yet, as he also acknowledged, the distinction in Egypt was not based on race, color or previous condition of servitude, but entirely depended on present wealth and power.⁵⁷²

Lieutenant Colonel Morgan experienced two incidents that illustrate how different attitudes in work ethic and discipline resulted in conflict. In the first, the young

⁵⁷¹ *The Papers of Grant, November 1, 1876-September 30, 1878*, ed. John Y. Simon (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 2005), xiv.

⁵⁷² Lockett, "Our Life in Egypt," 24, Lockett Papers.

officer was instructed to inspect Arabi Pasha's regiment, which was stationed in the outskirts of Cairo. During the inspection, he observed that the soldiers, whose equipment was apparently neglected, started to perform *salaat* in the square so that, he assumed, they could not be questioned. Morgan concluded that this was another example of the "Oriental cunningness." However, Arabi defended his regiment, claiming that the incident reflected the American officer's prejudice against Islam and that he only reported those who were praying. The Minister of War supported Arabi and intimated that if Morgan expected to remain in Egypt, it would be advisable for him "to drop some of his Christian prejudices." On the other hand, the Major reportedly seized a half dozen guns and bore them off to the Citadel the next day. The guns proved his point because they were filthy.⁵⁷³

The second incident began with Ratib Pasha's courtship with Mademoiselle Girardin, an opera singer in Cairo, but soon turned into a conflict over work ethic and military pride. Indeed, the ballet and opera artists were of curiosity in the city, and, as Graves suspected, they generally acted as mistresses or lovers during their winter stay in Egypt. When Ratib could not convince the young lady that he was the commander of the Egyptian Army, he promised her to show up in front of her hotel with his staff. The next day, the native officers joined him on the Cairo streets, which appalled Morgan, who thought it was yet another example of the abuse of power and corruption inherent in the pasha system. When Ratib returned from his *campaign*, he called Morgan, who refused to participate in the group, and asked him "if his conduct was a sample of the discipline he had come so many miles to teach his countrymen, and for which His Highness paid such an extravagant price." Morgan

⁵⁷³ Morgan, 291; Hesselstine and Wolf, 74.

informed him that he might be a mercenary, but he would “never put His Highness’ uniform to such a doubtful use as presenting it before actresses as proof.” The challenge worked, Morgan said, and Ratib never asked for such a personal favor again.⁵⁷⁴ However, it would be unfair to see this interesting case as a simple manifestation of the “Oriental decadency” as Morgan inclined to portray. Masculine respectability has always been organized around a set of practices, representations, and appearances universally. In many cultures, the symbolism of the rank and uniform are utilized to define men’s self-hood as essential qualities. It assures, spreads fear, and arouses respect—all manly attributions that are said to attract the others. Here the Pasha’s sense of himself was clearly in need of demonstration, and such manly shows were not uncommon in the United States then, yet perhaps in different guises.

There were other problems, even fights, but those were generally personal aggressions, like Morgan’s slapping a police prefect during an opera show in 1871 winter when the *bey* requested “a glass of water” in an insulting tone. Supporting his American officer, the Khedive ordered the prefect to apologize, acknowledging that he did not bring the Americans to wait upon anyone.⁵⁷⁵ Indeed, the prefect’s act seems like a deliberate insult born of jealousy and the he probably tended to prove his self-hood with a claim of authority/superiority, which would cease only after the supremacy of his *Effendina* outdid it. On the other hand, this sequence of events established the Americans’ social status in the very beginning by demonstrating the Khedive’s favor and the American assertiveness.

⁵⁷⁴ Morgan, 290-291, 305; Charles I. Graves to Margaret L. Graves, October 23, 1875, Graves Papers.

⁵⁷⁵ Warren, 402-403; Chaillé-Long, *My Life in Four Continents*, 42.

Dye's striking a young native officer was another personal matter with which Khedive Ismail had to deal personally. During the Abyssinian Campaign, Colonel Dye accused Lieutenant Ibrahim Lutfi, who served in General Loring's staff, of leaving a valuable box on the road, and hit him. This created excitement and indignation among the Egyptians because Lutfi was considered "by all, from the Khedive down, as a very capable, intelligent, worthy and amiable officer." As a proud Muslim, the Lieutenant could not bear the indignity of having been struck by a "dog of Christian," thus he filed a charge against the Colonel. In return, the Khedive ordered a Court of Enquiry with equal numbers of Americans, Europeans, and native officers.⁵⁷⁶ Dye refused to go before the court upon the ground that it, as a body, would deny him justice. As Graves reported in a long letter, his fellow took the higher ground that he would never go before any court unless composed exclusively of Americans, and asked his discharge from the service under his contract with six months advance pay and a certain sum in compensation for the wound he received in the Abyssinian Campaign.⁵⁷⁷

However, General Stone did not forward Dye's "unreasonable" request, thinking it would be understood that he approved it. The majority of Americans thought Dye was decidedly wrong, and they feared "this new trouble with an American officer, following so closely upon White and Porter might so disgust" the Khedive. Americans were also concerned with the official position of the United States consulate on the case (with "the American consul-general in his official capacity, going from one to the other") because the Khedive had discharged some of the

⁵⁷⁶ Dye, *Moslem Egypt and Christian Abyssinia*, 177; Hesseltine and Wolf, 109.

⁵⁷⁷ Charles I. Graves to Margaret L. Graves, February 4, 1877, Graves Papers.

French officers after the French consul had interfered in such matters. Graves concluded that they were all anxious that the repeated troubles with the American officers might result in all others' discharge before due-time, thus, in a dishonorable way. "While I do not care a great deal about a discharge," he said, but he would not like "to be discharged because [his] countrymen exhausted the patience of His Highness."⁵⁷⁸

Colston claimed the ill-will towards the mercenaries was the primary source of all the problems, and it generally emanated from the Turkish-Circassian element, which monopolized most of the highest ranks. According to him, this group hated the staff, which they considered a "check upon their peculations and irresponsible powers," and often plotted against them. However, he asserted the line-officers, most of whom were native Arabs, did not display an outward dislike of the Christian staff-officers "even though they felt it."⁵⁷⁹ Indeed, endorsing Colston's remarks, a *The New York Times* correspondent had observed much earlier that the influential officers were "very indecorous, if not insulting" to Americans even though the Khedive treated them well.⁵⁸⁰

Such a comparison between the native Arabs and the dominant or "conqueror" groups regarding the general administration was a common theme in mercenary narratives. Lockett, for example, described Turks as the upper class, a race of robbers and tyrants "since the first irruption of their hordes from the plains of Central Asia." According to the Alabaman Colonel, they were courageous people, but their courage

⁵⁷⁸ Ibid.

⁵⁷⁹ Colston, "Modern Egypt," 147-148.

⁵⁸⁰ "The American Army Officers in the East," *The New York Times*, July 27, 1871.

was tainted with grossest cruelty. “They have hospitality,” he observed, but it was mingled with arrogance and vulgar pride. On the other hand, his portrayal of the Arabs was not all celebrating even though it was more sympathetic. He believed they possessed “no glaring vices,” but it was equally difficult for him to discover that “they possessed any of the cardinal virtues,” as well.⁵⁸¹

8.3. The Fellah and His Soldierly Conduct

American officers generally claimed that the native Egyptians were gifted with the power of physical endurance, but they did not have a military inclination necessary to sustain a successful armed force. On the contrary, they observed, the military was “horribly repulsive” to the fellah. Lockett asserted that even though the Egyptians might be soldiers in name or had military uniforms on their backs and arms in their hands, they were not soldiering in fact, hence could not fight. Acknowledging that the natives might have some soldierly qualities for they drilled and marched well or they were docile and obedient, he still complained those men lacked the “great and absolutely necessary soldierly quality of courage.”⁵⁸² In another article he wrote for *Nation*, the Colonel claimed that the Egyptians utterly lacked in the prime quality of real soldiers, the fighting quality, which was “a combination of combativeness, self-reliance, independence, vindictiveness, revengefulness, and pride.”⁵⁸³ Similarly, Charles Coles Pasha, who served in Egypt as the British inspector general of the prisons, endorsed the American views about Arab’s fighting capability and wrote in

⁵⁸¹ Lockett, “Our Life in Egypt,” 25, Lockett Papers.

⁵⁸² Samuel Henry Lockett, “Arabi Pasha’s Failure,” undated newspaper clipping (c.1881-82), Lockett Papers.

⁵⁸³ Lockett, “The Egyptian Disaster,” Lockett Papers.

his memoirs that the native troops could not be a fighting force.⁵⁸⁴ Colonel Colston also recalled his astonishment when he had seen men cut off their thumbs just to be exempted from service and witnessed “gangs of conscripts [being] brought to the citadel” in “pairs-fastened by the wrists with short chains,” captured while trying to evade military duty.⁵⁸⁵

Likewise, Colonel Dye asserted the fellah’s soldierly aptitude was very low as they did not have a spark of patriotism, and indeed hated soldiering “with so intense a hatred” that the conscripts would cut off one of their fingers in order to avoid it.⁵⁸⁶

Dr. Warren gave examples in his memoirs of how the natives were creative in their attempts to get a disability report from the physicians. Those practices were incomprehensible to the American veterans who fought for their causes/duties—Union or Confederate—often sacrificing everything imaginable. However, what they overlooked was that the main motivation that brought them to Egypt—the need to feed their family—overlapped with the reasons the *fellahen* were unwilling to serve. Obviously, for a peasant, the conscription meant a long-term separation from the family, a bare land and cheap labor, all causing both material and psychological insecurities in the absence of protective networks or any supporting state apparatus of modern sense. Therefore, while Graves described his service in Egypt as “Egyptian corn for Georgian bread,” the conscription was an inevitable loss for the native subordinates, who would be engaged in Egyptian ventures in Sudanese deserts and Ottoman campaigns in the remotest parts of the empire. Moreover, it should also

⁵⁸⁴ Charles Coles, *Recollections and Reflections* (London: Saint Catherine Press, 1917), 36.

⁵⁸⁵ Colston, “Modern Egypt,” 143; Coles, 36.

⁵⁸⁶ “Egyptian Soldiers,” interview with Colonel Dye, *The Spectator*, undated newspaper clipping, Lockett Papers.

be noted that self-maiming to avoid the impositions is a general case when any government resorts to universal conscription (especially in war-times), and it was not particularly different in the 1870s Egypt.

The lack of desire among Arabs to fight was partly due to centuries of oppression by foreign conquerors, thus blocking strong ideas of national duty. Asking how the native soldiers thought of their role in an army that was not referred in their language, Khalid Fahmy, historian of the modern Middle East, emphasizes that the native soldiers did not believe they were engaged in any national struggle.⁵⁸⁷ Indeed, for the *fellahen*, the “country” (*vatan*) did not allude to any civic notion but simply “home,” unlike what it meant to the Americans. Hence, aggressive imperial ventures were not celebrated among the peasantry, and they would not fight fervently as long as their own *vatan* was not at stake. Thus, it could not be expected that their loyalty to family or home would be transformed into duty to the country in contrast to Southern men’s case in the American Civil War.⁵⁸⁸ Questioning “how can courage be expected from a race who are accustomed to receive the bastinado as a matter of course from every man clothed in a little brief authority?” Colonel Colston inquired about what could motivate the Arab peasants to fight:

Love of country? Why, he has no pride in Egypt as his country; at most, he thinks only of his little village of mud huts as such. [...] Loyalty to his prince? What is the Khedive to the Egyptian soldier but a Turkish oppressor, who takes his last piastre for taxes and forces him into the army against his inclination and prejudices? Money? He nominally is entitled to the pay of one dollar per month, but he hardly ever gets it. [...] Only religious fanaticism might stir him up to fight.⁵⁸⁹

⁵⁸⁷ Khalid Fahmy, *All the Pashas Men. Mehmed Ali, His Army and the Making of Modern Egypt* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 252-3.

⁵⁸⁸ Wyatt-Brown, *Southern Honor*, 59.

⁵⁸⁹ Colston, “Modern Egypt,” 144-145.

Accordingly, Colston told his friends in the United States years later in an “instructive and entertaining” talk that the “utter lack of national pride and patriotism,” and the attempts to avoid military tasks by many tricks made the officers’ responsibility of building up their morale highly difficult.⁵⁹⁰ Khalid Fahmy endorses Colston’s interestingly historical observations in no small measure. Yet, he asserts that the religious motives or certain material benefits (like regular pays to compensate their losses) that could make the soldiers feel distinguished were not always strong incentives to wear colors. According to him, the way the Egyptian Army functioned could not have allowed the natives to think of it proudly and feel a sense of belonging to a cause.⁵⁹¹

In this regard, Lockett also explained why the Egyptians were such “arrant cowards.” He argued they were “practically the basest of slaves” of those who had looked down from the summits of the pyramids for forty generations. In their villages, they were beaten by the tax-gatherer till their last piaster was wrung from them, and they were not better treated by their superiors in the army. The Colonel believed they were “worse off than the former slaves of the South, for these latter had individual owners” and asserted “nothing but long continuance of slavery and degradation can wholly eradicate it from a whole people.” Have not the Egyptians lost this quality under the long rule of their beys and pashas, he concluded, an affirmative answer to the original question could be a satisfactory explanation.⁵⁹²

⁵⁹⁰ John D. Bellamy, *Memoirs of an Octogenarian* (Charlotte, North Carolina: Observer Printing House, 1942), 34.

⁵⁹¹ Fahmy, 99, 253; *See also* Khaled Fahmy, “The Nation and its Deserters: Conscription in Mehmed Ali’s Egypt,” in *Arming the State*, ed. Erik Jan Zürcher, *Arming the State: Military Conscription in the Middle East and Central Asia, 1775-1925* (London: I.B. Tauris, 1999).

⁵⁹² Lockett, “The Egyptian Disaster,” Lockett Papers.

Contributing to the discussions, Graves observed nothing could excite the average rural Egyptian unless it be some religious fantasies, “in memory of or by command of the prophet.” Claiming that the natives were fatalist, the Colonel recollected an Arab man telling him all the steel, cannon and breech-loading rifles against the Abyssinians were an insult to the god, because, if the god wanted them to defeat the enemy, they would succeed without these.⁵⁹³ Derrick endorsed his Georgian fellow pointing out the social fact that fighting against fate was seen in Egypt an impiety “worthy only of an infidel.” However, he added ironically in regard to the Abyssinia disaster that “the prophet must have indeed looked down with indignation upon the slaughter of the Faithful, [...] from haughty pacha, with his jeweled sabre and gaudy uniform, down to poor private soldier of the Soudan in his white cotton regimentals.”⁵⁹⁴ Ultimately, whatever the specific case regarding the defeats, the religious fatalism, which placed far too much emphasis on the will of god and not enough on the power of gunpowder, can be said to contribute to the Egyptian apathy, as General Loring pointed out.⁵⁹⁵

8.4. Oriental Religion and Women in the Mercenary Accounts

The critical observations regarding the professional realm provide insight into Americans’ impressions of the local culture in a broader sense, altogether representing a story of the strangers in a strange land. Not surprisingly, the clash of cultures often produced mutual misunderstanding and prejudices, which would be

⁵⁹³ Charles I. Graves, diary entry, April 5, 1877, and “Lecture on Egypt,” 24, Graves Papers.

⁵⁹⁴ Derrick, “A Military Picnic,” 12, Derrick Papers.

⁵⁹⁵ Loring, 69-70.

manifested in familiar rhetoric contributing to the Orientalist discourse. Observing that the East was the opposite of what he was accustomed to, Dr. Warren, for example, found Egypt so peculiar that he felt “as if he had lost his identity, and had been wafted to another sphere.”⁵⁹⁶ This sphere, according to Colonel Graves, was “a relic of the past, of the days when men dwelt in huts, traveled on camels, and lived hundreds of years,” which he did not find compatible with the nineteenth century.⁵⁹⁷ Such marginalization illustrated how the exotic was seemed an antithesis to American progress by “self-idealization and other demonization,” making the “Orient” a screen upon which the Western values could be projected.⁵⁹⁸ In other words, Americans often fell back on the white man’s burden, or the idea that the Christian West could “enlighten” the Muslim East, as was in the African case of “civilizing,” which complemented Khedive Ismail’s auto-Orientalist views.

Religion was central to this theme. Most of the Americans in this Muslim land despised Islam and showed little respect for religious sensibilities. Converts, like Emin Bey, received the most derision, as seen in Colston’s portrayal of him as “one of the most contemptible specimens of humanity, [...] an ugly little monkey.”⁵⁹⁹ Being the governing code of social life, “Mohammedanism” was seen as an obstacle to progress in daily life and intellectual planes. They claimed there could never be lasting advances in education, morals or government without a radical reform in the

⁵⁹⁶ Warren, 418.

⁵⁹⁷ Graves, “Lecture on Egypt,” 24, Graves Papers.

⁵⁹⁸ Amira Jarmakani, *Imagining Arab Womanhood: The Cultural Mythology of Veils, Harems, and Belly Dancers in the U.S.* (New York: Palgrave & Macmillan, 2008), 122; Holly Edwards, “A Million and One Nights: Orientalism in America, 1870-1930,” in *Noble Dreams, Wicked Pleasures: Orientalism in America, 1870-1930*, ed. Holly Edwards (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000), 17.

⁵⁹⁹ Quoted in Dunn, *Khedive Ismail’s*, 60.

religion. Emphasizing the need for a challenge to Arab-Islam orthodoxy, Loring wrote, Egyptians would continue to “languish under the iron heel of the so-called Islam, much of it really in contradiction to the Koran until some Arab Luther shall arise to strike of their fetters.”⁶⁰⁰ Quoting from the American traveler Henry Field, who suggested Islam was incompatible with civilization, the “Old Blizzards” also claimed that the natives “entrenched themselves in their besotted ignorance against every form of progress.” According to him, Islam was fundamentally responsible for the Egyptian “lack of intellectual stamina” and the true believer was possessed with the idea that modern improvements were the devices of the infidel.⁶⁰¹ Ironically, rumors that Loring converted to Islam would spread in the American papers. Upon such news, Graves wrote to his wife that the reports of him turning Mohammedan were simply absurd.⁶⁰² With this, it should be noted that none of the American mercenaries who came to Egypt during the 1870s converted Islam, contrary to many former foreign officers who served in Mehmed Ali’s staff in the first half of the century (including French General Joseph Sève (then Suleyman Pasha the French) and George Bethune English (Muhammed Effendi)).

It is noteworthy that Loring and his fellow countrymen did not pay any attention to the contemporary “modernist efforts” in Egypt or opinion leaders like Afghani, whose religious teaching, according to Nikki Keddie, offered a path “to rationalism, science and fresh interpretations” in the Islamic faith.⁶⁰³ One can suspect that the

⁶⁰⁰ Loring, 68.

⁶⁰¹ Ibid; Henry M. Field, *From Egypt to Japan* (New York: C. Scribner’s Sons, 1905), 59.

⁶⁰² Quoted in Hesseltine, 60; Charles I. Graves to Margaret L. Graves, September 17, 1875, Graves Papers.

⁶⁰³ Nikki R. Keddie, *Sayyid Jamal ad-Din ‘al-Afghani’: A Political Biography* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1972), 86-87.

Americans must have heard about the influential Iranian scholar who was highly respected in the 1870s Cairo when they served in the same city. Otherwise, this is another example of how much some veterans were uninformed about the local dynamics despite their self-assured explanations in various topics regarding contemporary and cultural affairs. Moreover, Loring's views on Islam's incompatibility with progress had been a long-debated subject in the late nineteenth century. Like the General, conservative Muslims and Western observers were often skeptical about the compatibility of values such as religious re-interpretation, scientific investigation or modern education with Islam. Yet, the Modernists saw this tension as a historical case, not an inherent feature of the faith.⁶⁰⁴

On the other hand, the local approach to non-Muslims was equally unfriendly. Before Cairo was the stomping ground of tourists, "the true believer's hatred for the accursed *giaour*, or 'Christian dog,' was something that he was very proud of," Morgan stated. Accordingly, Americans were often warned to keep away from the mosques until they became better acquainted with the people or were accompanied by a native "who could tell them that [they] were under the special protection of the *Effendina*."⁶⁰⁵ However, some of them believed there was "not the slightest danger in Egypt for a Christian," as the foreigners are too numerous in all the great centers to fear anything "from Mohammedan fanaticism."⁶⁰⁶ Yet, these assuring remarks would be proved wrong to some extent when the Nationalists rioted in 1882.

⁶⁰⁴ Charles Kurzman, *Modernist Islam 1840-1940: A Sourcebook* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 4.

⁶⁰⁵ Morgan, 272.

⁶⁰⁶ Charles I. Graves to Margaret L. Graves, February 16, 1877, Graves Papers.

One of the most recurrent themes in the mercenary accounts about Egyptian culture was Eastern women's status. American officers often claimed that "Oriental" and American women represented different stages in the course of history. Unlike their Western sisters who were relatively active in social and economic life, Muslim women were portrayed as uneducated and secluded, leading a "life of physical enjoyment of which indolence is the chief element."⁶⁰⁷ Native women were usually represented as slaves of the domestic sphere, shaped by simple pleasures such as gossip, embroidery, smoking, or bathing, without knowing anything of life, "being simply pieces of furniture in their homes."⁶⁰⁸ Emphasis on cigarettes and hookah completed the derogatory Orientalist portrayal, for smoking was attributed to lower-class women in the nineteenth century American society. Arguing that female inferiority was a cardinal dogma of Islam, Colston concluded Americans, especially women, had "every reason to thank Heaven" that their destinies were cast in a Christian land, and that they were "blessed with ennobling influences of the Christian religion and civilization."⁶⁰⁹

Likewise, Colonel Lockett compared women's condition in the United States and Egypt and claimed the latter was by no means an enviable one. He wrote that the poor women were always "beast[s] of burden," doing the drudgery, carrying all the heaviest loads and receiving many a cuff and blow from a brute of a husband. On the other hand, he continued, the women among the rich were also simply prisoners confined behind the bars of the harem window and only allowed out veiled or under

⁶⁰⁷ Colston, "Modern Egypt," 159.

⁶⁰⁸ Warren, 418, 436; Loring, 114-115.

⁶⁰⁹ Colston, "Modern Egypt," 161.

the guardianship of the loathsome eunuchs. According to him, these upper-class women were petted favorites, showered with costly gifts or service from others; yet, their short-favored time was as frail as that of a political office holder in a doubtful state. At any moment, he said, a favorite “might fall from her high estate and become in all but name the very slave of a successful rival.”⁶¹⁰ In another article sent to *Criterion*, he demonstrated another aspect of the contrasts between the Egyptian and American customs. After giving a detailed account of arranged marriages, which he described as “a good deal of diplomatic sparing and business sharpness,” and the passivity of the couples under such “bargains,” he asked his fellow ladies to think about their sisters in Muslim lands:

Now this, my fair friend, [...] gives you a faint idea of the life and condition of your sisters in the Eastern world. What is such a life worth, viewed from our standpoint? What is girlhood in such a state of society with no happy school days, with no social intercourse with the other sex, with no parties, picnics and promenades, no love, no courtship, no freedom as girl or woman, no bright childhood, no joyous youth, no happy wifhood, no honored age? The picture is too dark to dwell longer upon.⁶¹¹

These observations about the domestic sphere were largely hearsay and biased—at a time when American women were also trapped by the cult of domesticity and deprived of many basic rights at home. It also shows, unwilling to study the culture, American officers were unable to understand a social system based on the religious dogma and practices, and their assumptions mostly failed to be superficial or highly reductionist. Moreover, most of the comments were limited to elites who had

⁶¹⁰ Lockett, “Our Life in Egypt,” 28.

⁶¹¹ Samuel Henry Lockett, “The Marriage Ceremony in Egypt,” *Criterion*, undated newspaper clipping, Lockett Papers.

harems, thus overlooking the women in the countryside who supported household income by tending livestock or taking on manual labor.⁶¹²

These cultural juxtapositions were mainly due to the lack of communication with local families, as only a few veterans came to Egypt with their families, and the wives could rarely mingle with Muslim women. Thus, borrowing the clichés portraying Eastern women as passive or “tyrannized” by their despotic men, mercenary accounts inevitably contributed to the Orientalist discourse, allegorically referring to the weak feminine East to be rescued by the civilized/masculine West. In this regard, having a “prurient curiosity” about the status of Muslim women in Egypt, American mercenaries nursed the common belief that the “harem” was a scene of lewd debauchery. Indeed, most of them asserted that indolence, ignorance, and sexual immorality were the chief characteristics of this peculiarly Eastern custom. Colonel Dye’s judgment about its impact on the whole society, for example, was insulting. “To this institution,” he heatedly declared, “with all its ignorance, superstition, envy, jealousy and intrigue [...] may be traced lying, blackmail, bribery, forgery, theft and corruption generally, high and low, and exorbitant taxes, cruelty and murder, emasculation and slavery, and all their concomitants!”⁶¹³

Graves contributed to this discussion from the point of the family. The Colonel often explained he purposely left the children at home with their mother because “the moral atmosphere was bad,” stating he would not let his children in a country where

⁶¹² See, among many, *Women in Middle Eastern History: Shifting Boundaries in Sex and Gender*, eds. Nikki R. Keddie and Beth Baron (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992); Madeline C. Zilfi, *Women in the Ottoman Empire: Middle Eastern Women in the Early Modern Era* (Leiden: Brill, 1997); Margaret Lee Meriwether and Judith E. Tucker, *Social History of Women and Gender in The Modern Middle East* (Boulder: Westview Press, 1999).

⁶¹³ Dye, *Moslem Egypt and Christian Abyssinia*, 28.

polygamy existed and secured under the Islamic law.⁶¹⁴ According to him, females in all “Mohammedan” countries were regarded simply as “creatures to minister to the enjoyments of the men,” adding that wives were generally white, while concubines were selected among the “negresses.”⁶¹⁵ Astonished to see that the conduct of the husband would be considered as that of a “prudent, refined, educated, pious Moslem gentleman” by the public, he rhetorically asked his wife if she could you expect any advance in civilization among these people as long as their religion allowed and even encouraged such conduct, by prescribing rules for it?⁶¹⁶ Speaking of the marriages, none of the bachelor officers married to Egyptian ladies, nor did any of the daughters marry to Arab or Turkish men in Egypt (even though Greene wrote General Mott married to a Turkish, archival records do not support her claim).⁶¹⁷ This is because the Egyptian women of upper classes who maintained an isolated life in their domestic spaces were mostly unavailable to the strangers’ eyes. While some of the officers in Napoleon’s occupying legion in 1798 (for example, general and statesman Jacques Menou) and Mehmet Ali’s foreign staff (including Joseph Sève) converted to marry Muslim ladies or took native women regardless of the faith as mistresses, Americans kept company with Europeans acting in Cairo, as Graves and Derrick implied. On the other hand, it should be noted that the way soldiers interact with native women as a part of “militarized cultural encounters” is much related to the status of soldiers in the foreign soil – either as invaders, conquerors or guests.

⁶¹⁴ Charles I. Graves to Margaret L. Graves, October 27, 1876, Graves Papers.

⁶¹⁵ Charles I. Graves to Margaret L. Graves, October 23, 1875, Graves Papers.

⁶¹⁶ Charles I. Graves to Margaret L. Graves, April 16, 1878, Graves Papers.

⁶¹⁷ Greene, “The Bey from Virginia,” 24.

Obviously, American bachelor mercenaries were not similar to the “liberators” of the conquering armies.⁶¹⁸

That said, some of the mercenaries’ observations in family and women context did not correspond to the traditional Western imagination and their fellows’ approach. For example, opposing to the Oriental polygamy narratives, Colonel Lockett pointed out that plurality of wives to the number of four was allowed by the religious laws and tradition, but it was not common, and even an Oriental might be “wife-poor” as “land-poor,” considering the cost of marriages.⁶¹⁹ Dr. Warren and Lieutenant Colonel Morgan also, more accurately, defined the harem as equivalent to “family,” including all female members and children as well as female slaves, contrary to its established image as a collection of odalisques in an eroticized space.⁶²⁰ In an address to the American Geographical Society members, General Stone would even exalt the Egyptian family life, pointing out the Eastern women had some “domestic privileges” some of which American women did not have then. He promoted the Muslim women’s private domestic sovereignty where men were not allowed to cross or interfere.⁶²¹ However, Stone’s remarks were true only for the upper-class women who had some sort of internal control or household autonomy that most women in

⁶¹⁸ Juan Cole, *Napoleon’s Egypt: Invading the Middle East* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007), 134; Fergus Robson, “French Soldiers’ Gaze upon Italian and Egyptian Women: Gender, Masculinity and Sexuality in Militarized Cultural Encounters,” 2015, <http://www.mwme.eu/essays/index.html> (retrieved July 7, 2020); Charles I. Graves to Margaret L. Graves, July 13, 1878, Graves Papers.

⁶¹⁹ Lockett, “Our Life in Egypt,” 27.

⁶²⁰ Warren, 425; Morgan, 283.

⁶²¹ Stone, “Political Geography,” 361.

the region did not have. As Covey points out, Stone's tributes remind the cult of domesticity and separate spheres notion in the United States.⁶²²

8.5. Voluntary Isolation and Veterans' Views of the Khedive

After all, it would not be wrong to claim that American officers in the Egyptian Army were competent in their professions, but they were not ambitious in adjusting the local culture. Excluded from the society by the religious and cultural gap, the mercenaries lived apart from the locals to a great extent and socialized only with the consulate officers, missionaries, and foreign businessmen in such polyglot venues like Café des Colonies or Café d'Orient, the International Club, Philological Society, and the Cairo Opera. As Hesseltine and Wolf put accurately, they lived in Egypt, however, "they were never of it."⁶²³ In this scheme, there is a striking difference between the mercenary and missionary groups' attitudes. In contrast to the American mercenaries in Egypt, missionary communities were self-conscious establishments and sustained mechanisms, including social institutions that provided a venue for integrating the American community into the texture of local society, as Stephen Tuffnell points out, in regard to the general scheme of missionary activities.⁶²⁴

Lockett and his elder daughter Jeanie's remarks provide another window into this voluntary isolation. Expressing they did not have a real home-life for them in Egypt, the Colonel wrote they had "no wide circle of sympathizing friends, no plain simple

⁶²² Covey, 182.

⁶²³ Henry C. Derrick, diary entries, July 10, 1877, September 25, 1877, and October 10, 1877, Derrick Papers; Hesseltine and Wolf, 64.

⁶²⁴ Tuffnell, 636.

honest-hearted neighbors” with whom to associate on terms of intimacy.⁶²⁵ Perhaps, one of the few exceptions was an African girl named Katura. Jeanie wrote in her grown-up years that the niece of their landlord meant a lot to her at a time when she needed a much sought after peer. “Many friends have I made and departed from in my wandering life,” she said, but “Katura, with her soft, sweet ways, her innocent and almost childish nature,” had won a place in her heart.⁶²⁶ However, the same girl had written in her journal that she was “so tired of seeing Arabs” and she would be “so glad to get away from every Arab” before their departure from Egypt in 1877.⁶²⁷ Finding Arabs “nasty,” she tried to keep away from them as she was instructed.⁶²⁸ These, indeed, reflected her parents’ approach to the local community.

The self-isolation was partly due to the presumed cultural superiority. It is remarkable, however, that this snobbery generally went beyond the individual and regional differences among the American group. That is, Southerner and Northerner or the junior and the senior, most of the veterans represented the same Western men. At that time, in the United States, their fellow soldiers were compounding errors in their dealings with the freedmen in the South and Indians in the West. Likewise, the mercenary group in Egypt showed “no greater aptitude in handling the human problems in the delta of the Nile than their fellows managing the Freedman’s Bureau

⁶²⁵ Lockett, “Our Life in Egypt,” 29.

⁶²⁶ Jean Lockett Fuller, “Katura or Reminiscent of an American Girl in the East,” unpublished manuscript, undated, Lockett Papers.

⁶²⁷ Jeanie Lockett, “A Journal of My Trip from Cairo, Egypt to America,” unpublished manuscript, September 1877, Lockett Papers.

⁶²⁸ Jeanie Lockett to Het, August 17, 1875 (copied on May 1, 1876), Lockett Papers.

showed in the delta of the Mississippi.”⁶²⁹ Only Stone, who was considerably more positive in his cultural portrayals, was an exception, yet not fundamentally.

Even though the Americans were not in good terms with the locals as shown, their views about their sponsor, Khedive Ismail, were mostly positive. It is noteworthy that they ignored some of his qualities, which would be attributed to the “Oriental” style they were highly critical of (like extravagancy). According to Hesseltine and Wolf, the veterans saw the Khedive through American lenses. For them, the authors claim, Ismail was sort of renowned American tycoons, “men of bold and audacious vision, with more than a touch of flamboyance in their nature.”⁶³⁰ General Loring, for example, championed the “enlightened” Khedive’s achievements and believed he made earnest endeavors to modernize his dominions and promote his people’s well-being by abolishing slavery or educating women.⁶³¹ “The extraordinary man, who has placed himself so high above the foulness and abominations of the East,” said a Loring-inspired correspondent, and asserted that he deserved the admiration of the whole world.⁶³² Graves was another officer in the American contingent who wholeheartedly supported the Khedive, whose position was surrounded by peculiar difficulties, stating he was “the most enlightened, liberal ruler now in the world.” Admiring Ismail’s works to educate his people and make Egypt prosperous, the Colonel portrayed him as “a gentleman, a man with a big heart and a big soul; a man

⁶²⁹ Hesseltine and Wolf, 45-46.

⁶³⁰ Hesseltine and Wolf, 52.

⁶³¹ Loring, 77-79.

⁶³² Hesseltine and Wolf, 51.

of noble ambitions, generous; hospitable; true to his word.”⁶³³ Served for more than three years in his General Staff, the Georgian officer testified to his good qualities, asserting that Ismail carried with him the good wishes of every American officer who served in his army.⁶³⁴

According to Stone, Ismail’s best man in the American group, the Khedive was endowed with high intelligence and devoted all his resources to his country’s advancement.⁶³⁵ Believing that he appreciated the immense material advantages which his country would derive from the introduction of Western science, the General claimed the history would “establish his fame as one of the great rulers of the nineteenth century.”⁶³⁶ Colston, too, saw Ismail as “the most belauded of men,” who became afterward “the best abused.” For him, the Khedive was superior in ruling and personality to his royal contemporaries in Europe, and he “towered infinitely above the Eastern rulers” except his grandfather to whom he was “inferior in native genius and force of will.” Stating, while the many of the Eastern rulers treated their subjects with cruel barbarity, Colston asserted that it would take hours to relate “what he has done for his country, for the diffusion of knowledge and the progress of civilization.” According to him, Ismail was intelligent and industrious to a degree never before found among Mahomedan princes. On the other hand, he added that the Khedive tried to carry his reforms and innovations too fast, and he

⁶³³ Graves, “Lecture on Egypt,” 8; Charles I. Graves to Margaret L. Graves, October 23, 1875, Graves Papers.

⁶³⁴ Charles I. Graves, diary entry, April 8, 1876 (extract from Charles I. Graves to Margaret L. Graves, April 8, 1876), Graves Papers.

⁶³⁵ Stone, “Political Geography,” 370.

⁶³⁶ Stone, “Political Geography,” 375.

was recklessly prodigal.⁶³⁷ Yet, some of the Americans, like Dye, had doubts about the Khedive's progressive intentions, portraying the "Oriental Prince" both confused and extravagant.⁶³⁸ Such discrepancy, however, should be read through skeptical lenses, considering his personal discontent with the Khedive's conduct about his court-martial after he had struck Lieutenant Colonel Lutfi in the Abyssinian Campaign.

8.6. Conclusion

Overall, this chapter presents a reaffirmation of an "us" identity among the American officers against a "them" in Egypt. The mercenary narratives prove the American officers shared the contemporary Western views over the Eastern peculiarities and their observations solidified the widespread preconceptions. Placing the American ethics and manners in direct opposition to the Egyptian ones, most degraded the "Oriental" work ethics, religious dogmas, and social mechanisms in the country, which were altogether believed to be principle reasons for the backwardness (or being "uncivilized"). Their notion of civilization was, not surprisingly, Western-centric, and the localities were contrasted with their own practices as the norm. However, it is remarkable that they championed the Khedive who was regarded as thoroughly Western-oriented (or "Christian minded"). Moreover, these narratives show the American veterans failed to study the culture they were interacted for several years and avoided being integrated into their host society. On the other hand, the Orientalist approach and their (voluntary) isolation from the native elements

⁶³⁷ Colston, "Modern Egypt," 136-137.

⁶³⁸ Dye, *Moslem Egypt and Christian Abyssinia*, 1-5.

strengthened the in-group mechanism, thus contributing to their unity abroad, like white supremacy brought former foes together in the United States, the domestic parallel.

CHAPTER IX

ENTANGLEMENT IN THE “TIDY, LITTLE WAR” OF 1882: ENGAGEMENT, POLEMICS, AND OBSERVATIONS

“Since the massacre of last month in Alexandria mamma has been terribly anxious when papa has been called there; but as his service requires him to be there tomorrow, there is nothing left us but silent endurance and hope. I had a wretched foreboding all day that some unhappiness was in store for us.”⁶³⁹ Fanny Stone, the elder daughter of General Stone, penned her anxiety during the Cairo riots in her diary with such plain words. Fanny’s voice provided a look into the effects of the riots on her family. Her father had to leave his family to join Tewfik, the new Khedive in Alexandria, who sheltered in the suburbs before the British bombardment of the city. The separation and the following problems clustered around the Stone family presented a father straddled between a sense of duty and loyalty and family concerns, as well as a mother’s display of courage and dignity while conducting their safe passage from Cairo to Alexandria in the midst of riots. Another American, Charles Chaillé-Long, who had returned to the United States and studied law at

⁶³⁹ Fanny Stone, 290.

Columbia University after his mercenary service ended in 1877, would also make his mark in then-familiar lands during its most tumultuous days. Having been serving in the tribunal (mixed) courts, Chaillé-Long assumed the office of the acting consul of the United States to Alexandria prior to the city's bombardment. In this position, he displayed a high standard of gallantry, adding not only his long-sought reputation but also to the prestige of his native country. Focusing on the activities and reports of the two officers in such turbulent period, this chapter presents the American entanglements in contemporary Egyptian affairs and their observations on Arab nationalism. Moreover, the polemics between the involved American officers open an often-ignored window into one of the most-discussed historical events in the late nineteenth century.

As previously mentioned, the cotton prosperity in Egypt came to an end after the close of the American Civil War, and the Suez Canal proved to be a less rewarding investment. Khedive Ismail took enormous loans to finance his territorial ambitions and pursue the expansive public works. However, the Egyptian treasury was not able to support this lavish scheme, and the Khedive finally had to accept Anglo-French financial supervision with the establishment of the Public Debt Commission in 1876. The Commission was an international body to administer the payments to the national creditors and bankers. The control over the Egyptian finances culminated in the appointment of finance and public works ministers from Britain and France.⁶⁴⁰

⁶⁴⁰ Crabitès, *Ismail: The Maligned Khedive*, 243; F. Robert Hunter, *Egypt under the Khedives, 1805-1879: From Household Government to Modern Bureaucracy* (Cairo: American University in Cairo Press, 1999), 180–89.

Not surprisingly, the influx of foreigners, the special privileges, and their obviously increasing influence in Egyptian affairs led in the late 1870s to the development of Egyptian national sentiment. The resentment was flamed by European overseers' strict measures, such as reducing the size of the army (thus dismissing most of the native elements), and Colonel Ahmed Arabi emerged as the leader of the movement under the slogan "Egypt for Egyptians." With peasant roots, the Colonel was seen as the true voice of natives who were frustrated with the foreigners and local landlords. The Turkish-Circassian high command in the army caused another popular discontent. While the higher positions were occupied by this non-native class, which Arabs saw a tyranny upon their people, the common soldiers or lesser lines were drawn from the fellah. According to Wilfrid Scawen Blunt, the English poet who was an observer and an active participant in the Egyptian affairs during the revolt, the discontent got stronger when the native soldiers' pay was cut while the Circassians' higher remunerations remained undiminished.⁶⁴¹ Donald Malcolm Reid notes, however, that "Egypt for Egyptians" slogan, emphasized rather a proto-nationalist discourse and was not perceived in a literally ethnic definition as it coexisted with loyalty to the Ottoman caliphate.⁶⁴² Indeed, the Nationalist Party Program indicated that they accepted the Ottoman sultan's superior authority, but opposed to those "who would reduce Egypt to the condition of a Turkish *Pashalik*."⁶⁴³

⁶⁴¹ Wilfrid Scawen Blunt, *Secret History of the English Occupation of Egypt being a Personal Narrative of Events* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1922), 99.

⁶⁴² William L. Cleveland and Martin Bunton, *A History of the Modern Middle East* (Boulder: Westview Press, 2009), 99; Donald Malcolm Reid, "The Urabi Revolution and the British Conquest, 1879-1882," in *The Cambridge History of Egypt*, ed. M. W. Daly (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 217-238.

⁶⁴³ Blunt, 383.

Arabi Revolt of 1879 and 1882 started with the Nationalist officer's demand for the dismissal of the mixed cabinet. Upon surrounding to the rebels' demands, Ismail thought it would relieve his position against the internal pressure, but he was deposed by the Ottoman sultan Abdulhamid in June 1879. His successor Tewfik's policies under the ultimate control of foreigners and the Sublime Port exacerbated antagonism among the Arabs; thus, Colonel Arabi finally secured the ministry of war in 1882 and became a pasha. However, the discontent would not cease. The Egyptian nationalists rioted in Alexandria on June 10, 1882, which resulted in "massacres" provoking the British intervention. Alexandria was bombarded by the British vessels on July 11, and the Anglo-Egyptian War between the native forces under Arabi's command and British troops started. The war ended with the British victory at Tel-el Kebir (110 kilometers northeast of Cairo) on September 13, which signified the beginning of the British protectorate in Egypt.⁶⁴⁴

9.1. Stone's Observations and An American Polemic

Stone's observations of the European influence in Egypt, subsequent nationalist fervor, and his experience during the bombardment of Alexandria are found in an introductory note to the *Century's* coverage of his daughter Fanny's diary, an open letter in which he fiercely responded to Caspar F. Goodrich's critical points to his earlier remarks (Goodrich was a navy officer who was in the United States European Squadron during the Anglo-Egyptian conflict), his correspondence with the Military Museum in Virginia, and a long private letter to his West Point friend Alfred

⁶⁴⁴ Edward M. Spiers, "Intervention in Egypt," in *The Victorian Soldier in Africa* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2018), 77.

Morcedai, dated September 1882.⁶⁴⁵ In this letter, Stone commented on the country's political history from the Mehmed Ali period to the British occupation. Fanny Stone's diary entries also give glimpses on what her father did in Alexandria while the straddled General had to deal with dangers around his family.

Stone, an admirer of the late Khedive Ismail and an open critic of the British on many occasions, shared Egyptians' resentment against the European influence. According to him, "England was covetous" and wanted to dominate "the rising power through whose territory ran the Canal of Suez," its means of rapid communication with its dominions in India. France, on the other hand, strived to have an influence in the region which it had at the beginning of the century.

Emphasizing the sacrifices of the native elements, Stone protested the double standards in the financial conduct, comparing the European civil officers who were paid well to the Egyptians who "saw their uniform, which had been so much respected in the land, had become a mark of inferiority." He observed the discontent in the army grew rapidly among the civil services, as civil employees from England, India, and France poured into the country, especially in harbor, postal, and railway services. For him, this constant increase in foreign employment led to the Egyptian element's disappearance from the public service.⁶⁴⁶

⁶⁴⁵ Charles Stone to Alfred Morcedai, September 1882, Alfred Morcedai Papers, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C. (partly published by Frederick J. Cox, "Arabi and Stone: Egypt's First Military Rebellion, 1882," *Cahiers d'Histoire Egyptienne* 8 (1956): 155-175; Charles P. Stone, "Introductory Note to 'Diary of an American Girl in Cairo during the War of 1882,'" *The Century*, June 1884, 289; Charles P. Stone "The Bombardment of Alexandria," *The Century*, October 1884, 953-956; Charles P. Stone, "Correspondence: Stone Pasha and the Secret Despatch," *Journal of the Military Service Institution* 8, no. 29 (March 1887): 94-95.

⁶⁴⁶ Charles P. Stone to Alfred Morcedai, September 1882, Morcedai Papers.

On the other hand, Stone's denouncement of the European influence did not make him cooperate with the Nationalist rebels. Indeed, his position against the rebellious clique was clear back in 1879 during Ismail's last days, when three colonels, including Arabi demanded the dismissal of the minister of war. The colonels claimed the minister acted arbitrarily and unjustly in favoring the Circassians and oppressing the natives. After such an unacceptable attempt, they were arrested, and a court-martial ordered. However, a battalion invaded the War Department and took them out. Stone insisted that "there was but one way to treat a military revolt," and that was "severe, terrible repression; making an example which would never be forgotten in the land."⁶⁴⁷ He stated that if the demands had been accepted and the minister of war dismissed on the demand of mutineers, "the next demand would be the dismissal of a whole ministry – and the next the destruction of the sovereign." Stone recommended suppressing colonels' revolt by using "faithful" officers whom he knew in person and a company of Circassian volunteer infantry still in service. However, Ismail, who ignored his advice, then dismissed the minister and pardoned the colonels. Stone's warnings were prophetic: on September 9, 1881, the ministry was overthrown, and Arabi became Under-Minister of War. Yet, it should be noted in this case that Stone was concerned with military discipline and professional principles rather than showing sympathy towards the Circassian/Turkish element in the army, which the Arab colonels protested.⁶⁴⁸ Indeed, as mentioned in the previous chapters, the American mercenaries unanimously had shared the Egyptian comrades' discontent with the non-Arab high command, which had a climax during the infamous Abyssinian Campaign.

⁶⁴⁷ Ibid.

⁶⁴⁸ Ibid.

Making his observations a matter of heated debate, Stone's account of June 10, 1882, differs from many Western observers. The commonly accepted version of the incident is that a barbaric upheaval followed an ordinary friction between the Christians and Muslims in Alexandria, which resulted in Christian atrocities. Claiming "a false political coloring was given to the affair," Stone portrayed the incident as a "so-called massacre" and believed that Arabi and the Sultan both blundered to such an extent that European powers had a show of right to intervene. According to him, contrary to what was reported, "not one woman or child among the Europeans was touched," and hundreds of Christians sheltered in one of the great mosques during the riots.⁶⁴⁹ These remarks were, indeed, compatible with his general view of Egyptian courtesy. M. E. Chamberlain demonstrates the British press was also neutral in the earlier reports. *The Pall Mall Gazette*, for example, gave a factual account of how the incident started and "took the matter lightly." *The Daily News's* somewhat pro-Egyptian approach was revealed with a leading article asserting that in case of a European-Arab conflict, Western people tended to see it "a struggle between the savages and the well-ordered" even though there were "a great many of the wildest rowdies, and the queerest cosmopolitan scamps" among the Europeans.⁶⁵⁰ However, this approach changed later to a "massacre" committed by Muslim fanatics, and the outbreak was claimed to be premeditated. Arabi Pasha was charged with planning and organizing the masses. According to the United States Consul to Cairo, Elbert Eli Farman, the majority of the later reports represented "creative imaginations" of the correspondents. Contrary to General Stone, Farman,

⁶⁴⁹ Ibid.

⁶⁵⁰ M. E. Chamberlain, "The Alexandria Massacre of 11 June 1882 and the British Occupation of Egypt," *Middle Eastern Studies* 13, no. 1 (January 1977): 15.

and initial reports in the British press, Chaillé-Long also believed that the riots in the country were pre-concerted by the army under the control of Nationalists for whom he had no sympathy.⁶⁵¹

Stone went to Alexandria on July 6, with his son John upon Khedive Tewfik's order. After the British ultimatum that the city would be bombarded in twenty-four hours, he placed John aboard the frigate *USS Lancaster*, the flagship of the American admiral, and telegraphed his wife to remain under the protection of the General Staff officers. Stone was among five Western officials who remained around the Khedive with four Italians (an admiral, a private physician, his secretary, his master of ceremonies). They left Ras-El-Tin Palace on the night before the bombardment and went to Ramleh in the eastern suburbs. He believed this was his duty even though it was dangerous to ally with the Khedive against the rebel forces, leaving her wife and daughters among the rioters in Cairo:

I did all of which I was capable to aid the allies of the Khedive; well knowing that while such was my duty, yet the performance of that duty, day by day, and act by act, must necessarily add to the dangers clustering around my family in their isolation. In my position every act was, of course, well known and conspicuous to the enemies of the Khedive.⁶⁵²

Consul Farman recognized Stone's loyalty to the Khedive, telling the General kept his solemn promise to Ismail that "he would remain with and be true to his son" and did not leave him alone during the most troublesome days.⁶⁵³ Stone's position, once

⁶⁵¹ Elbert E. Farman, *Egypt and its Betrayal. An Account of the Country during the Periods of Ismail and Tewfik Pashas, and of How England Acquired a New Empire* (New York: The Grafton Press, 1908), 306, 307; Chaillé-Long, *The Three Prophet*, 192-194.

⁶⁵² Stone, "Introductory Note," 289.

⁶⁵³ Farman, 326.

more, exemplified an aspect of “trust honor,” which emphasizes the deeds of individuals who act reliably or being true to promises and commitments.⁶⁵⁴

Stone’s account of the Alexandria bombardment was denouncing. He condemned the military action as a display of the “British barbarism,” which was, according to him, responsible for many deaths. The General stated that the “barbarous disregard on the part of the British of the lives of citizens of all other nationalities” caused fearful anxiety and the horrible death of scores of Europeans” while the British subjects had been “carefully sent away.”⁶⁵⁵ Endorsing Stone’s statement, Commander Oliver A. Batcheller of *Galena* also reported that British citizens had already evacuated their posts before the bombardment.⁶⁵⁶ Thinking of the plight of his own family isolated in Cairo, Stone emphasized the impracticality of the earlier British notification, questioning the contemporary nature of the British “humanity:”

British subjects had been warned of the danger they would be in and had all been ordered out of the country [...] But there remained in Egypt many thousands of Europeans [...] many of them were in Cairo and the interior towns, and without the slightest regard of their safety [...] Think of clearing a city of 200.000 peaceable people in 24 hours with a single line of railway towards the interior! Think of clearing Egypt of 10.000 Europeans within 24 hours, or on the other hand, think of the position of these Europeans in the interior with the infuriated populace of a bombarded town rushing for safety into the interior to find isolated Europeans! What must be said of the civilization and humanity of Great Britain in the last quarter of the nineteenth century!⁶⁵⁷

In his letter to Morcedai, Stone blamed Admiral Edward H. Seymour of the Royal Navy for the loss of lives. According to him, had the Admiral given even forty-eight

⁶⁵⁴ Oprisko, 24.

⁶⁵⁵ Stone, “Introductory Note,” 292.

⁶⁵⁶ “American Force in Egypt. Acts of the Naval Officers before the Bombardment,” *The New York Times*, July 25, 1882.

⁶⁵⁷ Charles P. Stone to Alfred Morcedai, September 1882, Morcedai Papers; Cox, “Arabi and Stone,” 172.

hours' notice of his intention to bombard, the British government would have been spared the "frightful responsibility" which now weighs upon them of causing the "horrible death of men, women, and children," who perished miserably in the interior. Reminding that women and children were not the victims in the "so-called massacre" of June 10, Stone emphasized that during the bombardment as well as the panic flight from the hastily bombarded town, scores of Egyptian women and children perished. He believed this brought a sentiment of vengeance; therefore, retaliation came with the murder of the innocent and helpless Europeans by the victims' husbands, sons or fathers.⁶⁵⁸

Stone's observations started a heated debate among American officers who were entangled in the affair. After his introductory note to *Century* focusing on the "British barbarism," Commander Goodrich wrote an open letter to the magazine editors "to prevent the evil which might result from the promulgation of Stone's opinions" expressed in the previous issue. According to him, Stone's opinion involved serious charges against the British government, as represented by its diplomatic and naval officers in Egypt. The Commander also stressed that Stone was responsible for not bringing his family from Cairo to the American fleet anchored in Alexandrian shores because he decided the discomfort of a crowded train would be more dreaded than the dangers in Alexandria.⁶⁵⁹ Having been attacked in terms of his professional and private conduct, Stone would not mince his words in his answer to his American fellow. Relying on his first-hand observations, he reinstated the account of European misery and deaths due to the British actions. The General told

⁶⁵⁸ Charles P. Stone to Alfred Morcedai, September 1882, Morcedai Papers.

⁶⁵⁹ Caspar F. Goodrich, "The Bombardment of Alexandria. Letter from a United States Naval Officer," *Century* 28, July 1884, 635-636.

he visited hospitals and received police reports in the immediate day, and saw the commencement of the panic flight from the city:

Crowds of women of all classes of society were rushing forth into the open country outside, the greater number carrying each a small child and conducting other children; these, with old men who had hardly strength and activity to make their way, and young, strong, and fierce men, carrying, some of them, what they could of their household goods or of plunder, made up a scene which one would never wish to see again.⁶⁶⁰

Stone concluded his answer confidently, stating that “it was from such personal observations [...] of what had been the scenes of starvation, exposure, and outrage during the night” and from trustworthy reports of what happened later on. He emphasized that he was in a more reliable position than that of Goodrich whose “associations were only with the British and whose sources of information were almost purely British.”⁶⁶¹ According to Stone, Goodrich’s motives could only be understood “if he was the defender of the proceedings of the British government as a matter of his own intelligence and taste.” Indeed, the Commander was detached from duty with the American fleet and served on Wolseley’s staff at the battle of Tel-el-Kebir on September 13. Hence, his criticism of Stone’s judgments can be considered in terms of his devised loyalty and professional affiliations.

In the same issue in which Stone defended himself against Goodrich, *Century* published another open letter sent by Batcheller. Likewise, the Commander called the incident on June 10, a “riot” rather than a “massacre.” He noted that the rioters did not have weapons but donkey sticks or such fragments they secured in the cafes and shops they had looted while the armed foreigners shot down their opponents from balconies or windows in perfect safety. Endorsing Stone, he concluded his

⁶⁶⁰ Stone, “The Bombardment of Alexandria,” 956.

⁶⁶¹ Stone, “The Bombardment of Alexandria,” 954.

letter, stating that Goodrich had indirectly taken his information, and one needed to know the character of the large foreigner community in Alexandria to appreciate the situation. “Then,” he said, there would be “no difficulty in understanding why Stone Pasha spoke of the “event as the so-called” massacre of foreigners.”⁶⁶²

The polemic continued with Goodrich’s answer to both officers, with a remarkable rebuke in terms of Stone’s conduct of his family’s safe passage. However, defending his definition of the events as “massacre” in opposition to Stone and Batcheller, he pointed out that this subject was treated fully in a “pithy and interesting brochure” written by Chaillé-Long. According to the Commander, Chaillé-Long was “a man whose personal and official acquaintance with Egyptian affairs makes him an authority,” and he was “free from the grave charge of a leaning toward the British.”⁶⁶³ Indeed, claiming that “the crime was committed in the refusal to land troops on June 11,” and the bombardment after a month was a recognition of this fact, Chaillé-Long argued, “if there was a slightest disposition to employ force, Arabi’s army would have melted away like sun rays.”⁶⁶⁴

Stone saw the subsequent war between the British and Egyptian forces until July 13, when Arabi finally “threw off the mask” after sending a battalion of infantry and a squadron to surround the khedival palace. Till then, Arabi was in the cabinet and still appeared to respect the Khedive, though he dictated orders. However, the officers of the surrounding force declared they would not carry out the orders, and would be

⁶⁶² Oliver A. Batcheller, “The Bombardment of Alexandria,” *Century*, October 1884, 956-957.

⁶⁶³ Caspar F. Goodrich, “The Bombardment of Alexandria—To the Editor of the *Century*,” *Century* 29 (1884-1885), 797-798.

⁶⁶⁴ Chaillé-Long, *The Three Prophets*, 131.

faithful to the Khedive, which, Stone believed, “changed the color of everything.”⁶⁶⁵ On the other hand, Chaillé-Long’s version of this incident differs from that of Stone. As expected from the egocentric Colonel, he gave an indirect credit to himself for saving the Khedive from Arabi’s rebels, stating that the news of his entrance into the city with mariners was mistaken by the rebels as a British landing and ensued panic among them.⁶⁶⁶ According to Chaillé-Long, at this time, Stone only pleaded with him to enlist the aid of American Admiral Nicholson on behalf of his family.⁶⁶⁷ As Frederick Cox suspected, the discrepancy in their accounts may be attributed to the fact that Stone and Chaillé-Long did not have cordial relations in the last years of the mercenary mission, and the latter departed with some hostility towards the American Chief of the General Staff.⁶⁶⁸

Indeed, Chaillé-Long criticized Stone in the *New York Tribune*’s December 3, 1879 issue, in which he claimed the General had devoted his energy mainly to an expensive printing bureau, thus neglecting his fellow American officers –which it was for this reason the Cairo press called him “Le General Typographie.”⁶⁶⁹ His open criticism can also stem from that Stone reportedly had promised him a promotion but never mentioned it later. Moreover, his report on the Central Africa expedition was not published by the General Staff, although other reports had been printed. According to Hesseltine and Wolf, Chaillé-Long, who was jealous of his fame, suspected that the General waited until he could claim all the credit for

⁶⁶⁵ Charles P. Stone to Alfred Morcedai, September 1882, Morcedai Papers.

⁶⁶⁶ Chaillé-Long, “Egypt under the Viceroy,” 260.

⁶⁶⁷ Cox, “Arabi and Stone,” 156.

⁶⁶⁸ *Ibid.*

⁶⁶⁹ “A Retired Explorer. Colonel Long and his Adventures,” *New York Tribune*, December 3, 1879.

himself. After his discharge, he had spread the word that Stone's "incompetence and imbecility" had reduced the American mission to a pitiable state, claiming the *Pasha* became a "thorough Turk," and thought only his personal ends "at the cost of the demoralization of the corps of American officers."⁶⁷⁰

9.2. Stone Ladies in the Midst of Turmoil

While Stone allied with the Khedive and watched the turmoil from the palace, his wife Jeannie was literally called upon to demonstrate courage and give proof of her husband's high standing among the Arabs. Mrs. Stone was highly respected by the American network in Egypt. Graves, for example, found her "a very warm-hearted, frank woman saying pretty much what she thinks." According to him, "having a Southern heart," she was a woman of the world, but at the same time, one of the most devoted.⁶⁷¹ Jeannie was also a popular figure among the local people. She was actively engaged in philanthropic organizations, contrary to other mercenaries' wives, who mostly avoided interaction with the local scene. For example, she executed the ladies' branch of Cairo's Red Crescent. Instrumental in raising money in bake sales, this club also initiated independent campaigns. In this respect, "Madam Stone Pasha" sent to the central bureau of Red Crescent boxes of medicine, first aid materials, and 5,611 francs for the use of the Ottoman government. Indeed, her engagement solidified her and General Stone's status among the locals, at a time when Khedive's wives also contributed to such campaigns.⁶⁷²

⁶⁷⁰ Quoted in Hesselstine and Wolf, 229-230.

⁶⁷¹ Charles I. Graves to Margaret L. Graves, December 4, 1876, Graves Papers.

⁶⁷² Pinar, 245-47.

During the nativist riots, when she was encircled with many troubles, Jeannie Stone was able to keep calm. Advising her three daughters of the instability, she told them that they must have been cheerful, patient, and brave, continued their studies, and kept themselves busy. She assured them they had firearms enough in the house to defend themselves until they could get help from the staff officers who were loyal to General Stone. "If they fail us," she declared, "you can be brave and face death like good soldiers. Only promise me never to let an Arab touch you. When it comes to that, remember I expect you to save yourselves by putting a bullet through your heart. Don't leave it to me to do it."⁶⁷³ Emphasizing the ultimate goal of purity, she not only referred to the female dignity, which was conceived in the form of "chastity" as Steward points out, but also racialized the threat. Mrs. Stone knew that their only chance for safety was displaying courage. She asked Arabi Pasha to pay her husband's salary for the month and declared him that they would leave the city, which the staff found a useless attempt. While she awaited Arabi's answer, the Stone ladies demonstrated a courageous and dangerous "performance." On July 30, they "reconnoitered" Cairo in an open carriage. Highly surprised and anxious, Fanny recollected they went straight into the heart of the city, showing that her mother had the control of her household and was not afraid of the rioters. Finally, Arabi granted Stone's pay and allowed them to leave Cairo. The Stone ladies reached Alexandria where the American consulate had prepared a house for them as General Stone was with the Khedive.⁶⁷⁴

⁶⁷³ Fanny Stone, 291.

⁶⁷⁴ Fanny Stone, 297-301.

9.3. Another Card for Chaillé-Long

Chaillé-Long's entanglement in this period is no less interesting than Stone's, which provided him another opportunity to boost his reputation. Thanks to his service, American influence and prestige asserted itself in Egypt. Having been practicing law in the Cairo mixed courts, Chaillé-Long was appointed as acting consul on June 15 (at the suggestion of Judge Barringer, associate Justice of the Court of Appeals and General Stone), immediately after the representative of the United States, Baron Behor de Menasce who was a Levantine-Austrian subject, had left Egypt.⁶⁷⁵ The absent agent supposedly told Chaillé-Long that his "personal safety was of more importance to him than the office which costed him a great deal of money."⁶⁷⁶ *Egyptian Gazette* of June 24, 1882, reported the necessity of an American representative in Alexandria, and praised Chaillé-Long for his "renewed proof of abnegation" which he had given "in accepting the grave and delicate functions of consul in Egypt." The report emphasized that he took over the post at a time when "the American colony found itself abandoned" and most needed of a representative.⁶⁷⁷

On July 9, the British consul asked Chaillé-Long to ensure the evacuation of American citizens in the city within twenty-four hours using the American warships anchored in Alexandria port. The European Squadron of the United States Navy (*Lancaster, Quinnebaug, Galena, and Nipsic*) had been directed to Egypt under the command of Rear Admiral James W. Nicholson in June, with orders to observe the

⁶⁷⁵ James W. A. Nicholson to W. E. Chandler, July 15, 1882, Chaillé-Long Papers.

⁶⁷⁶ Chaillé-Long, *The Three Prophets*, 134-135, 136.

⁶⁷⁷ Quoted in Chaillé-Long, *The Three Prophets*, 135.

conflict and to protect American citizens.⁶⁷⁸ Upon the notification, Chaillé-Long, with the Admiral's approval, arranged the transfer of Belgians, Swedes, Syrians, Armenians, Greeks, and others who had sought the consulate's protection. He noted that many French citizens, with their families, who came from Cairo, also took refuge in the American ships as they found their consulate closed. Meanwhile, Nicholson reported to the United States government that he would welcome "all persons of any nationality asking protection" whose countries had no vessels in the port, thus making *Lancaster* and *Galena* safe havens for "those unfortunate and innocent foreigners" residing in Alexandria.⁶⁷⁹

The refugees were many in numbers. Those on board of *Galena* had been transferred to an Italian merchant ship at a rate of twenty-five dollars per person on a daily basis due to the overcapacity.⁶⁸⁰ Chaillé-Long wrote in his memoirs that having abandoned these people to the "savage brutalities," the French consulate caused unnumbered victims who had been driven into the streets by the mob. Saying "how many will never be known," Chaillé-Long was fairly sure that hundreds perished in this way. However, according to him, Nicholson's prompt action, and the captains of the American ships rendered service in the cause of humanity and made the name of Americans "a household word of endearment in Alexandria."⁶⁸¹

⁶⁷⁸ Chaillé-Long, *The Three Prophets*, 145-149; William N. Still, *American Sea Power in the Old World: The United States Navy in European and Near Eastern Waters, 1865-1917* (Westport: Greenwood Press, 1980), 83.

⁶⁷⁹ Richard S. Collum, *History of the United State Marine Corps* (New York: L.R. Hamersly, 1903), 218.

⁶⁸⁰ Still, 84; "American Forces in Egypt. Acts of the Naval Officers Before the Bombardment," *The New York Times*, July 25, 1882.

⁶⁸¹ Chaillé-Long, *The Three Prophets*, 141-142, 147.

Finally, in the morning of July 11, Admiral Seymour aboard *HMS Invincible* signaled to fire Egyptian fortifications and batteries. Egyptian forces, which lost a remarkable number of men and guns, used the firepower effectively, but the British officers were sure about the outcome, as Charles Royle of the Royal Navy confidently stressed.⁶⁸² On the second day of the bombardment, a fire broke out on the shore, which surrounded the wealthiest neighbors of Alexandria inhabited mostly by non-Muslims.

When the fires were extinguished, American mariners began to patrol the city under the guidance of Chaillé-Long, placing guards at strategically important posts, including the bourse, telegraph offices, and banks that were not pillaged.⁶⁸³ The American force was composed of marines, a Gatling gun, a company of sailors, a three-inch breech-loading rifle and crew. Indeed, it was the first attempt to take control of the city. Captain Charles Beresford of the British fleet endorsed the American efforts, recollecting that order could not have been restored without the Americans.⁶⁸⁴ In a letter to President Chester Arthur, Stone also praised Chaillé-Long for having disembarked rapidly and floating the American flag over the bombarded city.⁶⁸⁵ Passing through the “black smoke stifling with hine and dust,” Chaillé-Long portrayed the scene after the bombardment:

In many places, a wall of flame burst from windows and doors, and, leaping across the narrow street, barred the way. We could only pass by climbing over the burned buildings and the fallen walls [...] Books and papers in the greatest confusion were strewed about, and upon them were to be seen the

⁶⁸² Charles Royle, *The Egyptian Campaigns 1882-1885* (London: Hurst and Blackett, Ltd., 1900), 606.

⁶⁸³ Kusel, 208.

⁶⁸⁴ Leo J. Daugherty, *The Marine Corps and the State Department: Enduring Partners in United States Foreign Policy, 1798-2007* (Jefferson, NC: McFarland & Company, 2009), 30.

⁶⁸⁵ Charles P. Stone to President of the United States, July 24, 1882, Chaillé-Long Papers.

blood-stains which told their significant story more plainly than words. It was difficult to recognize a spot which a few days before had been the pride of the Alexandrians. [...] All else was in ashes save the statue of Mehemet-Ali, which seemed to look down with horror upon the ruins around.⁶⁸⁶

According to Chaillé-Long, his fellow American officers (lieutenant commanders Goodrich and Hutchings, captains Denny, Cochrane, Burnett, Graham, Waller, Dent, Smith, and Dent, Gardner and Anderson) have worked with indefatigable energy in putting out the fires.⁶⁸⁷ Hence, Annapolis cadets had their turn after the West Pointers had represented American military skills for several years on the Egyptian shores.

After reopening the American consulate before other diplomatic missions were able to resume their operations, Chaillé-Long resigned from his temporary post on August 17, 1882, stating that he was no longer needed and unable to bear the expenses it had entailed.⁶⁸⁸ With this valuable effort, the Marylander added “diplomat” to his card, and was honored with the prestigious Order of Osmanieh, the second highest order in the Ottoman Empire for the civilian and military services, as well as Legion of Honor by the French government, “as a token of the esteem for the very great services he had rendered to Egypt, and particularly those immediately before and after the bombardment.”⁶⁸⁹ In his resignation letter, he informed the State Department of the American officers’ conduct, and that the British officers had personally expressed their appreciation of the American aid. According to the British, if the Americans had not helped, all that remains of the Place des Consuls

⁶⁸⁶ Chaillé-Long, *The Three Prophets*, 182-183 (copied from his diary, July 14, 1882).

⁶⁸⁷ Chaillé-Long, *The Three Prophets*, 186.

⁶⁸⁸ Charles Chaillé-Long to State Department, August 17, 1882, Chaillé-Long Papers.

⁶⁸⁹ Chaillé-Long, “Egypt under the Viceroy,” 260.

and the vicinity would have been inevitably destroyed. Admiral Nicholson also addressed a letter to the State Department showing his high appreciation for the consulate staff:

He was indefatigable in aiding the poor refugees before the bombardment, and since then has endeavored in every way to be of use to the interests of the United States. He [...] remained on duty until ordered to bring the archives on board of this vessel. The United States consulate under his charge was also the first one reopened on shore; in fact, his services have been in the past, and will, I think, in the future, be of such a nature as to merit the consideration of the Department.⁶⁹⁰

In accepting his resignation, the State Department formally stated its gratitude for Chaillé-Long's "valuable and humane services rendered in the interest of humanity" during the operations at Alexandria.⁶⁹¹

However, Chaillé-Long complained later that American efforts to secure the order and save lives had been forgotten or ascribed to others. Obviously, he was aggravated by being disregarded. Frustrated with the unfriendly omissions in an Egyptian journal regarding his service, the *Marylander* asked some witnesses to support his statements as evidence. For example, confirming that he had received the most generous assistance in restoring order from the American staff, Barton R. Bradford of the Royal Navy protested the neglect upon Chaillé-Long's service and emphasized the American welcome during the crisis once more:

The statement that the American detachment returned on board, is entirely incorrect, and I am sure the thanks of the European population are due to you for the zeal and energy you displayed in replacing them in possession of their homes. You were always at your post ready to assist everybody, without regard to nationality, and I may say that no man worked harder during that

⁶⁹⁰ James A. Nicholson to W. E. Chandler (Secretary of the Navy), July 15, 1882, United States Congressional Serial Set, Volume 2328; Chaillé-Long, *The Three Prophets*, 199; personal copy, Chaillé-Long Papers.

⁶⁹¹ State Department to Charles Chaillé-Long, September 8, 1882, Chaillé-Long Papers.

eventful week, I now thank you and your officers and men for their assistance, and also for the kindness we received at your hands.⁶⁹²

To remedy his anxiety, Chaillé-Long even penned a fourteen-page letter to President Theodore Roosevelt in 1903. In the letter, he complained that his denial of diplomatic positions for more than twenty years and accused of the State Department officials of dishonesty. The then sixty-three year old man who had a remarkable career in three continents (he was appointed as consul-general to Korea in 1887) hoped he could be guarded through the President's "energetic and patriotic power" from further grievance on his side, which, he implied, was notwithstanding his prolific career in the service of the United States.⁶⁹³

9.4. Americans' Views of the Arab Nationalism and Future of Egypt

It is interesting to note that Chaillé-Long's memoirs are somewhat reserved about political judgments on the British-Egyptian crisis, unlike that of Stone and some other former comrades. For example, blaming the British for the provocation and acquitting Arabi, General Loring asserted there was no question that the Arab leader opposed to the massacre of the Christians, and "did all he could to prevent it."⁶⁹⁴ On the other hand, Loring underlined his hatred of foreign influence, including the Circassian and Turk. According to him, Arabi believed the Circassian-Turk duo had "undeservedly placed them over the civil and military administration of his country," and Arabs rarely obtained office. Loring stated in a lengthy interview that Arabi and American veterans were often on good terms despite the initial problems, and the

⁶⁹² Barton R. Bradford to Charles Chaillé-Long, April 24, 1883, Chaillé-Long Papers.

⁶⁹³ Charles Chaillé-Long to Theodore Roosevelt, August 15, 1903, Chaillé-Long Papers.

⁶⁹⁴ Loring, 207.

former colonel “never ceased saying that they were the only foreigners whom he had welcomed to his country,” for he believed “the Americans had never taken an interest in his race.”⁶⁹⁵ Reminding the logic behind Ismail’s preference for the American recruitments mentioned in the second chapter, Arabi’s views reflected the –reported– sympathy of the nationalists toward the United States, for they knew the *Amerikani* were there “not to plunder and oppress but to aid and encourage.”⁶⁹⁶ Chaillé-Long’s version of Arabi, on the other hand, is a religious fanatic as a “bad and impolitic prophet.” He asserted that the “very poor set of patriots” around him were taking care of themselves at the expense of the nation even though the press wrote so.⁶⁹⁷ For example, according to Chaillé-Long, Mahmoud Fehmy was fanatical and hated the Christians, and likewise, Ali Fehmy was an “abject creature, timid and coward.” He claimed that the presence of a national party only concealed their religious fanaticism and hatred of the Christian.⁶⁹⁸ The Nationalist Program, on the other hand, underlined they were not a religious body but a political organization, stating “it included within its ranks men of various races and various creeds” and promoted equal rights to all who cultivated the Egyptian soil and spoke its language.⁶⁹⁹

However, Elbert Eli Farman and Simon Wolf, representatives of the United States, respectively in Cairo and Alexandria, sympathized with Arabi and his followers.

⁶⁹⁵ “The Egyptian War: General Loring Gives His Views on the Situation,” *New York Herald*, September 8, 1882.

⁶⁹⁶ Simon Wolf to Secretary of the State, March 21, 1882, *cited in* James A. Field, 425.

⁶⁹⁷ Chaillé-Long, *The Three Prophets*, 88, 96, 100.

⁶⁹⁸ Chaillé-Long, *The Three Prophets*, 98, 99, 113.

⁶⁹⁹ Cited in Blunt, 385.

Describing Arabi as a hero, Farman declared “no patriot was ever more popular [...] no patriot was ever less actuated by motives of personal ambition,” and concluded that “he was the idol of his people.”⁷⁰⁰ Supporting General Stone’s observations, Farman argued Ferdinand de Lesseps (the Suez Canal’s developer), Jewish bankers, aggressive European powers, and especially the British should have been blamed for the 1882 riots.⁷⁰¹ Likewise, Wolf believed Europeans would seize upon the slightest provocation to occupy Egypt, and the riots gave them what they needed. Having informed the State Department that on such a limited chessboard, the game of European diplomacy was more or less played, the Consul stressed that Americans should have been protected, and the United States had to strive to avert the catastrophe. Indeed, he had requested the American squadron near Egyptian coasts and met Arabi on November 11, 1881, at Stone’s home. Wolf shared Arabi’s belief that Egyptians were “the natives and owners of the soil” and deserved to be free from oppression. After assuring him that the United States was “in no way mixed up in European or Levant politics” and that he spoke as a “fellow man as an individual from [...] a free country [...] whose citizens had [...] themselves suffered tyranny and tasted the bitterness of an iron yoke,” Wolf urged Arabi to show moderation and beware of the “Trojan Horse of French and English influence.” He clearly stated there was “scarcely a native but knows [...] that the United States are their friend,” as Vice Consul Nicholas D. Comanos stated once that Americans were not there “to plunder and oppress but to aid and encourage.”⁷⁰²

⁷⁰⁰ Farman, 302.

⁷⁰¹ Farman, 303.

⁷⁰² Simon Wolf to James. G. Blaine, September 15, 1881, October 29, 1881 and November 11, 1881; Simon Wolf to Frederick T. Frelinghuysen, March 21, 1882, DUSCA; Nicholas D. Comanos to Secretary of State, September 1, 1879, DUSCA; Oren, 264-65.

In the meeting at Stone's house with the consular clerk as the interpreter, Wolf urged Arabi to remain loyal to the Khedive and avoid hasty steps. Arabi replied that Egypt should have controlled its own destiny, even though the lack of qualified people at times made it necessary to seek outside help. In this respect, the Pasha mentioned General Stone. Even though Stone had stood with the Khedive against the army agitators, the Nationalist leader said he "served Egypt for Egypt's good, and should have been well remunerated."⁷⁰³ Army members' sympathy for Stone was also demonstrated in a Khedival Geographical Society meeting years later when a graduate of staff school described Stone's loss as "inconsolable."⁷⁰⁴

Stone, on the other hand, was discreet about Arabi. Even though he saw the Pasha as a rebel, he did not denounce him openly and maintained communication during the rebellion. Initially seemed to assume a neutral attitude, the General informed Arabi of the torpedo mines in the harbor and some naval machinery that were recently shipped from the United States.⁷⁰⁵ That said, when the colors changed, the General credited the American efforts in Arabi's defeat because his Egyptian staff officers had been loyal to the Khedive; thus the British troops led by Garnet Wolseley "had only to encounter an army with only a body and legs, but without any head." Stone believed if Arabi had had any gumption, to say nothing of military capacity, the British would have met with several severe defeats.⁷⁰⁶ Stone's bitter denunciation of

⁷⁰³ Quoted in Field, 428.

⁷⁰⁴ Quoted in Field, 434.

⁷⁰⁵ Cox, "The American Naval Mission in Egypt," 177.

⁷⁰⁶ "Egypt's American Leader. General Stone's Departure - His Reason for Resigning Valuable Paper Destroyed," *Boston Globe*, February 6, 1883, 6; "Why an American Counselor of the Khedive Resigned his Office," *Egyptian Gazette*, January 8, 1883.

Arabi's military competence was perhaps due to the latter's failure to heed General's advice on the national defense. As early as 1871, Stone had submitted a report to Ismail, which focused on protecting the coastal possessions against any assault from the sea. Having covered the results of three recent invasions of Egyptian soils as well as a detailed expose on how the Delta could be used to repel invaders, the report argued that Tel-El-Kebir and Zagazig would be of great importance in the Egyptian affairs.⁷⁰⁷ Indeed, Arabi followed Stone's strategy in the primary defense points against the British, although it proved to be partial. Stating that Stone regretted not having been able to fortify these two points, Colonel Lockett believed Arabi's making his first serious stand against the invading forces at Tel-el-Kebir showed Stone "put the idea into his head that this position was the key to the Nile Delta."⁷⁰⁸

American veterans' views on the emerging Arab nationalism and the country's future can complete their entanglement and observations on contemporary Egyptian affairs. Chaillé-Long, for example, rejected the idea of an authentic Nationalist movement in Egypt. According to him, the weakness of Khedive Tewfik, and the intrigues of the Powers gave a renewed life to the "so-called" National Party. He insisted that "a color of nationalism had been given to the movement," especially by the French consul general. Asserting confidently that the cry of "Egypt for Egyptians" was just a snare and delusion, he believed, even if the Nationalists had succeeded in placing the country under the control of its native people, it would be still a great question whether the condition of the fellah would have been improved. Stating they were pulverized by taxes under the lash of the courbatch, Chaillé-Long described the

⁷⁰⁷ Cox, "American Naval Mission," 174.

⁷⁰⁸ Samuel Henry Lockett, "Arabi and His Army," *Nation*, September 28, 1882, 258.

fellah as a “mere chattel attached to the glebe.” Therefore, they had little interest in the movement flourished in Cairo while the English-French condominium secured them the suppression of troublesome taxes with an organized central inspection, abolition of forced labor, and the adoption of fixed-term military service.⁷⁰⁹

Similarly, Loring claimed there was no such thing as patriotism among Arabs.

Nevertheless, unlike his fellow, the General foresaw a rising national sentiment with Arabi. According to him, the natives were drawn to Arabi because he was an Arab and the representative not only of their religion but of their race. For the first time in centuries, he concluded, there could be born some notions of patriotism in the ancient lands.⁷¹⁰

Evoking Colonel Derrick’s call for the Italian domination in Abyssinia as a civilizing force in the region,⁷¹¹ Chaillé-Long and Loring openly called for European control for the sake of the native Egyptian population. Claiming the country’s future could not be entrusted to the fellah, Chaillé-Long asserted that this was the Egyptian “manifest destiny,” and the diverse interests of the Europeans would merge into a condominium for the benefit of them. Thus, the Eastern question, which he described as a menace, might become “a pledge for the peace of Europe.”⁷¹² Loring was more assertive in his support for the British control. Reiterating his Orientalist views about the local dynamics and need for instruction in social and political realms, he suggested the British should have owned Egypt as “no government could better rule

⁷⁰⁹ Chaillé-Long, *The Three Prophets*, 87-89.

⁷¹⁰ “The Egyptian War: General Loring Gives His Views on the Situation,” *New York Herald*, September 8, 1882.

⁷¹¹ Derrick, “A Military Picnic,” Derrick Papers.

⁷¹² Chaillé-Long, *The Three Prophets*, 231-232, 235.

her” than the “lion in her path.” According to the General, when the “relics of barbarism” was removed after a strong arm of power forced an “enlightenment” in the government as well as religion, Egypt would rise from its ashes.⁷¹³ Stating that the Ottoman government drained Egypt by an increasing annual tribute and was “sucking her life blood” for years, Colonel Graves also believed Egypt would be simply exchanging one master for a better one if any European nation or even Russia could possess it.⁷¹⁴ Unsurprisingly, Stone bitterly denounced the British “political bondage” in the country’s future and left Egypt in early 1883 (resigned in December 1882) after twelve years. His reason for leaving was that Egypt had virtually become a British province despite the protestations of the contrary and that the British officers ransacked his offices, destroying invaluable documents, among which were numerous reports and maps prepared by the American officers. The destruction, he believed, was of almost irreparable loss to scientific knowledge. Farman, on the other hand, claimed the British authorities also insisted on his retirement.⁷¹⁵

9.5. Conclusion

Examining a short period when the American mercenary group was already dissolved, this chapter primarily accounts for Stone and Chaillé-Long’s engagements during the Nationalist uprising in 1882 and the subsequent British bombardment of Alexandria. Stone’s case displayed his utmost allegiance with the Khedive and

⁷¹³ “The Egyptian War: General Loring Gives His Views on the Situation,” *New York Herald*, September 8, 1882.

⁷¹⁴ Charles I. Graves to Margaret L. Graves, June 13, 1877, Graves Papers.

⁷¹⁵ “Egypt’s American Leader. General Stone’s Departure, His Reason for Resigning, Valuable Paper Destroyed,” *Boston Daily Globe*, February 6, 1883, 6; “Why an American Counselor of the Khedive Resigned his Office,” *Egyptian Gazette*, January 8, 1883; Farman, 272.

provided first-hand American insights into the recent historical events. He was indeed straddled between his patrimonial responsibilities and professional duties, which proved to be a test of loyalty. Mrs. Stone's handling of the situation in Cairo during the riots, on the other hand, shows she courageously managed to arrange the safe conduct of the family. Chaillé-Long's efforts to rescue foreign refugees and help to maintain control in the city after the bombardment as the acting consul of the United States added to the American "prestige" abroad and boosted his long-sought personal recognition, winning him a diplomatic card. In the context of Americans' engagement in a transitional period, particularly interesting were their diverging ideas of what happened (Goodrich and Stone's polemics) and what would follow in the future. The mercenary narratives show Americans saw Egypt in a historical course as a victim of Turkish oppression and resembled it to the early American experience. However, some called for a protectorate in the country instead of independence, which represents the prevailing Western mindset regarding Oriental autonomy. The expectation that Egypt would be a British colony was indeed proven, considering that the British troops left the country in the 1950s.

CHAPTER X

CONCLUSION

When the neo-Confederates chanting “South will rise again” marched against the removal of the equestrian statue of Robert E. Lee in Charlottesville, it was more than a hundred and fifty years since the Confederate Commander signed the surrender documents in the parlor of Appomattox Court House. However, the war fought in a wide milieu from the battlefields to the Capitol’s long corridors and humble veteran houses throughout the country fifteen decades ago, still “lies at the heart of the story Americans tell themselves about themselves” as the Civil War historian Don H. Doyle notes.⁷¹⁶ In return, the war and Reconstruction have provided historians with a considerable amount of subject matters through which they could construct narratives, revise the canonical knowledge or address the story in socially, geographically, and chronologically broader frames. One of the recent approaches in these scholarly efforts is the internationalization of the Civil War Era with a transnational/global perspective beyond the traditional boundaries of the diplomatic

⁷¹⁶ Don Harrison Doyle, *The Cause of All Nations: An International History of the American Civil War* (New York: Basic Books, 2015), 11.

histories. Today, almost one-hundred-and-fifty years after the first group of the American Civil War veterans arrived in Egypt, Colonel Purdy's tomb in Cairo stands as the only solid monument to their Egyptian sojourn, which could deservedly be placed into the literature of the Civil War Era's global histories.

Between 1869 and 1878, almost fifty American officers from both sides of the Civil War were recruited into the Egyptian army. Despite the recent hostility, the former foes collaborated in reforming the old-fashioned khedival military establishment by reorganizing the units and professional training, building up the defenses, exploring unknown territories down to Equatorial Provinces, and mapping the vicinity as well as the peripheries of Egyptian influence as skilled cartographers. As an earlier example of ex-Confederate-Union amalgamation, this "mission" was small in number compared to other post-war diasporic communities, yet highly representative with men of different skill sets, affiliations, ranks, and ages.

The end of the Civil War left the United States with a vast pool of disbanded veterans as the Congress reformed the regular army. They either had to earn their life as civilians or sought for adventures as soldiers of fortunes. For many of the Union veterans, the main motive was the lack of opportunity in the professional ranks. For the ex-Confederates who were largely forbidden to serve in the new United States Army and had troubles in adjusting themselves to Reconstruction, the financial difficulty and corresponding social stigmas were stronger motivations. Overall, they were in search of some sort of redemption, either in financial terms which had strong implications regarding honor or respectability of the men in the nineteenth century or professional pursuits. The personal pursuits of the unemployed or dissatisfied Americans would coincide with the Egyptian quests when Khedive Ismail planned to

utilize Western expertise to modernize his country. A modern military force was in the center of his proposed reforms, which would securely be financed by the drastic profit from the Civil War cotton boom. Khedive's favor for an American contingent had two main practical reasons: First, Americans recently experienced a long war with modern equipment, training, and tactics. Secondly, the United States had no imperialistic plans on Egyptian territory and was seen as a friendly partner vis-à-vis the European Powers.

American recruitment in Egypt was organized by Thaddeus P. Mott of New York, who was an ideal independent agent for Ismail, given his personal connections to the Ottoman Porte. The first recruits arrived in 1870, and three successive groups followed them until 1875 summer when the last company landed in Alexandria. Many of these mercenaries were West Point and Annapolis graduates, some of whom had mercenary backgrounds. However, Egyptian sojourn proved to be a disappointment for some "soldier of misfortunes" who were dissatisfied with their assignments that necessitated supervision rather than commanding troops. Mott's close relations with the consul-general in Alexandria, who instigated the sectional divisions in the mercenary group, and utilizing American expertise in public works changed the dynamics of the American mission.

After a quasi-war against Mott, Charles P. Stone ascended to the leadership of American veterans in Egypt. A West Point graduate and Mexican War veteran who was reportedly the first volunteer to enlist in the Union Army, Stone's military career was devastated after a Congressional committee charged him with treason in 1862. When Stone established his authority in Egypt as the chief of the general staff, he extended general and military education to lesser units of the army, founded a

military library, organized a new branch in the general staff to conduct geographical expeditions and mapping, supervised fortifications and inquired about technology transfer from the United States. He managed to restore his self-worth in a twelve-year active service in Egypt and returned to the United States as an esteemed pasha.

Stone was influential in the Khedival Geographical Society which disseminated knowledge about the Nile Basin and Eastern Africa. Among his most accomplished explorers and cartographers were Raleigh E. Colston, Samuel H. Lockett, Charles Chaillé-Long, Henry G. Prout, and Erastus S. Purdy, who altogether conducted a series of expeditions and topographic surveys in Sudan, Uganda, and the Ethiopian borderlands. Charles I. Graves and Henry C. Derrick, who were instrumental in engineering and logistical projects, contributed to these grand-scale expeditions with surveys in the vicinity. The final reports of these expeditions are more tangible legacies of their exploits from a universal scientific viewpoint than the military worth.

In 1876, ten of the veterans participated in the Abyssinian Campaign in which Egyptian forces suffered a humiliating defeat against what they saw “barbarians.” Although Americans were not given command on the battlefield, the ethnic rivalries worked against them, and the defeat signaled the end of the mercenary service in Egypt. Finally, the American mission dissolved with the army reduction in 1878 when the national budget was under European overseers’ control. Only Stone, Purdy, Prout, and Chaillé-Long were in Egypt during the Arabi Revolt and Anglo-Egyptian war in 1882, though the latter three were civilian employees at the time. Stone and Chaillé-Long would be both active participants and observers of the political turmoil that ended with the British control in the country.

Overall, the veterans' sojourn in Egypt had temporary and more tangible impacts on both sides. From the Egyptian perspective, the prevailing legacy was mostly limited to disseminating geographical knowledge through explorations, mapping, and conducting scientific surveys. Having added to the information gained in the earlier expeditions in Africa (for example, Baker and Stanley) or paving the way for the future ones, these missions had both cultural and commercial implications in the region. With this, Egyptian influence reached down to Sudan, new routes opened for trade or army transfer, and logistical investments like lighthouses were built to protect commercial interests. Moreover, their in-depth observations served as among the earliest accounts of Somalians or Central African tribes as well as the topographical features in the peripheries. These exploits indeed were universal legacies of the explorer-soldiers even though British colonial narratives often ignored the Americans' contribution to the introduction of the old continent.

From a military viewpoint, Dunn concludes that Ismail's "Neo-Mamluks" were "poor investments" because they were not able to repeat the success of Mehmed Ali's Mamluks at the battlefield. However, it is not fair to argue whether they were poor or good investments, for Americans never commanded troops, and they participated only in one battle during their mercenary service. Oren and Field speculate about another legacy, arguing that the patriotism exemplified by the Americans was featured heavily in the future role of the army in national modernization and proliferation of national sentiments. Even though such an influence was demonstrated by the native staff officers who trained in the military schools modeled after West Point and who never wavered in loyalty to the Khedive during Arabi Revolt, the authors' approaches are generous celebrations of the

American influence in Egypt. On the other hand, in a counterfactual interpretation, the modernization project led by Stone in terms of military education, fortifying the assets, and technology transfer would have proved to be more successful had the British not invaded the country (perhaps then American legacy would have been more visible).

On the other hand, the “Arabian Nights” of the Civil War veterans had more tangible legacies from the American perspective, considering their personal redemption, Reconstruction’s transnational dimensions, and the United States’ engagement in the Middle East in the nineteenth century. These aspects, indeed, made the story an American experience with an Egyptian background.

Concerned about financial burdens and its social implications like masculine self-worth as well as professional worries, American officers found a common cause far from home. Egyptian sojourn provided these “losers” with some stability and opportunity to prove their martial abilities. Remarkably, many of them returned home with relative financial security, decorations on their chests, and local fame, securing their much sought-after dignity. In this respect, Colonel Graves’s delight in receiving “a different welcome [...] from the one in 1864” vividly illustrated ex-Confederates’ rehabilitation.⁷¹⁷ Colonels Derrick and Graves restored their farms, and most of their fellows involved in business in the following decade. Lockett, Colston, and Chaillé-Long gained reputation with lectures about Egypt and his encounters with the native Africans. Stone’s devastated career was crowned with his service to two khedives. Even though some members of the American

⁷¹⁷ Charles I. Graves to Margaret L. Graves, July 25, 1878, Graves Papers.

contingent returned home with no better conditions than they had arrived, Egypt, after all, served as a temporary asylum for them, as well.

As Egypt drew men who had fought against each other during the recent Civil War, this mercenary experience was an early proving ground for the sectional reunion in military service. The comradeship of ex-Confederates and Union veterans in the Egyptian Army reflected a micro reconciliation model, with the former enemies representing American identity together before the Spanish-American War (1898), which is regarded as the national parallel. In a distant land, which was probably not the first destination to think of, the recent enemies came together and maintained their country's reputation. This legacy of reconciliation has two aspects. The first is about the cultural foundations that made it possible. The former foes were able to reunite because they were indeed similar to each other. In this respect, their experience contributes to the broad discussions about the differences or similarities among Civil War soldiers' in their motivations and how much of an adjustment the veterans had to make to get along during Reconstruction. Secondly, their expatriation presents the cultural gap among Americans and their host society. These threads pertained to perceptions—how the ex-Confederates and Union veterans understood each other and Egyptian people. When brought into dialogues, these two threads indicate they were remarkably similar in their concerns with money-making, efficiency, and lack of concern over customs.

Another legacy from the American perspective is their historical role as the forerunners of the Egypt-United States cooperation. The existence of mercenaries in Egypt proves how widespread American participation was in terms of military and cultural encounters during that period. American transnational exploits, exporting

military and civil engineering know-how – and the interest generated in Egypt – show how the United States was globally extending its influence long before 1898 even though it was not an official mission. In this respect, particularly interesting was the idea of the United States being seen as a non-imperial actor. Indeed, Americans benefited from this nineteenth century conviction, which, in return, served to increase American interests in the Middle East.

After all, the mercenary accounts deserve to be paid attention not because they were seldomly listened or represent a cluster of “curiosities.” Indeed, the body of texts presents various aspects of human experience often ignored in political histories. They are essential to understand in which ways social-economic changes altered the lives of their subjects, how these men served in such a mission and interacted with a strange setting, how they coped with the adjustment and other difficulties, and finally, how they were able to reclaim their much-sought dignity. The American veterans who lived and worked in Egypt for a while either desired to recover financially, restore their good names or receive some sort of public recognition. After all, most of them were able to recuperate from their varying concerns at home and left an American mark on Egypt. The story of reconstructing themselves and the American in this unimaginable setting is colorful as the Egyptian background, and it deserves to be taken into consideration in a broader scope beyond the Egyptian military history.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Archival Collections

Abraham Lincoln Papers. Manuscript/Mixed Material, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

Alfred Morcedai Papers. Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

Alexander Macomb Mason Papers. Library of Congress, Manuscript Division, Washington, D.C.

Benjamin F. Butler Papers. Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

Charles Chaillé-Long Papers. Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

Charles Iverson Graves Papers. Southern Historical Collection, Wilson Library, The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

David French Boyd Papers. Special Collections, Louisiana State University Libraries, Baton Rouge.

Henry Clay Derrick Papers. Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

James Morris Morgan Papers. Southern Historical Collection, Wilson Library, The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

National Archives and Records Administration (NARA), Washington, D.C.

Raleigh Edward Colston Papers. Southern Historical Collection, Wilson Library, The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

Samuel Henry Lockett Papers. Southern Historical Collection, Wilson Library, The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

William B. Hesseltine Papers. Wisconsin Historical Society, University of Wisconsin, Madison.

William Tecumseh Sherman Papers. Manuscript/Mixed Material, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

Unpublished Manuscripts

Chaillé-Long, Charles. "The Forgotten American Mission to Egypt." Chaillé-Long Papers.

Colston, Raleigh Edward. "Address Before the Ladies Memorial Association at Wilmington," May 10, 1870. Colston Papers.

-----. *Problems of Free Society*. Colston Papers.

Fuller, Jean Lockett. "Katura or Reminiscent of an American Girl in the East." Lockett Papers.

Graves, Charles Iverson. "An Address on Egypt and Egyptians." Graves Papers.

-----. "Lecture on Egypt." Graves Papers.

Graves, Margaret Lea. "Reminiscences of Margaret Lea Graves." Graves Papers.

Lockett, Cornelia. "House Keeping in Cairo." Lockett Papers.

Lockett, Jeanie. "Edith and Jeanie." Lockett Papers.

-----. "Journal of a Visit to Cairo, Egypt," July-August 1875. Lockett Papers.

-----. "My Second Attempt – Our Trip across the Ocean," May 1, 1876. Lockett Papers.

-----. "A Journal of My Trip from Cairo, Egypt to America," September 1877. Lockett Papers.

Lockett, Samuel Henry. "The Contrast of the War." Lockett Papers.

-----. "Notes on the Abyssinian Campaign of the Egyptian Army." Lockett Papers.

-----. "Our Life in Egypt." Lockett Papers.

-----. "Recent Military Operation of the Egyptians." Lockett Papers.

-----. "Recent War in Egypt," February 1881. Lockett Papers.

Marks, Hettie Lockett. "Origin of the First Confederate Flag. A Sketch of Mrs. Napoleon Lockett." Lockett Papers.

Porter, Fitz John. "In memory of Gen. Chas. P. Stone," 1887, Harvard College Library Collection.

Published Materials

- “A Remarkable Swindle: A Sharper Selling Commissions in the Egyptian Service. The Story of a Dupe.” *The New York Times*, April 15, 1875.
- “A Retired Explorer. Colonel Long and his Adventures.” *New York Tribune*, December 3, 1879.
- “A Soldier of Fortune Dead. General Thaddeus P. Mott and His Battles for Several Nations.” *Paterson Daily Press*, November 24, 1894.
- “A Splendid Career was Ended in the Death of Colonel Graves.” *Rome Tribune*, November 5, 1896.
- Allen, Charles. H. *The Life of “Chinese” Gordon, R.E., C.B.* Toronto: William Briggs, 1884.
- Alpers, Edward A. “Charles Chaillé-Long’s Mission to Mutesa of Buganda.” *The Uganda Journal* 29, no. 1 (1965): 1-11.
- Ambrose, Stephen E. *Duty, Honor, Country: A History of West Point*. Baltimore and London: The John Hopkins University Press, 1999.
- “American Officers in Egypt. General Stone’s Command and its Alleged Abuses – An Interview with Colonel Horatio B. Reed.” *Daily Graphic*, January 29, 1879.
- “American Officers in the Service of the Khedive.” *The New York Times*, August 26, 1870.
- “Americans in Egypt – The Abyssinian Expedition.” *New York Tribune*, February 26, 1876.
- Anderson, David. “Down Memory Lane: Nostalgia for the Old South in Post-Civil War Plantation Reminiscences.” *The Journal of Southern History* 71, no. 1 (2005): 105-136.
- Armitage, David, et al. “Interchange: Nationalism and Internationalism in the Era of the Civil War.” *Journal of American History* 98, no. 2 (2011): 455-89.
- Balch, Edwin Swift. “American Explorers of Africa.” *Geographical Review* 5, no. 4 (1918): 274-81.
- Barbour, John D. “Edward Said and the Space of Exile.” *Literature & Theology* 21 (2007): 293-301.
- Beard, Rick. “Disunion: The Scapegoat of Ball’s Bluff.” *The New York Times*, January 15, 2012.
- “Beauregard and the Khedive.” *The New York Times*, July 21, 1882.

- Beckert, Sven. *Empire of Cotton: A Global History*. New York: Alfred Knopf, 2015.
- Bellamy, John D. *Memoirs of an Octogenarian*. Charlotte: Observer Printing House, 1942.
- Berger, Peter. "On the Obsolescence of the Concept of Honor." In *Revisions: Changing Perspectives in Moral Philosophy*, ed. Stanley Hauerwas and Alasdair Macintyre. Notre Dame: Notre Dame University Press, 1983.
- Bishop, Donald M. "Shared Failure: American Military Advisors in Korea, 1888-1896." *Transactions of the Royal Asiatic Society* 58, no. 1 (1983): 53-76.
- Blight, David W. *Race and Reunion: The Civil War in American Memory*. Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2002.
- Blunt, Wilfrid Scawen. *Secret History of the English Occupation of Egypt being a Personal Narrative of Events*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1922.
- Brandes, Stanley. "Reflections on Honor and Shame in the Mediterranean." In *Honor and Shame and the Unity of the Mediterranean*, ed. David Denny Gilmore, 121-34. Washington, D.C.: American Anthropological Association, 1987.
- Buck, Paul H. *The Road to Reunion 1865-1900*. Boston: Little, Brown, 1937.
- Burke, Peter. *Exiles and Expatriates in the History of Knowledge, 1500-2000*. Waltham: Brandeis University Press, 2017.
- Burkley, Margaret Nola. "Floyd County, Georgia, During the Civil War Era." Ph.D. diss., Florida State University, 1998.
- "Butler Trouble." *The New York Times*, July 18, 1875.
- Buxton, Robin Joy Love. "American Efforts to Modernize the Egyptian Army under Khedive Ismail." Master's thesis, Portland State University, 1978.
- Carmichael, Peter S. *The War for the Common Soldier: How Men Thought, Fought, and Survived in Civil War Armies*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2018.
- Chaillé-Long, Charles. *Central Africa: Naked Truths of Naked People*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1877.
- , "Chaillé-Long's Work on the Nile." *Bulletin of the American Geographical Society* 36, no. 6 (1904): 346-52.
- , "Correspondence: The Part of the Nile Which Colonel Chaillé-Long Discovered." *Bulletin of the American Geographical Society* 41, no. 4 (1909): 222-24.

- . "Egypt under the Viceroys." *The Era Magazine* 11, no. 3, 1903, 245-261.
- . *My Life in Four Continents*. London: Hutchinson and Co., 1912.
- . "Lake Ibrahim: A Protest and a Decision." *Bulletin of the American Geographical Society* 40, no.1 (1908): 17-18.
- . "The Desert." *The Cosmopolitan: A Monthly Illustrated Magazine*, March 1890.
- . *The Three Prophets: Chinese Gordon, Mohammed Ahmed (El Mahdi), Arabi Pasha*. New York: D. Appleton and Co., 1884.
- . "The Uganda Protectorate and the Nile Quest." *Bulletin of the American Geographical Society* 36, no. 1 (1904): 52-54.
- Chamberlain, M. E. "The Alexandria Massacre of 11 June 1882 and the British Occupation of Egypt." *Middle Eastern Studies* 13, no. 1 (January 1977): 14-39.
- Clark, G. H. *The Life of John Stone Stone: Mathematician, Physicist, Electrical Engineer and Great Inventor*. San Diego: Frye & Smith, Ltd. 1946.
- Clendenen, Clarence, Peter Dugan and Robert Collins, eds. *Americans and Africa – Americans in Africa, 1865-1900*. Stanford: Hoover Institution on War, Revolution and Peace, 1966.
- Coker, Joe L. *Liquor in the Land of the Lost Cause: Southern White Evangelicals and the Prohibition Movement*. Lexington: The University Press of Kentucky, 2005.
- Coles, Charles. *Recollections and Reflections*. London: Saint Catherine Press, 1917.
- Colston, Raleigh Edward. "In the Egyptian Desert." *Chambers Journal*, April 23, 1881.
- . "False Prophet of the Sudan." *Nation*, February 15, 1884.
- . "Life in the Egyptian Deserts." *Journal of the American Geographical Society of New York* 11 (1879): 301-333.
- . "Modern Egypt and Its People." *Journal of the American Geographical Society of New York* 13 (1881): 133-164.
- . "Stone Pasha's Work in Geography." *Journal of the American Geographical Society of New York* 19 (1887): 48-59.
- . "The British Campaign in the Soudan for the Rescue of Gordon." *Journal of the American Geographical Society of New York* 17 (1885): 125-265.

- , "Union Sentiment among Confederate Veterans." *The Century*, May-October 1887, 309-310.
- "Costume Suggested for the Brave Stay-at-Home 'Light Guard,'" *Harper's Weekly*, September 7, 1861.
- Coulling, Mary P. *The Lee Girls*. Winston-Salem: J. F. Blair, 1987.
- Covey, Eric Dean. *Americans at War in the Ottoman Empire: US Mercenary Force in the Middle East*. London and New York: I. B. Tauris, 2019.
- Cox, Frederick J. "Arabi and Stone: Egypt's First Military Rebellion, 1882." *Cahiers d'Histoire Egyptienne* 8 (1956): 155-175.
- , "Colonel John Lay's Naval Mission in Egypt." *Cahier D'histoire Egyptienne* 5 (1953): 36-46.
- , "Khedive Ismail and America, 1870: A Diplomatic Incident: L'Affair Butler." *Cahiers d'Histoire Egyptienne* 3 (1951): 374-381.
- , "The American Naval Mission in Egypt." *Journal of Modern History* 26, no. 2 (June 1954): 173-178.
- Crabitès, Pierre. *Americans in the Egyptian Army*. London: George Routledge and Sons, 1938.
- Crabitès, Pierre. *Ismail: The Maligned Khedive*. London: George Routledge and Sons, 1933.
- Cullum, George Washington. *Biographical Register of the Officers and Graduates of the U.S. Military Academy, at West Point, N.Y., from its Establishment, 1902, to 1890: With the Early History of the United States Military Academy*. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin and Company, 1891.
- Davis, William C. "Confederate Exiles." *American History Illustrated* 5 (June 1970): 30-43.
- Dawsey, Cyrus B. and James M. Dawsey, eds. *The Confederados: Old South Immigrants in Brazil*. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1995.
- Duignan, Peter and L. H. Gann. *The United States and Africa. A History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984.
- Dunn, John P. "An American Fracas in Egypt-The Butler Affair of 1872." *Journal of the American Research Center in Egypt* 42 (2005/2006): 153-162.
- , *Khedive Ismail's Army*. New York: Routledge, 2005.
- , "Americans in the Nineteenth Century Egyptian Army: A Selected Bibliography." *Journal of Military History* 70, no.1 (2006): 123-136.

- Dye, William McEntyre. *Moslem Egypt and Christian Abyssinia or Military Service Under the Khedive in His Provinces and Beyond Their Borders as Experienced by American Staff*. New York: Atkin & Prout, 1880.
- . "The Egyptian Campaign in Abyssinia." *Living Age* 134 (1877): 278-87.
- Edwards, Holly. "A Million and One Nights: Orientalism in America, 1870-1930." In *Noble Dreams, Wicked Pleasures: Orientalism in America, 1870-1930*, ed. Holly Edwards. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000.
- Eicher, John H. and David J. Eicher. *Civil War High Commands*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2001.
- "Egypt – A Threatened Abyssinian Invasion." *The New York Times*, 13 August 1875.
- "Egypt, Africa, and Africans." *The New York Times*, May 29, 1878.
- "Egypt and Abyssinia." *Times* (London), 25 May 1877.
- "Egypt's American Leader. General Stone's Departure - His Reason for Resigning Valuable Paper Destroyed." *Boston Globe*, February 6, 1883.
- Eliot, Ellsworth Jr. *West Point in the Confederacy*. New York: G. A. Baker, 1941.
- Elliot, Charlotte. *The Invalid's Hymn Book*. Dublin: Simpkin, Marshall, and Co., 1834.
- English, George Bethune. *A Narrative of the Expedition to Dongola and Sennaar: Under the Command of His Excellence Ismael Pasha, Undertaken by Order of His Highness Mehemmed Ali Pasha, Viceroy of Egypt*. Boston: Wells and Lilly, 1823.
- English, William Austin. "Adventures of a 19th Century American Muslim: The Strange Tale of George Bethune English." Master's thesis, Valdosta State University, 2015.
- Escott, Paul D. *Uncommonly Savage: Civil War and Remembrance in Spain and the United States*. Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2014.
- Fahmy, Khaled. *All the Pashas Men: Mehmed Ali, His Army and the Making of Modern Egypt*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- . "The Nation and its Deserters: Conscription in Mehmed Ali's Egypt." In *Arming the State: Military Conscription in the Middle East and Central Asia, 1775-1925*, ed. Erik Jan Zürcher. London: I. B. Tauris, 1999.
- Farman, Elbert Eli, *Egypt and its Betrayal. An Account of the Country during the Periods of Ismail and Tewfik Pashas, and of How England Acquired a New Empire*. New York: The Grafton Press, 1908.

- Faust, Drew Gilpin. "The Civil War Soldier and the Art of Dying." *The Journal of Southern History* 67, no. 1 (2001): 3-38.
- . *This Republic of Suffering: Death and the American Civil War*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2008.
- Field, Henry M. *From Egypt to Japan*. New York: C. Scribner's Sons, 1905.
- Field, James A. *America and the Mediterranean World, 1776-1882*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1969.
- Finnie, David H. *Pioneers East: The Early American Experience in the Middle East*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1967.
- Flynn, Charles P. *Insult and Society*. New York and London: Kennikat Press, 1977.
- Foner, Eric and Olivia Mahooney. *America's Reconstruction: People and Politics After the Civil War*. Louisiana: Louisiana State University Press, 1999.
- Foster, Gaines M. *Ghosts of the Confederacy: Defeat, the Lost Cause, and the Emergence of the New South*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1987.
- Fukuyama, Francis. *Identity: The Demand for Dignity and the Politics of Resentment*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2018.
- Garrison, Webb Jr. *Strange Battles of the Civil War*. Nashville: Cumberland House Publishing, 2001.
- "Gen. Colston's Military Career: Honors Gained in the Service of the Khedive." *The New York Times*, August 3, 1896.
- "Geographical Notes: Northern and Eastern Somaliland." In *Proceedings of the Royal Geographical Society and Monthly Record of Geography*, vol. 2. London: Edward Stanford, 1880.
- Gilder, Richard Watson. "To the Spirit of Abraham Lincoln." In *The Poems of Richard Watson Gilder*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1908.
- Gordon, Charles George. *Colonel Gordon in Central Africa, 1874-1879. From Original Letters and Documents*. Edited by Birkbeck Hill. London: Thos. de la Rue & Co., 1881.
- . "To the Editor of Herald." *New York Herald*, January 23, 1880.
- Greene, Betty Patchin. "The Bey from Virginia." *Saudi Aramco*, March-April 1974, 24-25.
- Grier, Douglas A. "Confederate Emigration to Brazil, 1865-1879." Ph.D. diss., University of Michigan, 1968.

- Gross, Samuel D. *Memoir of Valentine Mott, M.D., LL. D: Professor of Surgery in the University of the City of New York; Member of the Institute of France.* New York: Appleton, 1868.
- Guterl, Matthew Pratt. *American Mediterranean: Southern Slaveholders in the Age of Emancipation.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2008.
- Hanna, Alfred Jackson and Kathryn Abbey Hanna. *Confederate Exiles in Venezuela.* Tuscaloosa: Confederate Publishing Company, Inc., 1960.
- Harris, Jonathan. *A Statue for America: The First 100 Years of the Statue of Liberty.* New York: Four Winds Press, 1985.
- Harter, Eugene C. *The Lost Colony of Confederacy.* Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 1985.
- Hatch, Frederick. *Protecting President Lincoln: The Security Effort, the Thwarted Plots and the Disaster at Ford's Theatre.* Jefferson, NC: McFarland and Company, 2011.
- Hess, Earl J. *Liberty, Virtue, and Progress: Northerners and Their War for the Union.* New York: New York University Press, 1988.
- . *The Union Soldier in Battle: Enduring the Ordeal of Combat.* Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1997.
- Hesseltine, William B. and Hazel C. Wolf. *The Blue and the Gray on the Nile.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961.
- Holberton, William. B. "Confederate Demobilization." In *The Civil War Veteran: A Historical Reader*, eds. Larry M. Logue and Michael Barton, 23-24. New York and London: New York University Press, 2006.
- Hubbs, G. Ward. *Guarding Greensboro: A Confederate Company in the Making of a Southern Community.* Athens and London: University of Georgia Press, 2003.
- Hudson, Ethel. "Samuel Henry Lockett." *Louisiana State University Quarterly* 6, no. 3 (1911): 124.
- Huffard, R. Scott. "Perilous Connections: Railroads, Capitalism and Mythmaking in the New South." Ph.D. diss., University of Florida, 2013.
- Icenogle, David. "The Expeditions of Chaillé-Long." *Saudi Aramco World*, November-December 1978, 2-7.
- . "The Khedive's Cartographers." *Saudi Aramco World*, September-October 1984, 16-23.

- Janney, Caroline E. *Remembering the Civil War: Reunion and the Limits of Reconciliation*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2013.
- Jarmakani, Amira. *Imagining Arab Womanhood: The Cultural Mythology of Veils, Harems, and Belly Dancers in the U.S.* New York: Palgrave & Macmillan, 2008.
- Jasanoff, Maya. *Liberty's Exiles: American Loyalists in the Revolutionary World*. New York: Vintage Books, 2013.
- Jimerson, Randall C. *The Private Civil War: Popular Thought During the Sectional Conflict*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1988.
- Jordan, Weymouth T. Jr., et al. *Soldier of Misfortune: Alexander Welch Reynolds of the U.S., Confederate and Egyptian Armies*. Lewisburg: Greenbrier Historical Society, 2001.
- Katz, Herman M. *Brigadier General William McEntire Dye: A Pioneer of US Military Contributions to Korea*. Headquarters, United States Forces, Korea, 1982.
- Kauffeldt, Jonas. "Danes, Orientalism and the Modern Middle East: Perspectives from the Nordic Periphery." Ph.D. diss., Florida State University, 2006.
- Keddie, Nikki R. *Sayyid Jamal ad-Din 'al-Afghani': A Political Biography*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1972.
- Keddie, Nikki R. and Beth Baron, eds. *Women in Middle Eastern History: Shifting Boundaries in Sex and Gender*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992.
- Kensey, Paul. "West Point Classmates – Civil War Enemies," https://www.americancivilwar.asn.au/meet/2002_10_mtg_westpt_classmates_enemies.pdf (retrieved June 25, 2020).
- Khan, Yasmin Sabina. *Enlightening the World: The Creation of the Statue of Liberty*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2010.
- Kimmel, Michael S. *Manhood in America: A Cultural History*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.
- Kolchin, Peter. *A Sphinx on the American Land: The Nineteenth-Century South in Comparative Perspective*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2003.
- Kuneralp, Sinan. "Ottoman Diplomatic and Consular Personnel in the United States of America, 1867-1917." In *American Turkish Encounters: Politics and Culture, 1830-1989*, eds. Nur Bilge Criss, Selçuk Esenbel, Tony Greenwood, and Louis Mazzari, 72-73. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2011.

- Kurzman, Charles. *Modernist Islam 1840-1940: A Sourcebook*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- Lamb, Blaine. *The Extraordinary Life of Charles Pomeroy Stone*. Yardley: Westholme Publishing, 2016.
- “Letter from Egypt.” *The Daily Journal* (Wilmington, NC), August 10, 1873.
- Letters of John Hay and Extracts from Diary*. Washington, D.C.: private typescript, 1908.
- Linderman, Gerald F. *Embattled Courage: The Experience of Combat in the American Civil War*. New York: The Free Press, 1987.
- Lockett, Samuel Henry. *Carte générale de l’Afrique*. Cairo: Administration de l’arpentage de gouvernement égyptien, 1934.
- , “The Defense of Vicksburg.” In *Battles and Leaders of the Civil War III: Being for the Most Part Contributions by Union and Confederate Officers*, eds. Robert Underwood Johnson and Clarence Clough Buel. New York: Century Co., 1888.
- , *The Topography and Geography of the Country Between the Coast of Red Sea and the Abyssinian Plateau. Report Submitted to Gen. Stone Pasha*. Cairo: Printing Office of the General Staff, 1878.
- , “West Pointers of the Confederate States Army.” *Nation*, January 29, 1885, 95.
- Loring, William Wing. *A Confederate Soldier in Egypt*. New York: Dodd, Mead & Co., 1884.
- “Loring Remembers Grant’s Visit to Egypt,” *The Tarborough Southerner*, August 19, 1880.
- Marsot, Afaf Lutfi al-Sayyid. *A Short History of Modern Egypt*. London: Cambridge University Press, 1986.
- Marszalek, John F. *Sherman, a Soldiers Passion for Order*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 2007.
- Mason, Alexander Macomb. “Report of a Reconnaissance of Lake Albert Nyanza,” *Proceedings of the Royal Geographical Society*, 22 (1878).
- McCarthy, Mary “A Guide to Exiles, Expatriates, and Internal Émigrés.” *The New York Times Book Review*, March 9, 1972.
- McCurry, Stephany. *Confederate Reckoning, Power and Politics in the Civil War South*. Cambridge and London: Harvard University Press, 2010.
- McGregor, Andrew James. *A Military History of Modern Egypt: From the Ottoman Conquest to the Ramadan War*. Connecticut and London: Praeger, 2006.

- McHugh, Michael. *George McClellan: The Disposable Patriot*. Illinois: Christian Liberty Press, 2007.
- McKay, Bratt H. "A Man's Life, Featured, Honor, On Manhood." *Art of Manliness*, <https://www.artofmanliness.com/articles/manly-honor-part-v-honor-in-the-american-south/> (retrieved June 26, 2020).
- McPherson, James M. *What They Fought For, 1861-1865*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1994.
- McPherson, Tara. *Reconstructing Dixie Race, Gender, and Nostalgia in the Imagined South*. Durham. London: Duke University Press, 2003.
- Melville, Herman. *Clarel: A Poem and Pilgrimage in the Holy Land*. Eds. Harrison Hayford, Hershel Parker, Alma M. Reising and G. Thomas Tanselle. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1991.
- "Men of Maryland Specially Honored by the State or the United States." *Maryland Historical Magazine* 12, no. 3 (September 1917): 206.
- Meriwether, Margaret Lee and Judith E. Tucker. *Social History of Women and Gender in The Modern Middle East*. Boulder: Westview Press, 1999.
- Meyer, Lysle E. *The Farther Frontier: Six Case Studies of Americans and Africa: 1848-1936*. Selinsgrove: Susquehanna University Press, 1992.
- Middleton, D. "Henry Morton Stanley," *Encyclopedia Britannica*, <https://www.britannica.com/biography/Henry-Morton-Stanley>.
- Mitchell, Reid. *Civil War Soldiers 1861-1865*. New York: Viking, 1988.
- Moore-Harell, Alice. *Egypt's African Empire: Samuel Baker, Charles Gordon and the Creation of Equatoria*. Brighton: Sussex Academic Press, 2010.
- Morgan, James Morris. *Recollections of a Rebel Reefer*. New York, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1917.
- Moten, Matthew. *The Delafield Commission and the American Military Profession*. College Station: Texas A & M University Press, 2000.
- "Obituary-General Thaddeus Phelps Mott." *The New York Times*, November 27, 1894.
- Oliver, Andrew. *American Travelers on the Nile: Early US Visitors to Egypt, 1774-1839*. Cairo and New York: The American University in Cairo Press, 2014.
- Oprisko, Robert L. *Honor: A Phenomenology*. New York: Routledge, 2012.
- Oren, Michael B. *Power, Faith, and Fantasy, America in the Middle East, 1776 to the Present*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company Inc., 2007.

- Osterhammel, Jürgen. *The Transformation of the World: A Global History of the Nineteenth Century*. Translated by Patrick Camiller. Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2015.
- Pickett, LaSalle Corbell. *What Happened to Me?* New York: Brentanos, 1917.
- Pınar, Hayrettin. *Tanzimat Döneminde İktidarın Sınırları: Babıali ve Hıdiv İsmail*. İstanbul: Kitap Yayınları, 2012.
- Pinder, David A. "The Healing Years. West Point Association of Graduates." *Assembly*, November 1994, 30-34.
- Pitt-Rivers, Julian "Honor," *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*, ed. David Sills, vol. 6. New York: Macmillan, Free Press (1968): 503-11.
- "Honour and Social Status." In *Honour and Shame: The Values of Mediterranean Society*, ed. J. G. Peristiany, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1966.
- Prout, Henry G. *General Report on the Province of Kordofan*. Cairo: Printing Office of the General Staff, 1877.
- "Report of Colonel H. G. Prout on his Reconnaissance from Khartoum to El Obeid." *Journal of the American Geographical Society of New York* 9 (1877): 157-58.
- Qabaha, Ahmad Rasmi. *Exile and Expatriation in Modern American and Palestinian Writing*. Cham, Switzerland: Palgrave MacMillan, 2018.
- Quigley, Paul. *Shifting Grounds: Nationalism and the American South, 1848-1865*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.
- Quigley, Paul and James Hawdon, eds. *Reconciliation after Civil Wars: Global Perspectives*. New York: Routledge, 2018.
- Raab, James W. *W. W. Loring: Florida's Forgotten General*. Old Blizzards: Sunflower University Press, 1996.
- Reagan, Ronald. "Remarks at the Welcoming Ceremony for President Mohammed Hosni Mubarak of Egypt," January 28, 1988. The American Presidency Project.
- Reid, Donald Malcolm. "The Egyptian Geographical Society: From Foreign Laymen's Society to Indigenous Professional Association." *Poetics Today* 14, no. 3 (1993): 539-72.
- Report of the Joint Committee on the Conduct of the War, Part II, Bull Run-Ball's Bluff*, Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1863.

- Robbins, James S. *Last in Their Class: Custer, Pickett and the Goats of West Point*. New York: Encounter Books, 2017.
- Robinson, Francis, ed. *The New Cambridge History of Islam*, vol. 5. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- Rolle, Andrew F. *The Lost Cause: The Confederate Exodus to Mexico*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1965.
- Rosenburg, R. B. "Southern Poor Boys." In *The Civil War Veteran*. Eds. Larry M. Logue and Michael Barton. 95-102. New York and London: New York University Press, 2006.
- Sachs, Susan. "Cairo Journal, American Headstones Tugging at Egypt's Memory," *The New York Times*, November 8, 2000.
- Said, Edward W. *Reflections on Exile: And Other Literary and Cultural Essays*. London: Granta, 2001.
- Samuel Selig de (Baron). *An Englishman's Recollections of Egypt, 1863 to 1887*. New York: John Lane, 1915.
- Savage, Richard Henry. *In the Esbekieyeh Gardens and Other Stories*. New York: Home Publishing Company, 1901.
- *In the Shadow of the Pyramids. The Last Days of Ismail Khedive*. Chicago and New York: Rand, McNally and Co. Publishers, 1897.
- Sawyer, Roy T. "Dr. Edward Warren C.S.A Confederate Exile." In *The Heritage of Tyrell County, North Carolina*, eds. Gwen A. White and Virginia C. Haire. Columbia, NC: Tyrrell County Genealogical Society, 2004.
- Sessions, William Lad. *Honor for Us: A Philosophical Analysis, Interpretation and Defense*. New York: Continuum, 2010.
- Sharkey, Heather J. *American Evangelicals in Egypt: Missionary Encounters in an Age of Empire*. Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2008.
- Silber, Nina. *The Romance of Reunion: Northerners and the South, 1865-1900*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2002.
- Simon, John, ed. *Papers of Ulysses S. Grant*. vol. 28. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 2005.
- Smith, H. Worcester and F. Gustavus Skinner. *A Sporting Family of the Old South*. Albany: J. B. Lyon Company, 1936.
- Smith, Michael T. "The Beast Unleashed: Benjamin F. Butler and Conceptions of Masculinity in the Civil War North." *The New England Quarterly* 79, no. 2 (2006): 248-276.

- “Something to Define Liberty. Address at Maryland Sanitary Commission Fair, Baltimore,” in *Lincoln on War: Our Greatest Commander-in-Chief Speaks to America*, ed. Harold Holzer. Chapel Hill: Algonquin Books of Chapel Hill, 2011.
- Stanley, Francis. *The Civil War in New Mexico*. Santa Fe: Sunstone Press, 2011.
- “State Papers. Report of the Board of Visitors on the Last Examination,” *National Government Journal and Register of Official Papers*, 1, no. 37 (July 17, 1824).
- Stevenson, Robert Louis. “O Come Quickly Requiem.” *The Book of Sorrow*, edited by Andrew MacPhail. London, New York: Oxford University Press, 1916.
- Stewart, Frank Henderson. *Honor*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1994.
- Stone, Charles Pomeroy. “1824-1887 Memoir of Charles Pomeroy Stone.” *The Century War Series, Battles and Leaders of the Civil War*, vol. 1. New York: Century Co., 1887.
- . “A Political Geography of Egypt.” *Journal of the American Geographical Society of New York* 15 (1883): 361-374.
- . “Introductory Note to ‘Diary of an American Girl in Cairo during the War of 1882.’” *The Century*, June 1884, 288-289.
- . “Military Affairs in Egypt.” *Journal of the Military Service Institution of the United States* 5, no. 17 (1884): 154-183.
- . “The Bombardment of Alexandria.” *The Century*, October 1884, 953-956.
- Stone, Fanny. “Diary of an American Girl in Cairo During the War of 1882.” *The Century*, June 1884, 289-302.
- Sutherland, Daniel E. “Exiles, Emigrants, and Sojourners: The Post-Civil War Confederate Exodus in Perspective.” *Civil War History* 31, no. 3 (September 1985): 237-256.
- Tabori, Paul. *The Anatomy of Exile: A Semantic and Historical Study*. London: George G. Harrap, 1972.
- “Tardy Recognition for Nile Explorer: Geographers Present a Medal after 36 Years to Col. Chaillé-Long.” *The New York Times*, February 16, 1910.
- “The American Army Officers in the East.” *The New York Times*, July 27, 1871.
- “The American Fracas at Alexandria.” *Times* (London), July 17, 1872.

- Thomas, Frederick C. *Slavery and Jihad in the Sudan: A Narrative of the Slave Trade, Gordon and Mahdism, and its Legacy Today*. Bloomington and New York: iUniverse Inc., 2005.
- Thompson, Jerry. *Henry Hopkins Sibley: Confederate General of the West*. Natchitoches, LA: Northwestern State University Press, 1987.
- Tucker, Martin. *Literary Exile in the Twentieth Century: An Analysis and Biographical Dictionary*. London: Greenwood Press, 1991.
- Tuffnell, Stephen. "Expatriate Foreign Relations: Britain's American Community and Transnational Approaches to the U.S. Civil War." *Diplomatic History* 40, no. 4 (September 2016): 635-63.
- Twain, Mark. *The Innocents Abroad or the New Pilgrims' Progress*. New York: Modern Library, 2003.
- "Visit of Captain Stevens of the Guerriere, Courtesy of the Viceroy, Confederates Reconstructed in Egypt." *New York Times*, June 22, 1871.
- Vivian, Cassandra. *Americans in Egypt, 1770-1915: Explorers, Consuls, Travelers, Soldiers, Missionaries, Writers and Scientists*. Jefferson: McFarland & Company, 2012.
- Warner, Charles Dudley. *In the Levant*. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin and Company, 1876.
- Warner, Ezra J. *Generals in Blue: Lives of the Union Commanders*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1964.
- Warren, Edward. *A Doctor's Experiences in Three Continents*. Baltimore: Cushings & Bailey, 1885.
- Weaver, Blanche Henry Clark. "Confederate Emigration to Brazil." *Southern History Journal* 37 (1961): 33-53.
- Werlich, David P. *Admiral of the Amazon: John Randolph Tucker, his Confederate Colleagues, and Peru*. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1990.
- Westermarck, Edward. *The Origin and Development of Moral Ideas*. London: Macmillan and Co., 1912-17.
- Wheeler, John H. "Dr. Edward Warren Bey." In *Reminiscences and Memoirs of North Carolina and Eminent North Carolinians*. Baltimore: Genealogical Publishing Co., 1966.
- "Why an American Counselor of the Khedive Resigned his Office." *Egyptian Gazette*, January 8, 1883.
- Winkler, H. Donald. *Civil War Goats and Scapegoats*. Nashville: Cumberland House Publishing, 2008.

- Winnett, Susan. *Writing Back: American Expatriates and Narratives of Return*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2013.
- Wright, Lenoir Chamber. "United States Policy toward Egypt, 1830-1914." Ph.D. diss., Columbia University, 1957.
- Wyatt-Brown, Bertram. "Honour, Irony, And Humiliation in the Era of American Civil War." *Social Alternatives* 25, no. 1 (Special Issue: "Humiliation and History in Global Perspectives") (First Quarter 2006): 22-27.
- . "Honor's History across the Academy." *Historically Speaking* 3, no. 5 (June 2002): 13.
- . *Southern Honor: Ethics and Behavior in the Old South*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1982.
- Zilfi, Madeline C. *Women in the Ottoman Empire: Middle Eastern Women in the Early Modern Era*. Leiden: Brill, 1997.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1: American Mercenaries in the Egyptian Service (1869-1882)

Appendix 1: List of American Mercenaries in the Egyptian Service (1869-1882)

#	Name	Origin	Civil War Record	Arrival	Termination	Notes on Egyptian Service
1	Allen, Vanderbilt <i>United States Military Academy</i>	New York	Brevet Major, United States Volunteers	1872	Resigned, 1874	Colonel of Engineers. Member of Loring's staff in Alexandria.
2	Bassel, James <i>United States Military Academy, 1867</i>	Virginia	Second Lieutenant, United States Army	1874	Resigned, 1874	Colonel.
3	Campbell, William P. A.		Lieutenant, Confederate States Navy	1870	Died in Khartoum, October 10, 1874	Major of marines. 1870: In charge of khedivial steamers between Alexandria and Constantinople. 1874: Went to Sudan with Gordon. Died of cholera.
4	Chaillé-Long, Charles	Maryland	Captain, United States Volunteers	1870	Resigned, 1877	Colonel. 1870: Member of Loring's staff. 1871: General staff, orders and correspondence section. 1872: Aide to visiting General William T. Sherman. 1874: Went to Sudan with Gordon; to Uganda and the lake region. 1875: Visited Makraka Niam-Niam country; and Juba River region.

5	Colston, Raleigh Edward	Paris, France	Brigadier General, Confederate States Army	1873	Discharged, 1878	Colonel. 1873: Taught at military college, mapped Kenneh-Berence route, made geological surveys. 1874: Conducted hydrographic surveys of Berenice with Purdy and Mason, explored Bishereen Desert; surveyed ancient gold mines at Derehib. 1875: Continued exploration in Kordofan.
6	Dennison, James A. <i>United States Military Academy. 1870</i>	Indiana	Private, Second Lieutenant, United States Army	1875	Left Egypt, December 31, 1876	Colonel. 1875: Gundet Campaign. 1876: Gura Campaign.
7	Derrick, Henry Clay	Virginia	Captain, Confederate States Army	1875	Discharged, 1878	Colonel of Engineers. 1876: Gura campaign. Mapped southwest of Massawa with Lockett and a native civilian employee. Mapped districts of Berber and Harrar with Egyptian officers.
8	Dunlap, William W. <i>United States Military Academy. xxxxxxxx</i>		Colonel, Confederate States Army	1871	(?)	Lieutenant Colonel. Served in artillery school at Damietta.
9	Dye, William McEntyre	Washington, Pennsylvania	Brevet Brigadier General, United States Volunteers	1873	Discharged, 1878	1873: Colonel in General staff. 1876: Gura Campaign.
10	Fechet, Oscar Eugene <i>United States Military Academy. 1868</i>	Port Huron, Michigan	Second Lieutenant, United States Army	1872	Left Egypt, February 14, 1874	Major. 1873-74: Surveyed in Nubia and Sudan, from Aswan to Khartoum, Cairo to Suez.

11	Field, Charles W.	Woodford, Kentucky	Major General, Confederate States Army	1875	Discharged, 1877	Colonel of Engineers. 1875: Inspector general in Ratib's staff. 1876: Gura campaign.
12	Graves, Charles Iverson	Newton County, Georgia	Lieutenant, Confederate States Navy	1875	Discharged, 1878	Colonel. 1875: Assigned to Third Section to draw maps for fortifications. 1876: Gura Campaign, served as the port officer at Massawa. 1877: Surveyed east of Cairo. 1878: Surveyed for lighthouse at Cape Guardafui.
13	Hall, Wilburn Briggs <i>Annapolis Naval Academy</i>	South Carolina. Derrick noted "Georgia"	Lieutenant, Confederate States Navy	1874	Resigned, 1877	Major. 1874: General staff. Surveyed Lower Egypt. 1875: Chief of military construction after Gundet defeat. Supervised education of three of Ismail's sons. Visitor and inspector of government military schools.
14	Hunt, Cornelius Ensing	Virginia	Master's Mate, Confederate States Navy	1870	Died, February 28, 1873	Major. 1871: Taught at military school in Aboukir. Died of injuries due to falling from horse.
15	Irgens, Henry	Montana (?)	Sergeant, United States Volunteers	1876	Discharged, 1878	Captain. 1876: Served as assistant to chief engineer in Gura Campaign. Died in Liverpool en route to United States. Inspector of cavalry in Alexandria.
16	Jenifer, Walter Hanson	Maryland	Colonel, (initially US Army) Confederate States Army	1870	Resigned, 1871	

17	Johnson, Thomas D.	Tennessee	Private, Confederate States Volunteers	1875	Resigned, 1877	1876: Staff surgeon. Gura Campaign.
18	Kennon, Beverly	New York	Lieutenant, Confederate States Navy	1870	Resigned, 1872 (?)	Colonel. 1870: Worked on coastal defenses. 1871: Survey party to Aswan.
19	Lamson, Robert Schuyler		<i>NA (mining engineer)</i>	1875	Died in Darfur, November, 1876	1875: Member of Raib's staff. 1876: Gura Campaign.
20	Lockett, Samuel Henry <i>United States Military Academy, 1857</i>	Marion, Alabama	Colonel, Confederate States Army	1875	Resigned, September 1877	Colonel. 1875: General staff 1876: Gura Campaign. 1877: Directed preparation of the Great Map of Africa.
21	Loring, William Wing	North Carolina	Major General, Confederate States Army	1870	Discharged, 1878	Major General. 1870: Inspector general of infantry. 1871: In charge of coastal defenses. 1876: Gura Campaign: Chief of staff.
22	Loshe, Charles Frederick		Lieutenant, United States Volunteers	1875	Died in Suakim, October, 1878	Major. 1876: Gura Campaign: Chief of transportation. Surveyed Red Sea coast, died in Suakim.
23	McIvor, Henry Ronald		<i>NA</i>	1870		General staff.
24	Martin, Chancellor <i>United States Military Academy, 1868</i>	Illinois	Second Lieutenant, United States Army	1874	Resigned, 1877	Major. Served in the General staff.
25	Mason, Alexander Macomb <i>Annapolis Academy</i>	Washington D.C.	Lieutenant, Confederate States Navy	1870	Discharged, 1878	Colonel. 1871: Served aboard khedivial steamers between Alexandria and Constantinople.

							1872: Mapped Fayum and the Oasis of Siwa. 1874-75: Ascended Nile to New Dongola and explored route to El Fasher. 1877: Served in the Equatorial Provinces. Discovered Semliki River, circumnavigated Lake Albert.
26	Morgan, James Morris	New Orleans	Midshipman, Confederate States Navy	1870	Resigned, 1872		Lieutenant Colonel. 1870: Loring's staff. 1871: Ratb's staff. 1869: Khedivial chamberlain. 1870: Escorted first recruits to Egypt. General of division of cavalry and artillery. 1871: In the United States as the agent of khedive. Major. 1871: Signal corps.
27	Mott, Thaddeus Phelps	New York	Colonel, United States Volunteers	1869	Retired to Turkey, 1875		General of division of cavalry and artillery. 1871: In the United States as the agent of khedive.
28	Parys, Edmund	Belgium	Acting Ensign, United States Navy	1871	Died, April 13, 1874		Major. 1871: Signal corps.
29	Porter, David Essex	Washington D.C.	Brevet Captain, United States Army	1875	Resigned, 1876		Captain. 1876: Served in Gura Campaign as the assistant of chief engineer.
30	Prout, Henry Gosale	Massachusetts	Massachusetts Volunteers	1872	Discharged, 1872		1874: Colonel in General staff. 1875: Mapped Suakim-Berber route. Took over Colston's command at El Obeid. Mapped Kordofan and joined Mason to map Darfur. 1876: Governor-general of Equatorial Provinces in Gordon's absence.

31	Purdy, E. Sparrow	New York	Brevet Lieutenant Colonel, United States Volunteers	1870	Discharged, 1878	1877: In Equatorial Provinces. Brigadier General. 1871: Mapped area between Cairo and Suez and between Kennel and Kosseir on the Red Sea. 1874: <i>See</i> Colston. 1878: Civilian employee. 1881: Died in Egypt.
32	Reed, Horatio B.	New York	Brevet Lieutenant Colonel, United States Volunteers	1874	Sick leave in 1875, not returned.	Lieutenant Colonel. 1875: Went to Kordofan with Colston.
33	Reynolds, Alexander W.	Frederick Co. Virginia	Brigadier General, Confederate States Army	1870	Died, May 26, 1876	Colonel in Loring's staff. Died in Alexandria.
34	Reynolds, Frank A.	Philadelphia, Pennsylvania	Lieutenant Colonel, Confederate States Army	1870	Died, 1875	Colonel. 1870: Loring's staff. 1873: Visited the United States as inspector of arms. Died in Ilion, in Egyptian service.
35	Rhett, Thomas Grimke	Charleston, South Carolina	Major, Confederate States Army	1870	Resigned, April 1874	Colonel. 1871: Set up powder mills. 1872-3: One-year sick leave.
36	Rogers, Robert Morris <i>United States Military Academy, 1867</i>	Pennsylvania	Second Lieutenant, United States Army	1874	Resigned, March 1875	Colonel of Engineers.
37	Savage, Richard Henry <i>United States Military Academy, 1868</i>		Brevet Second Lieutenant, United States Army	1871	Resigned, 1872 (?)	Captain. Military secretary to general staff.

38	Sibley, Henry Hopkins <i>United States Military Academy, 1838</i>	Louisiana	Brigadier General, Confederate States Army	1870	Discharged, 1873	Brigadier General. Chief of artillery in Rosetta. Supervised the coastal fortifications. 1871: Major General. Chief of General Staff
39	Stone, Charles Pomeroy <i>United States Military Academy, 1848</i>	Greenfield, Massachusetts	Brigadier General, United States Volunteers	1870	Resigned, 1882	
40	Tevis, Carroll	Philadelphia, Pennsylvania	Brevet Brigadier General, United States Volunteers	1872	Resigned, 1873	Brigadier General. Director of military school. Joined to the Ottoman Army.
41	Ward, William Henry <i>Annapolis Naval Academy</i>	Virginia	Lieutenant Colonel, Confederate States Navy	1871	Discharged, 1878	Colonel. 1871: Supervised the torpedo experiments. 1872: Aide to visiting General William Tecumseh Sherman. 1875: Reconnaissance of Island of Thasos. Hydraulic survey of harbor of Kismayu. Juba River expedition. 1877: Surveyed Red Sea coast.
42	Warren, Edward	Virginia	Surgeon General of NC, Confederate States Army	1873	Discharged, 1876	Chief surgeon of staff.
43	White, D. G. <i>United States Military Academy (not graduated)</i>		Major, Confederate States Army	1875	Deserted, December 1875	Major. Surveyed east of Cairo.
44	Wilson, William H.	Ohio	Assistant Surgeon, United States Volunteers	1875	Resigned, 1877	Surgeon of Staff. 1876: Gura Campaign.
45	Sibley, Sidney Johnston		Cavalry Courier,			Lieutenant

Appendix 2: Photo Album: American Officers in Egyptian Uniforms

Charles Pomeroy Stone (Samuel Henry Lockett Papers)



Above: William Wing Loring (Samuel Henry Lockett Papers)
Below: Samuel Henry Lockett (Samuel Henry Lockett Papers)



Above: Henry Clay Derrick (Samuel Henry Lockett Papers)

Below: Charles Iverson Graves (Charles Iverson Graves Papers)



Above: Raleigh Edward Colston (Raleigh Edward Colston Papers)
Below: Charles Chaillé-Long



Above: Thaddeus Phelps Mott (Hesseltine and Wolf, photo album)
Below: Erastus Sparrow Purdy (Hesseltine and Wolf, photo album)



Appendix 3: Great Map of Africa

(Panel 1/4 and Contributors List. American Geographical Society Library, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee)



Appendix 4: American Consulate after the Bombardment of Alexandria

(Charles Chaillé-Long Papers)



U.S. Consulate at Alexandria After the Bombardment