UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

GRADUATE COLLEGE

EXPORTING THE AMERICAN CIVIL WAR TO "OUR NEIGHBOR TO THE SOUTH": THE CALIFORNIA CIVIL WAR CENTENNIAL AND COLD WAR MEXICO, 1961–1965

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the

Degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

By

ABIGAIL M. GIBSON
Norman, Oklahoma
2019

Downloaded from SHAREOK. Persistent Handle URL: https://hdl.handle.net/11244/321137

EXPORTING THE AMERICAN CIVIL WAR TO "OUR NEIGHBOR TO THE SOUTH": THE CALIFORNIA CIVIL WAR CENTENNIAL AND COLD WAR MEXICO, 1961–1965

A THESIS APPROVED FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY

BY

Dr. Anne Hyde, Chair

Dr. Rachel Shelden

Dr. Jennifer Holland

© Copyright by ABIGAIL M. GIBSON 2019
All Rights Reserved.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. ABSTRACT……...v

II. EXPORTING THE AMERICAN CIVIL WAR TO OUR "NEIGHBOR TO THE SOUTH"……1

III. BIBLIOGRAPHY……43

ABSTRACT

This project is about the California Civil War Centennial Commission's (CWCC) articulation of California's contemporary state identity through the lens of Civil War commemoration in the early 1960s. In its task to commemorate California's participation in the American Civil War as a part of the National Civil War Centennial between 1961 and 1965, the California CWCC chose to focus almost exclusively upon the Golden State's role in staving off the French intervention in Mexico between 1862 and 1867, an episode in European, Mexican, and American history that is only now receiving significant scholarly attention. The California CWCC–at the legislative mandate of the California State Assembly–focused their attention on three historical events and figures that related to the French intervention: the restoration of constitutional government in Mexico upon the overthrow of Archduke Maximilian and Napoleon III's forces, the political career of U.S. Senator James A. McDougall, and the wartime efforts of the Pacific Naval Squadron along the Pacific Coast. Together, these three components form what I term the CWCC's "California thesis," which argued that California's great contribution to the nation–and the world–during the Civil War was in warding off the incursions of empire and unfreedom in Mexico and the western hemisphere at large. I argue that the California CWCC, at the behest of the California State Assembly, chose the French intervention into Mexico because the episode had, in their mind, highly relevant present implications. The commission even promoted this particular memory of California's Civil War participation globally, using it as a means to explore diplomatic channels with Mexico. The California CWCC read their Cold War moment backwards onto the French intervention by presenting it as an instance when the United States (and particularly California) secured freedom abroad, much like it could in their own time. The California CWCC capitalized on their state's supposed special connection to Mexico as one of its immediate northern neighbors to assert their state's primacy in this fight for global freedom both to Americans and, more importantly, to people in Mexico itself. Thus, the project of the Civil War Centennial in California was used in the service of in diplomatic interest.

Keywords: American Civil War; American Civil War Centennial; Cold War; Memory and Commemoration; Mexico; French Intervention of Mexico; Transnational

"History is the past speaking to the present. It tells the future in a strange but effective way, for the inevitable changes that lie ahead always grow out of things men have been doing and saying and thinking in the years before. If we do not understand the past, we cannot understand the future either."[1] Justin G. Turner, first Chairman of the California Civil War Centennial Commission (CWCC), spoke these words on behalf of the commission at the Conference of Historical Societies of California in June 1961, at the very beginning of the American Civil War Centennial. Turner, tasked with showcasing California's role in the Civil War as part of a national commemoration of the war at its centennial, faced the challenge of linking California's past and future. The National Civil War Centennial Commission (CWCC), headquartered in Washington, similarly justified the five-year commemorative event using just that promise: that reexamining the Civil War would reveal as much or more about the American present and future as it would the American past.

The National CWCC, by Congressional mandate, declared the Civil War to be the "supreme experience in our history as a nation."[2] According to Congress and the National CWCC, fighting the war revealed a unique demonstration of valor and sacrifice on the part of American soldiers, and winning it "established that the United States would remain permanently one nation."[3] The National commission linked American strength in the mid-twentieth century directly to the unity

---

[1] Justin G. Turner, "The Civil War Centennial Conference of Historical Societies of California, June 23, 1961, Columbia State Park," typed address, p. 9, 23 June 1961, Folder 28, Box 1, F3734: California Civil War Centennial Commission Records, California State Archives, Sacramento, CA (hereafter CCWCC Records).
[2] *Joint Resolution to establish a commission to commemorate the one hundredth-anniversary of the Civil War, and for other purposes,* Public Law 85-305, *U.S. Statutes at Large* (1957): pp. 626–8.
[3] "Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense Fact Sheet," typed document, p. 1, undated, Folder 38, Box 2, CCWCC Records.

forged through the flames of civil war. The men and boys who fought on those bloody battlefields in the east were the greatest generation before the Greatest Generation because they fought for freedom at home. Their extraordinary example, properly commemorated, would inspire Americans to continue that legacy. Since the conclusion of hostilities in 1865, Congress proclaimed, "the sons of both North and South have subsequently fought side by side for human freedom, justice, and the dignity of the individual among people everywhere."[4] In the very language that created the National Civil War Centennial, Congress connected the unique burden of the United States as purveyor of global freedom in the 1960s to the experience of fighting the Civil War in the 1860s. By showcasing their Civil War history in this context, each state offered up its contribution to the nation and this particular, Cold War-informed vision of its future.[5] The stakes were incredibly high.

This project is about the response of one state to this high-stakes commemorative event– California. In commemorating California's participation in the Civil War as a part of the National Civil War Centennial, the California CWCC chose to focus almost exclusively upon the Golden State's role in staving off the French intervention in Mexico between 1862 and 1867, an episode in European, Mexican, and American history that has only recently enjoyed significant scholarly attention.[6] The California CWCC–at the legislative mandate of the

---

[4] Public Law 85-305, *U.S. Statutes at Large*, p. 626.

[5] Other scholars, notably Robert J. Cook in *Troubled Commemoration: The American Civil War Centennial, 1961–1965* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2007) have explored the National Civil War Centennial's Cold War dimensions as a project designed to promote domestic unity through historical consensus and to instill a sense of pride among Americans in their strong, freedom-loving nation as forged through this ordeal by fire. Also see Richard M. Fried, *The Russians are Coming! The Russians are Coming!: Pageantry and Patriotism in Cold War America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998), pp. 103–33, Michael Kammen, *Mystic Chords of Memory: The Transformation of Tradition in American Culture* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1991), pp. 532–610, and Barbara Gannon, *Americans Remember Their Civil War* (Santa Barbara, CA: Praeger, 2017), pp. 70–1.

[6] See Kristine Ibsen, *Maximilian, Mexico, and the Invention of Empire* (Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 2010), Andre Fleche, "Race and Revolution: The Confederacy, Mexico, and the Problem of Southern Nationalism,"

California State Assembly–focused their attention on three historical events and figures that related to the French intervention. First, they heralded the restoration of constitutional government in Mexico upon the overthrow of Archduke Maximilian and the forces of Napoleon III. Next, the commission highlighted the political career of U.S. Senator James A. McDougall of California, and finally they examined the Pacific Naval Squadron and its Civil War era actions along the Pacific Coast. Together, these three components form what I term the CWCC's "California thesis," which insisted that California's great contribution to the nation–and the world–during the Civil War was to ward off the incursions of empire and unfreedom in Mexico and the western hemisphere as a whole.

The California state government's choice to commemorate this rather unknown event during the Civil War Centennial was not obvious. The California State Assembly and the California CWCC had many other options in representing their state's Civil War history, such as the famed "California Column," a group of 1,500 Californian volunteers that marched over nine hundred miles to fight the Confederacy in the Arizona and New Mexico territories, the

---

in *The Transnational Significance of the American Civil War*, eds., Jörg Nagler, Don Doyle, and Marcus Gräser (New York: Palgrave, 2016), Doyle, *The Cause of All Nations: An International History of the American Civil War* (New York: Basic Books, 2015), Doyle, ed., *American Civil Wars: The United States, Latin America, Europe, and the Crisis of the 1860s* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2017), Patrick J. Kelly, "The North American Crises of the 1860s," *Journal of the Civil War Era* 2 (September 2012): 337–68, Erika Pani, "Law, Allegiance, and Sovereignty in Civil War Mexico, 1857–1867," *Journal of the Civil War Era* 7 (December 2017): 570–96, and Andrés Resendez, "Texas and the Spread of That Troublesome Spirit Through the Gulf of Mexico Basin," in *Secession as an International Phenomenon: From America's Civil War to Contemporary Secessionist Movements*, ed. Doyle (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2010). The most recent scholarship on this topic includes Steve Sainlaude, *France and the American Civil War: A Diplomatic History* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2019), William S. Kiser, "We Must Have Chihuahua and Sonora': Civil War Diplomacy in the U.S.-Mexico Borderlands," *Journal of the Civil War Era* 9 (March 2019): 196–222, and Patrick J. Kelly, "The Lost Continent of Abraham Lincoln," *Journal of the Civil War Era* 9 (March 2019): 223–48. For an early piece on the French intervention into Mexico see Alfred Jackson Hanna and Kathryn Abbey Hanna, *Napoleon III and Mexico: American Triumph over Monarchy* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1971).

"California 500" that fought in the east with the Massachusetts Calvary, and the state's renowned mineral wealth that supported the Union cause.[7] Although these episodes enjoyed some treatment at various California Civil War Centennial activities, the French intervention in Mexico loomed especially large. Critically, the California CWCC took its cue in its commemorative focus from the California State Assembly itself. California's governing body, via Assembly Concurrent Resolution, instructed the commission to highlight the history of the intervention, and particularly California's role in that episode. This choice to commemorate the French intervention in Mexico is the subject of this project.

The episode had, in these Californians' minds, crucially relevant implications for their own present. The commission even promoted this particular memory of California's Civil War participation globally, using it as a means to explore diplomatic channels with Mexico. The

[7] Although scholarship related to California's Civil War history is increasing, it still remains fairly limited. Some of the most exciting work regarding the Civil War in the Trans-Mississippi West more generally links the Civil War with projects of westward expansion and violence upon Native peoples. For general California Civil War history see Glenna Matthews, *The Golden State in the Civil War: Thomas Starr King, the Republican Party, and the Birth of Modern California* (Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 2012), Leonard L. Richards, *The California Gold Rush and the Coming of the Civil War* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2007), Stacey L. Smith, "Emancipating California: California's Unfree Labor Systems in the Crucible of the Civil War," in *Freedom's Frontier: California and the Struggle over Unfree Labor, Emancipation, and Reconstruction* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2013), pp. 174–205, Richard Hurley, *California and the Civil War* (Charleston, SC: The History Press, 2017), and Arthur Quinn, *The Rivals: William Gwin, David Broderick, and the Birth of California* (New York: Crown Publishers, Inc., 1994). For regional Californian Civil War history, see John W. Robinson, *Los Angeles in Civil War Days, 1860–65* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2011) and Monika Trobits, *Antebellum and Civil War San Francisco: A Western Theater for Northern and Southern Politics* (Charleston, SC: The History Press, 2014), Also see Andrew E. Masich, *The Civil War in Arizona: The Story of the California Volunteers, 1861–1865* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2006), Thomas W. Cutrer, *Theater of a Separate War: The Civil War West of the Mississippi River, 1861–1865* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2017), pp. 96, 113–4, and 116, and Daniel Brendan Lynch, "Southern California Chivalry: The Convergence of Southerners and Californios in the Far Southwest, 1846–1866," (PhD diss., University of California, Los Angeles, 2015). For scholarship related to the convergence of the Civil War and U.S.-Indian violence in the Trans-Mississippi West, see Ari Kelman, *A Misplaced Massacre: Struggling Over the Memory of Sand Creek* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2013), Brendan C. Lindsay, *Murder State: California's Native American Genocide, 1846–1873* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2012), and Benjamin L. Madley, "The Civil War in California and Its Aftermath, 1861–1873," in *An American Genocide: The United States and the California Indian Catastrophe, 1846–1873* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2016), pp. 289–336.

California CWCC read their Cold War moment backwards onto the French intervention in Mexico by presenting it as an instance when the United States (and particularly California) secured freedom abroad, much like it could in their own time. Emulating the National CWCC's presentist links between the Civil War period and the Cold War period, the California CWCC chose to emphasize the intervention because it demonstrated, more than any other aspect of Californian Civil War history, the Golden State's participation in the American task of promoting freedom and democracy abroad. The California CWCC capitalized upon their state's supposed special connection to Mexico as one of its immediate northern neighbors (and former part of Mexico itself) to assert their state's primacy in this fight for global freedom both to Americans, and more importantly, to people in Mexico itself.

This last point is critical. In its final two years of operation, the California CWCC literally exported Civil War memory into Mexico through their effort to erect a monument to Abraham Lincoln in Mexico City and through ceremoniously transporting California pioneer John A. Sutter, Jr.,'s remains from Acapulco to Sacramento. Both the Lincoln monument and Sutter episodes expanded the commemorative reach of the California CWCC and took the Centennial into Mexico. The California CWCC's efforts during the Centennial were used in the service of cultivating positive foreign relations with their southern neighbor during this period. In this mission, the commission had the backing and blessing of the U.S. State Department, the U.S. Department of Defense, Mexican Consul to Sacramento, Antonio Islas, the California State Assembly, and Governor Edmund G. Brown.

This project is only possible because of new work in three areas: Civil War memory, the transnational Civil War, and western boosterism in a Cold War context Caroline Janney, Barbara Gannon, and David Blight, have written about the politicization of Civil War memory in the Gilded Age period among veterans groups, politicians, and female-driven historical societies.[8] The California Civil War Centennial in the early 1960s involved a different cast of characters: American and Mexican diplomats, the governor of a powerful western state, Hollywood screenwriters, famed Civil War historians from leading Californian universities, and an array of California history buffs. Civil War memory has always been politicized and used to serve present political situations, and this was as true one hundred years on during the Cold War as it was in the immediate aftermath of the Civil War itself.

Robert J. Cook demonstrates this last point in his work on the politicization of Civil War memory in the service of Cold War consensus in *Troubled Commemoration: The American Civil War Centennial, 1961–1965* (2007). Cook argues that the National Civil War Centennial was largely a failure because it promoted a consensual vision of Civil War history that accommodated both Northern and Southern historical memory at the very moment when many leaders of the Civil Rights Movement called attention to the unfinished business of the war and Reconstruction. The National CWCC's attempts to present the Civil War as an event that united

[8] Caroline Janney, *Remembering the Civil War: Reunion and the Limits of Reconciliation* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2013), Gannon, *The Won Cause: Black and White Comradeship in the Grand Army of the Republic* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2011), and *Americans Remember Their Civil War*, David Blight, *Race and Reunion: The Civil War in American Memory* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2001) and *Beyond the Battlefield: Race, Memory, and the American Civil War* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2002). See also Nina Silber, *The Romance of Reunion: Northerners and the South, 1865–1900* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1993), Karen L. Cox, *Dixie's Daughters: The United Daughters of the Confederacy and the Preservation of Confederate Culture* (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2003), and W. Fitzhugh Brundage, *The Southern Past: A Clash of Race and Memory* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2005). For one of the few histories of Civil War memory in the 1960s, see Blight, *American Oracle: The Civil War in the Civil Rights Era* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2013).

Americans more than it divided them rang hollow in a nation deeply divided over race relations and the lingering effects of the war. Cook shows how the National CWCC politicized Civil War memory so as to fortify domestic unity as the Cold War continued to heat up, but that it failed in this endeavor. At the state level in California, we see how Civil War memory was also politicized in an official capacity and used to serve the interests of Cold War politics in California, particularly related to its somewhat strained relations with Mexico in the aftermath of the border chaos of the Bracero Program. The California Civil War Centennial similar, to the National Civil War Centennial, had Cold War dimensions, evident in the California commission's export of the Centennial into Mexico as a foreign relations campaign. Just as the Civil War was not a nation-bound event, memory of the war during this period was not nation-bound either.

The foreign relations purposes of Civil War memory during the Centennial, particularly the export of that memory south of the border, relates the story of the California Civil War Centennial to recent scholarship that explores the Civil War itself in a global and transnational context. Historians such as Thomas Bender, Andre Fleche, Timothy Mason Roberts, Paul Quigley, and Mischa Honeck have shown us the ways in which Americans both north and south of the Mason Dixon line understood the Civil War in a global framework related particularly to the 1848 revolutions in Europe.[9] Fleche in particular has demonstrated that Confederate

[9] Thomas Bender, *A Nation among Nations: America's Place in World History* (New York: Hill & Wang, 2006), Andre Fleche, *Revolution of 1861: The American Civil War in the Age of Nationalist Conflict* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2012), Timothy Mason Roberts, *Distant Revolutions: 1848 and the Challenge to American Exceptionalism* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2011), Paul Quigley, *Shifting Grounds: Nationalism and the American South, 1848–1865* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), and Mischa Honeck, *We Are the Revolutionaries: German-Speaking Immigrants and American Abolitionists after 1848* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2011). For an overview of the transnational turn in Civil War era scholarship, see Patrick J. Kelly, "The European Revolutions in 1848 and the Transnational Turn in Civil War History," *Journal of the Civil War Era* 4 (September 2014): 431–43.

nationalism was shaped by the Confederacy's perception of Mexico's "failures" as a multi-racial republic led by an indigenous president, Benito Juárez, which accounts in part for the Confederate government's attempts to support the French intervention in Mexico.[10] Roberts has similarly revealed that the counterrevolutionary suppression of the 1848 revolutions in Europe cultivated a sense of American exceptionalism as a nation that resulted out of a uniquely successful revolution, but notes that this sense evaporated as the sectional crises of the 1850s (particularly Bleeding Kansas) made a mockery of the American democratic process.[11] In examining the California Civil War Centennial, I extend this idea about the global significance of the Civil War in time to the 1960s, showing how the California CWCC and the California State Assembly had essentially the same idea regarding the international implications of the war. In their Cold War context, the commission framed the Civil War through the lens of the fight between democracy and communism. The French intervention in Mexico aided this framing.

Lastly, the California state government used the opportunity of the National Civil War Centennial to advertise their state–which in part accounts for the involvement of such figures as Governor Brown and U.S. Senator from California, Thomas H. Kuchel–and so relates this story to western boosterism. The California Civil War Centennial acted as a different kind of boosterism than the state's well-known boosters of the late nineteenth-century.[12] In the context of the Centennial, the California CWCC cultivated a state identity that worked more to demonstrate

---

[10] Fleche, "Race and Revolution: The Confederacy, Mexico, and the Problem of Southern Nationalism."
[11] Roberts, *Distant Revolutions*.
[12] For a discussion of nineteenth-century western boosterism more generally, see David M. Wrobel, *Promised Lands: Promotion, Memory, and the Creation of the American West* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2002), Wrobel, *Global West, American Frontier: Travel, Empire, and Exceptionalism from Manifest Destiny to the Great Depression* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2013), and Stephen V. Ward, "Selling the Frontier" in *Selling Places: The Marketing and Promotion of Towns and Cities, 1850–2000* (New York: Routledge, 1998), pp. 9–28. For western boosterism related to specific events, locations, and states, see J.S. Holliday, *Rush for Riches: Gold Fever and the Making of California* (Berkeley: Oakland Museum of California and the University of

California's national participation and its "uses" in the global fight for freedom rather than its advantages as a place of settlement. Just as the Golden State had proven itself to be a bastion of American military might in the fight for freedom during the Second World War, so did the state once again demonstrate its contributions to making the United States and the world free through the lens of the Civil War.[13]

The fact that state politicians and California scholars took the National Civil War Centennial so seriously as an opportunity to demonstrate state significance in the nation, suggests that historians should also reexamine the event seriously. The Centennial did fail to sustain a vibrant presence in everyday American life in the midst of a presidential assassination, substantial foreign relations crises, and the escalation of the Civil Rights Movement and American involvement in Vietnam. However, as Cook notes, that failure should not lead us to

---

California Press, 1999), Peter J. Blodgett, *Land of Golden Dreams: California and the Gold Rush Decade, 1848-1858* (San Marino: Huntington Library Press, 1999), Elliott West, *The Contested Plains: Indians, Goldseekers, and the Rush to Colorado* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1998), William Cronon, "Dreaming the Metropolis" in *Nature's Metropolis: Chicago and the Great West* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1991), pp. 23–55, David M. Emmons, *Garden in the Grasslands: Boomer Literature of the Great Central Plains* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1971) and Jan Blodgett, *Land of Bright Promise: Advertising the Texas Panhandle and South Plains, 1870–1917* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1988).

[13] The rapid development of the military-industrial complex in California during and after the Second World War, particularly in cities, has been extensively covered. Roger W. Lotchin remains one of the most prolific urban historians of the military build-up in California during this period, although he cautions against labeling this development California's "second gold rush." See *Fortress California, 1910–1961: From Warfare to Welfare* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992), "California Cities and the Hurricane of Change: World War II in the San Francisco, Los Angeles, and San Diego Metropolitan Areas," *Pacific Historical Review* 63 (August 1994): 393–420, and *The Bad City in the Good War: San Francisco, Los Angeles, Oakland, and San Diego* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2003). Also see Kevin Starr, *Embattled Dreams: California at War and Peace, 1940–1950* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004), Starr, *Golden Dreams: California in the Age of Abundance, 1950–1963* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2009), and Kirse Granat May, *Golden State, Golden Youth: The California Image in Popular Culture, 1955–1966* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2002). For local studies of the wartime and postwar boom in military production, infrastructure, population, and the national image of California, see Robert O. Self, *American Babylon: Race and the Struggle for Postwar Oakland* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2003), Marilynn S. Johnson, *The Second Gold Rush: Oakland and the East Bay in World War II* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993), Becky Nicolaides, *My Blue Heaven: Life and Politics in the Working-Class Suburbs of Los Angeles, 1920–1965* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2002), Eric Avila, *Popular Culture in the Age of White Flight: Fear and Fantasy in Suburban Los Angeles* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2004), and Nicolas G. Rosenthal, *Reimagining Indian Country: Native Migration and Identity in Twentieth-Century Los Angeles* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2012).

dismiss the event as insignificant. Investigating the Centennial at the state level illuminates how, at least for the highest echelons of the California state government, the Civil War Centennial mattered. It presented another opportunity to boost California's identity as "the State which ranks foremost and pre-eminent in [the] Union," as Sacramento mayor James B. McKinney phrased it at the Appomattox Centennial celebration at the State Capitol in April 1965.[14] The French intervention in Mexico, over all other options available in the history of the Civil War in California, perfectly illustrated the exceptional character of California as the CWCC and State Assembly saw it, for both Americans and Mexicans.

The essay starts by laying out how the California CWCC came to be, noting its early slow start with a radical revitalization in 1962 after the appointment of the important character in this story, Colonel William L. Shaw. Shaw's efforts in 1962 and 1963 expanded the reach of the California CWCC's activities both in the public and scholarly realms, and eventually, in the sphere of foreign relations by 1964. Shaw produced three pieces of scholarship that, at the instruction of the State Assembly, related to the French intervention in Mexico. This legislation and the articles published in *The Pacific Historian* and *The California Historical Quarterly* form the core of the "California thesis." Then, we return briefly to the CWCC's public activities through Centennial Day at the California State Fair in 1963, noting how the content of the activities for that public event shifted after the passing of the Assembly Concurrent Resolutions to reflect the California CWCC's reoriented commemorative focus. Finally, we explore the practical application of the California thesis with the export of the California Civil War

[14] "Appomattox Centennial," typed document, p. 1, undated, Folder 30, Box 1, CCWCC Records.

Centennial into Mexico to aid in cultivating positive foreign relations with the U.S.'s good "Neighbor to the South."[15]

The California CWCC had a few more years to wait before it could export their vision of the Centennial and California south of the border into Mexico, however. Given the high stakes of this Centennial opportunity, it is surprising how long it took for the California CWCC to get on its feet. The National CWCC and the Civil War Centennial had operated for three years before any sort of commemoration effort began in California. The State Assembly passed a Concurrent Resolution in January 1961 to create a Centennial Executive Committee, led by Los Angeles-based attorney and amateur historian Justin G. Turner, but it did little to indicate that California had any intention to participate in the Centennial.[16] A group of Civil War enthusiasts in Sacramento, who named themselves the Sacramento Civil War Round Table (SCWRT) in July 1961, essentially functioned in place of the California CWCC until 1962. Even when Governor Brown nominated Colonel William L. Shaw, who was before then Vice-President of the SCWRT and Executive Secretary of Northern California on the CWCC, as Chairman in 1962, the round table cooperated closely with the commission. The Civil War Round Tables in California were the powerhouses behind the California Centennial.

The SCWRT, a non-partisan and volunteer organization, included an eclectic mix of local businessmen, politicians, historians, and general history buffs interested in "the advancement of

[15] Reginald R. Stuart to William L. Shaw, letter, 19 May 1965, Folder 80, Box 2, CCWCC Records.
[16] *Commendation of the creation of a Centennial Executive Committee*, ACR 11, *California State Assembly Concurrent Resolution* (1961): p. 4676.

knowledge of the War Between the States."[17] They organized speakers, exhibits, and day-trips for the historically inclined public, as well as encouraged the development of more Civil War Round Tables throughout the state. The SCWRT saw themselves as a patriotic civic organization in their task to advance and spread knowledge about the Civil War. They believed the war revealed important qualities of the American character that would cultivate patriotism among Americans. In Article I, Section I of their bylaws, the SCWRT attested that their purposes included cooperating with "other patriotic and civic organizations in patriotic endeavors and community affairs."[18] The SCWRT enthusiastically supported the California CWCC by publicizing the efforts of the Centennial in their meetings and sponsoring important Centennial functions.[19] Each of the Californian round tables–Sacramento, Southern California (headquartered in Los Angeles), Stockton, La Jolla, and Torrance–served their immediately surrounding areas, which was especially important given the enormous size of California.

The size of the state posed a significant challenge for the round tables and the California CWCC. These organizations faced the challenge of sustaining participation and interest in the commemoration (even among its own members), which often resulted in an imbalance of members and activities between different regions of the state. Until 1963, when Shaw took over

[17] The first chapter of Civil War Round Tables was founded in Chicago in 1940. These round tables, which still exist, were very masculine organizations during this period, much like the California CWCC itself. For more about the national development of the Civil War Round Tables, see Cook, *Troubled Commemoration*, pp. 18–26, 34, 45, and 65; "Articles of Incorporation, the Sacramento Civil War Round Table," typed document, p. 2, 28 June 1962, Folder 5, Box 1, Register of the Civil War Round Table (Stockton, CA) Papers, Holt-Atherton Department of Special Collections, University of the Pacific, Stockton, CA (hereafter Stockton SCWRT Papers).
[18] "Bylaws, the Sacramento Civil War Round Table," typed document, p. 1, undated, Folder 5, Box 1, Stockton SCWRT Papers.
[19] "Civil War Centennial Day, September 9, 1962, Governor's Hall, Sacramento," typed list, September 1962, Folder 5, Box 1, Stockton SCWRT Papers.

from the Los Angeles-based Turner as Chairman of the CWCC, the majority of commission members were from Los Angeles and Orange counties.[20] When Turner resigned in late 1962 due to exhaustion, the regional balance shifted north towards Sacramento and San Francisco.[21] While it was a practical move to headquarter the California CWCC in Sacramento so as to be closer to the offices of Governor Brown, who took a keen interest in the work of the commission, it came at a cost. Members frequently had trouble getting to meetings due to the six hour drive between Los Angeles and Sacramento (or an expensive flight), which prompted some to resign.[22]

In the long run, however, shifting the regional representation of the California CWCC north to the state capitol proved to be a great advantage for the commission, and indicated a shift in the commission's association with the SCWRT and the California state government. By headquartering the California CWCC's operations in the capitol city, it was easier to involve Governor Brown and the California State Assembly. Moving the California CWCC's headquarters was just one of the many ways in which Shaw, both as Executive Secretary for Northern California and as Chairman, revived the slow-moving commission. William L. Shaw is a particularly important figure in the story of the commission because he was responsible for carrying out the wishes of the State Assembly in emphasizing the French intervention in Mexico during the Centennial. He wrote the three articles that form the California thesis, organized a

[20] The timeline of the California CWCC in its early days is somewhat confusing. For clarity's sake, Justin G. Turner served as Chairman of the Executive Committee and the CWCC between January 1961 and September 1962, when he tendered his resignation with Governor Brown due to exhaustion. Colonel William L. Shaw was Vice-President of the SCWRT when the Centennial began in 1961 and then served as Executive Secretary for Northern California for the CWCC beginning in May 1962. In March 1963, Governor Brown appointed Shaw Chairman of the CWCC as a whole, a position that Shaw held until the commission terminated in 1966. Thus, the SCWRT and the California CWCC were tightly intertwined in their efforts but were ultimately different organizations.
[21] Justin G. Turner to Edmund G. Brown, letter, 13 March 1963, Folder 8, Box 1, CCWCC Records.
[22] Charles S. Schwartz to William L. Shaw, letter, 28 January 1963, Folder 70, Box 2, CCWCC Records; Bruce W. Sumner to William L. Shaw, letter, 2 February 1963, Folder 71, Box 2, CCWCC Records.

host of public events such as "Civil War Centennial Day" at the California State Fair, executed the transfer of Sutter's remains to Sacramento, and was an ardent supporter of the building of a monument to Lincoln in Mexico City.

A veteran of the U.S. Infantry during the Second World War, Shaw brought a relentless productivity to the California CWCC. He was born in San Francisco in 1909 to parents both descended from early California pioneer families. The Shaw family moved from San Francisco to Sacramento in 1922, where Shaw graduated high school. By 1933, Shaw had earned a bachelor's degree from Stanford University in political science and a J.D. from Stanford Law.[23] In addition to his work for the SCWRT and the California CWCC, at the same time he served as Deputy Attorney General to the State of California, counsel to the State Military Department, colonel in the California Army National Guard's Judge Advocate General's Corps, and as legal counsel to the Sacramento Opera. He was an active member of the Sacramento County Historical Society, the California Historical Society, the Stanford Law Society, Sons of the American Revolution, and the California National Guard Association. Shaw's personal range of activities and involvement in the Sacramento community was matched only by the range of activities he put together for the California Civil War Centennial. After his appointment to the commission in 1962 and especially after he assumed the role of Chairman, Shaw revived the slow-moving commission and expanded its commemorative reach.

The first test of Shaw's tenacity as a member of the California CWCC was his work in putting together "Civil War Centennial Day" at the California State Fair in Sacramento from 1962 to 1964. His efforts at the fair sparked interest in the Centennial in California and drew

[23] "Colonel William L. Shaw Biographical Sketch," typed document, 4 April 1963, Folder 17, Box 1, CCWCC Records.

impressive crowds. At Shaw's behest, Governor Brown proclaimed September 9 to be Centennial Day in order to coincide with the California State Fair that was held every year in State Capitol Park. Joining forces with the California State Fair is but one example of Shaw's shrewdness in marketing the California Civil War Centennial. As of September 1962, 790, 895 people had attended the fair that year, bringing close to one million Californians in contact with the California CWCC.[24] The State Fair offered an excellent opportunity to publicize the Centennial, especially after such a slow first year. Of course, not all fair-goers would choose to attend the California CWCC's events. Civil War Centennial Day shared September 9 with Redmen and Pocahontas Day, Newspaper Boys Day, Folk Dance Day, Castro Valley Day, Sonora Day, and Senior Citizens Day.[25] Given this smorgasbord of events, the California CWCC's success in drawing crowds is impressive. 15,000 people passed through an extensive Civil War exhibit, while 5,000 attended a special two-hour event at the exhibit, and a whopping 200,000 viewed the U.S. Army Mobile Civil War Display throughout the course of the fair.[26] Indeed, Shaw pulled out all stops to make this event herald a new beginning for the California CWCC during the Centennial.

In creating the first Centennial Day at the State Fair in 1962, Shaw coordinated with the California State Archives, the California State Library, and private collectors from the SCWRT to create an extensive Civil War exhibit shown between 1pm and 6pm at Governor's Hall. The exhibit featured copies of significant Civil War documents and items, such as the Gettysburg Address, the Emancipation Proclamation, and funeral badges for President Lincoln, as well as

[24] "Both Sides in Civil War Will Be Honored at Fair," *The Sacramento Bee*, 9 September 1962.
[25] "State Fair Program Today," *The Sacramento Bee*, 9 September 1962.
[26] "California State Fair: Civil War Centennial Day," typed document, 9 September 1962, Folder 2, Box 1, CCWCC Records.

significant Civil War items related to California, including accounts of Lincoln's assassination from *The Sacramento Bee* and *The Sacramento Union*, soldier ballots cast by the California Volunteers in the presidential election of 1864, and a letter from the California Adjutant General to Secretary of War W.H. Halleck concerning secret organizations in the state seeking to overthrow the Union.[27] The rarest item on display was one of General Ulysses S. Grant's uniforms on loan from the Stanford University Art Gallery and Museum, insured for $1,200 during the week it was displayed.[28] Between 2pm and 4pm, the California CWCC organized a two-hour program that featured educational speakers and entertainment in the form of historical vignettes and music. A group of nine "very attractive young ladies" from the California Department of Investment named the "Flagettes" spoke on script for three minutes each about the battle of Gettysburg, the California Column, Clara Barton and the U.S. Sanitary Commission, California troops in the Civil War, First Lady of the Confederacy Varina Davis, California during the 1860s, and the "National Anthem We Love."[29]

Centennial Day had one glaring absence in its content, however: the French intervention in Mexico. Instead, the commission focused almost entirely upon more well-known aspects of California's Civil War history, like the California Column and the California 500. This absence at the State Fair–all three years of the Centennial–is an important point for two reasons. First, it reveals a critical difference between the California CWCC's public and more scholarly activities and the intended audiences for each. Visitors to the events that Shaw put on for Centennial Day

---

[27] "Materials from California Section of State Library to be Used for Display on Civil War for State Fair," typed document, 1962, Folder 2, Box 1, CCWCC Records.
[28] J.J. Murphy to William L. Shaw, letter, 22 August 1962, Folder 68, Box 2, CCWCC Records.
[29] Clara Barton's work with the U.S. Sanitary Commission during the Civil War inspired her to found the American Red Cross in 1881. "Civil War Centennial Day at California State Fair, September 9, 1963," typed document, p. 1, Folder 2, Box 1, CCWCC Records.

and other public activities like parades, do not seem to have been the intended target of the California CWCC and State Assembly's commemoration of the French intervention. Second, it demonstrates, that as of 1962, the French intervention into Mexico was not yet on the commemorative radar of the commission. That emphasis was to come later in April 1963 with the passage of Assembly Concurrent Resolutions #32, #42, and #50. However, even after that point, the French intervention did not make the cut at Centennial Day, although the CWCC began lightly threading Mexican history and culture into commission-sponsored events, as we will see when we return to Centennial Day in 1963. The absence of the French intervention in this public event suggests that commemorating the episode through historical scholarship and eventually the Lincoln monument in Mexico City had a different purpose than simply cultivating pride among Californians in their state's Civil War history. The California thesis, which rested its analytical punch with the French intervention in Mexico, did not develop until 1963 after the California State Assembly passed these resolutions.

Before examining the Cold War-informed content of the California thesis as expressed through the California State Assembly's legislation and Shaw's articles, let us revisit the history of the French intervention in Mexico itself.[30] The intervention began as a triple European invasion of Mexico–from Britain, France, and Spain–in 1861, just as the republic was getting back onto its feet under the presidency of Benito Juárez after years of civil conflict between the Liberal Party and the Conservative or Church Party. Mexico's civil war, the Guerra de Reforma (1857–1860), had severely weakened the republic and left it in debt to Britain, France, and

[30] For an excellent overview of the French intervention in Mexico and particularly its geopolitical roots and American Civil War context, see Thomas Schoonover, "Napoleon is Coming! Maximilian is Coming?: The International History of the Civil War in the Caribbean Basin," in *The Union, the Confederacy, and the Atlantic Rim*, ed. Robert E. May (West Lafayette: Purdue University Press, 1995), pp. 101–25.

Spain, who invaded under the pretense of collecting this debt.[31] Such pretense, as Thomas Schoonover argues, was part of a long history of European activity in the Caribbean region, now heightened as the United States extended its reach throughout the western hemisphere.[32] In the 1840s and 1850s, France, Spain, and Britain challenged American dominance in the region, which had been rhetorically established by the Monroe Doctrine in 1823 and was materially apparent by 1848 after the termination of the Mexican-American War and the Mexican Cession.[33] As the United States attained the rank of continental power, just as Mexico was embroiled in civil war, European powers, but particularly the self-declared emperor of France, Napoleon III, feared that the western hemisphere would be dominated by American interests forever.[34]

But in 1861, the attention of the United States turned inward with the firing on Fort Sumter, a moment that presented European powers with the opportunity to challenge American influence in the Gulf region.[35] In November 1861, Britain, France, and Spain–the three powers that lost the most ground in the New World over the previous century–signed the Tripartite Alliance. By the first week of December, six thousand Spanish troops landed off of the coast of Vera Cruz, opening the port to the arrival of seven hundred British troops and two thousand

---

[31] Sainlaude, *France and the American Civil War*, xii.
[32] Schoonover, "Napoleon is Coming!," 106.
[33] Sainlaude, *France and the American Civil War*, 186.
[34] Ibid, 4.
[35] Schoonover argues that historians should not reduce the triple European invasion of Mexico to purely the result of U.S. distraction during the Civil War because the invasion was in reality a continuation of decades of European aggression and challenge to the American presence in the Caribbean basin since the end of the eighteenth-century. Rather, he encourages his readers to think of the invasion of Mexico as simply another episode in the never-ending history of imperial ambitions in the Caribbean. He writes, "Somebody has always been coming to the Caribbean region: the Spanish, British, monarchists, or papists before the Civil War; and the French, Bolsheviks, fascists, or communists since then." See Schoonover, "Napoleon is Coming!," 122.

French troops a few weeks later.[36] When it became clear, however, that Napoleon had every intention of directly challenging the United States in this venture, Britain withdrew its forces so as not to damage its economic relationship with the United States. Spain followed Britain's path once Spanish officials understood that Napoleon and Mexican conservatives seeking to reestablish the Catholic Church's authority in Mexico did not intend to set up a Spanish prince as a puppet monarch.[37] Neither Britain nor Spain had any interest in fulfilling Napoleon's ambitious imperial appetite, which stretched not only into Latin America in the west, but east to the edges of Asia and Africa.[38]

By April 1862, both Britain and Spain had backed out of the Tripartite Alliance and left the French army alone to capture Mexico City.[39] The exit of Britain and Spain from Mexico left Napoleon free to embrace his grand plan to regenerate Latin America through Mexico and the French Empire in the New World as a counter to the expanding, Protestant, Anglo-Saxon hold in the western hemisphere as led by the United States. As Napoleon himself put it in a letter to Leopold I of Belgium, "A regenerated Mexico would form an insuperable barrier to the encroachments of the Americans of the North."[40] The result would be the resurgence of a Catholic, Latin world bridging the western and eastern hemispheres with France's recently established Second Empire in charge of it all.[41]

---

[36] Ibid, 101.
[37] Ibid, 118.
[38] Sainlaude notes that, while it would be anachronistic to term Napoleon's grand plan as one of globalization, his imperial ambitions certainly suggest that Napoleon was interested in fashioning a new world order based on conservative, Catholic, Latin values in opposition to liberal democracy. Both Napoleon and his formidable wife, Eugénie, harbored significant derision regarding the American political system, which they understood to be decentralized and thus unstable. See Sainlaude, *France and the American Civil War*, 2–3.
[39] Ibsen, *Maximilian, Mexico, and the Invention of Empire*, 1.
[40] Napoleon III quoted in Doyle, *The Cause of All Nations*, 117.
[41] Napoleon III declared himself emperor of the Second Empire of France (the First Empire, or Napoleonic Empire, having collapsed in 1814 after Napoleon I's defeat at Waterloo) in a coup d'état in 1852. For more background on

Napoleon's invasion did not proceed smoothly. Juárez's liberal forces, with the aid of American *Juáristas* or secret agents, proved to be unexpectedly stalwart in their armed resistance to the workings of the French Second Empire.[42] This resistance came to a head on May 5, 1862 at Puebla, Mexico, when the outnumbered Mexican army defeated the French. From that point forward, Cinco de Mayo became one of Mexico's principal national celebrations, a liberal victory against the conservative ravages of Old World empire. The victory of Juárez's forces proved short-lived, however. In April 1963, Napoleon's forces took Mexico City and drove Juárez out of the republic's capital city.[43] With Juárez in hiding and American interests temporarily distracted by domestic strife, Napoleon moved in. Assured by his advisors that France could easily overtake Mexico and Juárez, Napoleon selected the Austrian Archduke Ferdinand Maximilian to rule as a puppet monarch of Mexico under the watchful eye of the French throne. Maximilian and his Belgian wife, Carlota, arrived in Vera Cruz on May 28, 1864, having accepted the imperial crown of Mexico under the Treaty of Miramar.[44]

Maximilian and Carlota enjoyed just one year as Emperor and Empress of Mexico. Their fortunes quickly turned after the U.S. Civil War ended at Appomattox in 1865. That November, Secretary of State William Seward declared that Maximilian and Napoleon's government ran counter to American interests and sent troops to Mexico, supporting Juárez's forces at Bagdad and capturing that city in January 1866.[45] As diplomatic pressure from the United States and the

---

the French context of the Second Empire, see "Part I: The French Position" in Sainlaude, *France and the American Civil War*. For more on Napoleon's "grand plan" for a regenerated Latin world see Sainlaude, 31, Schoonover, "Napoleon is Coming!," 117, and Fleche, "Race and Revolution," 195; Doyle, *The Cause of All Nations*, 108.

[42] For more on *Juáristas* see Robert Ryal Miller, "Arms Across the Border: United States Aid to Juárez during the French Intervention in Mexico," *American Philosophical Society* 63 (1973): 1–68.

[43] Schoonover, "Napoleon is Coming!," 102 and Fleche, "Race and Revolution," 197.

[44] Sainlaude, *France and the American Civil War*, 201.

[45] Ibid, 202–4.

threat of a Prussian invasion of France itself intensified, Napoleon decided to abandon Maximilian and his grand plan for a regenerated, global Latin empire and began withdrawing French troops from Mexico.[46] As French troops evacuated Mexico City and it became clear that a strong contingent of *Juáristas* were encroaching upon the capital, Maximilian fled to Querétaro. After a three-month siege, Juárez's forces broke through and entered the besieged city, where they captured and executed Maximilian in June 1867.[47] Juárez was unanimously reelected president later that year. The Republic of Mexico had survived. Along with Union victory north of the border, the survival of Juárez and constitutional government in Mexico signaled that liberal democracy had maintained its hold on the western hemisphere against. The powers of conservative, monarchical imperialism.

Liberal democracy versus conservative monarchy and even west versus east; it is clear why such a history would appeal to a Civil War commemorative body like the California CWCC in the midst of a Cold War that similarly pitted democracy and communism and west against east against one another.[48] The language and content of the assembly concurrent resolutions passed by the California State Assembly and Shaw's articles, which form the California thesis, suggest why the commission chose this episode in Californian Civil War history above all others in

[46] The threat of a Prussian invasion was the beginning of the buildup towards the Franco-Prussian War of 1870–1, which left France severely weakened and resulted in the unification of Germany under Emperor Wilhelm I. See Ibsen, *Maximilian, Mexico, and the Invention of Empire*, 6.
[47] Ibid, 7 and Miller, "Arms Across the Border," 7.
[48] To reiterate, historians have demonstrated the ways in which Americans thought about the high stakes of Union victory during the Civil War in such a broad and existential sense, drawn in part from the idea of the 1848 revolutions in Europe as essentially a contest between liberal democracy and conservative monarchy (or revolution versus counterrevolution). A Union victory would signal that the republic experiment could withstand the flames of civil war and endure. The Civil War thus became a test of democracy's viability. Specifically with regards to the fate of republican Mexico, many Americans noted and linked the threat of the Confederacy with the threat of American loss in the western hemisphere. For instance, *The New York Times* published a piece in February 1862, warning its readers that "the monarchical projects directed against America do not stop" in Mexico. See Doyle, *The Cause of All Nations*, 109.

participating in the Centennial. It is important to note that the assembly and the California CWCC's history, for the most part, is not bad history. With the exception of the rather odd choice in commemorating the questionable legacy of Senator James A. McDougall, the content of Shaw's articles holds up against the recent spate of scholarship related to the French intervention into Mexico. Indeed, Shaw was almost fifty years ahead of his time in bringing this episode into the broader conversation of Civil War scholarship. Still, this legislation and Shaw's articles are products of their time and thus must be contextualized in the Cold War-driven purposes behind the Civil War Centennial at large and especially, the subsequent efforts of the California CWCC in exporting that story into Mexico.

Through this legislation and articles, the California CWCC developed their thesis about their state's participation and significance during the Civil War. The State Assembly's resolutions–and consequently Shaw's articles in *The Pacific Historian* and *The California Historical Quarterly*–portrayed California's role in staving off Napoleon and Maximilian's forces in Mexico as that of a benevolent neighbor looking out for its friends and allies.[49] In the first of these resolutions, ACR #32, the California State Assembly declared, "WHEREAS, the influence of the United States of America was a far-reaching weight to induce Napoleon III to withdraw from Mexico beginning in 1866 and concluding in 1867, and thereafter Maximilian was deposed and overthrown and constitutional government was restored in the Republic of Mexico as well as a triumphant President Juárez."[50] Here, the assembly made swift historical and

[49] As a state immediately north of Mexico, California faced a particularly potent threat from France because it did not have a buffer zone. Shaw's first article after the resolutions passed in 1963 expresses this point well. See William L. Shaw, "The Impact of Napoleon III Upon the Pacific Coast," *The Pacific Historian*, 7, no. 1 (1963), 14.
[50] *Restoration of Constitutional Government in Republic of Mexico Upon Overthrow of Maximilian and Withdrawal of Forces of Napoleon III of Imperial France in 1867,* ACR 32, *California State Assembly Concurrent Resolution* (1963): 4753–4.

causal jumps between official American disapproval of the intervention and Maximilian's downfall at Querétaro. The resolution then declared, "WHEREAS, sentiment in California in the years 1861–1867 was overwhelmingly in favor and support of the People of the Republic of Mexico and adverse to Napoleon III and Maximilian, and, among others, United States Senator James A. McDougall of California, 1862–1867, repeatedly in the Senate of the United States challenged and condemned the incursions of Napoleon III into Mexico."[51] The assembly centered the state of California in the story of the French intervention, aligning its freedom-loving propensities with that of the United States as a "far-reaching weight" against the incursions of empire. In maintaining that the abstracted people of California supported the similarly abstracted people of Mexico, the language of this resolution articulated a special connection between California and Mexico. After this resolution passed, the California CWCC emphasized this special connection at many of its activities in 1963, including, as we will see, 1963 Centennial Day.

In his first article published after the California State Assembly passed ACR #32, "The Impact of Napoleon III Upon the Pacific Coast" in *The Pacific Historian*, Shaw heeded the Assembly's instruction. He began by stating that "the State of California had an immediate and overwhelming interest in the course of the French intervention and the ultimate overthrow of Maximilian in the nation immediately south of California."[52] For most of this article, Shaw laid out the basics of the French intervention into Mexico, explaining with impressive insight its geopolitical roots. He further centered his analysis of the intervention by including a discussion

[51] Ibid.
[52] Shaw, "The Impact of Napoleon III Upon the Pacific Coast," 13.

of the ways in which French imperial overtures in Mexico necessitated the expansion and strengthening of the Pacific Naval Squadron that patrolled off the Californian coast, another stipulation from the California State Assembly in Concurrent Resolution #44.[53] In these and his subsequent two articles, Shaw centered California in the story of the intervention.

The second of the Assembly resolutions instructed the California CWCC to conduct research into the life and career of U.S. Senator from California, James A. McDougall. In this case, the assembly could have taken its cue from Shaw himself, who published an article on McDougall in *The Pacific Historian* in 1962, before the California Civil War Centennial's focus was reoriented towards the French intervention. For Shaw and the State Assembly, McDougall became a pinnacle of Californian greatness during the Civil War era. As senator, McDougall stood up time and again to the Lincoln administration in forcing the president and Seward to take a stance regarding the French intervention.[54] ACR #42 put it this way: "WHEREAS, the reported record of proceedings of the United States Senate preserved in the 'Congressional Globe' of the years 1861–1867 reveals that Senator McDougall spoke eloquently and convincingly on several of the most critical issues of that period…"[55] The resolution then rattled off a long list of issues that McDougall took a stance on, including Reconstruction, the Conscription Act of 1863, emancipation, the transcontinental railroad, slavery in Washington, and the French intervention into Mexico. In both of Shaw's articles on McDougall, published in 1962 and 1964 in *The Pacific Historian* and *The California Historical Quarterly* respectively, Shaw laid out all of the

[53] *The Preeminent Role of the U.S. Naval Squadron of the Pacific, 1861–1867,* ACR 44, *California State Assembly Concurrent Resolution* (1963): 4753–4.
[54] William L. Shaw, "McDougall of California," *The California Historical Quarterly* 43 (June 1964), 123.
[55] *Research as to the Life and Record of U.S. Senator James A. McDougall of California, 1861–1867,* ACR 42, *California State Assembly Concurrent Resolution* (1963): 4751–2.

major topics on which McDougall spoke before the Senate but highlighted the French intervention particularly.

In his 1962 article for *The Pacific Historian*, "United States Senator James A. McDougall," Shaw clarified McDougall's major contributions to the nation as California's senator: his sustained critiques of Confederate confiscation and Napoleon's imperial advances in Mexico. On this latter point, Shaw wrote that "the Senator directed attention to the *Monroe Doctrine* and insisted that the United States should protest against, and, if necessary, resist by force of arms, the extension of European monarchical institutions. After Mexico should cease to be self-governing and become powerless, then France could turn to Louisiana, Texas, and California. Control of the great bay of San Francisco would secure Louis Napoleon 'against any power in the world."[56] He ended the brief article by asserting that "We Californians of the Twentieth Century may take pride in his [McDougall's] discretion of the course of federal opposition to Napoleon III and Prince Maximilian in Mexico…"[57]

Here we see Shaw directly serving two purposes of the California Civil War Centennial. First, he centered California in the story of the intervention, noting how the protection of the San Francisco Bay (manned by the U.S. Pacific Naval Squadron) from France's Second Empire was of the utmost importance in preventing the spread of unfreedom in the western hemisphere in a domino-falling effect. He also attributed, in large part, Seward's decision to finally send American troops to aid Juárez's forces in Bagdad in 1866 to McDougall's repeated efforts to bring attention to the intervention on the Senate floor. Shaw suggested that if it were not for McDougall's persistence, federal opposition to Napoleon might never have mobilized into direct

[56] William L. Shaw, "United States Senator James A. McDougall," *The Pacific Historian*, 6, no. 4 (1962), 185.
[57] Ibid, 186.

military assistance to the Republic of Mexico. Second, Shaw made the temporal link between the 1860s and 1960s apparent in emulation of the National CWCC, in asserting that Californians of the twentieth-century should take pride in McDougall's efforts as a representative of the great state of California to offer U.S. aid to Juárez and constitutional government.

Shaw's second article on McDougall, published in *The California Historical Quarterly* in 1964, laid out McDougall's interpretation and use of the Monroe Doctrine. Shaw also demonstrated that the California CWCC's interest in McDougall came from the State Assembly. He wrote in "McDougall of California" that

> "the legislative intent of ACR 42 is sound in directing the California Civil War Centennial Commission to ascertain and stress the outstanding accomplishments of Senator McDougall in the United States Senate…Senator McDougall for several years insistently raised his voice in the Senate on behalf of the Republic of Mexico crushed under the heels of a European conqueror. Many leaders have given lip service to the Monroe Doctrine. Senator McDougall made the doctrine a living actuality on behalf of subjugated Mexico."[58]

For Shaw, McDougall brought the Monroe Doctrine to life in order to protect the freedoms of a sister republic. The doctrine itself did not articulate the need for U.S. intervention in Latin America, of course–it operated under the principles of non-colonization and two separated spheres containing European and American interests.[59] It was not until 1904, under the aggressive leadership of President Theodore Roosevelt and in the wake of the United States attaining the status of a world power, that American foreign policy transformed into a much more interventionist model. The Roosevelt Corollary to the Monroe Doctrine–an "interventionist

[58] Shaw, "McDougall of California," 132.
[59] See Jeffrey J. Malanson, "The Congressional Debate over U.S. Participation in the Congress of Panama, 1825–1826: Washington's Farewell Address, Monroe's Doctrine, and the Fundamental Principles of U.S. Foreign Policy," *Diplomatic History* 30 (November 2006), 817.

manifesto" as one historian has phrased it–bridged the gap between a more isolationist nineteenth-century and a more aggressive twentieth-century American foreign policy and created a model that policymakers emulated during the Cold War.[60] Shaw framed McDougall's mobilization of the Monroe Doctrine on the Senate floor as one in the service of freedom and the protection of American, but especially Mexican interest. As the quintessential Californian during the Civil War era, McDougall became the face of the California thesis, a representative of a preeminent state that stepped up to the plate to protect freedom in the west when no one else would.

McDougall's link to the French intervention was in large part the reason why he was chosen as California's Civil War representative. Much like the French intervention itself, McDougall was not an obvious choice for the California CWCC and the California State Assembly to make in deciding how they were going to represent their state's Civil War history. More well-known California Civil War era figures, such as Reverend Thomas Starr King or Lincoln's wartime nominee for the U.S. Supreme Court, Stephen J. Field of Yuba, California, would have been the expected choices in commemorating California during the Civil War. Perhaps Shaw's research into Senator McDougall's efforts to highlight Napoleon's advances in Mexico prior to the formalization of the California thesis in the Assembly Concurrent Resolutions in 1963 is what prompted the State Assembly to focus on the French intervention in the first place.

---

[60] Cyrus Veeser, "Inventing Dollar Diplomacy: The Gilded-Age Origins of the Roosevelt Corollary to the Monroe Doctrine," *Diplomatic History* 27 (June 2003), 301. For thoughts on the framework of American foreign policy during the Cold War from a former Secretary of Defense himself, see James Schlesinger, "Quest for a Post-Cold War Foreign Policy," *Foreign Affairs* 72 (1992/1993), pp. 17–9.

Thus, by mid-1963, the California thesis as outlined above–that California's role in the French intervention into Mexico demonstrated the state's preeminence in the fight for freedom abroad–was firmly formalized into California law. The California CWCC had its instructions, and now, under the ambitious leadership of Shaw, it proceeded apace. Beginning that year, Mexico made an appearance in many commission activities, illustrating California's special connection with its southern neighbor in preparation for commemorating the French intervention for the duration of the Centennial. One way the California CWCC promoted Mexican history in its activities for the public was in featuring a performance from a troupe of twenty Mexican men and women called "Los Gitanos," which means "The Gypsies" at Civil War Centennial Day in 1963 (see Figure 1). For thirty minutes, the troupe performed the dances of "Old Mexico" for the crowds gathered to listen to the Flagettes and to visit the Civil War exhibit.[61] Significantly, Los Gitanos was invited to perform at Civil War Centennial Day in 1963, *after* the California State Assembly passed legislation instructing the California CWCC to re-orient its commemorative focus towards the French intervention into Mexico.

From this point forward, the California CWCC lightly threaded Mexican history into their commemorative event. For instance, in May 1964, the committee held an observance of Cinco de Mayo before the California Legislative Assembly. Shaw and Mexican Consul for Sacramento Antonio Islas spoke before the assembly regarding the California CWCC's project in commemorating this episode. Shaw explained that "the major interest of the people of California was the war of invasion and conquest occurring at the same time [as the Civil War] in the Republic of Mexico…Maximilian was the handpicked ruler selected by Napoleon III and

[61] Press release, 9 September 1963, pp. 1–2, Folder 11, Box 1, CCWCC Records.



Figure 1. Members from the Mexican musical troupe, "Los Gitanos," or "The Gypsies," at Civil War Centennial Day at the California State Fair in September 1963. The troupe performed for thirty minutes the dances and music of "Old Mexico." Los Gitanos were invited to perform in 1963 in the months after the California State Assembly re-oriented the California CWCC's commemorative focus to the French intervention in Mexico. Folder 11, Box 1, CCWCC Records. Courtesy of the California State Archives.

Eugénie to rule in a kingdom set up by force of arms in the New World. Maximilian's strength lay not in the voluntary support of the Mexican people but rather in the number of Napoleon's bayonets. The throne of Maximilian was based upon the destruction of liberty and self-government of the Mexican nation."[62] Together, Los Gitanos' performance of the dances of "Old

[62] "Assembly Daily Journal, Forty-Fourth Legislative Day, Seventy-Fourth Calendar Day in Assembly," 5 May 1964, Folder 14, Box 1, CCWCC Records.

Mexico" for the public and the private legislative commemoration of Cinco de Mayo suggest concentrated effort upon the part of the commission to assert that California had a special connection to Mexico. After establishing this connection, the California CWCC was free to capitalize on it and commemorate the French intervention as a unique part of Californian and Mexican history.

In sum, from 1963 forward, the French intervention reigned supreme in the California Civil War Centennial's activities. While events for the Californian public largely focused on the military activities of Californians during the war, such as the California Column and the California 500, the California CWCC's scholarly activities emphasized more and more the French intervention from 1963 forward. This commemorative reorientation raises the question of who the intended audience was in focusing on the intervention and by extension, what the ultimate purpose was in choosing to commemorate it. Californians interested in their state's Civil War history do not seem to have been the intended target. Instead, the intended audience for the California CWCC's commemoration of the French intervention into Mexico seems to have been scholarly readers of *The Pacific Historian* and *The California Historical Quarterly*. By 1964 as the commission ceremoniously transported John A. Sutter Jr.'s remains to Sacramento and worked to erect a monument to Lincoln in Mexico City, this intended audience expanded to include the U.S. State Department, high-ranking members in the Mexican government, and Mexicans themselves. The commission's efforts to export Civil War memory of the intervention into Mexico in 1964 and 1965 is where we turn next.

The California CWCC took its cues from the National CWCC, which hoped that the Civil War Centennial could inspire conviction among Americans through a carefully curated

commemoration of the glory of the Civil War days and so act as a weapon in democracy's arsenal in the ongoing struggle against the spread of communism. As Cook argues, the Centennial was much more than objective lesson in Civil War history.[63] The National CWCC's rhetoric had Cold War foreign policy implications in what a proper commemoration of the Civil War could demonstrate about the exceptional American character to the world. If successful, the Centennial's vision of the Civil War had the potential to project American strength internationally. In 1959 at the second assembly for the National CWCC in Richmond, commission member Dewey Short proclaimed that Communists were "attempting to destroy the concept of freedom…there is no act however vile, no risk however great, no course however repulsive that they are not willing to take in order to carry out their avowed intention to bury us." He went on to say that by honoring the "great common sacrifice" of Americans both north and south and of the Mason Dixon line, Americans in the 1960s could intensify their present-day common commitment towards eradicating the stain of communism in the world.[64] He spoke, "Without conviction great states have fallen."[65] The Civil War Centennial was to be the source of that conviction. Its purpose, then, was much more than to simply cultivate patriotism among

[63] Cook, *Troubled Commemoration*, 15.

[64] The idea of a "great common sacrifice" on the part of both Union and Confederate soldiers has its roots much earlier in the immediate aftermath of the war and the late nineteenth-century. In honoring the dead on both sides, Americans remembering the Civil War could evade the tougher questions of what the war was fought for. This tactic was certainly present during the Centennial at the national level and in California. For more on reconciliationist memory in the nineteenth-century see Blight, *Race and Reunion*. For a different and perhaps more nuanced take on the workings of reconciliation among veterans groups, see Gannon, *The Won Cause* and Janney, *Remembering the Civil War*. Gannon and Janney argue that veterans groups like the Grand Army of the Republic did not evade the causes of the war through and emphasis on wartime sacrifice. Instead, both authors demonstrate that emancipation was central to how many Union veterans remembered the war, but that a remembering of emancipation did not necessarily translate to a support of civil rights.

[65] Dewey Short quoted in Cook, *Troubled Commemoration*, pp. 40–1.

Americans. The implications of its success extended far beyond the North American continent, or in the case of California, just south of the border.

The California CWCC, with help from the U.S. State Department, the Department of Defense, the U.S. Navy, U.S. Senator from California Thomas H. Kuchel, and Mexican Consul to Sacramento Antonio Islas, took this last point and ran with it in the final two years of the Civil War Centennial. In 1964 and 1965, the California CWCC undertook two tasks that greatly expanded the scope of their commemorative operations and took the Centennial in California in to Mexico. The Civil War Centennial, framed through the French intervention into Mexico, was in actuality an opportunity to develop stronger foreign relations with Mexico and so was an instrument of Cold War foreign policy. Just as Americans in the 1860s thought about the Civil War as a globally significant event, so too did the National and California CWCCs think about the globally significant potential of its Centennial.

U.S. relations with Mexico in the late 1950s and early 1960s were generally positive, but there still lingered some Mexican animosity towards their oppressive neighbor to the north and some American fear that communist influence would corrupt their special relationship with their southern neighbor and thus undermine American influence in Latin America as a whole.[66] Latin America had held a symbolic power for the United States since the aftermath of the Second World War both as a place that had primarily supported the Allies during the war and as an important site of American primacy afterwards. Accordingly, Washington feared that the region could be subject to subversive communist activities in the name of diminishing American

[66] Peter H. Smith, "Mexico Since 1946," in *The Cambridge History of Latin America, Volume 7, 1930 to the Present*, ed. Leslie Bethell (Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 117.

hegemony in the western hemisphere and shifting the balance of power to the east.[67] As a politically stable nation with strong economic ties with the United States, Mexico was critical in American efforts to maintain authority in Cold War Latin America as a whole.[68] At the most basic level Mexico served the same geopolitical purpose for the United States as its key into Latin America in the 1960s as in the 1860s.

For Mexico's part, there were a few hiccups in its diplomatic relationship with the United States during this period in the Cold War. First, border struggles related to the chaos of the Bracero Program and the mass deportation of undocumented Mexican agricultural laborers in Operation Wetback in 1954 and 1955 had somewhat soured U.S.-Mexican relations.[69] Second and more related to Mexican politics, the 1958 election of former Secretary of Labor Adolfo López Mateos to the presidency was of some concern to American authorities. As soon as he assumed office, López Mateos declared himself to be an extreme leftist with populist leanings, a declaration that troubled the Eisenhower administration and their suspicion of what they thought were the communist tendencies of labor.[70] One of López Mateos' goals as President of Mexico

---

[67] Lars Schoultz, "Latin America" in *The Oxford Handbook of the Cold War*, eds. Richard H. Immerman and Petra Goedde (New York: Oxford University Press, 2013), 190.

[68] U.S.-Mexico economic ties and investment had been important to Mexico's industrial development since the days of Porfirio Díaz, who ruled Mexico as president-turned-dictator from 1876 until the outbreak of the Mexican Revolution in 1910. After the consolidation of the *Partido Revolucionario Institucional* (PRI) political party in 1946, which made a policy of actively courting American investment in Mexican industries, Mexican economic growth soared, a growth that Washington termed the "Mexican Miracle." For more on the Mexican Miracle, see Smith, "Mexico Since 1946," pp. 83–117, "Introduction" to Eric Zolov, *Refried Elvis: The Rise of Mexican Counterculture* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999), pp. 1–17, Elisa Servín, "Reclaiming Revolution in Light of the 'Mexican Miracle': Celestino Gasca and the Federacionistas Leales Insurrection of 1961," *The Americas* 66 (April 2010): 527–57, and Héctor Aguilar Camín and Lorenzo Meyer, "The Mexican Miracle: 1940–1968" in *In the Shadow of the Mexican Revolution: Contemporary Mexican History, 1910–1989* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1993), pp. 159–99.

[69] For a good overview of the Bracero Program and Operation Wetback, see Andrew J. Hazelton, "Farmworker Advocacy through Guestworker Policy: Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell and the Bracero Program," *Journal of Policy History* 29, no. 3 (2017): 431–61 and Mark Brilliant, *The Color of America Has Changed: How Racial Diversity Shaped Civil Rights Reform in California, 1941–1978* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2010), pp. 149–54.

[70] Smith, "Mexico Since 1946," 114.

was to establish some level of diplomatic independence from the United States based on the principles of non-intervention and self-determination, but without compromising American economic investment in Mexico. Still, López Mateos tested the strength of Mexico's special relationship with the United States in June 1960–the same year Senator Kuchel proposed gifting a monument to Mexico–when he hosted Cuban president Osvaldo Dorticós Torrado for an official state visit in the months after Cuba's revolution in 1959. This state visit from the president of Cuba in conjunction with López Mateos' self-declared status as an extreme leftist with populist leanings worried authorities in Washington, who felt their grip on their southern neighbor slipping away. Furthermore, in the aftermath of the Bay of Pigs fiasco, anti-American demonstrations rocked Mexico City as Mexican officials condemned American involvement in the affair.[71] After the Cuban Missile Crisis in October 1962, however, López Mateos came out in support of the U.S. blockade of Cuba and U.S-Mexican foreign relations relaxed. López Mateos met frequently with Presidents Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson, and American investment in Mexico grew from $922 million in 1959 to $1.3 billion in 1964.[72] In 1964, presidential power smoothly transitioned to Gustavo Díaz Ordaz Bolaños, who continued his predecessor's policy of cultivating close diplomatic and economic ties with the United States.[73]

Thus, the special relationship between Mexico and the United States in the early 1960s persisted, but not without some cause for concern. Latin America was thrust onto center stage during this period in the Cold War in a series of geopolitical crises, starting in 1959 with the Cuban Revolution, in 1961 with the botched Bay of Pigs invasion, and 1962 with the Cuban

[71] Ibid, 116.
[72] Ibid, 117.
[73] Ibid, 118.

Missile Crisis. As the United States' southern neighbor and historic site of American investment and primacy, Mexico was critical in American Cold War foreign policy concerns regarding Latin America. With this context in mind, Senator Kuchel and the U.S. State Department's efforts to erect a statue of Lincoln in Mexico City was in the service of cementing good foreign relations with Mexico at a particularly vulnerable time in Cold War Latin America. In its last two years of operation, the California CWCC continued their commemoration of the French intervention into Mexico and did their part in aiding this effort.

Their first opportunity to help cultivate good foreign relations with Mexico and to export the Civil War Centennial south of the border came in early 1964, when the California CWCC again united forces with the Sacramento Civil War Round Table in creating the John A. Sutter, Jr. Memorial Committee. The committee's purpose was to transport Sutter's remains from Acapulco to Sacramento.[74] Sutter Jr., the son of Sacramento founder and California pioneer John Sutter, served as Vice Commercial Agent for the U.S. in Acapulco (appointed by none other than Senator James A. McDougall) in 1865 and later as the first U.S. Consul to Acapulco in 1870. He remained in Mexico for the rest of his life and was laid to rest in Acapulco in 1897. Sutter was witness to the entirety of the French intervention into Mexico, having lived in Mexico since 1852. As a California pioneer who helped his father in establishing Sutter's Fort and Sacramento itself, Sutter was the perfect illustration of California's connection to Mexico and the French intervention. Accordingly, the California CWCC took the closing of the municipal cemetery

[74] "Sacramento Civil War Round Table," typed document, p. 3, undated, Folder 59, Box 1, CCWCC Records.

housing Sutter's grave in Acapulco in early 1964 as an opportunity to further develop the California thesis in connection with the French intervention into Mexico.[75]

With help from the Sacramento Historical Society, the Sutter Memorial Committee approached the National CWCC and the Department of Defense to secure approval and resources to aid this endeavor. Independently of the National CWCC, Shaw approached Antonio Islas in February 1964 and asked him to contact authorities regarding the logistics of Sutter's movement and the possibility of organizing a ceremony in Acapulco in commemoration of the event.[76] By March, the Department of Defense approved the Sutter Memorial's mission. A destroyer from the U.S. Navy, the USS *Leonard F. Mason,* would sail from Long Beach to Acapulco to retrieve Sutter's remains. Shaw, his wife Caroline and daughter Carol, California CWCC member Ray A. Momboisse, and two Mexican descendants of Sutter, one of whom became mayor of Acapulco later that year, accompanied the USS *Leonard F. Mason* to Mexico.[77] The crew of the destroyer returned to Long Beach with Sutter's remains, later reinterred at Sacramento City Cemetery, where they remain today.

The transfer of Sutter's remains back home to the capital city he helped found became an unexpected commemorative exercise in the California Civil War Centennial that materially illustrated, more than any number of published articles could, the good relationship and even kinship between the state of California, the United States, and Mexico. Shaw understood that the significance of the mission to bring Sutter home had the potential to extend beyond mere

---

[75] "Return to Sacramento from Acapulco of the Casket Remains of John A. Sutter, Jr., March 1964," typed document, undated, Folder 24, Box 1, CCWCC Records.
[76] Antonio Islas to A Las Autoridades Migratorias Aduanales E Industria Turistica de la Republica Mexicana, letter, 25 February 1964, Folder 77, Box 2, CCWCC Records.
[77] Unfortunately, I have been unable to find records of what exactly this ceremony in Acapulco looked like. Suffice to say that the use of an American destroyer was certainly a dramatic touch. "Return to Sacramento from Acapulco of the Casket Remains of John A. Sutter, Jr., March 1964," Folder 24, Box 1, CCWCC Records.

commemoration and into the realm of foreign relations. A few weeks after returning from Acapulco, Shaw sent a letter to Consul General of the U.S. Foreign Service Terrence G. Leonhardy, informing him of the success of the Sutter mission and enclosing his own *Pacific Historian* articles on the French intervention into Mexico.[78] Clearly proud of his efforts, Shaw also sent Mexican diplomats, such as Consul General of Mexico Adolfo G. Domínguez, copies of his articles.[79] Shaw was aware of the potential his work as Chairman of the California CWCC had to facilitate good foreign relations between the United States and Mexico.

More than this material illustration of California's connection to Mexico through the figure of Sutter, the California CWCC's support of the project to erect a monument to Abraham Lincoln in Mexico City brought the Civil War Centennial permanently into Mexico. This second opportunity to export the California Civil War Centennial into Mexico arrived a few months after Shaw returned from Acapulco. A group of influential Californians, again wanting to link the two republics and their histories, had made several attempts since 1960 to present a monument to Mexico in celebration of the nation's one-hundred and fiftieth anniversary of its independence from Spain in 1810. Senator Thomas H. Kuchel and a bipartisan group of senators (including Barry Goldwater) had initially proposed gifting a statue of Miguel Hidalgo y Costilla, the Mexican priest and folk hero of the Mexican independence movement, but Mexican authorities instead suggested that the statue be of Abraham Lincoln. To the dismay of Kuchel, the Mexican Monument Bill remained dormant for four years after its initial proposal in 1960, by which time

[78] The U.S. Foreign Service is the personnel system of the U.S. State Department, including diplomats and other staff members at American embassies worldwide. Terrence G. Leonhardy to William L. Shaw, letter, 23 April 1964, Folder 78, Box 2, CCWCC Records.
[79] Adolfo G. Domínguez to William L. Shaw, letter, 6 August 1965, Folder 111, Box 2, CCWCC Records.

the one-hundred and fiftieth anniversary had passed. It was not until August 1964 that President Johnson signed the Mexican Monument Bill into law.[80] By that time, the commemorative focus of the statue, although still in recognition of Mexican independence in 1810, shifted to the French intervention into Mexico and the American Civil War. In involving the California CWCC, Kuchel, the U.S. State Department and Commission of Fine Arts team responsible for carrying out the commission and placement of the monument in Mexico City, tacitly made the monument a part of the California Civil War Centennial. Shaw and the National CWCC certainly viewed the episode in that manner.[81]

Kuchel's persistence in presenting a statue to Mexico is striking, especially given that the originally intended anniversary had passed. He explained to the Senate in August 1965 that "this act was intended to express emphatically the regard and good will of our people for their 'good neighbors' below the Rio Grande…We should not delay any further, however, an action which would constitute tangible evidence of the appreciation of the United States for the strong support Mexico has given us on many occasions and in a variety of ways."[82] As a tangible statement of good will, the Lincoln statue was intended to link the two nations together through the bonds of history. The minds behind the Lincoln monument took their cue in linking Lincoln and Juárez together from a long tradition of historians who had written about a close friendship between the two presidents.[83] This supposed friendship centered around an alleged correspondence between

---

[80] The Mexican Monument Bill is Public Law 88–399. Leonard Gordon, "Lincoln and Juárez–A Brief Reassessment of Their Relationship," *The Hispanic American Historical Review* 48 (February 1968), 75–6.
[81] Edmund C. Gass to William L. Shaw, letter, 11 October 1965, Folder 111, Box 2, CCWCC Records.
[82] Senator Thomas H. Kuchel, speaking on S. 944, 89th Cong., 1st sess., *Congressional Record* 111, pt. 15: 20191 (12 August 1965).
[83] For example, see Hubert Clinton Herring, *A History of Latin America, from the Beginnings to the Present* (New York: Random House, 1956), Nina Brown Baker, *Juárez, Hero of Mexico* (New York: Vanguard Press, 1942) and Pere Foix, *Juárez* (Mexico City: Ediciones Ibero Americanas, 1949).

the two men, a correspondence that, as historian Leonard Gordon pointed out in a 1968 article regarding the Lincoln monument in Mexico City, has never been found.[84] Despite never meeting, Lincoln and Juárez have long been linked together as heroic leaders of the two most important republics in the New World. In choosing a Lincoln statue, a replica of the statue created by Augustus Saint-Gaudens standing in Chicago's Lincoln Park, American and Mexican authorities hoped to illustrate the long tradition of U.S.-Mexican cooperation and good will. In their remarks at the unveiling ceremony in 1966, President Johnson and President Ordaz painted a portrait of Lincoln and Juárez as not only contemporaries but allies in the fight to preserve republicanism in the western hemisphere.[85]

The opportunity for the California CWCC to become involved with this presentation of the statue to further develop its commemorative focus on the French intervention into Mexico and the California thesis is undeniable. Even though the erection of the Lincoln monument in Mexico City did not happen until after the Centennial ended in 1966, Shaw remained in sustained contact with Senator Kuchel's office from the beginning of 1964 through the end of 1965. The National CWCC certainly recognized the contributions of the California CWCC, but particularly Shaw and Islas, both in the Sutter mission and the Lincoln monument. Because of Shaw's efforts, the National CWCC recognized him with an Award of Distinction, for

> "his distinguished contributions to the Centennial, marked by his outstanding services to the California Commission–and thereby to the people of the State of California–by his

[84] Leonard Gordon, an associate professor of history at Purdue University in the 1960s, wrote a fascinating piece in 1968, two years after the Lincoln monument was unveiled, explaining how the Lincoln–Juárez relationship had been greatly exaggerated in the service of cementing the U.S. relationship with Mexico. He explains how the State Department sent out researchers to scour the Lincoln Papers at the Library of Congress, Department of State Records at the National Archives, and Juárez and intervention records at the Biblioteca de México, Recinto de Juárez, Colegio de México, Biblioteca Nacional, Biblioteca de la Secretería de Relaciones Exteriores, and the Archivo General de la Nacion for any evidence of a close kinship between Lincoln and Juárez, but that they came up empty-handed. See Gordon, "Lincoln and Juárez–a Brief Reassessment."
[85] Ibid, 78.

> leadership of that Commission, and by his excellent and informative published articles on important aspects of the Civil War period of the nation's history, for popularizing the statewide participation in the Centennial, for gaining legislative recognition of aspects of the Centennial of vital historical concern to California, and for striving to contribute to the cordial and friendly relationship of the United States of America and the Republic of Mexico."[86]

Fellow California CWCC member and director of the California History Foundation at the University of the Pacific, Reginald R. Stuart, similarly commended Shaw in May 1965 and stated that he considers "the work of the commission trail-blazing in human relationships and understanding. It is men like yourself who pioneer new concepts of cooperation and bring about cordial understanding…"[87] According to its own members and the National commission, not only did the California CWCC serve Californians by bringing attention to the state's role in the intervention, but the commission served the diplomatic interests of their nation as a whole by positively contributing to the "good relationship with our Neighbor to the South."[88]

The Lincoln monument project effectively ended the efforts of the California CWCC as the National Civil War Centennial itself wrapped up in late 1965 following the nationally-celebrated Appomattox Centennial Day that April. In 1966, after the Lincoln monument was ceremoniously unveiled in Mexico City, the California Civil War Centennial Commission terminated its services to Californians, the U.S. State Department, and the people of Mexico. Members of the California CWCC went their separate ways to continue on with their lives. For his part, Shaw could rest easy knowing that he did all he could to project Californian identity as a preeminent state in the nation, both in the 1860s and the 1960s, and to served U.S. diplomatic interests with Mexico.

---

[86] Edmund C. Gass to William L. Shaw, letter, 11 October 1965, Folder 111, Box 2, CCWCC Records.
[87] Reginald R. Stuart to William L. Shaw, letter, 19 May 1965, Folder 80, Box 2, CCWCC Records.
[88] Reginald R. Stuart to William L. Shaw, letter 7 July 1964, Folder 78, Box 2, CCWCC Records.

But it was not enough for Shaw. Ever the productive historian, Shaw spent the next ten years building up his collection of materials related to the California Civil War Centennial Commission and donated them to the California State Archives in Sacramento in 1977, where they remain today. At the start of every folder contained in the California Civil War Centennial Commission Records (of which there are one hundred and twelve), Shaw typed up a one-to-two page summary of the contents of each folder. These files, while immensely helpful during the research process for this project, also required a bit of interpretive leg work on my part because they were written after the fact and were often more than mere summaries. Instead, these documents were Shaw's interpretations of the activities of the California CWCC looking back ten years on. They also raise a few questions regarding the successes and failures of the Civil War Centennial in California: why did Shaw feel the need to put so much work into preserving these records? Why was he uncomfortable with leaving the materials as they were? Why did it take him ten years to submit them to the State Archives? These questions are, of course, ultimately unanswerable because Shaw never wrote his intent in crafting these interpretive summaries. Still, this cultivated collection betrays a need on the part of Shaw to preserve all the work that he put into the Centennial and the need to preserve the California thesis and the California CWCC's forays into the realm of foreign relations for posterity. Ten years later, he still felt the work of the California Civil War Centennial to be of the utmost significance.

Furthermore, although he could not possibly know it, Shaw was fifty years ahead of his time in uniting the history of the French intervention into Mexico with the history of the Civil War, insightfully expanding the geographic reach of Civil War era scholarship. Five decades

later, Civil War historians have taken up the mantle in looking at the Civil War as part of a global framework. Shaw's own efforts to use his research into the French intervention in the service of American Cold War interests in Mexico and Latin America, shows us that there is much to be gained in temporally expanding that global framework of the Civil War into the twentieth-century.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Archival Collections

California State Archives, Sacramento, CA

F3734: California Civil War Centennial Commission Records

Holt-Atherton Department of Special Collections, University of Pacific, Stockton, CA

Register of the Civil War Round Table (Stockton, CA) Papers

Government Documents

Commendation of the creation of a Centennial Executive Committee, ACR 11, *California State Assembly Concurrent Resolution* (1961): 4676

Joint Resolution to establish a commission to commemorate the one hundredth-anniversary of the Civil War, and for other purposes, Public Law 85-305, *U.S. Statutes at Large* (1957): 626–8

Research as to the Life and Accomplishments of United States Senator James A. McDougall of California, 1861–1867, ACR 42, *California State Assembly Concurrent Resolution* (1963): 4751–2

Restoration of Constitutional Government in the Republic of Mexico Upon Overthrow of Maximilian and Withdrawal of Forces of Napoleon III of Imperial France in 1867, ACR 32, *California State Assembly Concurrent Resolution* (1963): 4727–9

The Preeminent Role of the U.S. Naval Squadron of the Pacific, 1861–1867, ACR 44, *California State Assembly Concurrent Resolution* (1963): 4753–4

Newspapers

"Both Sides in Civil War Will Be Honored at Fair," *The Sacramento Bee,* 9 September 1962

"State Fair Program Today," *The Sacramento Bee,* 9 September 1962

William L. Shaw Articles

Shaw, William L. "United States Senator James A. McDougall." *The Pacific Historian* 6, no. 4 (1962): 181–7.

Shaw, William L. "The Impact of Napoleon III Upon the Pacific Coast." *The Pacific Historian* 7, no. 1 (1963): 13–24.

Shaw, William L. "McDougall of California." *The California Historical Quarterly* 43 (June 1964): 119–34.

Published Books and Articles

Avila, Eric. *Popular Culture in the Age of White Flight: Fear and Fantasy in Suburban Los Angeles* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2004).

Baker, Nina Brown. *Juárez, Hero of Mexico* (New York: Vanguard Press, 1942).

Bender, Thomas H. *A Nation among Nations: America's Place in World History* (New York: Hill and Wang, 2006).

Blight, David. *American Oracle: The Civil War in the Civil Rights Era* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2013).

Blight, David. *Beyond the Battlefield: Race, Memory, and the American Civil War* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2002).

Blight, David. *Race and Reunion: The Civil War in American Memory* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2001).

Blodgett, Jan. *Land of Bright Promise: Advertising the Texas Panhandle and South Plains, 1870–1917* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1988).

Blodgett Peter J. *Land of Golden Dreams: California and the Gold Rush Decade, 1848–1858* (San Marino, CA: Huntington Library Press, 1999).

Brilliant, Mark. *The Color of America Has Changed: How Racial Diversity Shaped Civil Rights Reform in California, 1941–1978* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2010).

Brundage, W. Fitzhugh. *The Southern Past: A Clash of Race and Memory* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2005).

Camín, Héctor and Meyer, Lorenzo. "The Mexican Miracle: 1940–1968" in *In the Shadow of the Mexican Revolution: Contemporary Mexican History, 1910–1989* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1993), 159–99.

Cook, Robert J. *Troubled Commemoration: The American Civil War Centennial, 1961–1965* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2007).

Cox, Karen L. *Dixie's Daughters: The United Daughters of the Confederacy and the Preservation of Confederate Culture* (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2003).

Cronon, William. "Dreaming the Metropolis" in *Nature's Metropolis: Chicago and the Great West* (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1991), 23–55.

Cutrer, Thomas W. *Theater of a Separate War: The Civil War West of the Mississippi River, 1861–1865* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2017).

Doyle, Don ed. *American Civil Wars: The United States, Latin America, Europe, and the Crises of the 1860s* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2017).

Doyle, Don. *The Cause of All Nations: An International History of the American Civil War* (New York: Basic Books, 2015).

Emmons, David M. *Garden in the Grasslands: Boomer Literature of the Great Central Plains* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1971).

Fleche, Andre. "Race and Revolution: The Confederacy, Mexico, and the Problem of Southern Nationalism" in *The Transnational Significance of the American Civil* War, edited by Jörg Nagler, Don Doyle, and Marcus Gräser (New York: Palgrave, 2016), 189–205.

Fleche, Andre. *Revolution of 1861: The American Civil War in the Age of Nationalist Conflict* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2012).

Foix, Pere. *Juárez* (Mexico City, Mexico: Ediciones Ibero Americanas, 1949).

Fried, Richard M. *The Russians are Coming! The Russians are Coming!: Pageantry and Patriotism in Cold War America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998).

Gannon, Barbara. *Americans Remember Their Civil War* (Santa Barbara, CA: Praeger, 2017).

Gannon, Barbara. *The Won Cause: Black and White Comradeship in the Grand Army of the Republic* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2011).

Gordon, Leonard. "Lincoln and Juárez–A Brief Reassessment of Their Relationship." *The Hispanic American Historical Review* 48 (February 1968): 75–80.

Hanna, Alfred Jackson and Hanna, Kathryn Abbey. *Napoleon III and Mexico: American Triumph over Monarchy* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina, 1971).

Hazelton, Andrew J. "Farmworker Advocacy through Guestworker Policy: Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell and Bracero Program." *Journal of Policy History* 29, no. 3 (2017): 431–61.

Herring, Hubert Clinton. *A History of Latin America, from the Beginnings to the Present* (New York: Random House, 1956).

Holliday, J.S. *Rush for Riches: Gold Fever and the Making of California* (Berkeley: Oakland Museum of California and the University of California Press, 1999).

Honeck, Mischa. *We Are the Revolutionists: German-Speaking Immigrants and American Abolitionists after 1848* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2011).

Hurley, Richard. *California and the Civil War* (Charleston, SC: The History Press, 2017).

Ibsen, Kristine. *Maximilian, Mexico, and the Invention of Empire* (Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 2010).

Janney, Caroline. *Remembering the Civil War: Reunion and the Limits of Reconciliation* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2013).

Johnson, Marilynn S. *The Second Gold Rush: Oakland and the East Bay in World War II* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993).

Kammen, Michael. *Mystic Chords of Memory: The Transformation of Tradition in American Culture* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1991).

Kelly, Patrick J. "The European Revolutions of 1848 and the Transnational Turn in Civil War History." *Journal of the Civil War Era* 4 (September 2014): 431–43.

Kelly, Patrick J. "The Lost Continent of Abraham Lincoln." *Journal of the Civil War Era* 9 (March 2019): 223–48.

Kelly, Patrick J. "The North American Crises of the 1860s." *Journal of the Civil War Era* 2 (December 2017): 337–68.

Kelman, Ari. *A Misplaced Massacre: Struggling Over the Memory of Sand Creek* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2013).

Kiser, William S. "We Must Have Chihuahua and Sonora': Civil War Diplomacy in the U.S.-Mexico Borderlands." *Journal of the Civil War Era* 9 (March 2019): 196–222.

Lindsay, Brendan C. *Murder State: California's Native American Genocide, 1846–1873* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2012).

Lotchin, Roger W. "California Cities and the Hurricane of Change: World War II in the San Francisco, Los Angeles, and San Diego Metropolitan Areas." *Pacific Historical Review* 63 (August 1994): 393–420.

Lotchin, Roger W. *Fortress California, 1910–1961: From Warfare to Welfare* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992).

Lotchin, Roger W. *The Bad City in the Good War: San Francisco, Los Angeles, Oakland, and San Diego* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2003).

Madley, Benjamin L. "The Civil War in California and Its Aftermath: March 1861–1871" in *An American Genocide: The United States and the California Indian Catastrophe, 1846–1873* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2016), 289–336.

Malanson, Jeffrey J. "The Congressional Debate over U.S. Participation in the Congress of Panama, 1825–1826: Washington's Farewell Address, Monroe's Doctrine, and the Fundamental Principles of U.S. Foreign Policy." *Diplomatic History* 30 (November 2006): 813–38.

Masich, Andrew E. *The Civil War in Arizona: The Story of the California Volunteers, 1861–1865* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2006).

Matthews, Glenna. *The Golden State in the Civil War: Thomas Starr King, the Republican Party, and the Birth of Modern California* (Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 2012).

May, Kirse Granat. *Golden State, Golden Youth: The California Image in Popular Culture, 1955–1966* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina, 2002).

Miller, Robert Ryal. "Arms Across the Border: United States Aid to Juárez during the French Intervention in Mexico." *American Philosophical Society* 63 (1973): 1–68.

Nicolaides, Becky. *My Blue Heaven: Life and Politics in the Working-Class Suburbs of Los Angeles, 1920–1965* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2002).

Pani, Erika. "Law, Allegiance, and Sovereignty in Civil War Mexico, 1857–1867." *Journal of the Civil War Era* 7 (December 2017): 570–96.

Quigley, Paul. *Shifting Grounds: Nationalism and the American South, 1848–1865* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011).

Quinn, Arthur. *The Rivals: William Gwinn, David Broderick, and the Birth of California* (New York: Crown Publishers, Inc., 1994).

Resendez, Andrés. "Texas and the Spread of That Troublesome Spirit Through the Gulf of Mexico Basin" in *Secession as an International Phenomenon: From America's Civil War to Contemporary Secessionist Movements* edited by Don Doyle (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2010), 193–214.

Richards, Leonard L. *The California Gold Rush and the Coming of the Civil War* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2007).

Roberts, Timothy Mason. *Distant Revolutions: 1848 and the Challenge to American Exceptionalism* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2011).

Robinson, John W. *Los Angeles in Civil War Days, 1860–65* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2011).

Rosenthal, Nicolas G. *Reimagining Indian Country: Native Migration and Identity in Twentieth-Century Los Angeles* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2012).

Sainlaude, Steve. *France and the American Civil War: A Diplomatic History* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2019).

Schlesinger, James. "Quest for a Post-Cold War Foreign Policy." *Foreign Affairs* 72 (1992/1993): 17–28.

Schoonover, Thomas. "Napoleon is Coming! Maximilian is Coming?: The International History of the Civil War in the Caribbean Basin" in *The Union, the Confederacy, and the Atlantic Rim* edited by Robert E. May (West Lafayette: Purdue University Press, 1995), 101–25.

Schoultz, Lars. "Latin America" in *The Oxford Handbook of the Cold War* edited by Richard Immerman and Petra Goedde (New York: Oxford University Press, 2013), 190–211.

Self, Robert O. *American Babylon: Race and the Struggle for Postwar Oakland* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2003).

Servín, Elisa. "Reclaiming Revolution in Light of the 'Mexican Miracle': Celestino Gasca and the Federacionistas Leales Insurrection of 1961." *The Americas* 66 (April 2010): 527–57.

Silber, Nina. *The Romance of Reunion: Northerners and the South, 1865–1900* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1993).

Smith, Peter H. "Mexico Since 1946" in *The Cambridge History of Latin America, Volume 7, 1930 to the Present* edited by Leslie Bethell (Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 83–157.

Smith, Stacey L. "Emancipating California: California's Unfree Labor Systems in the Crucible of the Civil War," in *Freedom's Frontier: California and the Struggle over Unfree Labor, Emancipation, and Reconstruction* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2013), 174–205.

Starr, Kevin. *Embattled Dreams: California at War and Peace, 1940–1950* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004).

Starr, Kevin. *Golden Dreams: California in the Age of Abundance, 1950–1963* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004).

Trobits, Monika. *Antebellum and Civil War San Francisco: A Western Theater for Northern and Southern Politics* (Charleston, SC: The History Press, 2014).

Veeser, Cyrus. "Inventing Dollar Diplomacy: The Gilded-Age Origins of the Roosevelt Corollary to the Monroe Doctrine." *Diplomatic History* 27 (June 2003): 301–26.

Ward, Stephen V. "Selling the Frontier" in *Selling Places: The Marketing and Promotion of Towns and Cities, 1850–2000* (New York: Routledge, 1998), 9–33.

West, Elliott. *The Contested Plains: Indians, Goldseekers, and the Rush to Colorado* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1998).

Wrobel, David M. *Global West, American Frontier: Travel, Empire, and Exceptionalism from Manifest Destiny to the Great Depression* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2013).

Wrobel, David M. *Promised Lands: Promotion, Memory, and the Creation of the American West* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2002).

Zolov, Eric. *Refried Elvis: The Rise of Mexican Counterculture* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999).

Unpublished Dissertations

Lynch, Daniel Brendan. "Southern California Chivalry: The Convergence of Southerners and Californios in the Far Southwest, 1846–1866." (PhD diss., University of California, Los Angeles, 2015).