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Abstract

The study of nationalism throughout the 19th and 20th century is an important topic that many historians see as the prologue to both World War I, World War II, and the end of the Cold War. However, despite the amount of research done on nationalism, this paper will look into what methods modern leaders use to bring forth this sense of nationalism. A rewarding line of research to pursue is how leaders look towards the past and expose the strength and resilience that their ancestors had when fighting for their independence. The reason this is important is that it helps us understand how history is powerful enough to galvanize and unite a nation during tough times and how fascist and authoritarian governments use these tactics to gain power. In order to do so, I use 5 case studies to analyze how leaders exploit national legends. By doing so, I was able to identify certain themes such as national identity, nationalism, imperialism, and the alteration of ancient figures. These themes will help us understand how leaders and nations used ancient figures for their own political propaganda so that we can prevent the rise of fascists and authoritarian governments in the future.
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Introduction

This paper will look into how leaders and writers in the Modern era used ancient figures who fought against Rome to fulfill their political agenda. In order to do so, I will use 5 case studies to analyze how leaders exploited national legends. By doing so, I hope to identify certain themes such as national identity, nationalism, and imperialism. I began with an analysis of ancient leaders and their conquest against the Roman Empire. This analysis will bring forth an understanding of why these leaders revolted against Rome and fought for independence, how they went about recruiting and uniting their people to stand up against their oppressors, and why or why not they were successful. In order to do this, I used manuscripts written by Roman historians such as Tacitus, Cassius Dio, Julius Caesar, and Diodorus. Alongside the study of these ancient figures, an analysis of modern leaders, nations, and their speeches are also necessary to understand why they looked towards the past to generate support during their times. These analyses confirmed the idea that leaders used ancient figures to exploit their own political agenda. This was not only shown through speeches but also through monuments and propaganda. This research will also focus on how leaders and writers would recreate the image of an ancient figure in order to use them for their own political gains. The 5 case studies I used for this paper are the use of Viriathus by Portugal and Spain, the use of Vercingetorix by Napoleon III and France, the use of Arminius by Hitler and the Nazi party, the use of Boudicca by Queen Victoria and Victorian writers, and the use of Decebalus in the Protochronism movement. This thesis will provide us with a diverse view towards nationalism in the modern era and how leaders and writers manipulated ancient figures
for their own political gains. With this being said, let us begin by looking into Viriathus and his resistance to Rome.
Chapter 1: Spanish and Portuguese Use of Viriathus

Viriathus

This chapter will look into who Viriathus was and what his actions were that made him so well respected centuries later. All sources for this biography were derived from Diodorus Siculus and Appian of Alexandria. Diodorus was a Greek historian whose work entitled Bibliothēkē, was written around the second half of the first century BC. His goal was to establish a history of events from Alexander the Great to the Gallic Wars of Julius Caesar. He titled his book Bibliothēkē, because of all the historical writings he used from other historians to put together his book. Appian of Alexandria was a Greek historian who possessed Roman citizenship and rose to hold the office of procurator. He finished his book, Spanish Wars, by AD 165 in an attempt to record the history of Rome in 24 books; he recorded a majority of Roman wars including the Civil Wars. Both these authors provided their own account of the war between Viriathus and Rome, and they are deemed credible by historians despite the fact that they wrote it over a century later.

By 155 BC, the Romans expelled Hannibal and the Carthaginians out of Hispania (ancient Spain and Portugal) and were looking to solidify their power. After a campaign by the Romans in 152 BC, they were able to defeat the Celtiberians in the Second Celtiberian war. Seeking a way to create peace between himself and the Celtiberians, the praetor Sulpicius Galba offered a peace treaty and promised to relocate the Celtiberians to better farmlands. In 150 BC, Galba invited the remaining Celtiberian men, women, and children to see the new land they were promised. He divided them into three groups and
told them to lay down their arms, and after they did so, he slaughtered almost every one of them. Surviving the massacre was a shepherd by nature named Viriathus; he was described by Diodorus, “By nature of a healthy constitution, in strength and agility of body far exceeding all the Iberians; for he had injured himself to a sparing diet, much labour and toil, and to no more sleep than was absolutely necessary”. Within two years of the massacre, he was chosen as the leader of the Lusitanians to seek vengeance against the crimes of Galba and Rome.

After Viriathus came to power among the Lusitanians, the new Roman general in charge of the Iberian Peninsula, Gaius Vetilius, was sent to confront him. Vetilius managed to hunt down any foragers and survivors of Galba's slaughter. Viriathus’ men were afraid that they would be hunted down as well and “they sent messengers to Vetilius with olive-branches asking land for a dwelling place, and agreeing from that time on to obey the Romans in all things”. Vetilius accepted this peace offer on one condition, however, that they must surrender their arms. Obviously distrusting the words of Vetilius, since Galba also made the same offer earlier and slaughtered most of his kin, Viriathus convinced his men to decline the offer. Instead, he ordered all his men except 1,000 horsemen to scatter to a city called Tribola as soon as he mounted his horse. When he did so his men scattered, yet Viriathus held his place with his 1,000 horsemen. For the whole day, he would attack the Roman legions and retreat, using guerrilla warfare tactics. After allowing the safety of his men to Tribola, Viriathus and the rest of his men retreated back

---

to the city and reorganized for the battle to come. As Vetilius pushed after him, he made contact with Viriathus outside the city and when engaged, realizing too late, that it was a trap and the Lusitanians slaughtered half of the Roman legions. Viriathus and his men captured many soldiers and among them was Vetilius, who one Lusitanian, not knowing who he was and assuming he was just a fat soldier, slaughtered him. Of the 10,000 Roman soldiers who stood in Vetilius' legions, only 6,000 made it to the neighboring city of Carpessus. Following this great defeat, the Quaestor of the city Carpessus sent 5,000 troops, with the remaining 6,000 men who survived the battle at Tribola, to fight Viriathus. Viriathus defeated these remaining soldier and not one lived to tell the tale. Hearing of this terrible news Rome sent Gaius Plautius with 10,000 foot soldiers and 1,300 horsemen to track and defeat Viriathus. Confident that he could defeat Viriathus, Plautius sent forth 4,000 men to fight Viriathus and all were quickly defeated except a few. After this, Viriathus rested upon a local mountain called “Mount Venus” and awaited the rest of Plautius' men. When Plautius engaged him at the hill, he was completely beaten and “fled in disorder to the towns, and went into winter quarters in midsummer not daring to show himself anywhere”. After this battle, Viriathus went around terrorizing Roman colonies for food and armor.

After the failure of Vetilius and Plautius, Rome sent Fabius Maximus Aemilianus with two legions to fight Viriathus in 145 BC. However, due to recent wars with Carthage and Greece, the men sent with Aemilianus were young and had never seen war before. Viriathus challenged Aemilianus to open battle many times, but Aemilianus

---

3 Appian, 13.63
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refused and instead would send his men on raids to gain confidence and experience. When he believed his soldiers were ready, Aemilianus challenged Viriathus to open battle and won a decisive victory against the Lusitanian's. After fleeing from the grasp of Aemilianus, Viriathus encountered a Roman general named Quintus whom he quickly defeated and put to foot. Following the defeat of Quintus, Rome sent the adoptive brother of Aemilianus, the consul Quintus Fabius Maximus Servilianus, with 18,000 foot soldiers, 1,900 horsemen, and ten war elephants that he retrieved from Africa. Viriathus and 6,000 of his men attacked Servilianus with “great noise and barbaric clamor, and wearing the long hair which in battles they are accustomed to shake in order to terrify their enemies”, but were unable to push the Romans back.⁵ When fleeing the battle, Servilianus pursued Viriathus in a disorderly fashion. Noticing this, Viriathus reorganized his men and slew 3,000 Romans forcing them to their camps where they sieged the gates. Right before the Lusitania ns were about to break through, one of Servilianus' generals, Fannius, galvanized his troops and was able to push back Viriathus. After successfully forcing Viriathus back to Lusitania for winter, Servilianus went back to Rome in honor and was replaced by Aemilianus’ brother Quintus Pompeius in 141 BC. However, before Servilianus returned to Rome, Viriathus fought one more battle against him and won. Knowing that he was victorious and had the momentum, he offered a treaty to the Romans that allowed them to settle anywhere they desired. The treaty was accepted and the war between Rome and the Lusitanians was over, for now.

⁵ Appian, 14.67 (Translations for Appian comes from http://www.livius.org/sources/content/appian/appian-the-spanish-wars/appian-the-spanish-wars-14/)
After hearing about the one-year treaty, the consul Quintus Servilius Caepio, the brother of Servilianus, who was stationed in Spain, did not trust Viriathus and convinced the Senate to openly declare war against Viriathus again. In 140 BC Caepio mobilized his troops and approached Viriathus, who when seeing how large the Roman army was, fled and was unable to be found by Caepio. Viriathus desperately sought to seek peace and sent his most trusted friends Audax, Ditalco, and Minurus to Caepio in order to seek a treaty. Instead, the men brought gifts and promised Caepio that they would assassinate Viriathus if the Romans agreed to a truce. Caepio accepted these terms and offered them a generous reward, as well as their safety, after the deed was done. Being that these were Viriathus’ most trusted men, they were free to walk in and out of his tent. Taking this to their advantage, at night, while he was asleep, they went into his tent passed the guard and stabbed Viriathus in the throat, the only place without armor, and quickly disappeared. This murder happened so fast that the guards outside did not even notice what happened and assumed Viriathus went back to sleep after they left. When the sun rose the next morning and the people were curious to why Viriathus was still asleep, the guard stumbled upon a most treacherous sight. Appian mentions in detail how there was “grief and lamentation throughout the camp, all of them mourning for him, fearing for their own safety, thinking what dangers they were in”.

Meanwhile, Audax, Ditalco, and Minurus quickly returned to Caepio telling him that the deed was done hoping to receive the rest of their reward, however, Caepio gave them nothing because they were traitors. The funeral of Viriathus was large and many speeches were given honoring his character.

---

6 Appian, 15.74 (Translations for Appian comes from http://www.livius.org/sources/content/appian/appian-the-spanish-wars/appian-the-spanish-wars-15/)
and many achievements. After the death of Viriathus, a man named Tantalus took control and looking to avenge Viriathus went into open battle with Caepio, being quickly defeated and ending the war for good.

Let us now look into how these writers portrayed Viriathus in their texts in order to further our understanding of him and his war. Both Diodorus and Appian bestowed honor upon Viriathus throughout their works. When Diodorus first mentioned Viriathus, he stated how “he always carried weapons, and was famous for his conflicts with wild beasts and robbers”.

Diodorus added this part to show how brave Viriathus was before we even knew what he did against the Romans. Appian did the same thing, he stated, “Viriathus, who not long afterward became the leader of the Lusitanians and killed many Romans and performed the greatest exploits, which I shall relate hereafter”. Even before we knew what Viriathus did, both Diodorus and Appian, described him as brave and great. They expressed their real feelings towards Viriathus’ character after his own men betrayed him. Diodorus stated, “He was, as is agreed by all, valiant in dangers, prudent and careful in providing whatever was necessary; and, what was most noteworthy of all, while he commanded he was more beloved than ever any was before him”. Diodorus also discussed how his virtuous qualities were easy to prove through his title as general; for “during which time his soldiers were not only well-disciplined without any mutinies, but also nearly unconquerable”. Appian also lauded him for his success as a general, calling him, “a man who had the highest qualities of a commander as reckoned among

---
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Therefore, Viriathus was portrayed as a successful leader, an honorable man, and a man treasured by his countrymen. In the next chapter we will see how leaders and nations use these qualities of Viriathus for their own propaganda.

**Viriathus in Modern Times**

When looking into how Viriathus was used for nationalism, the book *Viriathus and the Lusitanian Resistance to Rome 155-139 BC*, by Luis Silva, best describes the use of Viriathus in Spain and Portugal. Most of the information that will be used for this analysis derives from Silva’s work. With this being said, the legend of Viriathus was linked to the Portuguese and Spanish spirit to the point that his name was attributed to nationalistic thought even when both countries faced both internal and external political problems. He was idealized with a variety of virtues; among them include bravery, nationalism, virtue, and sacrifice. This was why during times of oppression by fascist governments, the people would recall the supposed memory of Viriathus, the liberator of Hispania, for guidance and motivation. However, it was not just the civilians who connected with Viriathus but many fascist leaders as well. In an effort to overcome foreign domination and solidify their own power, Spanish and Portuguese fascist leaders used Viriathus to promote liberty and independence. So powerful was the legend of Viriathus that during the Spanish Civil War a unit of 10,000 Portuguese volunteers took up the name *Os Viriatos*, Viriathus, and joined the nationalist side during the civil war in the 1930's. The story of Viriathus was so inspirational that he was taught in all schools.

---

11 Appian, 15.75  
12 Silva, (2013), 237  
13 Silva (2013) 240  
14 Silva (2013) 240-241
and talked about in all villages, so that through the word of mouth he became a national symbol. However, his popularity was so immense that both Portuguese and Spanish scholars tried to claim him as their own. In the next few sections, we will look into how the Portuguese and Spanish idealized Viriathus for political and social gains as well as the dispute between both nations over who can claim Viriathus as their own.

**Early Mention of Viriathus in Portugal**

The first mention of Viriathus came in the 1500s during the Portuguese Renaissance, which saw a revival of classical texts, art, and philosophy. During this time, many historians began to identify and acknowledge ancient Lusitania as Portugal's precursor. In 1532, Gil Vicente wrote a book titled *Auto da Lusitania*, connecting the Lusitanians and Viriathus as the founders of Portugal. During this early period, two poems were released that turned Viriathus into a Portuguese hero. The first came during the fifteenth century titled *Os Lusiadas* by Luiz Vaz De Camões, and the second was *Viriato Trágico*, written by Brás Garcia in 1699. Garcia was an enthusiastic defender of João IV, the monarch of Portugal who ended the Iberian Union from the Spanish, thus making his poem an authentic nationalistic manifesto claiming that the king, like Viriathus, came from a long line of Portuguese heroes that has defended the homeland from invaders.\(^\text{15}\) Already from an early stage, historians began to link Viriathus as the founder of Portugal, as well as, a symbol as the protector of Portugal. However, it was not until 1593 with the book *Antiguidades da Lusitania*, by Resende, that Viriathus became a historical study in Portugal. Resende was the first person to use archaeology and anthropology to claim that the Portuguese were descendants of the Lusitanians. The

\(^{15}\) Silva (2013) 238
goal of these new studies was to glorify the Lusitanian people for their defiance of Roman hegemony in order to inspire the Portuguese people to revolt from Spanish dominion. The story of Viriathus was so powerful that it sparked up patriotism and nationalism within the Portuguese, and attributed to the motivations that led to the Restoration War of 1640. Yet, after the war and the liberation of their country, the spirit of Viriathus dwindled down in Portugal and would not be resurrected until the late nineteenth century.

The Rebirth of Viriathus In Portugal

The modern legend of Viriathus began to take form again in Portugal near the end of the 19th century and lasted until the end of the 20th century. It was at this time that a theme aroused in Portugal claiming Viriathus and the Lusitanians as the founders of the Portuguese nation. It could be possible that the Portuguese people were seeking nationalism and unification during this time for the recent events they just encountered at home. In 1833, Portugal underwent a civil war over who was the rightful king, Dom Pedro who was claimed king of Brazil or his younger brother Dom Miguel. War was the only solution and in the end, Dom Pedro became the King of Portugal, although dying a year later and leaving his daughter in power. Due to these events it was possible that the Portuguese people looked towards nationalism as a way to keep the country united and to prevent another civil war from breaking out. This could possibly be a reason why people began looking back into Portuguese history and brought back national historic figures. Which in turn led to the resurrection of Viriathus and the use of him by later leaders who
saw Viriathus as nationalistic legend for being the founder of Portugal. Therefore, after the Civil War, people began to look towards Portuguese heroes in order to unite the country through nationalism, which led to the resurrection of Viriathus in the twentieth century.

In 1932 Antonio de Oliveira Salazar became the new leader of Portugal and the new Portuguese Republic. Salazar lionized Viriathus as someone who represented Portuguese ethnic superiority. He looked towards Viriathus as a Portuguese hero and leader, and connected himself to Viriathus as a way to show the Portuguese people that he was a charismatic leader. Salazar saw himself as the modern-day Viriathus, creating a strong Portugal that was able to conquer outsiders and hold a great empire. However, during the regime of Salazar's Estado Novo (1932), the government made the idea of race fundamental to national pride within its colonial empire, therefore, making it important to maintain and propagandize the idea that the Portuguese descended from the Lusitanians. Salazar saw the Lusitanian people as a mighty race and in his quest to justify colonialism he linked the Portuguese people to them as a way to show that they were superior and capable of bringing forth prosperity to those they held dominion over. He even went far enough to deny any Celtic origins and believed that the Lusitanian people were their own race of men called ‘homo taganus’. Therefore he rapidly instilled the idea that the purity of the Portuguese bloodline and homeland was linked to Viriathus and Lusitania.

Despite the idea that the Portuguese people were superior and should have dominion over their colonies, many people began to resent colonialism, and overtime,

---
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Viriathus. The irony of ethnic superiority, which Salazar linked to Viriathus, came forward when the African colonial wars took place in the 1960s and 1970s and the Portuguese faced African rebels who through Portuguese indoctrination had come to identify themselves with Viriathus. These African rebels learned about Viriathus and saw him as a liberator rather than a person who sought out an empire. Thus, when word reached Portugal that African rebels saw themselves as Viriathus fighting against Portuguese oppression, many Portuguese citizens began to think about how unjust the colonies were. Therefore, little by little, the fascination with Viriathus began to dwindle and by 1968 his name had almost disappeared from school curricula in Portugal.

Opposition to Viriathus Being Portuguese

Although many Portuguese historians supported the idea that Viriathus was the founder of Portugal, there were still some who opposed this theory. The biggest advocate of this was a man named Alexandre Herculano who was the creator of scientific historiography in Portugal; he rejected any connections between the Portuguese and the Lusitanians. In the mid-1800s, Herculano argued that many people linked Viriathus to Portugal through urban myth; however, scientifically, there were no connections between the Lusitanians and Portuguese. He based most of his methodology on scientific fact rather than historical writings and mythology. However, in the late 1800’s, Jose Leite de Vasconcelos rejected Herculano's theory and supported Resende's claim that the Portuguese were related to the Lusitanians. De Vasconcelos was a Portuguese ethnographer and archaeologists who enthusiastically wrote about philology and
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prehistory and many scholars and archaeologists agreed with De Vasconcelos claim. Despite the support De Vasconcelos had, in 1934 Damião Peres published a book titled *Como Nasceu Portugal*, which confounded the theory that there was a long-lasting connection between the Lusitanians and Portuguese. He believed that the formation of the nation did not start with Viriathus but rather the first king of Portugal, Afonso Henriques (1509). Although fascist leaders tried to dispute De Vasconcelos theories, public approval towards Viriathus began to plunge in Portugal, and over time, inevitably lead to the downfall of Viriathus as the founder of Portugal.

**Early Mention of Viriathus in Spain**

Like the Portuguese, the Spanish nation also looked towards a founding hero of Spain and they chose Viriathus. The first text to exalt Viriathus and the Lusitanians came in 1344 by Afonso X, who wrote the *Cronica Geral de Espanha*. In his book, he represented Viriathus as a herculean hero who has no country and fought the Romans to establish a Hispanic Nation. Viriathus was again mentioned in *Don Quixote* (1605), in which the author Miguel de Cervantes advised the cónego to stop reading books about cavaliers and instead read books about great heroes from the past such as Viriathus. In the early days, we see that Viriathus was known as a Spanish hero and the liberator of Spain. However, why did the early Spaniards look towards Viriathus in the first place? If we look into Spain from AD 1300-1600, we see that Spain was in turmoil up until the mid-1500s. The Moors conquered the land of Hispania and the Spanish only possessed very few regions in the north. They wished to liberate Spain and it was no surprise that

---
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Afonso X looked towards Viriathus as a way to inspire his countrymen through nationalism. However, after the conquest of Spain by Ferdinand, Viriathus was no longer mentioned, perhaps since Spain has been liberated already. Therefore we see the decline of Viriathus in Spain up until the eighteenth century when he was resurrected again in Spanish society.

**Rebirth of Viriathus in Franco’s Spain**

In the beginning of the eighteenth century, many Spanish scholars referred to Viriathus as a Spanish hero. However, these scholars did not see Viriathus as a Lusitanian, like the Portuguese, but as a Celtiberian. Scholars in Franco Spain became obsessed with the origin of Viriathus, and in some books, he was called Valencian from a region in Southern Spain associated with the Celts. The fascination with Viriathus in the 18th and 19th century was not necessarily used just for nationalism and patriotism but rather to establish a founder of Spain. Spanish scholars desired to link Viriathus to Spain in order to show how a great hero founded Spain. There were many pieces of literature written about Viriathus such as Jose Zorillas several poems as well as a tragedy written by Hernando de Pizzaro in 1904 titled *Viriato*. However, in all of these pieces of work, Viriathus was depicted as Spanish and given a Spanish background. So powerful was this belief that in 1884 the Spanish Sculptor Eduardo Barrón González created a statue of Viriathus that he placed at a site known today as Plaza de Viriato in Zamora. The statue brings forth many questions about how Viriathus should be displayed, since no one really knew what he looked like, yet this will be discussed more thoroughly later in the chapter.

---
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when we discuss monuments of Viriathus. Therefore, we see how the fascination of Viriathus revolved around Spanish identity and the creation of a Spanish origin story; however, it was in the twentieth century that the role of Viriathus in Spanish history began to change.

Spain in the twentieth century developed a new meaning for Viriathus that associated him with the defense of nationalism and regionalism. Nationalism was necessary in regime changes, which was why in the twentieth century under the Franco regime that we see Viriathus being portrayed as a symbol of nationalism. Franco's revision of Viriathus in Spain was done to instill patriotism and confidence in a generation that has been treated poorly for so many years by its former government and to show that anyone could rise above their status.\textsuperscript{26} The use of nationalism for political gains was a common tactic used by fascist leaders, such as Franco himself. These nationalistic ideas about Viriathus were placed in Spanish schoolbooks in the 1930's, so the younger generation can learn about social mobility and how anything can be accomplished through unity. Therefore, in order to justify this concept of unification and nationalism, Franco looked towards a Spanish hero who has done this before, Viriathus. The use of Viriathus by Francisco Franco was done as a way to connect him with this great leader who was seen as the liberator of Spain. Therefore, it was important to connect Viriathus with Spain, rather than Portugal, and for this reason, many painters and authors during this era depicted Viriathus as the liberator of Hispania rather than the Iberian Peninsula. Hence, the use of Viriathus in the twentieth century under the Franco

\textsuperscript{26} Silva (2013) 243
regime was done to promote nationalism in order to gain support for his recent ascent into power.

The Fight Over Viriathus

The debate over the ownership of Viriathus began during the 20th century when, Portuguese and Spanish, scholars and historians began to debate over what region Viriathus was really from. As mentioned above, the Spanish believed he was a Celtiberian and that Lusitania was a Celtiberian village. While on the other hand, the Portuguese connected Viriathus with Lusitania only. From this period onward, both the Spanish and Portuguese claimed Viriathus as their own and wrote many pieces of literature about him. It was in 1900 that Spanish historian A Arenas Lopez wrote a book that debated Viriathus' regional and national identity. In Arenas Lopez's book, *Reivindicaciones históicas: Viriato no fué portugués si no celtibero: su biografía*, he believed that Viriathus was from Lusitania but that Lusitania was part of the Celtiberian jurisdiction. Another Spanish historian, M. Peris, claimed that Viriathus was from Valencia in 1926 and based his theory off of folktale and myth. To say the least, his theory was not taken seriously and many historians ignored his notion. Despite the books that were written by Spanish historians, many poets also wrote about Viriathus and they claimed that he was from the Spanish province Estremadura. The Portuguese, however, have also written many books to counter the heavy output of literature about Viriathus coming from Spain. The most famous and exciting book was written in 1904 by Teófilo Braga titled *Viriatho*, which was a historical novel describing the war years of Viriathus.

27 Silva (2013) 240
28 Silva (2013) 243
in great detail and color. Although it was fiction, Brag made multiple suggestions that Viriathus was Lusitanian and not Celtiberian.\textsuperscript{29} However, the problem with both sides was that they used legendary myths as a way to prove their point and it was not until a German man named Adolf Schulten used scientific research to determine where Viriathus was most likely was from.

**Adolf Schulten**

Adolf Schulten was a German historian and archaeologist who wrote two books about Viriathus and the history of Portugal. To the surprise of many, he had contributed most to the incorporations of Viriathus into Portugal's history and psyche in his work *Viriato* (1917).\textsuperscript{30} In his work he wrote that the Lusitanians were of Celtic origins, however, they developed their own identity and culture that was different from the Celtiberians at the time.\textsuperscript{31} Unlike many scholars from Portugal and Spain, Schulten uses archaeology and other scientific methods to formulate his proposal. This recognition of Celtic origin by Schulten was favored among Spanish historians and Afonso X himself. For his research, he was awarded an honorary doctorate from the University of Barcelona. It makes sense why the Spanish were so quick to laud Schulten, however, there were many people who opposed his theory. Some Iberian scholars, mainly Portuguese, claimed that the Lusitanians were of a native Iberian origin and that at most they were influenced by Celtic migration to the Iberian Peninsula.\textsuperscript{32} It is interesting that these scholars used the words ‘Native Iberian' rather than just stating Portuguese. If
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Schulten was to say that the Lusitanian were of Celtic origin who over time developed their own cultural identity, then it was possible to say that the Lusitanians and even Viriathus descended from either England, Scotland, France, or even northern Italy, where Celtic tribes were located. This would destroy the whole idea of Viriathus being a native who liberated Iberia from the Romans. Regardless of the many theories, the origin of Viriathus remains unclear today with both the Portuguese and Spanish claiming him as their own.

**Monuments**

Viriathus was well admired by both the Spanish and Portuguese and was shown their appreciation by the great amount of artwork and monuments done over the centuries. Despite the idea that no one knows what Viriathus looked like, paintings and sculptures of him were still done vigorously throughout Spain and Portugal. Brás Garcia did the oldest artistic representation of Viriathus in 1699 in his poem *Viriato Trágico*. (Figure 1) The painting had Viriathus surrounded by his killed comrades with one hand raised as if he was seeking vengeance for his men who were freshly slaughtered by Galba.\(^{33}\) However, Viriathus and the Lusitanians are portrayed in Roman clothing rather than traditional Lusitanian clothing. This was seen as fine at first, but as time passed, it was no longer suitable or respectful to portray Viriathus in Roman attire. The first attempt to draw Viriathus in a primitive wardrobe was done early in the mid 19th century by Augusto Roquemonts, *Juramento Dos Lusitanos*. Viriathus was portrayed as a warrior armed with a lance; he has a tunic with a leather belt on and possesses a beard with long
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barbaric hair. This seems to be the proper way to represent Viriathus, a warrior who looked barbaric and ferocious.

Although over a dozen pictures of Viriathus has been created by the end of the eighteenth century, the first sculpture of him was not done until Eduardo Barróns sculpture in 1884. Like most other depictions of Viriathus, this sculpture portrayed Viriathus as a Greco-Roman athlete who is bare-chested, taking an oath with his right arm, and holding a scepter in his left hand, indicating that he was a king. I am not entirely sure why Viriathus was portrayed this way; however, it could be possible that the Greco-Roman style seemed more triumphant and therefore a better way to glorify Viriathus or that Viriathus was still being portrayed as Roman in Spain. The statue can be seen today in the Plaza de Viratio in Zamora Spain. The statue "is raised on an unfinished, jagged granite pedestal, said to represent the hills where Viriathus walked. At his feet is a symbol of the beginnings of his life, a sheep". The sheep were most likely included in this statue to show how Viriathus was a simple man, a shepherd. It could have also been used to show that anyone can become great in society if they work hard. Yet, this statue of Viriathus in Spain portrayed Viriathus as Greco-Roman while the next statue we look at differed in his representation.

Another statue dedicated to Viriathus, the statue at Viseu in Portugal (1940), portrayed Viriathus as a barbarian who seemed to fit in with nature. He was also represented with a long beard, holding a shield and sword, and with his fellow countrymen cowering behind him. According to Silva, he believed that this statue had a
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stoic nature to it that represented Viriathus the way a Greek Hellenistic stoic would portray him. To understand this opinion let us look into how the Stoics portrayed foreigners. Naturally, the Greeks saw everyone besides men from Greece as barbaric and uncivilized; therefore, their depiction of foreigners was usually very negative. However, the Stoics believed that all men, barbaric or Greek, shared common attributes just in their own unique way. Therefore, if we look at the statue of Viriathus at Viseu, we see that he was portrayed as a Greek god of the sort; however, he possessed barbaric attributes such as his hair, tunic, fur coat, and armor. However, I believe there were other reasons for why the statue at Viseu portrayed Viriathus as barbaric, as well as Greco-Roman, which we will look into in the next chapter.
Figure 1: First painting of Viriathus from Bras Garcia’s poem Viriato Tragico (1699) Picture taken from https://archive.org/details/viriatotragicop00mascgoog
Figure 1.1: Statue of Viriathus in Zamora, Spain by Eduardo Barróns in 1884. Picture taken from https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Viriathus
Figure 1.2: Statue of Viriathus at Viseu, Portugal by Mariano Benliure in 1940. Picture taken from https://www.portugalvisitor.com/portugal-city-guides/viseu-guide
Monuments and Propaganda in Portugal

The statues of Viriathus were done as a way to commemorate the ‘Liberator of Iberia’, however, the statue at Viseu was also used for propaganda and nationalism. On the 300th anniversary of Portuguese independence from Spain (1940), the Ourivesaria Artisticas Alianca in Oporto commissioned Benliure to create a brilliant piece of work depicting Viriathus.\(^{36}\) The statue, as mentioned above, depicted Viriathus as a strong man, ready to fight, and to Silva, invincible. At the bottom of the statue is an inscription dedicated to the Portuguese Youth Movement. This youth movement, like the Hitler Youth, was a way to show the glory of their leader and their country by creating strong nationalistic young men. Being that this statue was created during the Salazar regime, it is possible to assume that the statue was used as propaganda to link the invincibility of Viriathus with the prosperity of Salazar and the future; the Portuguese Youth Movement. Luis Silva believed that the statue was full of symbolism that was most likely used by Salazar for propaganda. Silva mentions, "the dioramic statue is set around a large piece of granite with small boulders surrounding it, emphasizing that the Portuguese nation is strong and immortal".\(^{37}\) This was not the only piece of symbolism that Silva saw in this sculpture. He also believed that the idea of showing Viriathus in a warlike pose shows the willingness of this man to die for his sacred land, which during the anniversary of Portuguese independence must have passionately electrified the citizens behind freedom.
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and Salazar. If we are to look into this statue as a piece of propaganda then we can further understand why Benliure portrayed Viriathus the way he did.

As mentioned above, this statue was commissioned to celebrate the 300th anniversary of Portuguese independence from Spain. By depicting Viriathus in what they believed was Lusitanian attire the Portuguese were trying to claim Viriathus as their own. What better way to honor the independence of a nation by claiming a regional hero as their own? This statue was erected to promote Portuguese nationalism and independence from a super power (Spain), therefore, Viriathus could have been portrayed in Lusitanian apparel in order to claim him as the founder of Portugal, not Hispania as a whole. However, Silva believed that Viriathus still possessed Greco-Roman characteristics. Like the Spanish statue of Viriathus at Zamora, the reason Viriathus could have been portrayed Greco-Roman was due to the fact that the statue was meant to honor him. The Greco-Roman style has a way of making statues look glorified and godlike without including any texts. If we look at the statue at Viseu we see that his chest is popping out and his stance is strong and invincible. If we look at a famous Greek statue, such as Myron’s Discobolus in the 2nd century AD, we can see some similarities as I mentioned above. (Figure 1.3) We see a sculpture of a man tossing a disk; his chest is popping out and for some reason he looks glorified even though we do not his story. When honoring someone in a statue during Greco-Roman times, we see that the person was meant to be immortalized and godly. We see this same thing in the statue of Benliure, Viriathus was portrayed as a god who would be immortalized. Therefore, we see the creation of this
monument under the Salazar regime as a way to honor Viriathus, while showing promise and prosperity for Portugal under its new regime.

Figure 1.3: Myron’s Discobolus created in 2nd century AD. Picture taken from https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Discobolus

The use of Viriathus by the Portuguese and Spanish was done to ignite nationalism and create a national identity that started with Viriathus. They both portrayed
him as a liberator of Hispania and a freedom fighter; however, each one had their own version of who Viriathus was. Since Spain and Portugal were both seeking a national identity that started with Viriathus, they omitted the idea that Viriathus could be considered the founder of Spain and Portugal when they created an idealized version of him. This will become a common theme throughout this paper, how leaders and writers reshape the image of an ancient character for their own personal agenda. Thus, the Portuguese and Spanish each altered the image of Viriathus to claim him as a symbol of national identity and nationalism.
Chapter 2: Vercingetorix and Napoleon III

Vercingetorix

This chapter will look into who Vercingetorix was and what accomplishments made him a folk hero in Auvergne today. All accounts of Vercingetorix for this paper were derived from Julius Caesar’s account of the war, *Gallic Wars*, although other authors such as Plutarch and Suetonius mentioned Vercingetorix. Many present-day historians believed that Caesar’s *Gallic Wars* was done for propaganda and are unsure if everything he stated was completely accurate. In any case, this chapter will focus on Vercingetorix’s motivations and goals in his struggle against the Romans, as far as they can be determined.

In 58 BC, Julius Caesar embarked on a quest to conquer all of Gaul and turn it into a Roman province. After defeating the Suebi, Nervii, and Belgae by 54 BC, it was assumed that Caesar would return to Italy since the whole region of Gaul was subdued. At this moment some of the Gauls sought a way to drive out the Romans, using the opportunity of Caesar being called away to Rome. Vercingetorix, son of Celtillus, took charge of this movement and spoke against the tyranny of Rome. However, Roman supporters in the Gallic government who wished to keep peace with Caesar expelled Vercingetorix. Despite this, Vercingetorix campaigned with other leaders and people who wished to “take up arms for the sake of general liberty”38 and ousted those who have recently expelled him. He was given the title of king by those who supported him and

38 Julius Caesar. *Gallic Wars*, 7.4 (all quotes were translated through http://penelope.uchicago.edu/Thayer/E/Roman/Texts/Caesar/Gallic_War/home.html)
went around uniting the tribes of the region to fight against the Romans and tyranny. However, to ensure these tribesmen would be loyal when the time came, he took hostages from each tribe. To assert his dominance he would send home anyone who disobeyed him “with their ears cut off, or one of their eyes put out, that they may be an example to the rest, and frighten others by the severity of their punishment”. This tactic of fear to gain respect worked for Vercingetorix and within no time he assembled an army and attacked the tribes who remained loyal to Caesar. At this time, Caesar marched to Transalpine Gaul to deal with this new threat.

In 52 BC, Caesar returned to his troops and reported to all his men and legions that they were to strike terror and fear throughout Transalpine Gaul. Hearing of this, Vercingetorix regrouped his men towards the region of Arverni where they would be surrounded by only allies. However, Caesar had surmised that this would be their course of action and waited for them to arrive. When Vercingetorix received word that Caesar and his men were waiting for him at the Arverni, he returned to the Boii and attacked Caesar's allies there. However, Caesar also began to pillage the allies of Vercingetorix, forcing them to join his side in the war. The success of Caesar frightened Vercingetorix and the Gauls, which forced them to reconsider their strategy. They decided that the best way to defeat Caesar was to starve him into submission. Thus, they began to burn all crops that were not needed and “for the sake of the common weal, the interests of private property must be disregarded; hamlets and homesteads must be burnt in every direction” so that Caesar could not use them for shelter. Caesar discussed how these
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actions may have seemed cruel, however, from the point of Vercingetorix, it was far better than seeing his kin taken into slavery, “the inevitable fate of the conquered”. Vercingetorix then took his troops and set up camp sixteen miles away from Avaricum in order to follow Caesar so that he could monitor his foraging tactics and ambush areas he assumed Caesar would go to retrieve supplies. When a prisoner notified Caesar of this he quickly went towards Avaricum and began to besiege the town. The Romans were unable to push forward over the walls of the town due to the Gauls setting fire to their ramps; however, the Gauls were unable to push back the Romans as well. Vercingetorix then urged his troops to retreat during the night hoping that they could escape without the Romans knowing. Noticing that the Gauls were in retreat, Caesar rebuilt the towers and took over the city. However, due to the crimes committed earlier by the Gauls, in which they slaughtered an entire colony of Romans, no “aged men, nor women, nor children” were spared. Of the forty thousand residents in the city, only 800 made it out alive to Vercingetorix.

After this defeat, Vercingetorix promised his men, in fear of a mutiny, that he would unite the other tribes who have remained neutral up to this point. He managed to convince the Aedui, Caesars largest Gallic ally, to betray Caesar and join arms with him. In September of the same year, Vercingetorix formed camp at Gergovia and awaited Caesar's army to attack. This location that Vercingetorix chose was on top of a hill and made a frontal assault by the Romans futile. However, Caesar noticed that there was a hill next to Gergovia that was essential to Vercingetorix’s food and water supply, and
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decided it would be best to attack there first. At night, he quickly took over the hill and began the siege of Gergovia. However, the Aedui betrayed him and began attacking the Romans supply train. With his rations threatened, Caesar took four of his legions away from the siege and attacked the Aedui. After defeating them, he put pro-Roman officials in power and returned to the siege with his legions and 10,000 Aedui horsemen. Realizing that it was impossible to win this battle while Vercingetorix held the higher ground, Caesar tried to trick the Gauls into chasing them by staging a pretended retreat. In the clashes of battle, however, the rest of the army did not receive the signals and continued to push forward. After suffering many casualties, Caesar was forced to retreat to Aeduan territory.

Two days after his retreat, Caesar challenged Vercingetorix to open battle in an attempt to end the war; however, Vercingetorix rejected the skirmish. Caesar then joined his forces with Titus Labienus and his four legions; but then the Aedui rebelled again and slaughtered all the Romans in their province. With only two Gallic allies left, Caesar sought reinforcements from Germania and was attacked by Vercingetorix on his way back. The Romans were able to hold off the Gauls, weakening their morale, and forcing them to retreat and settle in the fortified settlement of Alesia. With almost all of Gaul united behind him, Vercingetorix had an army of 80,000 stationed at Alesia and outnumbered Caesars army four to one. Caesar realized his best course of action was to starve Alesia and began encircling them with trenches and blockaded all roads that led to the settlement. Vercingetorix noticed that there was a weak point in Caesar's defenses and
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sent 60,000 soldiers, under his relative Vercassivellaunus, to attack the Romans. While they would attack the weak side, Vercingetorix attacked the Romans from the front, picking out any weak areas within the Roman defenses. Luckily for Caesar, Marc Anthony, Gaius Fabius, and Brutus joined Caesar at the siege and defeated the 60,000 soldiers. Understanding that defeat was imminent, Vercingetorix held a Gallic council, “at which he stated that he had undertaken that campaign, not for his own occasions, but for the general liberty; and as they must yield to fortune he offered himself to them for whichever course they please”.44

In 51 BC Vercingetorix was taken prisoner by Caesar and was held captive for 5 years as Caesar regained order throughout Transalpine Gaul. In 46 BC, on his return to Italy, Caesar held a triumph45 and paraded Vercingetorix throughout Rome. As was customary during a triumph, Caesar humiliated Vercingetorix throughout the streets of Rome and ordered that he be strangled to death. Thus ending the life of the man who almost freed Gaul from the Romans.

Let us now look into how Vercingetorix and the Gauls are represented by Caesar in his book. Caesar gave a lot of respect to the Gauls and usually compared them to the Germanic tribes of Germania in order to prove that the Gauls were superior. His first instance of this was when he discussed his fear of Germanic tribes conquering Gaul. He stated, “That wild and savage men would not be likely to restrain themselves, after they had possessed themselves of all Gaul”46. He believed that the Germanic tribes were incapable of being civilized and that barbarism was in their nature. If they were to

44 Caesar, 7.89
45 A triumph was a civil ceremony done in Rome to publically celebrate the victory of a military general.
46 Caesar, 1.33
conquer Gaul then nothing would stop them from creating havoc throughout Italy. This was not an uncommon trait however, in Benjamin H. Isaac’s book *The Invention of Racism in Classical Antiquity*, he stated how several Roman authors found the Germans treacherous. Isaac also discussed how Caesar portrayed the Gauls as freedom fighters and showed admiration towards Vercingetorix. However, this was a common trait done by military leaders, Caesar represented Vercingetorix as heroic so that it looks like his campaign against him was tough and glorious. However, unlike most Roman writers, Caesar portrayed the Gauls positively overall. Caesar saw the Gauls as barbaric but believed they were capable of being civilized once conquered. He stated, “For neither must the land of Gaul be compared with the land of the Germans, nor must the habit of living of the latter be put on a level with that of the former”. Caesar clearly made a distinction between the Gauls and Germans, and later on his career, he vouched on behalf of the Gauls to have a right towards Roman citizenship. Interestingly enough, Caesar's generous view towards the Gallic people could have been stirred by political motivation. Caesar wanted to be seen as a great leader, not just a general, in order to expand his position within the Senate. If he were given the task of civilizing the Gallic province he would become wealthy and prove that he was a good leader. If this was the case, then it makes sense that while he was at war with Vercingetorix, he considered them to be honorable and brave. Hence, Caesar saw Vercingetorix and the Gallic people as barbarians who were brave, great warriors, and capable of being civilized unlike the tribes of Germania.
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**Napoleon III’s Use of Vercingetorix**

When looking into how modern writers, thinkers, and leaders used legends of those who resisted the Romans for nationalistic purposes it remains important to understand how and why nations and leaders look towards the past for their solutions. While the Portuguese and Spanish looked towards Viriathus as a way of creating a national identity, Napoleon III also used Vercingetorix for political and nationalistic purposes. Vercingetorix was a Gallic chieftain who fought against Julius Caesar and the Romans over the province of Gaul in ca. 52 BC. Although he was defeated, Caesar respected the chieftain and the Gauls for the bravery they possessed and their goal for independence. Napoleon used Vercingetorix to establish political legitimacy, unite the French against Prussia, create a new French identity, and justify his claim to imperialism. Moreover, this chapter will also look into how Napoleon changed the image of Vercingetorix to glorify Rome and incorporate them into French identity and colonialism.

**Napoleon III**

Napoleon III was born in 1808 and was the nephew of the French legend Napoleon Bonaparte who in 1804 became the first French emperor. Napoleon III spent most of his youth in Switzerland and Germany and became a captain in the Swiss army. Inspired by his late uncle, he took part in revolutionary activity and joined a military coup in Strasbourg. After failing, he was exiled to the United States and would return to France fiery with revolution on his mind. Upon his return, he was deemed a threat by the French Monarchy and was exiled to England in 1838.\(^49\) However, this did not stop Napoleon III,

and when the opportunity presented itself he returned to France and attempted another revolution. After being defeated again and imprisoned for life, he managed in 1846, disguised as a prison laborer, to escape jail and flee to England.\textsuperscript{50} After the French Revolution of 1848, Napoleon returned to France and won the Presidential election by a great margin. Despite being elected president, he spent his presidency trying to push legislation to extend the presidency for more than one term. He failed however and in response he held a military coup and removed those in the legislative assembly who opposed him.\textsuperscript{51} He then replaced the assembly with plebiscites who supported him and in 1852 passed a new constitution labeling France as an empire, making himself emperor. For the next 14 years, Napoleon embarked on wars and social movements. Since Napoleon ruled ruthlessly in his early years as emperor and was heavily disliked, he began to follow his uncle’s social policy and impose liberal values upon France.\textsuperscript{52} Napoleon himself admired Julius Caesar and wrote a history of his life. In 1870, Napoleon went to war with a revitalized Prussian army under Otto Von Bismarck. After a bloody and quick war, Napoleon was defeated in just ten months and was exiled to England where he would die on January 9, 1873. The loss of the Franco-Prussian war ended the political career of Napoleon III and the second French empire.

\textbf{Napoleon III and Vercingetorix}

Napoleon’s use of Vercingetorix and Caesar worked towards his goal of becoming emperor and gaining the support of Frenchmen. His goals were to unify the nation under him, to create a new French self-identity that linked the French to the Gauls.
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and Romans, and to justify French colonialism. His ability to do so was through propaganda and the process of monumentalization, in which he would erect monuments of Vercingetorix for propaganda. However, his goal to change French society was not just for the good of France, but to create a new society that linked Napoleon as the heir to a long and rich French history.

Napoleon’s main goal, after his rise to emperor, was to maintain political legitimacy in France and Europe. Therefore, in the 1860s, he created a Nationalist Cultural Project to study French history and connect it to the Gallic people in hope that he could seek legitimization through nationalism. Napoleon first funded the excavation of important battle sites between Vercingetorix and Caesar. The sites excavated were located at Alesia, Bibracte, Mount Beuvray in Burgundy, and Gergovia in the Auvergne. Napoleon then erected a statue of Vercingetorix at Burgundy in August 1865, which he believed was the location of the Battle of Alesia. The 35-foot statue was sculpted by Aimé Millet, it was made of flattened copper and erected on a granite pedestal. If we are to look at the statue (Figure 1.4) closely, we can see that the face of Vercingetorix resembled the face of Napoleon. Vercingetorix was portrayed in a long tunic holding a bronze sword; he does not have a beard and possessed a long mustache. When looking at a picture of Vercingetorix on a Roman coin (Figure 1.5) we see that he had a mustache and a beard, while this statue only had a mustache. Napoleon himself (Figure 1.6) had a long mustache and a small beard. Therefore, it can be presumed that the face of Vercingetorix was purposely made to resemble the face of Napoleon and its
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creation was used as propaganda by Napoleon. He used this statue to compare himself to Vercingetorix, as if he was the modern day version of him. By doing so he was legitimizing his claim to the emperorship by possibly claiming that he was the heir to all Vercingetorix has accomplished. However, we will go into more detail about the statue when discussing Napoleons use of it to unify the country and create a new French identity. Alongside the excavations and statue, Napoleon wrote a biography about Julius Caesar and presented it to the world in 1865 as well. The goal of the Nationalist Cultural Project was to educate French society about their history so that through nationalism he could legitimize his claim to the throne. Napoleon believed that Rome, mainly Julius Caesar, also played a major part in French history. He does not see Caesar as the enemy, but rather as the civilizer of the Gauls; we will look into this more when we discuss French identity and colonialism. However, his project was noted by other countries and was embraced for its intellectual design - the legitimization of Napoleon III’s power, as well as its appropriation of the ancient past.54 When looking into why Napoleon started the Nationalist Cultural Program we should note that by 1865 Napoleon was dealing with many domestic problems, mainly the rise of political oppositions in the Legislative Body.55 These men began to doubt Napoleons claim to power and his use of Vercingetorix and Julius Caesar was done to compare himself and his future to these historic legends. His political enemies, such as Adolphe Thiers56, began to protest any notions of getting involved in the quarrel between Prussia and Austria.57 Yet a few years
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later, Napoleon would go on to fight Prussia and would be defeated. His Nationalist Cultural Project, however, helped solidify his claim to the throne and allowed him the opportunity to lead a war against Prussia.
Figure 1.4: Statue of Vercingetorix at Burgundy, erected by Napoleon III in 1865. Photo was taken from https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Vercing%C3%A9torix_monument.

Figure 1.5: These are images of a Gallic soldier, maybe Vercingetorix but probably not, on Roman coins, dated 48 BC. The top coin was a bust of a Gallic man on one side and a chariot on the back. The bottom coin was an image of a lady, maybe Roman Goddess Victory, and most likely Vercingetorix tied up after his defeat. Photo was taken from https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Vercingetorix
Figure 1.6: Portrait of Napoleon III that was created by Hippolyte Flandrin, in the Versailles Museum. Photo was taken from https://www.britannica.com/biography/Napoleon-III-emperor-of-France
Napoleon aimed to unite the French people who had just gone through two revolutions in just 50 years. He understood that in order to fulfill his imperialistic design, he needed a unified France supporting him. As mentioned above, as part of his Nationalist Cultural Project he erected a statue of Vercingetorix at Burgundy. During the construction of this statue, Napoleon included a passage that Julius Caesar said about the Gauls; “a united Gaul forming a single nation animated by the same spirit can defy the universe”.\textsuperscript{58} Being that it was written in French, Napoleon III’s inclusion of this quote was clearly done as propaganda towards his own political ambition. For Napoleon was preparing himself for war with Prussia, and it could be possible, that in order to gain support for the war he included this quote to establish the idea that united they are able to accomplish much more. To further this propaganda against the Prussians and hoping to unify the French against them, Napoleon gave a speech in 1866 where he mentioned Vercingetorix. He stated, “In honoring the memory of Vercingetorix, we must not lament his defeat. Let us admire the ardent and sincere love of this Gallic chief for the independence of his country”.\textsuperscript{59} Napoleon saw Vercingetorix as someone who was willing to fight bravely and die for the independence of his country. This was something very relevant when looking into the rise of Prussia and the threat they represented to France. Napoleon’s ability to use Vercingetorix as propaganda was very effective in uniting the French behind him, despite his terrible loss to come against the Prussians. As we begin to move on to how Napoleon used Vercingetorix to create a new French
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identity we should understand that everything Napoleon did was to secure his own power and throne.

**French Identity: Gauls and Romans**

The rise of Napoleon III was followed by the rise of a new French identity of Napoleon’s creation. During the first French revolution, those who partook wished to destroy everything old and forsake the past. Napoleon III witnessed first hand tendencies of French revolutionaries; therefore, he understood the necessity to create a new French identity in order to maintain his power. His motivation to bring back the historical memory of the Gauls was done to create a foundation of the national mythology of identity encapsulated in the famous phrase “our ancestors the Gauls”. Napoleon wished to create a new national identity that started with Vercingetorix and was continued through the Roman Empire up until his time. By creating a new origin for the French people that began with Vercingetorix, he tried to create a new national identity; one that he hoped would recognize his power and accept his emperorship. To this end, the Nationalist Cultural Project excavated battle sites between Vercingetorix and Julius Caesar, as mentioned above. Their goal was to turn these excavations into monuments themselves and therefore invoke historical continuity between the past and the present. Therefore, through the process of monumentalization he was able to firmly root this human embodiment of French identity into the landscape of France.

Another reason for the connection between the French and Gauls could possibly be that Napoleon wished to remove any German ancestry from France. Historically
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speaking, the word France derives from the Latin word *Francia*, which stood for “Land of the Franks”. The Franks were a Germanic tribe that conquered and occupied Gaul in the fifth century. The nobility, up until the first French Revolution in 1789, would solidify their power through their ancestry to Clovis[^63] and the Germans who conquered Gaul.[^64] It could be possible that Napoleon knew this, and being anti-Prussian, wished to destroy any links between the French and Germans. Moreover, Napoleon wrote a biography on Julius Caesar and understood the contempt he had towards the Germans. As mentioned earlier in the section about Vercingetorix, Caesar at one point said that the Gauls were more civilized than the Germanic tribes. Caesar also admired the Gauls and understood the threat that the Germanic tribes could have on civilizations. In the eyes of Napoleon, he saw the defeat of the Gauls as a step towards Roman civilization over barbarism.[^65] The reason for this was that the Germanic tribes during the time of Vercingetorix were constantly attacking Gaul and the region. If the Romans did not conquer Gaul, then perhaps the barbaric Germanic tribes would have conquered them. Also, since Napoleon venerated Caesar, he could have created this new Gallic identity to distance the French from the “wild and savage”[^66] Germans. This could also be why the monument of Vercingetorix not only portrayed French Identity but German antipathy, as we will mention later on. Napoleon did not only incorporate Gallic identity but Roman as well. Napoleon believed that it was the Romans who civilized the Gauls and made them a nation. That was why in his speech in 1866, he also mentioned, “Let us not forget that it

[^63]: Clovis was the first King to unite all the Frankish tribes and started the Merovingian Dynasty in AD 511.
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is to the triumph of the Roman armies that our civilization is due”\textsuperscript{67}. Although Caesar and the Romans went against everything Vercingetorix believed in, Napoleon asserted them into his new French identity. One of the reasons could be that he disliked the Germans and wanted to portray this new French identity as anti-German, which would be useful in uniting the country against Prussia. Another reason, which we will discuss in the next section, was that Napoleon wanted to conquer the world and he wanted to consider the French as the heirs to Roman imperialism. Nevertheless, by offering the perception of continuity through the Nationalist Cultural Project, Napoleon created a new French identity that started with Vercingetorix and Julius Caesar and abandoned their Frankish/German origin.

**Colonialism: Vercingetorix and Caesar**

The 18th century was an era of colonialism as the major European powers contended with each other over the New World and Africa for colonial hegemony. The memory of Vercingetorix, brought to light by Napoleon, was used for more than creating a lineage that linked Napoleon and Vercingetorix together. After creating legitimacy as the true emperor, Napoleon embarked on colonial conquest. He sought to turn the monument of Vercingetorix into both a shrine to the vision of France as the heirs to the Roman imperial mission of bringing civilization to the barbarians and a reminder to the subjects of French colonialism that it is beneficial, even if temporarily painful, to accept the process the French were undergoing.\textsuperscript{68} Napoleon III believed that France became great because they were taken over and became part of the Roman Empire. This could be
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due to the fact that Napoleon was reverential of Julius Caesar. His history of Julius Caesar was done to validate, to audiences around the world, his personal power, his imperial system, and his aspirations for France.\textsuperscript{69} For Napoleon saw himself as the heir of the Romans imperial system, which was why in many cases he considered himself not only as a modern-day Vercingetorix but also a modern-day Augustus. Napoleon considered himself to be the Augustus to Napoleon Bonaparte; “as Caesars nephew asserted the greatness of Rome so Bonaparte’s nephew will assert the greatness of France”.\textsuperscript{70} His use of Roman imperialism was also done as a way to appeal to those under French hegemony.

Napoleon believed that when the Romans conquered Gaul, they made the Gauls strong enough to protect themselves from the restless and aggressive Germanic tribes. With this belief, it could be possible that he wished to convince the subjects of French colonialism that if they too willingly accepted a superior power they would become strong and stable as well. Napoleon also needed to convince the French people that colonialism was good and could help the French people prosper. Not just through exploitation, but also by creating a stable and strong ally that could be of use if a war was to come, which it would. On a side note, this century was full of liberal ideology, men who believed that nations should be run by the citizens and not monarchs. This could have been a problem for Napoleon since he wished to be a conqueror like his uncle, which was why through the Roman Empire and Vercingetorix he tried to convince the French people that colonialism was good for the world. Thus, Napoleon was capable of
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legitimizing his desire for colonial conquest by revealing how Roman imperialism made the Gauls a strong and civilized nation. Let us now look into the contradictions of Napoleon III by looking into how he used Vercingetorix and Caesar.

**Contradictions of Napoleons Use of Vercingetorix and Julius Caesar**

Vercingetorix was portrayed by Napoleon III and Caesar as an honorable and brave man. However, one can argue that Napoleon misinterpreted what Vercingetorix stood for. Vercingetorix fought against the Romans to liberate his country from imperialism and foreigners. He believed that by uniting the tribes of Transalpine Gaul they would become a unified nation under him. However, Vercingetorix also committed atrocities in order to fight Caesar as mentioned above. Napoleon III altered the image of Vercingetorix as a way to show how imperialism was good, and if led by a moral leader, imperialism would make the world a better place.

When looking into Napoleon III’s necessity to look into the past, we see that it was strictly done for political reasons. Napoleon III rose to power through a coup d’état and needed legitimacy to hold power among a divided French nation. Being that he was a man that studied the classics, well learned in Roman history, he looked towards Vercingetorix and Caesar for the support he needed. He compared himself to Vercingetorix as the liberator of France in order to legitimize his claim as emperor. He was the heir to Vercingetorix, the father of the French nation. Also, with the threat of Prussia, he compared himself to Vercingetorix to show that he was a leader that would protect France from invaders if they were capable of uniting under him. Napoleon III also inherited a large colonial empire, which has had to deal with many insurgencies, such as
Haiti’s recent independence from his uncle Napoleon Bonaparte in 1804. By creating a French identity that incorporated Vercingetorix and Rome, he marked himself, and his nation, as the heirs to the Roman Empire. Therefore, in 1852, after proclaiming himself as emperor, Napoleon found himself the leader of a nation that is deeply divided, at the brink of war with Prussia, and in charge of a vast colonial empire with no legitimate claim to his throne besides the coup d’état he just held. It was in this dark hour that he needed to fix his political situation and decided to commemorate, and use, Vercingetorix, and Julius Caesar for his own political gain.

The use of Vercingetorix and Caesar by Napoleon III was clearly done to legitimize his title and pursue his political agenda of world conquest. Napoleon portrayed Vercingetorix as heroic and brave, someone willing to sacrifice his life for the independence of his nation. Caesar also glorified Vercingetorix and the Gallic people; however, he did so by comparing the Gauls favorably to the tribes of Germania. It was not that Caesar believed the Gauls were a superior race, but rather that they had the potential of being civilized, unlike the Germanic tribes. What was most controversial about Napoleon’s use of Vercingetorix was that he changed the image of the Gallic hero for his own political gains. Rather than portraying Vercingetorix as a freedom fighter against imperialism, he honors the fight of Vercingetorix but believed that Roman imperialism was good. He uses Vercingetorix to portray Caesar and the Romans as the good guys who wanted to civilize the world. It was also interesting how Napoleon III did not use the Antonine dynasty to encourage imperialism. The Antonines ruled over Rome during the peak of their empire and they were from the south of France. They would have
been far more efficient and less contradicting in his creation of a French identity.

Nevertheless, the use of Vercingetorix by Napoleon III helped us understand how leaders change the image of historical figures for their own political benefit.
Chapter 3: Arminius and Hitler

Arminius

This part of the chapter will look into whom Arminius was and what he did against the Romans that would make him famous in Germany centuries later. The main source used to get all the information for this section derived from the Roman historian Cornelius Tacitus, although, other writers such as Cassius Dio and Suetonius have recorded these events. Tacitus was a Roman orator and a public official who was known for his histories titled *Germania*, *Historiae*, and *Annals*. It was from the *Annals* that the story of Arminius was recorded, although, he was born after the events occurred.

In the year 18 BC the wife of a local Germanic chieftain, Segimer, gave birth to their first son Arminius. Only a few years later this eldest son was sent to Rome as a hostage to guarantee peace between the Cherusci and Rome. While in Rome, Arminius was raised like a Roman; he was schooled in Latin and Roman warfare. Around AD 7 he was sent to fight in his first war with the Roman legions of Tiberius Claudius Nero, the stepson of Emperor Augustus. He served in the auxiliary forces and it was during this time that Arminius learned Roman warfare, something he would use later on in his own revolt. In AD 8 he was transferred back to the Rhine to serve under Quinctilius Varus. Varus’ goal in Germany was to turn the whole region into a province, which he successfully did. However, he fiercely taxed the natives and treated them as slaves leading them to the brink of revolution. Arminius, being general of the Auxiliaries, took his army and went back home to the Cherusci where he saw his father for the first time since he left. It is here where Segimer and Arminius begin to plan their revolt against
Varus, for you see, they have been treated with such a lack of respect that war was the only way to regain their honor. Knowing that his soldiers were not strong or disciplined enough to take on three legions, he sent messengers to the other tribes asking them to unite and revolt. Some of the tribes agreed to revolt, however, Segestes, one of Arminius’ enemies, “had repeatedly given warning of projected risings, especially at the last great banquet which preceded the appeal to arms; when he urged Varus to arrest Arminius”.

Varus, understanding that Segestes hated Arminius, because Arminius desired his daughter, thought this was an act of jealousy and did not believe him. Thus, Arminius began to plan his trap against Varus and regain their honor.

At the break of winter in AD 9, Varus wished to return with his army to the Rhine to wait out the winter there. On their way, a revolt broke out in another part of Germany and Arminius saw this as the perfect chance to strike. He suggested to Varus that they should take a different path back to the Rhine so that they can crush the revolt on their way back, which Varus agreed to and the trap was now laid. Arminius told Varus that he was going to get reinforcements from the Cherusci, but returned with many tribes all united under him. Prior to this trap, Segestes tried to prevent this uprising and even held Arminius captive until the people said that they wanted this revolt and he had no choice but to join the rebels. Thus, when Arminius returned with the reinforcements, they quickly attacked Varus in the Teutoburg forest destroying a large part of his army and forcing Varus to retreat and set up camp. Realizing that it was much farther to retreat back to the nearest
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Roman city, he decided to push forward and attack Arminius instead. Again, Varus was defeated and forced to retreat and set up camp, however, Arminius surprised them and attacked their camp at night defeating the legions and forcing Varus to fall upon his sword. Tacitus mentioned that years later when Germanicus visited the site of the battle he saw “in the center of the field were the whitening bones of men, as they had fled, or stood their ground, strewn everywhere or piled in heaps.” Thus, all the legions in the Rhine were destroyed and only a few survivors were able to make it back home to tell the story.

With the death of Augustus, the new emperor Tiberius sent his nephew Germanicus to go and deal with the problems on the Rhine. Germanicus went forth and destroyed all the villages that joined Arminius and made his way throughout the Rhine. Segestes once again swore his loyalty to the Romans in AD 15, forcing Arminius to declare war on him. At this point, Arminius attacked Segestes and nearly defeated him until Germanicus arrived with reinforcements. Segestes and his family were safely escorted to Roman forts and among them were Arminius’ wife, Thusnelda, and their unborn baby. Tacitus included the pain that Arminius felt in a great display of love and affection for his wife. He mentioned how Arminius grieved loudly about his adoring wife and unborn child and swore to destroy all who wished to be tyrants over Germania. This emotional appeal that Arminius had furthered the unification of the tribes and many powerful leaders joined him in the war against Rome. Germanicus, eager to end Arminius, decided to hunt down Arminius to the Cherusci and ended up falling into a
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trap, however, he managed to survive with a great number of his troops and retreated back to his main force on the Ems. Alongside Germanicus was Aulus Caecina Severus\textsuperscript{74}, who was sent to reinforce Germanicus’ army. While Caecina was on the way to meet with Germanicus at the Elms, Arminius stumbled upon him and ambushed his men. However, due to the lack of discipline the Germans had, “for they left the slaughter to secure the spoil”, Caecina managed to escape.\textsuperscript{75} Germanicus, being well reinforced, fought Arminius in an open battle at the Weser River. There the two armies clashed and Arminius was forced to flee beholding heavy casualties. Despite this loss, Arminius had many tribes sending reinforcements and in no time had a strong army again. He would then make another stand at the Angrivarii barrier where he would again lose. However, to the fortune of Arminius, Tiberius grew weary of this costly war and against Germanicus’ pleas, he called back the troops and left Arminius alone.

Arminius now possessed much of Germania and his only enemy left was the powerful chieftain Maroboduus. Arminius took his army and fought Maroboduus in open battle and to the surprise of even Tacitus; the battle was fought in a Roman-style rather than barbaric chaos.\textsuperscript{76} Arminius was claimed the victor and the tribes divided the lands of Maroboduus. Arminius was now the most powerful ruler in Germany and proposed to the tribesman that they unite under him as king. However, many tribesmen disapproved of this and in AD 21 Arminius was betrayed by his relatives and killed, a sad ending to the man that liberated Germania from Roman conquest.

\textsuperscript{74} Aulus Caecina Severus was a Roman Consul in 1 BC and was a general in the Roman Army.
\textsuperscript{75} Tacitus. \textit{Annals}. 1.65
\textsuperscript{76} Tacitus. \textit{Annals}. 2.45
The Romans have always portrayed the Germanic tribes as uncivilized barbarians, as seen through Caesars *Gallic Wars*. Tacitus mentioned how Germanic tribes only respected leaders who were audacious, he stated, “For with barbarians, the more eager a man's daring, the more does he inspire confidence, and the more highly is he esteemed in times of revolution”. The Germans are portrayed as a society that only recognized strength, and for this reason, they are portrayed as cruel and uncivilized. Tacitus mentioned a scene in which Germanicus stumbled upon the battle site of the Teutoburg Forest; “In the adjacent groves were the barbarous altars, on which they had immolated tribunes and first-rank centurions”. Here they saw the true barbarity of the Germans who honored their altar by sacrificing Roman soldiers on it. However, Tacitus recorded one speech by Arminius that showed his intentions for starting this war. Arminius stated, “Is anything left for us but to retain our freedom or to die before we are enslaved?” In this speech Arminius was preaching freedom and that enslavement would not be a choice. This fear of enslavement that the German people have was also mentioned in another one of his books titled *Germania*. In this book Tacitus discussed the origins of the German people, their rituals, politics, and every aspect of their society, as he understood it. A common trait among the Germans, as stated above, was their fear of enslavement. He stated that women would rally men during battle with their “bosoms laid bare, having vividly represented the horrors of captivity, which the Germans fear with such dread on behalf of their women”. If there were any type of honorable characteristics that the
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Romans believed the Germans possessed, not including warfare, it would be the compassion that the warriors had for their women. Tacitus described the physical characteristics of the German people as well, stating, “All have fierce blue eyes, red hair, huge frames, fit only for sudden exertion”. Therefore, the Germans were usually portrayed as barbarians and uncivilized by Tacitus, however, Arminius was portrayed as a liberator even though he was still a barbarian. Now we will look into how Hitler and the Nazi Party used Arminius for their own political propaganda.

**Hitler and the Nazi Party**

This part of the chapter will look into Hitler and the Nazi Party’s use of Arminius in their quest for political power in post World War I Germany. The use of national legends to help create a national identity has become a common theme so far throughout this study. We will see how Hitler and the Nazi Party use this tactic to push their political ideology onto the nation. Their stated goal was to achieve German unity, purity, and dominance, though their actual goal was to entrench themselves politically. Another point worth mentioning was that Arminius was known as Hermann in Germany, which they believed was the translation of his Latin name into German; I will be using Arminius however. In this chapter we will see how Hitler and the Nazi Party used Arminius for propaganda prior to the 1933 election. However, before understanding Hitler’s use of Arminius, let us look into the use of Arminius in Germany prior to Hitler.

**The Praise of Arminius Before Hitler**

Arminius was reintroduced into German society from the 16th century onwards, when an account of the battle by Roman historian Tacitus resurfaced in a German
monastery. Later German nationalists, prior to the unification of Germany in 1871, fashioned the Germanic leader into an icon to help unify the German people against their enemies such as the Vatican, the French, and the Jews. Therefore we see that prior to Hitler, Arminius was seen as a nationalistic icon that represented the power and strength that a unified Germany could have.

Arminius was also featured in many operas throughout the 18th and 19th century. He was portrayed as Hermann, a blonde and muscle-bound warrior, featured in more than 50 operas such as “The Battle of the Teutoberg Forest”, which was written by a German poet Heinrich Von Kleist in 1808 as a call to arms against Napoleon Bonaparte’s occupation. A statue of Arminius was also erected in 1875 to celebrate the unification of Germany at Detmold. The symbolism being of course that Arminius united the Germanic tribes and now Bismarck and Prussia have done so as well. The nationalistic view towards this could possibly be the idea that under Arminius the Germans were united and unconquerable and therefore if the Germans are united again then they too will be unconquerable again. However, we will go into this in more detail later in the chapter.

Frederick the Great was also a fan of Arminius and was recorded to have seen Arminius as a role model. He encouraged poets and playwrights to create pieces of work honoring Arminius. Throughout his reign dramas and epic poems were released such as Johann Elias Schlegel’s Hermann (1740), Justin Moser’s Arminius (1749), and Friedrich
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Gottlieb Klopstock’s *Herman’s Battle* (1768). Therefore, ever since the beginning of his reintroduction, Arminius was seen as a nationalistic hero that showed the strength of a united Germany. This next chapter will look into how Hitler and the Nazi party changed the image of Arminius in order to use him for propaganda throughout their 1933 campaign.

The use of Arminius by Hitler and the Nazi Party was done to increase the popularity of the party. The Nazi party strongly believed in using propaganda in order to gain support and unite the nation. They tended to look back at ancient times as a way to show their nation how great the German race was. Arminius was the perfect candidate for them because he was a human embodiment of German nationalism for the past couple centuries. The use of Arminius was important to Hitler’s goal of unifying the country through nationalism, destroying the mandates put on Germany after World War I, and most importantly, winning the 1933 general elections.

**Hitler’s Use of Arminius in Theatre**

Prior to the 1933 election, Walter Steinecke, the new appointed regional leader of the NSDAP, visited Hitler in Munich and showed him a play titled *Die Hermannsschlacht*. When Hitler read the script he fell in love with it and believed it could be used as propaganda for the upcoming elections. Christian Dietrich Grabbe, a dramatist in the early 19th century, wrote *Die Hermannsschlacht* in 1835, however it was never performed until 1934. The play was about the struggle between Arminius and the Romans and the concept of regionalism and nationalism. These themes attracted Hitler
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for he believed in a united Germany and that the land of Germany was sacred. Grabbe wrote this play before the unification of Germany and it can be seen that this play was done to preach unification and the creation of a German nation. The play was first performed in Detmold, which was thought that the Battle of Teutoburg Forest had taken place. Hitler understood the political use of this play and used it as a way to preach the Nazi parties struggle to unite the country and defeat those who wish to keep Germany weak. This could possibly be why when he was first handed the script and told he can use it for propaganda for the upcoming election, he stated, “That’s the idea; a second battle in the Teutoburg Forest!” It was successful propaganda and the play was later performed throughout the nation. Another big propaganda tool was the movie *Ewiger Wald*, which was released in 1936 in Munich. The film was produced by a Nazi organization that was in charge of spreading cultural content throughout Germany. This film analyzed the natural beauty of Germany and provided a history of the region. There was a scene that referenced the Battle of the Teutoburg Forest and the two themes in the movie are *Blut* (by blood) and *Boden* (the forest). These themes resonated with Hitler because he preached about the dominance of the German race and about the necessity of the Germans to have more living space. Hitler and the Nazi party understood that cinema was an instrument that could be used to shape the minds of the German people and tell the patriotic story of Arminius through it.
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Hitler’s Use of Arminius on Postcards

Most references to Arminius appeared on propaganda poster cards that Hitler would disperse throughout Germany prior to the elections in 1933. His goal was to link Arminius to the Nazi party and distributed many postcards with Arminius on it. One postcard showed Arminius raising a sword on top of a pedestal with a red swastika behind him; written on the postcard was (translated from German) “Free Hermann’s Land”.

(Figure 1.7) The goal of this postcard was to express the Nazi’s goal of liberating Germany from foreign powers just like Arminius did before them. Another postcard that Hitler distributed prior to the 1933 elections was an image of two Nazi officials saluting to Arminius in the distant. Arminius was holding his sword in the air as if he was saluting back to the Nazi officials. On the card reads, “Where once the leader of the ancient Germans, Freed the German lands of its enemy, Hitler’s victorious flags now wave, Mightily into the new era”.

(Figure 1.8) Hitler’s campaign in 1933 focused on the unification of the German people and termination of any foreign mandates on Germany. Therefore he used Arminius to establish the idea that he was like Arminius and would defend Germany from all her enemies. However, there was one postcard of Arminius that was used to challenge and oppose Hitler. (Figure 2) This postcard was separated into two halves, the left side had Arminius standing victorious over two dead Roman soldiers, and one of them was still holding the Roman standard. While the right side showed Hitler standing victorious with his Nazi standard in his hand. The postcard wrote, “Hermann

91 Winkler (2016) 97
92 Winkler (2016) 99
broke the emblem of Roman Sovereignty”; “Adolf Hitler raises it up again”. This postcard was created and distributed by one of the highest-ranking WWI generals Erich Ludendorff. Ludendorff was part of the Nazi party in the early 1920s and left the party after not getting along with Hitler. This postcard was made to show how Hitler undermined everything Arminius stood and fought for because while Arminius fought to end tyranny and empire, Hitler preached tyranny and empire. These postcards, however, helped Hitler publicize his political agenda and through the use of Arminius he was able to convince the German people that he would protect Germany from all invaders and foreigners.

Figure 1.7: Nazi poster for the January 1933 elections. This picture was taken from Arminius the Liberator: Myth and Ideology by Martin M Winkler.
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Figure 1.8: 1933 Postcard of Two Nazi officials saluting the statue of Arminius. This picture was taken from Arminius the Liberator: Myth and Ideology by Martin M Winkler.

Figure 1.9: Nazi card entitled Two Liberators in the early 1930s. This picture was taken from Arminius the Liberator: Myth and Ideology by Martin M Winkler.
Hitler’s Use of Arminius in Speeches and Private Conversations

Hitler also used Arminius in his speeches and private conversations with Nazi officials. On January 5\textsuperscript{th}, 1933 Hitler delivered a speech to around 5,000 listeners, the speech was recorded by a local newspaper and titled “Triumphant Victory March by Adolf Hitler through the Lippe Region”.\textsuperscript{94} In this speech Hitler honored Arminius as the founder of the German nation and mentioned how he defeated the Romans to liberate Germany. Hitler also discussed the problems of division amongst Germans and how disunity would destroy the nation. Hitler also promised that the Nationalist Socialist Volk was going to end the division and unite the country.\textsuperscript{95} Since the party elections were only 6 months away, Hitler used Arminius in his public speeches to compare himself to this
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national legend. Hitler gave the same speech a couple more times in different towns preaching German unity and dominance. Even some Nazi officials gave speeches comparing Hitler to Arminius. On January 13th, a famous World War I hero, Karl Litzmann, gave a speech to a group of civilians comparing Hitler to Arminius. He told the audience that “just as Herman was treading on the Roman eagle… so Hitler would tread on Marxism”. Therefore, their comparison of Hitler to Arminius was used to show the German people that Hitler was going to unify the country and destroy his enemies like Arminius.

Hitler also mentioned Arminius a couple times in private conversation. Hitler’s personal secretary, Martin Bormann, recorded all of Hitler’s private talks which later historians would call Hitler’s Table Talk; I was able to find a translated book by Hugh Trevor-Roper. In Hitler’s Table Talks, there are two recorded times that Hitler mentioned Arminius. The first occurred midday on April 23rd, 1942, he stated, “Our history goes back to the days of Arminius and King Theodoric, and among the German Kaisers there have been men of the most outstanding quality; in them they bore the germ of German unity”. Hitler also went on to complain about how many people do not know the history of Arminius, and other German leaders, and suggested that they begin teaching it in school. The second time Hitler mentioned Arminius was at dinner on May 16th, 1942, which Hitler used to talk about the achievements of Arminius. He stated, the “Romans
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instructed the Third in the arts of War, and Arminius afterwards used it to defeat his instructors”, the Third being the auxiliary troops that Arminius led.

What can be concluded about these statements was that the first one was done in 1933 in a speech to the public. It was before the elections and Hitler addressed his goal of political unification and how he would accomplish it. His private talks, however, occurred in 1942 around 6 months before the Battle of Stalingrad. This was the peak of German success in the war, and Hitler was confident that he was going to win so he discussed the future with his guests. He focused on education and how the history of Germany should be taught in schools. Therefore, we see that Hitler used Arminius in his speeches and private talks to glorify the history of Germany and to portray himself as the protector of Germany.

Monuments

Monumentalization and how leaders used monuments for political propaganda has also become a common theme in this study. One example of this, as mentioned above, was the statue of Arminius, which was erected in Detmold by Ernst Von Bandel. (Figure 2.1) Ernst Von Bandel was an architect, sculptor, and painter who erected this monument in 1875 after Germany was unified. The statue of Arminius wields a 23-foot sword and stares westwards towards France. Hitler himself visited the monument during his campaigns to recognize the greatness of the German people. The monument was also a sign of authoritarianism and was used by Hitler to show that Germany needed
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a strong leader to unite and protect them. The Germans even associated this monument with their hatred for the French, which was why the statue faced France.

Figure 2.1: Statue of Arminius created in 1875 by Ernst Von Bandel.

**Arminius After the fall of Hitler and the Nazi Party**

After the fall of Hitler and the Nazi Party, the fascination around Arminius quickly dwindled away as his name was contaminated by militant nationalism. The Germans worked so hard to get rid of everything affiliated with Hitler that in 1945, many schools shunned his story and refused to teach it in class. However, interest in Arminius began to reawaken after the discovery of his famous battle was made in the late 1980’s. People began to gain an interest in Arminius, for many of them did not even know who
he was due to his affiliation with Hitler. However, the use of Arminius by Hitler showed us how leaders changed folk hero stories for their own propaganda.

Hitler’s use of Arminius was clearly done to boost his popularity prior to the 1933 general elections. The ability to portray Arminius as the liberator of Germany and compare him to Hitler was useful for Nazi propaganda. However, this brings about an important theme on how leaders changed the image of national folk heroes for their own propagandist use. We see that Hitler portrayed Arminius as a liberator who believed that the Germans should be free of foreign powers. He used Arminius to justify his goal of eliminating the mandates put on Germany by the Treaty of Versailles. He did not speak much about empire to the public, but rather, the safety and strength of the German nation. However, as seen in the Ludendorff postcard, Hitler also emphasized the idea of an empire in his secret meetings, which Arminius fought against. Hitler twisted the image of Arminius to show that the German nation was great and could conquer anyone. Moreover, when we look at how the Romans portrayed Arminius we see that he was seen as a barbarian who fought for the freedom of Germany. Tacitus stated, “undoubtedly the liberator of Germany; a man who, not in infancy as captains and kings before him, but in the high noon of its sovereignty, threw down the challenge to the Roman nation”. He did not desire an empire, as Hitler secretly exploited him for, but rather the independence of his nation. Thus, the use of Arminius by Hitler and the Nazi party demonstrated to us how leaders recreate national folk hero stories for their own political use.
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Chapter 4: Boudicca and The Victorian Era

Boudicca

This chapter will look into the uprising of AD 60 by Queen Boudicca and the Britons. The two main sources I used to get this story derived from Tacitus and Cassius Dio, although Suetonius and other writers have mentioned this revolt as well. Tacitus, as mentioned in earlier chapters, was a Roman senator and historian who recorded this account in his Annals near the end of his life in the second century AD. Cassius Dio was a Roman historian and statesman of Greek origin and was remembered for his book titled Historia Romana, written in the third century AD. What was interesting about both these accounts was that they differ on some minor facts. Tacitus most likely completed his Annals a century before Cassius Dio published his book. Also, Tacitus was only a couple years old when this revolt happened, while Cassius Dio was born nearly a century after. It could be that Cassius Dio used Tacitus’ book as a source but added other sources, which was why his account differed. Regardless, these sources provided us with a detailed understanding of why this revolt happened and its outcome.

Boudicca was the wife of the Icenian king, Prasutagus, who during the conquest of Briton in 43 AD by Claudius, was given an independent kingdom for his loyalty to the Romans. Cassius Dio described Boudicca as tall in stature, “in appearance most terrifying, in the glance of her eye most fierce, and her voice was harsh”. She was also known to wear a large golden necklace and a tunic of many colors. Boudicca and her family had good relations with the Romans up until AD 60 when her kingdom was taken.
over by the Romans. Cassius Dio and Tacitus both offered different reasons for why the relationship between the Iceni and Romans turned sour. Tacitus believed that after Prasutagus wrote down his will and provided an heir that “his kingdom was pillaged by centurions, his household by slaves; as though they had been prizes of war”.\footnote{Tacitus, \textit{Annales}, 14.31 (All translation for Tacitus comes from \url{http://penelope.uchicago.edu/Thayer/e/roman/texts/tacitus/annals/14b*.html})} Relations got so bad that Boudicca was lashed and beaten while the centurions who took over the kingdom violated her daughters. Those who were chief men of the Icenians were stripped of their family estates and titles; the relatives of Prasutagus were enslaved. Tacitus believed that it was for these reasons that Boudicca called for independence from the Romans. Cassius Dio on the other hand never mentioned any of this but rather believed it was financial problems that led to this uprising. He believed that the call for war was made due to “the confiscation of the sums of money that Claudius had given to the foremost Britons”.\footnote{Dio, 62.2} Decianus Catus, the procurator of Briton, declared that these funds must be paid back immediately and used force to get it. Dio also blamed Seneca\footnote{Seneca was a Roman stoic, statesman, and orator during the first 60 years of the Roman Empire.} for this uprising, stating, “In the hope of receiving a good rate of interest, had lent to the islanders 40,000,000 sesterces that they did not want”.\footnote{Dio, 62.2} After that, he forced them to pay him back, with interest, and used excessive force to ensure it.

Despite the two different accounts, Boudicca responded with a call for war against the Romans. She would go around on her chariot, with her two daughters, preaching to the tribesmen that they must unite and expel the invaders. She stated how they have learned “how great a mistake you made in preferring an imported despotism to
your ancestral mode of life, and you have come to realize how much better is poverty with no master than wealth with slavery”.

Boudicca was preaching to her kin that they have experienced life under Roman wealth and prosperity and they have witnessed life without Rome, and life without Rome was far better even if they were poor. After her call for independence, she raised an army of 120,000 soldiers and embarked on vengeance throughout her occupied land.

Boudicca then led her army against the Romans who were missing their commander, Gaius Suetonius Paulinus, who was on an expedition to Mona, an island near Britain. She first went to the city of Camulodunum, present-day Colchester, and attacked the poorly defended city. Boudicca destroyed all that was in her way and forced the Romans to take shelter in in a temple dedicated to Claudius. The siege lasted two days and in the end, no mercy was shown to any Roman. Quintus Petillius Cerialis, the future governor of the region, sent a relief force to remove Boudicca from the occupied city; however, he was greatly defeated and hardly managed to escape alive. The same fate fell upon the people of Verulamium. When Paulinus heard of the massacres, he returned back from Mona and stationed himself in Londinium, present-day London. Realizing that he did not have the numbers to hold the city, he sacrificed the city in order to fight on better terms. When Boudicca arrived at Londinium a great massacre took hold; Cassius Dio and Tacitus recorded the events that occurred. Tacitus stated, “For the enemy neither took captive nor sold into captivity; there was none of the other commerce of war; he was hasty with slaughter and the gibbet”.

Cassius Dio provided a more gruesome account
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of the tragedies that occurred. He stated how they hung up the noblest of women naked and “cut off their breasts and sewed them to their mouths, in order to make the victims appear to be eating them; afterwards they impaled the women on sharp skewers run lengthwise through the entire body”. Alongside these atrocities, seventy to eight thousand Roman citizens and allies were butchered throughout these three cities. It was now time for Paulinus to avenge those who were slaughtered and he chose his battlefield carefully.

When Paulinus returned from his expedition to Mona and heard how large the army of Boudicca was, he desired to withhold any engagement since he did not have the numbers. However, with a shortage of food and pressure from the Britons, he was forced to prepare quickly for a battle against Boudicca. After she sacked three towns, Boudicca continued uniting tribes and was able to form an army of 230,000 men and outnumbered the army of Paulinus. Cassius Dio mentioned how “Paulinus could not extend his line the whole length of hers, for, even if the men had been drawn up only one deep, they would not have reached far enough” Paulinus decided that the best course of action would be to divide his army into three strong divisions so that they can separate the army of Boudicca. The two armies met at Watling Street and a long battle took hold, however, Paulinus managed to be the victor. Tacitus mentioned how no quarter was given to any Briton, male or female, and that “by some accounts, little less than eighty thousand Britons fell, at a cost of some four hundred Romans killed”. During this battle,
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Boudicca died and her cause of death was not fully known. Tacitus reported that she took poison and killed herself while Cassius Dio says that she died from an illness. The Britons mourned deeply for the death of their queen and provided an expensive funeral for her. After this, the emperor Nero\textsuperscript{112} sent troops from Germany to assist Paulinus and all the tribes that sided with Boudicca were destroyed and put ablaze. Therefore, by the year AD 61, the uprising in Briton was pacified and Rome turned the island into a colony again.

Tacitus and Cassius Dio portrayed Boudicca as a strong and fearless ruler, yet they felt embarrassed that a woman can do such harm. Dio states, “Moreover, all this ruin was brought upon the Romans by a woman, a fact which in itself caused them the greatest shame”.\textsuperscript{113} Boudicca was respected as a leader, however, since she was a woman, it was considered embarrassing for Rome to suffer any defeat by her. Dio's account of Paulinus speech, prior to the battle of Watling Street, provided a good understanding of what Paulinus thought of the Britons. Paulinus stated, “Fear not, then, their numbers or their spirit of rebellion; for their boldness rests on nothing more than headlong rashness unaided by arms or training”.\textsuperscript{114} Dio also recorded a speech by Boudicca, which discussed her ability to lead them to war as a woman. She began to compare herself to other women who led nations such as “Messalina once and afterwards Agrippina and now Nero (who, though in name a man, is in fact a woman, as is proved by his singing,
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lyre-playing and beautification of his person). In this speech, which Dio could have possibly omitted, Boudicca compared Nero to a woman because of his effeminate characteristics. However, that does not mean that she believed a woman could not rule but rather that women have and still rule nations. Interestingly enough, the inclusion of this speech by Dio also showed that Nero was not well respected during the Antonine Dynasty. Moving forward, Paulinus believed that the Britons were barbarians who had no proper training and therefore could be defeated regardless of their great numbers. He also described them as ruthless and uncivilized, “it would be better for us to fall fighting bravely than to be captured and impaled, to look upon our own entrails cut from our bodies, to be spitted on red-hot skewers”. Paulinus viewed the Britons as wild beasts who took joy in tormenting their enemies. However, prior to the atrocities that Boudicca committed, she was seen as a liberator and a victim. As mentioned above, both Dio and Tacitus provided details of the crimes committed against Boudicca that led her to revolt in the first place. In the speeches they recorded of her, she discussed unity and freedom. Boudicca stated, “You have learned by actual experience how different freedom is from slavery”. She was preaching how being free and living in poverty was far better than being rich and slaves to Rome’s will. Again, she was preaching independence and could possibly be seen in modern days as an anti-colonialist. Boudicca also preached unity when she stated, “For I consider you all kinsmen, seeing that you inhabit a single island and are called by one common name”. In this speech, Boudicca could be seen as a
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nationalist who was speaking against Roman colonization. However, all of this was pushed to the side after the crimes the Britons committed against innocent civilians. The atrocities committed by the Britons outweighed their cry for unity and independence. Yet, the uprising of Boudicca and her fight for independence was memorable and her name became a symbol of nationalism in later centuries.

**Victorian Era**

One of the key figures in British history that was associated with Boudicca, by writers, was Queen Victoria. Queen Victoria took the throne in 1837 and reigned for 64 years until her death in 1901. Social reforms took place during the Victorian era, including the beginning of feminist movements in England. Her reign also saw a time of revolutionary activity spread across Europe, which led to the installation of a constitutional monarchy in England. Although Queen Victoria and Victorian writers used Boudicca for their own political gains, Boudicca became a symbol for many groups during the Victorian era. Therefore, this chapter will concentrate on how Boudicca was used for imperialism, nationalism, and feminism throughout the Victorian Era.

**Pre-Victorian Boudicca praise**

Prior to the propagandistic use of Boudicca during the Victorian age, Boudicca was remembered in British society in the 1500s during the Tudor era. Polydore Vergil first restored her into British society in his 1534 publication *Angelica Historica*. The book was designed to remember this queen’s military success and heroism against the Roman Empire. Boudicca became a well-liked British character during the Elizabethan age as
well, and she was occasionally included in the Elizabethan lists of Female Worthies.\textsuperscript{119} British men and women created these lists and they included the most laudable women throughout their history. Boudicca was attributed to these lists as a nationalistic symbol that fought for the freedom of England and was most likely used by Elizabeth I to promote the idea that a woman can rule.

Boudicca would begin to fade away up until her revival during the Victorian era; however, she was briefly mentioned again by Ester Sowernam. Sowernam was a pseudonym for a female feminist who used Boudicca to promote feminism and nationalism in the 17\textsuperscript{th} century. She praised the British Queen for defending “the liberty of the Country against the strength of the Romans when they were at their greatest, and made them feel that a woman could conquer them”\textsuperscript{120}. Boudicca was mentioned again in a poem, in 1782, by William Cowper titled \textit{Boadicea: An Ode}. His poem represented British triumph, heroism, and suggested that Boudicca’s actions were precursors to British imperialism, effectively making her an imperial antecedent and hero\textsuperscript{121}. The poem was published during a time of British expansion and imperialism, but also during a time of conflict since it came out following American independence from England and their first conquest of India\textsuperscript{122}. Therefore, we can see how Boudicca was used for feminism, patriotism, and imperialism prior to the Victorian Era.
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Victorian Era Use of Boudicca

After the Elizabethan era, Boudicca fades away from British literature and scholarly work until her reemergence during the Victorian era. The use of Boudicca by Queen Victoria was to link herself to an ancient British figure in order to show her greatness during a time period of nationalism, feminism, imperialism, and political struggle. Queen Victoria used Boudicca in every aspect of her political career and it was of no surprise that supporters of Boudicca always offered a tribute to Queen Victoria, furthering the connection between the first queen of England and the present one. As we will understand why later on in this chapter, by the twentieth century, Boudicca had already become an icon of nationalism, feminism, and imperialism.\(^{123}\)

Like Queen Elizabeth I, Queen Victoria and Victorian writers used Boudicca as a way to promote British nationalism throughout their kingdom. Interestingly enough, when the Victorians adopted Boudicca as a symbol of nationalism, her name changed to Boadicea by the public. Boadicea was inherited from the Victorians and was suggestive of selective myth-making, a real figure altered to become a symbol of British greatness in a Victorian time of empire.\(^ {124}\) Boadicea represented many things; she could be a symbol of maternity, strength, nationalism, or imperialism. Throughout the Victorian era, many writers began talking about ancient British heroes and Boudicca’s popularity began to rise again. In many books, they used Boadicea because she was the recreated version of Boudicca. For example, during the late Victorian era, a series of books to teach children about English heroes in antiquity were published. These included C. Merivale’s *School
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History of Rome (1877), A.J Church’s Stories from English History: From Julius Caesar to the Black Prince (1895), and G.A Henty’s Beric the Briton (1893). In these, Boudicca was not portrayed as a chieftain but rather a patriotic hero and the defender of Britain against those who wished to conquer the island. She was considered a nationalistic symbol that stood for British nationalism, as well as imperialism. Therefore, Boudicca (I will use this form to spell her name) could be transformed into any type of symbol during the Victorian era. However, she was considered a British patriot who believed in nationalism and British independence in many books as mentioned above.

Queen Victoria believed that by linking herself to Boudicca she would also be able to promote British patriotic nationalism in her empire. An interesting fact, however, Boudicca translates into modern-day Victoria, which Victoria may have used to associate herself with this legend. The connection between Victoria and Boudicca was popular among her supporters, which was why shortly after she became queen the artist Selous painted a portrait of a bare-breasted Boudicca in her armor, addressing her soldiers before battle. This painting was meant to honor Victoria as the new queen of England and promote nationalism. Boudicca has become a nationalistic figure by Victorian writers, even to the point that they used Boudicca as a way to obliterate the memory of being conquered by a foreign power and how they will never be slaves. Now that we see how Victorian writers used Boudicca, let us understand why Boudicca was being portrayed as a nationalistic hero during this time.
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One major problem that Queen Victoria had to deal with during her reign was the rise of a certain political ideology that would remove her from all power, the idea of a constitutional monarchy. One could consider the first step towards a constitutional monarchy to be the Magna Carta, delivered to King John in 1215. This was an attempt to limit the powers of the king by requiring the approval of Parliament before any decision. Although it was not truly successful, the feelings surrounding the Magna Carta arose from time to time, and then notably again during the reign of Queen Victoria.

Revolutionary feelings towards a constitutional monarchy rose all across Europe after the Third French Revolution. Like most monarchs, Queen Victoria did not wish to give up her power and this could be a reason why writers who supported Victoria connected her to Boudicca. Although gender did not play a role in these revolutions across Europe, perhaps the fact that Victoria was a woman could have sped up her removal from power. However, in order to fight this possibility, an increase in literature involving Boudicca swept throughout the empire of Queen Victoria. In order to promote nationalism and the glory of England, supporters of Victoria used Boudicca as a way to show that a woman can hold absolute power and be successful. Ten to twelve books were published yearly about Boudicca and other strong women from the 1850s to 1870s; books such as World Noted Women, Heroines of History, and Brave Women. Despite their attempt to promote nationalism through Boudicca, a revitalized constitutional monarchy took shape in England making Queen Victoria the last royal family member to have absolute power in England. On a side note, Queen Victoria did work with those who wanted a constitutional

monarchy and it could be that she did this so that she does not lose all her wealth, as well as her power, as was done to the monarchs in France. Hence, the use of Boudicca by Queen Victoria and her supporters was a symptom of nationalism throughout England, even though it did not stop the rise of a constitutional monarchy.

**Imperialism**

The British Empire at the time of Queen Victoria was one of the largest empires the world had ever seen, and by the end of her reign, she controlled a quarter of the world. She was portrayed as the heir to all Boudicca has accomplished by writers, despite being defeated by the Romans. Just like Queen Elizabeth used Boudicca as a symbol of imperialism, Victorian writers took her and made her a symbol of British imperialism over the colonial world. Her story was used to exploit the anti-colonialism sentiment around Europe and England at the time. The use of Boudicca by writers during the Victorian era countered the idea of Roman domination over Britain and projected nationalism and imperialism into British literature. Victorians believed that Boudicca was an example of British hegemony and used her in their writing to promote it. One example of this was a book by Marie Trevelyan titled *Britain’s Greatness Foretold* in 1900. This book was a fictional novel, which possessed an ancient Druid character that predicted the defeat of Boudicca and the rise of the British nation and empire. The book was meant to support British imperialism at its prime, and although it was near the end of Victoria’s reign, it showed how Boudicca represented imperialism in England.
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With the rise of a constitutional monarchy in England, imperialism played an important role in shaping the image of Victoria across the world. With the death of Prince Albert, it was possible that Victoria began to lose support among the people because Albert was seen as well respected advisor to Victoria. If Victorian writers were able to promote British imperialism in a positive way then they were promoting Victoria, since she was the leader of their empire. This could have been used to help build up her reputation and power throughout England and their colonial world. However, this interpretation of Boudicca by the Victorians was very ironic, and as we will see later, was heavily criticized in England later on.

**Feminism and the Suffragist Movement**

One movement in British society that began during the Victorian era was the rise of the feminist movement. Despite a male-dominated society, as mentioned above, many books depicting strong female characters appeared during the Victorian era. However, one of the major arguments against the feminist movement was “The Woman Question”. This section will discuss feminism and the Suffragist movement in Victorian England and how Boudicca played a role in this movement.

A debate around the Feminist movement swept throughout Victorian England questioning the role of women in social and political life. Already, feminists during this time period began writing books about this topic, such as John Stuart Mill's *The Subjection of Women* (1869). These authors, as well as, many other authors who wrote about women during this time, shared a fundamental theory: the human attributes of men
and women and the social injustice women go through on a daily basis.\textsuperscript{131} During this time period, many people looked towards powerful women to use in their books and Boudicca becomes a very famous one. She was the full representation of how a woman can adopt any role and do it well. The “Woman Question”, as Queen Victoria called it, involved group debates about the physical nature, political capacity, the morality of women, and their place in society.\textsuperscript{132} One of the reasons this question came to form was due to the Feminist movement and the complaints about limitations on education, property, and their status in marriage and family.

The first theory on the “Women Question” was known as the Victorian view because Queen Victoria supported it. The Victorian era was characterized as the age of the home, which was epitomized by Queen Victoria herself who came to represent family, motherhood, and class.\textsuperscript{133} The popular Victorian image of the ideal woman and wife came to be known as the “Angel in the House”. The Angel was expected to be devoted to her husband, seem passive, powerless, meek, charming, graceful, sympathetic, pure, and pious.\textsuperscript{134} This concept of the “Angel in the House” became the recommended view towards the role of women and how they should act. The second ideological take on this question was known as the “Separate Sphere” theory. This model dictated that the only proper place for a respectable woman was in the home, providing care to her husband and children. To supporters of the Separate Sphere theory, fertility was Gods mission and it was no surprise that their ideal woman, Queen Victoria, had 9 children. Although it may
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seem that Queen Victoria was a symbol and supporter of the housewife, feminists used Boudicca and Victoria as a way to show women excellence throughout history.

Despite the “woman question” being entirely sexist, it turned out to be beneficial in the early reign of the Victorian era because it allowed women to engage in political and social debates. It was during these debates that the use of Boudicca becomes relevant because feminist strained the idea that British women from the earliest times were treated with respect and equality. Their goal was to produce evidence that British women were always respected and given an opinion in society. Feminist writers recognized the political importance of history and began rewriting history to incorporate the roles played by women that were hidden due to a patriarchal society. Books such as *Woman in the Nineteenth Century* (1845), *Discourse on Women* (1849), and *The Destructive Male* (1868). All these books were written to expose the roles women played in history and to emphasize the necessity of women in politics. Literature contributed a lot to the feminist movement, in which female authors often took pseudonyms when they wrote because it allowed them to express their views on political and social problems without any sexual biases.

The rise of Boudicca as an imperial icon attracted the Suffragists and was quickly adopted by them. Her popularity made her a figure known throughout the country and the Suffragists used her to attack the male-dominated society. Women looked towards Boudicca because she was someone who led an army of men, if she can do that then
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women can vote. Feminist writers during the late Victorian era often considered Boudicca to be the first British heroine for her ability to convince early Britons to rebel against the Romans. The reason feminists looked back towards Boudicca was because they understood the political importance of history and these feminists wished to rewrite history in order to reveal the importance of women in politics. Although they were not entirely successful, their movement and use of Boudicca set the foundation for feminist and suffragists in the future.

**Monuments**

In 1850 Sir Morton Peto commissioned a statue of Boudicca to be created and erected in England. He chose John Thomas to create the statue and by 1855 it was completed. The statue consisted of Boudicca with a sword in her hand; she was raising it as if she was declaring war for the crimes committed against her family. To the side of her were her two daughters who were portrayed as cowardly and hiding behind their mother. The statue was erected in Birmingham in 1856, however, people confused John Thomas as John Evan Thomas, the Wales sculptor, and many years later the statue was removed and now stands in the Brecknock Museum in Brecon, Wales. (Figure 2.2)

Another reason this statue was moved to Wales could possibly be due to Welsh fascination with their Celtic origin. Like Portugal and Spain, both the British and Welsh considered Boudicca to be part of their culture. Although I will not go into this in detail, if you are interested in this topic I recommend you read *Drych y Pryf Oesoedd (A Mirror of the First Ages)* by Theophilus Evans.
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Again in 1884, Thomas Thornycroft created a statue of Boudicca to honor Queen Victoria, however, he did not erect the statue while he was alive. It was not until 1902, after the death of Victoria, that his son Sir William Hamo Thornycroft had it erected right by the Palace of Westminster and Big Ben. (Figure 2.3) The statue was made out of bronze and had Boudicca with a spear in her right hand and a crown on her head. She was riding in a chariot and beside her were her daughters. Her daughters were bare-breasted and they are seated close to Boudicca, however, they are not holding any reins to control the horse.

When looking into these two statues with more analysis we could assume that Boudicca’s children represented the British people. The daughters of Boudicca were raped and beaten by the Romans, as mentioned above, and it was possible that they symbolized the weakness of the British people. Boudicca on the other hand could have symbolized the British monarchy, or Victoria, who would guide the British people and protect them from their enemies. Regardless, the purpose of these statues, as mentioned above, was most likely done to glorify Queen Victoria and England, as well as Boudicca, who had become very popular throughout Victorian England.
Figure 2.2: This is the Statue created by John Thomas that now stands in the Brecknock Museum in Brecon, Wales. Picture taken from http://www.brecknocksoociety.co.uk/images/boadicea.jpg
Figure 2.3: Statue of Boadicea and Her Daughters by Thomas Thornycroft. Picture taken from https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Boadicea_and_Her_Daughters
The use of Boudicca by Queen Victoria and Victorian writers was done to portray her as a symbol of nationalism and imperialism. We see that they recreated her legacy and changed it in order to exploit her politically. When comparing this to Roman accounts, Boudicca was represented as a liberator who wished to free Briton from the Romans. It could be assumed that she was anti-imperialists, which was why the use of her by the Victorians contradicted everything she believed in. Boadicea, on the other hand, was the recreated version of Boudicca shaped during the Victorian era. Boadicea represented the culture of England at the time because she represented the alteration of Boudicca by leaders and parties who wanted to exploit her. If we look into how Boudicca was portrayed more recently, we can see in an article from the “Independent” by Nick Gilbert that Boudicca had become a poster girl for British intolerance and nationalism. Although the article was written in 2010, it may still be relevant to the foreign affair issues England deals with today. Gilbert brings forth the idea that Boadicea was a made up version of Boudicca during the Victorian Era that represented radical imperialism and nationalism. Gilbert stated, “She represents the now outdated mentality that our island is our castle and those who come here from abroad are to be repelled”.¹⁴⁰ It was of no surprise that Britons today believed that her image has been tainted into a figure that represented radical nationalism and ironic imperialism. They see her as an anti-foreign symbol, which promoted British hegemony and looks down upon other cultures as

inferior. Despite negative thoughts toward Boudicca today, the Victorians redefined her image into one that represented radical nationalism and imperialism for their own political gains.
Chapter 5: Decebalus and the Protochronism Movement

Decebalus

This chapter will look into the military struggle between Decebalus and the Romans from AD 86 to AD 106 and how Decebalus became a legend in Romania centuries after. All accounts of this story were derived from Cassius Dio and his book titled *Historia Romana*, although, there are other accounts of this story like the Column of Trajan. The Column of Trajan was a triumphal column erected by Trajan in AD 113 to celebrate his victory over the Dacians. His column portrayed scenes of his conquest including a few battle scenes, the creation of a magnificent bridge and other events. As mentioned above, Dio was an important and influential statesman under the Severan Dynasty and it was around this time (c. AD 205) that he began writing his histories. He included the story of Decebalus in epitome 67 and 68, starting with his war with Domitian.

In AD 86, the Dacians under their general, Decebalus, attacked the Roman province of Moesia and won a decisive victory against the Romans. Hearing of the news, the Emperor Domitian led an expedition against the Dacians. He took hold in Moesia and reorganized the army and their defenses. At this time, Decebalus became king of the Dacians and hearing that the Domitian landed in Moesia offered a peace treaty to the Romans. However, Domitian sent Cornelius Fuscus with a large army to deal with this new threat. When Decebalus was informed that instead of peace Domitian sent a large force to attack him, he sent an embassy to him with an insulting proposal. He declared that he would make peace with the emperor, with one condition however, that “every
Roman should elect to pay two obols to Decebalus each year".\footnote{Dio, Cassius, Historia Romana, 67.6 (Translation For Dio comes from http://penelope.uchicago.edu/Thayer/e/roman/texts/cassius_dio/67*.html)} Declining the proposal, Fuscus crossed the Danube in AD 86 and confronted Decebalus’ army. He was defeated and instead of sending another army to fight Decebalus, Domitian led a war against the Quadi and the Marcomani because they did not assist him against the Dacians.\footnote{Dio, 67.7} Domitian was defeated and on his way back to Rome he sent messengers to Domitian seeking a truce and offered to send embassies in order to set up the terms of the treaty. Decebalus accepted and sent Diegis to discuss the terms; in return, Decebalus was promised kingship over his region, was given a large sum of money, and was promised to receive large sums of money in the future.\footnote{Dio, 67.7} Thus the war between the Romans and Decebalus was over until its resurrection in AD 101.

After the murder of Domitian in AD 96, war with Decebalus was postponed until Trajan took power in Rome. After he restored order in Rome, Trajan set out on a campaign against the Dacians in AD 101. The reason Trajan started up the war again was that he took into the account the deeds done by Decebalus and he was upset about the amount of money the Dacians were receiving annually.\footnote{Dio, 67.7} When hearing about this, Decebalus was frightened because he understood Trajan was a good military commander, unlike Domitian. He sent embassies to the Senate in Rome hoping that they could seek peace, however, it did not stop Trajan from attacking them. In AD 102, Trajan set course to Tapae, where Decebalus was encamped and a fierce battle took hold. Dio mentioned
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how prior to the battle, his allies from the region sent a large mushroom with Latin characters written on it advising “Trajan to turn back and keep the peace”.\textsuperscript{145} Ignoring this and engaging anyway, Trajan was victorious, however, the casualties on both sides were numerous. Accompanying Trajan in this battle was his general Julianus, who after defeating Decebalus, chased down Decebalus to his capital, Sarmisegetusa. Fearing that the Romans would sack his capital, Decebalus “cut down the trees that were on the site and put armor on the trunks, in order that the Romans might take them for soldiers and so be frightened and withdraw”\textsuperscript{146} and this actually happened. After the battle was over and Trajan believed it was safe to leave the region, he returned to Rome in AD 102. While he was in Rome, he discussed terms of surrender with the Dacian representatives and the Senate. Decebalus was to surrender his arms, engines and engine-makers, give back any Roman deserters that took refuge in his kingdom, demolish any forts he created, and to withdraw from any captured territories.\textsuperscript{147} After the terms were agreed upon, Trajan celebrated a triumph and was given the title Dacicus.

After the treaty was signed and the embassies of Decebalus returned to Dacia, Decebalus continued to break the terms agreed upon by his men and the Senate. He even annexed a portion of Roman territory, Iazyges, and refused to give it back. It was at this point, in AD 105, that the Senate declared Decebalus as an enemy and Trajan returned to Dacia to conduct the war. Decebalus, however, was having problems recruiting men since many Dacians joined the side of Trajan. Again he sued for peace; however, he was unwilling to meet with Trajan personally and refused to set down his arms. Trajan
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declined his motion for peace and set camp in Moesia. Decebalus then resorted to, with
deceit and craft, to have Trajan killed in Moesia. He sent Roman deserters to Moesia
hoping that they would be admitted to a conference with Trajan and murder him.
However, one of the deserters was arrested on suspicion and after being tortured revealed
their entire plot.\textsuperscript{148} Decebalus then sent an invitation to Longinus, a leader of the Roman
army, and persuaded him to meet in order to create a peace between them. Longinus
accepted the invitation and when he met Decebalus was captured and put under question
publically.\textsuperscript{149} Longinus refused to speak and Decebalus sent word to Trajan that he would
kill Longinus unless his land was returned to him and the sums of the war were paid back
to him. Trajan responded with an ambiguous answer, trying to delay the death of
Longinus. However, one night, Longinus sent a freedman with a letter to Trajan telling
him that he was going to commit suicide rather then embarrass the emperor. After the
freedman left the camp, Longinus drank the poison at night and died.\textsuperscript{150} After receiving
the letter from the freedman, Trajan began his march towards Sarmisegetusa in the
summer of AD 106. He built a magnificent bridge over the Ister River\textsuperscript{151}, which Dio
believed was Trajan’s greatest accomplishment.\textsuperscript{152} After crossing the bridge, Trajan
attacked the capital and defeated Decebalus. When Decebalus knew that the battle was
lost, he committed suicide and his head was brought back to Rome.\textsuperscript{153}
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The Romans portrayed Decebalus as a sneaky and dangerous man, which they saw as fair for the crimes he committed. He planned the murder of Trajan as well as Longinus and nearly succeeded in his attempts. He also disobeyed the peace terms set by the Romans countless times throughout his engagement with them. However, the Romans consider him a successful general and called him “an expert in ambuscades and a master in pitched battles”.\textsuperscript{154} Despite the Romans hatred towards barbarians, these statements are true because Decebalus has been a menace to the Romans since AD 86. Therefore, the Romans portrayed Decebalus as devious and untruthful, however, they respect him as a military commander.

**Protochronism Movement in Romania**

This section will look into the Protochronism movement in Romania and how the leaders of this country more or less invented a glorified past to promote nationalism and ensure political legitimacy. It will also explore the early ideologies of Protochronism, the rise of Communism in Romania, and the switch from Romanian Communism to Romanian Nationalism. However, this case study differs from the rest in one aspect, the Protochronism movement looked towards the past not only to glorify Ancient Romania and stir nationalism, but also to show the significance of Romania to the western world.

**What was the Protochronism Movement and Autochthonism?**

Before going into the Protochronism movement in Romania let us first define what Protochronism was in order to truly understand it. Protochronism derives from the ancient Greek term for *first in time*, “describing the tendency to ascribe an idealized past
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In simpler terms, the term was meant to aggrandize the Dacians as the real ancestors of the Romanian people. This term was also referred to as Dacology or Thracology. The term Protochronism was launched in 1974 by comparativist Edgar Papu and was originated as a concept of literary theory. The goal of Protochronism was to prove that the Dacians had a major part to play in ancient history and that they were culturally advanced prior to other cultures such as ancient Egypt, Greece, and Rome. In fact, as we will discuss in more detail later when we examine Nicholae Densusian, many Protochronists believed that the founders of Rome were Dacian migrants. It was during this time that followers of the Protochronism movement began to study and learn about Decebalus, who they believed worked together with the Romans, despite our ancient sources to the contrary. The theory of Protochronism was related to the ancient Greek term Autochthonism, which was the theory that a particular race or people are indigenous to a certain place. In ancient Greece, autochthonism was used as a way to spurn bastards and foreigners. This theory, adopted by the Protochronists, denied any mixed ancestry within the Dacian community. It was also used in Romania as a counterargument to the idea that Romania only became culturally significant after it became a colony of Rome. Now that we have a basic understanding of Protochronism, let us look into the early ideologies of Protochronism prior to the rise of the Soviet Union and communism in Romania.

Protochronism Prior to WWII: Nicholae Densusian

Nicholae Densusian was a Transylvanian and Romanian ethnologist who wrote a book titled *Prehistoric Dacia*, which was published posthumously in 1913. The goal of his book was to reveal the importance of Ancient Dacia to the world. His thesis stated that around “6,000 BC Dacia had been the center of a world empire incorporating Europe, the Mediterranean, Egypt, North Africa, and a good part of Asia”. He believed that during this time all the major civilizations that were to form were all influenced by Dacian hegemony. “It was from here, between the Danube and the Carpathians, that civilization flowed out over the whole world. It was from here too that the Romans’ ancestors set out for Italy.” Densusian claimed that the Roman founders came from Dacia and tried to prove his point through language and archeology. He believed that it was not the Dacians who took up Latin but rather the Romans who took up the Dacian language. Densusian does not just think that the Romans spoke ancient Dacian, but that all the Romance languages derived from Dacia. In order to verify his point, he used the column of Trajan to try to prove that “the Dacians and Romans engaged in dialogue without interpreters, thus proving that they could make themselves understood perfectly while speaking their respective languages”. However, there are very few Dacian words that are known today and they show no resemblance to Latin. His book was looked down upon by all western historians and seen as an attempt to foster Romanian nationalism. This attempt to promote nationalism could be due to the fact that Romania became independent of the Ottoman Empire in 1877, and was looking for a new  
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identity. The rejection of Roman influence and the enforcement of Dacian hegemony by Nicholae Densusian could be seen as the first attempt to prove how important Romania was among the earliest civilizations. As it turns out, Densusian was the grandfather of the Protochronism movement, which would revive in full force by 1974.

Figure 2.4: Pictures of Decebalus on Trajan’s Column in Rome. Pictures were taken from http://www.trajans-column.org/?page_id=866
Lovinescu’s 1924-25 Theory of “Synchronism”

Eugen Lovinescu was another Romanian historian who believed that Romania was underestimated with respect to its origins. In 1924 Lovinescu developed the theory of “Synchronism”, which was the theory that in order for the continuation of modernization Romania must be synchronized with the West through the mass adoption of western institutions, practices, and ethics that reflect “the spirit of the time”. He believed that in order for Europe to continue its modernization process it would need to incorporate Romania more fully into it. When looking into why he developed this theory it is important to note that many western countries believed that Romania was not capable of modernizing or adapting to western culture and science. Yet, Lovinescu argued, since the first half of the nineteenth-century, the introduction of Western capitalism had been the driving force behind Romanian modernization. Despite Lovinescu’s passion and hope for his country, Romania was still, in many ways, a backward society that was not ready for western modernization. Yet, he believed that the Romanians were a dominant race and that over time, through the imitation of western laws and practices (i.e synchronization); it would prove its worth. In 1943 Lovinescu died, as did most interest in his ideas, and it would not be until 1974 that his theory would return as a motivation and an early foundation to the new Protochronism movement.

These early ideologies attempted to promote Romanian nationalism and importance to the rest of the world. While Densusian preached a radical thought towards Romanian importance, Lovinescu understood that Romania needed to work with the rest
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of the world in order to modernize. Both these nationalists became essential to the revitalized Protochronism Movement in 1974. However, with the rise of the Soviet Union, all nationalistic ideologies were abandoned when communism first took control of Romania. Thus, these early movements withered away in Romania by 1947.

**Rise of Communism and Romanian Nationalism Prior to Ceaușescu Regime**

The rise of the Soviet Union following the Bolshevik Revolution of 1917 started a period of communist hegemony over Eastern Europe. The Stalinization of Romania began in 1948 after the communist party in Romania seized power through propaganda and violence.\(^{163}\) In December 1947, the communist forced King Mihai Hohenzollern to abdicate and founded the Romanian Popular Republic. However, there were divisions amongst the Romanian Communist Party, and in 1948 Romania became a one-party system under the Romanian Workers Party and Soviet influence. The RWP controlled all media and public institutions in order to push Soviet and communist interests.\(^{164}\) During the early years of the new republic, the government began to institute cultural politics as a way to control the intellectual fields and the entire Romanian society with it. Cultural politics was the process of connecting political aims to a culture. In the case of Romania, they advocated that Romania only became culturally significant when they adopted communism. In order to make this possible, they created new institutions that would laud communism and the glory of the Soviet Union in all academic fields. The goal was to create a new national identity connecting Romania to communism and Marxism-
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Leninism. They began to collect documents on the history of the Communist Party and the Workers movement in each republic, provided a history of the party and the new republic, established books and articles discussing the revolutionary movement in Romania and the overthrow of King Mihai, and translated all works by Karl Marx and Lenin. By taking over the academic field they were capable of creating a new Romanian identity that sprung out from Soviet Communism. However, tension amongst the party began to rise as two groups began to fight over what could be published in the academic field. Since the party had complete control over the education system only certain writings could be published in order to follow the agenda of cultural politics. The two groups that were dissatisfied in particular were the historians and the veterans. Historians were essential to political legitimacy because they rewrote Romanian history to legitimize the new communist regime; however, the veterans outnumbered them and were loud in their dissent against Stalinism. It was at this point where a switch in cultural politics took hold in Romania.

From 1959-1964 a transition from Soviet-type communism to national communism took place in Romania. The leader of the party at this time was Gheorghe Gheorghiu-Dej and his goal was to promote anti-Stalinism, Leninism, and nationalism. With the rise of anti-Stalinism and the multiple challenges it created throughout the world, Gheorghiu-Dej began to assert his assurance that Stalinism would be eradicated under his leadership. He began to attack Khrushchev openly and started an anti-Stalinist movement throughout Romania. His first opportunity to break off ties with the Soviet
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Union occurred when Mao Zedong and China openly went against the Soviet Union.\footnote{Zavatti (2016) 165} Being that the Soviet leaders chose to disregard the complaints of the Romanians, mistrust between the two nations matured into open tension in 1963 when the Romanians openly sympathized with China in the columns of the \textit{World Marxist Review}.\footnote{Zavatti (2016) 167} The \textit{World Marxist Review} was a theoretical journal that produced Communist content from worker parties around the world. The comments made by the Romanians, as well as their mistrust towards the Soviet Union, brought about an open clash between Romania and the Soviet Union, which led to the declaration of autonomy by Romania in 1964. In the declaration, the RWP presented itself as anti-Stalinist, pro-Leninist, striving for communist unity, and supportive of the national road to communism, which they believed required the respect of different forms of communism.\footnote{Zavatti (2016) 168} At this point, a switch towards a nationalistic Romanian communism took place in order to prove that Romanian communism was unique in its own way.

The first step towards a new national ideology was to produce new books and articles to reshape the minds of the Romanian people. The Party History Institute was given the specific task of researching the history of Romania, mainly the history of the worker’s movement and the Party.\footnote{Zavatti (2016) 168} Gheorghiu-Dej gradually allowed the Academy historians to reconstruct the national past in order to exploit it politically, stating that the party was the protector of national culture. This movement would be endorsed fully by
Nicholae Ceaușescu after 1965. During this time period the veterans who were being contained, and in some cases, silenced due to their anti-Stalinist viewpoints were now reconsidered and reevaluated for their prestige and important contribution to the development of national culture. This recognition by the RWP emphasized national ideology and defended itself against party propagandist who strove to exert dominance over the intellectual field. However, many party propagandists were still sturdy supporters of the Soviet Union, which could be a reason why the veterans were given a new opportunity in the first place. This new movement symbolized a full reevaluation of the most prominent individuals in Romanian history. It was a new turn in cultural politics that shifted toward Romanian nationalism against the Party propagandists who remained loyal to Stalinist-style communism.

**Protochronism During Ceaușescu regime**

In March 1965, Gheorghe Gheorghiu-Dej died of natural causes and an opening for a successor was to be decided between two candidates. At the 9th Party Congress in July 1965, the decision to choose a successor was to take place between a reformer, Ion Gheorghe Maurer, and the Party favorite, Nicholae Ceaușescu. The goal of this congress was to choose a successor collectively; however, Nicholae Ceaușescu and his allies managed to win the election and Ceaușescu managed to impose himself as the single unquestioned leader. Within two years he succeeded in obtaining complete power and cleansing himself and his party from the crimes committed under Gheorghiu-Dej.
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Despite Gheorghiu-Dejs attempt to eradicate Stalinism at the end of his political career, he initially gained power through terror, military force, and forged his regime into an obedient and Stalinist-state machine.\textsuperscript{176} Ceauşescu used this to his advantage and had his historians and propagandists portray Gheorghiu-Dej, and his political partners, as enemies of the state. By 1968 he was in full control of the domestic situation, having shunned all his political enemies and any connection to Gheorghiu-Dej. From the very beginning of his regime, he wanted to present himself as reasonable, nationalistic, and open-minded.\textsuperscript{177} Despite his attempt to further himself away from the old regime, he followed the same anti-Soviet ideology and began a redirection in cultural politics.

His goal was to promote Romanian nationalism and to emphasize that all the problems in Romania were due to its Soviet tutors. He called for a rehabilitation of the nineteenth-century as well as the interwar history, and he stressed the necessity to return to universal history.\textsuperscript{178} It was during this time that he issued a rewritten history of the Party and began a more nationalistic version of Romanian history. Moreover, Ceauşescu made sure that in the new Party history that anyone who was affiliated with Gheorghiu-Dej was to be seen as a traitor. Ceauşescu’s necessity to obtain legitimacy led to this rewritten Party history. After this he shifted his focus to ancient Dacia and the importance of Romania throughout history.

In the early years of Romania, after her independence from the Ottoman Empire, they compared their history to the Roman Empire. The hero of Romania was the Emperor Trajan, who they believed brought civilization to Romania. However, during the
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Ceaușescu regime, ideology switched and the true hero to Romania was Decebalus. It was during this time period that many historical figures reemerged into Romanian society and Decebalus was the most important of them all.\textsuperscript{179} He was seen as a true Dacian hero who brought together Dacia and Rome, making Rome stronger and better. This new ideology took form and reignited the Protochronism movement throughout Romania. The goal of this new movement was to promote Romanian nationalism and independence, believing that the Romanian people have been great for millenniums and therefore do not need the support of foreign countries such as the Soviet Union. According to some scholars, “Decebalus helps the Romanians to forget that Romania has been in existence only since 1859.”\textsuperscript{180} Being that Romania was a new country, they needed to create a local hero to unite the country behind, just like Germany did with Arminius after their unification in the mid 19th century.

His goal to promote nationalism and Romanian dominance was advertised throughout the nation through propaganda and scholarly publications. Ceaușescu published a monthly magazine, \textit{Magazin Istoric}, which dealt with the history of Romania, the archaeology of the Mediterranean, and universal history. The magazine was used as an instrument of patriotism, presenting the greatness of Romania and Romanian socialism. \textit{Magazin Istoric} was a popular review of history, but, in reality, it was thoroughly supervised by the propaganda committee, allowing information that only promoted Romanian nationalism.\textsuperscript{181} It was in these magazine articles that radical ideology about Romanian hegemony was produced. This movement by Ceaușescu was
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part of an effort to reconstruct national identity and to speak out against Soviet control. In
order to shift away from the old regime and the Soviet Union, Ceauşescu needed to
change the mindset of the Romanian people in order to show that he was anti-Soviet and
pro-Romanian, therefore, he used nationalism as way to establish political legitimacy.

A character that played an important role in the revival of the Protochronism
movement and the shift towards Romanian dominance and nationalism was Edgar Papu.
Edgar Papu was a Romanian scholar and professor who became famous for his book in
1974 titled *The Romanian Protochronism*. While his initial goal was to describe an
essential trait of Romanian literature, his book quickly shifted into a basic theory
describing the Romanian image and values to the rest of the world.\(^{182}\) His concept of
Protochronism derived from Lovinescu’s theory of Synchronism. Papu wished to
challenge the widespread belief that Romanian literature was marginal and backward
when compared to the west.\(^{183}\) However, the movement did not move into full effect until
Nicholae Ceauşescu recognized Papu’s work. It was at this moment that a reemergence of
all ancient Romanian literature took place and Protochronism was applied to all domains
of knowledge.\(^ {184}\) Edgar Papu wished to change the self-image that Romanians had of
themselves in order to inspire his people that they were always a great nation. However,
his theory began to take a radical turn when Ceauşescu used this movement for his own
propaganda and political gain. Papu was also willing to work with Ceauşescu to develop
a new cultural and political ideology that shifted away from the negative view of
Romania, held by the West, and to fight those who opposed the Protochronism
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movement. By gaining the support of Ceaușescu, the Protochronist were the only people who could produce any type of history or literature, and they were seen as the protectors of Romanian culture. Because of this image, they were influential in the new regime for they had the ears of the common people. Many scholars, however, criticized the Protochronism movement as a corrupt and power-hungry movement that solidified their own political agenda by delegitimizing anyone outside their group as anti-Romanian. Nevertheless, after Edgar Papus book, the Protochronism movement was introduced to Romania and ultimately controlled all aspects of Romanian history and literature.

**Tyranny of the Protochronism Movement**

Romania experienced a wave of tyranny after the Protochronism movement took hold during the Ceaușescu regime. Being that the Protochronists were seen as the protectors of Romania and were the only ones allowed to write and authorize new literature and histories, many people began to write literature that would please the Protochronists. This attempt to please the Protochronists had been linked to patriotism, and competition among these “patriots” followed. People assumed that their discourse about the past would improve their present position in the cultural and political hierarchy. Therefore, everyone began creating histories that linked Romania to greatness. It was during this time that ancient figures reappeared into Romanian society such as Decebalus and the idea that the Dacians civilized and helped Rome become great. Anyone who opposed the Protochronist ideology could be considered a traitor and could
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be exiled or killed by the regime. This oppression was exceptionally brutal against those who were thought to be loyal to the Soviets. Literature was censored to anything that did not meet the Protochronists agenda. Ceaușescu used the Protochronists to push his political agenda and to eliminate any of his political enemies through propaganda created by the Protochronists. It was due to this subjugation that the Protochronism movement was heavily criticized by historians who saw the movement as an opportunity for Ceaușescu to exploit radical ideology for his own political gains. This was why many historians used to believe that the Protochronism movement died in 1989 with the death of Ceaușescu because it was so closely associated with him. But it did not.

**Iosif Constantin Dragan**

Iosif Constantin Dragan was born on June 20, 1917, in Romania and obtained his Ph.D. in law in Italy. While in Italy he started his own energy business (Butan Gas) that made him the richest person in Romania with a net worth of $1.6 billion. In 1967 he started the “European Foundation Dragan”, which was created to promote the values of Romanian civilization. Dragan was a strong believer in the Protochronism movement and he created his own television network, radio network, and private university that he would use to push Protochronist ideology. He was well known for his collaboration with Nicholae Ceaușescu to promote Protochronism. He believed that Romania was the cradle of western civilization and that the Romanian people were the oldest in Europe. As part of his support of Protochronism, he decided to commission the creation of a colossal monument to Decebalus in 1994.
In 1985 he chose the flint-stoned rock to be sculpted, which was located 128 m high in the mountains directly above an area known as the Iron Gorge. (Figure 2.5) The final product would be a bust of King Decebalus, modeled in some respect after his depiction on the Column of Trajan in Rome. It was assumed that he chose this site because Roman artifacts, left behind by Emperor Trajan, surrounded it. Not too far from the statue was the location of the bridge Trajan built to cross the Danube River, which was destroyed by Emperor Hadrian to prevent barbarians from crossing it. The Tabula Traiana, a Roman memorial plaque dedicated to Trajan’s bridge, was located on the site where the bridge would have been. (Figure 2.6) Additionally, Dragan brought in an Italian sculptor, Mario Galeotti, to oversee the project and start working in 1993. The project took ten years to complete and the workmen worked for six hours a day in two shifts from March to October. The dimensions of the statue are differently estimated, depending on where you assume the statue ends; it was between 38 to 55 m, but some estimates make it the largest stone monument in Europe.\footnote{“A Romanian Rushmore on the Danube Gorges Honoring the King of Dacians.”\textit{Webphoto.ro}, 12 Apr. 2012, www.webphoto.ro/romania/a-romanian-rushmore-on-the-danube-gorges-honoring-the-king-of-dacians.html. Pg 1} In the year 2,000, a commemorative plaque beneath the sculpture was completed. The plaque was written in Latin and stated, “DECEBALUS REX DRAGAN FECIT”, which means “King Decebalus. Dragan made it”. The choice to use Latin also brings curiosity to the mind, as if Dragan was leaving his mark on the world like emperors and kings before him. Being that it was a universal language, many leaders used Latin to commemorate a monument, such as the Statue of Liberty. Furthermore, this monument endorses Protochronist
ideology, after the death of Nicholae Ceaușescu, by promoting Decebalus as a national hero whose ancestors were the initiators of western civilization.
Figure 2.5: Statue of Decebalus funded by Iosif Constatin Dragan. Picture taken from http://www.ancient-origins.net/ancient-places-europe/colossal-head-decebalus-king-dacians-002840
The Protochronism movement provided us with an understanding of how Romanian leaders used nationalism and local heroes to hold power. In order for Nicholae Ceaușescu and the Protochronists to establish political legitimacy, they used nationalism and cultural politics. In doing so, they rewrote the national history of the Romanian people, revived ancient Dacian history, and used fear and oppression to try and manipulate not just their citizens but also the whole world. The ability to provide a history that glorified the ancestry of your people was powerful because it makes them
believe that they were unique and dominant. In this example, the Protochronists believed that their ancestors were purebred (Autochthonism) and that they were the founders of western civilization. They also pushed their political agenda by creating a new national identity and Romanian culture. When comparing this view to the Roman view of Decebalus there are some differences. The Romans portrayed Decebalus and the Dacians as barbarians who could not be trusted. Although they respected Decebalus as a commander, they believed he was devious and treacherous. The Protochronists, however, glorified Decebalus and all Dacians as the civilizers of the Mediterranean world. Yet, the goal of the Protochronism movement was not just to glorify ancient Romania, but also, to prove their importance to the rest of the world. By doing so, Nicholae Ceauşescu and the Protochronists solidified their power through fear, nationalism, and false patriotism. Moreover, after the 1989 Revolution and the end of a totalitarian state structure in Romania, the Protochronism movement died. However, Dragan continued to publish magazines entitled Noi Dacii (We Dacians) and holds an annual International Congress of Dacology.
Conclusion

We have seen through these five case studies how modern leaders and writers have used ancient figures to pursue their own political agenda. We have also discovered important themes in this paper: nationalism, colonialism, imperialism, national identities, fascism, legitimacy, monumentalization and the recreation of ancient figures. The most common theme was the use of ancient figures to bring about nationalism. Nationalism played an important role in uniting a country during times of chaos and political change. However, in all five case studies, we see how leaders and nations used ancient figures to preach a form of radical nationalism. They addressed the idea that their country was special and better than everyone else’s nation. We see that they did this because they were facing political problems abroad or at home. In Romania for example, we saw how Ceauşescu and the Protochronists used Decebalus to bring about a sense of Romanian nationalism in order to strengthen their power and cut off ties with the Soviet Union. They preached radical nationalism in order to bring about this nostalgic idea that their country was always great in order to unite the country behind them politically; a common theme we have seen done in all five case studies.

Another interesting theme that developed throughout this study was how leaders used these ancient figures to justify imperialism. When looking into this with more detail, we can see a common reason behind why leaders and nations do this. It seems to be, based off this study, that whenever a country has recently gained freedom or encountered threats from another nations, that a nation or leader would preach a sort of defensive imperialism as a way to protect them from ever being conquered again. For example, in
Germany we saw how Hitler and the Nazi party campaigned the idea that Hitler would reverse the mandates set upon them in the Treaty of Versailles. He preached that he would protect Germany from invaders and that in order to do so the German people needed more land. We see that Hitler and the Nazi Party believed that if they conquered those around them then they would be kept safe from ever being conquered and defeated again. This did not just happen in Germany, but in France and England as well. Both nations preached defensive imperialism in order to strengthen their countries position in the world so that they would be respected and feared. However, their use of ancient figures in order justify imperialism was ironic, which brings about the idea that leaders alter the image of ancient figures for their own political propaganda.

Based off of this research, I have come to the conclusion that it was common for fascists to manipulate the story of an ancient figure for their own political gains. They used these figures to bring about a sense of nostalgia in order to increase nationalism and link themselves to a great period in a nation’s past. If we look into how these leaders did it then we can look into our own present day and connect it to the presidency of Donald Trump. Trump, like the leaders in this paper, based his campaign on a nostalgic view of how great America used to be. His slogan, “Make America Great Again”, was done to bring about this feeling of greatness and nationalism. However, as we have seen above, leaders who do this are usually corrupt and dangerous. In order to prevent the rise of fascists in the future we must understand the tactics they used to gain power.

Despite the fact that I only focused on the negative use of ancient figures, there are also examples of leaders who looked towards the past for good. George Washington
was compared to Cincinnatus\textsuperscript{189} when he was offered a kingship after he won the American Revolutionary War. The comparison was done to show how a leader who cared about his nation should step down after he has served in office. However, supporters of Washington did not recreate the story of Cincinnatus so that he would keep power, but rather they told the truth so that Washington could be an example for later generations. However, most leaders crave power and it is for this reason that we study history in the first place, to learn from the mistakes of the past in order to prevent the mistakes of the future. Therefore, the study of how modern leaders and writers used ancient figures for their own political gains provided us with a lesson of how history can be changed to stir nationalism and how we can prevent the rise of fascists in the future by studying and understanding their tactics.

\textsuperscript{189} Lucius Quinctius Cincinnatus was a farmer, statesman, and general who was called to protect Rome from invaders in 439 BC. He was given title of Dictator and after he won the war, returned home to the farm and allowed the republic too take hold again.
Bibliography


Appian, *Spanish Wars*. (Translation for Appian comes from

http://www.livius.org/sources/content/appian/appian-the-spanish-wars/appian-the-spanish-wars-13/)

Appian, *Spanish Wars*. (Translation for Appian comes from

http://www.livius.org/sources/content/appian/appian-the-spanish-wars/appian-the-spanish-wars-14/)

Appian, *Spanish Wars*. (Translation for Appian comes from

http://www.livius.org/sources/content/appian/appian-the-spanish-wars/appian-the-spanish-wars-15/)


Boicu, Filip. “Protochronism / Protocronism.” *Academia*,

www.academia.edu/7067437/Protochronism_Protocronism.


Caesar, Julius. *Gallic Wars*. (Translation for Caesar comes from
http://penelope.uchicago.edu/Thayer/E/Roman/Texts/Caesar/Gallic_War/home.html)

Crossland, David. “Battle of the Teutoburg Forest: Germany Recalls Myth That Created the
Nation.” *SPIEGEL ONLINE*, SPIEGEL ONLINE, 28 Aug. 2009,
www.spiegel.de/international/germany/battle-of-the-teutoburg-forest-germany-recalls-
myth-that-created-the-nation-a-644913.html.


Dio, Cassius. (Translation for Dio comes from
http://penelope.uchicago.edu/Thayer/e/roman/texts/cassius_dio/68*.html)

Dio, Cassius. *Historia Romana*, (Translation For Dio comes from
http://penelope.uchicago.edu/Thayer/e/roman/texts/cassius_dio/67*.html)

Dio, Cassius. *Historia Romana*, (Translation for Dio comes from
http://penelope.uchicago.edu/Thayer/e/roman/texts/cassius_dio/62*.html)

Diodorus, *Bibliothēkē*. (Translation for Diodorus comes from
http://attalus.org/translate/diodorus33.html)

Ebbott, Mary, and Gregory Nagy. *Imagining Illegitimacy in Classical Greek Literature*.

Euler, Heinrich Gustav. “Napoleon III.” *Encyclopædia Britannica*, Encyclopædia Britannica,

Folgen, Thorsten, and Richard Warren, editors. *Graeco-Roman Antiquity and the Idea of


Mestrom, Job. *Arminius in National Socialism*.

theses.ubn.ru.nl/bitstream/handle/123456789/3980/Mestrom,%20J.J.%204130030%2015-08-2016.pdf?sequence=1.


Vandrei, Martha. ““Who Will Be a Coward When a Woman Leads?”: Boudica and the Victorian Female.” King’s College London, www1.essex.ac.uk/history/documents/conferences/hero-vandrei.pdf.

