

Kelsey Bell
Professor Safran
HIST 302W
April 23, 2018

HIST 302W: FINAL RESEARCH PAPER

The writings of six former American officers, who served in the Egyptian army in the 1870s, express a common level of respect and admiration for the Khedive of Egypt who employed them. However, a range of attitudes regarding the Egyptian people and society is present within the writings, especially in the way the soldiers describe slavery and the Egyptian peasants. The Unionists immediately resort to speaking negatively about Egyptian customs and the people because of cultural and religious differences, while the Confederates tend to be more curious about examining the necessity of certain systems and the progress being made so far.

BACKGROUND

Following the end of the American Civil War in 1865, Khedive Ismail of Egypt looked to American soldiers to help him modernize his military force because of their recent conflict experience. Having only been in power since 1863, Ismail began his reign with two goals in mind: getting “Egypt’s admission, on equal standing, into the western world, and... creating an African empire” (Dunn, p.47). Realizing his imperial aspirations required the renovation of the Egyptian army, Ismail looked to foreign mercenaries to train and advise his military force “following the example of Muhammed Ali” (Dunn, p.47). He saw American soldiers as experienced military officers and eagerly sought their expertise to improve the Egyptian army in areas like engineering, surveying, and conquest. What also made the American officer more appealing to Ismail was that he believed they shared a certain wariness of European interests and imperialism. The American soldiers selected for service were specifically recruited from American General William T. Sherman’s recommendations and their extensive training and battlefield experience in the United States’ military ([Dodenhoff](#)).

Around 50 American officers were recruited to serve in the Egyptian army in a command or technical position because of their extensive training and firsthand experience. The highest-ranking American officer in the Egyptian army was Charles Pomeroy Stone of the Union Army, who was put in

charge of running the Egyptian military for Ismail as Chief of the General Staff of the Khedive. Despite their side of the American Civil War, the American officers were employed in a wide range of positions during their service in Egypt. Men like Raleigh Colston got involved in the Citadel as administrators and professors, though Colston never actually taught a class (Hesseltine, p.123). Other American officers participated in military campaigns to regions like Abyssinia, including William McEntrye Dye, William W. Wing, and James M. Morgan. Several others participated in expanding the Egyptian empire further into Africa. Dye led an expedition to Nubia while Colston led an expedition to Kordofan and Darfour. The furthest mission of these six American officers was Charles Chaille-Long's expedition into Uganda. A [story map](#) has been created to further explain how the American soldiers arrived in Egypt and where they traveled in the region during their service in Egypt.

Overall, the different individual experiences in the American Civil War greatly impacted the way the Unionists and Confederates employed in the Egyptian army approached their observations of Egypt. As career soldiers, each of the six American officers in this analysis present Ismail in a positive light as he is their benefactor and Commander-in-Chief. However, their victory or loss experience in the American Civil War impacted how they observed Egyptian society once they arrived in Alexandria. This paper's Unionist perception is based on the writings of [General Charles P. Stone](#), William McEntrye Dye, and Charles Chaille-Long. These three Unionist soldiers came to Egypt with a recent victory to their credit, leading them to feel their definition of a modern society was justified. This attitude can be observed in writings of each of these three Unionists. Dye and Chaille-Long's personalities shine throughout their writings where they distinctively draw attention to how Egypt is succeeding based on their definitions of modernity. Chaille-Long also has an extensive collection of books and articles he wrote in an ostentatious manner. Critics recognize his writings as being full of self-admiration as an effort to gain the recognition he never obtained from the people of his time. Stone came to Egypt with a tarnished reputation having been held responsible for a failed battle during the Civil War ([New York Times](#)). Because of this, his writings present an admiration of Ismail for giving him a second chance to redeem himself as a military leader. Despite having slightly different experiences in the Union Army, each of these three Unionists are

eager to point out how the Americans in the Egyptian army are experienced and are responsible for helping Ismail modernize the Egyptian army.

The Confederate perception offers an approach to describing Egypt that is distinctively different from the Unionists as a whole. This side's opinion is gathered from the writings of Raleigh E. Colston, [William W. Loring](#), and [James M. Morgan](#). Each of the three Confederates either graduated from or was attending a military institute in the U.S. when the American Civil War broke out. With a strong connection to their home states, these three officers joined the Confederate Army to support their state. For example, Colston was born in France and came to the U.S. for military training. His connection to Virginia as his American father's home state led him to join the Confederate army to fight for his "Virginian" brethren. Despite being just as experienced as the Unionist soldiers in this analysis, these three Confederates came to Egypt having lost the American Civil War. Their loss led them to be not as forthcoming about their values and morals within their descriptions of Egypt. They also took the opportunity to observe the Egyptian culture as a whole, making the effort to better understand Egyptian cultural institutions that the Unionists simply disregarded as wrong.

However, this different approach doesn't mean the three former Confederate soldiers easily agreed with the Egyptians and their customs. As a professed Southern gentleman from Louisiana, [Morgan](#) was frequently frustrated with the native population. He almost resigned from the Egyptian army after a cultural misunderstanding at a local pasha's dinner party he attended with Loring. Morgan was very exuberant in nature a characteristic that can be observed in his autobiography. Having begun his military career long before the American Civil War, Loring was much more of a respected military officer as his writings suggest that he had a much more honorable nature than Morgan. Each of these three Confederate soldiers came to Egypt with different backgrounds when compared to each other. However, as a group, they are much more willing to try and understand the Egyptian ways. Even if they blatantly disagree with the custom or behavior, the Confederates tend to still emit a certain level of curiosity about Egyptian culture that is somewhat absent in the Unionists' approach. It is almost as if the Confederates can relate to the Egyptians as they also experienced the enforcement of certain values and reforms upon their states by

“outsiders” regardless of their personal opinions. The Confederates also express a certain view that their service in Egypt wasn’t as effective as they hoped it would be while the Unionists acted like the Americans were able to prove their excellence by going abroad and training a foreign military in their modern ways.

VIEW OF ISMAIL AND HIS RULE

Both Unionists and Confederates praised Ismail, their benefactor, as each of their writings express a certain level of respect and admiration for the Khedive’s efforts to modernize his country. The Unionists specifically noted Ismail’s policies that appeared progressive for the time. Within *The Political Geography of Egypt*, Stone paints Ismail and his grandfather Mehemet as the founders of modern Egypt, both men acknowledging how Western society could help them improve their country. He described Ismail as being devoted to Egypt’s advancement as he was “endowed with high intelligence, well educated in Europe, appreciating the immense material advantages which his country would derive from the introduction of Western science and its results, princely and grand in his ideas.” Stone argues throughout this article that these characteristics allowed Ismail to follow through with his goals and accomplish many things for Egypt throughout his rule. When describing the conquest of Darfour, Stone doesn’t only mention how this event added “an empire of territory” to Egypt. He also states that expedition was “the most deadly blow to the interior slave trade in Africa that had ever been struck.” It is not surprising that a former Union soldier is the one to note Ismail’s attempts to reform slavery as one of his accomplishments. Stone is sure to mention this as an accomplishment to show just how modern Ismail is as a leader. He also argued that Ismail’s achievements included having the ability to improve any civilization one of his conquests acquired, stating “his conquests were all to the advantage of civilization, for wherever his power was established there were established schools and hospitals and... commerce” (Stone).

Charles Chaille-Long, another Union soldier in the Khedive’s army, was sure to note Ismail’s progressiveness and effort to do what was best for his country even if it wasn’t successful. Within his preliminary remarks in *Central Africa: Naked Truths and Naked People*, Chaille-Long prepares his

publication about his expeditions by paying tribute to the “character of the enlightened Sovereign” who made it possible for him to fulfill his adventurous spirit. He describes the genius of Ismail as not European but as “one whose elevated soul and advanced ideas have placed him in the first rank of the progressive spirits of the century, and made him in this regard the type and pioneer of its civilization” (Chaille-Long, p.vi). Chaille-Long is willing to admit Ismail’s shortcomings, but does not view them as limiting Ismail’s vision for Egypt. It is Ismail’s vision and dreams for Egypt which appear to make him a modern leader to the Unionists.

The Confederate perspective also admired Ismail for his ideas and efforts to bring in more Western ideas into Egypt. They share an opinion with the Unionists that Ismail’s faults are not what prevented Egypt’s success. In *Modern Egypt and Its People*, Raleigh Colston argues that Ismail resembles more of a Western leader than an Oriental leader due to his respect for humanity, education, European habits, and innovative reforms. “The ex-Khedive and his sons are well educated for Orientals, and in their habits and mode of living, are quite European except as regards the harem” (Colston, p.137). He clearly sees Ismail above the average person from the Orient because of “what he has done for his country, for the diffusion of knowledge and the progress of civilization” (Colston, p.136). These two quotations show Colston’s respect for what Ismail achieved despite his limitations. He does note Ismail’s failures in statements like “he may have tried to carry his reforms and innovations too fast, and he has been recklessly prodigal, but it must be said that no man was ever so robbed and plundered as he has been” (Colston, p.136). However, this Confederate soldier ends his statements about Ismail’s shortcomings with a sense that other factors were at play to erode the situation in Egypt beyond the consequences of Ismail’s actions. For example, the previous quotation acknowledges Ismail may have been too quick and eager to carry out his reforms, but he was also severely taken advantage of by external players. This style of argument makes a reader believe that Ismail wasn’t the main one to blame for any modernization failures in Egypt. Colston also talks about the Khedive’s efforts to promote education of women in Egypt by stating that the reason this movement wasn’t effective was because “Moslem laws, customs, traditions and religion are so much opposed to the instruction of women” (Colston, p.161). He argues Ismail’s

vision isn't to blame for ineffective reforms, rather it is the structure and customs of Egyptian society that prevents Ismail from successfully modernizing Egypt.

PERCEPTION OF EGYPTIAN PEOPLE AND SOCIETY

Despite sharing a common respect for the Khedive, Unionists and Confederates in the Egyptian army have a different range of attitudes regarding the Egyptian people and society. They share a sense of superiority over the modern-day Egyptian, but have different perceptions of Egyptian institutions and why they do not respect the Egyptian peasant, the fellah. A better understanding of the differing American soldier perceptions can be gained by breaking this topic down to three specific subcategories: their attitudes towards slavery in Egypt, the fellah and his religion, and the Egyptian man as a soldier.

Attitudes towards slavery's existence in Egypt

When looking at the way the six American soldiers describe slavery in Egypt, the Unionists speak badly about it as an institution and any Egyptian custom that resembles it because of their definition of a modern society. Throughout their writings, all three Unionists express the opinion that a truly modern society doesn't tolerate slavery's existence regardless of the circumstances. This belief leads Stone and Chaille-Long to feel Egypt is modern under Ismail's rule because of the efforts made to abolish slavery in the region. As Stone describes Ismail's conquest of Darfour in *The Political Geography of Egypt*, he says it administered "the most deadly blow to the interior slave trade in Africa that had ever been struck." He praises Ismail's actions because they made Ismail look like a modern leader using his power to end the slave trade. Chaille-Long agrees with Stone's assessment of Ismail's modernity by stating "when the Khedive first initiated the project of opening Central Africa to commerce and civilization, the abolition of the slave trade was the first point of attack" (p.311). He genuinely believed that Ismail's motivation to start the expeditions into Central Africa was to end the slave-trade. In regards to people who argue that the Khedive's actions weren't sincere, Chaille-Long calls them "ignorant and unscrupulous writers" whose accusation "is as puerile, as it is without foundation" (p.312). He sees their accusation as a sure way to get published in the newspaper, not as an honest representation of Ismail.

Dye agrees with this Unionist association, but uses it to argue that Egypt isn't as modern as Stone and Chaille-Long believe in their writings. He doesn't accept that Egypt's efforts to end the slave-trade are sincere as others may believe. Under the reign of Ismail's predecessors, the anti-slavery opinion was imposed upon the Egyptian mind by Europeans according to Dye. "With all the professions heard in high quarters for the extinction of slavery, the municipal law having this aim...is only for the eye of the foreigner" (Dye, p.30). Thus, Dye argues that it is not the real opinion of the Egyptian people because they are willing to disregard the law to keep certain customs alive like making sure their harems are filled. If the Egyptians truly believed in the law and anti-slavery sentiment, they would end the harem institution. Dye is explicitly disgusted with the harem because he associates it with slavery. He doesn't see it as a wealthy family structure aimed to protect the woman's modesty. Instead, he views it as one of the last institutions of slavery in Egypt that prevents it from having a truly modern society. In his description of the "evil" of the harem, Dye makes the statement that "were Egypt's engagements...for the suppression of the slave-trade fully carried out, the harem would no doubt lose its influence and power" (Dye, p.29). He specifically calls the women in the harem "slaves" while noting how the institution breeds ignorance and barbarism because of its connection to the institution of slavery. In all, he sees the harem and its slavery backbone harming Egypt more than it may promote a distinctive Egyptian cultural identity. This is because the women of the harem end up being "the mothers, the educators of the youth upon whom hang Egypt's future hopes" (Dye, p.29). Egypt cannot move forward as a state when the mothers of its elite are "coming from the very depths of barbarism, ignorance and superstition" according to Dye.

The Confederate opinion of slavery's existence in Egypt differs from the Unionist perception because it is willing to see the necessity of the slave-trade in order to operate certain cultural institutions and to provide a labor force for modern reforms in Egypt. In a section of *A Confederate Soldier in Egypt*, Loring describes how Mehemet Ali and Ismail Pasha improved working conditions in Egypt from the wretched and abusive state they were in during Turkish rule. During a part where he explains Mehemet's plan to improve and repair canals, Loring states "this gave rise afterward to what was called the corvee

system of forced labor, which under the old soldier worked for the good of the people” (Loring, p. 63). He goes on to admit that this system led to many abuses that resembled slavery, but he also recognizes these projects were formed to improve the lives of the Egyptian people as a whole. Colston makes a similar admission in his *Modern Egypt and Its People* article when describing the process of obtaining a eunuch for the harem. He states “these creatures are all Nubians and are bought...from the Christian Coptic priests of the Upper Nile, who have the monopoly of the shameful traffic” (Colston, p.160). He acknowledges that it is a “shameful traffic,” but goes on to justify this process because the harems wouldn’t be able to function without them. He further justifies it by stating “the eunuch, nominally bought as a slave, ... becomes in fact the real master of the house which he enters” (Colston, p.160). Both of these Confederate opinions show that the Confederate perception is at least willing to justify slavery or institutions that resemble it as long as they are aimed at modernizing Egypt for the good of the people or allow the “slave” to improve his status over time.

Unlike the Unionist perspective, it is harder to get a true sense of what the Confederate soldiers specifically believe versus what society is telling them is no longer acceptable. Throughout their writings, the three former Confederate soldiers talk about slavery or institutions in Egypt that resemble it by addressing how a modern society no longer accepts it. Their statements are more about the observation that efforts are being made to abolish slavery in Egypt rather than the need or appeal to abolish it that is of focus in the Unionists’ writings. For example, in his *What Will Become of Egypt?* article, Loring described the little effort being made to end the slave-trade in Egypt before Ismail’s reign by stating that one of Ismail’s predecessors “for a brief period in obedience to the demand of Europe, pretended to abolish the slave trade, visiting the dark region and issuing decrees against it.” Loring acknowledges that Europe’s influence was a large factor to the start of the anti-slavery sentiment in Egypt. However, unlike the three Unionist soldiers, Loring doesn’t necessarily praise Ismail’s efforts to end slavery as a symbol of transforming Egypt into a modern nation. He doesn’t criticize Egypt or Ismail because of the continued existence of institutions like the harem that resemble slavery to the Western eye. All that Loring does is

state that these efforts were occurring, that they'd been occurring prior to Ismail's reign because of European influencers.

Regardless of the differences in how they view slavery or its continued existence in Egypt, each of the six American soldiers are race-conscious in their observations and how they chose to describe slavery within their writings. The Unionist authors classify members of the harem, which they associate with slavery, based on race. Even while criticizing the institution's continued existence, Dye takes time to note existing rank of the female members of the harem that is based on their race or origins. He states "not only is there a constant supply of blacks coming down the Nile, but of the more valuable and lecherous Abyssinians, and even of the beautiful Circassians and Georgians, who enter the establishments only of the more wealthy" (Dye, p. 29). This remark shows how Dye lumps the black women as one whole group at the lowest class rank in the harem. The Abyssinian woman, though also black, is distinctively different to him from the other black women in the harem. She is placed one rank above them as she is seen to be much more "valuable", possibly because of her Christian faith. The highest rank in the harem belongs to the Circassians and Georgians, women whose reputation dates back to the Middle Ages in the Near Eastern harems because of their pale skin and Eastern European origins.

The Confederate authors are also race-conscious throughout their writings, paying particular attention to the white slave trade and the power of the eunuch as these roles or institutions don't fit into the "normal" race relations of the time. Morgan was particularly interested in the eunuch's role in the harem even though they are slaves. He states "what astounded me most amid my new surroundings was to find that the eunuchs, whom I had always thought of as contemptible creatures, were in reality beings of great importance" (Morgan, p.274). Morgan continues, astonished that these men are able to have power and influence in state affairs even though they came to this institution as slaves. Loring and Colston emphasize the white women of the harem when they describe this institution, fixated on the white female as an oppressed "prisoner" within this institution. They do not pay attention to the black women of the harem as if it was reasonable to them that these individuals would be found in such an oppressive institution. Colston was so fascinated with both the white slave trade and the role of the eunuch that he

wrote two appendixes in his *Modern Egypt and Its People* article that specifically addressed these topics. He talked about the “Slaves of the East” in Appendix A, comparing the price of a black slave to the price of the white slave. Throughout his description, the white slave was significantly more costly than the black slave. The white slave also has certain characteristics like “in good health”, beauty, virginity, and age ranges to his or her price when the black slave does not.

Attitudes towards the fellah and his religion

Another way to grasp the American soldiers’ perceptions of the Egyptian people and society is by examining how they view the fellah and his religion. The Unionist and Confederate soldiers both express a sense of superiority over the modern Egyptian throughout their descriptions of the fellah, the Egyptian peasant. They begin to do this by establishing a clear distinction between the ancient Egyptian and the Egyptian of the 19th century. These soldiers romanticize the ancient Egyptians and their notable achievements as a great step forward for Western civilization. Then both sides make remarks that the modern-day fellah is inferior to his ancient ancestors and to the Americans because of his fanatical religion that corrupts his character. Despite this shared belief, the Confederates appear to be willing to see progress being made to the fellah’s character throughout their descriptions, while Unionists simply dislike the fellah’s character and degrade his worth.

The Union perspective sees the fellah as a weak man whose character is worsened by his faith. Charles Chaille-Long specifically describes the fellah as “little better than slaves” in his *American Soldiers in Egypt* article. Throughout his description, Chaille-Long expresses disgust for the fellah because he is not brave and is “a fanatic of the most malignant type.” He makes an interesting description of the fellah as being “neither Arab nor Egyptian – he is nondescript, a strange intermixture with the negro and the servile class, of the conqueror and conquered” (Chaille-Long). This description labels the fellah as a mixture of so many low classes while essentially being worthless to the modern Egypt that is emerging under Ismail.

Dye’s comparison between the Egyptian and the Abyssinian also highlights the Union opinion regarding the Egyptian fellah’s destructive character. Dye describes the Egyptian man whose “obstinacy

is passive, and does not arise from any determination or fixed resolution; whereas the Abyssinian ... comes at once to the point in dispute, and the negro loses no time in forcing the Egyptian to an issue of courage rather than an issue of strength and skill” (Dye, p.38). Dye specifically conveys more respect for the Abyssinian man despite his race because he is forthright, courageous, and self-restrained due to his Christian religion. On the other hand, Dye views the Egyptian as so stubborn in his passiveness and submission that he has no fixed purpose. “It is the Egyptian’s religion alone that is destructive. Its influence on his character has not overcome the effect of antagonizing physical circumstances which surround him” (Dye, p.39). Dye sees the Egyptian’s religion as the reason for his undesirable character with all its “exhausting” religious practices like polygamy and the harem weighing him down. Dye admires the “mountain Turk’s” willingness to fight for his beliefs more than the Egyptian’s compliance with being someone else’s instrument of war.

The Confederate perspective also blames the fellah’s “fanatical” religion for his weak character. However, this side is also willing to acknowledge the progress being made to the fellah’s character under Ismail’s reign. Morgan specifically describes the fellah’s religion as being a zealous faith that harms his disposition. When speaking about his time in Cairo, Morgan acknowledges that the city hadn’t become as big of a tourist location as it would in the future as “foreigners were curiosities, and the true believer’s hatred for the accursed Giaour, or “Christian dog”, was something that he was very proud of.” A Christian in Cairo would feel that “a fanatic was liable to make trouble at any moment” (Morgan, p.272). To Morgan, the Egyptian man was dangerous to the Christian equivalent because of his fanaticism. Morgan grows his description by also observing the doseh ceremony. This ceremony involved priests riding their horses over the bodies of Muslim men that laid on the ground. He said “the Arabs pretend to believe that the prostrate fanatics are so holy that the hoofs of the horse do not hurt them, but...the instant the animal passed over a body” the man would be carried away so none would be able to show the crowd their injuries (Morgan, p.289).

The fellah’s faith doesn’t make any rational sense to Morgan or the other Confederates because they focused on how Christianity is more virtuous and reasonable than Islam according to their point of

view. Colston makes a similar comparison when explaining how Christians can govern Muslims but Muslims shouldn't govern Christians. He states that "it is impossible to form a just conception of the Mussulman society without bearing in mind the fact that the Koran is a complete code of laws, not only religious, but civil and political" (Colston, p.155). Because of the Koran's dominance in the fellah's everyday life, Colston believes that the Muslim man cannot see the equality of all men above the law like the Christian man does.

Despite this common perception of the fellah and his Muslim faith, the Confederates are willing to see that the fellah's character is improving under Ismail's rule. In *A Confederate Soldier in Egypt*, Loring describes how the fellah was complacent with the ill-treatment he received from his oppressor due to religious factors until Ismail came to power. He does acknowledge religion as a factor that prevents the fellah from becoming intellectuals or curious individuals. Colston states that "the reader is probably aware that the Mahometan religion is largely responsible for this lack of intellectual stamina." The Koran becomes the foundation that the Muslim man measures his life and society based on so "whatever oversteps its sacred metes and bounds is impious" (Colston, p.67). However, Colston does acknowledge how Ismail's policies have improved the treatment of the fellah and his "manhood." Since the Khedive was committed to Egypt and the elevation of "the fellaheen," the fellah has been regaining his ability to fight back or acknowledge the mistreatment he faces. Colston says "recent events...have shown very clearly that the fellah is not altogether the spiritless animal described by casual tourists." Yes, their religion still holds them back from being a modern man. However, Ismail has been guiding them to no longer simply accept their circumstances.

Attitudes towards the Egyptian as a soldier

Since much of their time was spent among soldiers, it is also important to note how the American officers described their interactions with the Egyptian within the military sphere. Both the Unionist and Confederate perceptions have the Egyptian soldier portrayed as weak and ineffective because of his religion or lack of purpose to fight. The Unionists simply argue that the Egyptian soldier is weak and incapable of allowing the American officers to train them to become effective soldiers. Their reasoning

for this assessment is either the Egyptian's faith or lack of motivation to fight. Chaille-Long specifically places blame on the Egyptian's faith for preventing Americans from successfully wiping the Egyptian soldiers into shape. He states that the "fanaticism and hatred of the Christian deterred both General Stone and the American officers from ever holding intimate relations or having actual contact with the fanatical fellah army of the Khedive" (Chaille-Long). As a result, Chaille-Long believes that that American officers never really had a chance to be successful because they are religiously different from the Egyptian soldiers. Within *Modern Egypt and Its People*, Dye expresses his opinion that the Egyptian fellah wasn't a good soldier because he had no passion or reason to fight. He saw this as a distinguishing factor between the Egyptian's fighting capabilities and the Abyssinian's fighting capabilities, explaining the faults of the Egyptian soldier in Chapter 8. He acknowledges that the fellah has the ability of physical endurance to his advantage, but that it is not enough for him to be a good soldier. Dye felt "enthusiasm is possible with him only where his religion is involved, and he is utterly incapable of rising to the dignity of an American and English soldier." It is the fellah's religion and past oppression that prevents him from becoming a good soldier, not his physical abilities.

Despite sharing a belief that the Egyptian soldier was ineffective because of his lack of motive, the Confederate perception of the Egyptians' fighting capabilities did acknowledge that the Egyptian soldiers were well trained by the hands of French and American soldiers. Overall, the Confederates shared the Unionists negative view of Egyptians as soldiers. For example, Colston felt that the Egyptian army was weak despite being prepared and well-trained by foreigners. He states that "the Egyptian army proves that you may take men of splendid physical qualities, clothe them in handsome uniforms...drill and discipline them to perfection, and all this will not make soldiers of them unless you give them a motive to fight." He admits that the soldier has to have a reason to fight or passion for fighting to truly be effective. He grows this assumption by comparing the Egyptian soldier to who he considers the "best regiments in the Egyptian service," the African men taken from Central Africa and placed into the Egyptian army. To Colston, "there is a great deal more fight in these men, who probably were warriors in their own country, than in the fellaheen regiments" (Colston, p.146). Loring and Morgan also build off

this assessment while showing that Egyptian men in command positions are just as weak through their descriptions of Ratib. Ratib was the Egyptian commander in charge of the Abyssinian campaign. To Loring and Morgan, he was a coward and a bad commander because he wasn't willing to listen to any advice from American officers. This led the Abyssinian expedition to be a failure. When speaking about the Egyptian military as a whole, Morgan does note that the Egyptian soldiers were well trained by the Americans' French predecessors through his observation that "when we American officers entered the Egyptian Army it was composed of some sixty thousand well-drilled men. The French officers who had preceded us had done wonders with them in this respect, and in the manual of arms it would have put the West Point cadets on their mettle to have excelled any infantry regiment of the line" (Morgan, p.287). However, religious and cultural differences prevented the Americans from building off the French successes and really shaping an effective Egyptian military for the Khedive. Morgan emphasizes this charge when he describes inspecting Arabi Bey's regiment with Loring. While Morgan recorded that their weapons were unfit, the men of Arabi's command pretended to be praying while passing unfit weapons amongst themselves to prevent Morgan and Loring from examining them. However, the two Americans got criticized by Arabi, saying that "the bad report was only caused by [Morgan's] religious prejudices, as could be easily proved by the fact that [Morgan] had reported only the guns of men engaged in prayer as being out of order" (Morgan, p.291). As a result, Morgan observed the Egyptian soldiers manipulating their religious and cultural differences with the American officers to their advantage to prevent being critiqued as much as possible.

POSSIBLE CRITICISM

It is important to also note this research paper's shortcomings. Though this analysis is extensive by examining the writings of three soldiers in both the Unionist and Confederate groups, there are several more American soldiers who served in Egypt who have made observations about the country. By reading more soldiers' personal memoirs and articles, there may be information or point of views that alter or strengthen this analysis. However, due to time constraints and accessibility, these materials were left out

of this specific research analysis. To grow this analysis in the future, it would be interesting to explore these other writings to see how they relate to this existing argument.

CONCLUSION

Though some opinions are shared between them, the former Unionist and Confederate soldiers observe Egypt and its society through two distinctively different approaches. While the Unionists immediately resort to critiquing Egyptian customs and people for not being as modern as American society, the Confederates tend to be more curious in examining the different customs and institutions of the Egyptians. As a whole group, the writings of the six former American officers share a sense of admiration for Ismail while also agreeing that the fellah's religion and lack of purpose are largely to blame for his weak character and ineffective fighting abilities. Although both sides praise Ismail and dislike the Egyptian fellah, it is the Unionists who approach these subjects with a specific preconception about them. The Unionists appear to have had their values and beliefs justified during the American Civil War so they come to Egypt believing their way is the best. This is why they see Ismail as a modern leader based on their terms of modernity. This is why they speak negatively about Egyptian institutions that resemble barbaric practices like slavery. However, the Confederates appear to be more willing to explore the truths about these institutions. They admit many customs or institutions the Unionists call "barbaric" are actually just misunderstood by the Western eye. The Confederates are willing to see the necessity of slavery or forced labor if it means the Egyptians can operate their cultural institutions or reform projects. As a result, the writings used for this analysis provide a sense that the American officers came to Egypt in the 1870s with two different approaches to viewing Egypt and its society. Previous experience and cultural differences have led the Unionists and Confederate soldiers to have different ways of observing Egypt during their service, even though they may have arrived at similar opinions about Egyptian people and society as a whole group.

Works Cited

Primary sources:

- Chaillé-Long, Charles. "The American Soldier Abroad". *Frank Leslie's Popular Monthly* (1876-1904), Xxiv, 9, Oct 1887. <http://ezaccess.libraries.psu.edu/login?url=https://search-proquest-com.ezaccess.libraries.psu.edu/docview/136552147?accountid=13158>
- Chaillé-Long, Charles. "American Soldiers in Egypt". *Frank Leslie's Popular Monthly* (1876-1904), Xxv, 485, April 1888. <http://ezaccess.libraries.psu.edu/login?url=https://search-proquest-com.ezaccess.libraries.psu.edu/docview/136553446?accountid=13158>
- Chaillé-Long, Charles. *Central Africa: Naked Truths of Naked People*. 1 Jan. 1877, www.wdl.org/en/item/7779/.
- Chaillé-Long Charles. "Egypt, Africa and Africans"; *Address Delivered before the American Geographical Society of New York, at Chickering Hall, on the Evening of the 28th of May, ...* 28 May 1878, babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=msu.31293009767553;view.
- Colston, Raleigh E. "Life in the Egyptian Deserts." *Journal of the American Geographical Society of New York* 11 (1879), 301-333. doi:10.2307/196512
- Colston, Raleigh E. "Modern Egypt and its People." *Bulletin of the American Geographical Society of New York* 13 (1881) : 133-64.
- Dye, William McEntyre. *Moslem Egypt and Christian Abyssinia*. New York: Atkin and Prout Printers, 1880.
- Loring, William W. *A Confederate Soldier in Egypt*. New York: Dodd, Mead & Co., 1884.
- Loring, William W. "What Will Become of Egypt?" *The Manhattan* (1883-1884), 3, 249. <http://ezaccess.libraries.psu.edu/login?url=https://search-proquest-com.ezaccess.libraries.psu.edu/docview/135718436?accountid=13158>
- Morgan, James M. *Recollections of a Rebel Reefer*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1917.
- Stone, Charles P. "Military Affairs in Egypt." *Journal of the Military Service Institution of the United States* 5 (1884): 154-83.
- Stone, Charles P. "The Political Geography of Egypt." *Bulletin of the American Geographical Society of New York* 15 (1883): 361-74. <http://ezaccess.libraries.psu.edu/login?url=https://search-proquest-com.ezaccess.libraries.psu.edu/docview/125735010?account>

Secondary Sources:

- Dunn, John P. *Khedive Ismail's Army*. 2005. <https://search-proquest.com.ezaccess.libraries.psu.edu/legacy/docview/EBC/199724?accountid=13158.com>
- Dodenhoff, Col. George H. "A Historical Perspective of Mercenaries." *Naval War College Review*, by U.S. Naval War College, vol. 21, Naval War College, Newport, RI, 0AD, pp. 91-109, babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=osu.32435028210995;view=1up;seq=7.

Hesseltine, W. B., & Wolf, H. C.. *The Blue and the Gray on the Nile*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press, 1961.

New York Times. "NEWS FROM EGYPT: The American Army Officers in the East - Who They Are and What They Are Doing." *New York Times*, 27 July 1871.