

Published by the History Graduate Student Association
in cooperation with the University of North Alabama

Volume 1, 2011

North Alabama HISTORICAL REVIEW

North Alabama Historical Review
Florence, AL 35630

North Alabama Historical Review, 2011



editor

Jeshua Hinton

editor/layout design

Brandon Blaylock

Thanks,

Sam Burcham, Kerrie Holloway, Michael Mumaugh, Dr. Jeffrey Bibbee, Dr. Christopher Maynard, Dr. Chizuru Saeki, Dr. George Makowski, Dr. Thomas Osborne, Dr. Nicholas Mauriello, and Dr. Robert Koch.

We would also like to thank Deborah Bailey, Amanda Bliss, Samantha Brunhoeber, Cora Depew, Jennifer Hood, and Amber Huett.

This volume is dedicated to Professor Thomas Osborne.

The image on the front cover is of members of the E.B. Browning Society in front of Wesleyan Hall in 1899.

More information?

For submission information please email nahr.submissions@gmail.com.

Contents

WORLD HISTORY

- Arius: The Alexandrian Presbyter** 5
Brandon Blaylock
- Bogus Or Bona Fide: The Legitimacy Of The
Tudor Dynasty At The Accession Of Henry VIII** 16
Catherine James
- Redefining Resistance: The German Occupation
of the Channel Islands during World War II** 27
Kerrie Holloway
- Sheppard's Flock** 39
Lacy Offut
- Cultural Products and World Politics** 53
Rebecca S. Dobrinski
- Something Wicked This Way Comes: Margaret
Cooper's Encounter with the Devil as Evidence
for a Reformed Popular English Religious Culture** 65
Sam Burcham
- Empire & Spinsterhood: the Shaping of a New Identity** 83
Jo Larson
- "The Memory of Me in Good Works": The
Importance of the Legends of King Alfred the
Great to English Society** 96
John Griffin
- Fragile Flowers or Steel Magnolias: Women's
Rights in Japan to Occupation** 105
Lacey Holley

UNITED STATES HISTORY

- The Law of Love, Radical Holiness, and the Latter
Rain: The Birth of a Pentecostal-Holiness
Denomination in the Appalachians** 118
Brandon Blaylock
- Boston And The Birth Of A Nation: Cradle of the
Modern Civil Rights Movement** 131
Susan Powell
- Bush's War: For Oil or Moral Imperative** 143
Michael Mumaugh

Shiloh: Bloody Sacrifice that Changed the War Jeshua Hinton	161
The Experience of Confederate Nurses: Venerated in Myth But Overwhelmed by Reality Catherine James	173
BOOK REVIEWS	185
INSTITUTIONAL CONTRIBUTIONS	
Citizenship and the Constitution: Constitution Day Talk, Sept. 16, 2011 Dr. Thomas Osborne	206
The End of the Cold War: A Bibliographic Essay Dr. Christopher Maynard	212
Utilizing New Media in Graduate Academic Research Dr. Jeffrey Bibbee	214

4 Articles

WORLD HISTORY

Arius: The Alexandrian Presbyter

Brandon Blaylock

“[Philosophy] is the material of the world’s wisdom, the rash interpreter of the nature and dispensation of God. Indeed heresies are themselves instigated by philosophy.”¹

Arius was an Alexandrian Presbyter, born in the middle of the third century. He spent most of his ministry as an unremarkable leader of a Christian church on the outskirts of Alexandria.² When Arius was an old man he was suddenly labeled a heretic and was ostracized from his community. According to fifth century historian Socrates Scholasticus, the controversy began when Alexandrian bishop Alexander tried to expound upon the nature of the Trinity. Alexander asserted that the “Father” and the “Son” were co-eternal, and equally God. Arius heard Alexander’s assertions and took issue with them; he argued that, if the Jesus was begotten, as it states in the scripture, then there was, by necessity, a time before his begetting.³ Sozomen offers a slightly different account. He states that a conference was held in Alexandria to decide the question of the relationship of the Son – Jesus - to the Father - God. Alexander waffled on the issue but eventually sided with those who advocated the position that the Son is co-eternal with the Father. When Arius failed to recant his position, the controversy began.⁴

Any examination of the life and beliefs of Arius must begin

with an acknowledgement of the limitations of extant primary sources.

1 Tertullian of Carthage, *Prescription against Heretics*, VII:1.

2 Roger E. Olson, *The Story of Christian Theology: Twenty Centuries of Tradition and Reform* (Downers Grove, IL:InterVarsity Press, 1999), 318.

3 Socrates Scholasticus, *Ecclesiastical History*, Book 1, V - VI.

4 Sozomen, *Ecclesiastical History*, Book 1, XV.

6 Articles

Most of the sources that have survived are the work of men who believed Arius to be a heretic,⁵ or, as Alexandrian bishop Athanasius declared him, “a forerunner to the Antichrist.”⁶ Additionally, what is believed to be the system of “Arianism,” is likely nothing more than a concoction of the enemies of Arius.⁷ Rowan Williams (scholar and former archbishop of Canterbury) believes that the term “Arianism” is an abstraction and its use should be abandoned.⁸ Regardless of what it meant to be an “Arian” in the 4th century CE, there was a man named Arius. He lived in Alexandria and was a popular presbyter, until he was exiled. Over time, his name became synonymous with heterodox theology and heresy. However, prior to this occurrence, he was long a successful presbyter. How was Arius successful for so long prior to his conflict with Alexander? Further, how did his transition from presbyter to heretic occur? Although the primary source materials provided by Arius’ enemies are valuable tools for understanding the opposition to Arianism, as well as for developing a biographical sketch, other information must be sought if we are to cease “play[ing] Arius’ songs in an Athanasian key.”⁹

Although accounts differ slightly, sometime between 318 and 322 C.E., something changed for Arius.¹⁰ He went from being a footnote in the history of early Christianity to being a universal symbol of corruptibility

5 Alastair H. B. Logan, “Arius,” *The Blackwell Companion to the Theologians* ed. Ian S. Markham, vol. 1 (Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2009), 14.

6 Athanasius, *The Orations of S. Athanasius* (London: Griffith Farran & Co., 1893) 11.

7 Rowan Williams, *Arius: Heresy and Tradition* (London: Darton, Logman and Todd, 1987), 1. citation found: Michael Lieb, *Theological Milton: Diety, Discourse and Heresy in the Miltonic Canon* (Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 2006), 263.

8 *Ibid.*, 4.

9 Robert C. Gregg and Dennis E. Groh, *Early Arianism: A View of Salvation* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1981), 1.

10 Scholars do not agree on the exact date. The conventional date is 318; however, 321 seems to be fashionable at present. The year 322 has been proposed more recently but is the latest that the incident could have occurred. See *The Blackwell Companion to the Theologians* ed. Ian S. Markham, vol. 1 (Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2009), 10. for information regarding dating the Arian outbreak.

and theological error. Although the exact date of the outbreak of the heresy is unknown, it is clear that it occurred within ten years of Emperor Constantine's "conversion"¹¹ experience.¹² Despite the volumes of scholarly literature available on the controversy that surrounded the teachings of Arius, surprisingly little is known about the specifics of the doctrines Arius espoused. Most of Arius' writings that we do have are exclusively about God and the relationship between the God, the Father and his Son, Christ.¹³ Arius stressed "the absolute unity, otherness, and transcendence of God."¹⁴ He almost always couples statements about God with the word "alone." Arius reasoned that, if there was a Father and a Son, a subordinate relationship must exist. He argued that if the Son was begotten, there must have been a time when he was not yet begotten.¹⁵ Essentially, his argument was that the Son had a finite beginning, while the Father did not.¹⁶ Robert Gregg and Dennis Groh sum up the Arian beliefs by stating:

[A]ll creatures, the redeemer notwithstanding, were ultimately and radically depended on a creator whose sole method of relating to his creation was by his will and pleasure.¹⁷

Although this sketch provides some insight into the consequences and trajectory of the Arian phenomenon, it is lacking in context. How

11 Although the term "conversion" is problematic at best I will use it as it is the term used by Eusebius when writing of the event.

12 The conversion of Constantine occurred in 312 of the Common Era. see H. A. Drake, *Constantine and His Bishops: The Politics of Intolerance* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2002), xv.

13 Logan, 15.

14 Ibid., 16.

15 The question of "time" is a little confusing in Arius' *Thalia*. Arius contended that the Father alone is eternal, the Son is not eternal. However, the Son was begotten before all creation, and creation was then instigated by the Father through the Son. So, in a sense the Son was begotten out of time, at least prior to all other creation. It is clear from the *Thalia*, that Arius did not perceive the Son as eternal. Still, he certainly was not temporal in the sense that normal human beings are temporal. See Athanasius, *The Orations Against the Arians*, Oration 1:5-6.

16 Ibid.

17 Gregg and Groh, 5.

8 Articles

Arius came to hold the views that would get him into so much trouble is not known based on the sources available to modern scholars. Further, the question of timing is left unanswered. Why did the Arian controversy explode onto the scene when it did?

Examining Arius' environment as well as the timing of the controversy surrounding him is vital to gaining a more complete picture of his life. We know he operated in Alexandria, Egypt, a Hellenistic society with a rich, philosophical heritage. Thus, to understand Arius, we must examine Arius the Alexandrian. It was in Alexandria that Arius became a successful presbyter and subsequently drew the ire of Alexander and his deacon Athanasius.

Arius and the Arian controversy might be better understood as a product of the unique situation that Christians faced in the third and fourth centuries in Alexandria. Two aspects of the cultural and ecclesiastical dynamic present in Alexandria seem particularly relevant. First, Alexandria must be understood as a city with a rich philosophical heritage coupled with a diverse population, where Hellenistic philosophy, Judaism, and Christianity interacted to inform the collective religious experience. Occasionally, the religious encounters in Alexandria erupted in violence; occasionally, they served to inform each other in a rich and meaningful way.¹⁸ Conflating Arianism and Greek philosophy has often been done by orthodox apologists attempting to explain how Christian theology could go so wrong. In 1889, theologian Henry Melvill Gwatkin wrote, "Arianism began its career partly as a theory of Christianity, partly as an Eastern reaction of philosophy against a gospel of the Son of God."¹⁹ This prosaic remark might contain an element of truth, but

¹⁸ For more on this see Roger E. Olson, *The Story of Christian Theology: Twenty Centuries of Tradition and Reform* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1999).

¹⁹ Henry Melvill Gwatkin, *The Arian Controversy* (London: Longman, Greens, & Co., 1889), 1.

it conceals as much as it reveals. Arianism, like any ideology, must be understood in the context of its development. For Arianism, this meant Alexandria. Hellenistic influences had long been prevalent in Alexandria. For example, first and second century Jews in Alexandria understood that “reading scripture philosophically [...] meant [...] avoiding a superstitious literalism.”²⁰ With this understanding of the philosophical-religious tradition in Alexandria, one can better understand Arius.

The second aspect of Alexandrian Christianity that aids in understanding the Arian phenomenon is the autonomy enjoyed by the presbyters. Without strong oversight, Arius was allowed to develop his theology for several years while gaining a following and without ruffling the feathers of his bishop or Alexandrian Christians outside of his church. Eventually, this autonomy vanished and with it any tolerance for diversity in Christian expression.

Alexandria as a Hellenistic and Philosophical Center

During the first centuries of the Common Era, Alexandria was second in prominence only to Rome. Located on the Mediterranean on the northern tip of Egypt, Alexandria was a center for Hellenization. This had been a focus in Alexandria since its founding by Alexander the Great as well as during the subsequent Ptolemaic dynasty. The city was also the center of constant conflict between all the factions present in the Roman empire, be they Jew, Pagan, or Christian, as well as between the Empire and the people of the city. The Byzantine Emperor Justinian, during his *renovatio imperii*, stated his frustration with Alexandria continuing to ignore his

²⁰ Luke Timothy Johnson, *Among the Gentiles: Greco-Roman religion and Christianity* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009), 117.

10 Articles

imperial edicts.²¹ There was a unique element that ran through Alexandria that is present and continuous all the way from the time of Philo in the first century through the reign of Justinian in the fifth and sixth centuries. There is, through this discord, some coherence. It is a unique Alexandrian “factional individualism.”

The term “individualism,” as applied to Alexandria, must be qualified. It does not mean that in Alexandria there was what contemporary people recognize as individualism, where the focal point is on a single person. Rather, Alexandrian individualism denotes a stronger than normal identification with an individual sect. Alexandrians enjoyed an independent streak that colored their interaction with the Roman Empire outside their city and manifested itself in the interactions between rival groups within the city. Thus, “individualism” as it pertains to Alexandria can be understood as a strong factional group-identification within the larger matrix of religious practice. Further, it can be seen in the context of Alexandrian identification within the larger context of a Roman identity.

This factionalism might partially be attributed to the longstanding, divided nature of religious practices present in Alexandria. There was no single dominant religious force in Alexandria. Just as the Jewish community was strong, so too was the Pagan community. Eventually, the Christians would become a strong force in the city as well.²²

These constant interactions, often antagonistic, between different

21 Christopher Haas, *Alexandria in Late Antiquity: Topography and Social Conflict* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997), 5.

22 Although the Jewish population in Alexandria was severely reduced by the revolts of 115-117 C.E., it was not obliterated, as has occasionally been argued. See Christianus Brekelmans, Menahem Haran, *Hebrew Bible, Old Testament: The History of its Interpretation*, Vol. 2, Magne Saebø ed. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996), 479.

groups had an effect on those living in Alexandria. To live in the same city, each group had to conform with their neighbors to some extent, if only to communicate. The Jewish Philo, Christian Origen and Valentinus, and Pagan Hypatia for example, were from different times and religions, yet they shared Alexandrian values and certain beliefs and methods that rested loosely on Neoplatonist assumptions.²³ This, in itself, does not display any uniqueness of the Alexandrian tradition; however, it is sufficient to show that these interactions did take place and the influences are undeniable. Thus, Alexandria was a place where people understood and reacted to Greek influences.

Neoplatonic themes can be found in some of the writings of Arius. According to Roger E. Olson, “Neoplatonism [...] emphasized the oneness of being so that ultimate being, God, would have to be the absolutely undifferentiated One.”²⁴ This parallels Alastair H. B. Logan’s assertion that Arius was “determined to stress the absolute unity, otherness, and transcendence of God.”²⁵

Autonomous Presbyters of Alexandria

Alexandrian factionalism had another effect. It enabled disparate groups to function within a specific religious community without being held to a rigorously “orthodox” line. As long as Christianity was competing with Paganism and Judaism for its existence, there was little incentive to fracture the whole with infighting over specific interpretations of the Christian message. There are notable exceptions where a group either strayed too far from the confines of the larger religious identification, or a

²³ See Richard T. Wallis, ed., *Neoplatonism and Gnosticism* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1992), 49, 85-7, 208, 244-6, 250, 280-1, 299, 346.

²⁴ Olsen, 105.

²⁵ Logan, 16.

12 Articles

minority expression sought too much power. However, most groups, like the followers of Arius, were not considered too aberrant to tolerate. It is fair to assume, though it is speculative, that Arius did not have a “road to Damascus” experience. His views must have had at least some constancy. According to fifth century historian Sozomen, Bishop Alexander was the one who waffled on the issues Arius raised. He eventually sided with those, including Athanasius, who advocated what would become the co-eternal position.²⁶ It was not Arius that seemed uncertain of his position.

Christopher Haas states that the religious factionalism in Alexandria had a decidedly topographical element. He notes that specific presbyters were chosen for their churches based on the desires of the parishioners. These parishioners were also devoted to their presbyter and his specific style.²⁷ Arius, as a talented rhetorician and a noted aesthete, would not have been easy to control if the people that attended his church were supportive; and there is every indication that they were.

Athanasius marks a departure from the tradition of accepting the philosophical and rhetorical influences of the Greeks. Athanasius demonizes Greek philosophy.²⁸ Cyril of Alexandria, one of Athanasius’s successors to the bishopric of Alexandria, shared the Athanasian distrust of secular philosophy. He is often implicated in the mob murder of Hypatia the Neoplatonist philosopher.²⁹ Cyril’s immediate predecessor and uncle, Theophilus of Alexandria, was also aggressive in his opposition to Pagans and non-Christians and any influence that

²⁶ Sozomen, XV.

²⁷ Haas, 270.

²⁸ In Dialogue I of *Immutabilis*, Athanasius has his character Eranistes state, “I hold the truth.” Orthodox responds, “So say the heretics and Pagans. But let us not be enslaved to preconception, but discuss the question on purely Scriptural grounds. This is to keep the straight road.” Athanasius, “Dialogue I of *Immutabilis*,” *Later Treatises of S. Athanasius, Archbishop of Alexandria* (London: Parker and Co., 1881) 179.

²⁹ Daniel A. Keating, “Cyril of Alexandria,” *The Blackwell Companion to the Theologians* ed. Ian S. Markham, vol. 1 (Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2009), 79.

they might have in the Christian tradition. These shifts in Alexandria correspond with the time when Christianity became a tolerated, perhaps even preferred religion, in the empire. Thus, the more aggressive attitudes of Athanasius and his successors may be attributed to the larger shift that took place in society. The religious struggle and stalemate in Alexandria had been broken; Christianity was the victor. Consequently, the way that Christianity related to itself in Alexandria changed dramatically.

Emerging Arius

Who is the Arius that emerges from this understanding of Alexandrian culture? We find a man that fully embraced the rhetorical and philosophical traditions of Alexandria. Orthodox writers verify that there was an aesthetic quality to Arius that would have been fully in tune with the climate of Alexandria. On such writer notes Arius' aesthetic dress and eloquent speech. He declares, "[Arius] was unusually tall, wore a downcast expression and was [...] able to steal every innocent heart by his [...] outer show. For he always [...] was pleasant in his speech, and was forever winning souls round by flattery."³⁰ Although this statement was intended as an ominous warning about the guiles of evil in general and Arius specifically, also present in his criticism is a flattering observation about Arius's rhetorical skills. The vision of a monastic style of aestheticism emerges even more strongly when Epiphanius states that Arius took with him, following his expulsion, seventy virgin followers.³¹

Arius was the manifestation of converging attitudes prevalent

in Alexandria regarding Greek philosophy and pastoral autonomy.³² He

³⁰ Epiphanius, *The Panarion of Epiphanius of Salamis: Books II and III (Sects 47 - 80, De Fide)*, trans. by Frank Williams (Leiden, The Netherlands: E.J.Brill, 1994), 326.

³¹ Ibid.

³² Athanasius claimed that Arius had discarded "Moses and the other holy writers, and [...] put into their place a certain Sotades." Athanasius, *Orations*, 12.

14 Articles

lived and preached in Alexandria for many years prior to the outbreak of the controversy regarding his “heterodox” teachings. Although we can be certain that the environment in which Arius thrived was one that encouraged exploration and understanding of the Hellenistic philosophical traditions of Aristotle, Plato, the stoics, and the rhetorical style of the Greeks, his scriptural knowledge must not be under-emphasized. Arius’s *Thalia* contains numerous scriptural quotations. Athanasius wrote, “people may approve of the blasphemies of ‘Thalia,’ because it contains some scriptural words and phrases.”³³ Still, the environment in which his biblical exegesis developed was one that was informed by Greek philosophy, a Hellenistic worldview, and constant interactions among competing religious factions. Equally important his “heretical” teachings were tolerated for a long period of time and, by all accounts, garnered him a substantial following in Alexandria.

It was in the ascension of Athanasius that Arius began his descent from an Alexandrian presbyter to leader of heresy and enemy of orthodoxy. Without Athanasius, it is possible that Arius would have remained a little-known presbyter of a large congregation in Alexandria. His opposition to “the Arians”, in turn, defined Athanasius. Whether the Arians that served as his foil were real or Athanasius’s own fictional creation, as Rowan Williams contends, they did serve to catapult Athanasius into the role of defender of orthodoxy. It is possible that, without Arius, Athanasius would not have been the controversial saint known throughout Christianity for his extreme means employed in defense of orthodoxy.

One thing that cannot be disputed is that Arianism, however defined, has been used throughout Christian history by writers from 33 Athanasius, *Orations*, 17.

Sozomen to Augustine and even by theologians in the 19th and 20th centuries to exemplify the ultimate and definitive heresy. Orthodoxy could then be defined as that which opposes Arianism. Arianism, as such an ill-defined concept, serves the purpose of negatively defining orthodoxy better than a more systematic heterodox theology. The term "Arianism" can be applied to all sorts of "heresies" like a theological variant of Godwin's law.³⁴ If a theology is unorthodox, and it questions the Holy Trinity, it can be labeled as "Arian" or "semi-Arian," or later "neo-Arian."

More importantly, however, is that out of this opposition to "Arianism" arose the Nicene Creed. Alastair Logan notes that "even if the concept of 'Arianism' has been shown to be dubious, the issues he raised concerning the doctrines of God, Christ, creation, and salvation exercised the greatest theological minds of several generations and led directly to the Niceno-Constantinopolitan creed of 381, one of the few threads still holding together the tattered robe of Christendom."³⁵ The same Arianism that emerged from the climate of religious interactions in Alexandria and was subsequently declared a heresy, was the impetus behind the creation of a unified orthodoxy. Following the First Council of Nicaea the Christian community still had conflicts. Not every altercation within Christianity was resolved; not every theological outlier was addressed. However, at Nicaea, the infrastructure was laid, the road paved, and the path cleared toward an established orthodoxy, and a largely unified Church. That Church would remain so unified, at least officially, for 729 more years.

³⁴ Godwin's Law states that as an argument progresses the probability of one side being compared to Nazis approaches one.

³⁵ Logan, 23.

Bogus Or Bona Fide: The Legitimacy Of The Tudor Dynasty At The Accession Of Henry VIII

Catherine James

From “Bluff King Hal” to “Bloody Mary” to “Good Queen Bess,” the Tudor Dynasty is today recognized as a watershed in English history because of its charismatic monarchs. However, the Tudor Dynasty’s modern popularity and familiarity obscure a lingering question of legitimacy dating to its very founding.¹ Replacing the chaotic Plantagenet Dynasty, Tudor rule commenced in 1485 under Henry VII, yet insinuations of his illegitimacy immediately emerged among the nobility. Allegedly, Henry usurped the throne from King Richard III at the Battle of Bosworth Field, and he also lacked royal blood.² If Tudor rule was perceived as illegitimate, the accession of Henry VII’s seventeen-year-old son should have provoked a return to civil war as had occurred during the Wars of the Roses. Instead, Henry VIII peacefully assumed the throne of England in 1509 and “was greeted with feasting, dancing, and universal rejoicing.”³ In fact, “the advent of the new king made little alteration in the conduct of affairs.”⁴ The Tudor Dynasty at the start of Henry VIII’s reign was legitimate, and that legitimacy was attributable to the endless labor of the Tudor Dynasty’s founder – Henry VII.

1 Clifford S. L. Davies, “The Tudor Delusion,” *The Times Literary Supplement*, June 11, 2008, http://entertainment.timesonline.co.uk/tol/arts_and_entertainment/the_tls/article4111910.ece (accessed August 27, 2010).

2 Robert Bucholz and Newton Key, *Early Modern England, 1485-1714: A Narrative History* (Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2009), 41-42.

3 John Guy, “The Tudor Age: 1485-1603,” in *The Oxford Illustrated History of Britain*, ed. Kenneth O. Morgan (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995), 237.

4 J. D. Mackie, *The Earlier Tudors: 1485-1558* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962), 231.

Historically, legitimacy rested upon birthright, or possession of royal blood, a standard which Henry VII – and hence the Tudor Dynasty – met. Another traditional criterion for kingly legitimacy was right by conquest, fulfilled by Henry VII in his defeat of King Richard III at the Battle of Bosworth Field.⁵ Nevertheless, the Wars of the Roses “had unquestionably undermined confidence in the monarchy as an institution.”⁶ This paper contends that, therefore, Henry VII would be forced to both define and adhere to new and more demanding criteria of legitimacy to guarantee his dynasty’s future. First, “the essential demand [of legitimacy] was that someone should restore the English Crown to its former position above mere aristocratic faction. The king should not simply reign, he should also rule.”⁷ Sovereignty, or the condition of not being directly subject to internal higher authorities, and political stability were key elements of Henry VII’s legitimacy. Next, Tudor England’s recognition by foreign governments was a vital feature of legitimacy. Internal recognition issuing from sovereignty had to be augmented with international recognition to guarantee legitimacy. Lastly, the consent of the governed formed another crucial part of Henry VII’s definition of legitimacy. Though wanting to avoid the mistake of becoming a tool of faction as had doomed the Plantagenets, Henry desired a semblance of representative government in order to avert the threat of civil war by alienated nobles.⁸ Henry VII used these elements – sovereignty, political stability, foreign recognition, and consent of the governed – to consolidate and defend the legitimacy of the Tudor regime.

Sovereignty was the most important aspect of Tudor legitimacy,

5 Guy, “The Tudor Age,” 230-31.

6 Ibid., 232.

7 Ibid., 231.

8 Ibid., 232-35.

18 Articles

signaling that Henry VII would not be subject to any person of higher authority within his kingdom – he would not just reign, he would rule.⁹ In accentuating his royal supremacy, “Henry demonstrated his authority, defined acceptable behavior, and enforced an obligation of loyalty upon the powerful figures of the nation, [freeing] the crown from the direct influence of the aristocracy.”¹⁰ Indeed, Henry VII expressed sovereignty in his choice of government ministers whom he selected on the basis of skill and allegiance. No longer did noble rank guarantee contact with the king, rather “ability, good service, and loyalty to the regime, irrespective of a man’s social origins and background, were to be the primary grounds of appointments, promotions, favors, and rewards.”¹¹ Hence, great nobles and humble gentry vied against each other for offices, lands, pensions, and influence in a manner dictated by Henry VII, which permitted the allotment of spoils but only to persons who evinced loyalty and would not threaten the stability of his reign. Henry shrewdly permitted nobles enough power to perform the duties he allotted them and that comprised the extent of their power. For example, the Stanley family received mining rights in Lancashire in 1504, but their royal grant included provisions for tax collection – making the family directly answerable to the king.¹² Yet Henry VII’s sovereignty – and thus legitimacy – permeated numerous other facets of English life.

The practice of sovereignty extended into the social arena so that the power and prestige of the Tudor Dynasty would be awe-inspiring to the maximum number of subjects. Henry VII established Tudor legitimacy

⁹ *Ibid.*, 231.

¹⁰ Sean Cunningham, “Henry VII and the Shaping of the Tudor State,” *History Review* 51 (March 2005): 29. *General OneFile*, <http://ezproxy.una.edu:2053/gtx/infomark/A130052126> (accessed August 28, 2010).

¹¹ Guy, “The Tudor Age,” 232-33.

¹² Cunningham, 31.

by impressing people with majesty. For example, “he sat down under a golden cloth of estate to receive guests, surrounded by glowing tapestries and rich embroidered wall hangings, and with thick carpets underfoot. Trumpets blared and servants in colorful livery took their places in a scenic display whenever the king entered a room.”¹³ Henry believed the persistent demonstration of his authority fortified his sovereignty. To illustrate, he listened to church services in a box elevated one floor above the rest of the noble congregation, which placed him literally and figuratively closer to heaven and sent the message that he was sovereign.¹⁴ Henry VII descended from the box at the end of services and attracted the attention of the elite congregation, hence emphasizing the sovereignty of Tudor rule.¹⁵ Even architecture served to highlight Tudor sovereignty, as seen in the Privy Chamber. Royal households were segregated into public and private areas, including a suite of private apartments – the Privy Chamber – staffed by officers who “limited access to the royal person, opportunities for which were much sought after by those with political ambition and who regarded the monarch as the focal point of authority.”¹⁶ The king’s isolation from power-hungry nobles demoted them from manipulative figures to spectators whose main purpose was to partake of the pomp and majesty of the royal court.¹⁷ Henry VII asserted sovereignty in both government and public life and that allowed him take the next step to consolidate legitimacy – political stability.

When Henry VIII assumed the throne in 1509, he achieved the first

13 Carolly Erickson, *Royal Panoply: Brief Lives of the English Monarchs* (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 2006), 148.

14 Fiona Kisby, “When the King Goeth a Procession: Chapel Ceremonies and Services, the Ritual Year, and Religious Reforms at the Early Tudor Court, 1485-1547,” *Journal of British Studies* 40, no. 1 (January 2001): 64. JSTOR, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3070769> (accessed August 28, 2010).

15 Ibid.

16 Ibid., 46.

17 Cunningham, 30.

20 Articles

peaceful transition of power since the Wars of the Roses commenced in 1455 – a dynastic feat made possible in part by his father’s commitment to political stability. “The secret of [Henry VII’s success] was that his authority was generally regarded as the only guarantee of good order” following the chaos produced by the Wars of the Roses, lasting three decades, most of which involved nobles with large private armies.¹⁸ Political stability as defined by Henry VII consisted of two elements – military control and economic penalty. He ordered nobles to disband their private armies, because as the legitimate sovereign only he could have an army at beck and call. If nobles refused to relinquish their manpower, Henry VII imposed monetary or territorial fines upon them.¹⁹ Henry restricted the autonomy of the nobility and reinforced his legitimacy as sovereign by these actions, which confirmed that he was England’s only military authority. At the same time, Henry significantly strengthened Tudor finances by implementing such monetary and territorial fines because “the fundamental fact in the restoration of royal power was the restoration of royal wealth; in order to be the most powerful man in the kingdom the king had to be the richest.”²⁰

For Henry VII, political stability both ensured his dynasty’s legitimacy and discouraged aristocratic factions with localized private armies. Therefore, he concentrated “the command of castles and garrisons, and ... the supervision of military functions, in the members of the royal household, and he launched direct attacks on the local, territorial powers of the magnates, if he felt that those powers had been exercised in defiance of perceived royal interests.”²¹ Nobles who refused to accept political

¹⁸ Mackie, 58.

¹⁹ Guy, “The Tudor Age,” 234-36.

²⁰ G. R. Elton, *The Tudor Revolution in Government: Administrative Changes in the Reign of Henry VIII* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1969), 25.

²¹ Guy, “The Tudor Age,” 235.

stability were either prosecuted and made to pay a fine or – in the most severe cases – faced forfeiture and attainder, implying treason, loss of life and title, and loss of property and possessions to the Crown.²² King Henry VII appreciated attainders “could be used constructively in favor of the monarchy to wipe out at a stroke territorial powers of ‘overmighty’ or hostile magnates, while [simultaneously] augmenting the Crown’s own power and income.”²³ For example, Lord Burgavenny was found guilty of illegally keeping a private army of 471 men in 1507 and was fined £1 million in today’s currency.²⁴ Primarily due to fines and attainders, in 1509 annual crown revenue totaled £113,000, giving Henry VIII a realm both wealthy and tranquil as nobles behaved or paid out expensive penalties.²⁵ Henry VII assured Tudor legitimacy because he tipped the balance of power between crown and nobility back in favor of the king.

Legitimacy was also secured with Parliament owing to political stability. Henry VII abided by the maxim that the king had to live of his own and not seek revenue or more funds from Parliament – as had been required of monarchs during the Wars of the Roses since revenue from Crown lands and customs duties were dramatically lessened in the chaos.²⁶ Taxpayers and their parliamentary representatives were unreceptive toward more taxes and Henry perceived the necessity of avoiding a clash over funding. He “built up his legendary fortune on the secure basis of the vast and ever increasing Crown lands – old royal demesne, the family properties of Tudor and Lancaster, the spoils of the Wars of the Roses, gains of repeated forfeitures and attainders.”²⁷ Henry

22 Bucholz and Key, 407.

23 Guy, “The Tudor Age,” 236.

24 Ibid., 235-36.

25 John Guy, *Tudor England* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990), 10.

26 Bucholz and Key, 51-53.

27 Elton, 26.

22 Articles

satisfied Parliament by not demanding funding and that body willingly cooperated with him.²⁸ Henry VII assured Tudor legitimacy within England, quelling nobility and Parliament by means of political stability. He then turned his attention to another vital feature of legitimacy – that of international recognition.

Henry VII had achieved internal legitimacy through sovereignty and political stability, yet international legitimacy – or recognition within the community of kingly nations – was just as important to the legitimacy of the Tudor Dynasty. International recognition had multiple benefits, namely lessening the threat of foreign invasion, reducing the possibility of foreign partners for any English dissidents, and gaining allies in case of war against England by another foreign nation.²⁹ “Throughout his reign Henry VII’s foreign policy was defensive,” meaning that he cultivated friends rather than enemies abroad.³⁰ Henry enhanced the legitimacy of his dynasty by uniting it with more established foreign powers, specifically through marriage alliances. Thus, at his death, England might not have been encircled by allies, but certainly could claim relatives.

First, Henry strove to secure his northern border, forging a Treaty of Perpetual Peace with Scotland in 1502 and concluding the alliance the next year with the marriage of his daughter Margaret to Scotland’s King James.³¹ Henry VII also achieved an alliance with Spain, which proved enormously beneficial since by 1501 Spain would be a superpower due to Columbus’ discoveries. Not only was Henry VII’s son Arthur given in marriage to Ferdinand and Isabella’s daughter Catherine of Aragon, but Tudor England also gained a military partner against France in the 1489

28 Bucholz and Key, 53.

29 Ibid., 45-46.

30 Guy, Tudor England, 74.

31 Guy, “The Tudor Age,” 254.

Treaty of Medina del Campo with Spain.³² Though Henry VII's succession of marriage alliances gave Tudor rule prestige – and accordingly legitimacy – on the international stage, he further ensured legitimacy with recognition by the pope.

A recognition by the pope proclaimed to the world that Tudor England was sanctified by God. On March 27, 1486, Pope Innocent VIII “recognized categorically the title of Henry to the English throne and denounced any who should oppose him as rebels against whom the sentence of excommunication would inevitably be pronounced.”³³ In a Europe of solely Catholic faith, Henry VII's papal recognition was paramount in securing the legitimacy of his rule and that of his heirs. “It may be fairly supposed that Rome would not have spoken in such uncompromising terms, after so long a civil war, unless she had felt sure that the new king ... would establish a durable authority.”³⁴ An abundance of international friends did not mean Henry VII abandoned internal friends; rather, consent of the governed was essential in order to avert the threat of civil war by alienated nobles.

Consent of the governed was Henry VII's final measure in consolidating the Tudor Dynasty's legitimacy. Henry VII realized his sovereignty – especially the practices of forfeiture and attainder – must be counterbalanced with some form of noble participation in government or else civil war would again erupt.³⁵ He was also aware that Tudor legitimacy hinged in part on the incorporation of the defeated Yorkist element into government.³⁶ Henry VII satisfied consent of the governed by means of the King's Council and Yorkist inclusion.

³² Bucholz and Key, 46.

³³ Mackie, 65-66.

³⁴ Ibid., 66.

³⁵ Guy, “The Tudor Age,” 235.

³⁶ Bucholz and Key, 44.

24 Articles

The King's Council was "a judicious combination of carrot and stick," meant to ensure loyalty to Tudor rule.³⁷ A council routinely consisted of the nobility, bishops, and government ministers, and further comprised local representatives when great national crises developed, such as war.³⁸ As a rule, however, Henry VII did not consult with more than 20 or 30 councilors, so that he could always dominate. Yet, by "making councilor involvement a new and subtle dimension of magnate status, Henry VII went far towards filtering out the threat of alienated nobility that sprang from lack of communications."³⁹ Thus, Henry VIII inherited a kingdom with neutralized nobility owing to the royal council, as well as a realm whose distinct constituent elements – Yorkist and Lancastrian – had been reconciled.

Yorkist King Richard III's defeat by Lancastrian Henry VII at Bosworth Field obviously produced feelings of hostility and rebellion in those Yorkists who survived the battle and were forced to submit to the new Tudor rule. Henry VII was aware Tudor legitimacy largely hinged on the inclusion of the defeated Yorkist element into Tudor government. Thus, he imposed attainder on the most powerful Yorkists, but did not bother Yorkists with negligible influence – "that is, he destroyed those who had the potential to challenge him, while offering his protection and favor to those who were not a threat."⁴⁰ By this political maneuver, Henry VII caused many Yorkists to pledge allegiance to him, and he deprived potential Yorkist insurgents of a widespread popular following.⁴¹ Yet, Henry's readiness to incorporate Yorkists culminated in his choice of Elizabeth of York, niece of Yorkist King Richard III, for his queen. This

37 Guy, "The Tudor Age," 234.

38 Guy, Tudor England, 59.

39 Guy, "The Tudor Age," 235.

40 Bucholz and Key, 44.

41 Ibid.

“Union of the Two Noble and Illustrious Families of Lancaster and York” was calculated to secure the Tudor Dynasty’s legitimacy.⁴² Once Henry VII and Elizabeth had children, they would be impervious to any claims against dynastic legitimacy. In one sense, Henry achieved a coup d’état of matrimony instead of might, but his marriage was also part of a larger development indicating that “the Tudor state was a national monarchy to a degree new in England.”⁴³ Henry VII not only secured the legitimacy of the Tudor Dynasty by his marriage and other actions such as sovereignty and attainder, but concurrently transitioned from medieval to modern monarch.

By adhering to new criteria of legitimacy to guarantee his dynasty’s future, Henry VII eradicated numerous flaws in medieval government.⁴⁴ Even if he was not “the inventor of new methods of government, [he] mastered the art of streamlining the old.”⁴⁵ The foundation of his success was imposing political and financial commitment to the Crown. Henry VII prompted a new mindset among the nobility, who were oriented towards service and allegiance to the king in order to advance and prosper rather than contemplating factional plotting centered upon the king. Henry instituted modern government by placing military forces under his central command, by seeking sources of revenue not originated in an act of Parliamentary legislation, and by investing some power in the hands of lawyers and lay administrators, such as in the royal council.⁴⁶ Most significantly, Henry VII transitioned to modern monarch through his elevation of the rank of king above the nobility, letting him determine the course of government rather than

42 Guy, “The Tudor Age,” 231.

43 Elton, 4.

44 Cunningham, 28.

45 Guy, “The Tudor Age,” 232.

46 Cunningham, 28-29.

26 Articles

merely being a part of its progression.

The stage was set for Henry VIII's reign as a legitimate Tudor monarch. He benefitted from subdued nobility and a parallel overall national stability unknown prior to his father's reign.⁴⁷ Henry VIII took over a kingdom whose distinct constituent elements – Yorkist and Lancastrian – had been reconciled. The regime enjoyed favorable international recognition from Spain and Scotland. He gained a cooperative Parliament. Lastly, Henry VIII inherited royal supremacy – or sovereignty – and would not be subject to any person of higher authority in his kingdom. Henry VIII assumed the throne of England in 1509 and would achieve renown, yet his accession was a tribute to his father's perseverance and adherence to new and more demanding criteria of legitimacy, specifically sovereignty and political stability, international recognition, and consent of the governed. In his twenty-four year reign, Henry VII "revived the ancient strength of the English monarchy, turned it into new channels, inspired it with fresh energy, and sent it forth upon a path of future greatness."⁴⁸ Henry VII should be acknowledged as the greatest of Tudors because he oriented England politically and socially toward the king, who could then alone define and maintain legitimacy.

47 Bucholz and Key, 54.

48 Mackie, 230.

Redefining Resistance: The German Occupation of the Channel Islands during World War II

Kerrie Holloway

During World War II, the only part of Great Britain occupied by the German forces was the Channel Islands. Over the past seventy years, the Channel Islands have been discredited for their lack of large scale resistance similar to that found in many occupied European countries. Instead, this paper will explore how the residents showed their defiance through small scale, unorganized acts of passive resistance such as disobedience of German laws, minor sabotage, sheltering and aiding escaped slave workers, illegal news from wireless radios and leaflets, the “V for Victory” campaign, speaking their native languages, and paying homage to Britain in postage stamps. This type of resistance did not turn the tide of the war, but it allowed the people of the Channel Islands to take a stand against the German occupation and boosted their morale. While many people continue to view any collaboration by the Islanders with the Germans as treason, it should be seen as necessary for survival. By examining diaries, letters, interviews, memoirs, and monographs, this paper will demonstrate that although their outward collaboration contrasted with their resistance efforts, it was these efforts that showed the true loyalties of the residents of the Channel Islands.

The Channel Islands are located in the English Channel between England and France and are remnants of the Duchy of Normandy that became part of England in the Norman Conquest of 1066. They are British Crown dependencies but not part of the United Kingdom; they are

28 Articles

self-governed, but acts of Parliament do apply to them through special provisions.¹ The main islands of the Channel Islands are Jersey, Guernsey, Alderney, Sark and Herm. During the war, Great Britain demilitarized the Channel Islands before the German invasion and left the Islanders without plans for defending themselves against the occupation. Nevertheless, because the Islands were the only part of Great Britain occupied by Germany during WWII, they became extremely valuable as a symbol of German dominance over all of Great Britain regardless of their actual size and significance; and Hitler felt the Islands could remain under German control indefinitely because of their similar Norman heritage.² The occupation lasted from 1940-1945 and did not end until a year after D-Day and 7 days after Hitler's suicide.

The difference between active and passive resistance and organized and non-organized resistance has been constantly debated by historians since the end of World War II. Generally, active resistance denotes armed, militant resistance while passive resistance encompasses all other types of resistance. Organized resistance is resistance, active or passive, that requires cooperation between groups of people under some type of hierarchy of authority. Non-organized resistance is resistance that is carried out collaboratively or individually, but the people involved do not answer to any type of authority. In the Channel Islands, the only resistance during the German occupation was passive and non-organized. While many people collaborated in their resistance, there was no hierarchical, organized resistance like the European Resistance Movements; and there is no evidence of any active, armed resistance at all

1 Louise Willmot, "The Channel Islands," *Resistance in Western Europe* (Oxford, Burg Publishers, 2000), 66.

2 Louise Willmot, "The Goodness of Strangers: Help to Escaped Russian Slave Laborers in Occupied Jersey, 1942-1945," *Contemporary European History* 11 (2002): 211.

on the Islands. Rather than an excuse for not creating an organized, active resistance movement, passive resistance often shows the true loyalty of those involved because it is often a spontaneous reaction against the situation without the necessity of organization.³

The Channel Islands did not mount a large scale resistance movement for several reasons. First and foremost, Britain enumerated its policy that the Channel Islands should remain peaceful in a commentary from the War Office in London charging residents that “obedience to the occupant is one of the implied conditions of the special position accorded to the peaceful inhabitants.”⁴ In contemporary views, obedience was synonymous with collaboration; and thus, Britain forced Islanders to collaborate with Germany especially considering the demilitarization of the Islands before the Germans even arrived. Demographically, most of the young men who would have made up a resistance movement had either left to help fight the war or had evacuated before the arrival of the Germans so that they comfortably outnumbered the men of military age who were left on the Islands; and geographically, the size of the Islands left its residents nowhere to run and no place to hide.⁵ Finally, some Islanders argued against any type of large scale resistance based on morality. In his diary, Bernard Baker of Jersey noted, “I can of course kill a German, sabotage an aeroplane [*sic*], destroy a number of Lorries, but if by so doing I bring heavy punishments to bear on 40,000 people...am I a patriot? Or am I a traitor?”⁶ The lack of a large scale resistance movement did not mean that the Islanders approved of the Germans or wanted to

3 Jørgen Hæstrup, *European Resistance Movements* (Westport, CT: Meckler Publishing, 1981), 139.

4 Jurat Sir John Leale, “Guernsey under German Rule,” *International Affairs* (Royal Institute of International Affairs 1944--) 22 (1946): 219.

5 MRD Foot, *Resistance: European Resistance to Nazism, 1940-1945* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co, 1977), 270.

6 Rab Bennett, *Under the Shadow of the Swastika*, (New York: University Press, 1999), 18.

30 Articles

help them in any way, but rather, they had to resort to passive resistance because it was the only feasible form of resistance available to the Channel Islanders.⁷ As Charles Cruickshank puts it, "The Islanders cannot be criticized for not starting a resistance movement. They are rather to be congratulated on their good sense."⁸

One of the most prevalent forms of passive resistance on the Islands was the general disobedience of German orders and laws. Although this type of resistance was seen by many as pointless, the Islanders' disobedience of German orders did save some lives and showed their true loyalties to Britain.⁹ Many of the orders that were disobeyed dealt with livestock and produce as the Islanders tried to survive by supplementing the food rations regulated by the Germans. Peter Le Prevost, who lived out the occupation as a child on Guernsey, remembered how his father reported to the Germans that their family cow had either been lost or stolen when in reality she was slaughtered and the meat distributed to friends and family.¹⁰ Others disobeyed orders that would indirectly aid the Germans such as when the Superior Council in Jersey refused to repair a road that led to an ammunition dump.¹¹ John Crossley Hayes described in his memoir how one of his neighbors hid his car under a haystack for all five years of the occupation rather than surrender it to the Germans.¹² Another example is a small booklet printed by the Allies and distributed throughout the Islands entitled *Stiegel the Woodcutter*.

The booklet was written in German and abandoned the story of Stiegel

⁷ Hæstrup, 145.

⁸ Charles Cruickshank, *The German Occupation of the Channel Islands* (London: Oxford University Press, 1975), 152.

⁹ Madeleine Bunting, *The Model Occupation: The Channel Islands under German Rule, 1940-1945* (London: Harper Collins Publishers, 1995), 192.

¹⁰ Peter Le Provost, "A Child's War: The German Occupation of Guernsey," *WW2 People's War*, <http://www.bbc.co.uk/ww2peopleswar/stories/78/a4185678.shtml#top>.

¹¹ Cruickshank, 157.

¹² *Ibid.*, 62.

after the first page. The rest of the booklet provided soldiers and workers with comprehensive instructions on how to fake symptoms of shingles, jaundice, backache, digestive disturbances, and even partial paralysis so they would be considered unfit for work.¹³ By faking sickness and injury, Islanders could avoid doing work that would aid the German cause. Similarly, John Leale recounted a time in which he could not with a good conscience hang posters with anti-Russian propaganda because Russia had recently allied itself with Britain; instead, Leale sent the posters back with the excuse that hanging posters was not the job of the local administration.¹⁴

Along with general disobedience, several Islanders took resistance one step further and engaged in minor sabotage. Minor sabotage did not appear until almost nine months after the start of the occupation, but it continued to occur until the Germans left.¹⁵ In the last eighteen months of the Occupation, sabotage increased and was not limited to the Germans. Instead, it included painting swastikas on homes of Islanders accused of collaboration.¹⁶ Sabotage was most easily achieved by Islanders employed by the Germans, and like disobedience, many acts of sabotage concerned food supplies. Some were acts of omission in which merchants failed to mention that rats had nibbled on the melons bought by German soldiers or waitresses who failed to inform the Germans that they spit in their soup.¹⁷ Others stole food directly from the Germans by breaking bags of macaroni or flour and hiding some in their shoes while they unloaded supply boats.¹⁸ One Islander remembered sewing up “the arms and legs

13 John Crossley Hayes, “A Sojourn in Guernsey” (unpublished memoir, 1947), 43.

14 Leale, 223-224.

15 Willmot, “The Channel Islands,” 67.

16 Ibid., 68.

17 Zilma Roussel, “Evacuation: Guernsey,” WW2 People’s War, <http://www.bbc.co.uk/ww2peopleswar/stories/47/a1998147.shtml>.

18 Cheryl de la Mare, “Memories of the Occupation of Guernsey as Told by Ira Le Sauvage,”

32 Articles

of the underclothes they gave [her] aunt to wash, so that when there was an alarm, and they had to get out of bed quickly, they couldn't get into their clothes."¹⁹ Other acts of sabotage were carried out by children, mostly boys between the ages of 15 and 20, who stole German bicycles and food, defused mines, and cut telegraph wires and railway lines.²⁰ Finally, the most impressive act of sabotage was carried out on the island of Jersey where the Airport Controller, Charles Roche, ordered the chief groundsman to cut the grass much shorter than normal so that German pilots would not touch down quickly enough and instead crash into the fence. Twenty-eight planes were damaged within the year, and the Germans resorted to cutting the grass themselves.²¹

Another act of passive resistance carried out on the Islands was sheltering and aiding escaped slave workers, but the extent to which this occurred is unknown because of the inherent secrecy and the immediate one-way ticket to a concentration camp it typically earned if discovered. Over 16,000 workers were brought to the Channel Islands from both Western and Eastern Europe to work in the Organisation Todt, but the workers from Eastern European countries, such as Britain's ally Russia, faced much worse conditions. Many Islanders helped Todt workers by handing out food and warm clothing whenever possible even though such contact was forbidden by the Germans.²² On the island of Jersey Mrs. Metcalfe and her sister led an informal network of families and safe houses hiding escaped slave workers so that at the end of the occupation there were approximately 20 in hiding, and some of those escaped workers

WW2 People's War, <http://www.bbc.co.uk/ww2peopleswar/stories/38/a3846738.shtml>; Hayes, 54.

¹⁹ Bunting, 195.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 199.

²¹ Alan and Mary Wood, *Islands in Danger: The Story of the German Occupation of the Channel Islands, 1940-1945* (London: Evans Brothers Limited, 1955), 74.

²² Willmot, "The Goodness of Strangers," 215.

had been in hiding for almost two years.²³ Some Islanders took these workers, many who were Russian, into their home, taught them to speak English, and gave them new identities in order to escape notice from the Germans.²⁴ They used disguises like eyeglasses and hair dyes as necessary, and Islanders helped them obtain identity cards by requesting duplicates of their own “lost” or “stolen” cards.²⁵ While the total number of escaped workers may never be known, this is one area in which resistance did make a significant difference to the individuals who were saved.

Aiding escaped workers may not have been widespread, but listening to the BBC became the most prevalent form of passive resistance in the Islands.²⁶ Throughout the five years of German occupation, the Germans confiscated and returned the residents’ wireless radios several times. When the radios were outlawed, residents of the Channel Islands continued to listen to the BBC on hidden radios or crystal receivers – homemade radios they made using instructions aired on the BBC.²⁷ Islanders who had to hand in their radios rushed to buy others, if possible, being careful to change the hiding places often showing the importance the Islanders placed on hearing news from the country to which they remained loyal. Frank Falla commented in his memoir, “To have heard the BBC news inspired us with a feeling of knowing the truth, and gave us a heart to carry on.”²⁸ News from Great Britain also arrived by British planes that would fly over the Islands and drop leaflets which would then be passed around and used to create underground newspapers like the Guernsey Underground News Service, or GUNS.²⁹ GUNS published daily

23 Wood, 126; Bunting, 217.

24 Bunting, 219.

25 Willmot, “The Goodness of Strangers,” 217.

26 Bunting, 208.

27 Cruickshank, 151.

28 Willmot, “The Channel Islands,” 79.

29 Cruickshank, 151.

34 Articles

leaflets from May 1942 to February 1944 frustrating the Germans who viewed the news leaflets as evidence of organized resistance.³⁰ The leaflets were hidden in empty milk cans taken around by the milkman and pre-arranged books at the library that people could casually read, and three copies were sent daily to the neighboring island of Sark.³¹ The Guernsey newspaper came to an end after a raid on the house of Charles Machon, the linotype operator, and the subsequent imprisonment and death of him and Joseph Gillingham in a German concentration camp.³²

In the summer of 1941, the BBC made an appeal for people to put up “V for Victory” signs as part of the general resistance campaign in Europe. This campaign irritated the Germans because it was tangible evidence of the loyalty of millions of regular listeners to the BBC showing not only the determination of the Islanders to remain part of Great Britain but also how many Islanders had access to banned radios. In the Channel Islands, people drew “V” signs at various places including German street signs, houses, doors, gateposts, and walls. In Guernsey, a man named de Guillebon even chalked a “V” on German soldiers’ bicycle seats so that when the German soldiers sat down, their pants were marked with the ‘V’.³³ For this act of defiance, De Guillebon was caught and sentenced to a year in prison in France.³⁴ Similarly, two teenage sisters, Kathleen le Norman and Mrs. Lilian Kinnaird were seen making a “V” sign with their fingers and sentenced to nine months in jail.³⁵ Some Islanders took to wearing badges cut out of old pennies in the shape of a “V” and pinned undetected to the underside of their lapels.³⁶ However, the magnitude of

30 Bunting, 212.

31 Wood, 177.

32 Willmot, “The Channel Islands,” 72.

33 Bunting, 204.

34 Wood, 113.

35 Ibid.

36 Bunting, 204.

this act of resistance is in question with both Louise Willmot reporting that only a minority of the Islanders took part in the campaign and Rab Bennett stating that it was absent altogether.³⁷

Another act of passive resistance on several of the larger Islands was speaking their own languages which were incomprehensible to the Germans during the Occupation. Guernsey, Jersey, Alderney, and Sark all had their own dialects of Norman French that had been spoken for over 1,000 years.³⁸ As an act of resistance, the Islanders spoke derogatorily to the Germans in these dialects while the Germans just smiled in ignorance.³⁹ Speaking their native dialects also gave the residents of the Channel Islands a “language of solidarity and secrecy” in a time when many Islanders were in need of communicating without fear of the Germans overhearing.⁴⁰

The final act of passive resistance, and arguably the least significant, was hiding symbols of British loyalty in the newly authorized postage stamps. On Jersey, the first stamps were designed by Major N.V.L. Rybot. When asked, he almost refused rather than to aid the enemy, “but it then occurred to him that he could insult the Germans in the design – hence the insertion of four minute ‘A’s in the corners of the design, which were intended to stand for ‘Ad Avernum Adolfé Atrox’: that is to say ‘To Hell with You Atrocious Adolph.’”⁴¹ Another stamp designer, Edmund Blampied, incorporated the Royal cipher G.R., George Regent, in the scroll-work of the 3 pence Jersey postage stamp to pay homage to King

George VI. Both of these stamp designs went apparently unnoticed by the

³⁷ Willmot, “The Channel Islands,” 67; Bennett, 247.

³⁸ Julia Sallabank, “Prestige From the Bottom Up: A Review of Language Planning in Guernsey,” in *Language Planning and Policy: Language Planning in Local Contexts*, ed. Anthony J. Liddicoat and Richard B. Baldauf, Jr. (Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters, 2008), 121.

³⁹ de la Mare, <http://www.bbc.co.uk/ww2peopleswar/stories/38/a3846738.shtml>.

⁴⁰ Sallabank, 122.

⁴¹ Cruickshank, 128.

36 Articles

Germans.

The reports on resistance in the Channel Islands during the German occupation of World War II continue to be divisive with many researchers disregarding any form of passive resistance during the occupation. Because the Islands did not have a large scale resistance effort similar to that of France or other countries on the continent one such researcher, MRD Foot, concluded, "An embarrassment for an English writer on resistance remains: the Channel Islands.... virtually no resistance."⁴² Even those who agree the Islanders participated in passive resistance disagree over the extent in terms of the percentage of the population that participated. Some reports show that only a minority of Islanders, less than a thousand out of a population of 60,000 during the war, participated in organized resistance.⁴³ One local resident, John Hayes described in his memoir the Islanders' attitude as "not acceptance of [the Germans'] presence (collaboration) or denial of it (resistance) but rather indifference to it."⁴⁴

On the other hand, many historians argue the Islanders went above and beyond in their loyalty to the British. Even though the Channel Islands were exempt from military service outside of the Islands and were not required by the Constitution to send a single man to help Britain fight the war, they still "instantly and unhesitatingly reaffirmed their loyalty to the Crown, and for the second time in half a century waived their traditional right of exemption from military service overseas."⁴⁵ This act of extreme loyalty was one of the key reasons why large scale resistance was not possible in the Islands rather than a lack of resistance being evidence

⁴² Foot, 270.

⁴³ Willmot, "The Channel Islands," 85.

⁴⁴ Hayes, 67.

⁴⁵ Cruickshank, 326.

of disloyalty. In terms of the number of people involved in resistance efforts, historians have a hard time defining “organized resistance” and determining which individuals participated. On the Islands, many people may have participated individually, and most participated anonymously, because of the severe punishments given to those who were caught. John Hayes was “granted a special favour” of six months in jail on the Islands rather than in Germany for being in the possession of a wireless radio.⁴⁶ Others such as Canon Cohu, Peter Painter, and Louisa Gould were sentenced to several years in prison on the continent and died in concentration camps for the same transgression.⁴⁷ Perhaps the most telling comment came from Frank Falla who lived through the occupation on the Islands until being sent to the continent for his part in GUNS. Falla commented in his memoir,

My own feeling is that ninety-eight percent here were loyal to Britain and their neighbours. The two percent who weren't did damage beyond all proportion to their number. But a lot of those who came back didn't know what they were talking about, when blaming some of those who remained for “collaboration.” You only know what they went through if you have been through something like it yourself. No one else has any right to judge.⁴⁸

For those who did not live through the occupation on the Islands, it is hard, if not impossible, to draw the line between treasonous collaboration in order to aid the enemy and patriotic collaboration in order to obey Britain's mandate and endure the war without inflicting punishments on fellow citizens. Any acts that could be viewed as collaboration erred in judgment rather than loyalty. The Islanders' cooperation with the Germans came because they felt it was the best way to “endure the war,

⁴⁶ Hayes, 57.

⁴⁷ Wood.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, 235.

without thereby forfeiting any of their patriotism."⁴⁹

Passive resistance in the Channel Islands was significant because it boosted the morale of a people under enemy occupation and gave them the confidence that they were not allowing the Germans to take advantage of them. The Islanders gave little, if any, thought to how they would be perceived by their contemporaries, much less by the generations to come. Historians tend to agree that their small acts of passive resistance had no impact on German military strategy or the progress of the war in Europe, but these acts should not be underestimated. They showed the Islanders' true loyalty to Britain and allowed them to maintain their nation's honor. Even acts of petty sabotage were seen as small annoyances to the Germans that boosted the morale of the Islanders involved.⁵⁰ Jean-Paul Sartre, who participated in the resistance movement in France, wrote shortly after the liberation: "Resistance was only an individual solution and we always knew it...Its value in our eyes was above all symbolic."⁵¹ Even without a large, organized resistance movement like that in continental Europe, the Islanders chose the only avenue that they had available to fight the occupation – the symbolic resistance of disobeying orders, sabotaging the Germans, helping escaped slave workers, listening to the BBC, participating in the "V for Victory" campaign, speaking their native languages, and incorporating their loyalty into postage stamps.

49 Hayes., 339.

50 Willmot, "The Channel Islands," 78.

51 Bennett, 275.

Sheppard's Flock

Lacy Offutt

Yes sir, I am the Sheppard and all the turnkeys of Newgate are my flock. And I cannot but stir from here and they all come baaing after me.

-Jack Sheppard

The daring escapes of Jack Sheppard captured the imaginations of the people of London as it allowed the common man to live vicariously through Sheppard's deeds. In a time where the newspapers were reporting on an ever-increasing crime rate and parliament was passing stricter and more oppressive laws, Jack Sheppard gave people a sense of escapism in a world in which they otherwise had little control over. His deeds and the sensationalizing of them seized the attention of the Londoners of his time and gave them an anti-hero to cheer for who was able to escape the confines of an ordinary person's life. His exploits also gave his contemporaries a different view on crime and helped influence the way crime fiction was formed. His brief life affected the way Londoners of two centuries later would romanticize thieves, crime, and criminals.

If we are to understand what it was about Jack Sheppard's deeds that first so enthralled the people of his time, we must first look at the events that shaped the consciousness of an ordinary Londoner during this time. During the early half of the eighteenth century, after George I came to the throne in 1714, England experienced a flood of legislature aimed at keeping the lower classes in submission and the ruling classes firmly on top. Douglas Hay reasons that this was because of the "freedom not of men, but of men of property" which followed the 1688 Glorious Revolution. It was during this period that the value of property became far

40 Articles

more important to the ruling class than the value of human life.¹ It was this type of thinking that would see many criminals swing on the Tyburn tree for minor acts of theft -- Sheppard among them. Two of the laws passed, which were aimed at the criminal class, were the Waltham Black Act of 1723 and the Transportation Act of 1719.

Where previously the courts had the choice between hanging or branding a criminal and then releasing them, the Transportation Act gave them the option of sending these lower class men and women away for forced slave labor in the West Indies or the American colonies. The amount of time spent there would be based on what sort of crime they committed. For example, someone pardoned for capital punishment could expect fourteen years of this. With the passing of the Black Act in 1723, England -- and London in particular -- suddenly found itself with more offences that received capital punishment than ever.

The Waltham Black Act, or as it was more commonly called, the Black Act, would be the Act that Jack Sheppard, like many other low-class criminals of the day, would fall victim to. According to Thompson, this Act was said to have, "signaled the onset of the flood-tide of retributive justice."² This one act completely changed the face of English law of the day. The Act included in its count somewhere between 200-250 crimes that could receive capital punishment.³ The exact reason behind the passing of this Act seems murky at best. The only explanation that can be found involves acts of poaching done around the forests and private properties of England by men who would "blacken" their faces in order to conceal their identities. Specifically a group of armed men known as the Waltham

1 Douglas Hay, "Property, Authority and the Criminal Law" in *Albion's Fatal Tree* (Penguin Books: New York, 1977), 18-19.

2 E.P. Thompson, *Whigs and Hunters* (London: Penguin Books Ltd, 1975) 22-23.

3 *Ibid.*, 23.

Blacks would break into these forests, carry off deer, and rescue other offenders from the constables.⁴ These offenders, who would humiliate and defy authority and destroy or steal the ever-important property of the wealthy, were naturally seen as a threat against the established order of the world.

Other pieces of legislature passed at the time included the Riot Act of 1715, the Combination Act of 1721, and the Workhouse Act of 1723. The Riot Act was used as a way to disperse crowds of people if they were, “unlawfully, riotously and tumultuously assembled” so that people could not form a protest against the ruling class.⁵ In 1780 an anonymous “dilettante in Law and Politics” published a work arguing that the Riot Act was ignoring the Common Law of England and had created “capital crime out of what was not before in any degree, criminal or punishable.”⁶ This anonymous voice continues to point out the absurdity in the wording of this Act and how it needed to be remedied by newer amendments in the hopes of “preserving our freedom.”⁷

The Combination Act was the “earliest Act of British history designed to stop the formation of trade unions.”⁸ It had been set in place specifically for a group of master tailors who wanted to stop over 15,000 journeyman tailors from being able to unite and request better pay and shorter working hours. Together these Acts seem to paint a picture of a government seeking to control the freedoms of its people, or simply that of a wealthy faction which was completely uncaring towards the needs of the lesser classes. Thompson is writing about the Black Act, but his view that

4 Ibid., 27.

5 Peter Linebaugh, *The London Hanged*, (London: Verso, 2006), 17.

6 *Observations Upon the Riot Act with an Attempt Towards the Amendment of it* (London: T. Cadell in the Strand, 1781), 6.

7 Ibid., 28.

8 Linebaugh, 17.

42 Articles

it was “drawn up and enacted by men who had forced habits of mental distance and morality towards human life” can be extended towards these other Acts as well.⁹

With all of these new laws passed that were aimed at keeping the poor man in his place or which viewed human life as less important than a few stolen spoons, it is no wonder that the people of London welcomed the man who was able to defy this authority and escape the court’s judgment under impossible odds. Jack Sheppard must have seemed like a breath of fresh air to them.

The workhouse was an institution which would have also had an effect on the people of London and on Jack Sheppard himself. At the age of seven or eight Sheppard was sent to Bishopsgates workhouse where he stayed for a year and a half. Afterwards, he was taken in by Mr. Kneebone, a woolen draper, for whom his mother worked and who also employed Sheppard as a shop boy.¹⁰ Linebaugh sums up what affect this might have had on young Jack by pointing out that the workhouse was an “institution designed to instill habit of industry and obedience among its incarcerated inmates...produced Jack Sheppard, a master of escape.”¹¹

Once he was old enough, Jack was apprenticed to Mr. Wood, a carpenter, for the next seven years. During his apprenticeship, the Bloody Register calls Jack a, “very sober and orderly boy” of whom Wood and his wife seemed quite fond of.¹² In Sheppard’s own words, his descent into crime was from his association with a button-mould maker in Drury Lane who operated an ale-house which brought him into contact with Elizabeth Lyon, better known as “Edgeworth Bess,” a prostitute who Sheppard later

9 Thompson, 197.

10 Horace Bleackley. *The Trial of Jack Sheppard* (Edinburgh & London: Hodge & Co, 1933), 2.

11 Linebaugh, 14.

12 Nick Groom, *Introduction to The Bloody Register* (London: Routledge, 1999), 281.

describes as a “wicked, deceitful and lascivious Wretch” and the cause of his troubles.¹³

Following his association with Bess, Sheppard soon fell off the straight and narrow. His first crimes constituted of petty thievery in order to “satisfy her voracity.”¹⁴ Soon, these two trouble makers got in over their heads; Bess was arrested for the theft of a watch during the summer of 1723 and was locked into St. Giles Roundhouse. Once he had heard of her fate, Sheppard instantly went to rescue her. He got into an argument with the elderly custodian, which culminated with Jack forcibly taking away the key to Bess’s cell and subsequently freeing her. As Sheppard put it, “I have sometimes procur’d her Liberty, and she at others has done her utmost to obtain mine and at other times she has again betray’d me into the hands of Justice.”¹⁵

Betrayal was a common theme in the life of an eighteenth century lawbreaker, something compounded by the laws of the time encouraging thieves to turn King’s evidence or impeach each other; and it was certainly a theme in Jack’s life. In the month of October 1723, Jack partnered with his brother and pulled two robberies amounting to about fifty-five pounds worth of goods. While trying to fence these stolen items, Jack’s brother, Thomas, impeached Jack in hopes of securing for himself a sentence of transportation. Jack was good at hiding though, and had it not been for the second betrayal by James Sykes, called “Hell-and-Fury” and another associate of Jack’s, who tricked him into a game and called the constables on him, Jack might not have been found.

As it was, Sheppard soon found himself locked in St. Giles

¹³ *A Narrative of all the robberies, escapes, &c. of John Sheppard: giving an exact description of the manner of his wonderful escape from the Castle in Newgate, and of the Methods he took afterward for his Security* (London: John Applebee, 1724), 14.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 3.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 11-12.

44 Articles

Roundhouse, the very prison Bess had previously been in. That night, with the help of an old razor, he put a hole in the roof of his second-story prison and escaped amidst a gathering crowd. At this point Sheppard was still nothing more than a petty thief, albeit a rather lucky one.¹⁶ He was still not considered much of worth to the general populace. It was his third escape which truly got everyone's attention.

On 19 May 1724, Sheppard and Bess were again arrested and this time put in the New Prison of Clerkenwell. It was this escape which would truly begin the legend of Jack Sheppard. He was put in the Newgate Ward of the New Prison, chained into place with a pair of double links and basils which totaled fourteen pounds each. He sawed off his bindings and cut through the iron bar on the window and a nine inch oak bar before lowering Edgworth Bess -- who was called an "Amazon" and a striking contrast to Sheppard's own small frame -- out of the window and down 25 feet. He then got both himself and her to freedom after managing to escape over a 22 foot wall. According to the Newgate Calendar this deed gave him fame and he was "greatly celebrated among the lower order of people by this exploit; and the thieves of St. Giles courted his company."¹⁷ For the keepers of the gaol this escape was the most impressive one he ever did as it was "unprecedented in the history of the gaol; for no prisoner had ever before broken out of the condemned Hold in the daytime under the very noses of the turnkeys."¹⁸

Soon afterwards, Sheppard returned to his old ways of thievery, this time stealing from his old master, Mr. Kneebone. Kneebone advertised in the papers about his loss to Jonathon Wild, the thief taker, and secretly, a far greater thief and deviant than Sheppard. Wild was able to retake

¹⁶ Ibid., 5-6.

¹⁷ *Newgate Calendar* (Derby: Thomas Richards and Son, 1840), 72.

¹⁸ Bleackley, 21.

Sheppard with the help of Bess, and by October of 1724 Jack Sheppard was locked away in the most impregnable room in the Newgate Prison known as the Castle.

By this time Sheppard's fame had spread and people would flock to the prison to see him. The *Old Bailey Trials* says that there had never been "any felon in this kingdom, whose Adventures had made so much Noise as Sheppard's."¹⁹ According to the *Newgate Calendar* he was visited by "great numbers of people of all ranks, and scarce any one left him without making him a present in money."²⁰ Jack was full of his "jokes and stories of his own pranks, which he related in a Manner, that shew'd he was so far from repenting his Vices, that he only wish'd for an Opportunity of repeating them."²¹ All of London was aware of Jack Sheppard now; the people gossiped about him on the streets, the rich came to gawk at him, and newspapers printed stories and imaginary letters about this remarkable prison-breaker. Little did they know that his most astonishing escape was yet to come.

In the dead of night, Sheppard got himself free from the heavy manacles, unchained himself from the floor, and proceeded to use a broken link of chain to tear out a hole in the chimney where a pipe blocked his only exit. When he was finished he had a hole three feet wide, six feet in length, and enough rubble to fill a cart. Going up the chimney, he found himself in a room unopened for seven years. By use of his "art" Jack won his freedom from this room and then proceeded through the prison unlocking, breaking, or damaging the next five doors to stand in his way to freedom.

Over the next few days until his final recapture, Jack would

¹⁹ *Select Trials at the Sessions-House in the Old-Bailey* (Dublin: S. Powell, 1742), 140.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 75.

²¹ *Ibid.*, 138.

encounter many people, all of them talking about his escape. At Charring Cross, while he was laying low in the guise of a beggar, he found the talk around him to be full of nothing but the escape of Jack Sheppard. At an alehouse near Piccadilly he spoke with a woman who wished a curse to fall on whoever betrayed Jack Sheppard. In Haymarket he found two different ballads about his deeds being sung.²²

When he was eventually recaptured and sent to Tyburn the crowds that turned out to watch their hero go past on his final journey had not been so great since the execution of Robert Lockyer seventy-five years before.²³ Even on the way to his death this remarkable young man never gave up the thought of escape. His manner was as cheerful as ever even after his guards had stopped his first escape attempt of the day. He was said to have given his “usual quips and cracks for the benefit of the gaolers” and once on the journey he even laughed.²⁴ Until the very last of his life, Jack Sheppard continued to embody the spirit of freedom and escape, and the people loved him for it.

Watching hangings at Tyburn was a part of the normal life of the people of London and had been for awhile so it is not much of a surprise that a business of sorts sprang up around the spectacle of public hangings. For some time newspapers had been printing collections of work known as, “True Confessions” and “Dying Speeches,” especially by the 1720’s. This literature was focused on the criminals hung at Tyburn and their crimes. The accounts were usually gathered by the Ordinarys of Newgate who were sent to get the doomed prisoners to confess their crimes and repent and would often sell the stories to the newspapers afterwards.

Of course an account of a criminal who had done such

²² *A Narrative*, 26-27.

²³ Linebaugh, 26.

²⁴ Bleackley, 217.

extraordinary and seemingly impossible deeds as Sheppard would have been of great interest to the mobs with their thirst for this new type of entertainment. A man by the name of John Applebee, editor of *The Daily Journal* and the *Original Weekly Journal*, was one of these men who published crime literature; and he had a deal which allowed him and his reporter's special access to the condemned hold of Newgate.²⁵ One of the men who sometimes wrote for him was Daniel Defoe, the author of *Robinson Crusoe*.

Defoe found Jack Sheppard as interesting as his contemporaries, and, during Sheppard's two stays at Newgate, Defoe would visit and interview him. Five of the main biographies published about Sheppard contemporarily have been attributed either wholly or in part to Defoe.²⁶ It could be argued that Defoe's hand in how Sheppard's biographies were done helped shape the future of crime literature. Defoe presents his subject in a more humane light than the previous "accounts" had. He showed Jack as a human being and a "vivid individual spirit." Holmes puts it as Defoe presenting "a greater human depth, greater historic accuracy, and authenticity" than the accounts of previous criminals.²⁷ By all accounts Sheppard was a charming enough individual when he so desired to be. While he was imprisoned he was described as being "always cheerful and pleasant" and entertaining his guests with the tales of his deeds.²⁸ His charm and banter was another thing that would have endeared him to the populace. Had he been unpleasant to be around perhaps his legend would not have remained as strong in their hearts and minds. Regardless, it can be assumed that Defoe also found Sheppard's manner to be somewhat

25 Richard Holmes, *Defoe on Sheppard and Wild* (London: Harper Perennial, 2004), xv.

26 Ibid.

27 Ibid.

28 Ibid., xxviii.

endearing. Although he does not condone his crimes, Defoe presents him in a more forgiving light that could be seen as “often indulgent” and his actions as somewhat “romantic.”²⁹ In contrast, Defoe also wrote the account of Sheppard’s counterpart and nemesis, Jonathan Wild. In this work, Defoe kept the same literary style as before by showing Wild as a human being with a past and the causes that created his fall into villainy; but where he could forgive Sheppard his vices, he gave Wild “very little mercy.”³⁰ Holmes seems to highlight the discrepancy in the way the world and Defoe saw these two criminals by saying Defoe was as able to paint Sheppard in the style of an “ambiguous hero” but Wild as an “unambiguous villain.”³¹ Not that any way of writing the account of Jack Sheppard’s life could have made him any less of an interesting subject at this point, the king, himself, was said to have found Sheppard’s escapes amusing and wanted to see all of the new material that was out about him.³²

Years later Ainsworth would pen the words that Jack Sheppard, upon his death at Tyburn, was “launched into eternity!”³³ The words could not have been more true. After his death at the Tyburn tree, Jack’s fame skyrocketed monumentally. The people of London just could not get enough of him. Memoirs of his life sold quickly, playwrights such as John Gay quickly got to work, newspapers continued to print poems and “letters” by a deceased Sheppard, and on it went. Even years after his death Jack Sheppard’s story remained in the consciousness of the people in the old plays about him and through various penny novels.

29 Ibid., xxvi.

30 Ibid., xxvi.

31 Ibid., xxiii.

32 Bleackley, 36-37.

33 W. Harrison Ainsworth, *Jack Sheppard: A Romance* (Leipzig: Bernhard Tauchnitz, 1846), 457.

In the eighteenth century, Harrison Ainsworth brought a revived interest to the life and deeds of Jack Sheppard by writing a novel about him. It was called *Jack Sheppard: A Romance* and was a type of book known at the time as a Newgate novel. In this book he wrote Jack as a sympathetic and heroic figure and romanticized the life of a thief.

His book was an instant success. The story of Sheppard found as rich an audience in the 19th century as it had in the eighteenth. The tale of this legendary prison breaker who defied authority and could not be restrained by chains, or walls, locks or thief takers, society or prisons would have found a ready audience among the factory workers and middle class people of this time. Ainsworth found inspiration from Hogarth's *Industry and Idleness*, a set of twelve engravings made in 1747 depicting two apprentices, in which the idle apprentice bears a striking resemblance of, and is very likely based on, Jack Sheppard.³⁴

Ainsworth's novel instantly spawned off-shoot Sheppard stories and at least eight versions of it in play form. In fact, Jack Sheppard soon became a sort of "cult figure" comparable to any number of fads we have today. One man writing a letter to his mother remarking on the Sheppard craze wrote, "at the Coubourg people are waiting about the lobbies, selling Sheppard-bags -- a bag containing a few pick-locks that is, a screw driver, and iron lever..."³⁵

Ainsworth had the novel first serialized in *Bentley's Magazine* from January 1839 to February 1840, the same magazine *Oliver Twist* was publicized in. When *Jack Sheppard* came out, it outsold Charles Dickens's *Oliver Twist*. In October of 1839, *Jack Sheppard* was published in book form, and it sold 3,000 the first week it was out and 18,000 in the 2nd edition.

³⁴ Ibid., xxxvii.

³⁵ Juliet John, *Introduction to Paul Cifford*, ed. Edward Buluer-Lytton (New York: Routledge/Thoemmes Press, 1998), xxxvii, xxxix.

50 Articles

During the 1830's Ainsworth was "more eminent than even Dickens."³⁶

The story of Jack Sheppard struck a particular chord with the youth of this time. In the mid nineteenth century, R. H. Horne, a sub-commissioner in Wolverhampton, wrote that many of the poor factory children had never heard of many of the best known names of the time including Wellington, Napoleon Bonaparte, St. Paul, Moses, and even the name of the queen herself. However, they all had a "general knowledge of the character and course of life...of Jack Sheppard."³⁷ From the lodgings to the streets, from the workhouses to the theaters, London was once again speaking of Jack Sheppard. A seventeen year old vagrant told his interviewer, "I've read 'Jack Sheppard' through in three volumes; and I used to tell stories out of that."³⁸ Another eighteen year old told how he and his friends would check the books from the library to read aloud, "We used to think Jack and them very fine fellows. I wished I could be like Jack."³⁹

Not everyone saw the Sheppard books as an innocent method of escapism or a pleasant way to pass the time though. Some people believed that it was dangerous to hold criminals like Sheppard in such a high regard and present their deeds as heroic. Matthew Mayhew, the author of a four volume set of books in which he interviews the poor of London, was just such a person. Mayhew's interpretation of Ainsworth's novel was that "of all the books; perhaps none has ever had so baneful an effect upon the young mind, taste, and principles as this. None has ever done more to degrade literature to the level of the lowest licentiousness...or author..."

36 Ibid. xviii

37 W.O. Henderson and W.H. Chaloner, *Condition of the Working Class in England* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1971), 127.

38 Henry Mayhew, *London Labour and the London Poor* (New York: Dover Publications Inc, 1968), 388-383.

39 Ibid., 370.

guilty of pandering to the most depraved propensities."⁴⁰

He was not alone in thinking this either. A newspaper at the time, the *Standard*, describes it as "almost endless rubbish, balderdash, twaddle, and vulgarity."⁴¹ Many people held to the view that it was the "most threatening and subversive of all such crime fictions."⁴² They blamed the Sheppard novel on the corruption of youth in London, and in 1852, the House of Commons made an inquiry into the "situation of Criminal and Destitute Juveniles." The juveniles in question cited *Jack Sheppard* as what had led them to "their ruin."⁴³

John puts society's negative reaction to the Jack Sheppard novels and the criminal they were based on down to the changing of the times. "The individuality and amorality of the protagonists of these novels was disparaged largely because the Romantic age of heroes and rebellion was being replaced by a time when social responsibility and duty were the watchwords."⁴⁴ Regardless of the Victorian views on Jack, *Jack Sheppard* and the other Newgate novels were important in the further development of the crime fiction genre. They were able to bridge the gap between the eighteenth century criminal fictions such as Defoe's *Moll Flanders* and the works done in the nineteenth and twentieth century.⁴⁵ Undoubtedly, the novel *Jack Sheppard* was the most important and influential of these novels.

In any era that the story of Jack Sheppard is told in, it will find willing listeners. His is a tale of more than just a petty thief escaping from justice. His tale has become a story of resistance in the face of oppression and rebellion against authority. These subjects will always have an

40 Mayhew, 370.

41 John, xxxix.

42 John, vi.

43 Ibid., x.

44 Ibid., li.

45 Ibid., li.

52 Articles

audience as long as humans continue to strive for freedom. The effect of Jack Sheppard's life in the hearts and minds of his contemporaries and the even longer-lasting effect he had on the literary world cannot be denied.

Cultural Products and World Politics

Rebecca S. Dobrinski

The following essay was written as the final assignment for a graduate level history course, *The World Since 1945*. The required reading list for the course included: Fareed Zakaria's *The Future of Freedom: Illiberal Democracy at Home and Abroad*; Albert Memmi's *Decolonization and the Decolonized*; John Lewis Gaddis's *The Cold War: A New History*; Lynn Hunt's *Inventing Human Rights*; David Reynolds's *One World Divisible: A Global History Since 1945*; Gilles Kepel's *The War for Muslim Minds: Islam and the West*; and Samantha Power's "A Problem from Hell": *America and the Age of Genocide*. Through the narrow lens of the coursework, this essay looks at how a diverse group of authors viewed cultural products and the effects they have on world history.

Throughout the course, students found a number of common themes in the assigned readings. One theme in particular, the affects cultural products have on world politics, was peppered throughout many of the books. For this paper, cultural products will refer to intellectual property – creative works of a fictional or non-fictional nature or a work of fiction based on fact, including film, novels, photographs, television, radio, and the Internet.

In addition to the books, the class viewed one film, Gillo Pontecorvo's *The Battle of Algiers*, which contributed greatly to the discussion. The film set the tone for much of the interpretation of not only the Muslim aspects of the readings, but also the evolution of modern terrorism. In the January 12, 2004, *New York* magazine review of the film, Peter Ranier quoted former United States National Security

54 Articles

Advisor Zbigniew Brzezinski's assessment of the film as: "If you want to understand what's happening right now in Iraq, I recommend *The Battle of Algiers*."¹ As Ranier pointed out in his review, the movie has been co-opted by different groups as beneficial to their causes, from Brzezinski and the Pentagon's use of the film in relation to the situation in Iraq to the Black Panthers use in the 1960s as a training film.

The original idea for the screenplay was written by Algerian National Liberation Front leader Saadi Yacef, while he was imprisoned in France. Although a work of fiction, Pontecorvo's use of non-actors, Yacef and Brahim Haggiag, as the protagonists gave it a documentary feel. Many of Yacef's scenes were, in essence, reenactments of episodes of his life leading up to his imprisonment.² No matter how one interprets the film, its impact on understanding the French-Muslim situation in Algeria and the subsequent colonization, decolonization, and democratizing efforts throughout the world is unmistakable. Viewing *The Battle of Algiers* prior reading led the way for students to analyze the assignments through the use of interpretation and comparison with other cultural products.

In *Inventing Human Rights*, Hunt's use of eighteenth and nineteenth-century popular literature contributed to her argument of how novels influence readers' thoughts and ideas. She especially interpreted this as one of the ways the idea of human rights crept into the psyche of the Enlightenment generation, something she felt is often left out in the discussion on how the concepts of human rights evolved. Early in the book Hunt wrote, "Scholars have written at great length about the emergence of individualism and autonomy as doctrines, but much less

1 Peter Ranier, "Prescient Tense: Re-creating the carnage of fifties Algeria – bombings, assassinations, police torture – *The Battle of Algiers* is as relevant today as it was in 1965," *New York* magazine, January 12, 2004, http://nymag.com/nymetro/movies/reviews/n_9697/ (accessed December 7, 2010).

2 Ibid.

about how the self itself might change over time.”³ She described how the development of enlightenment thought evolved while the novel emerged and reading became more of a pastime.

Hunt specifically addressed the lack of women’s rights in a number of places in the narrative. One example was how the novel provided empathy towards the plight of women, “Readers found the heroine’s search for independence especially poignant because they immediately understood the constraints such a woman inevitably faced.”⁴ With novels published as early as the mid- to late-1700s, one has to wonder why it took over 100 years for women to gain the rights many others, such as slaves, non-property holders, actors, etc., gained much earlier.

Another concept Hunt discussed was “The Self-Contained Person.” She theorized that “a new concern for the human body” went hand-in-hand with the new concept of empathy with the judicially condemned.⁵ This way of thinking affected not only human rights, but the way humans lived: “Eighteenth-century changes in musical and theatrical performances, domestic architecture, and portraiture built upon these longer-term alterations in attitudes.”⁶ Hunt’s narrative often raised the modern concept of “empathy.” She wrote, “In the eighteenth century, readers of novels learned to extend their purview of empathy....Without this learning process, ‘equality’ could have no deep meaning and in particular no political consequence.”⁷ Hunt often revealed how empathy and concern for the human body were carried out in the personal lives of

3 Lynn Hunt, *Inventing Human Rights: A History* (New York, W.W. Norton and Company, 2007), 34-34.

4 *Ibid.*, 59

5 *Ibid.*, 82.

6 *Ibid.*, 83.

7 *Ibid.*, 40.

those who lived during and immediately after the Enlightenment.

Hunt described how Voltaire's attitudes and the theme of empathy in novels played a role in the abolition of judicial torture: "Natural compassion makes everyone detest the cruelty of judicial torture, insisted Voltaire. [...] A civilized nation, Voltaire concludes, can no longer follow 'atrocious old customs.'" ⁸ Hunt successfully made the argument that abolishing judicial torture and implementing human rights could not have happened independently of one another.

Hunt explained how late eighteenth century novels were often written by the philosophers and great thinkers of the age. In one example, two of the "great thinkers" served as editors of a popular collection of fictional letters published at the time. Hunt stated, "The 'editors' of the letters, as Richardson and Rousseau styled themselves, created a vivid sense of reality precisely because their authorship was obscured within the letters' exchange."⁹ It can be inferred from Hunt's narrative that Richardson and Rousseau understood the potential impact of these novels and how they occasionally broke through class boundaries.

Towards the end of the narrative, Hunt described a return to torture, racism, and oppression of women – problems she attributed to a vicious cycle of the evolution of human nature. In modern times, she explained, use of the media allows people to get firsthand accounts of these incidents. However, the modern media seems unable to provide viewers with a sense of empathy to these victims. She considered how mass media may be partially responsible for a shift in how people view human rights.

In the introduction to *The Future of Freedom*, Zakaria wrote, "It

8 Ibid., 75.

9 Ibid., 42.

gave the person or group with access to that technology the power to reach the rest of society. That's why the first step in a twentieth-century coup or revolution was always to take control of the country's television or radio station."¹⁰ While this was the first step for many revolutionaries, this type of revolution turned out to be short lived, thanks to the development of the Internet.

The Internet and the dissemination of knowledge have, in many ways, leveled the playing field between the governing and the governed. Via the Internet, as Zakaria noted, terrorists found instructions for nuclear weapons, which are based on easily accessible fifty-year-old technology. He called this the "democratization of violence" and explained that the state no longer has the monopoly on the use of force as a means to an end.

In the chapter titled "The Islamic Exception," Zakaria discussed how "globalization has caught the Arab world at a bad demographic moment."¹¹ Arab countries continued to experience a "bulge" of youth in that more than half of their populations are under the age of twenty-five. He goes on to show how a "bulge of young men" can be detrimental to society in any culture. This is especially apparent in how the majority of crimes are often committed by young men between the ages of fifteen and twenty-five, and how this segment of the population is heavily influenced by popular culture.

This "bulge" of youth has also had positive consequences throughout history. Zakaria showed how it was also an instrument of change as in the French Revolution in 1789, the Iranian revolution in 1979, and the social revolution of the 1960s in the United States. As shown

in the fictional account in *The Battle of Algiers* as well as in the events

¹⁰ Fareed Zakaria, *The Future of Freedom: Illiberal Democracy at Home and Abroad* (New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 2007), 15.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, 140.

described in Memmi's *Decolonization and the Decolonized*, the French were caught up in Algeria's "bad demographic moment." The film and essay showed how Algeria's moment could produce something seen simultaneously as a positive and a negative consequence, depending on which side of the argument one happened to be.

In *Decolonization and the Decolonized*, Memmi asserted that sometimes fiction told more of the truth than news media. His argument considered how literature usually has fewer restrictions and, therefore, can say "more" than is reported by traditional news sources. The ideas in his narrative incited one to wonder if there ever is a truly "free press." He did, however, provide a valid justification of the ways literature can be a useful tool in looking at the past. Memmi compared the differences between fiction and reality in the section "The New Citizen." He contended that "fifty novels from a given period provide a richer source of insight than tons of newsprint published during the reign of a dictator."¹²

The writers and intellectuals who opted to stay in colonized Arabic countries, such as Algeria, often turned to writing fiction as a way to disseminate ideas that were contradictory to those of their colonizers. Memmi explained, "They can attribute to fictional characters things they themselves feel and think."¹³ He then argued that primary documents are subject to censorship and therefore are ruined as sources for future historians. He placed great importance on fiction as a more accurate version of the real world. The fiction written by those who remain in an occupied country can often serve a better purpose than memoirs by the ones who were lucky to have left. Time not only clouds one's judgment

¹² Albert Memmi, *Decolonization and the Decolonized* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2006).

¹³ *Ibid.*, 36.

of a situation, but judgment often is affected by nostalgia for their family and homeland left behind. It can be inferred from Memmi's narrative that it was this "defect" of human nature that should lead one to question the validity of some memoirs and to reexamine the value of fictional accounts of the times.

The form of cultural products varied throughout the readings. Photographs were used as cultural products in Gaddis's book, *The Cold War*. At first glance, these photos seemed randomly inserted rather than integrated to the narrative. One could infer that the photos selected were most likely meant to represent meaningful events and people the author believed had an effect on the Cold War. For example, the use of the photo of Vaclav Havel and the Rolling Stones is an appropriate way to represent the changes taking place at the end of the Cold War. It showed not only the mixing of politics and popular culture, but the entrance of the strictly western phenomenon of rock and roll into a formerly Communist country where such things were at one time banned.¹⁴ On the other hand, the photo of Brezhnev and Nixon drinking champagne is misleading as it does not show any progress in world affairs but was merely a staged "photo opportunity."¹⁵ The final photo, an empty and snow covered image of Red Square with a few people walking in the night, "Last days of the Soviet Union: Red Square,"¹⁶ was symbolic of the end of, as well as the entire, Cold War.

Interestingly, Gaddis began calling the politically influential, as well as one of the book's chapters, "actors."¹⁷ Underneath the chapter title, he quoted three of his "actors": John Paul II, Deng Xiaoping, and

14 John Lewis Gaddis, *The Cold War: A New History* (New York: Penguin Press, 2005), top photo on last photo page.

15 Ibid., bottom photo on ninth photo page.

16 Ibid., bottom photo on last photo page.

17 Ibid., 195.

60 Articles

Mikhail Gorbachev. Gaddis introduced readers to an often-forgotten fact about Pope John Paul II: when he was still known as Karol Wojtyla, he was an accomplished artist, specifically an actor and playwright. John Paul II was one of the era's leaders who instinctively, and apparently by training, knew how to "move the hearts and minds of the millions who saw him and heard him."¹⁸ This talent was something that many of his contemporaries on the world stage lacked. Shortly after Wojtyla became pope, another actor was elected to a prominent position – Ronald Reagan as President of the United States. As compared to other world leaders, their backgrounds in theater prepared them for their roles in politics – as William Shakespeare so succinctly put it in *As You Like It*, "All the world is a stage." Ultimately, their theatrical training made John Paul II and Ronald Reagan more effective in leading their respective, mostly western, populations towards the end of the Cold War.

References to another work also prevailed in Gaddis's narrative, *The Prince* by Machiavelli. In one of the more famous ideas from *The Prince*, Machiavelli asked if it was better to be loved or feared. On the other side of the Cold War, Gorbachev veered away from his predecessors' styles of ruling the Soviet Union and chose to be loved rather than feared.¹⁹ In many ways, John Paul II and Reagan exercised their empathetic theatrical training to garner the affections of the people they governed and were eventually considered great leaders. Despite Gorbachev also choosing the affection route, he never achieved the status of a great leader. Gaddis explained this phenomenon in that great leaders such as Reagan and John Paul II "had destinations in mind and maps for reaching them."²⁰ Gorbachev never developed clear-cut ways

¹⁸ Ibid.

¹⁹ Ibid., 252.

²⁰ Ibid., 257.

to solve the problems of his constituents and worked harder towards gaining the people's affections. Although this is merely one example, the Machiavellian standard, as shown in *The Prince*, continues to be referenced throughout politics.

Since 2001, the media has gone to great lengths to try to explain how terrorists use technology to communicate and how the image of the United States as portrayed in cultural products continues to incite the hatred of the west. The terrorist group Al Qaeda has used television broadcasts to rally its supporters worldwide as well as to take credit for acts of terrorism. The group uses modern western technological advancements to condemn the very inventors of their choice of communications venues. Politics does indeed make for very strange bedfellows.

In *The War for Muslim Minds*, Kepel addressed the nature of terrorism. He wrote, "Terrorism has missed its political aim, but it continues to manifest its resilience in the face of repression and to cause havoc around the world."²¹ Does this mean that the use of terrorism has made any gains for different factions throughout the world? Terrorists' failures often coincide with the shortcomings of the western powers and, therefore, make one question who is victorious in the Middle East. Still, the use of written and televised media has effectively helped and hindered both sides of the "war on terrorism." The Al Qaeda cause has lost supporters and so has the United States' involvement in the Middle East. Sometimes the tools backfire, too.

Since 1945, especially in the United States and the western world, new forms of mass communication have brought details of world events

21 Gilles Kepel, *The War for Muslim Minds: Islam and the West* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2004), 151.

to more people than ever before. In the 1950s and 1960s, it was the mass production of the telephone and television that introduced people to their fellow world citizens. News and information could be sent and received much faster and communicated farther. The Vietnam conflict was the first war to be televised on a large scale.²² As Reynolds discussed in *One World Divisible*, there was no way these new forms of communication could not have changed peoples' views of the world around them. One point Reynolds failed to consider was how long this change would remain in effect. Does the visual image, however fleeting it is when delivered in ninety second media "sound bites," have the same impact as the written word and novel?

Samantha Power, in *A Problem from Hell*, addressed the nature of films in the age of genocide. She depicted how this medium can sometimes be used to alter the way difficult subjects are presented. She cited the ending of the film *The Diary of Anne Frank* as a primary example. The movie was changed to prevent creating a depressing end. The first ending depicted Anne in a concentration camp, her ragged clothing blowing in the wind. It was changed to something more hopeful prior to the movie's release in 1955, with an ending not "too tough in audience impact."²³ In contrast, by the 1961 release of *Judgment at Nuremberg*, movies began depicting a more realistic account of the concentration camps. *Nuremberg* included some of the actual footage of the liberation of the concentration camps.

It could be considered that Americans in the 1950s were not yet far enough removed from the atrocities of the war to want an honest

²² See David Reynolds, *One World Divisible: A Global History Since 1945* (New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 2000).

²³ Samantha Powers, *"A Problem from Hell": America and the Age of Genocide* (New York: Basic Books, 2007), 73.

depiction of life in concentration camps. The backlash to the 1950s, the social revolutions of the 1960s, may also present why filmmakers were more insistent in portraying it more realistically in the following decade. However, neither film seems to have the overarching reach that the introduction of popular novels had during the Enlightenment.

In *Inventing Human Rights*, Hunt argued that the novel helped to introduce compassion and understanding, often leading to a respect and struggle for human rights. Power seemed to dispel this way of thinking in regards to film. It has an impact, but it does not seem to last as long as the empathetic ideas depicted in novels.

What are the effects of cultural products on world politics? Do these products have lasting impacts on how the citizens of the world interact and relate to each other? In addition to these, the course readings leave the student with a variety of questions in need of answers.

Hunt wrote of how novels have affected political thinking. Her ideas of empathy were extremely relevant in the development of Enlightenment thought as well as the emergence of human rights. Without empathy for one's fellow human beings, the Declaration of Independence, the Declaration of the Rights of Man and Citizen, and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights could never have come into existence. The effects of the eighteenth and nineteenth century novel continue to be felt into the twenty-first century. It is through the view from Hunt's empathy that readers can best examine both Memmi's and Gaddis' discussions on using novels as tools of political change. Memmi's theories on the use of fiction in historical research also point to the lasting impact of the novel. On the contrary, as in Reynolds, could the conflict in Vietnam have received less political support due to its portrayal on

64 Articles

television?

In comparing Al Qaeda, as described by Kepel, to the terrorist network seen in the film *The Battle of Algiers*, one finds similarities and contrasts. In *Algiers*, the nationalists, or terrorists depending from which side one views the film, can be seen in a sympathetic light. Rarely, if ever, in the western world are Al Qaeda members and actions seen with sympathy or understanding. Other films referenced in the readings, such as *The Diary of Anne Frank* and *Judgment at Nuremberg*, were impactful at the time. Due to the rise in modern terrorism, *Algiers* was brought back to the forefront and attached a new significance. However, overall do films resonate in the same lasting way that concepts circulated via the written word continue to affect people?

The written word seems to have a more lasting impact – is it because the amount of time given to reading versus the brief visual images brought to us by television and film? Does the age of the novel affect the lasting impact of its concepts? However, it may be too soon to tell what the overall political impact of the visual media, much less the Internet, will have on the world.

Something Wicked This Way Comes: Margaret Cooper's Encounter with the Devil as Evidence for a Reformed Popular English Religious Culture

Samuel Burcham

In 1584 at Dichet, in the county of Somersetshire, a young woman by the name of Margaret Cooper had returned from visiting a small farm in the village of Rockhampton only to experience a number of strange and dark phenomena over the course of the following days. It is within this paper that I analyze Cooper's encounter with the Devil as evidence of two important aspects of a popular English religious culture—a Christ who could no longer be invoked via superstitious practices as the result of Elizabethan Church reform, in contrast to a Devil who had remained ever-present and untouched by religious change.

Something Wicked This Way Comes: Margaret Cooper and Popular English Religious Culture

*And the Lord said unto Satan, Whence comest thou?
Then Satan answered the Lord, and said, From going to
and fro in the earth and from walking up and down in it.
--Job 1:7*

If no devils, no God.

--The Triall of Maist. Dorrell (1559), p. 8.

In 1584 at Dichet, in the county of Somersetshire, a great company of friends and family members had gathered themselves in the bedchamber of a young woman by the name of Margaret Cooper. The young Margaret, it seems, had been acting rather strangely since her husband, Stephen,

who had fallen ill, had sent her “uppon the ninth daie of Maie last past into Gloster-Shire, to take order concerning a farme which he hath in a Villedge called *Rockhampton*.”¹ It was upon her return that she “began to use very muche idle talke...as it were one that had been bewitched or hastened with some evill Spirite.”² Those closest to her attempted to lead her in the Lord’s Prayer as a means to stave off the evil spirit, however, they would do so to no avail, for her possession would worsen to the point that she would have to be held down in her bed as “she fo[a]med at the mouth, and was shake[n] with suche force that the Bedd and Chamber did shake and move in the most straunge sorte.”³ It was during one of these fits that Margaret began to recount that she had seen a “Beare which followed her...which to her thinking had no hed,” upon her return from the farm.⁴ But those present—refusing to give credence to such ramblings—believed her to be imagining things and nothing more was said on the matter.

It was upon one evening during the following week, as all was quiet, that the present company heard the strangest noise in the street below. No sooner had they heard the noise, though, than did Stephen cry out as he noticed an “image come to the bedd much like unto a Beare, but it had no head nor no taile.”⁵ The great beast pulled Margaret from the bed and rolled her out of the room and down the stairs as those present continued to pray to God for His divine mercy. However, the monster

1 J. Kingston, *A true and most Dreadfull discourse of a woman possessed with the Devill: who in the likeness of a headless Beare fetched her out of her Bedd, and in the presence of seven persons, most straungely roullid her thorow three Chambers, and downe a high paire of staires, on the fower and twentie of May last. 1584. At Dichet in Sommersetshire* (London: J. Kingston for Thomas Nelson, 1584), Early English Books Online, http://ezproxy.una.edu:2084/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:18799(accessed July, 2011), 5.

2 *Ibid.*, 6.

3 *Ibid.*, 7.

4 *Ibid.*, 8.

5 *Ibid.*, 9-10.

seems to have vanished as quickly as it had come, for Stephen would bring her back to her bed in a matter of minutes. It was at this moment that the window at the head of her resting place came suddenly open and that an unseen force pulled her out of the bed, into the air, and toward the window, as those around her “sawe a great fire as it seemed [to] them at her feete.”⁶ The Devil, it seems, had come to torment the young Margaret Cooper and to drag her soul into Hell...

While this frightening account from the county of Somersetshire does indeed provide its readers with a thrilling narrative, it is much more than the story of one girl’s horrific encounter with the Devil. Should we follow the tradition of Peter Burke’s studies on popular culture, this account becomes suggestive of a popular sixteenth century English religious culture that is devoid of superstition as the result of Elizabethan reform.⁷ Here, we will be focusing on two aspects of this reformed religious culture in England. First, we will look at how Margaret Cooper’s experience in Somersetshire is representative of the idea of an ever-present Devil that the majority of English Christians held (an idea that was not much changed from that of the one held in the late Middle Ages), and that had been presented to them by the Church both before and after the Reformation. Next, we will look at how Cooper’s account is representative of the way in which Elizabethan reforms affected these Christians’ abilities to protect themselves from a Devil who had remained thoroughly unreformed and unchanged.

Modern readers would most likely peruse a record similar to that of Cooper’s encounter with the Devil without experiencing much in

6 Ibid., 11.

7 Peter Burke, *Popular Culture in Early Modern Europe* (Aldershot: Scolar Press, 1994), xxiv., Here Burke defines popular culture as “values and symbols, wherever these are to be found, in the everyday life of ordinary people.”

the way of fear, but the same cannot be said of most late medieval and sixteenth century Christians who saw their world as one in which “the Devil and his fallen angels were held to be the source of all evils which afflicted humanity.”⁸ Thus, Cooper’s account in Somersetshire is one that is representative of the popular idea that the Devil could, and would, appear to tempt and torment human beings at his discretion. But such ideas regarding the Devil did not originate during this time. In fact, they did not even originate in England. The earliest Christians in Rome would ardently hold to a belief in demons as “angels who had turned against their creator and turned wholly evil.”⁹ Therefore, the belief in an inherent evil that stood in opposition to God is evident at the very beginning of early Christian practice. It would not be until sometime later that Christians would come to adopt the belief that one of these demons was actually lord over all the others—Satan. And indeed this idea of Satan is the same one which seems to have been so prevalent in both Margaret Cooper’s record, as well as in many other records from the sixteenth century in England. But historians Dan Burton and David Grandy suggest that “originally, the term Satan meant ‘adversary.’”¹⁰ In fact, Burton and Grandy also make special mention of the fact that “Satan is only mentioned twice [within the Bible] with certainty” and that even then he does not present himself as an ever-present force trying to dethrone God.¹¹ Cooper and her fellow sixteenth century English Christians, however, would hold to a very different idea of Satan; God’s darkest foe—“[the Devil,” “Lucifer,” or “Satan” were one in the same. It seems that these

8 Eamon Duffy, *The Stripping of the Altars: Traditional Religion in England, 1400-1580* (Newhaven: Yale University Press, 1992), 268.

9 Richard Kieckhefer, *Magic in the Middle Ages* (Cambridge University Press, 2000), 38.

10 Dan Burton and David Grandy, *Magic, Mystery, and Science: the Occult in Western Civilization* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2008), 120.

11 Ibid.

sixteenth century Christians would hold to the idea of the Devil that had been recorded in the first century in the *Pseudepigrapha*. Here, the Devil is an evil force who is antagonistic toward both God and his human creations, for when God asks Satan to “worship the image of the Lord God [humans]...Satan balked.”¹² It was for such insolence that Satan, as well as his fellows who had also balked at the idea of worshipping God’s human creations, was cast down to earth. Sixteenth century English Christians, then, would feel well founded in believing that since Satan had indeed been cast down to earth, it would make sense that such a powerful being could be present whenever and however he wanted.

It is important to note that Cooper’s account is not an isolated incident, for this view of the Devil as an ever-present force is evident in many other fantastic accounts of dark phenomena in other areas of England. For example, in one medieval commonplace book, it is recorded that there were a company of knight-thieves who lived in one county and chose to rob any travelers who just so happened to find themselves on the road that ran adjacent to their castle. The story goes: the knight-thieves continually robbed many an unfortunate soul until one day a few among the group found that they were robbing a Christian monk. The monk, incidentally, seemed to be all too happy to be robbed, save he be granted one request—he wanted an audience with their leader. At that, the monk would find himself readily standing in front of the knight in due time. It seems that he had important news for the leader of the knight-thieves, for he immediately began by addressing to the young master that he was in terrible danger since one member of the knight-thief’s household was “no real man but a demon in human guise, who for fourteen years had served the knight by special order of the Devil”

12 Ibid., 122.

70 Articles

in order to “kill the knight and to drag his wicked soul to perdition.”¹³ In another account, an unsuspecting cleric became the subject of the Devil’s threatening presence when he appeared to him “in the form of a beautiful woman” even though the cleric thought himself to be quite alone in a small garden.¹⁴ And in yet another account, a woman by the name of Agnes Waterhouse invoked Satan in the form of a cat to “destroy many of her neighbor’s cattle and also that he should kill a man.”¹⁵ Such stories did present those who heard or read them with the idea that Satan and his dark henchmen were ever-lurking in the shadows, biding their time until they could pounce upon any unsuspecting person. However, these records also suggest that the Devil could assault the medieval and sixteenth century Christian in a variety of forms. Therefore, when he appeared to Margaret Cooper in the form of a headless bear on her way back from Rockhampton in 1584, relatively all English Christians—not just those in the county of Somersetshire—could have understood that she had had an encounter with a Devil who was quite active in the world, for he had already appeared to others in the form of a knight, a beautiful woman, and a cat, elsewhere. As popular belief would have it, the Devil would not allow himself to be ignored—not just in Somersetshire, but in the whole of England.

Certainly, then, it evident that the Devil was quite present in the daily lives of most English Christians, but they were not as helpless as may at first seem to be the case. Because the Devil and his fallen angels were believed to be running rampant, the people of late medieval England

13 A.G. Dickens, *The English Reformation* (New York: Schocken Books, 1964), 1.

14 *Ibid.*, 3.

15 Frank Luttmer, ed. *The Examination and Confession of Certain Witches at Chelmsford in the County of Essex, before the Queen Majesty’s Judges, the 26th day of July Anno. 1566* (London: 1566): Chelmsford Witches, Hanover College, <http://history.hanover.edu/courses/excerpts/260chelm.html> (accessed June, 2011), 3.

would turn to the Church, to Christ, as a means of finding the necessary protection that could help them keep evil at bay. This protection was offered in the form of prayers that bordered on magic spells, the act of pilgrimage to sacred locations, and the possession or presence of certain holy images, all of which were endorsed by the Church. Because prayer was obviously an important act in Margaret Cooper's encounter with the Devil—recall the way in which those present prayed to God for divine intervention on a number of occasions—we will limit our focus to that of the prayer-spells that the Church offered late medieval Englanders as a means of protection. The validity of such prayer-spells was to be found in all types of spiritual literature that was endorsed by the Church on the eve of the Reformation. For example, in the very same commonplace book that contained the story of the knight-thieves that I mentioned earlier, the reader also learns that the only way that their leader had escaped the horrible fate of being carried away to Hell was due to the fact that he “maintained his pious daily prayers to the Blessed Virgin.”¹⁶ As for the monk who encountered the Devil when he found himself alone in a garden, his recitation of the first words of the Gospel of John would see to it that “the devil disappeared in the manner of his kind.”¹⁷ However, it must be assumed that the farmer who had fallen victim to Agnes Waterhouse had not been pious enough to recite his prayers or use any of the other means provided by the Church to protect himself since, after all, he suffered an untimely death. It would seem, then, that the English Church had given the people these prayer-spells as a means of invoking divine protection for the Devil and his minions who:

Makyth tempestys in the see, and drownyth schyppes

¹⁶ Dickens, 1.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 3.

and men, thay makythe debate bytwyxe neyghtburs and manslaght therwyth; thay tendythe fyres, and brennen howses and townes; thay reryth wyndys and blowythe don howsys, stepuls, and tres; thay make wymen to ouerlaye hor children; thay makythe men to sle homsolfe, to hong homsolfe othyr drowne hom in wanhope, and such mony othyr curset dedys.¹⁸

Following the scholarship of Professor Richard Kieckhefer, I suggest that the prayer-spells themselves were believed to provide protection because they invoked the names of angels, of the cross, and of the sacred names of God, all of which are three of Kieckhefer's nine categories of invocation.¹⁹ For example, a recitation of the 'Deus Propicius Esto' prayer asks "Holy Michael, Holy Gabriel, Holy Raphael, all holy angels and archangels of God, hasten to help me. I beseech you, all you heavenly Virtures, that by the power of the most high God you give me your aid, so that no enemy may be able to condemn or oppress me, neither in my house nor out of it, neither sleeping or waking."²⁰ Certainly, this prayer suggests that its orator believed that God allowed his angels to serve people when invoked, as if they were divine servants for all humanity. But the belief in the purpose of this spell, as well as others like it, seems to have been just as important as the prayer itself. In the *Horae Reatae Mariae* the reader or hearer is presented with the assurance that anyone who says it, hears it, or possesses it "schall not perische in fyre nor in wother nother batyll or in iudgement."²¹ The fact that this prayer assures believers of their protection

18 Duffy, 268; an excerpt taken from *Mirk's Festial: A Collection of Homilies by Johannes Mirkus*, EETS (Early English Text Society), 1905.

19 Richard Kieckhefer, *Forbidden Rites: A Necromancer's Manual of the Fifteenth Century* (University Park, Pennsylvania: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1997), 133-138.

20 Duffy, 270; excerpt taken from the *Horae Eboracenses: the Prymer or Hours of the Blessed Virgin Mary according to the use of the Illustrious Church of York*, ed. C. Wordsworth, Surtees Society, CXXXII, 1920, 125.

21 *Ibid.*, 272; an excerpt taken from *Hore b[ea]t[issim]e marie virginis ad usum Sarum*, [Antwerp], Christopher Endoviensis for Francis Byrckman [London], 1525. RSTC 15939: Hoskins 67.

from an array of such maladies—and further assures them that when “thy soul schall deperte from thy body yt schall not entre hell,” suggests that orators undoubtedly believed themselves to be protected from the Devil.

Other prayers would invoke the sign of the cross as a means of protection in which words and actions would combine in order to drive away evil forces. For example, the ‘Crux Christi’ assured believers that one “who that bereth thys blessyn upon hym and says ut ones of a day...schall not peryshe wyrt soden deeth.”²² But assurance of protection via spoken word is not the only mystical quality that this prayer invokes. It reads:

Cross + of Christ be with me. Cross + of Christ is what
I ever adore. Cross + of Christ is true health...May the
Cross + of Christ banish all evil. Cross + of Christ...be
Ever over me, and before me, and behind me, because
The ancient enemy flees wherever he sees you...Flee from
me, a servant of God, o devil, by the sign of the holy
Cross + behold the Cross of the Lord + begone you
enemies, the lion of the tribe of Judah, the root of David,
has conquered.²³

The sign and symbol of the cross were quite powerful tools for the late medieval Christians since the image itself seems to have been able to make any environment a safe one—an environment that the Devil and his minions could never hope to overtake. This protection was further reinforced when one would physically recreate the sign of the cross with each mention of the holy symbol which is represented by the [+] that follows. Thus, when the orator of the ‘Crux Christi,’ states “Flee from me, a servant of God, o devil, by the sign of the holy cross,” he or she is to sign in a way that seems to create a protective barrier so as to evade Satanic influence.

Finally, there were various prayers that invoked protection

22 Ibid., 273; an excerpt, taken again from Hoskins 67.

23 Ibid., Hoskins 67.

74 Articles

through the very mention of the many names of God. Essentially a prayer of exorcism, the ‘Omnipotens + Dominus + Christus’ would employ the names of God to remove the Devil and his minions from a person or place, as it reads:

Omnipotens + Dominus + Christus + Messias + Sother +
Emmanuel + Sabaoth + Adonay + Unigenitus + Via + Vita
+ Manus + Homo + Ousion+ Salvator + Alpha + et Oo +
Fons + Origo + Spes + Fides + Charitas + Oza + Agnus +
Ovis + Vitulus + Serpens + Aries + Leo + Vermis + Primus +
Novissimus + Rex + Pater + Filius + Spiritus Sanctus +
Ego sum + Qui sum + Creator + Eternus + Redemptor +
Trinitas + Unitas + Clemens + Caput + Otheotocos +
Tetragrammaton + May these names protect and defend me
from all disaster, and from infirmity of body and soul, may
they wholly set me free and come to my help.²⁴

It seems, then, that late medieval English Christians believed that the very mention of God’s name, regardless of the form, had the power to save the body and the soul from any harm that might seemingly befall them. Here, each mention of the holy name was to provide an extra layer of protection. However, I would like to point out that it also seems as if these late medieval Christians placed their faith in numbers, as well. Here, God’s name is mentioned and accompanied by the sign of the cross in forty-seven different forms. This could be taken as forty and seven, in which case forty is the number of days that the divine Christ fasted in the wilderness, avoiding temptation, as well as the number of days which God caused it to rain upon the earth, destroying all evil in Creation. Both options seem relevant in terms of significance, but the number itself could in fact be a reference to Psalm 47, which is a psalm that declares God’s victory over all the earth, and which also mentions one of His desires, which includes “putting [the] enemies [of His followers] beneath our [their] feet.”²⁵ Perhaps,

²⁴ Ibid., 274; an excerpt taken from *Hor. Ebor.*, 126.

²⁵ Psalm 47:3 (New Living Translation).

then, late medieval Christians could be seen as referring to this Psalm as a means of invoking Christ to allot them victory over their enemies, namely Satan. Thus, it would seem that these late medieval Christians had many Church endorsed prayer-spells that could be used to keep the Devil at bay.

One will notice, however, that such prayer-spells are mysteriously absent from the account of Margaret Cooper's encounter with the Devil in Somersetshire in the latter part of the sixteenth century. At no point in the record do any of those present in her bedchamber utter anything close to resembling the 'Crux Christi' or the 'Omnipotens + Dominus + Christus.' In fact, there is no mention of any superstitious or magical phrases whatsoever, for it seems that Stephen and company rely solely on prayer to God as a means of protecting Margaret, as well as themselves. Thus, it is within this account that we find evidence for the fact that Protestant oriented changes, specifically those that were imposed upon prayer through Elizabethan reform, had seemingly taken hold by the late sixteenth century. Under Elizabeth the generous use of prayer-spells would be removed. And indeed, Margaret Cooper's account is solid evidence for this, but why did Elizabethan reform seem to gain the kind of acceptance that her record suggests, in a world where the Devil was so readily present? Perhaps the answer lies somewhere in the young queen's mentality toward religion, as well as her imposition of a newly revised Book of Common Prayer upon the people of England.

Elizabeth, it seems, had loathed superstition long before her reign. And for her, nowhere was superstition more evident than in the many practices of the late medieval Catholic Church. Her loathing of superstition is evident in the way in which she "declined to attend

76 Articles

Mass at court, declaring that she could not do so while she remained a Protestant."²⁶ In 1565 she would even inscribe this poem upon the last leaf of her French psalter, which would leave her subjects with no doubt as to how she felt about the mystical and superstitious aspects of late medieval Christianity, when she wrote:

No crooked leg, no blearèd eye,
No part deformed out of kind,
Nor yet so ugly half can be
As the inward, suspicious mind.²⁷

Indeed, for Elizabeth there was nothing that was more suspicious than the superstitious practices of the late medieval Catholic Church (one must assume that these suspicious practices were just one of the many things that Elizabeth saw as superstitious and utterly abominable before God). The young queen had systematically begun to remove the mystical aspects from the Church long before its composition, though, for at the outset of her reign "she had made skillful and complete plans," in which she would attack all manner of practices that she believed to be utterly superstitious.²⁸ It would be a time in which Elizabeth would seem to impose upon the people what some scholars have referred to as the 'doctrine of divine providence,' in which "there were no random instances [and] that all events reflected the design of God's purpose, even if this was unknown, and that in the long run virtue was rewarded and vice punished."²⁹ Essentially, the new doctrine stated that there was indeed a horribly dark and powerful evil in the world (i.e.—Satan) who sought

26 Christopher Hibbert, *The Virgin Queen: Elizabeth I, Genius of the Golden Age* (Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Inc., 1991), 41.

27 Leah S. Marcus, Janel Mueller, and Mary Beth Rose, eds. *Elizabeth I: Collected Works* (Chicago University Press, 2000), 132.

28 W.H. Frere, *The English Church in the Reigns of Elizabeth and James I, 1558-1625* (London: MacMillan and Co., Limited, 1924), 2.

29 Don Handelman, "Review: [Untitled]," *American Anthropologist*, 75, no. 4 (Aug., 1973): 1027-1028. *JSTOR*. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/673167> (accessed June, 2011), 1027.

to harm both men and women, but that there was nothing they could do about this. Thus, if God wanted them to be protected He would be the one to offer this protection; it could not be invoked through the use of superstitious prayer-spells. And as Margaret Cooper's account would have it, perhaps the new 'doctrine of divine providence,' which Elizabeth seemed so inclined to endorse, was one that stuck.

To further understand the acceptance of Elizabethan reform under such hopeless circumstances—as it is evidenced by the Cooper record—one must first understand the new prayer culture that would replace that of the superstitious prayer-spells that had previously been used. To see to it that this superstitious prayer culture was indeed removed, Elizabeth would impose upon sixteenth century Christians a newly revised Book of Common Prayer in order to be certain that the prayer-spells that had permeated the majority of the late medieval *Horae*, as well as primers and other books of devotion, were removed and replaced with a standardized liturgy that was based solely upon Scripture. Endorsed jointly, under both the Supremacy Bill and the Act of Uniformity, it would be, as historian W.H. Frere asserted, "the service book, which at this epoch, as at the Edwardine epoch, symbolized a real doctrinal change."³⁰ And as this doctrinal change would begin to take full effect, no longer would the sixteenth century English Christian have the superstitious and mystical prayer-spells as a means to invoke divine protection. The preface of the prayer-book itself would readily present the reader or hearer of its text with the idea that the prayer-spells, as well as other superstitious practices, were "untrue...uncertain...vain and superstitious," and that nothing else could be read or recited aloud "but the very pure word of God, the Holy Scriptures, or that which is [was] evidently grounded

30 Frere, 25.

78 Articles

upon the same, and that in such a language and order as is most easy and plain for understanding, both of the readers and hearers.”³¹Of course, it is most likely the case that Elizabeth did indeed hope to stave off the use of prayer-spells through the simple act of pointing out that, fundamentally, they were false invocations for God’s protection. It can also be safely assumed that since the majority of the superstitious prayer-spells were in Latin, or at the very least, somewhat vague, that Elizabeth believed that an English liturgy that was “in such a language and order as is most easy and plain for understanding” would entice her parishioners to put their superstitious ways behind them and adopt the new scripturally derived Book of Common Prayer. On another level, Elizabeth and her clerics would seek to turn the superstitious late medieval Catholic doctrine against itself, in which case it would claim that all of the prayer-spells that the people lifted up to the angels, as well as to the cross and God’s many names, were originally of a “decent order” that the ancient fathers had knowingly advocated for use. At some point, however, these prayers had “been so altered, broken, and neglected by planting in [them] uncertain stories, legends, responds, verses, vain repetitions, commemorations, and synodals” that they were now only profane remnants of what they had been intended.³² However, if such verbal defamation of the prayer-spells proved to be ineffectual, the prayer-book would see to it that their practice was completely removed through “imprisonment by the space of six months without bail or mainprise,” for the laymen caught using anything other than the new Book of Common Prayer. Clerics, on the other hand, would “lose and forfeit to the Queen’s Highness, her heirs and successors, for his first offence and the profit of all his spiritual benefices or promotion

31 John E. Booty, ed., *The Book of Common Prayer, 1559: The Elizabethan Prayer Book* (Washington: Folger Shakespeare Library, 1976), 16.

32 Ibid., 14.

coming or arising the year next after this conviction."³³ Thus, it seems evident that Elizabeth desired to remove the use of prayer-spells and other superstitious practices from all social spheres, both lay and elite.

As for the text of the Book of Common Prayer itself, it would rely solely upon scripture to request God's protection—however, only if that protection were to fall into accord with His divine will. For example, one would expect the litany that was to be used "In the Time of Death and Famine," which was included in the new prayer-book, to include all manner of superstitious elements so as to assure one of his or her life or of a good harvest. But this is not the case. Instead, the text reads:

O GOD, merciful Father, which in the time of Heliscus the prophet didst suddenly turn into Samaria great scarcity and death into plenty and cheapness, and extreme famine into abundance of victual: Have pity upon us, that now be punished for our sins with like adversity; increase the fruits of the earth by the heavenly benediction; and grant, that we, receiving thy bountiful liberality, may use the same to thy glory, our comfort, and relief of our needy neighbors, through Jesus Christ our Lord.
Amen.³⁴

Here, there is no mention of the angels. There is no call for the reader to physically sign his or herself, nor is there mention of God under any other names than those of Father or Lord. It is also important to note that this prayer offers its reader or orator with no assurance that the problem or crisis (in this case, famine) will be avoided, as was provided with the use of the prayer-spells. Thus, when this new prayer-book became legalized in 1559, believers who had been so used to assurance and protection would find themselves simply at the mercy of God's will.

With such evidence in tow, then, the reader becomes acutely aware that prayer-spells or any other manner of superstitious practices are absent

³³ Ibid., 7.

³⁴ Ibid., 75.

from Cooper's account. At the outset of Margaret's troubles, Stephen simply displays the mindset of a sixteenth century Christian who has accepted the reforms that have been imposed by the Elizabethan prayer-book. This is evident in the way in which, being troubled by Margaret's vain speech, "he perswaded her to call uppon God, and that being the creature of God she should not forget to call uppon her Creator in the daie of trouble: wherefore he counseled her to praie with him, and to saie the Lordes Praier after him."³⁵ However, 'vain speech' would not seem to be reason enough to worry much. Thus, perhaps the reader should not expect there to be much in the way of superstitious practice to be yet evident. And so, Stephen continued to pray, "but the more he praid and persuaded her to Praier, the more she seemed to bee as it were troubled with some evill Spirite."³⁶ It is at this point that Margaret's fits seem to be at their worst. They are so bad, in fact, that as I recorded earlier, Stephen had to call on Margaret's sister as well as their neighbors and friends for help. Certainly, it would seem that if Elizabeth's prayer-reforms had not been accepted, one among those present would have invoked protection for Margaret through the use of a prayer-spell. Instead, however, "her husband and friends persuaded her to saie the Lordes Praier with them."³⁷ And when Margaret exclaimed with such fright that she could indeed see the Devil, "they desired her to remember God and to call for grace" and that "her faith might bee only fixed uppon him to be vanquishing of the Devill, and his assaults."³⁸ Even when Margaret was on the verge of being drug into hell, the company that had gathered in her bedchamber would "charge the Devill in the name of the Father, the Sonne, and the

35 Kingston, 6.

36 Ibid., 7.

37 Ibid., 8.

38 Ibid., 9.

holy Ghost, to departe from her and to trouble her no more."³⁹ Therefore, it seems appropriate to suggest that this account is indicative of a sixteenth century English religious culture that had accepted Elizabethan reforms and that believed themselves to be utterly unprotected in the face of an ever-present Devil. And if this record does not suggest that this is the case for Christians in the whole of England, at the very least perhaps it suggests that this might hold true for the county of Somersetshire.

Despite tormenting Margaret Cooper so forcibly, the Devil was in fact unable to drag her soul to hell. Those who had gathered in her bedchamber believed that, because they had "cried to the Lorde to helpe them in that their greate nedde," they were able to pull her out of the fire that had sprung up at her feet.⁴⁰ Here, not only have Elizabethan reforms taken hold in print, but in practice as well. Therefore, this case study serves as an invaluable piece of evidence for two important aspects of popular sixteenth religious culture in England. First, we can see that the Devil was just as present as he had ever been and was now, in fact, more harmful than he had previously been. Second, the document strongly suggests that Elizabethan reforms had taken hold in Somersetshire, if not in the whole of England. However, I must point out that the record ends with a child. As those present glanced out of the bedroom window—the flames of hell that had appeared at Margaret's feet having disappeared—"they espied a thing like unto a childe with a very bright shining countenance, casting a greate light in the Chamber."⁴¹ Perhaps those gathered in Cooper's room had seen the countenance of Christ, whom they believed to have delivered Margaret from the clutches of

Satan. We will never know. But let us not forget that, while the Devil was

³⁹ Ibid., 12.

⁴⁰ Ibid., 11.

⁴¹ Ibid., 12.

82 Articles

indeed believed to be an ever-present force in sixteenth century England, maybe the child of God, the divine Christ, was just a present—regardless of whether He had been invoked through prayer—as well.

Empire & Spinsterhood: the Shaping of a New Identity

Jo A. Larson

By the height of the Victorian Era, the doctrine of separate spheres ruled both thought and action. Men enjoyed public lives while women were safely relegated to private spaces. However, by the mid-nineteenth century, another path was beginning to open for the Victorian middle-class woman as a new appreciation for singlehood began to develop. This elective spinsterhood was made possible by rising evangelicalism and imperialism. By the second half of the nineteenth century, many women began to opt for this newly honorable singlehood in place of marriage. Far from feminists, these women substituted duty to country for duty to husband. What appears on the surface to be a discontent with marriage and a growing desire to escape oppressive, gender-based, socio-cultural mores is no more than a redefining of duty. This paper does not argue the growth of first-wave feminism through nineteenth century political, educational, and legislative reforms. It does, however, argue that spinsters of the Victorian Age most often engaged in acts of reform and socio-cultural improvements out of a sense of *duty* rather than a commitment to female suffrage.

In a very thought-provoking article, Zsuzsa Berend argues most effectively that spinsterhood in the nineteenth century was elective.¹ As evangelicalism began to hold sway, ideas of love began to slowly take on new meaning. It was the emotionality of evangelicalism that imbued 'true

1 Zsuzsa Berend, "'The Best or None!' Spinsterhood in Nineteenth-Century New England," *Journal of Social History* 33, no. 4 (2000): 935-957.

love' with a new credibility.

Evangelicals associated spontaneity of feeling with true faith. Thus spontaneous emotions in heterosexual love, although treated cautiously, were no longer discredited; now they were regarded as a sure, though mysterious, sign of Providence.²

The evangelical movement effectively transformed romantic love into true love, complete with all the intrinsic values of Christian ideology.

Thanks to true love, a woman was bound by all that is holy to remain single until her one true love presented himself. To echo Zsuzsa Berend's catch phrase, single women were opting for "The best or none!" Marriage became a spiritual union to be engaged in only when one was positive it was a God-ordained union. The expectation was that each human had an ideal match with whom spiritual completeness and wholeness was possible. Any lesser match was deemed second rate at best and a dismal failure at worse. To marry simply to be married denied the opportunity to establish the perfect union based on shared temperament and beliefs. It denied God's plan. Attraction between a man and woman, if of sufficient strength, became proof positive of the union's righteousness.

But what if the single Victorian lady failed to find this 'true love'? Lucy Larcom calls it "a life of 'single blessedness'" preferable to "'marrying and giving in marriage' unless one is sure that the one is the one, and no other."³ Often the surfeit of nineteenth-century spinsters is pinned to an imbalance in numbers. It is surmised that too many women and not enough men was the root cause. However, Victorian diaries and letters are rife with examples of single women who, given the opportunity to wed, chose not to do so. Often these women were

² Berend, 937.

³ 23 Sept. 1853, in Shirley Marchelonis, *The Worlds of Lucy Larcom, 1824-1893* (Athens: 1989), 91. As found in Berend, 938.

involved in long-term, courting relationships with their beaux. Though most often the gentleman in question represented a solidly potential mate, the woman would end the courtship by jilting her potential spouse on the grounds that no flood of emotion had yet besieged her and laid her defenses bare. This belief in both the acceptance of and expectation of 'true love' as a prerequisite to marriage is graphically portrayed in the 1995 film version of Jane Austen's *Sense & Sensibility*. In several scenes, Marianne, the younger Miss Dashwood, repeatedly berates her older sister for a perceived lack of feeling and an inadequate depth of passion. Lacking that perceived depth, many real-world Victorian heroines opted for singlehood. The belief in these "noble truths" regarding true love was so great as to represent an abiding influence. If true love could not be found, singlehood was superior to any lesser option such as a lukewarm marriage.

This God-ordained true love coalesced into a concept of purity, nobility, selflessness, and moral fortitude that de-accentuated sexual implications and portrayed woman as the quintessential mother of morality. Referred to by scholars as domesticated love, its center of being was the home. Domesticated love rose above the sensual. Lasciviousness was anathema to the totality that was the Victorian woman. This moral motherhood validated and gave worth to the female emotional persona. During the Victorian Era, this persona became more highly prized, both on an individual and a national level. "The higher women rise in moral and intellectual culture, the more is the sensual refined away from her nature, and the more pure and perfect and predominant becomes her motherhood."⁴

True love and moral motherhood became inseparable concepts in
4 Berend, 940.

the Victorian mind and began to extend beyond the confines of marriage. The role of the Victorian woman encompassed many tasks. She stood as a moral benchmark, a teacher, and a reformer as well as a wife. And many of these roles could be fulfilled *sans* marriage. Thus, it was no longer necessary for a woman to be wed in order to fulfill her destiny. As a single woman, she still had value to society.

Previous to this new definition of elective singlehood, spinsters were regarded as a social burden. Often without control of private funds, these women were forced to depend upon the natal family or extended relatives. They served as nursemaids, governesses, seamstresses, housekeepers, and all-around factotums. Often seen as financial burdens with frail health and nervous psyches, they were deemed objects of pity and vexation. But the changing role from burden to the nation's moral mother enhanced the spinster's societal and cultural worth. Even if one did not find their true and perfect match, the old definitions of spinsterhood need no longer be feared. Singlehood did not necessarily produce a pariah.

These new concepts of true love and elective singlehood came together to forge a connection between Christian virtue and usefulness. "Finding their life-work filled spinsters with a sense of God-given purpose, with the satisfaction of working for others."⁵ This model of "service" was closely connected to wifely duty and motherhood. It was every wife's and mother's responsibility to provide guidance and aid to those in need. Such service was the responsibility of the single woman also. From society's evolving point of view, she was but an unmarried mother. As a female member of the British culture, she was expected to fulfill her God-given potential – if not as a breeder of future Englishmen,

5 Ibid, 945.

then as an aid to all who fell short of the glory of the empire. This was woman's work. Britain had attained the level, in their minds, of social perfection. It was up to the women to spread that moral perfection globally. This, after procreation, was their *raison d'être*. Thus, "home and the world, marriage and singlehood were not polar opposites but rather a continuum."⁶ Women, both married and single, had a responsibility to extend the home fires into the empire at large.

This importance of Christian usefulness, in conjunction with the new singlehood, developed a secondary socio-cultural doctrine – that of vocation.

A vocation provided the calling by which one participated in God's work and society's progress. It set the individual on the road to perfection; it enabled her to develop her talents, compose her anxious psyche, and discipline her body.⁷

The Victorian wife was expected to birth and nurture the succeeding generation of loyal Englishmen. However, this was a task not available to those women who opted for singlehood. If, as Chambers-Schiller argues, "Submission and duty were the ruling principles of Victorian life," then to whom was the spinster to submit?⁸ To whom did she owe such duties? Simply by virtue of her female gender, the Victorian woman was expected to accept specific responsibilities for home, family, and God. Fortunately for the spinster, motherly love was not restricted to biological mothers. That same care, concern, and nurturing could be applied to the children of the British Empire – its subjects.

⁶ Berend, 943.

⁷ Walter E. Houghton, *The Victorian Frame of Mind, 1830-1870* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1963). As quoted in Lee Chambers-Schiller, "The Single Woman Reformer: Conflicts between Family and Vocation, 1830-1860," *Frontiers: A Journal of Women Studies* 3, no. 3 (1978): 42.

⁸ Schiller, 42.

The most obvious path to caring for the diverse subjects of the empire was through missions. And though this was a path many single women did choose, it was not the only means by which they could exercise their vocations. Nurse, travel writer, naturalist, reformer, teacher and explorer were all areas in which single women sought to fulfill their duty to their society and to their country. In effect, these spinsters were married to their society and as such, carried with them a belief in their public responsibility.

Many middle-class spinsters opted for travel as a means of spreading British morals and Christian beliefs to indigenous peoples. Through travel they could interact with the indigenes and offer them the wisdom of the ruling society. "Women travelers to the American West articulated with other British feminists in their desires to 'save' their downtrodden Native American sisters."⁹ Whether in the American West, the coastal ports of India, or the jungles of West Africa, British women travelers, missionaries and travel writers alike viewed native women as unhygienic, subjugated, and downtrodden. Women missionaries held similar beliefs. All held a new authority in the empire – a nationally perceived moral authority. Philippa Levine posits:

Single women missionaries resembled social reformers of their countries of origin, not because the messages they transmitted presaged those of "the new woman", but in their assumption of a position of moral authority in relation to others whom they defined as in need of "uplift".¹⁰

However, the conflict for the nineteenth-century woman was not whether she was equipped for a successful vocation but that she

9 Karen M. Morin, "Peak Practices: Englishwomen's "Heroic" Adventures in the Nineteenth-Century American West," *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 89, no. 3 (1999): 493.

10 Philippa Levine, *Gender and Empire* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 267.

“shed no domestic responsibilities save motherhood with her rejection of marriage.”¹¹ In order to exercise her vocation, she must also deal with her many familial obligations. Chambers-Schiller quotes Susanna Winkworth, British reformer and author:

It is very difficult to think about oneself without its interfering with duties towards others. It ought not, and need not . . . but it is very hard to combine great energy in the pursuit of a worthy object, with a quick ear for the calls of duty in other directions, and an immediate yielding of the will to them when heard.¹²

Many single women still felt their desire for a vocation and their desire to fulfill their duty to society as being somehow de-feminizing. By responding to the demands of their vocation before responding to the needs of family, they considered themselves as unduly willful and lacking proper submission. Chambers-Schiller sees this as a simple role conflict. But it was much less simple and much more painful to the women of the time. Despite their adherence to their belief in their duty to God and their country, many spinsters acted in ways inconsistent with our twenty-first century concept of an independent, single woman. When Rose Kingsley traveled to the American West, it was in the company of British representatives to the Episcopal Church Convention to be held in Baltimore. As part of this company, Kingsley traveled to Colorado to visit her elder brother. She took with her a desire to uplift the heathen American Indian. However, in her book Kingsley repeatedly relates her concerns for her more delicate and feminine qualities. While visiting Colorado Springs, two Indians appear to be making sport of her by running past on all fours and engaging in other bizarre but harmless antics. A white man from the store comes out and holds the savages at bay

¹¹ Schiller, 43.

¹² Schiller, 42.

allowing her to pass unmolested. Kingsley's narrative "emphasized her feminine need to be rescued by the gallant white male, again not straying too far afield of a proper feminine voice."¹³ True love, usefulness, duty, and vocation embodied the Victorian elective spinster – and yet femininity must be preserved.

Kingsley's contemporary, the renowned Lady Isabella Bird, voiced her own concerns that female propriety and femininity be maintained. Long touted by scholars as one of the nineteenth-century's leading proto-feminists, Bird, like Kingsley, exhibits a palpable concern for womanly respectability and decorum. She advises future women travelers to the American West to adopt her own, peculiar mode of dress.

For the benefit of other lady travelers, I wish to explain that my "Hawaiian riding dress" is the "American Lady's Mountain Dress," a half-fitting jacket, a skirt reaching to the ankles, and full Turkish trousers gathered into frills falling over the boots, a thoroughly serviceable and feminine costume for mountaineering and other rough traveling.¹⁴

Bird's concerns center on the appropriateness and acceptability of her attire. When a London news reporter accuses her of wearing men's clothing, she heatedly responds via her publisher. Claiming "that as she had neither father nor brother to defend her reputation, she expected him personally to horsewhip the Times correspondent."¹⁵ Bird claims that for riding in the American West this was an acceptable and useful costume. However, while thus dressed, she still "'shrank' from the public eye."¹⁶

13 Karen M. Morin, "British Women Travellers and Constructions of Racial Difference across the Nineteenth-Century American West," *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers, New Series* 23, no. 3 (1998): 323.

14 Lady Isabella Bird, *A Lady's Life in the Rocky Mountains* (Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 1879 [1969]). citation found: Morin, "Peak Practices," 497.

15 D. Middleton, *Victorian Lady Travellers* (Chicago: Chicago Academy, 1965 [1982]). As quoted in Morin, "Peak Practices," 497-498.

16 Bird, 74.

As reported in their respective travelogues, both Kingsley and Bird, representative of their British social class, are unused to domestic chores. Their engagement in such activities as washing clothes or dishes is more akin to playing house than to keeping house. "Thus while Bird enacts domesticity, she simultaneously maintains her own version of true femininity by presenting herself ill-prepared and too delicate for work other than knitting and sewing."¹⁷ Morin notes that middle- and upper-class Victorian women stood as a testament to their husbands' success through their idleness. This idleness was a mark of femininity. And though such single women as Isabella Bird and Rose Kingsley were willing to brave the wilds of the American West in the late 1800s, they were not willing to tout those little conventions that defined their femininity.

Society's norms and mores presented challenges when a single woman set out to fulfill her duty by engaging in her chosen vocation. However, the spinster's principal external disadvantage was her family. Florence Nightingale stated:

I have known a good deal of convents. And of course everyone has talked of the petty grinding tyrannies supposed to be exercised there. But I know nothing like the petty grinding tyranny of a good English family.¹⁸

Despite personal commitment and a "sometimes" financial success, nineteenth-century spinsters often remained emotionally, if not financially, dependent upon their natal family and the approval of their society. Though the spinster saw virtue in her singlehood and her vocation, the family was willing to support her efforts only after she had met all familial obligations. As such, many spinsters struggled with family

¹⁷ Morin, "Peak Practices," 501.

¹⁸ Cecil Woodham-Smith, *Florence Nightingale* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1951), 45. As quoted in Chambers-Schiller, 44.

bonds for years. Before permission to pursue their chosen vocations could be had, there may be countless hours reading to elderly relatives or years of nursing a fragile mother or infirm father. Dealing with mind-numbing years of repetitive household chores for a bachelor brother was equally confining. Even those that did manage to flee the oppression of the natal family were often recalled repeatedly and forced to return home again and again to nurse one family member or another or to fulfill some other family obligation. Evangelicalism and changing social values validated her singlehood and her vocation. However, her own emotional conflict regarding familial duty kept her tied.

Here again, if we look at Kingsley's time in Colorado, she is protected by and responsible to her brother, Maurice. Even when she is offered an adventure of a lifetime, she meekly defers to her brother's judgment. Kingsley describes how she is offered the opportunity to ride on the train's cowcatcher as she and her companions approach Monument Park. She explains that "though in my secret heart I wished just to feel what it was like for once, M[aurice] told me it was really such a risk that I resisted the temptation."¹⁹

Scholars have long suggested that female reformers would have necessarily been spinsters since only a spinster would have had the leisure time necessary. But though spinsters did not have the demands of a husband or children, this only increased their responsibilities. As family members who were free to be called upon for any and all extra duties, the single woman was in high demand. A review of the diaries and letters of spinsters of the time validates this view. The Lamothe sisters were typical of this breed of single women. Judging by their correspondence, free time

19 Rose G. Kingsley and Charles Kingsley, *South By West: Or Winter In The Rocky Mountains And Spring In Mexico* (London: W. Isbister & Co., 1874), 106.

was in short supply.²⁰ Spinsters, by their very definition as husbandless and childless, were expected to care for elderly and infirm relatives, contribute to the family economy through garment sewing and household management, and to provide charity assistance to the parish poor and ill. It is a more reasonable and better founded assumption that it was married women who engaged in gender reform efforts.

Chambers-Schiller defines voluntary singlehood as a “dramatic new form of female independence.”²¹ Morin clearly argues that British women travelers to the American West represented a feminist drive to free Native American women from subjugation. Berend states, “Since they could be construed as pursuing autonomy and rejecting wifely dependence, spinsters are readily seen as ‘foremothers’ by contemporary feminists.”²² This construction of Victorian spinsters as proto-feminist reformers can be easily understood. Many of these women stand out in history as travel writers, naturalists, and reformers. Some increased their political standing by relocating to colonial possessions where they are no longer just women but “memsahib.” It was through their position as “domestic imperialists” that these women established themselves, at least within the colonies, as politically significant. Such imperial travel allowed many single women to exercise their physical and mental prowess by removing themselves from the confines of Victorian cultural mores. As travel writers, naturalists, artists, and commentators, single British women abroad experienced a socio-cultural freedom unavailable in England.

There is, however, little conclusive evidence that women’s decisions to remain single were propagated by a desire for feminist-brand

20 Christine Adams, “A Choice Not to Wed? Unmarried Women in Eighteenth-Century France,” *Journal of Social History* 29, no. 4 (1996): 883-894.

21 Berend, 935.

22 Berend, 935.

freedom. Female autonomy did increase during the nineteenth century. However, the belief that this was due to a growing discontent with marriage and a concerted drive for female autonomy through singlehood takes historical events out of context. There one attempts to explain the present at the expense of the past. Unfortunately, many women's studies engage in this context-reversal.

Far from a progression along suffrage lines, elective singlehood among the middle and upper class during the Victorian Era was driven by socio-cultural changes in the accepted understanding of the concepts of love and marriage. Evangelicalism's emotionality served to metamorph romantic love into a model of true love. This God-ordained model was perfect. Marriage was not seen as antagonistic but as the most desirable outcome. That outcome, however, was predicated upon the acquisition of true love – not just any love. Elective singlehood was far preferable to any marriage not based upon the God-approved union of two perfectly matched souls. This ideal of the perfect union became a Victorian reality.

In concert with this evangelical view of the marriage union, women, as the moral mothers of their society, adopted the Christian ethic of usefulness. Once again the evangelical view influenced these ideas of commitment, duty, and vocation. True love led to marriage, but, in lieu of a perfect life mate, it also led to singlehood. Women, both married and single, had a responsibility to the society and their nation. Women, as the keepers of society's moral code, were responsible to stoke the home fires and provide a shining example for the many heathen stepchildren to the empire. Herein, imperialism provided new avenues where these single women could exercise their vocations. Single women transferred their patriarchal duty to the nation and its society. As travelers, nurses,

explorers, and missionaries these women spread the light of cleanliness and morality in an uncivilized empire. Women's usefulness expanded. Spinsters no longer cowered under a mantle of social burden. They became bastions of British morality and exceptionalism. Inherent in their new worth was the understanding that these women could have, had they so chosen, married. But their high ideals and force of character led them to remain single instead of sacrificing their beliefs to a second-rate union.

By virtue of its Christian approval, feminine love, or true love, became a mainstay of social order and the British concept of superior humanity. Women's motherly character was separated from reproduction. Female love was separated from sexuality. The development of the moral mother, married or single, became the foundation of social progress. The spinster had new worth because she had duty.

“The Memory of Me in Good Works”: The Importance of the Legends of King Alfred the Great to English Society

John Griffin

At the end of the 1963 movie, “The Man Who Shot Liberty Valance,” Ransom Stoddard, played by James Stewart, has just recounted how it was someone else, not he, who shot the outlaw Valance, an event upon which Stoddard had built his entire political career. When the reporter rips up his notes, a stunned Stoddard asks, “You’re not going to use the story?” The reporter replies, “No, sir. This is the West. When the legend becomes fact, print the legend.”¹

In much the same way, the legends surrounding King Alfred of Wessex serve the same purpose. They have been recounted for such a long time that, even though the events did not take place, the legend has replaced the facts as perception has become reality. These stories tell us much more about the people of England than about Alfred himself. They give the English a sense of who they are and where they have come from.² It matters not if the stories are true, for their purpose is to create a national identity. The aim of this paper is to explore why these stories are important, their impact upon society and religion in England both early in

1 *The Man Who Shot Liberty Valance*. DVD. Directed by John Ford. Produced by Willis Goldbeck. Paramount Pictures, 1962.

2 Stephen J. Harris, “The Alfredian world history and Anglo-Saxon identity,” *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 100, No. 4, (Oct., 2001): 482-510. He makes a compelling argument for the case of religious and social identity working together to bring about a distinct English identity. Harris argues that, while other historians have viewed the idea of “Englishness” as having a foundation in Christianity, “...Christendom, a religio-ethnic order of identity altogether distinct from Christianity...” (483) better represents the force behind the ethnogenesis of “Englishness.”

her existence and later, and what they tell us about the people of England.

When someone says the word “legend,” the listener is most likely reminded of words and phrases such as “story,” “fiction,” and “larger-than-life.” In literature, there is the legend of Paul Bunyan. In sports, we have Babe Ruth and his legendary “called shot” in the 1932 World Series. In the motion pictures, we have the aforementioned Ransom Stoddard and his supposed shooting of Liberty Valance. Different though they may be, in each case there is one thing tying them together: they are all about events or people that, in reality, did not occur or exist. It matters not that Paul Bunyan did not create the Grand Canyon by dragging his massive axe behind him. Sports fans are not all that concerned with the fact that Ruth was most likely indicating to the opposing bench that he still had one strike left. The newspaperman did not care that Tom Doniphan, and not Stoddard, actually killed Valance. Why? Because in each instance, the legend gives those most affected by the story something to hold on to, something to be proud of, something by which they define themselves and their lives. Escaping the gravity of truth, the legend has taken a flight of mythic proportions.

The legends surrounding Alfred have also strayed into the area of mythology. Looking back, the myths of ancient Greece were explanations of why things happened the way they did and to give a beginning to the world of the Greeks. In the same way, the stories of Alfred have been used to demonstrate all that is good and desired in both an English people and an English leader. “Tracing English institutions and traditions back to Alfred,” writes David Horspool, “is a quasi-historical game that has been played for centuries. Modern scholarship discredited most of these shaky genealogies, but...these pseudo-historical notions illustrate the concerns of

the time in which they originate or become established...”³

For many, the word “myth” has a negative connotation. As Dr. Stephen Ausband writes, “We tend to think of myths as stories other people believe or once believed to be true, but that are not really true.”⁴ Upon closer inspection, however, we see that while they are still “not really true,” myths are and have always been, much more than simple stories meant to entertain. In 1963, the late religious historian Mircea Eliade wrote,

For the past fifty years at least, Western scholars have approached the study of myth from a viewpoint markedly different from, let us say, that of the nineteenth century. Unlike their predecessors, who treated myth in the usual meaning of the word, that is, as ‘fable,’ ‘invention,’ ‘fiction,’ they have accepted it as it was understood in the archaic societies, where, on the contrary, ‘myth’ means a ‘true story’ and, beyond that, a story that is a most precious possession *because* (italics mine) it is sacred, exemplary, significant.⁵

It is this definition, this view, that best allows us to understand the Alfredian stories and their importance. If we can see Alfred as earlier generations did, we can catch a glimpse of their worldview, limited as that glimpse may be.

The most famous of the Alfred legends is, of course, the burnt cakes. The details of the story have varied over the centuries but the main points remain intact. Briefly, Alfred, in desperate straits after the Vikings

³ David Horspool, *King Alfred: Burnt Cakes and Other Legends* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2006), 167-168.

⁴ Stephen C. Ausband, *Myth and Meaning, Myth and Order*, (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1983), p. 1. For additional reading regarding the role of myth in history and society, see William G. Doty, *Mythography; The Study of Myths and Rituals* (Tuscaloosa, AL: The University of Alabama Press, 1986). For the role of myths in English history, please see Hugh A MacDougall, *Racial Myth in English History: Trojans, Teutons, and Anglo-Saxons*, (Montreal and Hanover, NH: Harvest House and the University Press of New England, 1982), which focuses on the impact of racial mythology upon the role of England as a major player in historical events.

⁵ Mircea Eliade, *Myth and Reality*, trans. by William R. Trask (New York: Harper & Row, 1963), 1.

have routed his little band of soldiers, seeks anonymous solace amongst his own people at Athelney. Finding himself housed with a farmer and his wife, Alfred sullenly contemplates his fate and his future. One day in his depression, he fails to notice that the cakes his hostess was baking had burnt. Upon discovering this, she scolds him, chiding him for his ignorance and self-absorption. Adequately chastised, Alfred vows to not lose sight again of his responsibilities, either as baker's apprentice or as king.⁶

The story of the burnt cakes illustrates a key element in the English view of Alfred by demonstrating the humbling of a king. Subjects of a monarchy desire a leader that is at once strong, yet understanding of their plight. As the father figure of his country, Alfred must be attuned to the needs of his subjects. The fact that "the once all-powerful king was transformed into the most menial of servants" gives the reader the hope that their father-king understands them, sympathizes with them, feels for them, and loves them.⁷ In Alfred, the people have a focal point, someone to rally around as the epitome of all that is good and English. Looking closer to home, it should not be surprising if this sounds somewhat familiar, for while England has Alfred, America has George Washington, as interpreted by the stories of Parson Weems.

Weems' purpose in writing his *Life of Washington* mirrors that of Alfred's earliest biographer, the Welsh monk Asser. Published a year after the death of Washington in 1799, Weems weaved together inspiring and uplifting stories about America's first president, many of which were true. However, the most memorable ones have no basis, and rather are meant to canonize the recently deceased leader in the hearts of his countrymen.

6 Horspool, *King Alfred*, 80.

7 Alfred P. Smyth, *King Alfred the Great*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995), 325.

100 Articles

The most famous involves a cherry tree, a hatchet, and young George's refusal to tell a lie. Weems' higher moral purpose in recounting this story (which is to demonstrate the faultless character of Washington), outweighs the fact that it is false. Coupled with Washington's standing in the country at the time of his death, it is no wonder that this anecdote gained widespread and enduring acceptance as fact. When comparing each case, the American view would be that Alfred is their Washington, when in fact Washington is our Alfred. Washington, as "The Father of His Country," gives Americans a guidepost to point to in finding the beginnings of a national identity, much like Alfred gives rise to a sense of Englishness.⁸

Not only have the Alfredian legends had an effect on the way the English have viewed themselves, they have also impacted religion and the religious life of England. Here, too, we see Alfred being used to validate a certain aspect of an English viewpoint. In order to fully appreciate the impact of the Alfredian legends in this area, it is imperative that we understand the relationship, historically, between myth and religion. Myths have enjoyed a close, even symbiotic, relationship with the religious life of those telling the tales. They have been the building blocks of explaining the "why" and "how" of the origination event. When viewed in this way, myths begin to transform, becoming "a sacred history..." that "relates an event that took place in primordial Time, the fabled time of the 'beginnings'."⁹

8 While Weems' treatment of Washington is the one most-recognized by the general public, there are numerous other examples in the treatment of American history that demonstrates the power of myth. One of the most interesting is the account of the Almo, Idaho massacre in 1861, recounted by Dr. James W. Loewen in his book, *Lies Across America: What Our Historic Sites Get Wrong*, (New York: The New Press, 1999), 89-93. On a stone in the shape of the state of Idaho, erected by the Sons and Daughters of Idaho Pioneers in 1938, is the following inscription: "Dedicated to the memory of those who lost their lives in a horrible Indian massacre, 1861. Three hundred immigrants westbound. Only five escaped." The problem, according to Dr. Loewen and other historians cited by him, is that this massacre NEVER occurred.

9 Eliade, *Myth and Reality*, 5-6. Eliade goes on to write that "...myth tells how, through the deeds of Supernatural Beings, a reality came into existence, be it the whole of reality...or only

According to a recent biographer of Alfred, the king was portrayed as a “model ruler, with deep religious and ascetic tendencies...”¹⁰ Much of the Alfredian legends’ centrality to English Christendom can be attributed to Alfred himself, through the assistance of his biographer Asser. As Richard Abels writes in his biography of Alfred, “It is from Asser and Alfred’s own writings that we know him best. But what they teach us is less about the man as he actually was than about what he aspired to be and how he wished others to see him.”¹¹ For Asser, Alfred was the “embodiment of the ideal, but practical, Christian ruler...the ‘truth-teller,’ a brave, resourceful, pious man, who was generous to the church and anxious to rule his people justly.”¹² Again, we find the legend overshadowing the truth. While it is true that he attempted to lead a pious life, Alfred could also be ruthless when dealing with his enemies, and his subjects who ignored royal “admonitions.”¹³ Since, however, this was done in the vein of trying to spiritually lead his people, Alfred was not viewed as a tyrant, but as a firm, yet loving, spiritual leader.

Later, the stories of Alfred’s religious leadership were used to “illustrate the king’s moral virtues and to connect him with St. Neot and St. Cuthbert, a reflection of the desire of Alfred’s descendants to extend their patronage and political control over the churches of Wales and North Umbria.”¹⁴ This attempt to “forge a link between crown and monastery”

a fragment of reality - an island, a species of plant, a particular kind of human behavior, an institution. Myth, then, is always an account of a ‘creation.’”

10 Smyth, *King Alfred*, 206.

11 Richard Abels, *Alfred the Great: War, Kingship and Culture in Anglo-Saxon England*, (London: Longman, 1998), 311.

12 Barbara Yorke, “The Most Perfect Man in History,” *History Today* 49, No. 10 (Oct., 1999): 9.

13 Asser himself wrote that “those who had opposed the royal commands were humiliated in meaningless repentance by being reduced to virtual extinction.” *Alfred the Great: Asser’s Life of King Alfred*, translated with an introduction and notes by Simon Keynes and Michael Lapidge, (New York: Penguin Books, 1983), 102.

14 Abels, *Alfred the Great*, 158.

102 Articles

resulted in a new vision of King Alfred.¹⁵ St. Neot, who was supposedly a cousin of Alfred, had prophesied that the king “would suffer at the hands of the Vikings and be driven from his country.” If, however, Alfred were willing to place his trust in Neot, then he (Neot), who would pass away before the restoration of Alfred’s kingdom, would intercede on his behalf.¹⁶ Alfred did so and soon after won a decisive victory at the Battle of Ethandun. In regard to the connection between Alfred and St. Cuthbert, legend has it that, at the same time of Alfred’s exile on Altheney, he was visited in a dream by Cuthbert who, like Neot, promised victory to the king. St. Cuthbert established this promise with the accurate prediction that Alfred’s men would return to him with a large catch of fish, despite the fact that the river was frozen over.¹⁷ Again, victory on the battlefield was the result.

Although the stories themselves are different, the idea behind each remains the same. The saints each assist or aid Alfred in some manner, resulting in the king being indebted to them, a debt that he acknowledges. For both St. Neot and St. Cuthbert, or more importantly, their followers, the “end result was royal patronage for each saint’s monastery.” Each story “thus provides ‘historical precedent’ for what was in fact a novel change in patronage.”¹⁸ For the followers of these saints, the result of this connection to Alfred is the validation of their religious sect. Additionally, each instance (Alfred’s exile, the prophesy of the fish, the eventual restoration of his throne) is reminiscent of biblical stories of God’s love for His people and His kings, such as David’s exile from Saul

15 Ted Johnson-South, “Competition for King Alfred’s Aura in the Last Century of Anglo-Saxon England,” *Albion: A Quarterly Journal Concerned with British Studies* 23, No. 4 (Winter, 1991): 613, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4050743>, accessed: 15 March 2010.

16 Horspool, *King Alfred*, 79.

17 *Ibid.*, 92.

18 Johnson-South, “King Alfred’s Aura,” 618.

and Jesus telling Peter to cast his nets for fish. Much in the same way as these stories serve to demonstrate the justification of God's love for His people, the stories of Alfred's connection to St. Neot and St. Cuthbert serve to justify the worldview of the followers of these saints as being blessed by God, by linking them to the aura of Alfred.

What made Alfred great is not found in anything that he actually did, though he accomplished much. From scholastic and administrative functions, to military organization and ecclesiastical reformation, Alfred left an imprint upon early Britain that is both compelling and undeniable.¹⁹ In 1897, in an address calling for a celebration of the one-thousandth anniversary since the end of Alfred's reign, the British jurist and historian Frederic Harrison described the effect of Alfred on England:

No people, in ancient or modern times, ever had a Hero-Founder at once so truly historic, so venerable, and so supremely great. Alfred was more to us than the heroes in antique myths—more than Theseus and Solon were to Athens, or Lycurgus to Sparta, or Romulus and Numa were to Rome, more than St. Stephen was to Hungary, or Pelayo and the Cid to Spain, more than Hugh Capet and Jeanne d'Arc were to France—more than William the Silent was to Holland—nay, almost as much as the Great Charles was to the Franks.²⁰

We cannot ignore the fact that Alfred is most remembered for things he did not do. "What made King Alfred 'England's Darling,' [...] was the general acknowledgement that he was the first native of the British Isles to combine in his person the moral, physical and intellectual

¹⁹ Alfred's lasting legacy can also be found in his military and defensive organizational skills. As Horspool writes in *King Alfred*, "To many modern historians the greatest of Alfred's achievements was his creation, if not from scratch then from fairly rudimentary beginnings of a well-administered system of defense to keep his kingdom safe from Viking attack." (98).

²⁰ Frederic Harrison, "The Millenary of King Alfred: An Address Delivered in the Town Hall, Birmingham, on Monday, the 18th of October, 1897," <http://www.archive.org/details/cu31924031415155>, accessed 13 March, 2010.

104 Articles

virtues of the 'model Englishman,'"²¹ the "Hero-Founder" Harrison states. While it is agreed by most, if not all, English historians that these events did not take place, it is also agreed that their continued importance lies in their significance, and not in their authenticity. In the case of King Alfred the Great, when the legend does indeed become fact, you print the legend.

21 Abels, *Alfred the Great*, 309.

Fragile Flowers or Steel Magnolias: Women's Rights in Japan to Occupation

Lacey Holley

"To All the Pioneers of New and Better Worlds to Come"
-Margaret Sanger, 1938

Women's rights in Japan is a largely under-explored topic. Women are often presented in the Geisha stereotype. This is especially true of media made about Japan and shown to non-Japanese audiences. This presents a misnomer of the Japanese woman as victim, and this is not so. This paper explores their struggle for equal rights in politics, reproduction, and education. Japanese women gained the most during the periods of war, as did women in the west. The struggle culminated in the SCAP constitution of 1946 that granted political rights to Japanese women.

Japanese women, like those of other nations, had ideas on what the movement should do that varied from generation to generation, and sometimes woman to woman. Those from the Meiji Era were fighting the image of "good wife and mother" this was what the men at the time wanted the world to see.¹ This argument's presence makes sense in Japanese culture. First, it goes along with previously held ideals from the Tokugawa Period,² and blends with the trend in Westernization.³ Women in Japan try to create "women centered feminism"; this is championed by Hiratsuka Raicho. Gordon calls the wave of feminist thought at this time

1 Andrew Gordon, *A Modern History of Japan: From Tokugawa times to the present* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2009), 112.

2 This is Gordon's examination of late Tokugawa. One of the practices during this period was for the woman to stay in Edo (Tokyo) and raise their children while the men followed Alternate Attendance. This showed women as a central part of the culture and society, but in the background. Not the way they would later hope for.

3 *Ibid.*, 22-36.

at “least as threatening to the ruling elites” as some of the other groups.⁴ There were also groups that were more radical and thought marriage should be ended because it was detrimental to females. These women wanted to end all patriarchal authority. Japan’s rigid class system created multiple boundaries for lower-class women, much as Margaret Sanger found in New York City’s Lower East Side.

When Sanger visited Japan, the image of the Tokogawa women was still prevalent. Despite this, men were frank in discussions about women and relationship between the sexes. Sanger spoke at a meeting of the Peer’s Club, where the questions about women flew. Some examples she recorded are why do they divorce, could they love more than one man, and did they love their children. Motherhood and its role continued to be a pivotal point in the Japanese arguments. One man asked, “Is it not true that the American woman can be all things to her husband-his companion, mother of his children, mistress, business manager, and friend?”⁵ She writes in response, “I agreed with them that this was the ideal, but had to confess that by no means every American wife fitted into this picture.”⁶ In truth, there were still many gender misconceptions during this era.

Japan faced many changes as the twentieth century wore on, especially after the American occupation. A major change was women leaving the home and entering the workforce. What would then happen to their role as “good wives and mothers”?⁷ Kamiya Hiroo examines this in her chapter of *Feminist Geography* entitled “Daycare Services Provision for Working Women in Japan.” The early feminists emphasized

4 Ibid.

5 Sanger, 329.

6 Ibid., 329.

7 Gordon, 112.

motherhood when writing in the 1920s, and this emphasis remained while Hiroo was writing in 2005. She stated that women usually left their jobs upon becoming pregnant, versus western nations with daycare centers, and maternity leave. Japan has, in modernity, a different view of women than its western contemporaries.⁸ Hiroo examines the issue with graphs and charts illustrating different areas and times in the life of women. She makes note of the fact that during occupation the number of women working in rural areas was high; they would have worked in agricultural jobs. The number of women in the workforce in urban areas remained low due to the motherhood culture. Hiroo's work demonstrates an ever-evolving role of women. In 2011, as when she wrote in 2005, laws regarding women are changing to include an even greater scope of rights and privileges. Japan and the West have instituted alternative patterns for care.⁹ In 1997, Japan's Equal Opportunity Law was revised stating that women could not be discriminated against for hiring, promotion, or job training. Maternity leave and leave to care for elderly parents were added the same year. However, as Hiroo states, "It seems too early to judge the net effect of these shifting policy directions."¹⁰

Reproductive control is another element of feminist demands. Japanese women were involved in this fight. In *Feminism in Modern Japan* author Vera Mackie examines women and reproductive control in Japan. She looks at a period spanning from the later nineteenth century until Occupation. Mackie's examination is based on both secondary and primary accounts.¹¹ Their fight is much like that of women in other

8 Kamiya Hiroo, "Daycare Services Provision for Working Women in Japan" in *A Companion to Feminist Geography* ed. Lise Nelson and Joni Seager (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2005), 271.

9 Alternative care being when a woman (or man) leaves their work to care for a parent, spouse, or another relative other than a child.

10 Ibid., 289.

11 Mackie is using a chronological approach. I have chosen a topical approach to illustrate

countries. The government believed it could legislate control over women's bodies.¹² Women had limited options as a result.

Long after the Tokogawa system had failed, the image of the "good wife and mother" remained. It was something even feminists wanted to preserve.¹³ By the 1930s Japan was embroiled in what would become World War II. Many women were without their husbands and in need of assistance for their children, and Mackie states the need became more pronounced when women and their children began to commit suicide together.¹⁴ The Social Democratic League reported as July 1932 there had been 492 of these incidents that had claimed the lives of 821 children.¹⁵ This led to the formation of Bosei Hogo Ho Seitei Shokushin Fujin Renmei – the Alliance for the Promotion of a Mother and Child Protection Act – in September 1934. The other part of this group favored abortion and contraception stating that a woman should not have to give birth to an unwanted child.¹⁶

Women wanted power over their own future, and part of that was having control of their bodies. Hiratsuka Raicho presents a scenario in an edition of *Seito*¹⁷; she pointed out that she had used contraception before. The story is about a woman in prison for having an abortion.¹⁸ Mackie says there is debate as to whom the woman in the article is speaking to – some say it is her partner, and other commentators believe

various elements of the feminist need. Therefore, in this section on reproductive control the pages of Mackie's work will be varied in placement in her book. In addition, the section will cover about 80 years in one place versus the chronological approach.

12 Vera Mackie. *Feminism in Modern Japan: Citizenship, Embodiment, and Sexuality*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 2003) 1.

13 Gordon, 111, 120.

14 Mackie, 105.

15 Ibid.

16 Ibid.

17 This was a women's rights journal in Japan.

18 Ibid., 51.

it to a judge. Ellen Key¹⁹ states that children are often born due to the fact women feel they have no option. They are birthed into poverty and heartache. She said she decided not to have the child because she could not provide for it. Her thoughts were considered so deviant that the issue of *Seito* was banned by the national government. She stated that it must be an important decision to contemplate abortion.²⁰ Then she pursues the thought to looking at abortion sociologically. Hiratsuka felt that if abortion remained illegal some care must be provided for the children by the state to make sure their needs were met.²¹ Others did not see the issue so simply. Another writer at the time, Yamada Waka, felt that abortion was against the laws of nature; and though she felt for Ellen, she would not condone her choice.²² Others believed the solution to be the total autonomy of women in matters of their bodies.

Socialism appeared to have fueled the liberation of women from the bonds that held them. Their fight to be equal in legislation also went to the workplace and; as in western movements, this group of working women pushed to end the inadequacies they faced. Their demands included the end of night work for women and paid, adequate maternity leave as well as leave during their menstrual cycle each month. Margaret Sanger was a guest and lecturer in Japan during this formative period. While touring factories Sanger found that, like similar institutions in the United States, the conditions were deplorable. She described one room where the windows were closed and locked giving the whole room a hot, moist, damp feeling.²³

19 Mackie shows that Raicho identifies her as a fictional character based on the real Ellen Key a feminist from the Netherlands.

20 Mackie, 50.

21 Ibid.

22 Ibid.

23 Margaret Sanger, *The Autobiography of Margaret Sanger* (Minneola, NY: Dover Publications, 1934), 330. The Dover edition used for the paper is 1971. It was published in 1934 under the

110 Articles

The Japanese women also wanted to be enfranchised. Women had been fighting for the right to vote for over twenty years prior to it being granted. According to an article by Sharon H. Nolte, the pre-war fight began in 1919 and continued until 1931 when the state became consumed with the Manchurian Campaign.²⁴ This particular effort culminated in the 1931 Hamaguchi Suffrage Bill that came from a cabinet minister. Nolte points this out because with the structure of the government, it carried more weight.²⁵ In 1925, universal suffrage had been granted to men in all elections, and as a result, women's suffrage bills had been produced. All had failed to pass.²⁶

The 1931 Hamaguchi Women's Suffrage Bill would have been the first to grant suffrage of any kind to Japanese women. The idea was to allow women to vote in local and village elections. Revolutionary to this bill was the provision that a woman could hold public office with the consent of her husband.²⁷ Civil Code of 1897 stated she would need her husband's permission, as inheritance rights still went to the male head of household; thus, "officially" the woman would need his "permission" to access the money needed to follow customs.²⁸ These customs included entertaining dignitaries in their homes. It passed the House of Commons, or lower house, but it did not pass the House of Peers, according to Nolte,²⁹ and this was a result of the remaining patriarchal view. Suffragists in Japan also opposed limited voting rights. It did not seem like a victory,

title *Margaret Sanger: An Autobiography*. This also calls to mind the conditions of the Triangle Shirtwaist factory where a 1906 fire killed hundreds. There were no windows and the doors had been locked. These same things are found in the factory Sanger describes in this quote.

24 Sharon H. Nolte, "Women's Rights and Society's Needs: Japan's 1931 Suffrage Bill," *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 24 (Oct. 1986): 690.

25 Nolte, 690.

26 Gordon, 300.

27 Nolte, 691.

28 *Ibid.*, 692.

29 *Ibid.*

more a placation buried in the Tokugawa views of women. Adachi Kenzo, the Home Minister under Hamaguchi, condoned the activism of women, and he could understand their desires. Kenzo was quoted as saying the bill responded to “women’s demands over the past several years.”³⁰

The nationalism that had come into vogue around 1900 began affecting women during the Russo-Japanese War (1904-05). During this war, they praised the first Japanese Red Cross nurses as well as a founding political group for women the Patriotic Women’s Society.³¹ Women widowed by the war received some pension and worked in marginal jobs. Their plight and courage won the support of both sides politically. In addition, industrialization had created an emerging middle class, and they began to send their daughters to high school. Women who graduated could make a good salary for a few years before marriage. Even the poorest began to send girls to primary school. Attendance came up from seventy-one percent in 1900 to ninety-seven by 1910. Attendance usually averaged out of these numbers at approximately eighty-nine percent. Twenty-six percent, on average, went on through the middle school grades.³²

World War II would continue in Japan until 1945. On August 15, 1945, Emperor Hirohito did something he had never before done. He addressed the nation of Japan live over radio. Generally, his words were transcribed and released. Aihara Yu, a 28-year-old wife, remembers being called to the one radio in the village and hearing the emperor’s words.³³ Her story reintegrates the position of women during the war period.

Aihara received a public education and remembers something they

30 Ibid., 693.

31 Ibid.

32 Ibid., 696.

33 John W. Dower, *Embracing Defeat: Japan in the Wake of World War II* (New York: Norton and Company, 1999), 34.

112 Articles

learned about fighting for the state: the thought being the individual was of no importance.³⁴ Hiroo points this out as well. Hirohito's speech was not what the people had expected, at least according to Aihara Yu. She believed he would ask that people offer themselves to the state. Instead, he said that the Japanese army would be disarmed and able to return home. In other words, the war was over. She remembers thinking that her husband would come home to her if only he did not commit suicide when he heard the news. Sadly, he was already dead.³⁵ According to Dower, he died in a battle only a few days prior to the end of the war.³⁶ By the time of Hirohito's "agonized" speech of 1945, Japan lay in ruins. Three million people were dead countless others wounded, and ill – all this for a war waged in the emperor's name.

There would now be a new force in the Pacific, Douglas MacArthur. He was appointed Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers (SCAP). MacArthur was imperious, strong-willed, and a bit of megalomaniac. He and nine other Allied representatives oversaw the signing of the official surrender of the Japanese on the USS Missouri.³⁷ MacArthur spoke on the Missouri saying, "A better world shall emerge out of the blood and carnage of the past" – a place for "freedom, tolerance, and justice."³⁸ MacArthur appeared to have felt this way on the surface and put policy in place that would reflect that.

The Allied Occupation brought many changes to the people of Japan. MacArthur and his colleagues believed they could transform and "educate" and train a race inferior to them.³⁹ Koikari says that if

³⁴ Ibid.

³⁵ Ibid.

³⁶ Ibid.

³⁷ Ibid., 41.

³⁸ Ibid. This is a quote from MacArthur's speech on Japan's surrender.

³⁹ Mire Koikari, *Pedagogy of Democracy: Feminism and the Cold War in the U.S. Occupation of Japan* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2008), 41.

they found the entire race to be inferior and uneducated who needed them more than women did, those thought to be perpetually kept in the dark by oppression.⁴⁰ To SCAP they were prime candidates for growth, change, and emancipation.⁴¹ The Allies, especially Americans, had an understanding of Japanese women as victims and innocent bystanders. Koikari's argument is that Japanese women were not victims or bystanders but part of a dynamic that the western mind did not comprehend.⁴² They had always been part of this complicated world of gender relations. Imperialism helped shape the world that the Allied forces found post-World War II. She theorizes that much of what happened began with the Westernization of Japan.⁴³ Women's movements started during the turn of the twentieth century and cemented during the Russo-Japanese War (1904-05), and they had gained momentum prior to the Manchurian incident which as previously stated hampered all civil rights regardless of gender. Complicated gender roles were just part of the "Junpu Bizoku"⁴⁴ that the Allies had come upon in Japan. There had been some state participation from women during mobilization efforts for World War II. The Dainihon Kobubo Fujinki⁴⁵ was an example of state led work by women. Modern feminism as it emerged in Japan had roots in nationalism, colonialism, and westernization. An interesting point that Koikari makes is that MacArthur and the other Allied leaders perceive the women as victims because they compare them to the state of women in their own nations.⁴⁶ They do not consider the ramifications of an Eastern cultural dynamic.⁴⁷ This is often

40 Ibid., 40.

41 Ibid., 41.

42 Ibid.

43 Ibid.

44 This is a beautiful custom and culture.

45 All Japan Women's Defense Association

46 Koikari, 47.

47 Ibid., 47.

the case with occupying forces and colonialism.

MacArthur was determined to democratize Japan, that is to say, his understanding of democracy and relationships. He had a vision for his version of Japan. Women had long considered suffrage a priority and it being granted after the surrender would strengthen the “peace constitution” as it became known.⁴⁸ Ichikawa Fusae, a vocal advocate for suffrage prior to the war, started again immediately after the surrender. She believed that suffrage must be granted by the mobilization of women; and not because the occupied powers felt, they should have it. In the end, it was up to the Allies one way or the other – as with few exceptions, they wrote the constitution. By August 25, 1945, she had organized seventy women into a group called Sengo Taisaku Fujin Iinkai.⁴⁹ Fusae did get her wish in a way the newly formed Shidehara Cabinet which met on October 9, 1945 and agreed to women’s suffrage. Some of the ministers had been in favor of it prior to the war, and all agreed that after their contribution to the war effort, they should vote. However, before they could act on the matter, MacArthur gave Minister Shidehara the five-item reform demand. Even though MacArthur signed the constitution, the documents indicate that suffrage would have been granted by the Shidehara Cabinet. SCAP just presented their top five reforms before they could act on their convictions. The reforms came from his office but Hiratsuka Raicho, Yamada Waka, and Ichikawa Fusae, along with countless other suffragists, won the victory. They convinced the cabinet to agree to suffrage before MacArthur brought the document, and they deserve that credit. Their courage did bring about their means, perhaps just not in the way they

⁴⁸ Ibid., 46.

⁴⁹ Women’s Committee to Cope with Postwar Conditions- their idea was they could deal with reconstruction and the postwar situation of women.

hoped.⁵⁰

Suffrage was one thing; however, complete gender equality was the goal of the Allied constitution. MacArthur would later say that Japanese women were the perfect “poster child” for American democracy.⁵¹ Images of them casting their first vote and walking from feudalism to freedom are iconic and make America look like the democratic leader of the world.⁵²

The Cold War affected how long the occupation forces would take to draft the constitution. It was drafted from February 4, 1946 to February 12, 1946, barely over a week. SCAP felt that for democratization to be complete there had to be total gender and racial equality.⁵³ Since tensions were rising in the East because of a new fear of Communism, there was no longer a common enemy (i.e. Hitler), and the spread of that ideology was feared. MacArthur and others believed they had to get Japan under their control and democratized so they would have an ally in the East.⁵⁴

Two committees would deal with women’s rights in the constitutional convention, the Steering Committee and the Civil Rights Committee. There was a woman involved in the writing process Beate Sirota Gordon (at the time she was Beate Sirota). Sirota had experience that was instrumental in drafting the portions dealing with women. To strengthen her positions, she presented historical documents with similar beliefs: Weimar Republic Constitution, Meiji period government documents, and some from the Russians.⁵⁵ This helped the process move quicker. Some of Sirota’s ideas seemed revolutionary. She was impressed

50 Koikari, 50.

51 Ibid.

52 Ibid., 51.

53 Ibid., 53-54.

54 Ibid., 54.

55 Ibid., 57.

116 Articles

by Article 19 of the Weimar Constitution because it gave women equal place in marriage.⁵⁶ She drafted Articles 18-20, 23-26, and 29. Of them Article 23 was considered the most revolutionary.⁵⁷ All of the articles were very detailed and spelled out everything from marriage equality to the wife's participation in the decision to adopt. There was fear that her articles would end Junpu Bizoku, or the beautiful culture and traditions of Japan. Additional concerns also addressed head of household and succession. The draft went before the Imperial Diet that for the first time included women (39). Her work is pared down, calmed down, and included with other parts of the draft. For example, her Article 23 became Article 22 in the passed constitution.⁵⁸ Sirota achieved much success in her writing, and much of what she wanted is included.⁵⁹

Victims, "fragile flowers," and "caged birds" were all terms that people applied to the Japanese women. It turns out that they are none of these things except in the misguided perception of some. They are and had always been strong, just in a quiet even sedate kind of way. Like their sisters in Great Britain and the United States, they wanted to be enfranchised, have birth control, marriage rights, the right to obtain work, and to get an education. Over the period from the end of Tokugawa in 1868 until the Constitution of 1946, women fought valiantly for their rights and won them a bit at a time. The important issues were to shed light on the life and liberation struggle of the Japanese women and to demonstrate that despite the difference in culture women are all the same: strong, ethereally beautiful and courageous.

56 Ibid., 59.

57 Ibid., 60.

58 Ibid., 69.

59 Ibid., 70-71.

UNITED STATES HISTORY

The Law of Love, Radical Holiness, and the Latter Rain: The Birth of a Pentecostal-Holiness Denomination in the Appalachians

Brandon Blaylock

“I believe in union because I know there will be no creeds in heaven, and why not union on earth? I agree with Brother Spurling.”¹

“O, brother, if you now refrain
You are sure to miss the ‘latter rain;’
Be Sure you’ve counted all the cost
and got your blessed Pentecost!”²

On Thursday August 19, 1886 a small group of Christians dedicated to holiness gathered together for the first time. Their stated purpose was to “preach primitive church Holiness and provide for reform and revival of the Churches.”³ Led by Missionary Baptist minister Richard Spurling and his son R. G. Spurling,⁴ this group met at the Barney Creek meeting house in Monroe County, TN. After a few points of order were deliberated and a call for membership was commenced, they chose the *Christian Union* as the name for their fledgling group. The name they chose was a representation of the high hopes that they had for group. They wished to be a unifying body under which all Christians could unite in Christ. “All denominations know and fellowship each other by their creed or confession of faith,”

1 H. P. Hall, *The Way* no 3 vol 2. (Cleveland, Tennessee: The Way Publishing Co. March, 1905).

2 R. G. Spurling, “Gospel Evening Light” *Selected Writings of R. G. Spurling*.

3 J. Gordon Melton, *Melton’s encyclopedia of American religion*, 8th ed. (Detroit : Gale Cengage Learning, 2009), 338.

4 Although both Spurlings are “Richard Spurling,” when there is the possibility of confusion, I will refer to the elder as Richard Spurling and the younger as R. G. Spurling as this appears to be consistent with how they are identified throughout the literature. It is also worth noting that the Elder Spurling died shortly after the initial formative meetings of the Christian Union. Thus, any reference to a Spurling after 1891 is to the son, R. G. Spurling.

wrote Spurling, “instead of the way Jesus said for men to know his disciples. By [...] love one to another.”⁵ This sums up the goal of the Christian Union quite succinctly. There was no desire for the creation of a denomination, only a union of believers. Regardless of the elder Spurling’s misgivings regarding denominational strictures, the humble beginnings would spring forth numerous⁶ Pentecostal-holiness denominations spanning the globe and claiming adherents numbering in the millions. How this transition from a radical holiness, anti-denominational body to multiple Pentecostal denominations occurred is the subject of the present investigation.⁷

In describing this period, it is common to categorize the holiness movement along two mutually exclusive lines: the “stay-inners” and the “come-outers.” These two phrases are used to quickly identify the separatist leanings, and often the degree of the radicalization, of various holiness groups in the late nineteenth century. For the early Appalachian holiness community, which was led by the Spurlings, these standard identifiers failed to adequately describe their unique situation. Richard

Spurling and his son both saw not the establishment of a denomination

5 R. G. Spurling, “Dangers and Hindrances to the Cause of Christ,” *The Way* no 6 vol. 1. (Culbertson, North Carolina. June, 1904).

6 The Church of God (Cleveland, TN), the (Original) Church of God, Church of God with Signs Following, Church of God of Prophecy, Church of God House of Prayer, Church of God (Huntsville), The Church of God over which Bishop James C. Nabors is General Overseer, The Church of God for All Nations, The Church of God (Jerusalem Acres), and Church of God (Charleston) all claim as their heritage the Christian Union meetings of 1886.

7 For a broad overview of the history of the Church of God from an insider’s perspective, one should consult *Like a Mighty Army* by Dr. Charles Conn. This work is not an objective account of events and makes no effort to present itself as such; however, Dr. Conn’s use of primary sources and first hand interviews are extensive and the book provides a good introduction to the history of the denomination. For a more critical account of the early days of the church read R. G. Robins’ *A.J. Tomlinson: Plainfolk Moderist* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004) which is an indispensable resource for anyone interested in the life of Tomlinson, the early Church of God, or the Radical Holiness/early Pentecostal movements in general. For a more broad examination of the early Pentecostal movement see Nils Bloch-Hoell, *The Pentecostal Movement* (New York: Humanities Press, 1964.); Harvey Cox, *Fire From Heaven: The Rise of Pentecostal Spirituality and the Reshaping of Religion in the Twenty-First Century* (Cambridge: Da Capo Press, 1995); and Grant Wacker, *Heaven Below: Early Pentecostals and American Culture* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2001).

120 Articles

as their primary goal, but rather unity and “reformation”⁸ as their objective. However, after the fanaticism of their revivalistic methods and their intense criticism of landmarkism became an annoyance to the local congregation, they were no longer welcome in their Baptist church. Regarding these events, Spurling writes, “I failed to accept all of their creed [...]. They demanded my license which I readily gave up [...]. Now I must forever quit preaching or leave my church, so I left them [...] I was turned out of what I once thought was Christ’s only true church.”⁹ They did not leave willingly; they were forced out and their goal was not to start something new; thus, the first members of the Christian Union were both puritan and pilgrim. Perhaps it was their Baptist expulsion -combined with their collective aversion to denominationalism- that contributed to a third holiness category: “stay-outers.”

The path that these men and their fledgling group took toward becoming a Pentecostal denomination is both complicated and unique. The Church of God’s official history claims that the first tongues-speaking experience related to the Church of God occurred in Cherokee County, North Carolina at a revival led by three Baptist Evangelists and a Spurling follower, W. F. Bryant, in 1896.¹⁰ After the revival began, Spurling and his congregation from the Christian Union merged with this group in Cherokee County. This event occurred ten years prior to William Seymour’s Azusa Street revivals that propelled Pentecostal practice into a global phenomenon. There is no evidence, however, of this being a universal manifestation among the Christian Union members. There is also no evidence that the events or experiences of Cherokee County were

8 R.G. Spurling, *The Lost Link*, 1.

9 Ibid, 20.

10 A.J. Tomlinson, *The Last Great Conflict* (Cleveland, Tennessee: Walter E. Rogers Press, 1913), 186.

seen in terms of the modern Pentecostal belief in glossolalia as the “initial evidence of the Baptism of the Holy Ghost.” This unique Pentecostal tenet appears to have as its origin the revival led by Charles Fox Parham in Topeka, Kansas that occurred at the beginning of the year 1901.¹¹ The influence of these early Camp Creek manifestations seems to be limited as well to the people present at the local meetings during the revivals. Homer Tomlinson, son of early Church of God Patriarch A. J. Tomlinson, asserts that many people, including Charles Parham, traveled to witness the events at Camp Creek. He further asserts that it was this trip that initially peaked Parham’s interest in the tongues movement.¹² However, this seems unlikely for two reasons. First, there is no other record of such influence, and second, Homer Tomlinson was not particularly reliable or even sane and, as such, his credibility is questionable. An example of Homer Tomlinson’s mental instability can be demonstrated by his visit to Russia in 1958. Sitting in Red Square, dressed in long Chinese garments, he declared himself “King of Russia” and announced that he was running for president of the United States.¹³ Later, he made a similar declaration on the United States’ capitol steps- this time wearing a crown and robe and declaring himself King of the World.¹⁴

A further reason that these events of glossolalia appear to have been limited in influence is because the leaders, namely R. G. Spurling and elder William F. Bryant, failed to mention them in any documentation created contemporaneously to the events. There are extensive references

11 Nils Bloch-Hoell, *The Pentecostal Movement* (New York: Humanities Press, 1964), 18.

12 A. J. Tomlinson, *Diary of A.J Tomlinson*, ed. Homer Tomlinson (Queens Village, NY: Church of God, 1949), 1:25.

13 *U. S. Sect Leader Sitting in Red Square Proclaims Himself the King of Russia*. Special to The New York Times. *New York Times (1923-Current file)*; Jul 13, 1958; ProQuest Historical Newspapers New York Times (1851-2007) w/ Index (1851-1993), 29.

14 *Capitol Ousts ‘King of World’* New York Times (1923-Current file); Aug 9, 1958; ProQuest Historical Newspapers New York Times (1851-2007) w/ Index (1851-1993), 11.

122 Articles

to “Holy Ghost Baptism” throughout *The Way*, the monthly newsletter of their Holiness Church,¹⁵ but no references to speaking in tongues. The newsletter focused almost exclusively on sanctification and holiness. The oldest surviving references to the events of Cherokee County come from A. J. Tomlinson and were all written after 1908. This is not to argue that the tongues speaking events did not take place, only to point out that they were not of the same character as the events that took place later in Kansas or California. Concrete documentation of events that included speaking in tongues did not appear until the Church of God was an established denomination with clear doctrinal commitments. It is possible that speaking in tongues is alluded to in publications of the Christian Union. For example, an article in *The Way*, published in September 1905, on “Receiving the Holy Ghost,” contains a quote from chapter 2 that states: “And there appeared unto them cloven tongues like as of fire.” The article goes on to talk of the Holy Ghost “falling” on believers. One can also find an account of someone who “failed to get the blessing.”¹⁶ However, this most likely referred to a sanctification experience like those spoken of by Charles Finney. This analysis is corroborated by another article that states that “receiving of the Holy Ghost [...] makes us Holy or sanctifies us.”¹⁷ This is certainly not the same theology that was taught by Parham or Seymour. It appears that reading the statements from *The Way* as referring to modern Pentecostal theology or experience is anachronistic for a variety of reasons.

Failure to mention speaking in tongues, specifically, stands

out as the most convincing reason to believe that A. J. Tomlinson and

¹⁵ In 1902 the Bryant’s church took the name the Holiness Church at Camp Creek.

¹⁶ “Extract from a Sermon by A. M. Mills” *The Way* no 8 vol 2. (Cleveland, Tennessee: The Way Publishing Co. August, 1905).

¹⁷ “Receiving the Holy Ghost” *The Way* no 9 vol 2. (Cleveland, Tennessee: The Way Publishing Co. September, 1905).

M. S. Lemons, co-editors of *The Way*, were not referring to the modern Pentecostal conception of Holy Ghost baptism, but the late nineteenth century radical holiness doctrine of a sanctification experience. It is much more likely that the doctrine of the Holy Ghost espoused by the Christian Union was in line with that of W. B. Godbey who wrote of the “fires of the Holy Ghost” falling on him, “filling and flooding [his] soul and transforming [him] into a cyclone.”¹⁸ Godbey’s descriptions are remarkably similar to the terminology used in *The Way*. Godbey was no friend to the Pentecostal movement, and his experiences are decidedly holiness in nature, not Pentecostal.

One explanation that could be offered for why Lemons and Tomlinson failed to explicitly mention speaking in tongues in their publication could be that the publication was going out to a wider audience than those who were participating in the local congregations and revivals. Lemons and Tomlinson might have decided that there was no benefit in alienating potential subscribers- especially due to the fact that a topic as controversial as tongues was best avoided for the time- particularly since there was still no firm doctrinal commitment in the Christian Union. However, this seems less likely when *The Way* is compared to later Church of God publications like *Faithful Standard*, also published by A. J. Tomlinson, which makes no effort to hide the evident Pentecostal-oriented nature of the organization.

One of the more convincing items that indicates that the Holiness Church did not view the tongues experience of 1896 in the same way that it came to be viewed after Azusa Street is a half-page promotional notice printed in the August 1905 issue of *The Way*. The notice is promoting

18 W. B. Godbey, *Autobiography of Rev. W. B. Godbey*, A. M. (Cincinnati: God’s Revivalist Office, 1909), 98.

a revival to be held at Cumberland Presbyterian Church in Cleveland, Tennessee. The relevant portion reads, “We expect the Holy Spirit to be honored and to have full controll [*sic*], but special care will be taken to avoid all fanaticism.”¹⁹ The implication is clear, and it seems unlikely that the newsletter of a group that actively participated in the sort of “fanaticism” being denounced would have printed a promotional notice that amounts to a repudiation of their own techniques.

The path taken toward a modern tongues-speaking movement is one that first involves a parallel movement toward denominational structure. In the early history of the Church of God, there are two very distinct, almost conflicting movements. The first discernible movement is that of the cofounder, R. G. Spurling and William F. Bryant. As discussed earlier, Spurling was decidedly anti-denominational, and he was just as ardently anti-creedal. He was, at least nominally, Calvinistic in theology. He was a Restorationist who sought to reform and restore the church to what it had been in the New Testament. For membership in the Christian Union, he required nothing but an affirmation that every original member took; namely that they “be free from all men made creeds and traditions, and are willing to take the New Testament, or the law of Christ, for [their] only rule of faith and practice.”²⁰ One wonders if Spurling was ever challenged on the intrinsically self-defeating and contradictory nature of an anti-creedal creed. Regardless, this attitude was dominant in the early Christian Union. Further, both Spurling and Bryant openly advocated Christian participation in war.²¹ Most importantly, Spurling had no ambition toward starting or administering a movement of any type. When

¹⁹ *The Way* no 8 vol 2. (Cleveland, Tennessee: The Way Publishing Co. August, 1905).

²⁰ Tomlinson, *The Last Great Conflict*, 186.

²¹ Grant Wacker, *Heaven Below: Early Pentecostals and American Culture* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2001), 248.

the opportunity presented itself, he and Bryant were eager to leave the leadership of the Church in the care of others so they could devote all of their time to Evangelism. Virtually every one of these items is points of departure for the man that would replace Spurling as the Pastor of the Camp Creek congregation, Ambrose Jessup Tomlinson.

Tomlinson's personality was the antithesis of Spurling's in almost every way. He was self-confident to the point of arrogant, motivated, controlling, and meticulous; a perfect combination of traits for a self-aggrandizing leader. As soon as Tomlinson became involved in the Christian Union, his influence was felt. With Tomlinson in charge, the name of the group was changed to the Holiness Church (Tomlinson's church was called the Holiness Church at Camp Creek) and the beginnings of a denominational structure began to show. While Spurling was a Restorationist and an idealist, Tomlinson was a pragmatist. Where Spurling and Bryant would actively encourage Christian participation in war, Tomlinson was a pacifist.²² Where Spurling showed no indication that he desired to lead an organization, Tomlinson demonstrated an aggressive ambition to lead. Tomlinson joined the church at Camp Creek, was ordained, and installed as pastor all in one day.²³ Despite their differences, they had one major thing in common: unquestionable holiness credentials. Tomlinson had been familiar with the Christian Union for some time, at least since the revivals of 1896. It was around that time that Tomlinson, while selling bibles, had been first introduced to Bryant. So, the members of the Christian Union were familiar with Tomlinson and his holiness background.

One major part of Tomlinson's "holiness credentials" was his

²² Ibid., 249.

²³ Robins, 203.

126 Articles

monthly newsletter, *Samson's Foxes*. *Samson's Foxes* included everything one might expect from a holiness newsletter such as vehement denunciations of tobacco use, warnings against selfishness and, even on occasion, recommendations against seeing physicians in favor of divine healing.²⁴ The Holiness Church would establish their own newsletter, called *The Way*, which was heavily influenced by *Samson's Foxes*.

Tomlinson's signing on as the new pastor of the Holiness Church at Camp Creek marks a distinct shift in the trajectory of the group of churches that would become the Church of God. Without the influence of Tomlinson, there is no indication that what became the Church of God would have been anything more than a local body of radical holiness Christians with no denominational structure and a loose congregational polity.

By 1906, the denominational structure that had been emerging from Tomlinson's first appearance would be formalized. A small group representing local bodies from northeastern parts of Tennessee, northwestern Georgia, and southwestern North Carolina came together in formal union under the leadership of A. J. Tomlinson and formally became the Church of God.²⁵ Another new feature that was a point of departure from the Spurling leadership is Tomlinson's membership requirements. For membership in the Christian Union, one only need affirm his or her adherence to the New Testament as their only rule of law. By 1906, membership was becoming increasingly formalized and those who did not meet certain standards, such as anyone who was divorced, was denied membership in the Church.²⁶

24 *Samson's Foxes* 4, vol. 1. (Culberson, North Carolina: A. J. Tomlinson. April, 1901).

25 Robins, 117, 183. Tomlinson had, in his earlier years, been influenced by churches already identifying themselves as Churches of God located near Anderson, Indiana.

26 Charles Conn, *Like a Mighty Army* (Cleveland, Tennessee: Pathway Press, 1977), 83.

Perhaps it is ironic that a movement that started with the expressed purpose of Christian unity has had so many divisions and off-shoots. Much of this can be attributed to the autocratic, controlling personality of A. J. Tomlinson. However, it was with these same character traits that Tomlinson was able to co-opt and redirect the burgeoning Pentecostal-holiness movement in the foothills of the Appalachian Mountains. A movement that was previously dedicated to Christian unity, Tomlinson turned into a massive, top-down organization with him firmly in control.

The conflict between the first order of the Christian Union and the second order of the Church of God came to a head during the general assembly meeting in 1907. Here the lines between Spurling and Tomlinson were clearly drawn and we find the only indication of Spurling ever putting up a public fight to maintain the integrity of the organization he helped found 21 years prior. The debate was over pastoral appointments and the sides were drawn just as one might expect. Spurling advocated a congregational approach, and Tomlinson argued for Episcopal appointments that he himself would pass down.²⁷ Ultimately, Tomlinson won the day, and the Union completed its transition into a denomination. In spite of this loss, Spurling never wavered in his support of either Tomlinson or the Church of God.

In February of 1906, at the other end of the country, Frank Bartleman began praying for a “real pentecost” with “signs following.” Then, in March, Bartleman met William Seymour who had just returned from a trip to Texas where he met and fell under the influence of Charles Parham. On April 9th, during a Bonnie Brae meeting in Los Angeles,²⁸ the

²⁷ Ibid., 205.

²⁸ This was the location of the meeting prior to their move to Azusa Street.

spirit “fell” and there was speaking in tongues.²⁹ From these meetings, a southern minister, Gaston B. Cashwell, would carry the message of Pentecost back to his home region. In June of 1907, Tomlinson and his fellow pastor and co-editor of *The Way*, M. S. Lemons, traveled to Birmingham, AL to hear the Pentecostal message of Cashwell’s follower, M. M. Pinson. Lemons recalled that, although neither he nor Tomlinson received the gift of tongues, they both left feeling satisfied that it was indeed Biblical and proper.³⁰ After returning to Cleveland, Tennessee, they took the matter to Spurling, the man who was still considered the Biblical expert of the group. Spurling approved, declaring the practice “solid as a rock.”³¹

Cashwell was subsequently invited to preach to the Tomlinson’s Church. During the preaching of Cashwell, Tomlinson would receive the Holy Ghost Baptism with the evidence of speaking in tongues. This event occurred in 1908.³² Church of God historian, Charles Conn, argues that Tomlinson was the last of the Church of God ministers to receive the Baptism.³³ This assertion seems unlikely. It seems odd that Tomlinson would invite an outsider to preach Pentecost to his denomination when his associates already obtained the experience in question. It would also be peculiar that a group of ministers and lay people would chose a leader that did not share a deep a religious experience that they all claimed to have already attained. Finally, the only noted instance of someone leaving the organization came immediately following Tomlinson’s “baptism” experience. Immediately following the 1908 convention, Pastor J. H.

29 Frank Bartleman, *Azusa Street*, 41-43.

30 Tomlinson, *Diary of A. J. Tomlinson*, vol. 2. Citation found: Robins, 184.

31 Robins, 184.

32 Harvey Cox, *Fire From Heaven: The Rise of Pentecostal Spirituality and the Reshaping of Religion in the Twenty-First Century* (Cambridge: Da Capo Press, 1995), 72-73.

33 Conn, 85.

Simpson stated his objections to the tongues doctrine and left the church.³⁴

The most likely case is that there was an event that occurred in 1896, in Camp Creek, North Carolina that involved many people speaking in tongues; however, this appears to have been both an isolated event, and one without doctrinal substantiation. As such, it belongs in the narrative of glossolalia activities reported throughout pre-Pentecostal America. Reading the events of Camp Creek as a manifestation of the modern Pentecostal movement is possibly wishful anachronistic thinking by modern adherents desiring to trace their lineage further back than the facts allow. After the events of the Azusa Street mission became widely known, the individuals that were present at the Camp Creek meetings retroactively identified what they experienced with that new manifestation of Holy Ghost baptism, with speaking in tongues as the initial evidence. This retroactive identification, however, was beneficial in facilitating the ready acceptance of the new movement by the members of the Church of God. They were able to look at the experiences that had become a part of their heritage and collective folklore and see in the new movement something that looked very similar to what they had experienced 10 years prior. The move from holiness to Pentecostal denomination was easier for these Appalachian Christians than it would have been had they not shared the experiences of 1896. This was essentially confirmed by Tomlinson as he wrote in 1922, "those who received the Baptism did not realize what it was until after 1906."³⁵

Another reason the members of the Church of God were so eager to accept this new interpretation of the second blessing is because it represented a more tangible experience of the second work of God's

³⁴ Tomlinson, *Diary of A. J. Tomlinson*, 1:69-70.

³⁵ "History of Pentecost," *The Faithful Standard* 1:6 (Sept 1922). Citation found: Robins, 272.

grace that they had been preaching since the beginning. It is very difficult to qualify exactly what “sanctification” means; it is even harder to prove that one has been sanctified. Accepting the Parham premise that speaking in tongues is the initial evidence of the Holy Ghost Baptism makes the second work a great deal more evident and far less ambiguous. This line of reasoning is not universal to all holiness churches of the period, but only the more radical “fire baptized” variants into which the Church of God would comfortably fit. They tended to emphasize the second work of grace and the emotionalism that comes with Pentecostalism. In the radical holiness groups, this emotionalism was already present to a much greater extent than it was with their more tepid brothers. It was almost natural that radical Holiness churches adopt this theology. As John Thomas Nichol points out in his work on the Pentecostal movement, the Church of God was not the only southern holiness body to adopt the Pentecostal message. The aptly named Pentecostal Holiness Church made a similar transition. The final reason that the Christian Union, in particular, would be receptive to the Pentecostal theology has to do with their origins as a Restorationist organization. They sought to “reform and restore,” rather than to create. As such, the Pentecostal message, that placed such a high degree of emphasis on the story of the creation of the church as told in Acts, is a message that would resonate well with the original Christian Union believers. This, combined with the nearly universal acceptance of tongues by their leaders,³⁶ made the transition to a Pentecostal denomination almost natural.

³⁶ As noted earlier, J. H. Simpson left the group following the Pentecostal outburst at the 1908 convention.

Boston And *The Birth Of A Nation*: Cradle of the Modern Civil Rights Movement

Susan Powell

In February 1915, the epic film, *The Birth of a Nation*, premiered in Los Angeles to an eagerly anticipating and highly enthusiastic audience. Through a flurry of racial controversy, it then opened in New York and moved to Boston, the home of the abolitionist movement and the former locale of a young idealistic pastor named Thomas Dixon, author of *The Clansman*, the novel that had inspired the film. Boston became the touchstone of the protest movement against pioneering director D.W. Griffith's blockbuster film as it was released into Northern city theaters. Major newspapers closely covered the events in Boston, as did the black media, particularly the virtual African-American paper of record, the *Chicago Defender*. As a result, the race question, intensified by the film's portrayal of derogatory black stereotypes and glorification of the Ku Klux Klan, was presented to the public and a racial dialogue that affected both black and white America began.

Even as the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People battled *The Birth of a Nation* in New York, sensational newspaper ads ran in Boston announcing the April 10, 1915 opening of "D.W. Griffith's mighty spectacle" at the Tremont Theater. The local NAACP was already preparing to get the film banned, but William Monroe Trotter, editor of Boston's militant black paper, *The Guardian*, was not going to let the NAACP take the lead by muscling in on what he considered his territory. Before the movie opened, he and a force of two hundred black

citizens (including NAACP members) held a meeting with Mayor James Michael Curley, the colorful showboating politician. Griffith and his attorney also attended. The black delegation requested the Mayor ban the film "saying it would be a detriment to the negro race, causing race feeling and hatred."¹ Curley was not interested so much in the defamatory nature of the film as he was about any allusions to sexual immorality. Before he listened to any witnesses, Curley made clear the statutes regarding censorship:

if a play, film production, or any such form of amusement is indecent, immoral or tending to corrupt the public morals, the mayor, with the approval of the police commissioner, may censor the production, and then, if both find it objectionable, the mayor may forbid its production.²

That only three opponents had seen the film blunted the delegation's objections. Curley himself, moreover, seemed to go out of his way to defend the film. For every argument against showing the movie, the mayor had a rejoinder. He compared Shakespeare's *Merchant of Venice* and its portrayal of Jews with *The Birth of a Nation's* depiction of blacks. Trotter then gave a "lengthy and lurid" speech, reminding Curley of the support he had gotten from black voters. Speaking for the film's defenders, John F. Cusick, attorney for the photoplay company, gave Curley the official report from the National Board of Censorship that praised the movie for its educational and artistic value. Cusick then revealed that "the first production of this photoplay was in the East Room of the White House, before President Wilson and the members of his Cabinet. They declared it wonderful."³ According to the press, the blacks in the chamber began to hiss loudly. Two police officers had to maintain order as Cusick

¹"Negroes Hiss Wilson's Name," newspaper clipping, *D.W. Griffith Papers*.

² *Ibid.*

³ *Ibid.*

disclosed that not only had the President thought the film wonderful as well as educational, but that the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, his colleagues, and a number of congressmen also saw the picture and praised it, too. This revelation brought even louder hissing from the opponents. Griffith and Cusick then used their main defense of the film; a justification they and their defenders would use for the next sixty years: the biggest villains in the film were white men and only two villains out of six were “colored.” Griffith pointed out that protests like the NAACP’s could mean Indians had the right to protest Westerns where they are shown as killers of white men. Griffith cleverly read letters from the Knights of Columbus and Catholic priests in New York who wanted to take the children of their parish schools to see the picture. Griffith told Curley he would eliminate the notorious scene in *The Birth of a Nation* of the black renegade Gus’ intended rape of Flora Cameron if the mayor wanted it. Curley then announced,

My power is limited in this matter. I do not want to make political capital out of it, and I do not want to hurt a legitimate film doing business. You people seem to want everything pertaining to the negro cut out of this picture. Are there not good negroes and bad? Are there not bad whites as well as good? Do you want the assassination of Lincoln cut out? Why, the white people of the country would protest that. You must remember that history cannot be denied.”⁴

Trotter interrupted Curley’s condescending speech by again reminding the mayor how the black citizens of Boston had supported him in the last election. Curley replied that the film would open as scheduled, but that he would have a municipality censor present at the show as well as the Police Commissioner’s censor in order to see if the film violated the law. If it did, it would then be banned, but, at that moment, he said there was

⁴ Ibid.

no evidence to stop at least one performance. He disingenuously claimed he was personally staying out of the decision.

The Birth of a Nation premiered before a packed house that “sat for nearly three hours more dazed than anything else by the spectacle;” a work of art so “wonderful and so beautiful, and so full of life that it robs one of the power of criticism”⁵ The review rhapsodized Griffith’s artistic genius and power. The press disclosed that although Griffith may have feared a hostile reaction, he instead found a very appreciative Boston audience. During an intermission speech, he told the spectators that when he heard their applause when Dixie was played, he realized that “we are all Americans.”⁶ The next day the official censors reported to Mayor Curley that they “concur in the conclusion that the photo play entitled ‘The Birth of a Nation’ is not ‘obscene or immoral or tends to injure the morals of the community.’”⁷ However, to placate the black community with the “fullest possible measure of justice,” Curley requested certain offensive scenes be eliminated. But Trotter and his colleagues were not satisfied, telling Curley that they still found the film objectionable and that they were also refused tickets at the box office. The mayor agreed that the film was an insult to the black community and “that had he had the power he would stop the play at once,” but that there was “nothing more he could do under existing laws” and it was now a “case for the courts.”⁸

Mayor Curley’s political compromise satisfied Trotter not at all. On April 17, he led about five hundred black activists to the Tremont Theater where they attempted to break up the evening screening of *The Birth of a Nation*. The police had received advance notice that “colored men were

5 “Applause For Mr. Griffith,” *Boston Daily Globe*, April 10, 1915, 2.

6 Ibid.

7 “Birth of a Nation Approved by Mayor,” *Boston Daily Globe*, April 11, 1915, 32.

8 “Confers on Cuts in Photo Play Films,” *Boston Daily Globe*, April 13, 1915, 3.

to make a demonstration on the theater" that evening and had stationed 260 uniformed and plainclothes officers around the theater and Boston Common. When the management refused to sell tickets to the black men, they began to crowd into the lobby. Trotter was arrested at the ticket window when he vigorously demanded that he be allowed to purchase a ticket.⁹ Trotter and his cohorts, including several white men, "assumed such an attitude" that he and five others were arrested and charged with disturbing the peace.¹⁰ While being led away, Trotter was punched in the jaw by a police officer.

The treatment of Trotter and the continued showing of the film outraged Boston's black community. The next afternoon, for more than three hours, over a thousand men and women met in Faneuil Hall while an overflow of five hundred gathered in the square outside to hear speeches denouncing *The Birth of a Nation*. Speakers included Trotter, J.C. Manning, formerly a black Republican of the Alabama legislature, 85-year old Franklin B. Sanborn, who had helped to finance abolitionist John Brown, and Michael J. Jordan of the Irish National League. Ministers of Boston's leading black churches were also on the platform, as well as Rolfe Cobleigh, an editor of *The Congregationalist*, the magazine of the National Congregational Churches. Trotter began by attacking Mayor Curley, who had defended oppressed races while a Congressman, "yet finds himself unable to stop a play that is objectionable to the colored race, now that he is Mayor."¹¹ Curley was repeatedly hissed and jeered by the crowd, as was Woodrow Wilson. Franklin B. Sanborn declared that Thomas Dixon and D.W. Griffith were distorting history by asserting that the nation was born under Andrew Johnson's administration and by portraying the Ku

9 "Race Riot at Theater," *Washington Post*, April 18, 1915, 2.
 10 "Negroes Mob Photo Play," *New York Times*, April 18, 1915, 15.
 11 "Colored People to Storm State House," *Boston Daily Globe*, April 19, 1915, 1.

Klux Klan as the founding fathers instead of Washington, Franklin, and Jefferson. *The Birth of a Nation* would “prove to be the birth of Hell and damnation in this country,” declared J.C. Manning.¹² To loud cheering he claimed that while the film shows a black man pursuing a white girl,

I can go to Montgomery, Ala. tomorrow and find 300 white men chasing colored girls and they will not be prosecuted by the law. These pictures are a part of a propaganda to destroy the spirit of liberty in the North and to enable the old slave oligarchy to dominate in the Nation once more. They reflect on every virtue and sacrifice of the North that made it possible to preserve the Union.¹³

When the meeting ended, the protestors agreed to meet at the State House the next day to petition the governor to ban the film.

The next morning, in a scene that would become familiar fifty years later, two thousand people singing “Nearer My God to Thee” marched up Beacon Street to the state capital, where Trotter and sixty supporters were admitted to see Governor David Walsh. A negotiation was worked out with Trotter that if the municipal court, under a 1910 blue law, found any part of the film to be obscene, immoral, lewd, or have a tendency to injure the morals of the community, then the film would be prohibited. The Governor also pledged to recommend to the state legislature “the immediate passage of a law prohibiting the production of such plays.”¹⁴ Trotter triumphantly announced the decision to the waiting crowd, which dispersed peacefully and all demonstrations planned against the theater were cancelled.

On April 21, Judge Dowd of the Municipal Court ruled that the scene of the white girl leaping from a cliff to escape her black pursuer was

¹² Ibid.

¹³ Ibid.

¹⁴ “Boston Race Leaders Fight Birth of a Nation,” *Chicago Defender*, April 24, 1915, 4.

an offense against the existing law and unless the scene was eliminated within twenty-four hours, he would issue warrants for all those concerned with the production.¹⁵ The rest of the production he ruled within the law. Yet this ruling was pointless, since the management of the theater had already agreed to cut this scene on request of Mayor Curley. Curley naturally took credit for the elimination of the offensive scene in hope of deterring rising criticism among his black constituents.

The only option left to protesters was censorship legislation. Several different measures went before the Legislative Committee on Judiciary which, in essence, would control theatrical productions. Opponents of the film wanted the power of censorship in the hands of the Chief of the State Police while advocates wanted the mayor to have sole authority in such cases.

The NAACP began lobbying the legislature to vote for their version of the censorship bill while continuing to hold meetings within Boston's black community. Eight hundred black women formed a protective league, "one of the largest gatherings of colored women ever assembled in this city," in order to join the fight against *The Birth of a Nation* and "for the maintenance and protection of our civil rights."¹⁶ Two large mass assemblies were held on May 2, 1915. The first meeting, under the auspices of the NAACP at the Tremont Temple, featured only white speakers. At the same time, another meeting on the Boston Common included nearly two thousand people who heard black ministers declare "they prefer death to continued production here of 'The Birth of a Nation' and predicted 'disgraceful scenes in Boston' if the play is not

15 "Fight is Taken to State House: Court Will Not Stop Birth of a Nation," *Boston Daily Globe*, April 22, 1915, 1.

16 "Colored Women Form a League," *Boston Morning Globe*, April 26, 1915, DWG Papers.

stopped.”¹⁷ The next two weeks witnessed more meetings and more pressure on the legislature by Boston’s NAACP, black congregations, and ordinary citizens. Finally, on May 20, the State Senate enacted the bill that would make the Mayor, Police Commissioner, and Chief Justice of the Municipality the official censorship board. Protesters then petitioned the three-member board to stop performances of the film. On June 2, 1915, after forty minutes of deliberation, the censor board members “having given full consideration to the entire subject, have decided that the license of the theater should not be revoked or suspended.”¹⁸ Trotter tried in vain to meet with the censors. He then had to relay the news to his supporters that the film would continue to be shown. Disillusioned, black opposition thereafter essentially collapsed. Although blacks still picketed the film and police kept constant vigil at the theater, Boston’s protest against *The Birth of a Nation* never regained its former strength. By August 18, 1915, the film had been running for nineteen straight weeks, breaking all summer records and was even held over for two weeks due to public demand.

Though Boston’s black citizens failed to stop the screening of *The Birth of a Nation*, they were energized by their increased political leverage. Blacks were becoming an important voting bloc in the Northern cities and politicians such as Mayor Curley had to walk a very thin line in order to accommodate their black constituents while not offending their white supporters. As the movie continued its run throughout major Northern cities, most local politicians were becoming alert to the interests of potential black voters.

At the same time, other races and ethnic groups, such as Irish and

¹⁷ “Not Sure it is Best to Stop It,” *Boston Daily Globe*, May 3, 1915, 1.

¹⁸ “Censors ‘OK’ the Film Play,” *Boston Daily Globe*, June 3, 1915, 1.

Jewish Americans, began to speak out against distasteful stereotypes of blacks as a species of caricature that maligned their own cultures. Like African-Americans, other ethnic cultures thought "society had an obligation to protect its minority members from outrages to which only they were subject by virtue of their uniqueness."¹⁹ Leaders of the Irish National League in Boston, such as Michael J. Jordan, gave blacks full support as they had been fighting caricatures of the Irish in popular forms of entertainment for years. *The Jewish Criterion* of Pittsburgh expressed its objection to *The Birth of a Nation* and gave credit to Boston blacks for showing Jews "a new effective method" in fighting degrading racial characterizations.²⁰ *The Jewish Criterion* asked its readers, "What has the Jew to do with the colored problem? We reply, that he must fight every manifestation of prejudice. When prejudice commences with the negro, it will soon attack the Jew."²¹

Most significantly, while the resistance campaign in Boston was unable to suppress the film, it gave black organizations, mainly the NAACP, an issue that could rally a national black movement. While many NAACP leaders worried about the publicity they were giving the film, the reverse was at least as true: *The Birth of a Nation* was actually giving the NAACP publicity, introducing the association to people who otherwise would have never known of its existence. The squabbles among black leaders became secondary as the triumvirate of Booker T. Washington,

19 Cripps, Thomas, *Slow Fade to Black: The Negro in American Film, 1900-1942*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1977), 62.

20 "The Passing of Jack Adams," *The Jewish Criterion*, vol. 41, no. 10, June 4, 1915. Carnegie Mellon Libraries: The Pittsburgh Jewish Newspaper Project, http://pjn.library.cmu.edu/books/pages.cgi?layout=vol0/part0/copy0&call=CRI_1915_041_010_06041915&file=0008 (accessed January 21, 2010).

21 "Fight Prejudice," *The Jewish Criterion*, vol. 41, no. 22, August 27, 1915. Carnegie Mellon Libraries: The Pittsburgh Jewish Newspaper Project, http://pjn.library.cmu.edu/books/pages.cgi?layout=vol0/part0/copy0&call=CRI_1915_041_022_08271915&file=0010 (accessed January 21, 2010).

140 Articles

W.E.B. Du Bois, and William Monroe Trotter for once sought familiar ground for a shared objective, even though each of their methods differed. While usually the pariah of the more combative factions, Washington called the film a “vicious and hurtful play,” and kept close tabs on all activities in Boston through letters and telegrams.²²

In addition, while the New York protests were led for the most part by white NAACP leaders, Boston proved that blacks were perfectly capable of taking the reins themselves in the fight for their cause. And it was not just black leaders that conducted and participated in the protest, but average citizens who came together “locally in terms of the promotion of racial solidarity.”²³ The NAACP increasingly relied on black clergymen to rally their congregations. Picketing, demonstrations, mass meetings, marches, and a progressively more vocal black media were new tactics of public protest. And the black press grew more prominent as its excellent front page coverage kept the story alive. As the movie opened in other large Northern venues, such as Philadelphia, Chicago, and Ohio, scenes similar to those in Boston occurred. The sustained protests against *The Birth of a Nation* across the North and Midwest are a testament to the monumental efforts by the NAACP and local black communities to battle the wildly popular film. There was a continuous succession of meetings before local administrations, public hearings before city and state censorship boards, and cases brought before local and state courts. Black protesters, usually led by their local clergymen, united in the struggle against the movie by organizing demonstrations, lobbying legislatures, and in some instances, forming their own local NAACP

²² Booker T. Washington to Samuel Edward Courtney, Tuskegee, Ala., April 23, 1915, *Booker T. Washington Papers*, vol. 13, 277, University of Illinois Press, <http://www.historycooperative.org/btw/Vol.13/html/277.html>.

²³ Stokes, Melvyn, *D.W. Griffith's The Birth of a Nation*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007), 150.

chapters. Membership in existing branches multiplied rapidly. Just as the network of chapters strengthened the protest, the protest strengthened the chapters.

Protest against *The Birth of a Nation* was not only a political or legal issue, but it also was a moral one. In that Progressive age, when even Progressives ignored the race problem or considered blacks and other ethnic minorities inferior, it was the plea of these new activists, as the NAACP said, "to reach the conscience of America."²⁴ Inadvertently, D.W. Griffith, by creating one of the most remarkable instruments of popular culture that appealed to all classes of society, also forced segments of society to confront the racial question in a way that an editorial on Jim Crow laws might never have accomplished. While ordinary Americans sat in the theater and saw classic stereotypes that claimed, "this is how blacks are," blacks were outside the theater saying, "No, that is how blacks are not!" According to film critic Richard Schickel, *The Birth of a Nation* "presented an opportunity to the minority that long deplored the racist habit of mind to place before thinking people a virulent example of that mind publicly at work, thus exposing its working to a criticism that had long been wanting."²⁵

Finally, although a few areas prohibited the film from being shown or eliminated controversial scenes, for the most part, the campaign to stop the film was ineffective. And, not surprisingly, it was nearly impossible to ban the film in the South because of black disenfranchisement and the absence of NAACP chapters. But the success of protest against *The Birth of a Nation* cannot be scored by wins and losses. The crusade

24 "August Meier and John H. Bracey, Jr., "The NAACP as a Reform Movement, 1909-1965: To Reach the Conscience of America," *The Journal of Southern History* 59, no. 1 (Feb. 1993), 6.

25 Richard Schickel, *D.W. Griffith: An American Life*, (New York: Simon & Schuster, Inc., 1984), 299.

142 Articles

against *The Birth of a Nation* did not end the offensive depictions of blacks in popular culture and undoubtedly the film inspired the creation of a modern twentieth century Ku Klux Klan. However, the significance of the struggle against the film, as epitomized by the Boston protest, was the accomplishment of early twentieth century African-Americans to challenge and defy the reprehensible imagery of the Lost Cause ideology portrayed in the film. The furor, a pivotal point in redefining American popular culture, caused an awakening of a new black consciousness that became a cornerstone in the foundation of the modern civil rights movement.

In a letter to Booker T. Washington on May 3, 1915, African American businessman, Jesse H. Harris, expressed how the crusade in Boston affected him:

My dear Mr. Washington – You have heard of our fight here against the “Birth of a Nation.” We are still fighting and the best thing of all to my mind is that for the first time during my 27 years in Boston the entire Negro population is a unite. Now while at one of the hearings last week – as I looked over that vast crowd of Negro men & women – this thought came to me; this is a united people though in the manority [sic] now they are going to win. Why not enlarge this so I saw in my mind a meeting in this city in the Old Liberty hall – the speakers Washington, Walters, Du Bois – Trotter and others – where all things of the past would be buried. And a race of Ten Millions of Negroes would be united. A Nation would really be Born.²⁶

²⁶ Jesse H. Harris to Booker T Washington, Boston, May 3, 1915, *Booker T. Washington Papers*, vol. 13, 284, University of Illinois Press, <http://www.historycooperative.org/btw/Vol.13/html/284.html>

Bush's War: For Oil or Moral Imperative

Michael Mumaugh

When it comes to relations with the Middle East everything seems to boil down to one interest: oil. As demand for energy rose in the late twentieth century the events occurring in the Middle East, especially the Persian Gulf became important to the entire world. America as many other Western nations tried to keep good relations with oil producing nations in the Gulf region. With the fall of Iran, the United States started a reorganization of its Middle East alliances. Under the administrations of Carter, Reagan, and Bush, America began to shift support to Iraq, to keep the supply of oil from the Middle East flowing. So, it may appear from America's past foreign policy and economic situation in 1990 the United States went to war in the Persian Gulf for oil in 1991. Though one can make this argument, documents and actions demonstrate George H. W. Bush went into Kuwait in 1991 to defend international law, establish the foundations for his New World Order, and to punish a dictator for his transgressions. To understand this position the tangled web of alliances, historical background, and economic issues must be examined.

The same year Iran fell to the Islamic Revolution, Saddam Hussein became the president of Iraq. While the Carter administration was reeling from the changes occurring in Iran, Saddam and many in Iraq feared Khomeini's desire to spread the Islamic Revolution. With continued border conflicts and a distrust of the regime in Iran, Saddam in September of 1980 launched an invasion of Iran. Iraq wanted to seize control of the Shatt al-Arab waterway, establish control of the Khuzestan oil fields,

and stop Iran from spreading the ideals of the Islamic Revolution.¹ The Iran-Iraq War set the stage for the problems which would occur in the 1990s, therefore it is important to understand what happened during this conflict. It would seem with all the problems Iran was causing for America, the United States would back Iraq in this conflict, yet Carter, in the closing days of his presidency, claimed neutrality in the conflict. The Carter administration did not challenge Iraq's taking of the al-Arab waterway, but when Iraqi forces continued into Iran, Carter became concerned. With all this going on, Carter refused to send United States troops to protect important oil pipelines in the region, but he did send naval units to ensure the Straits of Hormuz were kept open so oil supplies would not be cut off.² Though Carter maintained official neutrality, the United States gave Saddam what he believed was a message of support. On April 14, 1980, Carter's national security adviser Brzezinski stated, "We see no fundamental incompatibility of interests between the United States and Iraq...We do not feel that American-Iraqi relations need to be frozen in antagonisms."³ This support led Saddam to believe that his war with Iran would be supported by America. Iraq received arms from the French and Soviets and monetary backing from six Arab states, Kuwait and Saudi Arabia among them. Initially, the offensive went well for Iraq, but they had underestimated the Iranian military complex. Though disorganized it was able to enlist large numbers of men, and their resolve stalemated and then reversed Iraqi gains. By 1982 the Iranians pushed the

Iraqi army out of Iran and entered Iraq. It would be during the Iranian

1 Phyllis Bennis and Michel Moushabeck, ed., *Beyond the Storm: A Gulf Crisis Reader*. (New York, Olive Branch Press, 1991), 33.

2 *Public Papers of the Presidents of the United States: Jimmy Carter 1980-81 Book III*. (Washington, United States Printing Office, 1982) taken from multiple sources: Town hall meeting in Nashville, Tennessee Oct. 9, 1980, Question & Answer Session in Lyndhurst, New Jersey Oct. 15, 1980, Associated Press Interview Oct. 17, 1980, 2131, 2268, 2319.

3 Bennis and Moushabeck, 33-34.

Operation Ramadan, boys as young as nine and men as old as fifty were used to run through Iraqi mine fields and artillery fire to clear the way for Iranian tanks. The Iranians took massive casualties but regained lost territory. Calls for a negotiated peace were denied by both sides in 1982 causing the war to drag on allowing Iraq to regain the initiative. By 1984 it was reported 300,000 Iranians and 250,000 Iraqis were dead or wounded. By 1986 Iraq turned to a static defense strategy, which caused large Iranian casualties, and by 1988 Iraq resumed its offensive. With the use of chemical weapons Iraq was able to roll back Iranian troops. Before the cease fire in August of 1988 Iraqi forces had penetrated deep into Iranian territory and captured large amounts of armored vehicles including artillery. It is hard to actually know how many were killed and wounded by wars end but it is estimated nearly one million Iranians and over 375,000 Iraqis were killed or wounded.⁴ One thing was certain, was even in victory, Iraq was near bankruptcy and would look to find ways to limit its financial problems.

So, how would Ronald Reagan treat the situations in the Middle East when he took up the presidency after Carter? Reagan kept Carter's policy of keeping the Straits of Hormuz open even as if it looked like it would be closed due to the fighting in 1984. When asked if he would use military force to insure the Straits were not closed Reagan said, "I don't think it would be proper for me to talk about tactics... I do not believe the free world could stand by and allow anyone to close the Straits."⁵ Reagan stiffened the American presence in the Gulf when it looked as the Iranians were closing in on the Straits during their 1982-84 offensives.

4 John Pike, *Iran-Iraq War 1980-1988* <http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/world/war/iran-iraq.htm> (Accessed 3/4/2011).

5 *Public Papers of the Presidents of the United States: Ronald Reagan 1983 Book II*. (Washington, United States Printing Office, 1985) from President's News Conference Oct. 19, 1983, 1491.

This increased resolve, shown by National Security Decision Directive 114, allowed for the use of force to protect oil production facilities and shipping in the region.⁶ This security decision showed a move toward siding with Iraq to protect American oil interests in the Persian Gulf. As the war dragged on, America in 1987 offered to re-flag Kuwaiti oil tankers, which had come under threat of attack in the region. Reagan also sent 42 warships to the Gulf to protect the oil shipments coming through the Straights. Though this show of power caused problems for Iran, it would not be without cost. Though the American warships protected the oil supplies in the region the *Vincennes Crisis* gave America's foreign policy in the region trouble. Overall, the American presence in the Gulf gave Iraq some support, but for the most part America seemed to be protecting its oil supply, not backing Saddam's regime. Carter and Reagan's policies in the Gulf gave Saddam a false belief of support in his regime. All American policies seemed to favor Iraq, especially when it came to the arms embargo on Iran. The selling of missiles to Iran during the Iran-Contra Affair was the only U.S. action contrary to the majority of pro-Iraq policies. Though America did see Iraq as the lesser of two evils in the region, America would be more interested in keeping the supply of oil open in the region so nothing such as the economic crisis during the oil embargo would happen again.

Though the Iran-Iraq War was brought to an end in 1988 it would be the starting point for the turmoil Saddam caused in the 1990s. The Iran-Iraq War caused massive casualties on both sides and left Iraq in severe financial troubles. Saddam saw himself and his nation as the

bulwark against Islamic extremism, and it was this belief which caused

6 U.S. National Security Agency, *National Security Decision Directive 114*. (Washington, Government Printing Office. 1999) <http://www.fas.org/irp/offdocs/nsdd/nsdd-114.pdf> (Accessed 3/4/2011).

him to demand the Arab nations to forgive his nation's debts. The war caused Iraq to accumulate a debt of over \$80 billion, which was nearly twice Iraq's gross national product, and half of this debt belonged to Kuwait, Saudi Arabia, and the United Arab Emirates.⁷ By 1990, Saddam believed his country was being treated unfairly by the other Arab nations. He wanted his nation's debts to be forgiven because he believed he had fought a war to protect them from the spread of the Islamic Revolution, but they refused. On top of Kuwait's refusal to negotiate on the debt, Saddam also believed Kuwait was cutting into his nation's oil profits by lowering the price of oil due to their supposed overproduction of oil. To make the situation worse, Saddam argued Kuwait was taking Iraqi oil out of the disputed Rumaila oil field located on the Iraq border with Kuwait. Saddam saw these activities as part of a Kuwaiti plot to hurt Iraq and led to his plans to invade Kuwait to retaliate for what was seen as an economic declaration of war.⁸ Surely, Saddam had to believe the United States would not just stand by and let him invade a country which was not only peaceful, but was also an oil producer. The following were some of the reasons Saddam Hussein believed he would not meet heavy resistance if he was to invade Kuwait. Saddam believed Saudi Arabia would not allow any non-Muslim to use their land to launch a campaign to liberate Kuwait or help defend their country. He also believed America was still suffering from the Vietnam Complex and would not be willing to fight on foreign soil. Lastly, Saddam believed his troops, who had proven themselves in the Iran-Iraq War, could match the United States if they entered the conflict.⁹ Of course all these assumptions would turn out to be wrong.

7 Bennis and Moushabeck, 52.

8 Ibid., 51-53.

9 Ibid., 53.

The United States continued to have a somewhat pro-Iraq stance in the Middle East into the early Bush years. This continued pro-Iraqi stance was outlined by George H. W. Bush's National Security Directive 26, which called for the U.S. to provide military training to Iraqis along with economic and political support. Yet, even this show of support was thin. The directive also stated should Iraq continue to meddle with the activities of other Middle Eastern nations the United States would support its allies in the region, namely Saudi Arabia, and provide them co-operational security.¹⁰ Though the United States told Saddam they would not just stand by and let Iraq dominate the region, Iraq moved forward with its plans to invade, and on August 2, 1990 Iraq began its invasion of Kuwait. The Emir of Kuwait, caught by surprise, escaped to Saudi Arabia only minutes before Iraqi troops entered Kuwait City. Once in control, Saddam claimed he was liberating Kuwait and began to establish a "Provisional Free Kuwait Government."¹¹ Saddam's decision to invade Kuwait forced the United States to decide if it would intervene. Would it be the rise in oil prices, caused by the fear created by the fall of Kuwait, or the desire to defend the rights of an independent country and United Nations Resolutions that would bring the United States military into the region?

Fears of oil prices going up due to Saddam's demands on OPEC along with the moving of 30,000 troops to the Kuwaiti border appeared in the August 6th edition of *Newsweek*. Though experts said the lower demand and large reserves of oil in America would keep the prices in the United States from rising too high, these assurances did not calm

10 U.S. National Security Agency. *National Security Directive 26*. (Washington, Government Printing Office, 1999). <http://www.fas.org/irp/offdocs/nsd/nsd26.pdf> (Accessed 3/4/2011).

11 Bennis and Moushabeck, 57.

all fears. For it was said if Iraq's pressure on OPEC continued, prices could sky rocket by winter time.¹² When Saddam did invade Kuwait and began to seize control of the oil fields and refineries, the price of oil on the stock market rose fourteen percent in two days. Some economists like Phillip Verleger feared the Iraqi actions in Kuwait would force other OPEC countries to give in to Saddam's demands for higher oil prices. He believed oil could rise to \$30 a barrel and the U.S. embargo on Iraqi and Kuwaiti oil imposed by Bush could cause a 1970s style recession.¹³ Though Verleger presented a dark future not all economists were as negative. Others argued the loss of Kuwaiti oil would not cause a huge reduction in the oil supply. Iraq's need for money would force them to keep up production and other OPEC nations could increase output to cover the small amount of oil not produced by Kuwait. Yet even these more optimistic predictions relied on Saddam not imposing production cut backs on OPEC nations.¹⁴ President Bush's decision to send troops to defend Saudi Arabia limited some of the fears of oil price spikes, but if war did break out in the Saudi oil fields, the price of oil was predicted to soar to \$50 a barrel. With all of this combined many Americans feared a massive recession and a return to the 1970s gas lines.¹⁵ Secretary of State Baker outlined the reason the United States was going to defend Saudi Arabia and its oil supplies when he said, "If you want to sum it up in one word: it's jobs... Because an economic recession worldwide, caused by the control of one nation, one dictator, of the West's lifeline [oil] will result in the loss of jobs on the part of American citizens."¹⁶ Yet one

12 "Guess Where Oil Prices Are Headed?," *Newsweek*, August 6, 1990, 50.

13 H. Anderson, R. Wilkinson, C. Dickey, J. Whitmore, and D. Pedersen, "Tanks and Troops Exact a Heavy Price," *Newsweek*, August 13 1990, 29.

14 *Ibid.*, 29-30.

15 H. Anderson, R. Thomas, S. Waldman, C. Friday, and N. De La Pena, "The Recession of '90's," *Newsweek*, August 20, 1990, 34-35.

16 Dilip Hairo, *Desert Shield to Desert Storm: The Second Gulf War*. (New York, Routledge,

150 Articles

question remains unanswered, why didn't Bush open up the Strategic Oil Reserves? Surely, this would have lowered fears, but it was not until after the offensive against Iraq began that Bush opened up the reserves. In fact, when the oil reserves were opened in 1991, the price of oil fell by a third almost over-night.¹⁷ So, why did he open the reserve only after the conflict started? It was because the S.O.R is only to be tapped in times of emergency. Not sure how events would go after the beginning of hostilities, there was a chance of a national energy emergency. Therefore, Bush opened the reserves.¹⁸ The statement by Baker and the refusal to open the reserves gives substance to those who argue the Gulf War was only for oil. However, to limit the reasons for U.S. actions to only these events is naïve. The actions to get Saddam to leave Kuwait through either unilateral action or, the favored U.N. action, showed Bush wanted to establish how international law would be upheld in the emerging post-Cold War world.¹⁹

Before anything got out of hand, it was imperative the U.S. get the United Nations support before it did anything in the Gulf. Secretary Baker told Bush that U.N. support and resolutions gave the appearance the U.S. was not going it alone.²⁰ While getting this support, Bush got permission from Saudi Arabia to station around 50,000 troops in the Persian Gulf. After the November election, Bush began to increase the number of troops to 430,000 enough to maintain an offensive if necessary.²¹

Many Arab nations voted during the Arab League Summit to also send 1992), 246.

17 Bennis and Moushabeck, 264-265.

18 *Public Papers of the Presidents of the United States: George Bush 1991 Book I* (Washington, United States Printing Office, 1992) from Statement by Press Secretary Fitzwater on the Strategic Petroleum Reserve Jan. 16, 1991, 45.

19 George Bush and Brent Scowcroft, *A World Transformed* (New York: Vintage Book, 1998), 303.

20 Margaret Warner "Jim Bakera's Biggest Test" *Newsweek*. January 14, 1991, 18.

21 Dilip Hiro, 237-238.

troops to defend Saudi Arabia, which destroyed any hope for Saddam's call for an Arab holy war against the United States.²² On top of the military buildup to limit Saddam's influence in the Middle East, Bush continued to push resolutions through the United Nations which strengthened the blockade and brought more nations to oppose Saddam. The United States, United Nations, and Arab states strengthened their positions as Saddam threatened a hostage crisis. When Kuwait fell, around 3,100 Americans and other Westerners were trapped in the country. Saddam threatened to place these hostages at military bases to prevent the U.S. from bombing them, and threatened their starvation till the blockade was lifted.²³ Bush's response was to wait out Saddam and see if the sanctions would cause him to back down. Bush did say in a press release he was "deeply troubled by the use of innocent civilians as pawns" but he knew if Saddam began to kill hostages war would erupt and the coalition would have the moral initiative.²⁴ Bush was unwilling to deal with a Tehran-like situation and was determined that something needed to be done. The pressure to do something got the U.N. Resolution 664 passed on August 18th, which demanded the release of all detained foreigners.²⁵ Luckily, the hostage crisis came to an end when Saddam, knowing the hostages hurt his chances for negotiations, released them on August 28th.²⁶ Even during the hostage crisis, military planning went ahead and in fact many Arab leaders were calling for the conflict to begin quickly. They believed the only way of getting Saddam to back down was with military action. It was also reported many American troops were attempting to get the Iraqis

22 Ibid., 20-21.

23 R. Watson, R. Wilkinson, J. Barry, M. Warner, A. McDaniel, and R. Nordland, "War Path" *Newsweek*, August 27, 1990, 19.

24 Ibid.

25 George Bush and Brent Scowcroft, 349-350.

26 Jean Smith, *George Bush's War*. (New York, Henry Holt and Company, 1992), 142.

152 Articles

to show acts of aggression.²⁷ Though many wanted a fight, there were many things which had to be accounted for. If it came to conflict, this war would be the first desert combat for the United States since World War II, therefore, the troops would have to learn to deal with the extreme heat and sandy environment. Also, coalition forces had to deal with the threat of Iraq using chemical weapons, therefore, troops would have to learn to use anti-gas uniforms, which made the heat worse, and how to use the antidote kits to combat nerve agents.²⁸ Overall, the buildup of coalition troops in Saudi Arabia ended any threat Saddam could take the Saudi oil fields. Establishing a strategy to combat the problems of the desert during Operation Desert Shield paid off in November where the use of force against Iraq was passed by the United Nations with Resolution 678. The resolution set a deadline of January 15, 1991 for Saddam to meet the demands of United Nations Resolution 660, which demanded Iraq withdraw unconditionally from Kuwait. If Iraq did not follow the demands of the Resolution, the U.S. led coalition had the authority to push him out with force in what would be called Operation Desert Storm.²⁹

On October 1, 1990, Bush speaking at the U.N. General Assembly said he hoped for a diplomatic solution, but the Iraqi annexation of Kuwait would not stand. If the Iraqis would unconditionally withdraw, there would be opportunities for Iraq and Kuwait to settle their differences permanently.³⁰ Saddam turned down this compromise and on October 4th he stated on Iraqi national radio “there would be no compromise Iraq will

²⁷ “War Path,” 20-21.

²⁸ M. Beck, R. Wilkinson, T. Stanger, J. Barry, A. Murr, and M. Mason, “Fighting in the Desert,” *Newsweek*, August 27, 1990, 24- 25.

²⁹ United Nations Security Council. *United Nations Resolution 678 (1990)* <http://daccess-dds-ny.un.org/doc/RESOLUTION/GEN/NR0/575/28/IMG/NR057528.pdf?OpenElement> (Accessed 3/6/2011).

³⁰ Jean Smith, 170.

never give up one inch of this land now called Province Number 19.”³¹ With Iraq making this firm statement of resolve, it was now apparent offensive operations were probably going to be called for. If it was going to come down to military action to take back Kuwait, coalition forces would have to overcome Saddam’s superiority in men, artillery, tanks, and their defense in depth. To make things worse, in December, Saddam increased his troop numbers in Kuwait to around 480,000 men and 1,300 tanks. General Powell informed Bush he believed a ground war would be necessary, but the coalition did not have enough troops to invade Kuwait.³² It would be mid-February before the U.S. would have the 430,000 troops needed to go on the offensive, so any action taken after the January 15th deadline would have to be done with air power.³³ Also even before it came to going on the offensive the United States would have to make sure its coalition stayed together. The numerous allies had different orders for their troops pertaining to how and when they could engage in combat. It was believed if Saddam provoked hostilities, all the coalition troops would fight and, if the U.S. decided to go on the offensive to push Saddam out of Kuwait, some might not agree to go in. The Saudi, Egyptian, and Kuwaiti forces would fight either way, and seemed to be more belligerent than the American troops in wanting Saddam gone. For the European troops, only the British were willing to fight under U.S. authority, French troops would only fight in a defensive role.³⁴ This uncertainty in how the troops would fight would cause problems in the operations of Desert Shield, and hurt planning for Desert Storm.

As January rolled around Saddam stood firm in Kuwait, but it

31 Ibid., 171.

32 Dilip Hiro, 274.

33 Ibid., 292.

34 R. Watson, J. Berry, D. Waller, and M. Warner, “The Price of Success” *Newsweek*. October 1, 1990, 20-21.

154 Articles

seemed as if he might be trying to buy more time with negotiations. Bush demonstrated the desire to negotiate to the final hour by allowing Baker to meet with Iraqi ambassador Aziz. The coalition had mixed reactions to the agreement but it would solidify support for the coming war on the American home front.³⁵ On January 9, 1991 Secretary Baker talked with Iraqi ambassador Aziz in Geneva. Baker handed Aziz a letter from Bush which called for Iraq to follow through with the demands of U.N. Resolution 678, only after that would the United States be willing to work with Iraq. Aziz refused to take the letter and it appeared Saddam would not leave Kuwait willingly before the January 15th deadline.³⁶ On January 12th the United States Congress passed a resolution allowing for the use of the "United States Armed Forces pursuant to United Security Council Resolution 678 in order to achieve implementation of Security Council Resolutions."³⁷ Now that Bush had the authority of Congress and the United Nations, preparations of war went ahead. On January 16th, a day after the U.N. deadline, Bush addressed the nation on television at 9 pm stating, "Tonight the battle has been joined."³⁸

Operation Desert Storm begun in the late hours of January 16, 1991, and it would be a six week operation which saw massive numbers of air sorties. The first stage of the operation was to take out Iraqi command and control facilities, airports, missile launch sites, radar sites, and oil refineries. The second stage was to destroy the Iraqi air force, Scud capabilities, and decimate Iraqi ground forces.³⁹ As the air campaign went forward, many military officers were finding the bombings were not achieving the effects they wanted. The Iraqis had placed many of

³⁵ George Bush and Brent Scowcroft, 419-421.

³⁶ Jean Smith, 223.

³⁷ Dilip Hiro, 300.

³⁸ Jean Smith, 250.

³⁹ Dilip Hiro, 319.

their planes in reinforced air shelters, and the successful deployment of inflatable dummy tanks and aircraft hindered the air campaign. During the first week alone the 12,000 sorties only destroyed 41 of Iraq's 700 airplanes, and the attempts to destroy Iraq's missile launchers were proving difficult due to their mobility.⁴⁰ The only part of the bombing campaign which was working was the destruction of the transport infrastructure which limited the logistical support of the Iraqi Army. Yet Iraqi moral in Kuwait was still high when during a propaganda campaign to get Iraqi troops to surrender in early February, only 86 out of 360,000 did.⁴¹ With the start of Operation Desert Storm, Saddam lived up to his threat to expand the war. Hoping to splinter the Arab Coalition against him, Saddam began to launch modified Scud missiles at Israel hoping they would retaliate. Many of these missiles hit Tel Aviv and Haifa, causing a few casualties. Instead of retaliation, the Israelis held back under U.S. pressure. This created a lot of sympathy for Israel, and the Arab Coalition did not splinter as Saddam had hoped.⁴² As time passed, the bombing seemed to crack Saddam's resolve, for he began to look to the Soviets for a negotiated peace.

In February, Saddam began working with Gorbachev to work out an agreement for a negotiated pull out of Kuwait and a military cease fire, but it came with many demands. This agreement made between Saddam and Gorbachev called for Iraq to withdraw from Kuwait thereby fulfilling the National Security Council Resolution 600, but it also called for U.S. forces to withdraw by the end of the month. The agreement called on Israel to pull out of Palestine, all of Iraq's debts were to be forgiven, Gulf countries would be left alone to create their own security arrangements,

40 Ibid., 322, 334.

41 Ibid., 352.

42 Ibid., 323- 324.

and the Gulf would be free of any foreign military bases.⁴³ Now if Bush went into the Gulf only for oil, this should have been agreeable. In the January 14, 1991 issue of *Newsweek*, Baker presented the belief the U.S. could negotiate with Saddam. Baker said if Saddam left Kuwait, the United States promised not to attack Iraqi forces and would not stop their Arab brothers if they decided to turn over oil fields or even a few islands in the Gulf to Iraq. Also, the United States would work to end the embargo, except for arms on Iraq, and would be willing to work on the Palestine problem.⁴⁴ This was before the conflict started, and with Saddam refusing to agree to meet these early negotiations he destroyed any chance Bush would agree to anything, but Iraq meeting all United Nations Resolutions. When Saddam announced he would live up to the negotiated terms with the Soviets, Bush said he would not honor them. Bush declared the United States and coalition forces would enforce the United Nations Resolutions and called on Saddam to withdraw from Kuwait unconditionally. Bush took this firm stance because he and many military officials believed Saddam was conducting a scorched earth campaign in Kuwait during their pull out. It was true, Iraqi forces were at work destroying the whole oil production infrastructure in Kuwait as they began to pull out. Bush gave Saddam an ultimatum saying Saddam had seven days to meet the demands of Resolution 600 or coalition troops would begin their ground offensive.⁴⁵ Apparently not believing the American threats Saddam began withdrawing his troops from Kuwait according to the agreement with the Soviets. Had Saddam held firm in Kuwait, his troops might have blooded coalition soldiers from their solid defensive positions, but on February 24, 1991 Saddam's troops

43 Ibid., 364-365.

44 Margaret Warner. "Jim Baker's Biggest Test" *Newsweek*. January 14, 1991, 15.

45 Tom Mathews, "Saddam's Last Stand" *Newsweek*. March 4, 1991, 18.

were caught in the open when Operation Desert Sabre was launched. This assumption is based on the Iraqi army had a chance of putting up a good fight due to the lack of devastation caused by the air campaign, and the fact even before the offensive began many Pentagon officials were unsure of the exact condition of Iraqi forces.⁴⁶ Yet by noon on the first day coalition forces, had achieved their twenty four hour objectives, and by the 26th, coalition forces were closing the circle around the Iraqi troops retreating from Kuwait on highway 80. Even as things were going bad on the ground for Iraqi forces, Saddam continued to say his troops were holding back American troops and his troops were only tactically withdrawing from Kuwait. Bush will set the record straight by saying Iraqi forces were in full retreat. Bush stated retreating Iraqi forces would be treated as threats and the only way to avoid more casualties was for the Iraqis to throw down their arms.⁴⁷ Once coalition troops encircled the retreating Iraqi forces the casualties became great along the road, gaining it the nickname, the Highway to Hell.⁴⁸ The fighting was made even worse due to all the black smoke created by the 500 or more Kuwaiti oil wells which had been torched by the Iraqis making it hard to breathe and lighting up the Iraqi retreat.⁴⁹ By February 27th, Kuwait City was retaken by coalition troops and thousands of Iraqi soldiers were taken prisoner. On February 28th, Bush, believing enough blood had been shed, and with all Iraqi troops out of Kuwait, he called a cease fire. Surprisingly, no one had figured the offensive would have gone so well. From the beginning

46 T. Morgenthau, R. Watson, J. Barry, and A. McDaniel, "Allied Blitzkrieg" *Newsweek*. March 4, 1991, 22.

47 *Public Papers of the Presidents of the United States: George Bush 1991 Book I*. From Address to the Nation on the Iraqi Statement on Withdrawal From Kuwait. Feb. 26, 1991, 176.

48 Dilip Hiro, 387.

49 T. Morgenthau, R. Watson, J. Barry, and A. McDaniel, "Allied Blitzkrieg" *Newsweek*. March 4, 1991, 20.

of the ground war to its finish, it only took 100 hours.⁵⁰ All that was left now to keep the hostilities from starting back up was getting Saddam to publicly agree to all twelve U.N. Resolutions.⁵¹

On February 27, 1991 Iraq's Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Foreign Affairs sent a letter to the U.N. declaring they would fully comply with all resolutions. On March 2, 1991 the United Nations passed Resolution 686 which confirmed a cease fire and demanded Iraq return all stolen property back to Kuwait and enter into talks with coalition army commanders to arrange for the ending of all hostilities.⁵² On March 2nd, Bush addressed the troops in the Gulf over the radio: "This is a war we did not seek and did not want. But Saddam Hussein turned a deaf ear to the voices of peace and reason... the coalition faced a moral imperative to put a stop to the atrocities in Kuwait."⁵³ Now with hostilities finished, Kuwait liberated, and Saddam agreeing to all the U.N. Resolutions, it was time to take stock of the situation. Kuwait had to rebuild around 730 oil wells, of which about 640 of them were still on fire. With so much destruction in Kuwait it would take years for the country to replace its oil producing infrastructure. In all, the destruction caused by the conflict placed the cost of the war around \$61 billion.⁵⁴ So with these stats in mind, can the war for oil argument stand with such destruction done to oil facilities? It would seem the United States and other coalition troops went to war against Iraq to up hold the United Nations Resolutions and keep a

50 *Public Papers of the Presidents of the United States: George Bush 1991 Book I*, 187.

51 R. Watson, A. McDaniel, M. Warner, C.S. Manegold, A. Underwood, and M Liu "After the Storm" *Newsweek*. March 11, 1991, 26.

52 United Nations Security Council. *United Nations Resolution 686 (1991)* <http://daccess-dds-ny.un.org/doc/RESOLUTION/GEN/NR0/596/22/IMG/NR059622.pdf?OpenElement> (Accessed 3/13/2011).

53 *Public Papers of the Presidents of the United States: George Bush 1991 Book I*. From Radio address to United States Armed Forces Stationed in the Persian Gulf Region, March 2, 1991, 207.

54 Dilip Hiro, 398.

dictator from bullying other nations.

With all the information presented, is there an argument for the assumption the United States went into the Persian Gulf War for oil and oil alone? Looking at the policies established under Carter, Reagan, and even Bush prior to the outbreak of war, it would seem oil was a driving factor in all of them. Yet if one is going to claim only the United States' actions were driven by the demand for oil then they are ignoring the acts of Iraq during the 1980s and '90s. Saddam wanted the Shatt al-Arab waterway, which would make shipping oil into the Gulf quicker for Iraq, and taking Iran's Khuzestan oil field would make large sums of money for Iraq. Then, before the invasion of Kuwait, what was Saddam asking for; control of Kuwaiti islands in the Gulf and control of the entire Rumaila oil field, even though Iraq already controlled the majority of it. So, it can also be argued oil was defiantly the driving force in Saddam's actions in the Gulf. Many will look at the economic situation in late 1990 to base their argument Bush was interested only in oil. Yes, there was a spike in oil prices and fears of oil and gas shortages, yet as already shown, not everyone agreed the fall of Kuwait would spell disaster in the oil markets. In fact, when the market was the most violent, right before military operations against Iraq, Bush opened the national oil reserves, therefore easing fears and causing the price of oil to fall. Even this action was argued as evidence Bush wanted oil since he waited so long to open the reserves. He waited so long because the reserves are only to be used in times of national crisis. Therefore, when hostilities began, no one knew how the war would go, and under these uncertainties Bush opened the reserves. Bush moved toward combat in the Middle East for some of the same reasons Truman went to Korea; such blatant aggression cannot

160 Articles

stand. Bush got international support through the United Nations and through this united front, placed an effective embargo on Iraq as well as conducted a successful military operation. If Bush stood against Iraqi aggression only to regain Kuwaiti oil, why did he not accept the negotiated settlement offered by the Soviet Union? Even though this agreement complied with Resolution 660, it also seemed to reward Iraq by giving them many of the concessions they wanted. Bush would see this as a diplomatic ploy and demanded Saddam comply with all of the U. N. Resolutions, which would not reward Saddam for his aggression. Even though early American policies seemed to favor the argument for the U.S. going to war for oil, it was not the reason U.S. led coalition troops went to war against Iraq. There is enough evidence that shows America went to liberate Kuwait, and with so much damage to the oil producing capabilities in the region, discounts the war for oil argument.

Shiloh: Bloody Sacrifice that Changed the War

Jeshua Hinton

The Battle of Shiloh effected a great change on how the American people and its soldiers viewed and fought the Civil War. William Tecumseh Sherman is famous for stating “war is hell,” and Shiloh fit the bill. Shelby Foote writes:

This was the first great modern battle. It was Wilson’s Creek and Manassas rolled together, quadrupled, and compressed into a smaller area than either. From the inside it resembled Armageddon [...] Shiloh’s casualties [roughly 23,500-24,000], was more than all three of the nation’s previous wars.¹

The battle itself was a horrific affair, but Shiloh was simply more than numbers of killed, or the amount of cannon fired, or some other quantifiable misery. The deaths at Shiloh made America comprehend what type of cost would be exacted to continue the war, and was a foreshadowing of the blood-letting that lie ahead. With incredible resolve, both sides marched onward.

After the success at Forts Henry and Donelson, Union troops felt that the war would soon be over, and even “Unconditional Surrender” Grant was convinced that “the Confederacy was a hollow shell about to collapse.”² Grant wanted to continue with his troops to Corinth, but his superior Henry Halleck constrained him to wait for General Buell to arrive, when the combined forces could be assured of victory.³ Grant seemed not to fear any attack, assured that the rebels would only fight

1 Shelby Foote, *The Civil War*, Vol. 1 (New York: Random House, 1958), 338, 351.

2 Ulysses S. Grant, *Memoirs of Ulysses S. Grant*, Vol.1 (New York: 1885), 368.

3 Foote, *The Civil War*, 323. “Don’t let the enemy draw you into an engagement now. Wait ‘til you are properly fortified and receive orders.”

162 Articles

a defensive war and would concentrate at Corinth only for that reason. Sherman wrote as much in his memoir, "I always acted on the supposition that we were an invading army...we did not fortify our camps against an attack, because we had no orders to do so, and because such a course would have made our men timid."⁴ And so the spade was abandoned, as was any defensive preparation to protect the camp that Sherman himself picked. He wrote, "The ground itself admits of easy defense by a small command, and yet affords admirable camping grounds for a hundred thousand men."⁵ What Sherman could not know was less comforting: nearly a hundred thousand men would be fighting there.

Generals Albert Sidney Johnston and P.G.T. Beauregard had little time to organize and prepare their troops for the coming battle, and that they did so in two weeks under the cloud of recent defeat was nothing short of a miracle. Braxton Bragg wrote of Johnston's army:

It was a heterogeneous mass, in which there was more enthusiasm than discipline, more capacity than knowledge, and more valor than instruction. The task of organizing such a command and supplying it...was simply appalling.⁶

After receiving the much-anticipated report from Nathan Bedford Forrest that General Buell was "marching quickly to join Grant on the Tennessee River," Johnston ordered his troops to march towards Pittsburg Landing.⁷ Johnston's raw army took three days to travel the short distance of twenty-three miles, bogged down in the mud from recent rains and from the

4 William T. Sherman, *Memoirs of General William T. Sherman* (Indiana University Press, 1957), 229.

5 *Ibid.*, 233. This was the only significant piece of land along the TN River not currently under water.

6 Charles P. Roland, *Albert Sidney Johnston: Soldier of Three Republics*, (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1964), 315.

7 Lynda L. Crist, editor. "A.S. Johnston to Jefferson Davis, April 3, 1862." *Papers of Jefferson Davis*, Vol. 8 (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University, 1995), 128.

lack of urgency from some of the troops. The march took so long that Beauregard lost his will, “convinced that the tardy advance had deprived it of all the advantage of surprise,” and wanted to call off the attack and return to Corinth.⁸ Johnston went with his “gut feeling,” determining that they would go on the offensive at daylight, when he reportedly stated “I would fight them if they were a million.”⁹ When the attack began at dawn, inconceivably, the Rebel army remained undetected by Union troops.

There was some tentativeness as the Confederate skirmishers spread along the battlefield: “Southerners were supposed to be the ones with the strong military ethos and should have been more eager to engage the enemy, but Grant’s troops had the smell of recent victory...”¹⁰ With little resistance, their courage swelled and the three Corps broke upon unsuspecting Union troops mulling over their breakfast fires. “Thousands of grey-clad demons erupted from the woods...the fighting was widespread and terrible...fields swarmed with thousands of men intent on butchering one another.”¹¹ The fight began well for the Rebels, but bogged down in the face of fierce resistance, from plundering the Union camps, and from Beauregard’s flawed attack design.¹² Because the battlefield was shaped like a funnel, with Snake Creek on one side and the Tennessee River on the other, “the battle line narrowed with each Southern advance, and the concentration of fire intensified” in the smaller area.¹³

Because of the shape and terrain of the field, cavalry was not afforded its

8 T. Harry Williams, *P.G.T. Beauregard: Napoleon in Grey* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University, 1955), 13.

9 Roland, *Johnston*, 324.

10 Joseph A. Frank, *Seeing the Elephant: Raw Recruits at the Battle of Shiloh* (New York: Greenwood Press, 1989), 83.

11 Irving McKee, “Ben-Hur” Wallace (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1947), 47

12 Instead of each Corp having an objective on the field, they were spread across the entire front in hopes of over-running the enemy with brute force. This negated Johnston’s plan to turn the Union left, which would cut the Yankees off from Pittsburg Landing and resupply, and push them off the high ground.

13 Frank, *Seeing the Elephant*, 88.

usual means of attack, and was used primarily by both armies to stop men from fleeing the field and corralling them into yet another charge or to hold the line.

The battle all but stalled as General Braxton Bragg's troops faced off against Brigadier General Benjamin Prentiss' division at the Hornet's Nest, where some 4,500 Union held off nearly 16,000 Confederates for several hours, buying Grant enough time to salvage his routing army.¹⁴ Save for these two Generals, Shiloh was more "a soldier's battle" than most, less affected by the actions of superiors than by the men's own determination to stand. "The blind and intricate battlefield offered little chance for careful planning; the haste and tumult left no time for tactics. On neither side was the guidance of general command of much service; it was the division, brigade, and regimental commanders who fought the battle."¹⁵ General Johnston did have some impact by compelling men forward as well as leading several charges, and Sherman wrote that his death resulted in a "perceptible lull for a couple of hours, when the attack was renewed with much less vehemence," but Johnston was cut down only half-way through the first day.¹⁶ Other commanders had even less of an impact. Grant was nine miles downriver when the battle began, and arrived almost four hours after the cannons began to boom. Beauregard and Grant were largely reduced to shoveling in reinforcements, often according to where the guns sounded the most or loudest. There was

14 James McDonough, *Shiloh: In Hell Before Night* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1977), 143. Why Bragg was unable to dislodge his foe when he nearly had a four-to-one advantage has mystified many. James McDonough writes that of the 13 charges upon that position, Bragg never sent more than 3,600 men, thus nullifying any apparent advantage.

15 J. G. Nicolay, "Abraham Lincoln: A History, The Mississippi and Shiloh," *The Century*, Vol. 36, Num. 5 (Sept, 1888), 670.

16 Sherman, *Memoirs*, 247. Additionally, Shelby Foote wrote that Johnston "behaved like a man in search of death," but I propose that he was performing much like many other Southern generals when their "blood was up." See Shelby Foote, *Shiloh: A Novel*, (New York: Random House, 1951), 17.

no controlling the fight with rapid maneuvers to flank the enemy, only frontal assault and counter-attack.¹⁷ It was basically a front-to-front melee, like two heavyweights trading vicious blows until one staggers and drops to the canvas. The battle was set upon the power of one opponent to overwhelm the other, rather than a battle of movement and tactical agility.¹⁸ A Yankee soldier after the battle stated “it was a soldier’s fight, well-put in the expression that the rebels out-generaled us, but we out-coloneled them.”¹⁹ The *New York Times* called Shiloh a “soldier’s battle,” and was glad that “when men were pitted against men, without advantage,” Northern troops “proved superior.”²⁰ With fewer numbers, Federal soldiers held the field just long enough for the sun to go down.

Generals normally have some benefit from sitting behind the lines, receiving reports and hearing the guns blaze, and are able to perceive through the smoke a larger picture of the battle what common soldiers could not: “The scope and breadth of a battle are almost always invisible to the participant, especially the simple soldier. The affair is generally a hodgepodge of scattered, disjointed encounters, highlighted by moments of supreme fear and incredible courage.”²¹ Ambrose Bierce, a soldier in the first division of Buell’s army to reach the battlefield, described the anticipation of the battle:

The breeze bore to our ears the long deep sighing of iron lungs. The division sprang to its feet and stood at attention. I am not sure, but the ground was trembling then. The sound of battle pulsed with regular throbbings, and the tension grew...²²

17 Frank, *Seeing the Elephant*, 86-87.

18 *Ibid.*, 88.

19 Roland, *Johnston*, 350.

20 “The Soldier’s Battle,” *New York Times*, April 19, 1862.

21 Tony Hays, *Shiloh Stories: Fact, Fiction, & Folklore* (Savannah: Tennessee River Museum Press, 2000), 91.

22 Russell Duncan, ed., *Phantoms of a Blood-Stained Period: The Complete Civil War Writings of Ambrose Bierce* (Boston: University of Massachusetts Press, 2002), 94.

Those on the front lines were killing or dying or running away, while nearly all in reserve were anxious to join in, lest they miss “seeing the elephant.” Sam Watkins, a private in the Confederate army, described what it felt like entering the battle:

Men were lying everywhere in every conceivable position...some were waiving hats and shouting us to go forward. It all seemed to me a dream, when siz, siz, siz, the Minnie balls from the Yankee line began to whistle around our ears...we were ordered to charge bayonets. I had been feeling mean all morning...but when the order to charge was given, I got happy. I felt happier than a fellow does when he professes religion at a big Methodist camp-meeting.²³

Some soldiers appeared almost possessed by the urge to kill; a *New York Tribune* reporter described the transformation to “maniac wildness,” where “men lost their semblance of humanity and the spirit of the demon shone in their faces...their one desire but to destroy.”²⁴ The determination of those soldiers to kill is difficult to understand, but many rested their conscience by relegating their religious beliefs to the rear; instead, they followed their patriotic duty and orders.

Rebel troops were told to fire at the biggest part of the enemy at point blank, to aim for officers and artillery horses, and were forbidden to help fallen comrades.²⁵ Victory was the reward for such practices, as dishonorable as it must have felt. Union men did similar things, such as aiming for the head: one Confederate reported how a Minnie ball hit his friend in the face, where it travelled into his mouth, causing him to swallow the ball. Both thought the man was lost, but the next day his

²³ Sam Watkins, *Company Aytch, or A Side Show of the Big Show* (Chattanooga Press, 2004).

²⁴ Quoted in Drew Gilpin Foust, *Republic of Suffering* (New York: Alfred Knopf Press, 2008), 36.

²⁵ Frank, *Seeing the Elephant*, 94.

friend was boasting how he could digest “two ounces of Yankee lead.”²⁶ Even amidst the carnage, men could take delight.

Most soldiers had no idea how many they were fighting, knowing only that it was fierce. “When the fighting got hot, the forty-round issue of balls, powder, and caps did not last long. Most soldiers could fire three rounds per minute. At this pace a regiment could conceivably fire their ammunition in less than twenty minutes.”²⁷ The soldiers did know that the Minnie ball could shatter bones, as well as make a sound when hitting flesh that they would never forget. Some compared the fight to “a hailstorm, mixed with thunder and lightning,” while others compared it to a train-wreck, “with nothin’ but limbs remaining.”²⁸ After the battle, Grant wrote “I saw an open field...so covered with dead that it would have been possible to walk across the clearing, in any direction, stepping only on dead bodies without a foot touching the ground.”²⁹ The battlefield itself, particularly “bloody pond,” must have resembled Dante’s description of hell. Warfare, once thought so glorious in the memoriam of 1776, was now showing its true murderous colors.

The horrors on the battlefield were a result of major developments in military technology in the decades before the war, the implications of which had not been integrated into military doctrine. “New artillery fuses, rifled iron tubes, and oblong artillery shells were among the improvements of artillery weapons...however, the most significant innovation was the increase in the accurate range of shoulder-held firearms,” which were accurate minimally to 300 yards.³⁰ The

26 *The Mobile Advertiser and Register*, April 11, 1862.

27 O.E. Cunningham, *Shiloh and the Western Campaign of 1862* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University, 1966), 474.

28 Frank, *Seeing the Elephant*, 92.

29 Grant, *Personal Memoirs*, 238.

30 Frank, *Seeing the Elephant*, 104.

commanders' use of tight formations, which aided in command and control while simultaneously comforting the green troops, presented a broader target and resulted in a much higher casualty count. The medical tents did little to stay the carnage.

The amount of wounded at Shiloh was boggling to outsiders, but it was absolutely stunning to the medical staff on hand. The *Charleston Daily Courier* reported one observer's disgust at the "butcher's table [...] groans fill the air, surgeons are busy at work by candlelight [...] the atmosphere is fetid with the stench of wounds, and the rain is pouring down upon thousands who yet lie upon the bloody ground of Shiloh."³¹ The *Cincinnati Times* had a similar tale: "...the dead and wounded are all around me. The knife of the surgeon is busy at work...all day long they have been coming in...I hope my eyes may never again look upon such sights."³² Ambrose Bierce gave a grisly description of the surgeon's tent:

Hidden in the hollows and behind clumps of rank brambles were large tents, dimly lit with candles, but looking comfortable. The kind of comfort they supplied was indicated by pairs of men entering and reappearing, bearing litters; by low moans from within and by long rows of dead with covered faces outside. These tents were constantly receiving the wounded, yet were never full; they were continually ejecting the dead, yet were never empty. It was as if the helpless had been carried in and murdered, that they might not hamper those whose business it was to fall tomorrow.³³

Even General Grant had a hard time stomaching the field hospital, and he writes:

(the)...log house on the bank had been taken as a hospital, and all night wounded men were being brought in, their wounds dressed, a leg or arm amputated, as the case might require, and everything being done to save life or alleviate suffering. The sight was more

31 *Charleston Daily Courier*, April 15, 1862.

32 *Cincinnati Times*, April 10, 1862.

33 Duncan, *Phantoms*, 99.

unendurable than encountering the rebel fire, and I returned to lie at my tree in the rain.³⁴

Men had never comprehended such a disaster; one soldier witnessing the burial detail worried that men had been reduced to the status of animals, deprived of the much-desired “good death [...] they dig holes and pile them all in like dead cattle and have teams draw them together like picking up pumpkins.”³⁵

The second day of the battle was decided before it was even begun, when Buell crossed the river at night, and when Lew Wallace’s “lost division” finally arrived. Deprived of its field commander, its men outnumbered and exhausted, the Rebel army put up an honorable defense, but fled the field by early afternoon.

Neither Buell nor Grant made a serious effort to run down their fleeing enemy, a mistake often made in both theaters of the War, and one which both leaders in Washington and Northern citizens would question. Sherman perhaps summed up the matter best in explaining why Beauregard was not pursued. “I assure you,” he stated, “we had quite enough of their society for two whole days, and were only too glad to be rid of them on any terms.”³⁶ When news of defeat reached Richmond, it could not have carried a heavier blow; gone was Jefferson Davis’s “pillar in the West,” and with it went the South’s best chance to block the Union invasion.³⁷ Though Jefferson Davis never would concede victory to the Union forces at Shiloh, the nation was not illiterate, and there sprang up a multitude of eyewitness reports in newspapers across the country, both

34 Ulysses S. Grant, “Battles and Leaders of the Civil War: The Battle of Shiloh,” *The Century* 29, No. 4. (Feb. 1885): 598.

35 Faust, *Republic of Suffering*, 71.

36 Cunningham, *Shiloh and the Western Campaign*, 501.

37 “News From the South,” *New York Times*, April 18, 1862.

170 Articles

accurate and otherwise.

On Wednesday, April 9th, the order of business was suspended immediately after Senator Orville H. Browning from Illinois read an erroneous telegraph dispatch which was received that morning by the *New York Herald*:

The bloodiest battle of modern times just closed, resulting in the complete rout of the enemy, who attacked us Sunday morning. Battle lasted until Monday 4:35 p.m., when the enemy commenced their retreat toward Corinth, pursued by a large force of our cavalry. Slaughter on both sides immense. Lost in killed, wounded, and missing from eighteen to twenty thousand; that of the enemy is estimated from thirty-five to forty thousand.³⁸

Reports in the South were just as erroneous, as exemplified by the *Savannah Republican*, which estimated that Confederate forces had lost “no more than four thousand,” as compared with the “eighteen to twenty thousand lost” on the Federal side. Though the paper later conceded that Confederate losses had been “nearer ten thousand,” they did not revise their estimate of the Northern troops.³⁹ Jay Cutler Andrews wrote in his two-volume account on Civil War reporting that:

Probably no battle fought during the Civil War exacted a greater amount of controversy than did the Battle of Shiloh, and for this the army correspondents were in no small degree responsible. Lacking precise information in many cases they dashed off long paragraphs, imaginary for the most part, about desperate hand-to-hand fighting that never occurred; circulated wild stories, wholly untrue, about Sherman’s men being bayoneted in their tents; and exaggerated the extent of both the Union defeat on Sunday and Union victory the next. The faking of eyewitness accounts took place while the self-styled authors never came any closer to the battlefield than Cairo.⁴⁰

38 Congressional Globe, Thirty-Seventh Congress, 2 Session. Vol. 32, pt. 2, 1581.

39 *Savannah Republican*, April 22-29, May 12.

40 Jay Cutler Andrews, *The North Reports the Civil War* (University of Pittsburgh Press, 1955), 179.

President Lincoln ordered a hundred-gun salute at the National Armory, and though relieved by the victory, he was mortified that the slaughter had been so great.⁴¹ Turmoil began anew for the Republican President and his soon-to-be-favorite general, as Lincoln was harshly criticized for retaining Grant when poor reports began to surface. Lincoln stood behind him, stating “I can’t spare this man; he fights.”⁴² A reality that the news reports could not obscure was that the war had changed.

“Deceptively easy Union advances and victories in 1862 had apparently confirmed a limited war strategy,” writes James McPherson. Grant’s capture of the Tennessee River forts convinced him the Confederacy was weak; “however, when the rebels regrouped and counter-punched so hard at Shiloh that they nearly whipped him, Grant changed his mind.”⁴³ The Union commander now “gave up all idea of saving the Union except by complete conquest.”⁴⁴ Complete conquest meant more than occupying territory, it meant destroying armies. Before the counteroffensive, Grant had been careful to “protect the property of citizens whose territory had been invaded;” after Shiloh his policy changed to “consume everything that could be used to support or supply armies of the enemy.”⁴⁵ Sherman became a pioneer in what was considered “total war” in the 19th-century mind: “I intended to humble their pride...we cannot change the hearts and minds of the people of the South, but we can make war so terrible...that the rebels will tire of it.”⁴⁶

The complete desolation of Shiloh lingered in both soldier

41 Larry J. Daniel, *Shiloh: The Battle That Changed the Civil War* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1997), 304.

42 Daniel, *Shiloh*, 308.

43 James M. McPherson, *Drawn With The Sword* (Oxford University Press, 1997), 76.

44 Grant, *Memoirs of Ulysses S. Grant*, 368.

45 *Ibid.*, 369.

46 Sherman, *Memoirs*, 249, 254.

172 Articles

and citizen. The battle which looked like a draw in later years must be regarded as one of the most decisive battles of the Civil War, because it steeled the Union for a hard fight, and pushed the Confederates into an ever-defensive war. The world had changed: romantic innocence had vanished and the war had turned vicious. In a letter to his wife following the battle, Grant summed up Shiloh's importance:

For the number engaged and the tenacity with which both parties held on for two days, during an incessant fire of musketry and artillery, it has no equal on this continent.⁴⁷

⁴⁷ John Y. Simon, ed., "Letter to Julia Dent Grant," *Papers of U.S. Grant*, Vol. 5 (Southern Illinois Press, 1973), 27.

The Experience of Confederate Nurses: Venerated in Myth But Overwhelmed by Reality

Catherine James

After General Lee's surrender at Appomattox, a glorious myth about the Confederacy arose, whereby the gallant "boys in gray" and devoted familial slaves were united with fervently loyal, elite, white female nurses to form the heart of the Lost Cause's tripartite description of its role in the Civil War. Only seven months following the war's end, the *Staunton Spectator* of Virginia published a "Tribute to the Ladies," whom it praised as "heroic amid danger, 'ministering angels' beside the cot where pain and anguish were wringing the brow of the sick and wounded soldier."¹ This sentimental rendition of Confederate nurses lingered into the twentieth century, as evidenced by the epic 1939 film *Gone With the Wind*, in which Melanie Wilkes, exhausted and frail, is nursing a soldier in an Atlanta hospital. Melanie tells Scarlett O'Hara that she is not tired because "this might be Ashley [her husband], and only strangers to comfort him. No, I'm not tired, Scarlett. They could all, all be Ashley!"² Notwithstanding its romantic appeal and regional popularity, the narrative of Confederate women's service as nurses has been more mythical than historical.

The indomitable Mary Chesnut declared in June 1861 that "every woman is ready to rush into the Florence Nightingale business."³ In reality, very few elite white women "rushed" into nursing service and, for those

Confederate women who did begin hospital work, they embarked upon

1 "Tribute to the Ladies," *Staunton Spectator*, December 12, 1865, 2, The Valley of the Shadow Project, <http://valley.lib.virginia.edu/news/ss1865/va.au.ss.1865.12.12.xml#02>.

2 *Gone With the Wind*, DVD, 1939, directed by David O. Selznick (Burbank, CA: Time Warner Entertainment Company, 1999).

3 Mary Chesnut, *Mary Chesnut's Civil War*, ed. C. Vann Woodward (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1981), 85.

an experience vastly different from the Lost Cause myth of their service as “ministering angels.” Confederate women met with harsh opposition to their nursing because it took them into the public sphere and since, in mid-nineteenth century Victorian culture, nursing was deemed by society as an occupation fit only for males or lower-class white women. Perhaps the greatest myth surrounding Confederate nursing perpetuated the idea that young female nurses found romance among wounded, but devastatingly handsome, patients. Yet, young women were essentially restricted from nursing service, owing to their parents’ fears of physical danger and social denigration. Lost Cause myth also maintained a united homefront, which was free of class divisions; however, class fundamentally defined the Confederate nursing experience. Lost Cause myth promoted Confederate nurses’ labor at the bedside of wounded soldiers, but Confederate nursing encompassed more than hospital work. Finally, Lost Cause myth affirmed Confederate nurses’ absolute loyalty to Southern independence. While Confederate nurses did have faith in the cause, they all too often came into conflict with and lamented the Confederacy’s inefficient centralized government because the desperate needs of their patients went unfulfilled.⁴ If Mark Twain’s *The Gilded Age* captured the Lost Cause nursing myth, stating that “in the late war we saw the most delicate women, who could not at home endure the sight of blood, become so used to scenes of carnage, that they walked the hospitals and the margins of battlefields, amid the poor remnants of torn humanity, with as perfect self-possession as if they were strolling in a flower garden,” then *Gone With the Wind* depicted the average experience of elite female Confederates during the war in the person of Scarlett O’Hara, who

4 Drew Gilpin Faust, *Mothers of Invention: Women of the Slaveholding South in the American Civil War* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1996), 92-112.

ran away from assisting with an amputation and screamed "I'm going home! I've done enough! I don't want any more men dying!"⁵

Scarlett O'Hara's meltdown in the face of medical butchery would have confirmed the suspicions of Confederate polite society, especially men, that women by nature were not suited for nursing. Lost Cause myth emphasized the South's calling upon women to make sacrifices for their country and, hence, women answered that call by nursing the country's injured defenders. Myth overlooked the fact that Confederate women were challenged as to their right to nurse until necessity demanded their acceptance. Opposition to elite white women's nursing service hinged upon established Southern gender roles that dictated female subordination and male protection.⁶ Southern womanhood required domesticity, purity, modesty, and delicacy, but the role of nurse implied none of these characteristics.⁷ In 1861, hospitals were considered to be squalid and only served the so-called dregs of society; therefore, elite Confederate women who entered hospital service would jeopardize their reputations. Moreover, the physical strain and emotional stress of nursing would be too exhausting for delicate females.⁸ Elite white women certainly nursed sick relatives and slaves, but they were not wanted in the masculine environment coexisting with military nursing. Instead, they should stay home and knit socks or roll bandages as their nursing contribution. Justification had to be found before Confederate women were accepted as nurses.

Faced with the unforeseen demands of an escalating war,

5 Mark Twain and Charles Dudley Warner, *The Gilded Age* (New York: Penguin Classics Series, 2001), 101; *Gone With the Wind*, DVD.

6 Nina Silber, *Gender and the Sectional Conflict* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2008), 13.

7 Cheryl A. Wells, "Battle Time: Gender, Modernity, and Confederate Hospitals," *Journal of Social History* 35, no. 2 (Winter 2001): 409, JSTOR, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3790195>.

8 Mary Elizabeth Massey, *Bonnet Brigades* (New York: Alfred Knopf, 1966), 44.

particularly massive casualty rates which resulted in lost manpower and the lack of trained medical personnel in the South, necessity took priority over traditional female gender limitations and allowed women to nurse, a transformation supported by the example of Florence Nightingale. She served as a British nurse in the Crimean War of 1853-1856 and, in the process, single-handedly changed nursing into an acceptable profession because of her elite social position and according personal respectability. Her example determined that Confederate women's virtue and compassionate nature enabled them to perform nursing service.⁹ Even so, a stigma remained attached to Confederate female nurses, as their memoirs attested, and many men and women in Confederate society felt that "nurses were not truly women, but in some sense men in drag."¹⁰

Some of the Confederacy's most famous nurses had reservations about their service and its impact upon their life. Phoebe Yates Pember was a widow of high social standing from Charleston, South Carolina, who worked as a nurse at the Confederacy's flagship hospital – Richmond, Virginia's Chimborazo complex. Yet, upon entering service, she considered that "the natural idea that such a life would be in injurious to the delicacy and refinement of a lady – that her nature would become deteriorated and her sensibilities blunted, was rather appalling."¹¹ Unlike Pember, Kate Cumming, arguably the Confederacy's best-known nurse, faced opposition rather than expressing anxiety about nursing's propriety. A twenty-seven-year-old resident of Mobile, Alabama, Cumming began nursing in Corinth, Mississippi after the battle of Shiloh. Her well-off

9 Faust, *Mothers of Invention*, 92-95.

10 Drew Gilpin Faust, "Altars of Sacrifice: Confederate Women and the Narratives of War," *Journal of American History* 76, no. 4 (March 1990): 1216, JSTOR, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2936595>.

11 Phoebe Yates Pember, *A Southern Woman's Story: Life in Confederate Richmond*, ed. Bell Irvin Wiley (Jackson, TN: McCowat-Mercer Press, 1959), 25.

family opposed her decision to volunteer for nursing duty, but Cumming replied, "I wonder what Miss Nightingale and the hundreds of refined ladies of Great Britain who went to the Crimea, would say to that!"¹² After a year of nursing duty, Cumming admitted that "scarcely a day passes that I do not hear some derogatory remarks about the ladies who are in the hospitals, until I think, if there is any credit due them at all, it is for the moral courage they have in braving public opinion."¹³ Overall, Confederate women believed that they faced a choice: to nurse and serve the cause or to preserve their genteel status.

Given the opposition to elite Confederate women's nursing, the question of how many Confederate women actually served as nurses during the war naturally arose. Lost Cause myth generated the notion that every elite woman in the South did her duty and "taught [her] fair, and heretofore, rather idle fingers to work for the soldiers [and went] into the hospital and attended to the sick and wounded."¹⁴ It has been difficult to accurately count the number of nurses since the Confederacy lacked an official management organization such as the United States Sanitary Commission.¹⁵ According to a recent survey of Confederate nurses, elites represented a small percentage of total female hospital workers – a direct contradiction of the Lost Cause story.¹⁶ If white elite women did not comprise the majority of Confederate nurses, the Confederacy must have relied upon a group of individuals that Lost Cause myth consciously chose

12 Kate Cumming, *Kate: The Journal of a Confederate Nurse*, ed. Richard Barksdale Harwell (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1959), xii.

13 *Ibid.*, 178.

14 A Lady of North Carolina, "The South Expects Every Woman to Do Her Duty," *The Old Guard* 4, no. 8 (August 1866): 483, Cornell University Library Making of America Collection, <http://digital.library.cornell.edu/cgi/t/text/text-idx?c=oldg;idno=oldg0004-8>.

15 Anne L. Austin, "Nurses in American History: Wartime Volunteers: 1861-1865," *American Journal of Nursing* 75, no. 5 (May 1975): 818, JSTOR, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3423465>.

16 Jane E. Schultz, *Women at the Front: Hospital Workers in Civil War America* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2004), 21.

to overlook.

The Lost Cause myth of Confederate nursing stated that female nurses most often had patrician backgrounds. In its postwar "Tribute to the Ladies," the *Staunton Spectator* proclaimed that "whosoever shall write the story of those times, will slander his theme if he assign not to the ladies of the South – and God bless them! – a peculiar merit and a special praise."¹⁷ Thus, only "ladies" made up the population of the Confederacy's women nurses in the Lost Cause narrative. In reality, the Confederate nursing workforce relied upon men, especially convalescent soldiers, slaves, and white lower-class women rather than elite white women.¹⁸ The average nurse was a male soldier, either assigned to a specific regiment or already in a hospital and in presumably better physical condition than the newly wounded. Among the Confederacy's nurses, the male-to-female ratio was five to one.¹⁹ Kate Cumming signified the small percentage of elite white women who served as nurses; however, she would have been referred to as a "matron" instead of "nurse" owing to her social status. "Matron" conveyed the proper respectability and authority due elite white women, whereas "nurse" was common.²⁰ Overall, Confederate hospitals were dependent upon the labor of white lower-class women and slaves. Slaves were forced to perform the most difficult hospital work, often hired out by their owners for a profit or meals in exchange for their work. Male slaves usually served as custodians and lifted or transported patients, while female slaves typically

¹⁷ "Tribute to the Ladies," *Staunton Spectator*, 2, The Valley of the Shadow Project.

¹⁸ Massey, *Bonnet Brigades*, 48.

¹⁹ Marilyn Mayer Culpepper and Pauline Gordon Adams, "Nursing in the Civil War," *American Journal of Nursing* 88, no. 7 (July 1988): 982, *JSTOR*, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3425867>.

²⁰ Jane E. Schultz, "The Inhospitable Hospital: Gender and Professionalism in Civil War Medicine," *Signs* 17, no. 2 (Winter 1992): 370, *JSTOR*, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3174468>.

cooked and washed the patients' linens.²¹ The sphere of Confederate nursing included all classes and black and white, but, ironically, elite white women maintained their higher status and, hence, helped to shape Lost Cause myth.

The 1862 Hospital Act was instrumental in shaping the Lost Cause myth of elite white female nursing. Extensive casualties suffered by the Confederacy in 1861 from disease, such as typhoid, prompted the Confederate Congress to investigate if the government's medical response was sufficient. The designated committee found a dire lack of personnel was hindering the medical response.²² Who better to fill the gap than elite white women, who already nursed their families and slaves and exhibited moral respectability lacking in lower-class white women and slaves? On September 27, 1862, by act of the Confederate Congress, women were allowed into military hospitals, with commanding surgeons employing two matrons, two assistant matrons, and two ward matrons.²³ This act endorsed the hiring of elite Confederate women by using the term "matron" and inferred that white lower-class women would be subservient in hospitals. From this act, the myth of tremendous numbers of elite white Confederate women patriotically answering the call of their country was born. However, elite white women did not answer that call and chose to do their nursing in a different and much more refined fashion.

In 1862, Mary Chesnut, who considered herself to be the South's most elite woman, went to a hospital in Richmond with a "carriageload of

21 Schultz, *Women at the Front*, 17-21.

22 H. H. Cunningham, "Confederate General Hospitals: Establishment and Organization," *Journal of Southern History* 20, no. 3 (August 1954): 376-78, JSTOR, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2955156>.

23 United States War Department, *The War of the Rebellion: A Compilation of the Official Records of the Union and Confederate Armies* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1880-1901), series 2, 4: 199-200.

180 Articles

peaches and grapes [and] made glad the hearts of some men thereby."²⁴ While Lost Cause myth has women as ministering angels at the bedside of wounded soldiers, Mary Chesnut was performing nursing duty when she distributed fruit to Richmond's wounded. So was Grace Brown Elmore, the twenty-one year old daughter of an elite South Carolina family, who recorded in her diary in 1864 that, "on Fridays I am always much engaged, cooking in the morning for the hospital."²⁵ Nursing was not restricted to healing men; rather, it encompassed multiple endeavors, from hospital visiting to hosting patients with minor injuries. Hospital visiting was the most prevalent type of nursing that elite women performed. Visitors read to patients, wrote letters to loved ones, and, above all, brought "delicacies" such as fruits, desserts, and buttermilk.²⁶ Although visiting was socially applauded, elite women prized hosting soldiers who had only minor injuries and were of the South's upper-crust. "In Richmond, when the hospitals were crowded, the women earnestly besought permission to take the men to their houses and to care for them there, as especially honored guests."²⁷ Most Confederate elite women were far from the battlefield, instead "nursing" close to home. Those elite women who ventured afield found different circumstances than what their counterparts at home experienced.

According to Lost Cause myth, Confederate nurses on the battlefield and in military hospitals were calm and clean, often pictured in pristine white clothing. A realistic depiction of battlefield nursing would include "the nauseating smells, the brutal summer heat, the floors coated

24 Chesnut, *Mary Chesnut's Civil War*, 155.

25 Grace Brown Elmore, *Heritage of Woe: The Civil War Diary of Grace Brown Elmore, 1861-1868*, ed. Marli F. Weiner (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1997), 73.

26 Faust, *Mothers of Invention*, 102-4.

27 George Cary Eggleston, "A Rebel's Recollections, III," *Atlantic Monthly* 34, no. 202 (August 1874): 166, Cornell University Library Making of America Collection, <http://digital.library.cornell.edu/cgi/t/text/text-idx?c=atla;idno=atla0034-2>.

with blood, and the thick swarms of black flies that tormented patients and attendants alike."²⁸ Rats beleaguered Phoebe Yates Pember, matron of the hospital servicing the battlefield wounded in Virginia. She wrote "the coldest day in winter, and the hottest in summer, made no apparent difference in their vivacious strategy. They ate all the poultices applied during the night to the sick, and dragged away the pads stuffed with bran from under the arms and legs of the wounded."²⁹ While harsh living conditions severely affected nurses, battlefield casualties caused greater emotional suffering. When Kate Cumming treated her first wounded soldiers after the battle of Shiloh, she recorded in her diary that "nothing that I had ever heard or read had given me the faintest idea of the horrors witnessed here." Cumming described men lying everywhere, "just as they were brought in from the battlefield. The foul air from this mass of human beings at first made me giddy and sick, but I soon got over it When we give the men anything [we] kneel, in blood and water; but we think nothing of it."³⁰ Cumming confirmed that nursing was the work of death and had little to do with romance.

Perhaps the greatest Lost Cause myth was the notion that young nurses found romance among their wounded patients. Young elite white women were restricted from nursing, owing to their parents' fears of physical danger and social denigration. It was feared young elite women would improperly come into contact with undressed soldiers, contract diseases, and suffer mental anguish as they had been sheltered from life's unpleasantness.³¹ Sarah Morgan, a privileged nineteen-year-old

28 Edwin C. Bridges, "Juliet Opie Hopkins and Alabama's Civil War Hospitals in Richmond, Virginia," *Alabama Review* 53, no. 2 (April 2000): 89-90.

29 Pember, *A Southern Woman's Story*, 84-85.

30 Cumming, *Journal of a Confederate Nurse*, 14-15.

31 Victoria E. Ott, *Confederate Daughters: Coming of Age During the Civil War* (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 2008), 50.

182 Articles

from Baton Rouge, Louisiana, was prevented from nursing by her family. She complained in June 1862 that, “not a square off ... lie more than a hundred sick soldiers. If I was independent, if I could work my own will I would not be poring over this stupid page I would stand by some forsaken man and bid him Godspeed when he closes his dying eyes. Yet it is as impossible as though I was a chained bear. Father seems to think our conduct reflects on him, there is no alternative.”³² Young elite women were kept from nursing since their families feared that their status would be tarnished by interaction with the “lower” classes of soldiers and white lower-class nurses. Class division was further reflected in interactions between elite white female matrons and their lower-class subordinates in hospitals across the South.

Lost Cause myth defined a united homefront, which was free of class divisions; yet, class delineated the Confederate nursing experience. Designations of “cook” and “laundress” were applied to slave women and white lower-class women, whereas elite Confederate nursing women such as Kate Cumming enjoyed the genteel title of “matron.”³³ In her diary, matron Phoebe Yates Pember records her lower-class ward nurses did not fulfill their responsibilities, with one nurse refusing to work, sitting around and spitting snuff into a spittoon.³⁴ Class divided nurses, with elite matrons like Pember expecting that lower-class nurses, as part of the “common class of respectable servants,” would be “amenable to authority.”³⁵ When lower-class nurses did not show proper deference, matrons readily condemned them; however, those same genteel matrons expressed their own defiance of authority by criticizing the Confederacy.

32 Sarah Morgan, *The Civil War Diary of Sarah Morgan*, ed. Charles East (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1991), 123-24.

33 Schultz, “The Inhospitable Hospital,” 370.

34 Pember, *A Southern Woman's Story*, 49-52.

35 Pember, *A Southern Woman's Story*, 47.

Ultimately, myth affirmed elite white female nurses' absolute loyalty to the "cause." Elite nurses had faith in the Confederacy, but often felt themselves to be in conflict with it because of the unfulfilled needs of their patients. Kate Cumming was deeply patriotic, but she criticized the government's denial of medical supplies and foodstuffs for wounded soldiers. Cumming was forced to go door-to-door after battles and ask local civilians for any spare food.³⁶ Elite nurses found themselves frustrated with Confederate bureaucracy and took action into their own hands, as did Mary Rutledge Fogg, an elite Nashvillian who told President Jefferson Davis that she had witnessed 50 gallant soldiers die because they lacked proper nurses. Therefore, he should expect to receive her corps of nurses in Virginia to care for Tennessee's soldiers – whether he liked it or not.³⁷ Lost Cause myth obscured elite white nurses' conflict with the Confederacy, preferring "ministering angels" over discouraged personnel.

In the end, the war's greatest impact was upon the individual nurse of the Confederacy. Cornelia Peake McDonald of Winchester, Virginia confessed that "nursing proved more than she could stand." She affirmed "at the sight of one face that the surgeon uncovered, telling me that it must be washed, I thought I should faint." She "tried to say yes, but the thought of it made me so faint that I could only stagger towards the door."³⁸ Like McDonald, countless Confederate nurses felt their desire to heal become engulfed by the ghastly nature of total war. On the other hand, Kate Cumming expressed the view of a minority of nurses that they had to act in the face of unparalleled slaughter. Cumming wrote, "are

we aware of all this, and unwilling to nurse these brave heroes who are

³⁶ Jessica Fordham Kidd, "Patriotism over Propriety: Confederate Nurse Kate Cumming," *Alabama Heritage*, no. 89 (Summer 2008): 31.

³⁷ Faust, *Mothers of Invention*, 94.

³⁸ Cornelia Peak McDonald, *A Woman's Civil War: A Diary, with Reminiscences of the War, from March 1862*, ed. Minrose C. Gwin (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1992), 38.

184 Articles

sacrificing so much for us? What, in the name of common sense are we to do? Sit calmly down, knowing that there is many a parched lip which would bless us for a drop of water, and many a wound to be bound up?"³⁹ Confederate female nursing was characterized by harsh condemnation and exaggerated tributes, but a candid judgment of the experience must state that nurses did their best and consequently elevated their service from myth to heroism.

39 Cumming, *Journal of a Confederate Nurse*, 65-66.

BOOK REVIEWS

186 Book Reviews

David Grimsted. *American Mobbing, 1828-1861: Toward Civil War* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999).

In *American Mobbing*, author David Grimsted takes a broad look at communal violence in the period prior to the Civil War, and compares Northern and Southern era mob activity. He argues that at the heart of these twelve-hundred-plus mobs was slavery, and that these conflicts were part of the accepted political process. The first in a two-part series and product of twenty-seven years of research, *American Mobbing* received generally favorable reviews in the *Journal of American History*, *The American Historical Review*, and the *Journal of the Early Republic*. The author received his PhD from the University of California at Berkeley, and has written two other social histories of the same period, as well as co-authored a textbook on American History. David Grimsted is currently Professor of History at the University of Maryland.

American Mobbing opens with a focus on the North, and the partisan politics surrounding Andrew Jackson's presidency. Grimsted finds that Northern Whigs supported abolition speakers, and by and large, Democrats were the rioters. Jackson, though personally exhibiting vigilante behavior, condemned the rule of "mob law," and three times sent troops to stop riots. There were riots against banks, mail fraud, and Catholics, but these merely foreshadow the violent wave which began in 1835 with the abolition movement's mail campaign. The postal enterprise ignited Southern outrage and widespread Northern opposition. There was both rioting against abolitionists and those for fugitive slaves. Southern press began literally calling for the heads of the abolitionists, and Northerners took offense at the breach in free speech. Thereafter, Grimsted argues, two separate patterns emerged in the increasingly contentious sections. He proposes that the differences consisted of "the distinction between property and person as focus of attack, the number of deaths, the situation of those who died in riot, the actions of officials, and the differing quotients of sadism" (13). While Northern racism was strong, as evidenced by the race riots, Yankees were also as likely to view Southern fanaticism as appalling as the anarchist views in the abolitionist camps (30). Press stories about the enforcement of the Fugitive Slave Law caused many to reevaluate their politics. Thereafter, Democrats in free states became increasingly conscious that they were defending a losing cause, while many in the South escalated the amount of violent deaths.

The heart of the author's work focuses on this Southern violence, and how it both derived from slavery and steered Northern sentiment towards war. While the number of incidents and deaths are nearly equal in both sections of the country, deaths in the South were the objective, and mobs were often led by public officials; property damage was the objective in the North, where deaths were often the result of police action. Grimsted correctly states that "Public murder and intimidation took on added vigor

from a society where status and character were tied to mastery, to the numbers of people over whom one wielded unquestioned domination" (98). While violence was not condoned by all south of the Mason-Dixon, many executions were witnessed in this "Southern spectator sport" (Over two-thousand were present for a public burning of a freedman convicted of murder in St. Louis) (95). The author convincingly argues that "mob activity, like personal violence, was less an attack on legality than an alternative system of securing justice...honest was the argument that mobs avoided the law's delays and circumvented the monetary influences within it...there was far less equal justice under the law than justice for sale" (110). Surprisingly, of the three types of mobs which Grimsted describes, the anti-abolition mobs were the least violent, while mobs intent on punishing criminals (such as gamblers or counterfeiters) were highly effective in gaining execution, and were often unopposed by lawmen. This power in numbers was also successful in squelching any opposition voice, a third type of mob that the author terms "scare mobs." He chronicles the struggle of both black and white opposition to the violence, and describes how each was silenced. "The murder of the helpless proved proslavery power and rightness...the burned bodies paid silent testimony to God's sanction of the human sacrifice gleefully offered" (177).

The final section focuses on political rioting. "Cities were the centers of greatest violence and corruption, but in all sections, American antebellum politics was a tough and professional profit-making sport" (198). From Philadelphia to St. Louis, from Charleston to New Orleans, elections were commonly "a hell's holiday of drunkenness and perjury and bludgeons" (198). The introduction of the "Know-Nothing" Party further muddied the waters, and triggered even more violence with its anti-immigrant stance, and the threat of further division in the South. The culmination of the sectional mob systems and politics was "bloody Kansas," where they would "meet, mingle, and mangle" (246). "The importance of Kansas lay less in its bloodshed than in its political reverberations, as the country became divided on a sectional basis between controlling parties" at odds over slavery (247). In this western arena, Southern interests would sacrifice all other rights to promote slavery, while Northerners increasingly condemned of both the South and the Democratic Party.

American Mobbing is the result of much research and is a valuable tool in understanding the American political violence that led towards Civil War. T.C. Buchanan states in his review that "while Grimsted's research is magnificent, his awkward presentation diminishes the power of his book... he is remarkably erudite on every page, but the sum of his insights is not as meaningful as its parts."¹ The major themes are often lost as he details the multitude of riots throughout. Though the book is divided into three sections, his organization is weak, neither following a chronological nor

1. Thomas C. Buchanan, Review: *American Mobbing 1828-1861: Toward Civil War* by David Grimsted. *Journal of Social History* 33, No. 3 (Spring, 2000): 760.

188 Book Reviews

a thematic order. Perhaps his greatest failure is to provide easy access to his quantification, hence forcing you to accept his analysis without seeing the results. He also takes a decidedly pro-Northern stance, condemning Southern violence, while concurrently condoning violence as a necessary evil as long as it is perpetuated by an abolitionist, who supported the “proper moral cause” (128). In spite of his interpretive failures, this social history by Grimsted poses many questions about the causes of personal violence and how that is tied to many sectional crises and the Civil War.

Jeshua Hinton

Joyce Appleby. *Inheriting the Revolution: The First Generation of Americans* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2000).

In *Inheriting the Revolution*, Joyce Appleby attempts to isolate the “first generation of Americans,” by which she means those born between 1776 and 1800. This generation, according to Appleby, faced a unique challenge. They developed in a period shortly after the Revolution and lacked any kind of example regarding their situation, created by events of which they had no first hand experience. In this climate, the first generation of Americans established the intellectual and social environment that would become the American vision. Appleby, a highly acclaimed writer and Professor of History at UCLA, relies primarily on a group of sources that she feels has not been fully examined. In researching numerous individuals from this “cohort,” she draws from over two hundred contemporary autobiographies from ordinary individuals, as well as a wide variety of secondary and primary sources.

Appleby examines many different facets of life in Post-Revolutionary America. Each chapter addresses a particular topic, including politics, economics, social class, interpersonal relationships, and reform efforts. Appleby seems more at home when addressing political and economic topics—her area of expertise. It is in these early chapters of the book that her analysis rings true. In keeping with her previous research, Appleby asserts that “far more than Andrew Jackson, Jefferson and his supporters democratized American politics.” This period is characterized by the failure of the elitist politics of the Federalist Party, a consequence of the revolutionary rejection of tradition and authority. The opening of economic opportunity, made possible by the shedding of colonial economic

controls, set about a change in the American mindset and undermined traditional class distinction. In both politics and economics, the emergence of individualism gave rise to a more participatory attitude among citizens.

Isolating the "cohort" from the revolutionary period and the Jacksonian period is a novel concept. Appleby attempts to prove that this generation laid the foundation for the reality born out of the ideology of the Revolution. Unfortunately, her attempt falls flat for one important reason. The "first Americans" did not live in a vacuum, isolated from those that came before or after them. Instead, they lived consecutively with those who *did* have first hand experiences from the Revolution, as well as those who would play an important role later in American history. By claiming that it was the first generation that cultivated individualism in politics and economics, Appleby ignores the colonial aspirations for the same goals. The narrative that she offers is a microcosm in a long, gradual evolution in thought.

There is another problem with Appleby's analysis. The set of ideas that she purports to be created by the "cohort" ignores a large part of the population. By relying primarily on autobiographies, she limits the range of ideas to those who were sufficiently successful enough in early America to warrant an autobiography. Those who were not successful do not appear in her narrative. Also, autobiographies tend to be self-congratulatory and generally positive. Appleby recognizes these shortcomings and claims in her preface that she takes them into account, but despite that, the narrative she weaves seems to take the contemporary accounts at their face value. In addition, various groups in American society lack the attention she gives to successful northerners. While she is careful to mention African Americans and women, she neglects to seriously address the experiences of unsuccessful whites and Native Americans. But the most serious deficiency is her analysis (or lack thereof) of white Southerners.

No one can deny the divergence of Southern and Northern life in early America. Inherent economic differences, primarily the result of slavery, created a tremendous difference in Southern and Northern society. Appleby misses an excellent opportunity to critically examine these differences. Instead of carefully researching and classifying societal developments in the South the same way she did for the North, Appleby writes off the South as a regional anomaly that rejected the new American ideology in favor of more traditional and conservative ideas. Their reliance on slavery handicapped the South, where people were unwilling to accept the new ideas that would destroy their way of life. Appleby's characterizations of the South are general. None of the anecdotal examples that compose her narrative of early America come from prominent Southerners. It is true that the dearth of written sources from the South limits the available pool of resources, but the implication that there are no such sources reflects badly on Appleby's analytical effort.

The second half of *Inheriting the Revolution* focuses primarily on

social history. Through religious revivals and an increase in social reform movements, ordinary people activated new norms based on individualism in the absence of traditional norms based on authority. In the chapters addressing careers and intimate relations, Appleby demonstrates how the rejection of authority altered the family life as well. Young Americans cast off their traditional family roles. Many took jobs outside of the home that were created by new economic opportunities. Others left the home entirely to explore the new country, traveling to the newly opened frontier to the West. The individualism and freedom that characterized the new political system led to individualism and freedom in the family as well, although Appleby points out that in the South, sons remained closely tied to their fathers. Without any firm social control from the government, new freedom sparked a host of activity that appeared uncivilized to many. Particularly, consumption of alcohol and rejection of traditional religious authority inspired reform movements across the country. Through individual initiative, citizens formed groups, wrote constitutions, and appealed to individuals to adhere to republican ideals.

The most important reform came from religious revival. The Second Great Awakening had a tremendous effect on the development of American society. Preachers from numerous denominations spoke against the godlessness and sinful nature that pervaded society. These new denominations rejected religious authority characteristic of the old world. In particular, new Christians rejected authoritarian Calvinist doctrines in favor of more democratic theology and practices. No less important was the abolitionist movement, which, partially tied to the religious reform efforts, made tremendous strides in the North, though not in the South. An underlying theme in the development of American society is the importance of improved transportation and communication. Democratic participation in society as a whole, but particularly in reform efforts, depended on these innovations to garner support across wide geographical areas.

Taken as a whole, Appleby's work cannot easily be classified into a particular historiographical school. While the bulk of the material comes from individual stories, including the perspectives of slaves, freedmen, women, and others typically ignored by consensus historians and championed by social historians, the stories she imparts are from exceptional people who achieved success. Also, her primary focus is not on their individual stories. Instead, she is interested in the stories as examples of the ideological changes that occurred during this transitional period in American history. Her entire argument is that a consensus of ideas was formed by the first generation of Americans which threw off the traditions of social, political, and economic authority. As such, she uses the mode of a social historian to achieve the aims of a neo-consensus historian.

Forrest McDonald. *States' Rights and the Union: Imperium in Imperio* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2000).

Forrest McDonald, professor emeritus of history at the University of Alabama, writes "Of all the problems that beset the United States of America during the century from the Declaration of Independence to the end of Reconstruction, the most pervasive concerned disagreements about the nature of the Union and the line to be drawn between the authority of the general government and that of the several states," (vii). Despite the importance of this issue, McDonald knows of no comprehensive survey on this subject, which he hopes to rectify with this work.

The key to McDonald's argument can be found in his subtitle. Roughly translated, *imperium in imperio* means "sovereignty within sovereignty." To better understand the battle between state and federal government, McDonald believes one must understand this view of divided sovereignty. He succinctly explores the British view of sovereignty under Parliament, which was an unlimited sovereignty, that resulted in an indivisible sovereignty. To do otherwise would destroy sovereignty itself. While a sovereign, whether a monarch or a representative body, such as England's Parliament, had the ability to delegate certain powers to other representatives or bodies, the power to rule lay ultimately with the sovereign.

American colonists, McDonald argues, saw it differently. The unofficial policy of salutary neglect by the British government ushered in the idea of divided sovereignty. Loyalty to the Crown, not the legislative power of Parliament, held the British Empire together and created sovereignty over some areas of colonial life, but not all. Without direct representation in Parliament, immediate sovereignty over the colonies fell to the various colonial legislatures. After the American Revolution, this idea of divided sovereignty devolved upon the state and national governments, first under the Articles of Confederation, then the Constitution.

McDonald divides the rest of his study roughly along presidential terms in office. He traces the argument between those who favored a strict construction view of the Constitution, which favored the states, and a loose construction view, which favored those who saw the national, or federal, government as having preeminence. What immediately becomes apparent is that this view is extremely fluid. The side upon which one fell in the argument depended upon one's goals. It was not uncommon for politicians to swing between strict and loose construction. For example, James Madison held to a loose construction interpretation during the Constitutional Convention and when defending the document in *The Federalist*. Yet, just a scant ten years later, he swung over to a strict constructionist view in his authorship of the *Virginia Resolution*. On the other hand, John C. Calhoun early on, was a staunch nationalist, yet when southern slaveholders perceived an attack upon that "peculiar institution,"

192 Book Reviews

he became the champion of states' rights.

McDonald offers a study that consists largely of secondary, rather than primary sources. By doing so, McDonald's work is more a general survey than a plowing of furrowed ground. However, this should not be construed as an indictment against this work. Rather, McDonald does an excellent job in using these sources to explain not only the political arguments of the various parties, but also the judicial ones. The main concern with the book is, while devoting the lion's share to the states' rights argument from 1776 to 1877, the next 130 years are given short shrift. McDonald devotes only his epilogue, totaling a scant eleven pages, to this time period. A second volume, devoted to the exploration of the states' rights argument after its major defeat in the Civil War, seems to be warranted. Nevertheless, this offering, which remains true to McDonald's Neo-Progressive historiography, is an essential addition to the study of the states' rights argument throughout the years, providing the student with a starting point from which to launch an in-depth look at the subject.

John Griffin

Sterling F. Delano. *Brook Farm: The Dark Side of Utopia* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2004).

The inherent scandal that a subtitle such as *The Dark Side of Utopia* suggests will leave readers who pick up Sterling F. Delano's *Brook Farm* looking for debauchery amongst the members of this communal living experiment sorely disappointed. Readers will find no dark secrets stashed among the pages of this book. What they will find, however, is a chronological narrative that follows the Brook Farm community from its founding in 1841, to its undesired abandonment in 1847. The book, which Delano claims is "not only a corrective study," but "a revisionary one as well," attempts to fix the problems that he finds with the work of Lindsay Swift, who was, until Delano, the only real chronicler of the Brook Farm community (xi). Here, Delano suggests that Brook Farm's failure was the result of natural phenomena and mounting debt, rather than the adoption of Fourierism, as Swift had previously suggested.

According to Delano, the initial idea for Brook Farm grew out of the Transcendental movement that had developed among a second generation of Unitarian ministers in New England. One such minister, George Ripley, was at the forefront of this movement. He became quite disenchanted with the nature of ministerial service. But religious woes were not his only concern, for he also desired reform for the society in which he lived. Of the

New England that Ripley observed, he stated that the “great danger of our country...is the inordinate pursuit, the extravagant worship of wealth.” (8) With this spirit of worldly and institutional rejection in tow, Ripley would resign his position as minister at Purchase Street Church in Boston, convinced that he would be able to serve God in a better way. His new service would be removed from the wealth driven society and from those who attacked the Transcendentalist rejection of traditional Christianity.

Ripley’s vision for a reformed society began with the hasty purchase of the Ellis Dairy Farm. Having garnered some support from a few investors, most notably the famous Nathaniel Hawthorne, the experiment placed the “community’s capital stock [at] \$12,000” (69). The cost of purchasing the Ellis Farm, however, was \$10, 500, expending all but \$2,000 of the money pledged to Ripley’s vision. In light of such financial records, it is evident that monetary pressures plagued the Brook Farm community from the onset. With this in mind, it seems ironic that George Ripley, a man who wanted to reject the pursuit of wealth in favor of a more person-oriented communal environment, spent the majority of his time worrying about continually procuring money so as to keep his community alive.

Delano is careful not to let the foreknowledge of the community’s inevitable decline make his story one of failure, though. Instead, he presents the Brook Farmer’s (as the residents of this community were called) as hopeful reformists who strove to create meaningful lives for themselves here. Far from what the book’s subtitle suggests, Delano relates a relatively peaceable and happy bunch of Farmers who enjoyed living together. Such a sentiment is even evident in mundane events like mealtimes. Rebecca Codman, a lesser known Farmer, “remembered years later that mealtimes were a ‘pleasant social time; all joined in making the time spent at our meals the pleasantest part of the day’s intercourse’” (174). The Farmers agreeable attitudes were also cultivated through the belief that “all labor was sacred” (66). Men and women would be paid the same wages for a day’s work, and would also be able to choose what type of work they did. Therefore, women could chose to do manual labor, while men tended to domestic affairs, and vice versa. Further adding to the agreeable nature of the Brook Farmers was the fact that their constitution “guaranteed religious freedom and promised ‘perfect religious tolerance’” (243).

As Delano initially presents things, Brook Farm does seem as if it was the very utopia that Ripley hoped it to be. But there were those who were less enchanted with the Farm. Nathaniel Hawthorne, though originally a supporter of the experiment, had reservations towards the community. And Henry David Thoreau’s visit made him “more determined than ever not to compromise his independence for the purported conveniences of Associative life” (134). Dissenters were not the real problem, however. Again, financial pressures presented themselves to the Farmers, forcing them to join the Fourierist movement on January 7, 1844. Somehow, the brilliant Ripley had failed to capitalize on the exceptional school that had

been created at Brook Farm that could most likely have staved off any further financial troubles. Instead of utilizing the school, the community joined a larger majority of New Englanders who were attracted to Charles Fourier's social ideas, inviting artisans and workingmen into the community. Their motives for hoping to become America's model phalanx (Fourier's ideal social community), were aimed at gaining funding from wealthy New York Fourierists in order to keep the Farm going. These hopes were never realized. An outbreak of smallpox in November of 1845, as well as a fire that destroyed the newly built phalanstry (a Fourierist community's central dwelling place) a few months later, would create financial pressures that proved to be fatal. By early 1847, the community was all but abandoned.

Ultimately, Delano's *Brook Farm: The Dark Side of Utopia* serves to study the rise and fall of Brook Farm as representative of the Transcendental movement as a whole. It is a metaphorical kind of study, as should be expected from Delano, a professor of American Literature. Since Delano is a literary scholar and not a historian, it is almost impossible to fit him into any one school of historiographical thought, though he might fall into the Revisionist school (as is his own admission). And while Delano does seek to revise Swift's argument, he also hopes to suggest that although the experiment was a failure, this should not distract reader from the Farmer's successes. Although the community's existence was short, the strides made towards women's rights, progressive education, and an egalitarian society did have quite the lasting impact.

Sam Burcham

Mary Kelley. *Learning to Stand and Speak* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2006).

Mary Kelley's premise for *Learning to Stand and Speak* is the idea that women in post-Revolutionary America through the antebellum era were the makers and shapers of public opinion in what she has termed "civil society" through the process of education. Through education women were able to pursue careers in writing, editing and teaching in ways they never had before. Through those avenues and in their roles as wives, mothers, sisters, and aunts women became the primary shapers of republican citizenship. Kelley defines civil society as, ". . . any and all publics except those dedicated to the organized politics constituted in political parties and elections . . . with the rights and obligations of citizenship from the rest of the nation's inhabitants." (5). She uses the term "gendered republicanism" to give a name to the role women

would play in the young nation (25).

Kelley uses an abundance of both primary and secondary sources. It would be impossible to discuss all her sources; however, she uses the records from the generous number of female academies that sprang up during this time period. She repeatedly mentions Sarah Pierce's Litchfield Female Academy, Mt Holyoke Seminary, and Rutgers Female Institute to name a few. She also uses periodicals from that era, particularly *Godey's Lady's Book*. She accessed records from various literary and benevolent societies as well as papers and books from notable female authors of the time. She mentions in particular Margaret Fuller, Harriet Beecher Stowe, Sarah Josepha Hale, and even Caroline Lee Hentz.

As the nation grew, the elite social classes began educating their daughters as well as their sons. The rise of the female academies during this era gave birth to a new generation of well educated women. Female academies were literally popping up everywhere. Interestingly the curricula for these academies were almost identical to those at universities such as Yale. This was what made them so attractive to the elite of that era. Women were being taught geography, physics, and moral philosophy along with languages like French and Latin. It was a belief at that time that for a woman to be a good partner for the well educated young man, she too should be well educated. The good wife should be a good representative of her family when attending various salons and teas. She should also be able to educate her sons and daughters in the proper ways of good republican citizenship so that they too might take their rightful place in civil society. However began to desire to use their newfound knowledge in more ways than just being a helpmate to a husband. Women began writing, editing, and teaching.

Writing, editing, and teaching were essentially the only lucrative ways in which a woman could really use her education during the post-Revolutionary era. That being said, a woman had to be extremely careful when writing for publication. A woman did not want to be seen as too full of herself or too academic. She did not want to appear to have the desire to actually be an author. She did not want to appear more intelligent than the men around her, as this could lead to social catastrophe. Many women began to form literary societies so they could continue to read, discuss, write, and evaluate various forms of literature. Novels were not included in the list of acceptable forms of literature. Novels were taboo and thought to bring about flights of fancy and cause women to forget their household duties. Novels were dangerous and could make the imagination run wild. They were not discussed seriously in literary societies, and most women would have been embarrassed to admit they enjoyed reading them. Literary societies were one vehicle for shaping public opinion and instilling republicanism. However, a woman did not want to be called *bas bleu* or "bluestocking." This term implied that she was an intellectual (gasp!) and thought herself just as intelligent as men or heaven forbid even more so. The

196 Book Reviews

term came into use as a reference to the Blue Stockings Society in mid 18th century England. This was a literary society for the most elite intellectuals of that period. Over time, the term came to have more negative connotations, and in post-Revolutionary America, most women tried to avoid the label.

Women were advised to use their knowledge for the service of others, meaning their husbands and families or as missionaries. Even if there were no literary societies available, many women continued to read works and then write letters to each other to discuss them. Kelley quotes Julia Hyde, a student from Mt Holyoke Seminary who when writing a letter to her friend Lucy Goodale states, "Take some book, and read it and form your own opinion as to its character, its influence, its beauties, and its faults" (16). It should be noted that African American women and women from the working classes were not included in these particular literary societies. However, those same groups of women formed their own societies, which usually included some type of benevolence work. Later, women came to join more social activism groups as the desire for true equal rights and suffrage arose.

Most of the literary societies and female academies published small periodicals and papers. With technology making printing easier and cheaper and with the expanding postal service this became easier to accomplish. Kelley points out that through that medium, women were shaping public opinion and discussing the virtues of republican citizenship. The rise of magazines is directly attributed to the reading, writing and education of the women of this era. One notable magazine was *Godey's Lady's Book*. This magazine, like many others, invited women to submit written work, and they did. Through writing some women came to be able to earn an income. Educated women looked to writing, editing, and teaching to earn an income, though they earned about half the salary a man would in the same positions.

As a New Social Historian, Mary Kelley discusses at length the roles women were allowed to pursue in order to participate in the young nation. Her primary assertions are of the newly educated woman and her role in shaping public opinion which she states several times in every chapter, and of the role those same educated women play in "civil society". She uses the latter term at least fifty-two times, so if, as a reader one is unsure of the author's premise early in the work, he will surely grasp it by the end. Kelley has a wonderful array of primary and secondary sources, but it seems as though she is trying to use them all, making the work seem "jumpy" for lack of a better term.

Melissa Wilkins

Steven Deyle. *Carry Me Back: The Domestic Slave Trade in American Life* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005).

Steven Deyle is a professor of history at the University of Houston. He specializes in nineteenth-century U.S. social and political history, especially slavery and the Old South. His book *Carry Me Back: The Domestic Slave Trade in American Life* (2005) was the recipient of the Southern Historical Association's Bennett H. Wall Award for best book on southern business or economic history. It was also a finalist for Yale's Gilder Lehrman Center for the Study of Slavery's Frederick Douglass Prize. This is Deyle's only book currently in publication, but his next work is entitled "Honorable Men: Isaac Bolton, Nathan Bedford Forrest, and the Murder of James McMillan," which also focuses on the antebellum South. (http://vi.uh.edu/faculty/deyle_s.asp)

Deyle has several aims with *Carry Me Back*, and I believe he meets them all. First, he says the domestic slave trade was the "lifeblood of the southern slave system," (4) and as such, it deserves more scholarship than currently exists on the topic. Deyle says that in order to understand the Antebellum South, and in fact the early U.S. as a whole, we must understand the domestic slave trade and all of its components. The interregional trade of slaves between the upper South and the lower South served to link the two together with common economic interests and ensured that the upper states would secede with their Deep South neighbors. The demand for slaves in the lower states raised the value of slaves and made it the second most valuable investment in the country next to land. Because of the dependence the trade created between the two regions of the South, "not only was the domestic slave trade responsible for the creation of the Cotton Kingdom and for bringing it great wealth, but in many respects, it also contributed to its eventual demise" (6).

Deyle also aims to prove the domestic slave trade was not separate from the market revolution occurring in America, but was actually an important part of it. He says this trade is generally absent from studies on the market revolution because those studies tend to focus on the North and how transportation, communication, and industrialization transformed society and modernized business practices there. Deyle argues that the interregional slave trade in the South "was not simply a consequence of this development (the market revolution) but a central component compelling it," (6). He says the Southern slave traders employed market techniques just as their Northern counterparts in business did, and he shows how they used new forms of communication and transportation to increase their profits and expand their markets. For example, the invention of the telegraph in 1844 allowed traders to discuss prices and demand across long distances. This mostly benefitted the larger traders, but all dealers in the slave market used new communication whenever it was possible. The traders also made use of the financial instruments of the market revolution by borrowing

money to start their business and extending credit to customers.

The first three chapters deal with the origins of the domestic trade, the rise and fall of the Cotton Kingdom, and how the interregional slave trade contributed to both. Those chapters serve as excellent background information on the institution of the domestic trade, but for me personally, the most interesting parts of the book are the later chapters that deal with the details of the trade and how various groups of people viewed it. Deyle describes in detail how slaves would be transported in coffles where rows and rows of people were shackled together and forced to walk up to 25 or 30 miles a day. He portrays the slave trader as someone looking to get rich quick, and most of the time they succeeded. A slave trader could easily make twice the salary of a bank president with a few good sales, and they knew how to pick out the slaves who would sell easily. They also knew how to deceive buyers by making the slaves look younger and healthier on the auction block.

Deyle also describes the perceptions of the northern abolitionists who wanted to end the interregional slave trade through congressional intervention. He discusses northern attacks on slavery through newspapers and works such as Stowe's *Uncle Tom's Cabin*, and how abolitionists made special appeals to both women and children's sense of morality. After discussing how "outsiders" viewed the trade, Deyle describes the effects the trade had on white southerners. He states that slaveholders were able to deflect the political arguments against slavery much more easily than the moral attacks by abolitionists. Paternalism was the slaveholder's answer to every question on the morality of slavery. Slave owners proclaimed they rarely sold slaves willingly, and only sold those who misbehaved. Many claimed to be tricked by ambitious traders, on whom they placed much of the blame for the interregional trade's existence.

The final chapter discusses what the interregional trade meant for those who were actually being bought and sold on the auction block. Deyle notes that, while not all slaves experienced the trade between states, "for the vast majority of African Americans, the domestic slave trade was a dreadful reality that posed a constant threat to their lives," (245). This chapter also discusses how many slaves resisted being sold by running away, faking an illness or injury, or even taking their own lives or the lives of their children. These acts of defiance served to undermine the paternalistic ideal their masters were trying to portray.

Deyle makes a convincing argument that the domestic slave trade in America was in fact a business that contributed to the market revolution in its own way. He also demonstrates that this trade became so entrenched in southern society and had the upper and lower South so economically invested in each other that it led to the construction of the Cotton Kingdom as well as its demise in the Civil War.

Joel H. Silbey. *Storm Over Texas: The Annexation Controversy and the Road to Civil War* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005).

In surveying the mostly positive reviews of this work, one question came to mind: did Amazon switch books on me? Perhaps the publishers soaked the reviewers' copies in some sort of mind-altering drug. I purchased the Kindle edition, so the flashy cover page and carefully-chosen period font may not have had the same hypnotic effect on me. The book I read should be held up as a negative example to all who choose to write history. If you are looking for an excellent example of how to cram a 15-page undergraduate paper into a full-length monograph, *Storm Over Texas* will make your day. If, instead, you want a well-reasoned and tightly-argued book that brings new insight into the political issues surrounding the annexation of Texas, you will have to wait until someone has written it.

For those who are interested in the thesis and content of this book, this paragraph shall suffice. Silbey's thesis is the annexation of Texas into the Union was the first domino leading to the Civil War. In order to substantiate his thesis, he spends what seems like the plurality of the book on Martin Van Buren and the internal politics of New York state, with a close second on James K. Polk. On an average of once every 10 to 20 pages, he mentions Texas, usually by quoting a New York politician who blames Van Buren's failed second nomination bid on the Texas controversy. The book recounts in chronological order the political machinations before and after annexation, in particular those that drove Tyler out of office and brought the unknown Polk into the White House. The question of whether Texas would be a slave state is coupled with Polk's alienation of Northern Democrats over Oregon Territory and war with Mexico. In addition, Silbey explains how even Stephen Douglas managed to alienate himself from the Southern Democrats with his tin-eared Kansas-Nebraska Act—an attempt to implement the Texas annexation terms on all further territorial expansion. In short, because after Texas' annexation Congress and the nation grew more sectional than partisan, Texas' annexation must have been the necessary catalyst.

It is not that I necessarily disagree with Silbey's thesis, as much as find it uninteresting. Texas' annexation was certainly a big, pivotal moment in American history, and was certainly an important link in the chain of events that led to the Civil War. But, so were any number of events in antebellum America, dating back to the first importation of slaves in 1619. To set Texas apart from all other events as the *sine qua non* of Civil War antecedents is a cheap sleight of hand. It is impossible to know whether the rise of sectionalism would occur without Texas, of course. What he can and did demonstrate from the historical record is uncontroversial; what he cannot defend is his thesis.

All who suppose the book somehow explores new ground, or synthesizes old evidence in a fresh and more reasonable manner are simply

200 Book Reviews

mistaken. That is one of my main points of contention. *Storm Over Texas* covers one of the most vibrant and controversial periods in American history, from the Texan Revolution and the Mexican War, into the era of Bleeding Kansas. Within his topic, America more than doubled in size, Mexico lost two wars, countless numbers of people from America and Europe poured westward, living out the ideals of the pioneer spirit and Manifest Destiny. Telegraphs, steam ships, and trains were beginning to carry information, people, and goods across vast distances at speeds and costs unimaginable a generation earlier, enabling each section of the nation to see each other more directly for the first time, often shattering the illusion of a national consensus. Herein lies my main issue with the book: Silbey takes all of this rich material and makes it trite, narrow, and boring.

There is simply nothing new in the book. As I mentioned, the bulk of the material covered could fit into an undergraduate's thesis. In his chapters on the same subject, Daniel Walker Howe provides all of the material covered by Silbey and more, in a more thorough and insightful manner. On the one hand, by focusing so narrowly on the political intrigue, *Storm Over Texas* assumes the reader already has a good working knowledge of the subject. On the other hand, the material that *is* covered is *also* part of the general knowledge of the subject. This is a book that manages to be both too basic to advance scholarship, and too obscure to serve as an introduction to the subject.

I read this book on my Kindle and computer, so I couldn't tell by feel how far along I was. I kept thinking to myself, "These background chapters sure are long. I wonder when I'll get to the meat of the book, because so far I have read nothing new." About halfway through, I realized it was all background material! To make it worse, Silbey is an awful writer. Three out of four sentences seem useless, redundant, or both. To be cruel, I will share a couple.

An utterly useless transition sentence, on the 1844 election:

AFTER THE INTENSE CAMPAIGN of the fall, the country went to the polls in early November and then settled down to await the announcement of the results that would be forwarded from local polling stations to county seats, and then to state capitals, to be tallied, checked, and, finally, announced. (77)

The average sentence a reader must wade through, commas and all:

These representatives could not, therefore, they familiarly repeated, afford to continue their opposition. (85)

Silbey also seems to have an allergy to direct quotation and exemplary illustration. Since the text of Calhoun's notorious *Pakenham Letter* would have been exciting, he summarizes it in the least interesting way he could manage. The quotes he does employ seem to have been carefully screened, with all color and personality filtered out. Almost all of the illustrations he uses are oval-framed portraits of the key players, with captions like, "A young congressman and senator, Douglas was an ardent

supporter of western expansion," and "Sam Houston was the Republic of Texas's pro-annexation hero and president." Strangely, the illustrations made the book even *more* boring!

In short, *Storm Over Texas* is a book with "Texas" in its title that covers Martin Van Buren in more detail than Texas; it manages to touch on every event mentioned in a good high school textbook, only with more words and less depth. Joel Silbey has taken a big rack of Texas barbecue, and managed to de-season it with his own special recipe of "Blandifying Sauce."

W. Neal Wright

Matthew G. Schoenbachler. *Murder & Madness: The Myth of the Kentucky Tragedy* (Lexington: The University Press of Kentucky, 2009).

Matthew G. Schoenbachler's self proclaimed aim in *Murder & Madness: The Myth of the Kentucky Tragedy* is to reveal a "probable construction of what happened" amidst the multitude of fabricated newspaper accounts, novels, short stories, and plays attempting to retell one of early America's most remembered and retold true-crime stories. Schoenbachler employs a variety of primary and secondary sources in his attempt to provide readers with an accurate account of the 1825 murder of Kentucky Statesman, Solomon Porcius Sharp, by Jereboam Orville Beauchamp- contrary to the deceptive romanticized version society has willingly accepted.

Schoenbachler asserts that "the purpose of this book is not to needlessly 'complicate understanding' of anything but "rather it is to clarify a series of events already quite complex enough." He agrees with other historians in their assertion that postmodern history may itself be an oxymoron, going against postmodern thought by asserting that an objective truth from the path exists and some accounts of history more accurately recount that fact than others. Schoenbachler employs the use of "micro-history" in debunking the myth of the "Kentucky Tragedy"-- imploring it for a broader understanding of the past as he fits the murder story into the larger landscape of early America in the 1820's by comparing it to the prevailing social, cultural, and political ways of the time.

Schoenbachler quotes Robert Penn Warren in his synopsis of the madness surrounding the event: "it was so confused and comic and pretentious and sad, and it seems very strange to us...we have what is left,

the lies and half lies and the truths and half truths..." Schoenbachler agrees with Warren in demanding the truth while understanding its entirety may never be known. His search is hindered from the beginning because even the primary source material is wrought with falsehoods, being fashioned under the politicized relief war of Kentucky in the mid 1820's. Schoenbachler cites three contradictory documents as the basis for truth behind the murder: the published proceeding of the trial, the Beauchamp's *Confession*, and Sharps brother's *A Vindication of Solomon Sharp*. The contradictions found in the documents support Schoenbachler's premise that "no document is completely reliable" while "every source is not equally dependable".

The general understanding of the "Kentucky Tragedy" is taken based upon conjectured accounts taken mistakenly at face value by the general public and historians alike - preferring the likely falsehood and sensationalism of the *Confession* as well as the fictional forged *Letters of Ann Cook* over the seemingly more reliable *Vindication* written by Sharp's brother. Schoenbachler is able to utilize the half truths and half lies (previously taken as fact) in connecting the reader to the history of the event by revealing the "unmistakable imprint of their times", providing "insight into their era".

The unveiling of the evidence history left begs the question as to why the majority bought into the fictionalization of the story, believing it to be truth. *Murder and Madness* answers the question by connecting the falsity's power, adhesiveness, and appeal to the idea of the early American prevailing theme of Romanticism - a theme Schoenbachler notes "that historians have been remarkably disinclined to engage". He calls the avoidance of the topic peculiar and egregious, that this "counter-enlightenment" may have had more of an impact in its time than did the enlightenment on 18th century America. In quoting May, Schoenbachler attests that its greater impact was due to Romanticism's ability to "transcend" all areas of the culture. He describes romanticism as the triumph of will over rationality- the individual over socially acceptable ideals of order, stability, and tradition.

Schoenbachler's investigation of the "Kentucky Tragedy", specifically the acts and motivations of Ann Cook and Jereboam Beauchamp, reveal one variety of this "multifaceted romanticism". He reveals fact through a micro-historical exploration of the event, quoting Richard D. Brown to further expound upon this method of "exploring and connecting a wide range of data sources... in which actual people as well as abstract forces shape events". Schoenbachler labels *Murder & Madness* as "an attempt to provide a analytical narrative" connecting what we know of the "Kentucky Tragedy" with oft historically covered themes of Early America: Westward Expansion, the rise of the novel, and Romanticism. This connection is successful in its shedding of light into the characters or Jereboam and Anna in addition to America's lack of regard for fact in their affair with the myth.

Schoenbachler describes Beauchamp as a classical Byronic "Anti Hero" who thought himself above any social structures or norms. He likens

Beauchamp to a cavalier who threw off any notions of “proper behaviors” of his day, which contradicted his own fabricated self-assertion of being of a lover of virtue and defender of honor in his self-serving attempt to emulate the ideals of “demonic romanticism” through what Schoenbachler calls an attempt to “daringly transcend the ordinary. He refers to Beauchamp as a symbol representing the youth of early 19th century’s shift away from collective morals and credits these tendencies to the possibility of being a product of his age- an age that “encouraged displays of audacity, willfulness, and aggression.” *Murder and Madness* depicts Beauchamp’s obsession with the scripting of his own story, one he knew the audience would believe, and one where he was the hero.

Schoenbachler calls his seventeen-year-old wife, Ann Cook, the supporting member and accomplice to his script, a “diminutive fury”, a lover of the written word, who was enamored with seduction novels. The couple’s *Confession* script portrayed her as a “poor orphan” who was seduced by the evil Sharp thus being robbed of her virtue provides yet another successful exposure by Schoenbachler of how this story is wrought with contradictions- believed because they fit with the entertainment stories of the time, what people wanted to believe as truth. They painted a picture of a character they knew the public would embrace instead of her true character- the anti-cultural female similar to those found in the literature she read - one without restraint, longing for passion and unbridled emotion.

Murder and Madness references Toqueville’s explanation of the social structure where young women ultimately lose the freedom and independence they previously enjoyed when they enter into marriage; Schoenbachler connects this to Ann’s own avoidance of marriage. He described it as but one instance of a larger pattern of defiance, for little of her behavior conformed to the social norms of “proper southern behavior”. He weaves the unconventionality of being thirty five years old, unwed, and pregnant into the larger backdrop of the late 18th century sexual revolution – a “looser” period between the times of Colonial America and the Second Great Awakening.

Schoenbachler displays how the murder itself was carried out in a manner so as to go against the social structure of the day- “a perversion of hospitality”- as Beauchamp stabbed Sharp as he was opening the door for him as a guest. He further develops the Beauchamp’s desire to be an Byronic hero of sorts in recounting how Jereboam himself seemed proud of his “privileged” position in the trial- “... who believed himself intellectually, emotionally, and morally above the ordinary run of mankind. He may well have been successful in what Schoenbachler deems “getting away with murder”; however this was in the perception of the public alone, long after he had been executed. Schoenbachler credits the couple with “audacity” and “considerable skill” as “they transmuted fiction back into ‘fact’” to the approval of early America due to their script- albeit believed as truth- serving as a “confirmation of their entertainment”, providing validity to the

204 Book Reviews

stories read by society. Their own *Confession* –a scripted play where they played the leading roles – was the first of a number of fictional “Kentucky Tragedies” dramatized throughout the 19th century.

Schoenbachler provides a detailed, investigative, and analytical narrative to shed light upon an episode of history whereby most of what is known of the event is laced with romanticized falsities told through literature. *Murder and Madness* succeeds in painting a larger picture of the influence of Romanticism during the late 18th and early 19th centuries through delving deep into the facts, lies, and details of the “Kentucky Tragedy” while connecting the event to the surrounding cultural forces and social environment of the time. The book spends a substantial amount of time describing the various other works on the topic; each aiding Schoenbachler’s aim of sorting through fact and fiction. The work urges readers to approach all documents, sources, and accounts of history with a critical and analytical mind; refusing to rely on a single source while searching for—even demanding the objective truth--the reality of what actually happened in our past.

Tiffany Murdock

INSTITUTIONAL CONTRIBUTIONS

Citizenship and the Constitution

Constitution Day Talk

Sept. 16, 2011

There have been two great epochs in the history of citizenship. The first citizenship came down from the ancient Greeks and Romans to the Renaissance city-states. Citizens were a privileged elite who shared common rights and duties. You will remember in the Book of Acts that the Roman officials who were preparing to bind and flog the Apostle Paul stopped when they found that he had that status, and it gave Paul legal privileges. From Aristotle to Machiavelli, citizenship was treated as a training in civic virtue appropriate for an urban elite. From Plato to Thomas Jefferson, citizenship was understood as a training for the elite in civic virtue, a distinctive status marked by duties of military service and political participation.

First, citizenship, our modern idea of citizenship, emerged out of the Enlightenment of the 18th century. One can see the transition in the composition of the Declaration of Independence. In his first draft of the Declaration, Jefferson wrote that, among his other sins, King George III had “constrained our fellow subjects....” then, scratching out *subjects*, he wrote instead *citizens*. So the Declaration reads “he has constrained our fellow citizens,” but what lies behind this scratching out of a single word and its replacement with another wording is an important transition: from subjects of a King to citizens of a nation.

Second, citizenship, our *modern* concept, is not about the privileges and duties of an elite, but the relationship of the people to the community. It is framed in terms of rights, not duties or privileges. Much of the politics of Europe and the Americas in the century after the age of Revolution was in fact a struggle over the meaning of citizenship in a polity that claimed to be the expression of the will of the sovereign people. Who, for example, had the right to vote? The right to hold office? The second citizenship emerged in a political landscape of constitutions, elections, representative assemblies, political parties, freedom of speech and press.

Our modern concept of citizenship may be said to have solidified at a very specific historical moment: the year 1789. In March of that year, the United States Constitution was ratified and the first Congress declared it in effect. A month later, George Washington was inaugurated as the first President under the Constitution. Two months later in Versailles, France, the National Assembly was formed; and in June, it declared that it would write a Constitution for France. Then, on August 26, the National

Assembly issued the famous *Declaration of the Rights of Man and Citizen*. Modern citizenship began in 1789 with these two events on both sides of the Atlantic.

The term citizen is used in both the U.S. Constitution and the *Declaration of the Rights of Man and Citizen*, but nowhere in either document is it defined. It is only in later court decisions and amendments to the Constitution that the effective meaning of citizenship in America was laid out.

Here is where the term occurs in our original Constitution, before all amendments: in Article I, Senators and Representatives are required to be citizens of the U.S. for certain periods of time before being elected, and Congress is given the power to make "a uniform rule of naturalization." In Article II, the President is required to be a "natural-born citizen or a citizen at the time of the adoption of the Constitution." Article III confers on Federal Courts jurisdiction over disputes arising between citizens of different states. Article IV entitles the citizens of each state to the privileges of the other states. But nowhere in all this talk of citizens is there a definition of citizenship.

Two types of citizens are implicitly recognized in the original Constitution: natural and naturalized. This is implied in the original Constitution in Article II's requirement that the President be a natural-born citizen; however, the meaning of natural-born citizenship would only be made explicit in the 14th Amendment.

Another implication of the language used in the original Constitution is that there are citizens of the United States and citizens of the several states. But there are a lot of ambiguities here, too. Do states have to treat all their citizens as legal equals? Is a citizen of one state who moves to another state automatically a citizen of that new state? If someone moves from one state to another, does he lose his citizenship in the state he is leaving? Can a person be a citizen of the United States without being a citizen of any state? Or vice versa? Can an Indian be a citizen? Can a freed slave be a citizen?

There is a careful distinction in the language used in the original Constitution and the amendments between *citizens* and *persons* or *people*. Persons have civil rights; citizens have political rights as well. This is what lingered of the old inheritance of First Citizenship, the ancient understanding of citizens as a privileged elite. But persons have civil rights; person, not just citizens, have the right to own property, to be secure against unreasonable searches and seizures. Representation in the House of Representatives is determined by a census of persons, not of citizens.

Then, as now, the United States was a country of immigration. Naturalization was a much more pressing question for the young Republic than birthright citizenship. A large percentage of the population of the country was in fact foreign-born, and immigrants were arriving in large

numbers daily. Seven of the 39 signers of the Declaration were foreign-born. Ten percent of the members of the First Congress were foreign-born (naturalized) citizens. The Constitution made no distinction between the rights of natural-born and naturalized citizens except eligibility to serve as President, a prohibition probably inspired by fear that some great European nobleman might immigrate, get himself elected President, and attempt to restore a monarchy and an aristocracy. So, the First Congress swiftly passed a naturalization law defining who was eligible to become a U.S. citizen. This law set the basic requirements for naturalization of foreigners until 1952. Who could become a United States citizen? "Any alien, being a free white person who shall have resided within the limits and under the jurisdiction of the United States for a term of two years." In every subsequent revision of the naturalization law of 1789 for 163 years, until 1952 – when I was in third grade – the phrase "white person" was maintained. Only white persons could become U.S. citizens.

Here is perhaps the greatest surprise in this talk for many of you who are listening. Citizenship law and court cases involving citizenship are almost entirely about one thing: race. Because of the "white persons" language in the naturalization law, it was necessary to determine in individual cases whether an alien was "white." It was a *prerequisite* for naturalization to be a white person, but what exactly did "white" mean? Was a Jew white? Was an Armenian white? Was an Arab white? Was a Hindu Indian white? Was a very light-skinned Japanese man white? Was a half-Japanese, half-German man white? How about someone who had one Filipino grandparent? Court decisions provided different answers to these questions. A scholar named Ian Haney Lopez has written a fascinating book about these so-called "prerequisite cases," entitled *White By Law*.

But then there was the problem of the natural-born citizens. Were African-Americans citizens? Were slaves non-citizens but free Blacks citizens? Article I did not make representation in Congress dependent upon the number of citizens in a state, but the number of "free persons, including those bound to service for a term of years, and excluding Indians not taxed." Thus it excluded tribal Indians but included indentured servants. Then it added "and three-fifths of all other persons." But there was only one category left: slaves. If a slave was freed, was he a citizen? Could one state make freed Blacks citizens while another refused to do so? Could a free Black person be a citizen in a free state but not a citizen of the United States? What about a freed slave brought from a slave state, say Missouri, to a state that did not allow slavery, say Illinois?

This ambiguity led directly to the most disastrous and infamous Supreme Court decision in American history, *Dred Scott v. Sandford*, in 1857. The claim of Scott was that when his master had brought him to a free state that he acquired the status of a citizen, which entitled him to sue in Federal court. The Chief Justice, a pro-slavery South Carolinian named Roger Taney, tried to use this case to solve the great political problem

of the day, the battle over the extension of slavery. But instead of ruling narrowly on the question of Scott's standing to sue in Federal court, as the Court could have, Taney's decision went much farther. He ruled that Blacks were "beings of an inferior order and altogether unfit to associate with the white race," and had "no rights which the white man is bound to respect." Even free Blacks born in free states, according to Dred Scott, were not and could not ever be citizens. And since this was a Supreme Court decision, no law made by Congress could overrule it.

After the Civil War, the Congress passed the Civil Rights Act of 1866. Its purpose was to overrule the Dred Scott decision of 9 years before. It said "all persons born in the U.S. and not subject to any foreign power, excluding Indians not taxed, are hereby declared to be citizens of the United States." This law was the first explicit constitutional definition of natural born citizenship, passed 77 years after the Constitution came into effect. But was the act constitutional? What was required was an amendment to the Constitution.

It was the language of the 1866 Civil Rights Act that was used in the Fourteenth Amendment, ratified in 1868. This amendment ended the ability of states to define or restrict state citizenship. The key language is contained in the citizenship clause of the amendment: "all persons born or naturalized in the U.S. and subject to the jurisdiction thereof are citizens of the U.S. and of the state wherein they reside." The gap that had existed between persons and citizens in order to accommodate the institution of slavery was closed up by the Fourteenth Amendment's citizenship clause.

It is strange and ironic that from the Fourteenth Amendment to 1952, Blacks and all other non-whites such as Chinese were explicitly included in birthright citizenship but excluded from naturalization. You still had to be a white person to be naturalized. The court cases regarding naturalized citizenship continued to be about who was or was not a white person. Not so with natural born citizenship. But how far was America prepared to go with birthright citizenship? If an alien person not legally eligible to be a citizen had a child who happened to be born on American territory, was that child a citizen?

In 1898, the Supreme Court decided the meaning of the citizenship clause of the Fourteenth Amendment in a decision, which is still the governing law of the land. The case was *U.S. v. Wong Kim Ark*. Wong Kim Ark was born in California in 1873 of non-citizen Chinese parents. In 1882, Congress passed the blatantly racist Chinese Exclusion Act, forbidding almost all Chinese immigration and naturalization. Wong traveled to China a second time in 1894, and when he returned he was refused admittance by the officials at the port of San Francisco on the grounds that he was not a U.S. citizen, even though he had been born in the U.S. The U.S. Attorney actually supported the position of the state of California in this, saying that Wong was "by reason of his race, language, color, and dress, a Chinese person" and therefore not a U.S. citizen. The Supreme

Court decided in this landmark case that the language of the Fourteenth Amendment included Wong as a natural born U.S. citizen. Anyone born in the United States is a U.S. citizen.

As a result of the Wong King Ark case, the Constitution has meant since 1898 that a person is a natural born citizen of the U.S. if he or she is born in the territory of the United States, even if he or she is born of parents who are, at the time of his birth, aliens domiciled in the U.S., as long as they are not foreign diplomats.

The next question was whether Native Americans or Indians were citizens of the U.S. "Indians not taxed" had been excluded in the language of the original Constitution. That was part of the acceptance by the U.S. that Indian tribes were sovereign nations. But with the coming of the reservation system, and the fact that many Indians chose not to live on the reservations, the question arose whether such persons were or could be citizens of the state or of the U.S. The Snyder Act, formally the Indian Citizenship Act of 1924, finally gave U.S. citizenship to all Indians born in the U.S., although some states still denied them the right to vote as late as 1938.

Today, of course, the hot-button issue about citizenship is the application of the Fourteenth Amendment citizenship clause to the children of illegal aliens in the U.S. The claim is often made that illegal immigrants purposefully come to the U.S. to have their children so that they will be entitled to citizenship. On the face of it, the Fourteenth Amendment seems to offer a clear answer. Challenges made by several states to the standing interpretation of the citizenship clause from the Wong Kim Ark case in 1898 have not been successful to date. The key court decision is *Plyler v. Doe* of 1982, in which the state of Texas argued that a child born in the U.S. of illegal aliens from Mexico was not a U.S. citizen because of a clause in the Fourteenth Amendment that the courts had overlooked.

Let us remind ourselves of the full text of the citizenship clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. It says, "All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State in which they reside." But what exactly does it mean to say "subject to the jurisdiction" of the United States? The claim of the state of Texas was that illegal aliens were persons subject to the jurisdiction of their own countries, not the U.S., and therefore their children born in the U.S. were not U.S. citizens. The Supreme Court rejected the state's claim in *Plyler* and held that the phrase "subject to the jurisdiction thereof" referred to only the physical presence of the parents in this country, and was intended to refer to the children of foreign diplomats born in the U.S. *Plyler* meant that no distinction could be made between the citizenship claims of children of legal and illegal aliens, as long as such children were born in the U.S. Some have proposed a Constitutional amendment as the only "solution" to this problem. If it is a

problem. Of course, we should ask *why* it is a problem.

In the light of the long history of the connection between citizenship litigation and our national obsession with race, it is difficult not to see such proposals as at least partly based in racial fears, especially given the fact that the great bulk of the illegal aliens concerned are Hispanic. One has to wonder whether there would be a similar concern if large numbers of white Canadians were crossing the border to have their children in the U.S. But the size of the illegal immigrant population in the United States meant that this question of birthright citizenship will not go away, and from whatever motives, we can be sure that citizenship and its entitlements will continue to be a live issue in this country into the foreseeable future.

Thomas Osborne, Ph.D.
University of North Alabama

The End of the Cold War: A Bibliographic Essay

Because of the length and complexity of the Cold War (1945-91), developing a reading list can be quite daunting; however, focusing on the end of the Cold War is more manageable. Moreover, exploring how the Cold War ended can in many ways help one understand the underlying factors that created and continued to fuel the superpower rivalry between the Soviet Union and the United States. The end of the Cold War unfolded during the presidencies of Ronald Reagan and George H. W. Bush on the American side and under the rule of Mikhail Gorbachev on the Soviet side. One of the best overviews of this period is Melvyn Leffler's *For the Soul of Mankind* (New York: Hill and Wang, 2007), which connects the end of the Cold War back to its origins. John Prados' *How the Cold War Ended* (Washington, D.C.: Potomac Books, 2011) is one of the most recent overviews and focuses on Gorbachev and Reagan. My own *Out of the Shadow: George H.W. Bush and the End of the Cold War* (College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 2008) is, to date, the only focused treatment of the end of the Cold War and the Bush administration. Collectively, these three books offer history students a solid foundation for studying the end of the Cold War and each contains an extensive bibliography for further reading.

Beyond that, participant memoirs are plentiful and offer some of the most direct insight to the decisions that pushed the two countries to a resolution of the conflict. *The Reagan Diaries* (New York: Harper Collins, 2007), edited by Douglas Brinkley, is both readable and enlightening. Mikhail Gorbachev's massive *Memoirs* (New York: DoubleDay, 1996) is quite long but ultimately compelling, and Jack F. Matlock's *Reagan and Gorbachev* (New York: Random House, 2004) offers a comparison of the two leaders from one of the participants who had unparalleled access to both leaders, having served as the U.S. Ambassador to the Soviet Union under both Reagan and Bush. Bush's own *A World Transformed* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1998), written with his National Security Advisor, Brent Scowcroft, provides a step-by-step examination of the final events of the Cold War. Philip Zelikow and Conodleezza Rice, both members of the Bush administration, focus on the reunification of Germany in *Germany Unified and Europe Transformed* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1995). James A. Baker, III, who served in both the Reagan and Bush administrations, provides an exhaustive chronicle of the diplomatic challenges of this period in *The Politics of Diplomacy* (New York: Putnam, 1995). From the Soviet side, Anatoly Chernayaev's *My Six Years with Gorbachev* (University Park: Penn State University Press, 2000) and Eduard

Shevardnadze's disorganized *The Future Belongs to Freedom* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1991) offer an insider's view. To tie it all together, one might consider a general Cold War textbook such as Walter LaFeber's classic, yet continually updated, *America, Russia, and the Cold War, 1945-2006*, 10th Edition (Boston: McGraw-Hill, 2006) or the more student-friendly text by Edward Judge and John Langdon, *The Cold War: A Global History with Documents*, 2nd Edition (Boston: Prentice Hall, 2011).

Christopher Maynard, Ph.D.
University of North Alabama

Utilizing New Media in Graduate Academic Research

Recent funding from governmental and foundational sources has allowed for an explosion of major archival information to be digitized and organized for researchers and students. With this new information available online, archival materials once only accessible in dusty libraries to European travelers with large research budgets is now available to a range of scholars globally. Digitized archival materials allow advanced undergraduates and graduate students to complete primary source based research from their home institutions allowing for more complex and more varied academic projects to be done for both coursework and for thesis-level research.

It is easy to access the internet for transcribed copies of various resources from Hammurabi's Code to Patrick Henry's speeches to recent press releases from President Obama. These resources are of critical importance to researchers and educators at all levels in providing glimpses into different worlds and historical events but these transcribed resources limit scholars and students to the text (often edited or translated by unknown individuals) and prevent a more comprehensive evaluation of a document. We are unable to analyze the style of writing, the distinctive marks on the paper, and the subtle or sometimes substantial wear on the document itself. Digital archives are not just websites with information. Digital archives:

- Provide information at any time and in any place;
- Provide access to collections of multimedia information that integrate text, image, graphics, audio, video, and other continuous media;
- Make it possible for users to personalize or customize how they access and represent information for example, by "harvesting" only relevant information and avoiding information overload; and
- Radically enhance collaborative intellectual activities, including research, learning, and design, by reducing barriers of geography, organizational distance, and time.

Digital archives and archival databases are far more advanced applications of technology to the systematic preservation of historic materials in their original form and provide for digital remote access to those original documents for scholars around the globe.

British archives, universities and libraries have recently invested heavily in the development of digital archives and databases that are open to virtually all researchers regardless of affiliation or academic rank. Some collections, such as the Treasures of the British Library, have digitized medieval and early modern texts like the William Claxton's editions of

the *Canterbury Tales* or several copies of *Magna Carta*. The ability to view these sources in high-resolution format with magnifying capabilities, textual comparisons, and academic commentary allow millions of individuals to access these fragile documents that were rarely available to all but a select few of elite scholars. While these are of value in numerous settings as true treasures of western civilization, they are not the only applications of such technology. Far more innovated databases have been developed by consortiums of academics that compile information from a range of collections, archives and individuals. The Church of England Clergy Database and the Anglo-Saxon Prosopography projects assemble resources from various archives and libraries across the United Kingdom that would not otherwise be able to digitize any part of their collections. Collections virtually unsearchable by non-UK based academics are now given an online presence that allows greater engagement with the cyber-researcher.

Digitized materials and databases are no substitute for the archival experience of a dusty room, white gloves and the inevitable case of archivist's nose but for the seasoned academic or apprentice scholar, online collections can provide a wealth of information that enhance one's work and excite one's imagination. As these collections become more sophisticated and materials become more plentiful, primary source material on any subject can be part of one's academic life at any stage of an academic career.

Jeffrey R. Bibbee, PhD
University of North Alabama