The Great Cattle Massacre: Humor and Ritual in the Irish Rising of 1641

William A. Brooks, Jr.

William A. Brooks, Jr. presented this paper to both the Fighting Irish Studies in America Conference at Notre Dame and the Phi Alpha Theta Lower Illinois Regional Conference at Illinois State University. At the latter conference, he won the award for best graduate paper in the European category. Mr. Brooks recently received his M.A. in history at Eastern.

Soon after the Irish Rebellion of 1641, pamphlets appeared throughout England describing barbarous acts committed by Irish Catholic rebels against English and Scottish Protestants. These pamphlets, coupled with Sir John Temple's *A History of the Irish Rebellion*, published five years later, confirmed the stereotypical English opinion of the Irish as ungovernable savages. With the eventual suppression of the rebellion in 1649-50, and the subsequent trial of the leaders, depositions describing the atrocities reinforced the barbaric image of the Irish in the eyes of the English. Atrocities did occur, though probably with nowhere near the magnitude suggested by published accounts and depositions. This paper does not confirm or deny the allegations, nor does it offer an alternative explanation for the rebellion. Most historians now agree that the rebellion began as a political rising by the Irish lords though it quickly escaped their control. I will instead argue that the pamphlet accounts can be read in terms of symbolic ritual and liturgy. Within the rebels' violent behavior was an attempt to re-establish, rather than undermine a traditional social order in Ireland.

Of course, prior to 1641, there was no unchanging traditional social order. English attempts at conquest had produced a shifting patchwork of settled areas

protected by the Dublin government mixed with remnants of nomadic society with feudal overlays.[1] The Tudor government introduced tillage agriculture, individual landholding and a formal legal system to modernize and pacify Ireland.[2] By 1603, with the surrender of the Earl of Tyrone and the introduction of the plantation system, traditional, pastoral Gaelic society was coming to an end.[3]

Stripped of many vestiges of their old civilization, the Irish clung to their Catholic faith as a means of local and communal identity.[4] The plantation scheme coincided with the Irish counter-reformation and both encouraged a religious tradition hostile to Protestant settlers. The Irish viewed the English and their Scottish brethren as heretics.[5] Pivotal in this religious rebirth were the newly established Ulster Franciscan Foundation and the Jesuits. Though both orders were newly educated on the continent, they preached in Gaelic, and directed popular antagonism against the reformed church. To the Irish peasant, they represented the traditional Irish ecclesiastical structure.[6] Sharing their economic deprivation, legal and religious discrimination, the Franciscans provided the Irish a theological and ideological justification for armed insurrection.[7]

This, then, is the background to the Irish Rebellion of 1641 and the flood of pamphlets thereafter. I have examined some sixty depositions, twenty pamphlets, and Sir John Temple's *The Irish Rebellion*. Virtually all accounts retell the same brutal behavior of the rebels and the clerics. Other historians have emphasized the bias of the pamphlets reflecting their English audience. But by applying the anthropological method of other social historians, I want to suggest that they can be used to reflect the *mentalité* and conflict of two diverging cultures.

Deponents at the trials of 1651-52 claimed the Catholic clergy instigated and encouraged acts of cruelty. Julian Johnson, Anglican parson of Athenry and

1 Aidan Clarke, "The 1641 Rebellion and Anti-Popery in Ireland," in *Ulster 1641: Aspects of the Rising*, Brian MacCuarta ed., (Belfast:Queens University Press, 1993), 141.
2 Clarke, "1641 Rising," 142.
3 Patrick O'Farrell, *Ireland's English Question: Anglo-Irish Relations, 1534-1970* (New York: Schocken Books, 1971), 30.
4 Ibid., 30.
5 Ibid., 44.
6 M. Perceval-Maxwell, *The Outbreak of the Irish Rebellion of 1641* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1994), 14.
7 Ibid.

Donmore in county Galway, testified that a friar was the principal man in a "robbery and slaughter" of a Protestant family, encouraging the rebels with the words "it was brave sport" to see the young Englishmen slain while defending themselves "their eyes burning in their heads."[8] Sir John Temple's book reported "Priests had now charmed the Irish! and laid such bloody impressions in them, as it was held, according to the maxims they received, a mortal sin to give any manner of relief or protection to any of the English."[9] On the one hand, this is just stock anti-popery and Protestant anti-clericalism. On the other hand, it could be said that the priests legitimized rebel actions, actions which constituted a Holy Crusade to exterminate the heretic.[10] Raymond Gillespie asserts that "religious differences which had been acceptable and accommodated in times of stability quickly came to the fore in times of uncertainty and instability. Protestant symbols such as the Bible were foci for attacks by Catholic rebels. The religious difference was not about ecclesiastical organization, but rather about interpretations of what was holy and therefore a mediation of divine will."[11] Churches, Bibles, and other religious symbols may have represented a territorial encroachment by outsiders. By destroying their enemies' territorial markers, the rebels reasserted domination in their ancestral community.

Especially chilling are testimonies which depict the mutilation of corpses and the desecration of Protestant graves. The pamphlet, *Doleful Newes from Ireland*, printed in 1642, describes just such an incident:

> Nor are these all the cruelties that are here committed, for in the very fields, men, women and children be scattered up and down, most of them naked, being murthered and starved, and many of them mangled and dismembered, some having their hands and feet cut off, others their eyes and tongues pulled out . . .[12]

In her study of religious riots in sixteenth century France, Natalie Zemon Davis contends that corpse mutilation was primarily a characteristic of Catholic crowds. Whereas Protestants believed that the "souls of the dead experience either salvation or the torments of the damned," the body no longer posed a threat to the community.[13] For Catholics, however, further degradation and humiliation of the body was necessary to exorcise the evil spirits.[14]

8 Mary Hickson, *Ireland in the Seventeenth Century or the Irish Massacre of 1641-42* vol.II (London: Green and Co., 1884), 14.
9 Sir John Temple, *The Irish Rebellion* (London, 1646), 69
10 Natalie Zemon Davis, "The Rites of Violence: Religious Riot in Sixteenth-Century France," *Past and Present* 59 (1973): 65.
11 Raymond Gillespie, "De-stabilizing Ulster, 1641-42," in *Ulster 1641: Aspects of the Rising*, Brian MacCuarta ed., (Belfast: Queen's University Press, 1993), 114.
12 *Doleful Newes from Ireland* printed for T. Bates, (London, 1642), 2.
13 Davis, 82.
14 Ibid., 82-83.

Perhaps the most nefarious incident symbolizing religious antipathy in the rebellion was the massacre at Portadowne. According to the testimony of George Littlefield and Edward Saltinghall of county Armaugh, seventy English Protestants "were rounded up" and kept under guard at the church of Loghgall for two days and nights. "Afterwards, under the escort of one hundred rebels, they were herded to the bridge at Portadowne and thrown into the water and miserably drowned."[15] On the surface, this, like the burning of inhabited churches, may appear only as a convenient means of mass execution. However, the use of fire and water takes on a liturgical significance as well. The river acted as a cleansing solution of Holy water, while fire represented the purifying rite of exorcism.[16] These were not spontaneous acts of violence and wanton savagery, but premeditated acts with clear objectives. Protestants were evil. This was an unmistakable attack upon the reformed religion. To the Catholic Irish, Protestantism was clearly a threat to the traditional religious order. Through purification rites and the destruction of Protestant symbols under seemingly official church sanction, the rebels defended the fundamental values and self-definition of their community.[17]

If humor could be found amongst tales of unspeakable barbarity, it would indeed be black humor. One incident surfaces in the testimony of Thomas Johnson, Vicar of Tullagh and Killycomen:

> The rebels in the barony of Costello and Gallen, in the said county of Mayo, in mere hatred and derision of the English and their very cattle, and in the contempt and derision of the English, did ordinarily and commonly prefer, or seem to prefer bills of indictment, and brought the English breed of cattle to be tried by juries, and having in their fashion arraigned these cattle, their scornful judges, then sitting amongst them would say 'They look as if they could speak English! give them the book and see if they can read,' pronouncing the words, '*Legit aut non*,' to the jury. And then, because these cattle stood mute and did not read, the Irish judges would pronounce sentence of death against them, and so they were committed and put to slaughtering.[18]

To the seventeenth century English reader, this deposition, along with several others describing the torture and burning of cattle, might well have appeared as just one more case of senseless depravity. But this mock trial can be seen as an extended joke upon the newly established institutions the colonists brought with them. While it may strike the modern reader as pointless, it

15 Hickson, vol.I, 85.
16 Davis, 82.
17 Davis, 90.
18 Hickson, vol.II, 5.

illustrates the difference between us and the people of early modern Europe.[19] Robert Darnton argues that "the best point of entry in an attempt to penetrate an alien culture can be those where it seems to be most opaque-- a joke, a proverb, a ceremony-- that is particularly meaningful to the natives."[20] The criminal prosecution of these animals serves as a bitter comment on the English legal and economic institutions, at whose hands the Irish peasant suffered. This "trial" illustrates the depth to which an outside force as powerful as the law had penetrated popular Irish society, thus demonstrating the interaction and division between the two cultures.[21]

The trial embodied an oblique attack on all English. It was an attack on the outsiders who had deprived them of their ancient liberties and customary rights. It exemplified an attack on tithes, landlords, and restrictions of the English law they had come to equate with oppression. The phrase uttered by the "judge," '*Legit aut non*' (can you read), illustrates the level of understanding the native peasant had acquired of the English judicial system. Evidence reveals that during the 1620's and 1630's litigation in the Irish courts had increased dramatically. Land disputes and tenurial agreement made up the bulk of the cases.[22] From the peasant perspective, the cattle served as the perfect proxy for the colonists, who deemed their cattle more significant than their tenants.[23] The imposition of the English legal system, deprived them of their land, forcing them into tenantry and taxes. By trying the English cattle, the Irish condemned the English legal institution. Perhaps they even yearned for the traditional law and order reinforced by the chieftains.[24] Indeed, studies have revealed that many of the Ulster tenants were descendants of 16th century inhabitants (those who had not fled between 1603 and 1607), and regarded some of the rebellion's leaders as their true overlords.[25]

19 Robert Darnton, "Workers Revolt: The Great Cat Massacre of the Rue Saint Severin," *The Great Cat Massacre and Other Episodes in French Cultural History* (New York: 1970), 77-78.
20 Ibid., 78.
21 Perceval-Maxwell, 232.
22 Raymond Gillespie, "The End of an Era: Ulster and the Outbreak of the 1641 Rising," in *Natives and Newcomers*, Ciaran Brady and Raymond Gillespie eds., (Dublin: Irish Academic Press, 1986), 196.
23 Darnton, 78.
24 Ibid., 82.
25 Gillespie, "End of an Era," 209.

This morbid sense of justice is not simply a matter of condemning and executing the English metaphorically. The importance the Irish peasant placed on cattle cannot be overstated. Cattle represented their livelihood: Milk and curd sustained them; dung heated their stone huts; land could be obtained and dowries presented with cattle. They housed their cattle in their huts at night for fear of wolves and spells cast by fairies. In fact, some even placed wreaths of mountain ash around the udders of their cows to ward off vexations by fairies.[26] Tales like "The Cattle Raid of Cooley" formed the basis of heroic folklore and legends. In short, cattle defined the traditional Gaelic community. they saw the English cattle, just as they saw the English colonists, as interlopers.

After the establishment of the plantation system, a gradual economic transformation took place in Ireland. A transformation from a subsistence to a market economy.[27] While the Ulster plantation was instrumental in affecting this transformation, the basic structure had not changed. Lands they previously held as free-holders under Irish lords, were now rented to them as tenants.[28] Donald Woodward's study of the seventeenth century Anglo-Irish livestock trade reveals that the Irish exported 30,000 head of cattle annually by 1641.[29] The explanation for this meteoric rise in livestock exportation in so short a period lies with the plantation colonists. The settlers, brought with them to Ireland superior breeds of cattle, and successfully established them there.[30] These larger and heartier animals caused further economic distress to the poor tenant by destroying their foreign hide market. Further aggravating the peasant's plight, were higher rent demands after the poor harvests of 1638-1641.[31]

One further dimension of the "massacre" needs to be explored if we are to understand the Irish *mentalité*-- the traditional folk customs of the Irish peasant. Two forms of traditional belief emerge--one ecclesiastical, the other secular. In the Middle Ages it was popularly held that demons could take diabolic possession of human beings and animals.[32] A homicidal boar or bull may very well be

26 Brian MacLysaght, *Irish Life in the Seventeenth Century* (New York: Barnes and Noble Inc., 1969), 178.
27 Perceval-Maxwell, 45.
28 Donald Woodward, "The Anglo-Irish Livestock Trade in the Seventeenth Century," *Irish Historical Review* 72 (September 1973): 490.
29 Ibid., 515.
31 Ibid.
32 E.P. Evans, *The Criminal Prosecution and Capital Punishment of Animals* (London: William Heineman, 1906), 6.

the incarnation of a demon. If left unpunished, the demon could enter human beings through the possessed animal. Cattle and poultry were particularly vulnerable to these vexations.[33] If the animal passed to other hands in the form of an inheritance or sale, the spell remained.[34] This helps interpret why the rebels chose to execute the cattle in such elaborate fashion, instead of confiscating the beasts for their own use. The cattle were manifestations of the heretical English, contaminated enemies of God.[35] The Franciscans and Jesuits perpetuated this superstition as a means of strengthening their influence and power over the peasants.[36]

In the secular sense, the prosecution of animals was by no means rare, often practiced by isolated tribes of Europe. Animal trials reinforced the natural order of man over beast. This was a ritual performed by a primitive people whose crude man's dominion over animals in "the great chain of being."[37] In a time when men's fortunes were more susceptible to the forces of nature, any perceived threat to that delicate balance was subject to man's justice.[38] Thus, the English cattle which thrived in the lush Ulster meadows were convicted of usurping man in the natural order.

Every community or society has its own conception of proper order. The Church, be it Catholic or Reformed, imposes a doctrinal order to insure salvation. Governments impose order in the form of laws and courts to maintain a civil and just society. Sometimes order comes in a form of inherited customs and traditions. Often, however, order is maintained in a form not so clearly defined. It only surfaces when disorder manifests itself in form of an external threat. This is an order that transcends all human experience and defies definition, a subconscious sense of uniformity. They saw themselves as defending the traditional customs and institutions that the English colonists had replaced. Like the Nu-Pieds of seventeenth-century France, the rebels perceived the settlers as outsiders, people who destroyed their way of life, or at least life as they preferred to remember it.[39] They wanted to return to that mythical "Golden Age,"

33 Ibid., 6-7.
34 Ibid., 7.
35 Clarke, "1641 Rising," 152.
36 Evans, 41.
37 Ibid., 40-41.
38 Ibid, 34-35.
39 Robert Mousnier, "The Nu-Pieds--1639," in *Peasant Uprisings in Seventeenth Century France, Russia and China* (New York: Harper and Row, 1970), 109.

described by their ancestors, when life was simple and harmonious.[40] The Irish Rebellion of 1641 surely appeared to the English and Scotch as a "world turned upside down," a violent overthrow of the proper social order. To the Irish peasant this was an attempt to restore order, in the form in which they knew it. This was the clash of two notions of a well ordered society. The ritual and liturgy, found not only in the church but in the belief system of the community, illustrates man's desires and fears in an uncertain age. But black humor in the midst of horrible destruction, adds a new dimension to the understanding of seventeenth century Irish life and rebellion.

40 Yves-Marie Berce, *History of Peasant Revolts: The Social Origins of Rebellion in Early Modern France* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1990), 169.

Sex and Sects: Gendered Language in Interregnum Hereford

Seth D. Rodgers

Seth D. Rodgers presented "Sex and Sects" at the Phi Alpha Theta Lower Illinois Regional Conference on 22 April, 1995. He is currently pursuing his M.A. in history at Eastern, and plans to write a thesis on the social and political significance of prostitution in late Stuart England.

English politics and society underwent sweeping changes after Civil War and Revolution. Parliament, Puritans, and the Army's experiments with England's government marked the period of 1647-1653. The victors tried creating a Godly nation through Republicanism and other non-traditional forms of government. The chaos of politics replaced the chaos of war. Experimentation climaxed with 1653's Parliament of Saints: A Parliament of the Godly selected by church congregations. English politics risked turning from traditional government. Rule by the Godly lasted less than a year; the attempt to impose Heaven on Earth failed. By 1654 radicalization of the English government ended. Ideological and religious differences exposed by Revolution hastened a return to traditional government and societal order. As government returned to familiar forms, in guise of the monarchical Protectorate, society desired pre-war stability, especially with religious and sexual issues. Many English men and women hoped restoring power to local gentry would end religious dissent and experimentation, but radicalism refused to disappear. Doctrinal disputes existed not only between defeated Royalists and victorious Puritans, but also among the victors themselves.

Sometimes religious, political, or personal disagreements would find expression in print. An example of this is a 1654 Hereford pamphlet exchange:

Impostor Magnus and its response *The Close Hypocrite Discovered*. The dispute concerns radical religious doctrine but reference to acceptable sex and gender roles also appear. The gendered language reveals a shared vision of women's relation to political upheaval and societal disorder. Images of disruptive women existed as part of Puritan England's Revolutionary and post-Revolutionary *mentalité*.

This essay proposes the following analysis of the above pamphlets: first, an outline of the pamphlets by Silas Taylor and Richard Delamain, second, an overview of gendered language in Early Modern England, last, a return to the pamphlets examining how shared language indicates shared *mentalité*, even between bitter enemies.

The first pamphlet, *Impostor Magnus*, promises examination of the religious and social doctrine of Richard Delamain, a minister in Hereford. The author, Silas Taylor, attacks the religious doctrine of Delamain who, "with inticing words, gliding over his bitter pills of blasphemy and error, hath done much mischief in the neighbouring Counties."[1] Fearful that others had "an itching ear to hear novelties," Taylor warns Hereford not to "embrace Doctrines of the Devil."[2] While "confess[ing] ignorance" in understanding Delamain's teachings, Taylor believes these teachings "hogs-wash."[3] Taylor finds disturbing some Christians "delight to make Religion a covert for their baseness."[4] Removal of Delamain would be difficult. Both Taylor and Delamain emphasize the Governor and several leading men in Hereford support Delamain.[5]

Richard Delamain's response disputes allegations of wrongdoing. Calling into question the character of this "accuser of the brethren," Delamain illustrates Taylor's various sins."[6] While admitting to unnamed "errors," Delamain "upon mature Deliberation, and due consideration renounce them all along since."[7]

---

1 Silas Taylor, *Impostor Magnus, or the Legerdemain of Richard Delamain, Now Preacher in the City of Hereford. Being A Narrative of his life and Doctrine since his first coming into that County* (London: 1654), 2. Spellings have not been modernized from seventeenth century sources.
2 Ibid., 4.
3 Ibid., 10.
4 Ibid., 17.
5 Taylor, 18; Richard Delamain, *The Close Hypocrite Discovered; or a true Description of the Life and Person of Cap. Taylor, in the City of Hereford: Being a Vindication of Mr. Rich. Delamain, Preacher in the said city, and Pastor of a Congregated Church in the said County: In answer to a scurrilous pamphlet entituled Impostor Magnus* (London: 1654), 5 (7). Pages misnumbered, corrected page in parenthesis.
6 Ibid., 1.
7 Ibid., 3.

Delamain believes his doctrine confirmed by the "Letter of Scripture."[8] Attacks on Taylor's character include Delamain comparing Taylor to Satan tempting Christ in the wilderness.[9] The pamphlet ends with Taylor labeled a common liar with no honor among gentlemen.[10]

Images of women appear within these attacks and responses of both Taylor and Delamain. "And you may see here he first makes practise with women and widdows," Taylor tells his audience when describing the spread of Delamain's heresies."[11] *Impostor Magnus*, by connecting Delamain with religious radicalism, attempts to evoke memories of Revolutionary disorder created by religious radicals. In the popular mind religious radicalism equaled female independence which led to sexual and social disorder. According to Taylor, Delamain used "familiar and private converse to sow the seed of the Doctrine of the Seekers."[12] Delamain also allegedly endorsed Ranter doctrines.[13] Both sects, the Seekers prior to the Revolution and the Ranters afterwards, gained a reputation for female independence and were viewed as responsible for much turmoil. Taylor exploited the fear of women abandoning traditional gender and sex roles, suggesting that Delamain, by endorsing radicalism, threatened the natural order of society. Surely any rational man, Taylor asks, could see the danger of "ignorant silly women, tell[ing] men both learned and knowing: That they could not understand" God because of their sinfulness.[14] The importation of sectarian beliefs by Delamain into Hereford would give rise to independent women. The independent woman, the spiritual and social equal of man, violated "natural order" and lead to chaos. This was a lesson of the Civil War and Revolution. This is Taylor's reason for wanting the potentially disruptive force of sectarianism removed from Hereford.

In his response, *The Close Hypocrite Discovered*, Delamain distances himself from the charges of radicalism by rejecting several Sectarian principles.[15] His response contains the same "feminized" language as Taylor's attack. "[Taylor] would make you believe of his valor . . . it must not be in actions, but in words,

8 Ibid., 4.
9 Ibid., 1.
10 Ibid., 10 (12).
11 Taylor, *Impostor Magnus*, 3.
12 Ibid., 10.
13 Ibid., 15.
14 Ibid., 5.
15 Delamain, *The Close Hypocrite Discovered*, 6.

his best skill being in that weapon, which is most proper to women."[16] Delamain insultingly compares Taylor to a gossip or scold.[17] English society expected women to be silent, those who did not were viewed as upsetting social order.[18] Delamain also refers to Taylor as the "mother of this divelish Pamphlet."[19] In a patriarchal society the role of father was held in highest esteem, not the role of mother. Once Delamain reduces Taylor to the status of a woman, the latter's argument becomes ignorable. Delamain thought Taylor no better than a woman, an almost-human with little importance.[20]

Before focusing on charges of sexual disorder, contemporary views of women and sects, and their relation to the images described by Taylor and Delamain, require examination.

The realms of politics and religion belonged to men, but limited roles for women existed.[21] The active role of women in sects was not unusual. In many ways it was a continuation of trends almost a century old.[22] For a few women in separatist Churches that role sometimes involved challenging Anglican or civil authority.[23] These challenges sometimes met with brutal response. Parliament's punishment of Quaker James Nayler in 1656, for entering Bristol on the back of a donkey while women placed boughs on the road in front of him, bordered on barbaric.[24] But the women who assisted Nayler received no punishment.[25] It was unthinkable to most Englishmen that a woman could be more than an accessory. Sects seemingly encouraged women to feel equal to men. Female equality threatened societal order. Many Englishmen, wearied by over a decade

16 Ibid., 6 (8).
17 David Underdown, *Revel, Riot and Rebellion: Popular Politics and Culture in England 1603-1660* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1991), 38.
18 N. H. Keeble, "'The Colonel's Shadow': Lucy Hutchinson, women's writing and the Civil War," in *Literature and the English Civil War*, ed. by Thomas Healy and Jonathan Sawday (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1990), 337.
19 Delamain, *The Close Hypocrite Discovered*, 7 (9).
20 Ibid., 6 (8).
21 Phyllis Mack, "Women as Prophets During the English Civil War," *Feminist Studies* 8 (Spring 1982), 21.
22 Claire Cross, "'He-Goats Before the Flocks': A Note on the Part Played by Women in the Founding of Some Civil War Churches," in *Popular Beliefs and Practice*, edited by G. J. Cuming and Derek Baker (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1972), 202.
23 Anne Laurence, *Women in England 1500-1760 A Social History* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1994), 204-205.
24 On Palm Sunday, 1656, James Nayler re-enacted Christ's entrance into Jeruselem. After his arrest, Parliament debated six weeks about his sentence. Christopher Hill describes Nayler's punishment and the results: "[He was] to be flogged through the streets of London, his tongue to be bored with a hot iron, his forehead branded; . . . [taken] to Bristol for a second flogging; and to be kept in prison until Parliament decided otherwise . . . physically he never recovered from it; he died three years later at the age of 43." Christopher Hill, *The World Turned Upside Down: Radical Ideas During the English Revolution* (London: Penguin Books, 1991), 249, 364-65.
25 Patricia Crawford, "The Challenges to Patriarchalism: How did the Revolution affect Women?" in *Revolution and Restoration*, edited by John Morrill (London: Collins and Brown, 1972), 122.

of unrest, viewed control or elimination of religious radicalism as essential to preserve "natural order."

However, the popular view of sectarians and women had little foundation in reality. Despite involvement by women and vaguely feminist rhetoric, radical sects were still patriarchal.[26] Sectarian men generally did not support women taking active and public roles in religion.[27] Separatists expected women to be submissive, like women in sanctioned churches.[28] Belonging to a sect was not the liberating experience contemporaries believed.

Sects were also suspect because of their sexual philosophies. The Seekers and Ranters appeared to encourage adultery and promiscuity. Fear existed of women expressing themselves sexually. This perception differed from reality. The Digger Gerald Winstanley acknowledged in the seventeenth century that sexual freedom was available only for men since pregnancy limited women's sexual freedoms.[29] Pregnancy was not the only barrier to female sexuality. Sex outside of marriage also carried strict legal sanctions. Anti-fornication laws passed by Parliament in 1650 provided the death penalty for female adulters, males subject to lesser punishments[30]. Although the harshest sentences were rarely carried out, the Interregnum assured the control of women both legally and sexually.

Taylor and Delamain, despite their disagreements over religion, share common images of women. Taylor's images of women include heretical beasts, unrestrained by the rationality of men, and cold-hearted sexuality.[31] Female sexuality causes Delamain to show "himself more effectionate to Mr. Cogans wife, then to his own child when it dyed."[32] It is worth noting that Taylor contrasts Mrs. Cogan's proper role of wife with mistress by omitting her first name. Delamain's presence would only result in an increase in incidents similar to when

> John Davis a Taylor, and Anne Madox a School-mustress ... in this County of Hereford ... perswaded his wife to permit Anne Madox to lye with them ... Davis perswades his wife to rise and go . . . left her husband and Anne Madox fast asleep together: (nay further, you must believe that there they lay without waking four hours together, or you shall be none of Delamains Church)[33]

26 Ibid., 123.
27 Laurence, *Women in England*, 204.
28 Crawford, "The Challenge to Patriarchalism," 123.
29 Ibid., 115.
30 Ibid., 116.
31 Taylor, *Impostor Magnus*, 12.
32 Ibid., 17.
33 Ibid., 17-18.

For Taylor a threat to the social order existed. Delamain, he feared, preached a message of license to the women of Hereford.[34] The encouragement of society's marginalized people to defy order equaled radicalism. In Taylor's view, radicalism offered Hereford nothing except chaos and humiliation. Any man who preached Delamain's doctrine encouraged disorder.

Delamain, however, also attacks sexual disorder. Responding to charges of "iporting with one Ginni Clare," Delamain assures the reader he was most active in expelling her from the Church.[35] The sexually free woman remained ignored by polite society. Delamain rejects the concept of "community of women," a symbol of Ranters supposed free-love doctrine, "as a most abominable wicked thing."[36] When Taylor attacks Delamain's wife as a "maid servant," Delamain argues his wife's good reputation--and points to Taylor's own sexual misdeeds with a Jone Clare.[37] However radical his doctrine is, Delamain emphasizes traditional roles for women.

Taylor and Delamain's use of gendered language indicates a shared *mentalité* among conservative and radical Parliamentarians. Their shared image of woman as an element of disorder reflects societal fears of religious instability and social disorder. The desire to return to the pre-Revolution order perpetuated the use of women as a symbol of political disorder. Associating an opponent with women labeled him a radical and a threat to traditional order. In response, radicals distanced themselves from feminist rhetoric, and separatist churches formed hierarchies that excluded women.[38] The linkage of women and sects had been made, providing more conservative elements an easily understood symbol to attack. Associating women with disorder during the Revolutionary era lasted into the Interregnum, exhibiting itself in the *mentalité* of the Puritan victors.

34 Ibid., 3.
35 Delamain, *The Close Hypocrite Discovered*, 7 (9).
36 Ibid., 6.
37 Taylor, *Impostor Magnus*, 17; Delamain, *The Close Hypocrite Discovered*, 7 (9).
38 Anne Laurence, "A Priesthood of She-Believers: Women and Congregations in Mid-Seventeenth-Century England," in *Women in the Church*, edited by W. J. Shields (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1990), 345.

Heinrich Heine: Anti-Semite or Misunderstood Genius?

by Ean E. Eskra

Ean E. Eskra is an undergraduate history major. In this essay he seeks to understand the controversial nineteenth-century romantic, Heinrich Heine.

> That I will be a defender of Jewish rights, of that I am certain... But a born enemy of all positive religions will never champion that religion which was the first to bring in its wake that disregard for people which causes so much anguish to this day.[1]
>
> Heinrich Heine

The brilliant German poet Heinrich Heine came of age in the German town of Dusseldorf, on the Rhine, during the passing of French Enlightenment thinking and the birth of German Romantic Nationalism. Enlightenment thinking taught Heine to be skeptical of traditional thought and to celebrate individual thought and reasoning. It also taught him to value humanity in the same manner. However, Heine's own individuality, specifically his Jewish heritage, kept him from attaining civic and political equality (which was the goal of the enlightenment) with the gentiles of his German homeland. This essay will show that scholars have misinterpreted Heine's resulting bitterness, Enlightenment values, and the wit of a satirical poet for Jewish self-hatred.

The Enlightenment beliefs that Heine had experienced and acquired in his early childhood from the French Revolution directly conflicted with German Romantic Nationalism, which arose in reaction to the Napoleonic conquest of German territories. Unlike the Enlightenment, which centered around skepticism, individualism, universalism, logical reasoning, and disdain for the middle ages, German Romantic Nationalism celebrated mysticism and the middle ages in search of an organic whole. Unfortunately for Jews, that organic whole had no place for them.

The best and shortest explanation of Heine's life is that of Lothar Kahn. He wrote:

> It is not easy to explain the phenomenon of Heine. He has baffled critics whose opinion of him is hopelessly split along political and religious lines. More than most writers he must be viewed against the background of his time. He stemmed from a people about to engage on a new and uncharted course; the period in which he lived was an age of transition; he was between generations and systems; in a real sense he existed between the no-longer and the not-yet. He appears to have viewed everything from the outside, never really daring to step inside any house, developing loyalty to none, but mocking the follies of all.[2]

1 Paul L. Rose, *Revolutionary Antisemitism in Germany from Kant to Wagner* (Princeton, NJ.: Princeton University Press, 1990), 159.

This description captures the essence of Heine. He was filled with confusion and contradiction because the century in which he lived, the nineteenth, was filled with the same characteristics. At an early age Heine realized his Jewish heritage would deny him the equality afforded to gentile Germans. This knowledge did not have a serious effect on him until 1825, the year he was baptized as a Christian. In April of that year he passed his examinations at the University of Bonn and became a lawyer. However, Heine could not practice law unless he became baptized because, "...it was the law then in Germany that none save professing Christians could ever be admitted to the bar, or accorded almost any other governmental recognition."[3] In June Heine became baptized into the Christian religion.

At first, Heine saw baptism as his, "entry ticket to European Civilization,"[4] but the ticket actually led to his exile from Germany. Soon after his baptism, Heine realized that his alienation in German society had only increased. He no longer desired to become a lawyer and could not obtain a professorship due to his Jewish heritage. Heine wrote in a letter to a Rabbi:

> I am very sorry I had myself baptized. I do not see that things have gone any better with me since. On the contrary, I have had nothing but misfortune. Is it not absurd? As soon as I am baptized I am decried as a Jew... Now I am detested by Christian and Jew alike![5]

Although he was a trained lawyer and a brilliant (if still unrecognized) poet, Heine bitterly realized that there was no place for him within Romantic Nationalist German society. He also realized there was no place for him in Jewish society either.

Heine joined radicals, such as Jewish-German born Ludwig Borne, in search of freedom for humanity. Heine and other German radicals like him dreamed of a revolution that would sweep Germany and change the established order of the country. In July of 1830 their revolution came, but it was not in

2 Lothar Kahn, *Mirrors of the Jewish Mind* (New Jersey: Thomas Yoseloff Publisher, 1968), 22.
3 Lewis Browne, *That Man Heine* (New York: The MacMillan Company, 1929), 126.
4 Rose, 159.
5 Browne, 137.

Germany. Heine and the others falsely believed that the revolution in France would spread into Germany. Unlike the other radicals, Heine remained in Germany awaiting the revolution. At this time he wrote a supplement to his series *Travel Pictures*, which criticized German Romantic Nationalism and anyone Heine considered his enemy. Because of his faith in the revolution he had written this book without restraint.[6] Heine wrote in a letter to a friend:

> The book is deliberately one sided. I know very well that the Revolution embraces every social interest, and that the aristocracy and the Church are not its only enemies. But I have purposely represented them as the only allied enemies, so as to consolidate the struggle.[7]

When the censors discovered this book Heine was forced to leave Germany forever. He would spend the rest of his life exiled in Paris, permanently alienated from the country whose language he had mastered and which he loved dearly.

Many scholars have attempted to prove or disprove the presence of a kind of anti-semitism in Heine's thoughts, but none have been able to give a definite answer. No writings have been recovered in which Heine directly addressed the issue of Jewish self-hatred, although he did leave writings which allude to embarrassment about and misunderstanding of his heritage. In his work *The Baths of Lucca*, for example, Heine described a Jew as follows:

> This old Jew with a long beard and a torn cloak who can not speak an orthographic word and is a bit mangy feels himself happier than I do with all my education... He does not have to worry about culture, he sits wrapped contentedly in his religion.[8]

Also, while commenting on his "race," he said that Jews were,

> A mummified people that wanders the earth, wrapped up in its swathing of prescriptive letters, an obstinate piece of world history, a specter that bargains for its maintenance with bill of exchange and old hose.[9]

These writings and others like them, which criticize the Jewish people and religion, appear to illustrate a contempt for his heritage, but do not prove a hatred of it or his people. Quotations like these have inspired scholars to attempt to answer whether Heine should be claimed and celebrated by the Jews or shunned and criticized for his seemingly anti-semitic thoughts. Two such researchers are Israel Tabak and Sandra L. Gilman. In his book, *Heine and His Heritage*, Tabak attempts to prove Heine's Jewishness by showing Heine's use of

6 Ibid., 199.
7 Ibid.
8 Sander L. Gilman, *Jewish Self-Hatred* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1986), 175.
9 Rose, 161.

Hebrew, the Old Testament, post-Biblical literature, Jewish history, and Jewish folk themes with in his poetry.[10] However, Jeffery L. Sammons, author of *The Elusive Poet*, writes:

> Rabbi Tabak's book must be regarded with caution...The several hundred allusions to the Bible that Tabak so assiduously collected do not prove his point, for it has always been fundamental that German writers are Bibelfest, and Heine, after all, responds exclusively to that inexhaustible wellspring of German language, Martin Luther's translation.[11]

He added that Tabak's attempt to prove Heine's Jewishness through parallel passages in the Talmud and his poetry was unconvincing.[12] Also, Sammons did not believe that a man,"...who did not know the calendar date of passover...," and "...nearly put the anniversary of the fall of the temple on the tenth day of Ab when the Hebrew name of the fast, Tisha b'Av, means literally 'the ninth day of Ab'...," could be thoroughly immersed in Jewish tradition.[13]

Unlike Tabak, Gilman attempts to prove Heine's anti-semitism. In her book, *Jewish Self-Hatred*, Gilman supplies the following definition of self-hatred, which he uses to interpret Heine's writing:

> Self-hatred results from outsiders' acceptance of the mirage of themselves generated by their reference group--that group in society which they see as defining them--as reality...The liberal fantasy is that anyone is welcome to share the power of the reference group if he abides by the rules that define that group. But these rules are the very definition of Other. The Other comprises precisely those who are not permitted to share power. Thus, the outsiders hear an answer from their fantasy: become like us--abandon your difference--and you may be one with us. On the other hand is the hidden qualification of the internalized reference group, the conservative curse: the more you are like me,...the more I am aware that you are but a shoddy counterfeit, an outsider.[14]

Gilman uses this logic in explaining Heine's writings. She agrees that Heine subverted other Jews in order to make himself, a baptized Jew, more appealing to the increasingly anti-semitic German culture he loved so much. One passage Gilman interprets is a passage by Heine on the Polish Jew. Heine wrote:

> The Wadzeck Weekly chronicle, cooked in porridge, could not have nauseated me any more than those rag bag figures of dirt; and high minded speech of the third former enthusiastic about fatherland could not of martyred my ears so excruciatingly as the Polish Jew jargon. Their German language was sprinkled with Hebrew and Polish.[15]

10 Israel Tabak, *Heine and His Heritage; A Study of Judaic Lore in his Work* (New York: Twayne Publishers, 1956), 6.
11 Jeffery L. Sammons, *Heinrich Heine, The Elusive Poet* (Mass.: Yale University Press, 1969), 452.
12 Ibid.
13 Ibid.
14 Gilman, 3.
15 Ibid., 25.

Heine elaborated this statement by stating that he preferred the Polish Jew with his lousy beard and garlic breath to the assimilated Jew of Germany. Although Heine admits his preference for these Jews, Gilman interprets the preceding paragraphs as being anti-semitic. She states that even though Heine believed the Polish Jews were better than assimilated Jews, Heine reviles their imperfect German dialect. By doing this, Heine is raising himself, a master of the German language, above these Jews, thus attempting to make himself more appealing.

Gilman's interpretation of Heine could be valid, but she forgot she was dealing with "the one who mocks the follies of all."[16] Heine was so obsessed with his own genius that he not only intellectually belittled the Jews, but everyone else. One can see this trait in his early life when he was living in Hamburg, a city he hated. He unflatteringly described its citizens: "Arrogant caviling, dense insensibility, hatred for anything better than themselves; this was the attitude of the citizens; hypocritical middle class morality combined with squalid debauchery."[17] His own arrogance can also be seen in a conflict with his millionaire uncle, Solomon Heine. After Heine defrauded his uncle of money, Solomon became very angry with Heine. Heine, feeling justified in his action, said, "The best thing about you is that you bear my name."[18] These two examples illustrate Heine's egotism. Gilman neglects to consider this characteristic while evaluating Heine's comments about Jews.

Tabak and Gilman both offer reasonable interpretations and observations about Heine's attitudes toward the Jews. However, these observations and interpretations are open to question. Unless a document is recovered that directly addresses the subject, no one will be able to know definitively if Heine was indeed anti-semitic. However, reading Heine's *Concerning the History and Philosophy of Germany* makes it difficult to believe he was anti-semitic. This book reveals Heine's thoughts about religion in Germany and about religion in general. Although he does not directly address Judaism, the views he reveals concerning religion are ones which are not consistent with anti-semitism.

Ludwig Borne comments on Heine and religion: "Christianity and indeed religion all together are not only abhorrent to him, they revolt him."[19] Heine had

16 Kahn, 22.
17 E.M. Butler, *Heinrich Heine: A Biography* (New York: Philosophic Library, 1957), 18.
18 Ibid., 51.
19 Ibid

a religion, but it was not a traditional religion. It was a celebration of his own genius. Rather than believe and accept Christianity and Judaism, both of which he found joyless, tyrannical and oppressive, Heine subscribed to his own religion. This was a religion with a God that manifested himself in each individual and became real through humanity as a whole. Although he never started his own religious sect, Heine did attempt to follow his own faith. He demonstrated this in his sympathy for Saint-Simonism.

Saint-Simonism was a movement and a religion that was aimed at emancipating the poor and oppressed. Ultimately the movement failed, but Heine was drawn to its cause. One of the main reasons was the movement's religious beliefs, which were similar to his own. Saint-Simonism was a religion of joy, not oppression and tyranny. It was a religion of humanity, not for humanity.

Heine's dream of this religion of humanity is revealed in *Concerning the History and Philosophy of Germany*. Heine wrote this book while he was in exile in Paris and being influenced by Saint-Simonism. Heine reveals a respect both for the early pagan gods of Germany and for Martin Luther, while also yearning for a refined pantheism. These elements are all part of Heine's "religion."

Heine had respect for the ancient pagan gods of Germany because these gods lived among the people and were at one with nature. When Catholicism entered Germany, it transformed these gods into devils, demons, and goblins and replaced them with one God. This God was above the people, and religion was removed from earth. Heine believed this was a great injustice. Catholicism had not only taken away a religion that was close to the people, but it transformed this religion of nature into an evil thing. However, Heine believed that the pagan gods would remain in German minds forever, even if only in their obscured form, because Luther "expelled" Catholicism from Germany. Although Catholicism's monopoly of spiritual issues was ended, the ghosts, goblins, and devils it created from the pagan gods remained with the people.

Heine's views of the man and the religion that expelled Catholicism were benevolent. He admired Luther for three contributions. First, he made it possible for German thoughts, needs and wants to be expressed. Second, he did away with religious authority and let reason rule. He did this by breaking the Papal

authority over people's thoughts. The right to freedom of thought, which Luther advocated, supported two other fundamental principles: freedom of the press and academic freedom. Third, he allowed man to face his creator. These were main beliefs of Heine's own religion.

Heine's religion was heavily rooted in pantheism, but although he respected the ancient pagan gods, he wanted a more refined pantheism. He believed that God was everywhere, in plants, animals, the earth and the free thinker. Heine thought "that in man the deity attains self-awareness and reveals this self-awareness through man."[20] He did not believe this happened in individuals only. He believed it occurred through the collective of humanity, "...the result being that every human comprehends and represents only one portion of the divine universe, whereas collective humanity will comprehend and represent the totality of the divine universe of idea and reality."[21]

Heine's religion was founded on the belief that all humankind is an incarnation of God. Each human is part of God. This belief opposed both Christianity and Judaism. As he saw it, in these religions people rely on God. They are like a sponge and God is like a great lake. People simply soak up His divinity. Heine, however, believed that man was an active part of God. This made it necessary for him to celebrate the flesh, unlike the other religions which shunned it.

Unlike Christianity, Heine's religion was joyful and in the material world. He thought that the divinity of man was revealed in material form. Christianity saw matter as evil because it fought the spirit world. Heine did not agree with this view because he believed that the spirit perishes when the body is debased and put through misery. Thus, he believed that life in the material world should be joyful in order to allow the deity to become self-aware. He criticized Christian belief because it created sin by forcing the material and spiritual worlds to clash. The oppression of the material world, the world in which humans exist, turned Heine away from Christianity and towards his own beliefs.

Heine's three main points in *Concerning the History and Philosophy of* Germany are not consistent with the anti-semitic mentality. Heine was a man who had a religion of man's own creative genius. Although he never

20 Heinrich Heine *Concerning the History and Philosophy of Germany*, trans. Helen Mustard (New York: Random House, 1973), 339.
21 Ibid.

created his own religious sect, he thought his religion was best for humanity. Heine once said, "Lay a sword upon my coffin; for I was an honest soldier in the war for liberation of mankind."[22] Heine saw the traditional religions as oppressive and joyless, rather than liberating.

Heine was not anti-semitic. However, he was not willing to accept the traditional religions of Judaism and Christianity. Because he exposed what he believed was wrong with traditional religion, Heine's reputation has suffered. In *Concerning the History and Philosophy of Germany*, Heine wrote in typical nineteenth Century fashion of a man whom he considered another misunderstood genius, Gotthold Ephraim Lessing. In this revealing passage, Heine wrote:

> You readily understand that a man like Lessing could never be happy. Even if he had not loved truth, even if he had not defended it on every occasion, he would still perforce have been unhappy, for he was a genius. "People will forgive anything," said a poet recently, "they will forgive you your fine figure, they won't even mind if you're talented, but they are pitiless towards a genius." And Alas! even though he may not encounter ill will from without, a genius would still find himself the enemy repairing misery for him. Thus the history of great men is always a martyrology; even when they did not suffer for the greatness of the human race, they suffered their own greatness...[23]

Heine was not anti-semitic. He was a man who suffered for his own genius and/or religion rather than accept those which he found oppressive and joyless. Heine's religion of human genius was typical of romantic notions of self-creation.

22 Butler, 75.
23 Heine, 361.

KULTURNATION

Calvin Clay Snyder

In this essay, Calvin Clay Snyder probes the intellectual orgins of the German national unification movement during the nineteenth century. Mr. Snyder is a graduating history major at Eastern.

The traditional historical analysis of the roots of 19th century German nationalism and eventual unification later in the century tends to emphasize the War of Liberation of 1813-1814 as the crucible in which German nationalism was forged. Although this war against Napoleon's aggression in the name of French Enlightenment liberated Europe from French domination, it must not be denied that many elements were already in place in the German psyche which prepared the Germans for a separate identity. German thinkers such as Johann Gottfried Herder, Johann Fichte, Friedrich Jahn, and Ernst Moritz Arndt, had already provided the intellectual impetus for a cultural nationalism that downplayed enlightened individualism and emphasized community struggle towards a German identity. The defeat of Prussia at Jena and Auerstedt on October 14, 1806, by the Napoleonic forces had awakened in German minds the fear that with the destruction of Prussia their somewhat tenuous identity might be completely obliterated. Influential German intellectuals came to the forefront to rescue German identity through a glorification of the German peoples' language and history. No less a figure than Johann Wolfgang Goethe dismissed their work as the affair of a few thousand educated men while millions remained soundly asleep. Yet, these thinkers were decisive in shaping the German romantic longing for a true harmonious folk-community in which individuals, contrary to the enlightenment's stress in individualist ideals, would reach freedom only by identifying with the greater whole. Thus, as a reaction to radical French nationalism Germans adopted Johann Gottfried Herder's idea of the *Volkstrum* based on language.[1]

1 Hagen Schulze, *The Course of German Nationalism: From Frederick the Great to Bismarck, 1763-1867* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), 50.

Herder's ideas had been published already in the late 18th century. In his *Another Philosophy of History* (1774) and *Outlines of a Philosophy of the History of Man* (1784-91) he described history as progressing through struggle, not by reason as the Enlightenment thinkers had suggested. He believed that different nations based on distinct languages had existed before the State and each was held together by a national spirit (*Volksgeist*) which was best expressed in folklore and folktales. He believed the nation was a community based on blood, and the nation-state would be a natural grouping of similar blood. Herder did not write to sway political movements, but after 1806 Germans were living a fragmented existence and his sense of Germanness appealed to the intellectuals during the French occupation. German thinkers exchanged and updated his ideas and influenced the cultural nationalism that was building.

The idealist philosopher, Johann Gottlieb Fichte was also influential in the growth of this cultural nationalism. In the winter of 1807-08, following the Prussian defeat by Napoleon, Fichte gave a series of lectures to an audience of students and academics in Berlin called *Addresses to the German Nation*. These lectures were an attack on Napoleon's occupation of the European continent. Fichte focused his lectures on persuading the Germans that they had a special duty to preserve their culture that had been under foreign influence. Fichte did not totally reject Enlightenment ideas as some other German thinkers were doing. His liberal influences were revealed in his eighth address when he claimed:

> It follows that the state, merely as the government of human life in its progress along the ordinary peaceful path, is not something which is primary and which exists for its own sake, but is merely the means to the higher purpose of the eternal, regular, and continuous development of what is purely human in this nation.[2]

Thus, like the liberals and Enlightenment thinkers, Fichte believed the nation-state was the means to a higher human purpose, not an end in itself. Fichte extended Herder's ideas on language and claimed a nation's existence is damaged if it allows its language to be influenced by foreign words or abandons its language for another. He cited examples both of the French who, he argued, had exchanged their original language for a Latin language, and of Prussia, whose defeat at Jena in 1806, he claimed, was a result of Prussia having been Frenchified under Frederick II. Fichte claimed the cultural survival of a people depended first on the formation of a nation. He felt the next step was to form

2 George Armstrong Kelly, ed., *Addresses to the German Nation, Johann Gottlieb Fichte* (New York: Harper and Row, 1968), 125.

the German nation into a single state. Fichte's ideas were simply ideas and were not based on political realities. Although he offered no concrete policies, his rhetoric inspired his German audience. Under the French occupation, Germans developed an intellectual voice and terms like Fatherland, *Volk*, and Nation became key political words, and set the tone for the educated bourgeoisie's sense of nationalism.

Another influence in the development of nationalistic ideas in Germany were the "Awakeners of Germanness," especially Friedrich Jahn and Ernst Moritz Arndt.[3] Jahn, considered the father of the gymnastics movement, encouraged young Germans to make themselves fit to liberate their country. He also emphasized the need to preserve the racial purity and customs of the German people in his book *Deutsches Volkstrum* (German National Character, 1810). More radical than Jahn, Arndt's rhetoric was fiercely anti-French, anti-semitic, and called the German people to action. "The highest religion is to love the fatherland above law and princes, fathers and mothers, wives and children."[4] Arndt expressed his definition of the fatherland:

> Where God's sun first appeared to you, where the stars of heaven first twinkled at you, where lightening first revealed to you God's almighty power and where his storm-winds roared through your soul producing Holy terror, there is your love,there is your fatherland.[5]

With this strong nationalistic rhetoric it appeared any liberal or Enlightenment ideas regarding individual liberty, equality, or the universal rights of man were being snuffed out by a strong German Nationalism that emphasized the cultural and racial ideals of the fatherland.

Good evidence that the roots of German nationalism were already growing on the eve of the War of Liberation is the widespread existence of the *Deutsche Burschenschaft* (German student fraternities). These fraternities promoted a union of students in every institution of higher education to promote national unity. Among the student's duties was that of "esteeming above everything the German people and the German fatherland, and he must be German in his words, deeds and life."[6]

Thus, already by 1813 and on the eve of the War of Liberation, a political atmosphere was forming, and key words such as Germanness, Fatherland, *Volk*, and Patriotism were stamped in the intelligentsia's lexicon of a call to action.

---

3 Michael Hughes, *Nationalism and Society, Germany 1800-1945* (Baltimore: Hodder and Stoughton, 1988), 27.
4 Ibid.
5 Ibid.
6 Schulze, *The Course of German Nationalism*, 52.

The War of Liberation lasted a short one-and-one-half years, and Napoleon was defeated. Other than removing the French occupation, what was achieved? Was Germany any closer to national unity? Germany was still only a cultural expression and the German-state did not materialize until the Bismarckian white revolution almost seventy years later. But a sense of German identity that was the basis for later nationalism was in place before the War of Liberation. This ideal evolved in the ensuing decades and contributed to the authoritarian evolution that created the state of Germany. Thus, the few thousand men Goethe referred to shaped the agenda of future nationalism, even though it would be a few more years before the millions would awake.

Whites Among the Indians: Critiquing Sources for Mandan and Hidatsa Studies

Jill Chwojko-Frank

Jill Chwojko-Frank received her Master's Degree in History at the College of William and Mary, and is currently enrolled in Eastern's Historical Administration Program.

Henry Boller conceded in his published journal that he enjoyed eating a prized Hidatsa delicacy. He recounted that "the idea of eating such a barbarous dish was at first revolting, but afterwards, when better able to appreciate these Indian luxuries, I found it very palatable, particularly the natural liquor or broth in which it is boiled, which with the addition of salt and pepper made an excellent soup."[1] The meat he described was a young bison fetus. It had to be a winter kill, Boller continued, because in the spring the calf is "too large and coarse."[2] Besides revealing cuisine that probably made many of his 1867 readers cringe, Boller also acknowledged that he found merit in what European culture considered barbarous. Today, many scholars refer to this attitude as cultural relativity. After living with the Hidatsa[3] for several years, Boller learned to see pieces of the world through Hidatsa cultural assumptions, even if it was through his stomach. Boller went so far as to proclaim that "Indian (women) are the best cooks of meat in the world."[4] Boller certainly did not become Hidatsa and we cannot take his writings as definitive descriptions of Hidatsa culture. However, his keen and colorful observations make his work an essential part of understanding Hidatsa history.

1 Henry A. Boller, *Among the Indians: Four Years on the Upper Missouri, 1858-1862*, ed. Milo Milton Quaife (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 1972), 236.
2 Ibid.
3 Throughout his account, Boller refers to his hosts as the *Gros Ventre* after the French nickname "Big Bellies." Perhaps an early Frenchman mistook the title of a leader as the name for the whole group. In this paper, the tribe will be called the Hidatsa.
4 Boller, *Among the Indians*, 235.

Much valuable information about the Hidatsa and the Mandan comes from similar Euro-American sources. The available documents range from reports written as business records to narratives published to satiate Eastern curiousity about the frontier. The observers were men who came up the Missouri River in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries as employees or explorers for trading companies and various European governments, including the United States. These writings document their contact with and impressions of the American Indians they met during their travels.

The presence of whites among the Indians affected Mandan and Hidatsa culture and society, just as it did all other tribes on the continent. As Europeans and white Americans increasingly intervened in the Northwest, trade, government policy, and infectious disease altered living conditions along the Missouri. The two tribes became increasingly involved in European trade, intertribal warfare, and the encroachment of American "civilization." The writers were in a good position to record many of the dramatic changes that occurred on the Upper Missouri throughout the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

These published documents are wonderful for researchers in part because of their easy accessibility through libraries. With archaeology and oral traditions, two other substantive sources for information, the scholar must do extensive field work to find the sources and interpret the findings. Written sources can often help resolve apparent inconsistencies among archaeological finds or between oral traditions. However, written documents require intense scrutiny. The authors had their own agenda or reasons for writing their observations. Most of them did not intend to be objective observers of Native Americans but were instead diligent and opportunistic recorders of rapidly changing societies. The fact that writers are biased does not invalidate their commentary. A thorough reading of their ideas includes looking at the text on two levels-(1) what they noticed and why, and (2) what they might have overlooked. This paper looks at seven of the writers who left first-hand contributions to Mandan and Hidatsa studies.

The Mandan and Hidatsa have lived for centuries in what is now North Dakota.[5] When whites began visiting, they lived in various villages on the banks of the Missouri River between the Knife and Heart rivers. During the

5 Roy W. Meyer, *The Village Indians of the Upper Missouri: The Mandans, Hidatsas, and Arikaras* (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 1977), 5, 10-11.

eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, the Mandan and Hidatsa were unique societies that lived amicably near each other. However, many aspects of their lifestyles were similar despite their uniqueness. They built their villages on the high banks of the river for access to good crop land and protected home sites. The flood plains in the river valley below offered excellent soil for growing the corn, beans, squash, and sunflowers on which they relied. The terraces and bluffs above the flood plain were ideal locations for secured communities. By the eighteenth century, they frequently selected village sites on points which needed fortification on only one or two sides, with the river providing a protective barrier for the others. The fortifications included palisades with room between the planks for firearms and arrows and ditches inside the perimeter to protect those defending the village.[5]

Inside the village was an assortment of earthlodges, ranging in size from 40 to 90 feet, arranged around a central ceremonial structure and open plaza.[7] The lodges started with a frame of cottonwood posts and rafters which were covered with layers of willows, grass, and earth. These large and sturdy structures could support a big extended family plus some horses and dogs inside as well. A large gathering of people could even sit on top of the roof. Some homes included a rail around the outside for easy access to the top. Inside the homes there were spaces for many beds, cooking, working and storage areas, including underground cache pits, a central fireplace and a shrine. The size of the lodge depended on the size of the family, just as the size of the village depended on the number of lodges. European contact era villages could have from a few dozen to over 150 homes. Scholars have estimated that the eighteenth century Mandan-Hidatsa population was around 12-16,000 or more.[8]

Bison hunting was another major part of Mandan and Hidatsa life. Whereas growing corn and building houses were traditional occupations for women, the men were the hunters and warriors. Men would periodically go on short hunting trips and bring back their pack horses loaded with bison meat, hides, and other products. Once the women got the bison they would cook some meat immediately, fix delicacies for the returning hunters and their guests, save some meat to

6 George F. Will and H. J. Spinden, *The Mandans: A Study of their Culture, Archaeology and Ethnology*. "Papers of the Peabody Museum of American Archaeology and Ethnology," Vol. III, No. 4 (Cambridge: Harvard University, 1906), 105; Meyer, The Village Indians, 2.
7 Will and Spinden, *The Mandans*, 105.
8 Meyer, *The Village Indians*, 13-14.

cut into strips for drying, and later would prepare the hide. The hides provided rugs, clothing, foot covers, rope, and many other everyday necessities of village life.[9]

The attackers of Mandan and Hidatsa villages were various Sioux tribes, especially the Yanktonai and the Teton Sioux, and many other tribes with whom the Mandan and Hidatsa traded. These village communities were opportunely situated to be trading centers between tribes to the north and east and other tribes traveling from the south and west. The Northern tribes could bring hides and British goods, while those from the South brought their own goods along with a few Spanish trade items. In exchange, the Mandan and Hidatsa offered vegetables from their garden, decorated robes, and other goods. The crops were not only food for sustenance, but were a very lucrative currency in the network of Indian markets. Their location and wealth also made them susceptible to raids for horses, goods, or political gains. Groups of Mandan and Hidatsa men would also attack neighboring tribes and traveling trade bands to achieve the same goals.[10] These attacks are one aspect of Missouri River life of which the visitors took particular notice.

The earliest known document describing a European visit to these Missouri agriculturalists was written in 1738. Pierre Gaultier de Varennes, the Sieur de la Vérendrye along with his two sons, François and Louis-Joseph, traveled from their fur trading posts in Canada with a group of Assiniboine traders. Led by descriptions from his Assiniboine hosts, La Vérendrye journeyed to the Mandan expecting to find a culture physically and socially similar to the French. During his two week stay he gained a more accurate understanding of Mandan society. His discussions and observations of these people were hampered by the loss of his Cree interpreter. Vérendrye reported that while the Assiniboines visited the Mandan these visitors ate more than their hosts thought proper and were encouraged to leave by rumors that the Sioux might attack soon. Although he had planned to stay with the Mandan for several weeks, Vérendrye decided to leave after about two weeks (December 3-13). He left behind two men to learn the Mandan language and, in the middle of December, started back north to one of his forts.[11]

9 Boller, *Among the Indians*, 233-5.
10 Anthony McGinnis, *Counting Coup and Cutting Horses: Intertribal Warfare on the Northern Plains 1738-1889* (Evergreen, CO: Cordillera Press, Inc., 1990), 15,18, 21, 218 n. 1; Meyer, *The Village Indians*, 42, 69.
11 G. Hubert Smith, *The Exploration of the La Vérendryes in the Northern Plains, 1738-1743*, ed. W. Raymond Wood (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska, 1980), 37.

In December of 1797, another short-term European guest came to the Mandan villages. David Thompson traveled to the Missouri as an astronomer and explorer for the North West Company. Although he worked for the trading company and was accompanied to the villages by traders, Thompson's interest was not in trading goods, but acquiring information for his trading company. His published journal details the number and size of villages and of the lodges within the communities he encountered between December 30, 1797 and January 10, 1798. Thompson was especially interested in their defensive and agricultural capabilities. His expedition purchased over 300 pounds of corn and other vegetables to supply their journey.[12]

The nineteenth century brought many more short and long term European and American visitors to the Missouri village Indians. Trading companies began establishing forts closer to the Missouri and eventually lived right next door to the Mandan and Hidatsa. Another two-week visitor was Alexander Henry the Younger. While working for the North West Company in 1806 he paid a short visit to villages of both the Hidatsa and the Mandan. Instead of traveling in the middle of winter, Henry came in the middle of summer (July 19-29, 1806) and offered some of the first depictions of agriculturalists working in their fields. His commentaries were driven by a pessimistic and not very forgiving attitude about the culture and living conditions he confronted. Frequently, his comments are more useful for understanding the hardships of traveling in the Northwest than of the people and places he saw.[13]

A few years later, John Bradbury stayed for several weeks in the summer with the Mandan and Hidatsa. He was a botanist who accompanied a group of men traveling to Salt Lake and the Pacific coast. A group of traders also joined their party. This time the travelers came by boat along the Missouri from St. Louis. They arrived at a Missouri Fur Company trading fort on June 22, 1810 near a Hidatsa village on the Missouri river. Bradbury stayed collecting plants until the 17th of July. The Pacific voyagers invited Bradbury to continue with them, but he decided to return to St. Louis that summer before water travel became difficult and to insure that his extensive live plant collection arrived in St. Louis alive for further study. As he returned to St. Louis, Bradbury

12 David Thompson, *Travels in Western North America, 1784-1812*, ed. Victor G. Hopwood (Toronto: Macmillan of Canada, 1917), 162-175.
13 Elliott Coues, ed., *New Light on the Early History of the Greater Northwest: The Manuscript Journals of Alexander Henry and of David Thompson, 1799-1814*, 3 vols. (New York: Francis P. Harper, 1897), 322-366; Meyer The Village Indians, 47.

was most disappointed that he did not have time to collect more plants.[14]

One of the most colorful reports of Mandan life came from the paintings of George Catlin. This former portrait artist turned visual ethnologist arrived at the village just in time to see a very important ceremony in the summer of 1832. His view of the annual religious rite of passage and ceremonies promoting communal unity, called the Okipa, was hampered by his desire to find proof that the Mandan were actually of Welsh origin. The creation stories related during the several days of celebration have some concepts similar to those in the Judeo-Christian tradition of Noah and the Great Flood. In between discussing the possible origins of these similarities, Catlin painted and described the intricate costumes, ceremonies, and people involved. His stay was also a short one, lasting only from July to mid-August.[15]

While Catlin visited the Mandan he stayed at the Upper Missouri Outfit's trading post, Fort Clark. Two years after the painter's visit, a man named Frances A. Chardon came to the fort and began to keep a daily journal. Since he was a businessman interested in acquiring wealth by trading, most of his comments concern bison robe inventory, amounts of supplies, and daily operation of the fort. The most dramatic accounts in his journal are the tallies and lists of Mandan and Hidatsa who died during the smallpox epidemic of 1837.[16] His stay near these Indians is the longest of the authors listed so far. His journal encompasses the years 1834-1839. However, he spent much longer working as a trader. Before he came to Fort Clark, he worked at a trading fort among the Osage. After his journal ended he continued at Fort Clark until at least 1843 and returned to the Upper Missouri for periods of time after that.[17]

Another trading post employee who kept a journal during the years of his stay was Henry A. Boller of the Clark, Primeau and Company fur-trading partnership.[18] He worked at Fort Atkinson near a combined Hidatsa-Mandan village (often called Like-A-Fishhook village because of a sharp bend in the river) and the American Fur Company's Fort Berthold. His stay lasted from the summer of 1858 to the spring of 1860. Besides communicating fascinating

14 John Bradbury, *Travels in the Interior of America, in the Years 1809, 1810, and 1811* (Ann Arbor, MI: University Microfilms, Inc., 1966), 134-175.
15 George Catlin, *O-KEE-PA: A Religious Ceremony and other Customs of the Mandan*, ed. John C. Ewers (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 1976).
16 Francis A. Chardon, *Chardon's Journal at Fort Clark, 1834-1839*, ed. Annie Heloise Abel (Pierre, SD: 1932), 121-162.
17 Ibid., xv-xlvi.
18 Boller, *Among the Indians*, viii.

descriptions of the local food, Boller also gained intimate knowledge of life on the Upper Missouri by leaving the fort and living with the Mandan and Hidatsa in their winter quarters. Although these farming groups were sedentary compared to the nomadic tribes of the Plains, these people actually had two homes in the same area. The summer homes afforded good crop land and fortified protection, while the winter homes offered good woodland protection from winter winds and snowstorms. Winter quarters were usually a few miles away from the river in a wooded area. The proximity of trees made wood gathering easier in winter, a season when most tribes did not conduct raids and defense was not as critical. After spending an intense winter interacting with the community, Boller's descriptions became more detailed and insightful.

Soon after Boller left, the observations of traders and explorers were replaced by the reports of Indian agents and military commanders. Within thirty years, the United States government, through encouragement and force, convinced the Mandan, Hidatsa, and the Arikara who joined them to move out of their village and onto farms on a reservation.[19] Between the years 1738 and 1860, the Mandan and Hidatsa had maintained their political independence and self-determination.

Much modern analysis depends on the European observers for determining the cultures and behaviors of these communities during those years. The documents contain information we could probably never get from another source, but they do not include everything. Since they are not all-encompassing, our assessment of Mandan and Hidatsa life may be missing major components. The most important information they offer may be in discovering why the visitors noticed what they did and what they might have overlooked.

The most important subject for Europeans in the Missouri river villages was trade. The first explorers went there to discover trade opportunities and later travelers could get there because trade routes were established and maintained. The Mandan and Hidatsa wanted the traders to come so they could have access to more European goods. Europeans believed the Indians could not live without those items and could improve their society if they used more of them. However, the process of dependence on European goods was gradual and never completely replaced traditional items. Henry found the corn mill that Lewis and

19 Meyer, *The Village Indians*, 109.

Clark left for the Mandan in 1804 torn apart and used for points for arrows and one large piece equipped with a handle like a hammer.[20] Other observers found the Mandan and Hidatsa to be shrewd and able traders.[21] Verendrye believed that the Assiniboines were pressured into trading "all they possess, such as muskets, powder, ball kettles, axes, knives and awls." Vérendryes placed a higher value on the European, metal trade goods. The Assiniboines apparently did not agree and were willing to trade their European items. If the Mandan and Hidatsa required large amounts of European goods in exchange for their own products, perhaps they did not see them as worth that much either.

All parties did agree that bison products were an important commodity and, for the Europeans, Indian hunters were the most effective source for acquiring them. The traders were interested in noting how many bison the Mandan and Hidatsa killed and how many robes would be available for trade. For the Europeans, the more bison the better. For the Indians, some benefits came with the opposite situation. If fewer surplus hides and meat supplies were available, then each piece had a higher value and the hunters could trade fewer hides for the European goods that they needed or wanted. Part of the reason that the traders so frequently noted the scarcity of bison may have been that the Mandan and Hidatsa were trying to augment the exchange value of hides. During the second winter of Boller's stay, villagers decided that the traders could not move with them to winter quarters unless they promised to raise the amount of goods traded for each hide.[22]

Even Bradbury, who did not come to trade, described trading arrangements in detail.[23] Trading was the reason for contact with the Indians and most meetings focused on trade discussions. When Bradbury was invited to various Hidatsa and Mandan homes, he concluded that the main motive was the Indian's interest in trade. He also commented on how gracious and polite they were as hosts.[24]

Bison hunting was frequently discussed, but most of the writers never went themselves. Chardon noted when bison herds were sighted and recorded how many kills were brought back to the fort and to the village. Although Boller often described his hunting outings, he initially emphasized the sporting

20 Coues, *New Light*, 329.
21 Smith, *Exploration*, 56.
22 Boller, *Among the Indians*, 347.
23 Bradbury, *Travels in the Interior*, 110-116.
24 Ibid., 169.

aspects of the hunt.[25] He was not responsible for feeding the fort. After wintering with the Hidatsa, Boller's attitude changed. "I went out frequently with the hunters," Boller explained, "and the novelty having long since worn off, looked upon it as a regular business and not merely an exciting pastime."[26]

Several of the writers were quite blatant about the fact that they did not trust the Indians and described whenever someone lived up to those expectations. Descriptions of thieving and dishonesty appear frequently. Chardon stated that "they (the Mandan) are so treatcherous, that it is impossible to Know Friend or Enemie, however I consider them all the later, and an Indian is soon turned, like the wind, from one side to the other."[27] Vérendryes decided that the "Indian will give service only as long as he is paid, and in advance, and considers promises a subterfuge."[28]

The writers also seldom mention acts of kindness, but they did exist. Bradbury thought that his hosts were "superlatively honest towards strangers" and that "no people discharge the duties of hospitality with more cordial goodwill than the Indians."[29] Boller showed gratitude and friendship for an American friend's Indian wife and their children. He asked his father in Philadelphia to purchase a dress and some toys and send them to the fort.[30] Henry could barely believe the kindness exhibited by his Mandan host, Black Cat. Henry received a horse, supplies, and tobacco for trading, all on the promise of sending furs that fall.[31] What Henry failed to recognize was the importance of giving in Mandan society and the status gained from accommodating foreign guests. Henry's presence probably raised Black Cat's status and the generosity may have been from gratitude and hopes for further political gain. Henry also probably insulted other Mandan and Hidatsa by not staying with them or accepting invitations. By comparison, Henry's actions were not always generous. While traveling with the Hidatsa, Henry grabbed a bladder full of water from a passing woman and after drinking it complained about the quality.[32] These writers too often assumed inherent dishonesty was enough reason for Indian uncooperativeness or hostility without looking deeper into the Indians' motives or their own treatment of their hosts.

25 Boller, *Among the Indians*, 122.
26 Ibid., 228.
27 Chardon, *Chardon's Journals*, 130.
28 Smith, *Exploration*, 61.
29 Bradbury, *Travels in the Interior*, 169.
30 Boller, *Among the Indians*, 49-50.
31 Coues, *New Light*, 401-2.
32 Ibid., 391.

Assumptions about trickery and slyness, and other visitor biases, are evident in Vérendrye's first encounter. His expedition to the Mandan was plagued with minor problems that amounted to major inconveniences. Cree and Assiniboin tribes tried to prevent Vérendrye from traveling to the Mandan and many Assiniboin tribes insisted on accompanying him. In the final days of his trip, Vérendrye lost a box which held important supplies and paper, and his bag of gifts for the Mandan was stolen. When the party finally arrived at the village, the Mandan soon informed them that the Sioux would attack soon. Vérendrye later learned it was just a ruse to get rid of the Assiniboin, but he was surprised at how easily the Assiniboines were duped after they insisted on coming. Before his traveling companions left, an Assiniboines chief informed Vérendrye that his interpreter had run off with a woman he loved and would not be returning. Vérendrye accepted this response and was left in the Mandan village without a means of communicating with his hosts.[33] Perhaps the Assiniboines were so willing to leave because they had already achieved their goal of limiting Verendrye's contact with a potential trading partner. After all, Vérendrye and the traders left after only a few more days.

European assumptions about sexuality may have clouded Vérendrye's judgment in his predicament. He quite readily believed the excuse that the man had followed a woman. Mandan and Hidatsa expressions of sexuality were very different from Christian-European traditions. Both Mandan and Hidatsa spiritual beliefs included ceremonial intercourse as part of their quest for power. Power was a complex concept including ideas about strength, skill, luck, and success. One way of acquiring power was through intercourse. In the ceremony that most writers noticed and disliked, the wives of young men seeking power offered to have intercourse with an older man in the tribe who was successful. The old men could either accept or refuse. At the end of the ceremony, the old man handed the woman a sacred bundle which she held to her chest. The power would then be retransmitted to the man through relations with his wife.[34]

Most of the writers were critical of the women's lack of chastity and the men's seemingly lack of sexual control over themselves and their wives. To be

33 Smith, Exploration, 53, 54, 57.
34 Alfred W. Bowers, *Mandan Social and Ceremonial Organization* (Moscow, ID: University of Idaho Press, 1991), 48, 84, 284-5, 316-19, 335-337.

fair, they were also critical of European visitors who participated in short-term sexual liaisons with Mandan and Hidatsa women. Europeans emphasized the immorality of sex outside of marriage, with consent of the husband, and accepting presents as well. Many of the voyagers and traders took advantage of the women's seeming willingness to have sex for only the price of a trinket. Although these European writers complained about and criticized these practices at great length, they never tried to analyze the practices for motives other than sexual gratification and monetary gain. Bradbury did notice that husbands and wives consulted before she agreed to extend or accept an offer. Essentially, the women were acting as prostitutes in the eyes of our writers.[35]

Besides noticing sexual practices or their cooking abilities, European men had little contact with women. They learned very little about the women's skills, perspectives, and contributions to the community. Even in cooking, the writers notice little beyond the quality and taste. Boller praised the women's cooking abilities and described some recipes in detail. Henry found the food disgusting and described native eating habits as barbaric. Since Europeans tended to mention the lack of salt and pepper frequently, their sense of taste may not have been sensitive enough to detect the variety of ingredients in their dishes besides meat, corn and beans. They also did not seem interested enough to ask about or record that information. Henry demonstrated his lack of understanding when he examined a cooking pot. Some of their cooking pottery was cone shaped. Henry described how the women must carefully (and in his opinion awkwardly) place the pots in a hole of ashes, instead of analyzing the benefits of having more surface area contact with a heat source.[36]

The European men might not have learned much about women because women might not have been very willing to talk to them. Hidatsa and Mandan had very specific ideas about the division of labor between men and women. Each probably did not know too much detail about the others skills. Therefore, the Indian men could not describe the women's jobs at all. Although he might have learned much from the women, who were the farmers and gatherers, Bradbury made friends with the village shaman. Bradbury did not initiate the association, the Hidatsa man did, and no women seemed to find the same

35 Bradbury, *Travels in the Interior*, 125.
36 Coues, *New Light*, 328.

interest in his plant collecting. Bradbury understood enough to know that it was improper to walk through a woman's garden, but never recorded any conversations with them.[37]

Another important factor which affected the Europeans' impression of the Mandan and Hidatsa life was the time of year that they arrived. The wealth of the Indians and the availability of bison herds changed throughout the year. Since Boller arrived in the spring, which are the lean months in these groups' annual food cycle, he noticed their hunger, the lack of bison, and their dependency on roots and berries.[38] Bradbury noticed the scarcity of food when he arrived in the summer, but that year the cause was bad luck and bad weather. The season had been very wet and many of the cache pits, where food was stored, had been water damaged and the food destroyed. However, later in the summer when the corn reached the green stage, the supplies were replenished.[39] Since Catlin arrived during an important ceremony he witnessed many rounds of feasting. The winter diet was different than the summer diet, but Thompson, who arrived in winter, thought that they only ate bison and deer meat because that was all he saw.[40]

Two twentieth century studies fill in many of the details that the European observers missed. Gilbert L. Wilson worked with Buffalo Bird Woman, a Hidatsa living on the Fort Berthold Reservation, to write a book recording traditional farming and food preparing techniques. Buffalo Bird Woman was born in a Hidatsa village soon after the smallpox epidemic of 1837. She remembered moving to Like-A-Fishhook village and living with the Mandan and Arikara. She was raised learning the traditional role for women in Hidatsa society and maintained that knowledge even after she moved to the reservation.[41] The study is unique because it offers a personal account of a Hidatsa woman. She gave detailed explanations of skills and traditions, and told why Hidatsa's did things that way. For women's and agricultural history the work is priceless. Since Buffalo Bird Woman never learned English, Wilson had to translate all of her commentary and, as the writer, he decided what to print. Wilson worked with Buffalo Bird Woman after traditional Hidatsa farming had declined in

37 Bradbury, *Travels in the Interior*, 116, 147, 173.
38 Boller, *Among the Indians*, 35.
39 Bradbury, *Travels in the Interior*, 118.
40 Hopwood, ed., *Travels in Western North America*, 171.
41 Gilbert L. Wilson, *Buffalo Bird Woman's Garden* (St. Paul, MN: Minnesota Historical Society Press, 1987), xi-xxiii.

importance and he considered her agriculture to be "primitive."[42] Wilson's stated aim in producing this anthropological study was to let Buffalo Bird Woman inform him and his readers. Unfortunately, it is only one woman's perspective. Anything that she missed was lost, anything she misunderstood was misrecorded, anything she overemphasized in her longing for traditional life was misrepresented. On the other hand, she grew up in an oral society which required a good memory and learned, not from books, but from the community. The smallpox epidemics only served to strengthen the Hidatsa and Mandan desire to keep hold of their traditions.[43]

Another author who took advantage of the living memories was Alfred W. Bowers. In his study, *Mandan Social and Ceremonial Organization*, Bowers consulted Mandans at the Fort Berthold Reservation to augment his previous research of the written descriptions. When Bower's informants disagreed on a particular subject he often included several descriptions of the same story or ceremony. Since his subject was the religious life of the Mandan, Bowers depended on his informants' willingness to disclose personal and sacred information. Bowers selected people, especially Christians, who would divulge the details of ceremonies and ideas.[44] He also admits that many of his informants died before he got the chance to ask all his questions.

There are many questions that the eighteenth and nineteenth century visitors to the Mandan and Hidatsa villages did not ask. They did not notice much about the children, how they were taught, or what their lives were like. The ceremonies focused on men's power and male rites of passage. The women may have had their own rites and means of acquiring power that were just as important. For people to have lived together in a small area, the community must have had social controls that escaped the notice of outsiders. The writers saw extreme violence outside the village, but did not see much, if any, inside and did not ask why. The writings concentrated on the power of men and not the interdependence that accompanies their distinct division of labor. The observations do not reveal much about the women's perspective on their sexuality or the views on polygamy, since sisters frequently married the same husband. These men were

42 Ibid., 3.
43 Alfred W. Bowers, *Mandan Social and Ceremonial Organization* (Moscow, ID: University of Idaho Press, 1991), 75. Originally published in 1950. The research at Fort Berthold was conducted in 1930-31.
44 Ibid., 4.

not responsible for examining everything, but it is the reader's responsibility to inquire into what they likely missed.

The subjects featured in these and other documents about the Mandan and Hidatsa may be overemphasized in modern studies. Since the information is easily available, it encourages us to look at those aspects which have culture appear to have clear evidence to explain them. They repeat stories of warfare and aggression. But there is also evidence of peace and cooperation. There is ample information on the trading culture in these societies, and significantly less about them as consumers. Some overlooked ideas may be minor but others have interesting possibilities for further study. Instead of reassessing what the Indians expected from Europeans, there might be some value to looking at what Europeans expected of their hosts. The visitors did not seem to think much about that, but the Mandan and Hidatsa were still willing to offer their hospitality. We will never know everything about these two societies, but looking at the available documents in new ways may provide a more balanced, holistic view of their lives.

The Religion of American Slaves

Lori Thull

Lori Thull, a graduate student, composed this essay for her Nineteenth Century Social and Cultural History class. She searched the slave narratives collected for the Works Project Administration program for evidence regarding the role religion may have played in the slaves' effort to preserve a separate identity.

The peculiar institution of slavery continues to provoke debate among American historians. One argument concerns the degree to which slaves maintained a separate identity apart from that of the whites. In 1959, Stanley M. Elkins wrote in his book *Slavery: A Problem in American Institutional and Intellectual Life*, that through the concentration camp environment of the antebellum South, slaves adjusted to their fate and became obedient, humble servants, never considering revolution from the system.[1] However, other historians argue against Elkin's thesis, saying that slaves did not submerse themselves into the white culture; instead, blacks succeeded in preserving a separate identity through various institutions within their own culture.

In *The Slave Community*, John Blassingame describes the religion of slaves as being one of the institutions which slaves used to maintain their separate identity from that of the whites in the antebellum South. Blassingame points out that blacks did learn the fundamentals of Christianity from white missionaries and that the slaves' religion helped them to escape the bondage of their daily lives.[2] As the slaves experienced the religion taught by their masters, they formulated their own religious beliefs and practices, marking a distinct separation from the white culture.[3] However, did every slave enjoy the opportunity to find his or her own religion? How did various masters handle the issue of religion in relation to their slaves? Slaves owners differed greatly in their treatment of the religion of the slaves, from forcing the slaves to attend the white

1 Stanley M. Elkins, Slavery: *A Problem in American Institutional and Intellectual Life* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1959), 131.
2 John Blassingame, *The Slave Community - Plantation Life in the Antebellum South* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1979), 103.
3 Ibid., 131.

churches to prohibiting any practice of religion whatsoever. However, studying narratives of former slaves leads one to conclude that the slaves did use religion as a way of maintaining their own identity, as Blassingame argued.

George Rawick edited and compiled slave narratives which were taken from interviews of blacks who had been slaves prior to the ratification of the Thirteenth Amendment. Because workers for the WPA project administered these interviews in the mid-1930's, most of those interviewed had been young children at the time of slavery. Therefore, some critics may discredit this oral history. Despite this criticism, the narratives are still of value as a source for looking at slavery through the eyes of actual slaves or through their memories of stories told by other slaves.

In regard to the religion of the slaves, a significant majority of the interviewees were asked about, and sometimes voluntarily included, their religious experiences in their narratives, demonstrating the importance of religion for the slaves. While one slave said she "can't membuh nuthin' 'bout no churches in slavery," others reported going to church with their white masters.[4] Sina Banks, a slave from Missouri, reported, "Our old master made all his slaves go to church."[5] Apparently, these masters strongly felt that it was their duty as civilized white men to Christianize the slaves. A slave in Alabama said that after going to the whites' church and standing outside the door, listening to the preacher, the slaves would go home and have to tell the master what the preacher said. "He wanted us to know about religion."[6]

Other slaves spoke about the same practice of attending the white church with their masters but having to stand outside or sit in the back of the church. On one Arkansas plantation, a slave remembered, "We went right along by [the whites'] side till we got to church and we set down in the back seat."[7] Another slave from a Cherokee plantation said that she and the other slaves would wait until the white folks came out of the church until they could go into it.[8]

Holding separate religious services for the blacks, though, occurred more often than allowing them to attend church with the whites. Sam Anderson, an ex-slave, reported, "Me Master didn't allow church on plantation, but there were

4 George P. rawick, ed., *The American Slave: A Composite Autobiography, Oklahoma Narratives*, Vol. 12. Supplement, Series 1, (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1977), 2.
5 Ibid., 13.
6 Ibid., 183
7 Ibid., 297.
8 Ibid., 350.

two preachers who he would allow to preach under a tree on Sundays and even white people would visit their churches."[9] Other masters allowed church in the quarters and even the slaves' own preachers. Lewis Bonner from Texas claimed, "On Saturday and Sunday the slaves would have church in the quarters. There were three or four preachers among them."[10] Another slave from Arkansas said that his master let them have church meetings, but they could not sing songs about Yankees.[11]

While some masters allowed blacks to hold their own services in the quarters or build their own churches, other masters vehemently prohibited any religious services. Demonstrating their strong determination to retain religion, some slaves simply held their services in secret places, such as in the woods under brush arbors or "in the basement of some old buildin'."[12] Robert Williams said that on his plantation in Mississippi, they could have meetings but the master did not like it. "He want us all to sleep instead of listening to preaching. Said we could work better with the rest, so when the meeting nights was set everybody slip away quiet so the old master wouldn't know about it."[13] Other slaves talked about praying under a pot or turning all the pots over so that the praying would not be heard by an angry master.

Even though whites sometimes warned them not to hold religious services, many slaves obviously found religion to be a necessary part of their daily lives. Blassingame wrote that the slaves used this outlet to escape from their lack of liberty in reality, and from the narratives, he seems to be correct. The songs and prayers they used in their services reflect liberty and freedom that could be found in heaven. One slave sang a song about "going home to die no more," while others cited such meaningful spirituals as "Swing Low, Sweet Chariot," "I Am Bound for the Promised Land," and "On Jordan's Stormy Banks."[14] The ex-slaves discussed how important prayer and music were to them, especially since the greatest number of them could not read the Bible. One man reported, "The slaves loved to pray," while another maintained, "Prayer and faith can overcome anything."[15] The difference between the whites' calm, quiet services and the blacks energetic, louder, praising services mirrors the separate identity the slaves

9 Ibid., 6.
10 Ibid., 70.
11 Ibid., 170.
12 Ibid., 100
13 Ibid., 395.
14 Ibid., 13.
15 Ibid., 267, 292.

were able to find in their interpretation of Christianity.

Many masters used the slaves' love of religion to manipulate them into obedience and loyalty. Robert Burns, an ex-slave from Tennessee, said, "Dem white preachers who would call dem selves preaching to de slaves would only preach to de niggers about being good, obedient and work good and hard for dare master."[16] Another slave from Tennessee claimed that her mistress would tell her to be a "good, obedient slave" so that she could go to heaven.[17] Easter Jones of Georgia also reported that the preachers could only talk about obeying the Master and Mistress, as did Cora Shepherd of Columbia County, South Carolina.[18]

Regardless of how some of the whites manipulated religion, the slaves succeeded in creating their own form of religion, separate from that of the whites. Religion became an inherent part of the slaves' identities, a concept especially apparent in the narratives. At the end of almost every interview, the ex-slave reported to which religion he or she currently belonged, be it Baptist, Methodist, or any other religion. Many of them also included a statement about living a good life and going to heaven. For example, Mollie Barber ended her interview with, "De colored Methodist church is where I go, and I try to live right. I know if I live for Jesus he will show me de way."[19] Another ex-slave said, "I belonged to the colored Baptist church because I want a good resting place when I go."[20] Yet another interviewee proclaimed, "I am a Baptist from head to foot, yes sir, yes sir."[21]

An emphasis on religion and its importance to their personal identity surfaced almost universally throughout the ex-slave narratives. Because the ex-slaves represented a variety of slave states in the Confederacy, the narratives provided an expansive impression of slavery throughout different regions of the South. The interviews show that religion and religious services did not differ greatly according to specific regions; rather, religion became an identifying and unifying factor among slaves throughout the whole South. Instead, what differed was how each master regarded the religion of the slaves: if he required

16 Ibid., 80.
17 Ibid., 97.
18 George P. Rawick, ed., *The American Slave: A Composite Autobiography, Georgia Narratives*, Vol. 4, Supplement, Series 1, Part 2, (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1977), 350, 355.
19 Rawick, *Oklahoma Narratives*, 31.
20 Ibid., 51.
21 Ibid., 70.

services, tolerated them, or prohibited them. In any case, no master, according to the narratives, succeeded in preventing the slaves from maintaining a separate identity from the whites through the institution of religion.

The Effect of Personal Bias on Woodrow Wilson's Politics of Neutrality

Michael D. Kruger

The Historical Research Methods course at Eastern requires students to analyze a section of a college textbook for historical accuracy. What follows is Michael Kruger's assessment of one interpretation of Woodrow Wilson's decision to enter the First World War.

> A second factor pulling the United State into [World War I] was the deep-seated feelings of President Wilson himself.... Wilson had long admired the British people and their form of government. Although technically neutral, the president strongly, although privately, favored the Allies and viewed a German victory as unthinkable... . Hence, although Wilson asked Americans to be neutral in thought as well as in deed, in fact he... [was] neither.[1]

In the above passage there are many contentions which may be disputed. This essay will examine the evidence that history provides us and, thus, verify or refute the passage's main points. I will primarily address Woodrow Wilson's views of Great Britain and Germany, the causes and effects of his neutral stance, and the question of whether the United States' eventual entry in to the first world war was influenced by any biases President Wilson may have had. In the end, it will be apparent that while Wilson was indeed personally biased towards the British, he did not let this bias affect his actions as president.

The United States has long been considered a melting pot, composed of immigrants and their descendants from a multitude of nations around the world. Because the largest number of these peoples came from Europe, it should come as no surprise that World War I had the potential to cause tremendous divisiveness across the country; declaring war on any of the numerous belligerent powers threatened to "rend the unity of America."[2] Thus, it was in the best

---

1 Susan D. Becker and William Bruce Wheeler, *Discovering the American Past: A Look at the Evidence*, vol. 2, *Since 1865*, 2d ed., (Geneva, IL: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1990), 121.
2 Ray Stannard Baker, *Woodrow Wilson: Life and Letters*, vol. 5, *Neutrality, 1914-1915* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, Doran, and Co., Inc., 1935), 17.

services, tolerated them, or prohibited them. In any case, no master, according to the narratives, succeeded in preventing the slaves from maintaining a separate identity from the whites through the institution of religion.

The Effect of Personal Bias on Woodrow Wilson's Politics of Neutrality

Michael D. Kruger

The Historical Research Methods course at Eastern requires students to analyze a section of a college textbook for historical accuracy. What follows is Michael Kruger's assessment of one interpretation of Woodrow Wilson's decision to enter the First World War.

> A second factor pulling the United State into [World War I] was the deep-seated feelings of President Wilson himself.... Wilson had long admired the British people and their form of government. Although technically neutral, the president strongly, although privately, favored the Allies and viewed a German victory as unthinkable... . Hence, although Wilson asked Americans to be neutral in thought as well as in deed, in fact he... [was] neither.[1]

In the above passage there are many contentions which may be disputed. This essay will examine the evidence that history provides us and, thus, verify or refute the passage's main points. I will primarily address Woodrow Wilson's views of Great Britain and Germany, the causes and effects of his neutral stance, and the question of whether the United States' eventual entry in to the first world war was influenced by any biases President Wilson may have had. In the end, it will be apparent that while Wilson was indeed personally biased towards the British, he did not let this bias affect his actions as president.

The United States has long been considered a melting pot, composed of immigrants and their descendants from a multitude of nations around the world. Because the largest number of these peoples came from Europe, it should come as no surprise that World War I had the potential to cause tremendous divisiveness across the country; declaring war on any of the numerous belligerent powers threatened to "rend the unity of America."[2] Thus, it was in the best

---

1 Susan D. Becker and William Bruce Wheeler, *Discovering the American Past: A Look at the Evidence*, vol. 2, *Since 1865*, 2d ed., (Geneva, IL: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1990), 121.
2 Ray Stannard Baker, *Woodrow Wilson: Life and Letters*, vol. 5, *Neutrality, 1914-1915* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, Doran, and Co., Inc., 1935), 17.

interests of the nation to adopt a policy of neutrality towards all aggressor nations. Such a policy was outlined by President Wilson in a speech delivered before the Senate on August 19, 1914, in which he stated: "Every man who really loves America will act and speak in the true spirit of neutrality, which is the spirit of impartiality and fairness and friendliness to all concerned."[3] In the same speech, he also asked that all citizens remain "neutral in fact as well as in name."[4]

While the president espoused neutrality, there is ample evidence showing that he was personally partial to the Entente Allies. In *Wilson the Diplomatist*, Arthur S. Link, the premier Wilson historian and biographer, claims that "on two, perhaps three, occasions during the two and a half years of American neutrality [Wilson] avowed to close friends his personal sympathy for the Allied cause."[5] This assertion is consistent with information taken from other sources which depict Wilson as pro-British. Ray Stannard Baker, Wilson's authorized biographer, points out that Wilson's ancestors and personal heros were British. Even more convincing than this evidence, however, is the fact that Wilson's "first and greatest book advocated a reconstruction of the American governmental system in the direction of the British. . . ."[6] Moreover, author John Morton Blum claims that "Wilson could not help but share" the English cause because, among other things, "he had always believed. . . that American history was simply an extension of British experience."[7]

Contributing to Wilson's enthusiasm for the British cause were his strong reservations about the Germans. The principal evidence for this view comes from an August 30, 1914 entry in the diary of Wilson's most trusted advisor, Edward Mandell House. Wilson evidently told House "that if Germany won [the war] it would change the course of our civilization and make the United States a military nation," a thought Wilson abhorred. He also apparently expressed horror at German treaty violations, especially in regard to Belgium, and disappointment in "the German people as a whole."[8] Such an attitude could

3 John Randolph Bolling, comp., *Chronology of Woodrow Wilson* (New York: Frederick A. Stokes Co., 1927), 190.
4 Ibid., 191.
5 Arthur S. Link, *Wilson the Diplomatist* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins Press, 1957), 35.
6 Baker, 64.
7 John Morton Blum, *Woodrow Wilson and the Politics of Morality*, ed. Oscar Handlin (Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1956), 95.
8 Arthur S. Link, ed., *The Papers of Woodrow Wilson* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1979), 462.

account for his subsequent reactions to stories of German atrocities. According to Secretary of State Robert Lansing, Wilson "would not read of them and showed anger if the details were called to his attention."[9]

There are, of course, those who point out that Wilson also had positive feelings towards the Germans. Foremost among these is, once again, Arthur Link. In one work, "Wilson and the Ordeal of Neutrality," Link cites Wilson's profound admiration for "German contributions to modern history."[10] In another, *Wilson: The Struggle for Neutrality*, Link argues that Wilson's original emotional reaction to the war was anti-German, but, after careful analysis, he concluded "that Germany is not alone responsible for the war, and some other nations will have to bear a portion of the blame in our eyes."[11]

Whether Wilson's personal biases actually affected American policies will be addressed later. If we were to judge from face value, however, it would appear as if they did. The rest of the world certainly thought so. In April of 1915 House reported that the French believed Wilson to be pro-German.[12] Such an opinion was echoed in Britain by 1916.[13] The Axis powers, on the other hand, viewed Wilson as pro-Entente Allies.[14] These discrepancies in opinion were derived from the effects our neutrality had upon the two sides of the war and, in several instances, from what appeared to be inconsistent policies.

"American neutrality did work greatly to the benefit of the Allies" as they were allowed complete access to U.S. markets, a privilege denied the Germans by the British Navy.[15] However, several policies were simply "disadvantageous to the British." For instance, a ban on loans to belligerent governments prevented the British from purchasing American made products, because it limited their monetary resources. This ban, more than any other action, led the British to believe that Wilson was pro-German.[16] The Germans, on the other hand, pointed to several instances in which Wilson had been willing to compromise with the British, but not with the Central powers, after each had violated U.S.

9 Link, *The Diplomatist*, 35.
10 Arthur S. Link, "Wilson and the Ordeal of Neutrality," in *The Higher Realism of Woodrow Wilson and Other Essays*, ed. Arthur S. Link (Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University Press, 1971), 89.
11 Arthur S. Link, *Wilson: The Struggle for Neutrality* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1960), 52-53
12 Charles Seymour, ed., *The Intimate Papers of Colonel House* (New York: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1926), 1:417.
13 Ibid., 2:52, 260.
14 Ibid., 251.
15 Link, *The Diplomatist*, 36.
16 Ibid., 37.
17 Charles Seymour, *American Diplomacy During the World War* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins Press, 1934), 17.

neutrality, as a sure sign that he was Pro-Entente.[17]

Despite the facts just presented, the inherent personal biases of Wilson and his apparent violations of neutrality, Link contends "President Wilson tried as hard as any man could have done to remain neutral," and, in fact, succeeded in doing so.[18] The most obvious evidence supporting this claim is the manner in which Wilson dealt with the two opposing sides. Yes, the Entente fared better than the Central powers, but only because the British, to a great extent, controlled the sea. The policies regarding the two sides were ultimately equal; in fact, Wilson strived to ensure that this was so. For instance, he prevented "the sale of submarine parts, and hence parts for any naval crafts," to belligerents, as this would be "contrary to. . . strict neutrality;" this hurt the British more than the Germans as Germany already had naval manufacturing facilities. Likewise, Wilson's ban on loans to belligerent governments, which I have already mentioned, had a profound negative effect upon the British.[19]

One may inquire, then, about the apparently inconsistent method with which Wilson compromised with the British, but not the Germans, after both had violated U.S. neutrality. Was this not in itself a violation of neutrality by the American president? To answer this question one must examine Wilson's rationale for his policies. As it turns out, his reasoning hinged upon the types of violations that each side had committed.[20] For the most part, the British violated American property rights; U.S. trading vessels were frequently delayed while the British searched them and seized any materials they considered contraband.[21] In contrast, the Germans violated neutral rights by declaring unrestricted submarine warfare, a policy which potentially endangered the lives of American citizens.[22] Wilson viewed this German tactic "as an attack upon humanity." It was his opinion that while property losses could be redressed through financial means, "there could be no compensation for lost lives." Thus, he refused to compromise with the Germans on any question of neutrality until this issue was resolved. Wilson's personal conviction regarding the value of human life, not personal like or dislike for a specific country, led to this seemingly inconsistent policy.[23]

18 Arthur S. Link, ed., *Woodrow Wilson: A Profile* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1968), 173.
19 Link, *The Diplomatist*, 37.
20 Seymour, *American Diplomacy*, 18.
21 Ibid., 35.
22 This fear was realized on May 7, 1915 when the *Lusitania*, a passenger liner, was torpedoed without warning, resulting in the deaths of 128 Americans. Link, *The Diplomatist*, 56.
23 Seymour, *American Diplomacy*, 17-18.

As it is obvious, then, that the United States was in fact neutral during the war, the question remains as to why Wilson adopted this policy despite his own personal opinions. To answer this question one must look in part to his speech of August 19, 1914, in which he made his original appeal for neutrality. Although this speech focused upon neutrality as a method of reducing divisiveness within the United States, it also touched upon Wilson's loftier objectives.[24] In essence, Wilson wished to "perform the healing task of reconciliation once the nations of Europe had come to some sense," and to lead the world to a permanent peace.[25] This, then, partially accounts for the United States' neutrality, as well as Wilson's persistent calls throughout the war for a "peace without victory."[26]

Regardless of Woodrow Wilson's post-war aspirations, however, there was yet another all-important factor in his decision to remain neutral: the great majority of the American public did not want to become involved. Quite simply, the population felt that the United States had no physical interest in the war and consequently, that the country should maintain its traditional, isolationist stance. Wilson, keenly aware of this sentiment, felt that as a representative of the people, he had a duty to act upon their wishes.[27] This view was eloquently set forth by Wilson himself in a January, 1916 address in Milwaukee:

> Governments have gone to war with one another. Peoples, so far as I remember, have not, and this is a government of the people, and this people is not going to choose war.... We do not want the question of peace and war... entrusted too entirely to our Government. We want war, if it must come, to be something that springs out of the sentiments and principles and actions of the people themselves...[28]

In light of this viewpoint, the post-war objectives of Wilson, and the United States' obviously unbiased method of dealing with both Central and Allied powers, the major contention in this essay's opening paragraph is invalid. Regardless of his personal prejudices, Woodrow Wilson was, in deed, neutral.

24 Bolling, *Chronology*, 191.
25 Link, *A Profile*, 174.
26 Earl Latham, ed., *The Philosophy and Policies of Woodrow Wilson* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1958), 178.
27 Link, *The Diplomatist*, 32.
28 Woodrow Wilson, *President Wilson's Addresses*, comp. George McLean Harper (New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1918), 158.

Assessing the Matabele Wars: An Exercise in Understanding the Perspective of "The Other"

Scott T. Noth

Instead of focusing on the victors' perspective, Scott T. Noth explores an unfamiliar viewpoint in this paper for an Imperialism and Colonialism Graduate seminar. Mr. Noth is working on his M.A. in history at Eastern and anticipates graduating during Summer 1995.

The last two decades of the 19th century were characterized by frenzied European expansion and colonization. This was the period of the so-called "scramble for Africa," where European powers fought with each other over pieces of the great African cake. One of the most famous episodes in the scramble was that involving Cecil Rhodes and his British South Africa Company and their attempt to acquire the lands and mineral wealth of the Ndebele, a Nguni speaking society settled in modern day Zimbabwe.

The intrusion of the British South Africa Company into Matabeleland can be viewed as merely an episode of European expansion: simply another chapter in the advance of imperialism. However, few imperialist forces have received such widespread admiration or condemnation as the B.S.A.C. and few have had such an aggressive leader as Cecil Rhodes: a man whose devotion to the "advancement of `Anglo-Saxondom'" was revealed in his professed desire to build a British empire "stretching uninterrupted from Cape to Cairo."[1] For Rhodes, the Matabele people were mere obstacles to his imperialistic ambitions.

Historically, imperialists like Rhodes have consistently failed to appreciate the perspective of their opponents; historians as well have consistently failed fully to understand the dilemmas which native people faced. The failure of

1 Harold Nelson, *Zimbabwe: A Country Study* (Washington: U.S. Government, 1983), 17.

imperialists and historians to comprehend the view of the "Other" is discussed by J. D. Hargreaves: "Once historians can begin to see African states, not just as curious museum pieces whose affairs are only intelligible to anthropologists, but as polities sharing many basic aims with governments everywhere, his [sic] whole perspective may begin to change."[2]

This paper will study the Matabele War of 1893 from the perspective of the Ndebele, focusing on the internal political pressures posed by European expansion and the dilemmas these pressures posed for the Ndebele king. Representatives of the British South Africa Company did *not* view the Ndebele nation as a legitimate political entity. In their drive to settle and exploit Matabeleland, the B.S.A.C. deliberately deceived and manipulated Lobengula, the Ndebele king, for concessions until they could finally justify his removal by force. The first of two wars against the Ndebele--commonly called the Matabele Wars--commenced on October 5th, 1893 when High Commissioner of the B.S.A.C., Sir Henry Loch, gave Dr. Jameson permission to proceed with his plans to invade Matabeleland. Less than a month later, the King of the Ndebele was in full flight to the north and the troops of the British South Africa Company marched triumphantly into the capital, Bulawayo.

To understand the Ndebele perspective on these events, one must explore the political organization of the Ndebele, the specific goals of the B.S.A.C., the political motivations of major pre-war treaties and land concessions, and the general policies of Dr. L. S. Jameson, (the Company's chief agent). Also, a study of specific controversial events that "set the grounds" for conflict provides valuable insight to the true mind-sets and motivations of the main characters just before the war began.

The Ndebele political organization--Lobengula's dilemma

The Ndebele were a closely knit people: organized in a highly stratified caste society with a king, (*ikosi*), holding absolute power. Following the Zulu pattern, the king was supported by several military units, each led by a separate chief, (an *induna*). Being a highly militarized society, the Ndebele preferred warfare to cultivation or mining. Iron tools and weapons as well as grain, cattle, and captives were provided by subservient tribute paying societies, such as the

2 J. D. Hargreaves, "Towards a History of the Partition of Africa," *Journal of African History*, Vol. I, (1960): 109.

Shona, who lived East of Matabeleland.[3] According to historian Stafford Glass, "This practice had an economic basis in that it enabled cattle and grain to be secured for the nation; it had also a political and military objective in that youths may be secured to be trained as soldiers."[4] Lobengula's succession to the throne was hotly contested and the cleavage resulted in a brief civil war in 1870. An unstable succession, however, was only the beginning of Lobengula's troubles. The steady approach of Europeans posed a difficult dilemma for the new *ikosi*.

Lobengula, like his father who rule before him, recognized that a war with Europeans would likely end in an Ndebele defeat, so he adopted a rather pacific policy.[5] This policy angered his young warriors, however, who to gain status in Ndebele society, won their honors in battle. Lobengula, according to John Galbraith, "seemed to be caught between the contradictions of white objectives and the basic nature of Ndebele society."[6]

Ultimately, it was the Ndebeles' relationship with the Shona that caused the most tension with the Europeans. Raids on the subservient Shona were necessary to maintain order and reproduce the state. These raids produced friction with white pioneers who had other plans for the Shona. According to Adrian Darter, the pioneers saw the Mashona as a potential labor source: "When the pioneers arrived, they looked upon the gloomy Shona faces on which the stamp of bondage clearly showed, and were sure that they had found a people who should be only too glad to receive their protection in return for labour services."[7] The B.S.A.C. never seemed to appreciate why Lobengula resisted the loss of Ndebele power over the Shona. J. A. Barnes emphasizes the significance of Ndebele raids, verifying Lobengula's fear: "Prohibition on raiding would strike at the very roots of the Matabele military state, socially as well as economically."[8] A complete understanding of this conflict is necessary in forming an appreciation of the Ndebele nation *as a political state* and to understand the king's dilemma. For it was with this dilemma in mind, that Lobengula shaped his policy *vis-á-vis* the British South Africa Company.

3 Nelson, *Zimbabwe*, 13.
4 Stafford Glass, *The Matabele War* (London: Longmans, 1968), 2.
5 Nelson, *Zimbabwe*, 16.
6 John S. Galbraith, *Crown and Charter: The Early Years of the British South Africa Company* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1974), 30.
7 Adrian Darter, *The Pioneers of Mashonaland* (London: Oxford Press, 1914), 97.
8 J. A. Barnes, *Politics in a Changing Society* (Cape Town: University Press, 1954), 30.

Cecil Rhodes' Ambitions: "From Cape to Cairo"

Cecil Rhodes was an aggressive imperialist administrator who coveted the land and rich mineral resources to the north of the Limpopo River including lands under Lobengula's hegemony. Throughout the mid-nineteenth century, several nations had been diligently working to solicit and acquire concessions from the Ndebele King: the Boers, Portuguese, Germans, and British were the strongest contenders. In the words of John Moffat, a key negotiator for the B.S.A.C., by the end of August 1888, "there was already quite a crowd of Europeans badgering the King at Bulawayo."[9] Cecil Rhodes, however, proved to be the most determined aggressor.

Rhodes established a company to exploit the supposed mineral wealth of Matabeleland, but his ambitions were not limited to economic profit. Biographer Patrick Keatley contends that Rhodes believed in British superiority and in his own destiny to help extend the British empire: "He believed that he had a special mission in life and this mission was to paint the map of Africa red--i.e., to acquire as much as possible of Africa for the British."[10]

The achievement of all these ambitions, however, was impossible in the face of a formidable Ndebele army and constant competition from rivals. For this reason, Rhodes initiated efforts to establish a legal British presence in Matabeleland that would thwart the ambitions of all competitors. The Lobengula-Moffat Treat and the Rudd Concession provided Rhodes with a legal basis for his imperialistic ambition.

The Lobengula-Moffat Treaty of 1888: "Would I have given myself to any white nation in this way?"

In 1888, Rhodes contacted Sir Sidney Shippard, (the Administrator of Bechuanaland), and asserted that Great Britain should declare Matabeleland and Mashonaland to be under British protection.[11] The B.S.A.C. appointed the Reverend John Moffat to establish official relations with Lobengula. John Moffat was the son of Robert Moffat, the famous missionary who had befriended Lobengula's predecessor, Mzilikazi, and was acquainted with Ndebele customs. This was the first concrete effort by the B.S.A.C. to involve itself in Ndebele political affairs.

9 Philip Mason, *The Birth of a Dilemma* (London: Oxford Press, 1958), 121.
10 Patrick Keatley, *The Politics of Partnership* (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1963), 77.
11 Stanlake Samkange, *Origins of Rhodesia* (New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1969), 57.

Historian Arthur Keppel-Jones suggests that Moffat's mission was to ascertain the truth about the Grobler Treaty, a "friendship" treaty between the Ndebele and the Boers, and, if possible, to get Lobengula to sign a treaty giving Britain the sole right to influence affairs in Matabeleland.[13] Moffat attempted to nullify the Grobler Treaty by trying to persuade Lobengula completely to deny its validity. In January of 1888, Lobengula signed such a statement: "I Lobengula, Chief of the Amandebele, declare that the words of the treaty of 30 July 1887 [the Grobler Treaty] . . . are not true--they are not my words."[14] This statement, according to Keppel-Jones, "was enough to convince Moffat that the Grobler Treaty had been repudiated."[15]

Eleven days later, Moffat convinced Lobengula to enter into a formal treaty with Britain. This treaty stated concisely that:

> Lobengula . . . will refrain from entering into any treaty with any Foreign State or Power to sell, alienate or cede . . . any part of Amandebele country . . . without the previous knowledge and sanction of Her Majesty's High Commissioner for South Africa.[16]

The B.S.A.C. naturally interpreted the treaty's terms as giving them nearly complete authority to decide the fate of Lobengula's land and its resources. Lobengula found to his regret that he had apparently signed away much of his independence.

After signing the treaty, the Ndebele King reemphasized to Moffat his determination to maintain complete political hegemony. When Moffat asked whether the Boers had secured political rights concerning land distribution, Lobengula replied "Would I have given myself to any white nation in this way?"[16] Obviously, Lobengula was becoming aware of the B.S.A.C.'s trickery with words, including Moffat's.

In effect, Moffat's treaty severely restricted Lobengula's ability to control his nation's foreign affairs. Moffat had so far expanded Britain's political control over Matabeleland that Lobengula would have to ask Britain's permission to make international policy decisions. Colin Leys asserts that Moffat claimed that Lobengula agreed "not to enter into correspondence on any subject with any foreign state or power, without the previous knowledge and permission of the

12 Ibid., 57.
13 Ibid.
14 Arthur Keppel-Jones, *Rhodes and Rhodesia: White Conquest of Zimbabwe, 1884-1902* (Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1983), 156.
15 Samkange, *Origins*, 58.
16 Ibid., 65.

Governor at the Cape."[17] Considering Lobengula's absolute denial of this agreement, one must ask how such a misunderstanding could have occurred. Would Lobengula have signed a treaty that put him virtually under the control of the British Government? A more plausible possibility is suggested by J. G. Lockhart and C. M. Woodhouse, in their biography of Rhodes. They maintain that the missionary C. D. Helm, (the oral interpreter of the treaty), "was secretly in the employ of Rhodes."[18] This brings into serious question the legitimacy of Moffat's interpretive claims.

On the back of the Lobengula-Moffat Treaty, Helms has written "the document has been fully interpreted and explained by me to Chief Lobengula and his full council of Indunas . . . this thirtieth day of October, 1888."[19] Colin Leys raises an interesting suspicion concerning Helms' writing: Helms' statement was signed on 30 October, 1888, whereas the treaty itself was signed on 11 February, 1888, (eight months before). According to Leys, it seems improbable that Helms would have waited to explain the meaning of the treaty a full eight months after Lobengula had signed it.[20]

The Rudd Concession: ". . . there is a great misunderstanding about this."

The Rudd Concession of 1891, which granted exclusive mineral rights to the British South Africa Company in Matabeleland, was to become the most controversial agreement signed between the B.S.A.C. and the Ndebele. One scholar argues that: "If Moffat was less than forthcoming with Lobengula, Rudd deliberately deceived him."[21] The B.S.A.C. took extreme liberty in its interpretations of the contents, drawing opposition not only from Lobengula but from several European-based interests.[22] It is not surprising that Rhodes pursued it so determinedly, since, according to historians Robinson, Gallagher, and Denny, "the [Rudd] concession, to Rhodes, was of extreme importance: it was the basis of his entire project." Robinson continues, saying that, "on it [the concession] he could raise his company and exploit the option that it gave him in the dominions of Lobengula."[23]

17 Colin Leys, *European Politics in Southern Rhodesia* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1959), 7.
18 J. G. Lockhart and C. M. Woodhouse, *Rhodes* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1963), 144.
19 Gustav S. Preller, *Lobengula* (Johannesburg: Johannesburg Press, 1963), 76.
20 Leys, *European Politics*, 8.
21 Nelson, *Zimbabwe*, 18.
22 Glass, *The Matabele War*, 8.
23 R. Robinson, J. Gallagher, and A. Denny, *Africa and the Victorians* (London: Oxford Press, 1961), 240.

The stipulations of the concession, albeit deceptive, were truly a work of diplomatic genius. The concession *seemingly* benefitted both Rhodes and Lobengula. Samkange maintains that Lobengula's interests partially coincided with those of Rhodes. He asserts that "Lobengula wanted no more white men in his country, while Rhodes did not want any more white competitors in Matabeleland."[24] Lobengula's reasons for wanting to preserve his hegemony were plain enough. Rhodes' true intentions were not as evident. From a close examination of the treaty and the events surrounding it, it is clear that Rhodes never intended to limit his expansion simply to Lobengula's domain. According to Lockhart and Woodhouse, "the arrangement, [the Rudd Concession] suited Rhodes admirably, for the occupation of Mashonaland would enable him to extend his tentacles into more distant lands and make treaties with the chiefs."[25]

From the outset, the Rudd party, (consisting of Charles Rudd, James Maguire, Sir Sidney Shippard, and Francis Thompson) deceived Lobengula as to their true intentions. Samkange recounts the party's first meeting with the Ndebele King. After presenting him with one hundred gold sovereigns,

> they told him that they were not like other concession seekers, since they did not want land, but only permission for about ten men to dig for gold. In return they promised Lobengula a thousand rifles, a hundred thousand rounds of ammunition, a gunboat on the Zambezi, and an allowance of 100 pounds sterling every new moon.[26]

Lobengula wanted to believe from these initial meetings that the B.S.A.C. would pose no significant threat to his security and sovereignty, that Rhodes' company was not like the other concession seekers. According to Per Hassing, Shippard stressed that "the English like to make money by trading and mining, but do not in general covet land."[27] The B.S.A.C. sought to define their role as a "protector" of Ndebele interests. Only by granting the concession, they claimed, could Lobengula and the B.S.A.C. end the constant harassment from other land-greedy interests. "We do not covet the land of the Amandabele for ourselves," Shippard told Lobengula, but "we do not wish to see the Boers gaining possession of it."[28]

By 1891, however, Lobengula was well aware of the Imperialists' tactics in twisting promises to suit their own purposes. In what seems a premonition, the

24 Samkange, *Origins*, 84.
25 Lockhart and Woodhouse, *Rhodes*, 175.
26 Samkange, *Origins*, 73.
27 Per Hassing, "Lobengula," *Leadership in Eastern Africa* (Boston: University Press, 1968), 242.
28 Ibid.

Ndebele King had reprimanded another prospective imperialist in 1871, saying "Yes, you may promise fairly now, but in the future time, when you are strongly established, you may forget your promise and exceed the liberty I have given."[29]

Unfortunately, Lobengula's suspicions about the Rudd Concession were confirmed in the actual document itself. The signed concession differed significantly from the simplistic ideas first offered by Shippard to Lobengula, and the B.S.A.C. took advantage of the document's vague clauses to give themselves enhanced political control in Lobengula's domain. For example, in addition to exclusive charge over all metals and minerals in Matabeleland, the B.S.A.C. gained "full power to do all things that *they may deem necessary* to win and procure the same . . ."[30] (emphasis added). The concession also authorized the grantees "to take *all necessary* and lawful steps to exclude from [Matabeleland] all persons seeking land, metals, and mining rights therein . . ."[31] (emphasis added).

Rhodes' own broad interpretation of the Rudd Concession is revealed in a letter he wrote to Jameson: "Our concession is so gigantic, it is like giving a man the whole of Australia."[32] Clearly, Lobengula did not view the mining rights concession as "giving" away his entire country. After reading an article regarding the Rudd Concession in a Cape Town paper, Lobengula made known his disagreement with the B.S.A.C.'s interpretation. He immediately sent a Notice to be published in *The Bechuanaland News* and the *Malmani Chronicle*:

> I hear it is published in the newspapers that I have granted a concession in all my country to Charles Rudd . . .. As there is a great misunderstanding about this, all action about this, all action in respect of the said concession is hereby suspended, pending an investigation to be made by me in my country.[33]

The Colonial office in London paid little attention to Lobengula's complaints. Cecil Rhodes, however, was greatly troubled by the Ndebele King's rejection of the concession. According to Samkange, "Rhodes realized . . . that the Grant of a [Royal] Charter would depend upon his having a valid concession from Lobengula."[34]

29 J. P. R. Wallis, *The Northern Goldfields Diaries of Thomas Baines* (London: Oxford Press, 1946), 236.
30 C. W. Mackintosh, *Some Pioneer Missions of Northern Rhodesia and Nyasaland* (R. L. Museum, 1950), 398.
31 Ibid.
32 A. J. Wills, *An Introduction to the History of Central Africa*, 3rd ed. (London: Oxford University Press, 1973), 135.
33 Ibid., 137.
34 Samkange, *Origins*, 87.

How could such a misunderstanding have occurred? First, it is entirely possible that the final document was not the one read to him and to which he agreed. It was the Reverend C. D. Helm who not only had interpreted the treaty for the king, but had also advised him to grant the concession to Rhodes.[35] As mentioned before, Helm was employed by Rhodes and therefore probably not as impartial as Lobengula was thought to think. Second, the European's version of the concession is not consistent with the facts. Interesting questions regarding the validity of the concession are raised after studying the conclusions of the Inyati missionaries. These missionaries, who had no part in the negotiations, were asked by Lobengula to read the Rudd Concession in order to resolve the misunderstanding once and for all. Samkange describes the moment in which Lobengula asks arguably the most important question of his reign. Lobengula handed the missionaries a copy of the Rudd Concession, saying, "Read that piece of paper, and tell me faithfully whether I have given away any of the land of the Matabele." The missionaries replied, "Yes King, you have. How can the white men dig for gold without land?"[36]

This simple exchange raises fundamental questions concerning the validity of Rhodes' version. For example: if the concession was read to Lobengula, as Reverend Helm contends, then why was the king unable to ask such questions before the Inyati missionaries read it to him? If the concession had been completely explained by Helm to Lobengula and his full council of *indunas*, why is it that his *indunas* were found to be ignorant of its contents?[37]

Such questions may only be asked by one willing to consider the misunderstanding from the perspective of the "Other." If one does not consider this perspective, such fundamentally important questions will quite possibly be overlooked and an objective truth consequently missed. Clearly, the B.S.A.C. took full advantage of the communication barrier to advance its own hidden agenda, driven by the insatiable appetite of their leader, Rhodes. Considering the Ndebele's unfortunate plight following these events, one can understand why Lobengula, weary with frustration near the end of his life, declared, "The white man is, indeed, the father of lies."[38]

35 Ibid.
36 Ibid., 114.
37 Ibid., 116.
38 Ibid., 55.

Jameson's Policy Towards Lobengula and the Robbery of Telegraph Wires--"What great wrong have I done?"

Dr. L. S. Jameson, Chief Agent and Administrator for the B.S.A.C. was responsible for the Company's general policy towards the Ndebele nation. By studying the key points in his evolving policy in the late 1880's and the early 1890's, one can understand the immediate causes of the Matabele Wars. Stafford contends that "the policy [Jameson] chose to follow could not function side by side with the needs of the military system of Lobengula and his Matabele nation."[39]

By December 1891, Lobengula still maintained that he had not in any way renounced his ownership of Mashonaland. Lobengula claimed complete hegemony over the subservient Mashona peoples even after the B.S.A.C. had, according to P. F. Hone, "strengthened its claim to the occupation, if not the possession, of Mashonaland through the Lippert Concession."[40] This concession, according to Hone, gave the British the added right to "lay out, grant or lease . . . farms, townships, [and] building plots . . ."[41]

Jameson's subsequent policies clearly indicate that he held absolutely no regard for Lobengula's long-kept tradition of extracting tribute from subservient societies throughout the region: a region which at that time was being systematically developed and settled by Europeans. An example of Jameson's disregard of Ndebele hegemony in Mashonaland is demonstrated in his policy of screening Ndebele who attempted to enter Mashonaland: he accepted Ndebele workers but turned back raiding parties. Historian A. G. Leonard briefly summarizes this policy, illustrating Jameson's personal assessment of an Ndebele's purpose and worth: "There were no other reasons why the Matabele should enter Mashonaland. Above all, those with warlike intentions must be kept out. Raiding parties, bent on extracting tribute from vassal Mashona chiefs, were the least welcome."[42]

Such demeaning policies as these contributed greatly to Lobengula's dilemma. The Ndebele King's firm resistance to the changes being introduced by the intruders, based on years of Ndebele tradition, was necessary to maintain order in his state.

39 Glass, *The Matabele War*, 13.
40 P. F. Hone, *Southern Rhodesia* (London: Oxford University Press, 1909), 110.
41 Ibid.
42 A. G. Leonard, *How We Made Rhodesia* (London: Oxford University Press, 1954), 193.

The tension created by Jameson's policy was further intensified by the use of threats to maintain the integrity of a Company-imposed border. Biographer Felix Gross cites a series of telegrams that illustrate the nature of the border dispute: "On September 5, 1892, Lobengula was asked to keep his *impis* [raiding parties] out of the Victoria district . . . and on May 22, 1893, Jameson wrote, "'. . . I have already explained to the king that bodies of this people crossing into Mashonaland might get into trouble.'"[43] Lobengula, too, found little in the actions of whites of which he could approve. Philip Mason cites Lobengula's warning to Jameson in February 1892: "I don't like the action you have taken with the Mashona. What does it matter if the Mashona fight among themselves? It is bad for you to mix yourself up in such matters."[44]

Despite Lobengula's attempts to maintain his traditional hegemony over the Mashona, Jameson's border policy persisted. A seemingly trivial event, the robbery of five-hundred yards of telegraph wire by Mashona peoples who desired to use it for bodily ornament, escalated the political dispute between the Europeans and the Ndebele into military conflict. The B.S.A.C.'s police responded to this robbery by seizing Mashona cattle. This action angered Lobengula, for he was the ultimate owner of the cattle and he wished to punish the Mashona himself. Glass contends that this situation revealed an enormous opportunity for Rhodes to justify the removal of the Ndebele by force: "The B.S.A.C. had stressed to both sides the need to observe the boundary. Both had made it clear that aggressive bands were not to enter Mashonaland."[45] When Lobengula naturally applied justice through a small raiding party, Jameson declared war, driving all Ndebele from the predominantly European Victoria district. Unable to compete with European firepower, Lobengula and his people were forced to withdraw.[46] Lobengula in a last, desperate appeal for reason, wrote, ". . . what has my *impi* [raiding party] done among the white people? . . . the *impi* had no concern with white men. I want to know from you . . . what great wrong have I done?"[47]

It is Lobengula's final plea for an explanation that best illustrates the B.S.A.C.'s failure to appreciate the dilemma of the "Other." Guided by Cecil Rhodes' continental ambitions, the Company viewed the Ndebele people

43 Felix Gross, *Rhodes of Africa* (London: Oxford University Press, 1956), 207.
44 Mason, *The Birth of a Dilemma*, 154.
45 Glass, *The Matabele War*, 38.
46 Ibid., 71-73.
47 Ibid., 152.

solely as irritating obstacles to European expansion. From the perspective of the "Other," it is clear that the B.S.A.C. did not fully respect the Ndebele nation as a political entity. Through deceptive treaties and concessions, Company representatives (as well as employee Reverend Helm), merely manipulated the sizeable communication barrier with the Ndebele King in order to gain as much political power within his domain as their consciences would allow. A study of the Lobengula-Moffat Treaty, the Rudd Concession, and Jameson's various policies brings one to a greater appreciation of the severity of "Lobengula's dilemma" and how the Company manipulated it. It is clear from the study of this specific case alone that employing the perspective of the "Other" can enrich one's understanding of the history of European imperialism.

Medieval Synthesis

Connie M. Stewart

Connie M. Stewart, a freshman psychology major, responded to the following take-home exam question in her General Education World History class:

> The term "Medieval Synthesis" refers to a perceived inclination in Eurasia roughly during the period 500-1500 A.D. to create large-scale, stable civilizations whichwere capable of absorbing and neutralizing a great many heterogeneous elements. To what extent do you find this to be a useful term in seeking to understand this millenium over the breadth of the entire continent? How would you define it? Can you give examples from Europe, Asia, and Central Asia to support the validity of this concept? Are there examples and instances which do not fit the concept? Do they render it invalid, or do they exist, rather, as the inevitable exceptions to the rule?

The sources she used are: Reilly, Kevin. Readings in World Civilizations, *vol I, 2d ed. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1992; Stavrianos, L.S.* A Global History from Prehistory to the Present. *NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1991.*

Medieval Synthesis" can best be described as the bonding and integration of heterogeneous aspects from previously separated cultures into one society. "Medieval Synthesis" is an appropriate term to describe the actions taken by groups across Eurasia during the millennium which ranged from 500 to 1500 A.D. Examples of these actions can be found in the following places: Confucian China, the Islamic Empire, the Ottoman Empire, the Mongol Empire, and Medieval Europe in the time period from the eleventh century to the thirteenth century. However, instances do occur which contradict this idea of synthesis, and I contend that these occurrences are inevitable exceptions to the rule.

First, traditional Confucian China, during this time period, tried to integrate different cultural aspects into its way of life. In the essay titled, "China, Technology, and Change," Lynda Shaffer describes one aspect of this integration, the Chinese civil service exam. According to Shaffer, the institution of this system made more people able to participate in government, and this is illustrated in the

fact that after the exam system was created, ninety-eight percent of the male population was eligible to serve in government. Shaffer says, that prior to this system, only wealthy aristocrats had been able to become government officials. Logically, the allowance of poor peasants into positions of relative power in government would include more diverse cultural and political viewpoints than the previous aristocratic government would have. Furthermore, in the essay called "The Chinese Civil Service Exam System," Ichisada Mizazaki expresses the fact that when this system was created 1400 years ago, it was designed to allow the emperor to choose advisors and officials based upon qualifications merit. In other words, problems might occur if the aristocrats were poorly qualified to be individuals. In addition, according to L.S. Stavrianos, a Chinese man named Chu Hsi, who lived in the late twelfth and early thirteenth centuries, studied Buddhism and Taoism, as well as Confucianism, and he integrated these three sets of ideas into one cohesive set. Stavrianos states that, after Chu Hsi's death, the Confucian Chinese leaders used Chu Hsi's commentaries along with Confucian texts as the basis for later versions of the Civil Service Exam, and this textual combination ultimately became the official text of China. By using Chu Hsi's ideas, the leadership in China integrated, or synthesized, Buddhism and Taoism into its previously exclusive Confucian ideas. Traditional Confucian China serves as an example of "Medieval Synthesis."

The Islamic Empire also serves as an example of the integration of other cultures between 500 and 1500 A.D. For instance, selections from The Koran in the Reilly text refer to Christians and Jews as people of The Book, and according to The Koran, people of The Book must be respected because they are good men. The Koran, the holy book of the Islamic faith represents the rules by which the Islamic Empire lived. Also, J.J. Saunders's essay titled, "The Civilization of Medieval Islam," expresses the fact that the nations which the Islamic Empire conquered and ruled did not originally speak the same language, but the Muslims spread the Arabic language to all the lands which they conquered. In this way, the Islamic Empire brought many different nations with various tongues together under one universal language. In addition, Saunders states that the Persians in the Islamic Empire took ideas which Christians brought to Islam about Greek thought and combined them with Sanskrit folklore of India. Furthermore, Stavrianos states that the Islamic Empire used the

medical knowledge, which the Greeks had acquired in the classical civilization of approximately 500 B.C., to teach and to treat its entire empire. Thus, the Islamic Empire assimilated ancient Greek thought in their civilization of the seventh century A.D. The Islamic Empire also practiced "Medieval Synthesis."

In addition, the Ottoman Empire of the fifteenth century, which included Arabic, Jewish, Caucasian, and African people, worked to include aspects of other cultures into its own. First, this Empire followed the Sunnic tradition of Islam which calls for everyone to guide his or her own life. This idea is best illustrated in the "Millett System" of government which ruled over people through their respective churches, and these churches were ultimately ruled by the Ottoman Empire. This system brought all the religions together into one cohesive governing body. Also, as the excerpt from C.E. Bosworth's book *The Great Islamic Empire* states, the Ottomans used Janissaries, or well trained fighting troops hailing from the Balkans, as a means of "tapping the manpower of the Balkans," (p. 284). Janissaries served as an integrating force because they were Balkan Christians, not elite wealthy Muslims, and this meant people who were not Islamic were conquering and perchance having an influence upon the lands of the Ottoman Empire. The Ottoman Empire also made efforts to assimilate other cultures into its own.

Furthermore, the Mongol Empire of the thirteenth century worked to bring other cultures' characteristics into its own. According to Stavrianos, the Mongol Empire encouraged all outside religions to establish missions in its borders. For instance, the Mongol Empire traded heavily with the Islamic Empire, and ultimately after conversion to Islam, the Mongol Empire began to conquer lands in the name of Islam. Also, according to Stavrianos, the Mongol ruler named Kublai Khan changed the position of Mongol leader into a Chinese-styled emperorship when he moved his capital city from Karakorum to Peking. In addition, Stavrianos states that Genghis Khan assimilated the weapons of siege, in which the Chinese specialized, into his army's tactics so cities would be more easy to capture. This action brought aspects of Chinese origin into the non-Chinese Mongol society and represents an effort to synthesize a culture. Eventually, as Stavrianos states, the Mongol Empire is shattered by internal cultural assimilation because, unlike other empires, the Mongol Empire did not legitimately possess some unifying characteristics which new cultural aspects could

be blended with. In other words, the Mongol Empire synthesized so much, that it engulfed itself in others' ideas into obscurity. The Mongol Empire also engaged in "Medieval Synthesis."

In addition, Europe in the time period from the eleventh through the thirteenth centuries, worked to create a "Medieval Synthesis." According to Stavrianos, Europeans used The Crusades to spread Christianity oversees, in an effort to make it the universal religion it was thought to be. For instance, Christians regained former lands of the Islamic Empire, such as Spain, in order to unify it with the other Christian nations of Europe. In addition, Stavrianos states that the Holy "Roman" Emperor or the Pope strove to create not only a unified Christian Empire, but he also sought to make it a unified Latin empire, since this was the language of the Catholic Church. Once Catholicism was spread to all of these lands, churches were built everywhere, and due to the fact that all of these churches were similar, Gothic architecture was present across Europe. Another example of cultural integration is mentioned by Stavrianos. He states that in the twelfth century, the Catholic Church started universities which taught liberal arts, commerce, civil law and medicine in addition to religious laws. These new universities represent a view of scholasticism, or the study of the Bible along with other works by people such as Aristotle, and scholasticism represents a combination of faith and reason. Furthermore, Stavrianos states that travelers to Asia such as Marco Polo tried to bring treasures of the Orient back home to Europe. Lastly, in the Reilly text, an excerpt called "Just War and Just Price," from *Summa Theologica* by Thomas Aquinas, uses The Bible and secular works to discuss points of moral ethics. Aquinas discusses selling for profit by quoting Matthew from The Bible, but he also quotes Cicero in a discussion of the same point. Aquinas, a famous theologian of this period, serves as another example of the ways which Europeans used to create a cultural synthesis. Europeans between the eleventh and thirteenth centuries made efforts to assimilate other cultures.

Some instances and events in the time period between 500 and 1500 A.D. do not support the idea of "Medieval Synthesis." First of all, the Magna Carta of 1215 represents more of a legal reform of the existing culture in England than an assimilation of other cultures. The first paragraph of the Magna Carta clearly stipulates all of the parties involved-- King John of England, Bishops, Earls,

Barons, and Sheriffs-- and lists the locales of these respective individuals. None of the locations listed are outside the kingdom of England. Another example which goes against the idea of assimilation of other cultures was mentioned by Stavrianos, and he states that city-states in Europe organized into powerful defense conglomerates, such as the Hanseatic League, in order to prevent outsiders from coming into the respective league's territory. Lastly, Stavrianos mentions that the Mongol Empire deliberately rejected much of China's religion and culture in order to separate themselves from China. These exceptions to the idea of "Medieval Synthesis" exist as the inevitable exceptions to the rule, and I believe that this is true because the amount of assimilation taking place during Medieval times far exceeded the amount of separation and non-assimilation that took place in the same period. In addition, these separatist activities took place in the Mongol Empire and in Europe where much effort was made to synthesize society into a great whole. The exceptions to "Medieval Synthesis" are inevitable exceptions to the rule.

The term "Medieval Synthesis" can appropriately be used to describe activities by cultures throughout Eurasia in the time period from 500 to 1500 A.D. Cultures that took part in this activity included the following: Confucian China, Islamic Empire, the Ottoman Empire, the Mongol Empire, and Medieval Europe between the eleventh and thirteenth centuries. Contradictions to these synthesizing activities are few, and thus represent inevitable exceptions to the rule.

"A Walk in the Sunshine": Civil Rights and the End of the Southern Democratic Party

Susan J. Roth

Susan J. Roth was a co-winner of the History Department's Lavern M. Hamand Writing Award for best graduate paper. She is currently pursuing her M.A. in history at Eastern. Her thesis topic is anti-semitism and the founding of the B'nai B'rith Hillel in Champaign, Illinois.

The Presidential election of 1948 was a significant event in the history of the American civil rights movement not only in that for the first time, civil rights took its place among "respectable" political concerns,[1] but in that it transformed the Democratic party. From the era preceding the Civil War, the Democratic party was identified primarily as the party of the South. The party's identification with southern tradition, states rights, and white supremacy were similarly entrenched. The African American, only nationally enfranchised since Reconstruction, had little if any place in the Democratic party. As a result, for the remainder of the nineteenth century and well into the twentieth, the black voter, when he could vote without obstruction, was more than likely to vote with the grand old party of Abraham Lincoln, the Republican party.[2]

The Democratic party ideology was slow to change in regard to race and race relations, and this intransigence usually reflected itself in the officeholders the party elected. Grover Cleveland, the first post-Civil War Democratic President, was the surprising exception, as displayed by his appointment of blacks to federal posts and reception of Frederick Douglass at the White House. If Cleveland had raised new hopes among blacks for the Democratic party, Woodrow Wilson (for whom some black leaders had actively campaigned) proceeded to crush them. Wilson, a Southerner at heart, made no move to end

1 Harvard Sitkoff, "Harry Truman and the Election in 1948: The Coming of Age of Civil Rights in American Politics," *Journal of Southern History* 37 (Nov. 1971): 615.
2 Henry Lee Moon, *Balance of Power: The Negro Vote* (Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1948), 87-90.

Barons, and Sheriffs-- and lists the locales of these respective individuals. None of the locations listed are outside the kingdom of England. Another example which goes against the idea of assimilation of other cultures was mentioned by Stavrianos, and he states that city-states in Europe organized into powerful defense conglomerates, such as the Hanseatic League, in order to prevent outsiders from coming into the respective league's territory. Lastly, Stavrianos mentions that the Mongol Empire deliberately rejected much of China's religion and culture in order to separate themselves from China. These exceptions to the idea of "Medieval Synthesis" exist as the inevitable exceptions to the rule, and I believe that this is true because the amount of assimilation taking place during Medieval times far exceeded the amount of separation and non-assimilation that took place in the same period. In addition, these separatist activities took place in the Mongol Empire and in Europe where much effort was made to synthesize society into a great whole. The exceptions to "Medieval Synthesis" are inevitable exceptions to the rule.

The term "Medieval Synthesis" can appropriately be used to describe activities by cultures throughout Eurasia in the time period from 500 to 1500 A.D. Cultures that took part in this activity included the following: Confucian China, Islamic Empire, the Ottoman Empire, the Mongol Empire, and Medieval Europe between the eleventh and thirteenth centuries. Contradictions to these synthesizing activities are few, and thus represent inevitable exceptions to the rule.

"A Walk in the Sunshine": Civil Rights and the End of the Southern Democratic Party

Susan J. Roth

Susan J. Roth was a co-winner of the History Department's Lavern M. Hamand Writing Award for best graduate paper. She is currently pursuing her M.A. in history at Eastern. Her thesis topic is anti-semitism and the founding of the B'nai B'rith Hillel in Champaign, Illinois.

The Presidential election of 1948 was a significant event in the history of the American civil rights movement not only in that for the first time, civil rights took its place among "respectable" political concerns,[1] but in that it transformed the Democratic party. From the era preceding the Civil War, the Democratic party was identified primarily as the party of the South. The party's identification with southern tradition, states rights, and white supremacy were similarly entrenched. The African American, only nationally enfranchised since Reconstruction, had little if any place in the Democratic party. As a result, for the remainder of the nineteenth century and well into the twentieth, the black voter, when he could vote without obstruction, was more than likely to vote with the grand old party of Abraham Lincoln, the Republican party.[2]

The Democratic party ideology was slow to change in regard to race and race relations, and this intransigence usually reflected itself in the officeholders the party elected. Grover Cleveland, the first post-Civil War Democratic President, was the surprising exception, as displayed by his appointment of blacks to federal posts and reception of Frederick Douglass at the White House. If Cleveland had raised new hopes among blacks for the Democratic party, Woodrow Wilson (for whom some black leaders had actively campaigned) proceeded to crush them. Wilson, a Southerner at heart, made no move to end

1 Harvard Sitkoff, "Harry Truman and the Election in 1948: The Coming of Age of Civil Rights in American Politics," *Journal of Southern History* 37 (Nov. 1971): 615.
2 Henry Lee Moon, *Balance of Power: The Negro Vote* (Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1948), 87-90.

segregation in the federal government, subscribing to the old argument that segregation was necessary "to prevent interracial friction." Wilson's betrayal turned blacks away from the Democratic party for years to come.[3]

Although local Democratic machine politicians still garnered black support, as they had even before the turn of the century, the first nationwide move of black voters in the direction of the Democratic party happened only with the arrival of Franklin D. Roosevelt and the New Deal. Even then, Roosevelt's black support did not seriously coalesce until 1936. For example, in four wards in Cleveland, Ohio, black voters cast 7153 ballots for Roosevelt in 1932, in contrast with the 7456 votes Alfred E. Smith had received from the same wards in 1928. During that same time, according to Henry Lee Moon, "the Hoover rating among colored voters in Cleveland climbed to 72 per cent!" By the following election, however, most black voters were voting for Roosevelt, and the trend continued throughout Roosevelt's prolonged administration, despite the strong challenge posed by Wendell Wilkie, the Republican candidate in 1940.[4]

The role of the Roosevelt administration in the transformation of the Democratic party in the South was carried out in several ways. The most obvious was the New Deal. As Moon has succinctly expressed it: "At no time since the curtain had dropped on the Reconstruction had government focused so much attention upon the Negro's basic needs as did the New Deal." Moon has further explained that through the efforts of the Roosevelt administration, blacks began to see a way to full citizenship, and as a result, "voted repeatedly to retain and strengthen the New Deal."[5] At the same time, the New Deal had been affecting white Southern Democrats in seemingly paradoxical ways. At first, the traditional resistance to the centralization of economic and political power was dropped in the face of the massive need for relief from hunger and unemployment. Also, many Southern politicians made use of the provision of New Deal-generated jobs to build up constituent loyalties, which in turn helped to guarantee their own political futures.[6]

Even early on, however, Southern opposition to Roosevelt and the New Deal (at least on the part of the white upper classes) had begun to grow. This opposition had coalesced by 1935, during the "Second New Deal," which shifted

3 Ibid., 90-97.
4 Ibid., 18-19, 31-32.
5 Ibid., 210.
6 Robert A. Garson, *The Democratic Party and the Politics of Sectionalism, 1941-48* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1974), 2-3.

the focus of the Roosevelt administration from recovery to reform. The Southern elite, already feeling their loss of power over the (black and white) masses through the various federal programs, took even greater offense at such measures as the Wagner Act, the "soak-the-rich" tax, the Farm Tenant and Housing Act of 1937 and the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938.[7]

Also at issue was the composition of the Democratic party.[8] By 1936 it was widely believed, even by Southerners, that Roosevelt "had destroyed the last vestiges of sectionalism and had united the party beyond all dreams." This perceived unity resulted in the decision of the 1936 Democratic National Convention to abolish the two-thirds majority requirement for approval of nominations and other party decisions. Then in the 1936 election, as if in affirmation in this belief in Democratic unity, Roosevelt combined the support of urban workers and Southern Democrats towards a landslide victory.[9]

The unity, however, was in many ways illusory. One of the earliest signs of southern discontent with the Roosevelt coalition became apparent at the Democratic National Convention that same year. South Carolina Senator "Cotton Ed" Smith, offended by the mixed seating of black and white delegates, made a dramatic exit from the convention hall. It would not be the last incident of a Southern walkout from the Democratic Convention over the issue of race.[10]

Other early cracks in the Roosevelt coalition included the "Grass Roots Convention," organized by Eugene Talmadge, which gave rise to an anti-New Deal wing of the party, dubbed the "Jeffersonian Democrats." While this early southern splinter wing did not last long, it nonetheless stimulated the idea of a Southern breakaway from a Democratic party that in the urban northern areas was being increasingly characterized by a "liberal-labor-Negro coalition." Additionally, it was the southern Democratic-dominated Congress who was instrumental in blocking Roosevelt's attempt to "pack" the Supreme Court in 1937.[11]

The Roosevelt coalition nonetheless managed to stay together through World War II, even as black political consciousness was increasingly raised,

7 George Brown Tindall, *The Disruption of the Solid South* (Athens, Georgia: University of Georgia Press, 1972), 30-31.
8 Ibid., 31.
9 Garson, *The Democratic Party*, 7.
10 Tindall, *The Disruption of the Solid South*, 31-32.
11 Ibid., 32-33.

both through the New Deal and the war effort. Although Franklin Delano Roosevelt was not about to risk further alienating the Southern Democratic contingent (that was already plotting against the New Deal) in order to advance the cause of racial justice, he was neither unsympathetic nor completely unresponsive to the needs of the black electorate. His most overtly pro-Civil rights act was Executive Order 8802, which created the first federal Fair Employment Practices Committee (FEPC) in 1941. The executive order came in response to pressure from labor leader A. Philip Randolph, who had threatened a march on Washington. With the creation of the FEPC, blacks gained increasing employment in the defense-related jobs created by a wartime economy. The war work also stimulated the migration of over one million Southern blacks to the cities in the North and the West, between 1941 and 1946.[12]

Following World War II, blacks who had served in the military returned with an increased sense of equal worth and a new determination not to retreat from the gains of the New Deal and the war effort. In addition, fighting against Hitler's blatantly racist regime gave black GIs an increased sense of the gap between the democracy that the American government was promoting abroad and the often undemocratic America they experienced. While few blacks would have wished for an Axis victory, in light of Hitler's more blatant racialism, fighting the Nazis abroad gave black Americans new assertiveness to challenge racism at home.[13]

In the Democratic political arena, the challenges to the continuity of the Roosevelt administration were mounting. Although the state of Roosevelt's health was not widely known to the public at that time, by 1944, it became increasingly apparent to political operatives that Roosevelt was not well. While some delegates to the 1944 Democratic National Convention wanted simply to retire Roosevelt through the imposition of term limits, most were primarily concerned with whether or not he would live very long after 1944. As a result, the principle conflict of that convention was over who would be Roosevelt's running mate.

The members of the Southern Governors' Conference quickly deemed that the then Vice President, Henry Wallace, was "unsafe," and demanded his

12 William C. Berman, *The Politics of Civil Rights in the Truman Administration* (Ohio State University Press, 1970), 6-7.
13 Steven F. Lawson, *Running for Freedom* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1991), 20-22.

replacement. Wallace, outspoken and ultraliberal, was an anathema to the southern Democrats, most of whom already felt betrayed by the leftward shift in the national Democratic party. Replacing Wallace was of particular concern to the Southern Democrats that year because "in view of the age of the President, and in view of the inevitable wear of office" if Roosevelt were to win a fourth term, the end result might be "the elevation of whoever was Vice President at the time." [14]

The Vice Presidency was hardly the only issue threatening to split the Democratic party in 1944, but in the end, nearly all southern Democrats (even those who fiercely opposed Roosevelt and the New Deal) concluded that a southern breakaway was simply not worth the risk, either to themselves or to the party. Therefore, the southern Democrats focused their demand on the removal of Wallace from the ticket, and his replacement "with an acceptable Southerner." This according to historian Robert Garson, would give them "the symbolic satisfaction of knowing they could still influence their own party." [15]

Wallace, however, enjoyed strong support among northern liberal Democrats and blacks, who were equally aware of the possibility of a foreshortened fourth term for Roosevelt. Walter White, the head of the NAACP went so far to threaten that if Senator James F. Byrnes (a favored candidate of the southern Democrats) or any other southerner received the Vice Presidential nomination, "ninety percent of Negroes would either vote Republican or go fishing on election day." White furthermore advised Democratic operatives that a replacement of Wallace "would be construed as further surrender to the reactionary South by the Administration."[16]

When it came down to the Vice Presidential nomination the Democratic party faced a serious dilemma. On the one hand they knew that Wallace could not get nominated in the face of the united opposition of the southern Democrats. On the other hand, an unambiguously southern running mate would cost Roosevelt both the black vote and the labor vote. In the end, Roosevelt agreed to the selection of a "compromise" running mate, Senator Harry S. Truman of the border state of Missouri. Truman himself was initially reluctant to become Roosevelt's running mate, and in fact had previously announced his intention to

14 Garson, *The Democratic Party*, 96.
15 Ibid., 113-14.
16 Ibid., 116. Quotation from White to Joseph Guffey, July 19, 1944. In box 291/1, NAACP Files.

support James F. Byrnes. Truman was finally persuaded (following Byrnes' withdrawal from the running) after "eavesdropping" on a long-distance telephone conversation, that was in fact, meant for his ears. In this conversation, Roosevelt shouted into the receiver that if Truman "wants to break up the Democratic party by staying out, he can."[17]

Truman himself, today so firmly associated with Civil Rights advances, most notably the desegregation of the military, originally neither saw, nor sought to sell himself as the Civil Rights candidate. His record in that area, however, was particularly strong, especially for a politician of his time and locality. Back in the 1920s, he had launched his political career with the help of local party boss Tom Pendergast, who was instrumental in helping Truman win the black vote, which in turn gave Truman his first sense of its importance. By the time Truman was first elected to the Senate, in 1934, he consistently allied himself with the liberal bloc in matters of civil rights.[18]

Truman's early support of civil rights, however, was in many ways more a matter of politics than of conviction, especially as he also had a southern white constituency in Missouri whose vote he had to attract. One example of Truman's early ambivalence was a remark he had made to a southern Senator in 1938, regarding an antilynching bill, in which he said: "You know I am against this bill, but if it comes to a vote, I'll have to vote for it.....the Negro vote in Kansas City and St. Louis are too important." (The bill never made it to the Senate floor). Truman's views on civil rights fairly quickly matured beyond considerations of political expediency, but even then he continued to make a distinction between what he saw as matters of simple justice, and outright advocacy of the abolition of Jim Crow. In many ways, he had most succinctly expressed his early middle-of-the-road viewpoint in a 1940 speech to the National Colored Democratic Association, in which he stated: "I wish to make it clear that I am not appealing for social equality of the Negro....the highest types of Negro leaders say quite frankly that they prefer the society of their own people. Negroes want justice, not social relations."[19]

Aside from the Vice Presidential nomination, however, civil rights itself was the major bone of contention within the Democratic party in 1944. At a time

17 Ibid., 120.
18 Berman, *The Politics of Civil Rights*, 8-9.
19 Ibid., 12.

when the Democratic white primaries were still operative in some Southern states, the inclusion of a civil rights plank in the party platform had genuine potential to split the party. The civil rights plank that was initially drafted, therefore, was intended to offend neither black leaders nor Southern proponents of states' rights and white supremacy. The plank ended up pleasing neither group. Providing no specifics one way or the other, the plank simply affirmed that "racial and religious minorities have the right to live, develop, and vote equally with all citizens and share the rights that are guaranteed by our Constitution." The closest thing this plank had to provisions for enforcement was the statement that "Congress should exert its full constitutional powers to protect these rights." Four years later, this middle-of-the road plank would be challenged by both factions of the party.[20]

The concerns for the Vice Presidency within both wings of the Democratic party turned out to be justified. Roosevelt handily won a fourth term and subsequently died April 12, 1945, not long after his fourth inauguration, conferring on Truman "not only the highest office in the land, but the deep political divisions that Roosevelt had left behind him within his own party." The biggest division, without question, was over the civil rights issue. No sooner had Truman assumed the Presidency, than he was asked by reporters about his civil rights position at his first Presidential press conference on April 17, 1945. In response to the query on "where the President stood" regarding fair employment and voting rights, Truman adroitly replied: "I will give you some advice. All you need to do is read the Senate record of one Harry S. Truman."[21]

It became clear fairly quickly, however, that Truman would not be able to continue to rest comfortably on his past record; nor would he satisfy the black electorate and civil rights advocates merely with words. The situation was no longer just a matter of regional or even national politics in the postwar era. The founding of the United Nations, the emerging independence of former colonies in Africa and Asia, and the Cold War would shine the world spotlight on the American racial situation as it had never been focused previously.[22] If America was to effectively champion freedom, human rights, and democracy abroad, it could no longer maintain the racial status quo at home, or as one historian has expressed it, be "more concerned with democratic elections in

20 Garson, *The Democratic Party*, 118-19.
21 Berman, *The Politics of Civil Rights*, 23.
22 Sitkoff, "Harry Truman," 598.

Poland than in the American South." Indeed, by 1947, an NAACP division, headed by W.E.B. DuBois, had filed a petition to the U.N. Human Rights Commission concerning the treatment of blacks in the United States. The petition had little if any legal effect, but it did serve to focus greater attention on the disparity between American rhetoric and policies.[23]

Fighting the Communist Menace (perceived and actual) also ultimately compelled the Truman administration seriously to address the race issue, lest it play into the hands of Communists, both in-country and abroad. Up to the post-war era the civil rights issue, if it had appeared on the white American political stage at all, was promoted by leftist organizations, many of them communist-dominated. On the world stage, the U.S. found itself in "competition with the Soviet Union for the favor of the emerging nonwhite nations" making its racial policies at home "a damaging embarrassment" to the anti-Communist cause.[24] One of the tasks of the Truman administration and the liberal Democrats, therefore, was to defuse the Communist threat by co-opting its possible appeal to the emerging "third world" abroad and to minority voters at home.

Truman, however, initially hesitated to act decisively in the race matter, as he was preoccupied with establishing a mandate to guide the nation into the postwar era. For example, early in his presidency, he almost paradoxically endorsed the creation of a permanent Fair Employment Practices Committee and at the same time failed to push for appropriations for the existing temporary FEPC.[25] However, it was not even as if the temporary FEPC was going to receive support from the southern wing of Truman's own party. Already, southern Democrats were determined to block any measure of Truman's that seemed to favor civil rights.

What finally goaded Truman into action was a series of acts of racial violence in 1946, many over the issue of black voting rights. One of the most shocking to Truman, himself a war veteran, was the blinding of Isaac Woodward, who had just been discharged from the service.[26] Responding to the outcries of black organizations (including a picket by fifty women from the NAACP), Truman and his attorney general Tom Clark mobilized a somewhat

23 Donald R. McCoy and Richard T. Ruetten, *Quest and Response: Minority Rights and the Truman Administration* (Lawrence, Kansas: University Press, 1973), 66-68.
24 Robert Weisbrot, *Freedom Bound: A History of America's Civil Rights Movement* (New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 1990), 10.
25 Sitkoff, "Harry Truman," 599.
26 McCoy and Ruetten, *Quest and Response*, 66-68.

handicapped Department of Justice to investigate the violence. Little was finally accomplished in terms of prosecutive action (the Justice Department's jurisdiction was limited at the time), but Clark subsequently announced that he would seek the passage of an anti-lynching bill in the next Congress (the elections were coming up too soon for action in the 79th Congress).[27]

In the meantime, Truman was further apprised of the details of the racial situation by the National Emergency Committee Against Mob Violence, headed by Walter White. The report ultimately convinced Truman to bypass the Congress to create a civil rights committee by executive order. White later recalled that after having read the report, Truman exclaimed: "We have to do something...Everybody seems to believe that the President by himself can do anything he wishes...but the President is helpless unless he is backed by public opinion."[28]

By the time of the 1946 Congressional election however, it seemed as if public opinion was definitely against the Democrats in general and Truman in particular. The Republican takeover of both the House and Senate convinced many high-placed operatives of Truman's forthcoming defeat in the 1948 election. Yet it was ironically the Republican takeover that helped to make Truman less beholden to the Solid South, and therefore freer to style himself as a liberal Democrat in general, and Democratic champion of civil rights in particular.

The rise of Progressive party candidate Henry Wallace also eventually gave Truman the incentive to shift leftward, in order to co-opt Wallace's appeal as the candidate of the common people.[29] Wallace, a biologist by profession, and for a while Truman's Secretary of Commerce, undoubtably had personal scores to settle as well as political convictions to advance in his presidential campaign. Already smarting from his removal from the 1944 Presidential ticket, he proceeded to exacerbate his alienation from Truman, largely through his Madison Square Garden speech (and other foreign policy statements) that ran counter to the administration's increasingly hard-line views. His subsequent dismissal, whether or not in response to the demands of Truman's conservative Secretary of State, undoubtably fueled Wallace's hatred of Truman as "a 'politician,' without

27 Berman, *The Politics of Civil Rights*, 47-50.
28 Ibid., 51; Quoted from Walter White, *A Man Called White: The Autobiography of Walter White* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1970), 330-31.
29 Karl M. Schmidt, *Henry A. Wallace: Quixotic Crusade, 1948* (Syracuse, New York: University Press, 1960), 91.

principle or conviction and with an amazing capacity to be on all sides of a question not only at different times but at one and the same time."[30]

Truman's most immediate response to the post-election situation was then to make a speech at the annual NAACP rally in front of the Lincoln Memorial, at the invitation of Walter White. Disregarding advice to keep the actual mention of civil rights confined to the last paragraph of his speech, "not to exceed one minute," Truman devoted his entire talk to the issue of civil rights. His speech included a discussion of the role the federal government in the protection of civil rights and the significance of civil rights to the growing cold war conflict. Throwing aside concerns for placating the South, Truman asserted "we cannot, any longer, await the growth of a will to action in the slowest state or the most backward community."[31]

Demands for Truman to back up his words with action increased with publication of the report of his Committee on Civil Rights. The now famous document, *To Secure these Rights* went even further than Truman had recommended, both in its description of the problem of American racial discrimination and in its proposed solutions.[32] The Committee on Civil Right's recommendations included, but were by no means limited to the following:

-- The establishment of a permanent Commission on Civil Rights in the Executive Office of the President, preferably by Act of Congress.

-- The enactment by Congress of an antilynching act.

-- Action by the states or Congress to end poll taxes as voting prerequisite.

-- The enactment by Congress of legislation establishing local self-government for the District of Columbia.

-- The enactment by Congress of legislation providing that no member of the armed forces shall be subject to discrimination of any kind by any public authority or place of public accommodation, recreation, transportation, or other service or business.

In addition, the committee's report pointed to the discrepancy between American civil rights goals and realities, which in the words of the Committee, created: "a kind of moral dry rot which eats away at the emotional and rational bases of democratic beliefs." [33]

30 Jules Abels, *Out of the Jaws of Victory* (New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1959), 103-105.
31 Berman, 61-62; Quoted from a Memorandum to Matthew J.Connelly from David Niles, June 16, 1947, Clark Clifford File, Harry S. Truman Library; and from White, *A Man Called White*, 330-31.
32 Ibid., 70-71.
33 McCoy and Reutten, *Quest and Response*, 87-91: Quoted from *To Secure these Rights: The Report of the President's Committee on Civil Rights* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1947), 139.

To Secure these Rights produced an immediate and largely positive response among civil rights organizations, which in turn served to increase the pressure upon Truman to act upon his earlier statements. The person who finally convinced Truman that decisive pro-civil rights action was not only morally right but politically sound was his advisor, Clark Clifford, who in his celebrated 43-page campaign memorandum advised Truman to do everything he could to "outbid the Republicans" (and Henry Wallace) in the matter of courting the black vote. More pointedly, Clifford assured Truman that "the South can be considered safely Democratic," and that in regard to formulating national policy "can easily be ignored."[34]

Following the submission of Truman's "omnibus" civil rights legislation, however, Southern Democrats began to make it perfectly clear that they could and would not be ignored in the upcoming Presidential election--at least not without serious consequences for the Democratic party and the President. As the Democratic National Convention in Philadelphia approached, southern Democratic operatives threatened to walk out of the convention and run their own Democratic ticket if Truman and the national Democratic organization did not repudiate civil rights. They made this point clear early on in the campaign, at the annual Jefferson-Jackson Day Dinner in Washington, D.C., when South Carolina Senator Olin M. Johnston and his wife, the vice-chair of the dinner committee, reserved an entire table prominently near the Presidential dais--and then did not show up. The irony was that Truman made no mention of civil rights during that entire evening.[35]

A meeting with the Conference of Southern Governors, convened by Democratic National Committee Chairman J. Howard McGrath, intended to reconcile sectional differences within the party, proved fruitless. South Carolina Governor Strom Thurmond refused to be seated, as he fired off his questions at McGrath. In return, McGrath responded to his committeeman's suggestion that he compromise, with a firm "no compromise." McGrath further stated, that as Chairman, he was "not going to push this thing one spot further than the President's message." But, he added neither would he" withdraw one inch from the confines of that message.[36]"

34 Irwin Ross, *The Loneliest Campaign: The Truman Victory of 1948* (New York: New American Library, 1968), 22-23.
35 Ibid., 62-63.
36 Jack Redding, *Inside the Democratic Party* (New York: Bobbs-Merrill, 1958), 135-37.

It was almost as if Truman did not have enough problems. Already in hot water with the South over the civil rights issue, Truman also found himself facing discontent on the left, from the Americans for Democratic Action (ADA) an anticommunist liberal organization. The ADA, which had spearheaded the leftward shift in the Democratic party, never went as far as to endorse Wallace as an alternative (in the way that Strom Thurmond was for the "Dixiecrats"), but nonetheless decided to refrain from endorsing Truman or any other candidate until after the party convention. As political historian Steven M. Gillon put it; "There was certainly no enthusiasm for Truman, but no one knew a way out of the dilemma."[37]

The battle lines, therefore, were drawn, even before the Democratic conventioneers had reached Philadelphia. Several state leaders, beginning with Virginia Governor William Tuck sought various ways to get Truman removed from the Democratic slot on their state ballot, ranging from "a blind ballot" (by which voters would simply select the Democratic party, leaving the choice of candidate to electoral college operatives) to replacing Truman with an acceptable Southern candidate in the Democratic slot, effectively relegating the national Democratic party candidate to third-party status. (In the end, only a few states would accomplish the latter.)[38] On the left, the specter of Henry Wallace still loomed. At the same time, the most unlikely coalition of the ADA and Southern wings of the Democratic party was formed to "draft Eisenhower," despite the General's earlier protest that he was did not want to be a candidate--for any party.[39]

In the end, the draft-Eisenhower movement fizzled, and a brief campaign to nominate Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas never reached the convention floor. Truman ultimately received the nomination with little actual opposition (although he was denied the usual unanimous nomination). The intra-party showdown therefore, centered on the Democratic party platform--specifically its civil rights plank.

Truman, recently awakened to the true extent of Southern ire over his civil rights stance, but having already committed himself too firmly to back down, argued for a very broad, general plank, similar to the one drafted in 1944.

37 Steven Gillon, *Politics and Vision: The ADA and American Liberalism, 1947-1985* (Oxford: University Press, 1987), 39.
38 Redding, *Inside the Democratic Party*, 138-39.
39 Garson, *The Democratic Party*, 269-71.

The Southern Democrats, if they could not have the civil rights plank excised altogether, demanded at least a change of wording so that it also stated that neither the Democratic party nor the federal government would "encroach upon the reserved powers of the state by the centralization of the government or otherwise." The ADA, in contrast, drafted an entirely new plank that included specific provisions for anti-poll tax and antilynching legislation, as well as the creation of a permanent FEPC.[40]

A prelude to the main "floor fight" that would make the history books occurred over the seating of the Mississippi delegation, which had previously resolved not to support the Democratic ticket if Truman was nominated and the civil rights program endorsed. George L. Vaughn, a black member of the credentials committee, attempted to present a minority report opposing their seating. Vaughn was shouted down and the Mississippi delegation was seated, following a voice vote. The following morning, however, after a long night of discussion and debate, Senator Hubert Humphrey, one of the drafters of the ADA plank, acted on his decision to push for the stronger civil rights plank, as well as a roll-call vote to get it passed, despite warnings from the administration spokesman that he would "split the party wide open."[41]

The party, by that time however, was already so badly fractured, that nothing short of complete retreat from civil rights would have brought the southern wing back into line. Following a morning of debate, lobbying, and presentation of various other civil rights planks, Humphrey launched into a rousing speech that included his now immortal call "for the Democratic party to get out of the shadow of states' rights and walk forthrightly in the bright sunshine of human rights." The eventual roll-call vote resulted in the passage of the ADA plank, 651 1/2 to 582 1/2. It also resulted in the walkout of the Alabama and Mississippi delegations (although none of the other southern states followed them out). As Time commented on its report on the convention, "The South had been kicked in the pants, turned around, and kicked in the stomach."[42]

40 Gillon, *Politics and Vision*, 47-48.
41 Ross, *The Loneliest Campaign*, 122-23.
42 Ibid., 125-26.

The South, however, had not lost all of its fight. Within weeks of the Democratic National Convention, many Southern Democrats, as promised, convened a States Rights' convention in Birmingham, nominating Strom Thurmond and Fielding Wright as "States Rights Democrats." Despite the unlikelihood of a "Dixiecrat" win, the southern Democrats banked their hopes on throwing the election into the House of Representatives, in which they presumed that they would have more leverage in selecting the next President.[43] One historian has argued, however, that even if the election had gone into the House, a Dewey or even a Truman victory was more likely than one for Thurmond.[44]

In the end, however, Truman's upset victory happened both despite and because of the three-way split in the Democratic party. The southern walkout in Philadelphia gave Truman new credibility with black voters and civil rights activists, and also freed him from nearly all obligation to please the South. Also, by the end of the campaign Wallace's candidacy had ceased to be a threat, owing largely to the taint of Communist support, which Wallace stubbornly refused to repudiate. Finally, the South, while not nearly as safe as Clifford had predicted, largely came through for Truman. Most Southern voters (and electors) as predicted, stuck with the national Democratic ticket, despite their objections to both Truman and civil rights, and Thurmond's candidacy succeeded only with the four states in which the Dixiecrats had managed to appropriate the Democratic party label--Alabama, Louisiana, Mississippi, and South Carolina.[45]

The 1948 Presidential election had undeniably brought the Civil Rights issue to the political forefront. By the same token, black voters were now recognized as a "legitimate" constituency, which neither major party could afford to ignore. Although the transformation of the Democratic Party was far from complete (the last Dixiecrat gasp would be heard in 1968, from George Wallace), the signs were already clear that from then on, the Democratic party would never again be automatically allied with the American South. As southern historian George B. Tindall expressed it, "the region had finally moved out of the old Civil War-Reconstruction configuration in politics."[46] So, for that matter, had the party.

43 Sitkoff, "Harry Truman," 605.
44 Abels, *Out of the Jaws of Victory*, 214-15.
45 Ross, *The Loneliest Campaign*, 247.
46 Tindall, *The Disruption of the Solid South*, 38-46.

Constructing Community: The Meaning of Fairs, Court Days, and Royal Celebrations in Eighteenth-Century Virginia

Kristan Crawford

Kristan Crawford was a co-winner of the History Department's Lavern M. Hamand Graduate Writing Award. She presented this paper at the Phi Alpha Theta Lower Illinois Regional Conference at Illinois State University, where she received an award for Outstanding Use of Primary Documents. This paper is a shortened version of the first chapter of her M.A. thesis on community, public ritual, and popular disturbances in eighteenth century Virginia.

Eighteenth-century Virginia was an early modern European society. Community overshadowed individual interests. Low literacy and farming contributed to the predominance of an oral culture, in which face-to-face encounters and ritualistic actions provided the basis of communal solidarity.[1] As in England, Virginia's social hierarchy required each inhabitant to express either deference or condescension to each man or woman encountered within the society.[2] Prior to the imperial crisis, Virginia's county communities, although stratified, remained cohesive. This paper argues that before 1765, despite some tensions, the populace interacted in ways which reinforced the communal will and created a unified society.

Some historians prefer to emphasize the individual over the community. Edmund S. Morgan discusses how the atomistic nature of frontier Virginia contributed to the central American paradox, namely, how slavery and freedom coexisted in colonial Virginia, "the one supporting the other." Other historians

1 Rhys Isaac, *The Transformation of Virginia, 1740-1790* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1982), 125.
2 David Hackett Fischer noted how deference, or the "culture of subordination," was the "psychological cement" of the hierarchical system. He also discussed condescension: "To condescend in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries was to treat an inferior with kindness, decency and respect." David Hackett Fischer, *Albion's Seed: Four British Folkways in America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1989), 384, 385-7; Bertram Wyatt-Brown, *Southern Honor: Ethics and Behavior in the Old South* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1982), 63.

The South, however, had not lost all of its fight. Within weeks of the Democratic National Convention, many Southern Democrats, as promised, convened a States Rights' convention in Birmingham, nominating Strom Thurmond and Fielding Wright as "States Rights Democrats." Despite the unlikelihood of a "Dixiecrat" win, the southern Democrats banked their hopes on throwing the election into the House of Representatives, in which they presumed that they would have more leverage in selecting the next President.[43] One historian has argued, however, that even if the election had gone into the House, a Dewey or even a Truman victory was more likely than one for Thurmond.[44]

In the end, however, Truman's upset victory happened both despite and because of the three-way split in the Democratic party. The southern walkout in Philadelphia gave Truman new credibility with black voters and civil rights activists, and also freed him from nearly all obligation to please the South. Also, by the end of the campaign Wallace's candidacy had ceased to be a threat, owing largely to the taint of Communist support, which Wallace stubbornly refused to repudiate. Finally, the South, while not nearly as safe as Clifford had predicted, largely came through for Truman. Most Southern voters (and electors) as predicted, stuck with the national Democratic ticket, despite their objections to both Truman and civil rights, and Thurmond's candidacy succeeded only with the four states in which the Dixiecrats had managed to appropriate the Democratic party label--Alabama, Louisiana, Mississippi, and South Carolina.[45]

The 1948 Presidential election had undeniably brought the Civil Rights issue to the political forefront. By the same token, black voters were now recognized as a "legitimate" constituency, which neither major party could afford to ignore. Although the transformation of the Democratic Party was far from complete (the last Dixiecrat gasp would be heard in 1968, from George Wallace), the signs were already clear that from then on, the Democratic party would never again be automatically allied with the American South. As southern historian George B. Tindall expressed it, "the region had finally moved out of the old Civil War-Reconstruction configuration in politics."[46] So, for that matter, had the party.

43 Sitkoff, "Harry Truman," 605.
44 Abels, *Out of the Jaws of Victory*, 214-15.
45 Ross, *The Loneliest Campaign*, 247.
46 Tindall, *The Disruption of the Solid South*, 38-46.

Constructing Community: The Meaning of Fairs, Court Days, and Royal Celebrations in Eighteenth-Century Virginia

Kristan Crawford

Kristan Crawford was a co-winner of the History Department's Lavern M. Hamand Graduate Writing Award. She presented this paper at the Phi Alpha Theta Lower Illinois Regional Conference at Illinois State University, where she received an award for Outstanding Use of Primary Documents. This paper is a shortened version of the first chapter of her M.A. thesis on community, public ritual, and popular disturbances in eighteenth century Virginia.

Eighteenth-century Virginia was an early modern European society. Community overshadowed individual interests. Low literacy and farming contributed to the predominance of an oral culture, in which face-to-face encounters and ritualistic actions provided the basis of communal solidarity.[1] As in England, Virginia's social hierarchy required each inhabitant to express either deference or condescension to each man or woman encountered within the society.[2] Prior to the imperial crisis, Virginia's county communities, although stratified, remained cohesive. This paper argues that before 1765, despite some tensions, the populace interacted in ways which reinforced the communal will and created a unified society.

Some historians prefer to emphasize the individual over the community. Edmund S. Morgan discusses how the atomistic nature of frontier Virginia contributed to the central American paradox, namely, how slavery and freedom coexisted in colonial Virginia, "the one supporting the other." Other historians

1 Rhys Isaac, *The Transformation of Virginia, 1740-1790* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1982), 125.
2 David Hackett Fischer noted how deference, or the "culture of subordination," was the "psychological cement" of the hierarchical system. He also discussed condescension: "To condescend in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries was to treat an inferior with kindness, decency and respect." David Hackett Fischer, *Albion's Seed: Four British Folkways in America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1989), 384, 385-7; Bertram Wyatt-Brown, *Southern Honor: Ethics and Behavior in the Old South* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1982), 63.

incorporate Darrett B. Rutman's "network analysis" approach, which argues that people associate in orderly groups: networks formed by landform, distance, technology, or social topography. These communities, or "small worlds," James R. Perry suggests, "provided cohesion" in colonial Virginia society.[3] But as Morgan's thesis seems to suggest that American exceptionality and, thus, the Revolution was inevitable, while the approach of Perry and Rutman would imply that the Revolution never happened, a third approach suggesting a change from a consensual society to one based on conflict (say, after 1765) would be in order.

This paper examines mainly the evidence for communal action and how it integrated a gentlemanly elite and an agrarian populace primarily before 1765. Three social activities particularly displayed communal solidarity: fairs and festivals, courthouse gatherings, and royal celebrations. These activities enabled the inhabitants of the county community to interact, and, despite seeming disorder, strengthen communal relationships.

Virginia's colonial legislature repeatedly established Fair days in various counties and towns, including Fredericksburg, Richmond, Suffolk, Newcastle, and Alexandria.[4] The Fredericksburg Fair, held biannually from 1738, was perhaps the most successful fair during this period. In 1774, when the Scottish indentured servant, John Harrower, disembarked from his Atlantic voyage, he encountered there "a great number of Gentlemen and Ladies driving into Town it being an anuall Fair day."[5] The establishment of fairs shows the social desire for communal interaction and, because they were often held at county seats, also reinforced the "county community." As Harrower's mention of "a number of Genteel Company *as well as others*" during the May 1774 fair[6] suggests, all ranks interacted at the annual fairs.

The fairs' function was social more than economic. Festivals, some lasting

3 Edmund S. Morgan, *American Slavery, American Freedom; The Ordeal of Colonial Virginia* (New York: W.W. Norton and Co., 1975), 6; Darrett B. Rutman and Anita H. Rutman, *Small Worlds, Large Questions: Explorations in Early American Social History, 1660-1850* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1994), 40-1; James R. Perry, *The Formation of a Society on Virginia's Eastern Shore, 1615-1655* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1990), 7.

4 William W. Hening, *The Statutes at Large; Being A Collection of all the Laws of Virginia, from the First Session of the Legislature, in the Year 1619* (Richmond, Va.) V, 82-3; *The Journals of the House of Burgesses*, 18 April 1747; ibid., 17 December 1748; ibid., 29 February 1752; hereafter cited as: *JHB*.

5 Hening, *Statutes*, V, 82-3; Edward Miles Riley, ed. *The Journal of John Harrower: An Indentured Servant in the Colony of Virginia, 1773-1776* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1963), 40. See also, *Virginia Gazette* (Parks) 16 May 1745; 5 September 1745; 20 March 1746; 4 June 1746; 25 April 1751; (Hunter) 30 April 1752; 9 May 1755.

for days, engaged all social ranks and provided an opportunity to escape planting drudgery. Although fairs provided the means to auction land, this proved inconsequential compared to other festivities.[7] For instance, the St. Andrews Day Festival had "Horse Races, and several other Diversions," and included prizes for the best wrestler and runner.[8] Harrower recounted how "Puppet shows, roape dancings &c" ended a week of horse racing in Fredericksburg.[9] In 1752, a "Company of Comedians from the new theatre in Williamsburg" intended to proceed to Fredericksburg, "to play during the Continuance of the June Fair."[10]

Williamsburg's atypical fair in December 1739 demonstrates a failed attempt at communal interaction. The *Virginia Gazette* advertised this fair: "for the Buying and Selling of Horses, Cattle, Hogs, Sheep, &c and all sorts of Goods, Wares and Merchandizes." Although this fair intended "to encourage trade and promote commerce," the *Gazette* later admitted that this "has not met with the desired Success." Even a bounty offered to the person who brought the most horses, sheep and hogs, failed to excite interest.[11] The *Gazette* claimed that there had not been enough "timely Notice of the Encouragement intended to be given to those who brought Horses, Cattle, Hogs, &c to the Fair," although the public received two weeks prior notice. The real reason for this fair's failure was that its expressed intent was business-related and not community-oriented. It lacked entertainments which allowed the community to gather and interact.[12]

Closely associated with these recreational social gatherings were festive activities at the county courthouse. The courthouse allowed for central communal gathering and social interaction.[13] This interaction enabled the community "to define social rank, mutual obligation, and shared values."[14] Courthouse gatherings demanded the acceptance of one's place in the social continuum and reinforced the social hierarchy, and, thus, unified the community.

6 Riley, ed., *John Harrower*, 45. (italics mine)
7 *Virginia Gazette*, (Parks) 16 May 1745.
8 Ibid., 30 September 1737.
9 Riley, ed., *John Harrower*, 65.
10 *Virginia Gazette*, (Hunter) 30 April 1752.
11 *Virginia Gazette*, (Parks) 23 November 1739; ibid., 30 November 1739.
12 Ibid., 7 December 1739.
13 Thomas Bender, *Community and Social Change in America* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1978), 70-71; A. G. Roeber, *Faithful Magistrates and Republican Lawyers: Creators of Virginia Legal Culture, 1680-1810* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1981), 78-9.
14 Ibid., 74.

Typical advertisements of courthouse activities included the public sale of land, schooners, and tobacco.[15] In addition, horse races, sometimes with a "purse of 30 pistoles," cockfighting, and other sports occurred regularly.[16] A northern tutor described a five-mile horse race around Richmond Courthouse in his journal. He noted that "The Assembly was remarkably numerous; beyond my expectation and exceeding [sic] polite in general."[17] Perhaps racing crowds were more genteel and polite than others. But gaming competition did not disrupt the social order. The crossing, but not levelling, of social ranks helped unify the traditional society.

Courts created what has been called in English history "county communities." Monthly court meetings created an opportunity for private business and social exchanges, especially at nearby ordinaries, or taverns.[18] Lightning in Sussex County allowed a rare glimpse into the social setting of a court day, when, in the evening of a court day, it "struck near the end of the court house," and killed two horses and three hogs. Present were "upwards of an hundred people in and about the ordinary, within thirty yards of where the mischief was done." Ehren Horn, the man who owned the horses, "was indemnified upon the spot, by the generous contribution of the Gentlemen who attended the Court."[19] The gathering suggests a festive ending to the court day. Horn evidently had brought horses to sell during the day. The "Gentlemen" who donated reinforced their social position as well as the community itself by relieving a community member in distress.[20]

Burgess elections perhaps best displayed the dichotomous festive/solemn role of the county courthouse. These occasions particularly revealed the importance of face-to-face interaction. Burgess contenders had to prove their ability to serve their community by providing drink and entertainment, while the solemn ritual was central to an oral-based society.

Robert Munford's *The Candidates; or, The Humours of a Virginia Election*, written circa 1770, provides insight into the communal interaction that occurred during Burgess elections. This three act farcical play focuses on *Wou'dbe*, a gentleman seeking re-election. Three new candidates also seek

15 *Virginia Gazette* (Parks) 11 August 1738; ibid., 6 June 1745; ibid., 4 June 1746.
16 Ibid.
17 Hunter Dickinson Farish, *Journal and Letters of Philip Vickers Fithian, 1773-1774: A Plantation Tutor of the Old Dominion* (Williamsburg: Colonial Williamsburg, Inc., 1943), 32.
18 Sydnor, *American Revolutionaries*, 79.
19 *Virginia Gazette*, (Rind) 4 August 1768.
20 Isaac, *Transformation*, 90.

election because *Worthy*, a past Burgess along with *Wou'dbe*, refuses to run. The new contenders attempt to sway the freeholders' opinions. The Candidates is worth analyzing to test whether the playwright, himself a Burgess from 1765-1775, thought of pre-revolutionary Virginia elections as consensual or conflictual.[21]

Treating comprises a major theme of The Candidates. In one act, the county freeholders anxiously await at a race-field the four candidates' arrival. One freeholder, *Twist*, asks: "We are very dry here; Mr. Guzzle, where's your friend Sir John [Toddy], and Mr. Wou'dbe? they are to treat to-day, I hear." The freeholders become increasingly intoxicated. *Wou'dbe* later invites "most of the principal freeholders to breakfast with me, in their way to the court-house." Not surprisingly, alcohol makes an appearance at this morning event. *Mr. Julip*, a Justice, orders a servant to bring him "the spirit" because his chocolate drink needs "a little lacing to make it admirable."[22] Munford, at least, saw elections as constructing a jovial sort of order.

Did such a view of festive elections have a basis in reality? Community treating occurred regularly, despite a 1705 law which prohibited Burgess candidates from treating, promising money, or showing preference to any freeholder "in order to be elected... to serve in the General Assembly."[23] In Lunenburg County on 29 March 1756, the issue of treating emerged in a contested election. When Matthew Marrable complained of Thomas Nash's "undue Election and Return," county officials sought to determine whether Nash or "his Agents" gave "any Treats, or Entertainments, . . . to the Freeholders."[24] The lengthy case provides an interesting account of Virginia society.[25]

The election committee in 1756 focused on the issue of treating during the poll. At first, Mr. Nash, "at a race where many Freeholders were present," cautioned a fellow candidate, Mr. Embry, "not to spend any Thing, as the Writ was out, and [Nash] did not spend any Thing himself." Mr. Nash, when told by a freeholder that "he would call for some Punch," replied that "it should be at

21 Jay B Hubbell and Douglas Adair, "Robert Munford's The Candidates," *William and Mary Quarterly* V (April 1948): 217-18, 220-21. All references to his work are from this edition.
22 Munford, *The Candidates*, 241, 243, 252, 255.
23 Hening, *Statutes*, III, 243.
24 The governor signed election writs at least forty days prior to the proposed meeting of the General Assembly. The colony's secretary then sent the appropriate writ to each county sheriff, who in turn sent copies to the county minister. Each Sunday until the election, the minister publicized the upcoming event after his church service. Hening, *Statutes*, III, 236-7.
25 *JHB*, 29 March 1756, 344; 7 May 1767, 456-7.

[the freeholder's] own Expense" because Nash was a candidate. The freeholder expected a customary drink and Mr. Nash probably refused only because a fellow candidate was present.[26] Further, a bar keeper at the ordinary, "was applied to for Liquor by the Voters." The bar keeper charged liquor delivered during the poll "to the Candidate in whose Name it was demanded." After the poll closed, he tried to collect. "Mr. Nash asked him by whose Orders it was delivered, for if it was not by his Orders, he would not pay for it." The reply was that he "depended on his [Nash's] Honor: Upon which Mr. Nash paid for what was charged to him." Mr. Marrable, however, refused to pay for more than a small quantity of rum to give to some people "who were preparing a Barbacue," even though his bar account was among the largest. Nash's vindication came when the Committee of Privileges and Elections announced that Mr. Nash had not consented to treating.[27] Nash had respected the law, but provided for his community and upheld a code of honor, nevertheless.

As Bertram Wyatt-Brown points out, treating was not simple bribery. It was "rather the demand of male constituents that the office-seeker thereby prove his manhood, indifference to heavy financial loss, and claim to the respect of those accepting his bounty."[28] It also acted as a way for community members to accept publicly their social rank. If the worthy candidate expected selection, the populace expected treating from the community's better-sort. Hence, *Woul'be* states in *The Candidates*, "...it surely is the duty of every man who has abilities to serve his country, to take up the burden, and bear it with patience." But he also asks, "Must I again be subject to the humours of a fickle crowd?"[29] The famous diarist Landon Carter claimed that he lost his re-election because he did not "familiarize" himself "among the people."[30] He neglected his expected and anticipated duties. Election day combined festival with respect toward the local authorities. Polling ritual reinforced the community's social order which in turn, reinforced social stability.

26 Ibid.; Sydnor, 57.
27 *JHB*, 7 May 1757, p. 456-7.
28 Wyatt-Brown, *Southern Honor*, 337.
29 Munford, *The Candidates*, 252, 231.
30 Jack P Greene, *The Diary of Colonel Landon Carter of Sabine Hall, 1752-1778* (Charlottesville: The University Press of Virginia, 1965), I:7.

The election usually began mid-morning. From the court house doorway, the county sheriff announced the opening of the poll, and the voters then entered to cast their vote(s).[31] Behind a bench sat the sheriff, the appointed election clerks with record books, and the candidates. When the freeholder voted, he took an oath in front of the bench, which verified his status as a county freeholder (a requirement which after 1736 meant he owned either one hundred acres of unimproved land or twenty-five acres with a house). The sheriff then asked how he voted, and the clerk appointed to the appropriate candidate recorded his response. The candidate then rose and thanked the freeholder. This continued until the sheriff determined that all available freeholders voted. In *The Candidates* the sheriff states, "Gentlemen freeholders, come into court, and give your votes, or the polling will be closed." Finally, the tallied returns proclaimed the winner. The sheriff "returned the burgesses," with a public announcement and a written form sent to Williamsburg.[32] The day ended at the ordinary, perhaps after a speech like *Worthy's* in *The Candidates*: "Gentlemen, I'm much obliged to you for the signal proof you have given me to-day of your regard. You may depend upon it, that I shall endeavour faithfully to discharge the trust you have reposed in me."[33]

Of course, all this drink, honor, and inequality did not produce a completely pacific society. Disorderly "riots" or "tumults" plagued some Burgess elections. For example, as soon as the poll opened at noon in the 1742 Orange County election, several men "throng'd into the Court-house in a riotous Manner, and made such a Disturbance, that the Sheriff and Candidates were obliged to go out of the Court-house, 'til the house was clear'd." Polling resumed, after the sheriff "in order to let the Voters pass in and out quietly," appointed an under-sheriff and another man "with drawn Swords across the [courthouse] Doors." However, a John Rucker believed his honor threatened, and "threw the Under-Sheriff and another Person headlong out of the Doors; . . . and seized the Under-Sheriff's

31 General elections, in which each freeholder cast two votes, occurred when the governor dissolved the assembly and called for new elections. By-elections, in which each freeholder cast only one vote, occurred to replace "burgesses whose service had been terminated by death, resignation, or disqualification." John G. Kolp, "The Dynamics of Electoral Competition in Pre-Revolutionary Virginia," *William and Mary Quarterly* XLIX (October 1992): 655.
32 Hening, *Statutes*, IV, 475-8; Sydnor, *American Revolutionaries*, 27-8; Griffith, *Virginia House of Burgesses*, 60-2; Richard L. Morton, *Colonial Virginia*, vol II, *Westward Expansion and Prelude to Revolution, 1710-1763* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1960), 718-20; Munford, *The Candidates*, 257.
33 Ibid.

Sword with both his Hands." Even within this tumult, however, order was reinforced. The displaced under-sheriff "was rescued by the By-standers," which suggests that the community did not sanction Rucker's behavior. Rucker's actions only temporarily disrupted the election process. Towards evening, the other guard left his post, "and immediately the People throng'd into the Court-house in a drunken riotous Manner, one of them jumping upon the Clerk's Table, and dancing among the Papers, so that the sheriff was unable to clear the Bar, or the Clerk's to take the Poll." The Committee of Privileges and Elections determined that "John Rucker did, before and during the Time of the Election, give several large Bowls of Punch amongst the People, crying out for those Persons who intended to vote for Mr. Slaughter, to come and drink of his Punch." Furthermore, Rucker stood at the courthouse doors and prevented the supporters of another candidate from entering. Later, Rucker "confessed he had won several Pistoles, upon Mr. Slaughter's being elected the first Burgess."[34]

Such "riotously and unlawfully" conducted elections illustrates that the community was capable of violence. However, the carnival atmosphere that surrounded elections provided popular festive recreations, evident by the people who "throng'd" into the courthouse.

Ties to the royal throne also served as a unifying force within Virginia society. The *Virginia Gazette* regularly mentioned the celebrations of King George II's birthday. The 30 October 1739 celebration at Williamsburg, for example, began with inhabitants displaying the flag at the Capital. At noon, the cannons at the Governor's house "were thrice discharged," and in the evening, "the Governor's House, the College, Several Gentlemen's, and other Houses, were beautifully illuminated." The evening ended with a ball at the Governor's house, and with "great Demonstrations of Joy, Suitable to the happy occasion, and agreeable to the distinguished Loyalty of this colony in general, to His Majesty, and His Illustrious Family." Other birthday celebrations included the King's ships and forts firing their cannon.[35] No popular disturbances correspond with these public rituals before 1765.

Even more evident of a consensual community was the colonial procession celebrating the defeat of the Jacobite forces in Scotland in 1745.[36] The Norfolk

34 *JHB*, 4 June 1742, 50-1.
35 Ibid., 27 October 1738.
36 William W. Willcox and Walter L. Arnstein, *The Age of Aristocracy, 1688 to 1830* (Lexington: D. C. Heath and Co., 1988), 119-20.

celebration consisted of a full-sized effigy of the Pretender in Highland dress and a procession which contained three drummers, a piper, three violins and six men wearing inscribed sashes and carrying long rods. A man dressed as a nurse carried a warming-pan complete with a child "peeping out of it." Six men followed the cart holding the effigy, and finally, "A vast Crowd of People of the Town and Country" marched behind the procession. The procession ended at one o'clock in the town center, the courthouse, in front of an erected gibbet. Liquor poured freely during the afternoon's festivities and royal toasts and twenty-one gun salutes filled the air. The evening saw the "Town beautifully illuminated." The day culminated when a "large Bonfire was kindled round the Gibbet and . . . the Effigie dropt into the Flames." This act elicited "loud Huzza's, and Acclamations of Joy . . ." A ball capped the day's celebration.[37]

This ritualistic celebration involved the populace as well as the elite. Both expressed allegiance to the Hanoverian succession. The procession drew on popular culture. It closely resembled the shaming ritual of the *charivari*, replete with "rough music" and cross-dressing.[38] The warming-pan symbolized the belief that an infant boy had been smuggled into the Queen's bedchamber in 1688.[39] Thus, James III's son, the rebel Stuart Pretender, Bonnie Prince Charlie, (represented in the Norfolk procession wearing Scottish clothes) was a bastard's son. The cross-dressing male "nurse" symbolized a world turned upside down.

Other celebrations of the defeat of the rebels in Scotland in 1745 were organized in Hanover County, Williamsburg, Norfolk, Suffolk, and other places. "The Gentlemen of Hanover County" raised money for "Publick Entertainment" and provided (liquored?) punch to the populace. A bonfire and window illuminations ended the evening, and "all was conducted with Decency and good Order."[40] Like elections, treating, and court day festivities, these expressions of "joy and loyalty," might have been engineered by the elite. But they were public and enabled the populace to gather in common cause.

37 *Virginia Gazette*, 24 July 1746.
38 David Underdown, *Revel, Riot and Rebellion: Popular Politics and Culture in England, 1603-1660* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1985), 100-101.
39 Rachel J. Weil, "The Politics of Legitimacy: Women and the Warming-Pan Scandal," in *The Revolution of 1688-1689, Changing Perspectives*, ed. Lois G. Schwoerer (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 65-67.
40 *Virginia Gazette*, 21 August 1746.

Before the imperial crisis began in 1765, traditional Virginia society interacted in ways which reinforced the communal will. Although tensions existed, each individual subordinated his or her personal interests to the collective good. The social hierarchy that characterized this society proved essential because it provided communal order. Other historians have emphasized that when the imperial crisis interrupted that hierarchy, social disorder intensified and popular disturbances increased. But, as the writing of *The Candidates* suggests, consensus and community remained an important part of white, male popular culture in Virginia, perhaps through the Revolution itself.