Alchemy: The Rude and Disgraceful Beginnings of Chemistry

Lara Boudreau

Lara Boudreau, a senior chemistry major with teacher certification, wrote this paper for Dr. Kammerling's Senior Seminar: European Witchhunts in the Fall of 2001.

In 1831 Thomas Thomson dismissed alchemy as, "the rude and disgraceful beginnings of chemistry,"[1]. Karl Marx used alchemy as a metaphor, calling the circulation of capital, "The great social retort into which everything is thrown, to come out again as the money crystal. Nothing is immune from this alchemy, the bones of the saints cannot withstand it."[2] However, it does not deserve such a bad reputation. All the alchemists were not con artists or greedy men trying to get rich quick. Unfortunately, they were all too often seen as such by others of their time as well as being remembered as such in our own time. True alchemists were honest men seeking to improve themselves and the world but received a bad reputation from false alchemists who were selfish con men and counterfeiters.

Alchemy is best known as being the search for a substance that would transmute, or change, metals into gold. This substance was known as the Philosopher's Stone. Since being able to produce gold from any other metal would make its creator very rich, most people assume that the only motive for doing it would be greed. Yet, as Richard Brzezinski and Zbigniew Szydlo stated in "A New Light on Alchemy*,"*

> When a true alchemist, as opposed to a quack, was attempting to make gold he was not merely lusting for wealth: gold, because of its rarity, lack or reactivity, and glowing luster was the mineral world in its ultimate state of perfection. By discovering how to make gold, the alchemist would, it was though, also have the means of perfecting the plant and animal worlds.[3]

Moreover, while the Philosopher's Stone might have been the main goal of alchemy, it was not the only one. Alchemists had many other goals which they were attempting to achieve. Included in these goals were the searches for the universal solvent, or alkahest, which would dissolve all substances, and the universal medicine, or Elixir of Life, which would cure all diseases. More bizarre goals included attempts at palingenesis, or the reincarnation of plants and animals, and the creation of homunuli, or miniature humans. All these activities sought to, "Mak[e] sense of nature." [1]

Once sense was made of nature, that information could be used to cure all diseases and even eliminate poverty. Franciscan Roger Bacon often advocated alchemy, believing, "Alchemy is the most important of the experimental sciences; transmutation of metals should be undertaken in order to alleviate the poverty of the people,"[1]. Yet this could also be used to harm people and make the rich richer. For this reason, early alchemists, led by Philippus Theophrastus Aureolus Bombastus von Hohenheim (Paracelsus) were very secretive. They believed that secrecy was necessary, "as a protection of God's or Nature's powers, which should not be available to the unworthy, parallel with the protection of God's truth available only through allegory in mainstream Christian discourse."[4]. Indeed , they kept their writings in a riddle-like style that required years of study to understand. Later alchemists wrote in a much more simple and direct language. One of the most prominent of these later alchemists was a Polish man named Sendivogius, who wrote a relatively easy-to-read treatise on alchemy called *A New Light on Alchemy*. Fifty-six editions of this book were published, and copies were owned by Sir Isaac Newton and Antoine Laurent Lavoisier, the father of modern Chemistry. The secrecy they originally maintained became one of the biggest detriments to the alchemists. By keeping their knowledge secret, they allowed the imaginations of others to create an image for them. It was in this way that alchemists became known only for their attempts to transmute baser metals into gold.

One should distinguish between true alchemists and false alchemists who included con artists trying to trick people out of their money, counterfeiters who made money of false gold, and men trying to discover the secrets of making gold in order to get rich quick. Often the reputation of these false alchemists haunted true alchemists. Alchemists became known only as greedy con men.

The alchemists' reputation as con artists was created by men who would come into a town, swindle a person or several people out of their money, and then disappear. Although this was not deserved by true alchemists, there were indeed many men who pretended to be alchemists in order to swindle gullible people out of money. Both Chaucer's "The

Canon's Yeoman's Tale," written in 1390, and Ben Jonson's *The Alchemist*, written in 1610, involve alchemists who convince greedy men to invest heavily in their work, and then run off with the money. Although, "neither [story] deals with alchemists who are, or believe they are, carrying out the alchemical project"[5], these two works demonstrate the low popular opinion of alchemists. As Knapp states, Chaucer's Yeoman's performance allows the view that many alchemical endeavors are scams, but it is possible that some are not, that there is, somewhere, a secret that will help Nature perfect herself more efficiently,"[6]   But, this point is subtle and could be easily missed by someone who is reading the story. A similar story involved an Arab who appeared in Prague in the 1590's claiming to be able to multiply gold. According to Brzezinski, "He obtained 100 gold marks from each guest, and placed the coins in a large crucible with a mixture of acids, mercury, lead, salt, eggshells and horse dung."[7] He then produced an explosion that masked his departure, along with the 2400 gold marks he had collected. Stories such as this circulated widely during the Middle Ages.

Another stereotype that haunted alchemists was the idea that they were greedy men who were only trying to produce gold to make themselves rich. This image began when people saw alchemy as, "both the intellectual work of perfecting Nature and the physical work of minding the ovens and retorts, but the emphasis falls on the latter."[8] The physical work was more visual, and therefore assumed to be the only work that alchemists did. Chaucer's "The Canon's Yeoman's Tale" displays this very clearly. According to Knapp, in this story, "Two instances of the word *work* treat it in the medieval way, "to bring about".... Another two instances assert the Canon's crafty planning.... The rest...refer to the work of the lab."[9]

  Further, alchemists were often labeled counterfeiters. This reputation arose over whether alchemists' gold was worth as much as natural gold. The Dominican Albert the Great believed that, "alchemists' gold differs from natural gold in that it possesses the properties or *accidentia* of natural gold but not its essence or *essentia*."[10] This meant that even if the alchemists could produce gold from baser metals, it would not be as good as real gold, and it would be dishonest to sell it as such.   This was what concerned kings most about alchemists. Many kings kept this evil in check by allowing alchemy only with special permission from the monarch, and arrested and imprisoned all others. Henry VI of England advocated of providing special permission to alchemists. Engaged in a long war with France, his treasury was running out of money and he needed a way to bulk it up quickly. So he issued decrees "to the nobility, the clerical order, the professors, and the medical doctors...to contribute their talent to the replenishment of the treasury and to the needs of the kingdom."[11] In these decrees Henry VI concentrated on the priests believing that, "it should be easy to change base metal into precious since they daily changed bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ."[12] The priests found this very insulting and refused to help, but many others did respond and the crown granted permission was to at least seventeen men. The gold produced by these men was used to make English coins. However, since alchemists' gold was not considered to be worth as much, once it was discovered that the coins were made of manufactured gold, they were no longer accepted by merchants of other countries. Some countries took drastic measures to keep these counterfeit coins out. According to Will Ogrinc, "in 1490 the weight of the Scottish coin had to be doubled so that it could be more easily distinguished from its English counterpart."[13]

More damaging than bad reputations was the disapproval of the church. In 1317, Pope John XXII issued a bull stating that, "the practice of alchemy was thereupon forbidden for laymen and clerics."[1] after alchemists had been unable to prove to the Pope that they practised their science in accordance with nature. However, when one reads the bull more closely one will discover that it was, "directed not against alchemy as a science but against those who pretend to be alchemists while practising deceit and counterfeiting money,"[1]. While this bull was not a direct attack on true alchemists, it sparked the idea in the church that alchemy was evil. In 1376, Dominican Nicolaus Eymericus, who was the inquisitor general of Aragon, associated alchemists with magicians, "because they cannot possibly achieve their aims without the assistance of demons,"[1].   As the idea of an Antichrist became more popular in Europe, alchemists became increasingly associated with him also. Hugh Argentinensis, author and illustrator of *Der Antichrist* stated, "The Antichrist (*Enndkrist*) is accompanied by masters who teach him the art of making gold as well as other sorcery and wicked tricks,"[1]. These arguments and association gave the alchemist an increasingly negative reputation, making him more like a witch or sorcerer and less like a philosopher or scientist. Even once alchemists turned their attention to medicine, the criticism from the church continued. Erastus criticized Paracelsus, calling him a heretic for refusing " to make a categorical distinction between disease as a potency and disease as an actuality.... For if diseases, evils, existed as substances (*semina*) before the Fall, then they would have been evil substances created by God, and

[14]

this notion is unacceptable theology." This twisted Paracelsus's words, but succeeded in continuing the idea that alchemy was evil.

As with any other science, alchemy progressed. Ogrinc states that because of the social unrest in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, alchemists began searching for cures to specific diseases, instead of a universal Elixir of Life. Paracelsus was one of the first alchemists to suggest that minerals could be used to cure human diseases. This declaration sparked a whole new debate. Jole Shackelford states "Early Reception of Paracelsian Theory: Severinus and Erastus"that, "In France, the medical community was quickly split into Galenist and chemical camps that violently argued about the therapeutic usefulness of chemically prepared, mineral-based drugs.[15] The Galenist camps depended heavily on the religious aspect of medicine, arguing that Paracelsian drug therapy was, "impious, even heretical."[16] The chemical camps pointed to the experimentations that had been done and often included people who were not previous supporters of alchemy. Michael Savonarola, a professor at the University of Ferrara was one such supporter who did not believe, "transmutation is possible because, in his opinion, alchemists are unable to change forms or species. He does, however, praise their 'chemical' services to medicine."[17] This movement away from the universal searches and towards more specific searches transformed alchemy from the wild goose chase into sciences such as chemistry and medicine.

In conclusion, alchemists received a bad reputation from their own secrecy, false alchemists such as con men and counterfeiters, and the Church. While this reputation was popular in their own times as well as being held by most people today, it was not deserved. Alchemists were philosophers who were trying to perfect themselves and improve the world around them. Indeed, as Brzezinski and Szydlo state, "It is perhaps time that alchemy was acknowledged as the mother of chemistry, rather than just a wayward cousin."[18]

---

[1]Richard Brzezinski and Zbigiew Szydlo, "A New Light on Alchemy," History Today 47:1(1997), 17-24.

[2]Ibid.

[3]Ibid.

[4]Peggy Knapp, "The Work of Alchemy," Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies 30:3 (2000), 575-600.

[5]Ibid.

[6]Ibid.

[7]Brzezinski and Szydlo, 17-24.

[8]Ibid.

[9]Knapp, 575-600.

[10]Ibid.

[11]Will. H.L. Ogrinc, "Western Society and Alchemy," Journal of Medieval History 6 (1980), 103-32.

[12]Ibid.

[13]Ibid.

[14]Jole Shackelford, "Early Reception of Paracelsian Theory: Severinus and Erastus," Sixteenth Century Journal 26:1 (1995), 123-136.

[15]Ibid.

[16]Ibid.

[17]Ogrinc, 103-32.

[18]Brzezinski and Szydlo, 17-24.

STUART VIEWS OF KING HENRY III AND KING RICHARD II
David Bell

David Bell, a senior history major with teacher certification and inductee into Epsilon Mu of Phi Alpha Theta in 2001, wrote this paper for Dr. Newton Key's History of England to 1688 class in the Fall of 2001. David was also the recipient of the prestigious Hampton Graduate Award from Eastern Illinois University to fund two years of graduate study.

Englishmen in the mid-seventeenth century were curious and intrigued by the limits of kingship power and disagreements over such limits led some to force Charles I out of the monarchy. Historians looked then to the past for answers, and found them in the reigns of Henry III and Richard II, both of whom experienced civil strife and numerous parliamentary conflicts during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries much like Chares I was experiencing in the 1640s. Charles and James I at first strongly enforced Divine Right, which is that kings have power from God and people should not rebel against them for they would therefore be rebelling against God. Maintaining this policy was important to keeping the citizenry in check, but would inevitably fail and cost Charles the monarchy and his head as he was executed in 1649. The books and pamphlets compared in this essay address the reigns of Henry III and Richard II and were written in the mid-seventeenth century. Examining how these past rulers and citizens dealt with each other helped the people of 1640 understand the English Civil War and the execution through Parliament of the rightful ruler, King Charles I. It may even have helped the eighteenth century citizens act against their monarch. Each earlier monarch was either troubled by civil war or would soon experience such a catastrophe. Power struggles between kings and Parliament would define both reigns, eventually resulting in the strengthening of Parliament in both cases. Favoritism, envious barons, and poor advisory councilors would initiate these disputes, and ultimately help redefine Parliament, much like the situation in the 1640s.

The books and pamphlets compared were written roughly in the mid- seventeenth century, a time when Civil War was breaking Parliament's power and purpose was questioned. It is logical, then, that most people would be writing about these two monarchs because both dealt with the powers of Parliament, civil war, and deposition of a king, as well as the role the King's councilors played in the growing hostilities towards Parliament. This paper uses the 17th century pamphlets to compare and contrast the reigns of Richard II and Henry III, before returning to the question of why they focused on their reigns.

Sources from the Stuart period emphasized that both King Henry III and King Richard II ascended the throne at an early age (Richard at ten and Henry at nine), and in both instances the public supported their coronations. For Richard II the citizens spared "no cost to express their Loyalty and zealous Affection to his Person, both in his passage through Town, and at his Coronation."[1] There may well have been fears about his legitimacy as king because his father, the Black Prince Edward, died before his grandfather Edward III. Edward III had six sons, and thus upon his death there were many uncles and relatives attempting to control and influence the young king, which would cause problems later.

Henry III was also well supported. As Sir Robert Cotton wrote in 1627 "to satisfie all, a child asendeth the throne, mild and gracious, but easie of nature, whose Innocency and naturall goodnesse led him safe along the various daungers of his fathers Raigne."[2] This view coincides with recent historians that write that Henry III "was not a bad man, possessing none of his father's viciousness."[3] One year prior to Henry's coronation, England had experienced a civil war when the barons forced John to accept Magna Carta, vastly limiting the powers of the monarchy and empowering the parliament. These conditions would underlie the conflict throughout Henry's reign, as he would continuously try to reestablish his authority over the barons.

Stuart writers also noted that both Henry and Richard's reign began with parliamentary control of the country, though technically Parliament did not exist during Henry's reign. Henry's battles were between him and the feudal landowners, such as barons and nobles, who would eventually form the House of Lords. Both monarchs, however, relied too heavily on their advisors, each having favorites that essentially ruled the kingdom, much to the barons' displeasure and eventual rebellion. Henry III, for example, relied mostly on the advice of his Council, including his Uncle Hubert de Burgh and Peter des Roches. De Burgh wielded supreme authority during Henry's minority worked to keep others out of the king's council. In addition, Henry appointed Frenchmen to his council, enraging the barons because, according to Sir Robert Cotton in 1627 "nothing is more against the nature of the English, then to have strangers rule over them."[4] Despite the obvious opposition form the barons de Burgh advised Henry to delay or deny their desires.[5] Richard similarly angered the barons and the church because he "regarded nothing the councells

of the Sage and the Wise men of the Realm."[6] Instead Richard relied heavily on the advice of Michael de la Pole, later appointed Chancellor, and John de Gaunt, his uncle.

These "evil Counsellors" caused part of the rift between parliament and King for both Richard and Henry.[7] None of the sources from the Stuart period, however, adequately explain other reasons for the fallout between King and Parliament. In both instances the barons had fought hard during the previous reigns to gain more power. Prior to Richard II's reign, the barons consistently pushed for control and increased their authority by creating what would become the House of Lords and Commons, and requiring that they must approve any tax increases. Subsequently, when Richard II began disregarding Parliament's advice, the barons were incensed.[8] During Henry III's reign, the barons had just forced his father, John, to sign Magna Carta, granting lords and barons more power. They were quite angry when Henry appointed his own advisors and rarely sought parliament's advice, thereby violating Magna Carta.[9]

According to the Stuart writers, these problems should be blamed not solely on the kings or councilors, but on the time period and parliamentary greed. Regarding de Burgh, Sir Cotton points out "bad times corrupt good Councells and make the best Ministers yeelde to the lust of Princes," implying that it wasn't de Burgh's personality but rather the period that had corrupted him.[10] In Richard's case it was Parliament that was greedy and evil, according to the Stuarts. They state that "parliament induced him [Richard II] to believe that all the ill they did was a generall good" and that Parliament used the money of the Crown for their own reasons. Parliament also made Richard II swear that he would protect them, even though their allegiance was questionable.[11] The great council of the king could not inform the king of these conspiracies because they too were denied access by Parliament. Chancellor Scroop was another victim of the time. The barons wanted the king to grant them their rightful lands through inheritance, to which the king agreed but the Chancellor "who zealously desired the prosperity of the kingdom, and just profit of the king, absolutely refused to do it."[12] Scroop told the barons that the Crown was financially depleted, and that the King needed those lands. This was an action that soon afterwards resulted in Scroop's removal from office.

While these pamphlets cite different reasons for revolutionary actions, it appears that revolution in fact did occur under both Henry III and Richard II. In both instances the king had been ruled by an advisory council for a short while and upon coming of age demanded more power. Both Parliaments of these monarchs' respective reigns resisted the king in separate but similar ways. In King Henry's instance, the Stuarts discuss how Parliament was disgusted with the favoritism showed to Hubert de Burgh and agreed to conspire against him by siding with his rival, Peter des Roches. By doing so they brought charges against de Burgh, executed him, and supported des Roches authority.[13] Roches, however, proved no better than de Burgh in the eyes of the barons as he appointed foreigners to his cabinet, further enraging the barons.[14] The barons forced upon Henry the Provisions of Oxford, which stated that the subjects could rise against him if he was ruling against the law. The Stuart writers referred to this as a "traitorous Ordinance," and denounced the formation of a Baronial Council under the Provision by writing "for one bad king before, they had foure and twenty worse."[15] The Pope later annulled this agreement, and the King and barons agree to arbitration by King Louis XI of France. This, according to the Stuart pamphlets, is what begins the revolution of the barons. Louis XI judged in Henry's favor and sparked the barons to rebel successfully.[16] The pamphlet does not, however, mention that Henry III gave up claim to all his lands in France in return for Louis's support.[17] The king did counter the barons and defeat them, and as punishment took all their lands. One Stuart pamphlet argues that "this sentence (though it was less that they deserved)" started the fires of rebellion again.[18]

The civil unrest during Richard II's reign was slightly different. While the barons did conspired to retain control, Richard's relation with them was not nearly as solid as in Henry's reign, nor did it end as peacefully. Richard, who had wanted complete Supreme authority ever since minority, Richard became suspicious and paranoid of Parliament and trusted no one.[19] The pamphlets do not mention exactly why he felt this way, but the blame could fall on the "merciless Parliament" of 1386, which executed Richard's advisors and forced him to accept an agreement that allowed his subjects to rebel if he governed against the consent of his peers,[20] much like the provisions of Oxford. Twentieth-century historians seem to agree that Richard learned a valuable lesson that "he must co-operate with his greater subjects and must rule by consent if he wanted to retain his crown."[21] Like Henry III,

Richard began the fires of rebellion by claiming lands for himself rather than the rightful heirs. Unlike Henry, however, Richard's actions led to his deposition by Henry de Gaunt, who became outraged when Richard took his lands, and raised an army that overwhelmed the king. Henry de Gaunt did, however, use Parliament to depose King Richard, rather than simply using force.

Overall, then, these seventeenth-century writers show that greed, relentless pursuit of power by the royal court, and parliamentary disputes were the roots of the problems in the reigns of Henry III and Richard II. Stuart writers were especially interested in Henry III and Richard II's reigns because they were experiencing civil strife and were looking to past instances that would help define parliamentary powers. Such research by seventeenth-century historians was important in helping them solve problems caused by an unpopular king, like Charles I. Charles's era of personal rule (that is without Parliament) 1629-40, resulted in a buildup of anti-monarchy sentiment, which consequently led to the Long Parliament (1640-1653). The actions of this Parliament attempted to undo all that Charles I had invoked, and they looked to the reigns of Henry III and Richard II to rationalize their actions. This period was littered with rebellion and Civil War, which ultimately resulted in regicide, or the execution of Charles I. This regicide was acceptable to some because of the similar treatment of Richard II, who was the first English king to be deposed through parliamentary actions. Following Charles's execution came a time of chaos, as England was without a monarchy for the first time in its history. Oliver Cromwell and the "Lord Protector" position was a failed experiment, and England would restore the monarchy in 1660 to Charles II. The entire process on rebellion and revolution would be repeated in 1668, when James II is forced to abdicate and William and Mary come to power.[22] This "Glorious Revolution" is the result of nearly a century of internal conflict, both religious and political, which both Henry III and Richard II experienced centuries earlier. Examining the people's reaction to those reigns helped seventeenth-century Stuart historians decide on appropriate actions to take.

[1] Sir Robert Howard, *The Life and Reign of King Richard the Second* (1681), 3.

[2] Sir Robert Cotton, *A Short View of the Long Raigne of Henry the Third* (1627), 3.

[3] David Williamson, *Brewer's British Royalty* (London: Cassell Academic, 1996), 196.

[4] Cotton, *A Short View*, 10-1.

[5] Ibid, 7.

[6] Well-wisher to the common-wealth, *The Life and Death of King Richard the Second* (1642), 2.

[7] Edward Chamberlayne, *The Present Warre Parallel'd* (1647), 1.

[8] Clayton Roberts and David Roberts, *A History of England, 1, Prehistory to 1714, 2nd ed.* (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1985), 180.

[9] Mike Ashley, *The Mammoth Book of Britain Kings and Queens* (New York: Carroll and Graf Pub., 1998), 532.

[10] Cotton, *A Short View*, 10.

[11] *The Bloody Parliament in the Raigne of an Unhappy Prince* (1643), 3.

[12] Howard, *The Life And Reign*, 33.

[13] Cotton, *A Short View*, 10-1.

[14] Ibid, 11.

[15] *The Present Warre Parallel'd*, 3.

[16] Ibid, 4.

[17] Roberts and Roberts, *A History of England*, 145.

[18] *The Present Warre Parallel'd*, 11.

[19] *The Bloody Parliament*, 3.

[20] Roberts and Roberts, *A History of England*, 181.

[21] Michael Hicks, *Who's Who in Late Medieval England* (London: St. James Press, 1991), 3:151.

[22] Elisabeth G. Ellis and Anthony Esler, *World History: Connections to Today* (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey:

Prentice Hall, 1999), 431-5.

From Sin to Laziness: Early Modern Views of the Poor and Poor Relief

Teresa Cribelar

Teresa Cribelar, a history graduate student at Eastern Illinois University, was inducted into Phi Alpha Theta in 2000 and is the current Epsilon Mu Chapter President. This paper was written for Dr. David Smith's graduate seminar in fall of 2001 and was also the co-recipient of the Lavern Hamand Graduate Writing Award.

Views of the poor in seventeenth- and eighteenth-century England and France change from that of the poor as sinners to the poor as lazy. Poor relief reflected this change through law and ideology. In the seventeenth-century, the poor were in need of moral reform. They led a life of sin, which caused their state of poverty. Fixing this required charity for all while reforming their morals through spirituality. Once the poor were cleansed of their sins, they could help themselves. The eighteenth century, bringing with it the Enlightenment, changed these beliefs. The crime of the poor became laziness rather than sin. Training and support, it was believed, would make the poor self-supporting. If they could not work and support themselves, then they were lazy and required confinement and forced labor. Charity became reserved for those who could not work. A dramatic shift in the perception of the poor and the function of poor relief occurred during the seventeenth and eighteenth-centuries. This essay presents the thesis of changing poor relief as argued in the historiography of poor relief in France. This thesis of changing poor relief remains, if applied to actual laws and events in England's history of the same period.

--France—

Histories of poor relief in seventeenth and eighteenth-century France often begin with the *hopitaux generaux*, which started in 1614 under the ancien regime. Secret societies started these hospitals for the confinement of beggars and the poor, as they were unruly and possibly dangerous. Under Louis XIV, the state took an active interest in the hospitals through edicts. In 1724, the state began an intensified role through a royal edict requiring all beggars imprisoned. Beggars had two weeks to find a job before they were thrown in the hospital. Numbers in hospitals rose, and the government provided money for their maintenance. By 1733, the edict had proved a failure and arrests of beggars became less frequent.[1]

By the mid-eighteenth-century, repression of beggars and vagrants once again began. Due to proletarianization, rural impoverishment, and mobility, begging and vagrancy became a severe problem in the eyes of the elites and authorities. The laws of 1764 and 1767 set up aggressive confinement of beggars in *depots de mendicite*, basically workhouses, by policing agents of the state. The *depots* differed from the hospitals in several ways. They were established as a repressive deterrent for the imprisonment of beggars. The state also supervised and financially supported the *depots* considerably more than the hospitals. Over all, the *depots* were unhealthy and not well liked by possible inhabitants or social reformers.[2]

Kathryn Norberg takes a broad look at the treatment of the poor in *Rich and Poor in Grenoble, 1600-1814*.[3] She provides a good overview of one city, much like others, which allows for generalized conclusions about the treatment of the poor. Norberg compares the changing treatment of the poor to changing society. As modernity arises and social relationships change, the treatment of the poor mirrors that change from a personal, paternal relationship to one of distant, bureaucratic poor relief.

Norberg begins by explaining the early poor relief of the seventeenth century by confraternities in Grenoble. Confraternities were small religious associations for lay people, often secretive. Women confraternities worked modestly, often in hospices or hospitals. They started their own systems of confinement solely for women. Often, they helped house destitute women who many times were unwed mothers. They also set up a house for reforming prostitutes. The prostitutes were not always willing inhabitants of this house. Important for the women's confraternities was the spiritual reform of the poor. Their goal was making the poor better people through Christianity. As the records of the confraternities repeatedly state, the ladies acted "like perfect mothers to the poor" by providing the poor with food, clothing, spiritual instruction, and moral support.[4]

Men also formed confraternities and took on much larger tasks, often referred to as "Great Works." These

men were very secretive and discreet while providing what Norberg calls "seventeenth-century charity at its fullest."[5] They worked in hospitals, in the streets, and in people's homes. For example, brothers of the confraternity would visit the homes of the poor, inquire about their circumstances, and report on these weekly so they could decide the best ways to benefit the poor.[6] Confinement became the centerpiece of their program, as most people believed in the seventeenth-century that confinement in workhouses and hospitals would eliminate begging. In order to make mass confinement a realization, the brothers infiltrated institutions and governing boards, as they could not openly voice their opinions if they remained secretive.[7] The confraternities believed in confinement and the spiritual and moral reform of their charges.

Confraternities generally thought of the poor as sinful. The confraternities "saw in the poor not Christ but the Devil himself."[8] The outlook of the common person of Grenoble differed. The poor were not completely bad. Many adhered to a set of values and morals just like their more wealthy counterparts. While the confraternity laid the blame on men and women alike for crimes like prostitution and illegitimacy, the general public tended to blame soley women. This treatment of the poor as a whole was harsh, but when it came to individuals there was a sense of paternalism and caring.[9] General attitudes toward the poor revolved around sin and crime, yet were contradicted by the treatment of individual people.

The close contact with the poor mirrors society at this time when all relationships, especially those of work, were personal ties. The employer often knew his workers as people with lives and families and treated them as such. Relationships in society at this time reflected these personal ties.

Norberg suggests contemporary views about the poor started changing between 1680 and 1729. The rich still maintained personal ties with the poor, who were increasingly confined, but they began to search for a more systematic approach to poor relief. The rich learned that the poor were not all criminal and sinful, and indeed crime overall decreased. The rich began to forgive rather than reform. Basically, a more humane attitude towards the poor began, while charitable giving and services increased.[10] Attitudes towards beggars changed in part due to an ordinance in 1724, which required the arrest and confinement of beggars. Records were kept and thus, the beggars became recorded people. A human face was given to them, and people, especially the directors of the hospital, began to see this. Records of paupers receiving bread provide proof of the change to a systematic approach to poor relief.[11] As the eighteenth-century began, the poor took on a new image. They began the journey to becoming the misfortunate who must be dealt with in a systematic and soon bureaucratic way. Training the poor to help themselves became the goal.

By the 1720s, the French government realized that the local enforcement was not working. The state passed more laws and used state resources for poor relief and repression. A royal declaration of July 1724 aimed at helping the labor force by forcing beggars to work in hospitals, on public works projects, or as laborers. Local hospitals were relied upon for confining beggars and paupers. This enlarged the hospitals repressive duties. This did not completely work as hospitals had trouble coping with the numbers. Of the hospitals chosen, the program worked well at times, depending on the money received from the state. The demographics of the hospitals changed from infirm, aged, and children to men and women who were capable of work.[12] The time from 1724-1733, referred to as the "Great Confinement," saw unprecedented numbers of people confined by the royal police. All in all, some relief was provided for cities in need due to mendicity.[13] The state began taking more control of its citizens. This time, it came in the form of regulating and policing the poor with the use of state funds. Later, in the 1760s, more people came under the veil of vagrant and the enforcement became greater.

As urbanization increased along with impoverishment, the need to control vagrants and beggars grew as well. By 1769, all vagrants and beggars were subject to arrest as the program initially used for arresting vagrants enlarged itself. This was in response to the increasing working class, the growth in the numbers of poor, and increased vagrancy in the countryside. The government was alarmed by the assaults on property and people in the countryside, thus creating depots, or workhouses, in which all forms of repression were carried out by the government.[14] As the government saw a need for increased security, it provided it through more arrests and the use of state funded institutions, rather than using institutions already in place.

Thomas McStay Adams describes the depots in great detail, ranging from their institution in the 1760s up to the French Revolution. For the most part, the focus remains on government bureaucratic endeavors in the construction and implementation of the new far-reaching social policy of confining all beggars in a systematic form.

Adams uses a great deal of writing in explaining the intricate workings of the processes by which laws and edicts were decided upon.[15] In 1764, the intendants received jurisdiction over beggars and vagrants, thus relieving the local authorities of the duty. Workhouses were set up to replace hospitals and take in the most unassuming beggars in an attempt to repress all forms of mendicity. There were varying degrees of priority arrests though. Bands of beggars took high priority, while at the other end, resided a regular, hungry, poor beggar. Over time, debates about this prioritization arose as the infirm and repeat offenders never had a full place in the system. Soon, all beggars were arrested. [16] Masses of reports began streaming from the *depots* in regard to the inhabitants and the institutions themselves. Training and discipline became the main focus. By the early 1770s, people began realizing that there was a difference between those who chose a life of vagrancy and those who landed there out of happenstance or necessity.

The depots became corrupt, overcrowded and viewed in a highly negative light.[17] What started as an enthusiastic social policy relieving the communities of beggars and vagrants became a huge undertaking that took a turn for the worse as public sympathy for the unfortunate poor rose.

The demographics of the poor served continued to change throughout the eighteenth century. Able-bodied men should have been reformed and thus back out on the streets working. The hospital became a place for the sick, the very young or old, and women. Women were faced with hardships due to illegitimacy. Men could leave the pregnant women behind; women could not do this. Orphaned children faced obvious obstacles, and older people who could not work often had no place else to turn, especially when they were sick. The hospital began resembling a more modern hospital by definition.[18]

Paupers receiving bread became older and sicker on the whole, with more women receiving than men. This was often due to men being more mobile and able to earn wages. The area in which paupers lived tended more towards one general area in the city as well. Men with large families received aid, but others, according to those distributing bread, should take care of themselves.[19] There was also a change in the handling of paupers. People needing aid must request it from the proper people. Charitable giving disappeared as a bureaucratic system emerged.

Paupers submitted petitions sent to the Bureau of Directors for decisions on aid.[20] People became a name on a paper with a condition. They no longer were faces, names, and individual people. Charity was reserved for those unable to work and forced labor awaited those who could work, but were simply lazy in the eyes of others. According to Norberg, this mirrored the change in society. As wage-labor increased, personal ties between people decreased. Employers saw employees as workers who received pay. There were no personal ties. This was the same with the poor. They became numbers on paper rather than individual faces and names.

Adams highlights the efforts of Turgot in the mid-1770s to reform the treatment of the poor. The process by which Turgot and his ministry researched and reported findings and solutions is spelled out at length. His ministry believed that many of the people arrested were victims of circumstance reduced to poverty by misfortune and should not be treated as criminals. The key to their plans included prevention rather than repression as arrests were suspended and beggars released.[21] Poor relief should be the focus according to them, and they tried to shut down some of the *depots*. [22] Turgot fell from power in 1776 before his reforms were really instituted, and the new ministry quickly reverted back to the old ways of dealing with mendicity.

Turgot's work was not all in vain as enlightened ideas spread and the *depots* were cleaned up a bit. The regulation of 1785 required better maintenance as well as better medical standards and living conditions. [23] Beggars began the rehabilitation process more often and training for work became more common.[24] However, by the Revolution, the *depots* were another tick on the list of royal despotic actions. Adams takes the creation of the *depots* and weaves an intricate pattern of bureaucracy in action. By the end of the eighteenth century, enlightenment thought had crept into the policies of poor relief and confinement, but not to the extent that people actually allowed beggars on the street once again. They knew what was not working and that change was needed, but were hesitant to institute that change.

Schwartz argues that this increasing policing of the poor reflects the expansion of the repressiveness of the state. Increasing impoverishment resulted in hardening attitudes toward the poor, especially those who proved even slightly intimidating. The increase in policing led to more officials in the countryside, thus changing the attitudes of the French countryside towards royal officials. These officials became important for protection and took on a positive perspective.[25] Thus, the state helped the poor and the poor learned to work with public and state officials.

By the mid 1770s, officials became more prudent with their arrests as controlling so many beggars and

vagrants became difficult. The feelings of Turgot also began seeping into the thinking of the central government and royal administration. Fewer arrests were made and those detained were often more serious offenders related to vagrancy linked to intimidation, petty theft, and robbery. Repression became narrowed and more focused.[26]

Attitudes towards the poor in France during the eighteenth-century take on different meanings according to the authors. The Enlightenment, as influence, can be seen as positive in Norberg and Adams, while Schwartz presents a much more cold bureaucratic system. Norberg composes an almost friendly system seemingly ignoring the effects of the 1760s, while Schwartz and Adams emphasize the harshness of this era and the *depots*. France definitely did not treat the poor with humane kindness in the eighteenth-century. For the most part, the poor were seen as a threat and parasitic on society. Reform and discipline was needed rather than care and help. In the seventeenth-century, the reform sought was moral and spiritual betterment. In the eighteenth-century, they sought to train people through forced labor.

--England--

Can this argument about change overtime be applied to England? An analysis of pamphlets and debates further supports the theory developed by French historians. Pamphlets often provide popular views of the poor as they were often distributed widely. Debates in Parliament and the laws resulting from these debates also often reflect attitudes of the people. Of course English poor relief followed distinct laws. Paul Slack presents a clear, concise view of the English Poor Law from 1531-1782. Population pressures, changes in public attitude towards the poor, and government desire to control its subjects more closely led to a series of changes in the poor law.[27] Humanism played a central role in English poor relief. Christian charity was an obvious expression of this and goes hand in hand with moral reform. There became a new aversion to dirt and disease that the poor represented and the rich feared. Humanism also gave the government the duty of making social change and this included eliminating poverty.[28] Lawmakers in England also realized the limitations of centralized government poor relief early in the process. Unlike the generalized hospitals and depots of France, the English sought poor relief applicable to rural areas as well as large cities. Thus, it was also subject to the opinion of local authorities enforcing it and often remained a highly localized form of relief.[29]

Starting with the early results of the poor laws, Slack describes the local parish, seemingly more local than the French provinces. Each parish had their own poor tax and decided how it was spent. Uses included binding poor children as apprentices, removing pregnant strangers, giving housing to paupers, as well as the usual clothing, food, lodging, and medical care. Cash handouts were by far the most common form of poor relief throughout this time. This could come in the form of a weekly cash allowance or relief for short periods as needed. The regular payments were usually given to the old, disabled, children, or those who could not work for one reason or another. The relief given for short periods usually went towards able-bodied men. The overseers of the dole had discretionary powers and thus could form lines of patronage and social control through the poor law. They were supervised to an extent, usually preventing extreme corruption to the point that they no longer aided the community. This type of poor relief led to a very personalized institution in which neighbor helped neighbor. Expectations of poor relief resulted from this system as well, but also raised objections to it.[30] This is similar to late-seventeenth and early-eighteenth century France where the confraternities went out among the poor to address their needs. Comparison to the poor as sinners can also be made during this time, as related in the laws and several publications from the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

Most of the ordinances until 1647 treated beggars and vagrants quite harshly. They were physically punished and forbidden to beg. The parishes took care of the poor in the later sixteenth-century, and the poor could be put to work. Pamphlets from the mid- to late-seventeenth century relate the sinfulness of the poor and the need to force them to work.

One pamphlet from 1650 deals with poor children and the result of this being poor adults living in a state of sinfulness. It states, "through the general neglect of most places, poore children maintained by their respective parishes, and others are bred up like Atheists."[31] The poor engaged in "idleness, thefts, whoredomes, prophane cursing, swearing, and almost all kinds of wickednesse." Obviously the poor were sinners who must be educated and reformed. Children must be educated properly so they do not end up in the above conditions. The author suggests the placing of poor children in workhouses for education and proper training in an industry. Pensioners should be in workhouses or given jobs that can be done within their home. Poor, to supplement their income, might also receive

an allowance.[32]

A pamphlet from 1659 carries the idea of the poor as criminals a step further. The prisons should become workhouses and prisoners and the poor held together. By combining the financial support for prisons and the poor, workhouses could function quite well for the government. Debtors, which are just the poor put in prison for being poor, will also find relief in this.[33] This author frankly equates the poor and criminality by putting convicted criminals and the poor in the same institutions.

Sir Josiah Child proposed several ideas for the relief of the poor in 1670. At least two more pamphlets copied his ideas in later years, so the popularity of his ideas continued. Child states that "the Children of our Poor bred up in Beggery and Laziness…are…rendered for ever after indisposed to Labour, and serve only to stock the Kingdom with Thieves and Beggers."[34] He hints at later views of the poor as lazy and opposed to actual labor. He advocates employing the poor, which gains more revenue for the state, while also saving it quite a lot in poor relief. Employing the poor is a "Duty to God," and being poor is one of the "great sins."[35] He exhibits the seventeenth-century view of the poor as sinners, who need moral reform.

A popular pamphlet from 1678 (reprinted in 1681) equated begging to sinfulness. The subtitle, "For the prevention of Begging, a practice so dishonourable to the Nation, and to the Christian Religion," blatantly equates begging and sinfulness. [36] The title page also prints two verses from the Bible which state that people should work for the necessities of life and not steal or beg for them. This pamphlet exemplifies the transition period towards viewing the poor as people who must be forced to work. The pamphlet focuses on workhouses and poor children. Workhouses should be reserved for those without homes, while those with homes should receive work they can do there. People must work for charitable handouts as well. Poor children need training and must be placed in a workhouse and then apprenticeship for this work-based instruction.[37] This pamphlet reflects the eighteenth-century belief that workhouses taught people to work and prevented idleness while also reflecting an older view that this laziness was a sin that must be corrected.

A pamphlet from 1700 exhibits seventeenth century thought by promoting charity, and the author suggests specific groups which should receive charity: widows, the sick, orphans, and those having too many children to support. These groups need a weekly distribution of aid collected from taxes. Other groups need the constant care of a hospital or poorhouse. Most of these people could not work for one reason or another.[38] Charity was for those who truly need it, but the author still promotes charity and allowances for those who can work, but need help.

Reforms combating rising costs of poor relief in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries began appearing in the mid-eighteenth century. To cut expenditures, determining legitimate needy in the parish, deterring the undeserving, and supervising overseers (reducing the number of those who were overgenerous) became the goals.[39] Part of the arguments rested on the idea of settlement and determining a person's home parish and sending them there to prevent another parish from paying for the relief of that person. This began the paper work maze of the English system. Parishes now had to record people moving in and out and determine people's rights in a parish depending on the number of years spent there[40]

The Act of Settlement actually passed in 1662 with three parts forcing responsibility for the poor onto parishes. The main part of the act was, "Newcomers to a parish may be removed by 2 JPs if complaint made within 40 days and they have rented houses worth less than 10 pound p.a. Certificates from the home parish allow residence in some circumstances."[41] The following years brought more provisions. In 1692, two provisions resulted in rate-paying, apprenticeship and a one year service earning a person a settlement and names could only be added to the list of pensioners with the authority of the justice of the peace. Two more changes to the Act of Settlement were brought in 1714. Constables could remove idle and disorderly beggars and the expense of passing vagrants could be met with levied county rates.[42] The basic principles of the Act of Settlement remained over many years, with the result that the poor were often forcibly removed from parishes.

Views of the settlement acts began changing, but on April 28, 1773, the House of Commons debated settlement. Mr. Graves introduced a bill preventing the unnecessary removal of the poor from parishes other than those of their homes. He believed that removal prevented them from moving to parishes where they could make the most money for their skill. Thus, removal could throw them into an even more perilous situation elsewhere and make them even more of a burden to another parish. For the most part, members agreed with him, although one thought a bill against removal would still overburden some parishes with poor not from their parish.[43] It is interesting that

the reason given for the change was allowing men to make more money and support themselves at a better level. This relates to the thought that men able to work should support themselves and their families and not rely on charity.

Reforming poor relief overseerers became the focal point of reform. As Lord Lyttelton stated in parliamentary debates as late as 1775, parish officers were corrupt, cruel, and wasted money for their own enjoyment.[44] But, local regulation of overseers remained more popular than overarching state regulations. Mayors, aldermen, and ministers all took on roles as supervisors. Monetarily compensating overseers was also thought a deterrent to their corruptness.[45] Various reforms led to overseers gaining less patronage who focused on the proper spending of poor relief and administration of workhouses.

Combating deterrence to work came in the form of workhouses. The Workhouse Test Act of 1723 called for the establishment of workhouses containing all the poor with no outside relief given. Corporations for the management of workhouses were set up to manage their finances and operations. Workhouses, which functioned less as a deterrent and more of a moral and work ethic reform school, provided only temporary relief and outside aid remained a large proportion of relief. It was believed that only the old, young, and infirm would require housing. In 1782, Gilbert's Act required the able-bodied poor to find outside work and become self-sufficient while being housed and those infirm or old could find support in the institutions from the parish. Changes in workhouse laws related the growing skepticism of the day regarding the actual abilities of a workhouse to reform the poor, just asthe French had become skeptical in the use of confinement. [46]

Historian Dorothy Marshall suggests two views of workhouses existed simultaneously. "It is not uncommon to find attempts to combine the profitable employment of the poor with the use of the workhouse both as an asylum and a deterrent."[47] Many areas formed local bodies in charge of establishing and running local workhouses rather than leaving it to small communities and overseers. Depending on the area, workhouses were set up for employing or deterring the poor, or more than likely, a combination of both. Some workhouses were large, well-run, and semi-supported themselves, while others relied on parish funds for maintenance and merely provided a home for the infirm, old, and young. Inmates, wards, or paupers (as those living in workhouses were variously called) received likewise varying treatment.[48] Each workhouse was really an individual case.

Debates about the administration and purpose of workhouses regularly surfaced in Parliament. Debate in Parliament on May 4, 1733 shows the need for charity due to mismanagement of workhouses. A one million pound lottery was motioned for the relief of those who lost a great deal of financial support from the workhouses whose corrupt management corporations used the funds inappropriately. The final decision was the appropriation of 500,000 pounds until research into how much was actually needed could be done. Then, the number could be adjusted as needed. The interesting debate over the motion reveals a shift towards believing that workhouses could train the poor to work and support themselves, although many continued to argue for charity for all.

Several spoke out against a lottery in general because it would not determine who truly needed aid or how much each person should get, but the burden of actually determining this was just too large to deal with quickly. The poor are continually referred to as "objects of compassion." This shows attitudes of the seventeenth century persisting. The poor were the unfortunate who needed charity. Sir William Wyndham provides an excellent example of combining charity and work. He believes the poor to be in need and charity should be given, but inquiries into the actual need of those persons must be made before money should be given out. He dislikes lotteries for the poor because it gives them false hope of making money through means other "than that of industry and frugality, which is the only way of getting riches that ought to be encouraged by wise people."[49] Wyndham presents a wonderful example of a transition occurring in the views of poor relief. He shows signs of the seventeenth-century in presenting the poor as those who need charitable help. At the same time, he also presents the poor as those who will get out of work or industrious activity if they can make money an easier way.

A report made to the House of Commons on May 30, 1759 reflects the change towards forcing the able-bodied poor to work while giving charity to those who cannot work. A committee had been formed whose job consisted of reporting on the state of the poor in England. At this time, they had nine resolutions. First, in parishes with no workhouses, the poor were a heavy burden on and useless to the community. The charitable handouts being given to people able to work undermines the intention of poor relief and encourages "idleness and intemperance" in the poor.[50] Four resolutions involve the creation and management of workhouses directly. Workhouses are advantageous to the public because they will put the idle to work while supporting themselves for the most part. Workhouses serve several functions, including "assisting and relieving such persons as by age, infirmities, or diseases,

are rendered incapable of supporting themselves by their labor, or employing the able and industrious, reforming the idle and profligate, and of educating poor children in religion and industry."[51] The poor are utilized to the best of their abilities and hopefully trained in an industry and will learn to provide for themselves. Two resolutions explain the need for workhouses in every parish, so that the settlement laws may be repealed as vagrants can be placed in a workhouse no matter where they go. One resolution makes it clear that parish officers will have an easier time if they do not have to give charity to the poor and simply put them to work.[52] The report made in May 1759 provides a perfect example of forcing able-bodied poor to work while reserving charity for those who could not work and thus needed it.

Another set of resolutions presented in the House of Commons on January 22, 1765 restates the need for more workhouses. They argued the system of using parish officials to regulate the local poor is a burden on the individual parishes and bad for the public as a whole. Employment of the poor is the most effective method of poor relief. There is a great need for the grouping of parishes and districts and establishing a workhouse, hospital, and house of correction for the large group.[53] Larger workhouses should provide a more economical means of combating the problems of the poor. Acts passed from 1748 to 1785 reflect the economical need for the combination of parishes. In Norfolk and Suffolk, there were fourteen incorporations from 1756-1785.[54]

Pariliament began looking at the issue of relieving poor laborers in old age in 1772. Mr. Dowdeswell spoke on December 11 on behalf of a group proposing a bill for the relief of poor laborers in old age. The bill proposes a voluntary offering of money by the laborers and manufacturers in parishes for the relief of laboring men after the age of fifty. It supplements their incomes as they earn less with age. Women may receive this as well, even at an earlier age if they are widowed with dependents, but that age determination will come later. Thus, laborers can look forward to old age and will lead healthier lives because they want to live to an old age. Without support, they must live on very little, so as younger men, they tend to spend all of their wages on alcohol and may work as little as possible to enjoy life when they are young as it can only get worse with age. As Dowdeswell states, the poor will benefit because the prospect of future comfort "will render them sober and industrious."[55] Here again, the poor were to be made more industrious and this is seen as the only way to combat the problems faced by the aging poor.

On March 27, 1775, Mr. Gilbert proposed the creation of a Committee on Poor Laws due to the conditions of the poor brought about by the current poor laws. He believed there was some way to better poor the laws and actually help the poor. On April 11, 1775, the committee reported back with twenty-six resolutions. The first few relate how bad the current poor laws work and how they could be bettered. Settlement laws must be restated because at present, people cannot move to places with better employment and thus better themselves. Consolidation of parishes could benefit smaller parishes. When workhouses are created, more care needs taken with classifying those who can work at what jobs. Regulation of workhouses needs bettering. The resolutions go on with the delegation of wealthy landowners as governors with the power of appointment. They decide who gets appointments as guardians of the poor and supervisors of workhouses. Poor unable to work or who cannot maintain themselves by honest labor will be placed in workhouses where their necessities will be met while working at a task suited to their ability. The poor who have been temporarily hindered in their ability to maintain themselves can receive temporary relief in the form of charity from the guardians when it is necessary. Resolutions fifteen through seventeen deal with the placement of abandoned children. They are taken care of in workhouses, instructed properly, made to work at tasks suited to them, and set out as apprentices at the appropriate age.[56] This provides a perfect example the intentions of workhouses. People, or children, are brought in, trained at an industry, and then released to support themselves.

The resolutions also set up a system of checks on the workhouses. They required clerks to record expenses and incomes accurately and guardians reviewed this information at monthly meetings. Justices of the Peace reviewed accounts and set up an average sum that parishes should contribute, and no parish's contribution must exceed that average.[57] An attempt at strict regulation of the workhouses was needed according to the committee and they laid out definite terms for regulation.

Mr. Gilbert reported additional resolutions on May 11 including limitations on the number of workhouses per county while allowing the governors to borrow on credit from poor rates for the proper establishment of such houses. According to Gilbert, an act passed in 1744 needed amendments because abuses of it are great and these harm the public because it creates more street beggars. Workhouses need set rules and regulations that governors can enforce with effect.[58] These resolutions add to the regulations of poor houses and governors for the most part, but also call for the amendment of older laws for clarification, which is important for future legislation.

The result of the resolutions and the work of Mr. Gilbert was Gilbert's Act of 1782. It basically instated laws created from the many resolutions proposed by the committee.[59] Gilbert's Act was a result of several years of research and work by a few members of Parliament. Gilbert tried to further legislation in future years, but did not have much luck. Other members saw it as too expensive and never passed the regulations he wanted.[60] Gilbert's Act began the major reform of poor laws that would continue into the nineteenth-century.

Regardless of the effects of the poor law, philanthropy played a large part in the aid of the poor. People realized that the poor law could only do so much and thus helped on their own terms. In the eighteenth-century, 'associated philanthropy,' or subscriptions funding charitable activity by several benefactors becomes popular. Charitable schools and hospitals became the best examples of this. Women and children were targeted as concern for the physical and moral state of the nation once again took center stage. Fraternities arose after 1660 and remained popular in the eighteenth-century, which protected their members in case of illness or misfortune. People still wanted more activity in the use of their charity than simply paying the poor tax.[61] Thus, England provides an example of combining state support with private charity at its best.

--Conclusion—

Poor relief in France and England developed along similar lines in the seventeenth and eighteenth-centuries. Views of the poor changed from that of sin as crime to laziness as crime. Poor laws reflected this change. In the seventeenth-century, charity was encouraged for all poor while reforming their moral and spiritual state. If they became less sinful, they could pull themselves out of poverty. These ideas changed in the eighteenth-century as legislation forced the able-bodied poor to work. The poor were simply lazy and not necessarily sinful. Correcting this laziness became the goal as charity was reserved for those who really could not work and maintain themselves. This change in the attitude towards the poor and poor relief reflects the Enlightenment and the use of reason rather than spirituality. Reason explains the thought that training a person to work should correct their laziness, and they should then be able to support themselves. Views of the poor and poor relief changed in France and England during the seventeenth and eighteenth-centuries.

---

[1] Dirk Van Damme, "The Confinement of Beggars in Eighteenth-Century France: The Population of Some 'Hopitaux Generaux' and 'Depots De Mendicite,'" *Paedagogica Historica* 26 (1990): 102-3.

[2] Ibid., 103-4.

[3] Kathryn Norberg, *Rich and Poor in Grenoble, 1600-1814* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1985).

[4] Ibid., 20-6.

[5] Ibid., 27.

[6] Ibid., 31.

[7] Ibid., 32-4.

[8] Ibid., 34.

[9] Ibid., 40-62.

[10] Ibid., 81-2.

[11] Ibid., 102-4.

[12] Robert M. Schwartz, *Policing the Poor in Eighteenth-Century France* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1988), 34-47.

[13] Ibid., 50-1, 248-9.

[14] Ibid., 249.

[15] Thomas McStay Adams, *Bureaucrats and Beggars: French Social Policy in the Age of Enlightenment* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990), 28-68.

[16] Ibid., 75-9.

[17] Ibid.,118-22.

[18] Norberg, *Rich and Poor*, 177-81.

[19] Ibid., 182-92

[20] Ibid., 192-3.

[21] Adams, *Beggars and Bureaucrats*, 130-58.

[22] Schwartz, *Policing the Poor*, 249-50.

[23] Adams, *Beggars and Bureaucrats*, 168-75.

[24] Ibid., 240-45.

[25] Schwartz, *Policing the Poor*, 250-51.

[26] Ibid., 250.

[27] Paul Slack, *The English Poor Law, 1531-1782* (London: MacMillan Education, 1990), 11.

[28] Ibid., 15.

[29] Ibid., 18-21.

[30] Ibid., 26-9.

[31] *Several Propositions tendered by the Corporations for the Imploying the Poor of the City of London, and Liberties* (London 1650).

[32] Cotes, *Several Propositions*.

[33] William Pryor and Thomas Turner, *The Out-Cries of the Poor, Oppressed, & Imprisoned or A safe Way to free the Poor of this City and the whole Nation of England, from Begging and Starving, Presented to the Council of Officers* (London, 1659), 3-4.

[34] Sir Josiah Child, *Sir Josiah Child's Proposals For the Relief and Employment of the Poor* (London, 1670), 1.

[35] Ibid.

[36] Thomas Firmin, *Some Proposals for the imploying of the Poor, Especially in and about the City of London. And for the prevention of Begging, a practice so dishonourable to the Nation, and to the Christian Religion* (London, 1678).

[37] Ibid., 4-5.

[38] *Some Thoughts Concerning the Maintenance of the Poor* (London 1700), 4-5.

[39] Slack, *English Poor Law*, 35.

[40] Ibid., 35-9.

[41] Ibid., 62.

[42] Ibid.

[43] T.C. Hansard and William Cobbet, ed., *The Parliamentary History of England, From the Earliest Period to the Year 1803*, vol. 17 (London: Johnson Reprint Company, LTD, 1966) 843-846.

[44] Ibid., vol. 18, 627.

[45] Slack, *English Poor Law*, 45-8.

[46] Ibid., 39-45.

[47] Dorothy Marshall, "The Old Poor Law, 1662-1795," in *Essays in Economic History*, ed. E.M. Carus-Wilson. (London: Edward Arnold, 1963), 300.

[48] Marshall, "Old Poor Law," 301-3.

[49] Hansard, *Parliamentary History*, vol. 19, 71-3.

[50] Ibid., vol. 15, 941.

[51] Ibid., 942.

[52] Ibid.

[53] Ibid., vol. 16, 6.

[54] Slack, *English Poor Law*, 63.

[55] Hansard, *Parliamentary History*, vol. 17, 640-2.

[56] Ibid., vol 18, 546-9.

[57] Ibid., 550-1.

[58] Ibid., 551-2.

[59] Slack, *English Poor Law*, 63-64.

[60] Hansard, *Parliamentary History*, vol. 27, 265-269.

[61] Slack, *English Poor Law*, 48-52.

<center>"Let Them Enforce It": The Supreme Court and the Cherokee Cases</center>

<center>Kristopher Maulden</center>

Kristopher Maulden, a Junior history major at Eastern Illinois University, was recently inducted into the Epsilon Mu Chapter of Phi Alpha Theta. This paper was written for Dr. Lynne Curry's US Constitution and Nation course in Spring 2001.

Historians often relegate the Cherokee cases to a secondary role in American history for a number of reasons but mainly because the cases never truly figured largely in the controversies that created them. *Worcester v. Georgia* should have aggravated the states' rights debates of the 1830s and it should have settled the official stance the United States took in protecting Indian nations from individual state interests, but it did neither. History seems to have decided that the Cherokee cases failed to affect American policy and political practice because of the cases' irrelevance at the time they were heard. However, the Cherokee cases did not fail merely because they were inconsequential. Instead, they failed because the events surrounding them made the cases inconsequential. Many problems within the United States government led to the Cherokee cases' failures. Among them are the U.S. Supreme Court's lack of real power and President Andrew Jackson's refusal to enforce even the simplest of laws--or in this case decisions--when they interfered with his interests. Although the decisions were at times sweeping but always extremely well-crafted, Jackson's abuse of the presidency led to the consequences described above and, ultimately, the forced removal of the Cherokee and many other Indian nations.[1]

Before comparing the Cherokee cases with other events of the Jackson administration, the history of the cases must be considered and understood. Georgia had wanted the lands of the Cherokee and the neighboring Creek nations since the end of the American Revolution, if not earlier. After the Revolution, the state claimed one hundred million acres of land, which included Cherokee and Creek lands and encompassed all of present-day Alabama and Mississippi.[2] Georgia even claimed land that belonged neither to Great Britain before the Treaty of Paris nor to the United States afterward but instead belonged to Spain.[3] The federal government did not respect Georgia's claims, however, and moved to protect the Indians from Georgia's encroachments. The federal government and the Cherokee signed the Treaty of Hopewell on November 28, 1785, which guaranteed the Cherokee the protection of the United States.[4] The Creek nation also made a treaty with the United States, the Treaty of New York, in 1790 to protect them from Georgia's aggression. The United States went so far as to guarantee the Creeks any contested lands between the Indian nation and Georgia and even returned some lands that Georgia had claimed for itself.[5] This in effect allowed the federal government to limit Georgia's size by guaranteeing land to the Creeks that the state wanted.[6] Georgia continued to claim the lands, though, and the federal government had to agree to remove the Indians at some point in the future in order to end the conflict. This agreement, known as the Compact of 1802, also stipulated that Georgia would no longer claim lands to the west that the government had set aside as Indian lands.

Still, removal was not a viable option in 1802, quite simply because the federal government had nowhere to send the Indians. Only after the Louisiana Purchase did the United States gain a vast tract of land to the west, which in turn made removal seem possible. After all, many Americans thought the massive land purchase could easily support the Indians east of the Mississippi as well as those already in the Louisiana Purchase. Thus, public and legislative support for removal grew throughout the United States. Immigrants and older Americans saw Indian lands as somewhere they or their children could settle and make a living. Others saw Indian removal as part of national expansion, which also included the expulsion of the Spanish from Florida and the West. Still others saw removal as part of America's mission to bring Western civilization to all of North America.[7] Public policy followed public feeling, as it usually does over time, and in December of 1829 Andrew Jackson presented the Indian Removal Bill to Congress, which would increase federal efforts to move the Cherokee and other tribes across the Mississippi River. The Congressional members of the embryonic Whig party strongly opposed the Bill, and in a vote along party lines in the Senate, Jackson and his Democrats won by a twenty-eight to nineteen tally.[8] However, the Whigs ground the Bill to a halt in the House, forcing a tie vote. In response, Jackson told the Democrats he was hinging his administration's success on the Indian Removal Bill, and "he pressured and bullied, and the original legislation passes in the House by a vote of 102-97."[9] Jackson then promptly signed it into law in late May 1830.

At the same time, Georgia had made a series of laws encroaching on Cherokee rights. In retaliation, Cherokee chief John Ross decided that the Cherokee had little choice but to sue in federal court to stop the state from enacting its laws.[10] The Cherokee seemingly had the law on their side; Article IX of the Articles of Confederation as well as numerous acts of the Continental Congress set out to give the United States sole power over Indian affairs by stipulating that treaties could only be made by federal diplomats. Additionally, Article I, Section 10 of the Constitution barred states from entering into treaties and Article I, Section 8 gave the federal government the sole power to negotiate with Indian nations.[11]

Also, the Treaty of Hopewell appeared to favor the Cherokee. Article III gave the federal government sole protection over the Cherokee, as was discussed above. Also, Article IX gave the United States over the Cherokee nation the "sole and exclusive right of regulating the trade...and managing all their affairs in such a manner as they think proper."[12] Georgia's interference in Cherokee affairs appeared plainly unconstitutional and in violation of the Treaty of Hopewell, and the Cherokee hoped that the Supreme Court would see the state's actions as such.

The Cherokee decided to pursue original jurisdiction from the Supreme Court under Article III, Section 2, which states:

> The judicial power shall extend to all cases, in law and equity, arising under this Constitution, the laws of the United States, and treaties made, or which shall be made, under their authority; to all cases...between a State or the citizens thereof, and foreign states, citizens, or subjects.[13]

They said that the Court could originally rule because the Constitution plainly declared that "judicial power of the United States shall be vested in one Supreme Court."[14] The Cherokee claimed that they were a foreign state, satisfying the conditions of Article III, Section 2, and so the Supreme Court should take the case.

> Additionally, they sued under the Supremacy Clause in Article VI, which states:
> This Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof, and all treaties made, or which shall be made under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land; and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby, anything in the constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding.[15]

They also used Article I, Section 10, known as the Obstruction of Contracts Clause, to make their case; the Obstruction of Contracts Clause, as it appears in the Constitution, says that:

> No state shall enter into any treaty, alliance, or confederation; grant letters of marque and reprisal; coin money; emit bills of credit; make any thing but gold and silver coin a tender in payment of debts; pass any bill of attainder, ex post facto law, or law impairing the obligation of contracts, or grant any title of nobility.[16]

The Cherokee used these passages to claim that Georgia had made its own laws in contradiction with the Treaty of Hopewell, which was a treaty of the United States and therefore had precedence over Georgia's laws. They said Georgia was also obstructing a contract between the United States and the Cherokee, describing treaties as "contracts of the highest character and of the most solemn obligation."[17] Because Georgia was acting unconstitutionally, the Cherokee sought an injunction against the execution of Georgia's laws.

The Supreme Court decided to take the case in March of 1831, naming it *Cherokee Nation v. Georgia*. Georgia never replied to the Cherokee claims or the Court's announcements before the case, though; instead, the state asserted that the Supreme Court had no power to oversee a state's business. Even so, Georgia lobbied Congress during arguments of *Cherokee Nation v. Georgia* to limit the powers that the Supreme Court had under Section 25 of the Judiciary Act of 1789. In the Judiciary Act, Congress had allowed the Supreme Court to declare a state law unconstitutional and to grant such an injunction that the Cherokee sought.[18] Georgia's actions will figure largely later in the Cherokee cases, but in 1831 the Supreme Court, and the rest of the United States, were focused on *Cherokee Nation v. Georgia*. The Court decided by a margin of four votes to two to deny the injunction. John Marshall spoke for the majority in denying that the Cherokee and other Indian nations were independent but were "more correctly...domestic dependent

nations."[19] He said that they were dependent based upon his discovery doctrine. This doctrine traces itself to Marshall's opinion in *Johnson v. M'Intosh*, where Marshall said that land titles were recognized only if they came from the European government, or its descendent in the United States' case, in charge of the land. He said that by discovery the Europeans claimed the right to purchase or conquer Indian lands, and in the process Indian nations, though they did not totally lose their sovereignty, had it diminished nonetheless.[20]

Of course, discovery in and of itself did not suffice to debunk the Cherokee nation's claims. Marshall also said that the European nations long considered the Indians as "being so completely under the sovereignty and dominion of the United States, that any attempt to...form a political connexion with them, would be considered by all as an invasion of our country, and an act of hostility."[21] The United States has merely followed that tradition, Marshall wrote, and so the United States did not consider the Cherokee as independent. He pointed to Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution as evidence. The Framers, Marshall said, separated "foreign nations" and "Indian tribes" because they did not consider the Indian nations as either foreign or independent.[22] Since the Cherokee were not a foreign state, he concluded, the Court had no original jurisdiction powers, and so it could not grant the injunction that the Cherokee desired.

Many have denounced Marshall's opinion as inconsistent, weak, or merely protective of the Court's power. His discovery doctrine has often received the most criticism, even in his day. In *Fletcher v. Peck*, the case in which the discovery doctrine first appeared, Justice William Johnson considered Marshall's idea preposterous, saying that no nation could occupy a land yet not have claim to it.[23] However, Marshall never set out to define a new legal doctrine in his opinions; instead he merely continued the laws of Europe because he had little choice otherwise. As one writer described it, "United States courts simply could not adjudicate the most basic questions about the way that non-Indians had colonized and converted aboriginal lands into...lands for their own use."[24]

Critics say that Marshall would have ruled differently in *Cherokee Nation v. Georgia* if he were younger.[25] They have accused him of being too old to be an effective Supreme Court Justice in 1830. They have also referred to Marshall as a mentally exhausted man.[26] But Marshall appears a perfectly capable Chief Justice. His rejection of original jurisdiction and of the Cherokee nation's petition seem well in keeping with his prior rulings. He rejected original jurisdiction on previous occasions, most notably in *Marbury v. Madison*. In that decision, he denied Marbury's claim because, according to him, the Framers did not set up the Supreme Court to make an original ruling and issue a writ of mandamus in the manner Marbury asked. In *Cherokee Nation*, Marshall again shied away from original jurisdiction, and he used the argument that the Cherokee were not a foreign nation in order to do so. If they did not qualify, he could reject the motion out of hand without having to rule on the injunction itself.

Additionally, Marshall made his decision for utilitarian purposes. If he decided that the Cherokee and other Indian nations were indeed independent, then he would have allowed European nations, especially England and Spain, to move into American lands and form alliances with the Indians. Considering that the United States had recently fought the War of 1812 partially because the British remained allied with Indian tribes on American soil, allowing Europe to get involved in Indian affairs--with American blessing even--would have made no sense at all. Therefore, Marshall had no practical reason to side with the Cherokee.

Also, the dissenting opinion withers under scrutiny, and so Marshall may have been justified in rejecting the Cherokee nation's motion. The dissent's author, Justice Thompson, commits a series of logical errors in his arguments for establishing the Cherokee as an independent nation. He says that if Georgia had bought land from the Cherokee and refused to pay for the land, then the Court would recognize the Cherokee as an independent nation.[27] However, Thompson severely misses the point: he tries to compare what would have been a commercial case that likely would have been brought first in a lower federal court with what, in *Cherokee*, was an appeal for an original ruling while considering the Cherokee a foreign nation. The Cherokee did not have to be a foreign nation to sue for payment, though; they only needed standing in court or, at the very least, a lawyer who could represent them. Thompson further claims that "if they, as a nation, are competent to make a treaty or contract, it would seem to me to be a strange inconsistency to deny to them the right and the power to enforce such a contract."[28] Of course, under the treaties the Cherokee signed, they seem to have signed away their independence.[29] Further, signing a treaty does not necessarily make a nation independent. Scotland provides the greatest example; they and England signed an agreement in 1707 that joined the two nations and made Scotland subservient to England. Here, Scotland indeed signed a treaty, but no one considers them an independent nation today just because they signed an agreement in the

past. When the dissent seems weak, it makes it even easier for Marshall to rule as he did, especially since he also had very pragmatic reasons to do so.

Even so, Marshall seemed open to decide the "question of right...in a proper case with proper parties."[30] Samuel Worcester provided just that opportunity; he and colleague John Thompson were arrested in mid-March 1831 for being on Cherokee lands without permission from Georgia. The judge they faced, wary to prevent a test case from advancing beyond his court, released the men by saying that they were federal agents, whom the law exempted. He based his decision on the fact that Worcester was the postmaster in the Cherokee town of New Echota and that both of them qualified as federal agents because the War Department gave money to missionaries to educate the Indians. However, Georgia's governor George Gilmer made sure that the Postal Service promptly fired Worcester and secured an opinion from the War Department that missionaries were not truly federal agents.[31] After all of this occurred, the Georgia authorities had no choice but to arrest Worcester once again. He came before the court again, this time with fellow missionary Elizur Butler, and both were convicted of violating Georgia's law against living in Cherokee lands without permission and sentenced to four years of hard labor.

Their case moved quickly through the system, and it came before the Supreme Court as *Worcester v. Georgia* in February of 1832.[32] As in *Cherokee Nation v. Georgia*, the plaintiffs sued Georgia in the Supreme Court under Article 25 of the Judiciary Act, which allowed the Supreme Court to overturn a state law or court decision if it "has been shown to be repugnant to the constitution, laws, and treaties of the United States."[33] Worcester and Butler's attorneys, William Wirt and John Sergeant,[34] claimed Georgia used an unconstitutional law to convict the two missionaries. Therefore, Wirt and Sergeant said, the Supreme Court should overturn Worcester and Butler's convictions and declare the Georgia law null and void, which the Supreme Court had power to do under the Judiciary Act.

Of course, the lawyers provided the Court specific reasons for believing Georgia's law was unconstitutional. They used, as they did in *Cherokee Nation*, the Supremacy Clause of Article VI in the U.S. Constitution to declare Georgia's law usurped the federal government's power by overriding provisions of the Treaty of Hopewell. Most notably, they pointed to Articles 3 and 9 of the Treaty, which placed the Cherokee under the sole protection of the United States and gave Congress the sole power to regulate Cherokee affairs--other than the Cherokee government, of course.[35] Also, as in *Cherokee Nation*, they argued that the treaties between the Cherokee and the United States were contracts. By passing a law concerning the Cherokee, Georgia broke the Treaty of Hopewell and thereby obstructed a contract, which is expressly forbidden in Article I, Section 10 of the U.S. Constitution.[36]

Georgia again refused to reply to the plaintiffs' claims, file a legal brief, or appear for oral arguments in the Court. They once again denied that the Supreme Court had power to oversee state business. For these reasons, *Worcester v. Georgia*, along with South Carolina's nullification of federal tariffs, fell into the ever-growing mess that was the states' rights debate of the early 1830s.[37]

Arguments lasted three days, and just over a week later, the Supreme Court handed down its decision.[38] In a unanimous decision, the Supreme Court sided with Worcester and Butler.[39] The decision was not fully unanimous though; Justice Baldwin believed that the case was not properly filed but ultimately sided with the rest of the justices, signing Justice McLean's concurring opinion.[40]

Marshall wrote for the majority, making a sweeping decision against Georgia. In it, he very simply declared that "the acts of Georgia are repugnant to the constitution, laws, and treaties of the United States,"[41] and therefore the law was null and void and the prisoners should go free as soon as possible. Marshall agreed with the reasoning that Wirt and Sergeant had put forth in their briefs and went further to explain the reasons the Court sided with their arguments. He pointed to the Compact of 1802, saying Georgia had recognized the United States held sole power over the Cherokee. They also recognized in the Compact that no state could interfere in Cherokee affairs or lands. He also defended the sovereignty of the Cherokee nation against the United States government, even though he maintained that the Cherokee were still a domestic dependent nation. He said that the United States merely secured the rights to regulate trade between the two nations and to remove the Cherokee from their lands whenever both sides agreed on terms for doing so.[42]

As strong (and largely praised) as this ruling was, it made little difference in the circumstances of the times. Andrew Jackson simply chose not to enforce the ruling when the Georgia courts refused to overturn Worcester and Butler's

convictions. Jackson's decision not to enforce *Worcester* illustrated the Supreme Court's weakness as an institution. The justices had no ability to force Georgia to overturn their decision without the United States government. They could have authorized a U.S. Marshal to go to Georgia to free the missionaries, but they adjourned before Georgia announced that they would ignore the ruling in *Worcester*.[43]

During the Supreme Court's recess, other events transpired that kept the Court from forcing its hand. On December 22, 1832, Georgia Governor Wilson Lumpkin pardoned the missionaries and repealed the law that the Supreme Court declared unconstitutional. This move freed the prisoners and took the unconstitutional law off the books as the Court wanted, but Georgia's leaders could claim that they did so voluntarily, thereby allowing them to still not recognize the Supreme Court's jurisdiction over individual states.[44]

The pardons also removed Georgia from the states' rights debates. Many states' rights supporters hoped that Georgia would join South Carolina against the federal government in saying that an individual state could nullify federal laws and rulings when they hurt that state's interests. Therefore, the news that Lumpkin had repealed the law and pardoned Worcester and Butler angered many of them.[45] This move allowed Andrew Jackson to move against a friendless (as far as states were concerned, at least) South Carolina. He threatened to send troops to enforce the tariff there, and so South Carolina gave in and respected the tariff. When Georgia removed itself from the states' rights issue, they relegated the case to a secondary role in the controversy, and history has remembered the Cherokee cases as such.

Jackson did not necessarily abstain from the *Worcester* controversies, though. He quite simply refused to do anything about the decision and Georgia's refusal to follow it. He has received criticism throughout history as well as in his own time. John Ross wrote an essay blasting Jackson for doing nothing in Georgia while pursuing the matters in South Carolina. Ross reasoned that Jackson could not continue to act in such a manner without being inconsistent. His logic was impeccable, but it did not change Jackson's behavior at all. Only Congress could force Jackson to act on the *Worcester* decision or could change his actions toward the Cherokee, but they did nothing at all.[46] Congress did nothing because the Cherokee nation's supporters in Washington and around the country had simply given up after Jackson refused to take action. Wirt advised Ross against filing another suit because he believed the Cherokee would gain nothing from it.[47] Supreme Court Justice John McLean, who wrote the concurring opinion in *Worcester*, also told the Cherokee delegation to the Supreme Court in 1832 that they should expect nothing of a Court decision in their favor, and further, he encouraged them to sign a removal treaty. The Senate's most enthusiastic supporter of the Cherokee, Theodore Freylinghuysen of New Jersey, told the tribe's leaders that they had no options left and should sign a removal treaty if a gracious one was presented to them. Secretary of War Cass began negotiating with the Cherokee on a removal treaty soon after it became painfully clear that Jackson had no intentions of enforcing *Worcester*.[48] What occurred after the Cherokee agreed to remove still haunts the United States and shall always remain a stain upon her history.

The United States severely failed the Cherokee nation in the Cherokee cases and in the negotiations between the two nations afterwards. However, the Constitution did not fail the Cherokee; after all, the Supreme Court did everything the Constitution allowed to protect the Cherokee. If the Constitution did not fail to protect the Cherokee and the other Indian nations forcibly removed in the same time frame, then the agents of the Constitution would have to shoulder the blame.

This blame has never fallen far from Andrew Jackson. His inaction forced the Cherokee to submit to the federal government and indirectly caused the tragic Cherokee removal across the Mississippi River. No law required Jackson to enforce the Supreme Court's decision, but the Constitution quite clearly expects the President to enforce the Supreme Court's decisions. Then again, the Framers did not expect a President to abuse his power and, in bad faith, sidestep the Constitution in order to insert personal interests into public actions.[49] Otherwise, the Framers would have stipulated the President's powers and responsibilities more carefully. Nevertheless, the Framers did not force the President to reasonably prosecute the powers given to him. Perhaps they should have, since Andrew Jackson's failure to do so concerning the Cherokee cases, particularly *Worcester v. Georgia*, ultimately resulted in the deaths of thousands of Cherokees on the Trail of Tears. If Jackson had merely acted more reasonably, the Cherokee could have come to terms with the United States much more easily, and removal could have been done much more practically and safely. Perhaps history has largely forgotten the Cherokee cases, but history will long remember the events that the cases could have so easily prevented if Andrew Jackson had only done his job.

[1] The United States Army forcibly removed the 14,000 members of the Creek nation in 1836, less than a year after the Cherokee arrived in the Indian Territory. Tim Alan Garrison, "Beyond *Worcester*: The Alabama Supreme Court and the [sic] Sovereignty of the Creek Nation," *Journal of the Early Republic* 19, 3 (Fall 1999), 448.

[2] Jill Norgren, *The Cherokee Cases: The Confrontation of Law and Politics* (New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc., 1996), 31.

[3] Ibid.

[4] "ART. 3. The Said Indians...do acknowledge the Cherokees to be under the protection of the United States of America, and of no other sovereign whatsoever." United States of America, "Treaty of Hopewell with the Cherokees," 28 November 1785 [database online]; available from the Texas Tech University Department of English.

[5] "It is hereby agreed...that the United States will cause certain valuable Indian goods now in the state of Georgia, to be delivered to the said Creek nation." United States of America, "Treaty of New York City, New York with the Creeks," 7 August 1790 [database online]; available from the Avalon Project at the Yale Law School.

[6] Norgren, *The Cherokee Cases*, 32.

[7] Ibid., 72.

[8] Ibid., 84.

[9] Ibid., 85.

[10] Ibid., 110.

[11] Ibid., 30.

[12] United States, "Treaty of Hopewell."

[13] U.S. Constitution, art. 3, sec. 2.

[14] Ibid., art. 3, sec. 1.

[15] Ibid, art. 6.

[16] Ibid., art. 1, sec. 10.

[17] Supreme Court of the United States, *Cherokee Nation v. Georgia* 30 U.S. 1 (1831) [database online]; available from Lexis-Nexis.

[18] Norgren, *The Cherokee Cases*, 100.

[19] Supreme Court, *Cherokee Nation v. Georgia*.

[20] Philip P. Frickey, "Marshalling Past and Present: Colonialism, Constitutionalism, and Interpretation in Federal Indian Law," *Harvard Law Review* 107, 2 (December 1993): 390.

[21] Supreme Court, *Cherokee Nation v. Georgia*.

[22] "In this clause they are as clearly contradistinguished by a name appropriate to themselves, from foreign nations, as from the several states composing the union." - Ibid.

[23] Norgren, *The Cherokee Cases*, 91; and Supreme Court of the United States, *Fletcher v. Peck* 10 U.S. 87 (1810) [database online], available from Lexis-Nexis.

[24] Frickey, "Marshalling Past and Present," 388.

[25] Marshall was in his mid-seventies when the Cherokee cases came before the Supreme Court.

[26] Norgren, *The Cherokee Cases*, 104-5.

[27] Supreme Court, *Cherokee Nation v. Georgia*.

[28] Ibid.

[29] The Cherokee placed themselves under the sole protection of the United States in Articles 3 and 9 of the Treaty of Hopewell. That in and of itself seems to suggest that the Cherokee gave up their independence, or at least some of it, in the Treaty. United States of America, "Treaty of Hopewell."

[30] Supreme Court, *Cherokee Nation v. Georgia*.

[31] Edwin A. Miles, "After John Marshall's Decision: *Worcester v. Georgia* and the Nullification Crisis," *The Journal of Southern History* 39, 4 (November 1973): 522-3.

[32] Supreme Court of the United States, *Worcester v. Georgia* 31 U.S. 515 (1832) [database online]; available from Lexis-Nexis.

[33] Ibid.

[34] Wirt and Sergeant also represented the Cherokee nation in *Cherokee Nation v. Georgia*. Norgren, *The Cherokee Cases*, 98-99.

[35] "ART. 9. For the benefit and comfort of the Indians...the United States Congress assembled shall have the sole and exclusive right of...managing all their affairs in such manner as they think proper." (See note 4 for the text of Article 3.) United States, "Treaty of Hopewell."

[36] Supreme Court, *Worcester v. Georgia*.

[37] The controversy surrounding the case and the nullification debate seem inexorably tied because they occurred at the same time. They do indeed intertwine on numerous occasions. These occasions will be discussed later, as they apply more after the case was decided than before. Miles, "After John Marshall's Decision," 542.

[38] The opinions for *Worcester v. Georgia* were handed down March 3, 1832, only twelve days after oral arguments commenced on the case. Norgren, *The Cherokee Cases*, 117.

[39] Seven justices sat on the Supreme Court's bench at the time both cases were argued and decided. However, one justice fell ill during both of the Court's terms in 1831 and 1832 and abstained from a number of cases. In *Cherokee Nation*, Justice Duvall missed the proceedings; in *Worcester*, Justice Johnson was the one who fell ill and missed the case. Many historians and legal scholars believe that, upon examining his opinion in *Cherokee Nation*, Johnson may have been the sole dissenter had he been present. Norgren, *The Cherokee Cases*, 107, 117; and Frickey, "Marshalling Past and Present," 399.

[40] Baldwin said that the writ of error petition that the Court sent to Georgia should have been returned by the state court itself rather than its clerk, who actually returned the petition. Marshall addresses these concerns expressly in his opinion, using *M'Culloch v. Maryland* and *Brown v. Maryland* as examples to show that the clerk could return petitions. - Supreme Court, *Worcester v. Georgia*.

[41] Ibid.

[42] Marshall expressly referred to parts of the Treaty of Hopewell that appeared to give the United States much more power than the Court recognized, but he reconciled the difference by arguing that the Cherokee should receive the benefit of the doubt. As he said it, "It is reasonable to suppose, that the Indians...certainly were not critical judges of our language," and that the Cherokee were unable to "distinguish the word 'allotted' from the words 'marked out.'" The actual subject of the contract was the dividing line between the two nations." He also later says that the Cherokee negotiators likely did not know that "hunting grounds" in English means only land that the Cherokee needed for hunting, not their entire territory. Therefore, they were still entitled to all the lands guaranteed them in the several treaties they made with the United States. Ibid.

[43] Norgren, *The Cherokee Cases*, 123.

[44] Miles, "After John Marshall's Decision," 535.

[45] Ibid., 542.

[46] Norgren, *The Cherokee Cases*, 130.

[47] Ibid., 127.

[48] Miles, "After John Marshall's Decision," 529-0.

[49] It should be noted that Jackson's plantation, the Hermitage, actually sat on land that the Cherokee ceded to the United States in the Treaty of Hopewell. During Jackson's administration, the Hermitage sat roughly one hundred miles from Cherokee lands, and the Cherokee still occupied roughly one-fifth of the land encompassing his home state of Tennessee. Additionally, it is very well known that Jackson made no qualms about his past as an Indian fighter and his hatred of Indians. This should lead most reasonable people to infer that Jackson simply wanted the Cherokee out of his home state and away from his plantation. Anon., "Cherokee Land Cessions," *State Maps on File: Southeast* (New York: Facts on File Publications, 1984), 9.17.

The Molly Maguires: Labor Heroes or Ethnic Terrorists?

Michael Pollock

Michael Pollock, a post baccalaureate student in teacher education, plans to enter the MA program in history in fall 2001. This paper was written for Dr. Nora Pat Small's Social History Class in the fall of 2001.

The years between 1863 and 1879 were years of violence, labor unrest, sabotage, and assassination in central Pennsylvania's anthracite coal region. "Black Thursday", June 21, 1877, saw ten Irish-Catholic miners, convicted of the murders of various mine officials, hanged for their crimes and for their membership in the secret order known as the Molly Maguires. A total of twenty men were executed by the close of 1879 for murders dating back to year of 1863. If history is written by the victors, the victors in these conflicts were the predominant institutions of the era. The business community, the political powers, the Catholic Church, and the media had concluded that the Molly Maguires were a secret band of Irish terrorists and thugs. This historiographical essay will contrast two views. One view was an overwhelming condemnation of the Molly Maguires seen during and immediately after the violent uprisings in the anthracite region during the 1860s and 1870s. The other view, shared by most later historians, was that the violence that occurred was to some degree justified by conditions in the mines, and seriously misrepresented by the political, religious, and commercial forces of that earlier era.

The business interests included the coalmine owners and operators, the railroad owners, and the private police and detectives hired to protect their interests. They, along with the press, the hierarchy of the Catholic Church, and the state government, all portrayed the Molly Maguires as a "band of Irish cutthroats, engaged in violence for its own sake, for money, or for revenge, who terrorized the anthracite region for more than a decade before they were finally brought to justice by a heroic Pinkerton detective."[1] The accounts of these events were written during or after the trials, and include the trial transcripts and newspaper reports. Also included are narratives by Franklin B. Gowen, the railroad president and lead prosecutor in the trials, Allen Pinkerton, the head of the Pinkerton Detective Agency, and F.P. Dewees, an attorney for the coal company. Voices sympathetic to the accused miners or their plight were not found in print.

Later historical works about the Molly Maguires question not only the accounts written during the period, the causes of the violence, and the motives of the Molly Maguires, but their very existence. These historians believe that the Irish conspiracy described by earlier accounts was invented by the industrialists of 1860's and 1870's Pennsylvania to discredit and cripple the fledging labor movements which threatened their supremacy. In 1995, one historian writes of these events,

By inventing this organization, the employers hoped to quash a budding unionization movement among their disgruntled work forces. In their conspiracy   against the labor-organizing coal miners, the operators engaged such disparate   allies as a detective agency, the commercial newspapers, the state judicial system,   and the Catholic Church.[2]

The violent social upheaval in coal rich Pennsylvania began with the influx of Irish immigrants during the pre-Civil War industrial boom. The famine in Ireland between 1846 and 1852, combined with harsh British rule, tenant abuses and evictions, overcrowding, poverty, and widespread anti-Catholicism, led to a massive emigration. Thousands of Irish fled to the promised opportunity of America. Centuries of abuses had led to the formation of secret societies across the Irish countryside as the only self-defense agrarian Irish had to combat murder, land confiscation, and religious persecution. These societies accompanied many Irish laborers who found their way to the booming coalfields of Pennsylvania. The rapid industrialization of the northern United States between 1840 and 1860, combined with the technological advances brought by the Civil War, created an insatiable hunger for coal.

The Irish laborers found the same antagonists in Pennsylvania that they had battled in Ireland, the English and the Scots. "In Ireland they were landlords and agents; in Pennsylvania they were mine owners and mine bosses."[3] If the Irish held the hope that ethnic tensions had been left across the Atlantic on their journey to a new start, they quickly learned otherwise. The mining community quickly divided, socially and physically, along ethnic lines.

The Irish turned to a secret society known as the Ancient Order of Hibernians (A.O.H.) for protection. Violence erupted in 1863 as Irish laborers rioted in opposition to the new federal draft laws, and then extended their protests to

demand better working conditions and wages. Periodically violence erupted over the next sixteen years. Many blamed the Molly Maguires, a radical faction of the A.O.H. named after a violent group of protesters who had roamed the Irish countryside fighting anti-Catholic persecution were blamed.

The murders and beatings in the anthracite region of Pennsylvania can be divided into two distinct periods. "Between 1863 and 1867 no fewer than 57 murders were committed in the area."[4] Between 1868 and 1874 very little violence occurred. This was also the time during which the first serious miner's labor group, the Workingman's Benevolent Association (W.B.A.), was active. Following an unsuccessful strike in 1879, the union collapsed, triggering another series of murders that continued until the trials in 1876. One early *New York Times* editorial declared

> The trade unions of England have resorted to murder, assassination and
> arson, in order to strike terror into the hearts of those who oppose them.
> This root of evil has been planted on American soil, and in the mining
> regions of Pennsylvania we see the legitimate fruit…. What better time for
> the extermination of this foul sore.[5]

Historian Anthony Bimba viewed the violence as a natural response to the working conditions forced upon the coal workers in his 1932 book, *The Real Molly Maguires*.

> The horrors of mining were literally indescribable. There were no provisions
> for safety or proper ventilation within the pits; mine inspectors were unheard
> of. The health and lives of the miners were at the mercy of the operators
> who bitterly opposed every move for protective legislation.[6]

The most powerful institutions in the anthracite region of Pennsylvania were the industrial powers of the Reading Railroad and the coal mine owners. Franklin B. Gowen best represents their attitudes during the upheavals of the mid-nineteenth century. By 1862, Gowen had risen from failed independent mine owner, to district attorney of Schuylkill County, in the heart of coal country. He had little impact on the violence attributed to the Molly Maguires during this early period. Gowen went to work for the
Reading Railroad and by 1869, following a brilliant presentation to the Pennsylvania
Supreme Court, he ascended to the presidency of the railroad.[7]

Over the next seven years, Gowen strengthened the monopoly held by the Reading Railroad. He engineered the buyout of the Reading's only remaining competitor, the Schuylkill Canal. He realized that the final key to dominance of the industry meant securing a steady supply of coal. He used freight rates and the pressure brought by the W.B.A. to run many independent mine owners into bankruptcy.[8] He raised freight rates by 100% for those independent miners who settled with the W.B.A. during the strike of 1871, effectively controlling the entire movement of coal in the anthracite region and forcing the union to agree to his terms. He simultaneously began to secretly purchase thousands of acres of coalfields for the railroad.

Gowen determined that the only roadblock to the Reading's dominance was the presence of the labor movement. The W.B.A. had gained strength, and the Molly Maguires were again active in the area. He hired the Pinkerton Detective Agency to infiltrate the A.O.H. and waged a public campaign tying the non-violent W.B.A. and the A.O.H. to the notorious Molly Maguires. When the detective James McParlan was done, Gowen returned to the role of prosecutor and used the detective's testimony and that of an informer to seal the fate of twenty Irish miners.

Contemporary accounts of Gowen praise him for his foresight, honesty, enthusiasm, and for his attack on the scourge of the Molly Maguires. He is viewed as the savior of the industry. Later assessments are less kind, portraying Gowen as the devil incarnate, a capitalist opportunist with no regard for the safety and well being of miners. F.P. Dewees, an attorney for the Reading Railroad, wrote the first account of the history of the anthracite region and the early trials published in 1877. "Mr. Gowen was adapted to carry out the ends in view, -- to wit, the maintenance and increase of the power of his company; the regulation of trade; the establishment of law and order; and the protection of the rights and property throughout the coal regions."[9] Gowen's attitude toward the miners is well illustrated by Allan Pinkerton's account of the magnate's reasons for hiring him in 1873.

> What we want is to get within this apparently impenetrable ring; turn to the

light the hidden side of this dark and cruel body, to probe to its core this
festering sore upon the body politic…. We want to work our mines in peace,
to run our trains without fear of sudden loss of life and property through the
malicious acts of the Molly Maguires; we want people to sleep unthreatened ,
unmolested, in their beds, undisturbed by horrid dreams of midnight prowlers
and cowardly assassins; we want the laboring men protected in their right to
work to secure sustenance for their wives and little ones, unawed by outside
influences; we want the miner to go forth cheerfully to the slope.[10]

Gowen believed that the miners, if free of the influences of both the union and the Mollies, would be content to labor with no complaints about working conditions or
wages. The Reading's British stockholders lauded Gowen in 1877, despite the precarious financial condition of the company.[11] A Reading director stated,

He had the difficult task two or three years ago of attacking one of the most   terrible and unscrupulous bodies of trades' union bullies and assassins that ever   infected any region of the world….The result is that he has now a contented set of   men at work who are satisfied with their employers.[12]

 These comments show that not only did the capitalists of these times view the Molly Maguires as a terrible threat, but the connection had been successfully made between them and all other labor organizations in the area, most notably the W.B.A.
    Dewees also makes these connections as he writes of the mine owners losing the right to operate their businesses as they please.

"the control and management of the mines, the manner of their working, the right   to employ and discharge hands, were passing away from the owners and were fast   vesting in, not the "Labor Union" proper but the "Labor Union" under the   direction of the "Molly Maguires."[13]

At the same time the business interests were intermingling the W.B.A., the A.O.H., and the Mollys, they did everything possible to portray the Mollys as having nothing to do with labor activism, but rather as a group of thugs bent on greed and personal revenge.
    Later accounts portray a much different scene in the region, and a much different view of the Molly Maguires. The railroad and coal companies, in concert with the state government passed anti-labor legislation, which suspended habeas corpus laws and allowed the hiring of private police forces. Those added to the burdens of low and fluctuating wages, poor working conditions, and unemployment.

In theory, at least, the powers of this new arm of the law were limited to
protection of mine and rail property; but in actual practice there was no   limit…When a man was suspected of a crime, the Coal and Iron Police entered his home, by force if necessary and removed the suspect to the county jail. They guarded him, extracted his "confession", and assisted in   his prosecution.[14]

    Other recent historians view the Molly Maguires and the union as labor heroes, fighting for worker's rights against insurmountable odds. The terrible working conditions in the mines and the secretive activism of the Irish mining community made violence, in the view of many later historians, inevitable and justifiable.

Those designated as Molly Maguires by the coal interests were Hibernians in the
 miner's union who put up a determined struggle against conditions of starvation and peonage in the coal fields…despite the defeat of the Long Strike of 1875 and   the destruction of the Union, the militant Irish miners continued their struggle   against bitter exploitation, tyranny, and terror.[15]

    The industrialists likewise saw the Pinkerton detective James McParlan, acting as an agent of the railroad and coal companies, as a hero, and by later writers as an agent provocateur and a possible murderer. He spent more than two

years infiltrating the A.O.H., documenting their activities, and finally providing the only key eyewitness testimony at the trials that sent many to jail and twenty to the gallows. George Kaercher, the district attorney for Schuylkill County, addressed the jury in an 1876 trial transcript:

> This man McParlan for days and months, while you were pursuing the ordinary avocations of life, was treasuring up day by day the evidence, which at the proper time, and in the proper way, would be introduced into a court of justice, and which would break down and utterly destroy this murderous organization and bring its leaders to condign punishment. He was laboring to insure the safety and security to the community, and to protect you and all of us in the future against the pistol and the knife of the secret assassin.[16]

The question of McParlan's tactics was brought up by the defense during each of the trials, and revisited by historians many years later. Kevin Kenny claims in his 1998 historiography, *Making Sense of The Molly Maguires,* "there was no doubt that McParlan participated in the planning of some of the Molly Maguire assassinations, that he knew about several of them in advance, and that he did little to prevent them or to warn the victims."[17] Anthony Bimba went further in his condemnation of the detective.

> It is clear that the Pinkerton agents did not confine themselves to a spy service nor even to the activities of the agent provocateur. When they could discover nothing and invention would not serve them, they actually committed crime and charged it to the miners.[18]

These claims are made based on the testimony of McParlan himself, who boasted during the trial that he had known of the plan and let the killings proceed to accumulate evidence against the Molly Maguires.

The press took an unusually harsh view of the Molly Maguires during the years of violence in the anthracite region. In weighing the balance between ethnic terrorists and labor activists, those reporting the events of these years invariably labeled the Molly Maguires as the former. Labor unrest resulting in violence throughout the industrialized North during these years was looked upon with disfavor. The *New York Times* reported during the trial in 1876 that "the revelations of the doings of the Molly Maguires uncover a state of brutish ignorance and superstition which one might think could not exist in this Republic. The Pennsylvania authorities owe it to civilization to exterminate this noxious growth."[19] The *Philadelphia Inquirer* was no kinder to the miners. "Capital was fettered, honest labor held by the throat, and Red-Handed murderers, Reeking with the blood of their victims, held high carnival over the prostrate form of Justice, blind and bleeding."[20]

Newspapers were a significant factor in the failure of the W.B.A.. During the "long strike" of 1875 the business community's efforts to link the union and the Molly Maguires began to pay dividends. "The principal newspapers in Pottsville outspokenly condemned the striking men, especially as the level of violence increased toward the end of the strike."[21] Because of this violence, the W.B.A. was increasingly identified with the Molly Maguires. By characterizing the labor union as a terrorist organization, powerful commentators ensured its destruction. A short article in the *New York Herald* in June 1877 restates another commonly held view of this era; that the Molly Maguires routinely committed acts of violence against other miners. "Late last night near Mantipoke a party of drunken Molly Maguires attacked a number of miners injuring all of them, more or less. Martin Mcintyre, one of the colliers was so badly wounded that he died this morning."[22] If true, this report is the exception. Of the sixteen men reportedly killed by the Molly Maguires between 1862 and 1875, only two were miners, the rest being mine owners, operators, foremen, or local officials.[23]

The newspapers were also partially responsible for the formation of a vigilance committee that may have been led by the Pinkerton detectives, and was responsible for at least two murders. The *Pottsville Evening Chronicle* urged a vigilance committee to string up the Mollys, while the *Tamaqua Courier* called for retribution that was "sure, swift, and terrible."[24] The picture of the events in the anthracite region as painted by the newspapers had a profound effect on how the American public judged these happenings.

The Ancient Order of Hibernians was strictly a Catholic society. The Catholic Church might be expected to have sided with the Irish-Catholic miners during these conflicts, and some local clergy were sympathetic to their plight.

The hierarchy of the Church however, were very critical of the methods employed to secure worker's rights, just as they had been critical of the Irish peasants who had fought the English. "The Molly Maguires in Ireland were known to attack Catholic chapels, and the Roman Catholic hierarchy on both sides of the Atlantic was resolutely opposed to the Molly Maguires, on theological and social grounds."[25] Secret societies were outlawed by the Church and when the connections between the A.O.H. and the Molly Maguires became accepted as fact, the clergy, viewing the Mollys as a dangerous terrorist band, condemned them.

Archbishop James Frederick Wood of Philadelphia, an English Protestant before his conversion to Catholicism, had little in common with the rough Irish-Catholics of the coalfields, and was a bitter opponent of the Molly Maguires from the early 1860s. He referred to the Molly Maguires as a "society rendered infamous by its treachery and deeds of blood --the terror of every neighborhood in which it existed…, the disgrace of Irishman…,the scandal of the Catholic Church."[26]

In 1875 as the W.B.A. collapsed, and as the violence in the area increased, a vigilance committee surrounded a suspected Molly Maguire house in Wiggins Patch and shot three people in retribution for the killing of two mine officials. They had been provided a list of suspected Molly Maguire names by the Pinkerton detectives. A Molly Maguire escaped, another was killed, and the wife of one was accidentally killed. Following this attack, Archbishop Wood excommunicated the Molly Maguires and the A.O.H. His entire message was printed in the *New York Times* on December 23, 1875.[27] Gowen wrote in his summation to the jury on September 1, 1875,

> When these assassins, through their counsel, speak of being Catholics, I desire to say to you that they have been denounced by their Church and excommunicated by their prelates, and that I have the direct personal authority of Archbishop Wood himself to say that he denounces them all and that he was fully cognizant of and approved of the means I took to bring them to justice.[28]

Pinkerton confirmed that the Archbishop had been informed of the presence of the detective and his plan to infiltrate the Molly Maguires.[29] Although some local clergy were less vocal in their condemnation, the attitude of the regional and national clergy had an effect similar to that of the press. They condemned the Molly Maguires, turning public opinion against them and eroding their Catholic support.

During the time they were active through the trials and hangings, the Molly Maguires were vilified by the Catholic Church. In future years, the Church accepted the apologies of the A.O.H. for their involvement with the Molly Maguires and once again found the flexibility to ignore their status as a secret society. Historians place most of the blame for the Church's conduct on the coal owners and operators.

> The operators used the backing of the Catholic Church to its fullest advantage as a means of rousing the religious prejudice of the masses against the miners… They were offered the alternative, either of giving up their organization and their struggle against the coal interests, or of being cursed and excommunicated from the church.[30]

The Pennsylvania state government viewed the Molly Maguires from a distance and through the field glasses provided by the railroad and the mine owners. Although the Molly Maguires wielded some political influence on the local level, the state had strong economic ties with the coal industry leaders and wanted two results. They wanted an end to the violence, and a steady supply of coal. Legislation was passed which enabled the consolidation of industry in the anthracite region, allowing Gowen's Reading Railroad to purchase coal land, thereby securing a virtual vertical monopoly. They also provided troops during the anti-draft riots and later legalized the use of private police forces to take whatever steps necessary to curb the violence of the labor movement. These company-directed forces became the feared Coal and Iron police. "While they were given a smattering of proper law enforcement duties, their first duty was to the company; as far as the Irish coal miner was concerned, here was an extra enemy to be fought."[31] The state was notable for its absence in the court proceedings.

The Molly Maguire investigation and trials marked one of the most astounding

surrenders of sovereignty in American history. A private corporation initiated the investigation through a private detective agency, a private police force arrested the supposed offenders, and coal company attorneys prosecuted – the state provided only the courtroom and the hangman.[32]

 In fact, the lead prosecutor was none other than Franklin B. Gowen. Gowen's performance in this role is believed to have been the key to the convictions. The written record of the trial was quickly published, and served as a primary window into the nature of the Molly Maguires. "That the railroad president who hired the Pinkertons to spy on the Molly Maguires also served as a prosecutor in their trials is a measure of the type of justice that was being dispensed in the anthracite region in the 1870's."[33]

The years of tumult in the coal counties of Pennsylvania culminated in the violent end of the Molly Maguires. The initial history, written by the courts, the coal companies, the detectives in their employ, and the press portrayed the Molly Maguires as vicious criminals, while their pursuers and prosecutors were viewed as saviors. These sources consider the eradication of the order in the same light.

The reign of the Molly Maguire is over. His record has been made and his acts have passed into history. His was a reign of blood. In the days of his pride and power no monarch was more potent, no Eastern despot more cruel and merciless. He held communities terror-bound, and in wanton malice he defied law, destroyed property, and sported with human life.[34]

Later accounts see the Molly Maguires in many different lights; as labor heroes willing to use violence in self defense; as a myth used by the elite to quell disturbances; as the victims of the greed of the capitalists.

Gowen placed himself in the position to be forever after recognized as "The Attila   of the Anthracite," who sent his charging murderous hordes, the coal and iron   police, like the ride of the Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse, through the mining   patches cutting down, maiming, and killing all who stood in his way.[35]

The violence, murders, arson, and near anarchy which ruled these days are not in dispute. The causes, the culprits, and the motivations remain open to question. In the absence of new evidence about these events the truth will remain elusive. The victors wrote the story, but not necessarily the true story. The differences in historical interpretation are easily understood. The established institutions which condemned the Molly Maguires and largely wrote their history had much to lose from the
successful organization of labor. The W.B.A. was a local attempt at forming a labor union and was only beginning to understand its potential when the organization collapsed. Some of the Irish miners resorted to what their own ethnic struggles had taught them. The true nature of the Molly Maguires remains shrouded in mystery, but the struggles in the anthracite region reflected major changes in the American industrial landscape and foreshadowed the growth of the national labor movement.

---

[1] Kevin Kenny, "The Molly Maguires In Popular Culture," *Journal of American Ethnic History* 14,4 (Summer 1995): 28.

[2] William C. Kashutas, "The Molly Maguires: Fighting For Justice," *Pennsylvania Heritage* 13 (1987) : 5.

[3] Wayne G. Broehl, *The Molly Maguires* (London: Oxford University Press, 1964), 1.

[4] Harold Aurand and William Gudelunas, "The Mythical Qualities Of Molly Maguire," *Pennsylvania History* 49,2, (April 1982): 92.

[5] *New York Times*, 14 May 1876.

[6] Anthony Bimba, *The Molly Maguires* (New York: International Publishers, 1932), 21.

[7] Broehl, 108. Gowen, fighting the monopoly label, convinced the court to give the Reading R.R. control over certain East-West rail corridors rather than the Pennsylvania R.R. He was also Irish (non-Catholic), a Democrat, charming, and a resident of the area.

[8] Gowen acted as a mediator between the W.B.A. and the mine owners, getting all parties to agree to a sliding wage scale based on the market price for coal. This put pressure on the owners allowing a consolidation of capital which would eventually doom the union. This also worked to

keep the production at a high level, meaning more tonnage for the railroad.

[9]F.P. Dewees, *The Molly Maguires* (New York: Burt Franklin, 1877), 71.

[10]Allan Pinkerton, *The Mollie Maguires And The Detectives* (New York: G.W. Dillingham Co., 1877), 105.

[11]Despite the monopoly the Reading Railroad and Iron and Coal Co. held, the huge debt Gowen had incurred in buying so much coal acreage had leveraged the company to the hilt.

[12]Broehl, 348.

[13]Dewees, 34.

[14]Arthur Lewis, *Lament For The Molly Maguires* (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1964), 36.

[15]Bimba, 11 & 67.

[16]Court Of Quarter Sessions of the Peace for Schuylkill County, Pennsylvania, *Report of the Case of The Commonwealth vs. John Kehoe et al.* (Pottsville: Miners' Journal Book and Jobs, 1876), 230.

[17]Kevin Kenny, *Making Sense Of The Molly Maguires* (Oxford; Oxford University Press, 1998), 200.

[18]Bimba, 81.

[19].*New York Times*, 14 May 1876.

[20]*Philadelphia Inquirer*, 20 May 1876.

[21]Kenny, *Making Sense*, 172.

[22]*New York Herald*, 27 June 1877.

[23]Kenny, *Making Sense*, 187.

[24]Ibid, 205.

[25]Kevin Kenny, "The Molly Maguires and the Catholic Church, " *Labor History* 36,3 (Summer 1985): 346.

[26]Lewis, 10.

[27]*New York Times*, 11 December 1875.

[28]Court of Oyer and Terminer of Schuylkill County, Pennsylvania, *Argument of Franklin B. Gowen of Counsel for the Commomwealth* (Pottsville: Miners' Journal Book and Job Rooms, 1876), 22.

[29]Pinkerton, 322.

[30] Bimba, 76.

[31]Lewis, 36.

[32]Kenny, *Making Sense*, 213.

[33]Kenny, "Molly Maguires in Popular Culture," 30.

[34]Dewees, 355.

[35]Charles A. McCarthy, *The Great Molly Maguire Hoax* (Wyoming PA.: Cro Woods 1969), 34.

Die Deutsche Siedlung: The German Element in Southern Humbolt Township: Architecture of Compromise

Peter Noll

Peter Noll, a graduate student in the historical administration program at Eastern Illinois University and an inductee into the Omega Xi Chapter of Phi Alpha Theta in 2000 wrote this paper for Dr. Nora Pat Small's American Architecture class in the fall of 2001. This paper was also the co-recipient of the Lavern Hamand Graduate Writing Award.

"Let a man build and you have him. You may not have all he is, but certainly he is what you have."   *-Frank Lloyd Wright*

Studying architecture and the built environment helps us construct the individuals that made and used them and their society. The building furthers our understanding, but without written records, the architecture lacks context and thus meaning. This study of Humbolt Township examines both the builders and the buildings in conjunction, and uses both the written and physical records.

Beginning in 1863, individuals originating from northwestern Germany began to arrive in Humbolt Township, Coles County, Illinois. After initial settlement, prolonged immigration into the southern part of the township persisted well into the twentieth century. The German immigrants created a dynamic and sturdy rural ethnic community centering around Saint Paul's Lutheran Church. They expressed those values both in the homes they created for themselves and the church they created for each other in the last three decades of the nineteenth century and the first decades of the twentieth. By maintaining traditional German architectural practices while adopting other ethnic traditions, the Humbolt community created a German-American culture. Indeed, their house forms provide a series of snapshots of the acculturation process isolated within time; and prove in spatial terms the existence of a German-American culture in Humboldt Township.

--History/Demographics—

Who were the Humbolt settlers? At the age of 19, in the year 1852, Wilhelm (William) Mohlenhoff left Oldenburg, Germany, to arrive at the port of New Orleans. From there, he made his way to Tennessee where he was eventually joined by his younger brother Henry (Heindrich), and his younger sister Mary. In Tennessee the Mohlenhoffs owned and operated a truck farm and nursery. During the Civil War, soldiers confiscated two of William's four horses (the other two were not shod) and wiped out his truck farm. In 1863 William, Mary, and Henry journeyed North to a German community in Illinois that they had heard of called Dutchtown (now Teutopolis). It was here that William met John Henry Phipps, who lived near Lerna. Mr. Phipps told William of land being sold by the railroad in Humbolt Township. William then moved on to Humbolt Township where he purchased a quarter section for $11.00 an acre in 1863. What was to become "Little Germany" was underway.[1]

The subsequent immigration of Germans that followed the Mohlenhoffs, lasting into the mid-twentieth century, is a standard example of chain migration. Almost all of the individuals finding their way to Humbolt Township were either relatives or acquaintances of individuals already established in the township as illustrated by Elise Knebel who arrived in 1869. "The brothers wrote that they longed to see the parents again and that they had a piece of land for us across from brother William's."[2] Although individuals came from several different areas, the main concentration of people came from Franklin County, Missouri; Cincinnati, Ohio; Indiana; or Oldenburg a small duchy in northwest Germany. For example in 1873 four Nolte brothers came with their father from Cincinnati and in 1872, several Homanns came from Franklin County, Missouri. The early arrivals tended to come as family units, while later arrivals were more likely to be single young men. These bachelors would work for an established farmer within the German Settlement until able to start out for themselves; sometimes a marriage to a daughter of one of these farmers would establish these men as landowners. Henry Macke arrived at the age of sixteen in 1893 directly from Oldenburg, Germany, hiring out for Louis Blume and later William Mohlenhoff before building up a successful farm of his own.

Among the individuals there existed considerable diversity in the amount of time spent in America before arrival in Humbolt Township, some being born in the United States of immigrant parents, some born in Germany but spending several years in the U.S. before appearing in the German Settlement, and others coming directly to Humbolt Township from Germany. Between 1863 and 1900 I have been able to find 30 men with enough documentation to establish their origin.[3]

| Born in the United States | 6 | 20% |
| Direct from Germany | 4 | 13.3% |

Born in Germany, but having spent time in U.S. prior to arrival in Humbolt Township.	20	66.6%

Note that while 66% of the men had already spent time in the United States, the range of time runs from decades to only a few years.[4] Such information must be considered when examining the issues of the maintenance of cultural tradition.

--Geography--

Its sometimes seems as though every hamlet on the vast Midwest prairie lays claim to having the best farmland in the state in which it resides. Certainly such claims exist with regards to the land of southern Humbolt Township. The German Settlement does exist upon very fertile soil, however, it was not always so. The area was slow to be settled because it is predominately low land and many areas could have been more appropriately designated as wetland. Indeed, the relative undesirability of land that could not support crops without improvement helped the rapid establishment of land ownership solely by members of the German Settlement. The land also lacked timber for building and fuel. To remedy this, William Mohlenhoff bought forty acres of wooded land southwest of Cooks Mill.[5] With the exception of land bought by Mohlenhoff and Schroeder, who bought some of their property from the Illinois Central Railroad, all the rest of the acreage acquired was procured through purchase from individual landowners. Because the land needed improvement in the form of trenches or tiling to facilitate drainage to increase the productive capability of the land the original owners were probably more willing to sell. Although there were whole sections of land owned by members of the German Settlement, there have always been pockets of non-Germans existing within the community.[6] As a result, the Germans in Humbolt Township were not isolated from extra ethnic influences.

As one looks at the growth of the German Settlement, it becomes readily apparent that Saint Paul's Lutheran Church was both the physical and spiritual center of the rural community. Driving through the countryside today within the traditional bounds of the German Settlement one need only look in the right direction to see the spire of the church breaking the horizon and piercing the sky. As the Settlement grew and expanded it did so with the church as a focal point. Very few of the farms were more than three miles distant from the church. By constructing an *x* and *y* axis with the church as a focal point and the land divided into quadrants it is possible to lay out the directions in which the settlement grew based on the plat book maps between 1869 and 1913.

Table 2 illustrates that the German Settlement grew towards the northeast, the southeast, and the southwest. In any one of these quadrants there exists more than twice the amount of land owned as there was in quadrant 1 (the northwest quadrant, see page 14). The explanation for this might lay in the fact that the land west of the Settlement was possibly more desirable, and thus the original landowners less likely to sell, as this was the direction towards the small town of Dorans, only two miles away and through which the railroad tracks led to Mattoon. The railroad track, which runs at approximately a 70-degree angle off of the x-axis two miles west of the church, can also be seen to be a physical boundary, although there was a slight amount of land ownership on "the other side of the tracks."

Land Ownership In Acres

	1869	1893	Percent Increase	1913	Percent Increase Since 1893	Percent Increase Since 1869
Quadrant 1	520	881.18	69.46%	929.2	5.45%	78.65%
Quadrant 2	160	1600	900%	2605.3	62.83%	1528.13%
Quadrant 3	0	1172.7		2586.72	120.58%	
Quadrant 4	0	814		1964.81	141.38%	
Total	680	4467.88	557.04%	8086.03	80.98%	1,089.12%

Proximity to the church and to the other members of the Settlement were also strong factors in the layout of the community. These individuals applied concerted effort at maintaining this proximity. Although the distribution represented the standard disbursal mode for agrarian areas, the land was massed together as closely as possible. In her account of the early days of the Settlement Elise Knebel illustrates this point: "The sisters were all so close together that we could visit all of them in one day. Father lived only a year and nine months [after arriving in Humboldt Township] but he was so active that he walked to visit his children."[7]

It has already been established that the church, the primary social institution, was the physical center of the community. The current location on which the church stands was not the site of the original church. The original building

was built on donated land about a mile north of the current location in 1882. As the settlement grew and shifted southwards the location of the church was disproportionately inconvenient for congregants living further and further south of the church. The result was that the property on which the current church structure now stands was purchased and the old building was moved a mile south in 1892, only ten years after its construction.[8]

Even before the advent of the automobile, one mile was not a great distance. A half hour is a conservative estimate on the time it would take to walk such a distance, not an insurmountable task. The 1893 plat map shows that the furthest distance that need be traveled by the vast majority of congregants was three miles.

Fig. 1 Original Church Building, Built 1882

This was the same distance that many congregants were traveling as the community expanded into the 20th century. It would certainly have been both easier and less expensive for the congregation to have left the building where it stood, however the move may have signified something more than just convenience. By moving the church, the community re-centered its social and spiritual core. In doing this the community made a psychological statement in spatial terms. Individuals, while trying to maintain spatial unity, were bound by constraints to buy up land where it was for sale. The church, however, was communal and thus represented the community value code; by relocating the building to the physical center, they reasserted its central spiritual and social role. At the same time, the community maintained egalitarianism among its members by ensuring that no member was a great distance further from the center than the rest.

--Tradition--

The persistence of German culture provides a key indicator as to how, if, and when German individuals became "Americanized." Absorbed into the greater heterogeneous American cultural synthesis, many German practices became invisible, while others remained distinctly ethnic. Much of the writing on German immigrants in the nineteenth century focuses on the urban experiences, their social networks, and the efforts at maintaining German culture in the United States. The rural experience, as embodied by the residents of the German Settlement in Humboldt Township, must be assessed differently than the urban Germans. Rural Germans are less densely settled and thus social organizations are more rare due to the distance between famili___. ___ ___ ___ ___ and only identifiable, institutional network through which the individuals of th___ ___ ___ ___stitutional, the kinship association among the several families certainly must have resulted in a social network outside of the church.

Fig. 2 1893 plat: German settlement highlighted

Perhaps the use of the German language presents the most visible aspect of ethnicity. Services, records, and meetings of the church being held in German, and insistence by the members on a preacher who could speak the language best illustrate this. The German Settlement was never large enough to be isolated; the members of this community interacted and lived amongst non-Germans. With the majority of the members being either born in this country or living in this country for some time before their arrival in Humbolt Township, it can be expected that some of these individuals would eventually learn to speak English. Initially, after the church was formally founded in 1880, German was the only language in which services were held. Thirty-four years later, in 1914, it was decided that one service per month be held in English for those who could not speak German. In 1919, this ratio shifted to half and half between German and English services alternating Sundays. By 1922 all church business of was conducted in English.

Even though by 1914 there were still original settlers who were active in the church, there were some members of the German community who did not have a firm enough grasp of the German language to understand services in the native tongue. By 1922, it can be assumed that while some might still speak German, the majority of the community was able to communicate well enough in English. Freda Christen (born in 1915 the youngest daughter of Henry Macke, who came directly from Germany in 1893) remembered that her parents only spoke a few phrases of German in the household, mostly when they did not want her to know what they were saying.[9] It would seem that if the community deemed the maintenance of this tradition important, it would have been taught to the children. The early twentieth century is also the time period when the children of the original settlers, who grew up in the German Settlement, were entering their 30s and 40s, a time in life when they were probably becoming influential in their church and community. It would seem then that the persistence of the language and ethnic identity was not as important among the second generation. Any such assumption though must be weighed against external forces such as increased anti-German sentiment in the nation during and after World War I.

Another tradition that can be documented that is distinctly German was that of *jungfrauenkranz,* which loosely translates to "virgin's wreath." In this practice, a wreath and greenery are hung outside the house in celebration of a young bride's marriage. This practice can be documented in the Elise Knebel account. "In the year 1875 my husband's cousin, Johanna Knapke, came to us. She and Henry Nolte were married at Hoferkamp's. In the afternoon the entire congregation gathered at our house for the celebration. The evening before an arch had been erected at the gate with a wreath containing "Hearty good Wishes" in verse as was the custom at that time in Germany.[10]" This practice (figure 3) lasted at least until 1929. Freda Christen, whose sister is the bride in this picture, recalls that this might have been the last wedding in which this tradition was used.[11]

Fig. 3 Jungfrauenkranz 1929

The evidence so far presented suggests the persistence of ethnic [...] twentieth century; a trend also exhibited in the lists of names comprising the confirmation classes of Saint Paul's. By the 1930s children's names are more often Americanized, Heindrichs become Henrys and Wilhlems become Williams.[12] However, the written record does not leave us much else by which to judge the persistence of tradition within the German Settlement. Assuming ethnic persistence is the same in the architectural tradition as it is in others we might expect to see the same patterns in the buildings of the German Settlement. This would then support the argument that ethnic persistence faded during the first third of the twentieth century and by the 1930s, the German Settlement, while still retaining a sense of community, had lost much of what marked it as unique to the "English" world.

--Houses--

The German influence on German Settlement houses is not overt; there are no half-timbered or stone fences. The house forms are distinctly American vernacular. But several of the structures exhibit alterations of the standard forms, or hybrids. The methods of construction, specifically balloon framing techniques, may not have been completely foreign to these settlers as many were coming from north Germany. Charles van Ravenswaay notes in his book on Missouri Germans that, "In the North of Germany, where wood was scarce and expensive, the buildings were plainer and the rails were light."[13] A common theme running throughout the Settlement bounds is a general lack of ornamentation. The houses can be categorized into five basic subtypes: I houses, upright and wings, massed plans with hipped roofs (square plans), massed plans with gable roofs, and cross gable constructions of either one or two stories. Of the 25 extant structures that could have been built by the first or second generation there are five I houses, nine cross gable, two upright and wings, two massed plans with hipped roofs, three massed plans with gable roofs, and three other types that do not fit neatly into the aforementioned categories. The majority of the extant houses are not the initial house built upon a given plot of land, but a second more substantial house built to shelter growing families and illustrate the economic success of this agrarian settlement.

The first houses occupied by the members of the German Settlement were of course either purchased or built. If the early houses were purchased from non-Germans it is unlikely we would see any ethnic characteristics unless the structure was modified. Tempering the early housing efforts was the factor that capital was more likely to be spent acquiring fertile farmland than on the construction of an elaborate house. Freda Christen remembers that her father always used to say that money you spend on a house does not make you any money.[14] She went on to say that the drive was always to acquire more land; this fact is born out by the plat maps. When new settlers would come to the area, they would live with another family or rent a place until they build their own house.

Elise Knebel wrote of her and her husband's first house that it was built with the help of a carpenter in 1870 across from her brother William. The house measured 16 x 26 feet, and when they moved in the walls were not yet plastered.[15] The house is no longer standing, but judging by the few other accounts of the early houses, this basic structure seems to be fairly common, with the family adding on or building a new house as the family increased in size. The house William Mohlenhoff built across the road appears to be a similar structure. The building (Fig. 4) appears to be a modest framed one story symmetrical five-ranked structure with a gabled entry porch accented with decorated verge boards.

In terms of the chronology, the house types of the German Settlement generally mirrored that of other American folk housing.

The I house form, centuries old and of British origin, was in the twilight of its popularity, but was still commonly constructed at the time of settlement. The most recent example of an I house was built on section 11 sometime after 1893 and before 1913; the others predate this, possibly being built by non-German individuals before being purchased by Germans. The two upright and wing or gable ell houses represent a transition point to cross-gabled houses, a form which becomes predominant in the twentieth century. The first example of a cross-gable house appears in 1890 in the form of a single story building, the remainder (all but one of which are two stories) occur on land that was purchased between 1893 and 1913. The massed plans are positively identifiable as early as 1898 (possibly earlier) in the form of hipped roofed, almost square, buildings, and continue into the twentieth century in forms approaching the bungalow.

Finding spatial patterns is not easy with such a small sample of buildings on which to draw. However, some patterns do seem to exist (see figure five). The first and most obvious is that the only three brick structures, all of them massed plans, exist in section 22, the oldest part of the Settlement (quadrant 2). Four out of five I houses exist in quadrant three. Although there are a few cross-gabled houses close to the focal point, most of them, along with the three houses that do not fit neatly into any of the classifications, form a periphery. Furthermore, all but two of the cross-gable structures and all of the "other" houses are south of the x-axis, while all but one of the massed structures lay north of it. In quadrant 1, which has historically had the lowest amount of land owned by the members of the Settlement, there exists only one extant structure, that being adjacent to the x axis that borders quadrant four.

Common to all I houses, cross-gable, and upright and wing structures was the inclusion of a rear wing, often but not always of a lower elevation than the rest of the house. In the massed houses this rear wing was only seen in three out of seven structures. Subdividing the massed house classification, the boxy, hipped roofed structures both exhibited the rear wing and predate the other massed structures. Of the three brick houses listed as massed structures none exhibited the rear wing, while the remaining two wood structures were split.[16]

--Evidence of Ethnicity--

For evidence of ethnicity in the buildings of the German Settlement the exteriors of the structures are again called to give witness, telling us stories of their interior organization of space. The ethnic element of these houses, as mentioned earlier, is not overt. It has been shown that structurally these buildings are neither distinctive in form nor material nor method of construction. A number of reasons to explain this are possible. It could result from a desire to blend in physically with their non-German neighbors, it could be a result of mass-produced building materials readily available via railroad only a few miles away, or, it could stem from a desire to express the economic success these individuals experienced. Perhaps they did not really give the form of their buildings much thought, preferring rather to invest in profitable land, or by the time the extant structures had been built they had already spent enough time in the United States to begin to lose some of their ethnic identity and perhaps architecture does not the enjoy the same degree of traditional persistence as other customs. Many of the houses originally built by the early settlers no longer exist and other structures inhabited were not constructed, but purchased from non-Germans. Yet, within the extant houses there does exist both evidence of ethnic identity and acculturation.

This cultural persistence has been recorded in five standing structures and one that is no longer extant. In most cases, it manifests itself outwardly in non-symmetrical structure types that, in the Anglo-American tradition, tend to be symmetrical. It can also be seen in the addition of elements to create a symmetry that otherwise would not exist if the form of the exterior followed the function of the interior.

The lack of symmetry is exhibited in two structures, both of them I houses. By definition,

an I house is one room deep, two rooms wide, greater than one story tall, and split by a central hallway straight down the middle. This general floor plan created two rooms of equal or nearly equal size. While this form was very popular in England and across the United States, it was not as common on the European continent. A more typical first floor plan in Germany would consist of an all-purpose dining room/kitchen (*Wohnkuche*) running the depth of the house along side one or two other rooms. Entry would usually

be obtained through a door leading directly into the multi-purpose kitchen.[17] This is, of course, impossible to do given the textbook definition and constraints of the I house. The simple solution to the problem for the immigrant family who is used to a certain organization of space, but who also want a fashionable (or culturally nondescript) house, is to slightly offset the front door. This then allows entrance directly into the kitchen or another room while eliminating the central hall.

The other type of accommodation using Anglo house forms is the creation of a symmetrical façade masking an asymmetrical interior. This trait has been documented in many areas that exhibit concentrations of ethnic Germans.[18] There are three extant houses in the German Settlement that do so. They accomplish the task by having two front doors instead of one. If the floor plan holds true (which would be the only reason for having two front doors) then the resultant creation is a house that has one front door leading directly into one room, while the second door leads into another; again there is no central hall. Most often, only one of the front doors is used.

Fig. 7 Double door houses

three of them have chimney stacks still standing. It is important to note that all of these stacks are centrally located. It is much more common for houses with central hallways to have end chimneys. Also, these five houses represent an example of two I houses, a boxy, massed structure, and a massed structure. The only house type not represented are the cross gabled house which does not easily facilitate such adaptation. The Macke house torn down in 1953 helps to illustrate how an individual can compromise with a non-ethnic design to fit within cultural traditions. Henry Macke worked for L. Blume and W. Mohlenhoff until he acquired enough capital to purchase his own farm. Sometime between 1905 and 1910, he added on to the house that he had purchased. The original structure was basically an I type. Before the addition was put on the existing structure was picked up and rotated ninety degrees clockwise. Then a six-room addition of what was to become the front of the house was added.[19]

Why did Henry Macke put two

doors on the front of his house? The simple answer was that he did not want a central hall, but instead wanted direct access to the living spaces of his home just as he probably had experienced in Germany less than twenty years earlier. The Mackes wanted the exterior of his home to be fashionable, but they wanted the inside to provide a sense of comfort and familiarity. What is ironic is that according to Henry Macke's daughter, most everybody always used the back door anyway.[20]

--Church--

It is impossible to ignore or escape the influence of Saint Paul's Evangelical Lutheran Church on the physical landscape or as a social organization. The Elise Knebel account from 1924 on her remembrances of the early days of the Settlement (beginning in 1869) makes references throughout to the church, illustrating the importance of the church to a community that, in a very real sense, *was* the church. The congregation was formally organized in 1880, although religious services had regularly been held in the houses of the various congregants well before that. The construction of the original church building and its subsequent change of location have already been discussed. In 1905, the brick structure that currently stands was built.

Contemporary newspaper accounts are rife with praise for the new building that was constructed. The *Journal Gazette* – November 20, 1905 stated, "St. Paul's Church was erected by one of the wealthiest rural communities in Illinois, and in points of general architecture, taste, elegance, and size it probably has no peer in the country nor in any cities of less than 50,000 inhabitants."[21] Perhaps the newspaper description was prone to sensationalism; however, it was at least partially true. The total cost of the church was $15,000 dollars, a great deal of money in 1905, that was raised by members of the German Settlement to construct for themselves both a house of worship and in a less tangible but no less real sense, an identity. The church, with Romanesque elements, illustrates fairly standard religious architecture. It is important to note that while the houses of the German Settlement are relatively unadorned and plain the church is quite the opposite. The Settlement people were more likely to use their money in the purchase and improvement of land than in the adornment or aggrandizement of their houses. However, when it came to the house of God and a house for the community the members were generous and felt the need to elevate the form of their architecture to the function of the building. This massive

brick structure is the best evidence of the strength and vitality of the German Settlement.

--Conclusions--

Do the domestic structures of the German Settlement demonstrate the existence of an ethnic population in the process of acculturation? Does the persistence of ethnic architectural habits mirror in time the fading of other cultural traditions? Based on existing evidence one might suggest that this is true. Although the surviving German-built or occupied structures that support this line of thinking fit well into the chronology, they are the minority of structures extant in the community. Another factor to be considered is what seems to be the complete cessation of building, or at least a drastic reduction, during the Great Depression, the beginning of which roughly correlates with the diminishment of other cultural traditions. This gap further hampers the efforts at a neat and tidy supposition.   No single motivation can explain the building patterns and practices of the German Settlement, how these individuals organized the spaces in which they lived. There exists a plurality of causes, yet it seems clear that ethnic tradition did contribute to the decision making process and help maintain a sense of community in the rural landscape.

Notes

[1]   Elise Knebel. Recollections of the time since she came to America in the year 1869. February 17, 1924. Located in Charleston Public Library, genealogy room, Charleston IL: February 17, 1924.

Henry Macke. Account of the early days of the German Settlement given to Coles County Historical Society. 1963   Coles County Historical Society institutional records.

[2]   Knebel, 4.

[3]   While the number of men coming directly from Germany may be higher due to single individuals arriving to work as farm hands, the number of women coming who had spent time in the United States or were born in the U.S. is slightly under represented as there are accounts of men from the German Settlement traveling to Missouri and Cincinnati to bring back brides. Although of lesser proportions, there exists documentation showing single women coming directly from Germany and single men coming from other locations in the U.S.

[4]   For more detailed information, see appendix 1. Most of the data in Appendix 1and thus Table 1 was found in the History of Coles County, 1876-1976 family histories section of the book. Documentation was also gleaned from the Elise Knebel and Henry Macke accounts.

[5]   Macke, 1.

[6]   For detailed illustration of land ownership see accompanying 1869, 1893, and 1913 plat maps.

Nichols, Ronald <u>Historical Plat Maps of Coles County, Illinois</u> (Charleston, IL:The Society, 1982).

[7]   Knebel, 4.

[8]   *Brief History of St. Paul's Ev. Lutheran Congregation*, *Fiftieth Anniversery*. 1930.

[9]   Christen, Freda. Personal interview. November 20, 2001.

[10]   Knebel, 2

[11]   Christen interview.

[12]   Growing Together in Christ 1880–1980, St. Pauls Lutheran Church. Mattoon.

[13]   Van Ravenswaay, Charles, The <u>Arts and Architecture of German Settlements in Missouri</u> (Columbia and London: University of Missouri Press, 1977), 147.

> Ravenswaay writes much on the architecture of Franklin County Missouri, a heavily German area from which several of the Humboldt Township residents migrated. However, the architecture is very different in Franklin County with half timbered, stone, and masonry buildings being common. That area of Missouri has a much more abundant and readily available supply of stone for building than does Coles County, which partially explains why they did not duplicate that architecture in Illinois.

[14]   Christen interview.

[15]   Knebel 1,4.

[16]   For pictures of the houses see appendix 2.

[17]   Glassie, Henry, "Eighteenth-Century Cultural Process in Delaware Valley Folk Building," in Upton, Dell and John Michael Vlach ed, <u>Common Places: Readings in American Vernacular Architecture</u> (Athens and Georgia: The University of Georgia Press, 1986) 406, 407.

[18]   For more information, consult the following sources.

   Glassie, 406-407.

   Peterson, Fred W. <u>Building Community, Keeping the Faith: German Catholic Vernacular Architecture in a Minnesota Parish</u> (St. Paul: Minnesota Historical Society Press, 1998) 44, 45.

   Touart, Paul B. "The Acculturation of German-American Building Practices of Davidson County, North Carolina." Wells, Camille ed. <u>Perspectives in Vernacular Architecture, II</u> (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1986) 73-76.

   Van Ravenswaay, 145-177.

   Chappell

[19]   Floor plan drawings created by Freda Christen and were digitally altered by the author of this paper to represent the changes in the structure over time.

[20]   Freda Christen interview.

[21]   <u>Journal Gazette</u>, November 20, 1905, front page as excerpted in Saint Paul's 100th Anniversery Publication.

Bibliography

A Brief History of St. Paul's Ev. Lutheran Congregation. 50th Anniversery, 1930.

Census of Population Records for Coles County, Illinois, 1880. [Microform] Washington
    D.C.:   Bureau of the Census, 1982.

Coles County, Illinois Genealogical Society. The Prairie Sleeps: Cemeteries of Coles
    County Illinois, Volume II, Humboldt, North Okaw, and Matoon Townships. Coles County, Illinois Genealogical
    Society, 1985.

Glassie, Henry. "Eighteenth-Century Cultural Process in Delaware Valley Folk
    Building." Upton, Dell and John Michael Vlach ed. Common Places: Readings in American Vernacular
    Architecture. Athens and Georgia: The University of Georgia Press, 1986.

Growing Together in Christ 1880-1980, St. Paul's Lutheran Church. Mattoon, 1980.

Knebel, Elise. Memoirs. Translated by Alma Homann. Charleston Public Library
     Genealogical Room, Charleston IL: February 17, 1924.

Ladd, Martha Catea, and Constance Schneider Kimball ed. History of Coles County,
    1876-1976: Coles County Illiniois. Charleston and Mattoon Bicentenial Commission, 1976

Macke, Henry. *Account on settlement of German community in Humboldt Township*
    reported to Coles County Historical Society. Board Minutes of Coles County Historical Society, 1963.

McAlester, Lee and Virginia McAlester. A Field Guide to American Houses. New York:
    Alfred A. Knopf, 1988.

Nichols, Ronald. Historical Plat Maps of Coles County, Illinois. Charleston, IL:
    The Society, 1982

Peterson, Fred W. Building Community, Keeping the Faith: German Catholic Vernacular
    Architecture in a Minnesota Parish. St. Paul: Minnesota Historical Society Press, 1998

Van Ravenswaay, Charles. The Arts and Architecture of German Settlements in
    Missouri. Columbia and London: University of Missouri Press, 1977.

Thomas. Richard L. Chicken Tommy and Other Stories. Mahomet, IL: Mayhaven

Publishing, 1994.

Trommler, Frank and Joseph McVeigh, ed. <u>America and the Germans: An Asssessment</u>
     <u>of a Three Hundred-Year History</u>. Vol. 1. Philadelphia: University of Philadelphia Press, 1985.

Touart, Paul B. "The Acculturation of German-American Building Practices of Davidson
     County, North Carolina." Wells, Camille ed. <u>Perspectives in Vernacular Architecture, II</u>. Columbia: University of
     Missouri Press, 1986.

Interviews

Christen, Freda. Daughter of Henry Macke, immigrated to Humboldt Township in, 1893.
     Personal intverview, November 20, 2001.

Degler, Marylea. Genealogist having done much research into the German Settlement.
     Personal interview, October 31, 2001.

British Education in the 1930s: A Focus on *The Road to Wigan Pier* and *The London Times*

Kelley Eyre

Kelley Eyre, a recent graduate of Eastern Illinois University with teacher certification in social science, wrote this paper for Dr. Newton Key's British History class in the spring of 2001. She was inducted into Epsilon Mu of Phi Alpha Theta in 2001.

George Orwell's *Road to Wigan Pier*, focuses on many divisions among English society during the 1930s. The worldwide depression affected huge numbers of unemployed in both industrialized and rural districts throughout England. Orwell 's book reveals the truth behind the doleful lives of the unemployed individuals desperately trying to survive, "Their job seemed to me so hopeless, so appalling that I wondered how anyone could put up with such a thing when prison was a possible alternative."[1] Industrialization produced "labyrinthine slums," a "dirty little country," and a rapidly spreading epidemic of suffering and struggles amidst thousands (17, 109). And yet, Orwell does not believe the real problem is the Depression, unemployment or even industrialization. Instead, the real problem is the class-based society in which he lived.

Orwell points to the problem of differences between the classes in relation to employment, housing, and education. Working and living conditions, disease, even food revealed a split in society between the lives of the lower and upper classes. As a member of the "lower-upper-middle class," Orwell compares himself to members of the lower classes (137). Moreover, it was in school that his class-based distinctions became entrenched. Orwell affirms that when he "was fourteen or fifteen, I was an odious little snob" (137). He refers to the effect of specific class distinctions he experienced as a young English schoolboy, "At school I was in a difficult position, for I was among boys who, for the most part, were much richer than myself, and I only went to an expensive public school because I happened to win a scholarship" (137). Orwell reflects upon his school days and notes that he "despised anyone who was not described as a 'gentleman'" (137). According to Walter Arnstein, "Because boys were enrolled as young as eight or nine, public schools encouraged both self-discipline and independence from immediate family ties. Their most important product was 'the character of the English gentleman's."[2] Industrialization not only brought about a series of changes to the social structure of England, but further penetrated the class divisions in education during the 1930s. George Orwell maintains that the class distinctions of England during the 1930s posed a major problem.

Was Orwell correct? Was the class-based educational system the problem? This essay compares his understanding of Britain's schools with that provided by the *Times* in the 1930's. After reviewing several articles from *The Times*, it becomes evident that the editors and reporters focused principally on the upper classes, and ceased to engage themselves with issues of education concerning the lower classes. Class was, indeed, paramount in the British educational system.

Distinctions existed in the way education was provided to different divisions of society in England. The private schools (fee-paying), paradoxically called "public," offered a quality education to their students. And, as with other class distinctions in English society, a large inequality existed between the students who attended these schools and those who attended state-funded schools. Throughout his investigations and experience, Orwell testifies that "rent and clothes and school-bills are an unending nightmare" (124). One concerned parent even wrote to the editor of the *Times*,

Sir--In these peculiar times, when harassed parents find it increasingly difficult to keep boys at public schools, it would not seem unreasonable to suggest that public school executives might by the exercise of economies in certain directions lend some aid."[3] Moreover, the author of the letter states that the Public School Boards convey an atmosphere of "callous disregard for parental interest. We hear so much of the need for economy, but the public school executives do not appear to have heard of it, or, if they have, it has left them stone cold." Almost one month later, the joint committee of the four secondary associations expressed its regret at the action taken by the Government (titled Circulation 1424) with regard to free places and fees in secondary schools:

The revolutionary extent of the changes foreshadowed is made clear from the following figures:--according to the latest official statistics, there are at present approximately 200,000 free places in the 1,367 schools on the Board's grant list, this figure representing 44.3 percent of the total number of pupils. The present free places will no longer be

free unless the circumstances of the parent satisfy the 'Means Test,' the low level of which will inevitably cut into a large proportion of pupils from the struggling middle class home so adversely affected already by the economic crisis".[4]

Consequently, governmental action such as Circulation 1424 continued to strain middle and lower class families due to the harsh requirements demanded by the Means Test.

Orwell comments that the working class had a quite different view of education from the other classes, "And again, take the working-class attitude towards 'education.' How different it is from ours….Working people often have a vague reverence for learning in others, but where 'education' touches their own lives, they see through it and reject it by a healthy instinct" (116). He progresses onward by remembering the days when he observed fourteen year old boys working at "dismal jobs" (137). Orwell regards the "doom of a job" a dreadful burden upon anyone by the age of fourteen (116). But the teenage working-class boys seem to desire to leave school. They want "to be doing real work, not wasting his [their] time on ridiculous rubbish like history and geography" (116). According to a newspaper article titled "Public Schools and the Poor," a large demand for scholarships by the lower classes led to for the proposed creation of scholarships for elementary schoolboys at public schools.[5] Most likely, students from the lower class aspired to continue their education in hopes of improving their knowledge in any direction and to take an intelligent interest in the world around them. The *Times* takes a stand on the issue of 14 scholarships by reporting,

> If this discretion is widely and generously used, there should be a risk that those most likely to profit will be thrown prematurely into industry because all the places in secondary schools are occupied by those who can pay full fees.[6]

For the first time, the *Times* suggests that students from the lower classes should be able to enter private schools. Regarding the previous observation from the November 26th edition of the newspaper, many intelligent individuals would lose the opportunity to enter a private school due to the high tuition fees. Therefore, such students would get thrown into a factory job, without the prospect of continuing their education.

Orwell proves thought that money accompanies happiness more so than an education: "I should say that a manual worker, if he is in steady work and drawing good wages--and 'if' which gets bigger and bigger--has a better chance of being happy than and 'educated' man" (117). Again, Orwell is relaying his upper class attitude that the typical worker does not strive for an education. However, in 1932, the number of applicants for the Miners' Welfare Scholarship Scheme was 723, an increase of 51 candidates from the previous year.[7] The total amount of money paid toward the scholarship fund reached £1,376,338 in 1932, which was awarded to miners as well as their children. Furthermore, the *Times* supports the Miners' Welfare Fund, "Close the door to the opportunities of the poor and you are bottling up forces which will blow you to destruction."[8] Proof of the success of educating boys part-time at their employment is as follows:

> Having started to earn their own living, the young employees are much more interested in opportunities for further education… Parents say that the young people are better behaved and 'easier to handle' at home… Managers say that the young people are better morally, better disciplined, more interested and more conscientious in their work, are better physically, and are more skilled at their job.[9]

Students enrolled at school had proven to be more well-rounded individuals. The student's success in the classroom rubs off into his or her everyday encounters enhancing life skills such as commuication, organization, and cooperation. Furthermore, classes at colleges for the unemployed became popular in the 1930s. The Working Men's College in Camden Town enrolled nearly 500 unemployed men in classes of education and physical training. The college taught language, arithmetic, handwriting and spelling to men mostly "half being under twenty-five years of age."[10]

In *The Road to Wigan Pier*, Orwell supposes, "there is no place in the world where snobbery is quite so ever-present or where it is cultivated in such refined in subtle forms as in an English public school…Your snobbishness… sticks by you till your grave" (137). Mr. Frank Fletcher confirms Orwell's opinion of the arrogant public school officials. At the annual meeting of the Incorporation of Headmasters in London, Fletcher joked, "The public schools, are open to everyone--like the Ritz Hotel".[11] Obviously, the lavish hotel was only accessible to those families who could afford such costly rates. The upper classes defend that their public education is superior because of the spirit and intimacy among the students. Lord Middleton even quoted

> Whenever public schoolboys met in any part of the world there was a feeling of comradeship in the feeling that

they had been to a British public school. Thanks to the public school training we were able when the Boer War broke out to enroll 4,000 men in the army, and they turned out to be excellent officers in a very few weeks."[12]

Furthermore, Lord Middleton gave insight, "One cannot help thinking that whatever the difficulties of this country there is a public school system and the public school spirit which will come to help us through them."[13] He argues that the educated were the strength of the industrial country. Orwell further states, "As one example out of many, take the public school code of honour, with its 'team spirit' and 'Don't hit a man when he's down,' and all the rest of that familiar bunkum" (165). The Times defends the value of the public schools and the strength of school spirit.

The boys were taught to work, and to wish to go out into the world and face their just responsibilities. Moreover, there was instilled in all of them a spirit which continued all through life-- a desire to render useful service to their country and fellow beings, outside and beyond school or office hours.[14]

Is this "spirit" and loyalty to the nation only found in high-priced public schools? Of course, old male Dovorians or Etonians were proud of their school and wanted their sons to have the same opportunities and privileges they themselves had enjoyed. Nevertheless, does this mean lower class families did not want the best for their children? The *Times* made clear the respectability and inequalities among the classes. While the *Times* features stories regarding "The Old-School-Tie Spirit" ["The old school tie is a jolly good thing"][15] and "Hats Off!" ["His mother, inculcating a moral lesson, bids him to remember that it is not the coat that makes the gentleman, but the top hat"],[16] stories regarding the state-funded schools were of different matter: unquestionably reflecting that of a lower societal class. For example, Dr. F.H. Spencer described twenty schools he visited while in the Midland country

Fifteen of them…ought to be blown up… Half of them had no internal water supply at all… Not one school had a hall… There were few schools in the north of England where heating was adequate… Children were often too cold to be educated.[17]

Although the Times supports that "the investment [to repair schools] would be one of permanent value," it clearly gears its articles toward middle to upper class membership as it printed hundreds of articles regarding public schools.[18] One reader addresses the editor of the *Times*,

The weakness of the public school system is its class basis, and that it would make for a healthier social community if this could be widened… If it [public school education] is valuable, then it should be made as widely accessible as possible, but this could only be done by the expenditure of public money.[19]

The same subscriber mentions that the public schoolboy of the 1930s "does not walk into a job just as he used to" but has to enter the arena of life just as others while competing "with his fellows from every type of school."[20]

The outbreak of World War II left many unemployed males in England without any opportunity to educationally advance. The *Times* discloses their opinion in a 1939 article, "Many employers have already declared that they cannot take boys of eighteen who are likely to be called away [for military service] just when they are becoming useful to their firms."[21] If the boy cannot earn a living and if his parents cannot afford further education, what is he to do? Four years earlier, in October of 1935, the number of unemployed persons between the ages of fourteen and twenty-one years of age in Liverpool was over 13,200. As the *Times* projected, "In the immediate future the numbers are likely to be considerably increased owing to the high-birth rates in the years following the War."[22] One method to decrease the unemployed among the young was to increase the school-leaving age.

The most profound impact upon education in the 1930s was the passage of a national system of education. To assist society as a whole, three essential elements were provided. First, it granted nursery and infant education for children through the age of seven. Next, junior education was provided to students up through the age of eleven, and finally, post-primary education was provided up to the age of fifteen years of age.[23] This was a significant change from the Education Act passed in 1918, which fixed the school-leaving age at fourteen.[24] The *Times* noted the new system of national education "would add to the efficiency of our industrial system: it may help to bridge the gulf now fixed between one class of the population and another."[25]

The educational system in Britain was in need of change because its new industrialized society could not survive without educated labour. The educational system flourishes once it is recognized that it (education) prepares

not for Utopia but for the world; it must serve the community as well as the individual. Throughout the 1930's Britain's class distinctions were evident, however improvements were later made in the state-funded schools. The *Times* laments their opinion

> The nation of to-day faces prospects for which education must make full provision: it cannot disregard international anarchy, low physical standards, and the plight of the juvenile unemployed, to mention only three of the tragedies of this generation.[26]

Of course, even today, the secret of training for such citizenship had/has not yet been fully discovered. According to the Times, such training can not come from books, sermons, or lessons, but instead, it will be achieved by effort, moral and physical strength. Finally, the *Times* contends

> This is the next great task for the educational system: to provide from childhood through adolescence an education for the body which will also educate the spirit in self-discipline, self-respect, and willing service.

> There could be no greater task for a Ministry than this.[27]

Consequently, by the close of the 1930s, the *Times* begins to advocate a new consideration on the subject of education. Whereas the once staunch patrons of the wealthy classes and expensive public schools, the *Times* enters its support upon new changes and improvements in England's educational arena. Although change can be seen as both negative and positive, Orwell suggests that the pathways to this change were not so bad after all. As Orwell writes, "especially as I sometimes saw in my childhood before the war, when England was still prosperous--that reminds me that our age has not been altogether a bad one to live in" (118).

---

[1] All references to *The Road to Wigan Pier* are parenthetical. George Orwell, *The Road to Wigan Pier*, (New York, 1937), 10.

[2] W.L. Arnstein*, Britain Yesterday and Today: 1830 to the Present*, (Lexington, 1996), 93.

[3] "Public School Expenses," in *The Times*, (10 Aug. 1932), 6.

[4] "Secondary School Fees Again," *The Times*, (24 Sept. 1932), 11.

[5] "Public Schools and the Poor," *The Times*, (20 April 1935), 8.

[6] "Secondary School Fees Again," *The Times*, (24 Sept. 1932), 11.

[7] *The Times*, (21 Feb. 1999), 9.

[8] "Teachers' Laments," *The Times*, (19 April 1933), 13.

[9] "The Day Continuation System," *The Times*, (7 Jan. 1935), 13d.

[10] "Education for the Unemployed," *TheTimes*, (5 May 1933), 11d.

[11] "English Spirit in Education," *The Times*, (4 Jan. 1932), 12b.

[12] "Spirit of the Public Schools: Lord Middleton's Tribute,"*The Times*, (6 March 1933), 14.

[13] Ibid.

[14] "Value of Public Schools,," *The Times*, (2 May 1933), 16.

[15] "The Old-School Tie" Spirit,,"*The Times*, (12 Jan. 1939), 10.

[16] "Hat's Off!,"*The Times,* (14 Oct. 1939), 9.

[17] "School Environment" in The London Times, (8 Jan. 1937), 14.

[18] "School Environment" in The London Times, (8 Jan. 1937), 14.

[19] "Public Schools: To the Editor of the Times" in The London Times, (6 April 1935), 8.

[20] "Public Schools: To the Editor of the Times" in The London Times, (6 April 1935), 8.

[21] "Service After School" in The London Times, (24 Nov. 1939), 9c.

[22] "Young Persons and Unemployment: Serious Problem in Liverpool" in The London Times, (26 Feb. 1935), 11g.

[23] "A National System of Education: Stages Outlined by Head Teachers" in The London Times, (18 May 1939), 18d.

[24] "Schooling After Fourteen" in The London Times, (12 Jan. 1935), 13c.

[25] "How Many Years at School?" in The London Times, (21 Feb. 1935), 13e.

[26] "A New Deal for Youth" in The London Times, (10 April 1939), 11d.

[27] "A New Deal for Youth" in The London Times, (10 April 1939), 11d.

Angela Stanford is a graduate student in the historical administration program at Eastern Illinois University. She was recently inducted into the Epsilon Mu Chapter of Phi Alpha Theta. This paper was written for Dr. Terry Barnhart's 20th Century US Cultural History Class in the fall of 2001.

"The Price Asked and the Price Paid By Soldiers in Vietnam"
By: Angela Stanford

"Seriously, though, Pete, please take care of yourself and don't be a hero. I don't need a Medal of Honor winner. I need a son. Love, Mom"[1]

How many other mothers shared the same thoughts as First Lieutenant Peter Mahoney's mother as they wrote to their own sons stationed in Vietnam? How many nervously answered the telephone or read through the mail worried that it may bring news of their child's death overseas? Roughly 60,000 parents of American soldiers realized their worst fears during the Vietnam War;losing their children. Thousands more mothers and fathers received their sons back, if they were lucky, physically intact, while others, though alive, returned to their families with bodies full of holes and scars and perhaps missing extremities. Nearly all of these men carried psychological scars. Most civilians were ill-prepared to receive these men back into their homes, and into society as a whole, because of the emotional damage they had sustained as soldiers.

The men who came home were not the same men who had gone away. The vets knew they were different and each sought understanding, but found few who cared to listen. Vietnam had become a dirty war, something immoral and wrong, and those who participated in it were viewed by many at home as disgraceful and undeserving of respect. Throughout the next several pages, the reader will see the extent to which soldiers suffered during their tours of duty, and how that was compounded by their return to the States. These experiences helped create some of the anger, pain, and controversy that still surround the Vietnam War. One will also see how and why some soldiers became involved in antiwar protests themselves.

United States' involvement in affairs in the small Asian country of Vietnam began in the 1940s. By the end of Eisenhower's presidential term, roughly 5,000 men were stationed in the country. By 1968, a critical and controversial year in the war during which Lyndon Johnson was president, that number had skyrocketed to over 500,000.

Vietnam was a different kind of war in a number of ways. Perhaps most obviously, it was the first war fought under the watchful eye of the world via television news cameras and reporters. People at home could keep up on the

current happenings overseas, and some knew as much about military positions, strategies, and body counts as they did about the daily weather forecast and the hometown news. This war differed also in that the type of combat required differed completely from that of World War II. Soldiers fighting in the latter had had clearly defined combat lines, knew who the enemy was, and knew why they were involved in the war. The soldiers in Vietnam were fighting under unfamiliar conditions in a strange land that had different weather patterns and geographical features. Vietnamese civilians were sometimes as much the enemy as a soldier in uniform, and combat lines simply depended on the day. They saw "unrelieved combat,"[2] and there were no fixed goals to work toward. Victories were measured by greatly distorted body counts—if a United States soldier found a dead Vietcong who had a gun, he was credited with six kills, one for the body, five for the gun.

One veteran described the overall situation well: "The nights were worst of all…there's absolutely no lights; it's kind of a very alone experience. It's like tellin' you to go out and fight Charley with a slingshot, and you know that the only friendly ground is the piece you're standing on that very moment."[3] Although the majority of veterans returning home made proper adjustments and led productive lives after the war, some veterans did suffer from serious emotional distress as a result of the constant fear, uncertainty, and confusion they faced daily when in the bush. Coming back to the "world" proved difficult for them after having been so isolated and constantly under such stress, and society was unable to understand the behavior they witnessed. Support for veterans stood in lowly comparison to that which World War II veterans received upon their return home.

Many soldiers were proud to be serving their country in whatever way requested. In a letter home, Sp/4 Peter H. Roepcke, from Glendale, New York, explained, "Sure I want to be home with you and have all the things we dream about. But yet being here makes a man feel proud of himself—it shows him that he is a man. Do you understand? "[4] Another man, PFC John Louis Brown, wrote to his sister shortly after missing her wedding due to his tour of duty in Vietnam. He, of course, would rather have been part of the event, in the presence of family and friends, and enjoying a time of celebration and joy, but instead he was fighting a war halfway around the world. In this particular letter, PFC Brown gives a rather noble reason for being in Vietnam.

> I have a far greater task at hand that will ensure that not only my sister, but everybody's sisters
> can get married in the church of her choice, have children, and instruct them in the religion of
> their parents, send them to the school of their choice. Until this is done for the whole world,
> brothers like me can't possibly be at their sister's wedding.[5]

The Vietnam War, one can argue, was often misunderstood by those not stationed there. The confusion of the war, the blurred enemy lines, the constant uncertainty of enemy identity, and the always-present threat of death was enough to defeat even the strongest men, and many did succumb to the terrors of the Vietnamese jungle. The average

age of the Vietnam veteran was between 19 and 20.[6] They were still children, not men prepared to fight a war such as this. They were "plucked from city streets, farms, and small towns, often possessing only a high school education and little experience of the world."[7] The government had told the public that the war was to help the people of Vietnam, to help them resist the communist forces, and to help educate them in better agricultural practices so they could sustain themselves. The young men joining the ranks of the U.S. military had no reason to question their superiors. "It's nothing I can't handle,"[8] Sp/4 Robert Devlin said confidently in a letter home. Not long into soldiers' tours, though, most realized they had become a part of something much bigger and more complicated than they had expected.

A lack of understanding about the purpose of the war and disagreement with those in authority over them was common among men stationed in Vietnam throughout the duration of the war, but especially during the last several years. Some men interviewed after Vietnam said that had they known what Vietnam was really all about, they never would have enlisted in the first place, or at the very least would have taken on a shorter term. Others noted that the South Vietnamese, whom United States soldiers were instructed to protect and help, did not want American troops there at all. Some soldiers felt that the Army's intent was good and they were proud to be serving, despite having some reservations and questions. A Marine veteran, Paul Atwood, believed

> There's nothing wrong with love of country, but I get afraid of where that feeling leads….It was clear to me that the Vietnam veteran was being scapegoated for the war, that collectively the United States had called upon vets to go and do something and then had turned its back on them afterwards.[9]

Feeling that their own country abandoned them devastated many soldiers.

The feeling of abandonment was very common and evident in the many letters sent home. Letters kept soldiers connected to the world back home, to their families, and to anything that resembled the reality that no longer existed for them in the jungle. Corporal John Houghton wrote to the mother of a fallen friend and said this:

> We're all in desperate need of love….Some nights I don't sleep. I can't stand being alone at night. The guns don't bother me—I can't hear them anymore. I want to hold my head between my hands and run screaming away from here.[10]

Holidays and birthdays were especially difficult for the men, and certainly for the families left at home. No one felt the separation and hopelessness quite as acutely as the men in Southeast Asia.

In war, killing in the name of duty became almost as ritualistic for some as putting on a pair of boots, and Vietnam was certainly no different.

> The frightening thing about it all is that it is so very easy to kill in war. There's no remorse, no theatrical 'washing of the hands' to get rid of nonexistent blood, not even any regrets.[11]

Seeing killing and destruction from both sides desensitized men to the loss of life that they caused. "Men who do not expect to receive mercy eventually lose their inclination to grant it,"[12] remembered one veteran.

Some soldiers, of course, never developed a mind for killing. They had a difficult time accepting the brutality of it.

> After a firefight I felt drained and empty, it seemed pointless. Our battles were never decisive and tomorrow always came with the welcome of surviving one day only to have to face another.[13]

Another man spoke about the constant fear everyone felt.[14]

The ever-present reality of death invaded men's minds and went with them to the battle ground and did not leave them when they were lucky enough to get some sleep. Faces of fallen friends or mutilated bodies of the enemy were continuous images. Sp/5 Richard Cantale had to identify a man brought in from the field, and it was only after finding the man's dog tags that Cantale was able to do so. It was the body of his friend Rankin.

> After I left the place, I sat down and cried. I couldn't stop it. I don't think I ever cried so much in my life. I can still see his face now. I will never forget it.[15]

Young men saw blood and fear everyday, but had no idea how to deal with it. Many had not yet lived themselves, and gained experiences needed to begin to understand these types of things. Most, as mentioned before, were young, in their late teens and freshly out of high school. War for them had only been glory stories from World War II veterans. Despite these horrendous conditions, young men formed friendships within their ranks, and it killed them each time one was lost to the enemy. The following quote from one veteran who stood over a dying man from his patrol is especially poignant.

> It ran through my mind for a moment, "Did his mother feel something, did his father feel something, did anybody? Was she reaching for a can of peas in the supermarket and feel a tug or a jolt and not know what it was? Does anybody close to him know that he just died?"[16]

The prospect of returning home excited and relieved men after having been away for so long, but it also terrified many of them. Most had read the accounts of antiwar protestors standing in airport terminals greeting returning veterans by spitting on them. They had heard stories about vets who had gone home before them and were called baby killers. Many had received letters from wives and other family members telling them they could not wait to have them home so all their lives could get back to normal. What was normal now, though? These men had fought invisible enemies and the elements for months, and had been basically isolated entirely from home, from "the world," and now they were expected to just fall back into their place in society. "When your time gets near, it sort of scares

you because you know in your heart that you're not like the people back home. It's a funny feeling to be afraid to go home."[17] Some men worried about whether or not their own families would want to hear their war stories, and if they did have an opportunity to share them, would those at home understand? What would loved ones think of their sons after learning of some of the horrible things they had participated in? "I'm pretty proud of my last year…but they mean very little to anyone outside that group of Americans who have been over here and who have been through it."[18]

Most often, soldiers returning to the United States were flown here alone or in small numbers, and many of them were simply left at the airports with their families. There was no time to decompress, to unlearn the ways of living that had been normal for however long they had been gone. There were also no welcoming committees at airports, no big town parades celebrating their return, and no songs thanking all of those dedicated men who had given so much. The few who still had time to serve after being released from service in Vietnam went to bases in the States and finished their terms. There they had time to calm down, think out what had just happened, and come to terms with as much of it as possible. One can argue they readjusted to civilian life easier than did their counterparts who returned to their families directly after being discharged.

Stereotypes about the Vietnam veteran abounded throughout the Sixties and into the Seventies as men returned home. Many people viewed these new veterans as crazed killers who were on drugs, mentally unstable, and incapable of loving.[19] Veterans were hard pressed to find sympathetic ears and often turned to each other and to psychiatrists in order to cope. Others turned to the world for comfort. "Nights I went to local bars, trying for a fast pickup and lay, dating every chance I could, and spending all my money…I had trouble sleeping."[20]

Veterans' families often found it too difficult to cope with stories of war in Vietnam and they chose to ignore that anything had happened. They asked sons and husbands not to discuss their time in the bush, and uniforms were quickly stuffed into closets to help everyone forget. Some of the men who came back opposed to the war also found their families turning against them. One veteran just home from the war tried to talk his younger brother out of signing up for service in Vietnam. He was asked to leave the home, and both the brother and the father refused to speak to him again. Only his mother seemed to understand.[21] Unfortunately, this was not an uncommon thing for veterans.

Faced with society's indifference, uneasiness, and outright rejection and gripped by their own troubled memories of the war, thousands of veterans lapsed into silence.[22]

Throughout Vietnam, the antiwar movement did not restrict itself to the general public at home. Just as it began losing ground at home about 1968, opposition to the war actually grew among the ranks of the soldiers

themselves. Certainly it seems unexpected that those who were fighting opposed the war. Were they not supposed to be the citizens most filled with national pride and a sense of loyalty and duty? Reading accounts from many of them, one sees that in fact most veterans did not agree with the war, that most did not feel it was just, but fought anyway because it was their duty, the American thing to do, or because they were unable to bring themselves to resist outwardly and join any form of protest. Sp/4 John Riggan wrote home saying, "The longer I am here, the more my hatred of war grows…the tragedy is the price that I see reclaimed daily, and my only hope is that someday it can be justified."[23] Disagreement with U.S. involvement did not confine itself to the lowest ranks of soldiers. Even those in higher positions agreed, as did one sergeant named Phillip Woodall, who wrote his father that he was there because "I'm a soldier and it's my job and there are other people depending on me. That's my excuse. That's all I have, theories and excuses, no solutions."[24]

However, some men did become active participants in the protest against the war and voiced their opinions clearly. " 'It was every revolutionary's dream: to get the soldiers to lay down their guns.'"[25] The group Vietnam Veterans Against the War organized in 1967, and became a very active and visible antiwar vehicle. One of the common complaints men made was the lack of support they felt from Washington.

> They put us in a war that was as unwinnable as it was immoral. They put us into a war that even they could not explain, and so young men died for old men's pride.[26]

They felt that if the war was so important, so justifiable, why did the politicians not send their own children? Why only send those from the classes below them that had no way to protect themselves?

> These weren't the educated kids, these weren't the kids sitting around intellectually singing hootenanny songs. These were guys who were disenfranchised and oppressed and they were taking it up. That's what made the GI movement such a threat.[27]

As veterans returned home, the controversy continued.

Some men applied for conscientious objector (C.O.) status and were assigned to non-combat positions. Many hours were spent on KP duty and more spent in medic areas cleaning up after the wounded and dying that passed through everyday. Michael Senecal, who obtained C.O. status and was sent to Vietnam to assist in a medic area, remembered not receiving any serious mistreatment with the exception of a few minor instances in Vietnam, but still felt the pressures and disgust other men felt.

> Some of my daily tasks consisted of scrubbing blood, intestines, brains, and human matter in general from the canvas litters outside of the emergency room…the entire 'feeling' that a war zone emits disturbed me so entirely that, even today, I at times feel psychologically disoriented.[28]

One of the more organized military protests was in the United States among the ranks of men at Fort Jackson in Columbia, South Carolina. "The striking thing about Fort Jackson is its grotesque resemblance to a small American town."[29] Women could be seen carrying groceries down the sidewalks, and railroad tracks divided the place like any normal town, and yet one saw military men marching everyday, filing past them in formation. Fort Jackson had swimming pools, gymnasiums, theaters, libraries, and so on amongst the barracks and training fields. It was there that Private Joe Miles formed an antiwar group called GIs United Against the War in Vietnam. Miles had been an activist before being drafted into the war in 1968, and after beginning his term of service he continued to write to his political authorities about his views. Authorities transferred Miles to another base within a few weeks, but not before he had founded the group. After Miles' departure, other men took over leadership positions and before long, the group had a large following.

The name of the group was intended to convey the group's ideals. They wanted it to be clear that all races and nationalities were welcome, and that all of these men stood against the war. The name was to be respectable and recognizable enough so that simply mentioning it would cause someone to understand who was being referred to.[30]

GIs United began as a group of black men gathering to discuss such things as racial equality, oppression of the working class, and certainly the oppression of GIs. They felt the ranks of soldiers being called on to fight in Vietnam were unfairly weighted toward the lower classes, also a complaint among civilian protestors. As more men became interested in the group and began attending meetings, the group became racially diverse and grew in strength. Private Jose Rudder, one of the men involved, said this about white men joining in:

> We were first committed to instilling pride and integrity amongst the ranks of our brothers, and at the same time we were committing ourselves to the antiwar struggle and…as white GIs they would have to understand and accept this as white men, and they did.[31]

Base officials, aware of the group's presence and growing influence, tried to stifle its impact on base by passing a regulation that no more than eight men were to be gathered in any barracks at any given time because of the danger of URI, Upper Respiratory Infection. The men recognized the effort to disband the group, but continued to meet and educate people about the war and why it was wrong. Later, Private Joe Cole claimed:

> The meetings were tremendously impressive. There was a profound respect. Although most of the people in the meetings, either white or black, had had no organizational experience, no one spoke out of turn. [32]

On March 20, a group of men happened to be outside talking with each other and joking around, when the discussions turned toward more serious matters. More men gathered around to join and an impromptu GIs United meeting of about 200 or so men took place. Though the officials said nothing that night, four men were put in

stockade the next day. Five others were also taken into custody, but one man, Private John Huffman, one of those five, was soon released after officials revealed that he had been an informer sent in to spy on the organization and bring back to them useful information they could use to disband the group. The other eight, Privates Cole, Andrew Pulley, Jose Rudder, Delmar Thomas, Edilberto Chaparro, Tommie Woodfin, Dominick Duddiek, and Curtis Mays were labeled the Fort Jackson Eight and charged with "demonstrating in uniform, demonstrating without approval of the post commander, disrespect to an officer, and breach of the peace."[33] All initially faced courts martial and ten years of hard labor at Leavenworth if the courts found them guilty. Through the use of some of the best lawyers and legal council, charges against all eight men were dropped. Six of them received undesirable discharges.

The Fort Jackson Eight, like other groups both organized and otherwise, exercised their rights as citizens to protest the war. They held peaceful demonstrations, tried to circle petitions within their vicinity, and even called media attention to their cause, making it nationally known that the GIs United were soldiers against Vietnam. Part of the Students for a Democratic Society's Port Huron Statement describes well what GIs United were trying to combat with their organization, and what other groups also hoped to accomplish through their efforts.

> Although mankind desperately needs revolutionary leadership, America rests in national stalemate, its goals ambiguous and tradition-bound instead of informed and clear, its democratic system apathetic and manipulated.[34]

Vietnam has never officially been called a war, but one would have a difficult time trying to convince many of the almost three million veterans who served there that it was not. The service performed there is worthy of respect, and veterans deserve and need understanding. Only in the last twenty or so years has the war really been looked into and seriously studied in order to better understand it and the men who fought. Many of those who were there still suffer from nightmares and flashbacks, and depression and feelings of guilt are still present. "I'll never understand what I did in Vietnam and what happened and why. I'm now trying to forget."[35] Many have never really returned —for them the war is still going on. Others have made new lives, but will never forget what happened and what part they played. The men who came back missing extremities or handicapped in other ways have arguably had an even more difficult time adjusting and learning. Countless men who served lost someone close to them, and dealing with that alone is one of the toughest parts of healing. Just as the men who were killed or missing in action will not be forgotten, nor will the war or the land called Vietnam.

> "Once you were a strange, alien name…
> then you were a small, damp green hostile land
> where…I…nearly died
> Now you are…a part of me."
>
> –Jan Barry[36]

[1] Bernard Edelman, ed., *Dear America: Letters Home From Vietnam* (New York, 1985), 4.

[2] Myra Mac Pherson, "A Different War," in *The American Experience in Vietnam: A Reader*, ed. Grace Sevy (Oklahoma, 1989), 60.

[3] Murray Polner, *No Victory Parades: The Return of the Vietnam Veteran* (Chicago, 1971), 21-2.

[4] Edelman, 121.

[5] Ibid., 230.

[6] Fred Wilcox and Jerold M. Starr, "The Wounds of War and the Process of Healing," in *The Lessons of the Vietnam War*, ed. Jerold M. Starr (Pittsburgh, 1999), 261.

[7] Paul Boyer, *Promises to Keep: The United States Since World War II* (Massachusetts, 1995), 312-3.

[8] Edelman, 3.

[9] Willa Seidenberg and William Short, ed., *A Matter of Conscience: GI Resistance During the Vietnam War* (Massachusetts, 1992), 4.

[10] Edelman, 208.

[11] Ibid., 106.

[12] Robert J. Mc Mahon, ed., *Major Problems in the History of the Vietnam War* (Massachusetts, 1995), 256.

[13] Seidenberg and Short, 8.

[14] Edelman, 118.

[15] Ibid., 207.

[16] Boyer, 313.

[17] Edelman, 301.

[18] Ibid., 286.

[19] Ibid., xxxv.

[20] Polner, 12.

[21] Ibid., 80-1.

[22] Christian G. Appy, "American Veterans and the Antiwar Movement," in *Major Problems in the History of the Vietnam War*, ed. Robert J. McMahon (Lexington, Massachusetts, 1995), 518.

[23] Edelman, 228.

[24] Ibid., 225.

[25] Todd Gitlin, *The Sixties: Years of Hope, Days of Rage* (New York, 1987), 236.

[26] Boyer, 314.

[27] Seidenberg and Short, 56.

[28] Alice Lynd, ed., *We Won't Go: Personal Accounts of War Objectors* (Boston, 1968), 245.

[29] Fred Halstead, *GIs Speak Out Against the War: The Case of the Ft. Jackson 8* (New York, 1970), 16.

[30] Ibid., 55.

[31] Ibid., 33.

[32] Ibid., 33.

[33] Ibid., 13-4.

[34] Boyer, 293.

[35] Polner, 128.

[36] Robert Jay Lifton, *Home from the War: Vietnam Veterans, Neither Victims Nor Executioners* (New York, 1973), 265.

International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers Local 309 and the Fate of American Construction Trade Unions, 1965-2002.[1]

Louis Baczewski

Louis Baczewski, a senior history major at Eastern Illinois University, wrote this paper for Dr. Edmund Werhle Fall of 2001. It was part of an independent study project and received the Alexander Hamilton Paper Award.

"The word around the IBEW (International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers) was that if you could not find work in the United States or Canada you could go to East St Louis."[2] IBEW Local 309 in East St Louis had a reputation throughout the country as a strong local. It controlled the work and provided above average working conditions in its jurisdiction. 309 cooperated with its state and local legislators and could count on a vast array of jobs due to the regions industrial prospects. In the mid to late 1960s the work picture could not have been better for all trades in this region, and across the country. Unemployment was at an all time low; in 1968 and 1969 "rates fell as low as 1.6 percent for electricians while the other trades had similar rates."[3] Low unemployment coupled with the building trade's relative monopoly on the supply of skilled labor amounted to a contractor's worst nightmare. In this period, organized labor had the upper hand in this struggle and hence the ability to make significant wage and benefit demands. Yet these exceptional times would prove to be a double-edged sword.

Local 309, like trade unions across the country, lacked the manpower in the 1960s to meet the demand generated by government-funded projects. In effect, the entire country was in a construction boom and skilled journeymen were in great demand. Contractors were dependent upon unions to provide enough skilled labor for the many projects developing around the country. Construction unions looked outside of their own membership to fill this labor void, taking on "permit workers" or "white tickets"[4] who were not fully accepted into the union, but worked on union projects. Local 309 used white tickets when there was too much work for the local men to handle. Yet, when worked slowed in the 1970s, these ticket workers lost their jobs.

What seemed as a period of opportunity, was in truth a time when trade unions created their own worst enemy: non-union competition. This problem began when the prosperity of the 1960s era ended, and the white ticket workers were "put back on the street." Due to the bargaining power that construction unions gained during the 1960s, contractors and corporations alike became increasingly resentful of union power. The prosperity and negotiating strength that unions took for granted during the late 1960s would soon be compromised. When the unions failed to organize the white tickets after the prosperity of the 1960s subsided, corporations saw the opportunity to capitalize on the available workforce. These white tickets received on the job training, but were excluded from union membership. Unions would not accept these ticket people, so non-union firms did so.

The repercussions caused by these exclusionary practices, which were made in unions across the country, were not as harmful in local 309's region. As IBEW locals and other trade locals throughout the United States began to fall apart, 309 stayed strong. Yet, local 309 was still plagued by a mentality of exclusion, which characterized most trade locals. Only their tough reputation, infrastructure, and political clout enabled them to survive. Former 309 business agent[5] Mike Faust suggested that, "the local did not want too many members, for they wanted to keep the work in a confined group, selfishness on our part perhaps. No, not perhaps, surely it was selfishness."[6]

This mentality would destroy many unions across the country once the difficult economic times of the 1970s and 1980s coincided with a corporate and conservative governmental collaboration to undermine unions. Union market share dwindled since the 1970s and as construction jobs increased, union memberships stayed relatively static. Anti-labor legislation and corporate attacks combined with construction unions' self-inflicted wounds resulted in a battle for the very survival of organized labor. Trade unions had become increasingly anachronistic in their methods; old school ideologies hindered change or even the recognition of an existing threat. By the 1980s, the non-union threat could no longer be ignored or dealt with through intimidation or violence. All of these aforementioned threats combined with the drastic economic changes of the past 40 years have led unionists to the realization that they must either change or perish.

Using local 309 as an example, this paper investigates the economic crossroads of the 1960s and the effects of this turning point on the present day. The "country club" mentality, which was characteristic of most trade unions, was no different in local 309. Yet local 309, unlike many trade locals across the country, survived: the question is why? The reason seems to be 309's strong cooperation with local and state legislators as well as a relatively

diversified and abundant work picture in their region. However, local 309 was still hindered by the membership's exclusiveness and unwillingness to change, organize, or do smaller commercial and residential work. Despite the amount of work and cooperation with legislators, 309 now realizes that change must come if it wants to survive. Eventually, the determined and skillful leadership of the local was able to make great strides, but even those officials seem to wonder if it is too little too late.

--The Sixties--

During the mid 1960s, the construction boom reached national consciousness. As President Lyndon Johnson said in May 1964, "Construction wages are rising too fast, to the dismay: of home-buyers and home makers, who have to pay through the nose for plumbers carpenters, electricians, etc; of other workers who feel these decentralized unions are getting away with murder."[7] Although unions saw it differently, St. Louis also fad a construction boom. In November of 1966, the Local 309 submission to the *Electrical Workers Journal* headlined as, "Many Traveling Brothers Helping Local 309." The local was overrun with work and could not handle the influx. The article boasted that at least 200 men were working on Granite City Steel foundry alone. By 1967 with the construction of a basic oxygen furnace and hot strip projects, the Granite job would carry an estimated 700 electricians.[8] All the while, the local industrial complexes of Monsanto, and Ethyl in East St Louis, had an estimated 100 to 200 men each. Around the same time, major commercial jobs were also underway. The entire Southern Illinois University Campus at Edwardsville had been under construction since mid 1965 and would be until the early 1970s. By 1967 the Federal government announced a ten million-dollar project on near by Scott Air-Force Base, a five-year powerhouse job was begun in Baldwin[9], and Granite City announced another seven million-dollar project.[10]

Consequently, most of the 300 Local 309 wiremen were forced to serve as foreman or crew leaders, and the rest of the workers had to be found elsewhere. The first option to fill this void was to use "traveling brothers," journeymen IBEW members who travel to find work in other locals typically during boom times when overtime is involved or to find a local with a better pay scale. [11] But travelers, for the most part, sought overtime work and a sizable amount of these jobs were only 40 hours-a-week. Since this economic boom was raging all across the country at this time, many travelers went somewhere else. "A fella [traveler] may have worked for you for a day, six hours, whatever…when he found out there was no overtime, he quit the job," explained one 309 foreman.[12]

With few options, local 309 allowed contractors to hire off the street, under the condition that they would pay them the prevailing wage. These men hired off the street were called ticket help or white tickets. The region was so desperate that for electricians that one contractor in Granite City began to advertise on St Louis KMOX radio in order to find workers. Men were hired in Granite City, promptly put on a company truck, and then taken to the hardware store to buy their hand tools. The tool cost was deducted from their first paychecks and they were put to work.[13] At this point, there was so much work, that experience was helpful, but hardly necessary for being hired. Former BA Mike Faust who was second in command on the Granite City Steel BOF project, remembered that his crew, was comprised of only one journeyman the rest were ticket workers.[14]

From 1966 to late 1969, this boom continued. Work eventually tapered off in 1971, to the point where only a handful of travelers or white tickets were employed in the 309 area.[15] The boom died, but in those few years, drastic changes had occurred that which changed American union strength forever. The hiring of white tickets to fill the work void was used across the country and in every trade from carpenters to boilermakers. When the economic boom ended, the ticket help was put back on the street. Former BA, David Foree recalls:

> The mistake we made was, [from the ticket help] we took no working dues, we took no working assessments: we did not allow them to become members, we basically taught them the trade and then we said, "we don't have any use for you." And the mistake was made that we should have taken in, at least, those who were qualified, and we would not have the non-union competition we have today, and basically all the crafts did the same thing… It didn't make a difference what part of the country you were in…those men, had been taught skills now, and they were going to go on making a living like everyone else.[16]

This portended trouble. Yet few even considered expanding the membership of Local 309, and any local for that matter: this was not even seen as an option yet alone a necessity. The union now admits its shortsightedness and the desire for a "country club" atmosphere within its membership. Union members were confident that if they

restricted their membership they could control the trade.[17] The members worked to remain exclusive, in part because the 1960s had proved to be a great victory, due to union's success in winning their wage demands. Hence the unions felt no need to expand their memberships and instead kept their work in a confined group of established members.

This mentality combined with the fact that the unions controlled the market share at the time perpetuated indifference among union members. The average journeyman had no reason to fear any loss of work except in relation to normal fluctuations in construction. Most locals did not want to expand their membership at the risk of putting themselves out of work. Even as early as 1942 an IBEW member had complained that, "there is an appalling lethargy on the part of our organization. Trade school graduates were flooding the market for electricians, yet the old-timers refused to organize them."[18] One 309 man commented that before his admittance to the local in 1956,"there was a period for about 10 years that the local did not take one apprentice."[19] The old union idea of "there is only so much work to go around" was in a sense logical, but it hindered change, which became more and more necessary after the 1960s. Even after this boom time subsided, as former business agent, Mike Faust recalled, local 309 "did not organize 10 people in that period, 309 was horrible about organizing. We didn't want to organize…our membership did not want the man in charge to do it [the BA]….50 percent was because the membership didn't want it, and 50 percent was my own fault…we were all at fault."[20]

One major problem was the rampant nepotism in local 309 and in all construction trades. "The bad thing about nepotism is, that to say that because my father was a good electrician and loved the trade, just because my name is the same as his, then I am going to be good. No! I might be the biggest damned dud to ever set foot in the local. And I can think of some who left a mark on my mind that will never be erased" commented former assistant BA Don Schmeder.[21] "Eighty percent of the people in the industry were relatives of some sort up until the mid 1960s."[22]

Change did come in 1966, when the JATC (Joint Apprenticeship Training Committee) was created in local 309. "The advent of the JATC brought an end to all that nepotism, it was the best thing that ever happened to us, we had a hard time believing it, but it was a fact."[23] This new committee comprised of both contractors and union members selected apprentices, placing more on the basis of qualifications rather than on mere name recognition. The union now had to work with their NECA (National Electrical Contractors Association) contractors to choose the apprentice candidates, consequently the best candidates were now taken. In addition, the federal government would step in, under the Free and Fair Employment Act (Civil Rights Act of 1964), in an effort to end discrimination as well.

"In 1970 IBEW local 309 signed a Consent Decree with the federal government, stating that although we had not discriminated in the past, we would continue not to discriminate in the future."[24] The basis for this legal action was 309's "violation of civil rights failing or refusing to make reasonable steps to eliminate racially discriminatory policies and practices.[25]" Shortly after the signing of this decree, 309 accepted its first black member into apprenticeship. Eventually, the federal government would enforce guidelines that dictated how the structure of the apprenticeship program would have to operate. Eventually, the federal government would monitor every apprenticeship program.[26]

While these changes did bring much needed reform, the problem with the white tickets was not addressed: between 250 and 300 had worked in 309's jurisdiction alone.[27] In essence, there were as many white tickets as there were members in the local in the late 1960s. Not one of these white tickets was brought into membership. Former BA Mike Faust suggested that most of these ticket workers were "Boomers"[28] who moved on to someplace else. "They were informed that they were just guests here, and only a few stuck around and tried to set up, but they eventually failed. We made them understand that they were only guests here."[29] 309 relied on its image to deal with non-union workers and ticket workers.

As Mike Faust stated, "We use to have a very rough reputation, very rough; rough as in don't mess with us."[30] One such example of the local's toughness was revealed when Mike Faust described how he dealt with a group of recalcitrant travelers:

> There is a group of IBEW members called the fleas…they are travelers… and they come and try to establish their rules, hoping to dictate, policies, practices and procedures [undermining the local authority on the job]…At the BOF job they were really bad, in fact they even had meetings. I found out

about one of their meetings [and] went into that tavern. There was ten or twelve of them in there. And I said, 'say you all know who I am, my name is Mike Faust, I'm working on this job right over here. If any of you guys, in here, are on that job, over there, and you are not out of this place in two minutes, you're fired tomorrow. And any of the rest of you guys that don't like it, well meet me over in the parking lot, right now, and I'll take you one at a time till you're all done. You son of a bitches aren't gonna light here.' So, you would be surprised, [we] had no more fleas on that job…That's how you have to do things some times. I don't put up with that shit and I don't expect our people to put up with it…You can't be nice to somebody who is tearing down your conditions.

Scare tactics and a tough reputation were enough to quell the threat for a time. Most "old timers" would not discuss such tactics, but clearly intimidation was used. This imposing image was not developed by word alone and it is obvious that 309's visage was a formidable defense in it of itself.

Despite this reputation, some white tickets remained working in the smaller union shops doing smaller residential work, which most wiremen hated to do. Mike Faust stated that "one [white ticket] worked for 37 years, and we would not take him in. There were 6 or 7 ticket people that were in shops for a least 10 years and they were still there when I left [the office of BA (which he held between 1970 and 1990)], but they were never organized."[31]

Yet, many union wiremen and linemen refused to perform the smaller residential and commercial work. "Our guys would not wire houses; it was like sending them to their deaths, nobody wanted to do it. Most small shops usually consisted of… travelers and ticket people"[32] Assistant BA Artie Minor agreed: "We had a problem with our wireman and our contractors leaving the small work to the non-union."[33] In addition, one major problem with ignoring residential work was, "just about anybody can do it…a non-union contractor can go in with a minimal amount of training and become productive at it in a short time."[34] During times of construction decline, smaller work like residential served as a savior helping workers make it through the tough times. But since it was increasingly ignored in the 1960s and 1970s, the unions' residential market share decreased. To give an example,

"Phoenix Arizona…had three or four powerhouses [heavy industrial] going at the same time and all the local men ran to the powerhouses. And when the powerhouses were done: they were done! They are now making a total package of about 18 bucks an hour, recalled 309 BA Dave Foree."[35]

Local 309's present total package is around $38.39 an hour. The difference between a $18 total package and $38.39, drives home the importance of not ignoring the small projects.

One example of other tensions in the union was, as East St. Louis became poorer and more violent in the late 1960s, the business office wanted to relocate. The membership refused and resisted a dues increase to pay for a new union hall. It took a nearby shooting for the membership to finally agree to the dues increase needed for relocation. According to one member, the only reason that the hall finally relocated was because a man happened to get shot near the hall and stumbled in for help during a union meeting. "If that guy hadn't got shot, we would still be down there."[36] In 1968 the 309 submission to the *Electrical Worker*, revealed that 309 had broken ground for a new hall in Collinsville.[37]

Members resistance to the relocation was not the only rank-and-file problem. It was difficult for the business agents to accomplish much in the way of change, including organizing campaigns, because the membership resisted almost anything, especially anything that involved a dues increase. Assistant BA Don Schmeder stated that, "whenever you were going to vote for an increase in dues, we didn't have enough chairs in the hall, here they come, and they're all mad. But we always had enough chairs at a normal union meeting."[38] Issues of money were always a problem for the business office. For example, Don Schmeder stated that, "I had an oil change once, it cost $15, a member said 'don't you think you could have got that done cheaper some place else.' I responded, do you want me to spend time looking for the cheapest oil change, or would you rather I worked on union business."[39] Resistance to change coupled with the problem of ignoring the smaller work and not organizing, eventually resulted in severe problems.

<center>--The Seventies--</center>
"Most observers agree that as late as 1970, nearly 80 percent of total construction dollar volume in the United
[40]

States was performed under union contract. Today this figure is probably closer to 30 percent or less." In 1969, a construction users anti-inflation commission was formed, it eventually came to be known as the Business Roundtable. Its members were chief executives from 200 major corporations, "with the expressed goal of restoring order to an industry that they perceived to be out of control."[41] The commission represented the major corporations of General Motors, General Electric, Exxon, U.S. Steel, Dupont, and many other major companies, who wished to undermine the trade unions control, because of inflated labor costs.[42] The Business Roundtable worked to create a non-union force to serve the corporations by subverting collective bargaining. The mentality on the local level allowed this to occur. Unions had held so much control that they were unaware and unwilling to realize the problems that would soon develop. Major corporations soon worked to build non-union competition across the country.

Even as early as 1970 IBEW president Charles Pillard warned that," if the old head in-the-sand policy regarding the very real problems facing the building trades are continued, disastrous days lie ahead for organized tradesmen…these large contractors would not hesitate to go open-shop to stay in business. And they certainly intend to stay in business!"[43] Although the international office gave warnings, no major non-union organizing campaigns would be initiated in the IBEW until 1987. In any event, the 1970s would prove the beginning of the end of the AFL-CIO's hold on the construction trades. Local 309 survived while many locals' collective bargaining crumbled even so, the local still faced a treacherous road. The 1970s proved difficult as the economy weakened and competition grew; the 1980s proved even worse.

In February 1971, the *Electrical Worker* entry from 309 headlined, "Local 309 hopes for improved work scene."[44] The amount of work decreased for both the inside[45] and outside[46] branches of the trade at this time, but most men were working. However, by March of 1972, "more wiremen were out of work than at any time in recent history."[47] Available work declined during 1972 for Local 309, forcing the local to implement its first 32-hour workweek.[48] The reduced workweek was effective, but there were still times when as much as 40 percent of the local was laid off.[49] Layoffs mounted throughout 1972 and continued into 1973 and 1974.

The country was facing a recession and an economic stagnation. Foreign competition lay at the heart of many of the challenges. A section of the *Electrical Worker* stated, "that the United States suffered the equivalent of a net loss of 900,000 jobs because of rising imports and the movement of American production overseas between 1966 and 1971."[50] The 1973 oil embargo made matters even worse, because of inflated operating costs. This increased the corporate resolve to aid the rise of the "open shop" to battle the union due to the corporate conflict with "overpriced union labor."[51]

As early as June 1969, an article in the *Electrical Worker* from local 309 expressed concern about the growth of the "right to work movement," which aimed at enacting anti-union laws. The article pleaded with younger workers to realize the implications of "right to work," claiming that out of 19 of the right to work states in existence at that time, only one had a average income above the national average. But, the article offered no means to deal with this problem with except to call upon Congress to repeal section 14 of the Taft-Hartley Act, which permits compulsory open-shop laws. And Local 309 still did not implement any new agendas for organizing. Instead they sought to expand their political work to raise money for COPE (AFL-CIO political action committee) and work with their local legislators. The union consensus at this time was that non-union was non-skilled, and not a rival to union craftsmanship.

Despite the economic problems plaguing most of the country at the time, there were still some opportunities for journeymen to travel to other locals to find work. Some locals did have work opportunities and the 309's 32-hour workweek proved quite successful.[52] This shortened workweek allowed more men to be put to work by reducing each mans hours. The local survived as work fluctuated in 1974 and 1975, but work became more difficult to find yet again in 1977. The local faced strikes and layoffs in 1977 and 1978 and severe winters slowed construction to a crawl. Yet, still no major changes were initiated to curtail the growth of non-union outfits. In many cases Illinois building trades were able to still hold on, due to the strong union relationship with state and local legislators. This relationship enabled Local 309 an ability to fight anti-labor legislation, an option that many US locals did not have, or failed to recognize. This cooperation also gave unions the ability to secure federal, state, and local projects.

In any event, new forces such as the ABC (Associated Builders and Contractors), the CIU (Congress of Independent Unions) and the Brown & Root Company were gaining strength. Each of these organizations aimed to directly combat AFL-CIO union work. Conservative legislators and corporations created the mock unions of the ABC

and the CIU in order to undermine construction unions, by essentially repealing the Davis Bacon Act. The Act is "a 1931 law that sets wage standards on all federally funded projects in order to prevent the government from depressing local wages in the competitive bidding process."[53] It protects the prevailing wage laws on the federal and state level.

The prevailing wage was and is set by those who have the greatest preponderance of work, and since unions typically held the greatest amount and kept records of their work, they were able to set wages on federal work in labor friendly states. The ABC worked to create a separate prevailing wage for itself and undermine the AFL-CIO. In Illinois, however, they met resistance due to the trade's strength in the legislature.

In the southern petro-chemical belt, the Business Roundtable mobilized a non-union work force of former white tickets, who had been denied union access. The Roundtable began to aid these inadvertently union-created, non-union workers and deliberately select the non-union construction companies in order to undermine the unions. Since the unions would not organize these individuals, the opposition did. As Artie minor assistant BA and organizer started:

> When the Business Roundtable got together and decided to selectively target this work [electrical construction] to deliberately non-union companies, the non-union companies had a work force because they went right to the permit people. And the permit people had no allegiance to the union, so they went straight to work for these companies and had the skills, and that's where the work stayed. Then they slowly, but surely, dried up those really good union areas that were down south. These areas were very unionized, in fact, their wages were higher than those in the north, which is unheard of anymore because of all of the right to work down there.[54]

In this petro-chemical corridor, "between Brownsville and Biloxi, there are [presently] 1.3 million non-union construction workers… some 280,000 of them ought to be in the IBEW."[55]

In the South, the utter union failure was ominous, but areas such as Illinois still held on. Yet they found the 1980s increasingly more difficult. The cooperation with Illinois legislators provided 309 with a safety net, so it was able to fend off the non-union juggernaut during the trying times of the 1970s and 1980s. Local 309 fared better for it lacked the large-scale ticket worker problem that other regions faced. They also did not have unsympathetic legislators in their region. Yet, 309 still had a multitude of problems.

--The Eighties--

Work for local 309 in March of 1982, was "at an all time low…100 wiremen and apprentices were off and 30 lineman and apprentices were off."[56] This was part of a nationwide trend: between 1981-1982 unemployment rates for:

> Construction workers was 14.5 percent to 19.4 percent, well above a national percentage of joblessness which had reached a 41-year high in April 1982 of 9.4 percent. The number of joblessness reached a 44-year high in April 1982, 10,307,000 workers. The number of business failures soared to 17,043 the highest in 20 years.[57]

Local 309's entry in the *Electrical Worker* advised other IBEW members to "contribute to COPE, help all you can, and register to vote and then vote."[58] Because of the state of the country at this time, there was little to no work for anyone, and construction, is typically the first industry to suffer. During the slowdowns in the 1970s there were still certain areas in the country where journeyman could travel and find work, but "the bad thing about the 80s was that there was no place to go… the whole country was in a depression, as far as the construction industry was concerned."[59] One 309 wireman stated that in the early 1980s, "for a 2-year stretch I missed about a year's worth of work… over a third of our local was off."[60]

To add to the problems, the Reagan administration helped build non-union competition through administrative cooperation with corporations and non-union groups such as the ABC. "Between 1979 and 1988, ABC officials and their allies managed to repeal mini Davis-Bacon laws in nine of the 41 states that enacted prevailing wage provisions."[61] Such efforts resulted in an annual 7.5 percent wage drop within those nine states.[62] As Mike Faust explained,

The first major threat that we had was in the 1980s, we had pockets of non-union before that, but nothing like what it was like then. It was an invasion… they were getting help from national politics as soon as Reagan got in. He was a very fine actor, he acted real well as president, he acted real well in his B movies, and he acted real well to cut our throats and cut our wages. He helped out the non-union cause as much as anyone in America, through his absence of knowing what was going on and listening to all the corporate people.[63]

As Don Schmeder suggested, " we had a lot of diversification, a lot of these locals that fell apart only had one product, or one field to work in. Maybe just manufacturing in one specific plant, so when that plant went down the tubes, so went that local. If there was no work in the country you could always go to 309."[64] Yet, a stagnating economy combined with the anti-union political atmosphere created a desperate picture for trade unions across the country. As manufacturing and industry began to falter, or move overseas, Local 309 lost much of its strength. While other locals fell apart due to this destruction of the manufacturing all across the country, 309 endured. Local 309 began transforming from an industrial-based local to a commercially-based local. Despite hard times, 309 still resisted organizing.

Especially in hard times, the idea of taking on more men seemed ridiculous to the membership. Mike Faust, BA between 1970 and 1980, commented that, "I am guilty of not organizing, but I thought I could control it… but that's not true. [The IBEW] was pushing by word alone. They were not aggressively telling you to organize, the reason being, it is in the constitution that you are supposed to go out and organize the unorganized. We should have been doing our job all along, though we weren't…. We liked our little haven of happiness and didn't care to share it with too many people was what it was."[65] The union survived the 1970s and 1980s, battered, but largely unchanged. The 1990s however, proved to be the turning point for local 309. They now faced the painful choice to either organize, or perish.

--The Nineties—

Between 1965 and 1990, "the electrical construction workforce grew from 200,000 to 550,000, yet International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers membership stayed relatively static at 140,000."[66] The IBEW had controlled 80 percent of electrical work nationwide, yet by the 1990s the percentage had decreased by one half.[67] The market had increased, while the union market share decreased. For a long time, Local 309, like most construction locals, had resisted change and especially organization. The desire for the "country club" atmosphere had to be eradicated, but the question was how?

The international office knew that organization was the key to rebuilding market share. As former President John J. Barry stated, "we had to do something because we could see the slippage in the numbers and the control of work…. Construction locals were in horrendous shape, for the most part, and organizing was a word that was foreign to their vocabularies."[68] Considering the diverse situations faced throughout the country organizing would have to be done on the local level. Organization in 309 was still "resisted with great force for many years even, when the big proclamation [from the IBEW calling for locals to devote more effort toward organizing] came down in 1987 it went pretty much unheeded until 1998. Where I was sitting three years ago, I didn't think that this was going to be a good thing for us," recalled Artie Minor.[69] One 309 wireman commented that, "it was just completely opposite of what everybody thought, I didn't say it out loud, but I thought to myself, it makes sense. I thought... that's what we should have been doing all along."[70]

Local men had to fight their old perceptions of non-union and the somewhat logical idea that "there is only so much work to go around." Taking on more members without gaining more of the market share would just cause more problems. Consequently, the union would not only have to bring in more non-union people, but it would have to acquire their market as well. Ever pressed by the international office, which had initiated the new COMET (Construction Organizing Membership Education Training) organizing campaign, local 309 finally began to face facts. This IBEW program dictated a plan of attack, but local 309 could organize as it pleased as long as it gained in market share and numbers. The task at hand was complex and burdensome, but 309 was able to make great strides toward changing the way they perceived their situation. 309 could no longer keep its doors closed. It could no longer afford to act in a closed minded manner.

The local had survived up to this point, due to its dedication to COPE and the abundance of work in their area. However, "historically, if it [309] did not have work at the Monsanto plant or at Granite City steel, men were "on the

bench"[laid off].[71] In the early 1990s these properties provided enough work to keep 309 going. Yet, "over the last 5 or 6 years that complexion has changed, because there hasn't been any work of great magnitude on either of those properties. The industry kept us going here until about 1995 and then we went commercial."[72] The late 1990s brought a new construction boom, but unlike that of the 1960s, this boom was primarily commercially based. White tickets were taken yet again, but the local attempted to take only loyal people as ticket help, and then fully organize them after they had worked for any length of time.

The 309 business office began organizing these white tickets and eventually extended their efforts to organizing local non-union contractors. This was not an easy task however, and the local had to figure out ways to combat non-union influence. 309 implemented a market recovery program, which intertwined organization with target money. The local, for the first time, hired a full-time organizer. This organizer then aggressively worked to take over non-union work, which was primarily residential. The local's historical indifference toward residential and the smaller work would soon change as it worked to combat the non-union's stronghold. "Three years ago we were probably down to 4 or 5 guys doing residential work, yet we probably have at least 40 now," notes Artie Minor. [73] The local worked to take the top people from these non-union shops, in the hopes that by taking the leaders, others would then follow. In many cases this worked, but the local needed to secure more work, not just take on more people.

To combat this, the union worked to organize entire non-union shops by wearing them down. The union used target money to subsidize a union contractor in order that they could underbid typically cheaper non-union outfits. The union then worked to take a non-union's top men while undercutting them with target money. This pushed some contractors against a wall and forced them to negotiate. Dave Foree explained, "that once they come to the table and we show them what we have to offer in the way of personnel training and other benefits, that many times closes the deal."[74]

Organizer Artie Minor also suggested that the issue of undercutting also pulls non-union contractors to their side. Non-union contractors who themselves are tired of being undercut by other non-union shops agree that, "undercutting is a race to the bottom instead of the top."[75] In the effort to get jobs by giving low bids, many outfits are not even making a profit. The counterproductive result of undercutting, "is an argument that you can really get across to a non-union contractor."[76]

The efforts of the last three years have resulted in the organization of around 100 formerly non-union electricians. In addition, the local has also begun to pick up more trade school graduates and qualified applicants. Consequently the number of apprentices has soared to more than 100. "The IBEW has gained 16 percent of the market share in the state of Illinois in the last 12 years," going from 74 percent to 90 percent of the market. This percentage represents the best within the IBEW. "The latest wireman's contract was for an increase of $4.50 over 4 years. This time, it was $5.80 over 4 years, plus the apprentices got a $4.40 raise. I have every reason to believe that the guy who follows me is going to do even better than that, and the reason is we are controlling more of the market," boasted Dave Foree.[77] Yet more work still needs to be done, for as Artie Minor suggests, "if you completely ignore the problem, who knows, you don't have to drive too far and there's 40 and 50 man non-union shops in St Louis."[78]

--Conclusion--

Ultimately, the 309 members faced a new reality and take a different perspective in relation to organization to save their work. Although, 309 faced less in the way of a direct non-union onslaught, it transformed to protect its smaller work. The local had to fight the old mentality of exclusion and the vision of non-union as the enemy. After all, the non-union men were just performing a job like anyone else. As one wireman suggests, "If a guy knew how to do something then why wouldn't he be entitled to do it? He is going to do it anyway. If he goes to school and he learns a trade and goes out on the non-union side, he is going to do that work because he is trained to do so, and he doesn't care whether the union wants him or not. It is gratifying work and it is not just because it is union or non-union work."[79]

The 309 membership realized that their mistakes, lost them the market share, and they had to reinvent the way they confronted the non-union challenge. No longer could these contractors just be ignored or intimidated. The contractors were organized, or battled with target money. In addition, the union misconception that non-union people were always less qualified or skilled was becoming a fiction. IBEW electricians realized that despite their extensive

training, some non-union outfits were just as skilled. Wiremen and lineman could no longer speculate that due to their extensive apprenticeship training they could hold a monopoly on the more complex types of work.

Local 309 electricians realized competing in this ever-changing market meant keeping up in every way, from training to organizing. The local made changes, due primarily to the pressure placed on them by their international union. The IBEW for that matter is the present leader in this organizing resurgence in the trades, and its COMET program has influenced all trades. Local 309 survived, but not because it perceived the problems of trade unions before others did. In truth, it acted quite late, but strong cooperation with state and local legislators and a strong work situation enabled them to survive. Even though 309 saw the light, there are still problems in many other areas across the country. Dave Foree suggests that, "even though the IBEW now is going up in numbers at the present time, its market share is not increasing with the market that is out there, so there is still not being enough done, even today. I don't think this holds presently for this particular area, but it does nationwide."[80] In addition, there are still internal problems as well. Some wireman have still not warmed up to the idea of organization. Another problem is, NECA (National Electrical Contractors Association) has accused Foree of "diluting the market, the membership resisted organization and so did the contractors: they don't want the competition."[81]

In conclusion, 309 did not spearhead any agendas or have the forethought to initiate a progressive movement. What they did do was wait until the last minute to realize that without change they were doomed. Thus this local is an example of how necessary change is for American trade unions, for without drastic measures, unions may cease to exist in this country. Whether people realize this or not, unions set regional wage standards and benefit working people in and outside of the unions, and in every form of labor. Losing organized labor means losing a collective voice of working people.

---

[1]This paper is dedicated to the memory of Michael Paul Tongay, decorated Navy firefighter, amateur bullrider, local 309 journeyman treetrimmer and Lineman's apprentice, father, brother, and son.
This paper was made possible in part by grant from the Undergraduate Research Council. My thanks also to Professor Edmund Wehrle for his guidance and help with this project.

[2] Don Schmeder, interview by author, Belleville Labor Museum, 10 Febuary 2002.

[3]Mark Linder, *Wars of Attrition: Vietnam, the Business Round table and the decline of Construction Unions* (Iowa City, 1999) 17.

[4] A "white ticket" or "card worker" is a person taken off the street to fill a work void for a trade union. This worker is paid the union scale, but receives no benefits or fringes and pays no dues. This ticket worker is not in any way a member of the union.

[5] A union business agent (BA) is the top executive officer of a local union. The BA negotiates contracts, resolves grievances between workers and contractors, deals with union monetary issues, appoints assistant BAs to represent each of the jurisdictions within the local, and has a myriad of other duties as well.

[6] Mike Faust, interview by author, Maryville, Ill., 9 February 2002.

[7] Linder, 18.

[8] David Foree, interview by author, Southwestern Illinois Building and Construction Trades Council office, Collinsville, Ill., 30 November 2001.

[9] *Electrical Workers Journal*, January 1967.

[10] *Electrical Workers Journal,* March 1967.

[11] "Traveling brothers" are called when certain IBEW locals need a greater workforce, when the local membership can not handle the amount of work. This serves as a helpful tool for IBEW locals, either to call more workers to their jurisdiction, or to send their own men away when local work is slow. Many IBEW members live their entire lives exclusively on traveling, either in the search of big overtime jobs, or to eventually settle in regions with a better pay scale.

[12] Foree, Interview.

[13] Ibid.

[14] Faust, Interview.

[15] *Electrical Workers Journal*, based on all local 309 admissions between 1966 and 1971.

[16] Foree, Interview.

[17] Linder, 40.

[18] Grace Palladino, *Dreams of Dignity Workers of Vision / a History of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers,* (Washington D.C., 1991), 187.

[19] Schmeder, Interview.

[20] Faust, Interview.

[21] Schmeder, Interview.

[22] Faust, Interview.

[23] Ibid.

[24] John Lorentzen, and Dave Sorge, *309: The History 1902-1977* , 33.

[25] United States of America v. International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers Local Union No. 309. No. 69-10, United States District Court; (E.D. Il, July, 3, 1969).

[26] Schmeder, Interview.

[27] Faust, Interview.

[28] A "boomer" was a non union construction worker who traveled across the country looking for large projects that required a mass of manpower.

[29] Faust, Interview.

[30] Ibid.

[31] Ibid.

[32] Ibid.

[33] Artie Minor, interview by author, Collinsville, IL, KofC Hall, 20 November 2001.

[34] David Key, interview by author, Paderborn, IL, 2 December 2001.

[35] Foree, Interview.

[36] Faust, Interview.

[37] *Electrical Workers Journal*, February 1969.

[38] Schmeder, Interview.

[39] Ibid.

[40] Jeff Grabelsky, and Mark Erlich, *Recent Innovations in the Construction Trades*, 169.

[41] Ibid.

[42] Ibid.

[43] Linder, 40-1.

[44] *Electrical Workers Journal*, February 1971.

[45] The word "inside" here refers to wiremans work, which represents the bulk of local 309's work. In technical terms, the wireman's work jurisdiction begins at the kernys or at the meter, or as the IBEW Constitution states, the wireman controls any work "beginning at the secondary side of the transformer" and that which does not interfere with lineman's jurisdiction in sec. 4. The wireman's jurisdiction and training encompasses a massive amount of duties in industrial, commercial, residential construction, and maintenance. The work encompasses lighting from inside to signal, heating and air control, motor control, any and all alarm systems, as well as communications.

[46] The word "outside" here refers to linemen's work which deals with utility work or power supply, and this work encompasses a vast array of duties as well. The IBEW Constitution defines their jurisdiction as being over, "the operation, maintenance, and repair of equipment owned or operated by utility employers." This work in effect covers a vast amount of duties, from building and maintaining substations to setting poles, setting high voltage towers, placing transformers, running underground wire from fiber optics to high voltage.

[47] *Electrical Workers Journal*, March 1972.

[48] Lorentzen and Sorge, 48.

[49] Key, Interview.

[50] *Electrical Workers Journal*, July 1972.

[51] Grabelsky. and Erlich, 170.

[52]

Key, Interview.

[53] Grabelsky and Erlich, 170.

[54] Minor, Interview.

[55] Foree, Interview.

[56] *Electrical Workers Journal*, July 1982.

[57] Ibid.

[58] Ibid.

[59] Key, Interview.

[60] Bacewski, Interview.

[61] Grabelsky and Erlich, 171.

[62] Ibid.

[63] Faust, Interview.

[64] Schmeder, Interview.

[65] Faust, Interview.

[66] Grabelsky and Erlich, 176.

[67] Minor, Interview.

[68] Palladino, 267.

[69] Ibid.

[70] Baczewski, Interview.

[71] Foree, Interview.

[72] Ibid.

[73] Minor, Interview.

[74] Foree, Interview.

[75] Minor, Interview.

[76] Ibid.

[77] Foree. Interview.

[78] Minor, Interview.

[79] Baczewski. Interview.

[80] Ibid.

[81] Ibid.

A Question of Honor (Review Essay)

Aaron Osborne

Kenneth S. Greenberg, *Masters and Statesmen: the political Culture of American Slavery*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1985.

Bertram Wyatt-Brown, Southern *Honor: Ethics and Behavior in the Old South* New York: Oxford University Press, 1982.

Some historians argue the South by the time of the Civil War was a culturally distinct nation from the North. What made the South so different? Obviously, a person can point to slavery, but there were subtler differences, which together formed a society unique from the North. An overarching sense of honor throughout the South was the driving force behind the behavior of members of Southern society. At least, that is the belief presented by Bertram Wyatt-Brown in his book *Southern Honor: Ethics and Behavior in the Old South* and shared, in part, by Kenneth S. Greenberg in his work *Masters and Statesmen: The Political Culture of American Slavery*. Wyatt-Brown early in his book provides a broad definition of honor:

> essentially the cluster of ethical rules, most readily found in societies, of small communities, by which judgments of behavior are ratified by community consensus. Family integrity, clearly understood hierarchies of leaders and subordinates, and ascriptive features of individuals and groups are guides for those evaluations (xv).

Greenberg never provides a direct definition of honor, possibly because he ties it in with republicanism. Also, it should be noted that although Wyatt-Brown does define honor he also offers other definitions when they are needed to help clarify a point he is trying to make. In fact, as Wyatt-Brown formulates and supports his otherwise very persuasive argument, he the constantly redefines honor. This occasional admittance that honor is too vague to clearly describe makes the reader start to think honor is perhaps just a buzz word applied by Southerner's themselves in hope of rationalizing their unique behavior from that of Northerners.

Southern Honor is based on a large body of primary literature including letters, court cases, and diaries as well as a substantial amount of secondary literature, with the latter being used to outline elements of behavior's relationship to honor. Wyatt-Brown believes it essential to use literature from Hawthorne to Twain as a means of introducing, and to better explaining honor. He believes the explanations to be necessary because it is almost impossible for a modern person to see how honor could exist in a violent culture that subjected an entire race to slavery. Greenberg also based his work on an extensive pool of primary and secondary literature that focuses the attention on the main argument:

> Masters wanted to exercise authority over free people in a way similar to the way they ruled slaves. Having authority in the statehouse and authority on the plantation reflected and reinforced each other (1).

Elements such as religion, law, morality, and politics constitute shaping elements such as republicanism and honor for Greenberg and Wyatt-Brown. In other words, these distinct institutions and beliefs combined together created a person's sense of honor. While Greenberg focuses a great deal on explaining the political effects of such elements, Wyatt-Brown treats the whole of Southern society with politics as only a part of the greater outlook.

Within *Southern Honor* there are two base types of honor that are discussed which, at times, work in tandem with one another and at other times cause contradictions in Southern society: primal honor and gentility. Primal honor takes its roots from such old European cultures such as the Anglo-Saxons and Germanic tribes. This type of honor was used to describe archaic values and found a home in justification or explanation of tragically violent events. Primal honor could be seen in acts such as lynching, and in attempts to explain misfortune of the South during the Civil War. Gentility was used to mark appropriate social ranking, and consisted of three parts, sociability, learning, and piety. The levels of gentility were so subtle that members of Southern society were not always sure they had acquired the rank of gentleman. With those two types of honor as his guidelines, Wyatt-Brown works to outline the varied aspects of Southern society including familial and gender hierarchy, expectations for civil white male behavior,

gambling and fighting, acceptance into certain cliques, and lynching and charivari.

Along with those social aspects of honor is the bolder argument that the cultural gap that developed between North and South, which led to the Civil War, is also tied in with honor. The idea of Southern honor being tied into secession is also discussed within the Greenberg work. Before going into more detail on how honor relates into all of the societal aspects mentioned above, note there is a potential flaw in the honor argument. As was said earlier, Wyatt-Brown offers many different views of honor throughout his book, and at one point he presents honor as an almost intangible force: "It existed not in authenticity of the self but in symbols, expletives, ritual speeches, gestures, half-understood impulses, externalities, titles, and physical appearances. All these might conform with rational, innovative thought and action, but often enough, they were diametrically opposed" (6). If someone is attempting to describe the causation of a certain behavior or event it is most easily understood in the realm of something that can be measured or singled out. Southern honor appears to be involved in everything and nothing at the same time. How can someone base their argument on a "half-understood impulse"? Wyatt-Brown appears to struggle with his own definition of honor.

Wyatt-Brown suggests that politics at home were just as important to a Southern white man as were city, state, or national politics. One important facet of home life was child rearing. Wyatt-Brown argues that child rearing in the South was unique in the way it "subjected young to flawed prescriptions of shame and humiliation and the ideals of hierarchy and honor, a mode in sharp contrast to the conscience-building techniques of pious Yankees" (118). Yet, after making the statement about the importance of honor to the difference between child rearing in the South and in the North, Wyatt-Brown qualifies his statement. Wyatt-Brown points out that it would be an error to consider honor as the principal guide in childcare, admitting some Southerners believed the traditional approach to be faulty. The reader is left wondering what was the principal approach to Southern child rearing, if there was one. Also, how did other approaches connect to honor and development of the child in later life? At what point did honor become the driving force behind a Southern white male's life?

Aside from familial relationships, another interesting part of Southern culture was the implementation of lynch law. Along with lynching Wyatt-Brown includes a study of charivari, which is a less violent form of mob action. Brown gives a comparison by describing charivari as "a less blood thirsty, more festive occasion, more parallel with church ritual and custom than was lynch law, which was more a complement to ordinary judicial procedure" (440). One typical example of charivari would have been tar and feathering. Commonly an act of lynching or charivari was carried out against someone because they were viewed to have dishonored a family or group. Since families and special organizations were the basis of Southern culture, an act against a certain person of high social standing was seen as an act against the community. Wyatt-Brown also uses lynching to support the idea that the South had become unique from the North since lynching had been dying out in the North before the Civil War, but remained strong in the South. He offers an explanation as to why the South continued to lynch:

> Only as society became more secular in character, more impersonal in its dealings, and more institutional in its forms of exchange and control did the ancient ideal of community justice erode. In the American South that transformation was somewhat slower than in the rest of the country. There, where a form of primal honor continued to flourish, one could find the same attitudes about aliens, deviants, and social underlings as once existed in very ancient times (442).

Wyatt-Brown convincingly argues that honor influenced, if not directly caused, acts such as lynching. One might wonder how he would examine the lynchings that did occur in the North around the time of the Civil War, even if they were fewer in number. Also, Wyatt-Brown limits his study of lynching to cases involving whites lynching African Americans, not offering an insight on how honor tied into the lynching of a white man.

How does honor relate to the causation of the Civil War? The Civil War was fought over slavery. In *Masters and Statesmen*, Greenberg works to display the almost bipolar personality of Southerners, mainly elites, by examining how republicanism and honor meant different things to the same man as they related to his life as a slave master and his life as a politician. As a Southern politician, a candidate was not supposed to actively seek public office because if someone strived to attain power it was seen as evidence of selfish ambition. Southerners typically viewed Northern politicians as aggressive, and therefore, corrupt. That was not the only aspect of Northern culture held in disdain by Southerners. One common fear was the subjection to the Northern system of labor, which Southerners worried could turn them into slaves themselves. As events in the antebellum U.S. led to a heightened sense of urgency over the question of slavery, Greenberg argues that Southerners could only foresee one outcome, "Southerners viewed the North as alien with its different labor system and foreign political culture. When community seemed impossible only

two options remained: to become an enslaver or to separate forever" (146). Wyatt-Brown reinforces the idea that Southerners saw themselves as having their collective backs to the wall. He asserts that the risks involved in secession mattered little to Southerners who believed their honor was at stake, and no matter the result, death was better than submission to the North. While both authors make a convincing argument that honor was related to secession, Wyatt-Brown would like to point to it as a major cause. Neither author can state with complete certainty that the North and South shared no similar qualities or that all Southerners took the idea of honor seriously.

The idea of disinterestedness towards holding public office was essential to Southern political culture, and honor was integral to passivity. Greenberg is forced to admit that passivity was not just a Southern phenomenon, and even Abraham Lincoln displayed passivity towards holding public office. Greenberg says that political passivity is a part of antebellum America and not just Southern political culture. Just as Greenberg was forced to admit that passivity was not unique to the South, Wyatt-Brown conceded that honor did not hold the same weight for every Southerner. He says, "Just as some Southerners were religious and others indifferent, so too some whites believed in honor and shame as the biblical stories presented them, whereas others took the ethic lightly" (25). Not only is it difficult to pin down exactly what honor is, it is also difficult to define its geographical scope and overall acceptance in the South.

Southern Honor does skillfully portray the South and the influence honor had on shaping practices and beliefs, but is not able to definitively portray honor as the main influence in Southern culture. At the base of *Southern Honor* is the assumption that Southern culture remained static for a number of years, from early colonial times until, in some respects, after the Civil War. Wyatt-Brown argues that the North and South were united under one common goal during the Revolutionary War, and since that time Southern mores experienced little change while changes occurred in the North at a much more rapid pace. From the assumption of a relatively unchanging Southern culture Wyatt-Brown uses evidence from many different time periods within the same chapter. It might have been useful to follow a chronological order and provide a comparison with what was happening in the North during the same time periods in order to make it clearer for the reader to see how the North and South diverged from one another with respect to honor. It also would have been interesting to see how Wyatt-Brown would have tackled passivity in politics in the same depth as Greenberg since it could have been used to strengthen Wyatt-Brown's over-all argument.

Wyatt-Brown states that "honor was a state of grace linking mind, body, blood, hand, voice, head, eyes, and even genitalia" (49). This definition of honor does not directly contrast with the first definition provided in this essay, but it appears to place honor in an individual's physical realm where honor, in the first example was a "cluster of ethical rules." If it is difficult to connect all of Wyatt-Brown's definitions of honor, it is also a struggle to accept that honor was the main driving force behind the acts of Southerners. And yet, it is impossible to deny that members of Southern society perpetuated some idea of gentility, or they would have, at least, liked to believe they were guided by a sense of honor.

Fallen No Longer:

A Review Essay of the Historiography of Prostitution in the United States

By Karen Klebbe
kklebbe@aol.com
217.766.8365

The story of prostitution is an ambiguous one, filled with ironies and contradictions. How did victimization or agency, dependence or independence, limitations or possibilities characterize these women's lives? It is moments of crisis that produce the records of prostitution; police records from run-ins with the law, reform movement reports, and scandals in newspapers. Historians have recognized that these sources often contain negative images of prostitutes as well as obscure their voices. As a result, historians have looked to other sources for examples of agency on the part of prostitutes. Once believed to have been a story solely about sex, historians have begun using prostitution to examine working-class culture, the history of women and sexuality, and the development of urban cultural, economic, and political life. By comparing recent histories of prostitution with earlier ones, this review essay seeks to chart the direction in which this historiography is heading.[1]

It is, of course, necessary to define prostitution. While some early historians defined any kind of sexual relations outside the conjugal bed as prostitution, later historians have refrained from making any such moral judgement. The common definition of

prostitute is one who habitually or sporadically has sexual relations for money. This definition does not include men or women engaged in "treating," the granting of sexual favors (not always intercourse) in return for such "treats" as dinners, entertainment, or items for personal adornment. Occasionally, such practices have been referred to as "amateur" prostitution and believed to be preferable to men, as it was cheaper than visiting a professional prostitute and believed to put one at less of a risk for disease.

Except in rare instances, the prostitute is assumed to be female. This is perhaps due to the covert and clandestine nature of male prostitution. George Ryley Scott, in his *History of Prostitution* (1936), claimed male prostitution to be as old as the female branch, just practiced more surreptitiously. Perhaps the attention given to female prostitution has overshadowed it. In *City of Eros: New York City, Prostitution, and the Commercialization of Sex, 1790-1920* (1992), historian Timothy Gilfoyle presents the conviction of Peter Sewally as an example of male prostitution. Arrested in New York in 1836, the black Sewally was charged with grand larceny. It was neither his crime nor his race that drew the attention of the authorities, but the feminine attire he was wearing at the time. He adopted the alias of Mary Jones and lived in a Greene Street brothel, where he claimed to perform domestic tasks as well as greeting male patrons. Gilfoyle asserts that Sewally's employment in the brothel most likely involved more than domestic tasks and greeting, revealing that certain forms of male prostitution were tolerated and even linked to the brothel subculture. Gilfoyle also offers as evidence the prosecution of brothels by several New York district attorneys for "harboring" young boys, presumably to prostitute them to male clients. The lack of attention historians give to male prostitution may be due to little information. Most historians of prostitution rely substantially on court records for information, as it is usually only when a prostitute was arrested that any evidence of her existence was produced. With the examination of nineteenth-century court records involving sodomy charges, some historians have concluded that homosexuality was not perceived as a threat to the family in the same manner as female prostitution. Homosexuality, as we define it today, was not perceived as sexuality, identity, or a social problem in the nineteenth-century. This could account for the lesser interest in male prostitution.

Though professed to be the "world's oldest profession," prostitution was not always an urgent social problem. In the early colonial period, the shortage of women and the desperate need for domestic labor guaranteed most women economic security as well as the protection of family and community. That the colonies were largely rural and agrarian also stymied the growth of a professional class of prostitutes. Religious leaders were more concerned with adultery and fornication outside of marriage than the exchange of sex for money. As Ruth Rosen, in *The Lost Sisterhood: Prostitution in America, 1900-1918* (1982), suggests, prostitution was a temporary state of sin, a personal vice, rather than an occupation or status.

This began to change with the industrialization and urbanization of America in the 1820s, starting in New England and the Mid-Atlantic States. The majority of early factory workers were young and unmarried females relocated from rural settings. In addition to being difficult, early factory work was low paying, often below starvation wages for women. Some young women resorted to prostitution in order to supplement their meager wages. In the growing metropolitan areas, there was a large unmarried and transient male population. Here the prostitute also found a large class of customers in newly arrived immigrants, as shown in Vern Bullough and Bonnie Bullough's *Women and Prostitution: A Social History* (1987). As more women poured into urban areas, the economy of industrialization did not expand fast enough to provide them with stable high paying work. The few occupations

open to women became oversaturated, consistently keeping the wages low. Nickie Roberts in her work, *Whores in History* (1992), shows how these economic conditions were the basis of an unprecedented boom in prostitution in the nineteenth-century.

It was this boom in prostitution that caused Dr. William Sanger to survey 2,000 prostitutes in 1855 (see his *History of Prostitution*, rev. ed., 1919). Sanger was the resident physician of the penitentiary hospital on Blackwell's Island in New York City, where patients were sentenced from the Court of Sessions or committed to the workhouse by police for vagrancy, drunkenness, or disorderly conduct. Not only did Sanger study prostitution all over the world from antiquity to the modern day, he questioned 2,000 New York female prostitutes on everything from their age, residency, and previous occupations to their marital status, number of children, and drinking habits. He classified the different kinds of prostitutes (mistress, brothel worker, women who worked out of a saloon or dance hall, and streetwalker) as well as the sites of prostitution, namely the parlor house, the brothel, the house of assignation, saloons, and the street. His general profile of a New York City prostitute is thus: young, foreign-born, unmarried, born one child, and from a poor working class family which had experienced some sort of economic/emotional trauma prior to her entrance to prostitution. Sanger also believed the prostitute spent on average only four years in the profession before succumbing to occupational hazards (alcoholism, syphilis) which resulted in her premature death. Marilynn Wood Hill, in *Their Sisters' Keepers: Prostitution in New York City, 1830-1870* (1993), argues that Sanger interpreted his results within a Victorian moralistic and middle class framework with certain biases against the culture of immigrants and the poor. Sanger's finding that 62% of the prostitutes interviewed were foreign born did not necessarily correlate to the general population of prostitutes. He did not take into account the fact the pool of prostitutes from which he was extracting his information were all convicted, and discounted the possibility of foreign women being targeted more by police than their native counterparts. As Hill notes, immigrant women, often poor and less valued than native-born women, may have had trouble finding well paying jobs and resorted to prostitution more often than American-born women.

When asked, "What was the cause of your becoming a prostitute?" over half the women surveyed replied *inclination* or *destitution*. By *inclination*, Sanger interpreted it to mean a voluntary resort in order to gratify the sexual passions and that these passions could only be awakened by some outside influence, be it the companionship of a prostitute or a member of the opposite sex. In a time when virtuous women were without passion or sexual desire, to concede sexual desire to prostitutes, Sanger implicitly labels them "deviant," placing them in the category of "the other." This plays into the representation of the prostitute as either the victim of seduction/abandonment, though only approximately 15% of those surveyed claimed this, or depraved. Yet Sanger does little analysis with the answer of *destitution*, other than acknowledge that working women's wages were so low as to necessitate supplementing.

Bullough and Bullough suggest that Sanger was using his study to bring about the regulation of prostitution in the United States with the purpose of preventing venereal disease. As Sanger notes,

> But if history proves that prostitution can not be suppressed, it also demonstrates that it can be regulated, and directed into channels where its most injurious results can be encountered, and its dangerous tendencies either entirely arrested or materially weakened.[2]

Proposing the surveillance of registered prostitutes by a medical bureau to be established within the police department,

prostitution's most injurious results (i.e. syphilis) would be contained and prevented from contaminating innocent wives and children of men who consort with prostitutes. Sanger continues,

> If (a physician) were to pronounce a girl infected, the world has no security that she will not continue her avocation; in order to remove all doubt upon this question she should be instantly removed to an institution where she can not possibly propagate the malady. This must be done under conjoint medical and police authority.[3]

Sanger advocates the incarceration of prostitutes (presumably against their will) in order to prevent the spread of disease to "innocents." He claims that forcing a diseased woman to treatment in no way interferes with her personal liberty, comparing venereal disease to the spread of smallpox or yellow fever. The diseased prostitute's freedom endangers every member of the community and is therefore a matter of public health.

Attempts at regulation failed, primarily due to the opposition of newly organized women's groups that claimed licensing was useless, as only a small percentage of prostitutes registered and men were not inspected. With the advent of the Progressive Era, the hey day of prostitution came to an end. Rosen notes that while Victorians considered prostitution to be a "necessary evil" that protected middle class women from the passions of men, and the prostitute to be a protector of domesticity, later prostitution became "the social evil," a moral problem on a national level. While the social purity reforms resulted in the closing down of red-light districts in most American cities, prostitution did not disappear. It became more clandestine and went underground, taking the new forms of massage parlors and call girls. The control of prostitution shifted from the madams of the brothels and the prostitute herself to pimps and crime syndicates. In essence, the power and control of prostitution shifted to men.

Almost seventy-five years after Sanger's study the call for legalization and regulation of prostitution was still being heard. Another doctor, William J. Robinson, demanded that prostitution be declared legal, as it will always exist since it satisfies a definite and important biological need (see his *The Oldest Profession in the World*, 1929). Robinson cites five major reasons women become prostitutes (in order of importance): they are strongly sexed women, unable to find a husband/lover, homosexuals, poor/desirous of luxury, and/or have impotent husbands. With the recognition of active female sexuality during this time period, it is of little wonder Robinson, a sexologist, placed the female sex drive as the number one reason women went into prostitution. In fact, the female sex drive played a role in four out of the five reasons given. While not denying economic causes exist in the choice of prostitution for most women, Robinson cautions potential exaggeration of these causes. It is a love for luxury, desire for ease, and freedom from the shop, factory, or domestic service that inspires women to prostitution and not on-the-brink-of-starvation poverty. Robinson even becomes comical; suggesting it is women's love of clothes (a "fact") that cause even married women to enter into prostitution. The reasons men patronize prostitutes is just as comedic and almost three times as long, from man being naturally polygamous, to the ill-health of one's wife, to sexual perversions. Robinson views the prostitute as providing a vital civic function. The prostitute makes monogamous marriage bearable for men, in that the variety she brings may inspire desire for one's wife. The prostitute also make marriage bearable for the wife in that she protects the wife from her husband's excessive virility and its potential violence should he not acquire satisfactory relief. For these and other reasons, prostitution should be made legal, judged as an occupation of public utility, and come under sanitary, not police, control.

George Ryley Scott continued on in this vein with his work, *A History of Prostitution from Antiquity to the Present Day*. Arguing that the true cause of prostitution is the biological and physiological urge of virile men to have intercourse with a female, Scott finds men to be essentially polygamous. This results in the majority of men using prostitutes since few can afford multiple wives. What is interesting about Scott's view of prostitution is that he unabashedly places the blame for prostitution on men, finding it

> Strange that…students of the subject should present as the major cause of prostitution the economic need of woman…The need for woman to earn a living outside orthodox respectable forms of labour, and of marriage, does not mean, as is so often submitted, that prostitution must exist. The real cause is the sexual appetite of man. This appetite creates the demand for fornication outside the married state; and the fact that man is willing to pay for the means of satisfying his sexual requirements bring into being the professional prostitute.[4]

This is a view little explored by other early historians of prostitution.

Scott believed that women entered into prostitution not out of an inability to find work, but because of a dissatisfaction with their station in life, prostitution could provide them with the funds to rise above their station. Scott attributes the decline of professional prostitution to the increased promiscuity found within the respectable (read middle) classes and the practice of "treating." Scott does not predict that prostitution will die out; quite the opposite, it will forever exist in one form or another as long as men are willing to pay for their sexual satisfaction.

The benchmark of recent scholarship on prostitution is Judith Walkowitz's *Prostitution and Victorian Society* (1980), a study of the Contagious Disease Acts enacted in England in the 1860s. While a study in class and gender in mid-Victorian Britain, the controversy of the acts themselves generated massive documentation about the lives and actions of actors, such as prostitutes, largely missing from the larger historical narrative. Walkowitz opposes the portrayal of prostitutes as silent victims of social injustices and male oppression and instead claims them as important historical actors. Working-class women, Walkowitz finds, looked at prostitution as the best in a series of unattractive alternatives. These women were not without agency; they negotiated prices, exploited customers while being exploited, often controlled their own labor, and lived together as a distinct female subgroup within their own working class communities.

From examining the registered prostitutes in Plymouth and Southampton, Walkowitz draws the conclusion that, since most women were in their early twenties, their experience of having previously been employed is likely, as is some kind of noncommercial sexual activity. The women also appeared to have left prostitution by their mid twenties, having only stayed in the profession for a few short years. Walkowitz finds this transition consistent with their working class counterparts as a time when most settled into a domestic situation with a man. It appears that as long as prostitution was a temporary period in a woman's life, she was not forever stigmatized nor limited in her future choices. This finding is very different from Sanger, the nineteenth-century observer, and his belief that all prostitutes lived no more than four years after entering the profession (although one could see the two analyzing the same set of facts—a transitory community—and arriving at different conclusions/explanations). The working-class fluid view of marriage and sexuality supported the community tolerance of prostitution. Many women lived out of wedlock with men, were married and deserted or practiced self-divorce. Prostitutes were also tolerated in the working class community

because of the financial contribution these women made to their communities through exorbitant rents, dressmakers, hairdressers, washerwomen, and the like.

Another incredibly influential work is Rosen's *The Lost Sisterhood*. Rosen's work examines the growth of urban prostitution, the reactions of a reform-obsessed society, and the progressive era legislation that resulted from this obsession. Like Walkowitz, Rosen believes focusing on a traditionally marginalized group brings the societal structure and cultural values of a society to light. The periodically uneasy truce between prostitution and society in the nineteenth-century ended as a result of forces that were transforming the societal order: urbanization, second wave immigration and industrialization, black migration to the northern cities, challenges to Victorian morality, and changes in family and class structure. The prostitute became a powerful symbol for these little understood socioeconomic issues. She explores the reformers' massive publicizing of white slavery, and shows it to be more hysteria among the middle-class than a reality. Rosen concludes that white slavery stories were an acceptable form of pornographic entertainment as well as overshadowing the true social and economic reasons women ventured into prostitution. Rosen, like Walkowitz, argues that women entered into prostitution because they profited from prostitution, occasionally even achieving upward mobility. Prostitution was a microcosm of the greater society. Few reformers made the connection and viewed the subculture as the greatest social evil in America, a very top-down perspective. From the bottom up, however, prostitution offered an ugly and often times brutal, but nonetheless viable method of achieving the socially acceptable goal of material wealth in a society that became increasingly based on consumer culture.

Compared to Walkowitz and Rosen's groundbreaking work, Anne Butler almost takes a step backwards with her study of prostitution in the American West, *Daughters of Joy, Sisters of Misery* (1985). While Butler agrees that prostitution was a form of employment and prostitutes were not helpless victims, she does not completely accept prostitution as a deliberate career decision as do Walkowitz and Rosen. The post-Civil War frontier, with its overwhelmingly male population, created an atmosphere where prostitution could and did flourish in an open manner. Many women faced a particularly dismal economic situation as frontier work was mostly closed to them, there was a shortage of work, paltry wages, and inflated prices. According to Butler, these are the causes of frontier prostitution. The realistic economic gains of prostitution were marginal, as most of their clientele were fellow workers with little money. Poverty continually kept prostitutes at the margins.

Butler also wishes to challenge the notion that the frontier welcomed prostitution in its infancy, only to reject prostitution as frontier society grew and became more stable. Her proof of this later rejection is the establishment of red-light districts in western cities and towns, which segregated prostitutes from the rest of society. Yet the evidence may suggest the opposite; that is the segregation of prostitution could be the acknowledgement of its place in society. This is an argument Butler does not explore.

Prostitutes attempted to find security and stability in permanent relationships just like other women during the nineteenth-century. Marriage and family life did not mandate retirement from the profession. Butler claims that the types of men prostitutes married, frequently saloon owners or pimps, brought violence and chaos to their lives, as it was expected that the women would continue to supplement the family income after marriage. Surprisingly, Butler herself imposes Victorian middle-class values on her subjects. She assumes that the women would have preferred to have ceased working and been in the home. Nor does she

acknowledge that prostitutes may not have regarded their sexual services or the disorderliness of their lives as particularly unusual or undesirable. Prostitutes are poor mothers, she writes, since,

> Prostitution hardly encouraged the most admirable traits of motherhood. Only the strongest personality could have worked as a prostitute and still risen above the corruption, dissipation, and poverty of the profession to rear children in a balanced, stable home atmosphere. This did not happen, for prostitutes had neither the energy nor skills to overcome the social and economic stagnation that encompassed them and their children…the relationships that prostitutes maintained with their children, like those with their husbands, soured and warped all the participants.[5]

There are no footnotes given for this kind of claim. She continually emphasizes scandalous stories of prostitutes' alcoholism, fights with each other, and suicides as other examples of their "wretchedness." By focusing on these particular aspects of the women's lives, Butler fails to acknowledge the social context in which these women lived. In her attempt to demystify the image of the glamorous prostitute of the west with a heart of gold, she instead presents a pitiful victim who lacks the agency to change her "degraded" position.

The Magdalenes: Prostitution in the 19th Century (1990), Linda Mahood's look at Victorian Scottish prostitution through the medical profession, organized philanthropy, and the local state, has undoubtedly been influenced by Walkowitz and Rosen's previous work. With the founding of Magdalene asylums and the lock hospital (the Glasgow system) in response to the Contagious Disease Acts of the 1860s in Great Britain transformed the structure of prostitution. The term prostitute appears continuously throughout the book in quotations as recognition of the fact it is a label dispensed by middle class observers and not an objective form of human behavior. Mahood's study emphasizes women's possibility of agency by concentrating on the form of resistance or acceptance of the moral code offered by the asylums and lock hospitals.

Though not written by an academic historian, *Whores in History* bears mention, if for no other reason other than it was written by a former sex worker, Nickie Roberts. Roberts traces prostitution and women's role in society from the Stone Age to our present day, using the word whore throughout, in an effort to reclaim it and defuse it of its pejorative overtones. While producing no new scholarship herself, Roberts freely admits to resting on the work of Walkowitz and Rosen, among others. She does do an excellent job of illustrating how the state itself pimps off the prostitute by creating a multitude of state employees- vice-squad cops, lawyers and judges, social workers, prison wardens and guards. Roberts puts prostitution on the feminist agenda by arguing that the whore stigma is the original tool of the patriarchy to oppress women, divide them from each other, and subordinate them to men. She writes,

> Uncomfortable as it may be for some feminists, though, it is implicit in the demand that women have control over their own bodies that they also have the right to sell their sexual services, if they wish to. There is no way that this can continue to be left off the feminist agenda; for what feminists and gays have been saying for twenty years now is that *no one should have the right to legislate over the consensual sexual choices of other*.[6]

More than an economic choice, Roberts argues that prostitution is about retaining control over one's sexuality.

City of Eros (1992) and *Their Sister's Keepers* (1993), written by Timothy Gilfoyle and Marilynn Wood Hill respectively, both cover nineteenth-century prostitution in New York City. Through analysis of real estate patterns of prostitution, the rise of an urban sporting male culture, and institutions of public leisure and commercial exchange, Gilfoyle identifies a three-part evolution of

sex, from the sacred to the secular phenomenon, and back to the sacred. Gilfoyle also produces a historical cartography of New York's commercial sex in the nineteenth-century by charting the changing geography of brothels. As a symbol of social degeneration for some and a public and popular activity for many, prostitution was highly ambiguous. It was not just sex for hire, according to Gilfoyle, but hotly contested cultural terrain. A certain paradox, prostitution represented the height of exploitation for women, yet rarely did other forms of labor offer such big financial gains. For men, it was a time of easy sexual exploration and freedom, but one that was inevitably linked to the limits of one's financial resources. Gilfoyle ends by noting that the brothel declined due to a number of forces. The increase in "treating" and premarital sex made prostitution less necessary or attractive to single men. It was also cheaper. Further, as women made gains in the service sector and white collar jobs, their wages and working conditions increased, making prostitution less an economic necessity.

In *Their Sisters' Keepers*, Marilynn Wood Hill argues that the positive appeal and rewards of prostitution drew a variety of women into the profession. Whether as a temporary measure or long-term commitment, the financial rewards of prostitution were significant. However, Hill claims that beyond the reasonably comfortable standard of living, for many, the control of one's own labor, and the support networks of other prostitutes and brothel madams offered significant, albeit less tangible, rewards. Hill uses numerous and varied sources for information, including census data, police and court documents, tax and property records, brothel directories, as well as the reports of reform organizations. Despite the litany of sources, it is Hill's use of the personal letters of Helen Jewett, a popular prostitute in New York City during the 1830s, that is the most convincing of her argument that prostitutes enjoyed a broad range of positive human relationships. Jewett's correspondence with friends and co-workers show these women supporting one another by sharing homes, leisure activities, visiting, money lending, and nursing in times of ill-health. Her correspondence with her customers is marked with affection rather than oppression. The letters appear more like those between lovers and not a prostitute and her customer. With examples of court cases, Hill, like Gilfoyle, demonstrates how prostitutes asserted their rights as citizens by suing customers, landlords, even each other. Hill focuses on brothel prostitutes, though this is most likely due to the sources available. Brothel prostitutes were more likely than streetwalkers to show up in censuses, tax records, and court cases. Hill urges the need to view prostitutes as people involved in the fullest range of human relationships, plagued by problems but given opportunities as well related to their profession and their gender.

While there is a good deal of work produced about nineteenth-century prostitution, the field is by no means satiated. There are few, if any, works solely devoted to the minority prostitute or the streetwalker. Much of this lack of scholarship is due to a deficiency in sources about these women, but there the challenge lies. These women certainly existed; the trick is to find them. Nor has prostitution, after the progressive era, been much addressed *by historians*. Using prostitution to look at the cultural, political, and economic life of the mid-to late-twentieth-century will be the next phase of scholarship in its history.

Regarded by early nineteenth-century reformers as depraved women with character defects, historians increasingly see prostitutes not as "fallen" women. By focusing on the every-day lives of prostitutes and the social and economic forces affecting their behavior, recent studies retrieve prostitution from the culture of depravity and crime. Believed to be a "necessary evil" by the Victorians, a "social evil" by the Progressives of the early twentieth-century, prostitution is today viewed by historians as a choice

among few economic opportunities for poor and working-class women. Prostitution has become the perfect microhistory with which to study the structures of a society's sexual, economic, and even political life.[7] No longer marginalized, historians now integrate prostitution into the larger historical narrative.

---

[1]This essay reviews Vern Bullough and Bonnie Bullough, *Women and Prostitution: A Social History*, rev. ed. (Buffalo, NY, 1987); Anne Butler, *Daughters of Joy, Sisters of Misery: Prostitutes in the American West*, 1865-1890 (Urbana, IL., 1985); Timothy Gilfoyle, *City of Eros: New York, Prostitution, and the Commercialization of Sex 1790-1920* (New York, 1992); and "Prostitutes in History: from Parables of Pornography to Metaphors of Modernity," *American Historical Review* (Winter, 1999); Marilynn Wood Hill, *Their Sisters' Keepers: Prostitution in New York City 1830-1870* (Berkeley, CA., 1993); Linda Mahood, *The Magdalenes: Prostitution in the 19th Century* (London, 1990); Nickie Roberts, *Whores in History: Prostitution in Western Society* (London, 1992); William J. Robinson's *The Oldest Profession in the World* (New York, 1929); Ruth Rosen, *The Lost Sisterhood: Prostitution in America 1900-1918* (Baltimore, 1982); William Sanger's *The History of Prostitution*, rev. ed. (New York, 1919); George Ryley Scott, *A History of Prostitution from Antiquity to the Present Day* (New York, 1936); and Judith Walkowitz, *Prostitution and Victorian Society: Women, Class, and the State* (Cambridge, 1980).

[2] Sanger, *The History of Prostitution*, 20.

[3] Ibid., 646.

[4] Scott, *A History of Prostitution*, 20.

[5] Butler, *Daughters of Joy*, 41.

[6] Roberts, *Whores in History*, 355.

[7] For a similar argument, see Timothy Gilfoyle's *American Historical Review* article "Prostitutes in History: From Parables of Pornography to Metaphors of Modernity."